The supposed thematic genitive in -(C)o in Mycenaean: a mirage

José L. García Ramón

1.[*]

A series of forms of the -o-stems in -o, properly -(C)o (so in what follows), are often attested where one would expect a gen.sg. -(C)o-jo. Both can even co-occur by the same scribe and without any recognisable difference, e.g.:

KN Da 1156

.a we-we-si-jo ovis^m 100   (J1; 117)

.b a-re-ke-se-u , / pa-i-to

KN Db 1159

.a we-we-si-jo-jo ovis^m 144 ovis^f 55[(J1; 117)

.b du-ta-so , / pa-i-to

The evidence for the 'genitives' in -(C)o, as masterly discussed by Anna Morpurgo Davies,[1] has been enlarged by the texts from Thebes,[2] which provide us with decisive evidence for forms in -(C)o of man's names before i-jo, i-*65 'son' and variants.

---

[*] It is a pleasant duty to thank Artemis Karnava (Rhethymno), Torsten Meißner (Cambridge), H. Craig Melchert (North Carolina) and José L. Melena (Vitoria) for their suggestions, remarks and criticism.

[1] MORPURGO DAVIES 1960.

[2] *FdC* I, 2001.

The dossier of the assumed thematic 'genitive' in *-(C)o* is not univer-sally agreed:[3] some of the instances may be explained as scribal errors, or as haplography (as is the case of the stems in *-iio*, cf. 2.), others are not necessarily genitives, and others, which should be taken into ac-count (e.g. *si-to°* in *si-to-po-ti-ni-ja*, 6) are not. On the other hand, it does not seem possible to state a chronological evolution or relevant dif-ferences between the different centres for the use of *-(C)o* or *-(C)o-jo*.[4] The major question remains, in any case, how the form underlying *-(C)o* may be accounted for: either as a proper case ending, namely a variant of the genitive (for which imaginary correspondences with Hittite gen. *-aš* and Hispano-Celtic gen.sg. -o have been invoked, cf. 3.), or that of a different case (namely an early ablative *-ōd*, as already proposed by Morpurgo Davies and, with partly different views, by Ivo Hajnal,[5] even if *-(C)o* and *-(C)o-jo* appear as interchangeable), or as mere occasional forms raised under conditions which may vary from one instance to the other – and must be accounted for case by case. The *vexata quaestio* defies any attempt at a definitive interpretation, as two recent overviews and their respective proposals make evident.[6]

Whether a real genitive ending spelled as *-(C)o* does actually exist remains an open question.[7] It is well possible that *-(C)o* does not conceal any ending, not even an asyntactic nominative of rubric, but simply the bare stem in */-o-/* of the different terms, simply because the context is transparent and the ending becomes unnecessary. This point was made *en passant* by John Chadwick *à propos* the syntactic incoherences in the **D**-tablets of Cnossos ("since the role of this person is sufficiently indicated by the position of his name in the tablet, it is of little consequence whether its syntax is fully expressed or not …")[8] or by Duhoux on *ka-ra-e-ri-jo me-no* ("simple yuxtaposition de termes, non accordés syntaxiquement… ,"

---

[3] The figures in Thompson 2017, 583 (dossier, 586-587), namely 25 stems (36 tokens), of which 14 stems (24 tokens) are in *-iio-*, are only indicative, and depend on the interpretations of the individual forms, which are not always compelling.

[4] Morpurgo Davies 1960, 53. There is apparently no direct connection between *-(C)o* and any scribe in particular (cf. 2., 5.).

[5] Hajnal 1995.

[6] Duhoux 2017; Thompson 2017.

[7] *Recte* Lejeune 1972a, 17-18: "…dans la mesure où il existerait authentiquement de tels génitifs en …o."

[8] Chadwick 1958, 287 ("an alternation of this kind is not only possible; it is natural"); Duhoux 2017, 168 and n. 82 (on *we-we-si-jo*).

cf. 4.).[9] This approach is surely right, as this paper will try to show.

The present contribution will not get into the discussion of the forms which remain obscure, and/or have been explained otherwise or simply as scribal errors by earlier research (cf. 2.), to which I have nothing to add. There will be no attempt at a doxography or at a discussion of the different interpretations proposed for *-(C)o*, which are indeed all incompatible with that proposed here.[10] Only some egregious misunderstandings, which periodically reappear, will be briefly pointed out (cf. 3.). I shall focus on the evidence for *-(C)o* in specific formulas, namely those with month names (with or without *me-no*, cf. 5.) and with personal names governed by substantives of the type *o-pa* (cf. 6.), where gen. *-(C)o-jo* is attested as well, and those with father's name and *i-jo*, *i-*65* and variants in Thebes (cf. 7.).

<p style="text-align:center">2.</p>

The instances of *-(C)i-jo* for the genitive of stems in **-ii̯o-* (mostly proper names), which are otherwise attested as *-(C)i-jo-jo* even by the same scribe (e.g. *we-we-si-jo* and *we-we-si-jo-jo* cf. 1.) are not conclusive by themselves, as they may reflect haplography, e.g. *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* , '*me-no*' (of *ka-ra-e-ri-jo**) beside *de-u-ki-jo-jo* , *me-no* or *di-wi-jo-jo* , *me-no* (KN: all Hand 219), or *wo-de-wi-jo* , *me-no* (KN: Hand 138) beside *wo-de-wi̯-jo-jo* , *me-ṇo* (KN: Hand 219) of *wo-de-wi-jo** /wṛdēwio-/ '(month) of roses' (cf. 5.), among others. The same applies to *-(C)a-jo* instead of **-(C)a-jo-jo* of nouns in **-aii̯o-*,[11] e.g. *e-te-wa-jo* , *wo-ka* beside *e-te-wa-jo-jo* , *wo-ka* (PY, both Hand 26) of the MN *e-te-wa-jo** /Etewaios/ (cf. 6.) or the MN *u-ta-jo* beside *u-ta-jo-jo* (KN; both Hand 117).

Haplography is surely plausible, and supported by several instances, but does not obviously apply to other **-o*-stems. In any case, that the supposed 'genitives' in *-(C)o* rely on a generalisation starting from the

<hr>

[9] Duhoux 1968, 784 (also 781-782 on *ka-ke-we* , *a-ḳe-te* [**PY Jn(1) 832**.9, as against .1 *ka-ke-we-te*, *a-ke-te-re*).

[10] Reference is made once and for all to the overviews by Duhoux 2017, 157-161; Thompson 2017, 576-579.

[11] The occurrence of *-(C)i-jo* for **-(C)i-jo-jo* in father's mentions preceding *i-jo* 'son' might reflect a haplography (as *-(C)a-jo* for **-(C)a-jo-jo*), as well as the bare stem form (cf. 6.).

stems in *-ii̯o- is hardly conceivable.[12] The possibility of haplology remains valid, even if one admits that the ending is superfluous in some contexts (cf. 5.-7.), but indemonstrable.

3.

On the assumption that -(C)o conceals, at least in some instances, a proper case ending, which must be elucidated, the interpretation as the outcome of the inherited ablative *-ōd (: Ved. -ād) perfectly fits into what we can assume for the prehistory of Greek. The fact that no functional difference may be stated between -(C)o and -(C)o-jo),[13] and that both endings are interchangeable as are e.g. -οισ(ι) ~ -οις in Homer, may suggest that the ablative had undergone syncretism with the genitive (*-osi̯o) already in Mycenaean times, as shown by Morpurgo Davies, or, in the alternative proposal by Hajnal, that it has partially merged with instrumental *-ō (*-oh$_1$), and lives on only in the separative and partitive uses of genitive and the expressions of time,[14] where it is concurrenced by gen. -(C)o-jo. These possibilities, which are in many respects complementary, are of major interest for the prehistory of Greek, but do not necessarily apply to the Mycenaean facts. It is certainly possible that some forms in -(C)o still conceal ablatival /-ō/ or even /-ōd/, and that the syncretism of genitive and ablative is not yet complete in Mycenaean.[15] Anyway, attempts to explain the use of forms in -(C)o for the expression of time (with month names) or of filiation (with father's name followed by a term for 'son')[16] as the reflexes of the pre-syncretic separative ab-

---

[12] *Pace* Thompson 2017, 586 ("the -o genitives arise by a number of kinds of scribal errors, one of which, haplography, is very likely to affect stems in -io-").

[13] Cf. Morpurgo Davies 1960: 42-3 ("due forme di genitivo"), 54 ("che … l'ablativo sia ancora vitale come caso a sé non sembra possibile" (54) this indication is not clear in quei nessi sintattici per cui la grammatica comparata riconstruisce determinazioni di ablativo … da un esame risulta che ciò non si verifica").

[14] Hajnal 1995, 260; already in Morpurgo Davies 1960, 53-54.

[15] García Ramón 2016, 225. Full syncretism would indeed imply the use of -o-jo in ablative function, which is not the case (Hettrich 1985, 116).

[16] That the forms in -(C)o in patronymic formulas may conceal a former ablative (Morpurgo Davies 1960, 55 n. 60; Duhoux 2008, 353-360; 2017, 154-156 ["usage virtuellement isolé"]) with reference to J. S. Speijer and his 1886 *Sanskrit syntax*, 16) is not supported by comparison: the case for the expression of filiation in Vedic is actually the genitive, cf. the onomastic formulas with putrá- (rudrásya RV 6.66.3a, asurásya 10.10.2c) and sūnú- (indrásya 4.37.4c). The ablative occurs only with 'born (from)' (e.g. Manu 10.64 śūdrāyām brāhmaṇāj jātaḥ), and the occasional occurrence of abl. amuṣmāt for gen. *amuṣya in the formula amuṣmāt putram 'one's son' (amum amuṣyām amuṣyāyanam amuṣmāt putram MS 3.3.5) is of no relevance for Mycenaean.

lative are unnecessary: the tablets do not allow to state a difference between separative-instrumental uses (-*(C)o*) and adnominal (-*(C)o-jo*), and the overall situation in Mycenaean, regardless of the instances of unexpected -*(C)o,* is so similar to that of 1st-millennium Greek as to let assume that comparison might help.

On the other hand, the assumption that the forms in -*(C)o* have correspondences in other Indo-European languages are untenable. The supposed thematic 'genitive' in -*(C)o* of Mycenaean has been assumed to reflect Proto-Indo-European *-*o-s*,[17] and to have a perfect match in gen.sg. -*aš* in Hittite, in Palaic and partly in Hieroglyphic Luvian.[18] This is far from compelling. It is true that Hitt.-Pal.-HLuv. gen.sg. -*aš* may be traced back to *-*os*, this being the genitive of the synchronic paradigm of inherited *-*o*-stems (e.g. *antuḫša-* c. 'human being, man:' *$^{*}en$-d^huh_2-s-ó-* 'one who has spirit in himself'): the form is synchronically identical to those of the nominative singular commune (*-*o-s*) and of the dative-locative plural (PIE *-*os*, previous to Core Indo-European *-*b^h-os/*-m-os*), but this 'homonymie fâcheuse,' which may be partly modified by the effect of accentuation rules in Hittite, is possible in a paradigm and may be avoided within the phrase syntax.[19] However, Hitt. -*aš* conceals not only the outcome of a putative PIE gen.sg. *-*o-s*, but also that of gen.sg. *-*éh_2-es* (or earlier *-*éh_2-s*) after the merging of the inherited *-*o*- and *-*eh_2*- stems in the new, synchronically uniform -*a*-stems of the Anatolian languages (with the exception of Lycian), subsequent to the remodeling of the PIE nominal inflection in Anatolian.[20] The inherited *-*eh_2*- stems, e.g. *ḫāšša-* 'hearth, fire-place'(: lat. *āra* 'id.'), ^{GIŠ}*ḫišša-* 'carriage pole' (: Ved. *īṣā́-* 'id.') are remodelled within the new -*a*-inflection in several respects: adoption of /-s/ from the *-*o*-stems in nom.sg. -*aš* (noted -*(C)a-aš* <*(C)a-aš*), elimination of -*ḫ(ḫ)*- (*-*h_2*-) in the oblique cases (gen. -*aš*, dat.-loc. -*i* instead of expected gen. *-*aḫḫaš*, dat.-loc. *-*aḫḫi*) by remaking after nom. -*aš*, acc.sg. -*an*. The original

---

[17] The case ending is assumed to underlie alph.Gk. Θεός-δοτος, Λυκός-ουρα (cf. Bader 1992, 4-10; Duhoux 2017, 166 with n. 55).

[18] The genitive is expressed by reflexes of *-*osio* and *-*e/oso* (with nouns) in 'Luvic' dialects and/or has been replaced in some uses by an inflected possessive adjective (CLuv. -*ašša/i-*), which lives on residually in some lexicalized items in Hittite, in Palaic and Hieroglyphic Luvian (Melchert 2012, 274-275).

[19] The same applies, for instance, to Lat. *domī, humī*, which conceal gen.sg. *-*ī*, as well as nom.pl. *-*oi̯,* and loc.sg. *-*o-i*.

[20] This crucial point is already pointed out by Morpurgo Davies 1960, 52.

difference between gen.*/-ǎs/ (*-o-stems, athematic stems) and */-ās/ (*-eh$_2$-stems) is concealed by Hittite accentuation rules. Alternatively, an extension of the outcomes of athematic gen. *-os (and *-s) to the synchronically unitary *-a-stems is equally possible,[21] as it is the case with dat.-loc.sg. -i, abl. -az, or allat. -a. Hitt.-Pal. (partly Luv.) -aš may thus be explained as an Anatolian innovation after the merging of *-o- and *-eh$_2$-stems.

Hispano-Celtic -o /-ŏ/, actually attested in personal names, is surely a specific innovation, against other branches of Continental Celtic, which has nothing to do with Hittite -aš nor with Mycenaean.[22] The creation of gen.sg. /-ŏ/ goes back to a proportional analogy based upon (a) the genitive singular of the -ā- stems (PCelt. *-ās) or (b) the pronominal genitive plural (PCelt. *-oi̯sōm, cf. Hisp.-Celt. soisum) in syntagms where (a) and (b) coexist with the thematic gen.sg. *-oi̯so (created after gen.pl. *-oi̯sōm).[23]

As to (a): gen.sg.   *sosi̯ās bnās   analyzed as   *sosi̯ā.s bnā.s
         gen.sg.   *soi̯so u̯ir-ī   analyzed as   *s.oi̯s.o u̯ir-ī, whence

→ u̯ir.o

As to (b): gen.pl.   *soi̯sōm u̯irōm   analyzed as   *s.oi̯s.ōm u̯ir.ōm
         gen.sg.   *soi̯so u̯ir-ī   analyzed as   *s.oi̯s.o u̯ir.ī, whence

→ u̯ir.o,[24]

or simply (a) *sosi̯ās bnās :: *soi̯so u̯ir-ī → u̯ir-o, (b) pl. *soi̯sōm u̯irōm ::

sg. *soi̯so u̯ir-ī, whence u̯ir-ī → u̯ir-o.[25]

In conclusion, the gen.sg. Hisp.-Celt. -o /-ŏ/ is an innovation that cannot even be traced back to continental Celtic.

---

[21] Cf. Lejeune 1972a, 18, with the reservation "sans parallèles dans ce que nous connaissons du grec ultérieur."

[22] Eska 1995, 37-40 (against an inherited ablative singular in *-ōd, with discussion of other views).

[23] As demonstrated by Eska 1995, 42 ("crossing with the descendants of *-oi̯sōm").

[24] Originally (a) as per Eska 1995, 40, (b) as per Watkins in 1999 (apud 2001, 222). Both (a) and (b) are accepted in Eska-Wallace 2001, 90-91 and Watkins 2001, 222-223 (2008, 3.999-1000).

[25] (a) as per Prosdocimi 1991, 158-159; (b) as per Watkins 2001, 223 (2008, 3.1000).

4.

In my opinion, attempts to explain the alleged forms of gen.sg. in -*(C)o* in terms of case-form are hopeless. Leaving aside those which are unsure or simply scribal errors and the instances of stems in *-iịo-*, which may be due to haplography (cf. 2.), the evidence is limited to constructions and formulas (with month names and temporal expressions, with terms with an indication in genitive, and with filiation formulas) where the context is so transparent as to make the case ending not imprescindible. In what follows an attempt will be made to show that this applies to the occasional spellings in -*(C)o* for expected -*(C)o-jo* This is perfectly understandable in Linear B, in which abbreviations and economic spellings are more than frequent, as happens in syllabic scripts and cuneiform traditions of other languages as well.[26]

5.

Some forms of month names in -*(C)o* (followed or not by *me-no* gen. /*mēnnos*/ often in smaller characters and/or raised signs, and separated by a word divider) are attested in Cnossos, namely *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* and *wo-de-wi-jo* (beside *ka-]ra-e-ri-jo-jo* and *wo-de-wị-jo-jo*), as well as *ra-pa-to*, *me-no*, and *a-ma-ko-to* , *me-no*, which have no counterpart in -*(C)o-jo*. The forms in -*(C)o* may be understood as an alternative to the genitive forms in -*(C)o-jo*.[27]

The different possibilities are attested for at least two Cnossian month-names, namely *ka-ra-e-ri-jo** /*krā^herio-*/ '(month) at the Head'[28] and *wo-de-wi-jo* /*Wṛdēwio-*/ '(month [or 'festival']) of the Roses':

Fp(1) 7.1 ka-ra-e-ri-jo , 'me-no' (also 18 A.1) and **Fp(1) 6**.1 ka-ra-e-ri-jo / pa-si-te-o-i … (all Hand 138) beside **M(1) 1645**.1 ka-]ra-e-ri-jo-jo , me-no[(Hand 103).
Fp(1) 16.1 wo-de-wi-jo , 'me-no' (A; 138) and **V(2) 280**.1 wo-de-wi-jo ... (C; 124) beside **Ga(4) 953**.1 wo-de-wị-jo-jo , / me-nọ [(I 3; 219).

---

[26] This is the case in Hittite, where the 'Accadographic' spellings, i.e. the use of bare stem forms, are regular in some contexts, e.g. with proper names or after numerals in listings (Hoffner & Melchert 2008, 250-257).

[27] Morpurgo Davies 1960, 41-43; Hajnal 1995, 247-253; García Ramón 2023.

[28] García Ramón 2023: 342-344: /*Krā^herio-*/ is an *-iịo-*derivative from **krā^hero-* (**kṛh₂s-ero-* 'at the head', cf. ὄρθιος :: ὀρθός *; aliter* Ruijgh 1967: 112 with fn. 66 "lieu pourvu d'une cime") beside locatival **krā^her-* (**ḱṛh₂s-(o/e)r-* 'horn', cf. Myc. instr. °*ka-ra-o-re* /°*krā^horē*/, pl. °*ka-ra-a-pi* /°*krā^hap^hi*/) as per Nussbaum 1986, 220-247.

The choice between *-(C)o-jo* and *-(C)o-* seems not to be connected with scribal (or dialectal) variants, as seen in Hand 138, that coherently writes *ka-ra-e-ri-jo*, *wo-de-wi-jo* as well as *a-ma-ko-to* (**Fp[1] 14**), *ra-pa-to* (**Fp[1] 13**), but also *de-u-ki-jo-jo* (**Fp[1] 1**.1), *di-wi-jo-jo* (**Fp[1] 5**.1). Attempts to interpret the forms in *-(C)o* as asyntactic nominatives, i.e. /*-(C)os*/, beside *me-no* 'monthly, per month,' or as gen.pl. /*-(C)ōn*/ (e.g. *wo-de-wi-jo* /*Wr̥dēwiōn*/ of an eortonym /*Wr̥dēwia*/* besides *me-no* as sg. /*mēnnos*/[29] or even pl. /*mēnnōn*/) are unnecessary.[30]

Given that *me-no* is often an addition, the possibility that the month name in *-(C)o* conceals a nominative of rubric or, better, simply the bare stem, remains open.[31] However, once accepted that for the time reference the norm (or *one* of the norms) is the formula [MONTH-NAME$_{\text{GEN}}$ – (gen.) *me-no*][32] with the variant without *me-no* [MONTH-NAME$_{\text{GEN}}$], an endless variant of the month name is perfectly conceivable, as the context and its position in the tablet make further details unnecessary. In other words, *ka-ra-e-ri-jo* and *wo-de-wi̯-jo* (KN) reflect the bare stems of the month names (which match the outcome of a possible haplography, cf. 2.) as against *ka-ra-e-ri-jo-jo* (*me-no*) /*krā^{h}erioio* (*mēnnos*)/ and *wo-de-wi̯-jo-jo* (*me-no*) /*Wr̥dēwioio* (*mēnnos*)/. The same applies to *ra-pa-to me-no*, and *a-ma-ko-to me-no*, for which haplology is excluded.

6.

A bare stem in *-o-* may equally be assumed for appurtenance formulas consisting of a personal name (in genitive) and an institutional term of the type *o-pa* /^{h}opā/ 'work (to be performed' as per José L. Melena), *qa-si-re-wi-ja* /*g^{w}asilēwiā*/ 'area or group controlled by a *qa-si-re-u*', or *wo-ka* /*wok^{h}ā*/ ([*i-qi-ja*] *wo-ka* '[horse-drawn] chariot' rather than

---

[29] Hajnal 1995, 252 ("ältere Ausdrucksweise"); Thompson 2017, 585 ("during the month of the Wordēwia").

[30] Unnecessarily complicated is the hypothesis of two syntagms - and two different forms underlying *-(C)o* and *me-no*: either nom. *-ιος* μήνως beside gen.pl. *-ίων* μηνῶν (Risch 1959, 223 n.34 : *Kl.Schr.* 446), or *wo-de-wi-jo , me-no* /*wordēwiōn mēnnós*/ and *wo-de-wi-jo-jo , me-no* /*wordēwioio mēnnós*/ (Hajnal 1995, 252).

[31] Chadwick 1958, 290 ("not to be construed in every case with the name … *me-no* afterthought addition since sometimes omitted"); Thompson 2017, 581, 585 ("… may indicate a lack of syntax … the month name … may be a nominative of rubric … *me-no* meaning 'during the month'"). *Aliter*, hardly convincing, Jiménez Delgado 2013 (*me-no* as nom. /*mēn*/).

[32] *de-u-ki-jo-jo , 'me-no'* (**KN Fp[1] 1**.1), *di-wi-jo-jo , 'me-no'* (**Fp[1] 5**.1); *pa-ki-ja-ni-jo-jo , 'me-no'* (**PY Fr[1] 1224**).

/*worgā*/ 'manufacture,'[33] i.e. [NAME$_{GEN}$ – *o-pa*] (so conventionally in what follows). In formulas of this type, the genitive of the name is actually the rule, cf. *e-ta-wo-ne-wo* , *o-pa* (**KN L 695**: gen. /*ēwos*/), *su-ke-re-o* , *qa-si-re-wi-ja* (**KN As[2] 1516**: gen. /*-ehos*/, cf. nom. *su-ke-re*) or *po-ru-we-wo* , *wo-ka* (**PY Sa[1] 796**: gen. /*-ēwos*/), *e-pi-wo-qa-ta-o* , *wo-ka* (**PY Sa[1] 1266**.

As to the thematic names, genitives in *-(C)o-jo* are well attested: *a-re-ki-si-to-jo* , *o-pa* /*Aleksitoio*/ (**KN Sf[2] 4420**.a), *pe-q̣e-ṛo-j̣ọ wo-ka* (**PY Sa[1] 793** r.), *e-ti-ra-wo-jo, wo-ka* /*Ertilāwoio*/ (**Sa[1] 1264**). Beside them, some instances in *-(C)o* depending on *o-pa* (*a-me-ja-to* , *o-we-to* , *ra-mi-jo*), on *q̣ạ[-]ṣi-re-wi-ja* (*a-nu-to*) and on *wo-ka* (*a-me-ja-to*, *e-te-wa-jo*) may be understood as *-(C)o*-variants only if they turn out to belong to thematic stems, as is the case in:

a-nu-to, in **KN As(2) 1516**.12]-ti-jo , a-nu-to q̣ạ[-]ṣi-re-wi-ja , VIR 1 su-ki-ri-to VIR 1, occurs instead of the expected genitive *⋆a-nu-to-jo* (actually attested **KN X 697**.1), as proved by the gen. *su-ke-re-o* in .20 se-to-i-ja su-ke-re-o , qa-si-re-wi-ja VIR 1 ku-to VIR 1. The form *a-nu-to* can only belong to MN /[(h)]*Anutos*/ (: Ἄνυτος), which is actually attested (nom. *a-nu-to* KN, TH), and may easily be understood as a scribal error.[34]

e-te-wa-jo , *wo-ka* beside regular *e-te-wa-jo-jo* , *wo-ka* of ⋆/*Etewaio-*/ (cf. Ἐτεο°, ⋆Ἐτέᾱς, see 2.) in the same formula and series (**PY Sa[1] 7, 755, 758, 760, 763, 766, 767, 768, 769, 774**: all Hand 26).

ra-mi-jo , *o-pa* in **TH Wu 88**.b ra-mi-jo , o-pa (in a lacunary text) may conceal a derivative (/*Lamio-*/?) of the place-name *ra-mo*⋆ (cf. allative *ra-mo-de* **TH Of 38**.1). If *ra-mi-jo* is really depending on *o-pa* it may reflect a haplography for ⋆*ra-mi-jo-jo*.

Two other forms may be left out of consideration for different reasons: *a-me-ja-to*, which occurs with both *o-pa* and *wo-ka* (**PY Sh 736** a-me-ja-to , o-pa , **Sa[1] 834** a-me-ja-to , wo-ka), is a genitive in /*-antos*/ (/*Ameiantos*/?),[35] cf. nom. *a-me-ja*⋆/*-ānt-s*/ (**KN F 153**); *o-we-to* (*o-we-to* ,

---

[33] Cf. MELENA 1983 (on *o-pa*); 2001, 62, 64; 2014a, 151 (on *wo-ka*).

[34] *Recte* MORPURGO DAVIES 1960, 43 ("una forma abnorme di genitivo"). The appurtenance to /[(h)]*Anuto-*/ is more than certain (*pace* HAJNAL 1995, 256: /[h]*Anu-s, -(s)tos*/; THOMPSON 2017, 584: "not certain … an *-o*-stem").

[35] MELENA 1983, 277; 2001, 64-65.

o-pa **KN Dm 1184**) defies any attempt at interpretation in terms of Greek.

In [NAME_GEN – *o-pa*] the appurtenance relation between the two members is more than evident, and makes indeed the case ending *-(C) o-jo* unnecessary (albeit used sometimes): this may explain the occurrence of endingless *-(C)o-* in this very formula.

The same explanation may apply to the formula *ko-ki-da , o-pa* (**KN Sd 4403**.b in small signs; **So[1] 4430**.a: inventories of chariots and wheels) which does not directly concern the subject treated here. It seems clear that *ko-ki-da* is a man's name and, in view of the normal structure of the formula, only a genitive is expected:[36] whether *ko-ki-da* is a scribal error, or conceals a gen. in */-(C)ās/* (i.e. an archaism, previous to regular *-(C)a-o /-(C)ā^(h)o/*), or simply the bare stem of the *-ā*-masculine (like the forms in *-(C)o-* for *-(C)o-jo*) remains open.[37]

An instance of endingless *-(C)o* alternating with gen. *-(C)o-jo*, which has probably not been paid the attention it deserves, is the theonym *si-to-po-ti-ni-ja* 'Lady of Corn' (**MY Oi 701**.3; cf. Σιτώ: Demeter in Sicily) as against *da-pu₂-ri-to-jo , po-ti-ni-ja* 'Lady of the Labyrinth (*/Dap^hurint^hoio/*)' (**KN Gg[1] 702**.2): *si-to°* can hardly be the first member of a compound, which would have no parallel in alphabetic Greek. The absence of word-divider simply indicates the close connection of the two members of the syntagm and *si-to°* is simply the bare stem, as is e.g. *a-ta-na°* */At^hānā-/* in *a-ta-na-po-ti-ni-ja* 'Lady of Athana' (**KN V 52**).

7.

We turn now to the filiation formulas with *-(C)o* followed by a term for 'son.' The filiation may be expressed in Mycenaean by means of the patronymic adjective of the type *a-re-ku-tu-ru-wo , e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo /Alektruwōn Etewoklewe^hios/*), or by the father's name in the genitive (formula [NAME – FATHER'S NAME_GEN], which may be enlarged by ['son']. For the patronymic adjective formula[38] there is no conclusive evidence: a border-line case would be *i-je-re-wị-jọ-* in the formula *i-je-re-*

---

[36] *Aliter* LEJEUNE 1972b, 301: *ko-ki-da* locative, *o-pa* final dative ("chez K. pour fabrication"); HAJNAL 1995, 258-259 (*ko-ki-da* "Dativ der betroffenen Person").

[37] Cf. MORPURGO DAVIES 1960, 48 ("aplografia"); MELENA 1983, 273.

[38] The formula is well attested in Homer (where it may be enlarged by 'son': cf. Αἴαντα προσέφη Τελαμώνιον υἱόν # [*Il*.11.367], equivalent to τόν ῥ' υἱὸς Τελαμῶνος [13.177 *et al.*]), and lives on, at different scales, in the Aeolic dialects of the 1st millennium.

ẉị-jọ-*65 (Thebes, cf. 7.3.). By way of contrast, the formula with father's name in the genitive (cf. Τυδέος υἱός *Il.* 5.335),[39] which is regular in alphabetic Greek, provides us with instances of *-(C)o*. In what follows, I shall try to show that *-(C)o* does not conceal an ending, but merely the bare stem of the name (conventionally [FATHER'S NAME$_\emptyset$] in what follows).

7.1.

Let us remember the essentials of the formula [NAME$_{NOM}$ – FATHER'S NAME$_\emptyset$] and the variant with mention of 'son' (in what follows: ['son' (*i-jo*…)]) meaning *i-jo* , *i-*65*, *u-jo* [: υἱός], as well as **65* /*ju*/ used as the abbreviation **/ʰuiu-/* as per Melena, cf. 7.3), which occurs both with and without word-divider.[40]

The formula [NAME – FATHER'S NAME$_{GEN}$] (cf. Πρόθοος Τενθρηδόνος υἱός *Il.* 2.756), e.g. *di-ri-mi-jo* , *di-wo* , *i-je-we* /*Drīmiōi* , *Diwos ʰiewei*/ 'to Drimios, the son of Zeus' (**PY Tn 316**.r10, cf. Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός *Il.* 1.9) might be attested with thematic names only in a unique variant [FATHER'S NAME$_{GEN}$ – DAUGHTER'S NAME$_{NOM}$], which occurs twice in a list of feminine personnel (**PY Vn 34**): *a-ta-o-jo* , *pi-ro-pa-ta-ra* .5, *qa-ko-jo* , *ma-ra-me-na* .6. The names *a-ta-o-jo* and *qa-ko-jo* have the same function as the genitives of man's names in other lines of identical structure.[41] However, they remain both unanalysable, as it is impossible to determine whether they belong to an **-o*-stem (and conceal /*-(C)oio*/) or to an **-ịo*-stem (and may be analysed as forms in *-(C)o*).

7.2.

The formula [(NAME$_{NOM}$) – FATHER'S NAME$_\emptyset$ – 'son' (*i-jo*…)] is attested with thematic names only in the type [FATHER'S NAME$_\emptyset$ – 'son' (*i-jo*…)]:[42]

pi-ma-ṇạ-ro , *zo-wi-jo i-jo* 'son of *zo-wi-jo* (prob. /*Dʷōwio-*/: Ζώϊος)' (**KN Vs[2] 1523**.4.5: 2x).

---

[39] With reverse word order cf. υἱὸς Τελαμῶνος (*Il.*13.177; 17.284,.293), /υἱός Πετεῶο Μενεσθεύς # (2.552 = 12.331; 13.690).

[40] Cf. the accurate dossier by DUHOUX 2017, 154-156; also 2008, 357-360.

[41] Cf. *me-ti-ja-no-ro*.1 /*Mē(s)tiānoros*/, *ka-e-sa-me-no-jo* .2 /*Kaʰēsamenoio*/, *e-to-mo-jo* .3 /(ʰ)*Etoimoio*/? , *de-ki-si-wo-jo* .4 /*Deksiwoio*/).

[42] With stems other than in *-o-*, namely in /*-ēw-*/ (e.g. *qo-te-wo* , *i-*65* **PY Aq 218**.16), in /*-n-*/ (*ku-no-*65* **TH Fq 236**.5), in /*-es-*/ (*pe-ri-me-de-o* , *i-*65* **PY Aq 64**.7).

pi-ṛo-ẉo-na , *wi-do-ẉo-i-jo*, *i-*65* VIR 1 (**PY Ae 344**) /*Pʰilo-woinā(s)
Widwoʰio(-)ʰuios*/.[43]

A variant with no mention of the name of the son is also attested:[44]

ra-]ke-da-mo-ni-jo-u-jo V 1[(**TH Gp 227**.2, without word-divider)
/*Lakedaimonio(-)ʰuios*/.

7.3.

The same formula may be assumed for a variant with 'son' expressed
by **65*, an abbreviation for /ʰu/ (*/ju/)[45] in the Theban series **Fq** (Hand
305), as rightly pointed out by Melena, who invokes the striking parallel
of <tu> for *tu-ka-te* 'daughter' at Knossos (e.g. **Ap 639**.4 *tu* MUL 2).[46]

[NAME – FATHER'S NAME$_\emptyset$ – SON (**65*)]:]ạ-me-ro , *qe-da-do-ro-*65* **TH
Gp 215**.1

[FATHER'S NAME$_\emptyset$ – SON (**65*)] : *a-]ko-ro-da-mo-*65* **TH Gp 215**.2
(/*Akrodāmo-*/: Ἀκρόδᾱμος)

a-ra-o-*65 ? (2x **TH Fq 214**.3 , **254[+]255**.7

ka-wi-jo-*65 **Fq 123**.1 (5x) (/*Gāwio-*/: Γάιος)

o-to-ro-no-*65 **TH Fq 214**.7

ra-ke-da-mi-ni-jo-*65[**Fq 229**.4 (5x) (/*Lakedamnio-*/)

ra-ke-mi-ni-jo-*65 V 2 (**TH Fq 229**.13 +) (variant spelling of the
precedent)

In the case of *i-je-re-ẉi-jo-*65* (**TH Gp 303**.1), surely /ʰ*Ierēwio-*65*/,
i.e. */ʰ*Ierēw-io-*/, it is impossible to elucidate whether it is the genitive in
-(C)o of a name or the nominative in /*(-C)io-*/ of a patronymic (cf. Hom.
Αἴαντα … Τελαμώνιον υἱόν) of a stem in *-*ēu̯*-. The absence of Ἱερεύς,
Ἱερεῖος, Ἱερήιος in the onomastics of alphabetic Greek makes a decision
impossible.

A variant with *ko-wo* /*korwo-*/ 'son' occurs twice: *pa-se-ri-jo ko-wo* (**MY
Oe 121**.2 *ka-ke-wi* LANA 2 *pa-se-ri-jo ko-wo* LANA 2 [), *u-wa-si-jo* , *ko-wo*

---

[43] *Aliter* HAJNAL 1995, 257 (*pi-ṛo-ẉo-na* feminine /°*woinā*/, *wi-do-ẉo-i-jo*, *i-*65* as 'u̯idu̯ōhios* ju-
nior').

[44] In the case of *a-tu-qo-te-ra-to* , *i-jo*]̣ (**KN Vs[2] 1523**.4) the father's name remains opaque, and a
thematic name remains hypothetical.

[45] **65* /ju/ and *i-*65* /hiju-/ (cf. pl. υἱέες Hom.) according to HEUBECK 1971; MELENA 2014b, 75-79.

[46] MELENA 2014b, 78 (and *per litteras*, 6.5.2002, with reference to the logogrammatic use of *KO* for
/*khoiros*/, *WE* for /*wetalon*/, *PO* for /*pōlos*/ or *E* for /*eripʰos*/); also *apud* PALAIMA 2006, 148. On
the Theban evidence for 'son' cf. HAJNAL 2006, 64-66.

(**KN Ai[1] 115** pa-ro , u-wa-si-jo , ko-wo [). The names could be thematic, namely *pa-se-ri-jo* /Pʰasēlios/ (: Φασήλιος) and *u-wa-si-jo* /Uwāsio-/ or /Uwansio-/ (cf. MN *u-wa-ta* KN, PY /ʰUwātās/ or /ʰUwantās/).

7.4.

It must be stressed that in the formula *pi-r̥o-w̥o-na* , *wi-do-w̥o-i-jo*, *i-*65* (**PY Ae 344**) an interpretation of *wi-do-w̥o-i-jo*, *i-*65* as '*wi-do-w̥o-i-jo* junior' is excluded,[47] and that the same applies to *pa-se-ri-jo* , *ko-wo* and *u-wa-si-jo* , *ko-wo* (cf. 7.3.). A very different position takes the formula with enclitic *-qe*, namely [NAME_{NOM} – *i-jo-qe* / *i-*65-qe*]: copulative *-qe* makes it evident that the formula refers to two persons [FATHER &(-*qe*) 'son' (*i-jo…*)], cf. *wa-ra-pi-si-ro* , *i-jo-qe* VIR 2 (**MY Au 102**.1) and *wa-ti-ko-ro* 1, *i-*65-qe* 1 (**PY Jn[1] 725**.8).

7.5.

In summa: The evidence for putative 'genitives' in *-(C)o* of the father's name in the filiation formulas of the type [(NAME) – FATHER'S NAME (*-C)o*) – 'son' (*i-jo…*)] is relatively limited, but has no counterevidence: the genitive in *-(C)o-jo*, which would be *a priori* expected, does not occur. This statement is crucial for our purpose: the father's name in *-(C)o*, followed by *i-jo* (and variants) may be understood as the bare stem of the name, i.e. as a non-inflected form. The absence of a recognisable genitive ending is easy to explain in the framework of the spelling conventions of Linear B, in which mere juxtaposition and abbreviations are normal.[48] The context and the formula (with occasional univerbation, as shown by the absence of word-divider) do not leave any doubt about the genitival function (: appurtenance) of the father's name, even if not marked by the specific ending.

The use of *-(C)o* may certainly have been triggered by special factors, especially by the haplography of **-(C)i-jo-jo* as *-(C)i-jo* in the stems in **-ii̯o-* (see 2.), and of *-(C)o-jo-jo* in (C)o-jo in immediate contiguity before *i-jo* 'son' (and variants): this is the case of *pi-r̥o-w̥o-na* , *wi-do-w̥o-i-jo*, *i-*65*, of *ra-]ke-da-mo-ni-jo-u-jo*, and of *wi-do-w̥o-i-jo*, *i-*65*. However, this may apply only to a reduced number of instances.

---

[47] *Pace* RUIJGH 1967, 207 n. 545; HAJNAL 1995, 257 ('u̯idu̯oʰios junior'); THOMPSON 2017, 584.

[48] Cf. CHADWICK 1958, 287; DUHOUX 1968, 782-783.

8.

A short reflection on one, or two, form(s) in *-(C)a* of masculine names instead of expected *-(C)a-o* in the patronymic formula (in close parallel with *-(C)o* for *-(C)o-jo*), as perhaps *ko-ki-da* depending on *o-pa* also in Cnossos (cf. 6.), may be in order at this point. One instance is sure, namely *pi-ro-i-ta* (MN /*Pʰiloitās*/: Φιλοίτης)[49] in *pi-ma-na-ro* , *pi-ro-i-ta* '*i-jo*' (**KN Vs[2] 1523**.5): *pi-ro-i-ta* has the same position (and function) as *zo-wi-jo* in *pi-ma-ṇa-ro* , *zo-wi-jo* , *i-jo* .4 (followed by an obscure *a-tu-qo-te-ra-to* 1[*i-jo* in the same line) and may thus be '(*pi-ma-na-ro*) son of Philoitās. Whether *pi-ro-i-ta* conceals a gen.sg. in /*-ās*/ previous to the generalization of *-(C)a-o* or merely the bare stem, as is the case of the *⋆-o*-stems (cf. 7.) must remain open. Less clear is the case of the MN *a-e-ri-qo-ta* (*ke-ki-jo* , *a-e-ri-qo-ta*) in **PY An[3] 657**.1 *me-ta-qe* , *pe-i* , *e-qe-ta* , *ke-ki-jo* , / .12 *a-e-ri-qo-ta* , *e-ra-po* , *ri-me-ne*. A transliteration /*meta-kʷe spʰeʰi ʰekʷetās Kerkios* (or *Kerkiōn*) *Aʰerikʷʰontās elapʰōn lime-nei*/ would imply the occurrence of two *e-qe-ta*. Alternatively, if *a-e-ri-qo-ta* is the father of *ke-ki-jo*, *a-e-ri-qo-ta* would conceal an old genitive /*°kʷʰontās*/[50] or simply the bare stem of the name. *Non liquet.*

9. In conclusion

The supposed 'genitives' in *-(C)o* of month names (with or without in-dication *me-no*, cf. 5.), with appurtenance formulas (cf. 6.) and with fil-iation formulas (cf. 7.) are manifestations of the same procedure and may be interpreted in the same way: the spelling *-(C)o* does not conceal a real genitive ending, not even a nominative of rubric, but simply the bare stem, since the context is transparent, and renders the ending un-necessary. Thus, its omission turns into a trivial matter. In other words, the forms in *-(C)o* reflect the simplest available graphic form as the re-sult of what one could call, paraphrasing Paul Kiparsky's linguistic 'con-junction reduction,' a *marking reduction*, for which there are typological parallels in cuneiform traditions, and may well apply to other aspects of Mycenaean writing and to the overall structure of the tablets. The inter-pretation proposed for *-(C)o* fits into the conventions of Linear B, and is, in my opinion, surely preferable to explanations in terms of an old ablative *⋆-ōd*, which are certainly coherent, but probably do not apply at the time of the tablets.

---

[49] Cf. the Cyprian MN *pi-lo-ta* /*Pʰilōtās*/, gen. *o-pi-lo-ta-o-se* (text: *o-pi-lo-ta-o-se-mi /⁽ʰ⁾o Philōtaos ēmi/, ca.* 600-475 , see *IG* XV 1, 70), as Artemis Karnava kindly points out to me. The name is richly attested in alphabetic Greek (Φιλώτας).

[50] For /*Aʰerikʷʰontās*/ cf. Melena 2001, 24; for /*°kʷʰontās*/ cf. Duhoux 2017, 163.

Bibliography

Bader, F. 1992 Problématique du génitif thématique: illustrations mycéniennes et homériques. In *Mykenaïka* 1990, 1-17.

Chadwick, J. 1958 Error and abnormality in the Mycenaean noun declension, *PP* 13, 285-295.

Duhoux, Y. 1968 La syntaxe mycénienne: à propos de la notion de 'faute.' In *Atti e memorie del Io Congresso Internazionale di Micenologia, Roma 27 settembre-3 ottobre 1967*, Incunabula Graeca 25, 781-785.

Duhoux, Y. 2008 Mycenaean anthology. In *Companion* 1, 243-393.

Duhoux, Y. 2017 Les patronymes en ...*o* et ...*a* des formules onomastiques mycéniennes: quel est leur cas? In I. Hajnal, D. Kölligan & K. Zipser (eds), *Miscellanea Indogermanica, Festschrift für José Luis García Ramón zum 65. Geburtstag,* 151-172.

Eska, J. F. 1995 Observations on the thematic genitive singular in Lepontic and Hispano-Celtic. In J. F. Eska, R. Geraint Gruffydd & N. Jacobs (eds), *Hispano-Gallo-Brittonica. Essays in honour of Professor D. Ellis Evans on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, 33-46.

Eska, J. F. & Wallace, R. E. 2001 Remarks on the thematic genitive singular in ancient Italy and related matters, *Incontri linguistici* 24, 77-97.

García Ramón, J. L. 2016 Il greco miceneo. In *Manuale*, 211-244.

García Ramón, J. L. 2023. Micénico *ka-ra-e-ri-jo (me-no)* y *ka-ra-e-ri-jo-jo me-no, po-ro-wi-to-jo y* los nombres de mes: las variantes de una fórmula de datación. In G. Rocca, E. Notti & M. Muscariello (eds), *po-ro-wi-to-jo. Scritti in onore di Mario Negri*, 329-362.

Hajnal, I. 2006 Die Tafeln aus Theben und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Dialektologie. In S. Deger-Jalkotzy & O. Panagl (eds), *Die neuen Linear-B Texte aus Theben. Ihr Aufschlusswert für die Mykenische Sprache und Kultur*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften 338, 53-69.

Hettrich, H. 1985 Zum Kasussynkretismus im Mykenischen, *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 46, 111-122 (: Festgabe Karl Hoffmann, 671-682).

Heubeck, A. 1971 Überlegungen zum Lautwert des Silbenzeichens *⋆65* in Linear B und zum griechischen Wort für ‚Sohn', *SMEA* 13, 147-155.

Hoffner, H. A. & Melchert, H. C. 2008 *A grammar of the Hittite language*.

Jiménez Delgado, J. M. 2013 A note on the Mycenaean thematic genitive ending in month names, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118, 111-123.

Lejeune, M. 1972a Le génitif singulier thématique. In M. Lejeune (ed.), *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne. Troisième série (1964-1968)*, Incunabula Graeca 43, 13-20 [*Revue de philologie* 39 (1965), 14-20].

Lejeune, M. 1972b Chars et roues à Cnossos: structure d'un inventaire. In M. Lejeune (ed.), *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne. Troisième série (1964-1968)*, Incunabula Graeca 43, 285-331 [*Minos* 9 (1968), 9-61].

Melchert, H. C. 2012 Genitive case and possesive adjective in Anatolian. In V. Orioles (ed.), *Per Roberto Gusmani linguistica storica e teorica. Studi in ricordo* 2, 273-286.

Melena, J. L. 1983 Further thoughts on Mycenaean *o-pa*. In *Res Mycenaea* 1981, 258-286.

Melena, J. L. 2001 *Textos griegos micénicos comentados*.

Melena, J. L. 2014a Mycenaean writing. In *Companion* 3, 1-186.

Melena, J. L. 2014b Filling the gaps in the basic Mycenaean syllabary. In A. Bernabé & E. R. Luján (eds), *Donum Mycenologicum. Mycenaean Studies in Honor of Francisco Aura Jorro*, 75-85.

Morpurgo Davies, A. 1960 Il genitivo miceneo e il sincretismo dei casi, *MemLinc* 15, 33-61.

Nussbaum, A. J. 1986 *Head and horn in Indo-European*.

Palaima, T. G. 2006 *65 = *far*? or *ju*? and other interpretative conundra in the new Thebes tablets. In S. Deger-Jalkotzy & O. Panagl (eds), *Die neuen Linear-B Texte aus Theben. Ihr Aufschlusswert für die Mykenische Sprache und Kultur*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften 338, 139-148.

Prosdocimi, A. 1991 Note sul celtico in Italia, *Studi Etruschi* 57, 139-177.

Risch, E. 1959 Frühgeschichte der griechischen Sprache, *Museum Helveticum* 16, 215-227 (: *Kleine Schriften*, 438-450).

Ruijgh, C. J. 1967 Études *sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*.

Thompson, R. J. 2017 The Mycenaean *o*-stem genitive singular in -*o*: a re-evaluation. In *Aegean Scripts* 2015, 575-589.

Watkins, C. 2001 À la suite des perspectives tracées par Michel Lejeune: aspects du grec et du celtique, *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 145.1, 213-223 (: *Selected Writings* 3, 2008, 990-1000).