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THE MORPHOLOGY OF PERSONAL NAMES IN MYCENEAAN AND GREEK: SOME OBSERVATIONS

To the memory of Olivier Masson († 23.2.1997)

1. Anyone who looks at Mycenaean from a linguistic point of view will try to situate it between Indo-European and Greek. To do so however means first of all to distinguish the features that Mycenaean shares with Greek from those which it does not. Secondly it means to identify in both classes those features which are inherited from Indo-European and those which are not. There is a possible third step or perhaps a counterecheck: to look at Greek features and to ask which ones of them arose after, or independently of, Mycenaean. This in effect leads us to compare Greek with Mycenaean and to ask which Greek features do not occur in Mycenaean—a dangerous attempt given the nature of our evidence. We assume, for instance, that the spread of the ρα-perfect is post Mycenaean, but we do so because of what we know about the history of Greek, not because we have no examples of forms like πέπαλα in Mycenaean. There is far too little evidence for Mycenaean verbal forms to warrant such a statement. When the spelling allows it, it is sometimes possible to reach this type of conclusions for the phonology, but that is because we are dealing with a small closed system of sounds and phonological rules; in the field of morphology, as the example given above indicates, this is rarely possible; for syntax and the lexicon it is impossible. However, there is an area where we have a considerable quantity of evidence: personal names. How I intend to exploit this field for the purposes of morphological analysis, will, I hope, emerge from what follows.

2. A series of recent and not so recent contributions has provided us with a great deal of information about Mycenaean personal names; we may refer to the 1958 book by Landau (Personennamen) and to the more recent contributions by e.g. Ilievski, Heubeck, Neumann, Masson, Risch, Ruigh, and others. All authors come across problems of interpretation; personal names, particularly if short, can be interpreted in a number of ways and the context, i.e. the meaning, does not help—all the more so since in each case it is not clear whether we are dealing with Greek names or names of different origin. A name like te-mo begins with a dental but this may be aspirated or not; the first vowel may be long or short and may be directly followed by -m- or by -r- or -l-, etc. However, if we leave aside the interpretation and concentrate on morphology some macroscopic facts are often clear. We are often (not always) capable of distinguishing compound names from simplicia and we are normally, even if not always, able to define the stem class to which a name belongs. From the beginning of Mycenaean studies, for instance, we have known that Mycenaean names, just like Greek names, included compounds of the type ἔμενης, ἔτσολης, ἔφσομος, ἔμερας, etc., which we assume represent in broad terms an inherited type. We also know that in addition to compounds Mycenaean can form its names, again as Greek, both from abbreviated forms of compounds, the so called hypocoristics (e.g. pe-ri-mo : pe-ri-me-de, i.e. Πέριμος : Περιμιδί) and from nouns or adjectives, ethnyes, etc. (e.g. Ἠλαρος : e-ra-po or Ζάνθος : ka-so-lo), the so-called sobriquets. Sometimes we can be more specific. Again from the beginning of Mycenaean
studies we know that a specific type of stems, the *eu*-stems, is extraordinarily frequent among personal names. This is old knowledge, but occasionally we are able to add to it. On the one hand the number of Mycenaean texts has increased and now we have texts from Thebes and Tiryns. On the other hand, and perhaps even more importantly, we now begin to have more easily analyzable data about Greek personal names. The last ten years have seen the appearance of three volumes of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* (*LGPN*). The first (1987) covers the Aegean Islands, Cyprus and Cyrenaeics; the second (1994) Attica, Volume III A. which covers the Peloponnese, Western Greece, Sicily and Magna Graecia, appeared in September 1997, long after the date of this Colloquium but in time for the proofs of this paper. The main aim of these volumes is historical but the linguistic reaping is also considerable. The fact that volumes II and III A. include a reverse index and that a reverse index is now available for the first volume allows a type of inquiry which so far was unthinkable.

Thanks to *LGPN* not only can we now exploit a much larger Greek corpus when we try to produce a Greek interpretation for a Mycenaean name (in some instances this may complicate rather than clarify the problems), but also – and more importantly for my purposes – for the regions covered by these volumes we can now know the relative frequency of particular morphological classes of personal names; we can then compare these results with a similar analysis of the Mycenaean data. At the simplest possible level consider again the class of *-eus* names in Mycenaean; that they are more frequent than in later Greece is obvious, but how much more frequent? We are now able to quantify our general impression.

The exact number of different personal names attested in Mycenaean is of course not known; scholars have spoken of figures of 1000 or even 2000. Thanks to Aura Jorro’s *Diccionario micénico* (1985–93) checking is now much easier, though of course the results of the check will vary depending on the attitude that we take to interpretation, restoration of broken words, etc. In addition the new Theban documents are certainly going to change the figures. At present my calculations yield a figure of ca. 1800 different names written in Linear B. We may assume that this figure is roughly correct, though it probably errs on the side of caution. For the *-ese* personal names Lundau spoke of ca. 80 names, Perpillou of a figure between 100 and 150; I have counted ca. 130 different personal names ending in *-eus* in the tablets. In other words the *-ese* names form ca. 7.22 % of the known Mycenaean names. Contrast now the figures for Attica. Out of 8306 names 69 end in *-eus*, that means 0.83 %; in vol. I of *LGPN* there are 98 *-eus* names out of 14150, i.e. 0.69 %; if we turn to Arcadia alone, out of ca. 1880 names only 5, i.e. only 0.26 %, end in *-eus*².

---


² I am very grateful to the editors of *LGPN*, Peter Fraser and Elaine Matthews, who in 1995 provided me with the reverse index to volume I and with the main Arcadian data from the forthcoming volume III A. of the work. My calculations for Arcadia are based on the 1995 data but I have made some corrections in the proofs to take into account the slight alterations introduced into the 1997 volume. Appendix I gives some rough absolute figures for the occurrence of various categories of names attested in Arcadia and in Attica. I must stress, of course, that my figures refer to types (different names) rather than tokens (different occurrences of the same name), since the former are much easier to find. It would be conceivable, however, that e.g. Attic used very frequently a smaller number of different *eus* names. Yet this is not the case. A quick search through *LGPN* II reveals that out of 62360 separate individuals for whom we have names, some 236, i.e. only 0.38 % of the total, carry an *eus* name. There are only two names (Μεταμος and Θαυμας) which are used for more than twenty individuals (27 in each case). Real persons who have the latter name all belong to the second century AD or to a later period. On the other hand there is an asymmetry between the number of different feminine names attested in Attica and the number of women which they refer to (cf. note 15).
3. Statistics which concern Mycenean usually do not mean very much because of the paucity of the material but in this case they are obviously significant and are as informative about the development of Greek as they are about that of Mycenean. As has been observed, our knowledge of Greek onomastics depends on three major bodies of material: the Mycenean texts, Homer, and epigraphical and literary texts. Given this staggering figure for Mycenean of 1800 names it should be possible to make about personal names the type of quantitative observations that are not possible for other parts of speech. Obviously this is not true when we move away from a particular type of morphological analysis and begin to depend on the identification of specific names. Even so it is possible to notice, as has been done, that ἄπος compounds of the type Ἀλκαντός are very rare or non-existent in Mycenean. The status of this observation is very different from that made earlier about the Greek perfect. If we accept Bartoněk’s figures, all that we have in Mycenean are 55 finite verbal forms.

I wish to argue that the joint analysis of Greek and Mycenean personal names can be profitably exploited for a study of the development of Greek morphology, if we are prepared to work at the interface between word formation and word inflection. This is because personal names occasionally show patterns of derivation and inflection more inventive than those of common nouns and adjectives. As an example of a well known fact consider the formation of feminines in Greek. A compound adjective of the εὐθηνής type has no separate form for the feminine; similarly thematic compounds ending in -τος such as ἄκτος, πολύκτος tend not to use special feminine morphemes. However, when we turn to the personal names connected with these adjectives, specific feminine forms exist: next to -κλές compounds as Ἑπεικέλες, we find as early as Homer feminines in -κλέα as Ἑνυκλέα; next to -γένης compounds such as Θαυγένης we find -γένεαι feminines as Ἀμφιγένεα (Risch, op. cit., 80 f.), though the two names of the Nereids in II. 18.46 (Ἠμηρίτει τε καὶ Ἀφανίτει) may point to a different state of affairs in origin. Some of these forms also occur in adjectives (ἁμαρτάνεις) but the clear impression is that here the personal names have the leading function and the morphology of the adjectives follows. Similarly, next to two-termination compounds of the ἄλαντος type, we find personal names where a special feminine is formed: in Attica next to Θέοδοτος there is Θεοδώτη, just as next to Διόδοτος there is Διοδώτη (LGPN II, s. v.). Here too the phenomenon is at least as old as Homer (Πολυκάστη) where we also find a few adjectives marked as feminines such as ἄμφωστη or πολυμνιστή (Risch, op. cit., p. 20). Indeed the general impression is that as early as Homer the basic marker of masculine personal names is perceived as -ος and of feminine personal names as -ά- and that this contrast is extended in the course of time to an increasing number of categories. In addition to the Attic contrast of Θέοδοτος and Θεοδώτη, consider also the masc. Θεόδωρος and the feminine Θεοδώρα; here too the creation of the feminine form is clearly an innovation and an interesting one since the second element of the compound is still transparently connected with the simplex δώρος, which is thematic. LGPN II gives for Attica a first date in the sixth century for the masculine and in the fourth century for the feminine. Equally strikingly we find in the sixth Century BC Ἀνθάπτος, but from the fifth century Ἀνσίλατη – though ἄπος is used both for horses and mares in Attic. On this evidence then it would seem reasonable to assume that the feminines are a late creation - until of course we discover that the same innovation is present in Mycenean in the name Θεοδώρα (MY V 659.4 τε-ο-δο-ρα-γε). Similarly the -εως feminines of personal names

* P. H. Iljinski, Res Mycenaeae, pp. 208 f.
* Cf. A. Bartoněk, in Mykenaika, p. 32; the figures are based on John Chadwick’s Glossary in Documents and consequently are out of date, but even so they are significant.
* Worbidung, p. 20.
are attested in Mycenaean (\textit{a-ti-ke-ne-ja}, etc.) and we have evidence for names like \textit{a-qi-ti-ja} (KN Ap 639, My Oc 103) built on the antecedent of \textit{\acute{a}phito}. From this point of view then Mycenaean shares the Greek innovations, even if it is possible that Homer—or the Nereids—preserve traces of a still earlier pattern.

4. So much for generalities: the main contention of this paper is that we have enough Mycenaean evidence about personal names to make meaningful comparisons with Greek, particularly if the Greek data are suitably analysed, and that we can use both sets of data a) to enlighten each other, b) to establish Greek patterns of development. To do this work seriously over a large range of data will take time; part of it has of course been done and we must simply collect conclusions which are already known. What I propose to do here is to choose an example and see if its analysis leads to interesting results.

4.1. I shall move in a well ploughed field, that of the personal names ending in \textit{-is}. At an early stage the \textit{i}-stems of Mycenaean were well analysed by Michael Meier\textendash{Brügger} in his 1975 Zürich dissertation. More recently, and for Knossos, they have been discussed in detail by John Killen at the Athens Colloquium, while the general linguistic background is analysed by Alex Leukart in his new book\footnote{Cf. M. MEIER, \textit{td–Zur Geschichte eines griechischen Nominalaffixes} (1975) [=Ergb. zu KZ, 23]; J. T. KILLEN, \textit{"{A}us den Knossos Tablets}, Mykenaika, pp. 351 ff.; A. LEUKART, \textit{Die fri{"e}hgr{"a}chischen Nomina auf \textit{tas} und \textit{as}} (1994), passim.}. I shall base most of my conclusions on the evidence collected by Killen, but my aim is different from his. I want to contrast the position of Mycenaean with that of later alphabetic Greek. As I have done with \textit{-e\tsup{2}ug} names I start with some figures which are extremely provisional.

On my rough calculations (less rough for Knossos thanks to Killen’s work) there are 58 (and possibly up to 66) names whose nominative ends or is likely to end in \textit{-i}, i.e. presumably \textit{-i\textperiodcentered} from 41 to 45 at Knossos, from 9 to 12 at Pylos, 5 at Mycenae, 3 at Thebes and possibly 1 at Tiryns. This figure may well include consonantal stems which are disguised by the writing, but equally there may be \textit{i}-stems that I have missed\footnote{More specifically I have excluded \textit{to-ro-ri} (PY Cn 131, Jn 601) because the genitive \textit{to-ro-ri-ka} (PY Cn 635) makes it clear that we are dealing with an \textit{-iks} nominative. Yet with some hesitations I have not excluded \textit{mu-ke-q1-ri} at Pylos, though its status as a personal name has been doubted (DMMs s.v.), and though it may be an \textit{n}-stem, if we trust the form \textit{mu-ke-q1-ne-ja} of \textit{Thebes} Of 27. Also I have treated \textit{mu-ri} and \textit{mu-li-r1}, which refer to the same woman in Pylos Eb S8S and Ep 212, as two different names, though in fact one may be a misspelling for the other. The Mycenaean \textit{i}-stem names are listed in Appendix II.}. I have included without compunction forms ending in \textit{-i} in the nominative even when I knew that the indirect cases were built on a \textit{d}-stem. This is of course not damaging as far as comparisons are concerned. A similar list of Greek personal names would also include both forms ending e.g. in \textit{-\textalpha{\sigma}i}, gen. \textit{-\textalpha{\sigma}i\textalpha{\sigma}os} or \textit{-\textalpha{\sigma}i\textalpha{\sigma}{\acute{a}}s} and forms ending in \textit{-os}, gen. \textit{-\textalpha{\sigma}os}.

If, with all due reservations, we take the total figure of 58 as approximating the truth this gives us a 3.22% of the conventional total of 1800 personal names; the higher figure of 66 would give us 3.66%. The equivalent figures for \textit{-i}s names in Attica, Arcadia and the regions of volume I of the \textit{LGPN} are respectively: Attica 412, i.e. 4.96%; Arcadia 81, i.e. 4.30%, \textit{LGPN} I 1004, i.e. 7.09%. Here then, in contrast with the \textit{-e\tsup{2}ug} stems, Mycenaean is not totally out of line with alphabetic Greek, though the figures are lower. Yet if we looked at Knossos and Pylos separately two very different pictures would emerge: Pylos 1.09% or 1.3% (9 or 12 out of ca. 820 names); Knossos 3.76% or 4.12% (41 or 45 out of ca. 1090)\footnote{Note that the total figure for names at Knossos and Pylos is higher than the conventional figure of 1800 names (though this includes the names of the minor sites); this is because for each location names have been counted separately and there is considerable overlap in nomenclature.}.
5. Before turning to more detailed points, we must start with a classification of the i-stem personal names. A first observation concerns the types of inflection. In alphabetic Greek a large (and very productive) group is that of names which inflect with an -ο- stem. The vast majority is oxytone and consists of feminine names such as Εὐσέβις or Κάλλεκις, two types which in origin at least are different. Other -ο- names act as the feminine equivalent of a-masculines and may have a retracted accent: this is the norm for the feminines which correspond to paroxytone -ης masculines (cf. e.g. Εὐνεγίς). On the other hand the masculine names, depending on the form, the period and the dialect, oscillate between a simple i-inflection, which was the original state of affairs, a mixed i/id-inflection, where often the accusative ends in -αν rather than in -άς, and a consistent -id-inflection, which is clearly an innovation. Hence in Homer we find an inflection Πήρος, gen. Πήρος, or Πάρος, gen. Πάρος as contrasted with the later Πάρος, gen. Πάρος. Some feminines also belong here, i.e. start as i-stems but tend to get attracted to the id-stems. Thus the compounds of πόλις which yield both men and women names (in Attic Εὐπολίς is a man but Νυκτόλις a woman) have turned into id-stems. In general the personal names seem to follow the development of the normal i-stems and these start as a limited group which often gets transferred to the id-type.

So much for the inflection but something must also be said about the origins of these names. I adapt for this purpose a classification proposed on more than one occasion by Olivier Masson* and obviously by others before him. All types of i-stem masculine names (-i-, -id- and mixed) can be distinguished into two or perhaps three groups, with a number of subgroups:

(i) Compounds of i-stems like Ἀριστόπολις, Κλεόθεμις
(ii) Abbreviated compounds like Ἀρμίς vs. Ἀρμίνης, Ἀξανθις vs. Ἀξανάδας, etc.
(iii) Simplicia based on compounds and divided into:

a) Diminutives which are abbreviated forms based on compounds whose first element ends in -i- or, more frequently, in -o-: cf. Ἀρβυτις, Δάμης, Δείμης, Κάλλης, Νῦς, all based on compounds with a first element such as Ἀρβυτ-, Δαμ-, Δαν-, Καλ-, Νύ-.

b) Diminutives similarly built, but this time on the basis of compounds whose first element ends in -ο- or -ης: cf. Ἀγγης, Δίψ, Ἀλέξης, Ἐμας vs. Ἀγγηδίμως, Ἀλεξίδαμος, Ἕραδαμος, Ἐμαδαμος, etc.

(iv) Names (compounds or simplicia) derived from substantives like Ἀναύπις, Πόρως or the like (sobriquets), which are adopted in their basic form, though sometimes with a change in accentuation.

(v) Names derived from substantives but with some morphological modifications: cf. Ἀχανθής vs. Ἀχανθός, etc.

5.1. Before we turn back to Mycenaean with this classification in mind, we may try to find out how it applies e.g. to Attic.

A first glance at the reverse index of LGPN II (Attica) reveals that all the categories listed above are represented (I add here and there notes about the feminines). There is ample evidence for (i) with Εὐπολίς, etc.; (ii) is scarcely represented but Θέγως and

* Cf. e.g. O. MASSON, Onomastica Graeca Selecta, II (1990), pp. 613 ff. Before his premature death Olivier Masson read a draft of this paper and commented on it. This was just one of the numerous acts of generosity which accompanied the thirty-six years of our friendship. I owe to him and his work all that I know about Greek personal names and I still find it impossible to do something as banal as correcting proofs on subject such as this without asking him for advice.
Δίόγνητος belong here and self-consciously so: one Δίογνης in the Second Century B.C. is the son of a Δίόγνητος. In toto there are some 120 compounds, i.e. more than 30% of all i-stems. The most frequent are of type (i) and are formed with -πολίς (22, mostly masc., but also fem.), -θεμίς (8, masc. and fem.), -νότις (8, all fem.), -χαρίς (5, masc. and fem.).

The simplicia can again be classified as above. For iii a) we may quote Κάλλις (Καλλίς), or Φίλλις who is the son of Φιλονίτις; for iii b) e.g. "Αλέξις, Δέξιος, Διοξίς, 'Ερυξίς, 'Ερυξίς, Ζέους, Ζώος, etc. The fourth category is also represented; cf. e.g. Πόρτις. Perhaps we should mention here the feminine names derived from regional name or city names such as Σύβας or compounds like Επόκτης or the very late Συμβρώς. Finally Πρέπις and Κάλλις can exemplify the fifth type.

The account would not be complete however if we did not point out that in Attica almost 60% of the -ις names (i.e. 248 out of 412) are names of women, mostly formed with -ις, gen. -ιδος suffix. This acts as an all-purpose feminine suffix which can form abbreviated names out of compounds (Κάλλις vs. Κάλλιτος), but also feminines which match both masculine compounds and masculine simplicia (Ανωφανίς vs. Ανωφανής, Τύννις vs. Τυννίας/ Τυννίδας/ Τυννα). A further fact to consider in looking at these figures is that they represent personal names spread over a period which can cover as much as twelve centuries. Onomastics is traditional in nature but names do not altogether escape phonological changes. One of these is relevant to the classification of our data. Probably through phonetic reasons at some stage -των and -τως began to alternate with -ν, -νς 16; consequently part of the masculines in -ις, if they are late, can be shown to be derived from -τως and should not really concern us here.

5.2 Is Athens representative? We may try to compare these data with those from Arcadia which, needless to say, are far less wide ranging. Here there are 81 -ις names of which 22 are of women (-ις, -ιδος) 17. The standard type (i) of compounds is represented by 11 masculine names (Αγέπολις, Αγγελόπολις, Αριστόπολις, Νικόπολις, Σώπολις, Αριστόπολις, Αύτοπολις, Διωκόρας, Θεόχαρις, Θεόμακρας, Κλεόσκοπας), and 8 feminine names (Σενάγης, Χαμομίνης, Φαλανίς, Λυκαρίς, Νικοράτας, Φιλοράτης, Κλεοφαντίς, Τυραχής). Abbreviated masculine compounds occur; cf. Θεός (from Θεόδοκος) and probably the early Βόθις and Πάνθης of Mantinea (IG V 2, 202 and 323) which may be compared with -δήμος and -δήμος compounds even if the spelling of Βός is unexplained 18. The name Χαμομίνη may be the feminine equivalent of Χαμομίλιον and Συμφοράς is built on συμμορία, i.e. it is a sobriquet (Dubois, op. cit., I, p. 201); this may also be the right interpretation for Σενάγης.

Other names are simplicia and include a large number of hypocoristics of the iii a) type: "Αρετής (the father of "Αρετακλῆς); Δάμης (Δαμία; one Δάμης is the son of Δαμάρστος), perhaps Ευθύς (cf. Ευθόδαμος, Ευθύδαμος, Ευθύφασον, etc.), Γόργης (one Γοργής is the father of Γόργιτος), "Ιμπύπης (from Tegea; cf. also at Tegea Τιμεδοκλῆς, Τιμεδόκριτος), etc. Κάλλις, Κλαῖς, Λέοντας, Νίκις, Πάνθης, Πάλις (Παλιό-), Φάντας, Φιλίς (Φιλί-) all belong here. The evidence is plentiful; notice that these shortened forms correspond not only to the first elements of compounds which end in -ης as in Καλλιγένης, but also to forms which end in other vowels like "Αρετα-, Λαμι-, Ευθυ-, etc. In other

17 All figures are provisional and are based on an early version of volume III of LGPN. Note also that I have not counted Αντώνης, Νικής, Θέρες, which are obviously Roman names (Antonius, Iulius, Varus). On the other hand I counted Δμητής, though this is obviously from Δμήτης.
18 We would expect Βως, though Βως is also possible. Cf. HPV, p. 98; L. Dubois, Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien, II (1986), p. 98.
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words synchronically if all works as if there is a hypocoristic suffix -i which is added to the first element of the compound and prompts the deletion of its final vowel.

By contrast the iii b) type is practically not represented. Θαδας, as we have seen, is an abbreviated form of Θαιδας and does not belong there: "Αλεξις probably occurs twice (SEG xxxiii 201.4: IG V 2, 188) but is very late. The only real piece of evidence (if it is correctly read and interpreted) is the fourth century Τειος from Tegea which corresponds to compounds of the type Τειομαρος, Τειολαύς, etc., but is attested only once (in the genitive in IG V 2, 41. 37)".

Type iv) is better documented for women: cfr. Ελλη, Ελπιδήμη, Women names are also derived from ethnics: Δωρις, Ταβας, Ολυμπίς.

5.3. There are some serious differences between Attica and Arcadia. One concerns the quasi-absence of type iii b) ("Αλεξις in Arcadia, which is particularly noticeable in view of the numerous Arcadian hypocoristics of type iii a). The second concerns the feminines. In Arcadia they are proportionally fewer: 27.16 % of all the i-stems in contrast with 60.19 % in Attica. The result is that the i-stems provide ca. 12.22 % of all Arcadian feminines while in Attica they provide ca. 13.40 % of all Attic feminines. The difference is not great but it exists. To explain it we need a brief digression. Both in Attica and in Arcadia -ιας, -ιδας is widely used to form feminines, but the Arcadian -ις feminines have characteristics of their own: they are the feminine forms of full compounds (Χαμαης, Φιλαρχας, Κλεοφανης, etc.) or they are ethnics (Δωρις, Ταβας) or sobriquets; in all instances they are entirely transparent and they are not abbreviated forms1.

We may put it more explicitly: in Arcadia the -(δ)- feminine suffix does not form hypocoristics and Arcadia does not seem to have the equivalents of Attic Κολλης, Αμοις or Ζεννή. Indeed the last example highlights another divergence. In Arcadia the -ις feminines do not seem to have expressive gamination. In other words, in contrast with Attic, these Arcadian feminines do not include Kosenamen, nick-names, affectionate names, etc.

Should we conclude that the Arcadians were guilty of misogyny and did not bestow onto their women the tender affection that they deserved? Perhaps further linguistic exploration is in order. Proportionally speaking, we know more women names in Attica than in Arcadia: at a very rough calculation (based only on the major categories of names) ca. 180 names in Arcadia vs. ca. 1850 in Attica, i.e. the feminine names provide some 9.57 % of all names in Arcadia and some 22.27 % of all names in Attica15. But this is not the whole story and we need to look again at the morphology. In both Arcadia and Attica the bulk of the feminine names is provided by first declension names: ca. 120 in Arcadia, i.e. ca. 66.66 % of all Arcadian feminines; ca. 1250 in Attica, i.e. ca. 67.56 % of all Attic feminines. If we leave aside the -(κ)-neuters (Φιλιτσιν, etc.), which are well represented and practically not represented (5 examples, i.e. 0.22 %) in Arcadia16, the only other groups are the i-stems and the -οι/-οι feminines (Φιλιτσιν, etc.).

---

1 The other forms ending in -ας or -ης are not relevant. Ασπανις (fem.) corresponds to Ασπασία; Ασφαρδιας is a later form of Ασφαρδίας; Μεσις (fem.) cannot be based on a τεμάρμας compound: Θεορις (fem.) only occurs in the Greek Anthology and need not be Arcadian.

14 The name Θαδας seems to be the feminine equivalent of the masculine Θαιδας, which is presumably built on Θαις, the Arcadian for Θαις (cf. Dubois, op. cit., I, p. 33).

15 Notice, however, that the number of different women listed in LGPN II is proportionally much smaller than that of different women names. LGPN II lists some 62360 different persons of whom 5601 (i.e. 0.22 %) are women (cf. LGPN II p. vi with note 4).

16 All neuter names in Arcadia are late (Second Century B.C. at the earliest). They are an odd mixture: Ομοιοθάλης (presumably a form of Θαμθός; cf. Πευχρας in Athens), Φιλιτσιν, Επιδόμος, Όνομαι-φορος, Λόμπος.
In Attica the latter are relatively few in comparison with Arcadia: 154 names, i.e. ca. 8.32% of the Attic feminines, in contrast with 33 names, i.e. 18.33% of the Arcadian feminines.

If we look closely at the Arcadian ω-feminines it is clear that they operate at a different level from the τ-feminines: Ἀγκυά, Λυτώρα, Ζευξί, Καλλίκη, Κλεονώ, Μενή, etc. include hypocoristics, nick-names, etc. and may be marked by expressive gemination. In this they agree with the Attic ω-names. But it is also clear that in Arcadia the ω-feminines fulfil part of the functions (hypocoristics, Kozenamen, etc.) fulfilled by the τ-feminines in Attica; this explains both the numeric disproportion (so many more ω-names in Arcadia than in Attica) and the characteristics of the Arcadian τ-stems (transparent compounds, absence of hypocoristics, absence of expressive gemination, etc.). In this way we also understand why Attica has a large group of ω-λας femmines which in Arcadia are completely absent; their “level of discourse” is wrong for the Arcadian τ-stems.

There is a general lesson to be learned here. Not all regions behave in the same way with reference to the stems in which we are interested. In Arcadia τ-, τοι can form hypocoristics for the masculines, while -ιος, -ας forms feminines which resemble the masculines in more than one way but are not hypocoristics. There is still something to explain, however. How is it that in Arcadia we do not have, with one possible exception, masculine hypocoristics from the sigmatic compounds of the Ζευκτάκ type? We shall come back to this question later on.

6. We can now return to Myceenae. Once again here the main evidence comes from Knossos with Pylos and Mycenae being only minor sources of τ-stem names, a phenomenon which in the case of Pylos is striking and requires explanation. The appendix gives a list of the relevant forms for personal names (excluding therefore common nouns and gods’ names). Morphologically, we are in difficulties because most of the names are in the nominative which does not reveal what inflectional pattern they belong to. However, it seems clear that Myceenae has both τ-stems inflected as such (KiLLEn, op. cit., has made a case for two types of inflection, one with an <-i> dative and one with an <-e> dative) and -ειδ- stems (as well as one example at least of -ειδ- stems: a-tε-mi-to, a-ti-mi-te). On the one hand we have dative like pa-na-ki (MY), o-la-ki (MY), pa-na-ra-ki (TH), *56-i-ti (KN) and possibly ta-ra-qa-tef (KN; cf. ta-ra-qa-ti), on the other we have forms like i-te-te-ri-di (MY), which may be feminine but need not be17. So far this looks familiar. However, a) we do not know what other types of stems (-τ-, -n-ti?) are concealed in our list; b) we do not know how many of the i-nominatives are id- and how many τ-stems, c) we know nothing about accentuation, d) we do not know how strong is the link between id-stems and feminines. We do know, on the other hand, that there are id-common nouns which are masculine such as ke-ki-de (PY An 654, 656, 657, Na 103, 514.

17 In Arcadia these hypocoristics are hardly attested, though names of the Ζευκτάκ type are well documented: cf. first elements of compounds like Ἀγνή, Ἀδεξά, Ἀνακέ, Ἀργεί, Ἀργεί, Ἀρχαίος, Δεξί. Ζευς, Δίκαιος, Μάξιμος, Νέκτορ, Οὐρα, Πατή, Πιέδι. In Cyprus the situation is different; there is evidence for names like Ονιάς, Σίλικες, which clearly derive from compounds like Ονισκυκός, Σίλιακουρός, etc.

18 i-te-te-ri-di is the recipient of LANA 5 in MY 0c 121; it could be a personal name but also a title or a professional name since in line 2 we find ka-ke-rei LANA 2. It is labelled feminine in Dnięc, but LEUKART, op. cit., p. 305 thinks of a masculine because of the context. Certainly about status (personal name, title) and gender does not seem possible. RISERI (Tracedo Mycenae, pp. 290 f.) suggested that the two names o-to-go-wi-je and ke-ti-de of MY V 659, 5, 8 should be taken as dattive of an i-stem name (Orthostasio) and an id-name. This is an ingenious solution to a hard problem (why do these feminines end in -e), but the nominative tu-ka-tef(-ge) of lines 5 and 6 is difficult to explain. On the other hand, if the hypothesis was right, it could also be used to explain *56-i-ti-jelj (if the word is complete) of KN Fh 3487.
[ke-ki-do Na 848], a group of men in the o-kt tablets. Consequently there is no reason to believe that -id. is as clear a marker of feminines as it is in later Greek, even if, as we shall see, in Mycenaean ΟΕ 103 and ΦΟ 101 pi-ve-ri-di (dat. sg.) and pi-ve-ri-si (dat. pl.) refer to women. Among our 58 or 66 names the number of feminine names that we can identify as such with a minimum of certainty is small: 3 in Pylos; 7 in Knossos (where there may be many more). Hence the proportion of feminines to masculines (ca. 17 % or 15.5 % in Knossos) cannot mean very much because the figures are too small.

6.1. A substantial proportion of the i-names is disyllabic, or – more exactly – is written with two signs, while obviously some of the three-sign names may also be disyllabic (e.g. KN mu-ki-ti). At Knossos, out of 40 names which are not too fragmentary, 18 are two-sign ones. In Pylos and Mycenaean the position is different, but the figures are too small to be significant. From a Greek point of view the striking thing, however, is the absence of obvious compounds of the type which matter in Athens and Arcadia (and, we may add, in Cyprus), i.e. the ἀνδρις, ἄρχος, ἄγος, etc. compounds. This need not be too surprising since in Homer’s onomastics too these compounds do not occur. Yet, as we well know, composition plays a considerable role in Mycenaean onomastics and even among the shepherds of Knossos, who tend to have humber names, compounds are well attested (da-i-go-ta, e-ke-me-de, e-u-ko-ro, e-u-me-ta, etc.)19. The next question then is if there are any clearly recognizable i-stem compounds in Mycenaean. A few four- or five-sign names must be candidates for an interpretation as compounds (KN a-me-ju-si, a-na-ki-ti, ki-ri-ja-si, te-ra-po-ti, ta-qa-ra-hi[t]a-qa-ra-te, PY i-pa-sa-na-li[e] pa-sa-na-ti (lem.), i-sa-na-o-ti, go-re-u-po-ti (if they are i-stems), pu-ke-qi-ri, tu-ri-ja-ti, TH pa-pa-ra-ki) but none of them includes obviously recognizable Greek second elements of compounds, while some (e.g. i-pa-sa-na-li[e] pa-sa-na-ti) have features which point to a derivative of a pre-Greek name. A number of scholars20 have called attention to the -ak names which appear in Mycenaean (o-tu-ki, pa-na-ki, pi-ra-ki) and have suggested, though with various reservations, that they may be αἰλάκος compounds (cf. ἄν-αἰλακος): Οίτ-αίλακος (cf. Alks-οίτας), Φαίμ-αιλακος, ΤΦιλ-αλοκος. This is not impossible but far from proved: the unexpected ordering of Οίτ-αίλακος may of course be explained (LEUKART, loc. cit.), but still gives us pause. In the later onomastics αἰλακο- occurs in composition as the first element, while αἰλακος fulfils this role in final position. Finally it is difficult to separate πι-ρα-κι from πι-ρα-κι-jo of ΚΝ V 1002, even though we have no parallel for αἰλακος compounds, while πα-πα-κι of TH Of 25 looks somewhat alien. At present we cannot exclude the presence of i-stem compounds in Mycenaean names (pu-ke-qi-ri, if it is a personal name, is an obvious candidate for this role), but we cannot confirm it either.

Do we have abbreviated forms like Θέογος, etc.? Landau (Personennamen), who is very eager to find abbreviated forms of compounds, does not suggest it for the i-stems. Admittedly πι-ρα-κι could be an abbreviated form of a compound like Φιλάκος (the feminine πι-ρά-κα-ρα is attested) or Φιλακος, but it is difficult to separate πι-ρα-κι from o-tu-ki and pa-na-ki and a similar explanation would be less obvious for these two. In other words we do not know – nor can we know – whether Mycenaean has -ς-forms of type (ii).

6.2. If so we must turn to the simplicia and most of the i-stems, given their length, seem to be simplicia. We may look at the Greek classification proposed above and start from the end, which is less controversial: do we have in Mycenaean i-names derived from

20 C.f. e.g. ILIEVSKI, Chaumont Colloquium, p. 139, with the observations by LEUKART, ibid., pp. 145 f.
i-common nouns or from other nouns with some morphological change? The difficulties of interpretation again raise their head. For the first category one could point to te-mi of Knossos and think in terms of Hesychius’ gloss τέμις ἄποις and of the Mycenaean adjective te-mi-dwe(ta) or te-mi-dwe-te, or alternatively compare the Mycenaean place names ti-mi-to a-sε-e and te-mi-ti-ja or even the Greek θεμις which is such a frequent second element in nominal compounds. None of these possibilities can be excluded but none can be supported. As for the second category it would be possible to suggest e.g. that mi-ti of KN DI 463 should be read Μίθης on the basis of Gr. μίθας found in Myc. mi-to-we-sa (KN) and of a series of Greek names which include Μιθριδάς; on the other hand a reading Mithris would also be possible on the basis of the Cypriot name Μισθός, if this is correctly identified in Karnak (ICS, p. 121, no. 453 g). The range of possibility is too great to afford any plausible results. It is interesting to observe, however, that for the vast majority of two-sign i-stem names such suggestions are simply not available. In other words there are no obvious Greek words from which such names can be easily derived.

More secure results may come from looking at one or two feminines. The dative pi-we-ri-di in Mycenaean (OE 103), which refers to a receiver of wool, has sometimes been treated as a personal name, but given the existence of a plural pi-we-ri-ē (FO 101) may in fact be a descriptive term. In either case it has normally been interpreted as an ethnic (which turns or does not turn into a personal name) and has been formally connected with the Pylos place name pi-we-re (PY Aa 1182) and its derivative pi-we-re-ja-ta (PY Jn 389) which has also been used as a personal name. If this is correct, we learn that the -δι-suffix is used to form ethnies and, in this instance at least, feminine ethnies. It then becomes possible to attribute a similar origin to the name (dative) i-te-we-ri-di of MY OE 121, though a) we know of no equivalent place name, b) there is no guarantee that the name is feminine.

The awareness of the close link between ethnics and personal names (for which Mycenaean provides ample evidence as do the alphabetic texts) may also lead us to accept the earlier suggestion that two of the Pylos i-stem feminines may be interpreted in this way. That the suffix -ατας in Greek produces ethnies is well known; that this process is as early as Mycenaean is shown by forms like ti-mi-ja-ta (PY Fn 79; cf. Ruligh, loc. cit.); see also pi-we-re-ja-ta (PY Jn 389) discussed above. In alphabetic Greek we would expect these ethnies to be matched by feminines in -ατις and in Pylos we find two names of women, tu-ri-ja-ti (PY En 659) and ei-pa-sa-na-ti (En 74, Ep 212), which may belong in this category. A place name *tu-ri-ja could have yielded the derivative tu-ri-ja-jo (PY Jn 431), also used as personal name, and the feminine tu-ri-ja-ti corresponding to a supposed masculine *tu-ri-ja-la (Ruligh, loc. cit.; Leckart, loc. cit.). Similarly, Ruligh has suggested that *t-e-pa-sa-na-ti/ i-pa-sa-na-ti is interpreted as an original ethnic (feminine) of an *-ανα, -ανες place name comparable to pa-ki-ja-να-, pa-ki-ja-ne or Μεσσανα, Μεσσανες, which in its turn could be built on a pre-Greek name like *Iposos or the like. Here too the point is difficult to prove but in general it seems possible to assume that the i-stems of Mycenaean included -tis- and -id- feminines which originally were ethnies.

6.3. From a morphological point of view we learn that the pattern of alphabetic Greek for which next to α-masculines, and particularly to τα-masculines, the feminine is formed with an -ι- suffix (often but not always -α-) is already in existence in Mycenaean.


32 Cf. C. J. Ruligh, SMJE 15 (1972), pp. 102 ff. [= Scripta Minora, pp. 120 ff.]. See also Gschnitzer, Res Mycenaee, pp. 146 ff. who prefers a derivation from ἄπειρος.
an (or at least at Pylos). Yet these ethnics or supposed ethnics account for a very few i-stems, even if they provide a welcome match for the later evidence. The real question that we now must tackle is whether in Mycenaean, as in Greek, i-serves to form hypocoristics built on the first element of compounds. The bewildering type of short names found at Knossos (du-∂i, du-ri, ko-ti, ma-di, ma-ki, mi-ti, etc.) could of course qualify, but none of them matches the obvious forms that we find in Arcadian. Indeed, as in the ease of the compounds, it is noticeable that none of the Arcadian shortened forms appears in Mycenaean. We also notice that in no instance, except conceivably one (da-wei: da-wo-no at Knossos, where da-wo-no may, but need not, be an -eονο compound), do the attested i-stems names match the first element of an attested Mycenaean compound. Forms like ge-ri and pa-ri of Knossos are capable of a Greek interpretation as Θήρις and Πύρις (e.g. Πυριλάμπης), but there is no conclusive proof that this is correct; similarly pa-ti (KN) can easily be read as Pantis and compared with Greek Πάντις, in its turn an abbreviated form of the various Πάντιo compounds, but other interpretations would be possible. Here again the difficulties due to the spelling simply prevent us from proceeding. However we can at least say that, even if some of these i-names are hypocoristics from compounds, the vast majority of them does not seem to be.

Identification ought to be easier in the case of hypocoristics of the τεφθαμβοτος compounds (our type iii b). First we know that such compounds exist in Mycenaean. Secondly, if they had the hypocoristic form that we expect, we would be looking for forms ending in -ti (to match e.g. ne-τia-naf-re or a-ti-na-wa) or -si (to match e.g. ma-na-si-we-ko or the like). Yet once again we find no clear matches. In Knossos there are seven i-stem names ending in -si: Ἰτα-si, a-me-ja-si, ki-ri-ja-si, qa-ja-si, vu-si, to-pe-si, fe-ji-ja-si, but all of them (except one) do not look as if they were built on the first element of a bigematic compound of the τεφθαμβοτος type. The exception would be ru-si(te) if it were read as Lusis, but notice that we have no ru-s(i)- compounds in Mycenaean. As early as 1967 Masson expressed doubts about the interpretation (SMEA 2, p. 40, n. 92) and in my view these should be upheld. The reason is, not only that we have no other evidence for si-hypocoristics of τεφθαμβοτος compounds, but, more significantly, that such hypocoristics exist but are not i-stems. A long time ago Heubeck interpreted a series of σευς names in Mycenaean (o-na-se-u, pa-ra-ke-se-u, ka-ri-se-u, ka-va-se-u, e-we-ke-se-u, de-ke-se-u, a-we-ke-se-u and additionally a-re-ke-se-u, ge-ta-se-u, ge-te-se-u, go-we-se-u, te-se-u) as abbreviated forms of compounds like Ὄναπσματος, Πράξαντος, Χαίραιάνος. With minor divergences the same point was made by Masson and argued further by Perpillou, who accepted the link but doubted that the first origin of these σευ-forms was to be found in abbreviated compounds.22 However we solve the question of origins, it seems clear that the role of hypocoristic of the τεφθαμβοτος compounds is taken by the σευ-forms; if so, there is no reason to expect to find si-forms with this function.

Given this, even if we were certain that the Ἰε-ki-si of KN Xd 7712 is a personal name, it would be dangerous to restore it as a-κε-ki-si (cf. Documents4, p. 579). In Mycenaean the equivalent of Greek ΑΛήξις is a-re-ke-se-u (KN Da 1156). One may add that, though Mycenaean shows an impressive variety of suffixes, some of which we do not recognize from the later evidence, the Greek system of alternation of numerous suffixes for the various Kürznamen does not seem to be as yet operational in Mycenaean, or at least not in that form.

7. We may now summarize both results and problems for the Mycenaean data.

a) There is a very large number of i-stem names in Knossos; there is a very small (too small) number of i-stem names in Pylos.

b) We know very little about the inflection of i-stem names. From Pylos and Mycenaen we learn that there were both id-names and i-names and that the latter had an i-ending of dative singular. From Knossos we learn that, if Kilien is right, i-stem names could have both -i and -e (i.e. [ei]) endings of dative singular.

c) A number of features which characterize i-stem names in alphabetic Greek are absent or unrecognizable in Mycenaean, where;

(i) there are no clear compounds – particularly at Knossos
(ii) there are no obvious hypocoristicons of compounds (though two names at Knossos could qualify for this role)
(iii) with one possible (but not certain) exception there are no hypocoristicons of sigmatic compounds; indeed this function is taken by eis-names.
(iv) there are no clear sobriquets.

d) We know from Pylos (ke-ki-de) that in common nouns the -is, -idos suffix was not limited to feminines; we also know that it occurred in personal names, probably feminines, but we have no reason to believe that it was the archetypal feminine marker that it became later. We have no evidence from Knossos for its use in personal names.

e) Pylos offers a clear example of Greek morphological pattern with forms like the feminines tu-ri-ja-ti and perhaps e/i-pa-sa-na-li which seem to be -atis counterparts of -atas masculines. We have no similar data from Knossos.

7.1. Let us now return to the data about the distribution of i-stem names quoted above. These names form 1.09 % or 1.3 % of Pylos names vs. 3. 76 % or 4.12 % of the Knossos names. The Knossos pattern is not too dissimilar from that of Attic or Arcadian, while that of Pylos is. What has now emerged, however, is that the expected proportion is that of Pylos, not that of Knossos. Given that the i-stems are not yet clearly used to form feminines and that in any case there are few feminine names in our texts; given also that these stems do not seem to form hypocoristics or at best form very few, we expect to find a very low proportion of i-stem nouns. What is unexpected is the Knossos number. The small number in Pylos is perfectly in order.

If so, the question of what the numerous i-stems of Knossos are becomes more pressing. The conclusion we seem to have reached is that from a Greek point of view they have no right to exist, since they do not belong to any of the obvious categories. Yet not everything is lost. After a long detour we return in fact to the point that Kilien had reached at the Athens Colloquium and Heubeck had anticipated almost thirty years earlier\(^{21}\). At Athens Kilien pointed out that most of the Knossos i-names:

a) cluster in specific series (not dissimilar from those to which specifically Mycenaean formations like the e-names belong)

b) are matched by “longer” names characterized by “recognizable” suffixes: hence next to du-ni we have du-ni-ja, to ma-di ma-di-jo, to ge-ri ge-ri-jo; also next to du-ni we have du-ne-u, to ko-ti ko-te-u, etc.

In fact the i-stems share with the e-names studied by Risch (Tractata Mycenaeae, pp. 281 ff.) a number of characteristics in addition to their distribution patterns. We may notice a few.

First, a large number of very short and impenetrable names, mainly from Knossos, listed by Risch (\textit{su-se, wa-je, \textit{82-de [PY]}, i-we, re-ne}) can be compared with \textit{du-\textit{ni}, du-\textit{ni}, du-\textit{ri}, ko-li, ma-di, ma-ki, mi-\textit{li}, pa-li, pi-pi, pu-ri, ge-ri, ru-\textit{si}, sa-\textit{mi}, te-mi, tu-\textit{ti}}.

Secondly, the suffixes which characterize the \textit{i-stems} match in some features those of the \textit{e-names}; two Knossos women are called \textit{du-\textit{su-\textit{ni}} and \textit{pu-ja-\textit{ni}} and a man \textit{ra-\textit{wa-\textit{ni}}; Risch noted for the e-nominatives forms like \textit{pu-ne, pu-we-ne} (\textit{PY Jn 832}), wi-ra-ne (\textit{KN Dv 5193}; cf. \textit{wi-ra-ne-to} also at Knossos) and perhaps \textit{e-ra-ne} (\textit{KN C 902}) and \textit{di-wo-a-nef} (\textit{KN Uc 216}). Similarly the \textit{e-names} often end in \textit{-u-re} or \textit{-a-re} and among the impenetrable \textit{i-stems} we have at Knossos \textit{du-\textit{ri}, i-li-nu-\textit{ri}, pu-\textit{ri}}.

Finally the multitude of \textit{si-names} which cannot be derived from compounds is remarkable (see the list above); Risch highlighted the similarity between one of his \textit{e-names} \textit{go-ja-le} (\textit{KN Od 667, 681}) and the name \textit{go-ja-\textit{si}} (\textit{KN B 799}). But \textit{go-ja-\textit{si}} clearly belongs, as Killen has shown, with a cluster of Knossos \textit{si-names} written by hand 104 which is also responsible for a large number of \textit{e-names}. The conclusion which Killen reached seems now inescapable: some at least of these names, including most of the \textit{i-stems} of Knossos, are pre-Greek in origin and the alternation between \textit{-i} and \textit{-i-jo, -jo} and \textit{-e-u}, etc. is simply the result of the various attempts at integrating the names into the new system. That this is so is now confirmed by the great disparity in the number of \textit{i-stems} in Knossos and Pylas. Either the local names were different in Crete and in Peloponese, which is what we would expect, or Pylas was more thoroughly hellenized. Indeed it is in Pylas that we recognize some patterns of word formation (-\textit{atis} feminines vs. -\textit{at\textit{as}} masculines) which are characteristic of later Greek.

8. This is not the end of the story and there would be much to say about the consequences that this conclusion has for our understanding of the inflection of \textit{i-stem} names in Knossos, but I now prefer to discuss a few loose ends. What happened after Mycenaean? Clearly on the one hand we have the creation of numerous compounds with \textit{i-stems} (the \textit{Ariostolos, Kleobous} type), on the other \textit{-is, -idos} becomes a standard feminine-forming suffix, while at the same time in most dialects (but not in Cyprus) the \textit{id}-inflection begins to spread and take over from the \textit{i}-inflection. At the same time the \textit{i-stems} become more widespread while they create abbreviated forms of compounds. Why, as is normally supposed, are they more successful in Doric territory than elsewhere is not clear to me.

I now return to Arcadian, since we left an open question. As we have seen in Arcadia the standard type of sigmatic hypocoristics such as \textit{Alk\textit{is}, Ze\textit{is}, M\textit{nois}, etc.} is in practice not attested (the only serious exception to this rule is provided by \textit{Tevias}). It would be pleasant to say that Arcadian is highly conservative and preserves the Mycenaean state of affairs but this is in fact not true, since the other type of hypocoristics (\textit{Kal\textit{a}, etc.}) is well documented. If so, why do we not have the \textit{Ze\textit{is} type}? Could this phenomenon be in any way tied to the fact that Mycenaean built its hypocoristics for these compounds with an \textit{-eus} suffix and that Arcadian does not really preserve \textit{eu-names}?

If we start from sigmatic compounds such as \textit{Mvva\textit{ialos}, Mvva\textit{idamos, Mvva\textit{aporetos, Mvva\textit{tiolos}}, we soon discover that, though in Arcadia \textit{Mvva\textit{i}} is not attested, there are three other abbreviated forms: \textit{Mvva\textit{ion}, Mvva\textit{ias} and \textit{Mvva\textit{ies} and that this pattern is generalized for the sigmatic compounds, \textit{-o}\textit{ias, -\\textit{ti}, -\\textit{ei} is the most productive formation with 20 different names (and 13 instances of \textit{-\\textit{ti}}, \textit{-o}\textit{ion} the second most productive with 10 names (and 9 instances of \textit{-\\textit{ti}}, \textit{-o} with third with
six names. If we look for forms equivalent to Myc. a-re-ke-se-u, pa-ra-ke-se-u, de-ke-se-u we can quote Arcadian ἀλεξίας / ἀλεξίον, πολείας / πολείον, λεξίας. Naturally these suffixes provide abbreviated forms for other types of compounds as well but there they compete with i-forms, while they do not do so in the ease of the sigmatic compounds. In other words in Arcadian the abbreviated forms of the sigmatic compounds were kept apart from those of the other compounds. Can we establish a chronology for the three suffixes; is one more established or older than the others? One obvious fact is that in Arcadian the e vowel tends to be raised before a central or back vowel; hence it would be possible to derive -ας from -εας phonologically, but it is equally likely that -αες names have an independent origin. For the rest we can only speculate, but one fact may be worth noticing. In the famous Mantinea judgement of the beginning of the fifth century B.C. (IG V 2 262) one of those who "owed" to Atea is called Δρομεῖς. From literary sources we know for the same period (480 B.C.) an Olympionikas also from Mantinea called Δρομοίς (Paus. vi 11 4). The odds are that the two names are equivollent and that we are witnessing a process of replacement which led from -εας to -αες. If so we might argue (or again speculate!) that Arcadian inherited σεν-hypocoristhes of the sigmatic compounds and first replaced them with -αες and later with any of the suffixes with which -(o)ες alternated. The replacement process would also explain why -(o)ες is less frequent than the two competing suffixes. It is not claimed, of course, that all the attested -(o)ες names are survivals from an earlier period.

If this is correct, and if we can speculate further, another question arises: why was -(o)ες chosen to replace -(o)ες? The history of the εας suffix would require a full discussion which is impossible here. It seems likely, however, that in it converged a number of different sources. Here I can only throw out a suggestion. Would it be possible to see -εας, which is well known to be particularly diffused in Arcadia (more than 50 different names), as continuing, in part at least, the Mycenaean -εας suffix found e.g. in pu-re-εας/ pu-re-εας (KN Sc 243, TH Of 26 1, KN U 4478.5), ge-re-εας (KN Xd 122, Xd <296>, PY Cn 655.1), wo-ne-εας (PY An 654.2)? If so, it would be clear why -(o)ες could take the inheritance of -(o)ες, given that before the loss of internal [w] there was considerable similarity between the two suffixes. There is more: if were indeed the case that Arc. εας took over some of the functions of an earlier εις, it would be interesting to see history repeating itself. One and possibly two names of Arcadians, both found outside Arcadia, replace the expected ending -η of a sigmatic stem with -ες: Ξενοχρόνος (IG IV 2 226; II C.) and perhaps Πιεροσέλας (IG IX 2 1098; V C.; cf. also Πιεροσέλας in IG V 2 272 from Mantinea, IV C.). In similar manner Προμηθεύς and Σεμινθεύς were also secondarily reformed with εις, thus replacing the expected sigmatic ending which presumably was not sufficiently well characterized for the purposes of onomastics (PER-
Pillo, op. cit., p. 208 ff. And finally we may wonder if these speculations about the prehistory of -ες casts some light on the name of the Arcadian θηρίας recorded at Delphi in the third century (FD III 1 83, 14). Nothing need prevent this name from descending sound by sound, from the Mycenaean name ge-re-kea attested both at Knossos and at Pylos.

9. The previous section ends in a speculative mood with a number of questions and tentative statements. Have we reached any positive conclusion? I set out to argue that now that more sources are available a comparative study of the morphology of personal names in Mycenaean and in Greek is possible and indeed profitable. In the test case selected, that of the i-stem names, it emerged that a detailed comparison between early (i.e. Mycenaean) and late (i.e. alphabetic) data shows the anomaly of Knossos names built with an i-stem and confirms the views that had been expressed previously about the non-Greek origin of a number of these names. As all Mycenologists know, it is infinitely difficult to argue that a specific Mycenaean name is capable or is not capable of a Greek interpretation; the ambiguity of the spelling is an all-powerful obstacle. However in the instance discussed morphological considerations counteract the etymological difficulties. The i-stem names of the Mycenaean texts morphologically share few if any of the categories of the alphabetic period. If so, it is difficult, if not impossible, to understand why in Knossos, as contrasted with Pylos, there are so many i-stem names; the analysis of these forms (already proposed by Kilun) confirms their non-Greek origin. At the same time the difference in the level ofellenization at Knossos and at Pylos is highlighted.

This type of onomastical analysis, however, may also lead to results which go beyond Mycenaean. One of the striking facts which has emerged is how persistent are the differences in the morphology of personal names in different areas even over a very long period of time. Consider again the absence of “low-level” i-stem names in Arcadian as contrasted with Attic or the persistent absence in Arcadia of i-stem hypocoristories of sigmatic compounds like Μυκατάς or the like. Consider also how it is possible to connect this lack of -ος or -ις hypocoristics with the absence of hypocoristics of this type in Mycenaean where their role is fulfilled by -seus or -kesus names. The continuity can be partly explained in terms of the way in which personal names are transmitted. While we expect specific phonetic processes to last for a definite period of time and then to be replaced in most instances as part of an unconscious process, in the case of personal names the survival of specific forms may well be determined by the desire to continue in the family tradition. This type of continuity may explain the phenomena that I have been describing, but in their turn those very phenomena guarantee a sort of continuity. We may wish to keep these considerations in mind when discussing problems as diverse as those of the links between Mycenaean and the dialects of the first Millennium or of the Greek cultural continuity between the Second and the First Millennium.

28 It may be worthwhile to note that in Arcadia (and in Cyprus) there was a tendency to replace -ες nominatives with -ης forms (Dumont, op. cit., in note 12, i, pp. 116 ff.). This may well have been one of the reasons for the demise of -ες names, though the same reason would not explain the phenomenon elsewhere. In any case -ες, if replaced by -ης, would not have been available as a redeterminer of -ες names.

29 Obviously this is very speculative and, as indicated above, other interpretations of the Mycenaean ge-re-kea are possible. Yet Arc. θηρίας is likely to be due to the recharacterization of a hypocoristic θηρίας formed from the various compounds in θηρ. (cf. Dumont, op. cit., i, p. 198). If so, the form with η would demonstrate the connection of the suffix with -ες (gen. -ης) and would obligate us to assume that the -ες forms – or some of them – were due to secondary shortening.
APPENDIX I: APPROXIMATE FIGURES FOR THE ATTESTATION OF SPECIFIC CATEGORIES OF NAMES
[based on different names only; M = Men; W = Women]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names (M &amp; W; all)</th>
<th>Arcadia</th>
<th>Attica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1880</td>
<td>ca. 8396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 5</td>
<td>ca. 412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1800</td>
<td>ca. 69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 120</td>
<td>ca. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 22</td>
<td>ca. 248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 33</td>
<td>ca. 154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 5</td>
<td>ca. 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX II: i-STEM PERSONAL NAMES IN LINEAR B TEXTS
[The names which are certainly feminine are marked with F, but it is likely that there are more feminine names than it is indicated]

a) Knossos (from 41 to 45)

- a-ve-ja-si  B 799 v. 4
- a-ve-ka-ti  Db 1212
- da-ri       Dv 1239
- da-ri       Dd 1201; Dd 1271
- da-ri       Da 1143
- F da-sa-ri  Ap 639, 3
- je-i-ja-si  B 804, 3
- i-ti-ko-ri  Dq 439
- ja-ti-ri    De 1301
- ja-ti        B 799, 3
- ja-ti        Ce 76
- ki-ri-ja-si  B 801, 3
- F ko-pi      Ap 639, 1
- ko-ti        Db 5352; De 1084
- ? ka-ta-mi   L 750 v
- mo-dhi       As 603, 2
- mo-ti        Xd 107
- me-ta-ti     Dv 1434
- nina         Di 463
- mo-ka-ti     X 410
- F pa-ja-si    Ap 639, 2
- pa-ti        As 1516, 17; Dd 1281
- pa-zo-ti     Di 948
- ? [pa-av-va-ra/ ] L 750 v
- pa-ri        B 799, 7; Ch 1029; Dv 5087; F 452, 2; V 479, 2
- ge-ri        Di 1360
- qu-ja-si     B 799, 3
- ra-ni        B 41, 1; X 1801, 2
- ra-va-si     C 911, 8
- ? ra-ki-si    X 7712
- ru-qi-qe      Ak 634 (ru-qi/ ): L 588, 1; X 8214, 1 (fru-si)
- F ru-mi      Ap 639, 10
- F ru-si       Ap 5748, 1
- ru-mi        As 1516, 18
- ? [ru-ma-ti]  Ur <311>
- ta-ra-ti      V 7512, 2, ta-ra-ta/ Xc 524, 2
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\[te-mi\]  
\[te-ra-po-ti\]  
\[to-pe-i\]  
\[tu-ti\]  
\[F tu-\#49-mi\]  
\[F wa-\-ra-ti\]  
\[wa-vi\]  
\[^{56-i-\-ti}\]  
[Fh 1057; \[^{56-i-\-ti}\] Fp 15, 2; Fh 9077 (god’s names or man’s names??)]

[The man name \[^{i-}\] of, e.g., Dl 1579, Df 5275 is not listed because it could be the same name as one of those mentioned above]

**b) Pylos (9 or 12)**

\[F e-po-sa-su-ti\]  
\[^{i-}\] \[i-\-sa-na-o-ti\] (dat.)  
\[ka-ra-\-pi\]  
\[ka-ra-te-mi-de\]  
\[ke-ki\]  
\[ma-ta-\-i\]  
\[me-\-vi\]  
\[F mu-ti\]  
\[^{i-}\] \[F mu-ti-\-ri\]  
\[^{p\-}\] \[ke qi-\-ri\]  
\[^{i-}\] \[jo-re-po-\-a-ti\] (dat.)  
\[F tu-\-ra-ti\]  
[En 74.13; Ep 212.5, i-po-\-sa-na-ti Eo 247.4]

[The name \[^{to-\-ra-}\] / \[^{to-\-ra-}\] is not included; cf. note 7]

**c) Tiryns, Thebes, Mycenae (8 or 9)**

\[^{i-}\] \[a-\-ma-ti\]  
\[^{F}\] \[i-te-we-\-ri-di\] (dat.)  
\[^{k\-}\] \[o-\-to-\-ki\] (dat.)  
\[^{F}\] \[pa-na-\-ki\] (dat.)  
\[^{p\-}\] \[pa-\-pa-\-\-\-ki\] (dat)  
\[^{p\-}\] \[pi-\-ra-\-ki\]  
\[^{p\-}\] \[pi-\-\-\-\-vi\]  
\[^{p\-}\] \[pi-pi\]  
\[TI Z 9\]  
\[MY Oe 121, 1\]  
\[TH Z 841, 848, 971\]  
\[MY Fo 101, 8\]  
\[MY Fo 101, 1\]  
\[TH Of 29, 2\]  
\[MY Au 657, 5\]  
\[MY Go 610, 4\]  
\[TH Z 846, 854\]