

MYCENAEAN *TE-KO-TO-NA-PE*

by JOHN CHADWICK

The spelling variation *te-ko-to-a-pe* PY An 5. 1-5, compared with *te-ko-to-na-pe* PY An 18. 2,7 in a similar context was one of Ventris's basic examples for the construction of the 'grid'. It was hardly likely that two such words, each composed of five signs and differing in only one medial sign, would prove to be unrelated. Once the decipherment had yielded values, the alternating signs were identified as *a/na*; and it was then possible to explain the alternation as due to sandhi variants of a phrase or compound, in which the final *-n* of the first element might be either omitted in writing, as usual in final position, or written together with the initial vowel of the second element. No serious reasons have been advanced against this view, and despite initial doubts by L. R. Palmer¹, the principle of a sandhi variant is accepted by him in *Interpretation* pp. 33, 132 f., by M. Lejeune² and others.

The first attempt at interpretation started from the accepted fact that in the Mycenaean spelling *te-ko-to-ne* (KN Am 826.2; PY An 18.11?) we have the Greek word τέκτονες 'carpenters'. It must be emphasised that the occurrence of this word at Pylos is in the very same tablet as *te-ko-to-na-pe*; the reading, however, is extremely doubtful. *te-* though over erasure, appears certain, and *-ne* is probable; only traces of the other two signs remain. It is unfortunate that there should be an element of doubt at what appears to be the vital point of the argument; but no other reading has been proposed.

Since in line 11 *te-ko-to-ne* and a lost word precede the total in line 12: *VIR* 254[, while *te-ko-to-na-pe* and *te-ko-to-a-pe* are always followed by *VIR* 1³, it seemed reasonable to suppose that we had here the singular

¹ See below note 7.

² *Parola del Passato* 15 (1960) p. 18; I am indebted to Professor Lejeune for having criticised an earlier draft of this article. See also Lejeune's *Note* here p. 33.

³ Numeral lost in An 18.2.

*/tektōn/*⁴ combined with the same word beginning *a-*. An obvious candidate for this was supplied by line 6 of the same tablet, reading:

te-re-ne-we, to-ko-do-mo-a-pe-o VIR 1

The words *to-ko-do-mo* and *a-pe-o* are often (no doubt rightly) separated in transcription, but there does not appear to be a divider between them. *a-pe-o*, by comparison with *a-pe-o-te* (PY An 724.1, KN B 823) *|apeontes|*, *a-pe-a-sa* (KN Ap 633.1) feminine *|apeassai|*, was plainly the singular of the participle of ἄπειμι *|apeōn|*. *a-pe* therefore was taken as 3rd pers. sing. of the imperfect indicative, for which we reconstruct the form *|apēs|*. An alternative proposal was made by P. Katzouros⁵ that it represents a variant form of the participle in */(h)ens/*: but such a variation within the limits of a single tablet would be surprising⁶.

This interpretation was attacked by L. R. Palmer⁷, and his identification of it as an otherwise unknown place name has been generally accepted⁸. But there seem to be strong arguments in favour of both hypotheses, and it may be useful to consider all the relevant evidence.

Palmer's objections to *|tektōn apēs|* are two: (1) if this is a phrase, the word-divider would have been expected to separate the elements; (2) other words occupying the same position in the same tablets are place-names. Both of these objections need to be examined in detail; and this raises also the question of the significance of words meaning 'missing' or 'absent' on the tablets.

Palmer admits two situations in which the divider is frequently omitted: "with fair regularity in divine names, this reflecting some kind of tabu as I have suggested"; and "in double place names of the type *ma-ta-a-ka-re-u-te*"⁹.

It has been all too readily assumed, not least by the opponents of the decipherment, that the use of the word-divider in Linear B corresponds with the use of gaps to indicate division into words which is familiar from late manuscripts and printed books. Thus we regard departures from this norm as requiring comment, and frame rules such as that which states that enclitics are written as part of the preceding word. It should not be necessary to

⁴ I use the convention of oblique strokes / - / to mark reconstructed Mycenaean forms, as proposed by A. Heubeck, *Aus der Welt der frühgriechischen Lineartafeln*, p. 19.

⁵ *Neon Athenaiōn* 2 (1957), pp. 116-119.

⁶ Ventris had at first suspected that *a-pe* might be the genitive of a noun denoting the objects made by the carpenters; but this idea was abandoned because of the lack of any suitable noun or the support of a parallel.

⁷ *Die Sprache* 5 (1959), pp. 132-3, cf. *Interpretation* pp. 33, 132.

⁸ E.g. M. Lejeune, *l. c.* (note 2); W. Porzig, *Gnomon* 32 (1960), p. 588; F. Bader, *Erasmus* 16 (1964), p. 118.

⁹ *Die Sprache*, *l. c.*

remark that these divisions are dependent upon the writers' analysis of speech, and that the practice of Mycenaean scribes can only be deduced from the examples available to us. Moreover, the agreement in word-division between Linear B and modern texts is so close that we tend to forget that other principles are observed in Cypriot syllabic inscriptions, and even in the rare early examples of Greek alphabetic inscriptions which mark word-division.

A study of Mycenaean divine names does not offer much support for the suggestion that the divider is here omitted "with fair regularity". Since the majority of divine names consists of single words, the examples are restricted to a small class. For instance, *a-ta-na-po-ti-ni-ja* is presumably what we would regard as two words (whether the first element is a divine name or a place name), and since the phrase does not occur 'divisim', we can only compare other apparent phrases of the same kind: *da-pu₂-ri-to-jo*, *po-ti-ni-ja* KN Gg 702.2; *u-po-jo*, *po-ti-ni-ja* PY Fn 187.8¹⁰; *si-to-po-ti-ni-ja* MY Oi 701.3. *pa-si-te-o-i* is always written without the divider. But other phrases like *di-ka-ta-jo*, *di-we* (KN Fp 1.2), *po-ti-ni-ja*, *a-si-wi-ja* (PY Fr 1206), [*po-*] *ti-ni-ja*, *i-qe-ja* (PY An 1281.1) are separated, and it is hard to observe any rule.

Similarly place names compounded of two elements are frequently written undivided: *ti-mi-to-a-ke-e* (PY passim) is shown to be a compound by the derivative *ti-mi-ti-ja*. *ke-i-ja-ka-ra-na* (PY Nn 228.3) is probably a phrase composed of adjective plus noun, cf. *ke-e* (locative) Aa 93, Ad 295; but *pu-ro-ra-u-ra-ti-jo* may be either written as one word (Ad 664) or divided as *pu-ro*, *ra-wa-ra-ti-jo* (Cn 45.1-3, 8, 9, 12). Clearly the habits of individual scribes may be invoked to explain these differences.

But to restrict the omission of the divider in phrases to these two categories is to misunderstand the nature of Mycenaean graphic practice, even of writing in general. We have clear examples of such alternation in phrases which do not fall into either of these categories: *me-tu-ra*, *su-ra-se* (PY Ae 8, 72), *me-tu-ra-su-ra-se* (Ae 264); *to-to*, *we-to* (Sn 64.2), *to-to-we-to* (lines 5, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16 of the same tablet); *to-so*, *pe-mo* and *to-so-pe-mo* (Ep 301 and passim). It is hardly necessary to add *to-ko-do-mo-a-pe-o* (PY An 18.6) compared with *e-re-ta*, *a-pe-o-te* (An 724.1). It is clear that any two words felt to go closely together might optionally be written divided or undivided. Thus the absence of a divider cannot affect our judgement of *te-ko-to-na-pe*; and if the *-n-* of this form is due to sandhi, the omission of the divider in one form is automatic, for only in *te-ko-to-a-pe* could it be introduced.

However, even if we admit that any phrase may be written without the use of a divider, it might be objected that if the entry really consists of three words, a name, a description and a verb, one would expect the name and description to be linked as a phrase, rather than the description and the verb.

¹⁰ So *PT I* correctly; *PT II* omits the divider.

One can only speculate on the reasons for such an arrangement. We might for instance explain it as a deliberate choice to imply that the reason for the man's absence was that his services as carpenter were required elsewhere. But there is also the possibility that it is connected with the arrangement of *te-ko-to-a-pe* in An 5 in a column with a space between the shorter names and the beginning of the second word. This columnar arrangement is uncommon (there is a good parallel in An 172), and its meaning can only be conjectured. It is possible that the right-hand part of the entry was written first, leaving the names of the absent men to be filled in subsequently; the second name is undoubtedly cramped to fit into the space, but this may have been merely due to the desire to adopt the columnar arrangement.

Palmer's second objection is plainly the vital one. This proceeds from the hypothesis that if certain members of a series of entries can be shown to belong to a given class, the same must be true of the remainder. The hypothesis is justified where the series is long, well-preserved and regular. No one can doubt that the initial entry of every Pylos Na tablet is a place name, since so many of them can be proved to be. But it remains to be seen whether these conditions hold good in the relevant tablets.

An 5	<i>e-ta-je-u,</i>	<i>te-ko-to-a-pe</i>	VIR 1
	<i>wi-do-wo-i-jo,</i>	<i>te-ko-to-a-pe</i>	VIR 1
	<i>to-ro-wi-ka,</i>	<i>te-ko-to-a-pe</i>	VIR 1
	<i>po-ru-to</i>	<i>te-ko-to-a-pe</i>	VIR 1
.5	<i>o-tu</i>	<i>te-ko-to-a-pe</i>	VIR 1
	<i>sa-ni-jo</i>	<i>qe-re-me-ti-wo</i>	VIR 1
	<i>ku-ri-sa-to</i>	<i>mu-ta-pi</i>	VIR 1
	<i>[[i-na-pi,</i>	<i>ra-u-ta</i>	VIR 1]]

The last few lines show traces of deletion, and line 8 appears to be a remnant of an earlier deleted text¹¹; it must therefore be left out of account in determining the status of *te-ko-to-a-pe*.

There can be no doubt that the first word in each line is a man's name; and *ku-ri-sa-to* and *sa-ni-jo* recur in Cn 4.2,3 preceded by *mu-ta-pi* and *qe-re-me-ti-re* respectively. The latter is presumably a scribal error for *qe-re-me-ti-wo*, since this form is also found in Cn 875.3. *mu-ta-pi* occurs only in these two contexts. The parallel entries of Cn 4 contain undoubted place names, and the deduction that *mu-ta-pi* and *qe-re-me-ti-wo* belong to the same class seems justified. The further inference that *te-ko-to-a-pe* is also a place name is tempting, but, as we shall see, not inevitable.

¹¹ Its appearance is totally different, and E. L. Bennett and J-P. Olivier agree with me that it was probably deleted; it is out of alignment with 'the rest of the text.

Ae 134, Ae 264) this position is occupied by *a₃-ki-pa-ta*, which is generally admitted to be an occupational term 'goat-herd'. But the form of *i-na-ni-ja* and its alternation with *i-na-ne* strongly suggest that it should be identified as a place name (cf. the deleted *i-na-pi*, the instrumental to *i-na-ne*, on An 5.8).

Thus here too the balance of probability is superficially in favour of the identification of *te-ko-to-na-pe* as a place name. But before we accept that conclusion we must examine a little more thoroughly the hypothesis on which the conclusion is based, and review the chances of another strange coincidence.

Mycenaean scribes were unfortunately not entirely regular and reliable in their habits. We have just seen how in the Ae tablets quoted *i-na-ni-ja* and *a₃-ki-pa-ta*, though occupying the same position in the formula, are to be attributed to different categories. Such cases are by no means infrequent.

In order to abbreviate their text Mycenaean scribes sometimes fail to repeat a heading which is to be understood with following entries; the sense would have been instantly apparent to those familiar with the names and subject matter, and only to us is the result ambiguous or difficult to interpret. Take for instance An 424:

[- - -] *ra-pte-re VIR 12 pu-ka-[wo] VIR 6 te-u-ta-ra-ko-ro[*
ka-ra-u-jo, ra-pte-re VIR[]1 sa-ri-nu-wo-te , ra-pte-re VIR 10
ke-ra-ti-jo-jo , wo-wo , me-ri-du-ma-te VIR 2 da-ko-ro VIR 1

Here the entries consist of either one, two or three words followed by *VIR* and a number. We may assume a single word to be missing at the beginning of line 1; at the end of the same line probably only *VIR* and a number is missing. Where the words immediately preceding *VIR* can be interpreted, they are occupational terms or titles descriptive of the men: *|rhaptères|*, *|purkawoi|*, *|dakoros|(?)*, and *me-ri-du-ma-te* is clearly a compound of the official title *du-ma*; *te-u-ta-ra-ko-ro*, which resists plausible interpretation, is thus almost certainly a descriptive term¹². The entry containing three words begins *ke-ra-ti-jo-jo*, *wo-wo*, and *wo-wo* in similar formulas indicates a district. *sa-ri-nu-wo-te*, recurring in Mn 456.9, is the same as *se-ri-no-wo-te* Qa 1290, and is certainly a place name. Hence it seems safe to infer that *ka-ra-u-jo* and the missing word at the beginning of line 1 are also place names. The text may therefore be construed as four headings consisting of place names, which are omitted before the subsequent single-word entries, and can be set out in tabular form thus:

¹² There is no reason to assert that it is a place name either here or in Eo 276.1 (Palmer, *Interpretation*, p. 137).

Place	Description	
[- - -]	<i>ra-ptere</i>	VIR 12
	<i>pu-ka-[wo]</i>	VIR 6
	<i>te-u-ta-ra-ko-ro[</i>	VIR
<i>ka-ra-u-jo</i>	<i>ra-ptere</i>	VIR []1
<i>sa-ri-nu-wo-te</i>	<i>ra-ptere</i>	VIR 10
<i>ke-ra-ti-jo-jo wo-wo</i>	<i>me-ri-du-ma-te</i>	VIR 2
	<i>da-ko-ro</i>	VIR 1

A more complicated case, which however demands the same kind of solution, is Fn 187:

	<i>a-pi-te-ja [</i>	HORD 2]	NI 2
	<i>-po-si-da-i-jo-de</i>	HORD[T 1]	NI T 1
	<i>ka-ru-ke</i>	HORD[]	*65
	<i>-pa-ki-ja-na-de</i>	HORD T 1[]	NI T 1
.5	<i>-ka-ru-ke</i>	HORD T 1 V 3	NI T 1 V 3
	<i>de-do-wa-re-we</i>	HORD T 1	
	<i>ku-ri-na-ze-ja</i>	HORD T 2	NI T 2
	<i>u-po-jo , po-ti-ni-ja</i>	HORD T 5	NI T 5
	<i>o-pi-tu-ra-jo</i>	HORD T 3	
.10	<i>*85-to-*34-ta-ra</i>	HORD T 1	
	<i>a-ma-tu-na</i>	HORD T 1	
	<i>te-qi-ri-jo-ne</i>	HORD V 3	
	<i>u-do-no-o-i</i>	HORD T 3	
	<i>po-te-re-we</i>	HORD T 4	NI T 4
.15	<i>a-ke-ti-ri-ja-i</i>	HORD T 1 V 3	
	<i>ka-ru-ke</i>	HORD T 1 V 3	
	<i>i-so-e-ko</i>	HORD T 2 [V 3]	
	<i>po-si-da-i-je-u-si</i>	HORD T 1 V 3	
	<i>*34-ke-ja</i>	HORD T 1 V 3	NI[T 1 V 3
.20	<i>a-ro-ja</i>	[HORD]V 3	
	<i>ka-ru-ke</i>	[HORD]T 1	V 3

v a c a n t 2

Here there is only one word preceding each quantity of rations (except for *u-po-jo*, *po-ti-ni-ja* in line 8 which clearly contains a dependent genitive). But in lines 3, 5, 16 and 21 this word is *ka-ru-ke* |*kārukei*| 'for the herald'. If the same herald were intended in all four places, there could be no reason for failing to aggregate his rations; therefore either four different heralds are meant, or at least the same herald on four different occasions or journeys. In two cases (lines 2 and 4) *ka-ru-ke* is preceded by a designation of place with the allative suffix *-de*: *po-si-da-i-jo-de*, *pa-ki-ja-na-de*, thus providing the ne-

cessary headings to make the reference to the heralds specific. We may therefore infer that there are two more headings concealed in Lines 6-15 and lines 17-20, possibly *u-po-jo*, *po-ti-ni-ja* and *po-si-da-i-je-u-si*, in this case a deity and a religious community, which serve to define the subsequent references to 'the herald'.

Even more difficult is Ub 1318¹³:

- .1 *85-ke-i-ja-te-we, ka-tu-re-wi-ja-i di-pte-ra, 4 [-]pe-[...]di]-pte-ra 2
 *85-ke-i-ja-te-we, o-ka, di-pte-[ra]
 .2 *85-ke-i-ja-te-we o-pi-de-so-mo ka-tu-ro₂, di-pte-ra 4 ka-ne-ja wo-ro-ma-ta 4
 .3 me-ti-ja-no, to-pa, ru-de-a₂, di-pte-ra 1 a-re-se-si, e-ru-ta-ra di-pte-ra 3
 wo-di-je-ja, pe-di-ra 2
 .4 we-e-wi-ja, di-pte-ra, 10 wi-ri-no, we-ru-ma-ta, ti-ri-ši, ze-u-ke-si 1
 .5 wi-ri-no, pe-di-ro, e-ma-ta 4 e-ra-pe-ja, e-pi-u-ru-te-we, E 2
 .6 a-pe-i-ja, u-po, ka-ro, we-[...]ja 1 u-po, we-e-wi-ja e-ra-pe-ja E 1
 .7 mu-te-we, we-re-ne-ja ku-[4-5]pe-re 1 mu-te-we, di-pte-ra, a₃-za,
 pe-di-ro-i, 1

This is not the place to attempt a complete discussion of this text; but it is generally agreed to be a list of skins and leather and articles made from them: */opidesmoi/* 'bindings, thongs' (line 2); */pedila/* 'sandals' (lines 3, 5, 7); */hermata/* (ἑρμα) 'laces' (line 5). Here I shall confine myself to a formal analysis of the entries.

It is certain that it contains a total of 16 entries, since there are 15 numerals, and one has been lost at the end of line 1. *85-ke-i-ja-te-we must be a heading, since its other occurrences show plainly that it is either the name of a man or god or a title (An 1281.4, 10; Fn 50.11). Other certain headings are: *me-ti-ja-no* (man's name; genitive *me-ti-ja-no-ro* Vn 1191.1); *wo-di-je-ja* (woman's name; Vn 1191.1 - the association of these two names elsewhere is significant). Headings may also be presumed in the case of *mu-te-we* and possibly *a-pe-i-ja*. Miss Lang inferred from *me-ti-ja-no* that all the headings were in the nominative case, and therefore that *85-ke-i-ja-te-we and *mu-te-we* must be plural. But since only one heading is certainly nominative, this might be an error. Similar cases where a nominative has been written for another case occur; e.g. PY Eo 371:

- .A ke-ra-me-wo, wa-na-ka-te-ro
 .B pi-ri-ta-wo | ko-to-na [,] ki-ti-me-na GRA[

where comparison with En 467.5 shows that *pi-ri-ta-wo-no* (and probably *wa-na-ka-te-ro-jo*) should have been written, but the scribe had in mind the formula used in Eo 278: *ti-qa-jo*, *po-me*, *e-ke-qe*, *dwo ko-to-no*.

¹³ See M. Lang, AJA 69 (1965), pp. 98-101. The slightly improved readings given here are due to autopsy and discussion with Bennett in July 1965.

Since *we-e-wi-ja* (line 4, entry 9) is also found in line 6, entry 14, where it is not first word, it can hardly be a heading. Therefore the heading *wo-di-je-ja* must presumably continue from entry 8. Equally *wi-ri-no* (entry 10, repeated in entry 11) is manifestly a noun */wrinos/* 'oxhide' and is described as */welumata trisi dzeugesi/* 'covers for three pairs' and */pedilōn hermata/* 'laces for sandals'. Thus the heading *wo-di-je-ja* must be in force at least up to this point and probably to the end of line 5.

The purpose of this lengthy digression has been to establish a fact which could have been guessed: that Mycenaean scribes did not construct their documents with strictly rigorous logic, but were content to note the minimum which would enable them themselves to identify the figure correctly; and in particular, that one entry may often serve as a heading to several following it, and there is no straightforward method of determining where a new heading is introduced. This would have been obvious to the scribes themselves, and they apparently felt no need to indicate it to others. Much as we may deplore the absence of clear and logical arrangement, we must be content to use all possible clues to interpretation, and not to elevate the principle that every entry should be of the same type to an overriding imperative.

If we now apply the results of this investigation to An 18, we shall see that line 1 may have contained a place name and perhaps *VIR 1*; then it would be possible for *te-ko-to-na-pe* to be, not another place, but a record of a carpenter absent from this same place. Similarly in line 6, at the place *te-re-ne-we* one mason is absent, and *is duly counted notwithstanding his absence*; at *i-na-ne* (line 7) one man is present, one carpenter is absent; both have to be recorded.

The same kind of reasoning may now be applied to An 5. The men *sa-ni-jo* and *ku-ri-sa-to* were at (or from) the two places mentioned; but the remaining five men were all absent, though they had none the less to be counted. It is quite likely that all seven were carpenters, but the designation was dropped when the place name was added, since personal name plus place name served to distinguish the individual in question, but where no place name could be quoted, the occupational term was needed to prevent confusion with any other men of the same name. In fact we know of another */Widwoios/*, who was a bronzesmith at *ru-ko-a₂-ke-re-u-te* (Jn 415.3). Thus the interpretation of *te-ko-to-(n)a-pe* as a place name cannot be regarded as inevitable.

However, two further objections may be raised to the interpretation 'carpenter absent'. First, the parallel between *a-pe-o* */apeōn/* (cf. *a-pe-o-te*, *a-pe-a-sa* at Knossos) and *-(n)a-pe* */apēs/* is not exact. Similar variations between a participle and a finite verb can be quoted from one series of tablets, if not from the same tablet: *qe-qi-no-me-na* Ta 707.2, 708.2, 713.1, 2 and *qe-qi-no-to* (correctly explained as perfect indicative passive by D.M. Jones¹⁴) Ta

¹⁴ *Glotta* 37 (1958) pp. 112-117.

642.2, 3; all the Ta tablets were written by one scribe and make up a single document. Similarly *ka-ke-we*, *ta-ra-si-ja*, [*e*]-*ko-si* Jn 658.1, *ka-ke-we*, *ta-ra-si-ja*, *e-ko-si* Jn 706.1, where other tablets of the same series regularly use the participle *e-ko-te*. There may well have been a more exact parallel in An 614, if]*e-o* [in line 5 is a participle and]*a-pe-e-si*[is the correct reading in line 7; but unfortunately the text is too damaged to allow any conclusion to be drawn.

Secondly, we may ask why are absent workmen counted, and what is the meaning of the word]*a-pe-ōn*['absent'. All the relevant material has been collected by Lejeune¹⁵, and there is little to add to the facts there collected; but the join of KN Ap 633 to 618 shows that *a-pe-a-sa* is a general heading and must be taken as plural]*a-pe-assai*[. What is important to observe is the distinction between *o-pe-ro* and *a-pe-o*, etc. *o-pe-ro* is often used of persons followed by *VIR* or *MULIER* and a number; *a-pe-o*, etc., however, may also be used as an annotation to a named individual. Thus KN Ap 618 + 633.1 after *a-pe-a-sa* goes on to list two women by name; and it is possible that this heading applies to line 2 also. This would fit especially the use of *te-ko-to-a-pe* in PY An 5, where each of the men is named. The implication is that *o-pe-ro* simply denotes the number needed to make up the nominal establishment; *a-pe-o* on the other hand means that the person in question, whether specifically named or not, is absent from his normal station, but is still counted on the ration strength. Thus the list of]*eretai a-peontes*[at *ro-o-wa* (An 724) is not a catalogue of vacant places in the fleet, but indicates that the men in question are still officially counted as belonging to *ro-o-wa* but they have been sent away on various errands — a deduction which may provide the frame-work for an interpretation of this difficult tablet.

I suggest therefore that the 'absent' persons are listed because they are known to be elsewhere; and a similar explanation is needed for the note in the upper line of Ad 686: *o-u-pa-ro-ke-ne-[to]ou parogeneto*] 'did not present himself' and the remainder of this damaged line probably gave the name of the man concerned, though he is doubtless included in the 15 men of the main entry. This concern for the details in recording absent men makes it less likely that *a-pe-o* implies 'absent without leave', 'missing' or even 'dead'. The mason who is absent from *te-re-ne-we* in An 18.6 may in fact be one of those at Pylos or Leuktron or sent to *me-te-to* or *sa-ma-ra* on An 35.

Thus in weighing up the arguments in favour of each of the two interpretations of *te-ko-to-(n)a-pe-o* we must consider the following facts:

(1) The tablets in question also list tradesmen detached for service elsewhere.

(2) The deduction that the term is a place name cannot be directly confirmed, but is based upon the presumed regularity of structure of the tablets — a regularity that is certainly not always observed in other tablets.

¹⁵ *l. c.*, note 2. Lejeune envisages the interpretation]*amph-eōn*[as an alternative, but the compound is unknown and the sense unlikely.

(3) The sandhi observed in the variant spellings indicates that the interpretation should yield two words, the first ending in *-n*.

(4) The phonetic resemblance of *te-ko-to-(n)* to *|tektōn|* is a remarkable coincidence, if this a place name.

On the fourth point it must be noticed that both elements of the interpretation occur in the same text. One might invent a parallel and ask the chances of an Australian document referring to *carpenters* and *arias* also containing the place name *Carpentaria*; clearly it is not impossible, but it would be very remarkable. Palmer will doubtless draw attention to his alleged place name *re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo* (PY Aa 783, Ab 553, Ad 676) with its extraordinary phonetic resemblance to **re-wo-to-ro* 'bath' to be reconstructed from the adjective *re-wo-te-re-jo*. I shall argue the case against a place name more fully elsewhere, here it will perhaps be enough to call attention to Ad 676: *pu-ro-re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo-ko-wo* . . . etc. (no dividers used). *ko-wo* on the Ad tablets is regularly preceded by a genitive, usually plural, denoting the parentage of the men and boys listed; therefore *re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo* must be genitive plural of a noun describing the women whose sons are listed, not a place name subordinate to Pylos (like *ke-re-za*).

To sum up, I suggest that the identification of *te-ko-to-(n)a-pe* should still be regarded as an open question, to be resolved only by fresh evidence. Both interpretations involve difficulties, and it is hard to say which is the more implausible; but at least the question ought not to be treated as solved.

NOTE

de MICHEL LEJEUNE

Si *tekotoape* en An 5 (scribe de classe II/III), *tekotonape* en An 18 (scribe de classe II/III), *teko[to]na[pe]* en An 852 (scribe de classe I) est un toponyme pylien, son analyse par le grec paraît impossible.

a) L'alternance *-toa-* / *-tona-* marque que le mot se décompose en deux éléments, dont le premier est *tekoto-* ou *tekoton-*, le second *-ape*. [A la rigueur, on pourrait imaginer: que le second élément commençait par *ha-*, avec une aspiration débile; que le scribe de An 5 tenait compte de cette aspiration, mais qu'elle était abolie dans les usages des scribes de An 18 et de An 852; que *tekoto-* serait la forme antéconsonantique et *tekoton-* la forme antévocalique du premier élément. Mais on attendrait alors plutôt **tekotoa₂pe* que *tekotoape* en An 5].

b) Si le mot était un 'juxtaposé', c'est à dire un syntagme à premier terme fléchi (au génitif), on ne peut y reconnaître ni *τέκτονος* ni *τεκτόνων*, car il faudrait qu'on eût **tekotonoa_{pe}*, **tekotononape*; une dissimilation justifierait à la rigueur *tekotonape* comme issu de **tekotononape*, mais *tekotoape*

resterait inexpliqué. — Il n'y a aucun mot athématique à gén. sg. en -κτος ou -χθος (gén. pl. en -κτων ou -χθων) qu'on puisse ici invoquer; pas davantage de mots à gén. sg. en -γωτος, -γοντος, -κωτος, -κοντος, -χωτος, -χοντος (et gén. pl. en -των correspondants), excepté les participes de ἔτεκον, στέγω, στέλω, στέργω, τέγγω; pas davantage, enfin, de mots thématiques en -τος (gén. pl. -των, en ce cas, seul concerné) excepté στερκτός. Il est peu plausible que τεκόντος, τεκόντων, etc., fournissent le premier terme d'un juxtaposé toponymique.

c) Si le mot était un 'composé', le premier terme en serait nécessairement un thème à nasale; sans difficulté τεκτον- pourrait être isolé dans tekotonape; mais il faudrait admettre un doublet (antéconsonantique? voir, ci-dessus, a) τεκτο-, avec un traitement -o- de nasale voyelle que le mycénien ne présente guère qu'au voisinage immédiat d'une consonne labiale (ce qui n'est pas le cas ici).

d) De toute façon, on n'a rendu compte d'un mot complexe (juxtaposé ou composé) que lorsqu'on a rendu compte des deux éléments qui le constituent, et de leur articulation. Or tekoto(n)-ape, s'il s'agit d'un mot complexe, implique, au nominatif, un second élément -(h)αψ, ou encore, à la rigueur, -(h)αιψ, -(h)αλψ, -(h)αμψ ou -(h)αρψ, pour quoi le grec ne fournit aucune explication.

Ces observations mènent aux deux conclusions qui suivent:

e) Certes, le hasard peut faire qu'un toponyme tekoto(n)ape ressemble (sans qu'il y ait rien de commun entre eux quant à l'origine) à un appellatif tekotone 'τέκτονες'. [Et, pour être équitable, on rappellera que t, dans le toponyme, pourrait être autre chose que τ, k autre chose que κ, le premier o autre chose qu'une voyelle graphique, etc.; autrement dit, que la ressemblance pourrait porter sur les formes écrites des deux mots, sans porter sur les formes phonétiques]. — Le hasard peut même, à la rigueur, faire voisiner dans un même texte (An 18) des tekotone qu'on recense, et un bourg dont le nom tekotonape n'aurait rien à voir avec les τέκτονες. — Mais il serait assurément plus satisfaisant que le bourg lui-même s'appelât "Carpenters Grove", "Carpenters Hill", etc. Or ceci paraît exclu par l'ensemble des observations ci-dessus.

f) Personne, d'autre part, ne conteste que la toponymie de nos tablettes est, en général, prémycénienne. Sauf, précisément, dans le cas des désignations composées ou juxtaposées, qui représentent une couche de dénominations récentes, presque toujours explicables par le grec. Un toponyme composé ou juxtaposé dont le grec ne rend pas compte est donc a priori (ou, si l'on veut, statistiquement) improbable.

J. Chadwick a montré que, si la *structure des contextes* rend tentant de considérer tekoto(n)ape comme un nom de lieu, elle ne le rend pas nécessaire. Nous estimons que la *structure du mot*, si elle ne rend pas impossible de voir en tekoto(n)ape un toponyme, le rend, du moins, peu plausible.