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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 *-d$s, *-d$; *-ns, but nothing else, by normal phonetic development (unless IE *-a- and *-a- are set up).

R. A. CROSSLAND

AN INSTRUMENTAL-ABLATIVE IN MYCENAEN?

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 ‘ablatival’ 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 = -esti), (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 -e, -e, -e, whenever used as instrumental or ablative, should be considered different from the respective forms of locative or dative-locative (i.e. not -di, -di, -ei but perhaps -di, -di, -e). 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.

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. -άς, -άο, -ος (i.e. gen. sing.) and -α(ή) -εί(ή) -σι (i.e. dat.-loc. plur.) forms with the functions of (genitive) ablative and (dative-locative) ablative. 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.3

III. For the Cyprian prepositions the following evidence is available:4

(1) With gen.: ὄνομα (217: 4, 14); ὄνομα (217: 5, 5; 6/7, 15, 17).
(2) With acc.: τῶν (217: 19, 19/20, 21/2).
(3) With dat. and acc.: ἅ (9) (dat.: 2: 4; 5: 2; 182 β; 204; 209: 3/4; 210: 2/3; 212, 212, 5; 216, 4; 217: 1, 3, 8, 9, 17, 20, 21, 28: 1/2; 220: 4; 244: 3; 245: 5; 252: 2; 265: 3; 267: 3; 273: 1; 335: 3; 343: 2; acc.: 217: 27; 265: 2; ἄρα (217: 3; acc. uncertain, but in 94: 2/3 a gen. is unlikely), ἄρα (dat.: 217: 27/8).
(4) With dat.: ἅτο (217: 8, 11, 12, 20; 220: 5/6, 6, 11, 24), τῷ (2: 264: 2), σῶν (9) (51 β; 217: 29; 266: 3; 304: 4).

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

1 For our purposes we do not need to take into consideration Beekes's suggestion (BSL, 50 (1954), 96 ff.) that IE had an ablative ending *-στόν different from the *-όν of the genitive. In any case, *-στό > *-όν before the period in which we are interested.
2 The Pamphylean evidence is constantly ambiguous and I have preferred to ignore it. See, however, Thomb-Schäfer, Handschr., p. 152.
3 For the other cases 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 Claus-Schwyzer Del., and of Buck, Gdp. C = Hengst-Klaßenbach, Apokhrandria aus Kor (Abh. Berl. Ak., Kl. Spr., 1932), No. 41; D = IG, v, 2, pp. xxvi ff. (for a better edition see Pfannas, BCH, 1914, 101 ff. and for additional readings SBF, 1: 111; 161; xiv, 257 and Tod, OCh, n. 296). M = Dittenberger, Syl., ii, 359 (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 Ionic scribe; this accounts for the many errors and for the partial unreliability of the document (dated to ca. 207/6 B.C.). Schw. = Claus-Schwyzer, Del. A fuller edition of IG, v, 2, 343 was published by Pfannas in BCH, 39 (1915), 58 ff. (see Schw. 895, Buck, op. cit. 31). The most complete list of Arcadian prepositions is still that of R. v. Velzen, De toponim Arcadiae Ionsicae at sopiae veternum, Berlin, 1917, 49 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 Arche) influence should be taken into account, but the evidence available is much too
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be gen. or acc.), in 261 ἄληματες may be gen. [part.] sing. or acc. plur.) and in 306: 2 a gen. part. is usual after ἀπονοίας (290).

From the point of view of the prepositions; in (1) the genitive is expected, but its origin is in both cases doubtful: after ἔνα τι Chantraire (Gramm. hom., II, 52) assumes a real genitive (adnominal?), but Schwyzer-Debrunner (Gr. Gr., 11, 443) and Humbert (Synaxa gregev, 301 f.) are uncertain; the genitive after ἀνασ is an original ablative according to Humbert (op. cit. 323), Schwyzer-Debrunner (op. cit. 535) and Günther (IF, 20 (1906/7), 69), and the instance of ἄνασ with the accusative found in Elean (Schwyzer, Del., 410: 8) should tell against the possibility of an adnominal genitive. In (3) we have a rare example of τῷ with the dative (181: αἴσχρος τῷ τοίδι). It should be pointed out: (a) that such a construction is very ancient: τῷ τταλής τε μετρίοις οὐδε συμφώνου Ἰλισά (II, 12, 265) is not very different from τῷ ἔνα τινι μερείων (Tyr. 6 D.); (b) that far from being 'generally agreed' (Hillers and Housholder) that τῷ is an ablative preposition, Schwyzer-Debrunner (op. cit. 502 f.), Chantraire (op. cit. 128) and Humbert (op. cit. 316) agree in considering the genitive after τῷ as partitive (with the possible exception of phrases like τῷ τοίδι). For (4) it should be noticed that the interpretation of ἁκόρο in 264 is far from being sure; Iliissi (like Hoffmann) takes it as if it were ἁκόρο and recognizes here an abl. separatum, but see Masson ad loc. If Masson's and Hall's τῷ is correct, we may have here a remarkable archaism: see Beocian τοσνιτι (τῷ τοίδι) and perhaps Hom. 'λέθη τῷ (7), etc.1

IV. In dialect texts the Arcadian prepositions or adverbial forms are used as follows:4

1 But for the latter see Lejeune, Les adverbes grecs en -έν, Brussels 1955, 466 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 Claus-Schwyzer Del., and of Buck, Gdp. C = Hengst-Klaßenbach, Apokhrandria aus Kor (Abh. Berl. Ak., Kl. Spr., 1932), No. 41; D = IG, v, 2, pp. xxvi ff. (for a better edition see Pfannas, BCH, 1914, 101 ff. and for additional readings SBF, 1: 111; 161; xiv, 257 and Tod, OCh, n. 296). M = Dittenberger, Syl., ii, 359 (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 Ionic scribe; this accounts for the many errors and for the partial unreliability of the document (dated to ca. 207/6 B.C.). Schw. = Claus-Schwyzer, Del. A fuller edition of IG, v, 2, 343 was published by Pfannas in BCH, 39 (1915), 58 ff. (see Schw. 895, Buck, op. cit. 31). The most complete list of Arcadian prepositions is still that of R. v. Velzen, De toponim Arcadiae Ionsicae at sopiae veternum, Berlin, 1917, 49 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 Arche) influence should be taken into account, but the evidence available is much too
In verbal sentences the adnominal genitive and some kind of partitive (e.g. ἐκτὸς τοῦ, C. gen. or τῆς, c. gen.) are found. The verbs καταφθείνω (6: 47), ἀγαθόν (343 A 23/1), κοινάκια (C 4), κα(κ) στράτων (to τῶν κρατῶν: 262: 13), γάργα (τῶν ἐκλογων χρονίων: D 15), are followed by the partitive genitive. However, in the sentences πλῆς ἀμέσως καὶ νυκτὸς (3: 16), τότε ἐπεξεργάσοντας... πλῆθος (D 14), ἀρίστερα τοῦ έργου (6: 14), ἄποικότης τόκος (5: 3), ἀπὸ τῶν Σισάκων, ἀθέτους... ἀπεικονισθείσα (6: 94, 116), τό παλαιό τό καὶ παλιά ἀντικεῖστη ἀπεικονισθείσα... (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 constructions is to be found: τάς τινις πάντας τῶν τοιμάσισιν οἰς παραγόσεις (249: 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 ἐπες ταῖς προσεγγίσεις τοῖς εἰσφέροντας οἱ παραγόντας (D 22) quoted by Ilieński (Ling. Balk., loc. cit. 37) is obviously an instance of attraction of the relative (see in the same inscriptions, line 58: οἰνούς τῶν καθρηματικῶν τοῖς οἰκίσεως ταῦτα καθιεξέχονται). The evidence, although small, points to the existence in Arcadian of an ablative 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 δια c. gen. should be included in (2): στρατικός (in lieu of στράτευμα) is a non-eponymic form. κα(κ) το is found twice with the genitive, but the meaning of the first sentence is disputed and the second sentence is uncertain. The genitives of (5) probably belong to texts from the northern part of Arcadia, on the borderland with Achaia. In PDP (1664), 346-54 I have suggested that they are due to non-Arcadian influence. In (3) ἐπερ c. dat. belongs to a late inscription with relatively modern features (ἐς 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 ἐπερούντα and ἐς, Arcadian has the dative (in (4)), and while all the prepositions listed in (3) (ἐπερ και ἐν excepted) may be followed by three cases in ἐπερούντα (see L. H. Jeffery, The Local Scripts of Arcadian Greece, Oxford 1956, 211 n. 1) have been suggested. The instances of ἐπερούντα, ἐπερ και with the gen. found respectively in M 29, 57, M 2 and M 8 are obviously due to the influence of the Ionic or, more likely, to some misunderstanding by the Ionian scribal (see line 8; ἐπερούντα καὶ ἐπερούντα ἐπερούντα). 1 The suggestion that the phrase quoted can be taken as meaning ἐποίησε τὸ σαλφέων το οὐκ ἐπερούντα (see Ilieński, Lingüística Balkanica, loc. cit. 37 n. 1) is made very doubtful by the general sense of the texts, which would require ἐποίησε τὸ σαλφέων (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 constructions. Attic itself shows one and two-case constructions of ἐν and ἔννυστος and, later on, of περὶ versus the three-case constructions of Homer; almost all dialects tend to lose the distinction between ἐν c. gen. and ἐν c. dat., etc. 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 ἄτρομον and ἱππό 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 ἄτρομον) and to an ancient genitive (part. or loci, e.g. after ἐννυστος), from the point of view of our evidence there is no reason to split (3) into two parts. 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, Verhandsungen 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 Aeolian loci (l. 5 ἐννυστος), writes τῶν ἀφόγραφων ἐννυστος (sic), substituting in both cases the genitive for the prepositional dative of his dialect.
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genitive. Evidence for a syncrетism 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-ablative genitives.

We should now consider the Mycenaean evidence.

V. At present it is often, if not always, assumed that the –o adjectives agreeing with –pi nouns in the Ya-tablets of Pylos are to be taken as forms of the instrumental in –οις and kept apart from the dative-locative in –οι (either –οι or –οι). 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 Ya-series: elsewhere either the –οι 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 –ο and –οι (and perhaps –οι and –οι) cannot be interchanged: ka–ro–m[–(e)–]–(οι) of PYTa 714 (if this is the correct reading) and KO–NO–SI–JA ki–ri–is–ui–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 PYTn 1428 with ki–ri–is–ui–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 ablative meaning of the –pi place-names are (a) their occurrence in contexts where an ablative meaning is required; (b) their failure to alternate with –οι, –οι, –οι, –οι place-names in the dative-locative. To tackle (b) first: place-names in –οι, –οι, –οι are not frequent in Myc.; there are two obscure forms in Knossos (ka–ta–ra–i: Co 906.1; 96–97–ja–i: V 670.1), and two geographical names in –i in Pylos (sk–i–lo–u–i: An 657.10; pa–ki–ja–i: An 18.11; Gn 608.6; Tn 516.2; Un 2.1; Vn 150.7, 9). Only for pa–ki–ja–si is it possible to quote a contrasting form pa–ki–ja–si (Eb 338.17; Jn 829.7; Mu 221.1),3 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 pa–ra–i (An 656.13)/ pa–ra–pi (An 1.4; Mu 1408.2; Nn 228.6).

1 See Rhig, Memriseon, 1956, 111 ff.

2 If in PY Bk 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 locativus meaning is required.
we expect a locative after e-pijo-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-te-ro-i-pi (see Lejeune, Memoires, 1, 175, contra Illeviski, op. cit. 107 f.)

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-ablatival. The evidence is distributed as follows (the figures in square brackets after the numbers of the tablets refer to the hands of the scribes).

(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-pi-de-i; (b) Pylos: (a) e-si-me-de-i, i-ro-ke-ro-wi, o-i-i-pi, e-si-me-i (Fn 324.3, 2.5, 7.45), e-si-me-de-i (Fr 1184.2 [2]), o-to-ro-wi (Vn 851.9 [III/III]), po-ro-po-i (Gn 40.2 [2]); (b) uncertain examples: ou-pi-ke-i (An 1281.2 [hand unknown], pi-keto-i (Gn 700.1 [I]); (c) Mycenae: none.

(2) Place-names: (a) Knossos: (a) gi-ko-ti-wi (G 911.5), *gi-to-wi (Dl 7141: alternating with *gi-to-wi); (b) *gi-to-wi (Dl 5181, Dn 1093.4); (b) Pylos: (a) ti-me-a-keto (Gn 600.7, 3, 11-15 [21], Jn 829.13 [2], Ma 123 [2], Na 361 [1], a-pe-ke-i (Jn 451.26 [2]), a-to-ro-wi (An 13.4 [II/III]), e-si-wi (Io 438.19 [1]), e-si-wi (An 1191.3 [hand unknown]), ko-re-i (An 207.16 [43]), ke-i (An 193 [4], Ad 295 [23]), ma-wo-wi (Gn 595.3 [21], po-ro-ke-i (An 298.2 [1]), An 610.11 [3]), po-ro-wi (Na 540 [1], ke-i (Na 531 [1])); (b) ti-me-a-keto (An 661.10 [1], e-ta-te-i (Can 608.9 [1]), e-si-wi (Jn 829.19 [2]), pi-si-wi (or i-si-wi: An 13.4 [II/III]); (c) Mycenae: three.

(3) Others: (a) Knossos: a-ro-wo-ke-i (? D 7100), daj-i-wo-i (Fr 854.2); (b) Pylos: wo-te-i-wi (Es 644.1-15 [1]); (c) Mycenae: a-po-te-i (? Ge 602.5).

1 For the use of o-t i in Mycenae it may be interesting to notice that in PY Un 2.1 e-pi we-ro-ke-i could be taken as an instance of i-t i 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, Alti, 388-81 and Neiter, 1959, 55-60.
MORPHOLOGY, WORD FORMATION AND SYNTAX

Only rarely do we know the nominative of the dative listed above; the presumption remains, however, that the personal names are -es names in all instances, while the place-names and others are mostly -os names. A first observation must be made. No -es name has an -e dative; all those which we know are found in what looks like a truly 'datival' use and have an -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 -i and the -e ending was being made: (a) a kind of preventitive dissimilation, meant to avoid the sequence -e-i, and (b) the influence, perhaps faveourised by the possible presence in Mycenaean of accusatives of the type of ἄρξης, of the -e stem dative in -i and possibly of the -es stems.

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 -es place-names of Pylos a-ko-e (three times), ke-e (twice), no-ir-u-e, ge-re-me-e, to-se-e alternate with -pi in the same or (more frequently) in parallel texts: a-ko-e, ge-re-me-e, to-se-e, all occur in the Na- series, po-th-je-e (twice), a-ko-e, e-re-e alternate with -e forms, but not with -pi: ko-ro-e in particular alternates with wa-a-ar-wu and not with the wa-a-ar-wi which we know from Na 1009 and Xa 1377. In Jn 829.13 a-ko-e alternates with -pi, but also with e-re-i (considered a scribal mistake by Illiević). a-se-e occurs side by side with re-se-i in An 18. In the -i series e-ra-le-i occurs along with po-th-je-si, and possibly (but not certainly) a-ko-e is parallel to a-ko-le-usi; but, as we have seen, e-re-e alternates with -pi and -e, and re-se-e with -e. This means that of these fourteen instances of -es only eight alternate with -pi and only three with other -es place-names versus two which alternate with -e. Of the four -es place-

1 In view of the Cyprian evidence there is no reason to dismiss as due to Doric or koine influence the mouts of IG, v, 2, 61: 109: it seems more likely that we have here an Arcado-Cyprian words. The forms of acc. sing. in -es of -e stems quoted by Thumm-Scherer, Handbuch, i, 120 all later than IG, v, 2 (for the origin of these accusatives see Seler, Glossa, 37 (1938), 49 ff.). In any case, it seems to me probable that in the dat. sing. of the -es declension -i was felt to be the ending.
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names two alternate with -e; of the other one alternates with -i 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 es-i-wi into es-i-wi.

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

In this connexion it is important to study the use of the preposition pa-ro in the texts of Pylos. Hesiod 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. Illiević has pursued this suggestion and has identified, in the -e forms which follow pa-ro, either dative-locatives in -e or instrumental in -e according to the context. If this were correct, we should not find -e forms of the locative in such pa-ro constructions as, according to the theory, require an ablational meaning. However, in PY Cu 40.2, we read wu-no-jo wo-wo pa-ro po-po-re-i wo-no-wo owm 75. The place-name wa-no-jo wo-wo alternates with a-wo-u-e and with ma-ro-7 in the same text. If ma-7 (place-name in -pi) and, consequently, wa-no-jo wo-wo had an ablational 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 (and not -e) being ablative too, or -e has only locative meaning, in which case -pi must be locative too.

In the first case the whole basis for assuming an -e (e) ending of the instrumental-ablative distinguished from the -es ending of the dative-locative falls to the ground; in the second case the possibility of a locativ al meaning of -pi is proved once more and there is no further need for a new ending -e to account for the -es/-pi alternations.

1 In view of the Cyprian evidence there is no reason to dismiss as due to Doric or koine influence the mouts of IG, v, 2, 61: 109: it seems more likely that we have here an Arcado-Cyprian words. The forms of acc. sing. in -es of -e stems quoted by Thumm-Scherer, Handbuch, i, 120 all later than IG, v, 2 (for the origin of these accusatives see Seler, Glossa, 37 (1938), 49 ff.). In any case, it seems to me probable that in the dat. sing. of the -es declension -i was felt to be the ending.

2 In MY Ge 509 there is no need to recognize with Illiević an abl. in the personal names which preceded a-jo-wo: 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 -e stems fits into this general rule (-e(h)ei from *-e-sei), (d) that the -e-e names (and possibly adjectives) constantly have an ending -i (parallel to the ending -a-i of the -e declension and possibly of the -i stems), and (e) that, perhaps on the analogy of the -e-e names, this same ending -i is to be found sporadically (four instances versus fourteen) in the -e-e place-names too. It is only fair to add that any new piece of evidence can still change this view.