

THE ADVERBIAL SUFFIX -ΘΕΝ IN MYCENAEAN

There are a large number of Greek adverbs with the ending -θεν. This suffix is added to pronominal, demonstrative and interrogative stems: πόθεν, ποθέν, ἔθεν, ἀμόθεν (Aetol. μηδαμόθεν), ἄλλοθεν, αὐτόθεν, δμόθεν etc., personal: ἐμέθεν, σέθεν, ἔθεν, nominal stems: οἴκοθεν, θεό-θεν, ἰππό-θεν, δημόθεν, Ἰλιόθεν, Κορινθόθεν, Μεγαρόθεν etc., as well as adverbs: (ἐ)κεῖθεν, (προ)πάραιθεν etc. (cf. Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I, p. 628f.).

It is well known that this suffix has an ablatival meaning, expressing the point from which motion starts. Therefore it is common in construction with the verbs of motion and after the prepositions: ἐξ and ἀπό, e. g. Ἰδθηθεν κατιούσα (Δ 475); Ἰλιόθεν με φέρων ἄνεμος (ι 39), Διόθεν δέ μοι ἄγγελος ἦλθεν (Ω 561), ἀπό Τροίηθεν ἰόντα (Ω 492), ἐξ οὐρανόθεν κ. (Θ19). As „it is not found with the verbs meaning *to deprive of, free from, defend, surpass*, or with the corresponding adjectives and adverbs (except in the personal pronouns),“ Monro¹⁾ thought „that it could not be equivalent to an ablative and probably differed from the ablative in expressing *motion from* rather than *separation*“. But one can point out that the ablatival meaning is not limited to separation only. The forms in -θεν with the verbs of motion correspond to an ablative in Skt. and Latin, e. g.: *A yâtv indro divâ â prithivyâ maksû samudrâd utâ vâ pûrîsât Indra* (Rv 4, 21, 3): „Come, Indra, here from heaven or from the earth, soon from the sea or from the rubbish“, or *salilâsya mâdhât . . . yanti* (Rv 7, 49, 1: „they come from the middle of the sea“. In this case in Latin the ablative is used of towns and small islands, as well as *domus, humus, rus*. Posts use the ablative with other words too, cf. *nox humida coelo praecipitat* (Verg, *Aen* II, 9). Besides the gen.-abl. with the verbs of motion, e. g. Οὐλύμποιο κατήλομεν (Υ 125), ἀνέδου πολιτῆς ἀλός (Α 359), διώκετο οἴο δόμοιο etc. in Greek the adverbs in -θεν are frequently used: Ἀβυδόθεν ἦλθε (Δ 500), Αἰνόθεν εἰληλούθειν (Δ 520), Σύμηθεν ἄγει τρεῖς νῆας (B 671), Τροίηθεν ἰών (γ 257)²⁾.

Along with these, there are forms of the pronominal personal stems, which are constructed as a pure ablative with a comparative, in the same way as in Skt. and Latin (cf. *svadoh svadyah; dulcior uva*): οὐ ἔθεν ἔστι χρείων (Α 114), κρείσσων εἰς ἐμέθεν (Τ 217) σέθεν πολὺ χεῖρων (Υ 434).

¹⁾ D. B. Monro, *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*, Oxford, 1882, p. 113.

²⁾ S. more comparative examples in Delbrück, B., *Ablativ Localis Instrumentalis im Altindischen, Lateinischen, Griechischen und Deutschen* Berlin, 1867, p. 3ff.

The suffix *-θεν* has only ablatival meaning (cf. Schwyz. o. c. p. 545), but it is to be noticed that it has taken over some genitive functions as the genitive has taken over ablatival ones. The pronominal forms: *ἐμέθεν*, *σέθεν*, *ξέθεν* are sometimes constructed as true genitives with the verbs of *hearing*, *remembering*, *caring*, *reaching*, *touching*, e. g.: *σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀλεγίζω* (A 180, Θ 477), and with *ἄσσον*, *πρόσθε*, *ἄντα*, *ἀντίον*, *ἐνεκα*, *ἐκρητι*. Nevertheless, they are not always genitives, or „emphatic genitives“, as P. Chantraine³⁾ inferred. Doubtless the original meaning of the suffix *-θεν* was ablatival.

M. Lejeune, who systematically analysed the problem of the origin, development and meaning of the Greek adverbs in *-θεν*⁴⁾, concluded that the forms of personal pronouns in *-θεν* are younger than the demonstrative and interrogative formations. At first *-θεν* was added to pronominal stems of type *πρόθεν*, which in West Greek dialects was restricted by its partner *πῶ*. Thus it is evident that the personal pronouns in *-θεν* with genitival meaning are of secondary development.

Although there have been many attempts⁵⁾ to explain the origin of this suffix, it is still obscure. Bartholomae (IF 1,310) supposed that the suffixes *-θα* and *-τι* (loc.) have their etymology in IE **-dha*, **-dhe* and *-θεν* (abl.) < **-dhem* IE **-dhe*, or **-dhed*, a partner of *-tas*, IE **-tos*.

Inflectional elements could be noticed in adverbial suffixes of this kind: *-τι* = IE *-dhi* (locat.), *-θα* *-dha*, nom. or instr., cf. Skt. *dividhā*, „in two parts“, and the Greek particle *-τιην*, besides *-dhe* (< *dhee*) with *e*⁶⁾.

It is noticeable that there are no certain cognate forms of this suffix in other IE languages. The proposal that the suffix *-θεν* is contained in German *-ten*, e. g. *Osten*, *Westen* is not certain⁷⁾. Only Lat. *inde* (correl. *unde*) with the abl. meaning for *time* and *place*, Arm. and OIr. *and* „there“ and OSL *kəde*, Avest. *kuda*, Skt. *kūha* „where“ look as if they might contain the suffix *-θεν*, but they are all „zweifelhaft oder unhaltbar“, as H. Frisk says (cf. *Gr. Et. Wb.* s. v. *ἐνθα*, *ἐνθεν*).

M. Lejeune in the book mentioned above concluded that this suffix is a new Greek formation — a parallel formation to the similar adverbial suffix *-tah* in Indo-Iranian. The suffix *-tah* in Skt. is added, like *-θεν*, to pronominal stems: *ku-tah*, *ya-tah*, *ta-tah*, as well as to nominal: *mukha-tah*, and adverbs *abhi-tah*, *pari-tah* etc. But there is also a difference between them. The adverbs in *-θεν*, derived from adjectives, are not to be construed with nouns in the sentence in genitive-ablative. In Homer's phrase: *νείθεν ἐκ καρδίας* (K 10), according to M. Lejeune (o. c. p. 65), there is an apposition of two autonomous elements: adverb and prepositional construction, just as in the Attic expression:

³⁾ P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, I, Paris 1948, p. 243.

⁴⁾ M. Lejeune, *Les adverbes grecs en -θεν*, Bordeaux, Delmas 1939.

⁵⁾ S. the literature in Schwyz., *Gr. Gr.* I p. 627f., M. Lejeune, o. c. p. 435f.

⁶⁾ Hadzidakis, (*Glotta* 2, p. 113) supposed that the suffix *-θεν* and *-θε* were identical, but it is more likely that *-v* in *-θεν* is constant, not ephelekycticon, and the forms in *-θε* with the ablatival meaning are younger (cf. Schwyz., *Gr. Gr.* I, p. 627f.). Thus the original meaning of *-θε* was locative, and the *-v* of *-θεν* is etymological.

⁷⁾ Hirt, *Idg. Gramm.* p. 296.

ἐκ δρυός πόθεν, while in ἀμ' ἡοῖ φαινομένηφι, -φι is rather included in the inflection. The example from Pindar, *Olym.* VII, 43: ματρόθεν Ἀστυδαμείας is solitary. On the other hand Skt. adverbial forms in *-tah* are better fitted into the inflection, cf. *tatah sastah*. Hence M. Lejeune concluded that the Greek suffix -θεν had not developed enough and did not fit completely into the inflection.

Although there are great similarities between the suffix -θεν and the Turkish *-den*, as well as between -θε and *-de*⁸⁾ one cannot claim that the Greek suffixes -θεν and -θε are foreign intrusions. They could be an accidental coincidence, unless, indeed, they have undergone some mutual influence in remote times. As the Greek suffix -θεν has no certain counterpart in other IE languages, except the above-mentioned examples with somewhat different meaning, I am more inclined to infer that this suffix is a Greek innovation, based on the inherited IE element **-dh-*.

What is the reason for the development and spread of this suffix?

There is no doubt that the suffix -θεν was more vital than the separate fossilised abl. forms and the adverbs in -τος (ἐντός, ἐκτός) which are infrequently substituted for them in Hom. and classical Greek. This is confirmed by the pleonastic formations of abl. forms + -θεν, e. g. ἐτέρωθεν, Dor. τουτῶθεν, ἔξωθεν, πρόσσωθεν and of forms in -τος + -θεν: ἔκτοςθεν, ἐντοςθεν. The same pleonastic formation of a general abl. form + abl. suffix *-tas* can be seen in Skt. adverbs, as Whitney has already shown: *mat-tah*, *tvat-tah*, *yusmat-tah*. From the pronominal stems this formation is transferred to the nouns, cf. *matkrta*⁹⁾. As the adverbs represent the only type of words which keep the oldest fossilised case forms, we have no other way of reconstructing the earliest stage of the development and the decline of the case system. From the above-mentioned pleonastic forms, where both the pronominal stem and the determinant are in the ablative, we may judge that the fluctuation of the abl. ending had already begun in Skt. too, and it was necessary that this ending should be strengthened. It is natural to suppose that before the growth of these pleonastic formations in -θεν (Greek) and *-tas* (Skt.) the ablative as a separate case was active and strong enough to express its case relation. Thus, we can conclude that the adverbial suffix -θεν with an abl. meaning developed in Greek after the syncretism of the „local“ (according to Hirt) „cases“ (abl., loc. and instr.), and disappearance of the ablative in order to serve as a substitute for the latter.

It is very important for us to know when this substitution took place in Greek.

Along with the adverbial abl. suffix *-tos*, there existed in IE another suffix *-dh-* with a local meaning (*-dhe*, *-dhi*, loc.), from which Greek -θεν developed. When the ablat. case ending began to disappear, owing to the syncretism of the cases, the suffix *-tos* spread in Skt. and the suffix

⁸⁾ Mladenov, St., *Actes du Premier congrès de linguistes* 1928, 115. Убогъ въ общою езиковн. София 1927, p. 53—54, *Сравн. и. е. езиковн.*, София 1936, p. 321 f.

⁹⁾ A. Thumb, *Handbuch des Sanskrit*, Heidelberg 1905, p. 246.

-θεν in Greek. Pure adverbs of the type ἐνθεν, ἐντεῦθεν were formed first and then this suffix spread to the pronominal stems and the adverbs of the type πόθεν, which appeared as a correlative to the adverbs of the type πό-θι (loc.). The need for the expression of the ablative case relation helped the rapid spread of the suffix -θεν. Although the forms in -θεν did not completely penetrate into the case system, they are quite near to being cases, especially when they are constructed with the ablative prepositions: ἐκ (ἐξ), ἀπό, e. g. ἐξ οὐρανόθεν (Θ 19), ἀπὸ Τροίηθεν (Ω 492). The adverbs in -θεν, derived from place-names have the abl. meaning just as the forms in -θι and -σι have locative, and those in -δε allative meaning, e. g. Ἀθήνηθεν, Ἀθήνησι, Ἀθήναζε, Ἰλιόθεν, Ἰλιόθι, Ἰλιόνδε, Κορινθόθεν, Κορινθόθι, Κορινθόνδε. There are about six dozen different place-names in -θεν, and the whole number of the forms with this suffix is 317¹⁰). This great number shows that the suffix -θεν was very active in comparison with the adverbs in -δε, of which there are 104¹¹), and in -θι, only 61¹²).

When the suffix -θεν was so active in classical Greek and Homer, the question spontaneously arises: Did it exist in Mycenaean? The decipherment of the Linear B script revealed forms of a very archaic stage of Greek. They, together with Hittite forms and vocabulary, represent the earliest records of Indo-European speech. It is noticeable that there are a great many place-names in the Mycenaean archives. In them the allative is expressed by the suffix *-de*: *A-mi-ni-so-de* (= Ἀμισόνδε), *Ku-do-ni-ja-de* (= Κυδωνιάδε), *Pe-re-u-ro-na-de* (= Πλευρώνάδε) etc. They indicate that some things are to be carried to certain places. The locative pl. is expressed by the ending *-si* < **su*, which gives us reason to think that the loc. sing. was still alive too, as its substitution by the adverbs in -θι has not yet appeared in these texts¹³). It is well known that the majority of the tablets represent lists of different items of tribute which had to be taken from certain places to the palace. If the suffix -θεν existed in Mycenaean times, it should certainly appear, having regard to the nature of texts, in a great number of examples.

* * *

Although the question of the suffix -θεν in Mycenaean has been discussed by several scholars¹⁴), so far there is no systematic survey of

¹⁰) P. Kretschmer — E. Locker, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen, 1944, p. 136—138.

¹¹) Ibidem, p. 74.

¹²) Ibidem, p. 128f.

¹³) The forms where this suffix is supposed are the same as those in which other scholars see the suffix -θεν. But these forms are very few and uncertain, so that they cannot prove the existence of either -θι or θεν, as we shall see below (s. p. 121).

¹⁴) E. G. Turner, *BICS*, I (1954) pp. 17—20; M. Ventris & J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge, 1956, p. 91, 139; M. Lejeune, *La désinence -φι en mycénien*, Mémoires de phil. mycénienne, p. 163f.; H. Mühlestein, *Die Oka-Tafeln*, Basel 1956, p. 29; C. Gallavotti, *Documenti e struttura del greco nell'età micenea*, Roma 1956, p. 130; С. Лурье, *Язык и культура микенской Греции* М.-Л. 1957, p. 146; M. Doria, *Interpretazioni di testi micenei* II, (1958) p. 10f.

all the forms where this suffix may appear. As the opinions of scholars whether or not the suffix *-θεν* exists in Mycenaean are divided, it is necessary to reexamine all the examples where this suffix is possible. The suffix *-θεν* could be contained in the ending *-te*, which may have various meanings in Linear B script. In the material from Knossos, Pylos, Thebes and Mycenae, discovered and published to date, there are 90 different forms with this ending¹⁵). It is difficult to compose an absolutely exact classification of these forms, because some¹⁶) are not yet fully identified, being either found in fragmentary inscriptions without any ideogram, or, what is worse, single words in a fragment repeated nowhere else.

Nevertheless the greater number of them are nouns, *nomina agentis* in *-τηρ*, and personal names in *-θης*, *-της* (stems in *es*) (15), from the type *ιατήρ* (*i-ja-te*), *ραπτήρ* (*ra-pte*), *Πύθης* (*pu-te*)¹⁷). Here we can mention

¹⁵) Incomplete words, ending in *-te* (cf. Bennett's *Index* p. 81) are not included in this number. However, some other new-discovered words of this kind are to be added to this list, e. g. *e-ka-sa-te* (PY Qa 1291) and *jo-pte* (PY Xa 1336).

¹⁶) S. n. 24.

¹⁷) *A-de-te* (Eq 887,2 [4]), nom. sing. nomen agentis in *-ter*, (cf. *a-de-te-re*, An 207,6) nom. dual of the same word), along with other trade-names in An 207: *ke-ra-me-we* = *κεραμ-ῆ-φες*, *da-ko-ro* = *δάκοροι*, *po-ku-ta*, *ku-ru-so-wo-ko* = *χρυσουργοί*, *to-ko-so-wo-ko* = **τοξο-φοργοί*, *ra-pte-re* (s. below), *a-de-te* denotes a trade-name too, *An-deter* „binder“ (*Docs.* p. 386), or better *ἀρδε(σ)τήρ* < *ἀρδύω*, i. e. *ἄρδω* (M. D. Petruševski, *Ž. A. V.* 400) cf. V. G. *Suppl.* p. 3: *ἀρδευτήρ* = *ἀρδευτής* „celui qui arrose“.

*34-*te* (An 218,11). Although the value of the sign *34 is not determined and several different suggestions are given for this word, the ending *-te* is most probably the suffix of an agent noun *-ter*. It is possibly the same word as *ai-te* (Un 1321,3) and *ai-te-re* (B 101).

A-mo-te (KN So 0442), s. n. 27.

Au-te (*85-*te*) (Ta 709,2) = *αὐστήρ* (cf. *Ž. A.* VIII, p. 276).

I-ja-te (Eq 146,9) = *ιατήρ*.

Ko-re-te (Jn 829, 4—19 passim), *po-ro-ko-re-te* (Jn 829, 4—19 passim), nom. sing. masc., title of official in tributary villages (*Docs.* 397, A. Furumark, *Eranos* LIII, 19, V. G. *Lex.* s. v.) *korester*? (cf. *χορέννομι* „nourish, satiate“, Att. *Αλυκοπεῖς*). Possibly not *κόρανος* M. Ruipérez, (*Ét. mycen.* 107), because *ko-re-te-re* are not dealing with military work, as one can see from Jn 829. *Κόρανος* is chiefly *ruler, leader, commander* in war.

Ku-pe-re-te (KN B 799, r. l). — In the list of persons, with an ideogram of man and number 1, this word is a personal name, in nom. sing. (not the ethnic, derived from *Κύπρος* (*ku-pi-ri-jo*)).

Pi-ri-je-te (Ra 1547, 1548, 1549 (1550, 1543), name of a trade connected with swords: *prietēr*? „cutler“ (cf. *πριστήρ*) or from **quiri-* „buy“, Skt. *krinati*, Osl. *krnūti*.

Po-ki-te (KN B 806, 3) is also a personal name (cf. *Docs.* 423; O. Landau, *Myk. -griech.* PN. p. 107; V. G. *Suppl.* p. 19: *Φώκαι, Φώκη*).

Pu-te (As 1516,4) = *Πύθης* along with the ideogram of man and in a list of personal names, but in Uf 835 = *φυτήρ* cf. *pu-te-re* (V 159, Na 520) = *φυτήρες*.

Ra-pte (An 172,1; Ea 28, 29, [56], 325, 460, 754, 813), nom. sing. masc. **ραπτήρ* „stitcher, tailor“, cf. *ραφεύς*. The word obviously ended in *-τηρ* (cf. *ra-pte-re*, pl.) **Ραπτήρ* is not related with Lith. *verpiù* = *to spin*. (not *sew*), because in Mycenaean *F* should certainly appear (cf. *wi-ri-ne-o* = *Φρινεός*). Thus the etymology **uer-p-* (Hofmann, *Et. Wb. d. Gr.* s. v.) ought to be revised. In view of the alternations: *ra-pi-ti-ra*: *ra-qi-ti-ra*, derived from *ra-pre* (= *ραπτήρ*), obviously the word contained the labiovelar *-qu*, and it is more likely that its root is concealed in IE **srqy*

the well known IE nouns from *r*-stem: *μήτηρ* and *πατήρ*¹⁸). Then there are 12 examples of the dat. (i. e. dat.-instr.-loc.) forms in *-(v)τει* from (*n*)*t*-stems, e. g. *ἀνδριάντει* (*a-di-ri-ja-te*), *ἀλειφάτει* (*a-re-pa-te*)¹⁹), 12 participial forms in *-τες*, e. g. *ἔχοντες* (*e-ko-te*), *δεμέοντες* (*de-me-o-te*)²⁰),

sraqu- as B. Čop has recently concluded (Ž. A. VIII, (1958) p. 245—252, cf. also A. Heubeck, *I. F.* LXIV (1959), p. 123—125.).

Te-ra-pe-te (KN V 147,5) a personal name.

Su-ra-te (Ae 72; 264) a noun agentis, derived from the verb the aorist of which appears as *su-ra-se*, nom. sing. *sulater*, „exercising the right of reprisal“, (*Docs.* 169; 408).

¹⁸) *Pa-te* in An 607, 2, 5, 6, 7 = *πατήρ*, but in KN B 1055 (*to-so pa-te*) = πάντες.

¹⁹) *A-di-ri-ja-te-ge* (Ta 707,2) = *ἀνδριάντει kwe* instr. sing. of *ἀνδριάς, -άντος* „statue of a man“, cf. *a-di-ri-ja-pi-ge* (Ta 708,3; 714,2) = **andriant-phi* > *andriamphi* (*Docs.* p. 386) instr. pl.

A-na-ka-te (Un 219,7). The initial sign is doubtful, only the top is visible. J. Chadwick (*A Critical Appendix to the Pylos Tablets* (1955)) is unwilling to exclude *wa*, thus it is the same word *wa-na-ka-te* (Un 2,1, Fr. 1220,2, 1227, 1235,1) cf. the alternate spelling *wa-na-ke-te* in Fr 1215. The word *a-na-ka-te* cannot be a proof that *w* at the beginning was pronounced weakly as S. Lurja, (*J. K. M. G.* p. 86) states. The form is in the dat. sing.; the consonant group *-kt-* is spelt with the repetition of the vowel of the preceding syllable, by the analogy of the nom. sing *wa-na-ka*, but nevertheless there is an exception in *wa-na-ke-te*. According to J. Chadwick (*Some Notes on the 1955 Pylos Tablets*, p. 2) this indicates a syllabic division *wanak-tei* rather than *wana-ktei*.

A-re-pa-te (Un 267,3) the dat. sing. *ἀλειφάτει* (cf. *ἄλειφαρ*) (*Docs.* 224, 389 V. G. *Lex.* s. v.).

A-ti-mi-te (Un 219,5) the dat. *Artemitei*, with *i* instead of *e* (cf. the gen. *A-te-mi-to*, Es 650,5) and with *t* in the stem instead of *d* (*Ἄρτεμις, -ιδος*), as in the East Greek (J. Chadwick, *Trans. Phil. Soc.* (1954) p. 16, *Docs.* 127).

E-re-pa-te (Sd 0401, Sd 0403, Ta 642,2; 708,1) the dat.-instr. sing. *ἐλεφάντει* „with ivory“, cf. the gen. *e-re-pa-to* KN V 684 [Ch 144], Sa 793, and *e-re-pa* (Sd 0412, Va 482) *ἐλέφα(ν)ς*.

I-na-o-te (Ge 604,2) Ἰνάων, -οντος (J. Chadwick, *MT*² p. 109) cf. Ge 603—605, An 209,5 with the ideogram of man (*Docs.* 419), a personal name in the dat.

Ki-ri-jo-te (Da 1163 passim) cf. n. 27.

Pa₂-ra₂-te (An 7,7; 39, r. 3), the dat. sing. of *Pa₂-ra₂* (An 192, 16), a personal name Πάλλαξ, -αντος. In An 7 the words are in the dat. cf. 1.10 *pi-ri-e-te-si*.

Pe-ri-te (Vn 130,2) the dat. sing. of the personal name *Πείρις, -ιθος (cf. *πέρις-ιθος* „wicker basket“ V. G. *Suppl.* 18), depending on the preposition *pa-ro*.

Qo-ja-te (KN Od 667, B), hitherto unidentified. (Cf. C. Gallavotti, *Docum.* p. 86; V. G. *Suppl.* p. 22).

²⁰) *A-ke-ra₂-te* (Vn 493,1), nom. pl. masc. aor. part.: *agerantes* „who collected (*e-po*)“ *Docs.* 386, V. G. *Lex.* ἀγγέλιαντες; C. Gallavotti, *Documenti* p. 91. part. pres; M. Lejeune, *Mémoires* p. 276 part. aor.

A-pe-o-te (B 810, 823, An 724,1) cf. *a-pe-o* (An 18,6) ἀπέων, ἀπεόντες.

Da-ma-o-te (X 1051b) possibly from *δαμάω, δαμάζω* nom. pl. part. pres. masc.

De-me-o-te (An 35,1) (*to-ko-do-mo d.*) nom. pl. part. fut. act. *δεμέοντες* from *δέμω*.

E-ko-te (Eb 236, & passim) = *ἔχοντες* cf. *e-ko* (KN Sc 226) = *ἔχω*.

E-qa-te (An 615. e, — 724 [13], 14), nom. pl. part. *hequontes* „following“? (*Docs.* p. 393).

I-jo-te (An 1,1) ἰόντες nom. pl. part. pres. act., (cf. *i-jo* V 1523,4x², 5).

O-pe-ro-te (An 218,1; 724,6) nom. plur. masc. *ophelontes*, 5 men, cf. acc. sing. *o-pe-ro-ta* (An 724,3) (an inhabitant) *ophelonta* (*Docs.* 402).

[*pa₂*]-*si-re-wi-jo-te* (Sn 64,1) cf. n. 27.

Pa-to-do-te (Jn 706,1) is a doubtful word. V. G. (II *Suppl.* p. 64) proposed a „personal- or a place-name in the dat. — loc. sing. *Φαντ-όδων, -όντος, cf. ἀργι-όδων „aux dents blanches“. Mr. J. Chadwick also suggests that it is a place-name, be-

8 noun forms in the nom. pl. in -τες from the (n)t- stems, e. g. γέροντες (*ke-ro-te*)²¹), 4 forms of the dat. sing. and nom. pl. from the adjectives in -went, e. g. κομαFέντει (*ko-ma-we-te*)²²), an adjective (adverb) neuter άνFετές sing. in *es* (cf. *Ž. A. VIII, 277*), a conjunction: ότε (*o-te*)²³), an ethnic: ?Κρήτες (*ke-re-te*), 3 unidentified forms²⁴), 6 incomplete words ending in -te²⁵), one word with an uncertain -te²⁶), 5, possibly adverbial, forms derived from the pronoun stems and 19 place-names. We shall

cause a) all other normal Jn-tablets (excluding 829) have a place-name in the introductory formula, b) postponement of the name is paralleled in Jn 658 (*e-ni-pa-te-we*). But, I think, there is still possibility for explaining *pa-to-do-te* as a compound with a part. aor. -δοντες in the second part. The first part *pa-to* might be the acc. sing. masc. from πός, πάντα, παν-η (cf. *ku-su-pa*, Fh. 367, -παν, not *quam), referring to χαλκός. It is probable that the smiths received an amount of bronze (*ta-ra-si-ja*) in order to manufacture some objects and they could not receive another *ta-ra-si-ja* before they had given back what they owed. Although there are difficulties in explaining the first part of the compound, the second is clearer. It does not contain the suffix -θεν.

Ta-pa-e-o-te (B 823) has obviously an opposite meaning to *a-pe-o-te* „absent“; V. Ch. (*Docs. 171*): *tarpha eontes* (cf. θαμά). In the second part the participial form *eontes* is certain.

Wo-zo-te (Eb 236,2, Ep 539,5), nom. plur. (or dat. sing.) part. pres. *worzontes*, -tei from wǰgjō.

²¹) *Da-ma-te* (En 609,1), *du-ma-te-ge* (Jn 829,1), *me-ri-da-ma-te* (An 39,8; 207, 11), *me-ri-du-ma-te* (An 39,2; 424,3; 427,2; 594,2), *me-ri-du-te* (Fn 50,5) (*me-ri-du* <ma>-te), *po-ro-du-ma-te* (Fn 50,7), *po-ru-da-ma-te* (An 39, r. 1). There are several explanations for these words, but it is most probable that they denote names of „a class of men“.

Ke-ro-te (Jn 881,4, B 800,5) = γέροντες cf. *ke-ro-si-ja* (An 261, 1—15 etc.) γερουσία.

²²) *Ko-ma-we-te* (KN C 913,2; Dx 1049; PY Cn 925,1) a personal name dat. *Komawentei*, cf. nom. *Ko-ma-we* (An 519,1 etc.) = *κομά-Fενς, Κομήεις, gen. *Ko-ma-we-to* (Dw 931, Dv 1272) and the adjective *ko-ma-we-te-ja* (Tn 316, r3) (decorated with foliage, L. Palmer, *Minos V, 75*).

Pe-ne-we-te (Ld 5108) = pen-wente, from πένος, J. Chadwick (*Docs 318, 404*), dual or plur. adjective in -wente, -wentes describing garments; V. G. (*Lex. s. v.*) = *pe-ne-we-ta* (te instead of ta? (sic!)) connected with φάρFεα = *πνεFετά <πνέω, cf. πνευματώδης etc., C. Gallavotti (o. c. 90) „vaporosi“.

te-mi *71-te (KN So 0433 passim) and *te-mi-de-we-te* (PY Sa 1206). The latter indicates that the value of *71 is -dwe and the word is connected with τέρμις, which in Mycenaean time had a stem in *d* (besides the flection τέρμις,-ιος, cf. Hom. τερμιό-Fεντ, not τερμιό-ό-Fεντ-) and the ending -wens was added directly to the stem (M. Lang, *AJA, 62*, April 1958, p. 189, M. Lejeune, *Mémoires* p. 338f.).

²³) *o-te* (Ta 711,1) ότε Lesb. ότα from the pronoun stem *io-* (cf. ός) + the suffix *-te *-ta (Brugmann, *Grundriss*, II, 2, p. 732).

²⁴) *ki-te* (L 5777,2) M. D. Petruševski suggests ?*σχιωτήρ (σχίζω).

o-ke-te (X 116,1) M. D. P.: ?όρχηστήρ (όρχέομαι).

O-ko-te (Vc 126, Vd 137 bis [7558]) M. D. P.: ?*όγκωτήρ (όγκώω) or *όρκωτήρ.

²⁵) *al*.-*te* (An 261, 14), a personal name in -θης, -της (stem in -ες).

l-*pa-te* (X 984) *p. ke-ke-me-na*.

l-*pi-te-te* (K 872,3) perhaps in connection with *o-pi-te-te-re* (Vn 46,5) (cf. *Docs. p. 349*) *όπιτιθημι? cf. έπιθεμα.

l-*ru-te* (Fh 380).

*l*te (Jo 438,1; Na 544; Xn 1261).

l-*te-ru-wo-te* (Dw 922).

²⁶) *A-ko-mi-te* (Va 1324) = „*a-ko-so-ne*“ 2, J. Chadwick apud M. Lang *AJA 63*, p. 137. By autopsy I am now convinced that the reading „*a-ko-so-ne*“ is right. (Additional note!).

examine the words in which some scholars have seen the suffix $-\theta\epsilon\nu$, but we shall pay special attention to the supposed adverbial forms, derived from the pronominal stems and from the place-names.

Up to the present the following words have been suggested as adverbs in $-\theta\epsilon\nu$:

- a-po-te-ro-te* (Va 15,2).
- a-ro-te* (La 622,1).
- ja-po-te* (KN Od 562,3)
- o-a-po-te* (KN L 641,1) and
- e-te* (KN Am 600, 601; PY Va 15,2)²⁷).

²⁷) Besides these, adverbs in $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ from the nominal stems are supposed in three other words. M. Lejeune, (*Rev. de philologie* XXIX, p. 166) allowed the possibility that *a-mo-te* (So 0442) means ἀμόθεν „d'origine indéterminée“ and V. Georgiev (*Lex.* p. 41, II suppl. 69) *ki-ri-jo-te* = κριό-θεν < κριός and [*qa-*] *si-re-wi-jo-te* = γωασιλη-*Fi-jo-θε(v)*).

The first supposition for *a-mo-te* = ἀρόσθη, pass. aor., given by V.—Ch. (*Evid.* p. 99) was criticized by Furumark (*Eranos* LII p. 59) as „unrichtig“ and by M. Lejeune (o. c. p. 159) that it is „sans justification par la syntaxe et le contexte“ (cf. also P. Chantraine, *Minos*, IV, 61). It would be surprising to find pass. aor. in- $\theta\eta\nu$ so early (NB! This form is from the Knossos tablets), when it only began in Homer's time, or a little before it. A. Furumark's proposal (l. c.) ἀρροστήρ was accepted by V. G. (*Lex.* p. 21) S. Lurja (*J. K. M. G.* p. 254) „мастер колесниц“, partially by M. Lejeune (l. c.) and V.—Ch. (*Docs.* p. 372, 387) with regard to *a-mo-te-re* (X 770, X 6026), possibly the dual, or plur. of the same word. As the most probable meaning of *a-mo-te* V.—Ch. (l. c.) propose *harmote* (dual), from „*harmo*“ = „wheel“, found on KN So 7485,3: *a-mo* in the nom. sing. They suggested that the classical meaning of ἄρμα is *wheel*, which one can also see from other I. E. languages, e. g. Skt. *rātha*, Tokharian A *kukāl*. In support of this etymology of the chariot one can add the Slavonic term *kola*, neuter plur. from *kolo* „wheel“. A similar proposal for *a-mo-te* was given by L. Palmer (*Minos* V, 70f) „two undercarriages“, so, only „axle“ divides his opinion from V.—Ch.'s „wheels“. P. Chantraine (o. c. 61) thought that *a-mo-te* could be theoretically explained as a dat. sing. from *a-mo* = ἄρμα, „pour le char“, or „pour le montage“, but he finds that Furumark's explanation ἀρροστήρ is better.

Lejeune's suggestion ἀμόθεν does not give any clearer meaning to the inscription So 0442:

o-pe-ro
-ja a-mo-te pe-ru-si-nwa | ta-ra-si-ja WHEEL ZE 1. The damaged word may conceal the information from where the pair of wheels is due (*o-pe-ro*). Lejeune's attempt to reconstruct a personal name of a chariot-builder in the first, damaged word is also unacceptable because the inscriptions of this series do not give names of the workers (cf. *Docs.* p. 135). The reconstruction by Gallavotti (o. c. p. 117) *i-qi-ja a-mo-te* is not convincing either, because a meaningless repetition appears in this case: According to him *a-mo-te*, as well as *i-qi-ja* means „chariot“ (l. c.). The first word of the inscription in this series sometimes suggests the origin of the chariots, e. g.: So 0448 & 5794 PA-I-TO *a-mo-ta pte-re-wa te-mi-dwe-ta* WHEEL ZE 3. It is more probable that a place-name is concealed in the first word of So 0442 and it could be: *se-to-i-ja*, *ku-do-ni-ja*, *do-ti-ja* etc.

From the formal point of view V.—Ch.'s suggestion *harmote* is quite satisfactory, but from the syntactical side a better meaning is gained if we suppose an occupational name ἀρροστήρ in *a-mo-te*. The first word may be reconstructed as a place-name, perhaps *Ku-do-ni-ja* in the gen.-abl., i. e. *the charioter of ?Kudonija* (has) *a debt for the last year's ta-ra-si-ja* 1 pair of wheels. *Pe-ru-si-nwa ta-ra-si-ja* announces χαλκήΡες from PY Ma- and Jn-series. Thus, *a-mo-te* could not, by any means, be ἀμόθεν as M. Lejeune has supposed; but he himself was not sufficiently convinced. In the *Addenda* of his *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne*, p. 334 s. M. Lejeune aban-

A-po-te-ro-te appears only once in the V-series, whose context and translation are for the most part uncertain because of the absence of ideograms. For that reason the authors of *Documents* (V. — Ch.) keep the commentary on these tablets to the minimum, but nevertheless they mark *a-po-te-ro-te* as identified with certainty as ἀμφοτέρωθεν. Several other explanations have been given about this word (ἀποτέρωθεν, C. Лурье, o. c. p. 77, 173, 365f., 379; ἀποστέλλοντι, V. Georgiev, *Lex. s. v.*, *Ét. myc.* 66), and there are still more different interpretations of Va 15. As in another word (*e-te*) of Va 15 the suffix -θεν (ἐθεν) is supposed, it will be necessary to examine closely the whole inscription, because only from the context one can conclude whether those forms are adverbs with this suffix or not.

The inscription is on a small tablet of palm-leaf shape, written neatly on both sides, but unfortunately considerably damaged and there are gaps due to the obliteration of the text. One of the reasons for these lacunae is probably the fact that the tablet is written on both sides.

In this small inscription there are many problems to be solved. The word *o-[da]-a₂* in the first line is not certain. In the drawing of this tablet (*PT²* p. 3) the sign *o* is not visible at all, and the last sign looks

dons the first suggestion of ἀμόθεν, and he now also supposes a place-name in the first damaged word.

Ki-ri-jo-te (Da 1163, 1194 etc.). The subject of the series, where this word appears (14 times) — flocks of ewes and rams at Knossos — gives us reason to expect the word κριάς, but nevertheless V. Georgiev's explanation of this word κριάθεν is unacceptable, because this form should be spelt with *F* in this script: κριάς < *κριαFός cf. κεράδος, *κεραFός, *kereuos, Lat. *cervus* „deer“, Cymr. *carw*, Alb. *ka*, Lit. *karve*, Slav. *krava*, Gr. κέρας Lat. *cornu* (cf. J. B. Hofmann, *Et. Wb. d. Gr. s. v.*). By analysing the series where this word is found, one can come nearer to its meaning. The texts of this series are written in a constant pattern (cf. *Docs.* p. 201). It is noticeable that *ki-ri-jo-te* appears 9 times over the line, in the same way as the names of collectors, and 5 times under the line, connected with some place-name, as: *pa-i-to*, *ra-su-to*. As we find *ki-ri-jo-te* mentioned together with the name of a collector *We-we-si-jo* (Da 1163) it could hardly be a collector too. But it is not excluded that *ki-ri-jo-te* is a personal name. Comparing the phrase *pa-i-to pe-ri-qi-te-jo* (Da 1172) with *pa-i-to ki-ri-jo-te* it seems probable that the latter denotes a name of an „official responsible“ like *Pe-ri-qi-te-jo* (cf. *Docs.* p. 202), and it can be identified with *Συλλων, -οντος in the dat. sing. (cf. Pape—Benseler, *Wb. d. gr. EN s. v.* Συλλοῦς -οῦντος), or a place-name = *Γλιων, -οντος (cf. Γλίσσας, -αντος) in the dat.-loc. Here also there is no trace of the abl. suffix -θεν.

Pa₂-si-re-wi-jo-te (Sn 64.1). The beginning of this word is damaged and Caratelli (*Atti dell'Acad. Toscana, Scienze e lettere* 1956 p. 15) has reconstructed it [*i-je*]-*re-wi-jo-te*. Although in the drawing of the inscription one may read only [*re-wi-jo-te* (*PT²*, 10) cf. *Index* p. 3, and Bennett's restoration [*pa₂-si-re-wi-jo-te* „cannot be confirmed by an exact parallel, it seems very probable“ (J. Chadwick, *A Critical Appendix to the Pylos Tablets* (1955). Βασιλεύς was not an absolute ruler, but a princeps in a tributary village (cf. α 394: Βασιλῆες . . . εἰσι καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ ἐν . . . Ἰθάκη). Therefore it is not surprising that we find the name *pa₂-si-re-u* among the names of smiths (Jn 431.6), *po-ro-ko-re-te-re* and *ko-re-te-re* (Jo 438.20). There were possibly many βασιλεῖς in Mycenaean times as in Homer's times, and the present participle from the verb βασιλεύω could replace the noun Βασιλεύς. In Sn 64 we have such a participle in the nom. plur. The ending of this word *-te* is no proof that it contains the suffix -θεν. Nor is V. Georgiev convinced of his suggestion since he allows other possibilities for this word, e. g. the part. pres. nom. plur. in *-ontes*. Thus, we can not find a single example of the nominal stems with the suffix -θεν.

more like *me* than a_2^{28}). The first line is the worst damaged. But the most difficult and at the same time the key-word is *35-*ka-te-re*, which repeats on the reverse and is possibly contained in *ra-ka-te-ra* of the second line. Even the reading of this word is doubtful. There are several suggestions for the value of the signs *34 and *35 (cf. *Studies* I, 65, II, 31, III, 23), but none is convincing enough, because it is difficult with them to obtain a clear meaning in all the cases where these signs appear. This increases the number of different interpretations of the whole inscription²⁹).

There are some other doubtful details in this tablet too. Two vertical strokes, one above another can be seen after the last word of the first line and they are accepted by the authors of *Documents* as a numerical sign 2. It indeed represents an obvious exception to the usual writing of the number 2.³⁰) This tablet is broken in four pieces. There is no evidence that another small fragment from the right end of this tablet, where some more strokes (numerical signs) may possibly have been written, is missing. One cannot notice any trace of fraction at the end of the tablet either on the photograph or by autopsy. Thus, there is no other explanation³¹) for the vertical strokes, except that they are the numerical sign *two*, written in this way due to the lack of space. This excludes Lurja's interpretation of *35-*ka-te-re* as a verbal form ($\epsilon\kappa\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\rho\epsilon$)²⁹), since the last must be a noun in dual.

²⁸) This detail was also noticed by Bartonek, cf. *Archiv Orientalni*, 26, p. 681. By autopsy, however, I noticed that the last sign of this word might be a_2 , but *o-[da]-a₂* is still dubious: a) there is room for 4 signs, or 3 with a larger one in the middle (not *da!*), b) according to J. Chadwick „*o-da-a₂* is always first word in its clause“ and the preceding word *pu-ro* in Va 15 excludes it.

²⁹) S. Lurja (1. c. cf. *Minoica* p. 221f.) gave an interesting interpretation of this inscription, but it looks like a „far-reaching hypothesis built on slender evidence“, as J. Chadwick protests against all hypotheses of such a kind (*The Decipherment of Linear B*, 1958, p. 101). The basic word on which Lurja's thesis is built is the most doubtful *35-*ka-te-re*, explained by him as $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\rho\epsilon$, but the verb $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ is never written with $-\epsilon\rho-$ instead of $-\alpha\rho-$ (cf. $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$).

³⁰) The number 3, which is usually written with three strokes one after another like the Roman III, sometimes (cf. S. Dow, *AJA* vol. LVIII₃ (1954) p. 124—125) is shown in two lines as $\begin{matrix} \text{II} \\ \text{I} \end{matrix}$ (cf. En 609, 17 and Ep 539,9) obviously by the lack of space.

Probably the number *two* is written here in the same way. In fact, the scribe could press the end of the tablet as much as he wanted in order to write one stroke more (Cf. *Docs.* p. 111: The scribe or his assistant shaped the tablets . . . shortly before use, to the size and proportion to suit the expected length and nature of the record.). Everybody who has tried to write on clay tablets knows that it is quite easy to get more space at the end of the tablet. But we do not know whether Mycenaean scribes did this. There are evidence that they usually solved this problem in a different way. They continued the writing over the edge (cf. An 656, 13—14), or even round on the back (cf. Va 1324). As Va 15 is written on both its sides, such a continuation of writing is impossible. Perhaps for that reason the scribe has allowed this exceptional writing of the number *two*.

³¹) There are cases where the divider is written by two strokes (cf. Na 248 and 926 after *Ta-mi-ta-na* and *Pa-ka-a-ka-ri*), but these tablets are divided into two lines at the divider, and its duplication serves to break the writing between the majuscule word and the minuscule ones which follow. Obviously there is no reason to suppose this kind of divider in Va 15.

The erasures in the text, the uncertain value of the sign *35 and absence of an ideogram do not allow us to extract any clear meaning from the whole inscription.

E-te separated from the context could be easily identified as ἔθεν. It has possibly the same meaning in Am 600 and 601 (cf. *Docs.* p. 91, 170). Ἐνθεν as one of the oldest adverbs formed with the suffix -θεν can by all means appear in Linear B texts. But the difficulty of its identification depends on the fact that it is a short word giving the possibility of many different explanations, as ἔλθε (= ἤλθε), ἔστε, εἶτε etc., especially when the text is not certain. From that point of view *a-po-te-ro-te*, as a longer word, can be identified with more certainty as ἀμφοτέρωθεν (not ἀποστέλλοντες V. G., because it would be spelt with *ro*₂ **apostel/jontes*). But from the translation, given by V.—Ch. in *Docs.* p. 348 one cannot see which two sides are in question in *a-po-te-ro-te*. Even if we take it that *e-te* means ἔθεν it is still not clear to which two sides *a-po-te-ro-te* refers. I suppose that the meaning of the word *e-to* (line 1) is in some sense parallel to *a-po-te-ro-te*.

Unfortunately *e-to* is a short word too, and several different explanations have been given for it³²). It seems to me that *e-to* is an adverb too, possibly ἐντός and it makes clearer the meaning of *a-po-te-ro-te*. From the formal point of view there are no obstacles to that identification, and if its meaning „from inside“ was not previously documented (cf. M. Lejeune, o. c. p. 338) it may be confirmed from this inscription. *E-to* has the same position as *a-po-te-ro-te* and it is most likely that both of them are adverbs with the abl. meaning.

Because of the uncertainty of some words in Va 15 and the other above-mentioned difficulties, we can allow only as a possibility that the suffix -θεν exists in *a-po-te-ro-te* (= ἀμφοτέρωθεν) and *e-te* (= ἔθεν), as interpretation based entirely upon the resemblance of these spellings to the Greek words.

A-ro-te (PY La 622,1), *o-a-po-te* (KN L 641) and [*a-po-te* (KN Od 562,3) can be examined together, for the first two are from the same series — that dealing with textiles and wool. The third one belongs to a similar series with the ideogram of wool, and it is doubtless the same word *o-a-po-te*. Due to the fact that the inscriptions of this series begin with place-names or adjectives, derived from them, they represent for the most part receipts of cloth and wool (a sort of requisition) from the outlying settlements. The words *o-pe-ro* „debt“ (L 473, L 869) and *a-pu-do-si* „delivery“ (L 5867, 5930) confirm this for Knossos. The adjectives (ethnics) end in *-a* and they can be taken, according to V.—Ch. (*Docs.* p. 315) either as referring to the φάρφαξ themselves, nom. pl. neutr., or to the groups of women who had woven the cloth, in nom. pl. f.

A-ro-te = ἄλλοτε, ἄλλοθεν V. Georgiev, (*II suppl.* 43). This word appears in the very fragmentary Pylos series dealing with cloth. But

³²) V.—Ch. (*Docs.* p. 348): *eston* „they are“, (dual); V. Georgiev, (*Lex.* p. 34) ἔτο aor. med. from ἔημι; S. Lurja, (l. c.) ἐλθών „coming“.

even these poor fragments show a certain likeness to the corresponding series from Knossos, viz. the word *ko-u-ra* occurs in both series, and the places whence the cloth comes are designated in the Pylos La-series by the case ending *-pi*: *Po-to-ro-wa-pi* (La 623,1), *Mo-ro-qa-wo-wo-pi* (La 635), but at Knossos by ethnics, both of them expressing the same relation, i. e. the source of the cloth.

In view of these facts ἄλλοθεν might appear in the L-series, but somewhere at the end of the list, not among the first place-names. The fragment La 622, where *a-ro-te* is found, is too small to support the suggestion that it is concealed here. In addition we should expect the spelling of ἄλλοθεν < *aljo-then* with *ro₂* instead of *ro*. *A-ro-te* could hardly be ἀροτήρ, because of the number 4 (or 5 cf. *PT*² p. 65), which would need the pl. *a-ro-te-re*. It is also impossible to offer a satisfactory explanation for this word because of the uncertainty of the middle sign *ro* which is not shown in the drawing of this inscription (cf. *PT*² l. c.).

O-a-po-te = ὄ ἀποθεν (A. Furumark, *Eranos* LII, p. 46).

L 641: *o-a-po-te de-ka-sa-to a-re-i-jo | o-u-ge po*[

pa-i-ti-ja pe. CLOTH+TE 2 mi CLOTH+TE 14 da-wi-ja pe.

CLOTH+TE 1[

do-ti-ja mi. CLOTH+TE 6 pa₂-mi-ja CLOTH+TE 1[

ko-no-so | te-pe-ja mi. CLOTH+TE 3 tu-ni-ja CLOTH+TE 1[

(For the translation cf. *Documents* p. 317). Judging from the numerous ethnics in comparison with *Ko-no-so* we can assume that in the inscription two kinds of receipts of cloth are listed: the first from the outlying villages, denoted by ethnics; these are emphasized by the introductory words, because they represent the greater part of the goods, received by *Areios*. The second represents a smaller part of goods, which were possibly manufactured in Knossos (*Te-pe-ja* is most likely some woman's trade (cf. PY Ad 921), or the product of that trade). We should expect the ethnic *tu-ni-ja* to be mentioned before *Ko-no-so*, but it was possibly first omitted and afterwards added at the end. In a text like this it is natural that the adverb ἄποθεν might appear and Furumark has correctly found it in *o-a-po-te*. The initial syllable here is a prefix as in *o-o-pe-ro-si* (Nn 228,1), or *jo-do-so-si* (Jn 829,1) an old instr. sing of the demonstr. stem ὄ (cf. J. Chadwick, *MT*² p. 108). Usually a verb follows this prefix, but in this case it is compounded with an adverb before the verb *de-ka-sa-to*. „Thus *Areios* received delivery from *outside*³³), and there are not . . .“ Then ethnics follow showing where the cloth comes from.

ja-po-te (Od 562,3) looks like *o-a-po-te*, but the fragmentary text does not give any support to the meaning of ἄποθεν. The word *pe-re* which appears in every line of this inscription and is probably connected with φέρω, follows *ja-po-te* too. The latter can not be a subject of the sentence. *A-po-te-i* in MY Ge 602 does not solve the problem because

³³) The proposal of Gallavotti (o. c. p. 136) for *o-a-po-te*=ὀπόττε is unacceptable due to the spelling of the suggested πόττε without labiovelar (cf. πόττε Dor. ποκα, Ion. κοτέ Lesb. πότα), and the complete neglect of the second syllable *a*. Thus, Furumark's proposal ὄ ἀποθεν for this word is correct.

its „reading and interpretation are uncertain“ (cf. *MT*² p. 80, 107). P. Meriggi (*Glotta* XXXIV, p. 26) identified it with *apo(n)te(s)*, but this is disputable too. (The Myc. form is *a-pe-o-te!*).

It is noticeable that the texts where the supposed adverbial forms in -θεν are found do not give proof in their meaning of -θεν, except possibly *o-a-po-te* = ὄ ἀποθεν in KN L 641. But it is self-evident that *a-po-te-ro-te* is to be read ἀμφοτέρωθεν. However from this we can conclude that the suffix -θεν could exist in the pure adverbs in Mycenaean times. Let us now see whether this suffix had spread to place-names.

* * *

E. G. Turner (*BICS*, No 1 p. 17—20) states that the ending *-te* of the place-names represents the suffix -θεν. V.—Ch. (*Docs.* p. 139) disputed³⁴) his supposition, proving that the names ending in *-te* belong almost exclusively to the group of *-wo-te*, and this *-t* belongs to the stem. „In a few cases other forms are found which reveal a declension: nom. *e-ri-no-wo*, gen. *e-ri-no-wo-to*, dat.-loc. *e-ri-no-wo-te*“ (ibidem l. c.). Thus V.—Ch. conclude that all these place-names could be considered as loc.-dat. in *-tei*, and for that reason the ending *-te* could not be taken as a proof for this suffix. Nevertheless they have noted two place-names with this suffix: *ru-ko-a₂-[ke]-re-u-te* = *Lukoagreuthen?* (*Docs.* p. 149) and *a-ke-re-u-te* = *Agreuthen* (*MT*² p. 110).

More than half the place-names ending in *-te* belong to the group *-wo-te*. Of a total of 19 place-names with this ending, 11 end in *-wo-te*, one in *-we-te* and 7 in *-(e)-u-te*. They are:

a) Place-names in *-wo-te*:

1. *A₂-pa-tu-wo-te* (PY Cn 599, 3, 4, 5, 7) cf. Ἀπατούρια (*Docs.* p. 147).

2. *A₂-ru-wo-te* (PY An 657,8), *Halwontei* (Ἁλωῦς, Arcad. Paus. VIII, 25,2), cf. *a-ro-wo* (*Docs.* p. 147); L. Palmer (*Minos* IV, p. 134) *Alwontei* „at Aulōn“; H. M. (*Die Oka-Tafeln*, p. 5, 8, 27, 29); V. G. (*II suppl.* p. 43) Ἄρου(Φ)ώτης (*Suppl.* p. 6 s. v. *a-ro-wo*) ἄλφω (and *Lex.* p. 24 s. v. *a-ro-we*).

3. *E-ri-no-wo-te* (PY [An 427,1], Cn 4,5; Mn 456,8), gen. *E-ri-no-wo-to* (Eq 213,3) = Ἐρινόφοντος and nom. *E-ri-no-wo* (Na 106), cf. Ἐρινοῦς, -οῦντος.

4. *E-wi-ku-wo-te* (PY Na 604) loc. *-wontei?* (*Docs.* p. 148); V. G. (*II suppl.* p. 49): *Ἐυ-ιγγυφοντες(?) < εὔ-ἐγγύη, ἔγγυος: εγγ > ιγγ.

5. *Ne-do-[wo]-te* (PY Cn 4,6) cf. allative *Ne-do-wo-ta-de* (An 661,13) Νέδων, οντος river of E. Messenia.

6. *Pe-re-wo-te* (PY Na 513, Xb 176,1—2) hitherto not identified. Prof. M. D. Petruševski thinks that this place-name contains the word φρέαρ, -ατος < *bhreṃr, gen. -*bhreṃntos, spelt with *o* for *η* as in *e-ne-wo-pe-za*, *pe-mo* etc. In fact there are places named after the wells (cf. P.—B., *Wb. d. gr. EN* s.v. Φρέαροι) and Prof. Petruševski's suggestion is possible.

³⁴) S. Lurja, Я. К. М. Г. p. 146, similarly disagrees with Turner's suggestion.

7. *Sa-ri-no-te* (PY Vn 130,6). A defective spelling of the following *-no-te* might be due to weakening of *nwo* > *no* (cf. C. Gallavotti, *Atheneum* XLVI (NS XXXVI) 1958, p. 374 (=Atti del 2° colloquio, p. 80).

8. *Sa-ri-nu-wo-te* (PY An 424,2; Mn 456,9), V.—Ch. (*Docs.* p. 149): *Saliniwontei* ?loc. Σελινόως; L. P. (*Minos* IV p. 138), V. G. (*Lex.* s. v.) Σελινόωντι.

9. *Se-ri-no-wo-te* (PY Qa 1290). Alternative spelling of the preceding.

10. *Si-jo-wo-te* (PY Cn 4,10), not identified.

11. *So-wo-te* (PY Na 384) s. *Do-ro-qa-so-wo-te* (with a doubtful divider after *qa*, (*Docs.* p. 147); V. G. (*Lex.* s. v.): σό(Φ)οντες (-ει) or σώ(Φ)οντες (-ει?); M. Lejeune, (*Ét. myc.* p. 141): NL „L’Homme—Sauve“ i. e. δρώψ *nr-okw-; δρώψ ἄνθρωπος (Hsch.) and *So-wo-te* = σωθείς, loc.

b. Place-names in *-we-te*:

12. *Za-we-te* (PY Ma 225,2), M. Lejeune (*Rev. d. ét. anc.* LVIII (1956) p. 39): NL or *zaentes*, cf. (*Rev. d. ét. anc.* LX (1958) p. 16).

c. Place-names in *-(e)-u-te*

13. *Ta-to* / *Ma-ta a-ka-re-u-te* (PY Cn 4, 4, 9;), cf. *A-ka-re-u* (KN Ga 416) NP Ἀγαλλεύς? Ἀγαρεύς? (*Docs.* p. 415).

14. *Ru-ko-a-[ke]-re-u-te* (Jn 415,1), V.—Ch. (*Docs.* p. 149): *Luko-agreuthen* (cf. Λυκόα in Arcadia). L. Palmer (*BICS*, 2 (1955) p. 37): *Lukos-in-Aigaleus* „the territory of Mt. Aigaleon (*-te* represents the locative particle -θε)“.

15. *A-ke-re-u-te* (MY Ge 606,2), J. Chadwick (*MT*² p. 110. 121): *Agreuthen*, NL, (cf. *A-ke-re-u* PY Cn 441 [2], 3; *A-ke-re-we* (PY Un 1193,3).

16. *A-ne-u-te* (PY Cn 40, 7, 13). V. Georgiev (*Lex.* s. v.) suggested Ἀρνευτήρ as a personal name, but in the inscription all the lines begin with place-names.

17. *A₂-ne-u-te* (PY Cn 599,2), alternative spelling of the preceding.

18. *Pi-ru-te* (PY An 519,14; Cn 3,4). Turner (l. c.): place-name in -θεν. P. Meriggi (*Glossario mic.* s. v.): nomen prof., nom. pl., nomen agentis; H. Mühlestein (*Die O-ka Tafeln*, p. 29): NL ablat. in -θεν. L. Palmer, (*Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1954, p. 52): NL with the ending as in Τίρωνος -υθος; V.—Ch. (*Docs.* p. 207): NL *Pi-ru*-?

19. *Pi-pu-te* (PY An 427,3), V.—Ch. (*Docs.* p. 148): locat.; Turner (l. c.) *pi-qu-θεν*, *pi-qu*-. Possibly not nomen prof., nom. pl. (P. Meriggi, o. c. s. v.), neither Σπίγός? (V. G., *Lex.* s. v.).

For *pa-to-do-te* s. note 20.

It is obvious that we cannot expect the suffix -θεν in the place-names ending in *wo-te*, since the element *-t-* is a part of the stem. Whether the ending *-te* denotes exclusively dat.-loc. in this primitive script, or some other cases too, is a more difficult question. It could be answered only after a systematic analysis of the place-names which appear analogously with the forms in *-wo-te*. Here we can state only the absence of the suffix -θεν in this ending.

Za-we-te (PY Ma 225) is a place-name, judging from the fact that it is written in the same position as *Re-u-ko-to-ro* (= *Λεῦκτρον*, Arcadia, Laconia, cf. P.—Benseler, *Wb. d. gr. EN* s. v.). *Za-we-te* is the only place-name with the adjectival suffix *-wens*, *-wentos*. It is uncertain whether this name is the same as *za-we* (KN X 658) and as a place-name it cannot be easily identified with any geographical name of later times, but doubtless it does not contain the suffix *-θεν*. Prof. Petruševski's suggestion *Σκιαφεντες*, cf. *Σκιά/βεις* (St. Byz., Paus. 8, 35, 5) is however satisfactory.

The question about the place-names in *-(e)-u-te* is more complicated owing to the special nature of the vowel *u*. Besides the pure *u*, it can represent several other syllables beginning with *w*: *we*, *wo*, *wi* as we can see from these alternations: *di-u-ja* (Tn 316 r. 6): *di-wi-ja* (An 607,5 etc.), *au-u-te* (KN Od 666) = *αὐφετέες*, cf. Hsch. *ἀυετῆ· ἀυτοετῆ*, Cypriot *Ti-mo-se-u* = *Timosewo* (Schwyz. *Del*^s. 683,1) etc. (s. more examples in *Ž. A. VIII* (1958) p. 277).

Before we pass to the explanation of the words with this ending, the following notes should be added: The forms in *-(e)-u-te* are solitary. They appear only in this form, except *-a-ka / ke-re-u-re*, and only once, or some of them twice. We have mentioned 8 forms with this ending, but actually this number could be reduced to 4 viz. 3 forms (2 in *-e-u-te*, and 2, i. e. 1 in *-u-te*), because:

<i>Ta-to</i>	}	<i>A-ka-re-u-te</i>
<i>Ma-ta</i>	}	
<i>Ru-ko-a</i>		<i>-[ke]-re-u-te</i> and
<i>A-ke-re-u-te</i>		

may be considered, as 2, or even a single general form. The difference in the spelling of *A-ka-re-u-te* and *A-ke-re-u-te* can be explained either as a different spelling of the consonant group *kr*: in the first case it might be written with the repetition of the preceding vowel, as *wa-na-ka-te-ro* = *Φανάκτερος* (possibly by the analogy of *wa-na-ka*) cf. also the alternative spelling *wa-na-ke-te* in Fr. 1215, which is not accidental, *a-pi-ka-ra-do-jo* (Ae 398) = *Amphikladojo*, if it is correctly identified, and in the second — with the one that follows, which is the regular usage in the Linear B script; or the first case with *ka* might be an error, because it is found on the Pylos tablets only in Cn 4, where some other mistakes can be noticed. The first part of this compound: *Ta-to-*, *Ma-ta-*, *Ru-ko-*, *O-re-mo-*, (Jn 320,1), *Pu-ra₂-* (Nn 228,3) are closer determinations of the locality: *A-ka/ke-re-u-te*. The alternation of *a* with *a₂* (in Jn 415,1) is not significant, it is the same as in *A/A₂-ne-u-te* with a somewhat different spelling.

Pi-pu-te appears only once, in An 427,3; *pu* is slightly doubtful, but it can hardly be anything else except *pu*. According to the constant formula in this inscription: place-name (or ethnic) + trade-name, man's ideogram and numerical signs, *pi-pu-te* is obviously a place-name, whose identification is almost impossible. I think *pi-pu-te* is a scribal error; it is probably the same place-name *pi-ru-te*. *Pu* (instead of *ru*) is

perhaps anticipated from the following word PU-*ka-wo*. The ending *-te* of *pi-pu-te* (= *pi-ru-te*) does not represent the suffix *-θεν*, because the *-t* belongs to the stem (s. *pi-ru-te*).

In view of the pre-Greek place-name ending in *-uns*, *-unthos*, cf. Ἄρακυνθος, Βέρεκος, -υθος, Τίρυνς, -υθος, Ζάκυνθος etc., it is very probable that in *Pi-ru-te* we have just this suffix, as L. Palmer³⁵) proposed. V. G. (*Lex. s. v.*) suggested Σπίλο-θεν, cf. Σπίλος and (=?? Τίρυν-θεν, *Τίρύνθει loc.³⁶). *Pi-ru-te* might be also related with the name Φίλυς. The gen. of this word is Φίλυος, and its stem is in *-u*, but regarding the fem. personal name Φιλύτα (cf. P. — Benseler, *Wb. d. gr. EN. s. v.*), a stem in *-τ* might be assumed as well. Thus in a place-name of such a kind the ending *-te* cannot be a separate suffix either *-θεν* or *-θι*.

At first sight it might appear that the ending *-e-u-te* contains a separate suffix *-te* added to the stem of names in *-e-u*. Indeed, besides the other meanings (cf. Buck—Petersen, *A Reverse Index* p. 27) „rarely *-eus* designates a locality as covered with or characterized by something, e. g. δονακεύς „thicket of reeds“ etc.“ (l. c.). There are in classical Greek some rare place-names in *-eus*, as: Πειραιεύς, Φελλεύς (cf. Steph. *Th. l. G. s. v. φελλός*), Καφηρεύς etc. They are obviously derived from ethnics. The number of the place-names with the ending *-eus* and of the same origin was much greater in the Mycenaean age. It can be proved by the following cases in the different forms: *O-re-mo-a-ke-re-u*, *A-pa-re-u-pi*, *Ai-ta-re-u-si* etc.³⁷).

³⁵) L. Palmer, *Minos* IV, p. 136.

³⁶) The suggestion Τίρυν-θεν, or Τίρύν-θει (V. G. *Lex. s. v.*) could hardly be proved because it is impossible to connect the spelling *pi-ru-te* with the supposed by Georgiev himself etymology of this name (s. *Исследование по сравн.-ислѣп. языкознанию*, Москва 1958. p. 96, cf. *Die Träger der kretischmykenischen Kultur, Ihre Herkunft und Sprache*, Sofia, 1936, p. 112 f.), related with δειράς, -άδος.

³⁷) In the nom.: *O-re-mo-a-ke-re-u* (PY Jn 320,1) is without any doubt a place-name, derived from the personal name Ἄραρεύς or Ἀχιλλεύς (cf. *Docs. p. 148*; C. Gallavotti, *La Parola del Passato* X, p. 16; V. Georgiev, *II suppl. p. 61*; M. Lejeune, *Mémoires* p. 143 etc.).

Pu₂-ra₂-a-ke-re-u (PY Nn 228,3) = *πυλαι-*.

A-ka-re-u (KN Ga 416) and *A-ke-re-u* (Py Cn 441, [2], 3) are possibly personal names.

Da-i-ja-ke-re-u (PY An 218,3) is a name of profession, cf. L. Palmer, (*Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1954, p. 53): „land-divider“, or more probably a place-name regarding the other lines where well known place-names: *Me-ta-pa*, *O-wi-to-no* appear in the same position, (cf. Ventris, *Docs.* 178).

With the ending *-pi*: *A-pa-re-u-pi* (PY Cn 286,1; 643,1; [719,10], cf. H. Mühlstein (*Ét. mycén.* p. 94) Ἄφαρεύς; (*Docs. p. 147*; M. Lejeune, *Mémoires* p. 174, note 61).

A-we-u-pi (PY An 172, 8, 9), *Da-we-u-pi* (PY Cn 485, 1—8; 925, [1], 2, 3); *Wa-a₂-te-pi* (PY Na 1009) according to M. Lejeune, *Mémoires* p. 143, (cf. M. Doria, *Interpretazioni* II, p. 9) = *wa-a₂-te(u)-pi*, cf. *Wa-a₂-te-we* (An 207,9) „par dissimilation graphique ou phonétique“.

Ku-te-re-u-pi (An 607,2; Na 296) is possibly an ethnic, or the instr.-abl. pl. from *χυτρεύς*, as a class of men.

With the case-ending *-si*: *Ai-ta-re-u-si* (PY An 657,10) = *Αἰθαλεύς* (L. Palmer, *Minos* IV, p. 135), loc. pl.; (cf. V. G. *II suppl. p. 39*: *Αἰθαλεῖς*).

Very probably, in the above-mentioned place-names ending in *-e-u-te*, the final *-te* could be separated as a suffix added directly to the *eu*-stem, as some scholars have already suggested. Concerning this opinion of *-te*, the interpreters are divided. Some of them (Turner, l. c., V.—Ch. Docs. p. 147 s. v. *Ru-ko-a-ke-re-u-te*, H. Mühlestein, *Die Oka-Tafeln* p. 29, cf. *pi-ru-te*, C. Gallavotti, *Documenti* . . . p. 130, J. Chadwick *MT*² p. 110, 121, cf. *Agreuthen*) admit the possibility that the abl. suffix existed, others (L. Palmer, *BICS* 2, p. 37, M. Lejeune, *La dés.-φι in myc.* n. 17, M. Doria, o. c. p. 9, 10) concluded that it is the locative suffix $-\theta\varepsilon < \theta\varepsilon\iota$. The latter do not allow the abl. suffix $-\theta\varepsilon\nu$ „among so many locatives“³⁸). But can we claim with certainty that all the names along with the forms in *-e-u-te* are locatives? V. Georgiev (*Slov.* p. 59) supposes both $-\theta\varepsilon\nu$ and $-\theta\iota$ in *pi-ru-te*. After a detailed analysis of the place-names in these texts I have reached the conclusion that the ablatival meaning, not the locative, fits well there (cf. p. 123) and if the final *-te* is a separate suffix, then $-\theta\varepsilon\nu$ ³⁹) is more likely than $-\theta\iota$.

From the formal point of view the ending *-te*, if it is a separate suffix, is more likely to be an ablatival suffix $-\theta\varepsilon\nu$ than the locative $-\theta\iota$, because the locative ending $-\theta\iota$ has a short *-i*, which would hardly be spelt with *-e* in the Linear B script. The ending *-e* in the dat.-loc. of the consonant stems is possibly influenced by the dative, but in the suffix $-\theta\iota$ we have a pure locative and the final *-i*, in any case, should be written as *-i* not *-e*.

Once more I must underline the fact that these forms are not certain. As a matter of fact they are only two: *A/A₂-ne-u-te*⁴⁰) and *A-ka/ke-re-*

³⁸) M. Lejeune, *Mémoires*, p. 163f. (note 17), (cf. also M. Doria, o. c. p. 9): „Dans la mesure où les exemples sont valables, ces formes paraissent ressortir, du point de vue du sens, à la question ποῦ, non à la question πόθεν“. But I must object that not all of these forms correspond to the question ποῦ. There are inscriptions where the place-names fit with an abl., not locative meaning (cf. p. 124) and among these place-names forms in *e-u-te* appear as well. *A-ne-u-te* appears along with *Ma-to-pi* (= *Μάτωνφι cf. Μήλων, -ωνος, a personal name) derived from μῆλον the same as: ἀνδρών, -ῶνος, γυναικῶν, ἀπάνευθεν, ἐντεῦθεν, but they are found only in inscriptions from South Arcadia, cf. Μωλεῶν, -ῶνος (a village in Arcadia, Plut. *Pyth. orac.* 9) in Cn 40, and *A-ka-re-u-te* — along with *Mu-ta-pi* (Cn 4). For the abl. meaning of the ending *-pi* s. p. 124. Also the ending *-e* might denote both loc. and abl. function in this script (cf. p. 127).

³⁹) In classical Greek there are a few similar forms in *-eus* with this adverbial suffix. ῥανευ-θεν, Φλευθεν [Ἀρχ. Δελτ. I pp. 169—181], Ἀφαιρευθεν [IG, XII, IX, 210, 243]. According to M. Lejeune (*Les adverbs en -θεν* p. 103) these forms are formed by the analogy of ἀνευθεν, ἀπάνευθεν, ἐντεῦθεν, but they are found only in inscriptions from Eretria (Euboia), and the ending *-eu* is doubtful, because the diphthong *-eu* in Ionian is equivalent to *-eo* (cf. C. Buck, *The Greek Dialects*³ p. 40). M. Lejeune also finds that they: „sont peu clairs: s'agit-il de formes contractes à partir de *Ἀφαιρεοθεν etc.? [cf. cor. π(ε)ρᾶ <ε>οθεν si s'est bien ce qu'il faut lire dans l'inscription Schwyz. 123,12]; s'agit-il au contraire d'adverbes directement formés sur des nominatifs *Ἀφαιρευς etc. comme Ἀργῶθεν sur Ἀργος,“ (ibidem). The numerous Mycenaean forms in *-eu* give us reason to suppose a separate suffix in the ending *-e-u-te*, and it is more likely $-\theta\varepsilon\nu$, but owing to the primitive script and the special nature of the vowel *-u* there is still a small possibility of other explanations, as: *-went* *-wont*.

⁴⁰) S. Lurja, (*Я. К. М. Г.* p. 112) thinks that *A-ne-ta-de* (Ma 393,2) is from the same stem and derives the nom. *A-ne-u-ta*, but there is no reason for such a recon-

*u-te*⁴¹). It is noticeable that the supposed suffix *-θεν* could appear only after *eu*-stems. What is the reason for this exception? Why the suffix *-θεν* should spread first to these stems? It is difficult to give a satisfactory answer to this question. The nature of the *eu*-stems, indeed, contains such an ability to modify itself accepting different endings. The *eu*-stems behave as vowel-stems when endings begin with a consonant, and as consonant-stems, when endings begin with a vowel (*-γF*). But, can this peculiarity be a reason for the spreading of the suffix *-θεν* firstly to these stems?

On the other hand, having in mind that the vowel *u* has other values too, as it was mentioned above (s. p. 119) we may wonder whether the ending *-te* is correctly separated and identified as a suffix. Due to the fact that in the Mycenaean inscriptions there are many forms in *-we-te*, *-wo-te* and we see some in *-(e)-u-te*, one may question whether the IE suffix *-wens* does not appear with an alternation as *-wons* and *-uns* (the known suffix of the pre-Greek place-names). As a possible explanation of the ending *-e-u-te* we also accepted an influence of the pre-Greek names in *-υνς*, *-υνθος* over the Greek names in *-Fενς*, *-Fεντος* which had led to a hybrid spelling *-e-u*, dat.-loc. *e-u-te* (s. note 41). If so, the element *-t* in *e-u-te* could also belong to the stem.

struction because *A-ne-ta-de* is not a place-name. There are different interpretations about this word, but nobody so far has accepted it as a place-name (V. G. *Suppl.* p. 4: Αἰνήτη δέ (ἀνετά δέ), L. Palmer, *Minos*, IV p. 128: ἀνετά δέ the participle of ἀνήμι, „remitted“; M. Lejeune, *Mémoires*, p. 80: probably ἀρηνητά δέ.; Rev. d. phil. XXXII, p. 202: ἀν-έτα). The meaning ἀνετά best fits the text where the delivery is mentioned: so much given, so much remitted, so much not given, and thus it apparently has no connection with *A-ne-u-te* which is a place-name (cf. *Docs.* p. 147). L. Palmer (*BICS* 2, p. 37) and M. Doria (l. c.) explain it as *Aineuthe* = in Aineus. If so, it is surprising that the initial syllable is not written with the sign *43. A name like *Αρνεός or *Arne-wns-wntos would be more appropriate. Its stem is probably related with ἀρνεῖός < *ἀρνεῖος (< *ἀρσν-ηFος) and ἀρσν, ἀρνευτήρ.

Taking into consideration the different values which might be represented by the vowel *u* in Mycenaean, one must be careful in determining this ending. All the names in *-e-u-te* need not be in any case vowel stems and the final *-te* might be considered in some of them, if not in all, as a part of the stem.

The suffix *-wens*, *-wentos* is widespread in Mycenaean (cf. M. Lejeune, *Rev. d. ét. anc.* LXp.5—26), but it is remarkable that only a few place-names or ethnics contain this suffix (s. *Za-we-te* p. 119). It is just possible that the pre-Greek names in *-υνς*, *-υνθος* influenced the Greek names in *-wens*, *-wentos*, leading to a hybrid spelling *-e-u*, dat.-loc. *-e-u-te*. We might assume *A-ne-u-te* to be a name of this type.

A-ne-u-te and *A₂-ne-u-te* are one and the same place-name. The latter is spelt with *a₂* owing to the influence of *a₂-pa-tu-wo-te*.

⁴¹ *A-ka | ke-re-u-te* appears in the different forms only in the PY and MY-tablets, and this gives some reason for the supposition that the suffix *-θεν*, perhaps began to spread to the place-names only after the fall of Knossos (For the spelling *ka | ke* cf. the alteration *wa-na-ka | ke-te*). The identification of all its forms is not very easy: *Ma-ta A-ka-re-u-te* (Cn 4,9) = M.? — *Αγρεῦθεν or *Μάτην ἄγαν βέοντες??, or person. name Μάστας ἀγρευτήρ; *Ta-to A-ka-re-u-te* (Cn 4,4) = T? — *Αγρεῦθεν or *Τα-τῶς ἄγαν βέοντες?? or PN *Στάτος, *Στάρτος, Στάρτος ἄ.; *O-re-mo-a-ke-re-u* (Jn 320,1) = *δλειος Ἄ. (cf. n. 37); The final sign *u* is doubtful! *Pu-ra-a-ke-re-u* (Nn 228,3) = *Φυλλία (*Mémoires* p. 142) or Φυλλά-, or Πύλαι-Α. *Ru-ko-a-ke-re-u-te* (Jn 415,1) = Λυκο-Α. cf. Λυκόσουρα (Paus. 8,2, 1—4); *A-ke-re-u-te* (MY Ge 606,2) = *Αγρεῦθεν (cf. *a-ke-re-wi-jo o-pe-ro* MY Ge 604,3), probably with the suffix *-θεν*.

Even if we admit the possibility that *A-ne-u-te* and *A-ke-re-u-te* have the suffix -θεν, it cannot be a proof that this suffix had spread in the Mycenaean age from pure adverbs to place-names, not only because of the small number of examples in comparison with the great number of the place-names mentioned, but also because of its uncertainty, since the place-names appear in this form only and have not yet been identified. If we had but a single example in *-te* from a well known place-name, already documented in several forms (the allative in *-de*, or the locative in *-si*, and an adjective, derived from it), we could declare with greater certainty that the suffix -θεν was active in Mycenaean place-names. It is noticeable that no example in *-te* appears among the well attested place-names: *Ko-no-so*, *Ko-no-si-jo*; *A-mi-ni-so*, *A-mi-ni-so-de*, *A-mi-ni-si-jo* | *ja*; *A-ke-re-wa*, *A-ke-re-wa-de*; *Me-ta-pa*, *Me-ta-pa-de*, *Me-ta-pi-jo*; *Pe-to-no*, *Pe-to-no-de*, *Pe-ti-ni-jo*; *Ri-jo*, *Ri-jo-de*, *Ka-ra-do-ro*, *Ka-ra-do-ro-de*; *E-ra-te-i*, *E-ra-to-de*, *Pa-ki-ja-pi*, *Pa-ki-ja-si* *Pa-ki-ja-na*, *Pa-ki-ja-na-de* *Pa-ki-ja-ne* etc. This is a strong argument for the absence of the suffix -θεν in Mycenaean place-names.

It is evident that the adverbial suffix -θι, which in Homer and classical Greek was added first to the pronominal stems as: αὐτό-θι, ἄ-θι, πρό-θι (προ-θι) etc. and afterwards to the nominal: οἴκοθι along with οἴκοι/εἰ, Ἴλι-όθι, Λεσβό-θι etc., and has a locative meaning, is not to be seen in the Mycenaean inscriptions even in the pronominal stems⁴²). It is very probable that in Mycenaean times too, this suffix had not spread to the place-names, because the locative, as a separate case form was still alive. The hypothesis of Meillet⁴³) that the separate suffixes -θεν and -θι did not exist in IE, but only an extension of the dental *-dh-*, can be thus confirmed. In Mycenaean the suffix -θεν had developed in the adverbs of the pronominal stems, but -θι is not yet found there. These suffixes gradually became stronger and spread more widely to the noun stems after the syncretism and disappearance of „local cases“. The suffix -φι(ν) should not be added to this category, for it represents an old instrumental ending, which after the syncretism of the abl. & loc. took over their functions.

If the suffix -θεν, as well as -θι, did not have such a wide spread in the place-names (the few doubtful examples mentioned might represent the faint and uncertain nucleus of this spread restricted to the *-eu*-stems), the question spontaneously arises: How was the ablative case relation expressed in Mycenaean time?

⁴²) From the formal point of view both -θεν and -θι might be assumed in the ending *-e-u-te*. Only judging from the context and analysing the place-names, parallel with these forms can one conclude whether they are locatives or ablatives. I conclude that the suffix -θι does not appear in this script at all. The short vowel *-i-* of -θι cannot be expressed by the diphthong *-e(i)*. The dative of consonant stems is usually represented by *-e*, analogically to vowel (*-i-*) stems, but nevertheless there are examples (especially from Mycenae) in *-i* (cf. *ko-re-te-ri*, *ka-ke-wi*, *ke-ra-me-wi*, *pi-we-ri-di* etc.).

⁴³) Cf. M. Lejeune, *Les adverbs en -θεν*, p. 16f.

The survivals of the ablative in classical Greek: Delph. $\text{Fó}\lambda\omega$, Dor $\pi\tilde{\omega}$, Cret. $\tilde{\omega}$, $\delta\pi\omega$ etc., no matter how few they are, show that this case was active in earlier times. Doubtless it was lost very early. The separate pure ablative forms do not appear in Homer. There the ablative is expressed by the adverbial suffix $-\theta\epsilon\nu$, and the instrumental ending $-\phi\iota(\nu)$. How was the abl. expressed in Mycenaean times? Was it expressed by substitutes at that time too, or was it still current?

As the suffix $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ had not spread to place-names, then the abl. must have been expressed in some other way. I have to repeat that the abl. relation cannot be absent in texts of this kind, which are receipts from various places and persons. It is noticeable that in Mycenaean there are many adjectival forms derived from place-names. These adjectives — ethnics signify *belonging* to the places from the stems of which they are formed. They can be substituted for the ablative in certain respects. But it is also noticeable that along with these adjectives some place-names appear in the same positions. They must have some case ending. How shall we determine this case? What will serve us as a criterion for their determination?

First, the meaning of the inscription will help us to understand whether the place-names are in the loc., abl. or some other case. I shall again draw attention to An 1 (cf. *Ž. A.* VI p. 330 f.):

<i>E-re-ta</i>	<i>Pe-re-u-ro-na-de</i>	<i>i-jo-te</i>
<i>Ro-o-wa</i>		MAN 8
<i>Ri-jo</i>		MAN 5
<i>Po-ra-pi</i>		MAN 4
<i>Te-ta-ra-ne</i>		MAN 6
<i>A-po-ne-we</i>		MAN 6

„Rowers to go to Pleuron: eight from *Ro-o-wa*, five from Rhion, four from *Po-ra-*, six from *Te-ta-ra-ne*, seven from *A-po-ne-we*, (cf. *Docs.* 186). Obviously, the rowers should go *from* one place to another, and place-names from which they have to go cannot be in the locative, as they are pointed out in *Docs.* (l. c.).

It is to be noticed that in such an inscription with a clear abl. meaning, forms in *-pi* appear as well. From *Ku-te-re-u-pi* one can see, as Prof. M. D. Petruševski showed (cf. *Ž. A.* V (1955) p. 398f.), that the forms in *-pi* along with their instrumental meaning had an ablatival one too. A gradual development in the extension of the meaning of this ending is also noticeable. In the Knossos tablets the ending *-pi* has virtually only an instrumental meaning. It has not spread to place-names. The authors of *Docs.* do not find any place-name at Knossos ending in *-pi* (cf. p. 146f.). The only example of a place-name with this ending might be however found in the reconstructed form *ka-ta-ra-pi* in V 145, 4, instead of *Qe-ta-ra-pi*, along with *Ka-ta-ra-i* (Co 906,1)⁴⁴), whereas 200

⁴⁴) Cf. *Studies in Mycenaean Inscriptions and Dialect II* (1956), p. 22: *qe-ta-ra-pi* read *ka-ta-ra-pi*. Cf. also M. Lejeune, *Mémoires*, p. 163 = $\text{K}\alpha\theta\alpha\rho\alpha\iota$ (sc. $\text{p}\alpha\rho\alpha\iota$?), (s. n. 47), [...]-*ma-te-u-pi* (KN K 877) is not certain whether it is a place-name or not.

years later in the Pylos tablets this ending is much more frequently used. The great many place-names with this ending show that they are in some other case than the instrumental, for the instrumental of place-names in such texts is meaningless. Ventris—Chadwick, M. Lejeune, L. Palmer and others concluded that they were in the locative. But it is surprising that the locative was expressed in such different ways and of the ablative „only one, uncertain case“⁴⁵) was found in Mycenaean, when we can find more traces of the ablative in later times. However J. Chadwick now assumes here „an ablative, rather than an instrumental serving as locative“ (cf. *La Parola del Passato*, Fasc. LXII (1958) p. 292f.).

Doubtless, the syncretism of cases had already begun in Mycenaean. From the paradigm of the consonant stems we can see that the locative and dative pl. have one and the same ending *-si* (cf. also *o*-stems in *-o-i* < *oisi* < *oisu*, and *a*-stems analogically in *-a-i* < *aisi* < *aisu*, or the older *-asu*). It is remarkable that *in the lists of place-names where the ending -si, -a-i, (or -o-i) appear, the ending -pi does not appear. It shows that these two endings denote two different cases which are well differentiated in Mycenaean times, and are never confused*⁴⁶). If the ending

⁴⁵) M. Lejeune, (o. c. p. 177): „Un seul exemple, possible, mais non sûr, d'emploi ablatif, figure à Pylos sur la tablette An 607 qui, pour la localité *me-ta-pa*, inventorie une catégorie définie de personnel féminin in (*do-ge-ja*), en en précisant les origines“. Two points gave Lejeune reason for this statement: 1. Homer's use of the suffix *-φι* without prepositions: there is only one example with ablatival meaning (*ναῦφιν ἀμυνομένοισι* N 700), along with 12 examples with locative and 51 with instrumental meaning; 2. the Arcado-Cyprian use of the abl. prepositions: *ἀπό*, *ἐξ*, *παρά* with the dative (not the genitive), which he supposes in Mycenaean too. M. Lejeune allows „pour les formes en *-φι* une fonction ablatif, elle s'y trouvait ressortir, comme les fonctions locative et instrumentale, au „datif“ du dialecte“, (ibidem).

The large number of the locatives and instrumentals in *-φι(v)* without prepositions in comparison with only one example of the ablative at first sight indicates that M. Lejeune may be right in his conclusion. But, if in Mycenaean dialect the ablative were already lost, so that only one uncertain form of it could be noted, there is even less chance of finding such forms in Homer and in later times. On the contrary the fact that we find a certain abl. form without preposition in *-φι* and many with the prepositions *ἀπό*, *ἐκ* (*ἐξ*), *παρά* in Homer, and that in the dialects of classical times a few pure abl. forms are documented, gives us reason to suppose that in Mycenaean there were more examples of the ablative as a separate case. They emerge from an analysis of the texts (cf. p. 124).

Concerning the Arcad.—Cypriot use of prepositions *ἀπό*, *παρά*, *ἐξ* with the dative instead of the genitive, we have to bear in mind that these Arcad.—Cypriot inscriptions are about 700 years younger than the Mycenaean and in such a long period many changes could take place in a language. The Arcad.—Cypriot use of the abl. prepositions with the dative might easily be a secondary development. A priori it is impossible that Greek in its older stage had a poorer case-system than in later times.

⁴⁶) The case of Vn 130, where *34-*to-pi* is found in the first line and forms in *-si* occur in the list of place-names, cannot be taken as an argument against this statement, because, if *34-*to-pi* denotes a place-name, it refers to *Ke-sa-do-ro* (K. from *34-*to-pi*), and the locatives in the list denote places where the goods (*angeda*) are.

It is also important to notice that the locatives in *-si*, allatives in *-de* and instr.-abl. in *-pi* are well differentiated. The allative in *-de* is neither mixed with the locatives nor with the abl., because they differentiate in their meaning. There are only a few cases where the allative alternates with dative, e. g. Fn 187,2 *Po-si-da-i-jo-de* (to the place P.) and *Po-si-da-i-je-u-si* (line 18: for the people P.). Cf. also KN Fp. 14 + 21 + 27, 28: *a-mi-ni-so-de*, *pa-si-te-o-i* cf. Fp. 48,3, etc.

-*pi* had the meaning of the locative, we should expect to find at least one example of this ending among the forms in -*si*, *a-i* and *oi*. It follows that they are *intentionally* separated. From this fact the conclusion may be drawn that the ending -*pi*, besides the instrumental, had already taken on the ablative function in Mycenaean times. By the time this ending extended to the locative, the substitution of the ablative by the adverbial suffix -*θεν* and locative by -*θι* were perhaps wide-spread.

The spread of the suffix -*θεν* from the pure adverbs (*a-po-te* = ἄπω-*θεν*, *e-te* = ἔνθεν are documented) to place-names in the Knossos tablets is not found. In the Pylos tablets the suffix -*θεν* cannot be denied in *a-po-te-ro-te* = ἀμφοτέρωθεν and there is some reason to suppose the extension of this ending to the nouns of *eu*-stems, although the examples are not very certain. As the ending -*φι* at Knossos has possibly only begun to extend from the instrumental to the ablative meaning (cf. the single example *Ka-ta-ra-pi*), so the suffix -*θεν* in the Pylos tablets (200 years later) had probably only begun to extend from the pure adverbs of pronominal stems to those of noun stems.

Judging from such examples as: *Ka-ta-ra-pi* (KN V 145, 4): *Ka-ta-ra-i* (KN Co 906, 1⁴⁷); *Pa-ki-ja-pi* (Jn 829, 7, Ma 221, 1): *Pa-ki-ja-si* (An 18, 11, Cn 608, 6; Tn 316, 2, Un 2,1, Vn 130, 7, 9); *Po-ra-pi* (An 1, 4, Nn 228, 6): *Po-ra-i* (An 656, 13)⁴⁸ we can conclude that the ablative pl. in Mycenaean was expressed in the consonant- and *a*-stems by the suffix -*pi*, while -*si* i. e. -*a-i* (= *ai(s)i*) served for the locative and dative. Of the *o*-stems we have no clear example of the abl. pl., but it seems that the instrumental ending -*ois* (cf. Skt. -*aih*) has analogously taken the ablative function too. Unfortunately in this script the instrumental pl.

⁴⁷) The place-name *Ka-ta-ra-pi-i* is not identified yet. The explanation Καθαράι (scilicet παγαί?), given by M. Lejeune, *Mémoires* p. 163, is suitable, but such a place is not documented in Crete. It is most probable that this name is related with Κάτρη (Paus. 8,53,3; St. Byz. s. v. Κατρεύς, cf. *РЕРВ* XI, p. 45). The Ionic form Κάτρη in Crete is surprising. The final η is here probably a substitution of the diphthong -αι, pronounced as ē in Pausania's times. Thus, the name of this place was Κάτραι.

Recently I have noticed that V. Georgiev had already identified *Ka-ta-ra-i/pi* with Κάτρη in his new book *Исследования по сравнительно-историческому языкознанию* Москва, 1958, p. 109. He goes too far when he derives the name Κρήτη from Κάτρη < *Katra* (or *Kaptr-ja) with a change of *pt* > (*t*) *t* and the popular etymology of *Katra* to *Κρατα, Ionic Κρήτη, perceived as κράτη „mixed“ from κραάν-νυμι (cf. τ 127f., and *E.M.* s.v. Κρήτες). He also thinks that *Ke-re-te* (PY An 128,3) = Κρήτε(ς) is a later name of another development. (Additional note!).

⁴⁸) M. Lejeune, *Mémoires* p. 174 finds the same alternation in *Ka-ra-pi* (Ea 808) with *Ka-ra-i* (Es 644,8, 650,8, 726,1), but it is to be noticed that *Ka-ra-i* is obviously a personal name (cf. *Docs.* p. 419 = Κλαίς (Sappho) if not = ΚλαFίς), not a place-name; it takes the same position as other personal names in Es-series: *O-ka do-so-mo po-se-da-o-ne* (Es 727,1), *Ru-ko-u-ro* (= *Λυκοφορος) *do-so-mo* P. (Es 729,1) *Wo-ro-ti-ja do-so-mo* P. (Es 728,1) cf. with *Ka-ra-i do-so-mo* P. (Es 726,1). *Ka-ra-pi* (cf. *Docs.* = Κράμβις) is most likely the same personal name, as Prof. M. D. Petrushevski thinks, but only erroneously written with -*pi* instead of -*i*. It is also proved by the context itself (Ea 808) that *Ka-ra-pi* (= *Ka-ra* < ?i >) is a personal, not a place-name; *Ka-ra* < ?i > *e-te-do-mo e-ke o-na-to pa-ro da-mo* = Κλαίς *έτε(φο)δμώς έχει δυνατον παρό δάμφ. The place-name cannot have such a syntactical use with *e-ke*.

of o -stems could not be differentiated from other case endings in $-os$, $-\bar{o}i$, $-on$, $-oi$, $-ons$, but its existence in Mycenaean is certain. Besides the instrumental pl. of a - and consonant stems in $-pi$, there are forms of o -stems in $-o$ (*ku-ru-so a-di-ri-ja-pi* „*khrusois andriantphi*“, Ta 714, 2, *e-re-pa-te-jo ka-ra-a-pi* „*elephanteois kraatphi*“ Ta 722, 2).

The examples of the abl. pl. give us reason to expect this case in sing. too. O -stems most likely still kept alive the abl. ending $-\bar{o}(d)$. It is noticeable that place-names of o -stems ending in $-o$, (in sing.) appear along with other place-names in the abl. plur. (cf. *ri-jo* along with *po-ra-pi* in An 1). Therefore, among the other supposed case-endings in $-o$ we can allow an abl. one in $-o(d)$ too. The existence of this ending might be proved by the alternations of place-names ending in $-o$ with the adjectives derived from them, e. g. *o-ka-ra* O-WI-TO-NO An657, 13): O-WI-TI-NI-JO *o-ka-ra*, (An 657, 3); O-RU-MA-TO *u-ru-pi-ja-jo* (Cn 3,6): *u-ru-pi-ja-jo* O-RU-MA-SI-JA-JO (An 519, 12), etc. or from inscriptions like Pn 30, where the personal names: *Si-ma-ko*, *De-ka-to* are obviously in the abl. relation.

The gen.-abl. of a -stems in $-as$ contains an IE contraction (cf. Schwyzler, *Gr. Gr.* I. p. 554). The endings of the consonant stems, especially in er -stems are more clearly differentiated in the Linear B script (cf. *Docs.* p. 85f.). The question how the ablative sing. of consonant stems was expressed in Mycenaean times is much more complicated. In the texts where an abl. meaning can be presumed, forms of the consonant stems appear in $-e$. Many of them are ethnics in the nom. pl. in $-es$, but some have case-endings. There are two possible ways of explaining this ending: either this $-e$ is the same instr. ending $-ei$, which by the analogy of the plural forms in $-\phi$ has taken the abl. function too (this would throw more light on the Arcado-Cyprian use of the abl. prepositions: $\acute{\epsilon}\chi$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\xi$), $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}$ with the dative) or this $-e$ represents the separate abl. ending $-es$, differentiated from the genitive in $-os$ with the lower ablaut grade. I concluded that the second supposition was more likely (cf. *Ž. A.* V (1956) p. 329f.).

The purpose of this survey was to examine whether the suffix $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ had spread in Mycenaean Greek or not, but I could not avoid the question of the existence of the abl. at that time. The latter needs more systematic comparative research and it cannot be solved here. I have only one point to note in connection with the case-ending e , concerning place-names in $-te$. Judging from the fact that names in $-e$ are found in lists of place-names both in $-pi$ and $-si$, one can deduce that it may have both abl. and locative meaning. Thus, *E-ri-no-wo-te*, *Ne-do-wo-te*, *Si-jo-wo-te*, along with *Mu-ta-pi* and possibly Ἀκρεῦθεν (*A-ka-re-u-te*) in Cn 4 are in the abl., but *Sa-ri-no-te*, along with *Pa-ki-ja-si* in Vn 130 is in loc.-dat.

In conclusion we may state that although the suffix $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ existed in the pure adverbs, and the adverbs of the pronominal stems, it was not extended to place-names as it was in the later times. Having regard to the great number of classical forms in $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ in comparison with

the allative in $-\delta\epsilon$ (s. p. 108), one would expect the similar relation in the mycenaen place-names, where the allative in $-de$ often appears. But there are no more than two examples: *A-ka/ke-re-u-te* and *A/A₃-ne-u-te* from Pylos which may indicate that the suffix $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ had only begun to spread, (although there is another just possible explanation, viz. the element $-t-$ is perhaps a part of the stem in $-wont/went$.) Thus, it indirectly indicates that the ablativ was expressed in other ways and gives us reason to suppose that the abl. was still alive as a separate case in Mycenaean Greek.

Skopje.

P. H. Ilievski).*

*) My warmest thanks are due to Prof. M. D. Petruševski for his generous help, suggestions and encouragement during the preparation of this article, and to D-r John Chadwick for correcting the manuscript, his valuable comments and criticism.

ADDENDUM. — I have found out (cf. p. 119), that *za-we-te* is possibly a place-name. The identification $\Sigma\kappa\omega\Phi\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, cf. $\Sigma\kappa\omega/\beta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (St. Byz., Paus. 8, 35, 5), proposed by M. D. Petruševski, in that case, would correspond well. But the new idea, that *za-we-te* = $\sigma\tilde{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, $\sigma\tilde{\eta}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ < **kjavetes*, „this year“, put forward by L. Palmer at the Third International Congress of Classical Studies in London (31. VIII.—5. IX. 1959) is much more convincing. I am thankful to Mr. J. Chadwick for the information about this Palmer's suggestion.