

P  
Worcester College,  
Oxford

13 August 1963

To the Editor.

I write a further note on a-ko-ro e-pe-ke ( KN D1 932 ), interpreted by me as ~~ma-pekx~~ ~~ma-pek~~ agoros empekēs. The WOOL entry appears to offer difficulties to the interpretation of the adjective as 'with wool', 'woolly'. A similar puzzle is presented by the text Schwyzer Del.<sup>3</sup> 644, where eperoi are listed along with arnēades and etaloi as animals exempt from wool impost. It is agreed ( Schwyzer, Frisk and LSJ ) that eperos is a compound of epi and eros, meaning laniger 'woolly'. But why should woolly sheep be exempt from wool impost ?

→ The Sumerian evidence for the age-groups of lambs offers a clue. B.Landsberger ( Mat.Sum.Lex. viii/1, 1960, p.78 ) notes that the younger lambs, not yet fit for plucking, are called by a technical word meaning 'with wool'. This is precisely the meaning of eperos, and if this is a class of lambs, it would explain why they are exempt from wool impost. empekēs may well be the Mycenaean equivalent. In that case the minuscule comment of D1 932 indicates that the flock(s) of PA-RA-RO included, or was (were), to include, an agoros of this class of lambs, which may be the ki.RAMS recorded as 'missing'. The Sumerian and the Aeolic parallels suggest that they would not have yielded any wool for the time being.

J. 1  
415/ pe-ko is a separate problem. The evidence is scanty: only three fragmentary texts -- Dw.1621, D 7067 bis and D 7098. From the 'place' ( top register ) Killen would diagnose the word as the name of the 'collector' ( 'owner' ). But ki-ri-jo-te also occupies this 'place', and he agrees that this word cannot be the name of a 'collector' ( 'owner' ): see, for instance, Da 1163. Another possibility is that pe-ko is a colour designation. Cf. PY Cn 418, where ma-ra-pi pe-ko may stand for malāphi perkos 'dark on the underbelly' ( note the locative function of the -phi case ! ). Non liquet !

*of Mycenaean texts,*

*comm. Har. Litt. 22:3 (1956)*

That the adjuncts indicate age classes in the D series ( see *The Interpretation* p. 177 ) now seems reasonably certain. J. Sundwall ( *Soc. Scient. Fenn.* xxii:3, 1-14 ) pondered pa. = palaios, pe. = perusinwos and ki. as a kind of young male animal. ne. = newos was suggested in *Docs.* p.197. Killen has shown that za. = zawetes or possibly the derived adjective.

At Pylos palaioi contrast with wo-ne-we. If the latter are young animals, then the underlying word may be worneus, a derivative from wornon 'lamb'. I have already suggested that at MY wo-ro-ne-ja, contrasting with o-u-ka = owika, is a derivative ~~far~~ from the word for lamb. Is the MY spelling a scriptio plena ( of which I am dubious ), or is it a different dialect form, with metathesis, wronon ( cf. thronos/ thornos, wordon/ wrodon )?

Yours etc.,

*L. R. Palmer*

~~Dear Emmett,  
Greetings!  
I am all well. Hope same  
with you and yours.  
Later in the week  
I shall send you a new Knossos text as yet  
unpublished. I should like this to appear,  
if you can find the space, in the October Vestor.  
Interpretation was published on 1 August 1963.  
Yours,  
L.~~