## DEURO- AND PERAN-ANKALAIA

Five tablets preserve the «double-barrelled» names of two groups of towns within the Pylian orbit. Palmer was the first, I believe, to point in print to the antithetic prefixes de-we-ro and pe-ra and to the tell-tale cumulative totals. He remarks that «P. B. S. Andrews has brilliantly suggested that we have a $\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha-$ group and a $\delta \varepsilon u \rho o-$ group comparable with Latin trans- and cis-> ${ }^{1}$. In the same article Palmer made considerable progress in fixing the geographical limits of the two districts, in suggesting locations for one or two individual coastal towns, and in inferring the respective locations of the rest.

But the identification of the second element in the two compound names has proved difficult. There is good reason to believe, with Palmer, that the division was between towns on the west coast of TriphyliaMessenia and towns along the Messenian gulf (possibly only the eastern side of the Messenian promontory). In other words, the cape later called Akritas seems to be the dividing feature. But how is the second element to be equated with the promontory itself or with some important physical feature (or town?) in the immediate vicinity?

[^0]The compound names occur as follows:
(1) pe-ra-a-ko-ra-i-jo
(2) pe-ra-ko-ra-i-ja
(3) $p e-r a_{3}-k o-r a-i-j a$
(4) de-we-ro-ai-ko-ra-i-ja
(On 300.8)
(Ae 398)
(Ng 332; Wa 114)
(Ng 319)

There can be no doubt that we have to do with the same first and second elements in (1), (2), and (3). And it is all but a certainty that the second element of (4) is the same as the second element of (1), (2), and (3).

Ventris and Chadwick suggested that the second element might be transliterated Aigolaia (?) which they proceeded to equate with Mt. Aigaleon (Ai $\bar{\gamma} \alpha \bar{\delta} \circ \gamma$ ). They translated Deuro-aigolaia (?) as «those from this side of (?) Aigaleon» and they equated pe-ra $a_{3}-k o-r a-i-j a$ with pera( $i$ )Aigolaia (?) ${ }^{2}$. Palmer rightly criticized their identification, involving as it does a topographic anomaly ${ }^{3}$ and also «formidable morphological difficulty> ${ }^{4}$.

Palmer himself favors $\pi \hat{\varepsilon} \rho \alpha-$ and $\delta \varepsilon \tilde{v} \rho o-$ plus a district name ${ }^{5}$. Lejeune,
 'evening, western' and in ${ }^{\star} a_{3}-k o-r a$ a noun ${ }^{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ formed on $\dot{\alpha}_{\rho} \rho \omega$. Hence, he translates de-we-ro-ai-ko-ra-i-ja [ $\chi \omega \rho \alpha]$ as «commandement du Ponant». Pe-ra-ko-ra-i-ja he takes as referring to a $\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha i \alpha ~ \dot{\alpha} . \rho \chi \omega \lambda \dot{\alpha}$, «région extérieure», «région d'au-de-là» ${ }^{6}$.

2 Documents 144, 147, 149, 300, 301.
3 It is extremely difficult to imagine how Aigaleon, however we stretch its topographical extent or application, could have been used to mark the geographical division indicated in these documents.

4 Loc. cit., 144, 145.
5 He had previously suggested for the first element the equation pe-ra $=$ $=\Phi$ ¢pai (BICS 2 [1955] 38).

6 Cf. Lejeune M., 'Les Documents Pyliens des Séries $\mathrm{Na}, \mathrm{Ng}, \mathrm{Nn}$ ' in Études Mycéniennes (Paris 1956), pp. 146, 147. He goes on to say that another interpretation could be: provinces situated respectively on this side or that of a given limit, mountain or river. But he finds difficulty in accepting the equation de-we-ro $=\delta \varepsilon \tilde{u} \rho \circ$. It is true that the standard etymologies of $\delta \varepsilon \tilde{v} \rho o$ do not involve the digamma. Cf. Frisk H., Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg 1954) s. v., who takes it to be from «ぇ $\delta \varepsilon$-aupo oder (weniger gut) $\star \delta \varepsilon-\nu \rho \circ ? »$. But there are also difficulties with Lejeune's equation. Cf. Frisk, op. cit., s. v. $\delta \varepsilon i \varepsilon \lambda 0 \varsigma$, where the etymology is said to be «nicht sicher erklärt»

This is to suggest that Ruipérez has put us on the right track for the identification of the second element when he proposed the equation (almost certainly right in my opinion) a-ke-e $=\dot{\alpha} \gamma x \varepsilon^{\prime} \varepsilon l^{7}$. This dativelocative of $\ddot{\alpha} \gamma \times 0$ s 'valley', often used as the second element in compound place-names, is exactly the kind of description of physical environment which we should expect to find in most toponyms.

The basic meaning of a whole battery of Greek words formed from the root ${ }^{\star \dot{\alpha}} \gamma x-$ is 'bend', 'angle' (cf. Latin ancus, Skt. añkas, OHG angul). Several of these formations occur in Greek as early as the Homeric poems and they usually, then and later, stress the concavity of the angle, i.e., 'valley', 'inlet', 'recess', 'crook of the arm' etc. But a formation like $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \dot{\omega} \nu$ may as early as Homer connote the jutting angle of a wall, i.e. the angle thrusting out into space ${ }^{8}$. And Strabo clearly uses the same word to describe a point of land formed by a sharp bend in a river ${ }^{9}$.

It is no long leap from such a connotation to the idea of 'cape' or 'headland' thrusting out into the sea ${ }^{10}$. This is what one naturally associates from context with the word concealed in the second element
but Solmsen's derivation of $\delta_{\delta \varepsilon v \sigma \varepsilon \lambda}{ }^{\circ}$ from $\delta v^{\prime} \omega$ is quoted with apparent approval, and the reader is referred to Boisacq for «ältere Deutungsvorschläge» such as
 attractive in our context, and perhaps a new look at the etymology or the Mycenaean phonetics of $\delta \varepsilon \tilde{u} p o$ is in order.

As for Lejeune's ${ }^{\star} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega \lambda \dot{\alpha}_{2}$ there are good parallels for the formation and it fits the context reasonably well. However, almost every scholar who has studied the citations seems to sense the likelihood of some kind of topographical indication hidden in ${ }^{\star} a$-ko-ra. The equation suggested below has this point in its favor, as well as the apparent tendency for words with the -ōlo- suffix to denote abstract, rather than concrete terms.

Cf. also P. Meriggi's remarks on the pe-ra compounds in 'I Testi Micenei in Trascrizione' (Athenaeum, n.s. Vol. 33 [1955] p. 70). He suggests that the spelling with $r a_{3}$ is an attempt to indicate the glide perjakoraija when the last syllable of $\pi \varepsilon \rho i$ was elided before the following «a» vowel.

7 Minos V (1957) 182.
8 Iliad 16.702. «Three times Patroklos tried to climb upon a corner ( $\bar{\varepsilon} \pi^{\prime} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma-$ $x \vec{\omega} v o s)$ of the lofty wall.» For a recent treatment of the whole $\dot{\alpha} \gamma x$ - complex, cf. Frisk, op. cit., pp. 10-12.
${ }^{9}$ Geography 12.8.19 (580). The word $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \tilde{\omega} \nu \varepsilon$; is here translated «angles» or «headlands», which are washed away by the Meander in time of flood.

10 Cf. oxó $\pi \varepsilon \lambda o \varsigma$ already in use in Odyssey 12.73 etc., though here there is the added connotation of height ( $\sigma \times \circ \pi c \dot{\alpha}$ ).
of the compounds we are discussing ${ }^{11}$. Obviously, ${ }_{\alpha} \gamma \times 0 \varsigma$ and $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \omega \dot{\omega}$ are ruled out, but we have other possibilities in formations like $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \dot{\partial} \lambda \eta$,


Let us first consider the problem of reconciling the $v$ or $\alpha$ vowel (of classical Greek) with the second or ko syllable which occurs uniformly in our five examples. The $v$ is by all odds the more common in later formations; but the shift $0>v$ is troublesome, although perhaps not insurmountable ${ }^{12}$. Undoubtedly the more likely equation is $\star_{a-k o-r a}$ $=\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$. There are abundant and dependable parallels for Mycenaean $\check{\sigma}>$ classical $\breve{\alpha}^{13}$.

The $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \alpha \lambda$-formations are admittedly used quite regularly in later Greek to connote the inside of the angle. In connection with the land vs. sea, we often have a meaning like 'bay' or 'inlet' or perhaps 'gulf' ${ }^{14}$. And it may prove necessary to adopt such a meaning for our word. Then Deuro-ankalaia $=$ «the district on this side of the gulf», i.e. on the west coast of Akritas, a meaning which admirably fits the context. But Peran-ankalaia is more troublesome. It surely would be very misleading to call this area «the district beyond [on the other side of] the gulf» since at least some of the towns in question were apparently on the near (west) side of the gulf from the Pylian point of view ${ }^{15}$.

I feel however that we are on stronger ground to insist on the admittedly slighter evidence cited above for the idea of a 'point' or 'angle'

[^1]thrust out or up into space. And there is one reasonable certain case in early classical Greek where $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ means '(sharp) point'. In Prometheus, Hermes' threats include the statement $\pi \varepsilon \tau \rho \alpha i \alpha \quad \delta^{\prime} \alpha \gamma \times \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \quad \sigma \varepsilon \beta \alpha \sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\prime} \sigma{ }^{16}$. Here surely Aeschylus has in mind the version of the story where Prometheus is impaled on a mountain peak.

I suggest, therefore, that the correct interpretation of the two compounds is «on this side of The Point» and «on the far side of The Point». Thus to the local inhabitants in Mycenaean times, if this identification is correct, Cape Akritas was simply and quite naturally «The Point» ( $\dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ ).

We must now consider briefly the spelling problem in the syllable (or syllables) immediately before the $k o$. Looking back at our documents, we find the variants $r a-a, r a, r a_{3}$, and ro-ai. These differences cannot be due to spelling errors ${ }^{17}$. They indicate pretty clearly that the scribes were faced with a real difficulty in adapting a somewhat awkward writing system to an unusually tricky phonemic situation ${ }^{18}$.

It is obvious, of course, that scribes of (1) and (4) wrote the term self-consciously, i.e. as a phrase consisting of two separate elements which can be transcribed $\pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha \nu-\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \alpha \lambda \alpha<\alpha$ and $\delta \varepsilon v \rho o-\dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \alpha \lambda \alpha \iota \alpha$. And it is equally obvious that the scribes of (2) and (3) mirrored in their spelling an almost inevitable development in popular speech, i.e., they regarded the name as a single compound word which can be transcribed $\pi \varepsilon \rho \bar{\alpha} \gamma \times \alpha \lambda \alpha 1 \alpha$. But the scribe or scribes of (3) and (4) were trying to show something else, probably something about the pronunciation of the first syllable of the second element. We have now some evidence for the nature of the difficulty, granted that we are right in believing that this syllable would have been written $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi$ - alphabetically.

[^2]I have little doubt that the answer to at least one of the variants is to be sought in an attempt to show the length or quantity of the $\breve{\alpha}$ followed by the consonant cluster $\gamma x$. The grid has so far yielded little dependable evidence on the method of indicating long vowels which were certainly present in the language ${ }^{19}$. The second variant may equally well represent an attempt to show the pronunciation of $\check{\alpha}$ plus $\eta$ (velar nasal) ${ }^{20}$. A very promising method for sharpening our grasp of the writing system (as well as of certain features in the language behind it) is precisely in careful comparative study of a series of tell-tale variants such as our examples.

Finally, a few words must be said about the particular context of our texts. There can be no doubt that, added to the stem of the second element, we have an adjective suffix in $-\alpha, 0 \varsigma$ or $-\alpha i o \varsigma{ }^{21}$. The entries in Ng 319 and 332, recording assessed total of linen (?), surely involve district (collective) names which are most likely to be interpreted as neuter nominative plurals ${ }^{22}$. One occurrence, On 300.8, is unique in the sense that the last syllable is $j o$ instead of $j a$, and also that the compound occurs in the body of a large tablet. The text is missing at the top and badly damaged and rather carelessly written all through. But it has been recognized for some time that this is a record concerned with both of our major districts ${ }^{23}$. The line in question is a new heading $o-d e \quad p a_{2}-a_{2}-p e-r a-a-k o-r a-i-j o$, with two columns of place-names both

[^3]above and below it. The form of our compound will depend on the proper reading of the four syllables to the left. If the diagonal line is really a word divider, the first word should be $\tilde{\omega} \delta \varepsilon$ or $\omega \varsigma \delta \varepsilon^{24}$. If $p a_{2}-a_{2}$ is equivalent to $\pi \tilde{\alpha} \sigma \alpha(l)$ or something of the sort, the jo termination probably shows a genitive plural. If $p a_{2}-a_{2}$ is a verb form ${ }^{25}$, then our compound is probably a nominative plural masculine.

Our terms seem to indicate how largely the Pylians thought of distance in terms of travel by ship rather than by land. The Mycenaeans were a trading and raiding folk whose important towns were nearly all within easy reach of the sea. Obviously, some of the towns «beyond The Point» were closer to Pylos as the crow flies than the more northerly of those «on this side of The Point». But near or far were calculated in terms of sail and oar, not wheel or horse-back or $\mu \hat{\varepsilon} \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi o ́ \delta: \alpha^{26}$.

William A. McDonald

## University of Minnesota.

[^4]
[^0]:    1 Minos IV (1956) 140. Actually, Butman (Lexilogus, tr. J. R. Fishlake [1869] 466-475) argued with considerable cogency that $\pi \varepsilon \cdot \rho \alpha$ is closer to Lat. ultra (i.e., emphasis is on intervening space) and that the nearest Greek equivalent to trans is $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu$ (i. e., emphasis on something, like a river, intervening between two points or places). No doubt $\pi \hat{\varepsilon} \rho \bar{\alpha}$ and $\pi \bar{\varepsilon} \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu$ are dative and accusative of an old substantive ${ }^{*} \pi \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \bar{\alpha}(\dot{\eta})=\dot{\eta} \pi \varepsilon \rho \alpha i \alpha$ 'the opposite country'. A glance at the Liddell and Scott Lexicon (s.v.) makes it abundantly clear that, judging by classical usage, the accusative form best fits our contexts. It is the epic and Ionic form, used often from Homer onward, both as a preposition with the genitive and also absolutely. The common association is with the notion of water lying between. Furthermore, the accusative implies motion, as does $\delta \varepsilon$ üpo commonly in Homer and later. As will be developed below, $\pi \varepsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \alpha y$ and $\delta \varepsilon \tilde{p} \rho \circ$ are the natural prefixes for a nation of sailors to use in toponyms identifying the location of two groups of coastal towns relative to some fixed point. Hence, if it can be reconciled with the orthographic situation, $\pi \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\rho \alpha \nu}$ rather than $\pi \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\rho \alpha}$ is the preferable term in our toponym.

[^1]:    ${ }^{11}$ A-ka-ra occurs alone in two of the published Pylos documents (Cn 453; $\mathrm{Cn} 655.5,6,11,12,13$ ) and once in those from Knossos (Dx 969). Ventris and Chadwick (Documents, 200, 387) equate it with agorā 'collection (of sheep)' or 'collecting place'. I am not prepared either to accept or reject their identification; but in any case it would seem unlikely from context that their word (whatever it is) has any bearing on the equation which we are interested in establishing.

    12 Cf. Documents 77, where a couple of possible parallels are listed. Of these, $z o-k o=\zeta u \gamma o ́ v$ is attractive.
    ${ }^{13}$ Loc. cit. Cf. also Lesbian $\sigma \tau \rho \dot{o} \tau \circ \varsigma=\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \dot{\rho}$. For wise and willing counsel on linguistic matters throughout this article I am indebted to my colleague, Professor D. C. Swanson.
     Aeschylus Choephori 587, $\pi \dot{v} v \tau \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \alpha \dot{\lambda} \alpha \mathrm{l}$ ('inlets of the sea'); Aristophanes Frogs $704 \times \cup \mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \gamma \times \dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha<5$ ('in the cradle of the deep').
    ${ }^{15}$ One might hazard «the further district [where the sea-shore is] curving», i. e. stressing the idea of rounded concavity which is perhaps sometimes suggested by these words, rather than the idea of sharp angularity.

[^2]:    16 Aeschylus Prometheus Vinctus, 1019.
    17 Ventris and Chadwick (Documents 149, s. v. peraikoraija) speak of «alternate (defective?) spelling». Such explanations should be resorted to only when it is absolutely obvious or when every other possible explanation has been tested without success.

    18 Bennett kindly informs me by letter that Ng 319 and 332 are by the same hand; that Wa 114 is in the same class and possibly by the same hand; that On 300 is in an entirely different hand; that the scribe of Ae 398 belongs to the same class as the writer of On 300, but is apparently a different individual. Cf. also Lejeune M., 'Observations sur le signe 43 (AI)' in Études Mycéniennes, pp. 42-50.

[^3]:    19 It seems rather early to make such flat statements as «long vowels are not specifically indicated» (Documents 43). Cf also Bennett's statement, «length of vowels is not indicated in any way in writing» (Language 33 [1957] 560).

    20 The nasal in the last syllable of $\pi \varepsilon \rho p y$ (if it is correct to restore it even in the compounds in [2] and [3]) would have further complicated the phonemic situation.

    21 I know of no method to make a reliable choice and have therefore not written accent or diaeresis. Documents wavers from one to the other.
    ${ }_{22}$ Cf. Documents 301, where it is suggested that an alternative is to understand the term as applying to «the objects themselves, totalled by to-sa-de in the second line». In its fragmentary state, the context of Wa 114 could be interpreted as calling for a feminine nominative singular. The same can perhaps be said for Ae 398. In this case, we might understand a noun like $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho \alpha, \gamma \vec{\eta}$, Y$\cup \vee \cap$ ' with which the adjective agrees. There is of course the further problem of whether the Mycenaeans differentiated a feminine form in such compound adjectives.

    23 Cf. Documents 301.

[^4]:    24 So Bennett (by letter) and Georgiev. In Documents 401, 'but thus (the men from beyond A.) did such-and-such'.

    25 Perhaps from *$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha}{ }^{2} u \times 1$ 'get', 'acquire', 'possess', 'protect' (cf. Lat. potior, Skt. pa).

    26 It is an open question in my mind whether the adjectives $a$ - $k o-r a-j o$ and $a$-ko-ra-ja which occur in certain Knossos texts (As 516.8; Co 903, 904, 906, 907, 909, 910) conceal the same root. From a brief study of their context, I cannot see that they either confirm or weaken our Pylian equation. In Documents p. 387, a-ko-ra-jo is taken as 'nom. pl. masc.? : agoraioi', 'belonging to the $a-k o-r a$ of mixed livestock'; and $a-k o-r a-j a$ as 'nom. pl. neuter? : agoraia'. Cf. f. n. 11 above.

