

MYCENAEAN ADJECTIVES IN *-TE-RI-JO*: A REAPPRAISAL*By JUAN PIQUERO *Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED)*

(Submitted: 1 June, 2021; Accepted: 16 December, 2021)

This paper offers a systematic study of the Mycenaean adjectives in *-te-ri-jo* / *-téríos*. Its purpose is twofold: first, to examine whether the suffix *-téríos* was already fossilized in the Mycenaean period (*-téríos* vs. *-tér* + *ios*); second, to define the semantic values associated with this suffix in the same period. Particular attention will be paid to the interpretation of the Mycenaean words *pu-te-ri-ja* and *ko-re-te-ri-jo*

El presente trabajo presenta un estudio sistemático de los adjetivos micénicos en *-te-ri-jo* / *-téríos*. El propósito es doble: por un lado, determinar si el sufijo *-téríos* está ya fosilizado en época micénica (*-téríos* vs. *-tér* + *ios*); por otro, delimitar los valores semánticos asociados a este sufijo en este periodo. Se presta especial atención a la interpretación de los vocablos micénicos *pu-te-ri-ja* y *ko-re-te-ri-jo*.

[Spanish]

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this article is to offer an analysis of the Mycenaean adjectives ending in the syllabic sequence *-te-ri-jo*. It will consider first at what stage in the formation process these adjectives were in the second millennium BC (*-téríos* vs. *-tér* + *ios*) and will then proceed to narrow down the semantic values that can be associated with them through an examination of the Mycenaean corpus and a comparison with the semantic values of the adjectives in *-téríos* attested in alphabetic Greek.

The suffix *-téríos* is formed from the deverbial suffix *-tér* and the suffix *-io-* (IE **-yo-*), both of which are of Indo-European origin. The suffix *-io-* produces adjectives of Pertaining in a broad sense. As for the suffix *-tér*, it had the semantic value of Agent in Indo-European but came to denote both the Agent (*pu-te* **phutér* ‘planter’, *pi-ri-je-te* **prētér* ‘cutler’, *a₃-te* **aitér* ‘inlayer’) and the Instrument (*o-pi-ra₃-te-re* **opirhaistêres* ‘metal fittings’, *au-te* *austér* ‘kindler’) in Mycenaean.

The Mycenaean texts contain certain terms with the suffix *-te-ri-jo/-ja* which can either be interpreted as adjectives in *-téríos/-ia* or as nouns in *-térion/-ia*.¹ Although interpretation is made

*This paper is part of the research project *LERMIC* ‘Léxico religioso del micénico: conceptos, prácticas, objetos’ (‘Mycenaean Greek Lexicon: concepts, practices, objects’) which is funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (PID2020-118204GA-I00). I would like to thank Eugenio R. Luján, Berta González Saavedra, Maurizio Del Freo and Luz Conti for their help in the preparation of the article. The final version has greatly benefited from the comments and suggestions of two anonymous reviewers, to whom I am very grateful. Any mistakes remain my responsibility.

¹On the origins of the nouns in *-térion*, see Luján and Abad (2014: 258–9).

difficult by the nature of the Linear B syllabary and the typology of the texts, it is generally agreed that a first distinction can be made between nouns and adjectives in *-te-ri-jo/-ja*:

Nouns:² *po-ro-e-ke-te-ri-ja*, *ko-te-ri-ja*, *to-no-e-ke-te-ri-jo*, *re-ke(-e)-to-ro-te-ri-jo*, *po-re-no-zo-te-ri-ja* (?), *po-re-no-tu-ṭ[ri-ja* (?)

Adjectives:³ *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja*, *to-ka-te-ri-ja*, *pu-te-ri-ja*, *ko-re-te-ri-jo*, *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja*, *ra-pte-ri-ja*, *pa-ke-te-ri-ja* (?)

The methodology used in this paper follows the ideas expressed by Luján regarding the merging of the analysis of grammatical and derivational morphemes. As the author remarks, ‘we know now that lexical and grammatical morphemes constitute a continuum, and their meanings are organized in the same way – inside a cognitive frame, we can assume that in both cases there are core and peripheral meanings, but that the borders between these meanings are synchronically blurry, which allows for transitions and semantic changes over time. Derivational morphemes are in a certain sense midway between lexical and grammatical morphemes’. (Luján 2010: 163).

Thus, following this semantic classification of the terms according to their formation, the nouns can be divided into two groups:⁴

- 1 *-te-ri-jo/-ja* forms nouns of Instrument: *po-ro-e-ke-te-ri-ja* **prohelktērīā* ‘ladle’ (PY Ta 709.1), *ko-te-ri-ja* **khōstéria* ‘shovels’ (PY Ta 709.1) and *po-re-no-zo-te-ri-ja* perhaps **phorēno-dsōstéria* ‘belts of the *po-re-na*’ or a festival name (PY Un 443.2).
- 2 *-te-ri-jo/-ja* forms festival names:⁵ *to-no-e-ke-te-ri-jo* **thornohelktērīōi* (*-ōn*) ‘(festival) in which the throne is pulled’ (PY Fr 1222);⁶ *re-ke(-e)-to-ro-te-ri-jo* **lekhe(hei)strōtērīōi* (*-ōn*) ‘(festival) in which the bed is spread’ (PY Fr 343, Fr 1217.2)⁷ and *po-re-no-tu-ṭ[ri-ja* perhaps **phorēnothutērīai*, a festival related to the *po-re-na* (PY Ua 1413), if the reconstruction is accepted.

Although there is some agreement on the classification of the semantic values of the nouns in *-tērion*, this is not the case with the adjectives. In fact, these are usually not differentiated from the group of adjectives in *-io-*, such as *ra-wa-ke-si-jo* **lawagésios* ‘belonging to the *ra-wa-ke-ta*’ or *da-mi-jo* **dāmios* ‘(land) of the *da-mo*’.⁸ A fresh examination of the evidence is therefore

² The interpretation of the term *e-re-u-te-ri-* in PY An 18.1, which could read *e-re-u-te-ri-ja* according to the apparatus of PTT³ p. 22, is uncertain. It could be a form derived from the family of *eleútheros* ‘free’, well documented in Mycenaean (*e-re-u-te-ro eleútheros*, *e-re-u-te-ro-se eleúthērōse* (aor. Ind.) or *eleutherōsei* (fut. Ind.)), or perhaps a term related to *e-re-u-te-re erētērei* (dat. sg.?) ‘inspector’. See Ruijgh (1967: 188).

³ *e-re-te-ri-ja* might be an ethnic adjective in *-to-* derived from an unknown toponym, according to Melena (2000: 381). However, *e-re-te-ri-ja* in PY Pa 889 parallels *pe-ra-ko-ra-i-ja* in Pa 398. It might be suggested then that we are dealing with the geographical location of the *qa-si-re-wi-ja* where the *169 ‘beds’ are being produced. If so, Ἐπέρτιω cannot be excluded as a likely place-name.

⁴ See Guilleux (2008: 346); Luján-Ruiz Abad (2014: 258–9). There seems to be no evidence of nouns of Location with the suffix *-tērion* in Mycenaean, although they are common in alphabetic Greek (*khrestērion* ‘the seat of an oracle’, *bouleutērion* ‘council-chamber’, etc.).

⁵ These are all verbal government compounds in which the nominal element acts as a complement to the verb. See Guilleux (2008: 347).

⁶ There are other possibilities too. See *DMic. s.v.* and *LGM s.vv.* θρόνον, θρόνος.

⁷ Piquero (forthcoming). For the form *re-ke(-e)-to-ro-te-ri-jo*, see Meissner (2004). See also *DMic. s.v.* and *LGM s.v.* λέχος.

⁸ For example, García Ramón (2016: 237). Ruijgh (1967: 134–5) mentions them but does not consider them to form a distinct group from the adjectives in *-i-jo* from a semantic point of view.

required in order to shed some light on the questions that still surround the semantic interpretation of the Mycenaean adjectives in *-te-ri-jo* (Section 2).

2. ANALYSIS OF THE CORPUS OF MYCENAEAN ADJECTIVES IN *-TE-RI-JO* / *-TÉR(+)*IOS

Mycenaean shows an ending in *-te-ri-jo/-ja* in some terms that are interpreted as adjectives. This ending is generally considered to be the suffix *-térios/-ia*, but there is no consensus as to whether the suffix was already fossilized in Mycenaean (*-térios*) or should still be interpreted as the combination of two suffixes (*-tér + ios*). This uncertainty creates problems of semantic interpretation, since despite the formal connection between the suffixes the meanings proposed by scholars vary.

2.1. *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja*

The term *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* appears on two tablets from Knossos (*KT VI*): KN Cf 941.B (*ex C* (2)) and KN X 9191.a (if one accepts the reconstruction).⁹ It is also expressed through the adjunct *sa*, attested on KN C 394, D 5954 and C 7063.2 (*ex U*):

- (1) **KN Cf 941**
 - A. OVIS^m 8 [
 - B. pa-ro / a-pi-qo-ta , sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja , OVIS^f 10 [
 - v. A. [] [
 - B. [wi-ja[] [
- (2) **KN X 9191**
 - a.] sa-pa-ka-ṭe[-ri-ja?
 - b.]ḏe , / u-ta-no , [
- (3) **KN C 394**
 - 1. vac.[
 - 2. qe-[
 - 3. BOS^m 1 sa OVIS^m[
 - 4. pa-ja-o-ne / pa-ḏe[
 - 5.]vest.[
 - v.
 - 1.]no
 - 2.]sa OVIS^m 1 sa CAP^m 1[
 - 3.]we pa OVIS^m 1 [
 - 4.]vest. [
 - 5. inf. mut.
- (4) **KN D 5954**
 - sup. mut.
 -]ḏe-mo / sa OVIS^m [

⁹ Perhaps also on KN C 1561.

- (5) **KN C 7063**
1.] *vacat*
 2.]šq OVIS^m 2 OVIS^f 1 *190 6 VIN [
 3.] OVIS^f 1 pa OVIS^f 1 *190 4
 4.]OVIS^x 2[] OVIS^x [

As can be seen, both the complete word and the adjunct *sa* accompany references to animals, specifically sheep and goats. The term is generally interpreted as a neuter plural adjective *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* **sphaktéria* ‘(animals) for sacrifice’.¹⁰ This adjective in *-térios* would derive from a noun **sphaktér*, which is not attested in Greek of the first millennium BC¹¹ but may be found in Mycenaean on MY Ue 611.3: *pa-ke-te-re* **sphaktēres* ‘vessels which pick up the blood of a sacrificed animal’ (but cf. Section 2.7). In principle, adjectives in *-térios* should derive from agent nouns in *-tér*,¹² but if *pa-ke-te-re* is to be interpreted as **sphaktēres*, **sphaktér* would only be attested in Mycenaean as a noun of Instrument.¹³ However, one cannot exclude the existence in Mycenaean of an agent noun **sphaktér* ‘sacrificer’ which is not preserved in the texts,¹⁴ or the possibility that the adjective *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* is a derivative in *-térios* of **sphagyō* ‘slay, slaughter’, as will be argued below (Section 3.1).

Due to the poor state of the tablets, it is unclear whether *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* always refers to animals for ritual sacrifice. It seems, however, very likely, as can be inferred both from a comparison with other similar texts containing the sequence *pa-ro* and a personal name (Killen 2015: 633–634) and from the presence of the logogram *190 on KN C 7063 (Piquero 2017: 69–70).

2.2. *to-ka-te-ri-ja*

The term *to-ka-te-ri-ja* is attested on PY Vn 1341.4 from Pylos:

- (6) **PY Vn 1341**¹⁵
- sup. mut.*
1. *deest*
 2.]-te-ḏe-ṭa, ki-wa-ra-e-ṛu
 3. pə-ti-ni-ja
 4. to-ka-te-ri-ja, ki-wa-ra
 5. [•]-ku-ḏa-ṛu-e
 6. ku-[•]-ka, ki-wa-ra 5
 7. ṭu-[]pa-ṭa-jo 200
 8.]vac.
- inf. mut.*

Two possible interpretations have been put forward to explain *to-ka-te-ri-ja*: **stokhastéria* ‘for making targets’¹⁶ and **storkhastéria* ‘for making enclosures’.¹⁷ The adjective modifies the

¹⁰ There are other less plausible options. See *DMic.Supl. s.v.* See also De Lamberterie (2021).

¹¹ The later form *sphaktēs* (or *sphaktēs*) ‘slayer, murderer’ is attested in alphabetic Greek. See *LSJ⁹ s.v.*

¹² Chantraine (1933: 43).

¹³ This semantic extension of the suffix *-tér* is common in Greek. See Luján (2010).

¹⁴ It has been suggested that]*pa-ke-u* (PY Qa(1) 1308) could be interpreted as **sphageýs* ‘slayer’. The word appears in a sacrificial context in an inscription from Cos (*SIG* 1025.44; Cos, iv/iii B.C.). See *LGM s.v.* However, the word is probably incomplete. In addition, it is possible that PY Qa(2) 1305 and PY Qa(1) 1308 were parts of the same tablet. See *PTT³*, p. 181.

¹⁵ I follow the reading of *PTT³* p. 219. A reading]*jo-pi-do-ja* is also possible in .3 according to *PTT²*, p. 264.

¹⁶ Killen (2015: 741).

¹⁷ Melena (1996: 169, n. 18).

noun *ki-wa-ra* **skîwra* perhaps ‘wickerwork’ (i.e. objects plaited with twigs),¹⁸ but the meaning is obscure. The content of the tablet and its find-spot in Room 99 of the Northeastern Building of Pylos suggest a relationship with industrial production. More specifically, its comparison with PY Vn 1339 indicates that it records data about chariot manufacture and the making of objects related to chariots and the production of weapons. This is revealed by the presence of the term *pa-ta-jo* **paltaiôn* (gen. pl.?) ‘dart’, ‘javelin’ in line 6.

In this context, the interpretation of *to-ka-te-ri-ja* *ki-wa-ra* as **stokhastéria* **skîwra* ‘wickerwork for targets’ seems more plausible, considering also the entry *pa-ta-jo* in the same document.¹⁹ The term *to-ka-te-ri-ja* **stokhastéria* ‘for targets’ is an adjective in *-tēr(+)**ios* derived from an noun of Agent or Instrument **stokhastēr*,²⁰ which in turn derives from *stokhásomai* ‘to target’. However, as in the previous case, it might be an adjective in *-térios* derived from *stokhásomai* through an already fossilized suffix *-térios* (Section 3.1).

The meaning is therefore ‘wickerwork for targets’, perhaps for the use of the ‘javelins’ recorded on the same tablet.

2.3. *pu-te-ri-ja*

The term *pu-te-ri-ja* is attested on the Knossos tablets KN Uf(3) 981.b, Uf(3) 1022.b and Uf(3) 1031.b,²¹ where it modifies the term *ko-to-i-na* *ktoína* ‘plot of land’:

(7) KN Uf(3) 981

- a. ko-ṭo-i-na [
- b. e-ri-ke-re-we / e-ke-pu-te-ri-ja [

(8) KN Uf(3) 1022

- a. ko-to-i[-na
- b. pe-ri-qo-ta / e-ke-pu-te[-ri-ja

(9) KN Uf(3) 1031

- a. ḱo-to-i-na
- b. pe-ri-je-ja / e-ke, pu-te-ri-ja DA 1 ti-ri-to

The word *pu-te-ri-ja*²² has been interpreted in different ways,²³ but the most likely reconstruction seems to be **phutērian* (acc. sg.), an adjective in *-tēr(+)**ios* derived from *pu-te* **phutēr* ‘planter’, an agent noun in *-tēr* derived, in turn, from the verb *phýō* ‘to plant’.²⁴ The term *pu-te* **phutēr* ‘planter’ is securely attested on KN Uf(3) 835.b and Uf 5726.2, presumably on Uf(3) 987, and perhaps also on Uf(3) 991 and Uf(3)1011.²⁵

There are reasonable doubts as to the precise meaning of the term *pu-te-ri-ja* *ko-to-i-na* **phutērian* *ktoínan*. The problem was already discussed by Ventris and Chadwick in the second edition of *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (1973: 270), where they proposed a double translation:

¹⁸ Killen (2015: 742). See also *DMic.Supl. s.v. ki-wa-ra*.

¹⁹ But cf. Melena (1996: 169, n. 18): ‘an entry of “wicker hurdles” fits well among other commodities made from twigs, including “shafts (?), quivers (?) for darts” *X paltaiôn*’.

²⁰ Later Greek preserves the term *stokhastēs* ‘diviner’, ‘he who conjectures’ with a clear metaphorical sense. See *LSJ⁹ s.v.*

²¹ On the Knossos Uf series, see Hiller (1983); Del Frego (2001); Zurbach (2017: 70–83). On KN Uf(3), see also Del Frego (2005: 60–5).

²² The term appears without word-divider on two tablets (KN Uf(3) 981.b; 1022.b): *e-ke-pu-te-ri-ja*. Regarding the *scriptio continua* in Mycenaean, see Del Frego (2016: 147).

²³ Del Frego (2001: 31–32). See also *DMic. s.v.*

²⁴ Del Frego (2001: 31); *LGM s.v. φῶ*.

²⁵ Hiller (1983: 182). KN Uf 8485.b, a very fragmentary document, preserves the sequence]*pu-te*[which may belong to *pu-te* or *pu-te-ri-ja*, although a more accurate reconstruction is not possible.

‘a plot suitable for planting; given to a gardener?’. Scholars have generally favoured the second option,²⁶ assuming that the suffix **-yo-* attributes the meaning of ‘Pertaining to the word: ‘a plot belonging to a planter; a planter's plot’. Del Frio (2001: 31) notes that this construction parallels *ke-ke-me-no ko-re-te-ri-jo* ‘(terrain) *ke-ke-me-no* du gouverneur’, an expression discussed below (Section 2.4). In this sense, he maintains that *pu-te-ri-ja* plots were ‘inhabited’ by planters. This view is in line with the idea that the lexicon of land expresses meanings with administrative significance, as would the terms *ki-ti-me-na* and *ke-ke-me-na* which modify *ko-to(-i)-na* in Pylos, although their exact content is still debated.²⁷

The problem with this interpretation is that one needs to explain the difference between having the ‘plot of a planter’ (*ko-to-i-na pu-te-ri-ja*) and having a plot ‘as a planter’ (*pu-te*). Del Frio (2001: 41) argues that there were two levels of occupation: the plots with *pu-te* were inhabited by planters, while the *pu-te-ri-ja* plots, although originally assigned to planters, were later granted to other individuals. Moreover, on PY Na 520.B, some ‘planters’ (*pu₂-te-re*) *ki-ti-je-si *ktiensi* ‘cultivate’ the land, a verb which is related to the IE root **tkei-* also present in *ki-ti-me-na*. It seems therefore that the planters' task was to plant land with fruit trees,²⁸ but also somehow be responsible for the cultivation of flax.²⁹

2.4. *ko-re-te-ri-jo*

The term *ko-re-te-ri-jo* appears on PY An(2) 830.6, which records *ke-ke-me-na* lands and a list of *qo-u-ko-ro* ‘cowherds’:

(10) PY An(2) 830

1.] *vacat* [
2.] *ke-ke-me[-no DA qs*
3.] *di-ri-wa-ša* [
4. *ma-ra-ti-sa* [
5. *vacat*
- a. -no
6. *a-te-re-wi-ja , e-so , ko-re-te-ri-jo, ke-ke-me- DA 30* [
7. *vacat*
8. *e-sa-re-wi-ja , ro-ro-ni-ja , te-u-po-ṛo* [] *vacat* [
9.]no *DA 50* [] *vacat* [
10.] *qo-u-ko-ṛo VIR 28* [] *vacat*
11. *qo-]u-ko-ro, ra-wa-ra-ti-ja VIR 66*
12. *o-pi-da-mi-jo, pi-*82, qo-u[-ko-]ṛo VIR 60*
13. *a₂-ki-ja , qo-u-ko-ro VIR 60* [
14. *vacat* [
15.] *vacat* [

²⁶ But cf. Adrados (1961: 289): “en Cnosos se trata de *ko-to-na pu-te-ri-ja*, φυτόρια, es decir, consistentes en plantaciones (¿viñedo? ¿olivar?)”.

²⁷ *DMic s.vv.*; *LGM s.v.* κτιζω; κτιάνω.

²⁸ Hiller (1983).

²⁹ For the Na series, see Perna (2004: 209–56).

This document is a joint record of people by means of the logograms *DA* and *VIR*. These groups are registered by places. *VIR* entries refer to cowherds, whereas *DA* entries are linked to the presence of *ke-ke-me-no*, a land description qualified by place names and an adjective *ko-re-te-ri-jo*.

Line 6 records 30 *DA*³⁰ of *ke-ke-me-na* plots located in the interior (*e-so *énsō*) of the region of *a-te-re-wi-ja*, north of the Further Province (*pe-ra₃-ko-ra-i-ja*).³¹ The meaning of the term *ko-re-te-ri-jo* is unclear, although it is generally interpreted as an adjective modifying the substantival participle *ke-ke-me-no*.³² In other words, the line refers to *ke-ke-me-na* plots of the *ko-re-te-ri-jo* type. *ko-re-te-ri-jo* is most commonly interpreted as a derivative in *-io-* of *ko-re-te*, the title of an official whose functions remain the subject of debate (Section 4). Thus, the resulting reading would be ‘*ke-ke-me-na* plots of the *ko-re-te*’. In this case, the suffix **-yo-* would indicate Possession or, perhaps, Pertaining, as proposed for *pu-te-ri-ja* (Section 2.3).

2.5. *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja*

The word *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja* is attested on the Pylos tablets PY An(6) 35.5 and PY Un(2) 443.1 and, in a very fragmentary context, on TI X 6.b and KN X 996:

(11) **PY An(6) 35**³³

5. a-ta-ro, tu-ru-pte-ri-ja, o-no

6. LANA 2 CAP^f 4 *146 3 VIN 10 NI 4

(12) **PY Un(2) 443**³⁴

1. ku-pi-ri-jo, tu-ru-pte-ri-ja, o-no LANA 10 *146 10

(13) **TI X 6**

a.]37 [

b.]4 M 7 tu-ru-pte-ri-ja[

(14) **KN X 986**³⁵

tu-ru-pe-te[

The word *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja* *stryptēria* ‘alum’ appears in texts from Pylos in a context of commercial exchange: *a-ta-ro* receives wool, goats, textiles (*146), wine and figs in exchange for alum; *ku-pi-ri-jo* receives only wool and textiles (*146).³⁶ The interpretation is based on the meaning of the term *o-no *ónon* ‘payment’, ‘profit’, and so it seems that the Palace paid the individuals listed with products (wool, wine, textiles) in exchange for alum. It is not clear what use the Mycenaeans made of alum,³⁷ but the texts suggest some connection with the dyeing of textiles, the stypsis process of perfumed oils and the working of bronze.

³⁰ Probably a land measurement unit. See Zurbach (2017: 153–7).

³¹ Del Frio (2005: 173).

³² The number is uncertain. It may be a nom. dual *ke-ke-ménō*, if the omitted noun is *ko-to(-i)-na*, which seems likely.

³³ Lines 1–4 of the text do not seem to be related to the annotations in lines 5–6. The full text can be found in *PTT*³ p. 23.

³⁴ Lines 2–3 do not seem to be related to the annotation of line 1. The full text can be found in *PTT*³ p. 205.

³⁵ *tu-ru-pe-te[* is probably a graphic variant. See *DMic. s.v.*

³⁶ Killen (2015: 658–659). It is also possible that they are not ‘traders’ *vel sim.* but bronze workers. See Nakassis (2013: 99–100).

³⁷ See Perna (2005).

In any case, as far as the formation of the word is concerned, *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja* is a substantival adjective *stryptēria* (IPri.364.14), presumably built on an agent noun **stryptēr*, related to *stryphnós* ‘sour, harsh, astringent’.³⁸ It seems that its substantivation is due to its frequent occurrence in the phrase *gē st(r)yp̄tēria* ‘earth that contracts, astringent’.³⁹

2.6. *ra-pte-ri-ja*

The term *ra-pte-ri-ja* appears on PY Ub 1315.2 modifying the noun *a-ni-ja* (*(h)ānnīai* ‘reins’):

(15) PY Ub 1315

1.]-wo-ja a-ni-ja , te-u-ke-pi , 5 di-pte-ra₃ e-ru-ta-ra 1 6[
2. ro-u-si-je-wi-ja 6 Infra te-u-ke-pi
- a. 2
3. ne-wa , a-ni-ja , a-na-pu-ke , 5 dwo 2 a-pu-ke 9 a-ni-ja-e-e-ro-pa-jo-qe-ṛo-ṣa
- a. 1
4. a-pe-ne-wo 4 a-pu-ke, a-pe-ne-wo ne-wa po-qe-wi-ja ZE 11

The text⁴⁰ records hides (*di-pte-ra₃*) and products made of leather: reins (*a-ni-ja*) and halters (*po-qe-wi-ja*). In some cases, the state of the reins and the halters is described: *ne-wa* or *ra-pte-ri-ja*. There is no doubt that *ne-wa* should be interpreted as **néwai* ‘new’. With regard to *ra-pte-ri-ja*, the meaning ‘repaired’ has been proposed.⁴¹ Indeed, *ra-pte-ri-ja *rhaptēriai* could be an adjective in *-io-* derived from *ra-pte *rhaptēr* ‘saddler’ (perhaps, ‘mender’)⁴² or an adjective in *-tērios* derived from *rháptō* ‘sew together, stitch’. The text would thus refer to reins which are not new but have been darned, repaired, mended. However, in line with other interpretations of the adjectives in *-tērios*, it seems that the meaning should be ‘reins intended for the saddler’ rather than ‘repaired reins’, that is to say, reins which have not been repaired yet but are due to be repaired. Even so, it is still possible to accept the meaning ‘repaired, mended reins’ based on the general idea of the text, as the new objects seem to suggest a task which is already completed and to which the scribe bears witness. As far as the semantic interpretation of the adjective is concerned, it would have the value of Pertaining (Section 3).

2.7. *pa-ke-te-ri-ja*

The word *pa-ke-te-ri-ja* appears on the seal MY Wt 506.γ-α qualifying *ka-na-to*:

(16) MY Wt 506

- β. ka-na-to
- γ. pa-ke-te-ri-
- α. -ja

The term *pa-ke-te-ri-ja* raises a number of problems of interpretation. According to scholars, the word is either an adjective in *-tērios* or a diminutive in *-iov*, in both cases derived from *pa-*

³⁸ Melena (2014: 69). The most frequent term in Greek of the first millennium is *styp̄tēria*, whose relation, however, to *stryptēria* is not secure. See Ruijgh (1967: 114) and the objections in *DÉLG s.v.* στύφω. See also *DÉLG s.v.* στρυφνός and *EDG s.v.* στρυφνός: ‘No convincing etymology. Clearly reminiscent of στύφω “to astringe”’. Perhaps it derives from the same root, with secondary στρ-’.

³⁹ *LSJ⁹ s.v.* στυπτηρία.

⁴⁰ For a detailed interpretation of the text, see Bernabé-Luján (2016: 568–71).

⁴¹ *LGM s.v.* ῥάπτω.

⁴² The term *ráptēs* ‘one who stitches, clothes-mender’ is attested in later alphabetic Greek. See *LSJ⁹ s.v.*

ke-te-re. Although the suggestion that it is related to *pa-ke-te-re* is plausible, a new problem emerges with respect to the interpretation of the latter. The word is usually taken to denote an artifact *pāktēres* (nom. pl.) ‘dowels’, ‘fixing pieces’ (cf. *pégnymi*) on PY Vn(2) 879.4, PY Wp 1415 and PY Vn(2) 46.6, if the reconstruction is accepted. However, the term is also attested in Mycenae on tablet MY Ue 611.3, which lists vessels probably intended for a festival banquet.⁴³ In the case of Mycenae, the term has been interpreted as *paktēres* ‘containers for cheeses’ or *sphaktēres* ‘vessels which pick up the blood of a sacrificed animal’ (Section 2.1).⁴⁴ The meaning of *pa-ke-te-re* thus remains an open question, although for the purposes of this paper a reasonable hypothesis will still be advanced regarding the interpretation and meaning of *pa-ke-te-ri-ja*.

The word *pa-ke-te-ri-ja* appears alongside the term *ka-na-to* on the seal MY Wt 506. *ka-na-to* is attested in three documents from Mycenae, MY Ue 611.3, Wt 502.β and Wt 506.β, and probably in a text from Thebes, TH Ka 113. Since MY Ue 611 records a list of vessels and containers for a festival banquet and in TH Ka 133 the word *a-po-re-we amphorēwes* (nom. pl.) ‘jars’ appears, it has been proposed that the document from Thebes would record matters similar to the former. This is the reason why *ka-na-to* has been interpreted as *kánasthon* ‘wicker basket’. MY Ue 611.3 indicates a possible relationship between *pa-ke-te-re* and *ka-na-to*: the two terms are found together in the same line, while both may refer to vessels. A similar situation can be gleaned on MY Wt 506. But what about *pa-ke-te-ri-ja*? The absence of a word-divider and the lack of the enclitic conjunction *-qe* between the two terms of the seal (as on MY Wt 511) seem to suggest that *pa-ke-te-ri-ja* is an adjective in *-tērios* rather than a diminutive of *pa-ke-te-re*. If so, the phrase *ka-na-to pa-ke-te-ri-ja* bears a reasonable resemblance to other pairs commented above, such as *ko-to-i-na pu-te-ri-ja* (Section 2.3), which show the structure Noun + Adj. Thus, an interpretation ‘*ka-na-to* for *pa-ke-te-re*’ seems likely.

A final issue is the translation of the phrase. According to Ventris and Chadwick (1973: 496), *ka-na-to* could be interpreted as *gnathoi* ‘cramps’. However, this poses the question of the function of a cramp on a list of vessels. Consani and Negri (2016: 430) are perhaps right in proposing a type of small stake (it. *zipolo*) which would serve to seal the mouth of the vessels, but it is impossible to confirm this hypothesis on the basis of archeological evidence, as the authors admit. If *pa-ke-te-ri-ja* is reconstructed as *paktēria*, then *gnathoi* for *paktēria* ‘cramps for sealing’ *uel sim.* might be a plausible translation. Be that as it may, considering the uncertainties that affect the interpretation of *pa-ke-te-ri-ja* and in order to avoid arbitrariness in the analysis of the semantic values of the adjectives in *-te-ri-jo*, the term will not be taken into account.

3. THE SEMANTIC VALUES OF THE ADJECTIVES IN *-TE-RI-JO*

As already mentioned (Section 1), the suffix **-yo-* denotes belonging in a broad sense. However, the semantic values of the Mycenaean adjectives in *-te-ri-jo* can be further refined to provide a more homogeneous picture of their meaning. As seen in the presentation of the corpus above, the proposed meanings vary considerably. It is therefore worth asking whether the sequence *-te-ri-jo* admits the same interpretation in all cases.

The aim of this section is to analyse the Mycenaean occurrences and examine them in relation to the semantic values of the adjectives in *-tērios* from the first millennium B.C. in order to achieve a more uniform interpretation of the data.

⁴³ Varias García (2007: 837).

⁴⁴ Varias García (2008: 781).

3.1. The semantic values of the Mycenaean adjectives in *-te-ri-jo*

Adjectives with the suffix **-yo-* denote belonging in broad terms, but, as far as the Mycenaean adjectives in *-te-ri-jo* are concerned, these can be interpreted as having two additional semantic values, alongside a group of adjectives of uncertain value:

- a. Pertaining: *ra-pte-ri-ja*
- b. Means: *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja*, *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* and *to-ka-te-ri-ja*
- c. Doubtful cases: *pu-te-ri-ja* and *ko-re-te-ri-jo*

The adjective *ra-pte-ri-ja* provides evidence of the semantic value of Pertaining, namely of the original value of the suffix **-yo-*. Accordingly, the meaning ‘(reins) intended for the saddler’ or ‘repaired reins’ (Section 2.6) seems to be the most reasonable possibility. As will be seen below, *ra-pte-ri-ja* and perhaps *ko-re-te-ri-jo*, and less likely *pu-te-ri-ja*, are the only cases in Mycenaean to show the original semantic value of Pertaining. These cases reveal some hesitation in regarding the suffix *-térios* as a single unit, which should not be surprising, as it is such ‘bridging contexts’ that allow innovations to emerge.⁴⁵ As Ruijgh (1967: 99) notes, ‘la fonction de *-io-* consiste à désigner l’appartenance d’une façon générale: p. ex. δῆμιος ‘appartenant au δῆμος, destiné au δῆμος, concernant le δῆμος’ [‘the function of *-io-* consists in designating the membership in a general way: e.g. δῆμιος ‘belonging to the δῆμος, intended for the δῆμος, concerning the δῆμος’], but the evidence from Mycenaean, as argued below, suggests that the suffix *-térios* was undergoing change. The following examples point to the fossilization of the two suffixes: *-tér(+ios) > -térios*.

The second category, Means, is closely related to the semantic values of Patient and Instrument.⁴⁶ There are three terms with this semantic value in the Mycenaean corpus: *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja*, *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* and *to-ka-te-ri-ja*.

With regard to *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja stryptēría*, which appears substantivized in all its attestations in Mycenaean, it seems that Instrument and, more precisely, Means is the most appropriate semantic value.⁴⁷ Adjectives in *-térios* often exhibit this value in Greek of the first millennium BC. when they accompany a noun referring to an object, that is when they do not accompany an Agent (Section 5). As already mentioned (Section 1), Mycenaean Greek preserves examples of nouns in *-tér* with the value of Instrument (*o-pi-ra₃-te-re*, *au-te*), and it is therefore not surprising that the suffix *-térios* can also assume the value of Means.

Means also seems to be the most suitable semantic value in relation to *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* and *to-ka-te-ri-ja*. Indeed, both refer to objects which serve to achieve a goal. Thus, *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* are ‘(animals) for sacrifice’, namely ‘animals by means of which a sacrifice is made’ and *ki-wa-ra to-ka-te-ri-ja* are ‘wickerwork for targets’, that is, ‘wickerwork by means of which shooting (with javelins?) is practiced’. It could be argued that the notion of Pertaining in a loose sense is the prevailing one. Thus, ‘(animals) intended for the sacrificer’ or ‘wickerwork intended for the aimer, for the one who aims (with a javelin)’ are also possible alternatives. However, the Instrumental values of the nouns in *-tér* and *-térion* and the semantic value of

⁴⁵ See Luján (2010: 169–70).

⁴⁶ Means is here understood as a “non-prototypical Instrument”. For the features of the “prototypical Instrument” and the relation between non-prototypical instruments and other semantic categories in natural languages, see Stolz (1996); (1997). The proximity of Patient and Instrument is not self-evident and is not undisputed, but see Luján (2010) who discusses this relation. On the process of acquisition of the Instrumental value in phrases containing nouns in *-tér* with adjectival value, see Luján (2015: 545).

⁴⁷ A semantic analysis as Instrument (i.e. “prototypical Instrument”) is excluded, as neither an Agent nor a Patient can be presupposed. Both notions are absent from the Mycenaean contexts where the word *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja* is attested.

Means ('non-prototypical Instrument) in *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja* demonstrate that *-térion* and *-térios* were already conceived as a unitary suffix in Mycenaean times.

With regard to the 'doubtful cases', *pu-te-ri-ja* and *ko-re-te-ri-jo* are believed to have the general value of Pertaining to a group similar to that of *ra-pte-ri-ja*: *ko-to-i-na pu-te-ri-ja* 'plot intended for the *pu-te*' and *ke-ke-me-no ko-re-te-ri-jo* '(lands) intended for the *ko-re-te*'. A clear parallel to the cases of *pu-te-ri-ja* and *ko-re-te-ri-jo* is provided by the phrase *ra-wa-ke-si-jo te-me-no *lawagésios témenos* 'the *témenos* of the *lagétas*' (PY Er 312.3).⁴⁸ This is land (*te-me-no*) that is intended for the *ra-wa-ke-ta*, an official. Similarly, the *ko-to-i-na pu-te-ri-ja* may be intended for or concern the *pu-te* and the *ke-ke-me-no ko-re-te-ri-jo* for the *ko-re-te*. However, as already discussed, there are examples of adjectives in *-térios* in Mycenaean which suggest that other semantic values are possible.

4. THE TERMS *PU-TE-RI-JA* AND *KO-RE-TE-RI-JO*

The word *pu-te-ri-ja* modifies *ko-to-i-na*, 'plot of land', while the word *ko-re-te-ri-jo* modifies *ke-ke-me-no*, a term denoting the state of a piece of land. Both words form part of the Mycenaean vocabulary of land, a lexical group which presents particular difficulties in its interpretation.⁴⁹ In order to interpret these adjectives, it is first of all necessary to ask whether the technical terms referring to the state of the land denote its administrative state or its agricultural state. Scholars have convincingly argued for both views. In the first case,⁵⁰ *ki-ti-me-na* and *ke-ke-me-na* would mean 'inhabited (land)' and 'uninhabited (land)', respectively; in the second,⁵¹ '(land) under cultivation' and 'abandoned land'. If we accept that the vocabulary of land refers to the administrative state of the land, the phrase *pu-te-ri-ja ko-to-i-na* can be understood as 'plot intended for the *pu-te*, for the planter'. The same can be said of *ke-ke-me-no ko-re-te-ri-jo* 'ke-ke-me-no (land) intended for the *ko-re-te*'. In both cases, the suffix **-yo-* would have the more or less loose semantic value of Pertaining, as in *ra-pte-ri-ja*. However, the analysis of the semantic values of the rest of the adjectives in *-te-ri-jo* reveals a value of Means ('non-prototypical Instrument'), which is consistent with a process of fossilization of the suffix *-térios* similar to the one that affected *-térion* (Section 1). In this case, we would not be dealing with derivatives in **-yo-* but in *-térios*.

That being so, in parallel to the interpretation of *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* as '(animals) for sacrifice', it is possible to venture the interpretation 'plot for planting'⁵² or even 'plot on which to plant', where *pu-te-ri-ja* could have a Locative semantic value.⁵³ This interpretation is in line with the argument that the vocabulary of land refers to the agricultural state of the terrain, at least in the case of *ki-ti-me-na* and of the terms related to the IE root **tkei-*, such as *a-ki-ti-to*.⁵⁴ Indeed, if we accept that *a-ki-ti-to áktiton* means 'uncultivated land',⁵⁵ *ki-ti-me-na* may be taken to mean 'cultivated land' and *pu-te-ri-ja*, a parallel of *ki-ti-me-na* in Knossos,⁵⁶ would consequently mean '(plot) intended for planting', 'plot on which to plant'.⁵⁷ The term

⁴⁸ In addition to the fact that, according to Van Brock (1960: 229) and the objections of Ruijgh (1967: 99), adjectives in **-yo-* do not express possession, the lands to which these adjectives refer were not really in the possession of their holders, but were probably lands which were frequently managed by the *da-mo* and whose ultimate owner is unknown. See Zurbach (2017).

⁴⁹ On the lexicon of land, see for example Palmer (1998–1999) and Del Frio (2001).

⁵⁰ For example, Del Frio (2001).

⁵¹ For example, De Fidio (1987, 2008).

⁵² De Fidio (2008: 173).

⁵³ On the relation between non-prototypical instruments and locatives see, among others, Stolz (1996); Luján (2010).

⁵⁴ Piquero (2018, 2019).

⁵⁵ Piquero (2019).

⁵⁶ Del Frio (2001: 33).

⁵⁷ Luján (2012: 136).

ke-ke-me-na clearly corresponds to *ki-ti-me-na* in Pylos, but its meaning remains subject to debate.⁵⁸ On the other hand, if *pu-te-ri-ja ko-to-i-na* means ‘plot for planting’, then Del Frego’s hypothesis about the two levels of land occupation (Section 2.3) would have to be reconsidered. The fragmentary state of the tablets makes any conclusion difficult, although it is probable that both having a plot as a *pu-te* and having a *pu-te-ri-ja* plot mean that the task of the landholders, the *pu₂-te-re* ‘planters’, was to ‘plant’ the plots.

As regards *ko-re-te-ri-jo ke-ke-me-no*, scholarship accepts without objections the interpretation ‘*ke-ke-me-no* (lands) of the *ko-re-te*’ in line with *ra-wa-ke-si-jo te-me-no* on PY Er 312.3. The adjective has a possible semantic value of Pertaining, as the case of *ra-pte-ri-ja* demonstrates, but, following the argument about the fossilization of *-térios*, another alternative may be suggested. If the word *ko-re-te-ri-jo* is related to the noun *ko-re-te*, as is likely, it would be interesting to interpret the term based on the meaning of the verb from which *ko-re-tér* derives. Although there is no agreement on the etymology of *ko-re-te*,⁵⁹ it seems that it is related to the IE root **kerH₃-* ‘to nourish, feed, fodder’⁶⁰ and that the agent **korētér* derives from an athematic verb **korémi* (cf. *korésai*, *korénnymi*).⁶¹ If so, *ko-re-te* would mean something like ‘he who lets grow’ the community and would be etymologically related to *da-mo-ko-ro*, the name of another palace official whose second element would belong to the same root.⁶² If this approach is correct, the phrase *ko-re-te-ri-jo ke-ke-me-no* could be interpreted as ‘*ke-ke-me-no* (lands) for feeding, by means of which to feed’ with a semantic value of Means.

The question arises as to what exactly it means that these *ke-ke-me-no* lands were intended for feeding.⁶³ There are at least two explanations, both of which can help us understand better PY An(2) 830 and the use of the *ke-ke-me-na* lands recorded there. PY An(2) 830.10–13 lists a series of *qo-u-ko-ro *g^woukóloi* ‘cowherds’, who are probably related to the *ke-ke-me-na* lands recorded in lines 2–9.⁶⁴ It seems obvious that if there are cowherds it is because there are cattle, although the word may have to be understood as herdsmen in a more general sense, in which case they could be in charge of other animals too.⁶⁵ The first option is that the cows work the *ke-ke-me-na* lands, so that they can then be planted;⁶⁶ the second is that the *ke-ke-me-na* lands serve for grazing the animals themselves. As noted above, *ko-re-te-ri-jo* is believed to be related to the root of *korésai* / *korénnymi*, the same found in *ko-re-te* and *da-mo-ko-ro*. If this is so, the Mycenaean words related to the IE root **kerH₃-* would have the meaning ‘feeding men, making the community grow’, a meaning which also appears in Homer (*Il.*16.747; *Od.*8.98), in addition to ‘satiety’ in a figurative sense.⁶⁷ There is, however, another option. It has been suggested that the term *ko-ro* on TH Ft 219.1 should be interpreted as *kóros* ‘fodder’⁶⁸, ‘satiety’ in Homer (*Il.*19.221, etc.).⁶⁹ Thus, it seems that in Mycenaean the root could refer both to the feeding of humans and animals. The latter sense

⁵⁸ See *DMic. s.v.* and *LGM s.v.* κηάνω. See also Zurbach (2017: 82).

⁵⁹ *DMic. s.v.*

⁶⁰ On the problems presented by this root, see García Ramón (2010: 76–82).

⁶¹ García Ramón (2010: 87). See also Ruijgh (1986); *LGM s.v.* κορέννυμι.

⁶² García Ramón (2010: 76–82).

⁶³ Needless to say, ‘land for feeding’ is a metonymy for the crops that grow on that land.

⁶⁴ Palaima (1989: 115).

⁶⁵ See the discussion in Palaima (1989: 113).

⁶⁶ Like those appearing on KN Ch. See Zurbach (2017: 125–7).

⁶⁷ *Il.*13.365; 18.287; *Od.*4.541; 23.350. See also Ruijgh (1986: 383).

⁶⁸ García Ramón (2010: 82–3). Although there is no agreement: see *DMic.Supl. s.v.* *ko-ro*.

⁶⁹ García Ramón (2010: 85): “‘le fourrage pour des animaux’, attesté depuis Homère avec le sens figuré de ‘satiété’, cf. κορέννυμι ‘se rassaisie’”.

also appears in Homer: *ē tis kai Trōōn korēei kýnas ēd' oionóous dēmōi kai sárkessi* ‘many a Trojan now will glut the dogs and birds with his fat and flesh’ (*Il.8.379 f.*).⁷⁰ Finally, *ko-re-te-ri-jo ke-ke-me-no* might have offered both possibilities and served to feed both humans and animals, as they could include both cultivated and uncultivated parts, which is common in agriculture.⁷¹

Thus, given the semantic values of the adjectives in *-te-ri-jo*, *ko-to-i-na pu-te-ri-ja* and *ke-ke-me-no ko-re-te-ri-jo* could also be interpreted as having the semantic value of Means with the meaning ‘plot to plant’ and ‘*ke-ke-me-no* lands to feed’, respectively.

5. THE SEQUENCE *-TE-RI-JO*: ONE OR TWO SUFFIXES?

Having studied the evidence from Mycenaean, it is worth asking whether the suffix *-tērios* was already fossilized as a single suffix in Mycenaean times or was still interpreted by speakers as two suffixes: *-tēr(+ios)*. In order to answer this question it is necessary to review the Mycenaean attestations of the suffix and the semantic values which it has in alphabetic Greek. As noted by Chantraine (1933: 43), the suffix was not very productive in Greek, as it was soon replaced by *-tikós*. It appears mostly in the language of tragedy, which leads Chantraine (1933: 45) to conclude that ‘il était réservé au vocabulaire archaïsant de la tragédie, de la religion’ [‘it was reserved for the archaic vocabulary of tragedy, of religion’]. It is possible that in the fifth century BC the suffix sounded as archaizing and that the new formation *-tikós* was more in keeping with Ionian-Attic prose. However, the Mycenaean evidence suggests at least two things: (1) that the formation was relatively frequent in Greek in the second millennium BC; and (2) that it was not limited to the religious lexicon.⁷²

The values of the adjectives with the suffix *-tērios* in Greek of the first millennium BC depend on the noun with which they combine. If the noun is an Agent [+ control], they have the semantic value of Agent, but if they modify nouns with the semantic value of Force⁷³ or Instrument [+ manipulable], they assume the value of Instrument.⁷⁴ Below are some examples showing both values in Greek of the first millennium BC:⁷⁵

- 1 Agent: the adjectives in *-tērios* have the value of Agent when the noun which they modify refers to entities occupying the highest position on the scale of agentivity (‘prototypical agents’), for example, when they function as epithets of gods or refer to men or animals: *Dseÿs aleksētērios* ‘Zeus the Saviour’ (*A.Th.8*); *prostatērias Artémidos* ‘Artemis the Protectress’ (*A.Th.449 s.*); *hermēi mastērīoi* ‘Hermes the Searcher’ (*A.Supp.920*); *ándra lymantērion* ‘destructive man, destructor, who destroys’ (*A.Ch.764*); *mýōpa kinētērion* ‘agitating horsefly’ (*A.Supp.307*);
- 2 Instrument/Means: the noun which they modify occupies a lower position on the scale of agentivity, ‘external cause, force’: *skēptron eythyntērion* (*A.Pers.764*) ‘ruling sceptre’; *desmà limantēria* (*A.Pr.991*) ‘destructive bonds’; *hármatà polemistēria* (*Hdt.5.113*) ‘chariots for war’; *mýthous thelktērious* (*A.Eu.81*) ‘enchanting speeches’; *thusían peystērian* (*E.El.835*) ‘sacrifice to/by means of which to ask (the gods)’.

⁷⁰ Also in *Il.13.831 s.*; *Il.17.241*. Ruijgh (1986: 383–4) and García Ramón (2010: 82–83) cite other similar passages.

⁷¹ That some kind of cultivation technique was practiced on the *ke-ke-me-na* lands seems to be confirmed by KN Uf(3) 835 where a *pu-te* ‘planter’ is assigned to a *ke-ke-me-na* plot. For possible interpretations of this text, see Zurbach (2017: 82).

⁷² It is not used in Homer, except in the noun *θελκτίριον*, probably for metrical reasons. See Ruiz Abad (2014: 140).

⁷³ Forces do not have the feature [+ control] of the prototypical Agents and are different from Instruments in that they lack the feature [+ manipulable].

⁷⁴ Luján (2015: 544–7).

⁷⁵ Only a few significant examples will be included from among the oldest attestations of the suffix *-tērios*.

The Mycenaean evidence suggests that the sequence *-te-ri-jo* was undergoing a process of change. Thus, in the case of *ra-pte-ri-ja*, perhaps also of *ko-re-te-ri-jo* and, less likely, of *pu-te-ri-ja*, the suffix **-yo-* seems to function independently, forming adjectives with the semantic value of Pertaining: *-tér(+)ios*. However, the rest of the examples suggest that the speakers perceived the sequence *-te-ri-jo* as a single suffix *-térios*. This is demonstrated by the semantic value of Means ('non-prototypical Instrument') of *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja*, *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* and *to-ka-te-ri-ja*. The fossilization of the suffix *-térion* in Mycenaean (Section 1) and the testimony of nouns in *-tér* with an Instrumental value also point in the same direction. The cases qualified as 'doubtful', *pu-te-ri-ja* and *ko-re-te-ri-jo*, do not allow an unambiguous interpretation. They may represent a stage of fragmentation of the suffix *-tér(+)ios* with the semantic value of Pertaining ('bridging context'), but may also be taken to exhibit a value which is in line with the rest of the examples of adjectives and nouns in *-te-ri-jo*. Whatever the case, the interpretation of *pu-te-ri-ja* as '(plot) for planting' seems consistent with the interpretation of the Mycenaean lexicon of land and, more specifically, with the terms deriving from the IE root **tkei-* (Section 4).

6. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of the corpus of Mycenaean adjectives with the sequence *-te-ri-jo* shows that the suffix was in a period of change from its conception as two suffixes, *-tér + ios*, to its fossilization as one: *-térios*.

The word *ra-pte-ri-ja* presents the semantic value of Pertaining, which suggests a twofold interpretation of the suffix. However, the examples of *tu-ru-pte-ri-ja*, *sa-pa-ka-te-ri-ja* and *to-ka-te-ri-ja* are consistent with the semantic value of Means, which is closely related to the already existing value of Instrument attested in Mycenaean nouns in *-térion* and nouns with the suffix *-tér* (Section 1). The last two cases, *pu-te-ri-ja* and *ko-re-te-ri-jo* are uncertain. The analysis of the corpus of adjectives and nouns in *-te-ri-jo* indicates that *ko-re-te-ri-jo* may be interpreted as having the semantic value of Means, while *pu-te-ri-ja* might have had this same value or even a Locative value. Either way, one cannot rule out the possibility that both adjectives still preserve the notion of Pertaining deriving from the value of the still fragmented suffix **-yo-*. This interpretation is, however, less consistent with the evidence that shows an incipient fossilization of the suffix *-térios*, although it would be consonant with the idea of the so-called 'bridging contexts' which favour semantic change. Moreover, the interpretations of *pu-te-ri-ja* and *ko-re-te-ri-jo* proposed here suggest that the Mycenaean vocabulary of land could refer to the agricultural and not the administrative state of the land. The case of *a-ki-ti-to* and, consequently, of *ki-ti-me-na* seem to point in the same direction. Unfortunately, very little is known about the *ke-ke-me-na* lands. Let us hope that new texts and further research will shed some light on this complex area of the Mycenaean lexicon.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DMic. = Francisco Aura Jorro, *Diccionario Micénico*, Madrid, CSIC, 1985–1993.

DMic. Supl. = Francisco Aura Jorro – Alberto Bernabé – Eugenio R. Luján – Juan Piquero – Carlos Varias, *Suplemento al Diccionario Micénico*. Madrid, CSIC, 2020.

KT VI = José L. Melena, *The Knossos Tablets. Sixth Edition*. In collaboration with Richard J. Firth, Philadelphia, INSTAP, 2019.

LGM = Juan Piquero, *El léxico del griego micénico. Index Graecitatis, étude et mise à jour de la bibliographie*. Paris-Nancy: A.D.R.A-De Boccard, 2019.

*LSJ*⁹ = Henry G. Liddell – Robert Scott – Henry S. Jones – Roderick McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996.

*PTT*² = Jean-Pierre Olivier – Maurizio Del Freo, *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed. Deuxième édition*. Padova, libreriauniversitaria.it, 2020.

*PTT*³ = José L. Melena, *The Pylos Tablets. Third Edition*. With the collaboration of Richard J. Firth, Vitoria: Universidad del País Vasco, 2021.

Correspondence

Juan Piquero

Department of Classical Philology,

Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED),

Paseo de la Senda del Rey, 7. 28040 Madrid. Spain

Email: jpiquero@flog.uned.es

REFERENCES

- ADRADOS, FRANCISCO. R. (1961). 'Sobre los ideogramas micénicos *DA, PA, TA, ZE* y *171', *Emerita* 29(2). 287–296.
- BERNABÉ, ALBERTO & EUGENIO LUJÁN (2016). 'Testi relativi a pelli e manufatti in pelle', in Maurizio Del Freo & Massimo Perna (eds.), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare b*. Padova: libreriauniversitaria.it. 567–588.
- CHANTRAINE PIERRE (1933). *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- CONSANI, CARLO & MARIO NEGRI (2016). 'Registrazioni di vasi', in Maurizio del Freo & Massimo Perna (eds.), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*, vol. 2. Padova: libreriauniversitaria.it. 421–432.
- DE FIDIO, PIA (1987). 'Palais et communautés de village dans la royaume mycénien de Pylos', in Petar Hr. Iliovski & Ljiljana Crepajac (eds.), *Tractata Mycenaea. Proceedings of the Eighth International Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies Held in Ohrid, 15–20 Septembre 1985*. Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts. 129–149.
- DE FIDIO, PIA (2008). 'Miceneo *ki-ti-ta* e *me-ta-ki-ti-tá*', in Anna Sacconi, Maurizio Del Freo, Louis Godart & Mario Negri (eds.), *Colloquium Romanum. Atti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia. Roma, 20–25 febbraio 2006*. Pisa-Roma: Fabrizio Serra. 159–178.
- DE LAMBERTERIE, CHARLES, (2021). 'La fête des Achéens'. <https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:2oCiVN5tV4kJ:https://chs.harvard.edu/la-fete-des-acheens/+&cd=1&hl=es&ct=clnk&gl=es>.
- DEL FREO, MAURIZIO (2001). 'Mycénien *pu-te-ri-ja* et le couple *ki-ti-me-na / ke-ke-me-na*', *RPh* 75(1). 27–44.
- DEL FREO, MAURIZIO, (2005). *I censimenti di terreni nei testi in lineare B*. Pisa-Roma: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali.
- DEL FREO, MAURIZIO, (2016). 'La scrittura lineare B', in Maurizio Del Freo & Massimo Perna (eds.), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*. Padova: libreriauniversitaria.it. 123–166.
- GARCÍA RAMÓN, JOSÉ LUIS (2010). 'Reconstructing IE lexicon and phraseology. Inherited patterns and lexical renewal', in Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert & Brent Vine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen: Hempen. 69–106.
- GARCÍA RAMÓN, JOSÉ LUIS (2016). 'Il greco miceneo', in Maurizio Del Freo & Massimo Perna (eds.), *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*. Padova: libreriauniversitaria.it. 211–243.
- GUILLEUX, NICOLE (2008). 'Archaisms et innovations in grec mycénien. Une évaluation critique', in Anna Sacconi, Maurizio Del Freo, Louis Godart & Mario Negri (eds.), *Colloquium Romanum. Atti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia. Roma, 20–25 febbraio 2006*. Pisa-Roma: Fabrizio Serra. 337–349.
- HILLER, STEFAN (1983). 'Fruchtbaumkulturen auf Kreta und in Pylos' in Alfred Heuceck & Günter Neumann (eds.), *Res Mycenaee. Aketen des VII. Internationalen Mykenologischen Colloquiums in Nürnberg von 6.–10. April 1981*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 171–201.
- KILLEN, JOHN T. (2015). *Economy and administration in Mycenaean Greece. Collected papers on Linear B*. Ed. by Maurizio Del Freo. Roma: CNR.
- LUJÁN, EUGENIO R. (2010). 'Semantic maps and word formation: Agents, instruments, and related semantic roles', *Linguistic Discovery*, 8(1). 162–175.
- LUJÁN, EUGENIO R. (2012). 'La moción de género en los adjetivos temáticos en micénico', in Carlos Varias (ed.), *Actas del Simposio Internacional: 55 Años de Micenología (1952–2007) (Faventia Supplementa 1)*. Bellaterra: UAB. 127–153.
- LUJÁN, EUGENIO R. (2015). 'Papeles semánticos y formación de palabras. El sufijo griego -της', in Jesús de la Villa, Patricia Cañizares Ferriz, Emma Falque Rey, José Francisco González Castro & Jaime Siles (eds.), *Ianua Classicorum. Temas y formas del Mundo Clásico*. vol. 1. Madrid: Sociedad Española de Estudios clásicos. 539–548.
- LUJÁN, EUGENIO R. & CÉSAR RUIZ ABAD (2014). 'Semantic roles and word formation. Instrument and location in Ancient Greek', in Silvia Luraghi & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *Perspectives on semantic roles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 241–269.
- MEISSNER, TORSTEN (2004). 'Two Mycenaean problems', in John H.W. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European perspectives. Festschrift for Anna Morpurgo-Davies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 258–265

- MELENA, JOSÉ L. (1996–1997). ‘40 joins and quasi-joins of fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos’, *Minos* 31–32. 159–170.
- MELENA, JOSÉ L. (2000–2001). ‘63 joins and quasi-joins of fragments in the Linear B Tablets from Pylos’, *Minos* 35–36. 371–384.
- MELENA, JOSÉ L. (2014). ‘Mycenaean writing’, in Yves Duhoux & Anna Morpurgo Davies (eds.), *A companion to Linear B. Mycenaean Greek texts and their world. Volume 3*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters. 1–186.
- NAKASSIS, DIMITRI (2013). *Individuals and society in Mycenaean Pylos*. Leiden: Brill.
- PALAIMA, THOMAS G. (1989). ‘Perspectives on the Pylos Oxen Tablets: Textual (and archaeological) evidence for the use and management of oxen in Late Bronze Age Messina (and Crete)’, in Thomas G. Palaima, Cyntia W. Shelmerdine & Petar Hr. Ilievski (eds.), *Studia Mycenaea (1988) (Ziva Antika Monographes 7)*. Skopje. 85–124.
- PALMER, RUTH (1998–1999). ‘Models in Linear B landholding: An analysis of methodology’, in John Bennet and Jan Driessen (eds.), *A-NA-QO-TA studies presented to J. T. Killen (Minos 33–34)*. Salamanca: Universidad. 223–250.
- PERNA, MASSIMO (2004). *Recherches sur la fiscalité mycénienne*. Paris-Nancy: A.D.R.A.-De Boccard.
- PERNA, MASSIMO (2005). ‘L'alun dans les documents en linéaire B’, in Philippe Borgard, Jean-Pierre Brun & Maurice Picon (eds.), *L'alun de Méditerranée*. Naples: Publications du Centre Jean Bérard. 39–42.
- PIQUERO, JUAN (2017). ‘Los vidrieros del Centro de culto de Micenas’, in Aarón Balda Baranda & Elena Redondo Moyano (eds.), *Opera selecta. Estudios sobre el Mundo clásico (Veleia Acta 15)*. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Universidad del País Vasco. 63–72.
- PIQUERO, JUAN (2018). ‘The dossier *sa-ra-pe-da* of Pylos Revisited’, *SMEA NS* 4. 131–142.
- PIQUERO, JUAN (2019). ‘Mic. *a-ki-ti-to* / gr. alf. ἄκτιτος y el léxico micénico de la tierra’, in Juan Piquero, Pablo de Paz & Soraya Planchas (eds.), *Nunc est Bacchandum. Homenaje a Alberto Bernabé*. Madrid: Guillermo Escolar Editor. 319–327.
- PIQUERO, JUAN (forthcoming). ‘*re-ke-(e-)to-ro-te-ri-jo*: la ‘Fiesta del lecho’ de Pilo’, in Ana I. Jiménez-San Cristóbal (ed.), *Los antiguos se van de fiesta*. Madrid: Guillermo Escolar Editor. 114–125.
- RUIJGH, CORNELIUS J. (1967). *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- RUIJGH, CORNELIUS J. (1986). ‘Observations sur κορέσαι, κορέω, myc. *da-ko-ro* δακόρος etc.’, in Annemarie Etter (ed.), *O-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 377–392.
- RUIZ ABAD, CÉSAR (2014). *Papeles semánticos y procedimientos de formación de palabras: los nombres de instrumento y ubicación en griego antiguo en perspectiva tipológica*. Madrid: UCM (Ph.D.: <https://eprints.ucm.es/id/eprint/24939/1/T35256.pdf>).
- STOLZ, THOMAS (1996). ‘Komitativ-Typologie. MIT- und OHNE-Relationen im crosslinguistischen Überblick’, *Papiere zur Linguistik* 51(1). 3–65.
- STOLZ, THOMAS (1997). ‘Some instruments are really good companions, some are not. On syncretism and the typology of instrumentals and comitatives’, *Theoretical Linguistics* 23(1–2). 113–200.
- VAN BROCK, NADIA (1960). ‘Notes mycéniennes’, *RPh* 34(1). 216–231.
- VARIAS GARCÍA, CARLOS (2007). ‘Observaciones sobre algunos textos gastronómicos de Micenas’, in Javier Alonso Aldama, Cirilo García Román & Idoia Mamolar Sánchez (eds.), *Stis ammodies tou Omerou. Homenaje a la profesora Olga Omatos*. Vitoria: Universidad del País Vasco. 831–842.
- VARIAS GARCÍA, CARLOS (2008). ‘Observations on the Mycenaean vocabulary of furniture and vessels’, in Anna Sacconi, Maurizio Del Freo, Louis Godart & Mario Negri (eds.), *Colloquium Romanum. Atti del XII Colloquio Internazionale di Micenologia. Roma, 20–25 febbraio 2006*. Pisa-Roma: Fabrizio Serra. 775–793.
- VENTRIS, MICHAEL & JOHN CHADWICK (1973). *The documents in Mycenaean Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ZURBACH, JULIEN (2017). *Les hommes, la terre et la dette en Grèce, c. 1400 – c. 500 a.C.* Bordeaux: Ausonius.