



*Fourth Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, Downing College, Cambridge,
12 April 1965*

Front Row: Mme Masson, Mme Chantraine, Frau Risch, Mrs Palmer, Mme Lejeune,
Mrs Jones, Miss G. R. Hart, Mrs A. Morpurgo Davies, Prof. M. Lang.

2nd Row: Prof. M. Lejeune, Prof. O. J. L. Szemerényi, Prof. O. Masson, Dr J. Chadwick,
Prof. L. R. Palmer, Prof. J. A. Davison, Prof. E. L. Bennett, Prof. P. Chantraine,
Prof. V. Georgiev.

3rd Row: Dr A. Bartoněk, Prof. E. Risch, Prof. M. S. Ruipérez, Dr J.-P. Olivier, Prof.
G. Pugliese Carratelli, Prof. L. J. D. Richardson, Dr J. T. Killen.

4th Row: Prof. C. Gallavotti, Prof. D. M. Jones, Prof. A. Heubeck, Dr C. J. Ruijgh,
Dr P. H. Ilievski.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CAMBRIDGE COLLOQUIUM ON MYCENAEAN STUDIES

EDITED BY

L. R. PALMER

*Professor of Comparative Philology in the
University of Oxford*

AND

JOHN CHADWICK

Lecturer in Classics in the University of Cambridge



CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1966

result—especially when the word-stem is represented by an ideogram—that it is quite frequently unclear whether an orthography ending in *-as* should be interpreted as, grammatically, a gen. plural or the genitive of a collective in the singular. (This difficulty also underlies the uncertainty about whether one should set up *-az* and *-it* as plural inflections.)

(3) Hittite *-as* could < IE **-ās*, **-ās*; **-as*, but nothing else, by normal phonetic development (unless IE **-a-* and **-ā-* are set up).

R. A. GROSSLAND

AN INSTRUMENTAL-ABLATIVE IN MYCENAEAN?

ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES

I. It has recently been suggested that in Mycenaean the instrumental was still very much alive and had taken over the functions of the ablative.¹ The arguments adduced in favour of this theory may be summarized as follows:²

External evidence: Arcado-Cyprian presents in some respects a distribution of cases different, for example, from that of Attic; in particular the 'ablative' prepositions are followed by the dative and not by the genitive. It is argued that this is due to a pre-division syncretism of the instrumental with the ablative and to a subsequent syncretism of the former with the dative-locative.

Internal evidence: It is maintained that in the plural (*a*) the thematic declension has a form peculiar to the instrumental (*-o* = *-ois*), (*b*) the athematic declension and the *-a* declension have forms (in *-phi*) functioning only as instrumental and ablative. Moreover it is argued that the forms of the singular ending in *-a*, *-o*, *-e*, whenever used as instrumental or ablative, should be considered different from the respective forms of locative or dative-locative (i.e. not *-āi*, *-ōi*, *-ēi* but perhaps *-ā*, *-ō*, *-ē*). No evidence can be provided for the first and second declension, but for the *-s* stems of the third declension a functional distinction is found between forms in *-e-e* (of abl.-instr.) and forms in *-e-i* (of dat.-loc.).

A re-examination of this often-quoted, but rarely checked, evidence may be useful.

II. It is often assumed that in IE the dative and ablative plurals had identical forms, while the instrumental and locative had independent endings. If so, and if we may assume a straightforward progression from IE to Greek, it would be possible to suppose *either* that the

¹ In this shortened version of a longer paper it has been necessary to cut out some of the references and detailed discussion.

² Reference is constantly made to Risch, *MH*, 16 (1959), 220 f.; Householder, *Glotta*, 38 (1960), 1 ff.; Ilievski, *Ablativot, Instrumentalot i Lokativot vo najstarite grčki tekstovi*, Skopje, 1961 (from the English summary); Idem, *Ling. Balk.* 6 (1963), 35 ff. (see also Heubeck's review of Ilievski, *op. cit.* in *IF*, 68 (1963), 323 ff.).

forms of the genitive plural took over the ablative functions in a period anterior to, or contemporary with, that of the disappearance of the dative endings (replaced by the locative forms), or that the forms of the locative plural served for a while both as locative and as ablative. In the first case the full syncretism of genitive and ablative should have been completed before the Mycenaean texts; in the second case we might have in Myc. *-ās, -āo, -os* (i.e. gen. sing.) and *-ā(h)i -oi(h)i, -si* (i.e. dat.-loc. plur.) forms with the functions of (genitive) ablative and (dative-locative) ablative.¹ If that were so, it would be easier to assume that the forms of the locative singular were later used for the ablative (on the model of the plural), yielding a syntactical distribution parallel to that of Arcado-Cyprian, than to operate with a syncretism of instrumental and ablative. However, this can scarcely pass the stage of pure guesswork; the reconstruction of the IE declension mentioned above is not fully reliable and the development assumed may have been more devious than we can suppose. A discussion of the Arcadian and Cyprian evidence may be more profitable.²

III. For the Cyprian prepositions the following evidence is available:³

(1) With gen.: *ἀνευ* (217: 4, 14); *ἀντί* (217: 5, 5, 6/7, 15, 17).

(2) With acc.: *πρός* (217: 19, 19/20, 21/2).

(3) With dat. and acc.: *ἐν* (*ἐν*) (dat.: 2: 4; 85: 2; 182*b*; 204; 209: 3/4; 210: 2/3; 212*b*, 2; 215*b*, 5; 216*b*, 4; 217: 1, 3, 8, 9, 17, 20, 31; 218: 1/2; 220: 4; 244: 3; 245: 3; 252: 2; 265: 2; 267: 3; 273: 1; 335: 3; 343: 2; acc.: 217: 27; 265: 2), *ἐπί* (dat.: 231: 2; acc. uncertain, but in 94: 2/3 a gen. is unlikely), *περ(ι)* (dat.: 181: 2/3; acc.: 217: 27/8).

(4) With dat.: *ἀπύ* (217: 8, 17; 220: 3/4; 231: 1 [*ἀπό!*]; 352: 3?, 4),⁴ *ἐξ* (217: 5/6, 6, 11, 24), *πρό* (? 264: 2), *σύν* (*σύν*) (51*b*; 217: 28; 266: 3; 304: 4).⁵

Nouns associated with verbal forms provide no relevant information; the interpretation of the text is uncertain in 217: 9, 18 (*a-la-wo* may

¹ For our purposes we do not need to take into consideration Benveniste's suggestion (*BSL*, 50 (1954), 32 ff.) that IE had an ablative ending **-ots* different from the **-os* of the genitive. In any case, **-ots* > **-os* before the period in which we are interested.

² The Pamphylian evidence is constantly ambiguous and I have preferred to ignore it. See, however, Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch*, II, 192.

³ From O. Masson, *Inscriptions Chypriotes Syllabiques*, Paris 1961.

⁴ T. B. Mitford (*Studies in the Signaries of South-Western Cyprus*, *BICS* Suppl. No. 10, London 1961, 26) finds another instance of *ἀπύ* in 184 Masson where he reads *ἐπύ* *λφ(α)*? (but we should expect *λφ(α)* or *λφ(α)*).

⁵ Most of the instances of *σύν* (*σύν*) occur in the phrase *σύν τύχῃ*; the very existence of *σύν* is doubtful.

be gen. or acc.), in 261 (*εὐφεργασίως* may be gen. [part.] sing. or acc. plur.) and in 306: 2; a gen. part. is usual after *ἐπιτυγχάνω* (220).

From the point of view of the prepositions: in (1) the genitive is expected, but its origin is in both cases doubtful: after *ἀντί* Chantraine (*Gramm. hom.* II, 92) assumes a real genitive (adnominal?), but Schwyzler-Debrunner (*Gr. Gr.* II, 443) and Humbert (*Syntaxe grecque*³, 301 f.) are uncertain; the genitive after *ἀνευ* is an original ablative according to Humbert (*op. cit.* 323), Schwyzler-Debrunner (*op. cit.* 535) and Günther (*IF*, 20 [1906/7], 69), and the instance of *ἀνευ* with the accusative found in Elean (Schwyzler, *Del.*³, 410: 8) should tell against the possibility of an adnominal genitive. In (3) we have a rare example of *περί* with the dative (181: *εὐξόμενος περί παιδί*). It should be pointed out: (a) that such a construction is very ancient: *περί πτόλιός τε μαχήσεται ἡδὲ γυναικῶν* (*Il.* 18. 265) is not very different from *περί ἧ πατρίδι μαρνάμενον* (*Tyrt.* 6 D.³); (b) that far from being 'generally agreed' (Ilievski and Householder) that *περί* is an ablatival preposition, Schwyzler-Debrunner (*op. cit.* 502 f.), Chantraine (*op. cit.* 128) and Humbert (*op. cit.* 316) agree in considering the genitive after *περί* as partitive (with the possible exception of phrases like *περί πάντων*). For (4) it should be noticed that the interpretation of *πο-ρο* in 264 is far from being sure; Ilievski (like Hoffmann) takes it as if it were *πόρρω* and recognizes here an *abl. separationis*, but see Masson *ad loc.* If Masson's and Hall's *πρό* is correct, we may have here a remarkable archaism: see Boeotian *προτηνί* (< *πρό ταινί*) and perhaps Hom. *ἠλιόθι πρό* (?), etc.¹

IV. In dialect texts the Arcadian prepositions or adverbial forms are used as follows:²

¹ But for the latter see Lejeune, *Les adverbis grecs en -θεν*, Bordeaux 1939, 206 ff.

² For the sake of brevity the quotations are mainly from *IG*, v, 2; however, almost all the inscriptions considered are now available in better editions, and at the very least the texts should be checked against those of Cauer-Schwyzler *Del.*³ and of Buck, *GD*³. C = Herzog-Klaffenbach, *Asylierkunden aus Kos* (Abh. Berl. Ak., Kl. Spr., 1952), No. 4; D = *IG*, v, 2, pp. xxxvi f. (for a better edition see Plassart, *BCH*, 1914, 101 ff. and for additional readings *SEG*, I, 211; XI, 1169; xv, 227 and Tod, *GHI*, II, 202). M = Dittenberger, *Syll.*³, II, 559 (see also *IG*, v, 2, p. xxv): the text, although written in Arcadian dialect, comes from Magnesia on the Maeander, where presumably it was copied by an Ionian scribe; this accounts for the many errors and for the partial unreliability of the document (dated to ca. 207/6 B.C.). Schw. = Cauer-Schwyzler, *Del.*³ A fuller edition of *IG*, v, 2. 343 was published by Plassart in *BCH*, 39 (1915), 98 ff. (see Schw. 665, Buck, *op. cit.* 21). The most complete list of Arcadian prepositions is still that of R. v. Velsen, *De titulorum Arcadiae flexione et copia verborum*, Berlin 1917, 24 ff. The largest part of the evidence belongs to the fourth century since many of the earlier inscriptions are too short to provide relevant information; some dialect inscriptions, however, belong to the third century B.C. In almost all cases the possibility of a non-Arcadian (i.e. Doric or koine) influence should be taken into account, but the evidence available is much too

(1) With gen.: (a) ἐν]εκα (9: 3, possibly due to koine or Doric influence), θύσθεν (3: 23), ἰ-μέσος (Schw. 664: 17), ἴσοθι (D 13),¹ μεσοκόθεν (Schw. 664: 7/8, with gen.-dat. dual); (b) ἀν]τι (3: 24/5).

(2) With gen. and acc.: διὰ (gen. [?]: D 53/4; acc.: 343 A 13/14), κα(τύ) (gen.: 6: 11/12; 262: 23; acc.: D 2, 10, 56/7; 343 A' 8, A 30; 3: 24; 6: 17, 25, 27, 29, 32; 16: 7; 159 A 8, B 19; 262: 21, 27; cf. also κατάπερ *passim*).

(3) With dat. and acc.: ἐπι (dat.: 6: 22, 24/5, 44, 59, 61, 72, 97, 99, 100, 101; 10: 2, 8; 39: 13; 40: 20; 41: 17; 113a, b; 262: 18; 343 A' 4/5, A 5/6, 15, 22; 358: 2; 394: [?] 2/3; 549: 1, 23, 37; 550: 14; BCH (1914), 459 ff. nos. 4: 8/9; 5: 4/5; 6: 11; 11: 1; acc.: 3: 12, 21; 6: 83, 89; 16: 2 [?]; 36: 75, 83, 107; 38: 54; 40: 29; 174: 6; Schw. 664: 7, 18; M 54/5),² ἐν (ἐν) (dat.: D *passim*; 3 *passim*; 6 *passim*; 10: 7; 17: 5, 5/6; 261: 4; 262: 25; 343 *passim*; 415: 7; M 10, 45; Schw. 664 *passim*; BCH (1914), 451 ff. nos. 1: 7; 2: 5; 6: 9/10; 10: 7; 11: 15; acc.: D 50/1; 3: 4, 8; 5: 6 *passim*; 9: 4; 16: 9, 12; 261: 11; 262: 1, 34 [?]; 514: 3, 4/5, 9; M *passim*; Schw. 664 *passim*), πάρ (dat.: M 9/10; C 21; acc.: 3: 7, 14; 6: 40; Schw. 664: 10),³ πε(δά) (dat.: 262: 16; acc.: 6: 98), περ(ι) (dat.: M 8?, 47; acc.: 6: 3, 32, 109; 10: 8; 16: 8, 13; 343 A 24/5, 27/8), πός (dat.: D 11, 12; 4: 6; 6: 54; Schw. 664: 4/5; acc.: D 33, 38, 63, 66; 343 C 6, 25/6; Schw. 664: 14, 14/15; C 21; M 21/2, 23/4), ὅπερ (ὕπερ) (dat.: 16: 3/4; acc.: Schw. 664: 16, 24/5), ὀπύ (ὕπό) (dat.: M 6, 12, 31; acc.: Schw. 664: 15/16, 21).

(4) With dat.: ἀπύ (6: 4, 94, 116; 262: 22; 343 C 12/13; D 29, 60; Schw. 664 *passim*; M 24?), ἐπές (D 9/10, 21/2, 26/7, 37; 6: 54), ἐξ (D 5, 19, 45, 55/6; 6: 49, 99; C 29; cf. ἐξοντ(α) in D), σύν (BCH, 1914, 451 ff. nos. 1: 9, 5; 5, 11: 1/2).

(5) With an exceptional genitive: ἀπ(ύ) (SEG, XI, 1045), ἐπές (SEG, XI, 1112. 3).⁴

small to allow for a study of the internal development of prepositional constructs in Arcadian. The list offered above is intended only for statistical purposes: it is obvious that any syntactical study must also consider the prepositions from the point of view of the meaning which they carry in each context.

¹ The gen. after ἴσοθι is probably not very different from a real *ablativus comparationis*, like, e.g., that found after πλέον (see below).

² Most of the instances of ἐπι with the dat. are found in phrases like ἐπι Δαμοστράτοι (name of a magistrate) where Attic would use a gen.; ἐπι with the acc. is mainly found in the phrase ἐπι Ἀθανείων which functions as a tribe-name.

³ Householder, *op. cit.* 3 f. note 3 rightly points out that the only instance of πάρ with the dat. in Arcadian is really 'on the borderline between ablative and instrumental'. However, C provides another instance in which the correspondence of the dat. with the gen. of the other dialects cannot be called into doubt.

⁴ For another possible example of ἀπύ (*sic*) with the gen. in an archaic inscription see IG, V, 2. 403 (from the region of Lousoi) where the readings ἀπύ βεμίδων (see the editor *ad loc.*)

In verbal sentences the adnominal genitive and some kind of partitive (e.g. φέκαστος c. gen. or τίς c. gen.) are found. The verbs κατυφρονέω (6: 47), λαγχάνω (343 A 2/3), κοινανέω (C 4), κα(κ)-κρίνομαι (τῶν χρῆμάτων: 262: 15), γράφω (τῶν ἄλλων χωρίων: D 15), are followed by the partitive genitive. However, in the sentences πλὸς ἀμέρου καὶ νυκτός (3: 16),¹ πλέον ἀπέχων... πλέθρων (D 14), ἀφεώσθω τῷ ἔργῳ (6: 14), ἀπὺ τοῖ Σαίσκω/Ἀμφικλέος/ὄσω ποσεδεόμεθα (6: 94, 116), τῷ ταλάντῳ τῷ ἁ πόλις ἀπυδίει ἀπυδώσονσι... (*ibid.* 96/7: *attractio inversa?*) we seem to have a genitive continuing an ancient ablative. No contrary example of dative replacing an ablative in non-prepositional constructs is to be found: εἰ δέ τις ἐπι[τῷ] γυάνῃ τοῦτοῖς of 429: 5 (Phigalea, *ante* 420) offers a construction, already known from Pindar, in which a dative takes the place of a more usual genitive (part. not abl.). The ἐπές δὲ ταῖς παναγορίαις ταῖς ἐσλελοίπασσι οἱ φυγάδες (D 22) quoted by Ilievski (*Ling. Balk., loc. cit.* 37) is obviously an instance of attraction of the relative (see in the same inscription, line 58: εὐνοήσω τοῖς κατηνηκόσι τοῖς ἔδοξε ταῖ πόλι κατυδέσθαι). The evidence, although small, points to the existence in Arcadian of an ablatival genitive alongside an adnominal and a partitive genitive.

This conclusion may be confirmed, but not disproved, by the study of the prepositional phrases. The genitives of (1a) are obviously adnominal; the same may be true for (1b), but see section III above. It is doubtful if διὰ c. gen. should be included in (2): ἀνάγκας (in lieu of ἀνάγκαν) is a non-epichoric form. κα(τύ) is found twice with the genitive, but the meaning of the first sentence is disputed and the second instance is uncertain. The genitives of (5) probably belong to texts from the northern part of Arcadia, on the borderline with Achaia. In *PdP* (1964), 346-54 I have suggested that they are due to non-Arcadian influence. In (3) ὕπερ c. dat. belongs to a late inscription with relatively modern features (εἰς instead of ἐν). A comparison of the Arcadian pattern (as classified in (3) and (4)) with that of Homer shows that, while Homer has the genitive after ἀπό and ἐξ, Arcadian has the dative (in (4)), and while all the prepositions listed in (3) (ὕπερ and ἐν excepted) may be followed by three cases in

or ἀπὸ Λου(σ)ίδων (see L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, Oxford 1961, 211 n. 1) have been suggested. The instances of ἐκ (*sic*), ἐπι and περὶ with the gen. found respectively in M 23.57, M 2 and M 8 are obviously due to the influence of the koine or, more likely, to some misunderstanding by the Ionian scribe (see line 8: περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πάντων!).

¹ The suggestion that the phrase quoted can be taken as meaning εἰ μὴ ἀμέρου καὶ νυκτός (see Ilievski, *Linguistique Balkanique, loc. cit.* 37 n. 1) is made very doubtful by the general sense of the texts, which would require ἀμέρου καὶ νύκτα (as in line 13).

Homer, in Arcadian they are found only with two cases. This may be due to chance, but it seems to be confirmed by Cyprian. The first fact has no parallel in Greek, the second *may* fit into a general tendency of Greek to simplify prepositional constructs. Attic itself shows one- and two-case constructions of ἀνά and μετά, and, later on, of περί *versus* the three-case constructions of Homer; almost all dialects tend to lose the distinction between ἐπί c. gen. and ἐπί c. dat., etc.¹ We may wonder if there is any possible connexion between (3) and (4). This is provided, in my opinion, by the fact that the syntactical simplification shown in (3) is obtained in all cases through the elimination of the genitive (a 'local' gen.), differently for example from Attic, which seems to prefer the genitive in prepositional constructs. Again, after ἀπύ and ἐς we see a dative replacing a 'local' genitive of the other dialects. If then the prepositional constructs of both (3) and (4) show the same preference for the dative *versus* the 'local' genitive, we have no reason to keep the two phenomena apart. Similarly, in spite of the fact that the genitive which in other dialects follows the prepositions of (3) goes back both to an ancient ablative (e.g. after πρός) and to an ancient genitive (part. or loci, e.g. after ἐπί), from the point of view of our evidence there is no reason to split (3) into two parts.² It looks, then, as if the simplification of prepositional constructs in Arcadian (or in Arcado-Cyprian) had occurred after, and not before, the syncretism of ablative and genitive. If this conclusion is correct, it *may* be applied also to the constructs of (4). It is possible that the disappearance of the 'local' genitive has been influenced both by the need to simplify some prepositional constructs, and by the excessive load of syntactical functions carried by the genitive. Yet any inquiry in this direction is bound to be largely guesswork: it should be kept in mind that we are no clearer about the preference of Attic for the genitive than we are about that of Arcadian for the dative, even if the latter has been carried much further.

To sum up: I suggest that Arcadian (and presumably Cyprian) have a dative in lieu of a genitive of other dialects only after prepositions; that this phenomenon involves both prepositions which were followed by an ablative and prepositions which were followed by a

¹ See Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, II, 207 ff.

² The Arcadians themselves obviously did not feel any difference between datives corresponding, e.g., to Attic genitives and datives corresponding to Attic datives. A curious proof of this is given by the inscription BCH, 1914, 467, no. 10.8, where the scribe, who probably meant to use the Doric or Achaean koine (l. 5 ἤμεν), writes [E]πί Λαχάρους οὐν θεαπόων (sic), substituting in both cases the genitive for the *prepositional* dative of his dialect.

genitive. Evidence for a syncretism of genitive and ablative in Arcado-Cyprian is thus provided both by non-prepositional constructs and by the fact that the disappearance of the genitive after prepositions also involves non-ablatival genitives.

We should now consider the Mycenaean evidence.

V. At present it is often, if not always,¹ assumed that the *-o* adjectives agreeing with *-pi* nouns in the Ta-tablets of Pylos are to be taken as forms of the instrumental in *-ois* and kept apart from the dative-locative in *-oi* (either *-oi(h)i* or *-oi*). This is undoubtedly the most likely hypothesis so far, but it should be remembered that it rests only on the exiguous evidence provided by the Pylos Ta-series: elsewhere either the *-o* case does not appear or we are not able to recognize it. In this situation its syntactical function seems to be limited to the instrumental, but further evidence might modify this impression. It is still not certain that *-o* and *-oi* (and perhaps *-a* and *-a-i*) cannot be interchanged: *ku-ru-so* [[*qo*]-*u-ka-ra-o-i*] of PY Ta 714 (if this is the correct reading) and *KO-NO-SI-JA ki-ri-te-wi-ja-i* of KN E 777 (if *ko-no-si-ja* is not used as an independent place-name) might indicate the contrary.

After Lejeune's study of the *-pi* case (*Mémoires*, I, 159 ff. and 341), the only new texts which provide some additional information are PY Fn 1428 with *ki-ri-te-wi-ja-pi* and KN Dl 47 (new reading) with *su-ki-ri-ta-pi*. Both the tablets are too fragmentary to be used in a syntactical study. They are of interest only in so far as they provide us with a *-pi* case of an 'appellativum' in Pylos and of a place-name in Knossos. The arguments adduced to prove the ablatival meaning of the *-pi* place-names are (a) their occurrence in texts where an ablatival meaning is required; (b) their failure to alternate with *-a-i*, *-o-i*, *-si* place-names in the dative-locative. To tackle (b) first: place-names in *-a-i*, *-o-i*, *-si* are not frequent in Myc.; there are two obscure forms in Knossos (*ka-ta-ra-i*: Co 906.1; *da-*83-ja-i*: F 670.1), and two geographical names in *-si* in Pylos (*ai-ta-re-u-si*: An 657.10; *pa-ki-ja-si*: An 18.11; Cn 608.6; Tn 316.2; Un 2.1; Vn 130.7, 9). Only for *pa-ki-ja-si* is it possible to quote a contrasting form *pa-ki-ja-pi* (Eb 338.1?; Jn 829.7; Ma 221.1),² but even in this instance we are not in a position to prove the existence of a difference in the syntactical use of the two forms; the same applies to the opposition *po-ra-i* (An 656.13) / *po-ra-pi* (An 1.4; Mn 1408.2; Nn 228.6).

¹ See Ruijgh, *Mnemosyne*, 1958, 111 f.

² If in PY Eb 338.1 Ventris and Chadwick's supplement *pa-ki-ja-pi* is correct we seem to have a form in *-pi* in a text where a locatival meaning is required.

The texts quoted with more conviction in support of (a) are PY An 607.2: *do-e-ro pa-te ma-te-de ku-te-re-u-pi* (interpreted either as 'the mother is from *K.* [place-name]' or 'is from [the deme, class of] the potters') and PY An 1: *e-re-ta pe-re-u-ro-na-de i-jo-te. . . po-ra-pi* VIR 4. As far as I can see, in PY An 607 the reading *ku-te-re-u-pi* is not altogether certain. However, if the last sign is *-pi*, we find ourselves in a dilemma: on the one hand we require a trade name or a status name, because of the parallelism with the other lines of the tablet, while on the other hand we are compelled by the *ku-te-re-u-pi* of Na 296 to recognize here a geographical name. If that is so, before deciding the meaning of the sentence ('she is in *K.*', 'she comes from *K.*', 'she lives among the *K.*-ians') the relevance of *K.* in the context and its exact grammatical form (place-name, ethnic, etc.) should be established. If this cannot be done, the ablatival meaning cannot be proved. Parallel considerations may be offered for An 1: it has not been sufficiently emphasized (except perhaps by Gallavotti, *Documenti e Struttura*, 68) that the whole interpretation of the place-names following the heading rests on the meaning of *i-jo-te*: does it mean that the rowers are going to *P.* or that they are due to go or will go to *P.*? In the first case an ablatival interpretation of the place-names should perhaps be favoured, but in the second case it is certainly not necessary: for a future construction a parallel may be offered by *de-me-o-te* of An 35.¹ I shall just mention here the syntactical ambiguity of PY Jn 829. The standard formula: *X* (place-name) *ko-re-te* AES may *a priori* be understood as 'from *X* the *ko-re-te* (contributes)' or 'in *X* the *ko-re-te* (contributes)' or 'The *ko-re-te* in (of) *X* (contributes)', etc. So much for the possibility of recognizing ablatival forms merely through the meaning, or the supposed meaning, of the texts: we should accept the fact that our evidence is completely unsatisfactory and cannot yield any certainty. In any case, a useful warning against such deductions comes from the alphabetical Greek inscriptions: in a fourth-century Epidaurian list of *thearodokoi* residing in various places (*IG*, IV, 1504 = Schw. 395), the names of the towns and regions are alternatively in nominative, genitive, dative and dative with *ἐν* without any consistent pattern, and ethnics are occasionally substituted for place-names.

However, even in terms of the limitations set out above, it is still possible to point out some examples of *-pi* with a locative function:

¹ Men who are due to go to a place, can in the meanwhile be residing in various villages. For the use of the participle in Greek see Kühner-Gerth, I, 182 and for *ἰών* in particular *ibid.* I, 139 f.

we expect a locative after *e-pi/o-pi* both in PY Ae 134: *o-pi. . . ge-to-ro-po-pi o-ro-me-no* and in KN V 280: *e-pi i-ku-wo-i-pi* (see Lejeune, *Mémoires*, I, 175; *contra* Ilievski, *op. cit.* 107 f.).¹ We seem also to need a locative in PY Cn 418.3: *re-[u]-ko ma-ra-pi pe-ko a-ko-ro-we*, if we accept the interpretation of L. R. Palmer (*Interpretation*, 432) 'dark on the underbelly'. More doubtfully we might also add that it is difficult to make any sense of PY Eb 495 (*ne-ge-wo e-da-e-wo ka-ma: o-pe-ro du-wo-u-pi te-re-ja-e e-me-de te-[re]-ja*), if we do not take the *du-wo-u-pi* as referring to the *ka-ma* (neuter, as suggested by M. Lejeune, *PdP* (1962), 410 n. 21) in which the man works. See also section VI below.

VI. It is maintained that in the *-s* stems the *-e-i* ending has the functions of dative and locative, while the *-e-e* ending is used only as instrumental-ablative. The evidence is distributed as follows (the figures in square brackets after the numbers of the tablets refer to the hands of the scribes):²

(1) *Personal names*: (a) Knossos: there is no instance of *-s* stem in the dative, with the possible exception of the obscure divine name *pa-de|pa-de-i*; (b) Pylos: (A) *e-ti-me-de-i*, *]mo-ke-re-we-i*, *o-[.]te-i*, *i-ja-me-i* (Fn 324.1, 2, 5, 7[45]), *e-u-me-de-i* (Fr 1184.2 [2]), *o-to-wo-we-i* (Vn 851.9 [II/III]), *po-so-pe-re-i* (Cn 40.2 [21]); (B) uncertain examples: *o-pi-ke-de-i* (An 1281.2 [hand unknown]), *pi-ke-te-i* (Gn 720.1 [I]); (c) Mycenae: none.

(2) *Place-names*: (a) Knossos: (A) *qi-ko-we-e* (C 911.5), **56-ko-we-e* (Dl 7141: alternating with **56-ko-we*); (B) **56-ko-we-i* (Dm 5181, Dn 1093.2); (b) Pylos: (A) *ti-mi-to a-ke-e* (Cn 600.7, 8, 11-15 [21], Jn 829.13 [2], Ma 123 [2], Na 361 [1]), *a-pe-ke-e* (Jn 431.16 [2]), *a-se-e* (An 18.4 [II/III]), *e-re-e* (Jo 438.19 [I]), *e-ri-ka-we-e* (? Un 1319.3 [hand unknown]), *ka-ro-ke-e* (An 207.16 [43]), *ke-e* (Aa 93 [4], Ad 295 [23]), *ne-de-we-e* (Cn 595.3 [21]), *po-ti-ja-ke-e* (An 298.2 [1], An 610.11 [3]), *ge-re-me-e* (Na 540 [1]), *te-se-e* (Na 531 [11]); (B) *ti-mi-to a-ke-i* (An 661.10 [1]), *e-ra-te-i* (Cn 608.9 [1]), *e-re-i* (Jn 829.19 [2]), *re-si-we-i* (or *i-si-we-i*: An 18.4 [II/III]); (c) Mycenae: none.

(3) *Others*: (a) Knossos: *]a-ko-ro-we-i* (? D 7100), *]do-we-i* (F 854.2); (b) Pylos: *we-te-i-we-te-i* (Es 644.1-13 [1]); (c) Mycenae: *a-po-te-i* (? Ge 602.5).

¹ For the use of *ἐπι* in Mycenaean it may be interesting to notice that in PY Un 2.1 *e-pi wa-na-ka-te* could *a priori* be taken as an instance of *ἐπι* with the dat. of the name of the magistrate (as in Arcadian). However, the interpretation of the whole tablet is much disputed.

² For a classification of the scribal hands of Pylos see Bennett, *Atti*, 328-31 and *Nestor*, 1959, 55-60.

Only rarely do we know the nominative of the datives listed above: the presumption remains, however, that the personal names are $\bar{e}s$ names in all instances, while the place-names and others are mostly $-os$ names. A first observation must be made. No $\bar{e}s$ name has an $-e-e$ dative; all those which we know are found in what looks like a truly 'dative' use and have an $-e-i$ ending. This creates a problem when we remember that a very large majority of the other consonant stems have $-e$ datives. No plausible explanation of this differentiation has yet been offered. I tend to believe, but I cannot prove my suggestion, that two factors were operative at the time when the choice between the $-ei$ and the $-i$ ending was being made: (a) a kind of preventive dissimilation, meant to avoid the sequence $-e-ei$, and (b) the influence, perhaps favoured by the possible presence in Mycenaean of accusatives of the type of ἀτελήν, of the $-a$ stem dative in $\bar{a}-i$ and possibly of the $-i$ stems.¹ In any case, it should be emphasized that, of the two possible datives of the $-s$ stems, the exceptional one, from a Mycenaean point of view, is the $-e-i$ form, not the $-e-e$ form.

Among the place-names listed above only those of Pylos have a context sufficient for further investigation. The fact that the same hand writes $-i$ and $-e$ (e.g. 1 and 2) shows that this opposition is not likely to be due to dialect differentiation.

Among the $-e-e$ place-names of Pylos $a-ke-e$ (three times), $ke-e$ (twice), $ne-de-we-e$, $qe-re-me-e$, $te-se-e$ alternate with $-pi$ in the same or (more frequently) in parallel texts: $a-ke-e$, $qe-re-me-e$ and $te-se-e$ all occur in the Na- series. $po-ti-ja-ke-e$ (twice), $ka-ro-ke-e$, $e-re-e$ alternate with $-e$ forms, but not with $-pi$: $ka-ro-ke-e$ in particular alternates with $wa-a_2-te-we$ and not with the $wa-a_2-te-pi$ which we know from Na 1009 and Xa 1377. In Jn 829.13 $a-ke-e$ alternates with $-pi$, but also with $e-re-i$ (considered a scribal mistake by Ilievski). $a-se-e$ occurs side by side with $re-si-we-i$ in An 18. In the $-i$ series $e-ra-te-i$ occurs along with $pa-ki-ja-si$, and possibly (but not certainly) $a-ke-i$ is parallel to $a_2-ta-re-u-si$; but, as we have seen, $e-re-i$ alternates with $-pi$ and $-e-e$, and $re-si-we-i$ with $-e-e$. This means that of these fourteen instances of $-e-e$ only eight alternate with $-pi$ and only three with other $-e-e$ place-names versus two which alternate with $-e-i$. Of the four $-e-i$ place-

¹ In view of the Cyprian ἀτελήν there is no reason to dismiss as due to Doric or koine influence the Σοιδήν of IG, v, 2. 6: 109: it seems more likely that we have here an Arcado-Cyprian isogloss. The forms of acc. sing. in $-εα$ of $-s$ stems quoted by Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch*, II, 120 are all later than IG, v, 2. 6 (for the origin of these accusatives see Seiler, *Glotta*, 37 (1958), 49 ff.). In any case, it seems to me probable that in the dat. sing. of the $-a$ declension $-i$ was felt to be the ending.

names two alternate with $-e-e$; of the two others one alternates with $-si$ and the second may or may not do the same. These figures certainly do not encourage correcting $e-re-i$ into $e-re-e$; we should then also have to correct $re-si-we-i$ into $re-si-we-e$.

Thus the assumption of an ablative meaning of $-e-e$ and a locative meaning of $-e-i$ comes up against the contrary evidence of the cases in which $-e-e$ and $-e-i$ alternate; these by themselves constitute half of all the occurrences of $-e-i$ in place-names. On the other hand the high percentage of $-e-e/-pi$ alternations is significant only if it can be proved independently that $-pi$ is merely ablative and instrumental: otherwise the argument becomes circular.¹

In this connexion it is important to study the use of the preposition $pa-ro$ in the texts of Pylos. Householder has recognized that it is possible to assume that $pa-ro$ is followed by a single case (dative-locative), but has also admitted the possibility that $pa-ro$ may be followed by two different cases, not distinguished in writing. Ilievski has pursued this suggestion and has identified, in the $-e$ forms which follow $pa-ro$, either dative-locatives in $-ei$ or instrumentals in \bar{e} according to the context. If this were correct, we should not find $-i$ forms of the locative in such $pa-ro$ constructions as, according to the theory, require an ablative meaning. However, in PY Cn 40.2, we read $wa-no-jo wo-wo pa-ro po-so-pe-re-i wo-ne-we$ OVIS^m 75. The place-name $wa-no-jo wo-wo$ alternates with $a-ne-u-te$ and with $ma-ro-pi$ in the same text. If $ma-ro-pi$ (place-name in $-pi$) and, consequently, $wa-no-jo wo-wo$ had an ablative meaning, we should expect the same to be true for the $pa-ro$ clause. As it is not so, one of the two points of the theory must be reconsidered: either $-pi$ is ablative, in which case we must accept the possibility of $-e-i$ (and not $-e-e$) being ablative too, or $-e-i$ has only locative meaning, in which case $-pi$ must be locative too. In the first case the whole basis for assuming an $-e$ (\bar{e}) ending of the instrumental-ablative distinguished from the $-ei/-i$ ending of the dative-locative falls to the ground; in the second case the possibility of a locative meaning of $-pi$ is proved once more and there is no further need for a new ending \bar{e} to account for the $-e-e/-pi$ alternations.²

To sum up: In the present state of our documents there is not,

¹ In $we-te-i-we-te-i$ we have an $-i$ form corresponding to an IE locative. However, this need not support Ilievski's hypothesis, as $we-te-i-we-te-i$ is likely to have preserved in its semi-adverbial form an IE feature.

² In MY Ge 604 there is no need to recognize with Ilievski an abl. in the personal names which precede $o-pe-ro$: an adnominal dative is equally possible.

I believe, sufficient evidence to prove the existence of an instrumental-ablative independent in all numbers and declensions from the dative-locative. Such evidence as we have seems to tell against, and not in favour of this hypothesis. At present it seems safer and more economical to assume (a) that the regular ending of the athematic dative singular in Mycenaean is *-e(i)*, (b) that this ending is used for both the dative-locative and the instrumental (with a few exceptions which show the ending *-i*), (c) that the *-e-e* ending of the *-s* stems fits into this general rule (*-e(h)ei* from **-esei*), (d) that the *-ēs* names (and possibly adjectives) constantly have an ending *-i* (parallel to the ending *-ā-i* of the *-a* declension and possibly of the *-i* stems), and (e) that, perhaps on the analogy of the *-ēs* names, this same ending *-i* is to be found sporadically (four instances *versus* fourteen) in the *-as* place-names too. It is only fair to add that any new piece of evidence can still change this view.