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Mycenaean and Greek Prepositions: o-pi, e-pi etc.

1. Mycenaean prepositions have been less studied than other elements of the grammar. A general survey would be helpful but this is not the place for a full study. I intend to concentrate on two prepositions only, though I shall preface my discussion with some general observations.

1.1. In the Linear B texts there are a number of particles which on formal and functional grounds we want to identify with the Greek prepositions (using this term in its broader sense). Some of them occur both in prepositional phrases (e.g. me-ta-ge pe-i "among/with them") and in nominal and verbal compounds (e.g. me-te-ki-ta, me-te-ke-koma-na); they all have Greek equivalents (e.g. Myc. me-te, Gr. μετά).

Other particles occur in compounds only (e.g. po-ro- in po-ro-ko-wa); others occur in compounds and in adverbial function (e.g. po-st in po-st-ke-te-re and in o-u-ge a-ni-ja po-st); others may have adverbial function only (e-ni-ge (?), u-po (?)). Comparison with Greek normally leads us to treat these particles as prepositions: po-ro corresponds to ἐπί, po-st to πρός, etc. Their failure to appear in prepositional phrases may be due to the paucity of our evidence, though this need not always be so. In most instances our intuitions based on Greek are correct, but Mycenaean may have had distinctions which Greek did not preserve, and Greek may have introduced distinctions which Mycenaean did not make. Of po-ro we know that it appears in compounds and corresponds to Greek ἐπί; it is likely that it was used in prepositional phrases too but this we cannot be certain of. The occurrence of a particle in a compound is not sufficient evidence for its status: we have a contrasting pair a-pe-o-te and a-pe-e-o-te (KN B 823) where ap- may well be the elided alternative of a-pa, Arc. άντι; yet we cannot treat a-pe as a preposition on the strength of this evidence only1. When the prepositional status of a Mycenaean particle is not guaranteed by internal evidence, no theory based exclusively on the similarity or dissimilarity with Greek can carry certainty; it can only be adopted as a working hypothesis.

1.2. With these reservations in mind some generalizations are possible. The syntactical similarity between Mycenaean and Greek is striking. There is little doubt that in Indo-European "preverbs" were orthotonic and had a certain degree of autonomy in the sentence. Yet in Mycenaean univerbation has taken place and it is possible to distinguish between adverbs which occur on their own and preverbs which appear in composition. From this point of view the language of Homer, where

---

1 For a-pa-e-o-te see Lejeune, FEIP 15 (1960), 51f, = Mémoires II, 227ff., at p. 236ff., who however prefers to read a-pa-e-o-te as anaph-exotes. A different interpretation (i.e. νησιστόντες) was proposed by S. Luria in Klio 42 (1954), 54.
"tmesis" is frequent, is more archaic than Mycenaean — a fact of no mean importance. We are not in a position to determine the degree of syntactical cohesion of Mycenaean prepositional constructs, but it is remarkable that such constructs do exist. First, Mycenaean has prepositions which have a different grammatical status from nouns; secondly, Mycenaean has prepositions and not postpositions. The position of Indo-European was certainly different and, even if we attribute to the ancient Indo-European prepositional constructs, it is possible that these were in fact postpositional phrases. Before the decipherment of Linear B there was no reason to suppose that the pattern of classical Greek had arisen as early as the Second Millennium B.C. Indeed the example of Anatolian might have spoken for a different chronology. Among the languages of the Luwian sub-group, in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., Lydian resembles Greek: univerbation has taken place and there are prepositional (not postpositional) constructs. On the other hand, Cuneiform Luwian in the Second Millennium and Hieroglyphic Luwian in the first part of the First Millennium B.C. (before ca. 700) have 'preverbs' with a large degree of autonomy; the same forms also appear in postpositional constructs, though it is not always possible to make a meaningful distinction between preverbs and postpositions.

1.3. So far I have stressed the links with Greek and the contrast to IE: other features lead to a somewhat different picture.

In our texts prepositional phrases are rare. The nature of the data makes any attempt at quantification worthless, but the first impression is that a similar set of Greek inscriptions would be far richer in such constructs. This may be confirmed by more solid observations: Mycenaean has an instrumental where Greek would have a preposition with the dative (e.g. te-pe-za ... e-re-pa-te-to po-pi); Mycenaean frequently has place-names in the dative-locative where the later language would probably use τῶν or the like with the dative. We have evidence for only 7 prepositions which occur in combination with a noun in the dat-loc., instr., or accusative (a-pi, e-pi, me-ta, pe-da, ku-su, po-ro, o-pi); of these, three (o-pi, pe-da, ku-su) do so only once and in difficult contexts and for e-pi and o-pi it has been argued, as we shall see, that they are interchangeable. Yet we attribute to Mycenaean at least 17 forms which formally correspond to Greek prepositions (a-pi, e-nne, o-e, a-pu, en, e-ni, e-pi, ku-su, me-ta, e-pi, po-ro, pe-da, pe-re, po-ro, po-st, upo-uph, upo-po).

There are formal differences too. First, in contrast with a number of dialects Mycenaean does not seem to have 'apocope' in prepositions. Secondly, some individual forms differ: po-ro has a different vocalism from ἔπο-ἀρον; a-pu matches Arc. ἄροι, but not Attic ἀρόι; po-stands with ἀρός and ἀρόμα and is probably closer to ἐπο- ὡς or ἀρετή; upo-uph, if correctly identified in a-po-ri-ke-ri-sale, is a strange vocalism in contrast with ἀρός. Finally, a case could be made for the existence of prepositions which Greek does not possess. Does the presence of kasti-ke in both at Krassos and at Pylos speak for a kasti-preposition, since presumably kastikono was not used in Mycenaean too, though it is not attested? The texts have two words epi-65-ko and pe-65-ko which may point to a pe-preposition contrasted with e-pi; if read per- this could be compared with the per- of pe-ri-ke-ri-wo, which is correctly etymologized as a compound of per- and -ερ-, the zero grade form of "ver- 'year'". The hypothesis is attractive but far from certain. Ruijgh, SMEA 15 (1972), 94ff, has argued for an et-form (cf. Skt. ate) "hu-del-ala", which he recognizes in e-to-ri-jo and in names like e-bi-wo and e-te-me-de. Here too we need more data.

Semantic statements are even more difficult to make; the meaning of some prepositional phrases remains obscure nor is there any reason to believe that this is due to an aberrant value of the preposition in question rather than to the difficulty of choosing, within the wide range of values found in Greek, one which suits a context not fully understood. Occasionally we can make some interesting observations: in the only phrase where it occurs me-ma must mean 'between, among' (me-ma pe-π); it is satisfactory that this is the earliest meaning traditionally attributed to the preposition (cf. Wackernagel, Vorlesungen über Syntax, II, 240ff.).

We have difficulties in understanding the prepositional compounds too. In some instances the value of the 'prepositions' in these forms may differ from that of Greek. This may be the case for instance of pro in pro-ro-ko-rete, which has traditionally been compared with the pro of Latin processus rather than with the apo- of Greek compounds. Yet we should not forget that a newly published Argos inscription has a form προ-ο-κο-λο-νο-ς, which may conceivably serve as a parallel, and that προ-ο-λο-νο-ς has been compared too.

A list of doubts and difficulties has no natural limits; a common sense approach will simply state that as many warnings as possible must be registered before we tackle the more concrete work of interpretation.

2. Among the prepositions listed above, two, a-pi and e-pi, seem to occur both in prepositional phrases and in compounds. Traditionally they have been compared with Gr. ὁντευκτον, ὀνοδευτον, ὀντευκτον etc. and Gr. ἐκτ and treated as more or less interchangeable; the assumption is that, barring a few fossilized forms (such as ὁντευκτο), Myc. a-pi and e-pi are both continued (syntactically and semantically) by Gr. εκτ.

1 I cannot agree with Householder, Glossa 38 (1960), 9f, when he argues that po-ro can be read per.

2 pro- could also occur in po-ro but the word may derive from προ-πο-τον. Obviously po-65-ko can be differently explained (see e.g. Dossi, 357) and I am not certain that before -o- r would not be indicated in writing.

4 A case against this interpretation of pro-ro-ko-rete was made by Hooker, ΖΑ 26 (1976), 27ff., but see Chadwick in Carruba (ed.), Studia Mediterranea P. Meriggi deleta, Pavia 1979, 99ff. For the origin of the προ-ο-λο-νο see Risch, SF 59 (1949), 381; for the προ-ο-λο-νο see Kroll in Schiefer, Festschrift N. Kortelee, Athens 1983, 697ff. (I owe this reference to Dr. D.M. Lewis).
This view has been challenged. Monique Gérard\(^{10}\) after a close analysis of the evidence for \(o\-pi\) concluded that in Mycenaean there is no semantic overlap between \(o\-pi\) and \(e\-pi\); in later Greek \(\epsilon\iota\varsigma\) is the only real survivor, but in the Second Millennium \(o\-pi\) still means only "back, behind." L. Deroy\(^{11}\) has gone much further and denied any etymological or semantic connection between Mycenaean \(o\-pi\) and \(e\-pi\).

According to him in Mycenaean \(o\-pi\) would occur exclusively (or almost exclusively) in composition and in adverbial function with the meaning "behind, afterwards, secondarily, additionally"; this value corresponds exactly to that reconstructed by Deroy for the IE ancestor of \(o\-pi\) on the basis of the comparison with e.g. Sl. \(o\-pi\) and Latin \(ab\). On the other hand Deroy attributes to \(\epsilon\iota\varsigma\) a primary meaning "on, above" which is also found in Mycenaean. He makes no attempt to etymologize the form. A development from "secondarily to 'additionally' in the case of \(o\-pi\) and from 'on, above' to 'additionally' in the case of \(\epsilon\iota\varsigma\) could explain the later confusion, which led, for instance, to the replacement of the expected \(\delta\nu\theta\alpha\varsigma\nu\varsigma\) with \(\epsilon\iota\nu\varsigma\nu\varsigma\), but in Deroy's view such replacements are rare and the confusion, if any, is definitely post-Mycenaean.

I have argued that in no instance we can take for granted that the Mycenaean situation is identical to that of Greek unless we have positive evidence for this view. So, if we ought to recognize that, whatever we think of their conclusions\(^{12}\), there is some truth in the criticism by M. Gérard and L. Deroy of the traditional view; if this is to be upheld it needs some explicit support.

The question is more complicated than it appears at first sight. On the one hand there is a Mycenaean problem. Do we want to say that \(o\-pi\) and \(e\-pi\) are equivalent forms? If so, are we able to show that they do not differ semantically or functionally? Assuming that we can do it, how do we account for the different vocalism? On the other hand there is a Greek problem. Do we want to argue that \(\epsilon\iota\varsigma\) and \(\epsilon\iota\nu\varsigma\nu\varsigma\) etc. are related? If so, how do we explain the difference in meaning and vocalism? Finally, a third problem arises when we try to link the two types of evidence. What data, if any, allow us to claim that Mycenaean \(o\-pi\) was replaced by Greek \(\epsilon\iota\varsigma\)?

3. I do not intend to discuss at length all the texts where Mycenaean \(o\-pi\) and \(e\-pi\) occur; in most cases they are obscure and it is useless to indulge in more speculation. However, a survey of the evidence is necessary.

3.1 At Knossos \(o\-pi\) occurs in at least 27 different texts, often more than once in the same text.\(^{13}\) When the text is not too broken, \(o\-pi\) is followed by another word (see note 16 for the exceptions), which in the few unambiguous instances we have, turns out to be in the dative (-locative-instrumental) and, normally, to be a proper

\(^{10}\) L'emploi et le sens de \(o\-pi\) en mycénien, in: L. Deroy, Les levures d'impots dans le noyau mycénien de Pylès, Roma 1965, 89 ff.

\(^{11}\) Le problème d'\(o\-du\) et d'\(\epsilon\iota\) en grec ancien, ZA 26 (1926), 265 ff.; references to Deroy's earlier work, ibid.

\(^{12}\) The methodology of these articles has been well discussed by Parnagl in SMEA 13 (1971), 156 ff., to which I shall frequently refer.

\(^{13}\) A number of these texts is broken, but a complete list follows: As 1517, 11 (1027); Fh 368 (141); Le 5046, 1.2 (103); Lm 1568 lat. inf. (twice) (103); Lm 567, 1.2 (103; Lm 648 (103); Lm 2172 (103) (\(o\-pi\)); Mm 1580 v. (1327); Od 539 (103); Od 562, 1 (103) (\(o\-pi\)); Od 570 (103); Od 570 (103); Od 570 (103); Of 893 (1225); Y 336, 3 (103); Of 983 (132); V 1523, 3 (103); Wz 758 (\(o\-pi\)); Xd 7757 (124) (\(o\-pi\)); Xe 524, 1.2 (103) (\(o\-pi\)); Xe 536, 2 (103); Xe 691, 1.2 (103);
the question later; for the moment I observe, without much originality, that at Pylos "opi" occurs in a phrase paralleled by a Homeric formula, which has exi in its place.

Two other Pylos expressions must at least be quoted: o-pi-e-de-i of An 1281, 2 (H. 12) and o-pi-m-e-ne of An 7,7,8-11 (H. 5).

The beginning of An 1281 reads:

po-[i]ni-ja i-te-i]
|-

a-kta re-u-si wo-te VIR 2

The interpretation o-pi hedê “at her shrine” is possible and would suit the context we have; yet we must recognize that the text is broken and imperfectly understood.

An 7 contains some very broken lines with OLIV and VIR ideograms. The best preserved part has PN (?) or title/trade names in the dative followed by o-pi-mene and ideograms. The standard view favours o-pi menei “per month”; Gérard and Deroy prefer opinênei “au mois suivant” (a single word). Here too the first suggestion is attractive but unprovable in the absence of sufficient context. The second is philologically possible, but has no Greek parallels and one wonders whether it suits this style of documents. Non liquet.

3.3. The evidence for e-pi used autonomously (i.e. not in compounds) is weak. The form occurs twice at Knossos in contexts which we do not really understand, and three times at Pylos, again in obscure contexts.

In KN 280, 15 (written by the infamous ‘hand’ ‘124’) the phrase e-pi i-kwa-wa-pi is still baffling and the general context is mysterious.

In Lc1(1)561, hand 103, which frequently writes o-pi, also writes e-pi-ke:

[pou-pou] e-pi-te re-si
|-

e-ra-ta / TELA$^3$ + TE 1

We know that these tablets are records of stints allocated to groups of women; I do not feel competent to interpret the additional phrase e-pi-te re-si, which does not occur elsewhere. e-pi-te is presumably epi + khe, Gr. te ‘and’, and it could be an adverb (which I favour) or a preposition. re-si is a hapax.

3.4. The texts from Pylos are not particularly helpful. In Eb 842 and Ep 613,8 we find e-pi-te again.

Eb 842 sa-sa-wa e-ke-qe o-nos-o ka-ma-eu (H. 41)
|-

Ep 613,8 i-to-ke-to-i-te e-ra-pi ke i-to-pi-ke to-mo pe-no GRA / T 5

sa-sa-wa | o-nos-o e-ke ka-ma-eu e-pi-te to-me re-ra-pi[te] / to-pi-ke to-mo pe-no GRA / T 5

These texts have been intensely discussed; we ought to acknowledge that we simply do not understand them. If so, once again, we are not able to establish whether epi is a preposition or an adverb/preverb, nor do we know what it means.\footnote{J. T. Killen, BCS 13 (1966), 105 ff.; Hermathena 118 (1974), 82 ff.}

\footnote{A summary of the older hypotheses and a new suggestion in Y. Duhoux, op. cit., 34-6; yet another view in G. Dantel, Minos 77 (1981), 23 note 22.}
forms must refer to different instances of the same object. Knossos has a form |e-pi-ko-wo and Pyllos has both e-pi-ko-wo and o-pi-ko-wo; we cannot establish whether the second element of the compound is the same in all words and we may well be dealing with completely different words.

4.2. My list of comprehensible or ‘semi-comprehensible’ words (Appendix I) is reproduced below; words have been classified according to their meaning or the compound type which they represent. I have listed both o-pi and e-pi forms but kept them separate: (a) always refers to the former and (b) to the latter. The question marks refer to the plausibility of the classification adopted.

A. Possible prepositional Rektionskomposia with a) o-pi or b) e-pi

1. a) o-pi-ko-ro-si-ja (KN)
   b) e-pi-ko-ro-si-ja (KN), e-pi-ki-to-ni-ja (KN), e-pi-ro-ko-ja (KN)
   e-po-mi-jo (KN)
2. a) o-pi-da-mi-jo (PY)

B. Occupational names formed by o-pi + nominal root

1. a) ?o-pi-te-u-ke-we (KN), o-pi-ka-pa-e-we-e-ke (PY), o-pi-te-ke-e-ke (PY)
   o-pi-ke-e-te-e-ke (PY)
2. a) o-pi-su-ko (PY)

C. Compounds formed by a) o-pi, b) e-pi + Verbal root + -to (cf. E)

a) o-pa-wa-ia (KN, PY)
   b) e-pi-zo-ta (KN)

D. Compounds of the ομιχλος type

a) o-pi-ro-qa (PY)
   b) ?e-pi-ko-wo (PY, KN)

E. e-pi Verbal forms (cf. C)

b) e-pi-da-to (PY), e-pi-de-da-to (PY)

F. Miscellaneous

a) o-pi-de-so-wo (PY), ?o-pi-ko-wo (PY)
   b) e-pi-ko-wo (KN)

4.3. The words in A. 1. a) and b) can be read as opikonasia, epikonsiós, epikhúnta, epílopaia, epomós. In all instances an interpretation is available. opikonasia and epikonsiós, written by the same scribe in the same context, refer to attachments to the helmet: opikonasia can (but need not) be taken as an adjective in agreement with o-pa-wo-ne-ja, epomós (Gr. ἐπομής) must be shoulder pieces or guards; epikhúnta and epílopaia are presumably attachments or fittings for a tunic (γραμμ) and a cloak.
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The second problem concerns the interpretation of prepositional constructions in general. In a very interesting article about the Greek construction of *e- with the dative Genda has pointed out that much of the meaning of prepositional phrases depends on the case used; if Greek uses *e- in a final sense in e.g. *efti dokei 'to
supper' this is because, in Genda's view, the Greek dative could have this value on its own. Presumably that it is true of a prepositional phrase is also true of the Relati-
onskomposum built on that phrase. In our particular case it could be argued that in
*e-fi daimoi, the word daimoi in the locative (2) was sufficient to convey the
meaning required – which of course makes it particularly difficult to establish the specific
meaning conveyed by *e-.

In this first group of compounds then, both *e- and *e- have a value which is
mostly local and has to do with connection and close proximity: a firmer definition
does not seem possible.

4.4. The words in B seem to be occupational names which refer to officers of
different standing. A possible exception is o-pi-xe-ke-we of Knossos which is
quoted here rather than in Appendix I because of the formal similarity with the
Pylus words, but may well be a personal name. The Pylus words listed may be
reduced to two if o-pi-xe-ke-u of Un2 is taken as a mistake for o-pi-xe-ke-u-
which is by no means certain. At any rate it seems likely that in all instances we are
considering the words refer to officers dealing with *ka-po, te-u, ko, and conceivably
te-ko. The exact value of these words may not require discussion, the nature of the
compounds does. The suggestion that in all instances we have an –es form
derived from o-pi-xe-ke, o-pi-xe-ka, o-pi-te-ko (Derooy, op. cit., 297f.) seems to
me unlikely in the extreme. It is far more likely that these forms started as hypostases
on phrases such as *ka-po *ka-po (or ka-po-es), *ka opi x-e-ke or (or ka-po-ke-si)
etc. In these phrases *opi must again indicate some close association; we may resist
the temptation to translate ‘in charge’, but we can remember the shepherd of
ra-ma-i who was o-pi ge-to-ro-po-pi and use that phrase as a parallel (see 3.2)
The meaning of o-pi-xe-ke (B. 2.) has been frequently discussed. Since the
word refers to an official it seems reasonable to assume that the formation is parallel
to the one we have just discussed and arises from *opi x-e-ke u; the contrast with
the type of B. 1. may be due to the inflectional class of the noun: an –es stem
call for an –es derivative, while an –o- stem does not.

One final warning must be registered: the obvious interpretation of the words in B
is as hypostases of the type indicated. Yet here too we cannot entirely exclude that we

---

24 See Kilten, op. cit. (in note 15), 162 and 173.
25 The occurrence of these reconstructions is merely exemplar gratis. For this type of
compound see E. Risch, Worblung, 187f. For the e- compounds cf. H. Banier, Zur
Geschichte der griech. Kompasot von Typus einigo, Diss. Zurich 1950, which starts, however,
from the assumption that *e- originally had a local meaning "auf, an, bei".
(1976), 23ff. (with different etymologies).
27 Derooy op. cit. refuses to understand o-pi-xe-ke-u as ‘shore’ inter alia because for him *opi
cannot mean "on, by", but he does not consider the possibility that the word is a possessive
compound: "which has the sea behind". Panagis, SNEA 13 (1971), 163 has also pointed out
that "region behind the sea" is a possible concept, cf. German hintersen etc.
are dealing with possessive compounds (o-pi-su-ko) or with -e derivatives of possessive compounds. If so, o-pi-su-ko would be someone who has su-ko opi, and e-pi-ko-pe-e we would refer to someone who has tekklio (or the like) opi.

4.5. The forms listed in C. are not very helpful. o-pa-wo-ta is read opawora (< *op-aw-ora, cf. Gr. de(bo) and indicates plates attached to the armour. It may be a verbal compound, such as nosqetov or Myc. ko-de-ta, which has been substantivized. As an alternative, it could be compared with the diphthong or nonphthong type (Risch, Wortbildung, 1951), though this is improbable in the absence of an indirect case. At any rate it seems unlikely that o-pa-wo-ko is a simple verbal adjective from a compound verb (like e.g. xairothetaio). An original meaning such as “which is hung opi” would explain the force of the compound, but here too the exact way in which the hanging or attaching was envisaged (before, behind, inside, outside) cannot be defined further.

As for epi-so-ia it may perhaps agree with an understood thiope presupposed by the ideogram PUG; it can presumably be read epizōsta and a connection with thion seems suitable, but the absence of a clear context prevents us from saying any more. In particular it is difficult to see whether we are dealing with the verbal adjective of a compound verb or not. If this were the case we ought to classify the word under E together with epi-da-to.

4.6. The D words are formed by opi or epi and a verbal root in the -o- grade. o-pi-ro-see is normally compared with eklinon and translated ‘remaining’ or the like. This is also the value of Gr. kooute and we may wonder about the specific force of opi. A translation “back, behind” would be possible, but opi could also mean something like ‘additionally’. We can compare Gr. kathá to where the question arises for éta.

O-pi-ko-wo is attested in the heading of the o-ka tablets:

PY An 657, 1:

o-o-te-o o-pi-ka-ta e-pi-ko-wo

and perhaps in a broken Knossos tablet (As 4493) in the sequence:

[epi-ko-wo e-ga-te e-re-a-ta]

which precedes some men names.

There is no a priori reason to suppose that the same word occurs in both texts, though doubt we are dealing in both instances with epi- compounds. For the Pylus text a connection with xitho (cf. xithqomos) has been suggested. A meaning like “watchers” or the like would fit the context and epi could be compared with the preposition of e.g. thigmomos. If so the formation of the compound would be parallel to that of epi-ro-see, hence the classification adopted with some hesitation. We cannot extend it to lepi-ko-wo of Knossos for which we do not feel able to make

any suggestion about meaning or origin. Pylus also has an occupational name o-pi-ko-wo attested in Jn 881 above the word o-pi-su-ko discussed in 4.4. There is no reason to assume that o-pi-ko-wo and epi-ko-wo are interchangeable or have the same meaning; the second element of the compound can be differently interpreted. Melena (loc.cit.) argues for apikvoros, and thinks of someone who is in charge of the korpai ‘boys’ — but this too cannot be proved.

4.7. E lists the one certain verbal form composed with epi: epi-de-de-to of PY Vn 20, presumably a third person sing. middle perfect epidesiai. Because of this verb I have also listed here epi-da-to, i.e. the verbal adjective epidastes (or epidaitos?) which occurs twice in the Jn-texts. The existence of the perfect makes it possible to assume that the verbal adjective is a straightforward formation from the compound verb. There is little doubt that the verb means ‘distribute’ and that this meaning fits all the contexts here. Vn 2 is isolated but in the two Jn tablets epi-da-to always refers to what seems to be a second or additional distribution of bronze to the tle-iske ka-ke-ke (the quantities are smaller than those of the original distribution); presumably this is what epi refers to. In very similar circumstances the dialect of Heraclea has n'eoqerosato (Schwyzer, Dion. 63.54) with nóri instead of éta. In our texts we cannot establish, of course, whether the emphasis is on ‘additional’ or on ‘second, later’.

4.8. The Miscellaneous Section of my list includes words which have little in common with each other. o-pi-de-so-mo occurs in PY Ub 1318 in the phrase au-e-kpa-ia-te-we o-pi-de-so-mo kastor-ke, dupe-ta 4 (‘(??) A . . . 4 skins’). The obvious assumption is that o-pi-de-so-mo kastor-ke indicates the use for which the skins were meant, either as a daolute singular or as a nominative plural (if the noun is not neuter); kastor-ke may be an adjective in agreement which the preceding noun. Following Ruijgh and Chadwick (Docs. 2, 490f) we may interpret ‘4 skins for/as fastening(s) for pack-saddles’. The noun can be read opidesmos and Ruijgh points out the link with ἔκλεισθη and ἔκλεισσα. It is not clear whether opidesmos presupposes the existence of a compound verb opidē; verbal nouns can enter into composition (c.f. e.g. Hom. ἐγκλεισθησαν and Risch, Wortbildung 43) and, just as ἔκλεισσα is a yoke-fastening, opidesmos could be an opid listening. Presumably here epi opi indicates close proximity or connection, but it is impossible to decide among ‘back’, ‘on’, ‘above’, ‘close to’, ‘next’, etc.

We discussed o-pi-ko-wo earlier on 4.6. without reaching any conclusion. epi-kóva may be more interesting. All that we know about the word is that it occurs twice in the Knossos Fh series, once in Fh 343 dph-e-so to a OLE 15 epi-ko-wo.

33 Melena op.cit., 37ff. makes a good case for divorcing the Knossos word from its Pylus homograph and for comparing it with the o-pi-ko-wo of Pylus. I prefer to suspend judgment.
34 Melena loc.cit. quotes as a parallel eklinonos etc. but these forms seem to be determinative compounds of a secondary nature (cf. Risch, Wortbildung, 214 with the reference to Leumann, Homeroische Wörter, Basel 1950, 923; opikvoros, if it existed, could be treated, in parallel to o-pi-su-ko, as a hypostasis or (less likely) as a possessive compound.
35 Hesiod Th. 889 has ἐκλέων EUS. polis appelaios, which M. West in his commentary (Oxford 1966), p. 374 translates “and one part in ten is allotted to it”. West stresses ἐκλέων simply refers to a tenth part, but it may not be due to chance that there is a progression nine — ten and that éta ... δέκα concerns the last part.
36 Lingua 16 (1966), 13ff.
OLE 1 3 J V 3, and once in a more damaged tablet (Fr 380) with the same type of formula. The word is certainly contrasted with po-ro-ko-va, which occurs in the same text and is normally taken as indicating the destination of the oil. The second element of the compound is likely to be khowa, possibly in the dative (cf. Gr. ξηακός). epi is easily recognizable, but unless we define the meaning of the word, it does not tell us much. Yet epi is clearly contrasted with po-ro- - i.e., presumably, pro - found in po-ro-ko-va, and we may ask what is the significance of a Mycenaean contrast between epi and pro. A possible parallel is the Homeric contrast between adverbial αὐτῷ and ἐκεί in Il. 13, 799: τὸν άνοι μὲν θάλα, οὖν τό άνος άτοχω, "in front ... behind ...", or that between πιθήκος and ἐπιθήκη. If this was relevant we could think of first and second libations - but we still need some more explicit texts.

5. It is now time to summarize. In Mycenaean both opii and (less clearly) epi are used as prepositions. opii occurs with an instrumental plural (once) and with the dative/locative instrumental singular (many times); epi is followed once by an instrumental ending in -e-epi and once by a dat./loc./instr. singular. We have epi-epi, i.e., presumably εἰκα τρεῖς, three times; in these instances an adverbial value of epi cannot be excluded. Both opii and epi occur in compounds - very much the same types of compounds - but only epi occurs in a verbal form. There is one example of alternation between epi and opii in the word epi-ko-ra-ri-ja /opi-ko-ra-si-ja.

Occasionally we can establish some modes of continuity between Mycenaean and Greek; the one instance of prepositional opii with the instrumental (3.2.) is matched by an instance of ἐκτὸς in Homer. o-pei-da-ni-jo (4.3.) corresponds to ἐκθησίος and o-pei-ko-jo (4.6.) probably matches ἐκθείος. I am not certain whether the comparison between epi-de-ko-ro (4.8.) and ἐκθήσιος is significant. epi compounds are also matched by Greek compounds: cf. e-pan-jo (4.3.) and Gr. ἐπιθήκη.

As we can define the meanings of opii and epi on internal evidence?

As a preposition opii indicates at Knossos either 'at/on close to' or a relation of dependence (and is followed by a PN in the dat./instr./loc. (3.1.)); at Pylos it is followed by an instrumental plural and indicates 'being with/looking after/being in charge of (animals)' (3.2.). Of some compounds I have argued that they are hypotheses formed on prepositional phrases; the occupational names, which are all formed with opii (and not with epi) presuppose a phrase where opii ought to have again a meaning of 'being with/looking after in charge of (objects)' (4.4.). In o-pei-ko-ra-ri-ja opii marks something fitted or attached to the object indicated by the second element of the compound (4.3.); how the joining or fitting was done or envisaged is obscure, but here too the compounds lead us to reconstruct a prepositional phrase where opii means 'attached to/close to/with etc.', though more definite spatial values ('behind, before, above') cannot be excluded. The same possibilities arise for opii in o-pa-wo-ia (4.5.). If o-pei-ko- and o-pei-ra (4.3.) are also to be treated as hypotheses (which is not certain), opii will mean 'close to, by' and conversely, 'behind'.

5I find it remarkable that epi is so rare - and so obscure - as a preposition, while it can occur adverbially. We have epi-epi, but not o-pei-epi.

5. For the various meanings of opii it seems that the common denominator is a relationship of close proximity. This could explain why at Knossos we feel that X opii Y means that X is somehow subordinated to Y, while in the one clear prepositional phrase at Pylos and in the prepositional compounds of Pylos X opii Y refers to a situation where X is in charge of Y: a similar parallel is noticeable in some of the Greek constructions of εἰκον to the dative. In the Cortyn code εἰκον οὐκ ἔχει τὸν ἰδίον (IC IV 72 iv 1) means "serve dominus natum habeto", with the implication that the child will be under 'will belong to the owner of the poodle'. On the other hand in Homer (Il. 11, 106) ὑπακότους εἰκον ἄροι refers to a shepherd in charge of the sheep and in Xenophon (Cy. VI ii 28.33) ὑπέρ ἅπαν τῶν ἑπτά τῶν μηναίων δὲ δήλων τῶν ἑπτά τῶν ζωgráfων refer to the leaders of those in charge of the engines and the canals respectively. The same type of relationship would also explain compounds like epi-ko-ri-ja and presumably o-pei-ko-ja, o-pei-ko-jo, we must admit, remains outside this definition. "Close proximity" must be defined further by contrast with the value of other prepositions. I mentioned paro above (3.1.). We should also remember that in the choriots tablets of Knossos reins and προ-νο which are missing are defined as not being προ-νο, an adverb/preposition which presumably refers to simple addition. An alternative statement concerns προ-νο which is/are not προ-νο 'under'.

5.2. This is as far as we can go in assessing the Mycenaean evidence. There are all reasons to believe that both opii and epi indicated proximity and a close connection, but it is not easy to define this any further.

First, we are not able to establish a semantic difference between opii and epi though the two forms are not interchangeable (with one - important - exception) ⁴⁴. Secondly, whenever we can recognize a clear link between Mycenaean and Greek phrases, opii and epi are both continued by εἰκον. The traditional view seems partially confirmed.

6. Mycenaean by itself cannot solve the problem of origins; we can reconstruct a picture according to which epi and opii started as entirely different prepositions/preverbs and converged semantically until eventually opii was made superfluous and disappeared (except for some fossilized derivatives) in the post-Mycenaean period,
or we can think of two related forms (presumably in ablauting alternation), with somewhat different, but not entirely dissimilar functions, which also converged until a choice was operated. Whatever picture we favour Mycenean would represent an intermediate stage in the history of the two forms; the evidence it offers cannot allow us to choose between the two possibilities.

This means that we are thrown back to the Greek problem I mentioned at the beginning (2.): do we want to argue that ἐνι and ὑπῆρθε are related and, if so, how do we explain the difference in meaning? I have no space to discuss the details but the facts are easy to summarize: there is in Greek a cluster of adverbs and derivatives built on a stem ἐν- (ὑπῆρθε, ὑπῆρθε, ὑπῆρτος, ὑπῆρτος, and ὑπῆρτος (Burkert, M.H. 38, 1951, 1951f)). The meaning oscillates between 'behind', at the back' and 'afterwards, in future'. We also have ἔντι, which occurs as an adverb, as a preverb, and as a preposition, with a multitude of meanings, which sometimes — perhaps unaccountably — are derived from a basic value 'on, above'. The common view is that the ὑπή- forms are simply built on an Ablaut alternating of ἐνι. Not much effort has been devoted to explaining the difference in meaning. In fact, given that this exists and that it is accompanied by a difference in vocalism, a bridging element between ὑπῆρθε and its group on the one hand, and ἔντι, on the other hand, must be found if the two are to be linked. Previously, if the question arose, this could be identified in particles such as Latin ob, Greek ἐπι where the vocalism matched that of the ὑπή- forms, the function (prepositional rather than adverbial) only was closer to that of ἔντι, and the meaning was not circumscribed to 'behind, in future' as that of Gr. ὑπῆρθε etc.

The Mycenean evidence can now provide a much better link since ὑπί matches the vocalism of ὑπῆρθε etc., while at the same time it has meanings and functions which can or do correspond to those of Gr. ἔντι.

Yet, from a semantic point of view, Mycenean complexes rather than clarifies the issue: we are now dealing with a three-term rather than a two-term question. First, we have ὑπῆρθε and its group which means 'behind, in future'; secondly, we have ὑπί, which in Mycenean at least, indicates close proximity; thirdly there is ἐπι/ἐνπι which in Mycenean seems to indicate close proximity and in Greek appears to have meanings reducible to 'on, above' (on grounds which it must be admitted, are not well defined). To account for this situation we can envisage a number of different hypotheses:

1. There were three different roots: two of them (those of ὑπί and ἐπι) underwent semantic convergence round the Mycenean period.
2. There were two different roots: one accounts for ὑπῆρθε, one, with two ablauting forms, for ὑπί and ἐπι and Gr. ἔντι.
3. There were two different roots: one accounts for ὑπῆρθε and ὑπῆρθε, one for ἔντι, which at some stage underwent semantic convergence with ἐπι and replaced it.
4. There was one basic root with different Ablaut alternants and different derivatives.

The different meanings can be attributed to secondary developments and/or to the differences in meaning necessarily connected with the Ablaut alternation.

There is nothing intrinsically impossible or implausible in any of these four hypotheses, nor anything which contrasts with the evidence adduced so far. Indeed the conclusion of this paper could be that these are the four possible and that we cannot decide among them. Yet we may try to proceed somewhat further; we may be able to make a choice and, if we cannot, we ought at least to be clear about the cause of our difficulties.

6.1. The normal way to reach a conclusion in a situation of this type is to make appeal to comparative evidence — here this may turn out to be less helpful than it normally is. The real problem is that, when preverbs or prepositions are involved, the semantic considerations which in etymological research operate a check on purely formal comparisons tend to give way. In Old Church Slavonic — to take an example which is not immediately relevant to the present issue — po with the locative translates Greek ὑπό 'behind', μετά 'after', ἐπι 'for, on behalf of', ἔντι 'for'; with the accusative it translates ἔντι 'in, through', ἔντι 'to', ἔντι 'from', ἔσβο 'to'; with the dative it translates ἔσβο, ἔντι, or ἔσβο (with the accusative)43. It is impossible to compare the meaning of a preposition like this with that of another preposition in a related language unless a 'primary', more unity value is reconstructed or established. Yet this is not always a viable procedure. Frequently we do not have enough early data and the approach normally adopted ('it is obvious that the primary meaning must be concrete, well defined, etc., and must be such that all other meanings are easily derived from it') conceals, under the guise of common sense, a number of a priori assumptions. When data are available we often come across developments such that they could never have been reconstructed by this type of approach. Does French avec 'with' really derive from Vulgar Latin ab hoc from 'there'? Why does Latin post 'behind, after' come to mean 'with' "chez" in Merovingian and Carolingian Latin44.

In these circumstances it is no wonder that etymological work on prepositions often tends to contradictive views. Hittite ἐπια, for instance, is often linked with Gr. ὑπῆρθε and Myc. ὑπί (e.g. by Krammehuber, Heth. Wb. I, 1961f.), but sometimes a connection with Gr. ἔντι is postulated and some scholars also see in ἐπια the equivalent of both ἐπι- and ἐντι (Pocorby, JEW 59).

On general grounds it seems that extreme subjectivity in the comparison of prepositions and similar elements in related languages can only be avoided if a few conditions apply. First the formal correspondence must be beyond reproach. Secondly, either the meanings overlap in an intuitively obvious manner which is generally acceptable (Italian a, French a), or we can reconstruct earlier overlapping meanings on the basis of real data diachronically arranged (English with, German weder), or there are coincidences in e.g. phrases or compounds which are synchronically difficult to explain in the language considered but can be accounted for through comparison and reconstruction (English without 'stand against', ON vobstanda).

44 Cf. E. Löschke, Versuchte Studien zur sl. Sprachkunde u. Syntax, Lund 1936, 183, who quotes examples like "quasi hereditatem saeun. quae ei esset data, ... post me retinere" or "nec post me. ... tasso caballo nunquam habi". In the Formule Marcelli "post vos retinere" means "vous le gardez chez vous" (A. Udolpho, Formule Marcelli, Uppsala 1954, 130).
6.2. Let us now return to Greek and Mycenaean. Of the four hypotheses in 6. we could eliminate some (viz. 2. and 4.) if we could show that an Ablaut alternation of the opi/epi type is not admissible. The problem ought to be aired, but I doubt that this is a possible way out.

Recent developments in Anatolian studies point more and more to the fact that some of the IE "prepositions/preverbs" correspond to Anatolian nominal roots which at a later stage became fossilized but in Old Hittite still behave as such and are used in different case forms (the directive or terminative and the locative forms are known, the accusative is perhaps more disputed). So much was known, for instance, for Hitt. kant- (Gr. ἔπρος, Lat. anu etc.), but the same conclusions can be reached e.g. for Hitt. katta, kati, appa, appa, etc. If so, we could suppose that both opi and epikiti originated in a root noun which ablated in its declension and alternated between -o grade and -e grade forms (these could be full grades with -e or simply replacements for the expected zero grades). Obviously we would not expect two different grades of the root to occur in the same case form, but we could envisage a situation in which two different case forms or a case form and a derivational or compositional form were built on different grades of the root; later change could have levelled the endings, but in the first instance at least the different vocalic alternations would have been preserved. For a similar alternation in Greek we may consider the vocalism of ἡμέρα as contrasted with that of the root noun νείκος, νοίκος.

It seems then that on formal grounds we cannot object to the possibility of a single root. Unfortunately the comparison with supposedly related roots in other IE languages cannot teach us much more.

6.3. If opi and epikiti can be formally related, though need not to be, we are led back again to the semantic question. Is it at all plausible that the forms we are considering are all derived from one and the same root and that this acquired diverging meanings such as 'behind, in future, next to, on'? A positive answer can be given only if we support it in one of two ways. We can produce a typological parallel from a language where we have clear evidence for such a semantic development - that the language is related to Greek does not matter, provided that the prepositional systems are reasonably comparable. Alternatively we can try again to anchor our forms to a network of comparative relations such that a conclusion of the sort indicated is inescapable. It follows from what was said above that the second approach is unlikely to be fruitful (in the first instance at least). I shall try the typological approach first, but it should be clear that at best this will show that it is semantically possible

46 The bibliography is now immense. I can perhaps refer to Laroché, RHA 28 (1970), 35ff. and to the comprehensive, but still controversial study by F. Starke, Die Funktionen der dimensionsalen Kasus und Verben im Althetheschen, SBST 23, Wiesbaden 1977.

47 Obviously we would like to know whether other languages show an e/o alternation in prepositions related to our own and whether there is comparative evidence for both opi- and epo. Unfortunately a number of possible cognates are ambiguous for the vocalism (e.g. Skt. apit). Lithuanian apit- (< *apet-) and Old Prussian ephi- (< *epē-) must be cognate but their origin is uncertain. Armenian ephi- also, and with a vocalism need not be related to énti, though this is commonly believed. It is interesting, typologically if nothing else, that in Gothic we find on the one hand wafna, which translates óstef, wafro, which translates óstef and óstef, wafro, which translates óstef, óstrīģ and ephi- tó óstrīģ, and on the other hand tswast daga, which translates tswast daga, which translates tswast daga. The odds are that all these words are cognate (and may be related to our root); if so, we have a contrast of a- and i-vocalism which may go back to *e/ and *e-.
up (epi) these laws'; TL 27,1 megiste-ne epi-]nuneto eli ebi 'Megiston it (ne) set (nouneto) up (epi) for himself'. The object of the latter sentence is a stole to be set up; when the verb is used for bodies to be buried or a sarcophagus to be put in place the preverb is not epi but stoe (TL 51, 72)39.

What we learn from the Lycian texts then is that the language preserves in epi < *epi the missing t-form from the root of *apph. The original value survives in epide 'in future' which corresponds semantically to Hitite appizz(Note 39) (ya) 'latter' or appa-semewat 'in future' (literally 'in after-days'), but epi has moved its own way towards a meaning such as on, up. This may induce us to look back at epi < appi. Laroche has pointed out40 that there is a great similarity between the numerous instances of epi (p)ste and the phrase *eši stadii ppppevi... ebieli translated as δεκα εν τούτον ἔφεσθη ἡ συγκεκαθη 'what is written on this stole'. If so, epi can be used in parallel to eši 'on, in'.

It emerges then that Anatolian has a family of words which in the course of time developed such different meanings as 'behind, later, in future, on, in'. We can now answer positively the question asked before. Semantically it is possible, though obviously not necessary, that öntihe, öntoo, öpi, and epítěi all derive from the same root.

6.5. My question was asked in typological terms and I have tried to answer it in that vein. However, at this stage we must ask whether the Anatolian word family which I have been discussing could also be cognate with the root or roots which occur in Öntihe, öpi, and epítěi. In spite of all the reservations expressed above about the validity of comparison in this lexical field I believe that the answer can be positive. Formally there are no objections. Hitite appi- can derive from *op- and Luwian *app- can derive from *op- or *ep-. Lycian altered a Common Luwian a into e and epi can go back to either *op- or *ep- (Hitite appi and öpi). As for the endings, Old Hitite shows clearly that we are dealing with a nominal root with different case endings.

Semantically and formally a link between Greek and Luwian Anatolian is made more plausible by the existence of derivatives which are an exact match for each other. Gr. öntoo, as was pointed out long ago, corresponds to Hitite appiziz(ya) and both point to an earlier *topi-ye. Gr. öntihe and Gr. öntoo both mean 'behind' and 'in future', exactly in the same way in which appa and its derivatives have temporal and local connotations. Considering that the idea of futurity is neither in Greek nor in Hitite automatically connected with that of 'back, behind' the coincidence is striking.41

39 The particle epi also occurs in the same phrase as stoe but separated from it. Cf. TL 83, 10 a-men-epi s se a-[phl]e'-t 'if anyone bares in there anyone else'; epi could conceivably mean 'on top'.

40 Feuilles de Xanthos VI, 71; for epi cf. also ibid. 89.

41 For a very interesting discussion of the Greek words for 'behind' and 'in future', which inter alia points out that in post-Homerite epic epi can refer to the past, see J. Parn. Leg de Zabaran der Griech in iizer Theorien', in 'Altert. Gen. Staat. Uppsalensias', 13 (1969), 5ff. Parn. makes no use of comparative evidence. For Hitite Starker, op. cit. (note 45), 158 note 19, points out that the future can be envisaged as being 'before' as much as 'behind', and refers to the widespread conception of the future as being 'behind' which is found in the Near East (Sumeria). Yet it seems to me that here we are not dealing with cross-culture influences, but with something inherited. For the words in question of also Lehmann, IF 51 (1935), 319 ff.

From a formal and semantic point of view there are other facts to notice. First, in Hitite *appi is not attested but appizziz (ya) may be treated as one of its derivatives (< *appi-ye) — which guarantees the archaism of the formation.42 Similarly in Greek öntoo gave evidence for opi before the decipherment of Linear B. Secondly we know that in Hitite pani can occur as antonyme of appa; it is striking that in early Greek we find traces at least of a contrast between pa and ste which parallels that between Hitite pani (ya) and opi. Thirdly, if we use the evidence of both Hitite and the Luwian languages we can reconstruct for Hitite an original pair *pa(-)ape-tu (< *pro-ye) and *pante to which matches Greek ðapsto and ïnto to (< *pro-ye and *epi-ye). Hitite preserved appizziz (ya) but replaced the expected *parazi- with kantezi-; Lycian preserved prez-ib, but, with the rest of Luwian, replaced the expected -i derivative of *appi with *-iri derivatives, Lyc. epi-43.

The case seems strong enough to confirm the etymological connection between Greek ðapsto etc. and the Luwian context. This connection may now be extended to epiziz and opi, if we keep in mind on the one hand the Greek contrast between ðapsto and ïnto matched by Anatolian *pa(-)ape-tu and *pante, and on the other hand the Greek contrast between ënti and ðapsto matched by Hitite appa and p(a)appa. The semantic difficulties have been removed by the new data about the semantic development of app- in the Luwian group.

7. The conclusion at this stage is that there are no formal or semantic reasons which prevent us from deriving ãnti, ðapsto, epiziz, and opi from the same root. The vocalic alternation can be explained (6.2.) and the semantic development can be paralleled (6.4.).

I have argued above that the traditional account of these forms has much to be said for it, but cannot go by default. It needs support and support can be found. Yet I doubt that in this field demonstration is possible and I do not think that I have demonstrated that the traditional view is correct: I have simply made a case for it.

42 The form EGR-sh-r-ab quoted above is matched by a-ap-ya-r-ab of KUB XIII 98 Vs 1, 22, but the vocalism is exceptional. For the normal appiziz (ya) of Hitite cf. Kanemben, Heth. Wb., s. v. Neub. Der Anu-Text, SBT 18, Wesban 1974, 492. Argues for an Old Hittite vocalism apppiziz- which could be due to an original *appi-ye or to a phonetic change i > e; this is disputed by Kanemben, loc. cit., but in any case need not alter our conclusions.

43 For the Greek contrast between ðapsto and ënti see above 4.8, and note 40. For the connection between Gr. ðapsto and Hit. pani cf. Laroche, RHA 28 (1970), 47-8. For the Hittite contrast between appa and pani I borrow an Old Hittite example (KBo XVII 431 1, 12-17) from Starker op. cit. (note 48), p. 140, no. 198: a-ap-ya-r-ab-lat e-ne-ë-e a-pa-a-ma Lat-pali... "Indem (napa) er sich nach hinten wandte... Indem (napa) er nach vorne ging..."


45 Though I have deliberately ignored the constructions with ënti or the ënti compounds or derivatives which might support this thesis, I cannot help mentioning the form ãnto which occurs only in a Hattic fragment and in a Callimachus fragment (see Chastain, Dict. s. v.). The word is obviously rare and refers to younger female descendants; in view of the use of Hitite apppiziz-appiziz- and of Luwian *appir- (cf. Hier. Litw. POST-k t-o-li-ir FRATER-lar-ti-younger brothers') used exactly with this connotation, I feel that we must take the word as an archaism and derive it, with Schultze, from *appi-ye, i.e. from a formation parallel to that of ãnto, Of course we cannot entirely exclude that ãnto is simply a remodelling of an earlier *appiziz, but it would be difficult to see why the remodelling should have taken place at all.
However, if my suggestions are acceptable, they can allow us to tidy up two or three loose ends which remain in our account of the Mycenaean evidence for epi and opo. How do we explain opo-ir-po-qa (4.6) and how do we explain the contrast between epo-ko-wa and po-ro-ko-wa (4.8)? If opo is indeed related to Hittite appa and to δουλευ it is not implausible that in a compound such as opo-ir-po-qa it preserved a meaning 'back, behind'68. Also, if opo is related to appa we can understand why it is contrasted with pre in epo-ko-wa / po-ro-ko-wa. Finally, if epi-de-to refers, as I argued earlier (4.7.), to a secondary or additional distribution of bronze it is possible that in this compound epi still has the force 'after'.

APPENDIX I. "Clear" Compounds of opo and epi.

a) 1. opo-comounds at Knossos

1. 
opo-ko-wa Sa 5670, 2, 8100, 8149 (All H. 206), opo-ko-je-pi Sa 4401, 4403, 4404, 4405, 4406, 4407, 4408, 4409, 4412, 4413, 4415, 4450, 5091 (All H. 128), SF 4428 (128), opo-ko-ne-te-j0 Sa 8100 (206), 8149 (206), opo-te-te-ke-e-wa B 756, 10 (107).

2. opo-comounds at Pylos

o-po-wa Sa 737, 740 (All C ii), opo-de-qa Sa 657, 1 (1), opo-de-mi-jo Sa 830, 12 (1), o-C 608, 2 (C i), opo-de-mo-jo Ub 1318, 2 (32), epo-ko-te-te-e-je Sa 629, 2 (2), opo-te-te-mi-jo-pi Sa 701, 1 (2), opo-te-te-mo-jo Sa 619, 2 (2), opo-te-te Sa 777 (1), Ab 899 (21), Ab 691 (23), epo-te-te Sa 829, 2 (2), opo-te-te-e-je Sa 829, 2 (2), opo-te-te Sa 829, 2 (2), opo-te-te Sa 144 (46), 42, 8 (C iii).

b) 1. epi-comounds at Knossos


2. epi-comounds at Pylos

epi-ko-te Sa 389, 7 (2), 601, 7 (2), epi-te-de-to Sa 20, 1 (25), epi-ko-wa Sa 657, 1 (1).

a) 1. opo-comounds (7) at Knossos

o-po-wa-ne-ja Sa 339 (141), opo-de-mi-jo-jo Sa 230 ("124".), opo-de-mi-jo Sa 1519, 14 (101), 1519, 5 (101), o-o-po-ke-je Sa 603, 2 (103). Cf. also epo-ko-ne Sa 584, 1 (116) and epo-te-te-ke-e-wa Le 646 (103), L 8105 (103).

68 It may be worthwhile to quote the predicative use of EGR-AN / appa in Hittite to mean 'right' behind; cf. e.g. au-kun XII NAM-RA S4 "UR-ASG(G... ... gorges) EGP-AN -Zwoil NAMRA-Leute des UR-SA (in) Tappara HiInen) (R. Werner, Heth. Geschichtsprotokolle, STST 4, Wiesbaden 1967, 44; cf. also p. 78). For a similar use of δουλευ for people left behind cf. perhaps Hom. Od. 11, 67: "κνοικ ατ άρν τον δουλευ γουνημαν, οτον πασσαν, θαλ' κατακρονην τον δουλευ.... We should notice that if we allow the possibility that meanings such as 'back, behind, after' surface in the compounds of opo and epi, words like opo-po-qa and opo-te-to could be taken as possessive compounds with 'a behind' value of opo (cf. 4. 3. above).

Mykenean and Greek Prepositions: o-po, epi etc.

a) 2. opo-comounds (7) at Pylos

o-po-ke-te-pi (de) Sa 615, 8 (1), 724, 3 (1), o-po-wa-wa-pi Sa 709, 206, o-po-ke-te-pi Sa 1239, 1 (C ii), o-po-te-te-ke Sa 456, 2 (1), epi-ke-te Sa 927, 3 (2), epi-ke-te-te Sa 472 (41), 477 (41), epi-ke-te-te Sa 817, 9 (2).

Cf. also epi-pe-te-jo Sa 128, 2 (12) and epi-me-ne Sa 7,8 (9), 10, 11 (3) discussed in 3.2.

b) 1. epi-comounds (7) at Knossos


2. epi-comounds (7) at Pylos

epi-te-te Sa 723, 3 (1), epi-te-te Sa 431, 12 (2), epi-te-te Sa 109, 25 (C i), epi-te-te Sa 115, 2 (2), epi-te-te Sa 674 (23), epi-te-te Sa 456 (4), epi-te-te Sa 1314, 3 (C ii), epi-te-ke Sa 672 (23), epi-te-te Sa 944 (4), epi-te-te Sa 584, 10 (1), epi-te-te Sa 927, 4 (2), epi-te-ke Sa 130, 18 (5, 32), epi-te-te Sa 1265, 2 (43), epi-te-te Sa 851, 6 (12), 852, 1 (2), epi-me-ne Sa 1937, 5 (C ii), epi-me-ne Sa 851, 6 (12), 852, 1 (2), epi-ke Sa 165, 9, 10, 11 (1).

Addendum

This paper was already at the publisher when Eric Hamp's article on "Indo-European *H2top" appeared (MSS 40 (1981), 39-60). I can now refer to it for a more detailed comparison of the IE comparanda of epi / opo and for an account of their nominal origin similar to that reached above. I am more sceptical than Hamp about the status of the epi-forms (Gr. χεῦρα etc.) and, in view of my assessment of the Anatolian and Greek evidence, I am more worried than he is about the possibility of a semantic shift from "front, forehead" (the meaning which Hamp attributes to his reconstructed *H2epo-) to "back, behind, after". One could perhaps compare the semantic development of Gr. χεῦρας "with the face downwards, lying on the front, falling forwards" (LSJ s.v.) which is also used for the "back" of an animal, or a leaf or a hand, cf. δομα μεν 'the under parts of an animal' and δομα μεν 'the upper parts, the back'.

DISKUSSION

Daher: Mme Morpurgo-Davies a fort bien souligné l'état transitionnel que présente le mycéen par rapport à l'indo-européen et au grec alphabétique en ce qui concerne l'emploi des prépositions. Sur un point, je crois que cette situation est encore plus nette qu'elle ne le pense: il s'agit de la place des pré-postpositions. Le mycéen se situe à l'extrême fin de l'époque où la place de ces éléments était encore libre. Dans l'immense majorité des cas, il prépose, comme en grec du premier millénaire. Mais il existe deux exemples (le premier est indiscutable) de postposition: ka-no-no po-ri (suivi de quantités de
moutons et de laine: KN Dk 945) et ḫ-e-pi, que devait précéder un nom d'individu en KN L 2127 (cf. .setPreferredSize (L 567.1, etc.).

En ce qui concerne la signification de ḫ-e-pi et de po-ro: je crois que l'apparition de ces deux prépositions dans des contextes similaires, parfois chez un même scribe, n'est pas une raison suffisante pour postuler nécessairement une différence de sens entre elles. Il est tout aussi possible qu'il s'agisse de formules de sens équivalent - tout comme sont équivalentes des expressions comme a-u-qa pie-ne: o-u-qa a-ni-ja po-st: o-u-qa a-nil-ja po-st c-e-st (KN Sd 4402 : 4416 : 4422, du scribe 128).

Mellen: I should like to comment on a point of your sound contribution. This point concerns the interpretation of the words po-ro-ko-wa and ḫ-e-pi-ko-wa, which are attested in the Knossos Oil tablets. Recently I have studied in detail all the evidence concerning the Mycenaean oils, and I have attempted to throw some light on this pair of terms, ḫ-e-pi-ko-wa and po-ro-ko-wa, since I am afraid that the interpretation by Dr. Godart is unlikely.

 ḫ-e-pi-ko-wa is only attested on two tablets, Fh 343 and 380, but unfortunately the figures are lacking in the latter document. Considering Fh 343 as representative, we see that there is an enormous difference between quantities on both entries, and a closer examination will reveal that the entry preceded by ḫ-e-pi-ko-wa is one tenth of the previous one. Now, I shall produce another tablet, Fh 361, where an obscure double entry appears. It is tempting to suggest that the small quantity of this entry is actually one tenth of the greater one, and therefore we might take it as a further instance of an ḫ-e-pi-ko-wa entry. If this interpretation is not wrong, the tablet shows that zo-a and ḫ-e-pi-ko-wa were not parallel terms: zo-a is probably the dative of the nomen actinis of the verb ḫ-e-a, since the main purpose of the Mycenaean olive oil was to serve as vehicle or medium for perfumes. On the other hand, ḫ-e-pi-ko-wa is perhaps a nominative qualifying the tenth per cent quantity, which appears occasionally along with the figures of the main entry (zo-a), and my suggestion is that these tenth per cent quantities were some kind of bonuses added to the main delivery. Therefore ḫ-e-pi-ko-wa is to be viewed as an 'additional oil allowance' (ἐξαποθογ), cf. ἐξαπόθογος 'additional quantity' or ἐκάθορος 'additional reception'.

To my mind, ḫ-e-pi-ko-wa is an administrative term and the same might be true of po-ro-ko-wa, perhaps as 'allowance delivered in advance'.

---

1 J. L. Melena, El aceite en la civilización minoia, Producción y Comercio del Aceite en la Antigüedad. (2º Congreso Internacional, Madrid 1981, 255ff. and §16, 272 ff.)