

BCILL 131: Alberto BERNABÉ and Eugenio R. LUJÁN (eds.), *Donum Mycenologicum. Mycenaean Studies in Honour of Francisco Aura Jorro*, xii-276 p., Louvain-la-Neuve, Peeters, 2013.

ISBN 978-90-429-2909-8

Since the decipherment of the Linear B script by Michael Ventris in 1952, many books and papers have contributed to a better understanding of the Mycenaean texts and their cultural context. F. AURA JORRO has been able to critically review and systematize the richness and variety of the scholarship devoted to the interpretation of Mycenaean in his outstanding *Diccionario micénico*. This volume honours him with sixteen papers written by scholars working from different perspectives on the Linear B tablets, Mycenaean culture, and related fields. The papers collected in this book provide new insights into a number of various subjects: Linear B script and texts, Mycenaean grammar, lexicon and religion.

Some of the papers tackle with open questions concerning the phonetic value of certain Linear B syllabograms, thus making a contribution towards a more refined understanding of this script. The function of particular types of texts, such as the 'flat-based nodules', is also dealt with in the volume. Various linguistic questions raised by the study of the Mycenaean texts are the focus of other papers, including certain aspects of Mycenaean grammar in comparison to the situation in 1st millennium Greek and its Indo-European background, as well as onomastics, lexicon, and word formation.

Other papers are devoted to the interpretation of individual tablets, thus providing in-depth analyses of some texts. A number of papers deal with particular aspects of Mycenaean religion (gods, cults and rituals), and the volume also makes a contribution to the ongoing debate on the interpretation of the new Linear B texts from Thebes. Finally, some papers are concerned with the interaction of Linear B and Mycenaean with other languages and scripts and other questions of Aegean epigraphy.

The volume will be of interest not only for Mycenologists and specialists in the Aegean cultures, but also for scholars working on the history of the Greek language, Greek religion and institutions, and Indo-European.

PEETERS-LEUVEN

ISBN 978-90-429-2909-8



9 789042 929098

ISBN 978-90-429-2909-8 (Peeters Leuven)
ISBN 978-2-7584-0186-5 (Peeters France)

131

BCILL 131

BCILL

BIBLIOTHÈQUE DES CAHIERS DE L'INSTITUT DE LINGUISTIQUE DE LOUVAIN

ANTIQUITÉ

Alberto BERNABÉ and Eugenio R. LUJÁN (eds.), *Donum Mycenologicum*

Donum Mycenologicum

Mycenaean Studies in Honour of Francisco Aura Jorro

edited by

Alberto BERNABÉ and Eugenio R. LUJÁN



PEETERS
LOUVAIN-LA-NEUVE
2013

PEETERS

PUBLICATIONS LINGUISTIQUES DE LOUVAIN

Comité de Direction: Philippe BLANCHET (Rennes), Yves DUHOUX (Louvain-la-Neuve), Michel FRANCARD (Louvain-la-Neuve), Guy JUCQUOIS (Louvain-la-Neuve)

Comité de Rédaction: Sylvain AUROUX (Lyon), Claudine BAVOUX (Réunion), Philippe BLANCHET (Rennes), Thierry BULOT (Rennes), Didier DE ROBILLARD (Tours), Yves DUHOUX (Louvain-la-Neuve), Michel FRANCARD (Louvain-la-Neuve), Frédéric FRANCOIS (Paris), Guy JUCQUOIS (Louvain-la-Neuve), Jean-Marie KLINKENBERG (Liège), Pierre MARTIN (Québec), Liselotte PASQUES (CNRS, Paris), Pierre SWIGGERS (Leuven)

Rédacteurs en Chef: Yves DUHOUX — Guy JUCQUOIS (Louvain-la-Neuve)

Adresse de la Rédaction: Institut de Linguistique
Place Blaise Pascal
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique.

Les commandes, de même que les manuscrits destinés à la publication et les offres d'échanges, sont à adresser exclusivement à l'adresse suivante:

PEETERS
Bondgenotenlaan 153
B-3000 Leuven

Toute traduction ou reproduction, de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit, même par extraits, des textes publiés est interdite sans l'autorisation préalable de la Rédaction.

CONTENTS

Table of contents	V
Prefacio	
Alberto BERNABÉ – Eugenio R. LUJÁN	VII
Presentación	
Francisco RODRÍGUEZ ADRADOS	IX
Los términos micénicos en <i>-e-wi-ja</i>	
Alberto BERNABÉ	1
La tablette linéaire B TH X 105	
Yves DUHOUX	21
<i>Anthroponymica mycenaea: e-ke-ra₂-wo */En-kheriā-wōn/, *ἔγχειρία</i> y ἔγχειρέω ‘emprender’ (*‘poner mano en’), ἔγχειρήμα, ἔγχειρήσις*	
José Luis GARCÍA RAMÓN	25
Los temas en <i>-s</i> en micénico	
Eugenio R. LUJÁN	41
Filling gaps in the basic Mycenaean syllabary	
José L. MELENA	65
The reception of Aura Jorro’s <i>Diccionario Micénico</i> in Mycenaean studies	
Thomas G. PALAIMA	77
Problemi di epigrafia cipriota	
Massimo PERNA	85
Ricerche sul segno 25 del sillabario miceneo	
Rachele PIERINI	95
I supporti della scrittura lineare B e i cosiddetti ‘flat-based nodules	
Anna SACCONI	129
La polaridad ‘dar/pagar’ en el mundo micénico	
Rosa-Araceli SANTIAGO ÁLVAREZ	137
Danzas de animales micénicas	
Irene SERRANO LAGUNA	153
Mycenaean <i>-pi</i> and <i>pa-ro</i> in the light of TH Uq 434	
Rupert THOMPSON	163

<i>Po-ti-ni-ja</i> y <i>si-to-po-ti-ni-ja</i> en las inscripciones en Lineal B de Micenas Carlos VARIAS GARCÍA	179
Die Teilnehmer griechischer Kultprozessionen und die mykenischen Tätigkeitsbezeichnungen auf <i>-po-ro/-φόρος</i> Jörg WEILHARTNER	191
La situation épigraphique et linguistique à Milet à l'époque mycénienne Julien ZURBACH	211
General references	227

Mycenaean *-pi* and *pa-ro* in the light of TH Uq 434*

It is salutary that those of us who theorize about Mycenaean morphology and syntax be reminded from time to time that our grand theoretical edifices are often built on the foundations of the most slender evidence: foundations, indeed, which can be shaken by the discovery of even a single new tablet. **TH Uq 434** is just such a tablet, whose publication in the proceedings of the Rome Colloquium (ARAVANTINOS et al. 2008) has much to tell us about the status of the instrumental case in Mycenaean Greek, as well as the preposition *pa-ro*.

TH Uq 434

- .1 pa-ro , te-qa-jo-i_Lqa-si-re-u-pi
 .2 pa-ro , qe-re-ro e-te-wa *I52 1
 .3 pa-ro , o-to-ke-se-we , e-te-wa *I52 1
 .4 pa-ro , ri-wa-so , e-te-wa *I52 1
 .5 pa-ro , e-po-ro-jo , u-po-o-pa *I52 1
 .6 pa-ro , a-e-ri-qo , u-po-o-pa *I52 1
 .7 pa-ro , su-ko-pu₂-te-e *I52 1
 .8 pa-ro , ka-wi-jo , a-mu-ne-u-te *I52 1
 .9 pa-ro []je-u-pi , ka-
 .10 pa-ro , *22-ka-ne , wa-ka-[•]-te-we[
 .11 pa-ro , a-pi-qo-ta[]na-ra-ro []
 .12 pa-ro , pa-[]ka-pa-ti-ja[]
 .13 pa-ro , []wi-dwo-i-jo *I52[]
 .14 []*I52[]

inf. mut.

The text of **TH Uq 434** as printed by its editors is reproduced above. In lines 2–8 each entry begins with the preposition *pa-ro* /paro/ ≈ Classical παρά followed by a man's name, and ends with the ideogram *I52, representing an ox hide (the ideogram is strikingly similar in shape to the modern 'real leather' logo, and is surcharged with the syllabic sign *wi*, probably standing for /wīnos/ 'ox hide'), and the numeral 1. The editors interpret the document as recording the contribution of these ox hides by the named individuals to the palace. Line 1 appears to function as a heading for lines 2–8 and to sum up their *pa-ro* formulae in the

* I am especially grateful to Lisa Bendall for her perceptive comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Its remaining flaws are the fault of the author.

phrase *pa-ro*, *te-qa-jo-i* *qa-si-re-u-pi* /*paro* T^hēg^waiōihi g^wasileup^hi/, ‘from the Theban g^wasilēwes’. (/g^wasileus/ is the equivalent of Classical βασιλεύς, but seemingly refers to a minor local official rather than a ‘king’, for which the Mycenaean term is *wa-na-ka* /wanaks/ ≈ ἄναξ.) The ends of lines 9–14 are lost, but in .9 *pa-ro* seems to be followed by a plural form]*je-u-pi*, and so the editors suggest, plausibly in my view, that this forms a second heading parallel to that in .1 which sums up the *pa-ro* formulae in lines 10–14.

§1. There are 248 instances of *pa-ro* in the corpus where the final sign of the prepositional argument is legible. In the vast majority of these the spelling is compatible with either dative or instrumental morphology: 22 × *-Ca* = *a*-stem dat. /-āi/ or instr. /-ā/; 163 × *-(C)o* = *o*-stem dat. /-ōi/ or instr. /-ō/; 47 × *-Ce* = *C*-stem dat. /-ei/ or instr. /-ē/. In a very small number of cases we see forms which can only be dative: *ka-ke-u-si* in **PY An 129.7** must be /k^halkeusi/ ‘smiths’, the dat. plur. of an *ēw*-stem; *po-so-pe-re-i* in **PY Cn 40.2** must be the dat. sg. in /-ehi/ of an *s*-stem man’s name, /Posōp^helehi/ *uel sim.*; *i-sa-na-o-ti* in **PY Cn 254.6** looks like the dat. sg. in /-i/ of a *C*-stem man’s name; and *e-re-u-te-ri* in **TH Av 100.4b** must be /ereutēri/ ‘inspector’. Prior to the publication of **TH Uq 434** there were by contrast no examples which had to be instrumental. Thus while it remained possible that some of the ambiguous spellings concealed instrumental forms, we might have felt justified to argue on the basis of the unambiguous forms that we were dealing with morphological dative in all instances. That those of us who did so argue were wrong is now shown clearly by **TH Uq 434** which contains two unambiguously instrumental forms: *qa-si-re-u-pi* in line 1 and]*je-u-pi* in line 9.

The tablet contains another surprise, too. In line 7 the form *su-ko-pu₂-te-e* looks like it ought to be an *s*-stem formation from a noun /sūkop^hutēs/ ‘fig-planter’, either a man’s name (ARAVANTINOS et al. 2008, 26), or possibly an occupational or official title.¹ Now *s*-stem singular forms in *-e*, while common enough in place names (some ten different forms in *-e-e* are attested) are exceptionally rare in words denoting persons. Prior to the publication of **TH**

¹ It is true that in the parallel entries in lines 2–6, 8 and 10–13 we are dealing with personal names rather than occupational titles; but in line 12 we see the name *ka-pa-ti-ja*, and we know that at Pylos a woman named *ka-pa-ti-ja* is a *ka-ra-wi-po-ro* /klāwip^horos/ ‘keybearer’ (**PY Eb 338.A** and **Ep 704.7**), and we find the same title *ka-ra-wi-po-ro* associated in **PY Jn 829** with a title *o-pi-su-ko*, generally assumed to be /opisūkos/ ‘superintendent of the figs’. I wonder, therefore—highly speculatively—whether /sūkop^hutēs/ might be the Theban equivalent of Pylian /opisūkos/, although we would have to find some explanation as to why a woman named *ka-pa-ti-ja* was associated with the ‘fig-master’ at two different sites.

Uq 434 we had two examples: in **MY Ge 604.1** we find *ke-e-pe*, plausibly argued to be an error for *ke-pe-e*, a *datiuus incommodi* governed by *o-pe-ro* /op^helos/ ‘deficit’ of the man’s name *ke-po* known elsewhere in the **Ge** series; and we have *ti-ri-se-ro-e* as the recipient of olive oil (OLE) in **PY Fr 1204** and a gold vessel (AUR *216^{VAS}) in **Tn 316.5**. This could be the dative of a god’s name or epithet /Trishērōhei/ ‘the thrice-hero’, but it could formally be the plural of a nominative of rubric /Trishērōhes/. Our previous examples of personal *s*-stem *-e* were thus marginal and uncertain, but in *su-ko-pu₂-te-e* we have a clear and unambiguous example: but is it dative in /-ehēi/ or, now we know that *pa-ro* can govern the instrumental, instrumental in /-ehē/ ? A further question of wider significance is whether *pa-ro* governs different cases in its different senses, dative, presumably, when LOCATIVE² and instrumental when ABLATIVE; and, if so, is this evidence of an ABLATIVE sense of the instrumental more generally, and therefore of a syncretism of instrumental-ablative on the one hand and dative-locative on the other?

§2. Before we examine the context of the examples of *pa-ro* where the governed case is clear, we must deal with a further startling anomaly of **TH Uq 434**. In line 1 the editors print *pa-ro*, *te-qa-jo-i* _L *qa-si-re-u-pi*. If this reading is correct then the instrumental /g^wasileup^{hi}/ is qualified by a dative adjective /T^hēgwaiōihi/. Standard rules of concord would require either an instrumental adjective *te-qa-jo* /T^hēgwaiōis/ or dative noun *qa-si-re-u-si* /g^wasileusi/. If we assume scribal error is responsible for the failure of concord then the presence of *je-u-pi* in line 9 suggests that *te-qa-jo-i* is the error and the scribe intended *te-qa-jo*: we are still left, in other words, with the deliberate construction of *pa-ro* + instrumental. In any case, we should only appeal to scribal error as a last resort; to explain an apparent failure of concord as an error on the part of the scribe is to take the arrogant (and patently false) position that we know more about Mycenaean syntax than the scribe himself. If we reject the idea of scribal error we are forced to conclude that the scribe intentionally construed a dative adjective with an instrumental noun. What does this tell us about the grammatical system?

In **PY Jn 829**, a record of bronze contributed by the officials of the sixteen towns of the two provinces of Pylos, two place names which are demonstrably instrumental, *pa-ki-ja-pi* in line 7 and *e-ra-te-re-wa-pi* in line 17 stand in parallel with the demonstrably dative-

² Throughout this paper, in order to distinguish the labels of case forms from those of case functions, the latter are printed in SMALL CAPS.

locative *e-re-i* in line 19. This suggests a degree of overlap between the functions expressed by the instrumental and the dative-locative case forms.

In KN Ld(2) 787.B we find *pa-we-a₂*, / *o-re-ne-ja* *161 *ki-to-pi*[. Now *pa-we-a₂* is clearly /p^harweha/ ‘pieces of cloth’, and *o-re-ne-ja* an adjective in agreement with it, perhaps denoting some kind of decorative motif. The form *ki-to-pi* appears to be the instrumental plural of the noun /k^hitōn/ and has very plausibly been interpreted as meaning ‘for khitons’ (MILANI 1958, 108; DORIA 1968, 771-772; KILLEN 1979, 171). This would be an example of an instrumental form with final DATIVE function.

We thus have examples of instrumentals overlapping in function with dative-locative case forms, to the extent that the instrumental can apparently stand in a core DATIVE function, and this constitutes evidence at least of a partial functional syncretism between instrumental and locative case forms. We ought not, then, to be surprised if an adjective which was formally dative could qualify a noun which was formally instrumental. This might suggest that the syncretism was fairly advanced. We could imagine, for example, that elements of morphology which formerly expressed two or three distinct cases (dative-locative and instrumental; or dative, locative and instrumental) synchronically expressed one syncretic case, which we label ‘dative’ and which carried DATIVE, LOCATIVE and INSTRUMENTAL functions (and we could add ABLATIVE functions into the mix if we follow the hypothesis that the instrumental and ablative cases had already syncretised). Each set of morphs would be operating in free variation to express the same syncretic case, and eventually we would expect one member of each set to oust the others. This is exactly what happened in the later dialects, where the ‘dative’ case is expressed by morphs some of which have their origins in the IE dative, others in the IE locative, but which carry DATIVE, LOCATIVE and INSTRUMENTAL force.

If this is indeed the situation then the questions posed at the end of §1 become irrelevant: the scribe did not construe *pa-ro* here with an instrumental rather than a dative, but with a dative(-locative-instrumental) which here happens to be expressed by a morph which formerly belonged to the instrumental. Before we jump to this (I confess, to me, attractive) conclusion, however, we should observe that the reading *te-qa-jo-i_L-qa-si-re-u-pi* is far from certain. Although that is their preferred reading, the editors admit that *te-qa-jo*, *qa-si-re-u-pi* (i.e. both words instrumental) is also possible. What are their reasons for preferring the syntactically more difficult reading?

The reader is referred to the photograph of the tablet and Godart's facsimile drawing in the original publication (ARAVANTINOS et al. 2008, 32-33). The first three signs of the second word of line 1 are clear, but the sign which the editors restore as *i* exists only as a small vertical mark which touches the horizontal rule and is slightly skewed to the top left. Although the editors concede that this may in fact be a word divider, they are firmly convinced that this reading should be rejected. The reason—and it is the same reason that they read the next sign, also surviving only as a vertical mark touching the rule, as a syllabogram—is their claim that the divider, where present, is on this tablet always significantly raised above the rule: any stroke which touches or crosses the rule must therefore belong to a syllabogram. In fact, from Godart's drawing, this claim does not appear to be true. The first word divider in .2 separating *pa-ro* and *qe-re-ro* impacts the horizontal rule.

There are furthermore good reasons for wanting to see one of the two strokes between *jo* and *si* as a divider rather than a syllabogram. First, the only clear example where a divider is missing in this tablet is between the words *qe-re-ro* and *e-te-wa* in .2, but there is a large gap here, equivalent in width to the sign *we* of the line beneath. If one restores the *jo* and the proposed *i* and *qa* (using *i* and *jo* from .13, scaled to the same height as the signs in .1, and *qa* from earlier in .1, and using the existing traces as a guide to placement) it becomes apparent that, unless the ductus of these signs differed considerably from that of the remainder of the document, restoring both *i* and *qa* leaves no gap at all between *te-qa-jo-i* and *qa-si-re-u-pi*. Rather, these words would be written as *scriptio continua*. Furthermore, again, unless the ductus of these three signs was significantly different, whereas elsewhere signs are drawn neatly spaced from one another, these three would be so cramped as to be touching one another, or nearly so. Finally, the slope of the first of the two traces is pronounced, and resembles that of the divider between *pa-ro* and *e-po-ro-jo* in .5 rather than that of the vertical shaft of any of the syllabic signs. All of these anomalies can be removed by the reading *te-qa-jo* , *qa-si-re-u-pi*, i.e. /T^hēgwaiois g^wasileup^{hi}/ with both adjective and noun instrumental plural.

This does not, of course, rule out the possibility that the dative-locative and instrumental had syncretised and that /paro ... g^wasileup^{hi}/ had the same force as /paro ... g^wasileusi/ would have had. But it is the case that the scribe has, apparently, deliberately chosen instrumental morphology for both *pa-ro* formulae where the case is unambiguous. In the remaining instances the case morphology could be instrumental or dative-locative; but it

is curious that in line 7 he has used the rare *-e-e* ending in *su-ko-pu₂-te-e* which could be instrumental, rather than the common *-e-i* which could not. Is this choice significant? Can we, in other words, detect a difference in function when *pa-ro* is followed by unambiguous dative-locative and when it is followed by unambiguous instrumental morphology?

§3. It is generally held that *pa-ro* has two senses, one ABLATIVE ‘from X’, the other LOCATIVE ‘chez X, apud X’. In those instances where the case morphology following *pa-ro* is unambiguous, is there a correlation between morphology and sense?

If Aravantinos *et al.* are correct to interpret **TH Uq 434** as a record of the contribution of ox hides from the named individuals to the palace, we have here two examples of unambiguous instrumental morphology (i.e. in *qa-si-re-u-pi* and *]je-u-pi*; *su-ko-pu₂-te-e* is ambiguous) in what must be ABLATIVE *pa-ro* constructions. They argue plausibly that the tablet is compiled from a number of sealings (ARAVANTINOS *et al.* 2008, 27-29), and on sealings, which are documents intended to accompany contributions of goods being sent to the centre, the sense of *pa-ro* is highly likely to be ABLATIVE (PITEROS *et al.* 1990, 177).

It is conceivable, I suppose, that the tablet might list hides which have been despatched from the centre to individuals for processing, and so record their current location (LOCATIVE sense) prior to their return to the palace; but this is difficult. The most obvious form that such a process might take would be tanning, but it seems very unlikely that single skins would be sent to individual tanners, and we might expect a reference to tanners in the ‘heading’ in line 1. Furthermore, if the editors are right to interpret *u-po-o-pa* in lines 5 and 6 as /hupo hopās/, ‘because of *hopā*’ (ARAVANTINOS *et al.* 2008, 25), and if Killen is correct that /hopā/ denotes the ‘finishing’ or ‘renovation’ of existing goods rather than the production of new goods from raw materials, for which the term is *ta-ra-si-ja* /talansiā/ (KILLEN 1995), we would have to imagine that in lines 5 and 6 the ideogram *152 represented already-tanned leather undergoing finishing or renovation, while in the other entries it represented raw hide undergoing tanning.

There is plenty of evidence to link objects described as *o-pa* to storage records (KILLEN 1995, 331). **KN Sd 4403**, **Sf 4420**, **Sd 4422** and **So 4430** all record chariots and wheels, qualified by *o-pa*, which are in store. Sealing **KN Ws 1704** has the ideogram JAC(ulum) on side .α and the noun *pa-ta-ja* /paltaiā/ ‘darts’ on side .γ, with *o-pa* on .β, and was found in the arsenal in association with a box of arrows. It is quite plausible, then, that

PY An 129 lists 15 men under the headings *pa-ro* , *ti-ki-jo* and *pa-ro* , *ka-ke-u-si*. The former phrase contains a man's name, the latter the dative plural /k^halkeusi/ 'smiths'. There are further connections with the bronze industry: **An 340**, in the same hand and stylus, lists at least 19 men under the heading *pa-ro* , *a-ta-o*. In **Jn 431** *a-ta-o* is the name of an /atalansios k^halkeus/, and two of the names listed under him in **An 340**, *wo-ti-jo* in line 8 and *a-no-ra-ta* in line 12, appear as those of /atalansioi k^halkēwes/ in **Jn 832**. In **An 129** five of the men are listed individually, but ten are grouped together under the designation *za-mi-jo* , *pu-ro-jo*. Whether or not *za-mi-jo* represents /zāmioi/ 'forced levies' *uel sim.* (cf. Classical ζῆμια 'penalty'), *pu-ro-jo* is surely the genitive of the place name Pylos. Two of the other entries have words parallel with *pu-ro-jo*: the man's name *to-ro-wo* in line 5 is qualified by *ri-na-ko-ro*, and *ka-nu-ta-jo* in line 6 by *a-so-na*, which may be place names or occupational titles (VENTRIS – CHADWICK 1972, 535, 580).

In line 4 *pu-ro-jo* can scarcely be the destination to which the *za-mi-jo* are being sent, both because the ALLATIVE sense is inappropriate to the genitive case, and because no destination is given for *a-ta-ro-we*, *pe-re-wa-ta* or *we-ro-ta* in lines 2, 3 and 8. We cannot assume an implicit 'Pylos' in these entries, because then the explicit *pu-ro-jo* in line 4 would be unmotivated. Presumably, then, the men in line 4 are the *za-mi-jo* 'of, i.e. from, Pylos'. The same considerations apply to *ri-na-ko-ro* and *a-so-na* if these are place names.

The two *pa-ro* formulae could indicate where the men listed are currently located, or by whom they have been sent. If the latter, their destination or current location is not recorded, so we would assume Pylos itself. But if so, what sense does *pu-ro-jo* make in line 4? The evidence is circumstantial, but suggests that the LOCATIVE interpretation of the *pa-ro* formulae is the more likely.

PY Cn 40

(S4–H21)

.1	wa-no-jo , wo-wo , pa-ro , ne-ti-ja-no-re , pa-ra-jo	OVIS ^m 140
.2	wa-no-jo , wo-wo , pa-ro , po-so-pe-re-i , wo-ne-we	OVIS ^m 75
.3	wa-no-jo , wo-wo , pa-ro , zo-wi-jo , a-ko-so-ta-o	OVIS ^m 70
.4	wa-no-jo , wo-wo , pa-ro , po-ru-qo-ta , we-da-ne-wo	OVIS ^m 60
.5	e-ko-me-no , pa-ro , pa-ta , pa-ra-jo	OVIS ^m 80
.6	e-ko-me-no , pa-ro , []ma-te-we , we-da-ne-wo	OVIS ^m 70
.7	a-ne-u-te , pa-ro , ma-ri-ti-wi-jo , a-ko-so-ta-o	OVIS ^m 83
.8	ma-ro-pi , pa-ro , ro-ko , pa-ra-jo	OVIS ^m 150
.9	ma-ro-pi , pa-ro , ka-da-ro , we-da-ne-wo	OVIS ^m 85
.10	ma-ro , pa-ro , tu-ri-ta , a-ke-o-jo	OVIS ^m 80

.11	re-pe-u-ri-jo , pa-ro , e-zo-wo , a[-ko-so-]ta-o	QVİS ^m 82
.12	ma-ro , pa-ro , ma-u-ti-jo , a-ko-şo-ta-o	OVIŞ ^f 60
.13	a-ne-u-te , pa-ro , ka-ta-wa , a-ko-so-ta	OVIŞ ^f 80
.14	a-te-re-wi-ja , pa-ro , e-wi-te-we , a-ke-o-jo	OVIŞ ^f 70
.15–16	<i>uacant</i>	

PY Cn 599

(S4–H21; S719-H1 in .8)

.1a	pa-ro	
.1	wa-no-jo , wo-wo , ne-ti-ja-no a-ke-o-jo	CAP ^m 100
.2	a ₂ -ne-u-te , pa-ro , ka-so , a-ko-so-ta-o	CAP ^m 45
.3	a ₂ -pa-tu-wo-te , pa-ro , a-ke-ra-wo , a-ke-o-jo	CAP ^m 90
.4	a ₂ -pa-tu-wo-te , pa-ro , ru-we-ta , a-ke-o-jo	CAP ^f 40
.5	a ₂ -pa-tu-wo-te , pa-ro , a-wo-i-jo ,	CAP ^f 50
.6	wa-no-jo , wo-wo , pa-ro , ke-re-no , a-ke-o-jo	CAP ^f 80
.7	a ₂ -pa-tu-wo-te , pa-ro , e-zo-wo	SUS ^f 30
.8	e-ko-me-no , pa-ro , ti-ri-po-di-ko	SUS ^f 57

PY Cn 600

(S4–H21)

.1	o-re-e-wo , wo-wo , pa-ro , ke-we-no	OVIŞ ^m 50
.2	o-re-e-wo , wo-wo , de-ko-to	OVIŞ ^m 100
.3	o-re-e-wo , wo-wo , ke-ro-u-te-u	OVIŞ ^m 90
.4	o-re-e-wo , wo-wo , e-te-re-řo	OVIŞ ^m 90
.5a	-jo	
.5	o[-re-e-]wø , wo-wo , mi-ka-ri-jo , a-ke-o-	OVIŞ ^m 92
.6	re-qa-se-wo , wo-wo , wa-ra-wo-ño _L ja-kę-o-jo	OVIŞ ^m 70
.7	ti-mi-to , a-ke-e , te-[]QVİŞ ^f 80
.8	ti-mi-to , a-ke-e , a-[]-u , we-da-ne-wo	OVIŞ ^f 60
.9	re-qa-se-wo , wo-wo , ka-wi-ta	OVIŞ ^f 70
.10	re-qa-se-wo , wo-wo , wi-ja-te-we	OVIŞ ^f 80
.11	ti-mi-to , a-ke-e , o-pe-se-to , a-ke-o-jo	OVIŞ ^f 60
.12	ti-mi-to , a-ke-e , e-te-wa-jo ,	CAP ^f 30
.13	ti-mi-to , a-ke-e , a-no-ze-we	CAP ^f 36
.14	ti-mi-to , a-ke-e , qe-ta-ko	SUS ^m 30
.15	ti-mi-to , a-ke-e , *82-de[]	SUS ^f 12

PY Cn 254

(S4–H21)

.1a	pa-ra-jo	
.1	a-şı[-ja-ti-ja pa-]řo , tu-ru-we-u ,	OVIŞ ^m 180
.2	a-si-ja-ti-ja , pa-ro , ti-tu[]QVİŞ ^m 100

.3	a-si-ja-ti-ja , pa-ro , e-te-wa[OVIS ^s] 100
.4a	we-da-ne-wo	
.4	a-si-ja-ti-ja , pa-ro , a-no , de-ki-si-wo ,	OVIS ^m 80[
.5	a-si-ja-ti-ja_L pa-ro , ko-ru-ta-ta , we-da-ne-wo	OVIS ^m 80[
.6a	-jo	
.6	a-si-ja-ti-ja_L pa-ro , i-sa-na-o-ti , a-ke-o-	OVIS ^f [
.7	a-si-ja-ti-ja , pa-ro , ra-ke-u , we-da-ne-wo [
.8	a-si-ja-ti-ja , pa-ro , pi-ro-qo-[
.9	a-si-ja-ti-ja , pa-ro , a-ko-to-wo , a[
.10	[[a-si-ja-ti-ja pa-ro]]	

PY Cn 40, 599 form a single document recording flocks and herds of single sex and species associated with various places in the Hither Province. **Cn 600, 254** are a comparable document, in the same hand and stylus, for the Further Province. Animals are listed in the order OVIS^m, OVIS^f, CAP^m, CAP^f, SUS^m, SUS^f (although there are no SUS^m on **Cn 40, 599**). Each entry begins with a place name followed by the name of a herdsman, usually after the preposition *pa-ro* (in lines 2–15 of **Cn 600** the preposition is missing, and at least one of the names is demonstrably nominative). The entry ends with the animal ideogram and a numeral. Between the herdsman's name and the ideogram there may appear (i) nothing; (ii) the name of a 'collector' (usually) in the genitive case (e.g. *a-ko-so-ta-o* in **Cn 40.3**); (iii) the adjective *pa-ra-jo* /palaioi/ 'old, last year's' describing the animals; or (iv) the term *wo-ne-we*, which perhaps stands for /wornēwes/ 'lambs'. KILLEN (1984, 51) observes that these entries are similar in structure to those of the Knossos **Da–Dg** series, which he demonstrates record standing flocks involved in the production of lambs and wool (KILLEN 1964); *mutatis mutandis* he argues for a similar function for these Pylian records. If so, the *pa-ro* formulae would record the herdsmen under whose care the animals currently are, at the various places listed; and the sense of the *pa-ro* formulae, and of the place names, would be LOCATIVE. The majority of the herdsmen's names are of indeterminate dat.-loc. or instr. case, but *po-so-pe-re-i* in **Cn 40.2** is an unambiguous *s*-stem dat.-loc., and *i-sa-na-o-ti* in **Cn 254.6** is an unambiguous C-stem dat.-loc. We may note *en passant*, however, that one of the place names (*ma-ro-pi* in **Cn 40.8–9**) is instrumental,³ and another (*ti-mi-to* , *a-ke-e* in **Cn 600.11–15**) is an *s*-stem form in *-e-e* which could be instrumental.

³ cf. RUIJGH (1967, 368-369); the form *ma-ro* in **Cn 40.10, 12** is surely nominative of rubric, rather than an abbreviation of *ma-ro-pi*, *pace* Chadwick (VENTRIS – CHADWICK 1972, 559). As Ruijgh notes, we would be

TH Av 100

(304)

supra mutila

- .1] *uestigia*
 .2], po-te-we , si-to , ku-na-ki-si GRA 2 v 2 z 2
 .3]so , / si-to GRA 3
 .4a] VIR 1 MUL 1
 .4b]no pa-ro , zo-wa , e-re-u-te-ri
 .5] wi-ri-ne-u VIR 1

TH Av 101

(304)

supra mutila

- .1]*uest.*[
 .2]*ḏa-ṛo* VIR 1 *uest.*[
 .3]*po-me-ne* VIR 2 *ḏa*[
 .4] *a-ko-da-mo* VIR 2 T 6 V[
 .5]V 2 *ma-di-je* T 6 V 4 *ko-ru-we* T 2[
 .6a] *ku-su-to-ro-qa*
 .6b]-tē / *ṣi-tō_L to-pa-po-ṛo-i*[

KILLEN (1999, 219; 2001, 442-443) has argued that the Thebes Av tablets of hand 304, including Av 100, 101 above, record ‘allocations of foodstuffs to persons participating in religious festivals’, and are thus similar to the Fn series from Pylos. The reasons seem compelling. First, the amount (presumably of barley, HORD) allocated to *ma-di-je* on Av 101.5, viz. T 6 v 4, is the most common quantity allocated on PY Fn 79, which records allocations of HORD for those attending a five-day festival. Then, several of the names and occupational terms on this pair of tablets are associated with cult. An /ereutēr/ ‘inspector’ is found on PY Cn 3 ‘in the context of the supply of oxen, almost certainly for sacrifice’. The names *ma-di(-je)*, *a-ko-da-mo* and *ko-ru* recur on the Thebes Fq tablets, which are also records of allocations of cereals in connexion with religious festivals. The occupational term *to-pa-po-ṛo-i* ‘can plausibly be identified as a cult title’, /torpāp^horoīhi/ ‘basket-carriers’, for which we can compare the classical κωνηφόροι. And it is possible that the /poimenes/ ‘shepherds’ and /wrīneus/ ‘tanner, leather-worker’ were directly involved in the supply of animals for sacrifice and the subsequent processing of the hides of the victims.

dealing with an alternation between a singular and a plural form, as indeed with *pa-ki-ja-na* vs. *pa-ki-ja-ne*, *pa-ki-ja-si*, *pa-ki-ja-pi*.

If Killen's interpretation is correct, and I believe that it is, then the context here is one of disbursements from the palace, not of contributions to it; in **Av 100.4b** the phrase *pa-ro*, *zo-wa*, *e-re-u-te-ri*, in which the final noun is unambiguously a C-stem dat.-loc., is most likely then to record the current location of the woman (MUL) in line 4a, and possibly the tanner in line 6, perhaps for the purpose of allocating their rations.

§4. In those instances where the morphology following *pa-ro* is unambiguous we therefore see the distribution given below (Table 1). Although we cannot be completely certain about the sense involved, it does appear that there is a correlation between ABLATIVE sense and instrumental morphology on the one hand, and LOCATIVE sense and dative-locative morphology on the other.

Tablet	Sense	Dat.-loc. morphology	Instr. morphology
TH Uq 434	ABLATIVE	—	<i>pa-ro</i> , <i>te-qa-jo</i> , <i>qa-si-re-u-pi</i> <i>pa-ro</i> [] <i>je-u-pi</i>
PY An 129	LOCATIVE	<i>pa-ro</i> , <i>ka-ke-u-si</i>	—
PY Cn 40	LOCATIVE	<i>pa-ro</i> , <i>po-so-pe-re-i</i>	—
PY Cn 254	LOCATIVE	<i>pa-ro</i> , <i>i-sa-na-o-ti</i>	—
TH Av 100	LOCATIVE	<i>pa-ro</i> ... <i>e-re-u-te-ri</i>	—

Table 1. Sense and unambiguous morphology in *pa-ro* phrases.

Before the publication of **TH Uq 434** there was no reason to suppose that more than one case form followed *pa-ro*, whatever its sense. Although in the majority of instances the spelling was compatible with either instr. or dat.-loc. morphology, all of the unambiguous instances were clearly dat.-loc. On that basis I have argued elsewhere (THOMPSON 2000), following MORPURGO DAVIES (1966), that the use of *pa-ro* + dat.-loc. with ABLATIVE sense is similar to the construal of ABLATIVE prepositions with the dative in Arcado-Cypriot, and, in fact, that the Arcado-Cypriot phenomenon may constitute an isogloss inherited from Mycenaean or a close relative. In Arcado-Cypriot the ABLATIVE use of the dative is restricted to prepositional constructions. In other constructions Arcado-Cypriot, like the other dialects, uses the genitive with ABLATIVE force. I therefore argued that, like other dialects, both Arcado-Cypriot and Mycenaean had syncretised the inherited ablative case with the genitive and not, as some have supposed, with the instrumental. (In Arcado-Cypriot, so the other argument goes, the instrumental's subsequent syncretism with the dat.-loc. causes the

ABLATIVE force of the dative; but the use of the genitive with ABLATIVE force in non-prepositional constructions tells against this.) Now, however, as the table above shows, we apparently have evidence not only for a difference of case following *pa-ro* which correlates with a difference of sense, but also of clear ABLATIVE use of the instrumental. On the face of it, then, we have evidence which counters the analysis of THOMPSON (2000) and supports those who argue for a complete syncretism of instrumental and ablative in Mycenaean.

Before accepting this, however, we must be cautious. The evidence on which it is based is slight indeed. In fact, it rests solely on **TH Uq 434**. The discovery of a single tablet with LOCATIVE sense but instrumental morphology, or with ABLATIVE sense but dative-locative morphology would render it instantly invalid, and because the number of clear instances which we currently possess is too small to allow us to conduct statistical analyses of significance, we cannot be confident that such a tablet will not come to light. But future discoveries aside, this slender evidence in favour of an ablative-instrumental syncretism faces more serious and more immediate problems, because it ignores the counter-evidence which suggests a syncretism of instrumental with dative-locative already discussed in §2 above. And as MORPURGO DAVIES (1985, 100) has noted, if there is an alternative *o*-stem gen. sg. in *-o /-ō/* it would have to continue the inherited abl. **-ōt*, and this would entail a syncretism of ablative with genitive (as we would expect from comparison with every other Greek dialect) rather than with instrumental. But much more seriously—fatally, I think—the ablative-instrumental theory is in fact internally inconsistent.

Consider **PY Cn 40, 254**. Here *pa-ro* + dat.-loc. expressions stand after place names which are themselves of indeterminate morphology (*wa-no-jo*, *wo-wo* and *a-si-ja-ti-ja*) but which stand in parallel with unambiguously instrumental *ma-ro-pi* (**Cn 40.8.9**). Now, if the instrumental-ablative theory is correct *ma-ro-pi* and the other place names must have ABLATIVE force, and so must the *pa-ro* formulae. But in that case we have examples of explicit dat.-loc. morphology with ABLATIVE force and the clear correlation between morphology and force, and thus the reason for supposing an instrumental-ablative syncretism, is lost. If, on the other hand, *pa-ro* + dat.-loc. is LOCATIVE, then *ma-ro-pi* too must be LOCATIVE and, again, there cannot be an instrumental-ablative syncretism.

I can see only one coherent solution which resolves this dilemma, and that is the one presented in THOMPSON (2000). In summary, the instrumental and dative-locative had begun to syncretise such that while elements of instrumental morphology remained in use (and were perhaps still the only exponents of true INSTRUMENTAL-COMITATIVE and ORNATIVE force)

they could also express functions which properly belonged to the dative-locative. Now, in non-prepositional contexts the dative-locative (and thus also instrumental) expressed LOCATIVE force; but, by a simplification of the case government properties of prepositions identical to (perhaps even the ancestor of) that which resulted in Arcado-Cypriot ABLATIVE prepositions governing the dative (and similar to that which in Attic resulted in some prepositions which originally governed three cases dropping the dative and using the genitive even in LOCATIVE function), Mycenaean *pa-ro* + dative-locative (and thus also instrumental) could have either LOCATIVE or ABLATIVE force. Thus on **TH Uq 434** *pa-ro* + instrumental has ABLATIVE force, not because the instrumental *per se* has ABLATIVE force but because the syncretic dative-locative-instrumental can have ABLATIVE force after prepositions; and although this tablet at first sight provides evidence in favour of an instrumental-ablative vs. dative-locative split, in fact it supports only a dative-locative-instrumental syncretism. Nor should this come as any surprise, because this is exactly the same syncretism we observe in all of the other Greek dialects, including Arcado-Cypriot.

Rupert THOMPSON

Selwyn College, University of Cambridge

Cambridge, CB3 9DQ

U.K.

rjet1@cam.ac.uk

References

- ARAVANTINOS, VASSILIS L. – GODART, LOUIS – SACCONI, ANNA 2008, *La tavoletta TH Uq 434*, in SACCONI, ANNA – DEL FREO, MAURIZIO – GODART, LOUIS – NEGRI, MARIO (eds.), *Colloquium Romanum. Atti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma, 20-25 Febbraio 2006*, 23-33, vol. 1, Pisa, Roma.
- DORIA, MARIO 1968, *Strumentali, ablativi e dativi plurali in Miceneo: alcuni precisazioni, Atti e memorie del 1° Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia. Roma 27 Settembre - 3 Ottobre 1967*, 764-780, Roma.
- KILLEN, JOHN T. 1964, *The Wool Industry of Crete in the Late Bronze Age*, *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 59: 1-15.
- 1979, *The Knossos Ld(1) tablets*, in RISCH, ERNST – MÜHLESTEIN, HUGO (eds.), *Colloquium Mycenaeanum. Actes du sixième colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens tenu à Chaumont sur Neuchâtel du 7 à 13 septembre 1975*, 151-181, Neuchâtel.
- 1984, *The textile industries at Pylos and Knossos*, in PALAIMA, THOMAS G. – SHELMERDINE, CYNTHIA W. (eds.), *Pylos comes alive*, 49-63, New York.
- 1995, *Mycenaean o-pa*, in DEGER-JALKOTZY, SIGRID – HILLER, STEFAN – PANAGL, OSWALD (eds.), *Florent Studia Mycenaean. Akten des X. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Salzburg vom 1.-5. Mai 1995*, 325-341, vol. 2, Wien.
- 1999, *Some observations on the new Thebes tablets*, *BICS* 43: 217-219.
- 2001, *Religion at Pylos: the evidence of the Fn tablets*, in LAFFINEUR, ROBERT – HÄGG, ROBIN (eds.), *Potnia: deities and religion in the Aegean Bronze Age: proceedings of the 8th International Aegean Conference/8e Rencontre égéenne internationale, Göteborg, Göteborg University, 12-15 April 2000*, 435-443, Liège and Austin, TX.
- MILANI, CELESTINA 1958, *I segni a, a2, a3 (=ai?)*, *Aevum* 32 (2): 101-138.
- MORPURGO DAVIES, ANNA 1966, *An Instrumental-Ablative in Mycenaean?*, in PALMER, L. R. – CHADWICK, JOHN (eds.), *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*, 191-202, Cambridge.
- 1985, *Mycenaean and Greek Language*, in MORPURGO DAVIES, ANNA – DUHOUX, YVES (eds.), *Linear B, a 1984 Survey*, 75-125, Louvain-la-Neuve.
- PITEROS, CHRISTOS – OLIVIER, JEAN-PIERRE – MELENA, JOSÉ L. 1990, *Les inscriptions en Linéaire B des nodules de Thèbes (1982): la fouille, les documents, les possibilités d'interprétation*, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 114: 103-184.
- RUIJGH, C. J. 1967, *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam.
- THOMPSON, RUPERT J. E. 2000, *Prepositional Usage in Arcado-Cypriot and Mycenaean: a Bronze Age Isogloss?*, *Minos* 35 (395-430).
- VENTRIS, MICHAEL G. F. – CHADWICK, JOHN 1972, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, 2d edn., Cambridge.