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Since the early days of Mycenaean studies the word *ka-ma* has been related to the Hesychius’ gloss *καμάν* τόν ἄγρον. Κρήτες. However, although all researchers begin their analyses with this gloss, opinions are divided both regarding the meaning and the form of the Mycenaean word. Is *ka-ma* related to *καίνο* or to *χαμάι*? Is it an *a*-stem noun of feminine gender or a sigmatic stem noun of neuter gender? Is it a land given to individuals as compensation for their work, fallow land under improvement, or sacred land?

In his 1970 article, ‘Interprétations de quelques mots grecs mycénien’s’ (SMEA 12 (1970), pp. 121-135), M. D. Petruševski discussed the expression *ka-ma* *o-na-to* as one of the arguments in favour of the interpretation of *ka-ma* as an *a*-stem noun of feminine gender as Hesychius has recorded. The aim of this paper is to present further arguments to support the idea that the expression *ka-ma* *o-na-to* on the tablet PY Ep 613 (written by scribe no. 1) contains the genitive singular form of the noun *ka-ma* and that the form *ka-ma-o* recorded on PY Eb 156 (written by the scribe no. 41) is in fact in genitive plural.

The tablet PY Eb 156 written by scribe no. 41 reads as follows: [1]

*e-u-ru-wo-ta*, *te-o-jo*, *do-e-ro*, *ka-ma-e-uk* [e-ke-qe o-na-to] ’wo-ze-qe’ *to-so-de*, pe-mo GRA 1T 3
  a3-ti-jo-qo, e-ke-qe, to-jo-qe, au-to-jo, ka-ma-o, [ to-so-] de, pe-mo GRA [  

In the Ep series (PY Ep 613.9) scribe no. 1 has omitted the entry related to *a3-ti-o-qo* and has recorded only the entry of *e-u-ru-wo-ta*:

*e-u-[ru]-wo-ta*, *te-o-jo*, [do-e-] *ro*, e-ke-qe [ka-] *ma*, o-na-to, *wo-ze-qe*, *to-so*, pe-*mo* GRA 1 T 3

Let us first discuss the tablet PY Ep 613. The phrase *ka-ma* *o-na-to* has been explained as a phrase in accusative with *ka-ma* being a neuter gender sigmatic stem /kamas/ or /khamas/ and the word *o-na-to*, *jonatón/, an apposition of *ka-ma* or maybe an adjective qualifying the noun (Ruijgh 1972, 100, n. 32). But the comparison of the phrase *ka-ma* *o-na-to* with the other phrases in which the word *o-na-to*, *jonatón/, meaning “a portion of land enjoyed, a lease”, appears with *ke-ke-me-na* ko-to-na or *ki-ti-me-na* ko-to-na or just ko-
to-na in genitive (partitive) (Vilborg 1960, 132; Bartonēk 2003, 443), cf. ko-to-na-o ke-ke-me-na-o o-na-ta (PY Ed 901), o-na-ta ko-to-na-o ke-ke-me-na-o (PY Ed 236) suggests that ka-ma should be also in genitive (Petruševski 1970, 126; Vilborg 1960, 67; Chadwick 1973, 409).

In Post-Mycenaean Greek, the verb ὀνίναμαι and the nouns and adjectives derived from the same stem are also used with the partitive genitive, cf. δαιτός ὀνήσο (Hom. Od.19.68); τι άεν άλλος ὀνήσεται(Hom. II. 16.31); μή προτερον αύτην ἔξειν τω προφερομένων μαθημάτων ὀνήσιν (Pl. Sph. 230d).

In light of this argumentation, the entry in the ninth row of PY Ep 613 could be read and translated as follows:

/Euruvoitās, the(h)oyo doelos, (h)ekhei kwe kamās onāton, worgyei kwe, tosson de spermo GRA 1 T 3/

"E., servant of the god, holds a lease of kama and works, so much seed, wheat ..."

But what does the expression ka-ma o-na-to, /kamās onāton/, ‘a lease of kama’ really mean?

On the one hand, the land of the type ka-ma was leased just like other types of land (ko-to-na ke-ke-me-na and ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na), as is clear from the entry recorded on the tablet PY Ed 236: ka-ma-e-wo, o-na-ta, e-ko-te, ke-ke-me-na-o, ko-to-na-o, wo-ze-te, "The kama holders, having leases of communal plots and rendering the services...". The plots of the type ka-ma are in fact o-na-ta, [2] portions or leases from the communal land, which are special because they are given under the obligation to perform different duties or works, and not under the usual obligation which is presumed by the regular expression pu-ro da-mo. In the Eb/Ep series this type of obligation is expressed either with the whole phrase as it recorded on the tablet PY Ed 236, cf. PY Eb 862/ Ep 613.3 or with the shortened formula e-ke-qe, o-na-to, ka-ma-e-u / o-na-to e-ke ka-ma-e-u (cf. PY Eb 842.A; Ep 613.7).

On the other hand, there is evidence that, once allotted, the kama holdings were subdivided and leased by their holders to other people in the same manner as were the ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na or ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na plots. This type of obligation is expressed with the phrase o-na-to, e-ke, pa-ro ka-ma-e-wo, cf. PY Ep 539.5.7. [3]

Scribe no. 1 in the case of e-u-ru-wo-ta changed the original entry recorded by scribe no. 41 on the tablet PY Eb 156 and wrote ka-ma o-na-to instead of ka-ma-e-u [e-ke-qe o-na-to]. [4] This indicates that the expression ka-ma o-na-to was probably an even shorter alternative of the phrase e-ke-qe, o-na-to, ka-ma-e-u / o-na-to, e-ke, ka-ma-e-u, cf. also ka-ma-e-u, o-na-to, e-ke (PY Ep 613.7) (Del Freo 2009, 36). But Scribe no. 1 made one more change in the entry of e-u-ru-wo-ta. He omitted the second line of the original record, related to a3-ti-jo-ko, which raises the question as to whether this has anything to do with the meaning of the expression ka-ma o-na-to i.e. were e-u-ru-wo-ta and a3-ti-jo-ko related to each other as a lease giver and leaseholder?

Let us return now to the tablet PY Eb 156.
Different interpretations of the tablet and in particular of the content of the second row have been offered, based on the different interpretations of the forms to-jo and au-to-jo.

It has been proposed that e-u-ru-wo-ta held a lease from a3-ti-jo-qa, but a3-ti-jo-qa gave just a portion of his kama to E-u-ru-wo-ta and kept something (τοιὸν τε, "ceci précisément") from his land or for himself (αὐτοῖο "de son propre terrain" ou "a titre personnel") (Lejeune 1966, 19-22; Panagl 1979, 315). Then it has been proposed that E-u-ru-wo-ta held and worked both on the fields of a3-ti-jo-qa and on his own (Petruševski, Ilievski 1958, 277; Milani 1965a, 134 and 1965b, 417-8). According to Palmer’s interpretation, the form to-jo is a 3rd person singular optative of a verb designating some kind of obligation arising out of landholding (Palmer 1963, 206-7, 458, 488).

C. J. Ruijgh interpreted the tablet presuming that ka-ma-e could be in fact ka-ma-o, a genitive singular of ka-ma as a sigmatic stem noun, and translated the phrase to-jo, au-to-jo, ka-ma-o as "de ce même ka-ma", A3-ti-jo-qa holds lease from the same land as e-u-ru-wo-ta. [5]

What makes interpretation of the tablet PY Eb 156 difficult is certainly the deviation from the typical formula. But a closer examination of the Pylos series related to land holdings reveals that there are other tablets with similar contents.

The entry of a3-ti-jo-qa can be compared to those tablets in the Pylos Ea set which record the redistribution of land already allocated, with the expression e-ke o-na-to + gen. of a personal name or appellative + ko-to-na, cf. PY Ea 132: [6]

ru-ko-ro , ra-va-ke-si-jo , e-ke , o-na-to , su-qo-ta-o , ko-to-na
/Lukōros lāwāgesiyos (h)ekhei onāton Sugwotā(h)o ktoinās/
"L. holds a lease of Swineherd’s plot."

In the entry related to a3-ti-jo-qa, instead of the genitive of a personal name or an appellative stands the genitive of a pronominal phrase ὁ αὐτός. And from this aspect PY Eb 156 can be compared to another tablet PY Eb 472 where the form wo-jo appears, a genitive of the pronominal adjective ὁς (<savos>), [7] cf.:

we-te-re-u , o-pi-ti-ni-ja-ta , e-ke-qa , o-na-to wo-jo , *35-to
/Westreus Ὀπθινιϊτας (h)ekheikue onāton hwoγγο *35-tos/
"W. holds the lease of his ....".

The absence of the word o-na-to from PY Eb 156 is nothing unusual for Mycenaean scribes, whose formulas are as much elliptical as they are typical. Our scribe no. 41 uses the verbal form e-ke (e-ke-qa)on other tablets as well without its object in accusative, cf. PY Eb 177; 839, and this is also done by other scribes, cf. PY Ep 613.13 (scribe no. 1) or PY Ea 56 (scribe no. 43).
Bearing this in mind, the second row of the tablet PY Eb 156 could be transcribed and translated:

/‘Aithiyokws (h)ekhei kve toyyo kve autoyyo kamā(h)ōn, tosson de spermo GRA/,
‘A. holds this man’s (lease) of kama plots, so much seed, wheat ...

The pronominal expression to-jo au-to-jo refers to e-u-wo-ta. The pronoun αὐτός is used as an emphatic pronoun next to the demonstrative ὃ as a 3rd person pronoun. On the Mycenaean tablets, ὃ is found in other cases as well, dative singular to-e, to-me and dative plural to-i. The use of αὐτός as an emphatic pronoun with ὃ is also confirmed in Homer, cf. τῶ δ’ αὐτώ μάρτυροι ἔστων (Hom. Il.1.338).

The interpretation of the form ka-ma-o as a genitive plural /kamā(h)ōn/ would not have been so unusual. There is evidence on the land holding tablets that it was possible to render services in respect of more than one ka-ma plot (Jasinski-Ticchioni 1980, 237; Del Freo 2009, 45), cf. ne-qq-uω, e-da-e-uω, ka-ma, o-pe-ro, ὑ-ω-ω-u-pi te-re-ja-e, /Neigwêwos E. kamā, ophel(λ)on dvoiumpi teleyyā(h)en/ on PY Eb 495/Ep 613.1-2 and also the expression ke-ke-me-na-o ko-to-na-o o-na-to, /kk(h)ekhemenā(h)ōn ktonā(h)ōn onātont/ on PY Ep 704.5.6/ Eb 297.1.2.

Thus, on the tablet PY Eb 156 is probably recorded a dispute over the same plot of land. The man named a3-ti-jo-qq is perhaps the same one mentioned as an owner of private land, ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na, (PY En 74/Ep 247) and as a holder of a lease from the communal land from the damos (PY Ep 846.A/Ep 301.2). On the tablet PY Eb 156, he claims that he holds lease of the plots that belong exactly to e-u-wo-ta. The scribe no. 1 omitted his entry in the Ep version because his claim was rejected (cf. the case of the priestess e-ri-ta PY Eb 297/ Ep 704.5.6).

If this interpretation of the tablets PY Eb 156 and Ep 613.9 is acceptable, then we have another example of the form ka-ma as a genitive singular on PY Ep 613.10 (Petruševski 1970, 126; Vilborg 1960, 67; Chadwick 1973, 409) and another example in favour of the interpretation of the word ka-ma as ana-stem noun of feminine gender.
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Интерпретацијата на микенскиот термин ka-ta, иако досега била предмет на многу дискусии, и денес е актуелна. Дилемите се однесуваат и на конкретното значење, и на формата на зборот - дали се работи за именка од а-основи во женски род или за именка од сигматски основи во среден род.

Предмет на анализа во овој труд се плочките каде што зборот ka-ta се јавува во генитив. Од анализата на овие плочки произлегуваат дополнителни аргументи, кои покажуваат дека генитивот од ka-ta во едина е /kamās/ и дека според тоа формата ka-ta-o, која се среќава на РУ Eb 156.2, доколку е целосна, може да биде само во генитив множина /kamā(h)ōn/.