

ALFRED HEUBECK

SYLLABIC *r* IN MYCENAEAN GREEK?*

In some important contributions E. Risch has formulated his standpoint about the genesis of the Greek language¹; 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 times². We may differ in judging single phenomena: the results of his considerations that Risch has impressively summarized in 9 main theses³ 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

* Dr. J. T. Killen, Cambridge, has diligently read this paper and improved my somewhat poor English in numerous cases; I am very grateful to him for his valuable help.

¹ Of special importance are the following contributions: (I) «Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht», *MH* 12, 1955, pp. 61-76 (= *Language and Background of Homer*, ed. by G. S. Kirk, 1964, pp. 90-105); (II) «Die Frühgeschichte der griechischen Sprache», *MH* 16, 1959, pp. 215-227; (III) «Il problema dell'unità linguistica greca», relazione del Prof. Risch, «Le Protolingue», *Atti del IV Convegno Internazionale di Linguisti*, 2.-6. 9. 1963, 1965, pp. 91-118.

² Cf. J. Chadwick, «The Prehistory of the Greek Language», *CAH* I/II², chapt. 39, 1963.

³ III, pp. 107-109.

Mycenaean tablets have brought an explanation. We point only to the different development of the labiovelars followed by *e*, to be dated as Post-Mycenaean, since Mycenaean still preserves the IE labiovelars in nearly all positions⁴.

The fact that in the Homeric poems the pronominal forms δ , η , $\tau\acute{o}$ are used as demonstratives and have not yet taken on the function of articles⁵ 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 pronoun⁶ (for instance $\acute{o}\delta\epsilon$, attested in most of the dialects after Homer⁷, Att. $\acute{o}\delta\acute{\iota}$, Arg. $\tau\alpha\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ ⁸, El. and Boeot. $\tau\acute{o}\acute{\iota}$, Thess. $\acute{o}\nu\epsilon$, Arc. $\tau\omega\nu\iota$ [gen. sg.] and $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu$, Cypr. $\acute{o}\nu\epsilon$, $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\epsilon$ ⁹ and $\acute{o}\nu\nu\upsilon$, $\tau\acute{o}\nu\nu\upsilon$ ¹⁰), 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 dialects¹¹.

In his «Übersichtstabelle der besprochenen Dialektmerkmale» (I, p. 75) E. Risch has ranged the different forms of the modal particle ($\acute{\alpha}\nu$, $\kappa\epsilon$, $\kappa\epsilon\nu$, $\kappa\alpha$) among the group of the 'old' characteristics antedating 1200 B. C. But if the derivation of these different forms from an original $*\kappa\epsilon(v)$, $\kappa\alpha\nu$, proposed independently and in very similar detail by Kathleen Forbes¹² and L. R. Palmer¹³, is correct —and in my opinion they are right¹⁴ — one

⁴ For details cf. O. Szemerényi, *SMEA* 1, 1966, pp. 29-52.

⁵ Cf. E. Schwyzler, *Griech. Gramm.* I, 1938, pp. 610-612.

⁶ Cf. M. Lejeune, *RPh* 17, 1943, pp. 120 ff.; Anna Morpurgo Davies, *Glotta* 46, 1968, pp. 77-85.

⁷ Cf. E. Risch, *Studi linguistici in onore di V. Pisani*, 1969, pp. 831-843, esp. 840 f.

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.

¹¹ It seems better to ignore Myc. *to-so-ne* MY Oe 118.1; cf. J. Chadwick, *MT* II, 111; M. Lejeune, *Minos* 6, 1958, p. 115; E. Risch, *Studi Pisani*, p. 841.

¹² *Glotta* 37, 1958, pp. 179-182.

¹³ *A Companion to Homer*, ed. by A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings, 1962, pp. 90-92.

¹⁴ «Verführerische Ableitung»: A. Lesky, *AAW* 17, 1964, p. 135; scepticism is expressed by D. J. N. Lee, *AJPh* 98, 1967, pp. 45-56; cf. W. C. Cowgill, *Ancient Indo-Eur. Dialects*, ed. by H. Birnbaum and J. Puhvel, 1966, p. 88.

must suppose that in Mycenaean times there still existed a common Greek * $\kappa\epsilon(v)$, $\kappa\alpha v$, 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 γ to $\rho\alpha/\alpha\rho$, $\rho\omicron/\omicron\rho$ 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 γ to *or* (perhaps also to *ro* and *ar*), 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 γ 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 η , η and l .

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 γ 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 γ 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 $\gamma > ar/ra$, whereas a development $\gamma > or/ro$ perhaps happens only under certain condi-

¹⁵ For details cf. W. C. Cowgill, *loc. cit.*, pp. 80, 82, 90 s.

¹⁶ *Mnemosyne* 14, 1961, pp. 193-216; *Études*, pp. 69-71.

¹⁷ «The Treatment of γ and l in Mycenaean and Arcado-Cyprian», *Atti Roma*, pp. 791-814.

tions. It is unnecessary to discuss this question in detail, as our observations are particularly concerned with the Mycenaean material¹⁸.

In my view, it ought seriously to be considered whether in the Mycenaean period we have to do with the preservation of original *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 \bar{r} (< $r\bar{a}_2$) seems (without exception) to have developed to $r\bar{a}$ by Pre-Mycenaean times.

1. *ka-ra-te-ra*, certainly designating a vessel in MY Ue 611, probably acc. $|kr\bar{a}t\bar{e}ra|$ ¹⁹, from nom. *krātēr*, this being a -τήρ-derivation from a dissyllabic root $*ker\bar{a}_2-|kre\bar{a}_2-$, zero-grade $*kr\bar{a}_2-$. $kr\bar{a}-$ may go back to $*kre\bar{a}_2-$ as well as to $*kr\bar{a}_2-$; but as agent nouns formed with -τήρ show the zero-grade²⁰ of the root, we are led to suppose original $*kr\bar{a}_2-t\bar{e}r$.

2. *pa-ra-ke-se-u*, a personal name in PY Fn 324.10 (in dat. form *pa-ra-ke-se-we* $|-\bar{e}wei|$), a shortened form in *-eus* $|Pr\bar{a}kseus|$ of a Terpsimbrotos-Compositum e. g. $*Pr\bar{a}ksil\bar{a}wos$ (cf. later Πράξιλος) as the first element is derived from πρᾶξις as the first element is derived from πρᾶττω/πρήσσω, this showing guttural enlargement of a root

¹⁸ For the problems of the development of *r* in Greek I 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, ἄλειφόβιος: 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. Adrados, «La vocalización de las sonantes indo-europeas», *Emerita* 26, 1958, pp. 249-309: «Sobre la evolución griega de las sonantes indo-eur.», *Studia classica et orientalia A. Pagliaro oblata* I, 1969, pp. 63-74.

¹⁹ Cf. A. Morpurgo, *Lexicon s. u.*; J. Chadwick and Lydia Baumbach, *Vocabulary*, p. 209.

²⁰ E. Risch, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, 1937 (abbr.: *Wortbildung*), p. 26.

²¹ A. Heubeck, *BzN* 8, 1957, p. 267.

**per*₂-/*pre*₂-. As the action nouns on *-tis*/*-sis* are usually based on the zero-grade of the verbal root, a development *πρᾶξις* < **pr*₂-*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. Risch²². In view of Hom. *κράατος* it is most plausible to suppose for written *ka-ra-a-pi* a spoken *krāha(p)phi*, based on original **kr*₂*snt-phi*²³.

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 *|Thrākhēwi-|* and that it should be compared with *τράχῦς* and the local name *Τρᾶχίς*/*Τρηχίς*²⁴. These words are based on a dissyllabic root **dher*₂-*gh*-/*dhre*₂-*gh*-; both normal grade **dhre*₂-*gh*- and zero-grade **dhr*₂-*gh*- led to **t(h)rākh*-²⁵.

5. *ta-ra-nu* «footstool» PY Ta 707 + *|thrānus|*, cf. Hom. *θρῆνυς*. Again it remains uncertain whether the (deverbative) derivation is formed from normal grade **dhre*₂- or zero-grade **dhr*₂-.

For our investigation of (short) sonantic *ʒ*, 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 *|kara(h)pphi|* 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.

²⁵ Cf. H. Frisk, *GEW* II, p. 921 s. u. *τράχῦς*.

type κουροτρόφος 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 Γόρτυς²⁷.

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 */ararmot-menai, -ō/*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 Lang³⁰ 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 */Mātropulos/*, whereas it would create difficulties to suppose spoken */Mātorpulos/* and thus to admit an exceptional spelling *-Co-ro-* for *|-Cor-|*, otherwise found only in the one case cited above (*c*).

On the other hand, a reading */Mātorpulos/* 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 *Mātropulos* and *Mātorpulos*, the solution must be found in another direction.

²⁶ Cf. Fr. Bader, *Demiourgos*, pp. 3, 33 ff.

²⁷ Cf. A. Heubeck, *Praegraeca*, 1961, pp. 58-63 with bibliography; we point also to *po-pu-re-ja* */porphureja/* and *po-qa* */phorguā/*; 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.

³⁰ *AJA* 65, 1961, p. 161.

The morphological rules for the formation of compounds lead one to expect that a word *mātēr*, when it forms the first element of a compound, will have an original form *māt̄r-* (with the suffix *-t̄r* 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 *Mātro-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. *Māt̄r-pulos*, and that scribe 21 tries to render the phonetic sequence *-t̄r-* 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* *|-pōs|* «having four feet», seems to reflect a spoken *|q̄etro-|*. The explanation of this form could be given in different ways; one could suppose *a*) that *ʒ* 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 *|q̄etor-p.|*.

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, Boeot. τετράμεινον (*Del.*³ 523.14) and Thess. πετροετηρίδα (*Del.*³ 617g) still clearly evidence the old *-t̄r-*.

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

³¹ M. Lejeune, *BSL* 60, 1965, pp. 12-17.

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 μητρο- as the first part of a compound (cf. esp. Μητρό-πολις) show secondary *o*-thematization. I thank Mme Fr. Bader for having shown to me that the personal name Μητρόδωρος (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 $|q^u etor-|$ (c) encounters certain fundamental difficulties.

My own assumption, that the writer of the Ae-tablets saw the possibility of rendering spoken $q^u etr-$ 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 $\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\zeta\alpha$ are of the same origin cannot be doubted; $\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\zeta\alpha$ is to be derived from $*t\acute{r}epeza$, and this $*t\acute{r}epeza$ must be found in Myc. $to-pe-za$, whether we read, traditionally, $|torpeza|$ or, as I would prefer, $|t\acute{r}epeza|$. 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 $-t\acute{r}p-$ both in $qe-to-ro-po-pi$ and in $to-pe-za$ seem to point to the conclusion that this old sequence $-t\acute{r}p-$ 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. $q^u etr-$ and $t\acute{r}-$ in the words cited above have the same etymological origin —I offer no firm explanation of how the shortening $q^u etr- > t\acute{r}-$ is to be explained— is supported by the existence side by side of the Hom. words $\tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\rho\varsigma$ (epithet of «helmet») and $\tau\upsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$, both apparently composed of the same elements and illustrating the same form of the helmet³⁵. $\tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha-$ shows the normal development of the form $q^u etr-$ that is

³⁴ In G. P. Shipp, *Essays in Mycenaean and Homeric Greek*, 1962, pp. 18 f. n. 32. Cf. J. Chadwick-L. Baumbach, *Vocabulary*, p. 249; O. Szemerényi, *Studies in the I.-E. System of Numerals*, 1960, p. 79 n. 61; A. Morpurgo Davies, *Atti Roma*, pp. 803 f. The older explanation is preferred by H. Frisk, *GEW* II, pp. 917 f. s. u. $\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\zeta\alpha$.

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 *tr̥-* found elsewhere that contrasts with normal *tr-* > *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 *τριμίσκον* ἰμάτιον. Ἄσπένδιοι. 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*]-*a*₂ *ke-ro-ta*[— and *tormiskos* 'vierfädig, viergezwirnt', is attractive. *to-mi-ka*, which we prefer to read *tr̥mika*, seems to show a formation like *τράπεζα* 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* («Blumenstickereien»); in Mycenaean times, as today, embroidering may have been a task of women⁴¹.

As readings for the two forms cited one may suppose *thornos* 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 *th̥rno*-. It must not be concealed that this explanation does not

³⁶ E. Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* I, pp. 351 f.; M. Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*², 1955, p. 169 n. 2; P. Chantraine, *Dictionary*, p. 9.

³⁷ *Studia Mycenaea Brno*, pp. 115 f.; *Atti Roma*, p. 813.

³⁸ J. T. Killen and J.-P. Olivier, *BCH* 92, 1968, pp. 137 f.

³⁹ Cf. *to-no-e-ke-te-ri-jo*, too; J. Chadwick-L. Baumbach, *Vocabulary*; C. J. Ruijgh, *Études*, p. 113.

⁴⁰ Cf. J. T. Killen, *Atti Roma*, p. 642.

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 *-ijos*-derivative of *θρόνα* and design clothing adorned with *θρόνα*? We need not decide here whether in Hom. χρυσόθρονος *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 Hom. $\theta\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ as an Aeol. form (with aeol. $r > \rho\omicron$), whereas in the later $\theta\acute{o}\rho\nu\alpha\xi$ 'footstool' as well as in $\Theta\acute{o}\rho\nu\alpha\xi$, a local name found in Laconia and Argolis, we should have to do either with a development $r > \omicron\rho$ or with a metathesis $\rho\omicron > \omicron\rho$, both of which assumptions raise difficulties. The name $\Theta\acute{o}\rho\nu\alpha\xi$ could belong to a Pre-Doric, «Achaean» layer in the Peloponnese⁴², but the noun $\theta\acute{o}\rho\nu\alpha\xi$, 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 $r > \omicron\rho$ is by no means normal⁴⁵. The formation of the supposed *thynos* also raises difficulties: is a *-nos* derivation from the root **dher-* in the zero-grade *dhr-* possible?

4. Unsolved problems of a different kind are raised by the variant writings *to-ro-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 *ksuntroq^uā*, *ksuntroq^uhā* or *ksunstroq^uhā*. 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 *-trq^u(h)ā*; but as a nominal formation with *-ā* almost necessarily presupposes the *o*-grade of the verbal root

⁴² O. Masson by letter 24.1.64.

⁴³ P. Chantraine, *Kratylos* 7, 1962, p. 169 n. 1.

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).

⁴⁹ Cf. now C. J. Ruijgh, *Atti Roma II*, pp. 705-707.

of τρέφω or τρέπω (cf. later τροφή, τροπή), one is inclined to read $-troq^u(h)\bar{a}$ 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 $troq^u(h)\bar{a}$, a scribal error is evident on Fh 339⁵¹. 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 $troq^u(h)$ -seems conceivable⁵².

The personal name $e-u-to-ro-qa$ (PY Jn 478.10) certainly has an *o*-grade in $-troq^u(h)os$ 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: $torq^uis$, $-idos$. This assumption would presuppose a derivation from zero-grade $*troq^u-$; I ask therefore if the Myc. word should not be read $troq^uis$ ⁵³.

5. A comparable case, hitherto unknown, is provided by the archive of Mycenae. As J.-P. Olivier⁵⁴ 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 truth⁵⁵. I would suppose spoken γ , 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.

⁵¹ Cf. L. Godart, *Atti Roma* II, p. 803; *SMEA* 8, 1969, pp. 52 f.

⁵² For a personal name $to-ro-qa$ cf. the above cited name $]-to-ro-qa$.

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-akrijoi*. 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-ta₂*, or as a place-name in *-ijā*; certainly it is identical with (abl.) *u-po-ra-ki-ri-ja*, a toponym in Cn 45.4-7,11⁵⁹. For the word-formation the later names Διακρία, Διάκριοι and Ἐπακρία, Ἐπάκριος 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 Ὑπεράκριοι.

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-* original⁶¹. But the assumption of an old doublet *ὑπόρ beside normal ὑπέρ seems arbitrary, and, if one points to the correspondence between *upar-* and Pamphyl. ὕπαρ, *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,

⁵⁶ H. Mühlestein, *Studia Mycenaea Brno*, p. 115 (πῶλος, ἔπω).

⁵⁷ M. D. Petruševski, *ŽA* 15, 1965, p. 294 (pointing to θεο-πρόπος).

⁵⁸ *BzN* 13, 1962, pp. 146 f., with details. The explanation, given by M. Doria, *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti* 18, 1963, pp. 512 f., who thinks *u-pi-* a secondary variant of *o-pi* (~ἐπί), seems improbable, as in the Mycenaean texts regularly formed *o-pi* is documented as the normal form several times.

⁵⁹ The contrasting names formed either with *u-pi-* or *upor-/upar-* are surely not identical, as L. R. Palmer, *Minos* 4, 1956, pp. 136 s., and, firstly, M. Doria, *AIV* 120, 1960/1, p. 659 n. 2, have supposed.

⁶⁰ E. Vilborg, *Grammar*, p. 50; C. J. Ruijgh, *Études*, p. 175.

⁶¹ Julia Kerschensteiner, *MSS* 6, 1955, p. 61; cf. M. Doria, *loc. cit.*

which could be rendered according to Myc. spelling practices in two different ways. I would suggest a spoken *up γ (r)-akrija*⁶², 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 *-p γ (r)a-* with *-po-ra-*⁶³. In every case, this explanation can start from a form *up γ -*, indirectly attested by Pamphyl. ὕπαρ; the fact that in Mycenaean the form *up γ -* 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. Risch⁶⁴ 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 **opet γ (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 cites⁶⁵.

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. Mühlestein explained a long time ago in a clearly correct manner⁶⁶. (I pass over the less certain examples *a-no de-ki-si-wo*, *a-no-zo-jo* and *a-no-qa-si-ja*⁶⁷.) 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.

⁶⁵ *Mentions*, pp. 153-155.

⁶⁶ H. Mühlestein, *MH* 15, 1958, pp. 223-225; *Atti Pavia*, pp. 361-365; *MH* 22, 1965, p. 159. Inexplicably, the interpretation of H. Mühlestein 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 f., 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 *anr̥-* is to be found, and I would posit this phonetic shape —not *anor-*, as Mühlestein suggests— for Mycenaean also. Consequently, we must read *Anr̥-mēdēs* and *Anr̥-q^uhontās*. 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, *anr̥-* is the only possible form. This old athematic formation is recognizable in later ἀνδράποδον, ἀνδρακός etc. (with **anr̥-* > **anra-* > *andra-*), whereas a form like Ἀνδρομήδης for instance already presupposes the possibility of thematizing consonantal stems in the first element which arose in the Post-Mycenaean 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 *Anr̥(r)-altās*, 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-altās*: «he who nourishes the fire». As in our example (6), the analogical effect of names like *Anr̥-mēdēs* and *Anr̥-q^uhontās* seems to have prevented a development (*Anr̥(r)-altās*) > **Anraltās* > **Andraltās*, whose second phase (-*VnrV-* > -*VndrV-*) is attested in several names and nouns: *a-dī-ri-jo* |*Andrijos*, -*ijōn*|, *qe-ra-dī-ri-jo* |*Q^uēl-andrijos*|⁶⁹. *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra* |*Aleksandrā*| and *wi-ja-da-ra* |*Wijandrā*| as well as in ἀνδριός, whose Myc. instr. form is attested: *a-dī-ri-ja-te* |*andrijantē*|.

The proposed transliteration |*Anr̥q^uhontās*| 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-go-no* (7). The fact that a *ko-ma-we* |*Komāwens*| appears as an owner of flocks in some places, and a *ra-wo-go-no* |*Lāwoq^uhonos*| is named (2 ×) in the same

⁶⁸ Cf. Phryg. λαφαλτα-: *IF* 64, 1959, p. 130. But cf. now M. Lejeune, *Athenaeum* 47, 1969, pp. 179-192, esp. 189 f.; *SMEA* 10, 1969, pp. 19-47, esp. 23-30.

⁶⁹ -*ijos*-derivative of **Q^uēlandros* ~ Τήλανδρος: C. J. Ruijgh, *Études*, p. 148.

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-go-ta*, *ko-ma-we* and *ra-wo-go-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.: *-ēwei*), we would expect *ko-ma-we-te*; and if they are in the accusative (thus H. Mühlestein, *Atti Pavia*, p. 363), *ko-ma-we-ta* would be the correct form (*Komāwenta*) 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-go-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-go-ta/a-na-go-ta* seems likely. The scribe of B 798 (107) has written only 4 tablets, none of which have the form *a-no-go-ta*; for rendering *-nγ-* 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 *aleiphγ-* 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. Mühlestein⁷⁴ as «Tag für Tag». He reads *āmōr-āmar*⁷⁵, but a form *āmγ(r)-āma* (< *-āmγ?*) —cf. our remarks on *u-po-ra-ki-ri-ja* and *a-no-ra-ta*— with zero-grade *āmγ-*

⁷¹ Cf. M. Lejeune, *REA* 60, 1958, pp. 13 f., n. 42.

⁷² Cf. M. Ventris-J. Chadwick, *Documents*, p. 389; J. Chadwick-L. Baumbach, *Vocabulary*, p. 169; C. J. Ruijgh, *Mnemosyne* 14, 1961, pp. 204 f., *Études*, p. 71; L. R. Palmer, *Interpretation*, p. 42; M. Lejeune, *BSL* 60, 1965, p. 15; A. Morpurgo Davies, *Atti Roma*, p. 801.

⁷³ J. T. Killen and J.-P. Olivier, *BCH* 92, 1968, p. 121.

⁷⁴ *Akten des 2. Internat. Kretologischen Synedrion* 2, 1968, pp. 135 f.

⁷⁵ For comparable formations in Greek and the I.-E. languages cf. O. Masson, *ŽA* 15, 1966, pp. 257-266.

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 *-CrC-*:

11. *do-ka-ma-i* (PY An 1282.3): *dygmāhi*⁷⁶;
12. *o-pa-wo-la* (PY and KN): *op-āwryta*⁷⁷;
13. *pa-wo-ke*, gen. *-ko* (PY Aa 795; Ab 558; Ad 691; La 632): *-wryges*, *-ōn*⁷⁸;
14. *to-si-ta* (PN in PY Cn 719.2): *Thrsitās*⁷⁹;
15. *u-do-no-o-i* (PY Fn 187.13): *udr-nohoihi*⁸⁰;
16. *wo-do-we* (PY Fr 1203 +): *wrdowen*⁸¹;
17. *wo-ze* etc. (cf. A. Morpurgo Davies, *Lexicon*, p. 369 f.): *wryzei*⁸².

But as we have tried to show, spoken *-CrC-* 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 *krku-*. 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 Mycenaea Brno*, p. 116 (both with bibliography).

⁸⁰ H. Mühlestein, *MH* 22, 1965, p. 158; C. J. Ruijgh, *Études*, pp. 370 f. (with a differing explanation).

⁸¹ A. Morpurgo Davies, *Atti Roma*, p. 812.

⁸² Fr. Bader, *Demiourgos*, pp. 3 ff.; A. Morpurgo Davies, *Atti Roma*, p. 804.

⁸³ *Vocabulary*, p. 209; M. Doria, *AIV* 119, 1960/1, p. 722.

⁸⁴ A. Heubeck, *IF* 66, 1961, p. 32; C. J. Ruijgh, *Études*, p. 209.

19. *mo-ro-qa*, a title of high officials in Pylos, attested also on two Knossos tablets⁸⁵, has hitherto been variously explained⁸⁶; of the suggestions offered, H. Mühlestein's merits special attention⁸⁷. In keeping with the orthographical rules, he reads **mrog^uās* to be derived from **mrg^uās*, whose normal Att.-Ion. descendant could be found in βράβης (by-form of βραβεύς). The development *r* > *ro*, however, assumed by Mühlestein in this case, seems impossible. According to the traditional opinion, a form **morq^uās* would be expected, and this form should have been written **mo-qa*. As we have proposed here, a Myc. word **mrg^uās* 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^uās* (with *o*-grade of the root **mreg^u-*), whereas βράβης comes from another form **mrg^uās* (with zero-grade of the same root).

20. With some probability the adjective *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* (PY Er 312.7; Un 718.11) is to be read *wrō*⁸⁸.

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 *r*. 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 *thugatēr*; cf. dat. sg. *tu-ka-te-re* Oe 106.2; nom. *tu-ka-te-ge* |*thugatēr-q^ue*| V 659. *-ta-si* then would render spoken *-tysi*. It may be noticed that the reading *tu-ka-to-si*, proposed by H. Mühle-

⁸⁵ J. T. Killen and J.-P. Olivier, *Cambridge Colloquium*, p. 62.

⁸⁶ Cf. M. Gérard-Rousseau, *Mentions*, pp. 144-146; add: M. Lejeune, *REA* 43, 1961, p. 741; C. J. Ruijgh, *Études*, p. 327, n. 159.

⁸⁷ *MH* 15, 1958, pp. 222 f.; *Atti Pavia*, p. 360; approved by M. Doria, *AVI* 119, 1960/1, p. 741; A. Heubeck, *IF* 65, 1960, p. 258.

⁸⁸ For details cf. A. Heubeck, *ζΑ* 15, 1966, pp. 267-270; cf. M. Gérard-Rousseau, *Mentions*, pp. 250 f.

stein⁸⁹, but rejected by J.-P. Olivier⁹⁰ 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-Compositum» *Wrapsi-lāwos*⁹¹. 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 **wr̥ptis* 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 *wr̥psi-* 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 discussion⁹². Perhaps one should assume (with L. R. Palmer) a derivative of ἄρην, ἄρνός, i. e. an original form **wr̥nejos*; but it would be striking if beside *wo-ro-ne-ja* there were an alternative, but differently formed adjective *we-re-ne-ja* *|wr̥neja|* (PY Ub 1318.7)⁹³ 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 **wr̥neja*. If the interpretation I have proposed for the female personal name *pi-ro-wo-na* (MY V 659.7)⁹⁴ is correct, in this word we should find the corresponding «short» spelling of spoken *-wr̥*. (*Philo-wr̥nā*); the alternative spelling of *-wr̥n-* by *-wo-ro-n-* or *-wo-n-* could be paralleled in the Pylian cases *ma-to-ro-*: *ma-to-* etc.

⁸⁹ By letter 27.7.62; hectograph 15.1.63.

⁹⁰ *BCH* 91, 1967, p. 378; *MT IV*, p. 17.

⁹¹ A. Heubeck, *IF* 64, 1959, pp. 119-126.

⁹² Cf. L. R. Palmer, *BICS* 2, 1955, p. 36; *Nestor* 1963, p. 240; pp. 275 f.; *Interpretation*, p. 646; *Documents*, p. 323; J. Chadwick-L. Baumbach, *Vocabulary*, p. 175; P. Chantraine, *Cambridge Colloquium*, p. 177; C. J. Ruijgh, *Études*, p. 240; P. H. Ilievski, *ŽA* 17, 1967, pp. 25 f.; A. Morpurgo Davies, *Atti Roma*, p. 804.

⁹³ M. Lang, *AJA* 62, 1958, p. 191; A. Heubeck, *Bibl. Orient.* 17, 1960, p. 19; M. Doria, *AIV* 120, 1961/2, p. 657; J. Chadwick-L. Baumbach, *Vocabulary*, p. 175; P. H. Ilievski, *ŽA* 17, 1967, p. 25; C. J. Ruijgh, *Études*, p. 239.

⁹⁴ A. Heubeck, *BzN* 16, 1965, p. 205.

With these 23 examples the list of Myc. words containing etymological or spoken *ɣ* 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-pte*, *pa-we-a₂*, *ta-pa*, *ka-ri-se-u*, *wa-no*⁹⁵.

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 *ɣ* 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.*

	1. -Co-ro- (-Co-rV-)	2. -Co.-	3. Other possibilities
(1)	PY <i>matoropuro</i> : 21 (II)	PY <i>matopuro</i> : (I?)	
(2)	PY <i>qetoropopi</i> : 42 (III)	PY <i>topeza</i> : 2 (I)	
(3)	KN <i>torono-</i> : 102?	PY <i>tono</i> : 2 (I)	
(4)	PY <i>kusutoroqa</i> : 24 (II), 41 (III); KN: 137	PY <i>kusutoqa</i> : 1 (I)	
(5)	MY <i>poropoi</i> : 63	PY <i>toqi-</i> : 2 (I) MY <i>popoi</i> : 64	
(6)	PY <i>uporakirija</i> : 21 (III)		PY <i>uparakirija</i> : 3 (I)
(7)	PY <i>opetoreu</i> : 1 (I) (!)**		PY <i>opetereu</i> ; 41, 43 (III) (!)
(8)	PY <i>anorata</i> : 21, 22 (III)	PY <i>anomede</i> : 21 (III) (!)	
(9)		PY <i>arepozoo</i> : 43 (III) (!)	PY <i>arepazoo</i> : (I)
(23)	MY <i>woroneja</i> : 51	MY <i>pirowona</i> : 61	

* Roman numerals designate the classes, Arabic numerals the hands of scribes.

** The forms, noted with (!), do not fit the pattern which seems to emerge from examples (1)-(4), (6).

⁹⁵ For details cf. A. Morpurgo Davies, *Atti Roma*, pp. 801-806.

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 lose their irregularity if we replace them by the morphologically older forms to be reconstructed for Pre-Homeric times. H. Mühlestein⁹⁶ has rightly stressed the importance of one epic formula which seems to allow an insight into the prehistory of epic diction:

(ψυχῆ.....) λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἦβην.

The formula appears in this form Π 857 = X 363; a variant (Ἀχιλλεύς ...) Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτῆτά τε καὶ μένος ἦύ occurs at Ω 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 paper⁹⁷. Undoubtedly Homer wrote ἀδροτῆτα and meant ἀνδροτῆτα. We may also ignore here the vexed problem of how to define and to limit the term «epic formula»⁹⁸; we may assume in any event with some confidence that the passage cited (Π 857b = X 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 poetry⁹⁹.

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

⁹⁶ *Atti Pavia*, p. 365.

⁹⁷ *Glotta* 43, 1965, pp. 62-76; cf. *Lfgre*, p. 807 *s. u.*; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire*, p. 88.

⁹⁸ Cf. the prudent exposition of the problems given by A. Hoekstra, *Prototypes*, pp. 7-30 and *passim*.

⁹⁹ Cf. M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, 1950, p. 221; H. M. Hoenigswald, *Festschrift für F. B. J. Kuiper*, 1968, pp. 20-23.

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 ($\acute{\alpha}(\nu)\delta\rho\omicron\tau\tilde{\eta}\tau\alpha$ should «normally» be scanned $\text{—}\cup\text{—}\cup$, not $\cup\text{—}\cup$, as it is in the formula), by the assumption that the earlier phonetic shape of the word allowed a regular scansion. In fact, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\omicron\tau\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$ must go back to a form $*an\gamma\text{—}t\tilde{a}t\text{—}$, this having the normal zero-grade of the noun-stem. The accusative $*an\gamma\tilde{t}\tilde{a}t\tilde{a}$ shows the prosodical sequence $\cup\cup\text{—}\cup$, which is usable within the metrical structure of the hexameter and fits the formula¹⁰⁰. But since, according to the current opinion, the vocalization of γ is already to be found in Mycenaean times, we should be obliged to date the origin of the formula and at least of 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 conclusions¹⁰¹.

If, as is generally supposed, the development $\gamma > or$ is Mycenaean, we should be obliged to assume that in Mycenaean times the original $*an\gamma\tilde{t}\tilde{a}t\tilde{a}$ had already got a prosodical shape which no longer fitted the hexameter ($*an\omicron\tilde{t}\tilde{a}t\tilde{a} : \cup\text{—}\text{—}\cup$), and that in the further development of epic diction Myc. $*an\omicron\tilde{t}\tilde{a}t\tilde{a}$ had been replaced by the Aeolic form ($*an\omicron\tilde{t}\tilde{a}t\tilde{a} > *and\omicron\tilde{t}\tilde{a}t\tilde{a} : \text{—}\cup\text{—}\cup$), and lastly, that the Ionian singers had taken over $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\omicron\tau\tilde{\eta}\tau\alpha$ (with $\bar{\alpha} > \eta$) 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 Aegaeon, 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 = X 363 and Ω 6 may have been amongst others to be formed at this time when spoken *r* was still preserved. Then, with and after the consolidation of the tribes and ethnic groups in their later habitats, the vocalization of *r* may have ensued, besides many other phonetic developments which contributed to the dialectal differentiation of these groups. That it did not result in **anratāta* > **ἀνδρατήτα* may be due to the analogical influence of recent compounds with thematized *ἀνδρ-ο-* as their first part, like Ἀνδροκλῆς (in contrast to the correct Ion. development **anrkas* > *ἀνδρακάς* etc.); but *ἀνδρατήτα* could also be a loan-form from Aeolic, where this form would be normal: **anrtāta* > **anrotāta* > *ἀνδροτήτα*.

In an important paper, P. Wathelet¹⁰² 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 — ∪ ∪ — of νύξ ἀμβροτή (E 78) seems to result from the origin of the expression: original **nuks amrtā*, to be scanned — ∪ ∪ —, is correct. The same is to be said of ἄ(μ)βροτάξομεν (K 65), scanned ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪, < **ἀμροτάξομεν* < **amrtaksomen*¹⁰³, and (ἄσπίδος) ἀμφιβρότης (B 389, M 402, Y 281; transformed and enlarged Λ 32), scanned (— ∪ ∪) — ∪ ∪ —, < **amphi-mrtās*¹⁰⁴. It is to be noticed that in all these cases it is not the Ionic, but the Aeolic development *r* > *ro* that is to be found.

¹⁰² «La coupe syllabique et les liquides voyelles dans la tradition formulaire de l'épopée grecque», *Linguistic Research in Belgium*, 1966, pp. 145-173.

¹⁰³ C. J. Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*, 1957, p. 74.

¹⁰⁴ H. Mühlestein, *Atti Pavia*, p. 365; J. Latacz, *loc. cit.*, p. 66; P. Wathelet, *loc. cit.*, pp. 170 f.; H. M. Hoenigswald, *loc. cit.*, pp. 20 ff.

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. Wathelet¹⁰⁵ have seen, the formula Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρεϊφόντη (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 ἀνδρεϊ-¹⁰⁶. An original old (but I think Post-Mycenaean) formula («prototype» in the terminology of A. Hoekstra) **Enu(w)ali(j)os anḡ-q^uhontās* is surely to be reconstructed. Influenced then by the epithet of Hermes ἀργεϊφόντης, in which, as I suppose, ἀργεϊ- is regular dat.-loc. of ἄργος¹⁰⁷, 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* /*Anḡ-q^uhontās*/ (see above) may support the reconstruction of the «prototype» of our *Enyalios*-formula; whether the name of the Knossian official has the primary meaning «killer of men» or, as I believe, «he who distinguishes amongst men» *uel sim.*¹⁰⁸, is not here significant.

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

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Rüdiger Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*, 1967, pp. 124-127; H. M. Hoenigswald, *loc. cit.*

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.

¹⁰⁷ *BzN* 5, 1954, pp. 19-31.

¹⁰⁸ *BzN* 8, 1957, pp. 32-35.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. P. Wathelet, *loc. cit.*, pp. 162-164; 166-168; 165.

period of epic poetry, was placed at this position by preference is attractive; if we suggest that τράπεζα has replaced an original **trpeza*, it seems less strange that τρ- in τράπεζα does not lengthen the preceding short word-end ἦδὲ τραπέζας χ 438 etc.). To suppose an intermediate (Myc.) **torpeza* is to complicate the situation needlessly.

A similar argument obtains in the case of βροτός. Expressions like πάντεσσι βροτοῖσι (ν 397) and μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσι (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.) **mytoisi* removes the metrical anomaly; a development, however, leading from Pre-Myc. **mytoisi* to Myc. **mortoihi* > Aeol. *mrotoisi* > βροτοῖσι would be highly striking and improbable.

And lastly θρόνος. In the formula

Θ 199 σεῖσατο	}	δ' εἰνὶ θρόνῳ
Ο 150 ἔζετο		

D. J. N. Lee¹¹⁰ has already tried to explain the double strangeness that consists in the *correptio Attica* and in the form εἰνὶ by postulating an older (Myc.) form of θρόνος. He reconstructs a prototype: *— ∪ ∪ δ' ἐν θόρνῳ. If, however, a Myc. —and still Post-Myc.— form **thynos* is to be supposed, we have to argue in another way: the replacement of θρόνος by older **thynos*, for instance, would remove the metrical anomaly in the apparently formulaic expression used in the *Odyssey* 8× at the verse-end: κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε. And a form **thynos* (but also *thronos*) would fit the verse-end formula θρόνος ἀργυρόηλος (4× in gen., 1× in acc.) —in contrast to **thornos*. In this case certainty is not possible.

We summarize the developments assumed above in the following table:

¹¹⁰ *BICS* 6, 1959, p. 7; A. Hoekstra, *Prototypes*, pp. 144 f.; P. Wathelet *loc. cit.*, p. 165; C. Gallavotti, *loc. cit.*, p. 846.

Proto-Greek	Myc. and Submyc. Greek	Archaic Greek
$-C\gamma C- >$	$-C\gamma C- >$	{ Ion.-Att. $-CraC-$ Aeol. $-CroC-$
$-nrC- >$	$-nrC- >$	{ Ion.-Att. $-nraC-$ $-ndraC-$ Aeol. $-nroC$ $-ndroC-$
$(-VnrV- >$	$-VndrV- >$	$-VndrV-)$
$-mrC- >$	$-mrC- >$	{ Ion.-Att. $-mraC-$ $-mbraC-$ Aeol. $-mroC-$ $-mbroC-$

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.