

As a case-study, here we will look at the Ae series by Hand 42, and the tablets that appear to have been filed either with it or close to it. By examining the contents of these tablets, we may be able to determine the reasons for their spatial association in the AC. There seems to be several points of agreement between the Ae tablets and their neighbors that suggest they were intentionally filed together.

First, the similarity between the spill-routes of the Ea and Ae series is striking (figures 1 and 2). The Ea series appears in two groups, one in Room 7 and the other in Room 8. There is nothing apparent in the contents of each group to suggest that they should be considered administratively distinct units. It may be the case that they came into the AC at different times, but would have eventually been filed as a single unit. As can be seen in figure 2, the Ea series covers the length of Room 8, from the top of one section of the bench to the other. This does appear to be a fairly chaotic spill-route, with no certain starting point. However, when a lines are drawn between fragments of the same tablet (as in figure 2), it is apparent that some of these stray fragments broke off of tablets that fell along a straightforward spill-route, suggesting that the Ea series was filed as a single unit, and fell along a clear, straight path. Likewise, the Ae series also fell along a direct route, stretching from the top of one section of the bench to the other. These two series are the only ones to share this spill-route. This suggests that they were shelved very close to each other.⁴ The contents of the two series may shed some light on the reason behind their proximity.

The Ea series is concerned with land relating to the *lawagetas*.⁵ Although *ti-no* and *me-te-to* have been suggested, the location of this land is not certain, as the information in the tablets is not organized in the same manner as, e.g. the En/Eo series, in which the data recorded suggests a land survey of a restricted geographical area.⁶ Several plots of land recorded in this series is held on behalf of shepherds, cowherds and swineherds. Together, they are mentioned a total of seventeen times in these texts. Parallel to this, the Ae tablets by Hand 42 primarily list men appointed to watch over livestock for various individuals at various sites. The term used most often for these animals – *qe-to-ro-po-pi* – is generic, and could be applied to any type of livestock. Additionally, two names are found on both the Ea and Ae texts. *ta-ra-ma-ta* is found in the Ea and Ae series, and is unique to these two series, with the possible exception of Vn 851.⁷ He occurs in the Ea series five times and in the Ae series three times. *du-ni-jo* is prominent in both series as well. He does occur on several other texts from other series and may be the same person, although there is no absolute evidence for this.⁸

⁴ It should be noted that only 146 tablets and tablet fragments were found on the bench in room 8. Accordingly, the fact that Ae tablets were found with Ea tablets in *two* different parts of the bench on opposite sides of the room increases the likelihood that they were originally filed together.

⁵ As noted in previous studies of the Ea series. Most recently, see S. Deger-Jalkotzy, “Noch einmal zur Ea-Serie von Pylos,” in *Texts, Tablets and Scribes: Studies in Mycenaean Epigraphy and Economy offered to Emmett L. Bennett, Jr.* (1988), pp. 97-122. Also on the Ea series: M. Lejeune, “Analyse du dossier pylien Ea,” *Minos* 15 (1974) pp. 81-115; E.L. Bennett, Jr., “The Landholders of Pylos,” *AJA* 60 (1956), pp. 103-133; E.L. Bennett, Jr., “Pylian landholding jots and titles,” *Res Mycenaeae*, pp. 41-54; C.J. Ruijgh, “Observations sur la série PY Ea,” *Proceedings of the VIIth Congress of the International Federation of the Society of Classical Studies II* (Budapest 1984) pp. 477-483.

⁶ For a summary, see M. Lindgren, *The People of Pylos II* (1973), p. 187. On the function of the En and Eo tablets, see E.L. Bennett, Jr., n.5.

⁷ The name on the latter tablet is transcribed as]ta-ra-ma-ta.

⁸ Lindgren proposes that he is probably the same person as on An 192 and On 300.

The similarities between these two series warrant looking at the texts in more detail. The locations mentioned in the H42 Ae series (five tablets in the series do not have a place designated) are *i-na-ni-ja* (two times), *a-ti-ri-ja* (once), *a-si-ja-ti-a* (once), and *pu-ro* (once). Two of these places are identifiable: *pu-ro*, and *a-si-ja-ti-ja*, which is one of the seven district capitals in the Further Province lists.

The two toponyms that are undefined are *a-ti-ri-ja* – if this is in fact a place name – which is a hapax, and *i-na-ni-ja*. The only other mention of *i-na-ni-ja* is on An 18. This text *may* have some administrative similarities to the Ea and Ae series, although the evidence is sketchy. An 18 twice lists one man at *i-na-ni-ja* (once in the abbreviated form *i-na-ne*) as well as cowherds at *ti-no*. It should also be noted that this tablet was found on the bench in room 8, along the spill-route of these two series.

There may also be one other point to be made. As noted earlier, it has been suggested that the lawagesian land of the Ea series is in *ti-no*. This is based largely on Xa 565, listing *ke-re-te-u-ti-no*, perhaps with a word divider after “*ke-re-te-u*”. I have looked at the photograph of the tablet, and it at least seems possible that this is the case. There is a *ke-re-te-u* that is prominent in the Ea series, and this reconstruction of Xa 565 would suggest that *ti-no* is a place name. While at this point it cannot at all be demonstrated that *ti-no* and *i-na-ni-ja* are in close proximity on the basis of An 18, the possibility may prove stronger if we are better able to understand the mechanisms behind the filing system. It may be that the individuals recorded in the Ae series are working the land recorded in the Ea series. This would place the landholdings of the Ea series in various parts of the Pylian kingdom, which may explain why the location of the Ea land has proven to be so difficult. It may be a series created to record land unified not by location, but rather by type.

Between the Ea and Ae series, there are a number of similarities. The spill-routes suggest that they were shelved close together. There are two prominent personal names that are found in both series. The subject matter is similar, in that the Ea series lists several plots of land owned by shepherds, a swineherd, and a cowherd, while the Ae series is a record of people watching over *qe-to-ro-po-pi*. Finally, the locations with which both series are concerned may be close to one another in some instances. This does not suggest that the Ea and Ae series are directly related, complementary series. Rather, these series may reveal the method behind the filing system at Pylos. Any combination of the above-mentioned similarities – personal names, toponyms, and contents – may have prompted the responsible official to shelve these series in close proximity.

There is little that can be said about the three other Ae tablets by H42. The name Korudallos on Ae 26 is a hapax. The two remaining tablets may potentially be revealing. Ae 110 and Ae 303 record slaves of the key-bearer and priestess at Pylos. These two officials are *exclusively* listed together on the verso of Un 6, which records offerings to Poseidon and *pe-re-**82. Un 6 was found in the same place as many of the Ae tablet fragments, on the bench. It is unclear whether Ae 26, which also records slaves, is somehow related to these tablets. Unfortunately, it is difficult to see how the Ae series, Ea series, and Un 6 may all be directly related to each other by content.

In addition to the Ae series, H42 is responsible for nine other tablets.⁹ All but two of these tablets were also found on the bench in room 8. Again, these tablets have

⁹ Ua 9, Fa 16, Ua 17, Ua 25, Un 47, An 128, Un 138, Ua 434, and Va 482.

features in common, even if their exact relation is not easily discernable. There is further overlap in individuals and commodities. H42 records cypress for a horse (*i-qo*) on Fa 16, a tablet which was found among the Ea tablets on the bench. On Ea 59, H43 recorded land given to *ke-re-te-u*, for the sake of a horse (*e-ne-ka i-qo-jo*). He also records *ke-re-te* on An 128.3. Also on Un 138, H42 again presents a record concerning *du-ni-jo*. Finally, five of these tablets by H42 are U-series texts, several of which are concerned with sheep, goats, pigs, and cattle. Accordingly, between the Ea tablets, Ae tablets, and the other tablets by H42, we find land owned by animal herders, individuals assigned to watch over animals, and finally records of the animals themselves.

Again, it is difficult to determine the administrative correlation between these series. However, by studying the find-spots of these tablets, the scribal hands, and the terms used in the texts, we may be able to understand these tablets not as isolated series, but rather as “filing units,” which either share similar information which lends them to a similar filing place, or perhaps several series are ultimately the record of a single administrative action.

When the original locations of other tablet series can be determined and their contents, personal names and place names considered, we can better assess what factors affect the filing locations of tablets. The main series in this case study suggest that there were similar features between tablets that caused them to be filed together, and that there does appear to be a system behind the filing process in the Archives complex at Pylos.

Figure 1: Find-spots of the Ae tablets by Hand 42. Lines connect fragments of the same tablet.

Figure 2: Find-spots of the Ea tablets. Lines connect fragments of the same tablet.

