The Ae series at Pylos is rather small and poorly understood. It is comprised of 19 tablets and tablet fragments. The series can be further divided by hand. Here we are concerned only with the ten Ae tablets drafted by Hand 42 (H42). Seven of these tablets (Ae 8, 27, 72, 108, 134, 264, and 489) are similar in format and content. Each tablet records one man, his name, his occupation, the person for whom he works and, in some cases, where he works. In all cases, the man being recorded is employed to watch over cattle or quadrupeds. Ae 134 is characteristic of the layout of tablets in this group:

```
a       o-ro-me-no
  ke-ro-wo , po-me , a-si-ja-ti-ja , o-pi , ta-ra-ma-o qe-to-ro-po-pi VIR 1
```

Kerowos the shepherd at Asijatija watching over the quadrupeds of Thalamatas MAN 1

The other three tablets list slaves of Korudallos (Ae 26), the slave of the key-bearer (Ae 110), and 14 female slaves of the priestess for the sake of sacred gold (Ae 303). While these tablets together seem to be an occupational headcount, little information regarding the reason for their creation can be determined via internal analysis. However, a consideration of the find-spots of this series may help to contextualize it within the main tablet archive at Pylos. This may permit us to determine the original placement of the tablets on shelves in Room 8, the main archives room in the Archives Complex (AC). The spill-route of a series of tablets – that is, the path along which a group of tablets fell – suggests that the tablets were originally shelved at either end of this spill-route. If a tablet series is found in a small, constricted cluster on the floor or a bench, we can propose that these tablets did not fall very far or violently, perhaps falling straight down after a shelf or table burned. The latter case is well-attested in Room 7, where most tablet series are concentrated together in small heaps.

Reconstructing the original locations of these tablets offers further details about the function of individual tablet series, as well as the organization of the AC. First, we can better assess the “rules” of the filing system. Tablet series which are filed next to one another should have some common feature that suggested that they should be stored as a “filing unit,” or a cluster of several series. By studying find-spots and reconstructing the original positions of the tablets in Room 8, we can determine the features that distinguished one filing unit from another. These distinguishing features may include the geographical location concerned, personal names, or the commodities involved – assuming that the filing of these tablets was not a random act. Second, if a few “filing units” can be identified, perhaps the primary rules of filing can be determined from these few samples. These samples may further suggest how other series were related and even allow us to reconstruct the original location of individual tablets, such as Tn 316, or some of the An texts.

---

1 These tablets are: Ae 8, 26, 27, 72, 108, 110, 134, 264, 303, and 489. The readings of these tablets remain unchanged in J.L. Melena et al, PoN IV: The Inscribed Documents. The Ae series is probably not a unified series. There are several hands involved, the tablets of the series were found in four different rooms of the palace, and their content and data are inconsistent.

2 The terms used for the animals are me-tu-ra, (mi t u | a ) on Ae 8, 72, and 264, and qe-to-ro-po-pi, or “quadrupeds” on Ae 27, 108, 134, and 489.

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. 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 lavagetas. 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. 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. 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.4

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.
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. 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 \((i-go)\) 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 \((e-ne-ka i-go-jo)\). 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.