

STUDI MICENEI ED EGEO-ANATOLICI NUOVA SERIE

4, 2018

STUDI MICENEI
ED EGEO-ANATOLICI
NUOVA SERIE

è una rivista dell'Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo Antico
del Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Roma

ISSN 1126-6651
e-ISBN 978-88-7140-959-7

Direttore / Editor

Anna D'Agata (ISMA, CNR, Roma)

Comitato Editoriale / Editorial Board

Silvia Alaura (ISMA, CNR, Roma); Marco Bettelli (ISMA, CNR, Roma);
Marco Bonechi (ISMA, CNR, Roma); Maurizio Del Freo (ISMA, CNR, Roma); Francesco Di Filippo (ISMA, CNR, Roma);
Andrea Di Renzoni (ISMA, CNR, Roma); Yannis Galanakis (University of Cambridge);
Luca Girella (Università Telematica Internazionale Uninettuno, Roma); Anna Judson (University of Cambridge);
Françoise Rougemont (CNRS, Paris); Agnese Vacca (Università degli Studi di Milano)

Comitato Scientifico / Advisory Editorial Board

Mary Bachvarova (Willamette University, Salem, Oregon); Fritz Blakolmer (University of Vienna);
Harriet Blitzler (Buffalo State College, New York); John Bintliff (Leiden University);
Eva von Dassow (University of Minnesota); Birgitta Eder (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna);
Fikri Kulakoğlu (University of Ankara); Maurizio Giangulio (Università di Trento);
Carl Knappett (University of Toronto); Peter Pavúk (Charles University, Prague);
Jeremy B. Rutter (Dartmouth College); Recai Tekoğlu (Dokuz Eylül University, Izmir);
Andreas Vlachopoulos (University of Ioannina); Helène Whittaker (University of Gothenburg)

Stampa e distribuzione / Printing and distribution

Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon s.r.l.
Via Ajaccio 41-43 – 00198 Roma
tel. +39 0685358444, fax +39 0685833591
email: info@edizioniquasar.it
www.edizioniquasar.it

© CNR - Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo Antico (ISMA)
Area della Ricerca di Roma 1, Via Salaria Km 29,300, 00015 Monterotondo scalo (Roma)
Autorizzazione Tribunale di Roma nr. 288/2014 del 31.12.2014

SOMMARIO

Ilaria Caloi

Inaugurating the Court-Centred Building? A MM IIIB
Feasting Deposit at Neopalatial Sissi, North-Central Crete 7

Francesco Di Filippo, Lucia Mori

How Difficult? Mountain Roads and Pathways Reaching
Ancient Melid (Malatya) in South-Eastern Anatolia:
A Reconsideration 41

Eric R. Force, Jeremy B. Rutter

Holocene Fault Scarps at Mycenae (Greece)
and Possible Cultural Ties 63

José Miguel Jiménez Delgado

Nominative Case and Brachylogic Syntax in Mycenaean Texts 75

Massimiliano Marazzi

The 'Administered' System of Trans-Mediterranean
Maritime Relations at the End of the 2nd Millennium BC:
Apogee and Collapse 95

Rachele Pierini

Syllabogram *65 or Logogram *129 (= FAR)?
The Sign 𐀓 on Thebes Tablets, AB 65 in Linear A,
and Some Remarks on the *o*-Stem Genitive Singular in -Xo 111

Juan Piquero Rodríguez

The Dossier *sa-ra-pe-da* of Pylos Revisited 131

Miguel Valério

Linguistic Awareness in the Development
of the Anatolian Hieroglyphic Sign Values 143

*Massimo Vidale, Sara T. Levi, Marco Bettelli, Andrea Di Renzoni,
Matteo Bettuzzi, Valentina Cannavò, Franco Casali, Francesca Ferranti,
Leandro Lopes, Maria Pia Morigi, Carmelo Triolo, Mario Triolo*
Eating Molluscs at Stromboli (Aeolian Islands, Italy), 1700 BC 161

FORUM ARTICLE

Trevor Bryce

The Kingdom of Ahhiyawa: A Hittite Perspective

191

Responses

Eric Cline, Reaction to Trevor Bryce's Article

197

Jorrit M. Kelder, The Kingdom of Ahhiyawa: Facts, Factoids and Probabilities

200

Jeremy B. Rutter, An Aegean Archaeologist's Response

208

Robert Schon, Response to Trevor Bryce's Article

214

Mark Weeden, Hittite-Ahhiyawan Politics as Seen from the Tablets: A Reaction to Trevor Bryce's Article from a Hittitological Perspective

217

Anna Lucia D'Agata, Postscript

228

NOMINATIVE CASE AND BRACHYLOGIC SYNTAX IN MYCENAEAN TEXTS

José Miguel Jiménez Delgado

Summary

The objective of this paper is to evaluate some of the archaic endings that have been suggested for Mycenaean nominal declensions. The paper focuses on those endings that have left no clear trace in Alphabetic Greek, especially the genitive singular ending *-os* of the second declension and the genitive singular *-ās* of the first declension, but also the locative singular *-ēu* of the third declension. This study analyses the relevant examples according to the peculiarities of Mycenaean syntax. This allows us to consider them nominatives of rubric and to offer a more consistent image of Mycenaean nominal paradigms.

I. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this paper is to evaluate the plausibility of some of the archaic endings that have been proposed for Mycenaean nominal paradigms. From the beginning of Mycenaean studies after the decipherment of Linear B in 1952, archaic case endings without any clear trace in Alphabetic Greek have been attributed to some nominal forms in order to make their syntax more coherent. Indeed, it is always possible that Mycenaean preserved morphs that disappeared in Alphabetic Greek with little or no trace. Nonetheless, if one takes into account the peculiarities of Mycenaean syntax, most of those forms are readily understood as nominatives of rubric and so the Mycenaean nominal paradigms appear to be more consistent.

Given that the general interpretation proposed for the nominal forms under consideration is as nominatives of rubric, the paper starts with a comprehensive illustration of the nominative of rubric in Mycenaean texts. The list of the archaic case endings follows along with the reasons that have led some prominent scholars to identify them in Mycenaean. In the fourth section, the data relevant to this study is presented and is interpreted in the fifth section. Finally, some conclusions are offered.

It must be noted that only the examples from the Knossian corpus are taken into consideration in the fourth and fifth sections.

II. NOMINATIVE OF RUBRIC

Most nouns and adjectives appearing in Mycenaean texts can be interpreted as nominatives. It is true that the indeterminacy of Linear B, whose spelling rules prescribe that final *-n* and *-s* as well as *-i* in diphthongs are not rendered, leaves a number of items graphically undetermined regarding their syntactic case (on Linear B spelling rules, Bernabé-Luján 2006, 31-45; Risch-Hajnal 2006, 45-55; Melena 2014, 91-218; on the syntactic indeterminacy caused by those, Jiménez 2016, 21). Even so, texts tend to be simple enough so as to allow the interpretation of a number of nouns as nominatives of rubric.

The nominative of rubric is used when the syntactic function of the noun remains in the backstage. As signalled by its denomination, the nominative case is the most appropriate case to name things (Bécares 1985, s.v. ὀνομαστικός), and therefore, scribes systematically used the nominative when they record the name of a relevant person, place or object regardless of their syntactic function. Accordingly, the nominative of rubric is recurrent in headings as well as in lists in which only the pertinent people, places or objects are mentioned without any further information. See the following examples:

KN Ce 50.1-2¹

- .1 a-qi-ru OVIS^m 134 qa-ra₂-wo OVIS^f 43
 .2 a-nu-ko OVIS^f 51 ro-ru OVIS^f 32

MY Ue 611.1-4

- .1]pe-ra 4 a-po-re-we 2 pe-ri-ke 3
 .2]ka-ra-te-ra 1 po-ro-ko-wo 4 a-ta-ra 10
 .3]pa-ke-te-re 30 ka-na-to 5 qe-ti-ja 10
 .4]qe-to 2 ti-ri-po-di-ko 8 ka-ra-ti-ri-jo 7

PY Cn 131.1-2

- .1 pi-*82, we-re-ke
 .2 pa-ro, pi-me-ta, x OVIS^m 200 pa-ro, o-ku-ka, OVIS^m x 130[

The first example is a list of shepherds and their assigned sheep, the second is a list of different sorts of vases and the third is the beginning of the list of *pi*-*82's pens, with the corresponding sheep listed by the shepherds in charge of them. The shepherds' names of KN Ce 50 are in the nominative, as well as the names of vases listed in MY Ue 611² and the noun *we-re-ke* 'pens' in PY Cn 131.

The importance of the nominative of rubric has been highlighted in Mycenaean studies since their beginning (Vilborg 1960, 132; Bartoněk 2003, 442; Bernabé-Luján 2006, 214, 226; Duhoux 2008, 248; Jiménez 2016, 49-51). This type of nominative is also found in Alphabetic Greek, though the complexity of alphabetic texts makes it less compatible (Smyth 1920, §940, who speaks of independent nominative). The predominance of this kind of nominative allows us to interpret certain difficult cases as examples of the nominative of rubric or at least as variants of this. Among the most important are, in my opinion, the following cases:

- The personal names preceding *e-ke-qe* 'and s/he has' in the Eb and Eo series of Pylos; see, for instance:

PY Eb 1187

- .1 e-ni-to-wo, a-pi-me-de-o, do-e-ro, e-ke-qe, o-na-to
 .2 ke-ke-me-na, ko-to-na, to-so-de, pe-mo GRA T 1

The Eb and Eo series are part of what has been called the Pylian 'cadastre'. These examples consist of the personal name of the tenant (*e-ni-to-wo*), mostly followed by his occupational title (*a-pi-me-de-o do-e-ro* 'Amphimedēs' slave'), and the landholding recorded through the formula *e-ke-qe* (*e-ke* = ἔχει 's/he has') plus the type of landholding (*o-na-to ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na* 'lease of a *ke-ke-me-na* plot'). This construction has drawn the attention of Mycenologists since the decipherment of Linear B. There has been quite a number of interpretations, some of them questioning the identification of *-qe* with a copulative conjunction, especially Ruipérez's (1987), who equates *-qe* with the modal particle κε and interprets *e-ke-qe* as a prospective subjunctive (= ἔχηι κε) in spite of the labiovelar (EDG s.v. κε; Dunkel 2014, 397, 430). Hajnal (2004) does consider *-qe* as the equivalent of Alph. Gk. τε, but interprets this coordination as a kind of left dislocation with a topicalising effect. Ruijgh (1967, 317-318; 1971, 218-220) has asserted the conjunctive character of *-qe* in these examples by analysing the first conjunct as a nominal sentence: "Enithous, slave of Amphimedēs, (is a tenant) and he has a lease." The most reasonable explanation of this construction has been given by Chadwick (1976, 110-11; 1979, 28): the coordination would respond to a survey conducted in order to identify the tenants (first question) and their landholdings (second question). The collected

1 I have eliminated .1b te-pa-ra, pe-re-qo-ta for the sake of clarity.

2 Only *ka-ra-te-ra* is apparently in the accusative, but the final syllabogram *ra* has been interpreted as a device to render the final *-r* of the nominative /krātēr/, cf. Risch-Hajnal 2006, 51; Meissner 2008, 517.

information was recorded on individual ‘leaf’ tablets and then listed in recapitulating ‘page’ tablets, the corresponding Ep and En series, where there is no coordination. See the entry corresponding to PY Eb 1187: *e-ni-to-wo a-pi-me-de-o o-na-to e-ke ke-ke-me-na ko-to-na pa-ro da-mo to-so pe-mo* GRA T 1 (PY Ep 539.10). This explanation entails that the personal name preceding *e-ke-qe* is a sort of nominative of rubric from a syntactic perspective.

– The use of nominative case forms in enumerations is another kind of nominative of rubric. This one is called the enumerative nominative in Alphabetic Greek (Lasso de la Vega 1968, 330), and consists of the occurrence of the nominative within enumerations as a side effect of its denominative function, cf. *IG I³ 354* τὰδε οἱ ταμίαι ... παρέδοσαν τοῖς ταμίαισι... στέφανος χρυσῶς... φιάλαι χρυσαῖ... ‘the housekeepers delivered these things to the housekeepers: a golden crown, golden bowls, etc.’. In Mycenaean, the items enumerated after a headline tend to be in the nominative, at least when their case is graphically distinguishable. An illustrative example is the following:

KN Gv 863

.1]qa-ra, / jo-e-ke-to-qo , wo-na-si, ši[

.2] we-je-we *174 420 su ARB 104[

The interpretation of this tablet is difficult, especially *-to-qo*³. There is little doubt that the tablet deals with vineyards (*wo-na-si*, cf. Hsch. οἰνάδες ἀμπελώδεις τόποι), that the sequence *jo-e-ke-to-qo* comprises the particle *jo*-⁴ plus the verb form *e-ke* (= ἔχει) and that the record is located in *qa-ra*, a Cretan place. The syntactic relation of *we-je-we* ‘grape vine plants’ (Hsch. ὑτὴν τὴν ἀμπελον) with *e-ke* as its object is most likely, even if *we-je-we* is in the nominative (the accusative plural would be **we-je-wa*). The list of recorded items only comprises the grape vine plants (*we-je-we* *174) and fig trees (*su ARB*) – these grape vine plants were probably trained to climb fig trees (Ruipérez-Melena 1990, 155–156; on the interpretation of *we-je-we* and *174, see Del Frio 2005, 47–54).

– Another case of nominative of rubric would be the use of nominative nouns to name the referent of the following logograms, what can be compared to the ‘denominative’ nominative used with names or titles in Alphabetic Greek (Lasso de la Vega 1968, 329). This sort of nominative can be a kind of determinative, cf. *me-ri* *209^{vas} 1 ‘a vase of honey’ in KN Gg 702.1.2, but usually it merely expresses the referent of the following logogram or ligature in words: ligatures are the combination of several syllabograms written on a vertical axis to represent the word referring to the item concerned. A clear example is that of *ko-ru* ‘helmet’ in the Knossian Sk series followed by the logogram GAL, which depicts a helmet, in the list of the components of armour. A relevant case is PY Un 718, a tablet that records a number of commodities delivered to celebrate a feast in Poseidon’s honour. The following instances are encountered in the lists of deliveries made by each contributor: *tu-ro*₂ *TU+RO*₂ and *ko-wo* *153 in l. 4; *a-re-pa* *A+RE+PA* in l. 8 – the word actually written is *a-re-ro*, obviously a scribal mistake (*a-re-pa* = ἄλειπαρ) –; *me-re-u-ro* FAR in l. 10. Note that *153 depicts the kind of hide called *ko-wo*, while FAR is the logogram used to refer to flour, *me-re-u-ro* in Mycenaean. These nouns are written in the nominative singular, including *tu-ro*₂, which has been considered a nominative plural since it is followed by *TU+RO*₂ 10 – note that *tu-ro*₂ should be better understood as a diminutive τυρίον (nom. pl. τυρία) of τυρός ‘cheese’ (nom. pl. τυροί) than as the Mycenaean antecedent of that noun (τυρός < **tuh₂-ró-*, cf. *EGD* s.v.).⁵

3 The sequence *-to-qo* might be interpreted as the dative of a noun meaning ‘wine press vel sim.’, cf. Jiménez 2017. Other proposals are less convincing: Chadwick (1996, 280) equates *-to-qo* with τόπος ‘place, region, space’, although τόπος derives from **tep-* ‘to hit, stick, smear’ according to *EGD* s.v.; Melena (2014, 39) reads /hō(s) hek^hei tork^wos/ ‘the “circuit” (?) is as follows in vineyards’, i.e. *-to-qo* = τρόπος ‘turn, direction, way’. Note that Lejeune (1976, 200, n. 29) has suggested that *-to-qo* might be a man’s name.

4 This particle is the instrumental case of the relative pronoun with a lenited variant *o-*. It is used to introduce headlines that constitute relative clauses without an antecedent: the particle refers to the manner in which the event takes place as developed in the following lines. On this particle, Thompson 2002–2003; Jiménez 2016, 132–135.

5 This is, in my opinion, the best interpretation of *ro*₂; namely, that the syllabogram represents the diminutive suffix of neuter τυρίον, cf. García-Ramón 2016, 214. On this sort of diminutive in Mycenaean, cf. Jiménez 2011, 37 n. 23. The habitual interpretation entails that *tu-ro*₂ is the Mycenaean antecedent of τυρός, whose long ū would be the result of the resolution of a consonant cluster *rj* reflected by *ro*₂, cf. Ruijgh 1967, 275; Meier-Brügger 2004, 254–257, proposes a thematic derivative from an i-abstract **tūri-*, cf. Av. *tūiri-* ‘whey, congealed milk’.

– The appositive nominative, a use known in the first millennium (Lasso de la Vega 1968, 330), can also be regarded a sort of nominative of rubric. It consists of writing an apposition in the nominative though its head is in another case form. See the following example:

PY Ea 71

.a po-me
.b ko-do-jo ko-to-na₁ ki-ti-me-na GRA 1 T 4 v 3

Note that ‘*po-me*’ is added above the writing line in the nominative to identify the tenant of the recorded *ko-to-na ki-ti-me-na* as a shepherd. The nominative stands instead of the genitive, the expected case given that its head is in the genitive (*ko-do-jo*, a man’s name).

Not all possible cases are necessarily nominatives of rubric. A relevant example is *a-re-ki-si-to* in KN So 4433.b, since the tablet contains a present passive participle *wo-zo-me-no* referring to an action (the recorded pair of wheels are ‘being made’) whose agent is Alexitos. See the text of the line:

.b] , a-re-ki-si-to , wo-zo-me-no , ROTA ZE 1 [

Alexitos is the name of a man involved in the production of chariots and their wheels, cf. KN Sf 4420.a, So 1053.a. In this tablet, it is written with a graphic ending that allows for its interpretation as a nominative of rubric (/Alexitos/) or as a dative of agent (/Alexitōi/). The second possibility is known in the first millennium, though predominantly with perfect participles (George 2005).

– The most conspicuous instantiation of the nominative of rubric is represented by place names used to locate the record: the thematic ones and the *eh*₂-stems are graphically indifferent in the singular, since the Linear B endings *-o* and *-a* can render the nominative, the dative or even the locative. However, the athematic ones graphically distinguish those cases of their inflection, and in this regard, they can be inflected either in the dative-locative or in the nominative of rubric. How can be determined the case of the thematic and *eh*₂-stems? If they appear in association with athematic names in the same tablet or set, one can infer their syntactic case from the latter. See the following tablet, a list of rowers (*e-re-ta*) going to Pleuron (*pe-re-u-ro-na-de i-jo-te*) and organised through place names in the dative-locative referring to the locations where the rowers were stationed before going:

PY An 1.1-6

.1 e-re-ta , pe-re-u-ro-na-de, i-jo-te
.2 ro-o-wa VIR 8
.3 ri-jo VIR 5
.4 po-ra-pi VIR 4
.5 te-ta-ra-ne VIR 6
.6 a-po-ne-we VIR 7

Note that the place names are athematic (*po-ra-pi*, *te-ta-ra-ne*, *a-po-ne-we*), thematic (*ri-jo*) and an *eh*₂-stem (*ro-o-wa*).⁶ Naturally, the Mycenaean scribes could read the thematic and *eh*₂-stems in either way, though the athematic names ensure that they intended the locative reading in this tablet. Nevertheless, dative-locative and nominative of rubric can appear on the same tablet:

TH Ft 140.1-5

.1 te-qa-i GRA+PE 38 OLIV 44

6 It should be noted that the place names appearing on this tablet (except for the adlative *pe-re-u-ro-na-de*) have been taken as some of the clearest examples of the ablative case in Mycenaean, cf. Hajnal 1995, 160-161. This would entail the syncretism of instrumental and ablative in Mycenaean, especially in the case of *po-ra-pi*, since *-pi* can be either instrumental or locative (against the ablative use of *-pi*, see Thompson 1998).

.2 e-u-te-re-u	GRA	14	OLIV 87
.3 ku-te-we-so	GRA	20	OLIV 43
.4 o-ke-u-ri-jo	GRA	3 T 5	
.5 e-re-o-ni	GRA	12 T 7	OLIV 20

In this tablet, quantities of grain and olives are recorded – perhaps to measure land (Killen 1999, 217) – by place names, which are written in the dative-locative (*te-qa-i*, *e-re-o-ni*), in the nominative (*e-u-te-re-u*)⁷ and with a graphic ending that can be read either as nominative or dative-locative (*ku-te-we-so*, *o-ke-u-ri-jo*).

III. ARCHAIC CASE ENDINGS

Mycenaean Greek is the only form of Greek documented in the second millennium. Its dialectal classification is far from certain except for the fact that Mycenaean exhibits the palatalisation of the primary third person endings *-ti* > *-si* and *-nti* > *-nsi*, an innovation shared with Arcado-Cypriot, Attic-Ionic and Lesbian, while Doric, Boeotian and Thessalian kept them unpalatalised. Be that as it may, Mycenaean Greek also exhibits archaic features. Regarding noun declension, some archaic endings are preserved, especially thematic genitive singular *-o-jo*, cf. Hom. and Thess. *-οιο*, with apocope *-οι* in Pelasgiotis (Buck 1955, 88); athematic dative singular *-e* /*-ei*/, substituted by */-i/* in the first millennium; feminine nominative-accusative dual *-o* /*-ō*/, substituted by */-ā*/ in the first millennium; masculine nominative-accusative dual *-a-e* /*-āe*/, substituted by */-ai*/ in the first millennium, if this ending is really an archaism anteceding Hom. *-ᾱ* – it could also be a Mycenaean innovation blocked in the first millennium and due to the analogy with the third declension (Chantraine 1961, 56; Sihler 1995, 275); instrumental and locative plural *-pi*, cf. Hom. *-φι*.

Graphic indeterminacy makes it difficult to ascertain the exact form of some other endings. A relevant case are the endings of dative, locative, instrumental and ablative singular. In the first place, the forms of the dative singular of the first and second declensions are */-āi/* and */-ōi/* respectively, though the corresponding graphic endings *-a* and *-o* have been interpreted by some scholars as concealing the locative singular, */-ai/* and */-oi/*, and instrumental singular, */-ā*/ and */-ō*/, in specific contexts.⁸ The locative singular is indeed preserved in the third declension, yet the corresponding ending *-i* alternates with *-e* to express both the dative and locative functions (Thompson 1997-1998, 327-329; Jiménez 2016, 89; Lane 2016, 56-58) – there are also some instances of an apophonic locative ending in the second declension, such as *di-da-ka-re* (KN Ak(3) 781.1.3, 783.1, 784.2.3, 828.2.3, 7005.1-3), the locative singular of the Mycenaean noun equivalent to διδάσκαλος ‘teacher’ (Jiménez 2016, 88-89). The expression of the instrumental singular in the third declension by *-e* /*-ē*/ would imply the same graphic ending as the dative singular, but the instances are not numerous and the reading */-ei/* is perfectly possible (Jiménez 2016, 81-82). Finally, the dative endings *-a*, *-o* and *-e* would also render the ablative singular according to some scholars, although in that case the ablative would already be syncretised with the instrumental due to the loss of the final *-d* of the inherited ending **-ōd* (the ablative singular of the first and third declensions would be analogical, as suggested by Householder (1959; *contra* Ruijgh 2011, 276-277). In other words, apart from the morphological alternation of the inherited locative singular ending with the dative one in the third declension, it is fairly possible that the dative was already syncretised with the locative and the instrumental cases as well as the genitive with the ablative (Jiménez 2016, 99-100; Moralejo 2009). Nevertheless, graphic indeterminacy does not allow us to be certain, especially regarding the first and second declensions.

⁷ *e-u-te-re-u* might be a locative in *-ēu*, see below, but Del Frio (2009, 46) prefers to consider that this place name is in the nominative; see also Jiménez 2016, 47.

⁸ Including instr. pl. */-ais/* and */-ois/*, the former being analogous with the latter, which would continue PIE **-ōis*. These endings suppose that dat. pl. *-a-i* and *-o-i* should be read */-āhi/* and */-oihi/* with an aspiration previous to the restoration of *-s-*. However, instr. pl. *-a* and *-o* can also be considered as graphic variants of dat. pl. *-a-i* and *-o-i*, in which case the only interpretation of both series of endings is */-ais/* and */-ois/*, cf. Jiménez 2016, 99-100.

It is precisely graphic indeterminacy that has allowed some prominent scholars to propose the existence of some other archaic endings in Mycenaean that would alternate with the regular ones. These are problematic since they would break up the regularity of the paradigms. Note that the distinction of the locative, the instrumental and even the ablative from the dative singular graphic ending, despite being disputable, would entail that Mycenaean paradigms were more similar to the inherited ones than the first millennium paradigms. These other cases suppose, however, the coexistence of IE archaic forms with the forms that replaced them in Proto-Greek. Furthermore, there are remnants of the locative, instrumental and ablative singular in the first millennium (Schwyzer 1939, 549-550), while the archaic forms under consideration left no clear trace, as will be seen.

The first ending to be considered is *-o* alternating with the thematic genitive singular *-o-jo*. A number of thematic nouns and proper names that appear with apparently genitival functions end in *-o* instead of *-o-jo*. This led Morpurgo (1960) to postulate the preservation of the ablative in Mycenaean as an alternative to the thematic genitive (Hajnal 1995, 247-285). Proto-Indo-European only knew a specific ablative ending for the thematic declension in the singular, so Mycenaean would have preserved this archaism. More precisely, Morpurgo postulated the presence of the ablative in the thematic personal names of the collectors appearing on the Knossian D- series and alternating with the genitive, in the thematic month names followed by *me-no* (see below), in some Pylian men's names, such as *du-ni-jo* in PY Ae 263, *wi-do-wo-i-jo* in Ae 344, *si-ri-jo* in Eb 159.B, *te-u-ta-ra-ko-ro* in Eo 276.1 and *e-te-wa-jo* in Sa 1267, in the adjective *wa-na-ka-te-ro* in Eo 371.A, and in the expressions *te-o do-e-ra* (Eo 276.7; *te-o* = *te-o-jo*) and *me-tu-wo ne-wo* (Fr 1202.b; *ne-wo* = *ne-wo-jo*).

Later, the new Theban texts found in the 90s have produced a long series of men's names that can be interpreted as further instances of the thematic ablative in Mycenaean: *a-ko-ro-da-mo* (TH Gp 215.2), *a-ra-o* (TH Fq 214.13, 254.7), *i-je-re-wi-jo* (TH Gp 303.1), *ka-wi-jo* (TH Fq 123.1, 130.3, 254.6, 258.5, 342.2), *ku-no* (TH Fq 236.5), *o-to-ro-ro-no* (TH Fq 214.7), *qe-da-do-ro* (TH Gp 215.1), *ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo* (TH Fq 229.4, 254.13, 258.3, 275.3, 284.3). These names are followed by a sign that allows for two interpretations, either as the syllabogram *⁎65* or as the logogram FAR (the same sign can be used either as syllabogram or as logogram). It is difficult to decide, yet the sign is never separated from the preceding men's names. Moreover, in TH Gp 110.2, it is, indeed, separated from the following quantities assigned to the preceding man's name, while in TH Gp 124.1, it is separated from the following logogram. All of this is more congenial to its interpretation as syllabogram (Palaima 2000-2001, 483-484; Killen 2006, 103-106). If that is the case, *⁎65* would be the abbreviation of *i-⁎65* 'son' (PY Ae 344, Aq 64.7, 218.16, Jn 431.6, 725.8; dat. *i-je-we* in PY Tn 316.10), probably /hiyūs/, cf. *ra-ke-da-mo-ni-jo-u-jo* in TH Gp 227.2, where *-u-jo* is to be interpreted as the equivalent of ὠῖος - in Knossos, *i-jo* is used instead of *i-⁎65* and *u-jo*, cf. KN V(7) 1523.1a.4a.5a. The interpretation of these names as ablatives is, nonetheless, unlikely, since the patronymic ablative is unknown in IE languages (Duhoux 2017, 163-165).⁹ Haplography is possible in a number of them whose formation includes the suffix *-i-jo*, see *ra-ke-da-mo-ni-jo-u-jo*, which can mean either the son of Lacedemon or the son of Lacedemonios (entailing *ra-ke-da-mo-ni-jo-<jo>-u-jo*).¹⁰ Pierini (2011) and Duhoux (2017) have proposed the interpretation of these men's names in the genitive: their names would be constructed in the patronymic genitive modifying *⁎65* 'son' and would exhibit an archaic ending /-ō/ that was substituted in the thematic declension of all IE daughter languages save in Hittite (on the genitive case in the Anatolian languages, see Melchert 2012).¹¹ This substitution was triggered by the homonymy with

9 There are examples in Sanskrit and Latin, all of them dependent on a verb form, cf. *brāhmaṇāj jātaḥ* "born from a brahman" (*Manu* 10.64) and *Gnaivod patre prognatus* "born from Gneo, his father" (*CIL* VI 1285). In Sanskrit there is only one instance without a verb form, cf. *amuṣmāi putram* "son of that one" (MS. 3.3.5). See Duhoux 2017, 164-165.

10 Haplography was first mentioned by Lejeune (*Mém.* I, 199 n. 37) in order to explain the sequence *wi-do-wo-i-jo i-⁎65* (PY Ae 344), since *wi-do-wo-i-jo* is apparently a patronymic genitive; see also *Mém.* III, 17, where Lejeune attributes the genitives in *-jo* instead of *-jo-jo* to a "haplological lapsus." Note that Ruijgh (1967, 207 n. 545) explained *i-⁎65* as an apposition to *wi-do-wo-i-jo* so as to distinguish a son from his father with the same name, 'Widwōhios jr.'; see also Hajnal (1995, 257). It must be stressed that *wi-do-wo-i-jo* is a man's name and cannot be a patronymic adjective, as it appears on PY An 5.2, as well as on PY Eb 1186.A, Ep 539.12 (*wi-dwo-i-jo*), and Jn 415.3 (*wi-du-wo-i-jo*).

11 Other possibilities are more remote, like a genitive in /-ō/, cf. Att.-Ion. -ov, Dor. -ω, which are probably the result of a contraction unknown to Mycenaean, or in /-ōn/, cf. Cyp. *-o-ne*. On the Cypriot ending, see Egetmeyer 2010, 390-392.

the nominative singular and gave rise to different endings: *-osjo*, the most general one and the ancestor of Mycenaean *-o-jo*, while Latin and Celtic exhibit *-ī*, Germanic *-oso* (cf. Old Saxon *dag-as* and OE *dag-as*) or Balto-Slavic the ablative ending *-ōd*. Hittite and Mycenaean, the oldest documented languages, would preserve it, though in Mycenaean mostly in anthroponyms, a semantic class where archaisms are frequently found.¹² It must be stressed that this ending might be present not only in Theban thematic anthroponyms but also in Knossian and Pylian ones (Pierini 2011). Furthermore, the preservation of this ending would also explain the thematic month names ending in *-o* and construed with the appellative *me-no* ‘month’ (Pierini 2011, 51–58), an athematic genitive singular. In those phrases, *me-no* is a temporal genitive, and it is, in fact, construed with the same names in the genitive. Again, the use of those phrases to date religious offerings might point to a conservative context in which such an ending would fit perfectly.

Facts strongly suggest the preservation of the thematic genitive ending */-os/* as an alternative to *-o-jo* in some specific cases. Even so, this interpretation is not without problems: first, this ending was substituted in all the IE daughter languages, including Greek and some Anatolian languages, so this substitution was probably completed in Proto-Greek; second, there is no trace of this ending in Greek apart from the alleged Mycenaean examples, since the adduced parallel θεόσδοτος is probably analogical, cf. διόσδοτος (*DELG*, 429), as the Peloponnesian place name Λυκόσουρα might be analogous with Κυνόσουρα (Risch 1949, 266 n. 1); third, not all the men’s names preceding **-65* / *FAR* on the Theban tablets can be interpreted as genitives, particularly *]-we* (Gp 144.1), a fragmentary man’s name most likely in the dative, cf. *mo-ne-we* (Gp 110.2), *u-re-we* (Gp 179.1), **56-ru-we* (Gp *passim*) – therefore, *]-we FAR V 1* is a better interpretation than *]-we-65 V 1* and points to reading the sign as *FAR* in the relevant Theban tablets, at least in some cases (Killen 2006, 103–106). Another significant case is *ku-no FAR* / **-65* (Fq 236.5; *ku-no* in Gf 163.1, Gp 150.2, Fq 205.3): *ku-no* seems to alternate with *ku-ne* (Fq 229.9, 292.4) and *ku-si* (Fq 130.4), probably the corresponding nom. pl. and dat. pl. of κύων, κύνος ‘dog’, *ku-no* being the gen. pl. Those nouns may refer to people taking part in religious ceremonies disguised as dogs (Ricciardelli 2006; Weilhartner 2007; Serrano 2013). If this interpretation is correct, it is better to read *ku-no FAR* rather than *ku-no-65*. Notwithstanding, Duhoux (2008, 376) has interpreted *ku-no*, *ku-ne* and *ku-si* as different men’s names.

In the same vein, there are some men’s names which exhibit an ending that could be interpreted as an old genitive in */-ās/*. This case is similar to the previous one: those names are masculine *eh₂*-stems that appear in contexts in which they apparently modify other nouns (Jiménez 2012). In such a syntactic environment, the genitival interpretation is appropriate, yet in Mycenaean, the masculine *eh₂*-stems exhibit a genitive singular ending *-a-o* directly related to Hom. *-āo*. This case is more specific than the previous one since this masculine paradigm of *eh₂*-stems is an innovation exclusive to Greek and consisting of the creation of a sigmatic nominative in */-ās/* analogous with the sigmatic nominative of the thematic declension in */-os/*, which in turn triggered the creation of a new genitive in order to avoid homophony (Chantraine 1961, 54–55). Furthermore, the masculine genitive in */-ās/* is dialectally documented in the first millennium, although it is suspected to be an analogical creation and not very old (Chantraine 1961, 55; Morpurgo 1961). Be that as it may, Duhoux (2017) has directly connected these genitives with the alleged thematic genitives in *-o* in the sense that both endings would be archaisms preserved in anthroponyms.

Finally, Santiago (1975) proposed to interpret some place and men’s names ending in *-e-u* as archaic locatives with long *ē* and *ø* ending that would be equivalent to the inherited locative singular of *i*-stems in *-ēi* (Plath 2014). This ending *-ēu* would be present in Pylian place names used to locate tablets, namely *o-re-mo-a-ke-re-u* (PY Jn 320.1) and *pu₂-ra₂-a-ke-re-u* (PY Nn 228.3), and some personal names depending on the preposition *pa-ro*, *ra-ke-u* (PY Cn 254.7) and *tu-ru-we-u* (PY Cn 254.1); she has added the place name *e-u-te-re-u* (TH Ft 140.2) (Santiago 2017). This ending *-ēu* would have been preserved in the first millennium only in the preposition *ἔνυ* if this form is really an old locative (*EGD* s.v.; Dunkel 2014, 713). However, Mycenaean toponyms in *-ēu* tend to be constructed in the

12 The possibility of its preservation in Celtiberian is unlikely, since the Celtiberian thematic genitive singular ending *-ō* is an innovation without any clear explanation (Wodtko 2003, §25); in Old Prussian, the corresponding ending *-as* might be an archaism, but also the expected development of the inherited ablative ending with abbreviation and addition of a final sibilant analogous with the German genitive in *-(e)s* (Mažiulis 2004, §§91–92; Olander 2015, 136).

dative-locative or with an adverbial ending *-te* when locating the records (Jiménez 2016, 92-93),¹³ so those in *-e-u* can be interpreted as nominatives of rubric. Furthermore, the case of *ra-ke-u* and *tu-ru-we-u* might be explained as the result of a discontinuous redaction: according to Maurice (1985, 44-45), the scribe first wrote the fixed part of the line, *a-si-ja-ti-ja pa-ro* (*a-si-ja-ti-ja* is a toponym), and then added the name of the shepherd responsible for the sheep, depending on the preposition *pa-ro* ‘chez’. If this is the case, it is easy to understand how the scribe confounded the nominative with the dative corresponding to the preposition, although he used the correct case form in line 6 *pa-ro i-sa-na-o-ti*. It should also be pointed out that the dative-locative of *tu-ru-we-u* would be **tu-ru-we-we*, with two contiguous *we* syllabograms, what could have been considered a sort of dittography (Jiménez 2012, 66); in the case of *ra-ke-u*, whose dative-locative would be **ra-ke-we*, the following word *we-da-ne-wo* begins with *we*.

IV. DATA

Before presenting the relevant data, some points regarding the methodology followed in collecting it must be set forth. First, the words at issue are proposed to be interpreted as nominatives, more precisely as nominatives of rubric. This means that in order to restrict the discussion to the clearest cases, the words under consideration are those that may have a syntactic function other than subject and exhibit a graphic ending which can be interpreted as nominative or as an archaic case form differing from the usual forms of Mycenaean paradigms. Second, only examples from the Knossian corpus are discussed since this corpus is one of the most extensive as well as one of the most accessible to the researcher thanks to the brilliant edition by Chadwick, Godart, Killen, Olivier, Sacconi and Sakellarakis (*CoMIK*); it also shows the best examples. This corpus is somewhat special regarding its administrative configuration and its chronology, even though it is as valid as the rest of corpora from the linguistic perspective we are adopting here – on the chronology of the Knossian texts (Driessen 2008; on the administrative organisation of the Knossos palace, Marazzi 2013, 187; Del Frio 2016, 204-207). Note that the examples of locative *-e-u* are all Pylian, with the exception of the Theban toponym *e-u-te-re-u*, and that a number of the alleged thematic genitive singular men’s names ending in *-o* are documented on Theban tablets. The cases to be discussed, listed by series, are the following:

– In the A-series there are some names written with nominative endings which refer to the men to whom the women and girls recorded are assigned, like *a-pi-qo-i-ta* (Ai(3) 824.1), a man’s name in capital letters appearing in a tablet on which 32 slave women and 20 girls are recorded; similar cases are *a-ri-ke-u* (Ai(3) 966.b) and *a-no-qo-ta* (Ak(2) 615.1, Ap 618.2; see also *]-qo-ta* in Ai(3) 982.1), yet the latter is not in capital letters and is written over the line in Ap 618. It must be stressed that those men’s names with nominative endings – the only interpretation possible in the case of *a-ri-ke-u* (*a-pi-qo-i-ta* and *a-no-qo-ta* could also be masculine genitives in *-a*) – alternate with other men’s names in the genitive, cf. **56-so-jo* (Ai(3) 1036.1), *we-we-si-jo-jo* (Ak(2) 622.1), *a-no-zo-jo* (Ak(2) 627.1), *ko-so-jo* (Ap 637.2) and *ko-ma-we-to* (Ap 618.2),¹⁴ see also *pe-se-ro-jo* (Ai(1) 63.a) in a tablet with an explicit syntactic structure: *pe-se-ro-jo e-e-si* | MUL 1 *ko-wa* 1 *ko-wo* 1 “(the personnel) of Psellos are: one woman, one girl, one boy.” Different cases are *te-o* in the phrase *te-o do-e-ro* (Ai(3) 966.a), cf. *te-o-jo do-e-ro* ‘slave of the god’, a title frequently found in the so-called Pylian cadastre,¹⁵ and **56-ko-we* (Ap 618.1), an athematic place name also attest-

13 Cf. *a-ke-re-we* (PY Un 1193.3), *e-ra-te-re-we* (PY Ma 333.1), *ne-se-e-we* (PY Cr 868.2), *wa-a₂-te-we* (PY An 207.9), etc., and *a-ka-re-u-te* (PY Cn 4.4.9), *a-ne-u-te* (PY Cn 40.7.13), *a₂-ne-u-te* (PY Cn 599.2), *ru-ko-a₂-ke-re-u-te* (PY Jn 415.1), possibly also *a-mu-ne-u-te* (TH Uq 434.15). The adverbial ending *-te*, only used with toponyms in *-ēu-*, is locative and probably related to *-θē-* it is interpreted as ablative *-θēv* in *a-ke-re-u-te* (MY Ge 606.2). In the plural, they are constructed in the dat.-loc. or with the postposition *-pi*: *a₂-ta-re-u-si* (PY An 657.10), *a-pa-re-u-pi* (PY Cn 286.1, 643.1, 719.10), *a-we-u-pi* (PY An 172.8.9), *da-we-u-pi* (PY Cn 485.1-4.6-8, 925.1-3), *ku-te-re-u-pi* (PY An 607.2, Na 296).

14 *]-ta-jo-jo* (Ak(1) 5918.1) and *]-jo-jo* (Ak 7827) are probably to be added.

15 Theoretically, it is conceivable to interpret *te-o do-e-ro* as ‘slave of the gods’ taking *te-o* as a genitive plural. Note that the same formulation in the feminine *te-o do-e-ra* is also encountered on PY Eo 276.7, where it is certainly a scribal mistake, cf. *te-o-jo do-e-ra* on PY En 74.8, the corresponding recapitulating tablet.

ed in the dative-locative *56-ko-we-el-i (Dl(1) 7141.B / Dm 5181, Dn 1093.2). Finally, *a-nu-to* (As(2) 1516.12) is a thematic man's name, cf. *a-nu-to-jo* in X 697.2, whose *qa-si-re-wi-ja* 'group of workers' is recorded in As(2) 1516.12-19, although the name appears with a nominative ending instead of the usual genitive one, cf. *su-ke-re-o qa-si-re-wi-ja* in l. 20 (nom. *su-ke-re*), unless we interpret *a-nu-to* as an archaic genitive equivalent to *a-nu-to-jo*.

– In the B- series, the men's names *da-i-pi-ta* (B(5) 799.1) and *su-]ke-re* (B(5) 804.1) are both followed by the common noun *ke-do-si-ja* 'group of textile workers' and identify the foremen of each recorded group (the list of the male workers' names follows), cf. *su-ke-re-o qa-si-re-wi-ja* 'Synkheres' group of workers' (As(2) 1516.20), where the expected genitive of *su-ke-re* is used – note that *da-i-pi-ta* might be interpreted as a masculine genitive in *-a*, though in the case of *su-]ke-re* only the nominative interpretation is possible. For the restoration *su-]ke-re* see Melena (1975, 67, 69). It is also possible to interpret *]ke-re* as the ethnonym Κρής 'Cretan', a *t*-stem used as a man's name (*DMic* s.v.), or even as Κῆλης (Jiménez 2012, 57 n. 18), an *s*-stem. A very different case is that of *pu-si-jo* (Bg 992), a man's name (in the singular) or an ethnonym (in the singular or plural) that identifies a contributor of *po-ni-ki-jo* 'safflower' as *a-pu-do-si* 'delivery', a circumstance expressed through the apposition of those three elements without verb form, what could lead to the interpretation of *pu-si-jo* as a genitive: *pu-si-jo* / *po-ni-ki-jo a-pu[-do-si* – note that *pu-si-jo*, a derivative of the place name *pu-so*, might also be interpreted as an adjective modifying *po-ni-ki-jo*, see n. 21. Similar examples are likely present in Bg 1020, 1040, 5584, though the corresponding men's names / ethnonyms are damaged.¹⁶ The comparison with similar records of the Ga series, see below, allows interpreting this name as nominative of rubric rather than as genitive in *-o*.

– In the C- series there is a number of men's names appearing in the nominative as possessors of labour oxen, namely *ta-za-ro* (Ch 896), *pu-ri* (Ch 1029), *wi-du-ru-ta* (Ch 5754) and *te-re-wa-ko* (C 973)¹⁷ – *au-to-a₃-ta* (Ch 972) might be added, but the tablet is fragmentary. A couple of them are thematic (*ta-za-ro*, *te-re-wa-ko*), one is athematic (*pu-ri*) and another one an *eh₂*-stem (*wi-du-ru-ta*). It must be stressed that in one case, the man's name is written in the genitive, cf. *e-po-ro-jo* (Ch 897). There is also another instance of the place name *56-ko-we (C 902.5) in the nominative instead of the dative-locative (see above on Ap 618) and a couple of cases in which the thematic noun referring to the possessor of a *do-e-ro* 'slave' is written in the nominative or the 'archaic' genitive, namely *da-mo* 'the demos' (C(4) 911.6) and the man's name *ta-so* (C(4) 911.9.11), *do-e-ro* being in apposition to the personal name of the slave recorded, cf. *o-mi-ri-so* / *ta-so do-e-ro* in line 9. Furthermore, the man's name *pe-re-qo-ta* appears in the nominative in Ce 50.1b, where it is probably the name of a collector or the man responsible for the *o-pa* mentioned in Ce 50 v.1b (Palaima 2015, 635). The genitive is possible in both cases, especially if *pe-re-qo-ta* modifies *o-pa*. On the other hand, a man's name *e-te-wa-no* (C(2) 913.1) appears in the nominative albeit preceded by the preposition *pa-ro* and is probably a scribal mistake for **e-te-wa-no-re*, since the preposition is construed with dative. This is likely to be interpreted as Ἐτεῖωνος, which is documented in the first millennium, cf. *IG* XII, 3 578, 843.1, *IC* III.3 8.1, III.4 10.1. Nevertheless, it could be possible to interpret the Mycenaean name as thematic *Ἐτέριονος, in which case there would be no scribal mistake. Finally, it is relevant to remark on the nominative *pe-ri-te-u* (C 954.2) appearing on a tablet in which the remainder of men's names are thematic and probably to be understood in the dative, cf. *di[-pte-ra-]po-ro-i* 'for the hide-bearers' in line 3.

– In the D- series there are two cases: the first case are male collectors' names alternatively constructed in the nominative and the genitive, cf. *a-ka-i-jo* (De 1084.a, Dv 1085.a), *a-no-qo-ta* (Da 1289.B, Dq(1) 440.B),¹⁸ *a-te-jo* (D- *passim*),¹⁹ *da-mi-ni-jo* (D- *passim*), *e-me-si-jo* (De 1381.A), *te-ra-po-si-jo* (Da 1314.a, Db 1263.B, De 1361.A,

16 On some of these tablets, groups of men are recorded besides *po-ni-ki-jo*. These men could be either the recipients of the *po-ni-ki-jo* or the work force destined to produce it, cf. Bg 818 a]-*pu-do-si* VIR 30 M 6 N 2[.

17 "Possibly part of the Ch set, but in a different hand" (KT 6).

18 Note that *a-no-qo-ta* is followed by *o* in Dq(1) 440.B, the abbreviation of *o-pe-ro* 'deficit', and even though there is no syntactic relation between the man's name and *o-pe-ro*, this could explain that the nominative was preferred rather than the genitive *a-no-qo-ta-o* in order to avoid two contiguous *o* syllabograms.

19 If this one is not a possessive adjective derived from the man's name *a-to* (As 40.2), cf. *e-se-re-e-jo* (Dl *passim*), *pe-ri-qo-te-jo* (D- *passim*), *sa-qa-re-jo* (Dl *passim*).

1371.A, Dv 1439.a), *u-ta-jo* (D- *passim*), *we-we-si-jo* (D- *passim*) vs. *a-no-qo-ta-o* (Dq(3) 45.a), *pe-ri-qo-ta-o* (Dq(3) 42.a, 46.A), *ra-wo-qo-no-jo* (D 1650.a, Dl(1) 928.A; in Dl(1) 9841.1 ‘]-qo-ṇo-jo’), *u-ta-jo-jo* (D- *passim*), *we-we-si-jo-jo* (D- *passim*), *wi-jo-qo-ta-o* (Dq(3) 1026.a) – note that athematic men’s names are only documented in the genitive, cf. *a-di-je-wo* (D 747.a, 5520.a), *ko-ma-we-to* (Dk(1) 920.a, 931.a, Dv 1272.A, 7176.a, 8562.B), *o-re-te-wo* (Dq(1) 439.B), and this fact led Morpurgo (1960, 39-41) to interpret the thematic names ending in *-jo* of these series as ablatives alternating with the genitive in *-jo-jo*; the second case are athematic place names in the nominative, cf. **56-ko-we* (D- *passim*), which is also used in the dative-locative, cf. Dl(1) 7141.B, Dm 5181, Dn 1093.2, and other toponyms whose dative-locative is not documented, namely *qa-sa-ro-we* (Db 1329.b), *si-ja-du-we* (Dl *passim*; if this is not the dative-locative of a *u*-stem) and *ma-ri* (Dl *passim*).

– In the F- series the cases are three: the tablet Fp(1) 1 records a series of oil consignments directed to gods, religious personnel and places, usually written in the dative and in the accusative with the adlative postposition *-de* respectively, but some of them appear in the nominative of rubric, namely the theonyms *pa-de* (l. 4) and *e-ri-nu* (l. 8),²⁰ as well as the toponym *a-mi-ni-so* (l. 7). In the case of *a-mi-ni-so*, there was no more space to write the syllabogram corresponding to the adlative particle *-de* which is written in a similar record on Fp(1) 14.2 (see also Fp(1) 48.3) – the respective records read as follows: *a-mi-ni-so* | *pa-si-te-o-i* s 1[and *a-mi-ni-so-de* | *pa-si-te-o-i* s 2. It must be noted that Fp(1) 1 is a record of oil consignments and that the corresponding logogram OLE is absent in lines 7 and 10 due to the lack of writing space. Furthermore, there is a series of thematic month names preceding the temporal genitive *me-no* ‘within the month’ written with a graphic ending proper to the nominative or to the ‘archaic’ genitive, cf. *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* (Fp(1) 7.1, 15.1, 18.1; not followed by *me-no* in Fp(1) 6.1, Fp(2) 354.1), *ra-pa-to* (Fp(1) 13.1), *wo-de-wi-jo* (Fp(1) 16.1, 48.1), probably also *a-ma-ko-to* (Fp(1) 14.1b, if it is not an athematic name). This contrasts with other instances in which the graphic ending is the regular genitive one, cf. *a-ka*[]-*jo-jo* (Oa 745.1), *de-u-ki-jo-jo* (Fp(1) 1.1), *di-wi-jo-jo* (Fp(1) 5.1), *ka-ra-e-ri-jo-jo* (Gg(1) 7369.1, M 1645.1), *sa-pa-nu-wo* (X 999), *wo-de-wi-jo-jo* (Ga 953.1). Note that the ablative interpretation of the former (see above in the third section) is syntactically unacceptable, since it would express time after which (Jiménez 2013, 114-115), while the temporal genitive is partitive and it means that the oil delivery was made at some point within the month. Finally, it is possible to interpret the god name *a-re* as a nominative of rubric in Fp(1) 14.2, where names of other gods are mentioned in the dative, cf. *e-ke-se-si* in line 1 and *pa-si-te-o-i* in l. 2. The problem is that it is also possible to read *a-re* as a dative, cf. Hom. dat. Ἀρηι, yet the compound man’s name *a-re-i-ze-we-i* (TH Of 37.1) points, instead, to a dat. *a-re-i* (Killen 2015, 1115-1122).

– In the G- series plenty of examples are encountered. First of all, in the Ga series, a structure also found in the Bg series is used (see above), but in this case one of the names is athematic, and therefore, the nominative case is certain. Thus, *ra-je-u* in Ga(5) 1530.3b is a derivative of the Cretan toponym *ra-ja* either functioning as a man’s name or as an ethnonym and referring to a man who delivers *ki-ta-no* as *a-pu-do-si*; see *da-wi-jo* and *pu-na-si-jo* on the same tablet (lines 2 and 4 respectively). On the other hand, **56-ko-we-i-jo* (Ga(2) 424.b), *pa-ra-u-jo* (Ga(2) 425.A) and *da-wi-jo* (Ga(2) 427.1) deliver *po-ni-ki-jo*, the same spices delivered in the Bg series, but those are thematic names and their graphic ending is somewhat open to interpretation²¹ – *pa-ra-u-jo* could also be an athematic man’s name in *-ōn*, in which case it could only be interpreted as a nominative. In this respect, the nominative of

20 This noun refers to Erinyes (only one) and could be interpreted in the dative /Erīnūi/. However, it must be stressed that *ū*-stems undergo the split of the long *ū* into *uw* when another vowel follows, that is to say, that **e-ri-nu-wi* should then be expected, cf. Lejeune 1972, 245.

21 Other cases are less clear since the tablets are mutilated, like *a₃-ta-jo* (Ga(2) 419.1) and *tu-to* (Ga(2) 419.2b). Furthermore, there are toponymic adjectives that can be interpreted as men’s names, as ethnonyms (either in the singular or plural) or even as modifiers of the spices recorded, cf. Ga 418(2) *su-ri-mi-jo* | *ko-ri-ja-do-no* T 5 | *po-ni-ki-jo* M 3. In this regard, *da-wi-jo* is a derivative of the toponym *da-wo* and can be interpreted as a man’s name or as an ethnonym, but not as a modifier in Ga(2) 427.1: *da-wi-jo* | *a-pu-do-si* *po-ni-ki-jo* *di-ta-ka-so* M 8 N [] *o* [(*di-ta-ka-so* is most likely the recipient of the delivery or *a-pu-do-si*, a feminine noun that cannot be modified by *da-wi-jo*). The case of **56-ko-we-i-jo* (Ga(2) 424.b), a derivative of the toponym **56-ko-we*, is less clear, but it is also followed by *a-pu-do-si*, so it is probably not a modifier. The general criterion I have followed is to exclude those derivatives of toponyms that appear on tablets in which the noun *a-pu-do-si* ‘delivery’ is not mentioned – Ga(2) 421 is not taken into account because of its fragmentary state. I have also considered the possible ethnonyms in the singular by analogy with *ra-je-u* and *pa-ra-u-jo*, which can only be a men’s name.

rubric *tu-wi-no* (Ga(1) 517.b) alternates with the genitive *tu-wi-no-no* (Ga(1) 676.b), on two tablets with the same structure consisting of the man's name in capital letters followed by *ku-pi-ri-jo*, the spices recorded and its quantity, although the order of the elements differs: *tu-wi-no / ku-pa-ro ku-pi-ri-jo* AROM+PYC 1 vs. *tu-wi-no-no / ku-pi-ri-jo ku-pa-ro* AROM 6.²² In the latter tablets, there is no verbal noun like *a-pu-do-si* in the former examples and in the Bg series, a type of noun that might be construed with a subjective genitive – the subjective genitive refers to the subject of the action designated by its head, a verbal noun, cf. Jiménez (2016, 63-65). Furthermore, in the same series there is a nominative of rubric *pa-de* (Ga(3) 456.1) instead of the dative of recipient, cf. *pa-de-i* (Ga 953.2). Finally, *we-je-we* in Gv 863.2 appears in the nominative plural although it apparently depends on a finite verb form *e-ke* 'he has' as its object (see above in the second section).

– In the K- series, there is a very interesting tablet, K(1) 875, that records cups (*di-pa a-no-wo-to* 'cups without handles') produced by several *qa-si-re-wi-ja* 'workgroup' probably of metal (Killen 1987). Each *qa-si-re-wi-ja* is identified through the personal name of its foreman, *pe-ri-ta* (line 2), *wi-na-jo* (line 3), *i-da-i-jo* (line 4), *sa-me-ti-jo* (line 5), *i-je-re-wi-jo* (line 6). Note that the names exhibit a graphic ending to be interpreted either in the nominative or the 'archaic' genitive.

– In the L- series, there is a further instance of the place name *56-*ko-we* (Le 5646.2B) in the nominative to locate the record of its tablet. In addition, there is a man's name apparently written in the nominative, *i-se-we-ri-jo* (L(3) 473.B), followed by *o-pe-ro* 'deficit', cf. the Pylian sequence *ra-ma-o o-pe-ro* (PY Ub 1316) in which the corresponding man's name is in the genitive. Another Pylian name is also in the nominative, cf. *i-wa-ka o-pe-ro* (PY Ub 1317). Note that in the three cases the record is about the deficit of different products attributed to the men mentioned. Moreover, the dative is also possible, cf. *ke-e-pe o-pe-ro* (MY Ge 604.1; *ke-e-pe* is a scribal mistake for *ke-pe-e*), *i-na-o-te o-pe-ro* (MY Ge 604.2), *ra-ke-da-no-re o-pe-ro* (MY Ge 604.3), where the names of the men to whom the deficit (*o-pe-ro*) is attributed appear in the dative.

– In the N- series there is another case of the place name *qa-sa-ro-we* (Np(1) 5013), probably an athematic name in the nominative used to locate the record; see above on Db 1329.

– In the R- series, the noun *ke-ra* 'horn' (Ra(2) 984.2, 7498.B, 7732) is used as an argument of a perfect passive participle *de-de-me-na* 'bound' referring to an unidentified kind of dagger called *zo-wa*. This complement designates the material with which the dagger is bound. It must be noted that *e-re-pa-te* 'ivory' (Ra 1028.A), another material used to bind *zo-wa* daggers, is written in the instrumental dative. It is always possible to interpret *e-re-pa-te* as an instrumental ending in /-ē/ (see above in the third section), while it is more difficult to interpret *ke-ra* as an instrumental, since it is an *s*-stem neuter /keras/, unless we admit an alternative *ā*-stem (see below in the following section). In this respect, it must be stressed that the instrumental (dative) of *ke-ra* is *ke-ra-e* as documented in PY Sa 840.

– In the S- series there are two cases: first, the man's name *ko-ki-da* (Sd 4403.a, So(1) 4430.a) is written without the *-o* ending that is expected in view of its syntactic relation with the following noun *o-pa* 'a kind of service', cf. *a-re-ki-si-to-jo o-pa* (Sf(2) 4420.a); second, some place names which appear in the Sd series are apparently written with an ending that can be interpreted as nominative, dative-locative or even ablative in order to express the origin of the recorded chariots, namely, *ku-do-ni-ja* (Sd 4404.b), *se-to-i-ja* (Sd 4407.b) and *pa-i-to* (Sd 4413.b), although the first one can be understood as an adjective homonymous with the place name – the adlative particle of *ku-do-ni-ja-de* (L 588.3) makes it clear that the place name was *ku-do-ni-ja*, yet Κυδώνιος, α, ον is one of the adjectives derived from the place name Κυδωνία; the adjective of *se-to-i-ja* is not attested, the adjective of *pa-i-to* is *pa-i-ti-jola*. Finally, the case of *a-re-ki-si-to* (So(2) 4433.b), followed by the passive participle *wo-zo-me-no*, is less conclusive (see above in the second section), yet it is likely another instance of the nominative of rubric rather than a dative of agent.

22 All these thematically linked tablets were written by different scribes: the scribe of Ga 517 and Ga 676 is identified as Hand 135, while Ga 424, 425 and 427 are ascribed to Hand 136, Ga 1530 to Hand 221 and the Bg series to Hand 137.

– The V- series contains a very interesting tablet, V(7) 1523, in which several men's names are used to modify the common noun *i-jo* 'son' (Duhoux 2007, 96), which, in turn, modifies the names of the men recorded in apposition to them: *pi-ma-na-ro zo-wi-jo* 'i-jo' (V(7) 1523.4), where *zo-wi-jo* is apparently in the nominative instead of the genitive; *pi-ma-na-ro pi-ro-i-ta* 'i-jo' (V(7) 1523.5), where *pi-ro-i-ta* is in the nominative instead of the genitive;] *wa-du-na* 'i-jo' [(V(7) 1523.1), where *wa-du-na* is another *eh₂*-stem apparently in the nominative instead of the genitive, although this last instance is far from certain – the line is fragmentary and it is possible that another man's name following *wa-du-na* was construed with *i-jo*; on this tablet, see Jiménez (2012, 58–60). Note that in the three cases *i-jo* is written over the line and the men's names at issue can also be interpreted as 'archaic' genitives, since they most probably refer to the fathers of the people recorded. A further example might be *a-tu-qo-te-ra-to* 'i-jo' in l. 4, but it is not certain whether the man's name is thematic, or *i-jo* an apposition to it since *a-tu-qo-te-ra-to* is not preceded by another man's name – unless we understand that two men named *pi-ma-na-ro* are distinguished through their fathers' names in line 4, the first one the son of *zo-wi-jo* and the second one the son of *a-tu-qo-te-ra-to*; see how the line reads: *o-pi* / *di-zo pi-ma-na-ro zo-wi-jo* 'i-jo' 1 *a-tu-qo-te-ra-to* 'i-jo' 1. Finally, there is an example of the month name *wo-de-wi-jo* (V(2) 280.1) that can be interpreted as a nominative or an 'archaic' genitive; see above on the Fp series.

– In the W- series, there is a possible case of nominative of rubric modifying a second noun, *ta-to-mo* in *ta-to-mo o-nu-ke* (Ws 1703). This occurs if we understand that *o-nu-ke* refers to a kind of cloth and *ta-to-mo* to a balance or *σταθμός* in which the *o-nu-ke* sent were weighed. Nonetheless, the context is obscure and, among other things, the case and gender of *o-nu-ke* are not clear.²³

V. INTERPRETATION

In my opinion, the best way to interpret all the preceding examples is syntactic and not morphological. Indeed, a number of them have no alternative to a nominative interpretation, cf. *a-ri-ke-u* (Ai(3) 966), **56-ko-we* (Ap 618, C 902.5, D- *passim*, Le 5646.2B), *su-]ke-re* (B(5) 804.1), *pu-ri* (Ch 1029), *qa-sa-ro-we* (Db 1329.b, Np(1) 5013), *si-ja-du-we* and *ma-ri* (Dl *passim*), *pa-de* (Fp(1) 1.4), *e-ri-nu* (Fp(1) 1.8), *a-re* (Fp(1) 14.2), *pa-de* (Ga(3) 456.1), *ra-je-u* (Ga(5) 1530.3b), *we-je-we* (Gv 863.2). The comparison with these undermines the need to propose new archaic endings unfamiliar to the usual paradigms, such as the thematic genitive in */-os/*²⁴, a genitive in */-ās/* of the masculine *eh₂*-stems²⁵ or, even, an innovative instrumental in */-āl/* for an *s*-stem like *ke-ra* (Ra(2) 984.2, 7498.B, 7732) – in this case, one ought to admit the coexistence of secondary *képā* besides *képās* in Mycenaean (Ruijgh 1974, 190). Haplography can be called upon in some cases, as well as scribal mistakes, which are relatively frequent (Maurice 1985). Some of the examples can also be interpreted as conscious abbreviations: abbreviations of this sort are not strange in administrative texts addressed to a small group of officers who try to convey a maximum amount of information with a minimum of effort (Maurice 1985, 30). All this notwithstanding, if the syntactic simplicity of Mycenaean texts is taken into account, most of the examples can be interpreted as the result of the brachylogic style that characterises Mycenaean texts.

23 *o-nu-ke* is an athematic noun probably of masculine gender, cf. *ὄνυξ*. However, *o-nu-ka* (Ld(1) 584.2, 591.2) could indicate that the noun was a neuter in Mycenaean if this is really nominative plural. Otherwise, the last syllabogram might be an attempt to render the final stop as an alternative to the expected **o-nu-ku* (Meissner 2008, 517). The nominative singular *o-nu* (Od(1) 681.a) does not solve the problem either since it can be interpreted as a singular neuter */onuk^h/* or as another graphic alternative to **o-nu-ku*.

24 Possible in the case of *te-o* (Ai(3) 966.a), *pu-si-jo* (Bg 992), *da-mo* (C(4) 911.6), *ta-so* (C(4) 911.9.11), *te-re-wa-ko* (C 973), *a-ka-i-jo* (De 1084.a, Dv 1085.a), *a-te-jo* (D- *passim*), *da-mi-ni-jo* (D- *passim*) *e-me-si-jo* (De 1381.A), *te-ra-po-si-jo* (Da 1314.a, Db 1263.B, De 1361.A, 1371.A, Dv 1439.a), *u-ta-jo* (D- *passim*), *we-we-si-jo* (D- *passim*), *a-ma-ko-to* (Fp(1) 14.1b), *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* (Fp(1) 6.1, 7.1, 15.1, 18.1, Fp(2) 354.1), *ra-pa-to* (Fp(1) 13.1), *wo-de-wi-jo* (Fp(1) 16.1, 48.1), **56-ko-we-i-jo* (Ga(2) 424.b), *pa-ra-u-jo* (Ga(2) 425.A), *da-wi-jo* (Ga(2) 427.1, Ga(5) 1530.2), *pu-na-si-jo* (Ga(5) 1530.4), *wi-na-jo* (K(1) 875.3), *i-da-i-jo* (K(1) 875.4), *sa-me-ti-jo* (K(1) 875.5), *i-je-re-wi-jo* (K(1) 875.6), *i-se-we-ri-jo* (L(3) 473.B), *zo-wi-jo* (V(7) 1523.4), *ta-to-mo* (Ws 1703.β).

25 Possible in the case of *a-pi-qo-i-ta* (Ai(3) 824.1), *a-no-qo-ta* (Ak(2) 615.1, Ap 618.2, Da 1289.B, Dq(1) 440.B), *da-i-pi-ta* (B(5) 799.1), *pe-re-qo-ta* (Ce 50.1b), *wi-du-ru-ta* (Ch 5754), *pe-ri-ta* (K(1) 875.2), *ko-ki-da* (Sd 4403.a, So(1) 4430.a), *pi-ro-i-ta* (V(7) 1523.5).

Haplography is possible in two cases: on the one hand, with *ko-ki-da* instead of **ko-ki-da-o* since the following noun, which is its head, starts with *o-*, cf. *ko-ki-da o-pa* ‘Gorgidas’ service’ (Sd 4403.a, So(1) 4430.a), see also *a-no-qo-ta o* in Dq(1) 440.B, where *o* is the abbreviation for *o-pe-ro* ‘deficit’ though both terms have no syntactic relation – the line reads as follows:]*ka-mo* / *a-no-qo-ta o* OVIS^m [(note that]*ka-mo* is the shepherd’s personal name); on the other hand, with nouns in *-jo* in the genitive singular, since this entails two contiguous *jo* syllabograms, although haplography is difficult to evince unless some external evidence points to it. As a matter of fact, we cannot speak of haplography for the collectors’ names in *-jo* of the D- series, given that the nominative case is syntactically acceptable, yet the intention of avoiding the duplication of the same syllabogram can be suspected. This could explain the alternation of nominative and genitive with these names in contrast with the consistent use of the genitive with other names (*a-di-je-wo*, *a-no-qo-ta-o*, *ko-ma-we-to*, *o-re-te-wo*, *pe-ri-qo-ta-o*, *ra-wo-qo-no-jo*, *wi-jo-qo-ta-o*),²⁶ since in the former case there was a certain risk of confounding the genitive in *-jo-jo* with an apparent dittography – in fact, only the most frequent are attested in the genitive, i.e. *u-ta-jo-jo* and *we-we-si-jo-jo*. It must be noted that the great majority of collectors’ names in *-jo* / *-jo-jo* only appear on D- tablets written by the scribe identified as Hand 117,²⁷ who also wrote *a-no-qo-ta* without the genitive ending *-o* in Da 1289.B and the athematic man’s name in the genitive *ko-ma-we-to* in Dv 1272.A, 7176.a and 8562.B.

Regarding scribal mistakes, there is a number of instances that do not belong in the list being studied here. I particularly refer to those examples in which the last syllabogram of a noun is neglected and does not correspond to an oblique ending, like *po-ti-ni-ja-we* instead of *po-ti-ni-ja-we-jo* (DI(1) 943.A), *a-mi-ni-si* instead of *a-mi-ni-si-jo* (Sc 217 v.), *a-ja-me* instead of *a-ja-me-no* (Sd 4415.b), as well as the adjective *te-mi-dwe* in the singular (So 894.1) though referred to more than one wheel, cf. pl. *te-mi-dwe-ta* in line 3,²⁸ all of which can be considered abbreviations, whether intended or not. Other instances are due to a plain mistake, like *e-te-wa-no* (C(2) 913.1), a man’s name written in the nominative but preceded by the preposition *pa-ro*, which is construed with dative, although it cannot be ruled out that *e-te-wa-no* was a thematic name in the dative-locative. Scribal mistakes should be called upon only when there is clear evidence in order not to unnecessarily multiply them. Thus, the most clear case of a scribal mistake in the list above is *te-o do-e-ro* (Ai(3) 966.a), if we contrast this formulation with the canonical expression *te-o-jo do-e-ro*. However, the latter expression is Pylian and it would be theoretically possible to see an alternative formula ‘slave of the gods’ in the Knossian example – Hajnal (1995, 260-261) considers this example a scribal mistake along with *ke-ra-me-wo wa-na-ka-te-ro* (instead of *wa-na-ka-te-ro-jo*) on PY Eo 371.A, although in the latter case the lack of agreement is decisive (*ke-ra-me-wo* is the genitive of an *ēu*-stem). Another case might be *da-mo do-e-ro* (C(4) 911.6) and *ta-so do-e-ro* (C(4) 911.9.11) in a tablet in which the owners of the *do-e-ro* recorded are identified via possessive adjectives, cf. *pa-ta-ti-jo* in l. 4 (considered a thematic genitive in /-os/ by Pierini 2011, 82-83), or possessive genitives, cf. *pi-ri-to-jo* in l. 1.

In other cases, it is better to speak of abbreviations instead of scribal mistakes. Abbreviations are well known in Mycenaean and usually consist of the first syllabogram of a word used in the manner of a logogram, like *o* used as the abbreviation of *o-pe-ro*, which is one of the so-called adjuncts – “When a single syllabogram is placed before any logogram, it is usually described as an ADJUNCT: it qualifies or describes logographically the main logogram by means of an acrophonic abbreviation” (Melena 2014, 130-134) –, as well as *MA* for *ma-ra-tu-wo* ‘fennel’, *QE* for *qe-ro*₂ ‘corslet’, *RI* for *ri-no* ‘linen’, etc. There are also cases in which a word, not a logogram, is abbreviated into its first syllabogram, like *a* (PY Cn 328.5) for *a-ka-na-jo* (PY Cn 328.2-4), *a* (PY Tn 316 v.5) for

26 The only exception is *a-no-qo-ta* instead of *a-no-qo-ta-o* in Da 1289.B and Dq(1) 440.B (where it is followed by *o*, see above), cf. *a-no-qo-ta-o* in Dq(3) 45.a.

27 The exceptions are *a-te-jo* in DI 7134.B (Hand undetermined) and *da-mi-ni-jo* in Dk *passim* (Hand 119), Dq(1) 447.A and 1803.A (Hand 121). Hand 121 also wrote *o-re-te-wo* (Dq(1) 439.B) and *a-no-qo-ta o* (see above).

28 The number of pairs recorded is not preserved, yet the adjective *te-mi-dwe* should have been written in the dual if referred to one pair (KN So 4433.a) or in the dual / plural if referred to more than one pair (KN So 4437 / 894.3, 4429.b, 4431, 4434, 4439, 4445, 4448, 4449, PY Sa 791, 793). Note that ‘*te-mi-dwe*’ was added over the line after the entry was written and that there was no more space for another syllabogram: *pe-te-re-wa* ‘*te-mi-dwe*’ ROTA ZE [.

a-ke (PY Tn 316.3.v.1.2.8) or *wa* (EL Z 1.2, KH Z 16) for *wa-na-ka-te-ro* (TH Z 839, TI Z 29). The abbreviations included in the list are those whose result is a graphic form that can be considered a nominative of rubric and only entail the omission of the syllabogram corresponding to an oblique ending. Some of these abbreviations can be attributed to the limits imposed by the writing space. Examples of this are the graphic nominatives *a-no-qo-ta* (Ap 618), *da-i-pi-ta* (B(5) 799.1), *su-]ke-re* (B(5) 804.1)²⁹, *pe-re-qo-ta* (Ce 50.1b) and *zo-wi-jo* (V(7) 1523.4) instead of the genitives *a-no-qo-ta-o*, **da-i-pi-ta-o*, *su-ke-re-o*, *pe-re-qo-ta-o* and **zo-wi-jo-jo*; as well as *a-mi-ni-so* (Fp(1) 1.7) instead of the adlative *a-mi-ni-so-de*; **56-ko-we* (Ap 618) instead of the dative-locative **56-ko-we-e*; and *ke-ra* (Ra(2) 984.2) instead of the instrumental dative *ke-ra-e*. In all these cases, there was no more space for the corresponding ending. In the case of *se-to-i-ja* (Sd 4407.b) and *pa-i-to* (Sd 4413.b), an adjective should have been expected, although that would have meant adding another syllabogram (**i-qi-ja se-to-i-ja-ja* / *pa-i-ti-ja*; *i-qi-ja* means ‘chariot’ in Mycenaean) on two tablets with problems of writing space, but the result can still be read as a nominative. In the case of *pu-ri* (Ch 1029), the nominative of rubric is a natural alternative to the genitive and has the advantage of being shorter than gen. **pu-ri-jo*, for which there was no space. The case of *ta-to-mo o-nu-ke* (Ws 1703) is difficult to interpret, even though abbreviation is highly convenient in nodules due to the limitation of their surfaces to receive writing.

As has already been noted, abbreviations of this kind are somewhat expected in specialised media, since they allow the scribe to dispense of one syllabogram without creating special problems to understand the message. However, we cannot be certain whether some of these are due to scribal mistakes by omission and not to a conscious scribal decision in order to save time and/or to manage the writing space. Be that as it may, cases similar to the previous ones are encountered, although the absence of the final syllabogram cannot be attributed to a lack of writing space: *a-pi-qo-i-ta* (Ai(3) 824.1) and *a-no-qo-ta* (Ak(2) 615) are nominatives of rubric instead of the genitive like *a-no-qo-ta* (Ap 618.2), but in those tablets there was enough space to write the *-o* ending of the genitive. Similarly, in the tablets in which *ta-za-ro* (Ch 896), *wi-du-ru-ta* (Ch 5754) and *te-re-wa-ko* (C 973) are written, there was enough space for the genitive ending unlike in the case of *pu-ri* (Ch 1029). Furthermore, there was enough space to write the genitive *tu-wi-no-no* instead of the nominative *tu-wi-no* in Ga(1) 517.b, cf. Ga(1) 676.b where *tu-wi-no-no* is indeed written. It must be stressed that in those cases, the alternation of the nominative of rubric and the genitive is, in Chadwick’s terms, natural.³⁰ In other cases, however, the nominative of rubric is unexpected, cf. *pi-ro-i-ta* (V(7) 1523.5), which modifies *i-jo* in apposition to a man’s name, even though there was enough space for the genitive ending unlike in the case of *zo-wi-jo* (V(7) 1523.4). Furthermore, we have already seen that in Fp(1) 1.7, the scribe 138 wrote *a-mi-ni-so* instead of *a-mi-ni-so-de* due to the lack of space, yet he also wrote *pa-de* (Fp(1) 1.4) instead of *pa-de-i* (Ga 953.2) and *e-ri-nu* (Fp(1) 1.8) instead of *e-ri-nu-we* (V 52 *lat. inf.*), although there was enough space for the syllabogram of the dative ending in lines 4 and 8 – the same is applicable to *pa-de* in Ga(3) 456.1. In these cases, the nominative of rubric is a normal alternative in Mycenaean texts, and it appears alongside the corresponding oblique cases in the same tablet, cf. *da-da-re-jo-de* (Fp(1) 1.3), **47-da-de* (Fp(1) 1.9), *di-we* (Fp(1) 1.2) and *pa-si-te-o-i* (Fp(1) 1.5.7).

A very interesting example is represented by K(1) 875: this tablet consists of six entries in which cups without handle (*di-pa a-no-wo-to*) are recorded, each one in relation to a different *qa-si-re-wi-ja*; the identification of the *qa-si-re-wi-ja* is made through the personal names of their foremen (the first one is not preserved), but the names are written in the nominative instead of the genitive, all of them being names in *-jo* except for

29 The tablets B(5) 799 and 804 are damaged, so we cannot be certain about the lack of space. However, the signs inscribed on both tablets are cramped enough and the logogram VIR following the men’s names of those belonging to each *ke-do-si-ja* is never accompanied by a numeral as usual. It must be noted that this practice is common to the B(5) set of tablets.

30 *a-no-qo-ta* (Ap 618.2) is a different case. See the line: *tī-wa-ti-ja* / *a-*79 ‘a-no-qo-ta’ MUL 3 ko-ma-we-to MUL 2 we-ra-te-ja MUL 2* [. Androk^{wh}ontās’ women are three, while Komāwens’ women are two (*ko-ma-we-to* is in the genitive); *we-ra-te-ja* is an occupational title with no certain interpretation. All these women are from **T^hinwons*, a place name, and *a-no-qo-ta*, *ko-ma-we-to* and *we-ra-te-ja* are specifications that distinguish three groups of them, so a genitive *a-no-qo-ta-o* would be somewhat expected – *a-*79* is the personal name of a woman that can be alone or included among Androk^{wh}ontās’ women. On this tablet, see Jiménez 2012, 60-61.

pe-ri-ta. There is space enough to write the syllabogram corresponding to the genitive ending in all the entries save the last one, yet the scribe chose a formulation that is comparable to *a-nu-to qa-si-re-wi-ja* (As(2) 1516.12), *da-i-pi-ta ke-do-si-ja* (B(5) 799.1) and *su-]ke-re ke-do-si-ja* (B(5) 804.1), cf. *pe-ri-ta qa-si-re-wi-ja di-pa a-no-wo-to* [(line 2).

It must be stressed that, generally speaking, all the instances listed in the previous section are related to the brachylogic style of the Mycenaean texts. In fact, most of the examples do not entail haplography, scribal mistakes or abbreviation, they are just an instantiation of the simplicity characteristic of Mycenaean texts. See, for instance, *a-ri-ke-u* (Ai(3) 966), the man responsible for a slave whose name is written in the nominative instead of the genitive **a-ri-ke-wo*, and *pe-ri-te-u* (C 954.2), the recipient of a sheep, instead of **pe-ri-te-we*, the alternatives having the same number of signs as the nominative, which is syntactically satisfactory. We have already seen that the alternation of nominative of rubric and possessive genitive is acceptable in some cases, like with the collectors' names on the D- series. The most frequent collectors' names are attested both in the genitive and the nominative of rubric (Chadwick 1958): the first construction is adnominal, the second implies an implicit transitive verb – Chadwick (1958, 287) understood a noun like *a-ko-ra* (= ἄγορά) as the head of the genitive, and a verb form like *a-ke-re* (= ἀγείρει) of which the name in the nominative would be the subject. In the same vein, the sequences **56-ko-we-i-jo a-pu-do-si po-ni-ki-jo* (Ga(2) 424), *pa-ra-u-jo a-pu-do-si po-ni-ki-jo* (Ga(2) 425.A) and *da-wi-jo a-pu-do-si po-ni-ki-jo di-ta-ka-so* (Ga(2) 427.1) would trigger a subjective genitive; yet *ra-je-u ki-ta-no a-pu-do-si* (Ga(5) 1530.3), with a different word order also found in *pu-si-jo po-ni-ki-jo a-pu-do-si* (Bg 992) and *pu-na-si-jo ki-ta-no a-pu-do-si* (Ga(5) 1530.4), only befits a 'transitive' interpretation without a verb (Jiménez 2016, 185-186), since *ra-je-u* can only be interpreted as a nominative. A further example is *i-se-we-ri-jo o-pe-ro* (L(3) 473.B). In fact, the verbal noun *o-pe-ro* is also found with a subjective genitive, cf. *ra-ma-o o-pe-ro* (PY Ub 1316), although it cannot be completely discarded that *i-se-we-ri-jo* is in the dative (see above in the previous section). The alternation of the nominative of rubric with the dative of recipient is especially visible in C 954 where *pe-ri-te-u* in line 2 alternates with *di[-pte-ra-] po-ro-i* 'for the hide-bearers' in line 3 (the remainder of men's names are thematic singular), and in the former case an implicit verb form meaning 'receive, get' is to be understood. In the case of *a-re-ki-si-to wo-zo-me-no* ROTA ZE 1 (So(2) 4433.b), the genitive would have been possible, since Alexitos is responsible for the wheels recorded, but the passive participle might be construed with a dative of agent without preposition. However, the general style of the tablets endorses the interpretation of *a-re-ki-si-to* as a nominative of rubric: "Alexitos: a pair of wheels being made." Another group of cases is represented by the use of place names in the nominative of rubric to locate the record. In the case of **56-ko-we* (Ap 618), the nominative is incongruous given that it functions as a modifier of the participle *a-pe-a-sa* 'women being absent', and the lack of writing space allows us to speak of abbreviation. In other cases there is no lack of space and the nominative of rubric is syntactically acceptable, cf. **56-ko-we* (C 902.5, D- *passim*, Le 5646.2B), *qa-sa-ro-we* (Db 1329.b, Np(1) 5013), *si-ja-du-we* and *ma-ri* (Dl *passim*), all of them place names locating the record. Furthermore, the month names of the Fp series written in the nominative are usually followed by *me-no* above the line and in a smaller letter size (see below).³¹ In all these cases, *me-no* can be interpreted as an appended clarification of the preceding word in order to identify it as a month name dating the record (Jiménez 2013). This is somewhat the opposite phenomenon to the appositive nominative (see above in the second section), since the noun is in the case corresponding to the dating function, not in the nominative like the month name. Finally, there is an instance of the nominative of rubric in lists, the so-called enumerative nominative, cf. *we-je-we* (Gv 863.2).

A word on the scribes using the examples of the nominative of rubric seen above is in order. It must be stressed that the same scribe can discretionally use the nominative of rubric or the corresponding oblique case. For instance, see **56-ko-we* used by the scribe identified as Hand 117 in Da, Db, Dc, Df and Dv *passim* along with **56-ko-we-i* in Dm 5181 and Dn 1093.2, the corresponding locative – this is the same scribe that uses both the

31 However, in Fp(1) 14.1b and 18.1 *me-no* is written in the same line and with the same letter size as the month names *a-ma-ko-to* and *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* respectively.

nominative of rubric and the genitive with the collectors' names of the D- series. Some cases apparently point to the existence of the archaic endings mentioned above, such as the construction *a-nu-to qa-si-re-wi-ja* alongside *su-ke-re-o qa-si-re-wi-ja* in As(2) 1516 (Hand 101), which suggests the interpretation of *a-nu-to* as a thematic genitive with an ending in /-os/. However, the same scribe can use the alleged archaic genitives along with athematic nouns that can only be interpreted as nominatives of rubric. The most relevant case is *su-]ke-re ke-do-si-ja* (B(5) 804.1) besides *da-i-pi-ta ke-do-si-ja* (B(5) 799.1) on two tablets attributed to the scribe identified as Hand 104.³² In this regard, it must be noted that Duhoux (2017) has argued in favour of the existence of archaic genitive endings in *-a* and *-o*, at least in anthroponyms, and one of his reasons is that these genitives coexist with the regular athematic genitives in /-os/, which are never substituted by the nominative of rubric in the adnominal patronymic construction.³³ Nonetheless, Duhoux himself recognises the consistent alternation of the nominative of rubric and the genitive, for instance, in the case of *we-we-si-jo* and *we-we-si-jo-jo* in the D- tablets written by the scribe identified as Hand 117, even though in those series, the athematic collectors' names are always in the genitive (see above in the fourth section) – note that athematic names are rare, 9 instances in total, while only in the case of *we-we-si-jo* there are 16 instances in the nominative and 13 in the genitive; in the case of *u-ta-jo-jo*, the other man's name in *-jo* attested in the genitive in those series, there are 22 instances in the nominative and 26 instances in the genitive. Other cases are equally relevant regarding this alternation, such as the only instance of a man's name in the genitive in the Ch series, attributed to Hand 110, in contrast with the normal use of the nominative of rubric when the possessors of the oxen recorded are mentioned (*e-po-ro-jo : ta-za-ro, pu-ri, wi-du-ru-ta*). The same alternation is found between *a-ri-ke-u* (Ai(3) 966.b) and *] *56-ko-jo* (Ai(3) 1036.1), on two tablets ascribed to Hand 204, *a-no-qo-ta* (Ak(2) 615.1) and *a-no-zo-jo* (Ak(2) 627.1), on two tablets ascribed to Hand 108, and between *tu-wi-no* (Ga(1) 517.b) and *tu-wi-no-no* (Ga(1) 676.b), on two tablets ascribed to Hand 135. Other morphosyntactic cases alternate with the nominative of rubric even in the same tablet, cf. C 954 dat. *di[-pte-ra-]po-ro-i* vs nom. *pe-ri-te-u*, Fp(1) 1 dat. *di-we, pa-si-te-o-i* vs nom. *pa-de, e-ri-nu* or Ra(2) 984 instr.-dat. *e-re-]pa-te* vs nom. *ke-ra*. A very significant microcorpus is made up by month names: the Knossian scribe identified as Hand 138 uses both the temporal genitive and the nominative of rubric, cf. *de-u-ki-jo-jo 'me-no'* (Fp(1) 1.1), *di-wi-jo-jo 'me-no'* (Fp(1) 5.1) along with *a-ma-ko-to me-no* (Fp(1) 14.1b), *ka-ra-e-ri-jo 'me-no'* (Fp(1) 7.1), *ka-ra-e-ri-jo l me-no* (Fp(1) 15.1), *ka-ra-e-ri-jo me-no* (Fp(1) 18.1), *ra-pa-to 'me-no'* (Fp(1) 13.1), *wo-de-wi-jo 'me-no'* (Fp(1) 16.1, 48.1), in one instance without *me-no* following the month name, cf. *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* (Fp(1) 6.1). It is true that the remainder of Knossian scribes tend to use the temporal genitive when dating their tablets through month names, cf. *a-ka[]-jo-jo me-no* (Oa 745.1, ?), *ka-ra-e-ri-jo-jo me-no* (Gg 7369.1, M 1645.1, Hand 103), *sa-pa-nu-wo me-no* (X 999, ?), *wo-de-wi-jo-jo l me-no* (Ga 953.1, Hand 219), apart from a couple of examples in the nominative of rubric without *me-no*, cf. *ka-ra-e-i-jo* (Fp(2) 354.1, Hand 222?; *ka-ra-e-i-jo* is a scribal mistake for *ka-ra-e-ri-jo*) and *wo-de-wi-jo* (V(2) 280.1, Hand 124). The fact that *me-no* is usually written above the line and in a smaller letter size lessens incongruity when the month name is in the nominative, since *me-no* can be explained as an addition clarifying the function of the preced-

32 According to Killen (2015, 1127-1128), the nominative might be due to the fact that the man alluded to is listed along with the men belonging to his team, and this would explain oscillations like *a-nu-to [qa-]si-re-wi-ja* VIR 1 besides *su-ke-re-o qa-si-re-wi-ja* VIR 1 on the same tablet. Nonetheless, B(5) 799 and 804 are damaged and we cannot know whether *da-i-pi-ta* and *su-ke-re* were listed along with their men. Moreover, on K(1) 875 the members of the six *qa-si-re-wi-ja* mentioned are not listed, so the foremen's names in the nominative instead of the genitive cannot be explained in that way.

33 Apart from the Theban examples, all of them thematic (save perhaps *o-to-ro-no* in Fq 214.7) and amounting to 18 instances, the patronymic genitive would be attested in 7 examples: *zo-wi-jo i-jo* in KN V(7) 1523.4, *a-tu-qo-te-ra-to i-jo* in KN V(7) 1523.4, *pi-ro-i-ta i-jo* in KN V(7) 1523.5, *wi-do-wo-i-jo i-**65 in PY Ae 344, *pe-ri-me-de-o i-**65 in PY Aq 64.7, *qo-te-wo i-**65 in PY Aq 218.16, *di-wo i-je-we* in PY Tn 316 v.10. Of the non-Theban examples the Knossian ones of V(7) 1523 and *wi-do-wo-i-jo* might conceal 'archaic' genitives (only *pe-ri-me-de-o*, *qo-te-wo* and *di-wo* are athematic); on the Theban examples and on *wi-do-wo-i-jo*, see above in the third section. It is of interest to note that Duhoux (2017: 155-156) adds another three examples, all of them thematic: *ke-ki-jo a-e-ri-qo-ta* in PY An 657.11-12, *pa-se-ri-jo ko-wo* in MY Oe 121.2 and *u-wa-si-jo ko-wo* in KN Ai(1) 115. In the first example, Duhoux interprets '*ke-ki-jo* (le fils) d'*a-e-ri-qo-ta*', although *ke-ki-jo* tends to be regarded as a patronymic adjective and *a-e-ri-qo-ta* as the son's name; in the second example, *pa-se-ri-jo ko-wo* can be interpreted either as Phasēlos' or Phasēlios' boy (*ko-wo* means 'boy'); in KN Ai(1) 115, it is probable that *u-wa-si-jo* does not modify *ko-wo*, see the text: *pa-ro u-wa-si-jo ko-wo* ['*chez Hṽansios, a boy*'].

ing name (Chadwick 1958, 290-291; Jiménez 2013; Killen 2015, 1109-1115).³⁴ In this regard, Pylian scribes use the temporal genitive and the nominative of rubric in almost the same proportion, cf. *ki-ri-ti-jo-jo* (PY Es 650.1, Hand 11), *me-tu-wo ne-wo<-jo>* (PY Fr 1202, Hand 2), *pa-ki-ja-ni-jo-jo me-no* (PY Fr 1224, Hand 2), *po-ro-wi-to-jo* (PY Tn 316.1, Hand 44), *po-ro-wi-to* (PY Fr 1218.1, 1221, 1232.1, Hand Cii).

It is also of interest to note that archaic endings should be found in the oldest Mycenaean tablets, those coming from the so-called Room of the Chariot Tablets, which according to Driessen (2008), might be datable to LM IIIA1 (ca. 1400 BC). Indeed, possible cases of 'archaic' genitive appear in two tablets found in that deposit: on the one hand, the man's name *pe-re-qo-ta* (Ce 50.1b, Hand 124-B), while another man's name *pe-se-ro-jo* (Ai(1) 63.a, Hand 124-B), in a tablet also found in the RCT, exhibits the normal thematic genitive ending; on the other hand, *wo-de-wi-jo* (V(2) 280.1), month name that is not followed by *me-no*, so it is perfectly understandable as a nominative of rubric. It must be noted that the linguistic characteristics of the tablets belonging to that deposit are sometimes innovative, like the dat. sg. *te-ra-po-ti* (F(1) 193), the name of a recipient of grain, with the inherited athematic locative ending /-i/ instead of the dative one /-ej/.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The nominative is the most common case of Mycenaean texts. This is due to a brachylogic style whose main goal is to convey a maximum amount of information through minimal effort. Verb forms tend to be absent, and a number of nouns have a graphic ending subject to different morphological interpretations. In the case of indisputable nominatives that cannot admit another interpretation, nominative of rubric is mostly an acceptable reading. The nominative form can also be incompatible with the syntactic function of the noun, but the context in which the tablets were written was specialised enough so as to minimise the import of such incongruities. Haplography and scribal mistakes are less appealing than they might seem given their relative frequency in Mycenaean texts. All in all, the use of the nominative case is related to a style adapted to the limits imposed by the writing surfaces and the linguistic economy of specialised media. It is true that those limits are not necessarily evident, yet the general context supports the interpretation of those graphic nominatives as nominatives of rubric rather than as archaic case forms.

The results of this paper are based on the Knossian examples. However, they can be extrapolated to other corpora since haplography, scribal mistakes, abbreviations and brachylogic style are phenomena common to the texts of every Mycenaean centre. All of these texts are written on similar surfaces and belong to the same sort of specialised media, but if archaic endings are expected, they should be mostly in Knossos given that the oldest documents come from its archives.

Acknowledgements

This paper has been written within the research project *Estudio diacrónico de las instituciones socio-políticas de la Grecia antigua y de sus manifestaciones míticas* (reference FFI2016-79906-P) funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness. The author wants to express his gratitude to Juan Piquero, Maurizio Del Freo, Michael F. Lane and an anonymous reviewer for their comments on previous versions.

³⁴ The corresponding nominative **me* is avoided according to the rule whereby monosyllables are limited to adjuncts and logograms, cf. Melena (2014, 125). Alberto Bernabé (in personal communication) thinks that the monosyllable should be acceptable in *scriptio continua*, cf. *mi-to-we-sa-e* /miltowessa en/ (KN Sd 4404.b), *to-so-pa* /tosson pan/ (KN Xd 7730.2, PY Ja 749, Jn 601.9, TH Ft 140.8), even though the result would be confusing and would diminish the explanatory force of the common noun, cf. **a-ma-ko-to-me*, **ka-ra-e-ri-jo-me*, **ra-pa-to-me*, **wo-de-wi-jo-me*.

Abbreviations

- CoMIK Chadwick J., Godart L., Killen J.T., Olivier J.-P., Sacconi A., Sakellarakis I.A., *Corpus of Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos*, vol. 1-4, Roma-Cambridge, 1986-1998.
- DELG Chantraine P., *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*, Paris, 1968-1980.
- DMic Aura Jorro F. *Diccionario Micénico*, vol. 1-2, Madrid, 1985-1993.
- EDG Beekes R.S.P., *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden, 2010.
- KT 6 Melena J.L., Firth R.J. *The Knossos Tablets*, sixth edition, Philadelphia, forthcoming.
- Mém. I Lejeune M., *Mémoires de Philologie Mycénienne. Première série (1955-1957)*, Paris, 1958.
- Mém. III Lejeune M., *Mémoires de Philologie Mycénienne. Troisième série (1964-1968)*, Paris, 1972.

References

- Bartoněk A. 2003, *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*, Heidelberg.
- Bécares Botas V. 1985, *Diccionario de terminología gramatical griega*, Salamanca.
- Bernabé A., Luján E. R. 2006, *Introducción al griego micénico: gramática, selección de textos y glosario*, Zaragoza.
- Buck C.D. 1955, *The Greek Dialects: Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary*, Chicago.
- Chadwick J. 1958, Error and Abnormality in the Mycenaean Noun-Declension, *PP* 13, 285-295.
- Chadwick J. 1976, *The Mycenaean World*, Cambridge.
- Chadwick J. 1996, *Lexicographia Graeca. Contributions to the Lexicography of Ancient Greek*, Oxford.
- Chantraine P. 1961, *Traité de morphologie grecque*, Paris.
- Del Freo M. 2005, *I censimenti di terreni nei testi in lineare B*, Pisa-Roma.
- Del Freo M. 2009, The Geographical Names in the Linear B Texts from Thebes, *Pasiphae* 3, 41-67.
- Del Freo M. 2016, Gli scribi micenei, in Del Freo M., Perna M. (eds), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*, vol. 1, Padova, 199-207.
- Driessen J. 2008, Chronology of the Linear B texts, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World*, vol. 1, Louvain-la-Neuve, 69-79.
- Duhoux Y. 2007, Le nom du 'fils' en linéaire B, in Lang F., Reinholdt C., Weilhartner J. (eds), ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΟΣ. *Archäologische Forschungen zwischen Nil und Istros. Festschrift für Stefan Hiller zum 65. Geburtstag*, Vienna, 95-103.
- Duhoux Y. 2008, Mycenaean Anthology, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World*, vol. 1, Louvain-la-Neuve, 243-293.
- Duhoux Y. 2017, Les patronymes en ... o et ... a des formules onomastiques mycéniennes: quel est leur cas?, in Hajnal I., Kölligan D., Zipser K. (eds), *Miscellanea Indogermanica. Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón*, Innsbruck, 151-172.
- Dunkel G. 2014, *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme. Band 2: Lexikon*, Heidelberg.
- Egetmeyer M. 2010, *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre. Volumes I: Grammaire & II: Répertoire des inscriptions en syllabaire chypre-grec*, Berlin-New York.
- García Ramón J.L. 2016, Il greco miceneo, in Del Freo M., Perna M. (eds), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*, vol. 1, Padova, 211-243.
- George C.H. 2005, *Expressions of Agency in Ancient Greek*, Cambridge.
- Hajnal I. 1995, *Studien zum mykenischen Kasussystem*, Berlin.
- Hajnal I. 2004, *e-ke-qe* oder *e-ke?* – Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit in den mykenischen Palastarchiven, in Krisch T., Lindner T., Müller U. (eds), *Analecta homini universali dicata. Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik, Linguistik, Philologie, Politik, Musik und Dichtung. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart, 146-178.
- Householder F.W. 1959, *pa-ro* and Mycenaean Cases, *Glotta* 38, 1-10.
- Jiménez Delgado J.M. 2011, Distribución y uso de los signos *76 (*ra*₂) y *68 (*ro*₂) en lineal B, in Carande R., López-Cañete D. (eds), *Pro tantis redditur. Homenaje a Juan Gil en Sevilla*, Zaragoza, 31-42.
- Jiménez Delgado J.M. 2012, El genitivo singular masculino en -a del griego micénico y el nominativo de rúbrica, *Kadmos* 51, 51-70.
- Jiménez Delgado J.M. 2013, A Note on the Mycenaean Thematic Genitive Ending of Month Names, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118, 111-123.
- Jiménez Delgado J.M. 2016, *Sintaxis del griego micénico*, Sevilla.

- Jiménez Delgado J.M. 2017, Mycenaean Words Related to $\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega$ and $\sigma\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\omega$. A Story of Conflation, *Indo-European Linguistics* 5, 1-18.
- Killen J.T. 1987, Bronzeworking at Knossos and Pylos, *Hermathena* 143, 61-72.
- Killen J.T. 1999, Some Observations on the New Thebes Tablets, *BICS* 43, 217-218.
- Killen J.T. 2006, Thoughts on the Functions of the New Thebes Tablets, in Deger-Jalkotzy S., Panagl O. (eds), *Die neuen Linear B-Texte aus Theben. Ihr Aufschlusswert für die mykenische Sprache und Kultur. Akten des internationalen Forschungskolloquiums an der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 5.-6. Dezember 2002*, Vienna, 79-110.
- Killen J.T. 2015, The Language of Religious Texts: Some Fresh Thoughts on Old Problems, in Del Frio M. (ed.), *Economy and Administration in Mycenaean Greece: Collected Papers on Linear B, vol. 3 (2004-2012)*, Roma, 1107-1134.
- Lane M.F. 2016, Returning to Sender: PY Tn 316, Linear B *i-je-to*, Pregnant Locatives, $*perH_3-$, and Passing between Mycenaean Palaces, *Pasiphae* 10, 38-89.
- Lasso de la Vega J.S. 1968, *Sintaxis griega*, Madrid.
- Lejeune M. 1972, *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*, Paris.
- Lejeune, M. 1976, Pré-mycénien et proto-mycénien, *BSL* 71, 193-206.
- Marazzi M. 2013, *Scrittura, epigrafia e grammatica egeo-micenea*, Roma.
- Maurice N. 1985, Fautes de scribes. Pour une critique verbale appliquée aux textes mycéniens, *Minos* 19, 29-50.
- Maziulis V. 2004, *Historical Grammar of Old Prussian. Translation from Lithuanian and comments by Dr. Letas Palmaitis*, available at < <http://donelaitis.vdu.lt/prussian/mazgr.pdf> >.
- Meier-Brügger M. 2004, Zu griechisch $\tau\rho\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ 'Käse', in Penney J.H.W. (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, Oxford, 254-257.
- Meissner T. 2008, Notes on Mycenaean Spelling, in Sacconi A., Del Frio M., Godart L., Negri M. (eds), *Colloquium Romanum, Atti del XII colloquio internazionale di micenologia, Roma, 20-25 febbraio 2006*, Pisa-Roma, 507-519.
- Melchert H.C. 2012, Genitive Case and Possessive Adjective in Anatolian, in Orioles V. (ed.), *Per Roberto Gusmani: studi in ricordo, vol. 2, Linguistica storica e teorica*, Udine, 273-286.
- Melena J.L. 1975, *Studies on Some Mycenaean Inscriptions from Knossos Dealing with Textiles*, Salamanca.
- Melena J.L. 2014, Mycenaean Writing, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World, vol. 3*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1-186.
- Moralejo Álvarez J.L. 2009, La flexión nominal griega: revisión crítica. El sincretismo, in *E-Excellence. Biblioteca Virtual (área de cultura y filología clásicas)*, available at < <http://www.liceus.com/cgi-bin/aco> >.
- Morpurgo A. 1960, Il genitivo miceneo e il sincretismo dei casi, *RendLinc* s. VIII/15, 33-61.
- Morpurgo A. 1961, Il genitivo maschile in -ας, *Glotta* 39, 93-111.
- Olander T. 2015, *Proto-Slavic Inflectional Morphology*, Leiden-Boston.
- Palaima T. 2000-2001, review of V.L. Aravantinos, L. Godart, A. Sacconi, *Thèbes. Fouilles de la Cadmée I. Les tablettes en linéaire B de la Odos Pelopidou. Édition et Commentaire* (Biblioteca di Pasiphae 1), Pisa-Roma 2001, *Minos* 35-36, 475-486.
- Palaima T. 2015, The Mycenaean Mobilization of Labor in Agriculture and Building Projects: Institutions, Individuals, Compensation, and Status in the Linear B Tablets, in Steinkeller P., Hudson M. (eds), *Labor in the Ancient World: A Colloquium Held at Hirschbach (Saxony), April 2005*, Dresden, 617-648.
- Pierini R. 2011, *Ricerche sulla desinenza del genitivo singolare tematico in Lineare B*, Ph.D. diss., University of Bologna.
- Plath R. 2014, *Der Streitwagen und seine Teile im frühen Griechischen: sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den mykenischen Texten und zum homerischen Epos*, Nürnberg.
- Ricciardelli G. 2006, I nomi di animali nelle tavolette di Tebe: una nuova ipotesi, *PP* 61, 241-263.
- Risch E. 1949, Griechische Determinativkomposita, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 59, 245-294.
- Risch E., Hajnal I. 2006, *Grammatik des mykenischen Griechisch*, available at <<http://www.uibk.ac.at/sprachen-literaturen/sprawi/mykgr.html>>.
- Ruijgh C.J. 1967, *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam.
- Ruijgh C.J. 1971, *Autour de 'te épique'. Études sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam.
- Ruijgh C.J. 1974, review of M. Ventris & J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*: 2nd edition by John Chadwick, Cambridge 1973, *Mnemosyne* 27, 187-192.
- Ruijgh C.J. 2011, Mycenaean and Homeric Language, in Duhoux Y., Morpurgo Davies A. (eds), *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek Texts and their World, vol. 2*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 253-298.

- Ruipérez M.S. 1987, Subjunctive Forms in Mycenaean Texts, in Ilievski P., Crepajac L. (eds), *Tractata Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies, Held in Ohrid (15-20 September 1985)*, Skopje, 323-331.
- Ruipérez M.S., Melena J.L. 1990, *Los griegos micénicos*, Madrid.
- Santiago Álvarez R.A. 1975, Mycenaean Locatives in *-e-u*, *Minos* 14, 110-122.
- Santiago Álvarez R.A. 2017, De nuevo sobre los nombres en *-eus* en micénico, in Hajnal I., Kölligan D., Zipser K. (eds), *Miscellanea Indogermanica, Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón*, Innsbruck, 745-757.
- Schwyzler E. 1939, *Griechische Grammatik. Band 1: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, München.
- Serrano Laguna I. 2013, Danzas de animales micénicas, in Bernabé A., Luján E.R. (eds), *Donum Mycenologicum. Mycenaean Studies in Honour of Francisco Aura Jorro*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 163-171.
- Sihler A.L. 1995, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, New York.
- Smyth H.W. 1920, *A Greek Grammar for the Colleges*, New York.
- Thompson R.J. 1997-1998, Dialects in Mycenaean and Mycenaean among the Dialects, *Minos* 31-32, 313-333.
- Thompson R.J. 1998, Instrumentals, Datives, Locatives and Ablatives: the *-phi* Case Form in Mycenaean and Homer, *PCPhS* 44, 219-250.
- Thompson R.J. 2002-2003, What the Butler Saw: Some Thoughts on the Mycenaean *o-ljo-* Particle, *Minos* 37-38, 317-336.
- Vilborg E. 1960, *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*, Göteborg.
- Weilhartner J. 2007, Die Tierbezeichnungen in den neuen Linear B-Texten aus Theben, in Alram-Stern E., Nightingale G. (eds), *Keimelion. Elitenbildung und elitärer Konsum von der mykenischen Palastzeit bis zur homerischen Epoche. Akten des Internationalen Kongresses vom 3. bis 5. Februar 2005 in Salzburg*, Vienna, 339-351.
- Wodtko D. 2003, *An Outline of Celtiberian Grammar*, available at < <https://freidok.uni-freiburg.de/data/747> >.

José Miguel Jiménez Delgado
Departamento de Filología Griega y Latina
Universidad de Sevilla
C/Palos de la Frontiera, s/n
41004 Sevilla
Spain
jmjimdelg@us.es