

PREPOSITIONAL USAGE IN ARCADO-CYPRIOT AND MYCENAEAN: A BRONZE AGE ISOGLOSS?¹

Whereas the other classical dialects use the genitive to continue the IE ablative after prepositions such as ἀπό and ἐξ, Arcado-Cypriot construes these prepositions with the dative. Debrunner,² López Eire³ and Kuryłowicz⁴ explained this phenomenon as a syncretism of the dative and ablative, caused originally by a similarity of the plural morphs and then extended analogically into the singular.

Householder⁵ posited a syncretism of instrumental and ablative as an archaic ‘Achaean’ feature which was already present in Mycenaean, so that when the dative and instrumental also fell together the result was a total dative-locative-ablative-instrumental syncretism.

‘We are strongly inclined to the supposition that the ablative had not syncretised with the genitive at all in proto-Arcado-Cypriote, but either with the dative or some other case which later syncretised with the dative, at least in part... To explain these facts by assuming that Arcado-Cypriote once used the genitive with all ablatival prepositions is much more difficult and requires some theory explaining how they knew which genitives were ablatival.’⁶

Householder was followed by Ilievski⁷ who saw in Arcadian ἐπεὶ Φέρυο⁸ an old instrumental form with ablatival force.

- ¹ Throughout this paper Arcadian inscriptions are cited with reference either to F. Hiller, *IG v/2, Inscriptiones Arcadiae*, Berlin 1913 [= *IG v*], or to L. Dubois, *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*, Vol. II, *Corpus dialectal*, Louvain-la-Neuve, Cabay, 1986 [= Dubois]. Cypriot inscriptions are cited with reference to O. Masson, *Les inscriptions chypriotes syllabiques* (second edition), Paris, Boccard, 1983 [= *ICS*²]; T. B. Mitford, *The inscriptions of Kourion*, Philadelphia 1971 [= *IK*]; Cl. Traunecker, F. Le Salout, O. Masson, *La Chapelle d’Achôris à Karnak*, Paris, Centre Franco-Egyptienne d’Étude des Temples de Karnak, 1981 [= *Karnak*]; T. B. Mitford, *The Nymphaeum of Kafizin. The inscribed pottery*, Berlin / New York 1980 (= *Kadmos*, Suppl. II) [= *NK*]; T. B. Mitford, O. Masson, *The syllabic inscriptions of Rantidi-Paphos*, Konstanz 1983 [= *RP*]. Mycenological colloquia are abbreviated in the standard way.
- ² E. Schwyzer, A. Debrunner, *Griechische Grammatik*, München 1934–1953 (repr. 1959–1960) [= *Gr.Gr.*], II, pp. 447–8.
- ³ A. López Eire, *Simposio de colonizaciones, Barcelona–Ampurias 1971* (1974), pp. 274–277.
- ⁴ J. Kuryłowicz, *Problèmes de linguistique indo-européenne*, Cracovie 1977, pp. 148f.
- ⁵ F. Householder, «*pa-ro* and Mycenaean cases», *Glotta* 38, 1959, pp. 1–10.
- ⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 5.
- ⁷ P. H. Ilievski, *The ablative, instrumental and locative in the oldest Greek texts*, Skopje 1961 [= *Ablativot*], pp. 118f.
- ⁸ Dubois Phé. 1.3.

An entirely different line of explanation was offered by Delbrück,⁹ Günther,¹⁰ Buck,¹¹ Humbert¹² and Ruijgh,¹³ all of whom saw the influence of the ‘opposite’ preposition ἐν + dat. causing a replacement of the ablatival case by the locatival case where the ablatival context was already unambiguously marked by the preposition. Brugmann¹⁴ compared a similar but opposite replacement of locatival datives by partitive genitives with locatival function in Attic (ἐν Αἴδος/-ου, ἐμποδών, ἐν + gen. pl. of a demotic) and Doric (eg. from Laconia, *IG V/1 213 passim* ἐν Γαλαφόχῳ) which he does not consider elliptical (eg. sc. οἴκῳ).

Morpurgo Davies¹⁵ has observed that no Arcado-Cypriot preposition is attested as governing all three local cases (viz. gen., acc., dat.): whereas ἐπί, παρά, πρός, ὑπό and μετά show three-case government in Homer, none of their Arcadian or Cypriot counterparts governs the genitive; in contexts where other dialects construe them with a genitive, even a partitive, in Arcado-Cypriot they govern a dative. She sees this as part of a wider Greek tendency toward the simplification of the construction of three-case prepositions: Attic shows two-case government of ἀνά, μετά and later περί, and almost all dialects neutralise the distinction between ἐπί + dat. and gen.¹⁶ Arcado-Cypriot differs from, say, Attic in the choice of case which has been eliminated from prepositional constructions, the degree to which it has been achieved, the early date of the change, and in levelling it also to ablatival one-case prepositions.

Each of these explanations will cause a different distribution of the data. If the ‘syncretism’ theory is correct we should see the dative used in all ablatival contexts, both with and without preposition. We would also not expect to see datives used after prepositions which ordinarily govern non-ablatival (eg. partitive) genitives. If, on the other hand, the ‘prepositional’ theory is correct, we might expect to see traces of genitives used in non-prepositional ablatival contexts, although it is possible that the action of levelling might cause these too to be replaced by datives; and we would expect non-ablatival genitives with prepositions to be replaced also.

⁹ B. Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg 1893–1900, [= *Vergl. Syntax*] I, pp. 668f.

¹⁰ *IF* 20, 1906, pp. 73f.

¹¹ C. D. Buck, *Introduction to the study of the Greek dialects* (second edition), University of Chicago 1955, [= *Dialects*], p. 108.

¹² J. Humbert, *Syntaxe grecque* (third edition), Paris 1960, [= *Syntaxe*], p. 302, 307.

¹³ C. J. Ruijgh, *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1967, [= *Ét.*], p. 95.

¹⁴ K. Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der idg. Sprachen* (second edition), Strassburg 1897–1916, II/2, p. 610, 808, 826.

¹⁵ A. Morpurgo Davies, «An instrumental-ablative in Mycenaean?», *Cambridge Colloquium*, 1966, p. 196.

¹⁶ J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, Basel 1920–1924, [= *Syntax*], II, pp. 207ff.

II. PREPOSITIONAL USAGE IN ARCADO-CYPRIOΤ

The Arcado-Cypriot prepositions are summarized in TABLE 1.

	CYPRIOT	ARCADIAN
I. WITH GENITIVE		
(a) adnominal	<i>aneu, anti</i>	ἐν]εκα, ἀντί
(b) after an adverb		θύσθεν, ἰμέσος, ἰσόθι, μεσακόθεν
II. WITH ACCUSATIVE	<i>pos</i>	διά (temporal), κατύ / κά (possibly also with gen.?)
III. WITH ACCUSATIVE AND DATIVE		
(a) dat. used locatively	<i>in / en</i>	ἰν / ἐν, πός, πε(δά)
(b) misc. dat. functions	<i>epi, peri</i>	ἐπί, ὑπέρ, ὑπό
(c) dat. used locatively and ablatively		πάρ / παρά
IV. WITH DATIVE		
(a) locatival	<i>sun, pro(?)</i>	σύν
(b) ablatival	<i>apu / apo, ex / es</i>	ἀπύ, ἐπές, ἐς

TABLE 1: *Arcado-Cypriot prepositions and their cases*

PREPOSITIONS GOVERNING A DATIVE WITH ABLATIVAL SENSE

The Arcadian prepositions which govern an ablatival dative are as follows:

	(a) ἀπύ
Dubois O.1 (<i>passim</i>)	ἀπύ τῶινυ In a border decree with sense ‘from here’, followed by an expression meaning ‘towards...’
IG v 262.22	ἀπεχόμενος ... ἀπύ τοῖ ἱεροῖ
IG v 343.67–9	[ο]ῦ δαν ἀμισταίμαν ἀπύ τοῖς Ἐρχομιμί]οις both with sense ‘away from’; for the latter cf. <i>DGE</i> 362: ἐνορρον τοῖς ἐπιφοίφοις ἐν Ναυπάκτον μῆ ποστᾶμεν ἀπ’ [Ἐ]οπ]οντίδων.
I. v. <i>Magn.</i> 38.23	τῶν Μαγνήτων τῶν ἀπύ Μαιάνδροι ‘... [coming] from Meander’. The form of the preposition has been Ionicised by the engraver, but the syntax remains Arcadian.
Dubois Té. 4.29	ἀπύ τᾶι ἄν ἀμέραι
Dubois Té. 4.60	ἀπύ τᾶι ἀμέραι with temporal sense ‘since’ (ie. ‘from the day when’)

- IG* v 6.4 ἰν ἀμέραις τρισὶ ἀπὸ τᾶι ἂν τὸ ἀδίκημα γίνηται
temporal sense ‘in the three days after that on which ...’
- IG* v 6.94 ἀπὸ τοῦ Σαίσκῳ [*sc.* ἔτι]
IG v 6.116 ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀμφικλέος [*sc.* ἔτι]
eponymic formula, ‘since the year when S. was magistrate’
- (b) ἐς (= ἐκ)
- Dubois Té. 4.55-6 τὸς ἐς τᾶινι ἔσγονος
‘those born from her’
- IG* v 6.99 ἐς τοῦ ἔτι τοῦ ἐπὶ Δαμοστράτοι
temporal ‘since the year when D. was magistrate’
- IG* v. 6.49 κύριοι ἐόντω οἱ ἐσδοτῆρες τὸμ μεν ἐργάταν ἐσδέλλοντες ἐς τοῦ ἔργοι
local sense, ‘that the judges be empowered to expel the contractor from the site’
- Dubois Té. 4.5 τὸς φυγάδας τὸς κατενθόντας τὰ πατρῶια κόμιζεσθαι ἐς τοῖς ἔφευγον
‘that the exiles who have returned recover their ancestral possessions from which they were exiled’
- Dubois Té. 4.45 ἐς δὲ τοῦ ἡμίσοι αὐτὸς τὸ χρέος διαλυέτω
ablative of means, ‘that he pay off the debt by means of that half’; cf. Isocrates 14.152, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τρέφειν
- Dubois Té. 4.19 ἐς τοῦ νόμοι
Dubois Thé. 3.9 δῶναι ξένια τοῖς θεαροῖς τὰ ἐς τοῦ νόμοι
‘in accordance with the law’, ‘specified by the law’; cf. Demosthenes 24.28, ὁ ἐκ τῶν νόμων χρόνος

(c) ἐπὲς

This is evidently a compound of ἐπί and ἐς with a meaning akin to ‘concerning matters arising from’ *vel sim.*

- Dubois Té. 4.9–10 ἐπὲς δὲ ταῖς οἰκίαις, μίαν ἕκαστον ἔχεν
‘as to the houses, that each should have one’
- Dubois Té. 4.21–22 ἐπὲς δὲ ταῖς παναγορίαις ταῖς ἐσλελοί-
παισι οἱ φυγάδες

	‘as to the <i>panagoriae</i> which the exiles missed’
Dubois Té. 4.37	ἐπὲς δὲ τοῖς ἱεροῖς χρήμασι ‘as to the sacred money’
Dubois Té. 4.26–7	μὴ ἦναι αὐτοῖς δικάσασθαι ἐπὲς τοῖς πάμασι ‘that they not be allowed to bring a case concern- ing their goods’
IG v 6.54	πρὸς τᾷ ἐπὲς τοῦ ἔργου γεγραμμέναι σὺγγράφοι ‘... concerning the work ...’

(d) ὑπό

<i>I. v. Magn.</i> 38.5	ὁ χρησμός ὁ γεγωνῶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνι
<i>ibidem</i> .12	τὰν γεγωνῶσαν ὑπὸ τοῖς προγόνοις ... εὐχρηστία<ν>
<i>ibidem</i> .31	πάντων τῶν γεγονότων εὐγνωμόνων ὑπὸ τᾷ πόλι
<i>ibidem</i> .52	τὰ ὑπὸ τοῖς συγγενέσι καὶ φίλοις ... ἀξιώμενα

For Debrunner¹⁷ this dative continues an IE instrumental whereas the other dialects have a genitive continuing the ablative of source of action. However, we cannot rule out that the Arcadian dative is standing in this same ablatival function.

(e) παρά

Dubois Thé. 3.1–2	ἐπειδὴ παραγενόμενο<ι> παρ <τ>αῖ πόλι τῶν Κωί(ι)ων πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τᾶν Θελφουσίων
-------------------	---

The inscription of the Aegeiratae on the same stele has παρ[α]γενο[μ]ένων παρ <τ>ᾶς [πόλιος τᾶς Κωίων indicating an ablatival use of παρά. This is also suggested for the Arcadian version by the presence of the allatival πρὸς phrase which follows it: a locatival interpretation of the παρά phrase would not make sense. Hence ‘Having come to the city of the Thelphusians from the city of the Coans.’

<i>I. v. Magn.</i> 38.9	καθὰ εἶχον τὰς ἰντολὰς παρὰ τᾷ ἰδίαι πόλι
-------------------------	---

The Epidamian, Ithacan and Corcyran versions of the inscription have παρά + dat. in locatival function: *I. v. Magn.* 46.14–15, παρὰ ταῖς πόλ[ε]σιν; *ibidem* 36.9, παρὰ ταῖς πόλίοις; *ibidem* 44.15–16, παρὰ ταῖς πόλεσιν. It is therefore probable that the sense in Arcadian is also locatival. However, the Messenian version has ablatival παρὰ τᾶς ἰδίας πόλεως (*ibidem* 43.10–12), a use which is common after verbs of receiving but which is normally used of persons.¹⁸ Hence probably ‘since they received their instructions in their own city.’

¹⁷ *Gr. Gr.* II, p. 526.

¹⁸ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones, R. McKenzie, *A Greek English Lexicon* (9th edition, with supplement), Oxford 1968, [= *LSJ*⁹], s.v. παρά A II 3.

¹⁹ Householder, 1959, p. 6.

[For ἀπ' and ἐπές governing a genitive in ablatival function, see below, pp. 404f. For ὑπέρ, ἐπί and περί governing a dative where other dialects have a genitive, see below, pp. 406ff.]

The Cypriot evidence has been greatly expanded by the publication of the new joins and fragments from the Nymphaeum at Kafizin, although this has also added an element of confusion in that *apo* once and *es* uniformly are attested as governing an ablatival genitive. The range of prepositions is less broad:

(a) *apu / apo*

- ICS² 217.8, 17 *a-pu-ta-i*, *za?-i* = /*apu tāi gāi*/
'from the land'
- ICS² 220.3–4 *to-a-po-lo-ni*, ...*a-po-i-wo-i*, *ta-se*, *e-u-ko-la-se* | [*e*]-*pe-tu-ke*
= /*tō(i) Apol(l)ōni ... ap^h' hōi uoi tās euk^hōlas epetuk^he*/
'for Apollo, from whom Baalrom obtained the fulfilment of his prayers'
- ICS² 352.3 *a-po-na-me-no-i* ? = /*ap' Onamenōi*/
ICS² 352.4 *a-pa-ri-so-to-ke-le-we-i* ? = /*ap' Aristokleyei*/
NK 266(b) *a[po tō tritōi ? kas eikos]tōi uetei apo tōi proṣu <pa>rk^honti*
deka[ti]smōi apo tai(s) ap^haire(s)i tōn linōn kas tō spermatos
tai(s) en A(n)droklō uoikōi

This exemplifies a large number of dedications at Kafizin, with *apo* governing the dative in both temporal and local ablatival senses. The formula is standard and allows quite extensive restorations to be made in more fragmentary texts.

- NK 118(b).1–2 *apo tōi tetartō kas (e)ikos[tōi uetei*
ibidem .2 to a[na]t^hema (?) a[po] tō moi
NK 217.b *apo tāi[Androklō koinōnijāi*
NK 218.b *a[po tōi Androklō ko]inōnijō*
NK 252 *apo [tōi ...] ka(s) eikostōi uetei*
NK 275(b) *a[po tō]i pros[upark^ho(n)ti ? dekatismō]i*
NK 136 *apo tō [deuterō ue]teos ... a[po tō de]kadi ? ueteos*

This is a curious fragment in which the first *apo* is seemingly construed with a genitive and the second with a dative. The genitive with the first *apo* is discussed below, p. 406]

(b) *es / ex*

- ICS² 217.5 *e-xe-to-i*, *wo-i-ko-i* = /*eks tōi uoikōi*/
ibidem .6 e-xe-ta-i-po-to-li-wi = /*eks tāi ptoliūi*/
ibidem .11 e-xe-to-i, *ko-ro-i*, *to-i-te* = /*eks tōi k^hōrōi tōide*/
ibidem .24 e-xe-ta-i, *za?-i* = /*eks tāi gāi*/

At Kafizin and Karnak *es / ex* is construed with a genitive, for which see below, pp. 405f. For *peri* with a dative see below, p. 407.

NON-PREPOSITIONAL USAGES

There is a small but compelling amount of evidence that in non-prepositional constructions Arcadian used a genitive to continue the IE ablative. There is no evidence for Cypriot.

IG v 3.16: πλὸς ἀμέραι καὶ νυκτός

‘more than a day and night’: This is evidently a genitive continuing an ablative of comparison. The inscription is early fourth century, and the Arcadian genitive form in *-αι* tells against koine influence. Householder’s¹⁹ suggestion that the genitive is by analogy with the partitive after superlatives is surely not plausible, nor is Chadwick’s emendation of πλὸς to εἰ μὴ with ἀμέραι καὶ νυκτός as a genitive of time.²⁰

Dubois Té 4.14: εἰ δὲ πλεον ἀπέχων ὁ κᾶπος ἐστι πλέθρω

‘if the garden is further than a *plethron* away’: Again, an ablative of comparison. For Buck²¹ the form πλεον suggests koine influence; and indeed γέγραπται in .15 shows the koine form ‘imputable au graveur delphien’.²² Yet as Dubois (*ad loc.*) comments, the possibility cannot be ruled out that Arcadian also knew the form πλεον, and the text clearly shows dialectal rather than koine features in, for example, the demonstrative τῶνι in .14, and the *o*-stem gen. sg. in *-ω* rather than koine *-ου*.

IG v 16.6: ἀνκαρύξαι αὐτὸς ἀνδραγαθίαι

ca. 218BC. Dubois *ad loc.* sees a genitive continuing an ablative of cause, equivalent to ἔνεκα + gen.: cf. *IG* v 9.3, ἐν|οῖ|α|ν ἔνεκα καὶ εὐεργεσ|ι|αι. Nachmanson²³ however has claimed that this is the first example of such a dedication which omits ἔνεκα, so we are bound to wonder whether this is not so much an archaic use of an ablatival genitive as an innovatory (falsely archaising?) suppression of the preposition.

IG v 6.14: ἀφεώσθω τῷ ἔργω

A genitive continuing an ablative of separation. It is from the second half of the fourth century, but shows koine influence only in the gen. sg. in *-ου* in .11, whereas here the dialectal *-ω* has been used. Householder’s suggestion that the genitive is by analogy with the partitive after verbs meaning ‘lay hold of’²⁴ not only seems implausible, but is in any case disproved for Arcadian by the occurrence of ἐπ[ιθ]ιγάνε + (locatival) dative in *IG* v 429.5.

IG v 6.94: ἀπὸ τοῦ Σαίσκω ὅσω ποσεδεόμεθα

IG v 6.116: ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀμφικλέος ὅσω ποσεδεόμεθα

Morpurgo Davies sees in ὅσω an ablatival genitive with a verb of lacking.²⁵

¹⁹ Householder, 1959, p. 6.

²⁰ *Apud* Ilievski, *Ablativot*, p. 37 n.1.

²¹ Buck, *Dialects*, p. 208.

²² Dubois, *ad loc.*

²³ *Eranos* 9, 1909, p. 32, 38.

²⁴ Householder, 1959, p. 6.

²⁵ Morpurgo Davies, 1966, p. 195.

IG v 6.96–7: τῷ ταλάντῳ τῷ ἃ πόλις ἀπυδῖει ἀπυδώσουσι

Again τῷ is an ablatival genitive with a verb of lacking, while the antecedent τῷ ταλάντῳ seems to have been attracted into the same case by *tractio inversa*.²⁶

IG v 282: [] Ἰ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ συμμάχων δεκόταν

Dubois Ca. 1: Κα]φειῆς ἀνέθεν | τὸ]πόλλοι, δεκάτ[αν] |
πο]λεμίδων

Dubois on Ca. 1 *ad loc.* comments ‘le génitif-ablatif sans préposition est un trait bien archaïque et bien attesté.’ While this may be true, it is not clear that this is what we have here. Morpurgo Davies, for example, has argued that they are adnominals dependent on δεκόταν and δεκάτ[αν],²⁷ which seems equally plausible. While it is true that the earliest forms of the formula do not contain δεκάταν (eg. Θεβαῖοι τῶν Ηυετίδων, Lazzarini, *Formule* no. 957), these early examples may mean ‘X [dedicates the spoils] of Y’ rather than ‘X [takes the spoils] from Y’. Versions of the formula which have been extended with ἀπό (eg. Μεθάνιοι ἀπό Λακεδαιμονίδων, *DGE* 106) and λαβόντες or ἐλόντες do not necessarily preserve the exact semantics of the original form. Thus while it is possible that this formula contains an ablatival genitive, it could also be possessive or adnominal.

Thus far the data support the hypothesis that Arcadian has a syncretism of ablative and genitive in the manner of the other dialects rather than one of ablative and dative; and that after prepositions the dative has replaced the genitive in the same way that the genitive replaced the dative after certain prepositions in Attic. There are examples of genitives used ablativally in non-prepositional constructions, but there are by contrast no examples of datives used ablativally without prepositions. There are two instances which are sometimes quoted,²⁸ but they may be quickly dismissed.

IG v 429.5–6: εἰ δέ τις ἐπι[ι]γάνῃ τούτοις

The other dialects construe ἐπιθιγγάνῳ with a genitive; but it is a partitive one, not an ablatival (‘lay hold of, lay hold of a part of’). The dative in Arcadian may instead be of locative force (‘lay hands upon’).

Dubois Té. 4.21f.: ἐπές δε ταῖς παναγορίαις ταῖς ἐσλελοίπασι οἱ φυγάδες

The first ταῖς is the definite article in the dative as expected after the ablatival preposition ἐπές. The second is the relative pronoun which has been attracted from the accusative into the case of its antecedent.²⁹

²⁶ Morpurgo Davies, *loc. cit.*

²⁷ Morpurgo Davies, *PdP* 1964, pp. 346–354.

²⁸ Eg. Ilievski, *Ling. Balk.* 6, 1963, p. 37.

²⁹ Morpurgo Davies, 1966, p. 195; Dubois, *ad loc.*

PREPOSITIONS GOVERNING A GENITIVE

The genitives after prepositions listed under (Ia) in TABLE 1 above are a heterogeneous group, some of which appear to be adnominal; this is fairly clearly the case for ἔνεκα; and ἀντί, *anti* could well represent the loc. sg. of a noun followed by an adnominal gen., especially in view of Hittite *hant-* ‘face’.³⁰

Humbert,³¹ Schwyzer–Debrunner³² and Günther³³ agree in calling the gen. after *aneu* an original ablative, and that would fit the sense. Morpurgo Davies³⁴ has argued that the occurrence of ἄνευς governing the acc. βῶλάν in Elean³⁵ might indicate that the gen. cannot be adnominal; but it is equally difficult to explain the replacement of an ablative by an accusative as that of an adnominal. Perhaps one should rather see an accusative of respect in the Elean example, a sense which is fairly close to the adnominal.

The genitives listed under (Ib) could also plausibly be adnominal,³⁶ although Dubois³⁷ considers them to be ablatives of reference defining adverbs, rather than genitives after prepositions proper; and in non-prepositional constructions Arcadian uses the genitive, not the dative, to continue the ablative.

The genitives after διά and κα(τύ) in Arcadian are uncertain. The instances are as follows:

Dubois Té. 4.53f.: ὅσοι μὴ ὕστερον ἔφευγον δι’ ἀναγκᾶς

Dubois *ad loc.* sees μὴ ... δι’ ἀναγκᾶς as equivalent to ἐκόντες. The genitive presumably stands in causal ablatival function, but the form in -ας rather than -αυ casts doubt on its authenticity.³⁸ Morpurgo Davies³⁹ calls it ‘non-epichoric’, while Dubois *ad loc.* wonders if it might be ‘une delphisme’. Even if it is a genuine Arcadian construction, it might have been influenced by the construction of ἔνεκα with a genitive.

IG v 6.10–12: οἱ δὲ στρατηγοὶ πόσοδομ ποέντω εἴ καν δέατοι σφεις πόλεμος ἦναι ὁ κωλυὼν ἢ ἐφθορκῶς τὰ ἔργα, λαφυροπωλίου ἐόντος κατὸ τᾶς πόλιος

Dubois translates ‘Que les stratèges introduisent (les entrepreneurs lésés devant les Trois Cents) s’il leurs semble que c’est la guerre qui a empêché ou endommagé les travaux au cas où se produirait une vente de butin aux dépens de

³⁰ P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1942–1953, [= *Gramm. Hom.*], II, p. 92 sees a true adnominal. Schwyzer – Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* II, p. 423, and Humbert, *Syntaxe*, pp. 301f., are uncertain.

³¹ Humbert, *Syntaxe*, p. 323.

³² Schwyzer–Debrunner, *Gr. Gr.* II, p. 535.

³³ *IF* 20, 1906/7, p. 69

³⁴ Morpurgo Davies, 1966, p. 193.

³⁵ *DGE* 410.8.

³⁶ So Morpurgo Davies, 1966, p. 195.

³⁷ L. Dubois, *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*, Vol. I, *Grammaire*, Louvain-la-Neuve, Cabay, 1986 [= *Grammaire*], §125.

³⁸ For the Arcadian *a*-stem genitive in -αυ see Dubois, *Grammaire*, §55b.

³⁹ Morpurgo Davies, 1966, p. 195.

la cité.’ The generals are to admit the builders to a sale of booty κατὸ τᾶς πόλιος, but it is not completely clear what that phrase signifies. Dubois *ad loc.* compares *IG XII/2 527.4*, τὰ τε σε[συλαμμένα ... ἀνεκτλήσατο τό τε κατὰ τᾶς πόλιος σῦλον ἄρα[ι]ς (Lesbos) and Milet *Delphinion 148.48*, τοῖς δὲ ἔχουσι σῦλον ἢ κατὰ Μάγ[ι]νων ἢ κατὰ Μιλησίων, and understands ‘at the expense of the city’. Whatever the precise significance, a meaning similar to ‘concerning, in relation of’⁴⁰ and governing an adnominal or objective genitive would be reasonable.⁴¹ The koine genitive in -ου is suspicious, for elsewhere this inscription uses dialectal -ω.

IG v 262.23: εἰ δαλ λαῖ[ς] ἔατοι κατὰ τῶν[υ/ι], ἰμμενφῆς εἶναι

The reading is extremely difficult. Hiller’s εἰ δ’ ἄλλα ἡ[υ] is rejected by Comparetti,⁴² Schwyzer,⁴³ who reads εἰ δ’ ἄλλαῖ[ς] = ἄλλαξις, and Dubois, who prints the text as above, seeing δαλ as an assimilated form of the modal particle δαν, and λά[ι]ς = Att. λῆξις or Ion. λᾶξις, with the sense ‘piece of land’ or ‘lot’. He accordingly translates ‘Si en revanche un allotissement concernant ces individus est un jour autorisé, ceci fera un objet d’un blâme divin.’ It would be difficult to make κατὰ τῶν[υ] mean ‘in contravention of the preceding rules’, = παρά + acc., but a sense ‘concerning the aforementioned people’ with an adnominal (‘in the case of’) would make sense. For the glyph Η = /ks/, see Dubois, *Grammaire*, §§24, 26.

The examples of ablatival prepositions governing a genitive in Arcadian are as follows:

Dubois Cl. 1: ἱερὸς Τυνδαρίδαις ἀπ’ Ἐραέων

From the early part of the fifth century, so koine influence is unlikely. Richter⁴⁴ and Morpurgo Davies⁴⁵ see early Achaean influence as explaining the unexpected use of the genitive. This seems more likely than the explanation of Dubois:⁴⁶ for him the simplest form of dedicatory formula of this type consists of the name of the conqueror in the nominative followed by the name of the conquered in the genitive-ablative (eg. Lazzarini, *Formule*, p. 957, Θεβαῖοι τῶν Ηυετίων). This is then sometimes expanded by the addition of λαβόντες or ἐλόντες, and sometimes by the addition of δεκάταν, as in Dubois Ca. 1 and *IG v 282*. Very early in the dialects, he suggests, the bare gen.-abl. is remarked as ablative by the addition of the preposition ἀπό, hence such forms as Μεθάνιοι ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων (*DGE 106*). Therefore in Dubois Cl. 1 we have ‘la forme la plus élémentaire du renouvellement de la forme archaïque et le vestige d’une

⁴⁰ *LSJ*⁹ s.v. κατὰ A II 5,7.

⁴¹ Cf. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1968, [= *DELG*], p. 504, s.v. κατὰ, for whom these are ‘génitif[s] de but’.

⁴² *Annuario* 1, 1914, pp. 1–17.

⁴³ *DGE*, p. 661, n.

⁴⁴ *AJA* 1949, pp. 194–201.

⁴⁵ *PdP* 19, 1964, pp. 352–3.

⁴⁶ Dubois, *Grammaire*, §125a.

phase syntaxique antérieure à la constitution du datif-locatif en cas prépositionnel.’

Dubois Phé. 1.3: εἰ δὲ] μὲ ὑνιερόσει, δυμενῆς ἔασα ἐπέε Φέργῶ

The *communis opinio* is to take ἐπέε as the preposition ἐπέε with the final /s/ assimilated to the following /u/ with subsequent phonetic or graphic simplification. The interpretation of Φέργῶ, however, is disputed. For Householder⁴⁷ and Ilievski⁴⁸ it is an old instr.-abl. sg. For Dubois⁴⁹ it is a dat.sg. in /-oi/ whose final <i> has been suppressed through lack of space, for which he finds parallels in other neatly graven archaic inscriptions in which word division is not marked (cf. *IG* V/1 213.2, ἀνέθεκε Ἐθναία<i>); *I. v. Ol.* 266.3, ἐν Ἀρκαδίαι πολυμέλο<i>; *IG* v 429.13, Φορθασία<i>). An alternative is to follow Morpurgo Davies⁵⁰ in seeing very early Achaean influence.

I. v. Magn. 38 has been copied from an Arcadian original by an Ionian copyist who has ‘Ionicised’ it in a number of places: περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πάνσιν in .8 is clearly an error for τοῖς λοιποῖς; ἐπὶ Μαιάνδρου in .2; ἐκ παλαιῶν μὲν χρόνως ἔχοντες in .23, an error for Ionic χρόνων ἔχόντων and with the Ionic form of the preposition with Ionic government; ἐκ τῶν νόμων likewise in .57. ἀπὸ Μαιάνδρου in .23 shows Arcadian government.

Completely obscure is *IG* v 403, τᾶς Ἀρτάμιτος ἀποφομιον τᾶς Ηἡμέρας, in which ἀποφομιον could represent ἀπό + gen. pl.; but the sign Φ is totally opaque. The earliest editors understood it as a form of β and saw the word ἀποβῶμιον, but this was rejected in *IG* v/2 by Hiller, who doubts the inscription’s authenticity.⁵¹

There are, then, two isolated examples of Arcadian ablatival prepositions governing a genitive. The so-called examples in *I. v. Magn.* 38 are imputable to the Ionian copyist, and ἀποφομιον is intractable. The two ‘genuine’ examples are probably to be attributed to external influence. Cypriot presents a more complex picture. At Idalion *ex* governs a dative, but at other sites it appears to govern a genitive:

Karnak 49 (= *ICS*² 449): ni-ka-se .? e-xe-te-u-a-se | ta-se .? po-se-ke-ti-o = /Nikās ex... tās pos Ketīō/

This extremely difficult graffito from the temple of Achoris at Karnak appears to show *ex* governing an *a*-stem genitive in -ās. Masson suggested doubtfully in *ICS*², *ad loc.*, that it is a toponym, commenting ‘on attenderait le datif.’ In *Karnak*, *ad loc.*, he calls it a genitive toponym after *ex*.

At Kafizin Mitford claims that *es* uniformly governs a genitive in the dedicatory formula:

⁴⁷ Householder (1959), p. 5 n.2.

⁴⁸ Ilievski, *Ling. Balk.* 6, 1963, p. 38.

⁴⁹ Dubois, *Grammaire*, §125c.

⁵⁰ Morpurgo Davies, *PdP* 19, 1964, pp. 346–356.

⁵¹ So also L.H. Jeffery, *The local scripts of Archaic Greece*, Oxford 1961 [= *LSAG*], no.13, pp. 215, 211 n.1.

NK 266	<i>es tō hāni pe(m)ptō ka]s eikostō ueteos</i>
NK 218(b)	<i>es tō aopodo[thentos dekatismō</i>
NK 267	<i>es tō hāni pe(m)p[tō kas eikos]tō uē[teos</i>
NK 288	<i>es tō e<pi>geno[me]nō ? li[nō</i>

In fact only in *NK 266* is the genitive guaranteed by *ueteos*, and here the preposition *es* is missing in the lacuna, while elsewhere the forms in *-ō* are compatible with being datives with the *i-mutum* omitted in writing. However, given that the dedicatory formula is reasonably standard in these inscriptions, it is probable that the *ueteos* of *NK 266* implies a genitive also in *NK 267*.

If this is so, it is noticeable that (i) at Kafizin *apo* governs a dative even when it stands in exactly the same function as *es* + gen.: *NK 266*, *a[po tō tritō kas eikos]tōi uetei*; (ii) these inscriptions are all very late, *ca.* 220BC. The Idalion inscription, *ICS² 217*, is much earlier (478–470BC) and shows *ex* governing a dative, while the Kafizin inscriptions show koine vocabulary items alongside dialectal ones (*de]kas* ~ *dekatsimos*, *de]kakios* ~ *dekatophoros*).⁵² We might therefore legitimately wonder whether at Kafizin *apo* shows the genuine Cypriot pattern of government, as do both *apu* and *ex* in the earlier Idalion inscription, but that *es* has acquired koine syntax. That this might be the case is demonstrated also by the attestation of *apo* + gen. in *NK 136* possibly alongside *apo* + dat. later in the same inscription: *apo tō[deuterō uē]teos ... a[po tō de]kadi ? ueteos*; this sort of variation may suggest a change in the pattern of government which is currently under way.

The Karnak graffito must date from the first quarter of the fourth century since Achoris was Pharaoh 390–378BC and hired Greek mercenaries *ca.* 385BC.⁵³ This is a little too early for koine influence on Cyprus itself, but it is feasible that the speech of Cypriots who had left the island was open to contamination from other dialects.

It is therefore probable that in no certain case can an ablative preposition be shown to govern a genitive in Arcadian. In Cypriot the evidence also suggests that the authentic case construed with ablative prepositions was the dative, whilst very late inscriptions from Kafizin show a genitive with *es* and once with *apo*, probably under koine influence, and an inscription from Egypt shows a genitive with *ex*, again perhaps under external influence.

FURTHER POSSIBLE GENITIVE → DATIVE SUBSTITUTIONS

The preposition ὑπέρ governs an adnominal genitive ('on behalf of, for the sake of') in most dialects, but in Arcadian, a dative: *IG v 16.3–4*, μαχόμενος ὑπὲρ τᾶι τᾶς πόλιος] ἐλευθερίαι. Dubois⁵⁴ compares Homeric περί + dat., eg. *Od.* 17.471, περὶ οἷσι μαχόμενος κτεάτεσσι, and suggests that μάχομαι /

⁵² Mitford, *NK*, p. 161.

⁵³ Diodorus 15.29

⁵⁴ Dubois, *Grammaire*, §123e.

μαχέομαι is followed by a locative of the ‘stakes’, expressing either the concrete location or metaphorically the abstract concept *over which* the combatants are fighting. He suggests that the addition of the adverbials περί and ὑπέρ is a remarking of the bare locative, and accordingly sees an archaism rather than an Arcadian innovation. This is ultimately unverifiable, but it would be more convincing if the same adverbial had been added in both Arcadian and Homeric. As it is, Homeric περί + dat. in locative sense is a perfectly normal construction, whereas Arcadian ὑπέρ + dative in this function is not. The fact is that Arcadian has a dative where the other dialects have an adnominal genitive, and we must therefore wonder whether this is actually another example of a dative having replaced a genitive in a prepositional phrase, even where the genitive was not originally ablative.

In *I. v. Magn.* 38.8 περί governs a dative in the sense ‘concerning’: ὡς οἱ πολῖται βουλευσάντι περὶ τοῖνι. In .8 of the same inscription the engraver has erroneously carved περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν διαλεχθέσσι for περὶ λοιποῖς πάνσι διαλεχθέντων. In this same sense the other dialects have a partitive genitive.⁵⁵ Dubois sees an old metaphorical locative use, but it is also possible that a genitive has been replaced by a dative.

This same construction with the dative is also attested in Cypriot: *ICS*² 181.2–3, *-e-u-ka-sa-me-no-se-pe-ri-pa-l-i-ti* = */euksamenos peri paidi/* ‘having prayed about a child’.

The standard eponymic formula in Arcadian is ἐπί + dat. where the other dialects have ἐπί + (real) genitive, ‘in the year of ...’; eg. *IG* v 6.59, 72, ἐπ’ ἱερὶ Σαιτίοι (but very frequent —see Dubois, *Grammaire*, §123a for more examples). This could be a temporal locative use, corresponding to Myc. */muḡiomenōi epi ḡanaktei/* ‘on the initiation of the ḡanaks’ (PY Un 2.1) or it could be a case of genitives having been replaced by datives.

ANALYSIS

The data would seem to support the ‘prepositional’ rather than the ‘syncretism’ theory. The genitive is used, at least in Arcadian, to continue the ablative in non-prepositional constructions, which implies that there was prehistorically a general genitive-ablative syncretism; but the genitive has been severely marginalised in prepositional usages.

The hypothesis of Delbrück, Günther, Buck and Humbert however —viz. that prepositional phrases headed by ἀπό and ἐς were already marked for ablativity and thus the case following them underwent ‘neutralisation’ with the locative—is not quite enough to explain the distribution which we observe. If it were simply a case of removing ‘redundancy’ by using an ‘unmarked’ local case after

⁵⁵ Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* II, pp. 502f; Chantraine, *Gramm. Hom.*, p. 128; Humbert, *Syntaxe*, 316. This is despite the comments of Ilievski, *Ablativot*, pp. 118–9, and Householder (1959), p. 5, that the ablative sense is generally accepted.

'unambiguous' prepositions, we would not expect 'ambiguous' prepositions, ie. original three-case prepositions such as παρά, to undergo the same process, for in these prepositions the use of an 'unmarked' local case creates ambiguity rather than removing redundancy. Nor would we expect non-local genitives to undergo the substitution.

I prefer to see, with Morpurgo Davies, a process of simplification of the construction of three-case prepositions, perhaps motivated by a desire to reduce the syntactic load on the genitive. This process may have affected one-case ablative prepositions such as ἀπύ at the same time; alternatively it might have originally affected only the three-case prepositions, in which case the datives after ἀπύ and ἐς must be explained by the levelling of the construction of ablative prepositions, perhaps motivated by collocations of the type *παρὰ Σώκρατι ἐς οἴκω in which the former three-case preposition governs an ablative dative while the one-case preposition continues to govern an unsubstituted ablative genitive. There is perhaps some evidence that this was indeed the case since after three-case prepositions *all* genitives are replaced, whereas after one-case prepositions, only *ablative* genitives are replaced, while the partitives and adnominals after ἀντί etc. are left untouched. If the genitive after *aneu* is an ablative one, it may be that only *local* ablative genitives are subject to the substitution, and again, this would fit with the hypothesis that the extension to one-case prepositions was motivated by levelling in collocations of two ablative prepositions.

While there are no examples of non-prepositional ablative constructions in Cypriot to attest directly to a prehistoric genitive-ablative syncretism, the fact that the adnominal genitive after *peri* appears to have been replaced by a dative suggests that in Cypriot, too, the process was one of replacement of genitives wholesale by datives. Furthermore, since it is genitives, even non-ablative ones, which are subject to this substitution, it must have been genitive morphs rather than ablative morphs which were replaced; and this testifies indirectly to the existence of a genitive-ablative syncretism which must have been in place before the genitive → dative substitutions occurred. To start with a dat.-loc.-abl. syncretism, on the other hand, faces the difficulty of explaining how original ablative datives were replaced by genitives in non-prepositional constructions, while simultaneously maintaining that the genitive did not carry ablative function.

III. PREPOSITIONAL USAGE IN MYCENAEAN

The Mycenaean prepositions, adverbials and preverbs are listed in TABLE 2.

I. With Genitive	<i>heneka</i>
II. With Accusative	<i>peda</i>
III. With Dative	<i>amphi</i> <i>epi / opi</i> (also with instr. in <i>-pi</i>)

III. With Dative	<i>ksun</i> <i>meta</i> <i>paro</i>
IV. As preverbs only	<i>apu-</i> (and <i>apes-</i> ?) <i>en-</i> <i>peri-</i> <i>pro-</i>
V. Adverbial uses only	<i>posi</i> <i>hupo</i>

TABLE 2 : *Mycenaean prepositions, preverbs and adverbials*

The purely ablative prepositions of other dialects are either found only in composition (eg. *apu-*) or are missing altogether (eg. ἐκ and its equivalents, unless *a-pe-do-ke* = /*ap-es-dōke*/ in PY Fr 1184.1). It is nonetheless striking that the only preposition which governs a genitive, *heneka*, governs an adnominal — a situation which is reminiscent of that in Arcado-Cypriot.

Although the syllabic script obscures case forms to a large degree, there appear to be no prepositions which govern three or even two cases. Where later dialects have, for example, either *μετά* or *περά* construed with both genitive and dative, Mycenaean has *meta* + dat. and *peda* + acc. Householder⁵⁶ has observed that it is possible that *paro* governs two cases, a dative locatively and an instrumental ablatively, with the spelling rules obscuring the difference. However I have argued elsewhere⁵⁷ that in the plural at least (which is the only form, in *-pi*, in which the instrumental is uniquely identifiable) the instrumental is used locally only with locative function and that an instrumental-dative syncretism looks more likely than an instrumental-ablative one.

USES OF THE PREPOSITION *PA-RO* /*PARO*/

Perhaps the most interesting Mycenaean preposition is *pa-ro* /*paro*/, which corresponds to classical *παρά*. Opinion is divided as to whether its function is locative or ablative, and it frequently seems that selecting one or the other will require extremely complicated explanations of some texts. In this section I shall examine the uses of *paro* not with the aim of identifying one single sense which can be applied to all instances, but treating separately each usage, or group of similar usages, comparing them not with every other example, but only those in documents which are related by form. The following criteria are applied:

A. *Presence of other expressions in parallel with paro*. If forms which are evidently locative appear in parallel with *paro*, it may be assumed that *paro* too is locative. I treat the *-pi* case form as locative.

⁵⁶ Householder (1959), p. 9.

⁵⁷ R. J. E. Thompson, «Instrumentals, datives, locatives and ablatives: the *-phi* case form in Mycenaean and Homer», *PCPS* 44, 1998, pp. 219–250, esp. pp. 226–238.

B. *Presence of other expressions in series with paro*. If an item is said to be *at* a place X *paro* a person Y, it is probable that *paro* is locatival. On the other hand, if an item is said to be going *to* a place or person X *paro* a person Y, it is more likely that *paro* is ablatival.

C. *Context*. It is rare that the sense can be deduced solely from the context, but where possible, this sense is preferred.

D. *Economy*. If either a locative or ablative sense is possible, but one or the other requires more effort to understand, the simpler of the two is preferred. ‘Strained’ interpretations are rejected in favour of more ‘economical’ ones.

E. *Sense in similar documents*. Primarily, if one sense or the other can be established in one document of a set using the above criteria, the same sense can be postulated for other documents in the same set. With greater caution this may be applied to documents of different sets which share formal similarity.

1. *Personnel records*

KN Ai(1) 115 pa-ro , u-wa-si-jo , ko-wo [(‘124’b)

The Ai series at Knossos records groups of women and children, with a toponym (eg. Ai 739), an anthroponym (Ai(1) 63, Ai(3) 824) or, in Ai(1) 115, a *paro* formula. They are comparable to the Ak series, also at Knossos, and to the Aa and Ab series at Pylos. In PY Aa 76 the toponym is *po-to-ro-wa-pi*, an instrumental with probably locatival function.

KN Ai(1) 63 (‘124’b)

.a pe-se-ro-jo , e-e-si

.b MUL 1 ko-wa 1 ko-wo 1

KN Ai(3) 824 (—)

.1 a-pi-qo-ta / do-e-ra MUL 32 ko-wa , me-zo-e 5 , ko-wa me-wi-jo-e 15

.2 ko-wo me-wi-jo-e 4

KN Ai 739 (207?)

.1 ra-su-to , ‘a-ke-ti-ri-ja’ MUL 2 ko-wa 1 ko-wo 1

KN Ak(1) 612 (103)

.A TA 1 ‘DA 1’ MUL 9

.B ko-wa , / me-zo 1 ko-wa / me-wi-jo 1

.C da-te-wi-ja / ko-wo / me-zo 1 [kə-wə mə-]

PY Aa 76 (S640–H4)

po-to-ro-wa-pi MUL 4 ko-wa 4 ko-wo 3 DA 1 TA 1

I have argued elsewhere⁵⁸ that the Pylos Aa and Ab documents record a census of work groups and their current locations (where no location is given on an Aa text, an implicit *pu-ro* is to be understood; and where an Ab text records

⁵⁸ Thompson (1998), pp. 228f.

replaced the toponym in .4. The term *e-re-dwo-e* is evidently a designation of the men recorded, but its precise significance is not clear.⁵⁹

There is no internal evidence for the function of the toponyms, and hence of the *paro* formula —as for all of the toponyms in the As(1) and V(3) sets the case forms are obscured by the script. However, the sense may be locatival, since (i) an ablatival sense in the personnel records implies a movement of the workforce on an unimaginable scale; and (ii) if the toponyms are ablatival, since there is then no explicit mention of the current location of the workers, we must probably assume an implicit *ko-no-so*; but then the presence of an explicit *ko-no-so* on As 40 makes no sense. Thus possibly the sense of the toponyms on V(3) 655 is locatival, and since *paro* is in parallel with them, it, too, may be locatival. But the evidence for the interpretation of this tablet is weak.

PY An 129 (S129–H22)

- .1]pa-ro , ti-ki-jo
- .2 a-ta-ro-we VIR 1
- .3 pe-re-wa-ta VIR 1
- .4 za-mi-ro , pu-ro-jo VIR 10
- .5 to-ro-wo , ri-na-ko-ro VIR 1
- .6 ku-nu-ta-jo , a-so-na VIR 1
- .7 pa-ro , ka-ke-u-si ,
- .8 we-ro-ta VIR

PY An 340 (S129–H22)

- .1 pa-ro , a-ta-o VIR 16[
- .2 a-ta-o , ka-wa-ti-ro VIR 1
- .3 a-ta-o , wi-ri-wo[] VIR 1
- .4 a-ta-o[]te-u VIR[1
- .5 a[-ta-o]-ja-do-ro VIR 1
- .6 a-ta-o] , []-te-u VIR 1
- .7 a-ta-o , pu[]-a₂-ko VIR 1
- .8 a-ta-o , wo-ti-jo VIR 1
- .9 a-ta-o , te-pe-u VIR 1
- .10 a-ta-o , pu-ti-ja VIR 1
- .11 a-ta-o , a-re-[] VIR 1
- .12 a-ta-o , a-no-ra-ta VIR 1
- .13 a-ta-o , a-wa-ta VIR [1
- .14 a-ta-o , ka-u-ti-ta VIR [1
- .15] vacat [
- .16] vacat [

PY An 129 and An 340 are similar in structure and share the same hand and stylus. An 129 refers to smiths (*ka-ke-u-si* /*k^halkeusi*/), and there is some evidence to suggest that a number of the men in An 340 are also smiths: an *a-ta-o* is listed among a group of *a[-ta-]ra-si-jo* , *ka-ke-we* in Jn 431; *wo-ti-jo* and *a-no-ra-ta* are listed among two different groups of *a-ta-ra-si-jo* , *ka-ke-we* in Jn

⁵⁹ It resembles a perfect participle: J.T. Killen, J.-P. Olivier, *BCH* 92, 1968, p. 123; M. Doria *SMEA* 11, 1970, p. 155: = /*ēreiduoēs*/, perf. ppl. < ἐρείδω; *Documents*², p. 545.

832. An 340 could plausibly be understood as a list of smiths working under, and hence with, *a-ta-o*, but this is not certain.

It is possible that An 129 contains a number of toponyms. Whatever the significance of *za-mi-jo* in .4, *pu-ro-jo* probably represents the gen. sg. of the toponym Pylos⁶⁰. The collocation *za-mi-jo pu-ro-jo* could easily then mean ‘z.’s of (ie. from) Pylos’, especially if *za-mi-jo* indicates persons conscripted into the workforce as a penalty, ‘bondsmen’ *vel sim.*⁶¹ *a-so-na* in .6, in the same position as *pu-ro-jo*, may be the nom. sg. of an appellativum describing *ka-nu-ta-jo* or it may be a toponym.⁶² Similarly *ri-na-ko-ro* in the same position in the preceding line, possibly */lināgoros/* ‘collector of flax’,⁶³ or a toponym */Linagroī/ vel sim.*⁶⁴ If toponyms, they cannot be destinations to which the men are being sent by (ie. from) *ti-ki-jo* because there are no parallel toponyms in the other lines. There cannot be an implicit *pu-ro* in the lines without toponyms, because then *pu-ro-jo* in .4 would not make sense. Even if *a-so-na* and *ri-na-ko-ro* are not toponyms, the same considerations apply. Thus although the evidence is circumstantial, it seems quite likely that the *paro* expressions in this tablet are locatival, and it too is part of a survey of the workforce.

2. Commodities for a state banquet: PY Un, TH Wu, KN C(2)

In their *editio princeps*⁶⁵ of the inscribed sealings from Thebes, Piteros, Olivier and Melena have observed the similarity between the numbers of animals and other commodities listed therein and on tablets such as PY Un 138 and Un

⁶⁰ V. Georgiev, *Lexique des inscriptions créto-mycéniennes*, Sofia, Izd. Bolg. Akad. Nauk, 1955 [= *Lexique*], s.v.; M. Ventris, J Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge 1956 [= *Documents*], p. 149; *idem*, second edition, Cambridge 1973 [= *Documents*²], p. 575; A. Morpurgo Davies, *Mycenaeae graecitatis lexicon* [= *MGL*], s.v.; L. R. Palmer, *The interpretation of Mycenaean Greek texts*, Oxford 1963 [= *Interpretation*], p. 449; Mühlestein *MH* 22, 1956, p. 156; Ruijgh, *Ét.*, p. 59 and *Lingua* 42, 1977, p. 256.

⁶¹ It is, probably, the nom. pl. of an appellativum denoting the persons listed, possibly = */zāmioi/*, cf. ζημία: Meriggi, *Athenaeum* 33, 1955, p. 67; *Documents*, p. 412; Chadwick, *Ét. Myc.* 87; *MGL*, s.v.; Palmer, *Interpretation*, p. 465 (‘forced levies’); Ruijgh, *Ét.* 105 (‘s’agit-il d’hommes punis, de ferçats?’). The suggestions */sarmioi/* ‘sweepers’ (Mühlestein, *MH* 12, 1955, p. 128) and */dāmioi/*, being an official title (Luria, *VDI* 1955, p. 3, 17) both suffer from problems of spelling, and would probably rule out a connection with the bronze industry.

⁶² *Documents*², p. 535 offers both interpretations.

⁶³ Lejeune, *Mém.* I, p. 133 n. 21; Heubeck *IF* 64, 1959, pp. 129f; *MGL*, s.v.; Georgiev, *Cambridge Colloquium*, p. 118; Bader *Acta Myc.* II, pp. 156f.; *Documents*², p. 580 (or toponym); M. Lindgren, *The people of Pylos*, Upsala 1973, [= *People*] II, p. 137; Ilievski, *Tractata Myc.*, p. 156.

⁶⁴ Georgiev, *Lexique*, s.v.; Palmer, *Gnomon* 34, 1962, p. 710; *idem*, *Interpretation*, p. 370, 453; *Documents*², p. 580 (or appellativum); Sainer, *SMEA* 17, 1976, p. 55.

⁶⁵ Chr. Piteros, J.-P. Olivier, J. L. Melena, «Les inscriptions en Linéaire B des nodules de Thèbes: la fouille, les documents, les possibilités d’interprétation», *BCH* 114 (1990), pp. 103-185 [= *POM*].

2,⁶⁶ and conclude that the sealings are records of contributions of foodstuffs for consumption at a state banquet.⁶⁷ Three of the sealings, TH Wu 47, 59 and 60 contain *paro* formulae; their texts are printed below, along with those of PY Un 2 and 138, which also contains a *paro* formula.

PY Un 2 (S2–H1)

- .1 pa-ki-ja-si , mu-jo-me-no , e-pi , wa-na-ka-te ,
- .2 a-pi-e-ke , o-pi-te-ke-e-u
- .3 HORD 16 T 4 CYP+PA T 1 v 3 O v 5
- .4 FAR 1 T 2 OLIV 3 T 2 *132 S 2 ME S 1
- .5 NI 1 BOS 1 OVIS^m 26 OVIS^f 6 CAP^m 2 CAP^f 2
- .6 SUS+SI 1 SUS^f 6 VIN 20 s 1 *146 2

PY Un 138 (S138–H42)

- .1 pu-ro , qe-te-a₂ , pa-ro , du-ni-jo
- .2 HORD 18 T 5 po-qa OLIV 4 T 3 v 5
- .3 VIN 13 OVIS^m 15 WE 8 OVIS^f 1 CAP^m 13 SUS 12
- .4 SUS+SI 1 BOS^f 1 BOS^m 2
- .5 me-za-wo-ni HORD 4 T 8 v 1 ka-pa OLIV 7

TH Wu 47 (η??)

- .α SUS^m *supra sigillum D* [7]
- .β pa-ro te-qa-jo
- .γ ro-we-wi-ja

TH Wu 59 (ζ??)

- .αα *171 36 *supra sigillum J* [2]
- .αβ []SUS^x
- .β pa-ro , sa-me-
- .γα -we
- .γβ ro-we-wi-ja

TH Wu 60 (ζ??)

- .α SṢ^m *supra sigillum J* [2]
- .β pa-ro , sa-me-we
- .γ *vacat*

Given the sealings' function as 'certifying' animals and other commodities sent into the central palace from outlying districts one would expect the men named in the *paro* formulae to be the contributors, and that the formulae would then mean 'from Sameus' etc. However, since the sealings were written in the field, it is possible that the scribe wrote '*chez* Sameus', because that was where

⁶⁶ *POM*, pp. 172ff.

⁶⁷ Cf. J. T. Killen, «Observations on the Thebes sealings», *Mykenaiika*, pp. 365–380 [= Killen, 1992]; *idem*, «Thebes sealings, Knossos tablets and Mycenaean state banquets», *BICS* 1994, pp. 67–84 [= Killen, 1994].

the animal was at the time. Yet this locatival interpretation is more ‘strained’ than the ablatival interpretation, and thus less preferred under criterion D. Killen has furthermore suggested that KN C(2) 908 and 913 represent the next stage in the bureaucratic process when the contributions and their sealings have arrived at the centre: the sealings are transcribed onto tablets from which documents like Un 138 can subsequently be compiled:⁶⁸

KN C(2) 908 (112)

]pa-ro , /de-ki-si-wo CAP^f

KN C(2) 913 (112?)

.1 pa-ro , e-te-wa-no , a₃ CAP^m 1 [

.2 pa-ro ko-ma-we-te CAP^m 1 pa[

If this interpretation is correct, *paro* on KN C(2) 908, 913 can scarcely be locatival, since the animals are no longer *chez* their herdsman, they are at the central palace. For *pa-ro* , *de-ki-si-wo* to be taken locatively, the scribe must have blindly copied the sealing with no thought to what he was writing.⁶⁹

The sense of *pa-ro* , *du-ni-jo* on PY Un 138 is hard to establish. The variety and quantities of commodities listed are similar to those on the Thebes sealings, and the term *qe-te-a₂*, whatever its significance, also provides a connection (cf. Wu 51, 65, 96: <animal> *te-qa-de qe-te-a₂*, Wu 49, 50, 53, 63: <animal> *qe-te-o a-ko-ra*).⁷⁰ It is possible that *du-ni-jo* is a *du-ma*, and if so Hutton⁷¹ has suggested that he might be responsible for the disbursement of these goods from the central authority, in which case *pa-ro* , *du-ni-jo* could be either locatival (since they are currently in his keeping awaiting disbursement) or ablatival (since they are to be sent out from him). Yet no destination is recorded: *me-za-wo-ni* in .5 could formally be a recipient, but surely only of the commodities listed in .5; it is perhaps better taken in parallel with *pa-ro* , *du-ni-jo*, perhaps with *paro* to be understood. It is easier then to see *du-ni-jo* (and, perhaps, also *me-za-wo*) as responsible for sending these goods *to* the central authority, as Hutton has also

⁶⁸ Killen (1994), pp. 73ff.

⁶⁹ There is, admittedly, a possible parallel: on KN C(1) 5753 the allative *ko-no-so-de* is found, which would not be expected on a tablet which itself is from Knossos, but could be explained if it has been copied from a sealing. Cf. *te-qa-de* on TH Wu 96. See Killen, *Atti Roma II*, p. 79.

⁷⁰ The meaning of the term is opaque. The *communis opinio* is to see a verbal adjective in *-teos* derived from the verb *τείνω*, but this suffers from a number of problems, not least the variation of the forms *-e-o* ~ *-e-jo* ~ *-e-a* ~ *-e-a₂*, which might suggest an *s*-stem. W. F. Hutton, *Minos* 25–26, 1990–91, pp. 105–131, has suggested that *qe-te-a* might be the pl. of an *s*-stem /*k^hetos*/ ‘fine’ while the other forms are derived adjectives in *-eio* with the sense ‘resulting from fines’. Killen’s suggestion (*Coll. Myc.*, pp. 169f.; also Y. Duhoux, *Aspects du vocabulaire économique mycénien*, Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1976 [= *Aspects*], p. 142) that *qe-te-o* means ‘to be paid by the palace’ as opposed to *o-pe-ro* ‘to be paid to the palace’ is surely disproved by *te-qa-de qe-te-a₂* on the sealings.

⁷¹ Hutton (1990–91), p. 119.

3. Other KN C(2) tablets: records of sacrifices?

KN C(2) 914 (112)

- .A pa-ra-ti-jo OVIS^m 50
 .B a-ka-wi-ja-de / pa-ro , CAP^m 50

In view of the number of animals involved, this tablet would seem to be a record of the despatch of a hecatomb to a festival off/in *a-ka-wi-ja* (*a-ka-wi-ja-de* ?= /Ak^haiyiān-de/). In the context of such an allative form, *paro* can scarcely be locatival, unless the tablet records not the actual despatch of the animals but rather a group of animals ‘due to be sent to A., currently located *chez P.*’

KN C(2) 915 (112)

- .A] OVIS^f 10
 .B] pa-ro , a-pi-qo-ta / pa-ro do-e-ro CAP^f 10

KN C(2) 941 (112)

- .A OVIS^m 8
 .B pa-ro / a-pi-qo-ta , sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja OVIS^f 10

Despite the obvious spelling anomalies, *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* is perhaps best taken as /sp^haktēria/ ‘sacrificial victims’,⁷⁵ so these tablets may record the contribution of animals for sacrifice (and subsequent consumption?). If so, the easiest sense of *paro* is probably ablatival. A locatival sense may be possible if the animals are temporarily being stored by *a-pi-qo-ta* and *do-e-ro* (whether that is an anthroponym or denotes A.’s slave), but if so, it is unclear why the two groups of animals on C(2) 915 are stored by different individuals when the two groups on C(2) 941 are both stored by *a-pi-qo-ta*; is the species distinction significant, perhaps?

4. Flock records at Pylos: PY Cn, Cc 660

Tablets PY Cn 40, 599, 45, 254, 600, 962, 938, 131 and 453 provide many examples of *paro* followed by a herdsman’s name in the dative. The opening few lines of Cn 40 will exemplify the general structure:

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 , a-ko-so-ta-o OVIS^m 83
 ...
 .9 ma-ro-pi , pa-ro , ka-da-ro , we-da-ne-wo OVIS^m 85
 etc.

⁷⁵ Suggestion by Lejeune, *Mémoires de Philologie Mycénienne* (I: Paris 1958; II: Rome 1971; III Rome, 1972) [= *Mém.*] II, p. 203 n.18. Cf. Killen, 1994, p. 75. Cluster-initial /s/ is not normally written, and /akte/ has been rendered *-a-ka-te-* rather than *-a-ke-te-*. Neither is without parallel: for the former, cf. *e-sa-pa-ke-me[-na /espargmena/*, KN L 7375 (*Documents*², p. 546); for the latter, cf. *wa-na-ka-te-ro /uanaktero-/*.

of those same flocks (for example, the return of flocks let out to shepherds on short-term herding contracts ready for redistribution, as suggested by Godart and Killen⁷⁸) since while some names are shared between the two sets of documents, the majority are different, and furthermore the species is occasionally different (eg. *pu-wi-no* has CAP^f 55 on Cn 131.14, but OVIS^m 190 on Cn 655.5). It is probably easier to see Cn 131 as a record of different flocks, perhaps of a different status to those of Cn 655, 719 —notice the absence of any references to ‘collectors’.

Where names are shared between the two sets of documents, they are generally recorded as being at the same place; thus *o-ku-ka* and *ku-pi-ri-jo* are at *pi*-*82 in Cn 131 and 719, while those names which occur on or below .6 on Cn 131, after the second heading *ma-ro-pi*, if they occur also on Cn 655, are found in connection with *ma-ro-pi* there also. *a-ka-ma-wo* and *ko-ru-no* are found at *pi*-*82 on Cn 131.3,4 but at *wi-ja-we-ra*₂ on Cn 719.11,9, but *wi-ja-we-ra*₂ may simply be a sub-district of *pi*-*82. *po-ko-ro* is found on Cn 131.9, and hence in connection with *ma-ro-pi* and OVIS^m 100, but on Cn 45.7 as a herdsman at *u-po-ra-ki-ri-ja* with CAP^f 20; it is not certain that this is the same individual. Thus there is no evidence that the herdsmen have sent animals to the ‘enclosures’ at, say, two redistribution centres —since the locations of the ‘enclosures’ and the herdsmen are, so far as we can see, generally the same, the ‘enclosures’ might be the herdsmen’s own, in which case the *paro* formulae will be locatival; but it is equally plausible that herdsman have sent animals to local centres for processing, in which case the *paro* formulae could be ablatival.

PY Cc 660

(S4–H21)

.a a-ke-o , a-ke-re
.b me-ta-pa , pa-ro , ka-ra-su-no CAP^m 30

The tablets Cn 655, 719, 643, in that order, probably form a continuous document whose format is similar to Cn 40 etc. above. Up to and including .13 in Cn 655, where a ‘collector’s’ name appears it is followed by the term *a-ko-ra* /*agorā*/ ‘flock(?)’; thereafter, and in Cn 719, 643 *a-ko-ra* is not written after a ‘collector’s’ name. It seems likely that the scribe has simply stopped writing *a-ko-ra* but intends it to be understood with the other ‘collector’ entries on this document; and the same is probably true of Cn 40 etc. Compare this <‘collector’ name-genitive> [*a-ko-ra*] formula with Cc 660, above.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ L. Godart, «The grouping of the place-names in the Cn tablets», *BICS* 17,1970, pp. 159–161; J. T. Killen, «Records of sheep and goats at Mycenaean Knossos and Pylos», *Domestic Animals of Mesopotamia: Bulletin on Sumerian Agriculture*, Vol. VII, Cambridge 1993, pp. 209–218, esp. 215. For criticism, see Thompson (1998), pp. 233f.

⁷⁹ L. Godart, in *BICS* 17, 1970, pp. 159–161, has argued that there is a distinction between *a-ko-ra* and non-*a-ko-ra* animals, and that the omission of *a-ko-ra* is significant; I have argued against this interpretation at Thompson (1998), p. 233.

The *communis opinio* is to see in *a-ke-re* a verbal form /ageirei/ or /agērei/ corresponding to classical ἀγείρει ‘collect’,⁸⁰ and it might be tempting to see *me-ta-pa*, *pa-ro*, *ka-ra-su-no* as the place and person whence *a-ke-o* collects the animals. Yet ἀγείρω is only rarely used with such a sense —*LSJ*⁹ (*s.v.* ἀγείρω II.2) lists only three instances where it takes an ablative of the contributor (*Od.* 17.362; Herodotus 1.61; Demosthenes 8.26), and in all three cases it has the special sense ‘collect by begging’, which will not do here. Given the similarity with the *paro* entries on the Cn series, it is perhaps better to translate as ‘A. amasses a flock under the care of K. at M.’ with a locatival sense for *paro*.

5. *Sheep, wool and cloth records at Knossos: KN Dk, Ld*

KN Dk(1) 945		(120)
.1] -we-to	
.2] <i>vest.</i> / ku-mo-no pa-ro	OVIS ^m 110 LANA 8 o LANA 9
KN Dk(1) 920		(120)
.a] ko-ma-we-to	
.b] ni-ja-so / da-*22-to	OVIS ^m 60 LANA 8 o LANA 7
KN DI 47		(—)
.1] e-ke , e-u-da-i-ta	OVIS ^f 39? [
.2] ki-u-ro , su-ki-ri-ta-pi	o ki OVIS ^m 15 [

Killen has demonstrated that the D– series at Knossos probably represent a census of standing flocks producing wool for the textile industry. The Dk series records rams, the DI series ewes which are required to produce both wool and lambs (*ki* OVIS^m).⁸¹

Dk(1) 945 has a *paro* formula in the lower register. Comparison with less fragmentary texts, such as Dk(1) 920, also printed above, suggests that if the upper register reads]-we-to rather than]-we-ro it is probably the end of the ‘collector’s’ name *ko-ma-we-to*. The traces at the left of the lower register are probably the name of the shepherd. In that case, *ku-mo-no pa-ro* is standing in parallel with the toponyms of the other tablets. From sense alone, the toponyms could be either locatival (since that is where the sheep are) or ablatival (since that is where the wool is collected from). The topic of the tablets is the wool, which might favour the ablatival interpretation, but this is hard to reconcile with the sheep and lambs also being recorded. A sense ‘At X. *n* sheep produced *y* units of wool leaving a deficit of *z* units’ would suit the presence of both wool and sheep, and the presence of *su-ki-ri-ta-pi*, an instr.-loc., as the toponym in DI 47 would seem to confirm this.

⁸⁰ So *Documents*, p. 200, 386; *Documents*², p. 529; Ruijgh *Mnemosyne* 14, 1961, p. 209; *MGL*, *s.v.*; Palmer, *Interpretation*, p. 171, 404; J. Chadwick, L. Baumbach, «The Mycenaean Greek Vocabulary», *Glotta* 41, 1963 [= *MGV* I], p. 166 (*s.v.* ἀγείρω); Ilievski, *ŽA* 15, 1965, p. 55; *idem*, *Atti Roma*, p. 618; Bartoněk, *Atti Roma*, p. 757; Chantraine, *DELG*, 9 (*s.v.* ἀγείρω).

⁸¹ Killen (1964).

KN Ld(1) 584 (116)

- .1 po-]ki-ro-nu-ka 'o-pi-qi-na' TELA² 4
 .2 pa-]ro , e-ta-wo-ne-we 'o-nu-ka' TELA² 5
lat. inf.]to-sa TELA 15

KN L 871 (114?)

- .a pa-ro , re-wa-jo
 .b]ra , pe-ne-we-ta , / e-qe-si-ja , te-tu-ko-wo-a TELA⁴

Ld(1) 584 is the only relatively complete tablet from this set containing a *paro* formula. Two others, Ld(1) 5916 and 5955 contain *pa-ro* , *e-*], probably *pa-ro* , *e-*][*ta-wo-ne-we*; the same may be true of X 8291 (ms. 103, scribe of the Lc(1) textile set).

Killen has argued convincingly that the cloths described as *o-nu-ka* rather than *po-ki-ro-nu-ka* or *re-u-ko-nu-ka* are still in the process of being finished (and hence it is not yet known whether they will be *po-ki-ro-* or *re-u-ko-nu-ka*),⁸² and consequently *pa-ro e-ta-wo-ne-we* means 'in the workshop of Etawoneus'.

Compare this to L 871. Here the cloths are described as *te-tu-ko-wo-a* /*tetuk^hyo^ho^ha* 'finished'. It is unclear whether this is a record of cloths delivered to the central authority *from R.*, or of cloths *in R.'s workshop* awaiting delivery.

6. Wool at Mycenae: MY Oe 111

MY Oe 111

- .1 pe-ru-si-nwa , o-u-ka[
 .2 wo-ro-ne-ja , pa-we-si / [•]-me-'jo-i' LANA[
 .3 ne-[wa]o-u-ka LANA[
 .4]-ki-ni-*56 LANA 100[
 .5] o-ta-pa-ro-te-wa-ro LANA 200[
 .6] vacat]

The division of .5 is unclear. *Documents* posits *onta paro te-wa-ro*, with the pres. ppl. neuter pl. of εἶμι *sum*. Yet it is now clear that there is a gap between the <o> and the lacuna, in which case the participial interpretation is difficult, since we would expect */eonta/*, ὄντα being the specifically Attic development.

If *-pa-ro-te-wa-ro* contains *paro* + anthroponym, it is difficult to establish whether it is locatival or ablatival. The dative *pa-we-si* could be final, 'for cloaks', but it is unclear whether the tablet records contributions of wool coming into the centre, in which case an ablatival sense is better, or assignments of wool to workshops, in which case *te-wa-ro* might be a textile worker *with whom* the wool has been deposited. If this a store record (as the absence of names in the other lines, the presence of the terms *pe-ru-si-nwa* and *ne-wa*, and the large numbers suggest), again an ablatival sense (contributor) or a locatival sense (of the individual currently in charge of the stocks) is possible. It must be stressed, however, that it is not certain that a *paro* formula is involved here.

⁸² J.T. Killen, «The Knossos Ld(1) tablets», *Coll. Myc.*, pp. 151–181.

7. Commodity *146 at Pylos: PY Ma, Mb, Mn

The Ma series consists of nineteen tablets in S90–H2, seventeen of which have a similar structure and which refer to contributions of six commodities, denoted *146 (a rudimentary form of textile)⁸³, *RI* (flax?), *KE*, *152, *O* and *ME*, the amounts of which stand in the ratio 7 : 7 : 2 : 3 : 1.5 : 150, rounded to the nearest whole number of units. Sixteen relate to the nine and seven ‘towns’ of the H.P. and F.P., while Ma 335 refers to the additional place of *a-te-re-wi-ja*. None of these tablets contains a *paro* expression, but they are important for an understanding of the Mb and Mn series, which do. There are four types of entry on the documents: (i) assessment entries, listing the six commodities in the standard order and ratios, without deficits; (ii) contribution entries, prefixed with *a-pu-do-si /apudosis/*, which may contain deficits prefixed with *o*; (iii) exemptions granted to various groups, prefixed by *o-da-a₂ ... o-u-di-do-si* ‘thus they do not contribute’; and (iv) records of debts owed from last year, *pe-ru-si-nu-wo o-pe-ro*. Records of debts from last year and *apudosis* entries do not occur on the same tablet, but apart from this restriction various combinations are possible:

PY Ma 333	(assessment only)	(S90–H2)
.1	e-ra-te-re-we *146 46 <i>RI</i> M 46 <i>KE</i> [M 13 *152 20] <i>O</i> M 10 <i>ME</i> 1000[
.2	<i>vacat</i> [] <i>vacat</i> [
PY Ma 221	(assessment + exemption)	(S90–H2)
.1	pa-ki-ja-pi *146 22 <i>RI</i> M 22 <i>KE</i> M 7 *152 10 <i>O</i> M 4 [] <i>ME</i> 400[
.2	o-da-a ₂ , ka-ke-we, o-u-di-do-si, *146 1 <i>RI</i> M 1 *152 1 <i>o</i> M 1 <i>ME</i> 20 [
PY Ma 330	(assessment + debt)	(S90–H2)
.1	e-sa-re-wi-ja *146 42 <i>RI</i> M 42 <i>KE</i> M 12 *152 18 <i>o</i> M 8 <i>ME</i> 900 [
.2	pe-ru-si-nu-wo o-pe-ro *152 6 [
PY Ma 397	(assessment + debt + exemption)	(S90–H2)
.1	a-[·]-ta ₂ *146 24 <i>RI</i> M 24 <i>KE</i> M 2 [*152 10 <i>O</i> M 5] <i>ME</i> 500 [
.2	pe-ru-si-nu-wo, o-pe-ro *152 1 <i>O</i> M 1 [] <i>vacat</i> [
.3	o-da-a ₂]ka-ke-we, o-u-di-do-si, *146 2 <i>RI</i> 2 *152[1 <i>ME</i>]25 [
PY Ma 346	(assessment + <i>apudosis</i>)	(S90–H2)
.1	ka-ra-do-ro *146 18 <i>RI</i> M 18 <i>KE</i> M 4 *152[8 <i>O</i> M 4] <i>ME</i> 200[
.2	a-pu-do-si *146 14 <i>o</i> *146 4 <i>RI</i> M 16 <i>o</i> 2 <i>KE</i> M 4 *152 8 <i>O</i> 4 <i>ME</i> 440[

Killen has observed that a likely explanation for the distribution of entries is that early in the tax year assessments were drawn up, which may indicate shortfalls from last year, and that as payments were made, these assessment records were replaced by *apudosis* records. The lack of *pe-ru-si-nu-wo o-pe-ro* entries and *apudosis* entries on the same tablet indicates that debts from the previous year had to be cleared before payments could be made against this year’s requirements.⁸⁴

⁸³ Killen (1994), p. 67, 69.

⁸⁴ J.T. Killen, «Last year’s debts on the Pylos Ma tablets», *SMEA* 25, 1984, pp. 173–188.

In view of this, Ma 221, which contains the toponym *pa-ki-ja-pi*, will be an assessment record made early in the year. Hajnal duly sees ablative force since the tablet records payments *due from Sphagianes*,⁸⁵ but this is not the only possibility: using the same reasoning as Hajnal we could state that the assessment is made *for Sphagianes* and ‘prove’ pure dative force; or translate ‘[due from the tax-officers] *at Sphagianes*’ and ‘prove’ locative force. Hajnal further comments that the syntax does not vary according to whether the tablet is an assessment or payment record, and that in, for example, Ma 346, *ka-ra-do-ro ... a-pu-do-si* must mean ‘payment from *K.*’ While that is true, it will be seen at once from the text of the tablets that the toponym is written in connection with the *assessment* entry; there is no need to see any syntactic relationship between the toponym and the *payment* entry. Since one of the toponyms is in the *-pi* case form, I prefer to see locative force (‘assessment at <toponym>: ...; payment:...’).

PY Mn 162 (S90–H2)

.0 *supra mutila*
 .1] *146 4
 .2]ka-sa-ta *146 4
 .3 pa-ro , ke-ku-ro *146 4
 .4 a-sa-ti-ja *146 4
 .5 *vacat*
 .6 *vacat* [

PY Mn 1408 (S1398–Cii)

.0 *supra mutila*
 .1 ro-o-wa *146 [
 .2 po-ra-pi *146 5
 .3 na-i-se-wi-jo *146 2[
 .4 e-na[-po-ro *146

PY Mn 1412 (S1412–H14)

.1 pa-ro , ka-ra-
 .2 pa-qa-si-jo [*146
 .3 o-no-ka-ra[*146
 .4 ma-to-pu-ro[*146
 .5 da-nu-wa-a-ri[*146
 .6 po-ro[*146

The Mn series is fragmentary, and the work of at least three hands, S1398–Cii, S1412–H14, and also S90–H2, the hand of the Ma series. The scribal connection, and also the heavy featuring of commodity *146 (to a lesser extent also *RI*, *ME*, *O* on Mn 11) indicate that the two series are somehow related. Yet there are differences: the Ma series is the work of one hand, the Mn of several; the quantities on the Mn series are much smaller than those of the Ma series; with the exception of Mn 11, only one commodity appears on any given tablet. A major difference is the presence of anthroponyms after *paro* (*pa-ro ke-ku-ro* in

⁸⁵ I. Hajnal, *Studien zum mykensichen Kasussystem* (de Gruyter, 1995) [= *Kasussystem*], p. 173.

Mn 162.3 and *pa-ro ka-ra-* [in Mn 1412.1) whereas the Ma series is concerned with places rather than individuals. We may justifiably conclude that the functions of the two series are related but different.

If, with Hajnal,⁸⁶ we see the Mn series as records of the contributors, whether ‘districts’ of the nine and seven ‘towns’, or workgroups, of the commodities which appear on the Ma series, then an ablatival sense is possible (‘contributions from X.’), but so also is a locatival one (‘at X. they contribute’). There is in any case no evidence to compel such an interpretation. Three of the places appearing in the Ma series appear also in Mn records: *ro-u-so* (Ma 365, Mn 456.7, 1370.1), *si-re-wa* (Ma 126.1, Mn 456.4) and *a-[-]-ta₂* (Ma 397) if that equals *a-sa-ti-ja* (Mn 162.4).⁸⁷ These can scarcely be subdivisions of the ‘towns’, but may indicate contributions from the ‘town’ itself as the regional centre.⁸⁸ The problem remains that none of these ‘towns’ has an *apudosis* entry in its Ma tablet indicating that the payment has not actually been made, and while this could be explained away —are the Mn tablets actually left over from the previous year? was the palace destroyed before the corresponding Ma tablet was updated?— it seems like special pleading. Furthermore, I consider *po-ra-pi* on Mn 1408.2 to be an instr.-loc.

An alternative might be to see the Mn series as recording disbursements of the taxed commodities to various groups around the kingdom. A number of the toponyms look dat.-loc. (*e-ri-no-wo-te*, Mn 456.6,8, *sa-ri-nu-wo-te*, *ibidem* .9) or even like allatives in *-de* (*e-re-de*, Mn 1411.2, *ma-se-de*, *ibidem* .3, although these could also be datives of anthroponyms). Mn 11 has two forms which are probably datives of appellativa, *ja-ke-te-re* in .2⁸⁹ and *ra-pa-i-pi-jo-i* in .5,⁹⁰ who may be the recipients of the commodities listed. The evidence of KN M(1) 683 suggests that commodity *146 required finishing, and it is conceivable that this is what is being recorded on the Mn tablets, although the small number of units involved in each entry is possibly surprising. Might this indicate that the work is centred on small ‘cottage’ industries?

KN M(1) 683		(103)
.1a] a-ze-ti-ri-ja	
.1b]te-o	o-nu-ke LANA 9 M 2
.2]ti-mu-nu-we	*146 30

⁸⁶ Hajnal, *Kasussystem*, pp. 174ff.

⁸⁷ Both possibly spelling variants of *a-si-ja-ti-ja*, *Documents*, p. 147.

⁸⁸ So, for example, Killen, *BICS* 41, 1996, p. 147.

⁸⁹ Dat. sg. (*MGL*, s.v. —or nom. pl.? Lindgren, *People* II, p. 60 —or nom. pl.? Ruijgh, *Ét.*, p. 55 n.40, 65) of an agent noun in *-tēr*, possibly = *a₂-ke-te-re* < *iakestēr*: Georgiev, *Lexique*, s.v.; Lejeune, *Mém.* II, p. 209; *idem*, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien* (Paris, Klincksieck, 1972) [= *Phonétique*], 168 n.; Ruijgh, *Forum der Letteren* 4, 1963, p. 243; *idem*, *Ét.*, p. 55 n.40; Chantraine, *DELG*, s.v. ἄκος.

⁹⁰ Dat. pl. (*MGL*, s.v.; *Documents*², p. 578), although meaning unknown.

The Mb series records small quantities, less than five units, of commodity *146 in connection with toponyms of mostly indeterminate case or anthroponyms in the dative after *paro*.

PY Mb 1379	pa-ro na-me[*146	(S1412–H14)
PY Mb 1401	pa-ro , ka-wa-ti-ro[*146	(S1412–H14)
PY Mb 1377	wa-a ₂ -te-pi , ne[*146	(S1412–H14)
PY Mb 1366	di-wi-jo *146 2	(S1412–H14)

Evidently these are connected with the Ma and Mn series. Accordingly, Hajnal⁹¹ interprets them as records of contributions of taxation made by various individuals and therefore sees ablative sense in the toponyms and *paro* formulae. However, the Mb series seems more closely related to the Mn than to the Ma: the form corresponds more closely to the Mn entries, and a number of the anthroponyms and toponyms are the same (eg. *ke-sa-da-ra* Mb 1380 ~ Mn 1368.2,3; *e-na-po-ro* Mb 1435 ~ *e-na[-po-ro* Mn 1408.4). The functions are likely to be the same, and it is indeed tempting to wonder whether the Mb texts might not be the original records from which the Mn page tablets were subsequently compiled. As with the Mn series there is no reason to require an ablative interpretation; rather, a locative sense might be preferred, especially given what I consider to be an instr.-loc., *wa-a₂-te-pi*, in Mb 1377.

8. Land tenure records at Pylos

The Pylos E- series present a large number of instances of *paro* used to denote the relationship between an individual who holds an *o-na-to* and the individual or the *dāmos* from whom, or on whose land the *o-na-to* is held. The records are highly formulaic; the following texts exemplify the series.

PY Ea 800	(S28–H43)
ke-re-te-u , e-ke , o-na-to , pa-ro , mo-ro-qo-ro po-me-ne	GRA 2 [
PY Eb 369	(S149–H41)
.A wa-na-ta-]jo , e-ke-qe , o-na-to , ke-ke-me-na , ko-to-na	
.B pa-ro]dā-mo , ko-to-no-o-ko , to-so-de , pe-mo	GRA T 5

The basic formula for saying that A. holds a plot from B. or on B.'s land is A. *ek^hei(k^ue) o-na-to paro B.*, but it is not possible to determine whether the sense is ablative ('from B.') or locative ('on B.'s estate'). Both are equally plausible, and both largely amount to the same thing.

9. PY Fr 1184

PY Fr 1184	(S1202–H2)
.1 ko-ka-ro , a-pe-do-ke , e-ra ₃ -wo , to-so	
.2 e-u-me-de-i	OLE+WE 18
.3 pa-ro , i-pe-se-wa , ka-ra-re-we	38

⁹¹ Hajnal, *Kasussystem*, pp. 172f.

The document consists of two entries, the first recording a consignment of olive oil sent by *ko-ka-ro* to Eumedes, the second a number of stirrup jars (*ka-ra-re-we*).⁹² If the form of *a-pe-do-ke* is slightly awkward, its sense ‘gave’ *vel sim.* is clear enough.⁹³ *Documents*² sees the record as a delivery to Eumedes of both the oil and the jars needed to contain it, and consequently sees an ablative sense for *paro*. However, since both *ko-ka-ro* and Eumedes are perfumiers,⁹⁴ this cannot be a taxation record (which may explain why the technical term *apudōke* is not used) and so the jars need not be part of the same transaction as the oil, in which case the entry in .3 may simply be a record of jars in I.’s workshop. Thus nothing can be concluded about the sense of *paro* in this tablet.

10. PY Vn 130

PY Vn 130

(H1)

- | | |
|-----|---|
| .1 | o-ze-to , ke-sa-do-ro , *34-to-pi , |
| .2a | pa-ro |
| .2 | a-ke-a ₂ , me-ta-pa , pe-ri-te 1 |
| .3 | a-pi-no-e-wi-jo , pa-ro , e-ru-si-jo 1 |
| .4 | a-pi-no-e-wi-jo , pa-ro , a ₃ -ki-e-we 4 |
| .5 | e-na-po-ro , pa-ro , wa-do-me-no 9 |
| .6 | sa-ri-no-te , pa-ro , o-wo-to 5 |
| .7 | pa-ki-ja-si , pa-ro , a-ta-no-re 4 |
| .8 | ka-ra-do-ro , pa-ro , to-ro-wo 1 |
| .9 | pa-ki-ja-si , pa-ro , e-ri-we-ro 3 |
| .10 | e-wi-te-wi-jo , pa-ro , wi-sa-to 1 |
| .11 | me-te-to , pa-ro , ko-do 3 |
| .12 | ro-]u-so 24 |
| .13 | me-te-to , pa-ro , e-u-qo-ne 3 |

This is an extremely difficult text because two of the words, *o-ze-to* and *34-*to-pi*, are completely opaque. It appears to be a record of some sort of vessels, *a-ke-a₂ /angeha/* in connection with an individual *ke-sa-do-ro* and various other persons and places. The presence of the dat.-loc. *pa-ki-ja-si* in .7,9 requires a locative sense in the toponyms, and suggests one for the *paro* formulae: ‘at Sphagianes, *apud* Atanor: 4 vessels’ etc.

Detailed interpretation of the tablet is hampered by *o-ze-to* and *34-*to-pi*. The former appears to be a 3rd sg. verbal form prefixed by the *o-* introductory particle.

⁹² Cf. KN K 778.1:]*ka-ra-re-we* *210^{VAS}. Possibly /*k^hlarēues*/. Householder, *CJ* 54, 1959, p. 379; Palmer, *Interpretation*, p. 270, 276, 425; Duhoux, *Minos* 9, 1968, p. 92 n. 102; *idem*, *Aspects*, p. 120 n.310; *Documents*², p. 481, 494, 551; Chantraine, *DELG*, s.v. *χλαρόν*.

⁹³ The normal form is /*apudōke*/ without augment; an alternative is to see /*ap-es-dōke*/ with compound preposition (Luria, *PdP* 15, 1960, p. 258), but this is equally unparalleled. For Petruševski (ŽA 10, 1960, p. 324), /*ape-*/ is a ‘weakened’ form of /*apu-*/.

⁹⁴ Duhoux, *Aspects*, pp. 119ff.

Palmer has suggested /*hō gento*/ with *ke-sa-do-ro* as subject, ‘thus K. received’.⁹⁵ Mühlestein has suggested /*hō keitōi*/ ‘what belongs’ with *ke-sa-do-ro* as a dative.⁹⁶

Duhoux⁹⁷ and Ruijgh⁹⁸ have suggested a value /*lu*/ for *34, and Duhoux accordingly interprets /*lutorp^{hi}*/ ‘[fitted] with sieves’, describing the vessels. Hajnal⁹⁹ objects that a word of this form should mean ‘one who pollutes’ rather than ‘sieve’, and prefers Ruijgh’s derivation from a *nomen agentis* based on the verb λύω. He sees the /*lutorp^{hi}*/ as the persons from whom *ke-sa-do-ro* received the vessels. Yet both /*gento*/ and /*keitōi*/ are etymological interpretations of *o-ze-to*, neither of which is certain, and neither of which properly explains why the palatal <ze> is used. A value of /*lu*/ fits the available data fairly well, but is only a hypothesis.

11. Miscellaneous tablets

PY Xa 176 (Ci)

.1	pe-re-wo-te , pa-ro , i[-]qa-ne[
.2	pe-re-wo-te , pa[-ro

Although this tablet is too fragmentary to give any context, the presence of what looks like a dat.-loc. toponym in series with *paro* might suggest a locative sense.

PY Pa 49	pa-ro , e-ri-ma-si-jō	DE *169 10[(S49–Ciii)
PY Pa 53	pa-ro , re-u-ka-so	DE *169 7 [(S49–Ciii)

The meaning of these tablets is unclear. The meaning of ideogram *169 and the adjunct *DE* are not known, although *169 resembles an item of furniture such as a couch, and *DE* could stand for /*demnion*/. If, as appears from Pa 53, the right-hand edge is blank, they resemble texts such as KN C(2) 908 and 913, and might record deliveries from the two men named, so that *paro* might be ablatival. This would fit with the scenario of Pn 30, in which a ‘collector’ is taking delivery of a number of *169:

PY Pn 30 (H2)

.1	o-de-ka-sa-to , a-ko-so-ta
.2	si-ma-ko *169 23 o 10[
.3	ke-ka-to *169 26 o 9
.4	ru-ko *169 13 o[

⁹⁵ *Apud Documents*, p. 403, comparing Hom. γέντο, eg. *Il.* 8.43, and Cypr. ἀπόγεμε· ἄφελκε and ὑγγεμος· συλλαβή (Hsch.)

⁹⁶ *Apud Documents*, p. 403.

⁹⁷ Y. Duhoux, «Les syllabogrammes 34 et 35 du linéaire B», *Res Myc.*, pp. 112–125

⁹⁸ C. J. Ruijgh, «Le syllabogramme *34/35 du linéaire B: valeur possible $ru_2 = lu$ », *Studia Mediterranea II*, pp. 555–572.

⁹⁹ Hajnal, *Kasussystem*, p. 205.

Various other fragments whose meaning cannot be ascertained: PY Xa 1379 (by association with Xa 176 locatival?); PY Un 1320; KN X 793; KN X 8291 (unless, as noted above, p. 000 this is a textile finishing record, in which case it is probably locatival).

A MYCENAEAN POSTPOSITION /*apo*/?

PY Ea 259

(S28–H43)

.a u-me-ta-qe , a-po ,
 .b o-ke-u , e-ke , o-na-to , pá-ro , da-mo GRA T 2

Ea 259 is a record of an *o-na-to* held by *o-ke-u* from the *dāmos*. The lower register is clear enough, and follows the formula of the other E– series documents already described. The upper register, however, contains the mysterious sequence *u-me-ta-qe* , *a-po*. *Documents*¹⁰⁰ read [*? u-*]po, taken as adverbial ‘O. has an *o-na-to*, and under him, U.’, commenting, ‘This unique variation in the formula suggests some form of subtenancy’. It is conceivable that *apo* might function in a similar way, ‘and from him, U.’. Most scholars however interpret *a-po* as /*amp^hō*/, ‘both O. and U. hold an *o-na-to* from the *dāmos*’.¹⁰¹

Since *e-ke* is a singular verbal form U. cannot be a co-holder of the plot, and hence co-subject, unless there is a failure of concord, perhaps because *u-me-ta-qe* , *a-po* was added later; given its position, this is certainly a possibility. Alternatively *u-me-ta* may be conjoined with the *dāmos*, ‘O. holds an *o-na-to* from the *dāmos* and U. both’, in which case both *u-me-ta* and *a-po* must surely be dative, /*amp^hoin*/ *vel sim*. Yet /*-k^ue amp^hō*/ or /*-k^ue amp^hoin*/ seems rather more verbose than the customary language of the tablets: ‘both’ is surely redundant after /*-k^ue*/ whether it conjoins *u-me-ta* to *o-ke-u* or to the *dāmos*.

If, contrary to the *communis opinio*, *a-po* represents a postposition /*apo*/ the sense might be ‘O. holds a plot from the *dāmos* and from U.’ The variation in preposition *paro* ~ *apo* would perhaps be surprising, but could indicate a difference in the relationship between O. and the *dāmos* and between O. and U.: perhaps ‘on *dāmos* land, through U.’ (ablative of cause?). If this is the case, then /*apo*/ would probably have to be governing a dative since *u-me-ta*, if masculine, cannot be a genitive; we would expect *u-me-ta-o*.

An obvious problem is that the regular form of the Mycenaean ἀπό-equivalent is *apu*, although this need not be insurmountable. *apu* cannot be the result of the raising of /*o*/ to /*u*/ since this is not a regular sound change in Mycenaean, which implies that common Greek had both **apo* and **apu*. (Arcado-Cypriot ἀπύ, *apu*, could be either inherited **apu*, or the result of raising *o* > *u* /—# which is a regular phenomenon in those dialects).

¹⁰⁰ *Documents*, p. 259

¹⁰¹ Lejeune, *Mém.* II, p. 235, 273 n.23; *MGL*, s.v.; Milani, *Aevum* 39, 1965, p. 432; Ruijgh, *Ét.*, p. 296 and n.31; *Documents*², p. 449. *D.Mic.* comments that Gallavotti’s *apo* (*SIFC* 20, 1958, p. 66) ‘debe rechazarse’.

CONCLUSION

The majority of the instances of *paro* in Mycenaean could equally well be taken locatively or ablatively. However, when the sense can be determined, there are cases where it is difficult to see anything other than locative force (the An personnel records, Cn flock records, D- flock/wool records and L- cloth-finishing records), and again others where an ablative sense seems inescapable (the Thebes Wu sealings, Knossos C(2) animal records). Thus *paro* + dative appears to show precisely the same bivalence which *παρά* + dative manifests in Arcadian. Furthermore, although the number of true Mycenaean prepositions is small, there are no instances of any preposition governing multiple cases (though this may be accidental), and no instances of a preposition governing a genitive which is anything other than adnominal. If *a-po* in PY Ea 59 is a postposition (although this interpretation is purely speculative), then it is governing a dative, not a genitive.

If this pattern of government is not caused by a syncretism of dative and ablative, and I do not believe that any such syncretism can be evidenced,¹⁰² then the Mycenaean prepositional system begins to look startlingly similar to the Arcado-Cypriot one. One might then envisage a situation where a group of second millennium Peloponnesian dialects underwent a simplification of the pattern of government of their three-case prepositions which resulted in their being unable to govern a genitive and which brought about an ablative use of the dative in some prepositional constructions. One-case ablative prepositions were subsequently brought into line by analogy with ablative uses of former three-case prepositions, perhaps as a result of the levelling of collocations such as *παρά* <dat. of anthroponym> used with *ἀπό* <gen. of toponym>, while one-case prepositions governing an adnominal genitive were unaffected by this secondary, analogical shift.

If this is the case, then Arcado-Cypriot and Mycenaean share an isogloss which represents an innovation over common Greek, and which can be traced back to the Bronze Age. This has consequences not only for the relationship between the three dialects, but also for the relationship between them as a group and the other East Greek dialects, since it is clear that East Greek generally does *not* share this innovation. On the contrary, Homeric preserves three-case government of *ἐπί*, *παρά*, *πρός*, *ὑπό* and *μετά*; and while Attic has two-case government of *ἀνά*, *μετά*, and later *περί*, this looks like a later development, and it is in any case the dative rather than the genitive which is suppressed.

Chadwick¹⁰³ has observed that all of the divergences between Attic-Ionic and common East Greek are either demonstrably late (eg. the change of $\bar{\alpha}$ > η) or shared with West Greek (eg. *ap* / *pa* not *op* / *po* as the reflex of the syllabic

¹⁰² Thompson (1998), *passim*.

¹⁰³ J. Chadwick, «The Greek dialects and Greek prehistory», *G&R* NS 3, 1956, pp. 38–50. ‘as to the sacred money’.

liquids), and has thus proposed that Attic-Ionic was the result the contamination of a Mycenaean-like East Greek dialect by a West Greek dialect in the post-Mycenaean period. Yet if I am right in seeing an innovatory isogloss which Mycenaean does not share with Attic-Ionic, then Mycenaean must already have been distinct in the Bronze Age.

Cambridge, CB3 9ET
Queens' College

RUPERT J.E. THOMPSON