

NON-GREEK INFLEXIONS OR SCRIBAL ERRORS IN THE MYCENAEAN TEXTS

The idea that Mycenaean is a mixed language containing both Greek and foreign elements is not new¹⁾. Having in mind such theories, the authors of *Documents* stated that „the proportion of non-Greek words was higher in Mycenaean than in Attic, or even Homeric Greek“, but they warn that „it would be rash to assume all the words that so far defy interpretation were of non-Greek origin“²⁾. Determining that „the final classification of a language depends ultimately on its grammar and syntax“, they found that „in this respect Mycenaean displays undeniably Greek features“³⁾. With the exception of the undoubted presence of non-Greek personal names, they rejected every other foreign grammatical elements in Linear B, because „there are no tablets of reasonable extent which do not give some sign of being written in Greek“⁴⁾.

However, at the III International Colloquium of Mycenaean Studies at Wingspread, Saul Levin read a paper⁵⁾ where he tried to prove that the language of the Linear B texts contains, along with Greek, non-Greek components as well, not only in the vocabulary, but also in grammatical structure. In some inscriptions with apparent Greek grammatical structure and vocabulary, as e. g. Fr. 1184, he also discovers foreign features. He supposes that the Linear B language is a jargon, used particularly in writing by bilingual Mycenaean scribes. But he does not say which other language coexisted with Mycenaean Greek; he only notes some forms and groups of words which he qualifies as non-Greek inflexions.

It is well known that a completely „pure“ language does not exist, and Mycenaean is no exception. It is also true that bilingual scribes often leave traces of the languages they speak on the documents they write. But the examples which S. Levin put forward as a proof for non-Greek inflexions in Linear B cannot be allowed to pass without comment.

¹⁾ M. Pallottino, *Sulla decifrazione dei testi cretesi micenei in lineare B*, Atti Pont. Acc. ser. III, Rendiconti, 28 (1954/55), 29.

²⁾ *Docs.* (M. Ventris — J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, Cambridge 1956), p. 70.

³⁾ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁾ *Idem* 71.

⁵⁾ *Greek and Non-Greek Inflexions in Linear B*, Mycenaean Studies Wingspread 1964, p. 146—159.

Pointing to un-Greek inflectional elements, he expressed a doubt even in the case of such an evident Greek form as *ti-ri-po-de* (Ta 641) as to whether it is dual⁶) or plural. He showed similar suspicion concerning the plur. *a-pi-po-re-we*, the negative prefix *a(n)-*, and the enclitic conjunction *-qe*. But he found the most convincing examples for his thesis in the PY Es and MY Ge tablets.

According to him „neither the base nor the inflexions of the ‘cult-word’ *we-da-ne-we/ we-da-ne-wō* of Es tablets have anything to do with Greek“⁷). He noted that the form *we-da-ne-we* is followed by a greater quantity of GRANUM (always T 1 V 4), and *we-da-ne-wō* by a smaller measure, only by V 2 or 3. On the basis of this correlation L. supposes that *we-da-ne-we* is the nom. plur. form, and *we-da-ne-wō* the gen. sing. in *-os*. But as the same portion of the commodity *120 is respectively assigned to the other two recipients: *34-*ke-te-si* and *di-wi-je-we*, L. concludes that „the *-we* ~ *-wō* alternation in the Es tablets is something un-Greek“⁸).

In the MY Ge series he noted several non-Greek alternations: *ke-po* ~ *ke-e-pe* *o-pe-ro*; *pu-ke-o* ~ *pu-ke* *pe-ro-ro*, and he also tries to prove that

<i>o-na-to</i>	like	<i>o-pe-ro</i>
<i>na-to-to</i>		<i>pe-ro-ro</i>

represent non-Greek inflexions.

Taken separately from the context and on the condition that the scribes did not make any errors, these examples would certainly represent a difficult problem. But having in mind the context, as well as the other places where they appear, nearly all of the examples mentioned above can be easily explained as scribal errors.

As from the manuscripts and inscriptions of classical and post-classical times, so from everyday life, it is known that errors of different kinds are inevitable in writing. Both in manuscripts and inscriptions we find numerous errors, e. g.: letters and words are erroneously written, omitted, repeated or mixed, and sometimes whole sentences are dropped or appear without any meaning⁹). If such numerous errors are inevitable in one relatively perfect script of about 20-30 phonetic signs, how much more can we expect errors in the primitive Mycenaean script of about 90 syllabic signs.

⁶) *Idem* p. 148. An obstacle to that, according to him, is the „quite problematical origin“ of the dual ending *-e*. But the numerical sign *two*, besides *ti-ri-po-de* and the classical Greek dual forms in *-e* are sufficient proof that this is a Greek word with a Greek inflexion.

⁷) *Idem*, p. 150.

⁸) *Idem*, p. 151.

⁹) For errors in manuscripts see Fr. Blass, *Hermeneutik und Kritik in Einleitende und Hilfs-Disziplinen*, Iwan Müller, Handbuch d. klass. Altertums-Wissenschaft 1, München 1892, p. 252f., and for errors in inscriptions — W. Larfeld, *Handbuch d. griech. Epigraphik* I, Leipzig 1907, p. 280f., 266f., 294f.

As written documents the Linear B tablets are in some way similar both to copies of manuscripts of classical works and to the inscriptions on stone and metal. But the Linear B texts also have their own peculiarities in which they differ from both of them. Having regard to the fact that the Linear B tablets are generally autographs and not copies, one would expect the number of the scribal errors to be reduced to the minimum, as in the case of inscriptions on stone. But while the stonemason could carefully and slowly write on the stone, often inspect the written text and correct it, the Mycenaean scribe had to draw a great number of signs on the sticky, soft clay. Some of these signs are quite complicated and need more than ten movements to be written, and the scribe had to finish the tablet quickly, for otherwise the clay would get dry and it would be impossible to write on it¹⁰). These conditions contribute to the considerably higher number of errors in Linear B texts. From the analysis of the handwritings of these texts, made by E. Bennett¹¹), one can see that at least 40 scribes were engaged in writing the Pylos tablets. As the tablets are not so extensive, and all of them could have been written in about 15 days by one scribe¹²), it is to be inferred that the scribes were not professionals without other duties, but literate functionaries who wrote the tablets when it was necessary. This also represents another reason for the numerous differences and errors in the tablets.

Many errors in the Linear B tablets have already been pointed out by the editors and interpreters of the Mycenaean texts, but yet there is no special survey of them. Here I shall try to classify the most characteristic ones and explain how some of them have come about. I hope that this will throw some light on the examples cited by S. Levin, who ignores this important factor.

The errors of the Mycenaean scribes can be divided into several groups:

I CHANGES:

1. *Changes caused by the similarity of the signs.* — Just as similar letters of the Greek phonetic script are usually confused, e. g. A with Δ and Α, C with Θ, and Ο, ΛΛ with Μ, Τ with Γ, etc. so in the Linear B texts there are interchanges between similar signs.

The word *o-na-te-re=onateres*, cf. ὄνατερ (Pind.), is repeated in PY En-tablets 6 times and once in the label Wa 784, 1, but in En 659, 9, in the position where it should come, it is inscribed *o-to-te-re*. Cf. also *pi-ri-na-jo* (KN C 911, 1), possibly instead of *pi-ri-to-jo* (KT³,

¹⁰) Cf. *Docs.* 111; L. Deroy, *Initiation à l'épigraphie mycénienne*, Roma 1962, p. 125.

¹¹) *Athenaeum* N. S. 36, (1958) p. 34—37; cf. also *Anonymous Writers in Mycenaean Palaces*, *Archaeology* 13 (1960) p. 26f.

¹²) J. Chadwick, *Burocracia di uno stato miceneo*, Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica, N. S. 40 (1962), p. 340.

p. 30) gen. Φιλίστωτο. The change of *na* into *to* and the contrary has obviously occurred in a mechanical way because of the similarity of these two signs: (na : to).

For the same reason there are also interchanges between the following syllabic signs:

: *ra : ja* : *ja : wa* : *qe : ka*
 : *ro : pa* : *pi : ti* : *su : ta*, etc.

e. g. *mi-ra-ti-ra* (PY Ab 382) instead of *mi-ra-ti-ja* = *Milatiai*, ethn. of Μίλητος, Μίλατος¹³); *a-re-ro* (PY Un 718, 8) instead of *a-re-pa* = ἄλειφαρ or ἄλειφα; *ro-we-a* (KN X 5949) = *pa-we-a* — φάρεξ; poss. *a-pa-ja* (KN E 843, 5, cf. *KT*³ p. 86, 88) instead of *a-re-ja*; *pa-ra-wa* (PY SA 787, 1, 2) instead of *pa-ra-ja* = παλαίδ ROTA; *e-qe-si-wa* (ibidem) *e-qe-si-ja*, adj. of *e-qe-ta* and possibly *za-ku-si-wa* (PY Sa 787, 2) instead of *za-ku-si-ja* = Ζακύνθια; *e-ra-ti-ja-o* (PY Un 1317) instead of *e-ra-pi-ja-o*, poss. *elaphia-*, cf. ἐλάφε(ι)ος adj. of ἐλαφος; *qe-ta-ra-pi* (KN V 145, 4) = *ka-ta-ra-pi*, cf. Κάτρη *Κάτραι; cf. also *a-qe-de* (KN B 799, 6) = *a-ka-de*; *ku-su-to* (KN X 80) instead of *ku-ta-to*, cf. Κύταιον, etc.¹⁴)

¹³) S. Luria, *Vestnik drevnej istorii*, No 2, 1957, p. 20, cf. also *Eunomia* 1958, p. 57, states that *mi-ra-ti-ja* („or *mi-ra-ti-ra*, possibly the basic form“) is an occupational name rather than an ethnic. But the women of PY Aa, Ab and Ad series are qualified both by their trade-names and by ethnics. In Knossos they are referred more often by ethnics, cf. *a-mi-ni-si-ja* (Ai 825), *pa-i-ti-ja* (Ak 828,1), *ri-jo-ni-ja* (Ak 624), etc. *Mi-ra-ti-ja* is also an ethnic adjective, derived from Μίλητος, either on Crete or in Asia Minor, and the form *mi-ra-ti-ra* is obviously an error.

¹⁴) On the other hand, numerous different readings are due to the similarity of some signs when they are not perfectly clear, e. g.: *to : na* — *a-to-re-u* (KN Pp 494): *a-na-re-u*; *ja:su:ta* — *ku-ta-mi* : *ku-su-mi* (KN L 759); *pi-wo-ta-o* (PY Vn 46,7, Bennett *PI*² p. 193) : *pi-ri-ja-o* (Chadwick, *Minos* VI, 2, p. 9), etc.; *ja:wa* — *to-te-ja* : *to-te-wa* (KN X 7846b, cf. *KT* p. 193); *pi:wi:ti* — *ko-pi-na* (PY Ep 617,15); *ko-ti-na* : *ko-wi-na* (cf. M. D. Petruševski, Ž. A. XI, p. 318); *pi-jo-de* (PY Fr 1230) : *di-wi-jo-de* (cf. Ž. A. XI, 318; *Minos* VII, 2 p. 47f.); *go-pi-ja* (PY Na 329); *go-wi-ja* (cf. M. Lejeune, *Mémoires I*, p. 386); *wo-no-wa-pi-si* (PY Vn 48, 6; Xb 1419,2, see Chadwick, *l.c.*): *wo-no-wa-ti-si* (M. Lang, *AJA* 1961, p. 162) = Οινωζτις of Οινόν (M. D. P., Ž. A. XI p. 278; J. Puhvel, *Myc. Studies Wingspread* p. 169); *pa:to* — *a-pa-to*: *a-ro-to* (KN Gg 5185,1); *to-sa* : *pa-sa* (KN G 820,1); *o:wo* — *a-ni-o-ko*: *a-ni-wo-ko* (KN V 60), VC *a-ni-pi-ko*; *i-re-ne* — *se-re-mo-ka-ra-o-i* (PY Ta 707,2), *oj-no-ka-ra-o-i* (PY Na 1038, cf. Mn 1412, 2); *-ka-ra-o-re* = *κρασορε cf. κρασίρα i. e. from a noun of neuter *krasή with alternation *krasή (cf. Ilievski, *The Abl. Instr. and Loc. . . .*, Skopje 1961, p. 35, 111; also C. Gallavotti, *Myc. Studies Wingspread* 1964, p. 67f.); *e-pi-qe re-si* : *e-pi-qe-i-si* (KN Lc 561); *a-i-ka* : *a-ne-ka* (KN X 134,1, cf. *KT*³ p. 191); *ke:de* — *wa-na-si-ja-ke*: *wa-na-si-ja-de* (PY Vn 851,7), etc. etc. For *a-si-to-po-ko* : *a-pi-to-po-qo* (PY Fb 617,6) see L. Palmer, *Interpret. of Myc. Texts* p. 483.

2. *Changes of some sounds.* — *a-ra-ro-mo-to-me-na* (KN Sd 4408a) instead of *a-ra-ro-mo-te-me-na=hararmotmenai*, cf. ἡραμοσμέναι; *a-qi-ja-i* (PY An 1282), instead of *i-qi-ja-i = hikkwia CURRUS* (cf. Lejeune, *o. c.* p. 335; Palmer, *Interpret.* p. 422); *o-pe-to-re-u* (PY Ep 704, 1); *o-pe-te-re-u* (Ea 805; Eb 294, 1) a personal name; *wo-zo-e* (Eb 338,2) instead of *wo-ze-e*, inf. praes. (*Docs.* 412).

3. *Metathesis.* — There is a typical example of a metathesis in MY Ge 603, 5: *no-ko*, instead of *ko-no*, which is repeated 4 times in the same tablet, cf. also Ge 602, 5 and *ko-i-no*, scriptio plena, in Ge 606,7=σχοῦνος „ginger grass“.

4. *Changes of the gender, number, case and personal endings.* — *ko-wo* 6, instead of *ko-wa* 6 (PY Ab 789)¹⁵⁾; *ra-pte-re* (PY An 298, 2), plur. instead of *ra-pte=**ραπτήρ 1, sing.; *ka-ke-u* (PY Jn 725, 18), sing. instead of *ka-ke-we*, (plur.) *ta-ra-si-ja e-ko-te=γαλαχῆρες ταλασίαν* ἔχοντες; *po-se-da-o* (PY Es 653, 1) nom., instead of *po-se-da-o-ne* dat. Ποσειδαώνει δοσμός; *e-ke-si* (PY En 74, 21), instead of *e-ko-si*, *onatēres* ἔχοντι, where elements both of sing. and plur. are mixed.

II OMISSIONS:

1. *Haplography.* — *du-ni-jo<jo> me-tu-ra* (PY Ae 264, cf. Ae 8); *ke<ke>me-na* (Eb 747); *ko-to-na <a>no-no* (Ea 922)=*ktoina anōnos*, *k.* not subject to *o-na-to*; *ko-to-no<o>ko* (Eo 173, 1)=*ktoinokhos*.

Similar to these errors are the omissions in which some element of the preceding or following syllable is dropped, e. g.: *a-ra<ka>te-ja-o* (Ad 380)=*alakateiaon*, gen. plur., cf. *a-ra-ka-te-ja=ἰλακατεῖα*; *a-da-ma<o>jo* (Eo 351, 1); *a<ko>so-ta-o* (Cn 719, 8); *ko<to>na* (Ep 212, 3)=*κτοῖνα*; *o<da>a₂* (Vn 20, 1); *o-to-wo<we>o* (An 616, 4); *o<u>wo-ze* (Eb 338, 2); *ta-ra-ma<ta>o* (Ae 134); *te-qi ri<jo>ne* (Un 219, 4); *wa<na>ta-[jo]* (Eo 211, 4).

2. *Unmotivated omissions:*

a. *Dropped initial syllables.* — *re-u-te-ra* (Na 425), prob = *e-re-u-te-ra*.

b. *Dropped middle syllables.* — *a-mi<ni>si-ja* (KN L 513r); *a-pi-qo<ta>o* (PY An 616, 2); *di<pte>ra-po-ro* (Ea 814); *e-ke-ra₂<wo>ne* (Un 219, 1, cf. *Docs.* p. 417); *ke<u>po-da* (Na 568); *ku-ru<me>no-jo* (Ea 801, cf. *Docs.* p. 251); *me-za<wo>ne* (Fn 50,4) and in the next line *me-ri-du<ma>te* (Fn 50, 5); *o<na>to* (Ea 814); *o-pi-te<u>ke-e-u* (Un 2, 2, cf. *Docs.* p. 221), cf. *o-pi-te-u-ke-e-we* (A 39, 4; Fn 41, 14); *re<u>si-wo* (An 1281, 9, cf. line 3); *to<ro>qa* (KN Fh 339).

c. *Dropped final syllables.* — *a-ja-me<na>* (KN Sd 4415b); *a-ko-so-ta<o>* (PY Cn 40, 13); *a<ke>* (Tn 316, r5); *ke-ke-me<na>*

¹⁵⁾ Cf. E. Peruzzi, Minos 1952, p. 62.

(Eq 59, 2); *ke-ro-si* <*ja*> (An 261, r4, cf. *PT*² p. 227); *ki-ti-me* <*na*> (En 74, 1); *o-na* <*to*> (Ea 460; 757+819); *pa-ko* <*we*> (Fr, 1216); *pe-su-si-nu* <*wo*> (Ma 193, 2); *po-se-da-o* <*ne*> (Es 653); *re-u-ko-to* <*ro*> (Un 1319, 3); *te-o* <*jo*> (En 659, 10; Eo 276, 7); *to* <*so*> *pe-mo* (Ep 212, 8; 301, 11); *we-re-ka-ra* <*ta*> (An 610, 15, cf. *Docs.* 411), cf. An 298, 3.

d. *More than one syllable or a whole word dropped.* — <*to-so*>*de* (Ea 609, 5); <*o-na-to*> after *e-ke-qe* in En 74, 4 and Eo 224, 6; <*pa-ra*> in front of *ru-*83-e* in Eo 276, 2 and in front of *ai-ti-jo-qe* (Eo 247, 3).

III ADDITIONS:

1. *Dittography.* — *u-ru-pi-ja-jo* {*jo*} (PY Cn 3, 7, cf. *Docs.* 207; *do-ro-jo* {*jo*}, cf. *Docs.* 417, etc.

2. *Additions of a whole word.* — *ko-to-na* *ko* <*to*>*na* (PY Ep 212, 3), if the last word is not *zoivá*; {*to-to*} *to-to* *we-to* (Sn 64, 14) etc.

It is to be noticed that the errors of omission are more numerous than those of addition because of the difficulty of writing with this primitive script on such unhandy material as clay. The use of so many abbreviations, to some extent, is due to the same reason.

Errors were sometimes noticed by the scribe himself, and he made efforts to correct them while it was possible, i. e. while the clay was soft. Erased signs and words are noticeable in many tablets and other signs and words were written over them¹⁶⁾. But sometimes, after the scribe had noticed the error, being distracted, he put the correction in the wrong place and instead of correcting one, made two errors. Thus, when he had written the tenth line of En 659 and noticed the error *o-to-te-re*, the scribe meant to correct it and write *na*. He did so, but in the wrong place. Just under the erroneous word, indeed under the erroneous sign, he put *na* instead of *jo*, and wrote another incorrect word *te-o-na* (*do-e-ro*), instead of *te-o-jo d*. It is evident that *te-o-na* is an error, because in the Pylos tablets *te-o-jo* (*do-e-ro*) appears over 100 times and *te-o-na* only in En 659, where otherwise the word *te-o-jo* is correctly written 6 times.

¹⁶⁾ There are whole tablets erased and reused like palimpsests, e. g. KN Da 1147, Db 1279; PY Tn 316; MY Ge 603 etc. Syllabic signs, whole words, and sometimes a complete text of one or several lines on some tablets are written over erasures, cf. KN As 1516, 21;—1517, 10—13, Od 502b; PY Ab 745, cf. Jn 725, 18—21, Sh 739, etc. There is an interesting case of this kind in MY V 659, 3.4. According to Bennett *go-ta-ge* (line 3) appears to have been written over a deleted name beginning *ko*; and the numeral may have been changed from 2 to 1 and then back to 2. Under the first two signs of *e-ri-tu-pi-na* (line 4) he reads signs *go-ta*. Chadwick concludes (MY III, p. 65): „this suggests that the correction of line 3 took place when the scribe had reached this point“.

Corrections can also be seen in the ideograms, cf. KN Da 1098, Dc 926; PY Ad 380, Eb 156, Sa 793, etc. and in the numerical signs, e. g. KN Da 1098, Dd 1425, Df 5182; PY Aa 313,—775, etc. For the errors in the calculation see M. Lejeune, *Les forgerons de Pylos*, Historia 10 (1961), p. 420 n. 52; 424 n. 74.

An interesting mixture of case endings occurs in Es 649, 1: *a-re-ku-tu-ru[wo]-ne po-se-da-o-no*, instead of *a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo* (or possibly *a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo-no...* *do-so-mo*, as in Es 644) *po-se-da-o-ne*. The dative case ending *-(n)e* of *po-se-da-o* is anticipated in the man's name *a*. (Αλεκτρυών), and then another mistake is made in the case ending of the recipient.

In KN Sd 4408 *ja* of *a-ra-ru-wo-ja* is not perfectly clear, and it is possible that the scribe meant to change *a-ra-ru-wo-a* into *a-ra-ru-ja*¹⁶ (KT³ p. 138).

The scribes often used set formulae in the writing of the tablets, but sometimes they took some liberty in the expression of their thoughts. Thus in Eo 371 an error appears in the name *[pi-ri]-ta-wo* which is in the nom., instead of gen. This change is due to the blend of two syntactical patterns. The three written lines of En 467 correspond to the inscriptions: Eo 278, 268 and 371. But while in En 467 the thought is expressed without a verb, and the personal names are in the gen.: *ti-qa-jo-jo ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na to-so-de pe-mo*, in the corresponding Eo 278 we read: *ti-qa-jo po-me e-ke-qe dwo ko-to-no* = *This baios the shepherd and he holds two ktoinans*. The second line (En 467, 3): *po-te-wo ko-to-na ki-ti-me<na> to-so-de pe-mo* in Eo 268 is expressed in a shorter way, only with *po-te-wo ko-to-na* and the numerical signs GRANUM 2 T 4, which corresponds exactly to the amount on En 467. But in Eo 371 the two varieties of the formula in Eo 278 and 268 are confused: *pi-ri-ta-wo* (Πλινθών cf. M. D. P., Ž. A. IX, p. 230) ... (e-ke „έχει“) ~ (*pi-ri-ta-wo-no* Πλινθώνος) *ko-to-na „κτοίνων“* (cf. Docs. pp. 246, 250).

A similar inconsistency is observed in MY Ge series dealing with contributions of different spices: *ko-ri-ja-do-no* (χορίκυδρον), *ku-mi-no* (χύμινον), *ma-ra-tu-wo* (μάραθρον), etc.¹⁷.

Along with the personal names: *pe-ke-u* (= *Sperkheus*), *i-na-o* (= *Isnaon*), *ra-ke-da-no* (-anor), etc. which are in the nom., in Ge 602, 4 we would expect *ka-e-se-u*, as in Ge 605, 4, but, obviously, it is in some different case. The names of My Ge tablets are generally repeated (602:605; 603:604). In Ge 603, 605 and 602, except line 4, they are in the nom. The nom. here depends on the introducing formula: *jo-o-po-ro a-ro* [...] (ὅς ὅφλον) „so they owed“. But the same idea of debt is expressed here in another way as well, with the noun *o-pe-ro* (οφειλος) „deficit“, and naturally the personal names are then in some other case. Thus, the word *o-pe-ro* follows every name in Ge 604. In the book *The Abl. Instr. and Loc. in the Oldest Gr. Texts*, p. 93 f. 139 f., it has been pointed out that the case of the personal names in Ge 604 is not the dat., as was supposed by the authors of *Docs.*, but the (instr.-) abl. The name *ka-e-se-we* in Ge 602, 4 is also in the (instr.-) abl. The interchange of the nom. with the (instr.-) abl. has come about

¹⁷) According to J. Killen, Cl. Rev., N. S. XIV, 2, p. 172, some of them are used as unguent ingredients, but more of them for culinary purposes.

because the introductory formula of Ge 602: *jo-o-po-ro* has been conceived by the scribe as *o-pe-ro* (*pa-ro*) ἡφειλος (παρό) allowing another case which expresses the same thought.

Such examples of an (instr.-) abl. among the other place-names in the nom. we find in PY Nn 228: *po-ra-pi* (instr.-) abl. plur. and *te-tu-ru-we*, sing., along with *pu₂-ra-a-ke-re-u*, *e-na-po-ro*, etc. They can be also explained as a confusion of the heading formula: *o-o-pe-ro-si ri-no...* with the thought *o-pe-ro* (*pa-ro*).¹⁸⁾

Let us look now at the pairs:

o-na-to ~ *na-to-to* and *o-pe-ro* ~ *pe-ro-ro*.

The correct qualification of a Mycenaean word depends on several different factors: first on contextual indications, and for that reason we dare not separate it from the context; the normality of the spelling not only in one but in all the places where it appears; the resemblance of a Myc. form to that of classical Greek, etc. (cf. J. Chadwick, *Glotta* XLI, p. 160). Only with all these factors in mind, can one decide whether a Mycenaean form represents a „non-Greek“ inflexion, or is simply a scribal error.

The word *o-na-to* „ονάτον“ ὀνητόν Dor. ὀνατόν „a holding“ or „a lease“, cf. ὀνήτημι, appears nearly 200 times in the Pylos E tablets in this form, twice as *o-na<to>*, without the final syllable (Ea 460, 757+819), once as *o<na>to* (Ea 814), and twice it is completely dropped (En 74, 4 and Eo 224, 6). In Ea 305, where this word is expected, the form *na-to-to* appears. Levin admits that the repeated *to* over an erased *ke* is a proof that the word is correctly written. But this erasure shows a more complicated blunder of the scribe. It is impossible to discover why the first syllable of this word is omitted, but nevertheless some relation between the dropped first vowel *o* and the repeated syllable *to* in *<o>na-to{to}*¹⁹⁾ cannot be denied. The initial vowel appears in the repeated *to*. At the back of his mind the scribe had the notion that the word *o-na-to* consists of more than two syllabic signs, and after he had begun to write the first sign of the following word *ke-ke-me-na*, he erased *ke* and wrote another *to*, instead of the initial *o*. Similarly, when the scribe meant to correct *o-to-te-re* (En 659, 9) into *o-na-te-re*, he put *na* in the wrong place. The repetition

¹⁸⁾ It is to be noticed that the differences in writing of some words cannot be always explained as graphic errors. Thus, *ma-to-pu-ro* in Mn 1412 was emended by M. Lang AJA 1961, p. 161 in *ma-to<ro>-pu-ro*, but A. Heubeck, *Kadmos* I p. 61 f. explained it as *matro-pulos —matr-p.* (cf. Ž. A. XII, p. 418). Among the restored genitives, e. g. *wi-do-wo-i-jo<jo>* (M. Lejeune, *Mémoires* I p. 199 n. 37), *si-ri-jo<jo>* (*Docs.* 261), *e-te-wa-jo<jo>* (Chadwick, *MLS* 28. V 1958), the month's names of Knossos (*Docs.* 305), *ai-so-ni-jo* in *MY* Ui 651,4, among the other genitives, etc. there might be some (instr.-) ablatives as well.

¹⁹⁾ It is noticeable that the three tablets, where the errors *o-na<to>*, *o<na>to* and *<o>na-to{to}* appear, are written by the hand of one and the same scribe, cf. M. Lejeune, *Sur le vocabulaire économique mycénien*, *Myc. Studies* p. 99, n. 25.

of final syllables, when some of the preceding ones were omitted, is also observed in KN Sd 4408, 1, where instead of the omitted *ki* or *ke* in *po-ni-ki/ke-ja* = φονικια, *po-ni-ja-ja* is written.

Pu-ke pe-ro-ro (Ge 604, 5). — Between these two words there is quite a large gap. Probably the scribe has intentionally left room for dropped syllables, but later he has forgotten to add them. Two syllables are at least dropped here. The question is: which are they? The second one is obviously the initial *o* of *o-pe-ro*; this word follows the personal names in all the previous lines and it cannot be an exception here. As a compensation for this omitted *o*, the scribe has repeated the final syllable *ro* like in *<o>na-to{to}* and *po-ni<ki, ke>ja{ja}*.

It is more difficult to restore the final syllable of the personal name *pu-ke*. Judging from the form *pu-ke-o* in Ge 603, where the other personal names are in the nom., we can admit an o-stem name, possibly *Πύργιος²⁰) with a graphic change of *i* to *e*. Then in Ge 604, 5 we would expect the same form *pu-ke<o>* like *a-ke-re-wi-jo* in line 4. But it is not excluded that *pu₂-ke* of Ge 602, 2; 605,2 and 608, 4 might be identical with *pu-ke*, as Bennett suggests²¹). This can be identified with *Φύσκης of es-stem. Then we must admit that *pu-ke-o* in Ge 603 is in the gen. *Φύσκεος, instead of nom. (for such kind of errors see above I 4 and *tu-me-ne-wo*, MY Ui 709, possibly gen. of *Τυμνεύς, cf. Τύμνης-εω, or Τυμνῆρος from Τυμνεύς, along with *ke-po* in the nom.). In that case we could restore an (instr.-)abl. form of this name *pu-ke<e>* with the omitted final *-e* by haplography. Both restorations are possible, but however they are speculative, because the form *pu-ke-o*, on which the explanation depends, appears only once.

Ke-po ~ *ke-e-pe*. — The name *ke-po* is identified with κῆπος, κῆβος (Arist. *H. A.* 502-a 17) and Hesych. κῆπος: ζῶον ὅμοιον πιθήκῳ (cf. Landau, o. c. s. v.). According to Stephanus (*Th. L. Gr.*, s. v.) „nomen ex Aithiopico quodam vocabulo in Graecam speciem detortum esse“. There are personal names with the meaning of „monkey“ both in Mycenaean, cf. *pi-ta-ke-u* = Πιθακεύς and in classical Greek, cf. Πιθηκός -ου, etc. Thus the form *ke-po* can be explained as a non-Greek personal name Κῆπος, Κῆβος, but a corresponding Greek name can be also found in the Greek vocabulary. There is a documented name Σκέφρος (Paus. 8, 53, 2, 3), derived from σκέπω²²), with the meaning „shelter“. The name *Σκέπος, -ου cf. σκέφος, -ου or *Σκέφρος, -ου with a similar meaning: „protection“, „refuge“, could also exist, and it would correspond better to *ke-po*.

²⁰) O. Landau, *Myk. griech. Personennamen*, Göteborg 1958, s. v. Cf. Πύργιος, the place-name Πύργος in Triphylia and Πύργοι, -ών in Elis. Although in the phonetics of this word there are some pre-Greek, possibly Pelasgian, elements πυργ- < *bherg- (cf. Vl. Georgiev, *Isledovanija po sravn. istor. jazykozn.*, Moskva 1958, pp. 91, 101; A. J. van Windekkens, *Le pélasgique*, Louvain 1952, pp. 131f.), the inflexion of the personal name *pu-ke<o>* *Πύργιος might be Greek.

²¹) *MT II* p. 89, cf. also *MT III* p. 70.

²²) W. Pape — G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch d. griech. Eigennamen*, Graz 1959, s. v.

As for the variation of *ke-po* : *ke-e-pe*, Bennett (*MT II* p. 89) suggested that this „might seem at least partly due to inflexion“. In *MT III* p. 70 he states that the two spellings of these forms „represent the same person in different syntactical positions“. The form *ke-po* is inscribed by hand 57 in Ge 602, 5; 605.5 and *Ui* 709, 1 and by hand 58a, over two erasures in Ge 603, where a part of the text belongs to hand 59. The form *ke-e-pe* appears only once in Ge 604 which is written wholly by hand 58a. The personal names in Ge 602, 603 and 605 are in the nom., with the exception of *ka-e-se-we* (602, 4), and in Ge 604 — in the (instr-) abl., as we saw above. Thus, a different form can be expected in Ge 604 if the name is of cons. stem (cf. *i-na-o-te*, *ra-ke-da-no-re*). But *ke-e-pe* from *ke-po* „cannot be reconciled with any Greek declension“, as Chadwick²³⁾ noticed (*MT II*, 108). Is not, perhaps, this form an example of non-Greek inflexion? It might be, if we were sure that the scribe did not make errors. But having in mind the fact that this is written by the same scribe who wrote *no-ko* instead of *ko-no* and *pu-ke pe-ro-ro* instead of *pu-ke-o/e? o-pe-ro*, we doubt whether *ke-e-pe* is a correct form. Maybe the scribe intended to write *ke-po* here, but then he made two errors: 1. a kind of dittography (*ke-e-*) and 2. he wrote *pe* instead of *po* having in mind *o-pe-ro*. In this tablet there is no other sign *po* and, apart from *ke-po* of Ge 603, 1, where several corrections are visible²⁴⁾, we cannot see how this scribe used to write the sign *po*.

It seems that *ke-po* = **Σκέπ/φος* is an o-stem name, and if it is correctly identified, it could not vary in Ge 604, where the case edning of the personal names expresses an ablative relation, cf. *a-ke-re-wi-jo*. In any case, this doubtful form of a personal name „cannot be used to support a theory that any language other than Greek was in actual use in the Mycenaean Kingdom“²⁵⁾.

The alternation *we-da-ne-we* / *we-da-ne-wo* in the PY Es tablets represents a really difficult problem and a more complicated case. Many scholars have tried to solve it, but so far no agreement has been reached among them. Several different solutions are given about the meaning of this word: personal name²⁶⁾, god's name²⁷⁾, a title, religious

²³⁾ However J. Chadwick (*ibidem*) suggested that this form could be explained with the analogy of an es-stem noun, written with a metathesis *ke-e-pe*, instead of *ke-pe-e*. The word *σκέπως*, -*εος* with the meaning 'shelter' is documented in *E.M. s. v.* and it would correspond to this form. But it is to be noticed that personal names in -*os*, -*eos* are not usual in the Greek popular onomasticon. They occur only in the mythology and poetry as personifications, e. g. *Ιένος*, -*ους*; *Κάλλος*, -*ους*; *Κράτος*, -*ους*; *Σκότος*, -*ους*, etc.

²⁴⁾ Cf. E. L. Bennett, *MT III*, pp. 68f., 72.

²⁵⁾ *Docs.* p. 93.

²⁶⁾ *Docs.* pp. 279, 427 *Εύδάνευμος*, cf. also Landau, *o.c. s. v.*, S. Luria, *Jazyk i kul'tura mikenskoy Grecii*, p. 387.

²⁷⁾ V. Georgiev, *Lexique*, II *Suppl.*, s. v., S. Luria, *I. c.*

functionary²⁸⁾, place-name or ethnic²⁹⁾, month's name³⁰⁾, financial functionary³¹⁾, religious holiday³²⁾, etc.

This name appears in PY Cn tablets along with the other two cattle collectors: *a-ke-o* and *a-ko-so-ta-o*, and there obviously it denotes a person, called by his name, if not by an ethnic³³⁾. The genitive case ending of the cattle collectors depends on the word *a-ko-ra* = $\alpha\gamma\omega\varphi$ „collection“ (cf. Cn 655, 5.6.11–13), which corresponds to the use of the name in the nom. and the verb *a-ke-re* = $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\beta\epsilon\iota$ (cf. Cc 660). The dative, in an alternative spelling of this name: *we-u-da-ne-we*, appears with the preposition *pa-ro* in Cn 418,1. It has been suggested that in Es tablets *we-da-ne-wo* also denotes a personal name or a title in the gen., which is confirmed by the phrase: *we-da-ne-wo do-e-ro* in Es 644,6; 650,6 and 703,1. The dat. *we-da-ne-we*, repeated three times in Es tablets, would correspond well with the other recipients of GRANUM *po-se-da-o-ne di-wi-je-we* and **34-ke-te-si*. But the genitive form *we-da-ne-wo*, repeated 10 times together with these names, apparently does not harmonize with the other datives.

It is known that personal names, especially when they are of foreign origin, can sometimes be badly distorted by scribes. The analogy to some forms written earlier, or intended to be written, can also represent a reason for the erroneous writing of personal names. It is noticeable that the „correct“ dative form *we-da-ne-we* appears in Es 646, 649 and 647, i. e. in the tablets which correspond to the first two and the forth line of the general list in Es 644 and 650. The genitive *we-da-ne-wo* in the other 10 tablets might be allowed by the influence of the phrase *we-da-ne-wo do-e-ro* of the sixth line in Es 644 and 650. Thus, if *we-da-ne-wo* is either a personal name or a title of the religious sphere and in the Es tablets a recipient of wheat, then the alternation *-we/wo* might be considered as an error. But the explanation of a Mycenaean form as a scribal error can be assumed only after all the other possibilities have been exhausted and in cases where we have no better solution.

As some scholars have already suggested, *Wedaneu* is an important personage at the palace. He is a cattle collector and possibly he is the same as the person mentioned in An 610,14, who together with *a-ke-ra₂-wo* supplies a number of rowers. But it is not certain whether the same person in the Es tablets receives a small contribution of wheat together with Poseidon and the other two recipients: **34-ke-te-si* and *di-wi-je-we*.

²⁸⁾ A. Heubeck, Sprache 4 (1958), p. 98f.; M. Doria, La Parola del Passato 17 (1962) p. 164: title of a priest; L. Palmer, *Interpretation of Myc. Greek Texts*, Oxford 1963, p. 174.

²⁹⁾ V. Georgiev, *ibidem*.

³⁰⁾ M. Lejeune, *Mémoires I* p. 164.

³¹⁾ S. Luria, *l. c.*

³²⁾ Capovilla, G., Rivista di filologia 39 (1961), p. 9.

³³⁾ V. Georgiev, *ibidem*, suggested that even here *we-da-ne-wo* is a place-name, or ethnic, cf. n. 29.

It is difficult to identify *we-da-ne-we/we/wo* with any later documented Greek personal name or title. It is also doubtful whether a person can be a recipient together with Poseidon, one of the most honoured gods in Peloponnesus. For that reason we have to look for another more convincing explanation.

The suggestion that in *we-da-ne-we/we* is concealed a place-name or an ethnic should not be entirely rejected. The name *di-wi-je-we* which appears together with *we-da-ne-we/we/wo* gives us reason for such a suggestion. There is disagreement among the scholars about the meaning of this word as well. Several identifications for this word have been proposed so far: personal name³⁴⁾, priest of Zeus³⁵⁾, priest of temple of Zeus³⁶⁾, ethnic³⁷⁾, man or functionary, a title rather than a proper name³⁸⁾ just as *i-je-re-u*, etc. An ethnic certainly would best correspond to this name. The place-name $\Delta\tilde{\iota}\sigma\omega\zeta < * \Delta\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\zeta$ quite often occurs in Greece³⁹⁾. Every inhabited place near the sanctuary devoted to Zeus can be called $\Delta\tilde{\iota}\sigma\tau\omega\zeta$. In the Linear B tablets this place-name appears in two forms: *di-wi-jo* PY Mb 1366 and the allative *di-wi-jo-de* Fr. 1230⁴⁰⁾. The ethnic of this place is documented as $\Delta\iota\sigma\omega\zeta < \Delta\iota\sigma\tau\omega\zeta$ Att. $\Delta\iota\tilde{\eta}\zeta$, or $\Delta\iota\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\tau\omega\zeta$ (cf. Paus. 9,30,8: *οἱ Διάσται*). Both of these forms appear in the Mycenaean tablets too: *di-wi-ja-ta* (PY Nn228,4) = *Diwiastai*, if not *Diwiatai* from *Di-wi-ja* obviously an ethnic, used as a place-name among *ro-o-wa*, *po-ra-pi*, *e-na-po-ro a-pi-no-e-wi-jo*, etc. and in An 656,9: *di-wi-je-u* $\Delta\iota\sigma\omega\zeta$ in the sing., applied to one of *e-qe-tas*. The title *e-qe-ta* is usually qualified by his own name and the patronymic: e. g.: *ro-u-ko ku-sa-me-ni-jo*, *a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo*, *pe-re-qo-ni-jo a-re-i-jo*, *ke-ki-jo a-e-ri-ko-ta*. But more often it is qualified with an ethnic both in KN and PY tablets: *e-qe-ta e-ke-si-jo* (cf. *e-ko-so*, *Exos*), (KN As 821,2); *ko-no-si-jo e.* (KN B 1055,1); *pe-re-u-ro-ni-jo e.* (PY An 656,16); *e. wo-ro-tu-mi-ni-jo* (An 611,7), cf. *Πιθυμίτις*; *e. ka-e-sa-me-no a-pu₂-ka* (An 656,20), and in the same way *e. di-wi-je-u* (An 656,8—9). (*ai-ko-ta*, An 657,14: 218,6 and *di-ka-no-ro a-da-ra-ti-jo* An 656,14, can be added both to the first group with the patronymics or to the second with the ethnics). It is more probable that *di-wi-je-u* here is an ethnic $\Delta\iota\sigma\omega\zeta$ which denotes the district of the functionary *e-qe-ta*, as *ko-no-si-jo* = *Κνώσσιος*, *pe-re-u-ro-ni-jo* = *Πλευρώνιος* etc.

³⁴⁾ Docs. p. 193.

³⁵⁾ E. Risch, *Athenaeum* N. S. 46, p. 350.

³⁶⁾ A. Heubeck, *ibidem*.

³⁷⁾ P. Ilievski, *The Abl., Instr. and Loc.* pp. 72, 132; M. D. Petruševski, *Discussions mycénologiques*, Ž. A. XII, p. 300; *Zur Toponomastik Griechenlands im mykenischen Zeitalter*, Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der alten Welt, Bd. I, Berlin 1964, p. 168f. Vl. Georgiev, *L'importance des toponymes mycéniens*, Linguistique Balkanique IX, 1 (1964), p. 12.

³⁸⁾ L. Palmer, *o. c.* p. 152, 174.

³⁹⁾ Cf. Pape-Benseler, *Wb. d. gr. Eigennamen*, s. v.

⁴⁰⁾ Cf., *Minos* VI, 2, p. 47f.

In Cn 3,2 the same ethnic appears in the dat. sing. and applies to the functionary *e-re-u-te-re=ereuterei*, cf. ἐρευτής „exactor, collector of state debts“.

In the Es tablets this ethnic is probably applied to Poseidon as an epithet. It is known that round big sanctuaries there are small temples devoted to other deities. Thus, in *Diwion*, besides the sanctuary of Zeus (from which the place received its name), another temple, devoted to Poseidon, could also exist. Poseidon of this place might be called *Diwieu* as well. There are many epithets of the gods derived from the places where their sanctuaries are situated. In the same way as the place could take the name of the deity (cf. Ἀπόλλονία, Διον, Ποσειδωνία etc.), so the deities could be named according to the places where they are celebrated, e. g.: Ἀπόλλων Δελφικός, Δήλιος; Ζεύς Ὀλύμπιος, Δωδωναῖος, Μεγιστεύς, Σολυμεύς etc. Poseidon is also called: Ἐλύτιος or Ἐλύμνιος (Lesbos), Ἐπαχταῖος (Samos), Ἐρεχθεύς (Athens), Ταινάριος (Laconia), etc. Undoubtedly, Poseidon was celebrated in different places of the Pylian Kingdom in the Mycenaean times. One of these places was possibly *Diwion* and accordingly Poseidon, i. e. his temple, was called *Diwieu*.

In the first line of Es tablets the *dosmos* to *Poseidon*, i. e. to the main sanctuary of Poseidon, is noted. It was probably situated at Pylos (cf. Tn 316,1), which is usually omitted when the location is there (cf. the Aa series). It is remarkable that the contribution to this sanctuary is considerably higher than that to the other three⁴¹⁾.

*34-*ke-te-si* in the second line is still not identified, because the phonetic value of *34 is not yet discovered. If we assume that it is a place name where a temple of Poseidon was situated, then it might be in the nom. sing. *-tersis*, or in the loc. plur. in *-si*, and may denote: *dosmos* (to the temple of Poseidon) in *34-*ke-te-si*.

Wedaneu, like *di-wi-je-u*, is an ethnic⁴²⁾ which denotes the place where the sanctuary of Poseidon was situated. But its identification is not easy.

The ethnics Ἐδδανεύς from Ἐδδανα and possibly *Ἐλδανεύς from Ἐλδανα, in spite of their resemblance, cannot be brought into relation with *Wedaneus*, because the mentioned places are too far

⁴¹⁾ For the Es-proportions see Mabel Lang in *Mycenaean Studies* Wingspread, p. 37ff.

⁴²⁾ If we assume that *we-da-ne-we/wo*, *di-wi-je-we* and *34-*ke-te-si* are not recipients but givers of *do-so-mo* to *po-se-da-o*, then the alternation of *we-da-ne-we/wo* can be more easily explained as the nom. plur. *-ēwes*, and the gen. plur. *-ēwōn* of the same ethnic, and both of these forms would correspond with *do-so-mo po-se-da-o-ne* (cf. the syntax of Es 644 and Es 645 etc.).

However this explanation encounters two serious obstacles over which we cannot pass so easily: 1. The amount of the individual contribution would be considerably higher than that of these groups and we should expect the opposite; 2. It would be surprising that the scribe did not write all the amount of their *do-so-mo* at once as in the other cases, and save the repetition of writing their names 13, or 14 times. Obviously *we-da-ne-we* and *di-wi-je-we* are recipients and probably denote ethnics, epithets of Poseidon, i. e. of his sanctuaries.

from Peloponnese (the first in Arabia, the second in Spain and India). According to Stephanus Byz. the founder of "Εδδανα" was a Phoenician 'Εδδανός. The Phoenicians, indeed, could have contact with the Mycenaeans, but it is unlikely that *Wedaneus* has any relation with this place, known also under the name "Εδδαρος" which is explained as *Ed-Der* = „on the Euphrates“ (Ptol. V, 19,3; cf. PWRE Bd V, 2 col. 1932). However, the formation 'Εδδανεύς < "Εδδανα < 'Εδδανός, from the formal point of view, can help us to a possible interpretation of this Mycenaean word.

Similar ethnics in -εύς, derived from place-names with the endings -κνον, -ανα are especially familiar in the languages of Asia Minor, e. g. 'Αδανεύς from "Αδανα (Cilicia); Δαρδανεύς from Δάρδανον, cf. Δαρδανία, Τυμηνεύς from Τύμηνα (Lycia), etc. From "Ανδανον, the Carian name for Βαργύλια, is also possible the ethnic *'Ανδανεύς, like 'Ανδανιεύς from 'Ανδανία (Messenia). This gives us reason to suppose that the ethnic adjective *Wedaneus* might be derived from a place-name *Fέδανα or *Fέδανον, and that it is possibly related to some of the mentioned languages. The ethnics with the suffix -eus are particularly characteristic of Carian and Lycian, as M. D. Petruševski showed with the material extracted from Steph. Byz. (cf. *Linguistique Balkanique* VI, Sofia 1963, p. 19—24). Thus, the numerous Mycenaean forms in -eus can be explained by the influence of the languages of those peoples who very likely inhabited Greece before the Achaean invasion.

It is not excluded that the reconstructed place-name *Fέδανα, Fέδανον (possibly etymologically connected with Hom. ἐδανός⁴³) might survive in some other form. This form might be 'Ανδανία, the well known earlier name of Messenia and the residence of the kings of Leleges (Paus. 4, 1, 2, 3, etc.). Just as the Hom. ἐδανός was connected, by popular etymology, with ἡδύς, so 'Ανδανία (ἀνδάνω) might be a later Greek „translation“ and „adaptation“ of the pre-Greek place-name *Fέδανα, or *Fέδανον.

⁴³) About the etymology of the reconstructed name *Fέδανεύς < *Fέδανα, *Fέδανον only hypotheses are possible. It might be brought into relation with Hom. ἐδανός, but this word has no certain etymology too. According to M. Lejeune (Bulletin de la Soc. linguist., 1963, p. 82f.) its connection with ἡδύς, ἀνδάνω must be rejected because „cette interprétation est visiblement inspirée par une ressemblance formelle (ἐδ-/ἡδ-)", and ἡδύς is from *swād-. Solmsen's hypothesis that ἐδανός: εὐώδης (Hesych., Cyril Alex.) is connected with ἔ(ἡ)ημι, seems to him also hardly convincing. For that reason he tried to find a better solution. He proposed several possible interpretations, but he found the most probable: ἐδανός = („proprius“) < s(w)e-d-, with the reflexive pronoun *He-* in the root, cf. Att. ιδιος. From the formal point of view this explanation is suitable, although speculative concerning the meaning.

'Εδανός is possibly a pre-Greek, I-E. word with a meaning close both to ἡδύς and εὐώδης, as the ancient authors explained it. This word with such a meaning could be used as a place-name and we can suppose *Fέδανα or *Fέδανον with the ethnic *Fέδανεύς. But as its meaning was possibly not clear to the Greeks, they may have changed it later. Possibly 'Ανδανία is its later name.

Thus, if we assume that *we-da-ne-wo/we* is an ethnic, then a satisfactory explanation is available for all the places in the Mycenaean tablets where this name appears. Ethnic adjectives are often used as personal names in the Mycenaean documents, cf. *a-ke-re-wi-jo* (MY Ge 603, 604) from *a-ke-re-wa*; *tu-ri-si-jo-jo* gen. (PY Sa 758), from *tu-ri-so*; etc. (see *Docs.* 98f: Landau, *o. c.* 215f.). The cattle collector *Wedaneu* of PY Cn tablets can be also named with this ethnic. As an important personage he possessed a servant; *w. do-e-ro*. Here *we-da-ne-wo* is in the gen. sing. In An 610, along with numerous place-names and ethnics: *e-wi-ri-po*, *a-ke-re-wa*, *ri-jo*, *da-mi-ni-jo*, etc., *we-da-ne-wo* (line 14) would well correspond as an ethnic, and here it might be in the gen. plur. rather than in the gen. sing. The gen. plur. is also possible in Na 856, 1041 and, perhaps, in Un 1193, 3.

The form *we-da-ne-we* in Es tablets can be explained as dat. sing. of this ethnic used as an epithet of Poseidon **Φεδανεύς*. Then the alternation *we-da-ne-wo* might be accepted as gen. plur. with the meaning: *dosmos (to Poseidon) of Wedanewes**). Although this name might be of foreign origin, its inflexion is certainly not un-Greek**).

Skopje.

P. H. Ilievski.

*) After this paper was ready, in a talk with Professor M. D. Petruševski, I was informed that he had come to the same conclusion about *di-wi-je-we* and *we-da-ne-wo/we*, cf. p. 32.

**) I am very thankful to Dr. John Killen for having read an earlier draft of this paper and improved my English.