In some important contributions E. Risch has formulated his standpoint about the genesis of the Greek language; an eminent merit of these works lies to my mind in his repeated and emphatic warnings against incautious use of the dialectal situation of archaic and classical times as a basis for the reconstruction of linguistic conditions and developments in the second millennium: in other words, against considering the division and arrangement of the Greek dialects visible in later times as a rather linear continuation of a dialectal situation in Mycenaean, Pre-Mycenaean, or even Proto-Greek times. We may differ in judging single phenomena: the results of his considerations that Risch has impressively summarized in 9 main theses cannot be disproved in any essential respect.

The development of numerous linguistic phenomena that serve to differentiate the Greek dialects of the first millennium B.C. and to constitute certain dialectal groups is to be dated to Post-Mycenaean times. The relatively late origin of some dialectal differences has been recognized for a long time, but often the necessary conclusions have not been drawn; in other cases the

---


3 *III*, pp. 107-109.
Mycenaean tablets have brought an explanation. We point only to the different development of the labiovelars followed by \( \epsilon \), to be dated as Post-Mycenaean, since Mycenaean still preserves the IE labiovelars in nearly all positions\(^4\).

The fact that in the Homeric poems the pronominal forms \( \delta, \eta, \tau \theta \) are used as demonstratives and have not yet taken on the function of articles\(^5\) harmonizes with the situation represented by the tablets: here the article is unknown. The later dialects have given the function of the article to the original demonstrative pronoun, and created new and different demonstratives by joining deictic particles to the original pronoun\(^6\) (for instance \( \delta \delta \varepsilon \), attested in most of the dialects after Homer\(^7\), Att. \( \delta \delta \varepsilon \), Arg. \( \tau \alpha-\delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \), El. and Boeot. \( \tau \delta \varepsilon \), Thess. \( \delta \nu \varepsilon \), Arc. \( \tau \omega \nu \) [gen. sg.] and \( \tau \nu \nu \), Cyp. \( \delta \varepsilon \), \( \tau \delta \nu \varepsilon \) and \( \delta \nu \nu \), \( \tau \nu \nu \)\(^8\)), but these variant developments clearly also belong to Post-Mycenaean times, and the differences in forming new demonstratives cannot be used as criteria for the reconstruction of older dialects\(^11\).

In his «Übersichtstabelle der besprochenen Dialektmerkmale» (I, p. 75) E. Risch has ranged the different forms of the modal particle (\( \delta \nu \), \( \kappa \), \( \kappa \varepsilon \), \( \kappa \kappa \)) among the group of the ‘old’ characteristics antedating 1200 B. C. But if the derivation of these different forms from an original \( *\kappa \varepsilon (v) \), \( \kappa \varepsilon \), proposed independently and in very similar detail by Kathleen Forbes\(^12\) and L. R. Palmer\(^13\), is correct —and in my opinion they are right\(^14\)— one

\(^{8}\) Cf. P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 20, 1932, pp. 228 f.
\(^{9}\) Cf. *ICS* nr. 306.5, 7.
\(^{10}\) Cf. *ICS* nr. 216 b.1; 215 b.1.
\(^{12}\) *Glotta* 37, 1958, pp. 179-182.
must suppose that in Mycenaean times there still existed a common Greek *κε(υ), κοὐ, whereas the differentiation to be found in the archaic and classical dialects belongs to Post-Mycenaean times.

The dating of the different development of the original syllabic ɣ to ρκ/αρ, ρο/ορ has been left undecided by Risch—in contrast to nearly all other scholars who, in view of the Mycenaean writing system, suppose a Mycenaean change of old ɣ to or (perhaps also to ρο and αρ), to be dated to a time preceding the tablets15, and who implicitly take as granted a corresponding though differing development in the other dialects, already completed in Mycenaean times. On this assumption it would be justified to use the different vocalizations of ɣ visible in the later dialects for the reconstruction of Mycenaean or Pre-Mycenaean dialect groups.

In the present paper it is not possible to reconsider in extenso all the problems connected with the different treatments of the IE syllabic liquids and nasals, and the whole learned discussion revived especially by the decipherment of the tablets; thus, for instance, I pass over all that might be said about the development of ɲ, ɳ and ŋ.

I would only remind the reader of the following point: some scholars, above all C. J. Ruijgh16, comparing the fact that, on the one hand, in the Mycenaean documents Proto-Greek ɣ seems to be represented in the developed form or, and, on the other, the similar occurrence in Arcadian and Cypriot, have inferred a close relationship between these dialects and Mycenaean, or have even taken Arcadian and Cypriot as immediate successors of Mycenaean.

This inference, however, drawn from the treatment of ɣ has considerably been weakened by the investigations of Anna Morpurgo Davies17, who has shown that in Arc.-Cypriot we probably have to suppose a normal development ɣ > ar/ra, whereas a development ɣ > or/ro perhaps happens only under certain condi-

tions. It is unnecessary to discuss this question in detail, as our observations are particularly concerned with the Mycenaean material\(^{18}\).

In my view, it ought seriously to be considered whether in the Mycenaean period we have to do with the preservation of original \(\ddot{r}\). It will not be possible, it is true, to prove such an assumption beyond doubt; but some observations seem to favour it.

We may begin with a phenomenon, hitherto rarely observed, and which may be easily clarified. The so-called long sonantic \(\ddot{r}\) (\(<\ddot{r}\)) seems (without exception) to have developed to \(r\ddot{a}\) by Pre-Mycenaean times.

1. *ka-ra-te-ra*, certainly designating a vessel in MY Ue 611, probably acc. *krâêra\(^{19}\), from nom. *krâêrë*, this being a \(-\tau\eta\rho\)-derivation from a dissyllabic root *krez\(^2\)/kre\(^2\)-, zero-grade *krêz\(^2\)-. *krâ-* may go back to *kre\(^2\)- as well as to *krêz\(^2\)-; but as agent nouns formed with \(-\tau\eta\rho\) show the zero-grade\(^{20}\) of the root, we are led to suppose original *krêz\(^2\)-êr.

2. *pa-ra-ke-se-u*, a personal name in PY Fn 324.10 (in dat. form *pa-ra-ke-se-we [-êwei]*)\(^{21}\), a shortened form in -eus *Prâkseus* of a Terpsimbrotos-Compositum e.g. *Prâksilâwos* (cf. later Πράξιλαδος\(^{21}\)). *πράξις* as the first element is derivated from πράττω/πρήσσω, this showing guttural enlargement of a root.

---

\(^{18}\) For the problems of the development of \(\ddot{r}\) in Greek 1 point to two recent works, accessible to me only after the Salamanca-Colloquium: J. L. O'Neil, «The Treatment of Vocalic R and L in Greek», *Glotta* 47, 1969, pp. 8-46, and Françoise Bader, «De myc. *Matoropuro, arepazoo* à grec Ματρόπολις, ἄλειψος: Le traitement des sonantes-voyelles au premier millénaire», *Minos* 10, 1969/1970, pp. 7-63. Especially the article of Mme Bader is of great importance in respect of the arguments and conclusions presented in this paper; but it would have led too far to enter into a systematic discussion of all the arguments of Mme Bader. I have also resigned the consideration of the interesting theories of F. R. Adrian, «La vocalización de las sonantes indo-europeas», *Emerita* 26, 1958, pp. 249-309: «Sobre la evolución griega de las sonantes indo-eur.», *Studia clásica et orientalia A. Pagliaro obieta* 1, 1969, pp. 63-74.
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As the action nouns on -tis/-sis are usually based on the zero-grade of the verbal root, a development πράξις < *πραξ- k-tis seems probable.

3. ka-ra-a-pi PY Ta 722.2, se-re-mo-ka-ra-a-pi Ta 708.2 (instrum. pl.), se-re-mo-ka-ra-o-re Ta 707.2; Ta 714.2, [[qo]-u-ka-ra-o-re]] Ta 714.2 (instr. sg.). For discussion of the complex problems posed by this term, I refer to the extensive and persuasive investigations of E. Risch. In view of Hom. κρατος it is most plausible to suppose for written ka-ra-a-pi a spoken krâha(p)phi, based on original *krâhɔ phi.

4. ta-ra-ke-wi PY An 172.11 is to be found in a context where a word designating provenance must be expected. It seems highly probable that the name should be read as /Thrâkhēwi- and that it should be compared with τραχος and the local name ῥαχις/ης.24 These words are based on a disyllabic root *dherd-gh-/*dhred-gh-; both normal grade *dhregh- and zero-grade *dhrggh- led to *thrakh-.25

5. ta-ra-nu «footstool» PY Ta 707 + /thrânum/, cf. Hom. ἄρης. Again it remains uncertain whether the (deverbative) derivation is formed from normal grade *dhregh- or zero-grade *dhrggh-.

For our investigation of (short) sonantic r, the Mycenaean spellings -Co-ro- and -Co- are of particular importance.

a) In some cases written -Co-ro- surely represents spoken /-Cro-/: the local name re-u-ko-to-ro is to be read /Leuktron/, and po-ro- in the title po-ro-ko-re-te seems to stand for /pro-/. b) In other cases the spelling -Co- surely renders spoken /-Cor-/: -wo-ko as the second element of a compound of the

---

22 SMEA 1, 1966, pp. 53-66.
23 But /karaha(p)phi/ is possible, too.
24 Cf. M. Lejeune, REG 75, 1962, p. 343; M. S. Ruipérez, Cambridge Colloquium, p. 214. Both scholars offer remarks on the possible word-formation which, however, may be ignored here, since the loss of the last sign does not allow definite conclusions.
type κουρωτρόφος must be read /-worgos/\(^{26}\), and the spelling of
the local name ko-tu- (PY An 615.16; An 943.3; Eq 213.4; Na
908) refers to a place Γόρτυς\(^{27}\).

c) There is only one certain case where \(r\) standing between
a vowel and a consonant is rendered by the sign for \(ro\) : a-ra-ro-
mo-te-me-na, -no represents spoken /ararmol-menai, -o/\(^{28}\).

Leaving aside the cases \(a\) and \(b\) where -Cro- or -Cor- is clearly
to be read, we turn to more problematic cases.

1. The Pylian place-name which is written in the forms
ma-to-ro-pu-ro (Cn 595.5) and ma-to-<pu-ro (Mn 1412.4)\(^{29}\) seems to
me to be of special importance. The supposition of Miss Mabel
Lang\(^{30}\) that the second form should be corrected to ma-to-<<ro><-
pu-ro encounters serious difficulties: particularly the existence of
similar spellings elsewhere. But even more important seems to
me to be the fact that we have to do with two different scribal
‘hands’: the Cn-tablet is written by hand 21, the Mn-tablet
by the scribe of Mn 1367-1412 (Class I?).

At first sight, the spelling ma-to-ro-pu-ro seems to point to a
spoken /Mâtorpulos/, whereas it would create difficulties to sup­
pose spoken /Mâtorpulos/ and thus to admit an exceptional spell­
ing -Co-ro- for /-Cor-, otherwise found only in the one case cited
above (c).

On the other hand, a reading /Mâtorpulos/ for written ma-to-
pu-ro seems to be suggested by the examples in \(b\) above. But
as the assumption may scarcely be justified that in the kingdom
of Pylos one and the same place had two phonetically different
names Mâtorpulos and Mâtorpulos, the solution must be found in
another direction.

---

27 Cf. A. Heubeck, Praegraeca, 1961, pp. 58-63 with bibliography; we point also
to po-pu-re-ja [porphureja] and po-qa [phorguû]; cf. M. Doria, AIV 119, 1960/1,
p. 722.
28 J. Chadwick-L. Baumbach, Vocabulary, p. 176 (with bibliography); M. Doria,
AIV 119, 1960/1, pp. 726 f.
29 For preliminary remarks cf. A. Heubeck, Kadmos 1, 1962, pp. 61 f.
The morphological rules for the formation of compounds lead one to expect that a word mâtër, when it forms the first element of a compound, will have an original form mâtr- (with the suffix -tër in the zero-grade). The thematization of consonantal stems with the link-vowel -o- belongs to Post-Mycenaean times; it is widespread in Homer31. Thus from the standpoint of morphology a Mycenaean form Mâtro-pulos is highly improbable, if not excluded.

The above difficulties seem to be eliminated if we admit that the Mycenaean Greeks of Pylos still pronounced the place name in its original form, i.e. Mâty-pulos, and that scribe 21 tries to render the phonetic sequence -tr- with the scriptio plenior -to-ro-, whereas the writer of Mn 1367-141432 uses only the sign -to-33.

2. Similar observations may be made on those compounds which have as a first element the numeral "4". At first sight, the form qe-to-ro-po-pi (PY Ae 27; 108; 134; 489), instr. pl., formed from nom. sg. *qe-to-ro-po /-pös/ «having four feet», seems to reflect a spoken /qereto-rp/. The explanation of this form could be given in different ways; one could suppose a) that r developed to ro in Myc. under certain circumstances, b) that the consonantal stem of the numeral was enlarged by the link-vowel o in the compound, c) that qe-to-ro-po-pi is an exceptional spelling for spoken /qereto-rp/.

Of these hypothetical possibilities the second (b) must be abandoned at once: o-thematization is Post-Mycenaean. It is significant that the word-formation of later times apparently reflects the old manner of word-composition: Hom. τετράκις and τετράκυκλος, Bocot. τετράμεινον (Del.3 523.14) and Thess. πετροετηρίδα (Del.3 617g) still clearly evidence the old -tr-.

The other solution, (a), supposing an exceptional development r > Myc. ro, is impugned by the generally accepted, though

32 For valuable information (by letter 2.11.69) I am grateful to Dr. J.-P. Olivier.
33 The later names and nouns which have μπτρο- as the first part of a compound (cf. esp. Μπτρό-πολις) show secondary o-thematization. I thank Mme Fr. Bader for having shown to me that the personal name Μπτράδωρος (Pape-Benseler s. v.) does not exist (cf. G. Kaibel, IG XIV 306).
disputable rule $r > \text{Myc}.$ or; and the assumption of an exceptional spelling for spoken $q^\text{etor-}$ (c) encounters certain fundamental difficulties.

My own assumption, that the writer of the Ae-tablets saw the possibility of rendering spoken $q^\text{etor-}$ by $qe-to-ro-$, is supported by observations on the Mycenaean word designating «table». That $to-pe-za$ (esp. in the Pylian Ta-tablets) and later τράπεζα are of the same origin cannot be doubted; τράπεζα is to be derived from *τρέπεζα, and this *τρέπεζα must be found in Myc. $to-pe-za$, whether we read, traditionally, $/torpeza/$ or, as I would prefer, $/trpeza/$. As in our first example $ma-to-ro-pu-ro/ma-to-pu-ro$, the alternative spellings -to-ro-p. and -to-p. for a Myc. phonetic sequence which goes back to an original -τρυ- both in $qe-to-ro-po-pi$ and in $to-pe-za$ seem to point to the conclusion that this old sequence -τρυ- is still alive in Mycenaean.

This conclusion does not depend on whether or not we decide that the word for «table» contains as its first element the numeral «four» (like the designation of «four-footed animals»), or upon whether or not this is a shortened form of the numeral. As is well known, doubts have been cast on the traditional view by A. P. Treweek34; his objections, however, are not insurmountable. That Myc. $q^\text{etor-}$ and $τρ-$ in the words cited above have the same etymological origin —I offer no firm explanation of how the shortening $q^\text{etor-} > τρ-$ is to be explained— is supported by the existence side by side of the Hom. words τετραφάλαιας (epithet of «helmet») and τρυφάλαια, both apparently composed of the same elements and illustrating the same form of the helmet35. τετρα- shows the normal development of the form $q^\text{etor-}$ that is

---


35 The semantic difficulties, long discussed, may be ignored here; A. Hoekstra seems to have provided the solution of the problem: *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes*, 1965 (abbr.: *Prototypes*), pp. 66-69.
to be expected in composition, τρυ- shows a development of old τρ- found elsewhere that contrasts with normal τρ- > tra-36.

As a further confirmation, one may adduce a likely conjecture of H. Mühlestein's37. In the textile tablets at Knossos we find the term to-mi-ka (L 764: to-mi-ka TELA3; L 761: ra-su-ti-jo / to-mi-ka[; L 7400+Lc 7402+Ra 825038: ]to-mi-ka TELA2 12[]), strikingly reminiscent of the Hesychius gloss τριμύσκον ἵματιον. 'Αστέρι. The suggestion of Mühlestein that we have to do with two old parallel formations: trimiskos 'dreifädig, dreigezwirnt' —the form is perhaps to be found in Ld 788 A: ti-ri-[mi-ka?, B pa-we]-a2 ke-ro-ta[— and tormiskos 'vierfädig, viergezwirnt', is attractive. to-mi-ka, which we prefer to read tpyika, seems to show a formation like τρόπεζα and τρυφάλεια.

3. Of similar significance are the alternative forms to-no and to-ro-no-. In to-no (PY Ta 707.1,2 +) the Myc. word for «throne» is undoubtedly to be found39, and to-ro-no-wo-ko (KN As 1517.11) surely designates «throne-maker(s)»40. It is less probable that the professional name has as its first element the word pl. θρόνα («Blumenstickerereien»); in Mycenaean times, as today, embroidering may have been a task of women41.

As readings for the two forms cited one may suppose thronos and thronos; but in this case, also, it seems difficult to assume two different, exchangeable phonetic forms for one and the same object. According to my conjecture, both spellings reflect spoken thrho-. It must not be concealed that this explanation does not

37 Studia Mycenaea Brno, pp. 115 f.; Atti Roma, p. 813.
41 In X 192+L 8022 (L; cf. J. T. Killen and J.-P. Olivier, Cambridge Colloquium, p. 50) is to be found the word to-ni-ja, probably describing TELA more exactly. Should to-ni-ja be understood as an -ιον-derivative of θρόνα and design clothing adorned with θρόνα? We need not decide here whether in Hom. χρυσόθρόνος θρόνος or θρόνα is to be found; cf. H. Frisk GEW I, p. 686, and the critical remarks of P. Chantraine, Kratylos 7, 1962, p. 169.
remove all the difficulties. We should be obliged to interpret Ἑρόνος as an Aeol. form (with aeol. ἥ > ὅ), whereas in the later Ἑρόναξ 'footstool' as well as in Θερόναξ, a local name found in Laconia and Argolis, we should have to do either with a development ἥ > ὅ or with a metathesis ὅ > ὅ, both of which assumptions raise difficulties. The name Θερόναξ could belong to a Pre-Doric, «Achaean» layer in the Peloponnese⁴², but the noun Θερόναξ, as O. Masson has underlined⁴³, is, contrary to the widely-held view, certainly not a specifically Cypriot characteristic, and A. Morpurgo Davies, finally⁴⁴, has shown that in Arc.-Cypr. a development ἥ > ὅ is by no means normal⁴⁵. The formation of the supposed ὑθρόνος also raises difficulties: is a -νοσ derivation from the root *ὁδήρ- in the zero-grade ὅδήρ- possible?

4. Unsolved problems of a different kind are raised by the variant writings to-ро-q.- and to-q.- in several words. ku-su-to-ro-qa is to be found in KN B 817; PY Ec 411 and Er 880.8⁴⁶; on the other hand, in PY Eb 847.2 a short form ku-su-to-qa seems deleted, as the drawing of E. L. Bennett⁴⁷ suggests. That in all cases a term for «sum» (in the widest sense) is intended can reliably be deduced from the context; interpretations proposed include ksuntroqʰā, ksuntroqʰhā or ksunstroqʰhā. The last alternative is the least likely in view of etymological reasons⁴⁸; but a clear decision between them is scarcely possible⁴⁹.

If ku-su-to-qa is correctly restored and does not represent a scribal error, the interchangeable forms -to-ro-qa and -to-qa could point to a spoken -τρο(q)(ʰ)ā; but as a nominal formation, with -ā almost necessarily presupposes the ὀ-grade of the verbal root

⁴² O. Masson by letter 24.1.64.
⁴⁴ Atti Roma, pp. 807 ff.
⁴⁵ Cf. E. Vilborg, Grammar, p. 54; C. J. Ruijgh, Études, p. 113.
⁴⁶ In KN De 1371+X 1480+Dv 7115 (De), however, a restoration ku-su]-to-ro-qa seems impossible, as J.-P. Olivier, Cambridge Colloquium, p. 70, has shown; the sign-group ]-to-ro-qa is the second part of a personal name.
⁴⁷ PT II, p. 100.
⁴⁸ Vocabulary, p. 225 (with bibliography).
of τρέφω or τρέπω (cf. later τρωφή, τροπή), one is inclined to read -troq\(\theta\)(h)α and take the writing in Eb 847.2 as an error.

A comparable change is to be found in the Fh-tablets of Knossos. The form to-ro-qa in Fh 358; 376 (..]-ro-qa)\(^{50}\); 5446.2; 5497, which also appears on Fh 391, too (where it is written erroneously as ro-to-qa), alternates with the short form to-qa on Fh 339, which undoubtedly has the same meaning. If the word is to be read troq\(\theta\)(h)α, a scribal error is evident on Fh 339\(^{51}\). It is less cogent to suppose such an error if to-ro-qa/to-qa figures as a personal name, as L. Godart thinks; in this case a spoken τροq\(\theta\)-seems conceivable\(^{52}\).

The personal name e-u-to-ro-qo (PY Jn 478.10) certainly has an o-grade in -troq\(\theta\)(h)os as the second element of the compound. The Myc. noun to-qi-, probably «spiral», to be found in the instrum. form to-qi-de (PY Ta 642.3 +) as well as in the derivatives to-qi-de-jo, -a and to-qi-de-we-sa, is mostly understood as formed from τρέπω: torq\(\theta\)is, -idos. This assumption would presuppose a derivation from zero-grade *τροq\(\theta\)-; I ask therefore if the Myc. word should not be read τροq\(\theta\)is\(^{53}\).

5. A comparable case, hitherto unknown, is provided by the archive of Mycenae. As J.-P. Olivier\(^{54}\) has seen, in Oi 702.3 po-po-i is to be read, not po-po-re; thus an inexplicable word-form disappears, and the possibility arises of identifying the correct form po-po-i with po-ro-po-i in Oi 701.4. Since in the Oi-tablets the same «receivers» are named repeatedly, this assumption seems very probable. Of the two alternatives offered by J.-P. Olivier (ad loc.), either to emend 702.3 to po-<ro>-po-i or to accept a «less expanded spelling», the second seems nearer to the true\(^{55}\). I would suppose spoken ρ, rendered in different ways. Unfortunately the etymology gives no help. Of the two proposals

\(^{50}\) Cf. L. Godart, SMEA 8, 1969, p. 52 n. 46.


\(^{52}\) For a personal name to-ro-qa cf. the above cited name J-to-ro-qa.

\(^{53}\) Cf. Vocabulary, pp. 250 f.

\(^{54}\) MT IV, p. 22.

\(^{55}\) This opinion is now also preferred by J.-P. Olivier, Kadmos 8, 1969, p. 53, as Oi 702 and 701 are written by different scribes.
hitherto made for *po-ro-po-, pōl-opos\(^{56}\) and *propos\(^{57}\), the first should be rejected if our conjecture is correct.

6. Also of relevance to the present discussion are two designations of place which each have as their second element -a-ki-ri-jo, and which apparently form a sort of contrast to one another. On the one hand we have *u-pi-ja-ki-ri-jo, an attribute to nom. pl. ku-re-we on PY An 654.6, which some time ago I explained as a compound with prepositional *u-pi-\(^{58}\): *upi-akriói. Its counterpart is the form *u-pa-ra-ki-ri-ja PY An 298.1, to be interpreted either as a qualifying adjective connected with the (abl.) place-name ra-wa-ra-\(\text{la}_{2}\), or as a place-name in -ijä; certainly it is identical with (abl.) *u-po-ra-ki-ri-ja, a toponym in Cn 45.4-7,11\(^{59}\). For the word-formation the later names Διακρία, Διάκριοι and 'Επάκριοι, 'Επόκριοι may be compared; above all, the Myc. forms *u-pa-ra-ki-ri-ja/*u-po-ra-ki-ri-ja have their exact equivalents in the later expressions τὰ ὑπεράκρια, οἱ 'Υπεράκριοι.

However, the precise phonetic shape of the name written either as *u-pa-r.- or as *u-po-r.- is disputed; some regard the *upor-form as original and, consequently, the *upar-form as having developed secondarily by regressive assimilation (o - a > a - a)\(^{60}\). Others think *upar- original\(^{61}\). But the assumption of an old doublet *ὑπόρ beside normal ὑπέρ seems arbitrary, and, if one points to the correspondence between *upar- and Pamphylian. ὑπάρ, *upor-remains unexplained. It is a likely supposition that the two different spellings do not represent two phonetically different forms of the same place-name, but one and the same phonetic form,
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which could be rendered according to Myc. spelling practices in two different ways. I would suggest a spoken $upr(r)-akrija$, which was heard by scribe 3 as uprakrija and consequently written with the empty vowel $a$ in the syllable $pa$, whereas the other writer (21), rendered the phonetic sequence $-pr(r)a-$ with $-po-ra$. In every case, this explanation can start from a form $upr-$, indirectly attested by Pamphyl. $\ddot{\psi}p\omega\rho$; the fact that in Mycenaean the form $upr-$ preceding a second element with an initial vowel remained dissyllabic and did not become $upr-$, is probably to be explained by the analogical effect of other compounds in which the second part had an initial consonant. A comparable case will be discussed below.

7. With the different spellings of the toponym just mentioned E. Risch has compared the variant forms of a personal name (or title?), written $o-pe-te-re-u$ at PY Ea 805; Eb 294.1 and $o-pe-to-re-u$ at Ep 704.1. These varying spellings of the same name are best explained if we suppose spoken $*opetr(r)eus$. At present, however, we have no means of confirming this suggestion by etymology. The explanation offered by Mme. Monique Gérard-Rousseau seems as erroneous as the earlier attempts that she cites.

8. Also relevant to the present discussion are the personal names $a-no-me-de$ (PY Jn 706.5) and $a-no-qa-ta$ (often mentioned in Knossos, see below), which H. Mühlstein explained a long time ago in a clearly correct manner. (I pass over the less certain examples $a-no de-ki-si-wo$, $a-no-zo-jo$ and $a-no-qa-si-ja$.) In the

---

62 For $u$- (instead of $hu$-) cf. C. J. Ruijgh, Études, p. 68.
63 A similar explanation is proposed by F. W. Householder jr., Glotta 38, 1960, p. 10; cf. also E. Risch, Cambridge Colloquium, p. 156.
64 Cambridge Colloquium, p. 156.
66 H. Mühlstein, MH 15, 1958, pp. 223-225; Atti Pavia, pp. 361-365; MH 22, 1965, p. 159. Inexplicably, the interpretation of H. Mühlstein has been doubted by several scholars, e. g. by L. R. Palmer, Interpretation, p. 81, and most recently by C. J. Ruijgh, Études, pp. 353 ff., whose own explanation is scarcely satisfactory. We note the acceptance of the interpretation by M. Lejeune, BSL 60, 1965, p. 15.
67 M. Gérard-Rousseau, Mentions, pp. 32-34, lists the explanations given hitherto.
first part of these compounds anr- is to be found, and I would posit this phonetic shape —not anor-, as Mühlestein suggests—for Mycenaean also. Consequently, we must read Anr-mëdës and Anr-q^hontâs. We need not repeat the ingenious explanation of Mühlestein in detail; we restrict ourselves to pointing out that, morphologically, as a first part of a compound, anr- is the only possible form. This old athematic formation is recognizable in later ἀνδρώπισσα, ἀνδράκος etc. (with *anr- > *anra- > andra-), whereas a form like Ἀνδρομηθῆς for instance already presupposes the possibility of thematizing consonantal stems in the first element which arose in the Post-Mycenaen period.

To the forms interpreted by Mühlestein, I think it possible to add the personal name a-no-ra-ta (PY An 340.12; Jn 832.15), too. This I read as Anr(r)-altâs, and interpret it as «he who nourishes, makes grow, men»68, just as pu-ra-ta (PY Jn 605.3, 11) may be interpreted as Pur-altâs: «he who nourishes the fire». As in our example (6), the analogical effect of names like Anr-mëdës and Anr-q^hontâs seems to have prevented a development (Anr(r)-altâs) > *Anraltâs > *Andraltâs, whose second phase (-VnrV- > -VndrV-) is attested in several names and nouns: a-di-ri-jo /Andrijos, -ijon/, qe-ra-di-ri-jo /Qël-andrijos /; a-re-ka-sa-da-ra /Aleksandrâ/ and wi-ja-da-ra /Wijandrd/ as well as in ἀνδρός, whose Myc. instr. form is attested: a-di-ri-ja-te /andrijantê/.

The proposed transliteration /Anrq^hontâs/ would become still more probable if the identity of the names or even the persons a-no-go-ta and a-na-go-ta could be proved. a-no-go-ta is the name of an important man in Knossos, named on many tablets70 as an «owner» of women (Ak 615.1 and probably Ap 618 + Ap 633 + X 5922; cf. J. T. Killen, loc. cit., p. 55) as well as an «owner/collector» of flocks (at e-ra). In B 798.4 a-na-go-ta is named in parallel to ko-ma-we-ta (5) and ra-wo-qo-no (7). The fact that a ko-ma-we /Komawens/ appears as an owner of flocks in some places, and a ra-wo-qo-no /Lâwoq^honos/ is named (2×) in the same

---

70 The collection of A. Morpurgo, Lexicon s. u. is supplemented by J. T. Killen and J.-P. Olivier, Cambridge Colloquium, pp. 55, 68.
capacity at da-wo, may suggest that the three persons named in B 798.4, 5, 7 are identical with a-no-qo-ta, ko-ma-we and ra-wo-qo-no named on the D-tablets. Certain difficulties, however, remain: if the persons, enumerated in B 798, are named in the nominative (o-pi-te-u-ke-we .10, in this case, would be plural: -ēwes), we would expect the form ko-ma-we; if they are in the dative (o-pi-te-u-ke-we then would be dat. sg.: -ēweī), we would expect ko-ma-we-te; and if they are in the accusative (thus H. Mühlstein, Atti Pavia, p. 363), ko-ma-we-ta would be the correct form (Komâwenta) but o-pi-te-u-ke-we would scarcely be explicable. Is it possible to assume that the scribe, having written a-ke-ta .3, a-na-qo-ta .4, has in .5 erroneously added the sign -ta to the sign-group ko-ma-we, also?

In spite of all the difficulties71, the identity of a-no-qo-ta/a-na-qo-ta seems likely. The scribe of B 798 (107) has written only 4 tablets, none of which have the form a-no-qo-ta; for rendering -nr- he may have preferred the sign -na- to the sign -no-.

The two following examples are adduced only with reserve.

9. The much-discussed alternation of a-re-pa-zo-o (PY Un 267.2; 249.1; cf. a-re-pa Un 718.8; Wr 1437; instr. a-re-pa-te Un 267.3) and a-re-po-zo-o admits different explanations72; should we assume a spoken aleiphr- for both spellings?

10. The term a-mo-ra-ma which appears in Knossos on two tablets (Am 600 + X 665 + X 830773; Am 601) is convincingly interpreted by H. Mühlstein74 as «Tag für Tag». He reads âmôr-âmar75, but a form âm(r)-âma (< -âm(r)?) —cf. our remarks on u-po-ra-ki-ri-ja and a-no-ra-ta— with zero-grade âm(r)-

is to be preferred, since it is more likely in the compound than āmōr-.

As in the examples mentioned above, I would propose to read the following words in which written -Co-C- has been hitherto read as -CorC-, and in which -Co-C- seems likely to reflect -CrC-, actually with -Cᵢ₄C-:

11. do-ka-ma-i (PY An 1282.3): dygmahi⁷⁶;
12. o-pa-wo-ta (PY and KN): op-āwṛta⁷⁷;
13. pa-wo-ke, gen. -ko (PY Aa 795; Ab 558; Ad 691; La 632): -wṛges, -ōṅ⁷⁸;
14. to-si-ta (PN in PY Cn 719.2): Thṛṣṭīs⁷⁹;
15. u-do-no-o-i (PY Fn 187.13): uḍṛ-nōhoiḥ⁸⁰;
16. wo-do-we (PY Fr 1203 +): ṣṛdwren⁸¹;
17. wo-ze etc. (cf. A. Morpurgo Davies, Lexicon, p. 369 f.): ṣṛzew⁸².

But as we have tried to show, spoken -Cᵢ₄C- may also be rendered by the spelling -Co-ro-C-. It would lead us too far to discuss all the relevant forms; I would point briefly to 3 examples:

18. ko-ro-ku-ra-i-jo (PY An 656.7 +) has been connected with Κορκύρα (Documents, p. 398); in this case, the spelling could render spoken kṛku-. But this etymological proposal is to be rejected⁸³; it is more probable to assume a first element kroku-, i.e. a regular spelling ko-ro-, representing /kro-/⁸⁴.

---

⁷⁶ A. Morpurgo Davies, Atti Roma, p. 806 (with bibliography).
⁷⁷ A. Morpurgo, Lexicon, s. u., and Atti Roma, p. 811.
⁷⁸ Fr. Bader, Demiourgos, pp. 163 f.; A. Morpurgo Davies, Atti Roma, pp. 811 f.
⁷⁹ M. Doria, AIV 119, 1960/1, p. 728; H. Mühlestein, Studia Mycenae Brno, p. 116 (both with bibliography).
⁸¹ A. Morpurgo Davies, Atti Roma, p. 812.
⁸² Fr. Bader, Demiourgos, pp. 3 ff.; A. Morpurgo Davies, Atti Roma, p. 804.
19. *mo-ro-qa*, a title of high officials in Pylos, attested also on two Knossos tablets\(^85\), has hitherto been variously explained\(^86\); of the suggestions offered, H. Mühlestein’s merits special attention\(^87\). In keeping with the orthographical rules, he reads *mrog\(^u\)ās* to be derived from *mrg\(^g\)ās*, whose normal Att.-Ion. descendant could be found in βράβης (by-form of βραβεύς). The development \(\tau > r\), however, assumed by Mühlestein in this case, seems impossible. According to the traditional opinion, a form *morq\(^u\)ās* would be expected, and this form should have been written *mo-qa*. As we have proposed here, a Myc. word *mrg\(^u\)ās* could also have been rendered by *mo-ro-qa*; but it remains striking that the scribes of class I who otherwise seem to prefer the shortened spelling (in this case *mo-qa*) also use the «full» writing *mo-ro-qa* (An 519.2; Jo 438.5). It should not be excluded that *mo-ro-qa* represents spoken *mrog\(^u\)ās* (with o-grade of the root *mreg\(^g\)*-*), whereas βράβης comes from another form *mrg\(^g\)ās* (with zero-grade of the same root).

20. With some probability the adjective *wo-ro-ki-joe-joe* (PY Er 312.7; Un 718.11) is to be read *wrô-\(^8\)*.

The Mycenae tablets seem to differ from those found in Pylos and Knossos in certain points as regards both dialect and spelling rules. It will not be possible to clarify in which way the scribes of Mycenae have treated etymological or spoken \(\tau\). We only adduce a few possible examples; the pair *po-ro-po-* : *po-po-* (5) has already been discussed.

21. *tu-ka-ta-si* (MY Oe 112.2) is to be interpreted as dat. pl. of thugatér; cf. dat. sg. *tu-ka-te-re* Oe 106.2; nom. *tu-ka-te-qe* /thugatér-q\(^e\)e/ V 659. -\(^t\)a-si then would render spoken -\(^t\)si. It may be noticed that the reading *tu-ka-to-si*, proposed by H. Mühle-

---


stein, but rejected by J.-P. Olivier would correspond better to the spelling rules known from Pylos.

22. _wa-ra-pi-si-ro_ (MY Au 102.1) has been interpreted as a «short form» _Wrapsilos_, based on a «Terpsimbrotos-Composition» _Wrapsi-lawos_. This explanation, however, presents some morphological difficulties. An action noun in _-tis/-sis_ should in its first part regularly have the zero-grade of the verbal root, and an original *_wrtpis_ would be expected. According to the traditional opinion, this form should develop in Mycenaean to *_worpsis_, written *_wo-pi-si_. That the Mycenaean writer has tried to render spoken _wrpsi_ with _wa-ra-pi-si_ seems possible, but is not demonstrable.

23. The phonetic shape and the meaning of the adjective _wo-ro-ne-ja_ (MY Oe 111.2) has roused lively discussion. Perhaps one should assume (with L. R. Palmer) a derivative of _φήν_, _φνος_, i.e. an original form *_wrnejos_; but it would be striking if beside _wo-ro-ne-ja_ there were an alternative, but differently formed adjective _we-re-ne-ja_ /_wrēnea_ (PY Ub 1318.7) with the same meaning. The two possibilities suggested by Palmer, to assume either spoken _worneja_ (written in _scriptio plena_) or _wroneja_ (with metathesis), are unconvincing; perhaps one may suppose spoken *_wrneja_. If the interpretation I have proposed for the female personal name _pi-ro-wo-na_ (MY V 659.7) is correct, in this word we should find the corresponding «short» spelling of spoken *_wfr_. (Philoi-wrnā); the alternative spelling of *_wfrn,-_ by *_wo-ro-n,-_ or *_wo-n,-_ could be paralleled in the Pylian cases _ma-lo-_: _ma-lo_- etc.

89 By letter 27.7.62; hectograph 15.1.63.
91 A. Heubeck, _IF_ 64, 1959, pp. 119-126.
With these 23 examples the list of Myc. words containing etymological or spoken \( r \) is not exhausted. Of the remainder I would only mention the following, each of which in any event presents difficulties: e-ra-pe-me-na and ra-phe, pa-we-a, ta-pa, ka-ri-se-u, wa-no.65

In his contribution to the Cambridge Colloquium (pp. 150-157) E. Risch has rightly pointed to the importance the distinction of «hands» in the Pylian texts has for judging the dialectal situation of the Mycenaean period. He has adduced some examples (loc. cit., p. 156) which have also been mentioned above. Viewing this evidence from another angle, however, I believe that in some cases the diverging orthography of different scribes is perhaps to be explained by the assumption that we have to do with different attempts to render spoken \( r \) with the insufficient resources of the Mycenaean syllabary.

The tabulation of certain significant writing variants does not produce a fully consistent picture, but seems in some measure instructive.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. -Co-ro- (-Co-r(V)-)</th>
<th>2. -Co.-</th>
<th>3. Other possibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) PY matoropuro: 21 (II)</td>
<td>PY matoropuro: (1?)</td>
<td>PY uparakirija: 3 (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) PY qetoropopi: 42 (III)</td>
<td>PY topeza: 2 (I)</td>
<td>PY opetereu; 41, 43 (III) (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) KN torono: 102?</td>
<td>PY toqi: 2 (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) PY kusutoroga: 24 (II), 41 (III); KN: 137</td>
<td>PY popoi: 64</td>
<td>PY arenazoo: (I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) MY poropoi: 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) PY uporakirija: 21 (III)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) PY opetereu: 1 (I) (I)**</td>
<td>PY anomede: 21 (III) (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) PY anorata: 21, 22 (III)</td>
<td>PY arepozoo: 43 (III) (I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) MY woroneja: 51</td>
<td>MY pirozona: 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Roman numerals designate the classes, Arabic numerals the hands of scribes.
** The forms, noted with (I), do not fit the pattern which seems to emerge from examples (1)-(4), (6).

Unless I am mistaken, there exists a second means of assigning the vocalization of syllabic \( r \) to the Post-Mycenaean period. In this regard also we owe important insights to H. Mühlestein, who was the first to see the problem clearly and draw the necessary conclusions.

In our text of Homer there are numerous passages in which formulae appear not to conform to the metrical rules, but apparently loose their irregularity if we replace them by the morphologically older forms to be reconstructed for Pre-Homeric times. H. Mühlestein\(^6\) has rightly stressed the importance of one epic formula which seems to allow an insight into the prehistory of epic diction:

\[
\text{(ψυχή...)} \lambda i\pi o\upsilon' \ \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\rho o\tau\iota\varepsilon\tau\alpha \ kai \ \eta\beta\eta\nu.
\]

The formula appears in this form \( \Pi 857 = \chi 363 \); a variant ("Αχιλλεύς ...\) Πατρόκλου ποθέων \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\rho o\tau\iota\varepsilon\tau\alpha \ \tau\epsilon \ \kappaαι \ \mu\nu\epsilon\nu \ \eta\upsilon \) occurs at \( \Omega \ 6 \).

We need not discuss the problems concerning the transmission of the text; these have been cautiously and persuasively elucidated by J. Latacz in an excellent paper\(^7\). Undoubtedly Homer wrote \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\rho o\tau\iota\varepsilon\tau\alpha \) and meant \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\rho o\tau\iota\varepsilon\tau\tau\sigma \). We may also ignore here the vexed problem of how to define and to limit the term "epic formula"\(^8\); we may assume in any event with some confidence that the passage cited (\( \Pi 857b = \chi 363b \)) has formulaic character: Homer is using a group of words formulated by his predecessors and given to him by the tradition of oral epic poetry\(^9\).

As is well known, M. Parry had already shown in his fundamental works on oral poetry that certain prosodic irregularities of the epic text may not be explained by exceptional rules formulated ad hoc; they owe their existence to the fact that the epic poets prefer to admit a violation of prosodic rules resulting either

---

8. Cf. the prudent exposition of the problems given by A. Hoekstra, *Prototypes*, pp. 7-30 and *passim*.
from the necessary adaptation of the formula to the required syntax or from phonetic developments than to give up using the formula. Thus it seems attractive to explain the prosodical irregularity admitted by Homer (derabadapotía should «normally» be scanned — — , not — — as it is in the formula), by the assumption that the earlier phonetic shape of the word allowed a regular scansion. In fact, ᾨδρότης must go back to a form *anytā-, this having the normal zero-grade of the noun-stem. The accusative *anrtāa shows the prosodical sequence — , which is usable within the metrical structure of the hexameter and fits the formula. But since, according to the current opinion, the vocalization of r is already to be found in Mycenaean times, we should be obliged to date the origin of the formula and at least a certain part of epic formulaic diction as Pre-Mycenaean. Many scholars, it is true, are inclined to trace the tradition of epic diction back into the Mycenaean period, but are they willing to extend this line backwards into the middle of the second millennium B.C.? C. Gallavotti has shown the almost absurd consequences which result from following this argument to its logical conclusions.

If, as is generally supposed, the development r > or is Mycenaean, we should be obliged to assume that in Mycenaean times the original *anrtāa had already got a prosodical shape which no longer fitted the hexameter (*anortāa: — — ), and that in the further development of epic diction Myc. *anortāa had been replaced by the Aeolic form (*anrotāa > *androtāa: — — ), and lastly, that the Ionian singers had taken over ᾨδρότητα (with α > η) in its Aeolic shape.

In my opinion, the Mycenaean (or even Pre-Mycenaean) origin of Greek epic poetry, which has its culmination in Homer, is by no means proved, and in fact the sharp hiatus between the end of the Mycenaean period and the gradual reorganization of political and cultural life, which began after the end of the manifold migrations in the Greek homeland and the Aegean, makes it improbable that it was only heroic poetry which survived

100 Cf. H. Mühlestein, loc. cit.
101 Atti Roma II, pp. 847 f.
and resisted the storms that had almost wholly destroyed all the other elements of Mycenaean culture.

It seems better to assume an origin of epic poetry in the period of migrations between 1200 and 1000 at the earliest; the formula whose later-developed form is found in Π 857 = Χ 363 and Ω 6 may have been amongst others to be formed at this time when spoken ḥ was still preserved. Then, with and after the consolidation of the tribes and ethnic groups in their later habitats, the vocalization of ḥ may have ensued, besides many other phonetic developments which contributed to the dialectal differentiation of these groups. That it did not result in *anratāta > *ἀνδροτήτα may be due to the analogical influence of recent compounds with thematized ἄνδρο- as their first part, like Ἄνδροκλής (in contrast to the correct Ion. development *ἀντκας > ἄνδροκας etc.); but ἄνδροτήτα could also be a loan-form from Aeolic, where this form would be normal: *anftāta > *anrotāta > ἄνδροτήτα.

In an important paper, P. Wathelet\textsuperscript{102} has investigated all the Homeric cases, where short vowels preceding muta cum liquida are treated as short, and has provided what is undoubtedly their correct explanation. In a certain number of expressions, all of which give the impression of being of archaic and formulaic character, the need for short scansion resulted from the vocalization of the syllabic liquida that took place after the expression had been formed. The striking scansion — o o — of νυξ ὀμβροτή (E 78) seems to result from the origin of the expression: original *nuks amptā, to be scanned — o o —, is correct. The same is to be said of ἀ(μ)βροτᾶξομεν (K 65), scanned — o — — —, < *ἀμβροτᾶξομεν < *amptaksomen\textsuperscript{103}, and (ἀσπίδος) ἀμφιβρότης (B 389, M 402, Y 281; transformed and enlarged Α 32), scanned — — — — —, < *amphi-mptā\textsuperscript{104}: It is to be noticed that in all these cases it is not the Ionic, but the Aeolic development ḥ > ro that is to be found.

---


\textsuperscript{103} G. J. Ruijgh, \textit{L' élément achéen dans la langue épique}, 1957, p. 74.

The assumption of P. Wathelet, that from phenomena of this kind the singers seem to have assumed the right to make use of the possibility of so-called correptio Attica in other more recent formulations, and to think it metrically allowable, is very probable. On the other hand, as we have said above, I am sceptical about his inference that these archaic expressions are proofs of a Pre-Mycenaean heroic poetry, and propose another solution.

As H. Mühlestein, J. Latacz, and P. Wathelet have seen, the formula 'Ενυσλίω ἀνδρειφόντη (B 651, H 166, Θ 264, P 259), always used at the verse-end, falls within the context outlined above. Its formulaic character is as clear as its metrical monstrosity ('Ungeheuerlichkeit) and the formal strangeness of the first element ἀνδρει-106. An original old (but I think Post-Mycenaean) formula ('prototype' in the terminology of A. Hoekstra) *Ενυ(ω)λι(τ)ος ἀνρ-γυχοντᾶς is surely to be reconstructed. Influenced then by the epithet of Hermes ἀγυειφόντης, in which, as I suppose, ἀγυει- is regular dat.-loc. of ἀγυος, the formula was modified — at a time, doubtless, when the original meaning of the epithet of Hermes was no longer understood and had changed to «Argos-Killer». The fact that the KN-tablets have yielded a personal name a-no-qo-ta ἀνρ-γυχοντᾶς (see above) may support the reconstruction of the «prototype» of our Ενυαλίω-formula; whether the name of the Knossian official has the primary meaning «killer of men» or, as I believe, «he who distinguishes amongst men» uest sim.108, is not here significant.

Some remarks remain to be made about Homeric formulae which contain the words τρόπεζα, βροτός and θρόνος109. In all the passages (10) cited by Wathelet, a case-form of τρόπεζα stands at the verse-end; the assumption that τρόπεζα, at a very early

106 Cf. J. Wackernagel, GGN, 1914, p. 113, n. 1 = Kleine Schriften (s. a.), p. 1170, n. 1; Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer, 1916, p. 172; F. Bechtel, Lexilogus zu Homer, 1914, p. 44; E. Risch, Wortbildung, p. 28; P. Chantraine, Grammaire homérique I, 1958, pp. 84, 110; Dictionnaire, p. 87.
108 BzN 8, 1957, pp. 32-35.
period of epic poetry, was placed at this position by preference is attractive; if we suggest that τράπεξα has replaced an original *τρέξα, it seems less strange that τρ- in τράπεξα does not lengthen the preceding short word-end ἄδε τρατεξας χ 438 etc.). To suppose an intermediate (Myc.) *τρέξα is to complicate the situation needlessly.

A similar argument obtains in the case of βροτός. Expressions like πάντεςι βροτοίσι (v 397) and μερόπεσι βροτοίσι (B 285), both to be found at the verse-end, look formulaic as well as highly archaic (and odd, in view of the accumulation of Aeolisms). The reconstruction of an original (Post-Myc.) *μυτοίσι removes the metrical anomaly; a development, however, leading from Pre-Myc. *μυτοίσι to Myc. *μυτοίσι > Aeol. μυτοίσι > βροτοίσι would be highly striking and improbable.

And lastly θρόνος. In the formula

\[ \Theta \quad 199 \, \text{σείσατο} \quad \text{O} \quad 150 \, \text{ἐξετο} \quad \text{S'} \, \text{ἐλιν θρόνῳ} \]

D. J. N. Lee\textsuperscript{110} has already tried to explain the double strangeness that consists in the correpottio Attica and in the form ἐλιν by postulating an older (Myc.) form of θρόνος. He reconstructs a prototype: *— ο υ θρόνῳ. If, however, a Myc. — and still Post-Myc. — form *θρόνος is to be supposed, we have to argue in another way: the replacement of θρόνος by older *θρόνος, for instance, would remove the metrical anomaly in the apparently formulaic expression used in the Odyssey 8 at the verse-end: κατὰ κλαμους τε θρόνος τε. And a form *θρόνος (but also θρόνος) would fit the verse-end formula θρόνος ἀγνυρόθλος (4 x in gen., 1 x in acc.) — in contrast to *θρόνος. In this case certainty is not possible.

We summarize the developments assumed above in the following table:

It seems remarkable that the intrusion of \( d \) between \( n \) and \( r \) has ensued at different times under the same conditions in the same way.