

Elena DŽUKESKA

UDK: 811.14'02'367.626(093.2)
Review article

NOTES ON THE EVIDENCE FOR THE INFLUENCE OF PRONOMINAL ON NOMINAL INFLEXION IN MYCENAEN ARCHIVES

Abstract:

The inflexion of pronouns varies in different Indo-European languages and so far, as it can be reconstructed, in the Proto-Indo-European it was different in several aspects from the inflexion of nouns and adjectives. In the course of time pronominal and nominal inflexions went through a process of mutual levelling. The analysis and comparison of the thematic and athematic nominal inflexions has shown that gendered pronouns played important role in the development of the thematic o-stem and eH₂-stem substantives.

The evidence of the Greek language for the relationship of pronouns and other nomina is significant and complex at the same time, bearing in mind the individual development of Greek dialects and the archaic features of the earliest Greek records found in Mycenaean archives.

The aim of this paper is to re-examine the evidence for the influence of pronominal on nominal inflexion found in Mycenaean Greek documents in the light of more recent studies and discuss its relevance for the earliest history of pronouns and nouns in the Greek language and the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European.

Keywords: *Pronominal Inflexion, Nominal inflexion, Mycenaean Greek*

Pronouns differ from all other nomina both in respect of their function and in respect of their inflexion. As to the case endings, personal pronouns are more distinct. The inflexion of gendered pronouns is closer to the nominal inflexion, but nevertheless it presents several specific features, such as: the absence of **-s* in masculine nominative singular, the use of the ending **-d* versus nominal **-m* in the neuter nominative-accusative singular, the use of the endings **-syo* and **-so* in masculine and neuter genitive singular as opposed to nominal **-es/-os/-s*, the use of the ending **-ōd* to distinguish masculine and neuter ablative from genitive singular, the use of the ending **-i* in nominative plural versus nominal **-es*, the use of genitive plural ending **-sōm* in contrast to nominal **-m*.¹ These originally pronominal endings were gradually introduced in the nominal inflexion, and played important role in shaping the paradigms of thematic *o*-stem and *eH*₂-stem substantives. The comparison of the thematic and athematic nominal inflexions suggests that of pronominal origin is probably also the use of the instrumental plural endings **-ōis*, **-āis* as opposed to nominal **-bh-/m-i*.²

The testimony of Indo-European languages to this process varies both in respect of the extent and the chronology. As regards Greek, a simple comparison of pronominal and nominal inflexions reveals a high degree of levelling. Differences are observable only in three cases: the masculine nominative singular, cf. *ὁ* and *λύκο-ς*, the nominative-accusative neuter, cf. *τὸ* and *ζυγό-ν* and the feminine nominative-accusative dual, cf. *τῶ* and *στέλ-ᾶ*. The in-depth analysis however raises several questions for discussion. The pronominal genitive singular ending **-syo*, cf. Hom. *τ-οῖο*, Skt. *t-āsya* was introduced in the inflexion of the *o*-stems, as it is obvious from the numerous examples found in Homer and in Pelasgiotis, Thessaly, cf. Hom. and Thess. *πολέμ-οιο* and with apocope of the final vowel, Thess. *τ-οῖ*, *Φιλομρότ-οι*. But, in the other Greek dialects, forms in *-οιο* are found only in poetry, in verses that echo Homeric epics. The regular ending of the genitive singular forms of the *o*-stem nomina including pronouns was in fact **-ō*, written as *O* in the oldest inscriptions, and later *-ω* or *-ου*. There has been extensive debate whether this ending should be interpreted as a phonological development from *-οιο* (<**-o-syo*)³ or from a different pronominal genitive

¹Beekes, 2011: 226-227 and Beekes, 1988: 75-78, 82-83; Meier-Brugger, 2003: 228-230; Sihler, 1995: 384-387; Rix, 1992: 183-184; Weiss, 2009: 337-339.

²Beekes, 2011: 186-189, 200-201, 212-213; Meier-Brugger, 2003: 198-200; Sihler, 1995: 250-251, 258-264, 271-275; Rix, 1992: 118-120, 132-134, 138-141; Weiss, 2009: 205-208.

³Brugmann, 1892: 584-585; Schwyzler, 1953: 555; Chantraine, 1984: 37-39; Risch, 1959: 221; Sihler, 1995: 259-260. The development of intervocalic *-sy-* in Greek differs from the development of other clusters consisting of *s* and a nasal, liquid or *w*, both regarding the compensatory lengthening of the previous vowel and the dialectal distribution. A detailed discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of this paper. If forms in *-ου* are from *-οιο* that would imply loss of intervocalic *-y-* and contraction of *-oo* (a stage confirmed by Homeric instances in *-ου* that have metrical value *-oo*) after *-sy-* was assimilated into *-yy-* and the first yod became part of a diphthong *οι*, see Lejeune, 1972: 132-133. An alternative explanation including compensatory lengthening, cf. **-osyo* > **-ohyo* > **-oyyo* in

singular ending **-o-so*, cf. *τε-ο* (*τέ-ο*) gen. sing. of the pronoun *τις* (*τίς*), O.Ch.Sl. *❧-❧-❧-❧*, Goth. *❧-i-s* and Goth. *wulf-is*, OHG *wolf-es*, gen. sing. of the noun *wulfs*, *wolf*, 'wolf'?⁴ And how are we to explain the parallel existence of two endings in the Greek language (regardless of whether the answer to the previous question is phonological or morphological one), especially in Homeric poetry, cf. 1801 forms in *-οιο* versus 1881 forms in *-ου* (Chantraine, 1973: 165)? An analysis conducted by M. S. Ruipérez shows that in Homer the ending *-οιο* appears more frequently in the nominal inflexion, whereas the ending *-ου* (with metrical value *-oo*) in the pronominal inflexion (Ruipérez, 1979: 289-291), which could be an argument in favour of the thesis that *-oo* is from **-o-so*, and not from **-o-yo* (<**-o-syo*) and that pronominal and nominal inflexions in Greek had different endings in the *o*-stem genitive singular. According to another analysis conducted by N. Maurice the percentage of genitive forms ending in *-ου* (with a metrical value *-ō* and irreducible to *-oo*) with ablative meaning is bigger in *Iliad* than in *Odyssey* which indicates that the distribution of the endings *-οιο* and *-ου* in the Homeric poems is also related to the syncretism of genitive with ablative (Maurice, 1992: 408), cf. ablatives in *-ω* in Greek dialects in which genitive singular ends in *-ου*, such as *ᾶ*, *ᾶπ-ω* (Locr.), *❧οίκ-ω* (Delph.).⁵

Another issue is whether the pronominal **-syo* was also introduced in the *eH₂*-stems inflexion. Masculine *eH₂*-stem nominals have different endings from the feminine nominals in nominative and genitive singular. As regards the genitive, they end in *-ου* only in Attic. The evidence of Homer and the other dialects, cf. *-ᾶο* (Hom, Boeot, Thess.), *-ᾶυ* (Arc. Cyp.), *-ᾶ* (Dor. Thess., Lesb.), *-εω*, *-ευ* (Hom., Ion.) points to *-ᾶο*. Did this ending originate on the analogy with the *o*-stems ending in *-οιο* or in *-oo* (<**-o-syo*)?⁶ Or the *eH₂*-stems genitive plural forms in *-ᾶων* (<**-ᾶ-sōm*) were the source of analogy?⁷ Is it not easier to explain *-ᾶο* at least from phonological point of view as an outcome of the pronominal ending **-so*?⁸

As regards the substitution of the nominal nominative and genitive plural endings **-es* and **-❧m* with the pronominal **-i* and **-sōm*, in all Greek dialects and

Lesbian and Thessalian and > **-ōyo* (> **-ōo* > **-ō*) in the other dialects, was proposed by Kiparsky, 1967: 629-633, see also Willi, 2008: 246-250. This, however, would imply that the numerous Homeric genitives in *-oo* were just artificially created forms for metrical reasons.

⁴Rix, 1992: 138; Ruipérez, 1979, 289-291.

⁵For a more detailed account of the interpretation of the *o*-stems genitive singular endings, see Džukeska, 2014: 107-109, 161-163.

⁶Schwyzler, 1953: 560; Szemerényi, 1987: 1083-1084; Morpurgo-Davies, 1968: 17 and n. 1; Sihler, 1995: 274-275; Willi, 2008: 255-260

⁷Risch, 1974: 118.

⁸Geiss, 1956: 143-144; Ruijgh, 1979: 72-73; Lillo, 1985: 254-255; Bader, 1992: 7. For a more detailed account of the different solutions proposed for resolving this problem, see Džukeska, 2014: 88-89.

in Homeric epics nominative plural forms of the *o*-stem and *eH₂*-stem nominals end in *-οι, -αι*, cf. *οί, τοί*, Skt. *té*, Goth. *þai*, O.Ch.Sl. *ъъ* and *λα-οί* (Hom. *Il.* 1.10); *αί, ται* and *αὐται Μοῦσαι ... κοῦραι* (Hom. *Il.* 2.597-598), whereas the genitive plural forms of the *eH₂*-stem nominals end in *-ᾶων* (Hom, Aeol., Dor.), *-εων* (Hom., Ion.) or *-ων*, cf. *τάων*, Skt. *t̥sam* and *κουράων* (Hom. *Il.* 6.247). Pronominal feminine nominative plural forms in **-i* seem to be unique for Greek, since other Indo-European languages confirm the use of the nominal ending **-es*, cf. Skt. *t̥s*, Goth. *þos*.

The decipherment of the Linear B script shed new light on the history of the Greek language and gave scholars an opportunity to re-evaluate many linguistic issues. Pronouns are attested to a limited extent in the Linear B records, due to their administrative nature. Only forms for third person are found and not all case forms occur. Nevertheless, Mycenaean evidence for gendered pronouns and their influence on nominal inflexion is unique and significant, especially because it comes from the middle of the second millennium BC.

Most frequent (more than 350 instances) are the pronouns *to-so*, *τόσ(σ)ος* and *to-so-de*, *τοσ(σ)όσδε*. Most of the forms are recorded in the Pylos and Knossos archives, but there are few instances in Thebes, Mycenae, Tiryns, Khania documents as well. The other pronouns such as, the demonstrative and anaphoric *ό, ή, τό* (< PIE **so-/to-*), 3rd person *μιν, σφεῖς*, possessive *ός*, emphatic *αὐτός*, relative *ός* and *όςτις*, indefinite *έτερος* are attested only in Pylos.⁹ Without entering into a detailed discussion of the pronominal forms, it is of significance to point out that Mycenaean documents testify to the continuity in the use of certain particles with the pronouns, such as *-δε, -νε*, cf. many instances of *to-so-de* and *to-so-ne* (MY Oe 118.1), to peculiarities in the creation of complex pronouns, cf. *to-so-pa* (PY Ja 749) (< *τόσ(σ)ος* and *πᾶς*), *to-so-ku-su-pa* (KN Fh 367) (< *τόσ(σ)ος* and *ξύμπας/σύμπας*), to the antiquity of specific pronominal forms, such as Att. *θάτερον*, Dor. *ᾄτερος* for *έτερος*, cf. Myc. *a₂-te-ro* (PY Ma 365.2), to the existence of pronominal stems with reduplication, cf. Myc. *to-to* (PY Aq 64.2.5.14.15) and Skt. *táttad* (< **so-/to-*), to the existence of pronominal case forms enlarged with the element *-sm-* (< **sem-/som-/s̥-*, 'one'), cf. Myc. *to-me* (PY Ep 613.8) (< **so-/to-*) and Skt. *tá-sm-ai*, Goth. *þa-mm-a*, O.Ch.Sl. *ъъ-ъъ-ъъ* (masc. neut. dat. sing.), Cret. *ῶτι-μ-ι*, Avest. *ka-hm-āi* (masc. fem. dat. sing.) (< **k^{uv}e-/k^{uv}i-*) and perhaps to the existence of pronominal forms enlarged with nominal case endings, cf. Myc. *to-e* (PY Eb 842.B), */tōi-ei/*, dat. sing.,¹⁰ and dat. plur. *σφί(ν)* and *σφί-σι*, acc. plur. *ἄμμε* (Aeol.) and *ήμέ-ας* (Ion. Att.), acc. sing. *τίν-α*.

⁹ For the instances, bibliography and possible interpretations of Mycenaean pronouns, see Dic. Mic. I, II s.v. and Supl. Dic. Mic. s.v., Milani, 1965: 405-440, Bartoněk, 2003: 343-345, Delgado, 2016: 101-109.

¹⁰ For a detailed account of possible interpretations of *to-e* and *to-me*, see Džukeska, 2012: 106-108. Mycenaean evidence is even more unique if these forms are instrumental rather than dative-locative, see Ruijgh, 1985: 132, f. 94; Hajnal, 1995: 138, f. 176.

As to the pronominal case endings and their use in the nominal inflexion, in the Mycenaean Greek documents *o*-stems genitive singular forms regularly end in *-o-jo*, masculine *eH₂*-stems genitive singular forms regularly end in *-a-o* and *eH₂*-stems genitive plural forms regularly end in *-a-o*. These endings have parallel in the post-Mycenaean *-οιο*, *-ᾶο*, *-ᾶων*. The number of instances and the fact that they belong to various semantic categories and that they are found in different archives, in documents written by different scribal hands show without doubt that their use in the nominal inflexion was already wide and regular in the Mycenaean period of the Greek language,¹¹ cf. *ku-ru-me-no-jo* (PY An(3) 654.1), */Klumenoygo/*, *Κλυμένοιο* (Hom. *Od.* 3.452), gen. of the personal name *Κλύμενος*, *te-o-jo*, */t^heoγγο/*, *θεοῖο* (Hom. *Il.* 1.53), gen. sing. of the common noun *θεός* in the phrase *te-o-jo do-e-ro*, */t^heoγγο doelos/*, *θεοῖο δοῦλος*, or *te-o-jo do-e-ra*, */t^heoγγο doelā/*, *θεοῖο δούλη*, ‘god’s servant’, *pu-ro-jo* (PY An(7) 129.4), */Puloygo/*, *Πύλοιο* (Hom. *Il.* 2.77), gen. of the place name *Πύλος*; *ne-wo-jo* (KN Fh 5506.b), */newoygo/*, *νέοιο* (Hom. *Il.* 17.36), gen. sing. of the adjective *νέος*, ‘young, new’; *su-qa-ta-o* (PY Ea 59.3), */sug^wōtā(h)o/*, Hom. *σβώτεω* (Hom. *Od.* 14.459), gen. sing. of *σβώτης*, ‘swineherd’, *pu-ra-ta-o* (PY Jn(1) 605.11), */Pulartā(h)o/*, *πυλάρταο* (Hom. *Il.* 8.367), gen. of a personal name *Πυλάρτης*, *e-ma-a₂-o* (KN D 411), */Hermāhā(h)o/*, *Ερμείαιο* (Hom. *Od.* 12.390), *Ερμᾶο* (Boeot.), gen. of the theonym *Ερμείας*, *Ερμᾶς* (<* *Ερμᾶς*); *e-re-ta-o* (PY Ad 684 lat.sup.), */eretāhōn/*, *ἐρετάων* (Hom. *Od.* 2.319), gen. plur. of *ἐρέτης*, ‘rower’; *ke-ke-me-no-jo* (PY Na(1) 395 lat.sup.), */k^(h)ek^hemenoygo/*, gen. sing. and *ke-ke-me-na-o* (PY Eb 297.2), */k^(h)ek^hemenāhōn/*, gen. plur. part. perf. of the verb **k^(h)ik^hēmi* (<**gheH₂-*), cf. *κιχάνω*, ‘reach’; *ko-to-na-o* (PY Eb 297.2), */ktoināhōn/*, gen. plur. of *κτοίνα*, ‘plot of land’; *a-ra-ka-te-ja-o* (PY Ad 677), */ālakateyāhōn/*, gen. plur. of fem. occupational term ‘spinner’, cf. *ἡλακάτη*, ‘distaff’; *ku-te-ra-o* (PY Ad 390), */Kut^herāhōn/*, gen. plur. fem. of an ethnic, cf. *Κύθηρα*, *Κυθήριος*.

The genitive singular *-o-jo* is the only ending attested with a high degree of certainty in the pronominal inflexion. The number of instances is small, just 5, but it is significant that all of them belong to different pronouns, cf. *to-jo* (PY Eb 156.2), */toygo/*, *τοῖο* (Hom. *Il.* 10.57), gen. sing. of *ὁ*, *τό*; *au-to-jo* (PY Eb 156.2), */autoygo/*, *αὐτοῖο* (Hom. *Il.* 9.193), gen. sing. of *αὐτός*, *αὐτόν*, *wo-jo* (PY Eb 472.B), */hwoygo/*, Hom. *οἷο* (Hom. *Il.* 3.333), gen. sing. of *ὅς*, *ὄν* and *to-so-jo* (PY Er 312.2.8), */tosoygo/*, gen. sing. of *τόσ(σ)ος*. Two Mycenaean forms *to-o* (PY Un 1321.3) and *to-so-o* (PY Xa(3) 1342.1) have been discussed as genitives in *-oo* and as possible evidence for the use of the ending **-so* in the pronominal inflexion in the Mycenaean period (Ruipérez, 1979: 283-284, 292; Bartoněk, 2003: 608 and n. 283). However, the possibility that these forms are mistakes remains strong (Ruipérez, 1979: 283 n. 2; Delgado, 2016: 104, 108).

¹¹ There are more than 280 instances of genitive singular forms in *-o-jo* in the archives of Pylos, Cnossos, Thebes, Mycenaee; more than 55 instances of genitive singular forms in *-a-o* in the archives of Pylos, Knossos, Thebes and more than 55 instances of genitive plural in *-a-o* in the archives of Pylos and Knossos. The fact that almost all of the genitive plural forms are found in Pylos is probably due to a chance.

There are no certain genitive singular forms ending in $-o$ ¹² in the nominal inflexion either, which would confirm the antiquity of Homeric forms in $-ov$ (with metrical value $-oo$). The widespread parallel use of the genitive singular forms in $-o-jo$ and $-a-o$ in the Mycenaean Greek records indicates that the ending $-\bar{a}o$ could not have been created neither on the analogy with $-oo$, nor with $-oio$. Any effort¹³ to maintain the explanation that it was derived from the pronominal $*-syo$ must account for the fact that alternative spellings for $-o-jo$ and $-a-o$ are missing from the tablets and that is exactly what one would expect if $-\bar{o}ho$ or $-\bar{a}yo$ existed in Mycenaean or pre-Mycenaean Greek, cf. $to-ro-o$, $/Tr\bar{o}h-os/$, gen. sing. of personal name $Tr\bar{o}\zeta$ and $ku-na-ja$, $/gunay\bar{a}/$, nom. sing. fem. of adj. $\gamma\nu\nu\alpha\bar{i}o\zeta$. Intervocalic s has already changed into h and was not written at all (except for the syllabogram a_2 , $/ha/$ and the absence of hiatus resolution), whereas intervocalic y was in a process of changing and was sometimes written and sometimes not. Conservative spelling is possible, but would it refer to a morphological category or rather to a phonetic law? The j -series was in fact consistently used to denote the outcome of intervocalic $-sy-$ (probably $-yy-$, preserved as $-t-$ in post-Mycenaean Greek) in different categories of words, cf. $a-ti-ke-ne-ja$, $/Antigeneyy\bar{a}i/$, dat. sing. of Ἀντιγενεία ($<\text{Ἀντιγενής}$); $to-ro-ja$, $/Troyya/$, nom. sing. ($<Tr\bar{o}\zeta$); $a-ra-ru-ja$, $/lararuyya/$, $\alpha\rho\alpha\rho\bar{v}\bar{i}a$, nom. sing. fem. part. perf. ($<*ar-$, $\alpha\rho\alpha\rho\bar{i}\sigma\kappa\omega$). It is also possible that Mycenaean scribes used j -series to denote h , but it is hardly possible that this use would be exclusive and consistent, cf. $a-ro_2-jo$ (KN So (1) 4437), once instead of expected $a-ro_2-o$, gen. sing. of comp. $/ary\bar{o}s/$, Post-Myc. $\alpha\rho\epsilon\bar{i}\omega\nu$ ($<*ar$), but otherwise $a-ro_2-a$, $/aryoha/$, nom. acc. neutr.; $a-ro_2-e$, $/aryohes/$, nom. plur. fem. masc. or $qe-te-jo$ (P \bar{Y} Fr 1206; 1241.1), $/k^{w}eitehon/$ besides $qe-te-o$, $/k^{w}eitehon/$, nom. acc. sing. and $qe-te-a$, $/k^{w}eiteha/$ or $qe-te-a_2$, $/k^{w}eiteha/$, nom. acc. plur. neutr. of a verbal adjective $<*k^{w}ei-$, cf. $\tau\bar{i}\nu\omega$. The two syllabic spelling, however allows for the interpretation of the ending $-a-o$ as $-\bar{a}ho$ ($<*-\bar{a}-so$).

Bearing in mind their antiquity it would be reasonable to ask whether it is possible to find in Mycenaean records evidence for the use of the nominal endings $-o\zeta$, $-\bar{a}\zeta$, $-\omega\nu$ instead of pronominal $-oio$, $-\bar{a}o$, $-\bar{a}\omega\nu$ in the inflexion of o -stems and eH_2 -stems? Indeed in a number of contexts of genitive singular, forms ending in $-o$ or $-a$ occur, which could be interpreted as archaic genitives in $-o\zeta$, cf. Hitt. $-as$ and $\Theta\epsilon\bar{i}\acute{o}\sigma\text{-}\delta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\zeta$ (Boeot.), $[\Theta]e\bar{o}\rho\text{-}\delta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\zeta$ (Thess.) versus $\Theta\epsilon\bar{o}\text{-}\delta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\zeta$ (Bader, 1992: 6) or in $-\bar{a}\zeta$, cf. $\text{Προκλείδα}\zeta$ (Akarn.).¹⁴ But, these forms are found both in Knossos and

¹²For a full survey and discussion of forms ending in $-o$ and their possible interpretation as genitive singular forms see Lejeune, 1965: 15-17; Ruipérez, 1979: 283-284; Džukeška, 2014: 132-134.

¹³For a more recent survey and discussion of different solutions offered to resolve this problem and for the interpretation of $-o-jo$ as conservative spelling for $*-\bar{o}ho$, see Willi, 2008: 240-245, 251-254.

¹⁴For a full survey and analysis of Mycenaean forms in $-a$ see Hajnal, 1995: 99-102 and Džukeška, 2014: 98-99. For the forms in $-o$ see Thompson, 2017: 575-588; Delgado, 2013: 111-123 and Džukeška, 2014: 135-141.

in Pylos and it is not possible to ascribe them to a more archaic Linear B material. Mycenaean spelling is ambiguous and endings *-o* and *-a* could also be interpreted as nominatives, datives, locatives, ablatives, instrumentals, if not mistakes and certainly if they denote semantic roles which can be expressed with more than one case, such as Time or Origin.

A very significant aspect of the Mycenaean evidence for the influence of pronominal on nominal inflexion and for the reconstruction of Proto-Indo-European is the absence of certain genitive forms with ablatival meaning.¹⁵ Particularly striking is the small number of place names in genitive and genitive phrases with prepositions. In Post-Mycenaean Greek all genitive endings are also used to denote separation from source, a semantic role typically expressed with ablative. This was clearly not the case in Mycenaean Greek, cf. Pylos tablet An 1, where rowers from several places, *ro-o-wa*, *ri-jo*, *po-ra-pi*, *te-ta-ra-ne*, *a-po-ne-we* are going to Πλευρώων, *e-re-ta*, *pe-re-u-ro-na-de*, *i-jo-te*, *leretai Pleurōnade iyontes*. The absence of genitive endings *-oc*, *-oio*, *-ων*, *-αων* is obvious. Considering the parallel use of the instrumental plural ending *-pi*, */-p^hi/* in the athematic inflexion, *o*-stem and *eH₂*-stem place names ending in *-a* and *-o* could be instrumental-ablative forms as well. But, if isolated ablative forms in *-ω* (**-ōd*) are still preserved in post-Mycenaean Greek and if the pronominal ending *-oio*, was already introduced in the nominal inflexion, it is reasonable to assume that at least some of the Mycenaean *o*-stems forms in *-o* were ablatives in *-ōd* (Ilievski 1961: 61-62, 68-70).

As regards the instrumental plural, Mycenaean Greek documents provide evidence which is even more important and unique. The nominal ending *-φι*, Myc. *-pi*, */-p^hi/* (*<*b^hi*), which in Homeric epics is found only in adverbs with various semantic values, in Mycenaean was regularly used as instrumental plural ending in the athematic and *eH₂*-stems inflexions. Its frequent occurrence in lists with place names in opposition to dative-locative *-σι*, Myc. *-si*, */si/* (*<*si*) and *-αισι*, Myc. *-a-i*, */-aihi/* (*<*aisi*) indicates that it was used to denote not only instrumental functions, but also semantic roles usually expressed with ablative, such as separation or origin (Ilievski, 1961: 24-37).¹⁶ The regular use of a different instrumental ending *-οις*, Myc. *-o*, */-ois/* (*<*-ōis*) in opposition to dative-locative *-οισι*, Myc. *-o-i*, */-oihi/* (*<*oisi*) in the *o*-stems inflexion was probably due to the

¹⁵ For a survey of syntactical and semantic values of Mycenaean genitive see Delgado, 2016: 59-70 and Džukeska, 2014: 167-181.

¹⁶ Two instances of *-pi* on the tablet TH Uq 434 (discovered during 1993-1995 excavations in Thebes), especially the occurrence of *qa-si-re-u-pi*, an instr. plur. of βασιλεύς in a phrase with the preposition *pa-ro*, *παρά* and *te-qa-jo-i*, a dat.loc. plur. of an ethn. adj. Θηβαίος seem to challenge this view and show that the instrumental had begun to syncretize with dative-locative in Mycenaean. For a full list of research studies published on this issue see Suppl. Dic. Mic. s.v. *qa-si-re-u*, *te-qa-jo-i*. It is important to observe however, that in this case the form in *-pi* is not a place name, but a term denoting official title and possibly denoting semantic role that can be expressed with more than one case. Nevertheless, regardless of these two cases, the numerous genitive forms without ablatival function in Mycenaean archives present evidence for the case syncretism that cannot be dismissed as yet.

influence of pronominal inflexion. The irregular occurrence of forms such as *e-re-pa-te-jo-pi* instead of *e-re-pa-te-jo* (KN Se 891.A.B), instr. plur. of a material adjective *ἐλεφάντειος and *qe-qi-no-me-na* (PY Ta 707.2; 708.2), instr. plur. of a verbal adjective *qe-qi-no-me-no* next to *e-re-pa-te-ja-pi* and *e-re-pa-te-jo* in the same entries, indicates that the analogy between *o*-stems and *eH₂*-stems which finally led to the creation of instrumental forms in *-αις* next to those in *-οις* was already under way. Furthermore, Linear B tablets confirm that the ending *-φι* was once also used in the dual, cf. *du-wo-u-pi* (PY Ep 704.7), */d(u)woiumpi/* referring to *ke-ke-me-no*, *ko-to-no*, *dwo* (PY Eb 338.B) */k^(h)ek^hemenō ktoinō d(u)wō/*, 'two plots of communal land'.¹⁷

Finally, the nominative plural forms of the *o*-stems and *eH₂*-stem substantives ending in *-o* and *-a* are ambiguous. But, the optional use of the syllabogram *33, */rai/*, */lai/* in the Pylos archive in contexts that imply nominative plural confirms that the pronominal ending **-i* has already been introduced in the nominal inflexion in the Mycenaean period of the Greek language, cf. *pi-je-ra₃*, *to-qi-de-ja* *200^{ms} 3 (PY Ta 709.1), */p^hiyelai tork^wideyai 3/*, '3 dishes with spiral decoration', *di-te-ra₃*, *e-ru-ta-ra* 1[6] (PY Ub(-) 1315.1), */dip^ht^herai erut^hrai 16/*, 'red skins 16'.

This is additionally confirmed by the use of the dual nominative-accusative ending *-ω*, Myc. *-o* in the inflexion of feminine *eH₂*-stems, cf. *i-qi-jo*, *mi-to-we-sa*, *a-ra-ro-mo-te-me-na* ... CUR 2 (KN Sd 4415.b) */ (h) i k w i y o m i l t o w e n s a i a r a r (h) m o t m e n a i ... CUR 2/*, '2 chariots red colored, fitted together ...'; *to-pe-zo* ... *e-ne-wo-pe-zo*, *to-qi-de-jo*, *a-ja-me-no* ... 2 (PY Ta 715.3), */torpeg^wō ... en(n)ewopeg^wō tork^wideyō ayaimenō ... 2/*, '2 tables ... with nine legs, with spiral decoration, inlaid ...'. This ending was probably introduced in the nominal inflexion from the pronominal *o*-stems, cf. τὼ (Sihler, 1995: 273) to replace the original feminine nominal dual ending **-ai* (<**eH₂-iH*), cf. Skt. *ásv-e* 'two mares', OCS. *двѣ* 'two women',¹⁸ which became identical with the nominative plural **-ai*. In the Post-Mycenaean period a new ending *-ā* was created again on the analogy of the *o*-stems. Mycenaean evidence on this issue is important because it confirms the continuity and antiquity of isolated post-Mycenaean dual forms such as *μεγάλ-ω* (Att.), *καλυψαμέν-ω*, (Hesh. E198), *δραχμά-ω* (Boeot.), *καταστάτ-ω* (Elean). Both in Knossos and in Pylos next to the forms in *-o*, forms in *-a* are used in context of dual. An analysis reveals (Džukeska, 2005) that forms in *-a* were twice more frequently used in nouns, whereas forms in *-o* in adjectives and participles, which could be an indication that the ending **-ō* was first introduced in the inflexion of the adjectives and an argument in favour of the role of gendered pronouns in the development of *o*-stem and *eH₂*-stem nominals.

¹⁷ For full survey of instances, interpretation and bibliography see Dic. Mic. I s.v.

¹⁸ Schwyzler, 1953: 557; Beekes, 2011: 217; Sihler, 1995: 273; Rix, 1992: 135.

REFERENCES:

1. Bader, F. (1992). 'Problématique du génitif thématique: illustrations mycéniennes et homériques'. In Olivier, J.-P. (ed.), *Mykenaïka. Actes du IX^e Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens organisé par le Centre de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine de la Fondation Hellénique des Recherches Scientifiques et l'École française d'Athènes* (Athènes, 2-6. X. 1990). *Suppl. BCH* 25, 1-17.
2. Bartoněk, A. (2003). *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
3. Beekes, R. S. P. (2011). *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*, revised and corrected by M. de Vaan, Rev. ed. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
4. Beekes, R. S. P. (1988). 'The origin of the Indo-European pronominal inflection'. In Jazayery, M. A., and Winter, W. (eds.), *Studies in honor of Edgar C. Polomé*. Berlin – New York – Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter, 73-87.
5. Brugmann, K. (1892). *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen II₂*. Straßburg: Karl J. Trübner.
6. Chantraine, P. (1984). *Morphologie historique du grec*. 2e édition revue et augmentée. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
7. Chantraine, P. (1973). *Grammaire homérique I*. 2e édition. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
8. Delgado, J.M.J. (2013). 'A note on the Mycenaean thematic genitive ending in month names'. *IF* 118, 111-124.
9. Delgado, J.M.J. (2016). *Sintaxis del griego micénico*. Sevilla: Editorial Universidad de Sevilla.
10. *Dic. Mic. I, II* = F. Aura Jorro & F. R. Adrados *Diccionario micénico*. Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 1985-1993.
11. *Supl. Dic. Mic.* = F. Aura Jorro et al. *Suplemento al Diccionario micénico*. Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas, 2020.
12. Džukeska, E. (2005). 'Za formite na nom.akuz. dual kaj ženskiot rod od a-osnovite vo mikenskiot grčki', *Systasis* 6.
13. Džukeska, E. (2012). 'Grčkata zamenka ó, ῥ, τό vo mikenskiot period'. *Godišen zbornik na FZF* 65, 105-112.
14. Džukeska, E. (2014). *Formite na genitiv singular vo mikenskiot grčki i vo ajolskite dijalekti*. Skopje: Univerzitet "Sv. Kiril i Metodij", Filozofski fakultet – Skopje.
15. Geiss, H. (1956). 'Zum Genetiv der Masculina der ā-Deklination auf –āo', *Glotta* 35, 142-144.
16. Hajnal, I. (1995), *Studien zum mykenischen Kasussytem*, Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.
17. Ilievski, Petar Hr. (1961). *Ablativot, instrumentalot i lokativot vo najstarite grčki tekstovi*. *ŽA Monographs* 2.
18. Kiparsky, P. (1967) 'Sonorant Clusters in Greek', *Language* 43.3, 619-635.

19. Lejeune, M. (1965). 'Le génitif singulier thématique', *RPh* 39, 14-20.
20. Lejeune, M. (1972). *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
21. Maurice, N. (1992). 'Le génitif singulier thématique dans l'épopée: difficultés de scansion et contribution du grec mycénien'. In Olivier, J.-P. (ed.), *Mykenaïka. Actes du IX^e Colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens organisé par le Centre de l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine de la Fondation Hellénique des Recherches Scientifiques et l'École française d'Athènes* (Athènes, 2-6. X. 1990). *Suppl. BCH* 25, 407-409.
22. Meier-Brügger, M. (2003). *Indo-European Linguistics*, with contributions by M. Fritz, M. Mayrhofer. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.
23. Milani, C. (1965). 'I pronomi nel greco dell'età micenea', *Aevum* 39, 405-440.
24. Morpurgo-Davies, A. (1968). 'Gender and the Development of the Greek Declensions', *TPhS*, 12-36.
25. Risch, E. (1959). 'Frühgeschichte der griechischen Sprache', *MH* 16, 215-227.
26. Rix, H. (1992). *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges.
27. Ruipérez, M.S. (1979). 'Le génitif singulier thématique en mycénien et en grec du premier millénaire'. In Risch, E., Mühlestein, H. (eds.), *Colloquium Mycenaeanum. Actes du sixième colloque international sur les textes mycéniens et égéens* (Chaumont sur Neuchâtel, 7 – 13. IX. 1975). Neuchâtel – Genève: Faculté des lettres – Librairie Droz, 283-293.
28. Ruijgh, C. J. (1979). 'La morphologie du grec', *SMEA* 20, 69-89.
29. Ruijgh, C. J. (1985). 'Problèmes de philologie mycénienne', *Minos* 19, 105-167.
30. Sihler, A. L. (1995). *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. New York – Oxford: Oxford University Press.
31. Schwyzler, E. (1953). *Griechische Grammatik I*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
32. Szemerényi O. (1987). *Scripta Minora III*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
33. Thompson, R. J. (2017). 'The Mycenaean o-stem Genitive Singular in -o: A re-evaluation'. In Nosch, M.-L. and Landenius Enegren, H. (eds.), *Aegean Scripts. Proceedings of the 14th International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies. Copenhagen, 2-5 September 2015*. Vol. II. Roma: Istituto di Studi sul Mediterraneo Antico (Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche), 575-588.
34. Weiss, M. (2009). *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor – New York: Beech Stave Press.
35. Willi, A. (2008). 'Genitive problems: Mycenaean -Ca-o, -Co-jo, -Co vs. later Greek -āo, -οιο, -ου'. *Glotta* 84, 239-272.