

MYCENAEAN LOCATIVES IN ...*e-u*

1. Ever since the decipherment, Mycenaean words ending in ...*e-u* have been interpreted as singular nominatives in *-eus*, so abundantly represented in 1st-millennium Greek. Such an identification complies with the rules of Mycenaean orthography. In many cases it is obvious that we are dealing with a singular nominative, since the context exhibits other nouns that can be interpreted unmistakably as nominatives: e.g. in PY Nn 831 the forms *e-re-e-u* (.4), *a-ro-je-u* (.6), *e-po-me-ne-u*[(.8) and *ka-ke-u*[(.11) must be interpreted as nominatives, since the same list includes *a-mu-ta-wo* (.7, cf. *a-mu-ta-wo-no* in PY Jn 431.26, which is the genitive of a personal name, cf. .25 *to-sa-no-jo*) and *ko-re-te* (.9, cf. *ko-re-te-re*, *ko-re-te-ri* PY *passim*). This context imposes also the same interpretation for *po-me-ne* (.10) as the plural nominative, ποιμένες (cf. *po-me passim*, gen. *po-me-no* PY Ea 782) and not as the dative, as it is in PY Ea 800 *pa-ro mo-ro-qa-ro po-me-ne*.

The usual procedure¹ has been to regard the *-eus* interpretation as the only possible one. The aim of this study is to show that at least one more interpretation must be assumed.

2. Whatever the origin of the Greek nouns in *-eus* may be, it is generally agreed that all their forms can be accounted for as deriving from a non-alternant suffix **-ēw-*.

The *-εύς* nominative must be a shortened **-ηϋς* according to Osthoff's law.

The locative is expected to have been *-ēu*, a form paralleled—as regards both its lack of any ending and its *ē*-vocalism—by Skrt. *sūnāu* and Gr. πόλις².

The accusative **-ēum* admitted of different treatments, according to syllabication:

¹ M. Doria, *Avviamento allo studio del miceneo*, Roma 1965, p. 67, already pointed out the possibility of interpreting some forms in ...*e-u* as locatives.

² Cf. E. Schwyzler, *Griech. Gramm.* I, p. 572. An isolated case is μάντιος with the variant μάντιος in several mss.

a) $-*ēw̄m < -\eta\Gamma\alpha$. No Mycenaean word in ...e-wa has been interpreted in this way yet.

b) $-*ēm$, with IE loss of the second element of the diphthong, cf. Skrt. *dyām*, Lat. *diem* ($< *diēm$), and Gr. Ζῆν(α). For the Greek nouns in -eus themselves it is difficult to assume such a treatment, since the IE origin of these nouns is still far from being firmly established. Therefore, P. Chantraine assumes the analogy of Ζῆν(α) for Arcadian -ην (on which the nominative -ης would have equally been remade)³. M. Lejeune has suggested that some nouns in ...e-de (with postposition -δε)⁴ be interpreted as the accusatives in -ην of nouns in -εύς⁵.

c) $-*ēum$, which according to Osthoff's law would become $*-εuv$. Such an ending is not attested in 1st-millennium Greek.

On the other hand, it must be pointed out that the accusative case had very few chances to be attested in Mycenaean records: it could occur either in a «lative» form with -δε or as the object of a verbal sentence, a syntactic pattern that is extremely scarce in the Mycenaean texts.

3. Therefore, the interpretation of ...e-u as a locative form is in principle sound from the morphological point of view. Our endeavour will be to produce some contexts in which the interpretation of ...e-u as a locative case is, in purely combinatory analysis, the only satisfactory one, once we have given up the notion that the merely intuitive identification of ...e-u as nominative -εύς is the only possible one.

3.11. If we leave aside the documents PY Jn 829 (bronze

³ *Morphologie historique du grec*, Paris 1961, p. 100. O. Szemerényi, «Arcadian and Cypriote(?) ΙΕΡΗΣ and the Mycenaean antecedent» *SMEA* 6, 1968, pp. 7-13, reaches the conclusion that only in Arcadian the nouns in -εύς were transformed into -ης in the second millennium; «There, in the appellative class, the accusative in -έα developed from the early -ῆΓα, called forth a new nominative in -ής on the analogy of s-stems, and, in its turn, the new nominative led to the creation of a new accusative in -ῆν».

⁴ «La postposition -de en mycénien», *RPh* 35, 1961, pp. 195-206.

⁵ Further evidence for such Mycenaean accusatives may be provided by the form *a₂-ri-e* PY An 724.5, if ἄλιήν (nom. ἄλιεύς), cf. J.-L. Perpillou, «La tablette PY An 724 et la flotte pylienne», *Minos* 9, 1968, pp. 205-218.

deliveries from *ko-re-te-re* and other officials) and 881 (a badly damaged tablet concerning the locality *e-re-e-we*), the Pylos Jn series, characterized by the occurrence of the ideogram AES, makes up a very homogeneous group of records showing such recurrent headings as *ka-ke-we ta-ra-si-ja e-ko-te* and *to-so-de a-ta-ra-si-jo ka-ke-we* ⁶.

The heading *ka-ke-we ta-ra-si-ja e-ko-te* is always preceded by the mention of a place: *a-ka-si-jo-ne* (389.1), *]a-ke-re-wa* (310.1), *po-ti-ni-ja-we-jo* (310.14, cf. *infra*), *a[-ke-]re-wa* (693.1), *a-pu₂-we* (693.5), *a-pe-ke-i-jo* (431.1), *a-pe-ke-e* (431.16), *a-pi-no-e-wi[-jo]* (605.1), *a-si-ja-ti-ja* (750.1), *e-ni-pa-te-we* (725.1, cf. .18 [[*na-i-se-wi-jo*]]), *na-i-se-wi-jo* (692.1), *o-re-mo-a-ke-re-u* (320.1), *po-wi-te-ja* (601.1), *ro-u-so* (832.1, where the formula is somewhat different: *ro-u-so ka-ke-we a-ke-te-re*), *ru-ko-a₂-ke-re-u-te* (415.1), *wi-ja-we-ra₂* (478.1), *]me-no* (937.1). In the tablet Jn 845 the place-name has been lost.

However, the mention of place occurs after the formula in two records: *pa-to-wo-te* (706.1, where the formula contains the variant form *e-ko-si* instead of *e-ko-te*: *ka-ke-we ta-ra-si-ja e-ko-si pa-to-wo-te*) and *e-ni-pa-te-we* (658.2 with the same variation: *ka-ke-we ta-ra-si-ja e-ko-si e-ni-pa-te-we*).

The form *pa-ra-ke-te-e-we* (750.2) is not likely to be a place-name on the following grounds: *a*) such a mention occurs already on line 1, *a-si-ja-ti-ja*, and *b*) *pa-ra-ke-te-e-u* (833.11) is a personal name, or more likely an occupational noun (O. Landau did not include it in his book on personal names) in the nominative, of one of the *ka-ke-we*. We owe its interpretation as a place-name to L. R. Palmer ⁷. He rejects the interpretation of *Documents* as *prāktēwes*, plur. masc. nom., a word related to *πρηκτήρ*, «active smiths»; but the hiatus *-te-e-we* leads us to think of a derivative of an *s*-stem. On the other hand, L. R. Palmer regards the place-name on line 1, which is very well attested elsewhere, as a minor place of *a-si-ja-ti-ja*. However, he only takes into account this instance of Jn 750, and takes no heed of the evidence from Jn 832.11, where the form *pa-ra-ke-te-e-u* is followed by the ideogram AES and a numerical indication (M 3), which leads us to interpret it

⁶ Cf. e.gr. M. Lejeune, «Les forgerons de Pylos», *Historia* 10, 1961, pp. 419 ff.

⁷ *Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*, Oxford 1969, p. 280.

as the sing. masc. nom. of an occupational noun or personal name M. Lejeune⁸ understands it as «un allocataire ayant qualité de *pa-ra-ke-te-e-u*», who is one of the *ταλανσίαν ἔχοντες*: he takes *pa-ra-ke-te-e-we* (Jn 750.2) as an adjective describing *ka-ke-we*, for which he does not find any satisfactory interpretation⁹.

If we accept L. R. Palmer's interpretation of *pa-ra-ke-te-e-u* as a place-name, we shall have in Jn 932 a toponymic mention in ...e-u, similar to the *o-re-mo-a-ke-re-u* (Jn 320.1). It would be a minor place of *ro-u-so* (or perhaps of *a-to-mo*, if this is a place-name too)¹⁰. Apart from the fact that we have just set forth, this hypothesis encounters the difficulty that *ro-u-so* and *a-si-ja-ti-ja* are not contiguous. Then, we should have to resort to an auxiliary hypothesis: the occurrence of one and the same place-name in two different places (cf. Ἐρχομενός / Ὀρχομενός in Boeotia and Arcadia). However, the ground for such an argument would be too hypothetic and it would be better to give up the interpretation of *pa-ra-ke-te-e-we*, *pa-ra-ke-te-e-u* as a place-name.

The place-name *a-ke-re-wa* occurs in Jn 725.23 before the *ka-ke-we* heading of a short list of persons, a fact which does not imply of necessity that Jn 832.9 *a-to-mo ka-ke-we a-ke-te* contains in its first word a place-name.

3.12. The grammatical patterns of these mentions of place are twofold:

a) Use of the ethnic in ...i-jo, that we must understand as the plural nominative -ioi in agreement with *ka-ke-we*: *a-pe-ke-i-jo* (Jn 431.1, cf. *a-pe-ke-e* 431.16), *a-pi-no-e-wi[-jo]* (605.1). The form *po-ti-ni-ja-we-jo* (310.14) cannot be considered as an ethnic (in the formula *a-pe-e-ke ka-ke-we po-ti-ni-ja-we-jo ta-ra-si-ja e-ko-te*, 431.16, the mention of place is *a-pe-ke-e*, whereas the *po-ti-ni-ja-we-jo ka-ke-we* on Jn 310.14 concern the locality *a-ke-re-wa*). M. Lejeune¹¹ gives a quite coherent interpretation of this word:

⁸ *Op. cit.* n. 6, p. 425 n. 80.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 424 n. 79. J.-L. Perpillou's interpretation, «Observations sur le grec mycénien à propos du livre de C. J. Ruijgh», *RPh* 42, 1968, p. 259, of *pa-ra-ke-te-e-we* as a compound adjective *παλακ-εντής, cf. πήληξ (= a helmet maker), is more attractive.

¹⁰ Cf. *contra* M. Lejeune, *op. cit.*, n. 6, p. 424.

¹¹ «Notes mycéniennes: 1. *potinijawejo*», *PdP* 87, 1962, p. 407.

«Mieux vaut, pensons-nous, songer à un second terme identique à celui de l'arcadien κάτ-αρφος 'maudit' (Tégée); *ποτνί-αρφος signifierait 'voué à Πότνια'; *ποτνί-αρφον désignerait 'ce qui, en vertu d'une ἀρά, constitue le domaine de Πότνια'; l'appartenance au monde de Πότνια impliquerait une *deutio*, dont garde trace le mot *po-ti-ni-ja-we-jo* qui l'exprime»¹². As for *na-i-se-wi-jo*, the tablet Mn 1408, which is a record of some amounts of the commodity represented by *146 concerning different places (*ro-o-wa* .1, *po-ra-pi* .2, *na-i-se-wi-jo* .3, *e-na[-po-ro* .4), invites us to include *na-i-se-wi-jo* in the next group.

b) Use of the place-name in the locative. First, we must include in this group place-names with unquestionable case endings such as *a-ka-si-jo-ne* (389.1), *a-pu₂-we* (693.5, cf. *a-pu₂-de*), *a-pe-ke-e* (431.16), *e-ni-pa-te-we* (725.1), *pa-to-wo-te* (706.1) and *ru-ko-a₂-ke-re-u-te* (cf. n. 32). Secondly, there are forms ending in ...*o* or ...*a*, for which, according to the Mycenaean spelling rules, the examples of locatives that we have just seen impose an interpretation as locatives too. They are *a-ke-re-wa* (310.1, 725.23, 693.1), *a-si-ja-ti-ja* (750.1), *na-i-se-wi-jo* (692.1), *pi-wi-te-ja* (601.1), *ro-u-so* (832.1), *wi-ja-we-ra₂* (478.1), and]*mē-no* (937.1).

3.13. The only item whose classification is still pending is *o-re-mo-a-ke-re-u*. To assume that it is a «nominative of the rubric» would involve postulating for this place-name a special use that lacks objective backing in the nineteen remaining examples of the Jn series, and that would be only permissible if its interpretation as a locative were linguistically impossible. On purely combining grounds, we are led to conclude that it is another locative form.

3.21. The tablet PY Nn 228 records deficits of flax (*SA*) concerning nine localities¹³. Its text runs as follows:

¹² A further advance in explaining this term has been made by E. Risch, «A propos du nom *po-ti-ni-ja-we-jo*», *Acta Mycenaea*, Salamanca 1972, II, pp. 294-300. He regards *po-ti-ni-ja-we-jo* as an adjective deriving from **potnia* by means of an IE suffix *-weyo-*, which would alternate with *-meyo-*, as a suffix of substance.

¹³ Cf. M. Lejeune, *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne* I, p. 132.

- .1 *o-o-pe-ro-si* , *ri-no* , *o-pe-ro*
 .2 *u-ka-jo* , SA 20 *ro-o-wa* , SA 35
 .3 *pu₂-ra₂-a-ke-re-u* , SA 10 *ke-i-ja-ka-ra-na*
 .4 SA 5 *di-wi-ja-ta* , SA 60
 .5 *a-pi-no-e-wi-jo* SA 28
 .6 *po-ra-pi* , SA 10 *e-na-po-ro* , SA 33
 .7 *te-tu-ru-we* SA 38
 .8-15 u a c a n t

3.22. In contrast to what was pointed out in § 3.12, the ethnic never appears in the mentions of place owing to the fact that a noun (like *ka-ke-we* in the Jn series) with which the adjective agrees does not exist. The place-names are in the locative, as can be inferred from the unmistakable endings of *po-ra-pi* (.6, cf. An 1.4, Mn 1408.2, and *po-ra-i* An 656.13; we are no doubt dealing with a case in -φι), *te-tu-ru-we* (.7, which corresponds to the entry of Na 1054.B; cf. such locatives as *ti-mi-to-a-ke-e* 361,]*no-ka-ra-o-re* 1038, etc.). Therefore *u-ka-jo* (.2), *ro-o-wa* (.2), *ke-i-ja-ka-ra-na* (.3), *di-wi-ja-ta* (.4), *a-pi-no-e-wi-jo* (.5) and *e-na-po-ro* (.6) must also be interpreted as locatives.

The only place-name that would require a syntactic pattern different from that of the others is *pu-ra₂-a-ke-re-u*. On purely combinatory grounds, the interpretation of this form as a locative imposes itself.

4. The examination of the preceding contexts has led us to conclude that the interpretation of ...e-u as a locative is the correct one. We may wonder, however, whether we are dealing with an ending different from the well-known dative ...e-we, which is so frequent with place-names in locative function, or with the same ending written in two different ways. In fact, C. Gallavotti¹⁴ has found some examples of graphic alternation -we/-u at the end of a word.

The first item mentioned by the Italian scholar is *ka-ke-u* instead of *ka-ke-we* in PY Jn 725.18, on a line that was erased by the scribe himself. We should no doubt expect to find *ka-ke-we*, if we compare this introductory formula with the similar ones

¹⁴ «Le grafie del wau nella scrittura micenea», *Wingspread Colloquium*, pp. 12-22.

attested on other tablets which show the same arrangement: place-name + *ka-ke-we* + *ta-ra-si-ja e-ko-te* (Jn series). Moreover, the formula in 725.18 recurs in 692.1, where the expected *ka-ke-we* is written. It does not seem possible that the scribe had at his disposal the double spelling *ka-ke-u* / *ka-ke-we*, since in this case we should expect more examples of *ka-ke-u* in the numerous instances of this formula. Nor can we assume that each spelling belong to a different scribe, since the tablet under consideration is written in the same hand (2) to which all the tablets (except 658 and 706) presenting the form *ka-ke-we* are assigned¹⁵. The spelling *ka-ke-u* is rather to be regarded as a lapsus of the scribe, who wrote the singular instead of the plural nominative, such as it happens in Jn 832.9 with *a-ke-te* [instead of the expected *a-ke-te-re* (.1), which can be by no means explained as a graphic alternation. On the other hand, there is enough blank space after *a-ke-te* [to warrant the word to be complete. The hypothesis of a scribal lapsus is strengthened by the fact that the whole line has been erased by the scribe himself, a fact which must be duly taken into account.

4.11. Gallavotti's second example is *po-ro-u-te-u*, which occurs in PY Cn 131.5, with erased *-u* under *-we*. It thus appears that *po-ro-u-te-u* was a scribal error which the scribe himself emended by erasing *-u* and writing the correct sign *-we* on it. If he did erase *-u*, that means that *-u* and *-we* were not interchangeable spellings for him.

4.12. Neither would *a₃-ke-u* of PY Ta 641.1 help make a good case for taking *-u* as merely another spelling for *-we*, on the assumption that *a₃-ke-u* is the dual form in agreement with *ti-ri-po-de*. Such an assumption does not impose itself, since *a₃-ke-u* seems to be a personal name in the singular nominative¹⁶. But even if it were an adjective going with the dual *ti-ri-po-de*, the sin-

¹⁵ See E. L. Bennett, *Atti Pavia*, p. 329, and the subsequent *Concordance in Nestor I*, pp. 55-60.

¹⁶ Cf. M. Lejeune, *Mémoires I*, p. 100; M. D. Petruševski, *Živa Antika* 9, 1959, p. 154, cf. C. J. Ruijgh, *Etudes sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam 1967, p. 194, who gives an ingenious explanation for the appearance of a man's name in those circumstances.

gular *a₃-ke-u* might be well due to a scribal mistake¹⁷; only if a substantial number of certain examples can be produced, the case for a graphic alternation *-we/-u* will have some strength.

4.13. As to *ra-ke-u* in PY Cn 254.7, governed by *pa-ro*, like *tu-ru-we-u*, v. 1, and *ke-ro-u-te-u* 600.3, it is difficult to say whether it is an alternative spelling (*-u* instead of *-we*), or a scribal lapsus, or more probably an old locative in *-*ηυ* used after *pa-ro*, with which the syncretic dative in *-ηφει* is also found¹⁸.

4.14. With regard to the inverse spelling (*-we* instead of *-u*), the evidence produced by C. Gallavotti is only *ka-e-se-we* MY Ge 602.48. In fact, the expected nominative *ka-e-se-u* does occur in 605.4 and in PY Qa 1299. The hypothesis according to which *ka-e-se-we* is a nominative with alternative spelling *-we*, is not the only possible way to interpret the text, since *ka-e-se-we* may also be taken as a dative¹⁹, as P. H. Ilievski does²⁰ on the assumption that, in spite of the introductory formula of this tablet (*jo-o-po-ro a-ro-[ὡς ὠφλον...*) to which nominatives are related, the scribe had in his mind another heading, in which the same idea was expressed in a different way (*o-pe-ro ὄφελος*, like in 604.1), introducing some dative forms in ablative function. On the other hand, we cannot rule out the possibility that *ka-e-se-we* is the plural nominative of an occupational noun.

4.20. S. Luria²¹ has added further examples of the alleged singular nominatives in ...e-we instead of ...e-u. He produced *a-de-me-we* (PY Eq 146.5; he actually wrote *a-da-me-we*), which must be interpreted from its context as the singular nominative, since it is followed by the phrase *e-ke to-so-de pe-mo* and is paralleled by similar phrases headed by undoubted singular nominatives. It

¹⁷ L. R. Palmer, *Interpretation*, p. 344.

¹⁸ Cf. P. H. Ilievski, *The Ablative, Instrumental and Locative in the Oldest Greek Texts*, Skopje 1961, pp. 95-140.

¹⁹ See J. Chadwick, *MT III*, Philadelphia 1963.

²⁰ «Non-Greek inflections or scribal errors in the Mycenaean texts», *Živa Antika* 15, 1965, pp. 45-59.

²¹ «Zu den neugefundenen pyllischen Inschriften (1955-1958)», *PdP* 15, 1960, pp. 251 ff.

is sounder, therefore, to interpret it as the singular nominative of a noun not in *-eus*, but in *-ēs* or *-wens*, for instance.

4.21. The same can be said of another example mentioned by Luria, *a-no-ke-we* (PY An 192.13, KN Db 1251; he actually transcribed *a-no-ge-we*). In both texts it seems to be a nominative, at least in the Knossos text with certainty. No form of the alleged inflection in *-eus* is attested; *a-no-ke-wa* PY An 192.5 is possibly a derivative. M. Lejeune²² does not rule out the possibility of an interpretation *Αἰνοσκευής*.

4.22. Finally, with reference to the remaining form argued by Luria *au-ke-i-ja-te-we* (PY Ub 1318.1 twice, .2 and An 1281.4; there is a possible form of genitive *au[-ke-i-]ja-te-wo* PY Fn 50.11), it should be pointed out that *au-ke-i-ja-te-we* occurs in an obscure record concerning leather goods and including some personal names like *me-ti-ja-no* (a nominative *-άνωρ*). The interpretation of the tablet presents us with so many difficulties, that it would be rash, as long as the obscurities remain unsolved, to draw any conclusion as to the case and number of *au-ke-i-ja-te-we*.

4.3. In his communication to the Wingspread Colloquium, C. Gallavotti²³ tried to solve the problem posed by the occurrence of *i-je-re-u* on line 5 of the tablet PY Fn 837[+]864. All the personal names in the Fn series seem to be in the dative, and in order to explain this alleged nominative, C. Gallavotti resorts to the comparison with the reverse of the tablet An 39, where he reads the same names in the nominative. However, since the context does require *i-je-re-u* to be a dative, the possibility of interpreting this form as a dative must be seriously weighed out. The question now arises which ending is hidden under the spelling *...e-u*, and how such an ending got a dative meaning. We have suggested (cf. § 2) that the spelling *...e-u* may conceal an old endingless locative of *-eus* nouns; if we are not wrong, it is probable that we are dealing here with a form of locative used as a dative, although more examples of datives in *...e-u* will be necessary to give solid ground to this hypothesis.

²² «Les sifflantes fortes du mycénien», *Minos* 6, 1960, pp. 93 ff.

²³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 67 ff.

5. As we have just seen, none of C. Gallavotti's and S. Luria's examples is overriding, and their lines of argument do not have strength enough to make us give up our attempt to find a morphological explanation of the forms in ...*e-u* we are dealing with, instead of reducing the question to a problem of mere spelling.

5.11. The tablet Aq (formerly An) 218 exhibits on line 3 the word *da-i-ja-ke-re-u*, for which different interpretations have been suggested²⁴. H. Mühlstein and M. S. Ruipérez understand it as a person-qualifier δαῖ-αργεὺς formed upon δαῖζω and ἄργός, the meaning of which would then be «the one who is in charge of the land distribution». M. S. Ruipérez points out that the analogy with the place-names *me-ta-pa*, which occurs on line 4 of the said tablet, and *o-wi-to-no*, on line 5, would incline us to interpret *da-i-ja-ke-re-u* as a place-name. However, he finds the difficulty of the syntactic position, since in that case it would be a «nominative of the rubric» and such a nominative is usually at the beginning of the sentence. M. Lejeune excludes it from the group of place-names in *-a-ke-re-u*, whose formation he studies in detail²⁵, on the ground that for a place-name a case different from the nominative would be expected. L. R. Palmer²⁶, however, includes it in the group of compound place-names of the type *Newcastle-upon-Tyne* (*da-i-ja-ke-re-u* would indicate «the district *da-i* in the country *a-ke-re-wa*»²⁷) and does not state precisely the grammatical case of such a place-name. On the other hand, the occurrence of the place-name *ne-wo-ki-to* on the same line would lead us to disprove the interpretation of *da-i-ja-ke-re-u* as another place-name. Notwithstanding this, we should like to stress the fact that *da-i-ja-ke-re-u* as a place-name in the locative would not lack parallel forms.

²⁴ See H. Mühlstein, *Die o-ka Tafeln von Pylos*, Basel 1956; E. Risch, «L'interprétation de la série des tablettes caractérisées par le mot *o-ka*», *Atti Pavia*, p. 351; M. Lejeune, «Notes mycéniennes», *PdP* 17, 1962, pp. 411-412; M. S. Ruipérez, *Minos* 4, 1956, p. 146-164 and 5, 1957, p. 174-206.

²⁵ *PdP* 17, 1962, pp. 411 f.

²⁶ «Observations on the Linear 'B' Tablets from Mycenae», *BICS* 2, 1955, pp. 36 ff., and *Minos* 4, 1956, pp. 120 ff.

²⁷ L. R. Palmer, *Interpretation*₂, p. 76 n. 1.

5.12. Let us consider now thoroughly those forms in ...*e-u* which are preceded by *pa-ro*. They are *ra-ke-u* PY Cn 254.7, *tu-ru-we-u* 254.1 (*PTT a-si[-ja-ti-ja pa-]r̄o tu-ru-we-u*) and *ke-ro-u-te-u* 600.3 (if *pa-ro* of line 1 is to be understood before the last word of the following ones). In order to interpret *pa-ro* + *-eu* we must first consider the uses of *pa-ro* in Mycenaean.

6.1. The examples of *pa-ro* in Linear B are abundant and they occur at Knossos, at Mycenae and at Pylos. The evidence from the three sites —collected by F. W. Householder²⁸— allows to establish that the noun following *pa-ro* can be always interpreted as a dative. There are, however, two exceptions: the genitive *do-ro-jo-jo* PY Cn 45.6, which has been explained away as a ditto-graphy of *do-ro-jo*²⁹, and the nominative *ne-ti-ja-no* 599.1 (cf. *ne-ti-ja-no-re* 40.1), but it appears that the scribe first wrote *ne-ti-ja-no* in the nominative, and afterwards corrected (either the same scribe or the other that is responsible for the corrections on line 8) by adding *pa-ro* in minute signs above the divider between *-wo* and *ne-*.

6.12. It only remains to explain the forms ending in ...*e-u* governed by *pa-ro*, which, if there is no linguistic obstacle, must also be interpreted as singular datives. If we assume that the locative case of the nouns in *-εύς* did end in **-ηυ*, as supported by Skrt. *sūnāu* and Gr. *πόληι*, we are led to conclude that we are dealing here with locative forms used as datives after *pa-ro*.

To sum up, we take it for granted that the Mycenaean spelling ...*e-u* covers not only singular nominatives in *-εύς*, but also old locatives in *-ηυ*. They are *o-re-mo-a-ke-re-u* (§ 3.13), *pu₂-ra₂-a-ke-re-u* (§ 3.22), *da-i-ja-ke-re-u* ? (§ 5.11), *pa-ra-ke-te-e-u* ? (§ 3.11), and, probably, *e-o-te-u* in PY An 661.1³⁰ and *a-ke-re-u* in Cn 441.

²⁸ «*Pa-ro* and the Mycenaean cases», *Glotta* 38, 1959, pp. 1-10.

²⁹ F. W. Householder, *art. cit.*, p. 8.

³⁰ In accordance with the usual arrangement of the *o-ka* tablets (a personal name in the genitive + *o-ka* + a place-name) *e-o-te-u* is to be interpreted as a place-name in the locative. However, this interpretation does not impose itself, for there are some instances of place-name lacking, e.g. An 657.6. We wonder whether *e-o-te-u* is actually a personal name in the nominative or not.

2³¹. Further forms can be adduced: *i-je-re-u* (§ 4.3), *ra-ke-u* (§ 5.12), *tu-ru-we-u* (§ 5.12), and *ke-ro-u-te-u* (§ 5.12). Our suggestion is that these datives in ...*e-u* exhibit the old locative ending in -ηυ although they have undoubtful dative value as a result of case syncretism³².

7. Obviously enough, the Mycenaean evidence of a locative ending in -ηυ, as presented above, must have some bearing on the problem of the origin of the nouns in -εύς.

There would be no point in restating here the whole history of that much debated question, once J.-L. Perpillou has given us, in a recent book³³, a clear, critical and comprehensive survey of the many attempts made by scholars to clarify the origin of this morphological type.

In fact, the occurrence of locatives (and datives) in -ηυ in Mycenaean provides us with an important link in the line of argument that views the nouns in -εύς as originated from old IE *-u-* stems, a possibility that Perpillou, after all his criticism, cannot help leaving open.

7.1. Like *-i-*stems, Greek *-u-*stems exhibit two inflection types: constant zero degree (ὄφις ὄφιος, ἰχθύς ἰχθύος) and vowel alternation (πόλις -εως, πολύς -έος, πῆχυσ -εος). With stems like *πολι-* there has been an extension of *i-*vocalism in all the dialects (πόλις -ιος, -ιες) except for Attic, where πόλεως is thought to have originated from πόληος we actually find in Homer.

³¹ It is tempting to regard *a-ke-re-u* as an ethnic in toponymic function yielding further evidence for the old locative in -θυ, but this tablet is so mutilated to prevent us from including *a-ke-re-u* among the certain instances of such a locative ending.

³² There remain a number of locatives in ...*e-u-te* belonging to place-names (*a-ne-u-te* PY Cn 40.7,13; *a₂-ne-u-te* Cn 599.2; *a-ka-re-u-te* (?) Cn 4.4; *a-ke-re-u-te* MY Ge 606.2; *ru-ko-a-ke-re-u-te* PY Jn 415.1). As M. Lejeune has pointed out (*Mémoires* I, p. 163 n. 17), the meaning of those forms answers not to the question πόθεν, but to ποῦ; an observation that leads him to interpret *-te* as -θει (-θι relates to -θει like dative -ι does to -ει). The ending ...*e-u-te* seems to conceal -ευθε or -ευθει deriving from *-ηυθε, *-ηυθει (Osthoff's law), which may contain either the «pure» stem -ηυ- (cf. hom. ὄρεσ-φι, and Myc. *a-pa-re-u-pi*, *ku-te-re-u-pi*, etc.) or, less probably, the old locative in -ηυ.

³³ *Les substantifs grecs en -εύς*, Paris 1973.

It is generally assumed that *πολη-* spread from the locative case (cf. Vedic *agnā* from the stem *agni-*). The dative *πόληι* in Homer might preserve just the old (endingless ?) locative, out of which the Attic inflection was constituted. As for *-u*-stems, the fact that genitive *πήχεως* is not attested before Aristotle (who uses *πήχεος* as well) and that this ending is only warranted for *ἄστεως*, lends support to P. Chantraine's view³⁴ that *ἄστεως* borrowed its ending *-εως* from the quasi-synonym *πόλεως*. Thus, there is no need to postulate that the old locative in *-ēu* gave rise to **ἄσ-τηφος* > *ἄστεως*. Such a locative form should be better only taken as the starting point of the whole type of *-εύς* nouns through an extension that has a close parallel in the Attic inflection of *πόλις*, except for the singular nominative *πόλις*.

If our interpretation is correct, such a locative is no longer an asterisk form, but an attested one.

On the other hand, we need hardly say that the creation of the complete paradigm of the *-εύς*-nouns, as we view it, must be regarded as an innovation that took place in Greek before dialects split up, and long before the Mycenaean records were written down.

Castillejos, 228 - 7.º 2.º

Barcelona-13

ROSA A. SANTIAGO

³⁴ *Morphologie historique du grec*₂, p. 92.