

STUDI MICENEI ED EGEO-ANATOLICI NUOVA SERIE

5, 2019



Edizioni Quasar

STUDI MICENEI
ED EGEO-ANATOLICI
NUOVA SERIE

è una rivista del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Roma

eISSN 2532-1757

eISBN 978-88-5491-015-7

Direttore / Editor

Anna D'Agata (ISPC, CNR, Roma)

Comitato Editoriale / Editorial Board

Marco Bettelli (ISPC, CNR, Roma); Maurizio Del Frio (ISPC, CNR, Roma);
Andrea Di Renzoni (ISPC, CNR, Roma); Yannis Galanakis (University of Cambridge);
Luca Girella (Università Telematica Internazionale Uninettuno, Roma); Anna Judson (University of Cambridge);
Françoise Rougemont (CNRS, Paris); Agnese Vacca (Università degli Studi di Milano)

Comitato Scientifico / Advisory Editorial Board

Mary Bachvarova (Willamette University, Salem, Oregon); Fritz Blakolmer (University of Vienna);
Harriet Blitzer (Buffalo State College, New York); John Bintliff (Leiden University);
Eva von Dassow (University of Minnesota); Birgitta Eder (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna);
Fikri Kulakoğlu (University of Ankara); Maurizio Giangiulio (Università di Trento);
Carl Knappett (University of Toronto); Peter Pavúk (Charles University, Prague);
Jeremy B. Rutter (Dartmouth College); Recai Tekoğlu (Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir);
Andreas Vlachopoulos (University of Ioannina); Helène Whittaker (University of Gothenburg)

Stampa e distribuzione / Printing and distribution

Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon s.r.l.

Via Ajaccio 41-43 – 00198 Roma

tel. +39 0685358444, fax +39 0685833591

email: info@edizioniquasar.it

www.edizioniquasar.it

© Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche

Autorizzazione Tribunale di Roma nr. 288/2014 del 31.12.2014

SOMMARIO

<i>Oliver Dickinson</i> The Use and Misuse of the Ahhiyawa Texts	7
<i>Giampaolo Graziadio</i> Some Considerations on the Connections between Western Peloponnese and Cyprus in the Mycenaean Period	23
<i>Davide Nadali</i> Speaking Pictures, Writing Words: On the Interplay of Communication in Ancient Mesopotamia	47
<i>Laura Puértolas Rubio</i> How to Bewitch Someone: Bewitching Techniques According to Incantations in the Hittite and Luwian Ritual Texts	59
<i>Ester Salgarella</i> Non-Connective Behaviour of the Particle – <i>Qe</i> in the Linear B Documents from Pylos	71
POLITICAL BOUNDARIES AND CULTURAL CONTACTS DURING THE IRON AGE IN SOUTH-EAST ANATOLIA: CILICIA, AMUQ AND THE KARA SU VALLEY	
<i>Anna Lucia D'Agata</i> Misis (Ancient Mopsouestia) and the Plain of Cilicia in the Early First Millennium BC: Material Entanglements, Cultural Boundaries, and Local Identities	87
<i>Sabina Kulemann-Ossen, Hannah Mönninghoff</i> Hybridity of Styles: Iron Age Pottery from Sirkeli Höyük	111
<i>Marina Pucci</i> The Iron Age Sequence in the Amuq	147
<i>Sebastiano Soldi</i> The Iron Age Pottery of Zincirli Höyük: An Assemblage among Neighbouring Traditions	165

NON-CONNECTIVE BEHAVIOUR OF THE PARTICLE *-QE* IN THE LINEAR B DOCUMENTS FROM PYLOS

Ester Salgarella

Summary

This paper examines the non-connective behaviour of the particle *-qe* on Linear B administrative documents. In Mycenaean *-qe* usually performs a connective function as a coordinating particle. However, in a number of instances on Pylos documents its behaviour cannot be interpreted as connective. By examining the occurrences of the particle in those contexts where it is understood to perform a non-connecting function and by assessing the interpretations so far advanced to account for such idiosyncratic behaviour, this paper offers an alternative explanation of this peculiar usage of the particle *-qe*, viewed against the administrative backdrop of information management (recording and retrieval) and storage.

1. MYCENAEAN *-QE*: BEHAVIOUR AND OCCURRENCES

In Mycenaean Greek the syllabogram *-qe* (*/k^wel/*) usually represents the standard coordinating particle, corresponding to alphabetic Greek τε. Like τε, *-qe* shows an enclitic behavior, occurring in word-final position. Mycenaean *-qe* also occurs attached to the negative proclitic particle *o-u-*, resulting in the sequence *o-u-qe*, which is generally taken as corresponding – formally but arguably not semantically – to alphabetic Greek οὔτε (see Salgarella 2018). However, in a number of instances *-qe* defies an interpretation as a coordinating particle, owing to its occurrence attached to verbal forms, namely *e-ke* (ἐχει ‘he/she has’) and *e-ko-si* (ἔχονσι ‘they have’), without the presence of any other correlated element. It is noteworthy that, on the basis of the extant evidence, this peculiar usage of *-qe*, showing a non-connective behaviour, is limited to Pylos. In terms of occurrences, the data relevant to the problem under discussion are the following: *e-ke-qe* occurs on tablets of the Eb and Eo series by Hand 41, on tablets of the Ep series by Hand 1, and on Va 15.2 (more generally assigned to Stylus Group Cii). As to *e-ko-si-qe*, the term occurs on An 724.11 by Hand 1 and on Eb 321.A by Hand 41.

2. INTERPRETATIONS ADVANCED TO DATE

With respect to the interpretation given to the sequences *e-ke-qe/e-ko-si-qe* and the function therein performed by *-qe*, a number of different readings have so far been put forward, focusing mainly on the attestations from the Pylos E Class.¹ These proposals centre around two main interpretations of *-qe* as either a coordinating particle or a modal particle related to alphabetic Greek κε(v).

a) Copulative *-qe*

According to *Docs*², *-qe* may be considered as a copula, so that the expression *e-ke-qe o-na-to* (preceded by a person’s name) on the E Class would mean “(here is) X, and he/she holds a lease” (*Docs*², 246). Similarly, Ruijgh (1967, 317-318) interprets the sequence as an elliptic phrase meaning “X is the owner and holds a lease”, whereby *-qe* would have the function of coordinating two verbs (with the first implied).

¹ For a comprehensive examination of the usages of *-qe* (both connective and non-connective) on Mycenaean texts (beyond the Pylos E Class) and a review of the most influential interpretations so far advanced see most recently Delgado 2016, 139-145, 187-190.

b) Prospective *-qe*

Palmer (*Interpr.*, 189-190) argues that the addition of the particle *-qe* to the verb may have conveyed a prospective colouring to the sentence, specifically implying a future reference. According to him, in the preliminary versions of the Pylos landholding documents (Eb and Eo series by Hand 41), where the verbal forms *e-ke/e-ko-si* always occur with the particle *-qe* attached, the meaning of the entry may have been “X is to have such and such”. However, in the final versions (En and Ep series by Hand 1), where these proposals would have been realized, the same verbal forms occur without the particle. This prospective interpretation of *-qe*, and the suggestion that the records showing this feature are documents which had yet to undergo ratification,² sprang to Palmer’s mind by the observation of the distribution of the forms *e-ke-qe* and *e-ke* over the aforementioned series. Accordingly, Palmer explains the retention of the particle in a few instances on the Ep tablets, which seem to record exceptional types of land tenure related to the *da-mo*, by the fact that those proposals still required ratification. Nonetheless, one may well wonder why Hand 1 transcribed proposals which were yet to be ratified when compiling the final versions of the Eo tablets, as it would have been less laborious to leave them out and to record them only once they had been effectively ratified. Ruipérez (1987; 1997, 531-534) takes this interpretation a step further by advancing as a possible parallel to this prospective function of Mycenaean *-qe* the usage of the alphabetic Greek modal particle $\kappa\epsilon(v)/\kappa\alpha(v)/\tilde{\alpha}v$ + subjunctive (a parallel first hinted at by Palmer in *Interpr.*, vi-vii). This interpretation is theoretically possible since the Linear B script does not distinguish between short and long vowels, so that *e-ke-qe/e-ko-si-qe* may be taken as forms of either the indicative or the subjunctive. However, the possibility of relating Mycenaean *-qe* to $\kappa\epsilon(v)/\kappa\alpha(v)/\tilde{\alpha}v$ remains problematic on etymological grounds. This is because *-qe* goes back to Indo-European **k^we*, while the alleged form underlying alphabetic $\kappa\epsilon(v)/\kappa\alpha(v)/\tilde{\alpha}v$ is understood to be either **ke(m)* or **ke(n)*.³ Ruipérez therefore argues for the initial coexistence of two parallel forms, **k^we(m)* and **ke(m)*, followed by a subsequent generalization of the latter and the dismissal of the former. In support of his hypothesis he calls into question the connective nature of Mycenaean *o-u-qe*, since this seems to show a non-connective behaviour on PY Aq 64 and Aq 218. In these contexts, he takes *o-u-qe* as the combination of proclitic *o-u-* and enclitic *-qe*, the latter with an unusual non-connective function. Therefore, *o-u-qe* would represent the stage **ou-k^we(m)*, not yet exhibiting dissimilation after the vowel *u*, prior to the dismissal of the form **k^we(m)* in favour of **ke(m)*. However, an objection may be raised in this respect. If we were to accept Ruipérez’s proposal, we would be faced with two distinct formations resulting in the spelling *o-u-qe* in Mycenaean: one containing connective *-qe* and the other (attested only on the aforementioned two tablets) containing non-connective *-qe*. Finally, another, slightly different interpretation, in accordance with Palmer’s proposal of a prospective value attributable to *-qe*, is put forward by Lejeune (*Mém.*, III, 192 n. 43), who interprets *-qe* as an indefinite particle which he reconstructs as $\pi\eta$ and reads as “in a certain way” (although this particle is not attested in alphabetic Greek). He takes $\pi\eta$ as an instrumental form derived from the stem of the indefinite pronoun, conveying a notion of uncertainty or doubt. Following Lejeune, Duhoux (1972, 61-66) renders the particle as “sous réserve” or “sous condition” and, therefore, argues for the verb preceding $\pi\eta$ to be in the indicative and not in the subjunctive (as argued by Lejeune). Thence, he argues that the presence of *-qe* = $\pi\eta$ would imply that the existing landholding situation was subject to verification, whereas the lack of it would mean that the same situation had been subsequently ratified.⁴

2 According to Bennett’s analysis of the Pylos E Class (Bennett 1956), the PY En/Ep documents represent later versions compiled from the corresponding Eb/Eo records (see below under 3.1. The Pylos E Class). For a slightly different interpretation of some Eb and Ep records see Delgado 2005.

3 The origin and relations between Greek modal particles are still debated. According to Forbes (1958) and Palmer (1962, 90-92), all of these forms are descended from a common stem **ken/kn*, whose *e*-grade gave $\kappa\epsilon(v)$ and the zero-grade $\kappa\alpha(v)$, while $\tilde{\alpha}v$ arose later by false word division ($\omicron\upsilon \kappa\alpha\nu > \omicron\upsilon\kappa \tilde{\alpha}v$). Dunkel (2014, II, 429-431, fnn. 12, 18) disagrees with such an interpretation, believing that $\kappa\epsilon\nu$, $\kappa\epsilon$ and $\tilde{\alpha}v$ are etymologically unrelated: $\kappa\epsilon\nu < *ko-m$, $\kappa\epsilon < *ke/i$, $\tilde{\alpha}v < *án$. He claims (432) that $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ was the original particle aimed at stressing the prospective function of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses, but later on the syncretism of this particle with $\tilde{\alpha}v$ and $\kappa\epsilon$ caused $\kappa\epsilon\nu$ to be used within the functions of the other two particles.

4 “La présence de *-qe*, $\pi\eta$, après $\tilde{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ indiquerait qu’une situation déjà existante était sujette à vérification (séries Eb et Eo; exceptions Ep), tandis que son absence marquerait au contraire que cette situation était ratifiée (séries Ep et En)” (Duhoux 1972, 64).

c) *-qe* = δή < *g^wē

Pisani (1967, 134) proposes to relate Mycenaen *-qe* to alphabetic Greek δή. However, this interpretation is difficult to maintain, given that the meaning ‘indeed/certainly’ attributable to δή does not properly fit any of the contexts where *e-ke-qe* and *e-ko-si-qe* occur. Besides, doubts are cast on the etymology of δή, which, according to Dunkel (2014, II, 150), is more likely to derive from Indo-European *dē (perhaps < *dē-h₁) than *g^wē.⁵

d) *e-ke-qe* as ἐκ-ἡέπει

Following a completely different path, Teijeiro (1969, esp. pp. 170-173) argues that the syllabic sequence *e-ke-qe* represented a verbal form composed with the prefix ἐκ and a verb derived from Indo-European *sek^w- (parallel in construction to alphabetic Greek ἐννέπω) and meaning “to declare”. In his view the documents preserving *e-ke-qe* would represent declarations made by tenants of *o-na-to* land, which were subsequently recorded as ratified on the corresponding final documents. However, his interpretation was proven wrong by the attestation of the plural form of *e-ke-qe* as *e-ko-si-qe* (/ekhonsi-k^we/) and not as *e-ke-qo-si* (/ek-hek^wonsi/) – which should have been the expected plural of his reconstructed form – on the new text of Eb 321.A resulting from a join made by Olivier (retraction in Teijeiro 1972).

e) Conditional use of *-qe* < *k^we in adverbial syntagms

Teijeiro (1994) then puts forward another interpretation for the sequence *e-ke-qe* in these contexts. He takes *-qe* as derived from *k^we, but here functioning not as a coordinating, but as a conditional particle. Therefore, in his view, *-qe* would perform a function comparable to the hypothetical use of *k^we in adverbial syntagms with conditional value as attested in a number of Indo-European languages (Latin, Sanskrit, Gothic and Hittite).⁶

f) Generalizing particle (epic τε?)

Campanile (1959, 309) takes *-qe* as a generalizing particle representing the ancestor of epic τε with the meaning “as one knows”, so that his interpretation of the sequence *e-ke-qe o-na-to* is “(he/she) is accustomed to having”. However, Hooker and Ruijgh disagree on this interpretation. Hooker (1965, 270-276) believes that epic τε and connective τε are to be regarded as semantically distinct, and suggests that epic τε may have originated from the confusion with τ’ < τοι, where τοι, possessing a generalising meaning, was abbreviated for metrical correction. On the contrary, Ruijgh (1967, 331; 1971) argues for epic τε to have developed in post-Mycenaean times from the connective usage of τε. In particular, he takes the use of epic τε as an *emploi digressif-permanent* (Ruijgh 1971, 2), since the clauses in which it occurs⁷ express a general and characteristic fact (*fait permanent*).

g) Enumerating particle

Bader (1975, 106) proposes to take non-connective *-qe* as a particle built to the stem of the relative pronoun, occurring in contexts of enumeration with an anaphoric value. On this assumption, *-qe* is taken as related to the Mycenaean clause-initial particle *o-/jo-* in being derived from the stem of the relative, but at the same time as opposed to it in performing an anaphoric function, against the cataphoric one attributable to *o-/jo-*.⁸ In particular, the purpose of *-qe* would have been to connect the entry where the particle occurs with a preceding one showing the same syntactic structure.

⁵ Gr.Gr. II, 562-563; GEWI, 376; DELG 270; EDG 307, 322. δή probably gave δέ by vowel reduction. Because of Myc. *-de* > δέ, a source *g^we is not compelling.

⁶ Among the examples, Teijeiro (1994, 124) gives Latin *absque* with *esset/foret* (cf. Ter. *Hec.* 601 *quam fortunatus ceteris sum rebus, absque una hac foret!* “how happy am I in other respects, were it not for this one thing alone”).

⁷ In most cases epic τε is found after a relative or a coordinating conjunction at the beginning of a clause which serves as a digression with respect to a preceding element.

⁸ On the interpretation of Mycenaean particle *o-/jo-* see esp.: Thompson 2002-2003; Probert 2008.

h) Pre-Indo-European particle

Given the difficulties faced in trying to relate non-connective *-qe* to the Greek language, it has been speculated that non-connective *-qe* may represent a particle belonging to a pre-Indo-European substratum (Levin 1964, 119, 181; Hooker 1965, 267). However, methodologically speaking, postulating a non-Indo-European particle is more than a little questionable in the absence of any positive evidence for this.⁹

i) Topicalization phenomenon

More recently, Hajnal (2004) proposed to interpret the instances of *e-ke-qe* as examples of topicalization. He takes *-qe* as equivalent to the alphabetic Greek coordinating particle τε (< **k^we*) in all its occurrences in Mycenaean texts. In his opinion, the texts with *e-ke-qe* would show a phenomenon of dislocation, by which the subject is positioned to the left periphery of the text with a topicalizing effect.

3. REASSESSING THE EVIDENCE

Ensuing from the above outline, none of the attempts at finding an alphabetic Greek particle with a function parallel to that of Mycenaean non-connective *-qe* can be said to be convincing. Given the nature of the Mycenaean texts, the use of particles in Mycenaean is difficult to compare to their use in alphabetic Greek prose, although the use of the Mycenaean allative particle *-de* and copulative *-qe* is similar to that of alphabetic Greek δέ and τε respectively. In order to shed more light on non-connective *-qe*, I propose to analyse all its occurrences afresh, first by assessing those in the Pylos E Class (which comprises the great majority of the attestations) and then those on PY An 724.11 and Va 15.2.

3.1. *The Pylos E Class*

The Pylos E Class tablets, which record different kinds of landholdings at the location of *pa-ki-ja-na/ne*, are among the longest and most formulaic Linear B documents.¹⁰ Their classification into subgroups (*i.e.* series) rests on criteria such as variation in formulaic patterns, scribal attribution, document type and the kind of transaction involved, in addition to purely external criteria (document format and layout). The series this analysis is directly concerned with are the Pylos Eb, En, Eo and Ep series. These are further classified into two sub-groups based on scribal hand: the Eb/Eo group written by Hand 41 and the Ep/En group written by Hand 1 (Bennett 1956). Both groups record remarkably similar information and show a great deal of exact correspondences in terms of both subjects covered and extents of landholdings recorded. For this reason they are understood to reflect successive stages of bookkeeping, with the Eb and Eo tablets representing preliminary versions of records later transcribed as final ones on the Ep and En tablets respectively.¹¹ Moreover, the fact that both preliminary and final versions were still kept together by the time of the destruction of the Pylos palace¹² may be an indication that they were meant as “records rather of continuing conditions than of perfected transactions” (Bennett 1956, 117). With regard to the preliminary tablets,

9 E.g. in Linear A, very few words or sign sequences end in *-qe*. One such example is the alternation *ka-pa* vs. *ka-pa-qe*, the former occurring in the first line of some Haghia Triada tablets (e.g. HT 6a.1), while the latter apparently in the middle of a tablet (HT 6a.4-5).

10 The Pylos E Class represents our main evidence for land-holdings, preserving “detailed records of individual land-holdings which may well have been allocated, if not actually owned, by the centre, and from which the centre almost certainly derived revenues in the form of crops or the like” (Killen 2008, 165). For an overall analysis of land-holding documents see esp. Del Freo 2005. Most E Class records relate to the locality of *pa-ki-ja-na/ne*, which appears to have been close to Pylos, the administrative centre. On the interpretation of Linear B records relating to *pa-ki-ja-na/ne* see Del Freo 2008; 1995; Adrados 1997. On the significant role played by *pa-ki-ja-na/ne* see Lupack 2016; Montecchi 2016; Shelmerdine 2016.

11 Bennett 1956; Foster 1981; Del Freo 2005, 144. See also Delgado 2005 for a slightly different interpretation of some Eb and Ep records.

12 The Eb/Eo tablets were found in Archive Complex Room 8, Grid 13,23 (Palaima 1988, 98), near to the Ep/En tablets, found in Archive Complex Room 8 and in the doorway to Room 7 (PTTI, 114, 127).

the Eb documents are all narrow palm-leaf tablets consisting of a single entry arranged on two lines of writing, while the Eo documents are page-shaped tablets containing a varying number of entries, each one arranged on a single ruled line. All of the tablets in the group of final documents are page-shaped; the only difference is that on the En tablets the text is broken up into paragraphs, each of which is often preceded by a heading, a feature not shared with the Ep tablets, whose text was written continuously. Regarding the attestations of *e-ke-qe/e-ko-si-qe*, a remarkable distribution between the forms with and without *-qe* among these series is worth noting. The forms showing *-qe* consistently occur on the Eb/Eo documents by Hand 41, who never wrote simple *e-ke*, while Hand 1 consistently employed *e-ke* on his corresponding records with the only exception of three tablets (Ep 301, Ep 613, Ep 704), where *e-ke-qe* was used alongside *e-ke*. This pattern of occurrences suggests that the usage of non-connective *-qe* is a scribal peculiarity typical of Hand 41. To sum up, the main characteristics of the series under consideration may be systematised as follows (Table 1).

Stage	Preliminary versions	Final versions
Scribe	Hand 41	Hand 1
Series	Eb	Ep
	Eo	En
Employment of <i>e-ke-qe</i>	always	only on 3 tablets

Table 1. Eb/Eo and Ep/En documents.

Hence, on the basis of the above considerations as well as the observation that all of the interpretations put forward so far are unsatisfactory, it is my intention to tentatively follow a path completely different from previous scholarship, and perhaps only slightly hinted at by Bader's proposal (under 2 (g) above). Bearing in mind the inadequacy of previous attempts at approaching this issue on purely linguistic grounds, I would argue for an alternative explanation of the non-connective use of the particle *-qe*, to be seen within the context of Mycenaean (and more precisely Pylian) administrative practices. In my view, this use of *-qe* may be taken as a recording technique used, along with tablet format and layout, in the scribe's recording activity. More specifically, *-qe* may represent a graphic 'filing device' created by Hand 41 to indicate a consecutive connection between records belonging to the same administrative action.¹³ Moreover, this use of *-qe* as a linking device may well have originated from its connective function, since on PY Ta 707.1b (Hand 2), Wa 730.2 (Hand 2), and Fr 1223.2 (Hand 44) we witness the usage of *-qe* to correlate entries, a phenomenon which thus apparently represents – once again – a peculiarity of Pylos bookkeeping. Hand 41 might have been aware of such an employment of connective *-qe* since, as the tablet Fr 1207 is ascribed to this scribe, Hand 41 seems to have been at least partly involved in the redaction of the Fr series, one of whose tablets (Fr 1223) clearly attests the correlation of two entries by means of *-qe*. Therefore, this non-connective use of *-qe* may have been originally devised by Hand 41 to consecutively link separate records on his palm-leaf tablets (Eb series), each of which contains a single entry. However, since *-qe* is also attested on his page-shaped tablets (Eo series), which are made up of an introductory heading and a number of following entries each one containing *e-ke-qe*, it seems that *-qe* was contextually retained by default when Hand 41 copied these entries from corresponding palm-leaf tablets whose texts contained *-qe*. Although this posited series of documents is not preserved, based on the previous working assumption it is plausible to envisage the existence of a group of palm-leaf tablets as the original source for the compilation of the extant Eo records. The question becomes more difficult to account for when it comes to Hand 1's records, owing to the fluctuation in the retention of this particle. As said above, this scribe's rule seems to have been to avoid the employment of *-qe*, except for three documents (Ep 301, Ep 613, Ep 704), which are therefore to be considered as 'marked' contexts and are worth analysing in detail. The text of Ep 301 (given below) is subdivided into two paragraphs, only the second of which consistently retains *e-ke-qe* (here in bold).

13 In order to avoid misunderstandings, I would like to point out that in this paper the word 'filing' is used as adjective derived from the verb 'to file', and not 'filling' derived from 'to fill'. This is in order not to mistake the term 'filing device' with 'filling device', which may recall the Homeric use of certain particles *metri causa*.

PY Ep 301

- .1 ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, a-no-no, to-so-de, pe-mo [GRA 1 T 1
 .2a ko-to-no-o-ko
 .2b a₃-ti-jo-qo, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, to-so, [pe-mo]GRA 1 T 4 V3
 .3 wa-na-ta-jo, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, to-so-de,]pe-mo GRA T
 .4 a-da-ma-o, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, to-so,]pe-mo GRA T 4
 .5 a-tu-ko, e-te-do-mo, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko[-to-na to-so pe-mo GRA
 .6 ta-ta-ro, o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro, da-mo, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, to-so pe-mo[GRA V 3
 .7 vacat
 .8 pi-ke-re-u, **e-ke-qe**, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so, pe-mo[GRA
 .9 ra-ku-ro, **e-ke-qe**, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so, pe-mo GRA[
 .10 ku-so, **e-ke-qe**, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so pe-mo GRA V [3
 .11 ke-ra-u-jo, **e-ke-qe**, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to pe-mo GRA T 4
 .12 pa-ra-ko, **e-ke-qe**, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so pe-mo GRA T 7
 .13 ko-tu[-ro₂], **e-ke-qe**, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so, pe-mo GRA T 1
 .14 a-i-qe-u, **e-ke-qe**, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so, pe-mo GRA T 6

By comparing, when possible, the entries on Ep 301 with the corresponding Eb records it can be noted that in the first paragraph (ll. 1-6), which contains *e-ke*, the material of the entries is the same, but the formulaic structure slightly changes, with the sequence *e-ke-qe o-na-to* becoming *o-na-to e-ke* and the transposition of *pa-ro da-mo* before *ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na*.¹⁴

PY Eb records

- .A (anthroponym) || **e-ke-qe o-na-to** || ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na
 .B pa-ro da-mo || ko-to-no-o-ko || to-so-de pe-mo

PY Ep 301.1-6

(anthroponym) || **o-na-to e-ke** || pa-ro da-mo || ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na || to-so pe-mo

The correspondences for the first paragraph (after Bennett 1956, 106) are given in Table 2.

Ep 301 (Hand 1)	Corresponding Eb tablet (Hand 41)
.1 818 ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, a-no-no, to-so-de pe-mo GRA 1 T 1 [	
.2 846 .A a ₃ -ti-jo-qo, e-ke-qe , o-na-to, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na .B pa-ro, da-mo, ko-to-no-o-ko to-so-de pe-mo GRA 1 T 4 V 3	
.3 369 .A wa-na-ta-]jo, e-ke-qe , o-na-to, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na .B pa-ro]dā-mo, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so-de, pe-mo GRA T 5	
.4 747 .A a-da-ma-o, e-ke-qe , o-na-to, ke-me-na, ko-to-na . B pa-ro, da-mo, ko-to-no-o-ko, to-so-de, pe-mo, GRA T 4[	

Table 2. Text correspondence between Ep 301.1-4 and Eb tablets.

However, in the second paragraph (ll. 8-14) the entries represent the exact transcription of the corresponding ones from the Eb records, the only difference consisting in *to-so-de* (Hand 41) instead of *to-so* (Hand 1). The correspondences for the second paragraph (after Bennett 1956, 106) are given in Table 3.

¹⁴ The change in word order from *e-ke-qe o-na-to* to *o-na-to e-ke* may also be given a pragmatic interpretation (Matić 2003), with the former sequence corresponding to a broad focus (focal domain: *e-ke o-na-to*), the latter to a narrow focus.

Ep 301 (Hand 1)	Corresponding Eb tablet (Hand 41)
.8	496 .A pi-ke-re-u , e-ke-qe , ke[-ke-me-na ko-to-]na .B ko-to-no-o-ko , [to-so-]de pe-mo GRA T 14[
.9	566 .A ra-ku-ro , e-ke-qe , ke-ke-me-na , ko-to-na , [.B ko-to-no-o-ko to-so[-de pe-mo GRA
.10	893 .A ku-so , e-ke-qe ke-]ke-me-na , ko-to-na .B ko-to-no-o[-ko] to-so-de , pe-mo GRA V 3
.11	501 .A ke-ra-u-jo , e-ke-qe , ke-ke[-me-na ko-to-na] .B ko-to-no-o-ko [to-so-de]pe-mo GRA T 4
.12	377 .A pa-ra-ko , e-ke-qe , ke-ke-me[-na ko-to-na .B ko-to-no-o-ko [to-so-de pe-mo GRA T 7
.14	895 .A a-i-qe-u , e-ke-qe , ke-ke-me-na , ko-to-na [] .B ko-to-no-o-ko , to-so[-]de , pe-mo GRA T 6[

Table 3. Text correspondence between Ep 301.8-14 and Eb tablets.

It appears that *-qe*, which was employed by Hand 41 as a filing device, was retained by default by Hand 1 only when directly copying from Hand 41's Eb palm-leaf tablets without any personal re-elaboration of the entry, *i.e.* without making any variation to the pattern. The retention of this feature may also have been triggered by the fact that in these specific cases the term *o-na-to* is not present on the Eb records, so that the sequence *e-ke-qe o-na-to* (typical of Hand 41) could not have been changed into *o-na-to e-ke* (typical of Hand 1) without adding the element *o-na-to* (which, however, may have been perceived as implied).

Moving on to Ep 613, its complex text (given below) does not show paragraph subdivision. However, on the basis of the formulaic sequences employed, it can be divided into two sections (following Palaima 1988, 38). The first section (ll. 1-14) records landholdings using different kinds of formulae, which may reflect differences in the types of landholdings and the conditions attached to them.¹⁵ The second section (ll. 15-20) lists landholdings with the regular formula usually employed in all other Ep documents (apart from Ep 301 and 704).

PY Ep 613

- .1 ne-qe-wo e-da-e-wo ka-ma]o-pe-ro[du-]wo-u-pi , te-re-ja-e ,
- .2 e-me-de te-re-ja to-so-]de , [pe-mo] GRA 10 T 1
- .3] vestigia [ke-ke-]me-na , ko-to-na , ka-ma-e-u , **wo-ze-qe** , to-so pe-mo[GRA] T 6
- .4 te-re-]ta , su-ko , po-řo-du[o-pe-ro-qe]du-wo-u-pi , te-re-ja-e₁]**o-u-qe** , wo-ze[]
- .5 to-]řo-de , pe-mo GRA 10[] vacat
- .6 a₃-wō-re-u , a-si-to-po-qo , ka-ma , **e-ke-qe** , **wo-ze-qe** , to-so pe-mo GRA 1 T [2
- .7 a-•-ke-re-u , i-je-ro-wo-ko , ka-ma-e-u , o-na-to **e-ke** , **wo-ze-qe** to-so pe-mo GRA 1
- .8 sa-sa-]wō , o-na-to , e-ke , ka-ma-e-u , e-pi-qe , to-me , te-ra-pi[-ke]to-so , pe-mo GRA 1 T 5
- .9 e-u-]ru-wo-ta , te-o-jo , [do-e-]ro , **e-ke-qe** [ka-]ma , o-na-to , **wō-ze-qe** , řo-řo , pe[-mo] GRA 1 T 3
- .10 pe-]ře-qo-ta , pa-de-we-ū [**e-ke-qe** , ka-ma , o-na-to , si-ri-jo , ra-ke , to-so , pe-mo GRA 1
- .11 pa-]řa-ko , **e-ke-qe** , ka-ma , ko-to-no-o-ko , e-o to-so , pe-mo GRA 1
- .12 po-]řo-re[-ja te-]o-jo , do-e-ra , e-ke , o-na-to , pa-ro , pa-ra-ko , to-so , pe-mo GRA T 1 V 3
- .13 ko[-tu-ro₂ mi-]ka-ta , pa-de-we-u , ka-ma-e-u , **e-ke-qe** , **wo-ze-qe** , to-so , pe-mo GRA T 5
- .14 we-ra-jo[po-]ti-ni-ja-we-jo , o-na-to , e-ke , ke-ke-me-na , ko-to-na , to-so , pe-mo GRA T 2

¹⁵ Within this section, the restoration [*o-pe-ro-qe*] on line .4 has been questioned by Delgado (2016, 180) as it creates an anacoluthic construction.

- .15a pe-mo
 .15b ko-pi-na, te-o-jo, do-e-ra, o-na-to, e-ke, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, pa-ro da-mo to-so GRA T 2
 .16 mi-ra₁]te-o-jo₁]do-e-ra, o-na-to, e-ke, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, pa-ro, da-mo, to-so pe-mo GRA T 1
 .17 qe-ri-ṭa, te-o-jo, do-e-ra, o-na-to, e-ke, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, pa-ro da-mo, pe-mo GRA T 2
 .18]vestigia[te-o-]jo, do-e-ra, o-na-to, e-ke, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, pa-ro, da-mo, to-so pe-mo GRA V 3
 .19 te-o-jo], do-e-ṛo, o[-]na-to, e-ke, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, pa-ro, da-mo, to-so, pe-mo GRA V 4
 .20]ra-so, te-o-jo, [do-e-ro o-]na-to, e-ke, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, pa-ro da-mo, to-ṣo[pe-mo GRA

Now, looking at the Eb counterparts, Table 4 shows the Eb tablets corresponding to each entry on Ep 613 (Palaima 1988, 128).

Ep 613 (Hand 1)	Corresponding Eb tablet (Hand 41)
.1-2	495 .1 ne-qe-wo, e-da-e-wo, ka-ma, o-pe-ro, du-wo-u-pi, te-re-ja-e, e-me-de, te[-re-]ja [] .2 to-so-de, pe-mo, GRA 10 T 1 []
.3	Possibly (but doubtfully) 862 .A ko-i-ṛo, e-ke-qe , o-na-to, ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na .B ka-ma-e-u, wo-zo, to-so-de pe-mo GRA T
.4-5	149 .1 te-re-ta, su-ko[po-ro-du-]o-pe-ro- qe , te-re-ja-e, o-u-qe, te-re-ja .2 du-wo-u-pi-de, [to-so-de pe-mo GRA 10] <i>vacat</i>
.6	177 .A]re-u[?a-si-]ṭo-po-qo, ka-ma-e-u .B e-ke-qe wo-ze-qe] to-so-de, pe-mo GRA 1 T 2
.7	152 .A ka-]ma-e-u, e-ke-qe , [] .B] to-so-de, pe-mo GRA 1 []
.8	842 .A sa-sa-wo, e-ke-qe , o-na-to, ka-ma-e-u .B e-pi-qe, to-e, te-ra-pi-ke to-so-de, pe-mo GRA 1 T 5
.9	156+157.1 .1a wo-ze-qe .1b e-u-ru-wo-ṭa, te-o-jo, do-e-ro, ka-ma-e-u[e-ke-qe o-na-to]to-so-de, pe-mo GRA 1 [] .2 a ₃ -ti-jo-qo, e-ke-qe , to-jo-qe, au-to-jo, ka-ma-o, [to-so-]de, pe-mo GRA []
.10	159 .A pe-re-qo-ta ₁]pa-da-je-u, i-je-ṛo[-wo-ko e-]ke-qe .B ka-ma, si-ṛi-jo-jo ₁]ra-ke, [to-so-]de, pe-mo GRA 2
.11-12	173 .1 pa-ra-]ko, e-ke-qe , ka-ma, ko-to-no-ko[e-o to-so-de pe-mo GRA 1 .2 po-so-]re-ja, te-o-jo, do-e-ra, e-ke-qe , o-na-to, pa-ṛo[pa-ra-ko to-so-de pe-mo GRA T 1 V 3
.13	839 .A ko-tu-]ṛo ₂ , ka-ma-e-u, mi-ka-ta, pa-da-je-u, e-ke-qe [] .B] wo-ze-qe , to-so-de, pe-mo[GRA T 5
.14	364+366 .1 we-]ra-jo, po-ti[-ni-ja-we-jo e-]ke-qe , o-na-to ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na .2]GRA T[2] <i>vacat</i>
.16	905 .1 mi-ra, te[-o-jo do-e-ra e-ke-qe o-na-to ke-ke-me-na]ko-to-na [] .2 pa-ro da-mo[to-so-de pe-mo GRA T 1] <i>vacat</i> []
.17	900 .A qe-ri-ta, te[-o-jo do-e-ra e-ke-qe o-na-to ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na .B pa-ṛo, da-mo[to-so-de pe-mo GRA T 2

Table 4. Text correspondence between Ep 613 and Eb tablets.

In the light of the above occurrences, some remarks are in order. Hand 41 always employed the form *e-ke-qe*, where *-qe*, as proposed, may be taken as this scribe's own filing device, but, when adding the verb *wo-ze*, Hand 41 made use of the particle *-qe* performing its connective function in order to coordinate the two verbs, thus forming the sequence *e-ke-qe wo-ze-qe* "X holds and works". Hand 1 has behaved inconsistently in relation to this sequence, at times retaining the first *-qe*, at times omitting it. In particular, Hand 1 maintained the exact sequence *e-ke-qe wo-ze-qe* (ll. 6.9.13) when it was present in the Eb records, plausibly because Hand 1 perceived this sequence not as consisting of a filing device (first *-qe*) and a connective (second *-qe*), but rather as a 'double' connective *-qe*, generally employed to emphasize both the elements involved in the coordination. However, in those cases where the Eb records contain only *e-ke-qe* and the verb *wo-ze* was added by Hand 1 on his own entries, Hand 1 employed the simple *e-ke*, apparently being aware that *-qe* in the Eb records represented a filing device. In ll. 10.11, though, Hand 1 retained *e-ke-qe*, which occurs without *wo-ze-qe* on the corresponding Eb tablets. This circumstance is remarkable and calls for an explanation. It can be noted that ll. 10.11 involve a change in the structure of the entries, as another verb (not *wo-ze* any longer) follows *e-ke-qe*: in l. 10 *ra-ke*, which is generally interpreted as a third person singular aorist indicative active without an augment, and in l. 11 *e-o*, interpreted as a nominative singular present active participle.¹⁶ Thus, it may be thought that in these cases Hand 1 maintained *e-ke-qe* with the intention of writing the following verb with a connective *-qe*, parallel to the previous sequence *e-ke-qe wo-ze-qe*, but subsequently changed his mind and wrote the following verb without *-qe* (which makes sense in particular in relation to the participle *e-o*, since it cannot be coordinated with a finite verbal form), as it occurs also on the Eb counterparts (although restored on Eb 173). Therefore, contextually Hand 1's variation between *e-ke-qe* and *e-ke* may be due to his difficulty in understanding that the *-qe* attached to *e-ke* within a sequence of two verbs (*e-ke-qe wo-ze-qe*) did not perform the function of a connective (specifically, that of a 'double' connective *-qe*), but represented the usual filing device employed by Hand 41 in line with his own recording method. Hence, the ambiguity caused by these overlapping usages of *-qe* may have led Hand 1 to the choice of employing *o-da-a₂* as his own filing device instead of *-qe*, as the former had the advantage over the latter of being a recognizable new form, which was hardly interchangeable with anything else.¹⁷ Moreover, *o-da-a₂*, looking more elaborate – and thus perhaps more bureaucratic – may have represented a more adequate device for the status of Hand 1 (Pylos's archivist). This view is supported by the significant distribution of non-connective *-qe* and *o-da-a₂*, which is observable on the Eo/En documents. On the Eo page-shaped tablets by Hand 41 the form *e-ke-qe* is preserved, where *-qe* may have been retained by default when Hand 41 copied the entries from palm-leaf tablets of his own (not preserved). However, on the En page-shaped tablets by Hand 1, *-qe* is taken out and seemingly replaced by *o-da-a₂* (on *o-da-a₂* see Salgarella in preparation). This sequence of particles introduces coherent paragraphs, compiled on the basis of the corresponding Eo records. Therefore *o-da-a₂* appears to have been the specific device introduced by Hand 1 in order to give cohesion to the set and to avoid the use of *-qe*, which was a typical feature of Hand 41. Since Hand 1 employed *o-da-a₂* only within the E Class (Ed, En, Eq series), there is reason to take it as his (more elaborate) filing device, perhaps contextually envisaged to distinguish his own records from those written by Hand 41. Besides, since these filing devices appear together only in this context of the E Class, whose documents are the most complex ones at Pylos, their employment, as well as their origin, may have been due to the bureaucratic complexity of these landholding records. Finally, the last 'marked' context where *e-ke-qe* is preserved is Ep 704 (text given below) by Hand 1, a rather complex record dealing with different types of landholdings.

16 *DMic s.vv.* However, the interpretation of the form *ra-ke* is extremely difficult and therefore difficult to assess in the lack of any probative comparative evidence.

17 The string of particles *o-da-a₂* is an idiosyncratic feature which occurs only on a small number of tablets from Pylos and does not have an alphabetic Greek parallel (for a linguistic interpretation of the particles likely to be contained in this sequence see *DMic s.v.* and esp. Perpillou 1978; Delgado 2017). From a functional point of view, this string of particles has been understood to represent a means of introducing and linking together consecutive paragraphs or tablets with the same topic, most often in order to avoid the repetition of some information previously booked, e.g. a heading (*Interpret.*, 57; *Docs²*, 563; Hooker 1980, 63; Duhoux 2008, 304). However, the reason why it was employed as well as its restricted usage (only by some Hands and on some records) have not been fruitfully explored, and the above interpretation is worth reconsidering in the light of a reassessment of the attestations of this sequence (see Salgarella 2019).

PY Ep 704

- .1 o-pe-to-re-u , qe-ja-me-no , e-ke , ke-ke-me-na , ko-to-na , to-so , pe-mo[]GRA 2 T 5
 .2 u-wa-mi-ja , te-o-jo , do-e-ra , o-na-to , e-ke-qe , i-je-re-ja , ke-ra , to-so pe-mo GRA T 1 V 3
 .3 e-ri-ta , i-je-re-ja , o-na-to , e-ke , ke-ke-me-na , ko-to-na , pa-ro , da-mo , to-so , pe-mo GRA T 4
 .4 ki-ri-te-wi-ja , o-na-to , e-ko-si , ke-ke-me-na , ko-to-na[]pa-ro , da-mo , to-so , pe-mo GRA 1 T 9
 .5 e-ri-ta , i-je-re-ja , e-ke , e-u-ke-to-qe , e-to-ni-jo , e-ke-e , te-o , da-mo-de-mi , pa-si , ko-to-na-o ,
 .6 ke-ke-me-na-o , o-na-to , e-ke-e , to-so pe-mo GRA 3 T 9
 .7 ka-pa-ti-ja , ka-ra-wi-po-ro , e-ke , ke-ke-me-no , o-pe-ro-sa , du-wo-u-pi , wo-ze-e , o-u-wo-ze[]to-şo[]
 .8 to-şo[]pe-mo GRA []4

Although the entry on Ep 704.2, corresponding to Eb 416.1 (as in *PTTI*, 129), contains the sequence *o-na-to e-ke-qe*, it differs from the usual Eb formula *e-ke-qe o-na-to* in the changed order of the two terms, as observable below:

PY Ep 704.2

u-wa-mi-ja , te-o-jo , do-e-ra , **o-na-to** , **e-ke-qe** , i-je-re-ja , ke-ra , to-so pe-mo GRA T 1 V 3

PY Eb 416

- .1 u-wa-mi-ja , te-o-jo[]do-e-ra[]qe[-ke-]qe , i-je-re[-ja]ke-ra , o[-na-to
 .2 to-so-şo[]pe-mo GRA T 2 V 3 [] vac. []

This attestation of *e-ke-qe* is the most difficult one to account for, particularly in view of the fragmentary state of preservation of the corresponding Eb record. It is remarkable that *e-ke-qe* occurs only once on Ep 704, while all the other entries show the simple *e-ke*. Moreover, the word order of the sequence with the verb following the direct object is that typical of Hand 1, but with *-qe* attached. One may wonder whether the reason for the retention of *-qe* in this case was due to the slightly different word order attested on the corresponding Eb entry: that is, the unusual detachment of *o-na-to* from *e-ke-qe* by inserting the sequence *i-je-re[-ja]ke-ra*. Thus, *-qe* may have been retained by Hand 1 simply by default in transcribing a sequence which deviated from the usual pattern of the Eb records, but was subsequently avoided in the following transcriptions. Indeed, Hand 1 seems to have been aware of *-qe* being employed as a filing device given that contextually, apart from l. 2, this scribe always took it out, even in the only instance (Ep 704.5) where it might have been taken as a connective. In fact, the corresponding Eb entry (Eb 297) shows *e-ke-qe e-u-ke-to-qe*, where the doubling of *-qe* might have been intended as a ‘double’ connective; yet, on Ep 704.5 the transcribed sequence is *e-ke e-u-ke-to-qe*. Even though there does not seem to be a clear-cut explanation for the occurrence of *e-ke-qe* in this context, the proposal advanced in this paper may offer a clue to its better understanding. In conclusion, on the basis of the above argumentation it follows that it is exactly in those instances where Hand 1 shows a deviation from his usual formulaic pattern that we find the retention of *e-ke-qe*. Hence, I suggest that *-qe* was retained on some Ep page-shaped tablets since they were compiled by Hand 1 directly from the Eb palm-leaf tablets by Hand 41, and thus at times the *-qe* device might have been retained by default by Hand 1 (an oversight?). Contrariwise, when Hand 1 redacted the En page-shaped tablets from the Eo page-shaped tablets written by Hand 41, Hand 1 seemed to be aware of *-qe* on the Eo records being a ‘relic’ of its employment as a filing device on (assumed, although not preserved) separate palm-leaf tablets by Hand 41. Therefore, Hand 1 took it out and employed his own device instead, namely *o-da-a₂* (perhaps contextually created), to link up coherent sets of related entries arranged into separate paragraphs. Such a pattern of replacement of *-qe* with *o-da-a₂* is clearly shown by comparing the corresponding Eo/En entries. Built on this proposal, I suggest a possible chronological frame of reference for the recording process involved in the redaction of these E series tablets, as systematised in Table 5.

	Hand 41		Hand 1
	Preliminary versions		Final versions
Time	palm-leaf	page-shaped	page-shaped
<i>ke-ke-me-na</i> set	Eb		Ep
<i>ki-ti-me-na</i> set	[Eo]	Eo	En

Table 5. Proposed redaction process.

In the *ke-ke-me-na* set of tablets, the possibility of the existence of a set of page-shaped tablets at an intermediate stage between the Eb and the Ep series is excluded by the assumption that *-qe* was at times retained on the Ep documents as a result of their being compiled directly from the Eb palm-leaf tablets, where *-qe* was employed as a filing device. However, in the *ki-ti-me-na* set, the preservation of *-qe* on consecutive entries within a paragraph on the Eo page-shaped documents suggests the existence of a set of palm-leaf records by Hand 41, which are not preserved, leading to the compilation of the Eo series. If so, we might suppose the existence of a three-stage administrative process of recording the *ki-ti-me-na* land, characterized by the initial recording of information (palm-leaf documents by Hand 41), the consolidating stage (page-shaped documents by Hand 41) and the final redaction (page-shaped documents by Hand 1). This also suggests that the *ke-ke-me-na* set was the first one to be compiled, since in this set of tablets Hand 1 has retained *-qe* on the aforementioned Ep records rather than employing *o-da-a₂*, whereas the *ki-ti-me-na* set, which is characterized by the consistent replacement of *-qe* with *o-da-a₂*, was compiled subsequently. In keeping with this reasoning, I would add a further point in relation to the Ed series by Hand 1, which is a remarkable series since it both contains examples of *o-da-a₂* and consists of palm-leaf tablets. The presence of *o-da-a₂* may point to this series having been redacted after the compilation of the Eb/Ep and Eo/En sets: *o-da-a₂*, apparently devised by Hand 1 in the context of the En series for the proposed reasons, may have been productively employed by this scribe in other records of his own. Specifically, the peculiar nature of the Ed documents (which are palm-leaf tablets, but are conceptually conceived of as totalling documents, since each tablet records total extensions of landholdings related to specific groups of individuals) may have favoured the employment of *o-da-a₂* as a filing device aimed at both replacing *-qe* and linking together separate records involving the same administrative process. Moreover, the use of *o-da-a₂* to replace *-qe* on these palm-leaf tablets suggests that the possible existence of a series of palm-leaf records preceding the redaction of the Ed series might be assumed, although this must remain hypothetical for the time being. The present discussion may also shed more light on the attestation of the *hapax o-de-qa-a₂* on PY On 300. This sequence is plausibly to be taken as the enlargement of *o-da-a₂* by the insertion of the particle *-qe*, as can clearly be inferred from the fact that *o-de-qa-a₂* appears over erasure of *o-de-qe* (Docs², 467). Given that an interpretation of *-qe* as a connective seems highly unlikely here, the possibility of explaining *o-da-a₂* as the mixing of the two filing devices – perhaps by a scribe who had to be familiar with them both, that is to say had to be close to the work of both Hand 1 and Hand 41 – should be entertained. Since, on palaeographical grounds, the tablet has not been attributed to a specific hand – it is only assigned to Class ii (Palaima 1988, 119-120) – no secure scribal relationship can be proved. Nevertheless, based on the previous argumentation there remains the possibility for this tablet to be assigned to a scribe somehow related to both Hand 1 and Hand 41 (perhaps trained by them, or working under them).

3.2. Two further attestations: PY An 724.11 and PY Va 15.2

An 724.11 (H1) reads: *o-pe-ṛo* , [] , *e-ko-si-qe* , *e-qe-ta* , *ka-ma*[. In this instance, *-qe* may be interpreted either way. It could have performed a connective function, since, given the lacuna before *e-ko-si-qe*, the possible presence of a preceding verbal form cannot be excluded at all. Alternatively, and perhaps more likely, the entry represents the transcription of an E Class record. The tablet is written by Hand 1, and this specific entry is reminiscent of both the Ep 613.6.9.10.11 entries by Hand 1 recording *ka-ma* plots and certain entries belonging to the Eb series by Hand 41 (Eb 159.B, 173.1, 495.1), which record *ka-ma* land by means of the verbal form *e-ke-qe*. On An 724.11 *ka-ma*[is attested, and given the small amount of space available in the following lacuna it is unlikely that the term should be restored as *ka-ma-e-we*, which was suggested to be in agreement with *e-qe-ta*

(in fact, the sequence *e-qe-ta ka-ma-e-we* is never attested in the extant Linear B evidence). In my view, it is more sensible to consider the sequence *ka-ma* as complete and parallel to *e-ke-qe ka-ma* on the aforementioned entries. Therefore, in order to give a plausible explanation of the occurrence of *e-ko-si-qe* in this context, an Eb (or even an Ep) record behind the entry on An 724.11 may be thought of: *-qe* may have been contextually retained by default by Hand 1 while transcribing the entry from an Eb palm-leaf tablet containing *-qe*. Moving now onto the other text to be considered, namely Va 15.2, it has first to be pointed out that the Va series comprises five palm-leaf tablets characterized by the absence of ideograms (PTTI, 251-252), thus complicating our understanding of its thematic content, and no secure attribution to any scribal hand is possible (it is loosely attributed to Class ii). The text of Va 15, arranged over two ruled lines, is damaged and at times illegible: this causes further problems as regards its possible interpretation. The sequence *e-ke-qe* is attested on the lower line (.2b), which reads: *pe-]re-ku-wa-na-ka[] e-te , pu-ro , e-ke-qe , a-po-te-ro-te 1* (.2a shows the sequence *[]ra-ka-te-ra*). Given the lacuna prior to the occurrence of *e-ke-qe*, the plausible presence of a preceding verb which *e-ke-qe* may correlate with cannot be excluded. In particular, if such an interpretation is given to the sequence *Je-to*, which occurs on the same line (as in *DMic. s.v.*), clear support may be lent to *-qe* being a simple connective coordinating two verbal forms, or more specifically two clauses, since *e-ke-qe* is preceded by the term *pu-ro*, which should probably be taken as its subject. In my view, in this context *-qe* is more likely to be performing its connective function than the non-connective one, which, as argued, seems to be a graphic recording procedure restricted to the redaction of the E Class.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis presented above has led to argue that non-connective *-qe* should be taken as an idiosyncratic ‘filing device’ employed by Hand 41 in order to make it clear that each tablet or record showing it was part of a larger set. I would therefore argue that non-connective *-qe* represents a peculiar booking practice typical of a particular scribe at Pylos (Hand 41). This function would have originated from an extension of the connective use of *-qe*: from linking lexical items to linking related individual documents at the initial stage of a proposed tripartite administrative system associated with complex landholding records. These documents were later copied over by another scribe (Hand 1) into their final compilation versions. Hand 1, however, seems to have conceived of, and generally preferred, another functionally comparable (but graphically different) filing device in the form of a complex string of particles, namely *o-da-a₂*. This string was perhaps perceived as a linking marker which was less ambiguous and confusing than the simple particle *-qe*, since it was more elaborate and hence more clearly identifiable. As a result, both *o-da-a₂* and non-connective *-qe* are best explained if placed within the broader context of the scribes’ administrative recording techniques: that is to say, *-qe* and *o-da-a₂* should be taken as two comparable – but competing – graphic filing devices used in the document/record filing system. In fact, as pointed out elsewhere (Salgarella 2019), the string of particles *o-da-a₂* does not seem to possess a purely semantic meaning. Rather, since it appears to relate to the specific nature of the transaction recorded, it is likely to have functioned as a linking device employed to link together consecutive tablets or records within the same administrative action. Therefore, built on the observable significant distribution of *o-da-a₂* and non-connective *-qe*, I would argue that the non-connective behaviour of the particle *-qe* can be explained as another concurrent method fulfilling the purpose of linking together consecutive tablets or records which were meant to be part of larger documents. However, it does seem that the employment of *-qe* as linking device by Hand 41 led Hand 1 to come up with another comparable device of his own, namely *o-da-a₂*; this was, therefore, the latter to be developed. In these terms, assuming that the present interpretation holds good, both *o-da-a₂* and non-connective *-qe* would have merely represented graphic recording tools rather than lexical items, and as such ought to be interpreted as different kinds of filing devices graphically rendered in the Linear B script. Their employment is shown to be contingent upon scribal hands: *-qe* appears to have been the device specifically employed by Hand 41, while *o-da-a₂*, a more elaborated and thus possibly more bureaucratic string, is the one (most likely) forged and (clearly) preferred by Hand 1 for records of his own. The reason why these devices appear to have originated within the context of the Pylos E Class might be sought in the bureaucratic com-

plexity of these landholding documents, which required higher systematisation in order for the information to be neatly recorded and fruitfully retrieved. It is worth noting that such a peculiar bookkeeping method of transaction recording by means of filing devices is employed by Hand 1 (*o-da-a₂*) and Hand 41 (*-qe*), who are acknowledged to be particularly important scribes working at Pylos (Hand 1 is understood to have been the main archivist), and were plausibly also ‘heads’ of scribal palaeographic traditions (Palaima 1988, 30-31; 2011). This may mean that these two scribes had enough autonomy and confidence to elaborate suitable recording methods for providing their documents with a more clear-cut systematisation within an increasingly complex administrative system such as the one at Pylos. Finally, building on the distributional patterns observable for these two alleged filing devices, I have tentatively put forward a chronological frame of reference for the redaction of the Pylian landholding records (E series) dealt with here, arguing for the existence of a three-stage administrative process. This process would have consisted of the initial recording of information on palm-leaf tablets by Hand 41, a consolidating stage featured on page-shaped tablets by Hand 41 and the final redaction on page-shaped tablets by Hand 1.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Torsten Meissner for his useful comments on earlier drafts of this paper, stemming from my M.Phil. dissertation (University of Cambridge, 2015). I should also extend my thanks to Dr. Anna Judson and Dr. Rachele Pierini for their detailed and productive feedback on the latest versions of this paper.

Abbreviations

<i>DELG</i>	Chantraine P. 1968, <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque</i> , I-II, Paris.
<i>DMic</i>	Aura Jorro F., Adrados R.F. 1985-1993, <i>Diccionario micénico</i> , I-II, Madrid.
<i>Docs²</i>	Ventris M., Chadwick J. 1973 (1956), <i>Documents in Mycenaean Greek</i> , 2nd ed., Cambridge.
<i>EDG</i>	Beekes R. 2010, <i>Etymological Dictionary of Greek</i> , I-II, Leiden-Boston.
<i>GEW</i>	Frisk H. 1960-1972, <i>Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch</i> , I-III, Heidelberg.
<i>Gr.Gr</i>	Schwyzler E. 1953, <i>Griechische Grammatik</i> , I-III, München.
<i>Interpret.</i>	Palmer L.R. 1963, <i>The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts</i> , Oxford.
<i>Mém.</i>	Lejeune M. 1958-1972, <i>Mémoires de philologie mycénienne</i> , I-III, Paris-Roma.
<i>PTT</i>	Bennett E.L. Jr., Olivier J.-P. 1973-1976, <i>The Pylos Tablets Transcribed</i> , I-II, Roma.

References

- Adrados F.R. 1997, Notas de entrega, no catastro en *Pa-ki-ja-na*, *Minos* 29-30, 117-134.
- Bader F. 1975, Mycénien *to-so-de*, *to-so-jo*, *Minos* 14, 85-109.
- Bennett E.L. Jr. 1956, The landholders of Pylos, *AJA* 60, 103-133.
- Campanile E. 1959, Miceneo ed Acheo, *AnnPisa* 2/28, 303-309.
- Del Frio M. 1995, Il catasto miceneo di *pa-ki-ja-na*: due note paleografiche, *Kadmos* 34, 49-52.
- Del Frio M. 2005, *I censimenti di terreni nei testi in Lineare B*, Pisa-Roma.
- Del Frio M. 2008, L'identità de *l'e-qe-ta* du cadastre de *pa-ki-ja-ne*, *RPhil* 82, 63-69.
- Delgado J.J.M. 2005, Consideraciones en torno a PY Eb 297/PY Ep 704.5-6, *Kadmos* 44, 43-50.
- Delgado J.J.M. 2016, *Sintaxis del griego micénico*, Sevilla.
- Delgado J.J.M. 2017, The particle *ᾗα* from the 2nd to the 1st millennium, in Nosch M.-L., Landenius Enegren H. (eds), *Aegean Scripts. Proceedings of the 14th International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, Copenhagen, 2-5 September 2015*, Roma, 537-548.
- Duhoux Y. 1972, Mycénien *e-ke-qe* / *e-ko-si-qe*, *Minos* 13, 55-66.
- Duhoux Y. 2008, Mycenaean Anthology, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World*, Vol. 1, Leuven, 243-393.
- Dunkel G.E. 2014, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*, Heidelberg.
- Forbes K. 1958, The relations of the particle *ᾗν* with *κε(ν)* *κα* *κᾶν*, *Glotta* 37, 179-182.
- Foster E.D. 1981, The flax impost at Pylos and Mycenaean landholding, *Minos* 17, 67-121.

- Hajnal I. 2004, *e-ke-qe* oder *e-ke?* – Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit in den mykenischen Palastarchiven, in Krisch T., Lindner T., Müller U. (eds), *Analecta homini universali dicata. Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik, Linguistik, Philologie, Politik, Musik und Dichtung. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart, 146-178.
- Hooker J.T. 1965, Some interpretations of Mycenaean *ekeqe* and Homeric *TE*, *Glotta* 43, 256-277.
- Hooker J.T. 1980, *Linear B: An Introduction*, Bristol.
- Killen J.T. 2008, Mycenaean economy, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo-Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World*, Vol. 1, Louvain-la-Neuve-Walpole, 159-200.
- Levin S. 1964, *The Linear B Decipherment Controversy Re-examined*, New York.
- Lupack S. 2016, *pu-ro*, *pa-ki-ja-ne*, and the worship of an ancestral wanax, in Alram-Stern E., Blakolmer F., Deger-Jalkotzy S., Laffineur R., Weilhartner J. (eds), *METAPHYSIS. Ritual, Myth and Symbolism in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 15th International Aegean Conference, Vienna, Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology, Aegean and Anatolia Department, Austrian Academy of Sciences and Institute of Classical Archaeology, University of Vienna, 22-25 April 2014* (Aegaeum 39), Leuven-Liège, 537-541 (with plates CLII-CLIII).
- Matić D. 2003, Topic, focus and discourse structure: Ancient Greek word order, *Studies in Language* 27.3, 573-633.
- Montecchi B. 2016, *pu-ro*, *pa-ki-ja-na/ne* and the sanctuary of Poseidon at Pylos, *SMEA NS* 2, 119-136.
- Palaima Th.G. 1988, *The Scribes of Pylos*, Roma.
- Palaima Th.G. 2011, Scribes, scribal hands and palaeography, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo-Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World*, Vol. 2, Louvain-la-Neuve -Walpole, 33-136.
- Palmer L.R. 1962, The language of Homer, in Wace A.J.B., Stubbings F.H. (eds), *A Companion to Homer*, Cambridge, 75-178.
- Perpillou J.-L. 1978, Débuts de phrase en grec méridional archaïque, in *Étrennes de septantaine offerts à M. Lejeune par un groupe de ses élèves*, Paris, 179-181.
- Pisani V. 1967, Mykenisch *ekeqe*, *Glotta* 44, 134.
- Probert Ph. 2008, Mycenaean *o-* is accusative; *jo-* is nominative, *Glotta* 84, 126-168.
- Ruijgh C.J. 1967, *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam.
- Ruijgh C.J. 1971, *Autour de 'τε épique'. Études sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam.
- Ruipérez M.S. 1987, Subjunctive forms in Mycenaean texts, in Ilievski P., Crepajac L. (eds), *Tractata Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, Held in Ohrid (15-20 September 1985)*, Skopje, 323-331.
- Ruipérez M.S. 1997, Mycenaean Greek and its contribution to the reconstruction of IE syntax, in Crespo E., García Ramón J.L. (eds), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy: Actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid, 21-24 de septiembre de 1994*, Madrid-Wiesbaden, 527-536.
- Salgarella E. 2018, Some thoughts on Mycenaean *o-u-qe*, in Jasink A.M., Alberti M.E. (eds), *Akrothina II. Contributi di giovani ricercatori agli studi egei e ciprioti*, Firenze, 249-257.
- Salgarella E. 2019, Form and function of clausal particles in the Linear B texts from Pylos, *JGL* 19, 196-214.
- Shelmerdine C.W. 2016, Poseidon, *pa-ki-ja-na* and horse-taming Nestor, in Alram-Stern E., Blakolmer F., Deger-Jalkotzy S., Laffineur R., and Weilhartner J. (eds), *METAPHYSIS. Ritual, Myth and Symbolism in the Aegean Bronze Age. Proceedings of the 15th International Aegean Conference, Vienna, Institute for Oriental and European Archaeology, Aegean and Anatolia Department, Austrian Academy of Sciences and Institute of Classical Archaeology, University of Vienna, 22-25 April 2014* (Aegaeum 39), Leuven-Liège, 275-283.
- Teijeiro M.G. 1969, *E-ke-qe* et les tablettes E de Pylos, *Minos* 10/2, 167-176.
- Teijeiro M.G. 1972, New evidence on *e-ke-qe*, *Minos* 13/1, 984.
- Teijeiro M.G. 1994, **-qe* no coordinativo micénico y **kue* condicional, in *Actas del VIII Congreso Español de Estudios Clásicos I*, Madrid, 121-127.
- Thompson R.J.E. 2002-2003, What the butler saw: Some thoughts on the Mycenaean *o- jo-* particle, *Minos* 37-38, 317-336.

MONOGRAPHIC SECTION

POLITICAL BOUNDARIES AND CULTURAL CONTACTS DURING THE IRON AGE IN SOUTH-EAST ANATOLIA: CILICIA, AMUQ AND THE KARA SU VALLEY

The contributions collected in this section were presented in June 2018 at the workshop “Political Boundaries and Cultural Contacts during the Iron Age in South-East Anatolia: Cilicia, Amuq and the Kara Su Valley” run by Marina Pucci and Sebastiano Soldi at Ascona, during the International Conference *Beyond All Boundaries: Anatolia in the First Millennium BC* organized by Annick Payne and Jorit Wintjes. The initiative to publish them in this SMEA issue aims at offering a deeper glimpse of the stratigraphic sequences and ceramic production of a wide region at the border between Anatolia and northern Syria, comprehending Cilicia, the Amuq and the Kara Su valley.

In the early first millennium BC a group of independent political entities, which are usually called Syro-Anatolian, developed in the north-east area of the Mediterranean. By the end of the 8th century BC these new polities were all annexed to the Neo-Assyrian Empire. The contextual analysis of the material culture of four important Iron Age sites of this region, *i.e.* Misis, Sirkeli, Chatal and Zincirli, will significantly expand our knowledge of the period. It will also allow readers to contrast different historical narratives in which pottery is considered the principal instrument to reconstruct material practices based on the production and consumption of objects and goods, and to delineate the development of material cultures in a period which witnessed a peak of cross-cultural interactions in the eastern Mediterranean.

