Syntax and Context as Tools for Interpreting Mycenaean Texts and Scribal Processes: Un 718, Ta 709 and K(1) 740

THOMAS G. PALAIMA, Austin, TX

Oswald Panagl's work with the Linear B tablets has set a high standard for our work at interpreting Mycenaean texts, especially our attempts at understanding the details of how the texts communicated their meaning and how Mycenaean tablet-writers used the tools available in the Linear B script to convey essential information precisely and unambiguously to their target-audiences.[1] His accomplishments are all the more remarkable since there are considerable obstacles to our understanding the pragmatics of any Mycenaean text.

In normal approaches to discourse analysis, one can focus on the education, knowledge and empirically deduced habitual practices of the agent of communication, what can be understood of the actions said agent took on a particular occasion of discourse, and what can be deduced of said agent's specific and general intentions. Then one can place this information in a larger context by studying the interaction between the agent and the recipient of a message within

---

[1] I was privileged to be a colleague of Oswald Panagl at the University of Salzburg in 1992–93 and then to see firsthand the keenness and precision of his mind at work. His article on text linguistics and Linear B, "Textual Features in the Linear B Texts," *Chaumont Colloquium*, p. 313–321, was an inspiration to me as a graduate student as I began studying and trying to identify the work of individual Mycenaean scribes, whom I prefer here to call 'tablet-writers' in order to avoid any preconceptions about their status or functions, either imported from other cultures or from Mycenological discussions of how to view Linear B 'scribes' and the purpose of their surviving texts. Prof. Panagl should not be held responsible in any way for shortcomings in how I have selectively used or misused his methods in this paper.

One of his most recent articles with his long-time archaeological collaborator Stefan Hiller, S. Hiller and O. Panagl, "Ein mykenologisches Deutungsproblem aus philologischer und archäologischer Sicht," *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 6–7 (2001–2002), p. 115–120, demonstrates that close attention to word order and 'scribal' intention still yields significant results for our understanding of the Mycenaeans and how they lived their material lives.

On various interpretations concerning how Linear B tablets were written and by persons of what status, see now: T. G. Palaima, "'Archives' and 'Scribes' and Information Hierarchy in Mycenaean Greek Linear B Records," in Maria Brosius ed., *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2003), p. 153–194, figs. 8.1–8.9.

I use the following standard reference abbreviations:
CoMIK: J. Chadwick *et al.* eds., *Corpus of Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos,* vols. I–IV (Cambridge and Rome 1986–1998);
DMic: F. Aura Jorro ed., *Diccionario Micénico,* vols. 1 and 2 (Madrid 1985 and 1993);
Docs²: M. Ventris and J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek,* 2ⁿᵈ ed. (Cambridge 1973);
IDA: F. Vandenabeele and J.-P. Olivier eds., *Les idéogrammes archéologiques du linéaire B* (Paris 1979).

a still larger framework of semiotic systems (linguistic, social and cultural) that come into play during the discourse process.[2] Most, if not all, of these factors are imperfectly understood or difficult to retrieve when we are interpreting anonymous records written in an over-three-thousand-year-old script. Further difficulties are created by the fact that the Linear B records were intended for use within a closed bureaucratic system of record-keeping, itself devised and operated to keep track of economic information about materials and objects, inanimate and animate (including human beings), involved in the social, political, religious and economic activities of Mycenaean palatial territories.

With that proviso firmly in mind, I would like here to take up several problems raised by three Linear B tablets where Oswald Panagl's methods help us to arrive at a clearer understanding of what the writers of the Linear tablets intended their texts to mean. In the case of tablet PY Un 718, my discussion will bear upon text linguistic features of the kind treated by Prof. Panagl in his classic article on the subject wherein he discusses the same tablet in regard to other features.[3] With regard to PY Ta 709 and KN K(1) 740 the end result will also further our understanding of the material *realia* in the manner of Prof. Panagl's long and fruitful collaboration with his colleague Stefan Hiller.

Part 1: PY Un 718 and Related Matters

Un 718 by Hand 24 is an interesting text from the perspective of its internal syntax. Early in the history of Mycenology *per se*, the peculiar use of lexical items and ideograms or logograms on Un 718 figured in discussions of Mycenaean 'double writing', i.e., the distinctive way in which Mycenaean tablet-writers used those signs that either directly identified objects (ideograms) or the words that denoted objects (logograms) in conjunction with or divorced from phonetically spelled lexical items within the global message of a given tablet.[4]

	Un 718	(S312 H24)		
.1	sa-ra-pe-da , po-se-da-o-ni , do-so-mo			
.2	o-wi-de-ta-i , do-so-mo , to-so , e-ke-ra$_2$-wo			
.3	do-se , GRA 4	VIN 3	BOS^m 1	
.4	tu-ro$_2$, TURO$_2$ 10 ko-wo , *153 1			

2   D. Schiffrin, *Approaches to Discourse* (Oxford 1994), p. 19.

3   Supra note 1, p. 316–7.

4   For a discussion of theories of "double writing," particularly as it relates to PY Un 718, see T. G. Palaima, "The Development of the Mycenaean Writing System," in J.-P. Olivier and T. G. Palaima eds., *Texts, Tablets and Scribes: Studies in Mycenaean Epigraphy and Economy Offered to Emmett L. Bennett, Jr.* (*Suplementos a Minos* 10: Salamanca 1988), p. 329–330. The two Pylos texts here given are from the edition in progress of the Pylos tablets under the dynamic editorial leadership of José L. Melena.

```
.5    me-ri-to , V 3
.6         vacat
.7    o-da-a₂ , da-mo ,      GRA 2    VIN  2
.8    OVISᵐ 2 TURO₂ 5 a-re-ro , AREPA V 2 *153 1
.9    to-so-de , ra-wa-ke-ta , do-se ,
.10   OVISᵐ 2  me-re-u-ro , FAR T 6
.a                                                -ma
.11   VIN S 2     o-da-a₂ , wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo , ka-
.12   GRA  T 6  VIN S 1  TURO₂ 5          me-ri[
.13      vacat    [    me-]ṛị-ṭọ  V 1
```

apparatus criticus: palimpsestic; margin of text used as line .13

```
.4    10 possibly over erasure, if not trace of a previous text
.8    a-re-<pa> : cf. AREPA (which extends into line above)
.9    -jo , ka-'ma' over erasure
.12   me-ri[ over erasure
```

Panagl used Un 718 as an example of anaphorical and more restricted forms of ellipsis,[5] whereby the tablet-writer, aiming, as most Linear B tablet-writers do, at economy of recording, omits elements of an antecedent explanatory phrase because the reader of the text can understand them from the overall text syntax. In this case, the full antecedent phrase has indirect object *o-wi-de-ta-i* ('sheep-flayers'[6] = here the human recipients of the verbal action), direct object *do-so-*

5   Supra n. 1, p. 316–7.
6   *DMic, s.v.* B. Vine, *Aeolic* ὄρπετον *and Deverbative* *-etó- *in Greek and Indo-European* (*Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* Vorträge und Kleinere Schriften 71: Innsbruck 1998), p. 33–35, argues for an ingenious interpretation of the form *o-wi-de-ta-i* as the feminine plural recipients of the 'donations' of foodstuffs on this tablet, reconstructing it as */owideta-hi/* = "the Invisible Ones, the Ones Who Cannot Be Seen," with the initial Myc. *o-* being the regular and expected vocalization of sonant *$n̥$ as /o/. He dismisses the argument that we would expect the form to be **a-wi-de-ta-i* because of predictable analogical pressure of the /a/ treatment seen in other privative forms in Mycenaean (cf. *a-ta-ra-si-jo, a-no-we, a-no-wo-to*). In support he appeals to "whatever mechanism is chosen to explain similar variations elsewhere of the type Myc. *pe-ma/pe-mo* ('normal' vs. 'special', etc.), or to the possibility that an alternative treatment could be preserved as an archaism in theonyms."

    The force of Vine's explanation is weakened by two facts: (1) Hand 24 also writes tablets Er 312 and Er 880, where he clearly uses the 'special Myc.' *a*-treatment of the sonant in a labial environment (*pe-ma*, and not *pe-mo*) five times (!); (2) other commensal ceremonial provisioning texts make explicit reference in the dative or nominative to the individuals into whose care the foodstuffs for the banquets are entrusted: *du-ni-jo* (Un 138.1), *me-za-wo-ni* (Un 138.5), the *o-pi-te-<u->ke-e-u* (Un 2.2). We would expect this text to do the same. We should note that the generic quality of the designation of the plural *o-wi-de-ta-i* as the responsible parties for the foodstuffs is paralleled by *o-pi-te-<u->ke-e-u*, who is designated by title alone in Un 2.

mo to-so and verb *do-se*, one or the other of which is omitted from subsequent 'paragraph headings' (lines .7, .9, and .11). We can go still further in exploring such ellipses. All four 'paragraph headings' understand the probable location specifier (*sa-ra-pe-da*) and the ultimate divine recipient (*po-se-da-o-ni*) from the tablet-heading phrase in line .1 which reads: "at *sa-ra-pe-da* for Poseidon contributions" (*do-so-mo* is interpreted as a kind of rubric nominative plural here in line .1 in anticipation of the four entries listed below on this page-shaped tablet). It is clear from the use of *o-da-a₂* in lines .7 and .11 with and only with the subject donators (in line .7 *da-mo*, in line .11 *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma*) that Hand 24 is here subordinating the *da-mo* entry to the *e-ke-ra₂-wo* entry and the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma* entry to the *ra-wa-ke-ta* entry. This explains why in line .9 he feels the need to reinsert, or, as it were, de-omit, the verbal form *do-se*. This element of meaning is raised in explanatory value by the greater prominence of line .9 as a section header, parallel to lines .2–.3, within the overall structural syntax of Un 718, which schematically looks something like this, accounting for ellipses:

A at *sa-ra-pe-da* for Poseidon donations
  A₁ to the sheep-flayers   a donation of so much   *Enkhellawōn* will give
          A₁ₐ and thus   the *dāmos*
    A₂   and   so much   the *lāwage(r)tās* will give
          A₂ₐ and thus   the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma*

Hand 24 has already departed, for the sake of emphasis, from the standard word order in Mycenaean Greek accounting tablets: S(ubject)O(bject)V(erb) "with free postposition of heavy and clausal arguments of the verb."[7] Here the direct objects (*do-so-mo* in line .2 and *to-so-de* in line .9) are moved forward into the most prominent position in Greek clauses. This is also most likely the explanation for the emphatic placement of the indirect object *o-wi-de-ta-i* in line .2. It is moved all the way forward, even in front of the direct object *do-so-mo* and in parallel with the like positioning of *po-se-da-o-ni* in front of *do-so-mo* in line .1.

The alternative explanation of trying to connect *o-wi-de-ta-i* with the overall tablet header phrase and making it part of the syntactical unit of line .1 would be harsh, even though postponement is another way of marking emphasis. It should be noted, however, that the size and shape of the tablet and of the Linear B characters written upon it are such that each full line of text completely fills

---

On the entire question of Hand 24's dialect status and usages, see most recently: T. G. Palaima "Special vs. Normal Mycenaean: Hand 24 and Writing in the Service of the King?" in J. Bennet and J. Driessen eds., *A-NA-QO-TA. Festschrift for J. T. Killen* (*Minos* 33–34: Salamanca 2002), p. 205–21.

[7] See the most recent study of word order by J. D. Hill, "Observations on Clause Structure in the Linear B Pylos Corpus," (M.A. thesis, University of Texas at Austin 2002). Hill thus corrects the erroneous impression that regular Mycenaean word order is SVO, as given in *Docs²*, p. 90, a view articulated on the basis of evidence known prior to 1956.

the horizontal space of a tablet line, and on lines .11 and .12 there is crowding at the end of the lines. It is therefore remotely possible, simply in terms of the epigraphical layout of writing on the tablet, that we should shift the information 'to the sheep-flayers' to the end of sense-unit A in our schematic.

Of equal interest, however, is to explore why this tablet-writer felt the need to represent certain of the commodities listed on the tablets both lexically and by means of ideograms or logograms. Such an exploration is relevant both to the pragmatics and syntax of the text and to the question of the degree to which the signs that stand for objects function, at this stage of their use, ideographically or logographically. It will also affect our reading of the text.

In specific, it is remarkable that Hand 24 here feels the need, with items that he seems to consider to be not among the standard and basic repertory of object signs, first to write out phonetically the word-unit that denotes the item and then to give, in all but one of the cases where said items occur for the first time on this tablet, its ideographic or logographic equivalent. When the item recurs, as in the case of the sequence tu-ro$_2$, $TURO_2$, which appears for the first time in line .4, the subsequent entries give only the ideogram or logogram, i.e., just $TURO_2$ in lines .8 and .12.

GRA (three times), VIN (four times), BOS^m (one time) and OVIS^m (two times) are listed without any preceding lexical designation. Those non-lexically designated items are mostly front-loaded in their sections, as if standard and expected. Thus it would seem that the tablet-writer is not writing the lexical designations corresponding to the other ideograms or logograms because he feels that the items are part of the lexical syntax of the introductory phrases for each paragraph, where they would functionally serve as accusative objects, in line .3 in apposition to do-so-mo to-so in line .2; in lines .10 and .11 in apposition to to-so-de in line .9; and in lines .7, .8 and .12 functionally in object position as left open by o-da-a$_2$ in lines .7 and .11.[8]

In two cases, the lexical entry precedes an ideogram that might be considered ambiguous. *153 is preceded by ko-wo which is the full lexeme for the surcharged ko that appears in the center of the ideogram and is its acrophonic abbreviation. The word ko-wo meaning "sheepskin or fleece" appears only here. A similar logogram or ideogram without the surcharged ko and therefore treated as a different logogram or ideogram, namely *154, occurs on PY On 300 [+] 1074 and dubiously on Un 592. Both *153 and *154 are to be contrasted in form and, in the case of *153, in surcharged abbreviation with *152 "oxhide"

---

[8]   Panagl (supra n. 1), p. 321, ingeniously explains that in the Pylos Ta series the object position is left open in the heading phrase because the tablet-writer felt that the many items inventoried thereafter functionally occupied this position. Such a sense of connection of the 'logographic' entries to the textual syntax might induce a tablet-writer, like Hand 24, to identify the logograms or ideograms lexically or even to devise phonetically based composite ideograms or logograms for the objects being recorded. After all, ideograms or logograms composed of phonetic signs are effectively word-units in another form.

(with its surcharged *wi* = *wi-ri-no vel sim.*). There is then some potential ambiguity among these object-signs for 'hides' that the tablet-writer Hand 24 here takes pains to clarify in connection with his first use of sign **153* on the tablet.

However, the same desire for disambiguation can hardly apply to two other ideograms or logograms that are treated in much the same way on Un 718: *TURO₂* and *AREPA*. *AREPA* occurs only once on Un 718, so we do not know whether Hand 24 would have omitted the lexeme if he had had to list 'anointing oil' again. However, two other scribes (Hand 6 and Hand 2) use the same ideogram or logogram (*AREPA*) without any lexical identification at all. It is obviously part of the repertory of signs used by the tablet-writers at Pylos and its phonetic elements would be difficult to misinterpret either in reading the sign or reconstructing the word it represents.

Still Hand 24 cannot be accused of being pedantically fussy, because the master scribe at the site of Pylos, Hand 1, also writes an entry of 'cheese' on PY Un 1185 lexically and ideographically or logographically, i.e., with *tu-ro₂* and *TURO₂* in tandem. This would seem to rule out any argument that we are dealing here on Un 718 with an original 'coining' of a phonetically composed ideogram or logogram by Hand 24. Nonetheless, someone had to coin such ideograms or logograms for the first time, and this may indicate how tablet-writers would have done it. Again, however, as with sign **153*, Hand 24 feels confident that, once the ideogram or logogram is defined lexically once, it can be understood alone in subsequent entries.

The use of a lexical unit preceding the entry FAR in line .10 might be of a different nature. *me-re-u-ro* here might designate some modification of the FAR ideogram, rather than define it. When FAR occurs on Pylos texts, and also at Knossos, it is in relatively modest quantities and in contrast to other grains like HORD. On Un 47.4 it might have been erased and replaced by HORD in a large quantity. It is not clear there whether the tablet-writer first mistook one grain for another or some altered condition of that grain for the standard condition. This ambiguity is in fact well symbolized by the Latin transcription of the ideogram or logogram as FAR, whether we now read this as *far* 'spelt' or as *far(ina)* 'flour' or 'grain meal'.[9] Both possibilities remain open, especially because on Un 47 an original entry of FAR may have been erased and replaced by HORD.[10]

We might, however, be able to use an *argument from silence* for a slight preference for interpreting FAR as FAR(INA) 'flour' or 'grain meal' by noting that FAR does not occur on the large grain harvest texts of the F(2) series at Knossos, where, of course, an ideogram or logogram with the meaning of 'processed grain' would be out of place. Where FAR occurs at Knossos, as in the Fs series, it is in smaller quantities than other grains and often in conjunction with

---

[9] Cf. AES vs. HORD(EUM) or GRA(NUM).
[10] Cf. *Docs²*, p. 220 and 440, and J. Chadwick, "The Olive Oil tablets of Knossos," in L. R. Palmer and J. Chadwick eds., *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies* (Cambridge 1966), p. 31.

VIN, making one wonder whether it isn't 'grain meal' meant for consumption with wine. Likewise on Un 47, where FAR may have been erased, the immediately preceding preserved entry is VIN. Thus the confusion may have been connected with sequential order of entries (FAR, as we have said, often being associated with VIN) and not with any true alternation between FAR and HORD.

Most peculiar of all may be the way Hand 24 handles the entries dealing with honey. The Knossos Gg tablets (and the single Gq tablet from Khania) show us how allocations of honey, mainly to deities, were handled by several Cretan tablet-writers. The quantities of honey are indicated by numbers of amphorae $*209^{VAS}$ or $*209^{VAS}+A$ in all cases, with only one possible exception: Gg(1) 7369 by Hand 103 which, according to the reading in *CoMIK* III, contains the following entry in line .2: me-ri Ş[. The drawing and photo in *CoMIK* III make the reading of 'S' plausible, but not certain. However, given that other texts by the same tablet-writer and by other tablet-writers measure honey by $*209^{VAS}$, it is also possible that the remnants of the last hastily and cursorily drawn sign that concludes the bottom line of preserved text is a partial $*209^{VAS}$ instead of an 'S'.

In any case, tablet-writers 103, 135, 140 and 220 do one of three things: (1) write out the word 'honey' *me-ri* in front of or raised up alongside $*209^{VAS}$; (2) write the composite phonetic logogram *ME+RI* before or after $*209^{VAS}$, even raising it above line; (3) write *ME+RI* before $*209^{VAS}+A$. Note that in all cases the lexical unit or the composite phonetic ideogram or logogram is in the nominative case and the unit of measurement is what we understand, given the phonetic sign *a* surcharged in most cases, to be the vase logogram or ideogram for 'amphora', obviously manufactured in some standard size for such allocations.

In contrast, on Un 718.5, Hand 24 has written the genitive form of the word-unit for 'honey', eschewing entirely the use here of an ideogram or logogram, and it is followed by a sign for a unit of measure. It appears that he does something similar on lines .12 and .13. Although the lower right corner of tablet Un 718 is damaged, there appears originally to have been space enough to write *me-ri-to* on line .12, and there are enough traces in the margin line .13 to read the true text[11] there as:

vacat [me-]ṛi-ṭo, V 1.

If this is correct, then it would seem that Hand 24 did not find it satisfactory to list the quantity V 1 alone on the bottom margin line, where it could easily be overlooked or even accidentally obliterated in the handling of the tablet. He therefore chose in line .13 to repeat from line .12 the lexical unit denoting

---

[11] Note the proposed correction of the text from both the version given in E. L. Bennett, Jr. and J.-P. Olivier, *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed* (Rome 1973) and given in the edition in progress, namely in interpreting what those editions read as the unit-stroke '1' as a word-divider ',', i.e.: not 1 V 1, but , V 1.

'honey' in the genitive, followed, as in all other instances of a lexical unit before an ideogram on this tablet, by the word-divider. The large-scale entry at the end of line .12 is not redundant or even unnecessary, since it clearly alerts the later reader to the fact that there is an entry of 'honey' at the end of the text, and thus prevents the quantity entry on line .13 from being overlooked. Another reason for repeating the full entry on line .13 is the close syntactical connection Hand 24 feels between the 'V' unit and the genitive of material here.

The only further clue as to why Hand 24 would choose to use a genitive of material or substance, where Knossian tablet-writers opt for a rubric nominative form, is his use of what has long been viewed as a notoriously odd genitive on Er 312.2, .8: *to-so-jo pe-ma* GRA. On Er 312 the apparent and long controversial disharmony[12] between *to-so-jo* and *pe-ma* may now in fact be explained by Hand 24's propensity to use lexical units to define or qualify following ideograms or logograms. Thus syntactically here he would be conceiving of *pe-ma* as linked with GRA and not with *to-so-jo*.

Part 2: PY Ta 709 and Related Matters

Ta 709

.1 pi-je-ra₃ , to-qi-de-ja *200*^{VAS} 3 pa-ko-to , a-pe-te-me-ne *214*^{VAS} 2 po-ro-e-ke-te-ri-ja *214*^{VAS} 1 ko-te-ri-ja 6
.a   -sa-qe 1
.2 au-te 1 pu-ra-u-to-ro 2 qa-ra-to-ro 1 e-ka-ra , a-pi-qo-to , pe-de-we-sa 1 e-ka-ra , i-to-we-sa , pe-de-we-sa ,
                                                                                                     so-we-ne-ja , au-de-we-
.3 ti-ri-po , ke-re-si-jo , we-ke , *34-ke-u *201*^{VAS} 1 ti-ri-po , ke-re-si-jo , we-ke , o-pi-ke-wi-ri-je-u *201*^{VAS} 1

The interpretation of the word-unit *pa-ko-to* and its related ideogram *214*^{VAS} on Ta 709.1 has long been a thorny problem. By paying close attention to their textual environment, in the manner of Hiller and Panagl (supra n. 1), we might be able to offer a reasonable solution.

The additional commentary in *Docs*[2], p. 499, reconstructs the word as *phaktō*, dual of a word for a vessel, which, according to the lexicographical tradition, was used as a unit of measure in Arcadia and was equivalent to three Attic *kotulai*. Alternatively, one resorts to a gloss in Hesychius which lists various vase-name synonyms for an apparently feminine form *phaktai*. This second option is tentatively chosen by Anderson as the alphabetic Greek equivalent for *pa-ko-to* in her comprehensive survey of Mycenaean vessel names.[13] Here we shall argue that the form is to be reconstructed, as originally tentatively suggested by Ventris and Chadwick in their 1956 edition,[14] as connected with clas-

---

12 Cf. *DMic, s.v.*, and M. S. Ruipérez, "À propos de *to-so-jo* de PY Er 312," in J.-P. Olivier ed., *Mykenaïka (BCH* Supplément XXV: Paris 1992), p. 563–567, esp. the discussion on p. 566–567.
13 D. Anderson, "Mycenaean Vessel Terms: Evaluating the Evidence," *Minos* 29–30 (1994–1995), p. 304.
14 Cf. *Docs*[2], p. 337.

sical Greek πηκτός, 'fixed, fastened, well put together', here in the literal sense of 'fixed or constructed with rivets'.

In *IDA*, p. 240–241, the vase form with the name *pa-ko-to* and its logogram or ideogram *214^{VAS}, which occur together only here in the Linear B corpus, are classified as a "forme ouverte de format indéterminé," and for its name the *Docs*[2] identification *phaktō* is given. The sole descriptive term *a-pe-te-me-ne* found with it is considered to have no satisfactory explanation. Nonetheless, *Docs*[2], p. 499, gives us the still prevailing alternatives, among which *aputhmene*, a dual meaning 'without a base', which posits a scribal error of *pe* for *pu*, is the most economical explanation and the one preferred in *DMic, s.v.*

The only other place an ideogram or logogram of the form of *214^{VAS} occurs in the Linear B corpus is on Knossos tablet K(1) 740. There it is identified as a *di-pa* and the rendering of *214^{VAS} is further identified by surcharging sign *di*. A note in *IDA*, p. 240, remarks that *214^{VAS}+DI on K(1) 740 is in fact a *di-pa* (*202^{VAS}). The text of K(1) 740 reads as follows:

```
        supra mutila
.1      ] vestigia [
.2   di-pa  AES  *214^VAS+DI  30 [
.3   qe-ro2 'AES'  *255  16
.4   ku-ru-su-*56  *207^VAS  1
.5   pi-ri-je      ZE 1
.6      ] 'me-no-no [ '
        infra mutila
```

Indeed, if we study the forms of the ideograms or logograms for *202^{VAS} and *214^{VAS}, we notice that the shape of the body of the vase of *214^{VAS} on PY Ta 709.1 is nearly identical with *214^{VAS}+DI on K(1) 740.2 and also nearly identical with the shape of the single version of the ideogram or logogram that survives on K(1) 875, a longish (six-line) and unfortunately fragmentary list of 'un-eared', i.e., handleless, *di-pa*. The ideogram/logogram on K(1) 875, however, is written in the last line and along the bottom edge of the tablet and theoretically could be drawn a bit clumsily. Elsewhere at Knossos (K 773.B) and at Pylos (Ta 641.2b) the *di-pa* ideogram or logogram has a more sharply tapering shape. Its shape is less sharply tapered with a flat bottom, represented by a horizontal line on KN K 829 and 875 and, of course, K 740. The same kind of horizontal line is added to all the tapering shapes on PY Ta 641. The degree of care the tablet-writer Hand 2 here took to add the horizontal stroke to the bottom of his drawing of a more or less sharply tapering vase signifies that the 'base' of this vessel was a characteristic element of its design. This would then lend support to the interpretation of *a-pe-te-me-ne* as designating the two *pa-ko-to* vases listed on Ta 709.1 as versions lacking bases.

Further support for this line of interpretation is at hand if we view this entry not in isolation, but as Oswald Panagl has taught us, within its proper textual context. In the Ta series the scribe faces a great challenge in deciding how to enter information in making an inventory of a very large and diverse collection of ceremonial vessels, fire and cooking paraphernalia, tripods, sacrificial implements (stunning axes and butchering knives), chairs, tables and footstools (actually stools to be used for sitting). He decided to begin with the vessels and paraphernalia and then turn to the items of furniture.[15] The order of the texts then begins from its famous header Ta 711, which announces the inventory inspection and the occasion of its taking place, and then moves to listing the items, noting details that would make each item identifiable and 'retrievable', beginning with the vessels and fire implements. The first three texts are either in the order:

A. Ta 711-Ta 709-Ta 641,

or in the order:

B. Ta 711-Ta 641-Ta 709.

If order A is correct, the items would be listed in the order: vessels (*qe-ra-na*, *pi-je-ra*, *pa-ko-to*), fire and cooking implements, portable hearths, tripods, *qe-to*, *di-pa*. This has the advantage of making the intact tripods that end tablet Ta 709 precede the tripods that begin tablet Ta 641. The listing of tripods begins then with whole and undamaged examples and ends with the two damaged tripods (one with one foot, the other specified as 'burned away' with regard to its legs). Here the entry of the two *pa-ko-to* would precede the entries of *di-pa* and be separated from them by the fire and cooking implements and hearths and the tripods and *qe-to*. Given that the inspection is moving from chaos to order and has to start somewhere, and also given that the tripods would have been large and conspicuous, even when damaged, and would more likely be grouped together, A is the order that I prefer.

If order B is correct, the *di-pa* that end Ta 641 would precede the *pa-ko-to* on Ta 709 and would only be separated from them by the single *pi-je-ra* entry. The *pa-ko-to* would then stand to the *di-pa* as the damaged tripods to the whole tripods in the other arrangement, and their designation as 'lacking' or 'missing' their bases could be seen as the kind of damage that explains the slotting of the entry, just as the damaged tripods were listed after the whole tripods. In order A, the *pa-ko-to* would precede the *di-pa* entry, but again, given that we are at the start of the inventory, the entry position is not difficult to accept.

---

[15] Cf. T. G. Palaima, "The Pylos Ta Series: From Michael Ventris to the New Millennium," *BICS* 44 (2000), p. 236–7, with references.

Why then does tablet-writer Hand 2 use *pa-ko-to* and not *di-pa* to designate the entry of *214^{VAS} on Ta 709.1? Especially in the case of order B, but not implausible even in order A, I would argue that the term *pa-ko-to* here can be taken to define this kind of *di-pa* as 'riveted', perhaps, but not necessarily, even implying 'riveted in repair'. This in fact is how the bronze archaeological correlates of *202^{VAS}, *214^{VAS} and *214^{VAS}+DI are manufactured, being composed of "un certain nombre de plaques de bronze" riveted together.[16]

Now, if we continue to follow the methods of Prof. Panagl and the implications of our attention to textual context, we may clear up another, to me at least, longstanding puzzle. The entry: *qe-ro$_2$* 'AES' *255 16 on K(1) 740 has always been interpreted in connection with the known use of 'plaques' or 'platelets' of bronze in the manufacture of breastplates. This interpretation was suggested and lent force by the occurrence of the logogram or ideogram *162+QE used for breastplates in the Knossian Sc series. *IDA*, p. 21–22, takes the *qe-ro$_2$* to be large plates that are used in certain cases front and back to form protective body armor. *Docs²*, p. 494–5, 329–30, 380–1, argues from the order in which items are listed on the Knossian armor texts that the *qe-ro$_2$* are elements of the armor proper, e.g., 'shoulder guards' *vel sim.*, and not mere platelets. But this overlooks the evidence of Sk 6570 (formerly G? 5670 in *Docs²*, p. 495). On Sk 6570 *qe-ro$_2$* are itemized along with *o-pa-wo-ta*. *o-pa-wo-ta* in the Pylos Sh series are clearly 'platelets' used to build *to-ra-ke* and not an identifiable element of armor. Thus the same conclusion should be drawn about *qe-ro$_2$*.

Why, however, would 16 objects relating to armor, whether protective platelets used in its construction or, to me less likely, compositional parts of armor like shoulder guards, be listed on K(1) 740 in between two kinds of vases: thirty *di-pa* and one *ku-ru-su-*56 (a kind of 'tripod amphora'). The anomaly of such a positioning within the text disappears if we see the relationship of these objects to the vase form that immediately precedes them on the tablet. The 16 *qe-ro$_2$* then most likely are the kind of bronze 'platelets' that are archaeologically attested as riveted together to make bronze vessels like the 30 *di-pa* (or *pa-ko-to*) that immediately precede the 'platelets' on this tablet.

By following the lead of Oswald Panagl and concentrating on textual context, syntax and text pragmatics, we have been able to suggest ways of clearing up several longstanding textual ambiguities. We have also added to our understanding of how Mycenaean tablet-writers composed several important texts that they never imagined scholars would be reading and interpreting in the 21st century A.D.

---

[16] *IDA*, p. 236–238, figs. 161 and 162, where the bases characteristic of this form of vessel are very conspicuous.