THE MYCENEAN VERB FORM *I-JE-TO-* AND ITS CONTINUITY IN THE FIRST MILLENNIUM: THE IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXT AND COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF CORPUS LANGUAGES

SOBRE LA FORMA VERBAL MICÉNICA *I-JE-TO-* Y SU CONTINUIDAD EN EL PRIMER MILENIO: LA IMPORTANCIA DEL CONTEXTO Y EL ANÁLISIS COMPARATIVO EN LA INTERPRETACIÓN DE LAS LENGUAS DE CORPUS

JOSÉ MIGUEL JIMÉNEZ DELGADO
jmjimdelg@us.es
Universidad de Sevilla

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate the importance of context and comparative analysis for the interpretation of corpus languages. The interpretation of the Mycenaean verb form *i-je-to-* will serve as a case study to illustrate this point. This form is attested in a Pylian tablet recording important offerings to several deities. As will be shown, the context of the tablet is crucial for assessing the validity of the different proposals made so far, as is the comparison of this term with its cognates in other ancient IE languages. Finally, the continuity of the term in the first millennium will be traced. Continuity is not essential for the interpretation of Mycenaean terms but the existence of Greek cognates affords greater credibility.

Resumen

El presente trabajo tiene por objeto poner de relieve la importancia del contexto y el análisis comparativo en la interpretación de las lenguas de corpus. Para ello se ejemplificará con un caso concreto, la forma verbal micénica *i-je-to-*, que se documenta en una tablilla pilia en la que se registran una serie de ofrendas a diversas divinidades. Como veremos, para establecer la verosimilitud de las distintas propuestas que se han dado para su interpretación es fundamental el contexto de la tablilla en la que aparece, así como su comparación con términos relacionados de otras lenguas indoeuropeas antiguas. Por último, rastrearemos su posible continuidad en el primer milenio, dado que, si bien no es indispensable para interpretar los términos micénicos, sí que aporta una mayor plausibilidad.

1. Aims

The aim of this article is to emphasise the importance of context and comparative analysis for the interpretation of corpus languages. For this reason, I will focus on the Mycenaean term *i-je-to-*, a verb form which has led to numerous hypotheses. The term is attested in a tablet recording offerings for a religious ceremony. Apart from being a corpus language, Mycenaean Greek survives in a fragmentary state, as it is only documented in a limited number of texts of an administrative nature, in which several elements of the Greek language cannot be accommodated, such as the vocative, first and second person forms, the optative, etc.[1] As will be seen, the interpretation of Mycenaean terms depends precisely on this context, as well as on the comparative analysis of other verb forms from Greek and other ancient Indo-European languages. Finally, I will attempt to examine whether the paradigm to which the verb form *i-je-to-* belongs had continuity in the texts

---

1. On the nature of the Mycenaean texts, their writing system and their linguistic description, see Bernabé-Luján (2020).

of the first millennium or if it is only attested in that specific Mycenaean tablet. The continuity of a Mycenaean term in the first millennium is crucial for establishing its meaning, as it constitutes one of the main ways of checking the validity of its interpretation. This by no means implies that continuity is a necessary criterion, but it undoubtedly serves as a confirmation tool.

2. The verb form *i-je-to-*

The verb form *i-je-to-* occurs four times in PY Tn 316.2 and v. 1.4.8, a tablet which describes a ceremony held in several religious centres attached to the Palace of Nestor at Pylos (= *pu-ro*)[2]. The following is the transcription of the text of the tablet from Linear B, the syllabic script of Mycenaean Greeks, into the Latin alphabet, according to *PTT3*:

PY Tn 316

Recto
.1 po-ro-wi-to-jo ,
.2   ⌐ i-je-to-qe , pa-ki-ja-si , do-ra-qe , pe-re , po-re-na-qe
   pu-ro ⌐
.3   └ a-ke , po-ti-ni-ja AUR *215*VAS 1 MUL 1
.4 ma-na-sa , AUR *213*VAS 1 MUL 1 po-si-da-e-ja AUR*b* *213*VAS 1 MUL 1
.5 ti-ri-se-ro-e , AUR *216*VAS 1   do-po-ta   AUR*b* *215*VAS 1
.6   *angustum*
.7   ⌐ *vacat*
.8 | *vacat*
.9 pu-ro ⌐ *vacat*
.10   └ *vacat*

_____

2. The site, one of the most important in the Mycenaean world, is located on Epano Englianos, a hill of the municipality of Chora in the southwestern corner of the Peloponnese, in Messenia. It is named after the main leader of the Messenian troops in Homer.

Verso

v.1	⌈	i-je-to-qe , po-si-da-i-jo , a-ke-qe , wa-tu
v.2		do-ra-qe , pe-re , po-re-na-qe , a-ke
.a pu-ro		-ja
v.3	⌊	AUR *215*ᵛᴬˢ 1 MUL 2 qo-wi-ja , ṇạ-[ ] , ko-ma-we-te-
v.4	⌈	i-je-to-qe , pe-rẹ-*82-jo , i-pe-me-de-ja-qe di-u-ja-jo-qe
v.5		do-rạ-qe , pe-re-po-re-na-qe , a , pe-re-*82 AUR *213*ᵛᴬˢ1 MUL1
v.6 pu-ro		i-pe-me-dẹ-ja AUR*b*213*ᵛᴬˢ 1 di-u-ja AUR *213*ᵛᴬˢ 1 MUL 1
v.7	⌊	e-ma-a₂ , a-re-ja AUR *216*ᵛᴬˢ 1 VIR 1
v.8	⌈	i-je-to-qe , di-u-jo , do-ra-qe , pe-re , po-re-na-qe a-ḳẹ
v.9		di-we AUR*b* *213*ᵛᴬˢ 1 VIR 1 e-ra AUR*b* *213*ᵛᴬˢ 1 MUL 1
v.10 pu-ro		di-ri-mi-jo di-wo , i-je-we , AUR*b* *213*ᵛᴬˢ 1 [ ] *vacat*
v.11	⌊	*vacat*
v.12		*angustum*
v.13	⌈	*vacat*
v.14		*vacat*
v.15 pu-ro		*vacat*
v.16	⌊	*vacat*

The ceremony takes place in the month of *po-ro-wi-to* (*po-ro-wi-to-jo* is a temporal partitive genitive)[3] and is celebrated: at Sphagianes (*pa-ki-ja-si*); at the sanctuary of Poseidon (*po-si-da-e-jo*); at the sanctuary of *pe-re-*82 (*pe-re-*82-jo*), Iphemedeia (*i-pe-me-de-ja-*)[4] and Dia (*di-u-ja-jo*); and at the sanctuary of Zeus (*di-u-jo*). The text is divided into four sections, each headed by *i-je-to-* and referring to different offerings made at different sanctuaries. It mainly involves the offering of gold cups (AUR *215*ᵛᴬˢ, etc.)[5], women (MUL) and men (VIR) to various deities: the Lady (*po-ti-ni-ja*), *ma-na-sa* (?), the *paredros* of Poseidon (*po-si-da-e-ja*), the Thrice Hero (*ti-ri-se-ro-e*), the Lord (*do-po-ta*), *pe-re-*82 (?), Iphemedeia (*i-pe-me-de-ja*), the *paredros* of Zeus or Dia (*di-u-ja*), Hermes Areias[6] (*e-ma-a₂ a-re-ja*), Zeus (*di-we*), Hera (*e-ra*) and Drimios, the

---

3. Perhaps the month of sailing (*Plōwistos*) or flowering (*Phlowi(s)tos*). See *DMic. s. u.*
4. The theonym could be related to the name of the heroine Ἰφιμέδεια, *cf. DMic. s. u. i-pe-me-ḍẹ-ja*. Based on the context, *i-pe-me-de-ja-* in *v.* 4 is probably an error for *i-pe-me-de-ja-<jo->*, the name of the sanctuary of this deity, *cf.* Duhoux (2008: 327).
5. Probably also of silver cups, if it is accepted that the logogram AUR*b*, a variant of AUR 'gold', denotes 'silver', *cf.* Godart (2010: 112-114).
6. An epithet related to Ares. See *DMic. s. u.*

son of Zeus (*di-ri-mi-jo di-wo i-je-we*). On the interpretation of the tablet, see Melena (2001: 68-70), Duhoux (2008: 321-335) and Varias (2016: 557-563). Particularly interesting is the articulation of the ceremony in three parts. The first one is described by the verb form *i-je-to-* and must be related to a procession. The other two involve carrying the offerings (*do-ra pe-re* δῶρα φέρει) and leading (*a-ke* ἄγει) the *po-re-na* 'victims?'[7]. It is important to note that these verb forms are in the third person singular without an explicit subject (Jiménez Delgado 2016: 149-151), which is probably identifiable as the high priest or the *wanax* / king.

The sequence *a-mo-i-je-to* (PY Va 15 *v*.a), which could represent a fifth instance of the verb form under consideration, is more complex. See the text on the verso of the tablet in which it is attested:

> PY Va(1) 15
> *Verso*
>
> .a   a-mo-i-je-to
> pe-re-ku wa-na-ka , pu-ro e-ti-wa-jo *34-ka-te-re   [

This line, the only one on the verso of the tablet, includes an anthroponym in the nominative (*pe-re-ku-wa-na-ka*) and a second one (*e-ti-wa-jo*) that is probably also in the nominative, if the agent noun that follows is interpreted as a dual (**34-ka-te-re*), as suggested by another example on the recto of the tablet (**34-ka-te-re* 2). The toponym *pu-ro* situates the information at Pylos. Without further hints, it is impossible to determine the meaning of *a-mo-i-je-to*, but it seems relatively clear that it consists of two terms written continuously, *a-mo-* and *-i-je-to*, the latter of which could be the verb form that concerns us or a form belonging to the paradigm of ἵημι[8].

---

7. The interpretation of this term has been the subject of controversy, although it is generally agreed that it designates individuals referred to by the logograms MUL and VIR. It most likely does not refer to sacrificial victims but to people who dedicate themselves to the deity as servants. It might also denote bearers of offerings, if it is an agent name in -ην from the root of φέρω; *cf.* Piquero Rodríguez (2014).
8. The term *a-mo-* is even more obscure. It could be the Mycenaean word for 'wheel', a variant of Att.-Ion. ἅμα 'at the same time' or the Mycenaean form corresponding to the adverb ἁρμοῖ 'just, lately'. See *DMic. s. u. a-mo-i-je-to*.

3. The interpretation of *i-je-to-*

Mycenologists generally agree that the meaning of *i-je-to-* is related to processions, although its etymology is not clear; *cf. DMic. s. u. i-je-to-qe* and *LGM s. u.* ἱερός. Its connection to ἵημι 'to throw, send' should, in principle, be precluded, as ἵημι is not used in this context in the first millennium, where the verb πέμπω 'to send' is employed instead. It could be the case that this semantic specialisation did not apply in the second millennium and that ἵημι might have been used in this context, but even then, one would have to explain the middle-passive morphology of *i-je-to-*, since if what is sent is a procession (πομπὴν πέμπειν), it is difficult to interpret the form as passive in view of *pe-re* and *a-ke*. The use of a middle diathesis would also be unclear[9]. Much more speculative is the reconstruction of an athematic present with a root **Hiseh₁-* related to the adjective ἱερός 'sacred' and with a meaning 'to make a consecration *vel sim.*' (Palmer 1963: 265-266, 422; *Documents*² 461-462; Melena 2001: 68-70). Although this meaning would be compatible with the context of the tablet and explain the middle morphology (Jiménez Delgado 2016: 157), García Ramón (1986) has shown that the adjective ἱερός in fact derives from the Indo-European root $*h_1ei\underset{.}{s}h_2$-. The same root gave the verbs ἰάομαι 'to cure, heal' and ἰνάω / ἰνέω 'to empty, purify', and possibly the verb ἰαίνω 'to warm, comfort'[10]. In a later article, García Ramón (1996) argued that Myc. *i-je-to-* derived from this same root, which originally meant 'to set in motion' and is attested not only in Greek but also in Indo-Iranian; *cf. LIV*² *s. u.* $*h_1ei\underset{.}{s}h_2$-. In light of this, the middle morphology of *i-je-to-* could be understood as characteristic of the verbs of motion (*body motion middle*; *cf.* Allan 2003: 76-81). This interpretation fits well with the procession described in PY Tn 316, since the term would refer to an officiant who leads the procession and puts himself in motion to initiate it.

---

9. For the interpretation of *i-je-to-* as a form of ἵημι, see Ruijgh (1974: 190 and 1981: 56-60). It should be pointed out that this verb is usually constructed with complements that express direction. *Cf.* Lane (2016: 51-55), who follows the same interpretation and explains the nouns of place with which *i-je-to-* is constructed (*pa-ki-ja-si*, *po-si-da-e-jo*, *pe-re-*82-jo*, *i-pe-me-de-ja-*, *di-u-ja-jo*, *di-u-jo*) as locative datives rather than accusatives of direction with the postposition *-de*.

10. According to García Ramón (1986: 505), it would be a denominative from a heteroclite noun $*h_1is(h_2)\text{-}\underset{.}{r}/n\text{-}$ derived from this root.

As far as the formation of *i-je-to-* is concerned, García Ramón (1996) suggests three possibilities from an Indo-European perspective:

- − **is-e-toi̯ < *h₁is(h₂)-é-toi̯* through secondary thematisation of **is-toi̯*, a present with parallels in Iranian; *cf.* Av. act. *išn̥tī*, midd. *pair-išn̥te* 'to set / be set in motion' (Cheung 2007: 159).
- − **īs-e-toi̯ < *h₁i-h₁is(h₂)-é-toi̯*, a reduplicated athematic present root (**h₁i-h₁is[h₂]-toi̯*) with thematisation and a possible parallel in Ved. *íṣate* 'to hurry'[11].
- − **is-i̯e-toi̯ < *h₁ís(h₂)-i̯e-toi̯*, a present in -*i̯e/o*- with parallels in Indo-Iranian; *cf.* Ved. *iṣyati/te* 'to set / be set in motion', Av. *fra-ēiš́ii̯ā* 'incite'[12].

In all three cases, the studies of García Ramón (1992: 190-191 and 1996: 264) propose the loss of etymological *h₂*, which is explained as a tendency that originated in the protolanguage and involved the loss of laryngeals in interconsonantal position when preceded by a sibilant (**/H/ → Ø / s_R, C*); *cf.* Hitt. *ešnaš* 'blood' (**h₁ésh₂-n-o-s*) and Gr. μέλδεσθαι 'to melt' (< **sh₂meld-*, *cf.* a.a.a. *smelzan*)[13]. In the case of **h₁ís(h₂)-i̯e-toi̯*, the loss of *h₂* would be reinforced by the application of Pinault's Law, which predicts Proto-Indo-European loss of a laryngeal after a consonant when followed by *yod* before a vowel (PIE **hx → Ø / C0_i̯V*); *cf.* Byrd (2015: 213). This form, moreover, would be the one that corresponds best to the Mycenaean spelling, as it accounts for the suffix in *yod* –although the other two forms are not entirely incompatible[14]. For all these reasons, I argue that the best interpretation of *i-je-to-* is **is-i̯e-toi̯*, a present in -*i̯e/o*- with parallels in Indo-Iranian, which would refer to the procession that the high priest or the *wanax* / king of

---

11. Ved. *íṣate* 'to hurry' (midd.) could be from this root, although it could also be analysed as a desiderative form of **h₁ei̯*- 'to go'. See Hajnal (1996: 282, n. 36).
12. For the Vedic forms, *cf.* García Ramón (1996: 267).
13. The tendency that García Ramón adduces to explain, for example, the derivation of ἱερός from the root **h₁eish₂*- may be a feature that is specific to Greek. Thus, for the Hittite form *ešnaš*, see Kloekhorst (2008: 259). The Greek form μέλδεσθαι would contain a mobile *s*-; see Beekes (1969: 82-87) and Southern (1997: 107-108, 110-113). Overall, laryngeal loss is usually accepted for Greek in #s_R; *cf.* Nikolaev (2012: 201, n. 72).
14. On the hesitation in representing intervocalic aspiration through graphic hiatus, see Jiménez Delgado (2008) and Hellemans (2005).

Pylos would lead to make the offerings recorded in PY Tn 316 in honour of various deities[15].

4. *i-je-to-* in the first millennium

As we have seen, there is no consensus on the meaning of *i-je-to-*, as it does not seem to match well with such a common verb as ἵημι 'to throw, send' either in terms of context or morphology. We are most likely dealing, then, with a verb form that belongs to a paradigm with good parallels in Indo-Iranian, of which only indirect cognates remain in the Greek of the first millennium, such as ἱερός 'sacred', ἰάομαι 'to cure, heal' and ἰνάω / ἰνέω 'to empty, purify'. This verb form would refer to the movement of the officiant who initiates the procession related to the offerings recorded in the tablet and can be translated as 'to set oneself in motion'. The aim of this section is to examine whether the paradigm to which *i-je-to-* belongs had indeed disappeared completely in Greek in the first millennium, as this lack of continuity could challenge the validity of this interpretation. It is very likely that traces of this paradigm did indeed survive, especially in Homeric Greek. However, it is difficult to detect them because, as will be seen, the phonetic-phonological developments that took place in Greek in the first millennium led to its conflation with other paradigms with different meanings.

The term *i-je-to-* must have read /ihi̯etoi̯/ in Mycenaean, where the intervocalic aspiration was still perceptible; *cf.* Jiménez Delgado (2008). The result of the evolution of this present form at the end of the second millennium must have been /hīetai/ –/hīetoi/ in Arcado-Cypriot– with metathesis of the aspiration as in ἱερός[16]. Confusion with the middle forms of ἵημι was inevitable, especially considering that the initial iota tends to lengthen in such forms: ἵ̄εμαι. The conflation of the paradigm of Myc. *i-je-to-* with that of ἵημι had already been pointed out by Hajnal (1996)[17], but the process is

---

15. This is the most likely interpretation, according to García Ramón (1996: 267). However, Hajnal (1996) bases the derivation of the Mycenaean form **ī̆s-e-toi̯* on the Vedic parallel *í̥ṣate*.

16. In the case of ἰάομαι, García Ramón (1986: 513) attributes the loss of aspiration to the generalisation of an Ionian form with psilosis.

17. "*i-je-to* kann schon den Charakter eine Reliktform besitzen und auf /ʰī̆jēmi/ 'senden' bezogen werden. Die lässt sogar den Schluss zu, dass vielmehr ein solcher

more complex than it might seem at first, as a third root $*u̯ei̯h_1$- is involved in the lengthening mentioned above.

The lengthening of the middle forms of ἵημι has to do with the incorporation of a present stem from $*u̯ei̯h_1$- 'to pursue, long for' into its paradigm; *cf.* Jiménez Delgado (2022). This would explain the long scansion of the iota of the reduplication of the present of ἵημι, which is etymological in the case of $*ϝῑ́εμαι$[18] and would have extended from the middle forms to the paradigm of ἵημι. This is the situation observed in Homer and other Attic-Ionian writers, where the confusion was further reinforced by the early loss of the initial *wau*; *cf. DELG s. u.* ἵεμαι[19]. This confusion also explains why the middle forms of ἵημι have meanings that are proper to $*u̯ei̯h_1$-, such as the following[20]:

1. 'to rush, hurry'; *cf.* οἴκαδε ἱεμένων 'hurrying home' (Hom. *Il.* 2.154); ἵετ' εὐθὺ πρὸς τὰ νυμφικὰ λέχη 'he rushed straight to the marriage bed' (S. *OT* 1242).
2. 'to wish'; *cf.* ἱέμενον νόστοιο 'longing for his return' (Hom. *Od.* 15.69).

It is interesting to note that the middle voice of ἵημι also expresses the movement of the subject, as established by the Homeric scholia; see, for

---

Synkretismus (und nicht den Einfluss eines idg. $*u̯iH$-$(i̯)e$-toi) zu den oben erwähnten auffälligen Bedeutung 'eilen' des Mediums ἵεμαι zu ἵημι beigetragen hat." (Hajnal 1996: 286).

18. Harđarson (1993) considers that the Greek present stem $*ϝῑε$- was created from a reduplicated athematic present and, specifically, from a third person plural form: $*u̯i$-$u̯ih_1$-$entoi̯ > *u̯i$-$u̯ii̯$-$entoi̯ > *u̯i$-$i̯ii̯$-$entoi̯ > *u̯ῑ̯entoi̯$. On the other hand, Willi (2018: 156-157) proceeds from a third personal singular form of a reduplicated thematic present ($*u̯i$-$u̯i(h_1)$-e-$toi̯ > *u̯i$-$u̯i̯$-e-$toi̯ > *u̯i$-$i̯i̯$-e-$toi̯ > *ϝῑ́εται$) or even from a present in *yod* with zero grade $*u̯ih_1$-$i̯$-e/o-, as assumed by Solmsen (1901: 151).

19. The initial *wau* tends to disappear without trace in Attic-Ionic, but results with a rough spirit are also frequent, in this case by analogy with ἵημι; *cf.* Lejeune (1972: 176-177).

20. They refer less often to the action of throwing an object, *cf. Il.* 4.77 (τοῦ δέ τε πολλοὶ ἀπὸ σπινθῆρες ἵενται 'from which many sparks are sent flying', with a passive meaning), or from meanings derived from it; *cf. Il.* 22.80 (κόλπον ἀνῑεμένη 'opening her dress'), 24.300 (τοι τόδ' ἐφῑεμένη 'to you who commands this'), *Od.* 2.300 (αἶγας ἀνῑεμένους σιάλους θ' 'flaying goats and hogs'), 13.7 (ἀνδρὶ ἑκάστῳ ἐφῑέμενος τάδε 'commanding this to every man'), 23.240 (δειρῆς δ' οὔπω … ἀφῑετο πήχεε λευκώ 'she could not remove her white arms from round his neck').

example, Sch. D Thiel M 274 πρόσσω ἵεσθε· εἰς τοὔμπροσθεν ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὁρμᾶτε 'rush forward: go forward and get yourselves moving'. This meaning is less common in the Homeric examples[21], but it is the one that best survives in non-epic writers, as in the single example from Pindar: ῾ῑέμενοι *P.* 4.207. Table 1 presents the data corresponding to the emotive and motion meanings of the middle voice of ἵημι in Homer and other classical writers:

Table 1. Middle voice of ἵημι with emotive and motion meaning in different writers

Writers	Emotive middle	Motion middle
Homer	52	15
Sophocles	2	2
Euripides	5	4
Aristophanes	1	3
Herodotus	-	4

Overall, in classical Greek the emotive meaning was limited to the compound ἐφίεμαι[22], while uncompounded ἱέμαι usually conveyed the motion meaning[23].

The relation between the motion and emotive meanings of *$\ast u\underset{\sim}{e}ih_1$-* is usually explained on the basis of the desire of the agent who moves, *cf. LfgrE*

---

21. *Cf. Il.* 2.154, 8.313, 12.274, 13.291, 707, 15.543, 16.382, 20.399, *Od.* 3.160, 9.261, 17.5, 19.187, 20.356, 22.304, 470 as opposed to *Il.* 2.589, 5.434, 8.241, 301, 310, 11.168, 537, 12.68, 13.386, 424, 501, 585, 15.450, 16.359, 383, 396, 507, 761, 866, 17.276, 292, 18.501, 547, 20.280, 469, 502, 21.70, 23.371, 718, 767, *Od.* 1.6, 58, 2.327, 3.344, 4.284, 823, 10.246, 529, 13.334, 426, 14.142, 282, 15.30, 69, 201, 16.430, 21.72, 129, 22.256, 273, 409, 23.353.
22. *Cf.* S. *Ph.* 1315 (ἐφίεμαι); E. *Hel.* 1183 (ἐφίεμαι), *Io.* 521 (ἐφίεμαι), *Ph.* 531 (ἐφίεσαι), *Rh.* 46 (ἐφιέμενοι), 300 (ἐφιέμην); Ar. *Av.* 1105 (ἐφίεται). An exception is found in S. *Tr.* 514 (῾ῑέμενοι).
23. *Cf.* S. *Ant.* 432 (῾ῑέμεσθα), *OT* 1242 (῾ῑετ'); E. *Ba.* 139 (῾ῑέμενος), 628 (῾ῑεται), *Ph.* 152 (῾ῑεμένα), *Supp.* 698 (῾ῑετο); Ar. *Eq.* 625 (῾ῑέμην), *V.* 423 (῾ῑεσο), *Ec.* 346 (῾ῑεμαι); Hdt. 2.70.2 (ἵεται), 6.112.1 (ἵεντο), 6.134.3 (ἵεσθαι), 9.78.1 (ἵετο).

II 1158[24]. In this sense, the root can also be related to the original meaning of ἵημι, since the middle of *(H)i̯eh₁- 'to throw' may be reinterpreted as expressing a translational movement, the main characteristic of which is the speed of the throw, although originally this type of movement referred to the object and not to the subject:

ἵ̔εμαι   →   to desire to go to a place > to go / rush to that place
ἵεμαι   →   to throw oneself (toward a place) > to hurry

However, it is possible that a third root merged into the paradigm of ἵημι, namely, the middle present which corresponds to Myc. *i-je-to-*. Its conflation with this paradigm became inevitable, once the sibilant was lost in intervocalic position in Proto-Greek. From a semantic point of view, the forms of this verb would have contributed to the creation of the meaning 'to set in motion, to hurry, to rush' of the middle voice of ἵημι with long scansion of the initial iota of the present stem.

Thus, three etymologically distinct roots converged in the middle voice of the Homeric paradigm of ἵημι. However, this conflation was limited to the present stem. In fact, the meanings expressed by it are not attested in other stems, in which the middle voice is transitive, unless it has a passive meaning; see the examples in fn. 20.

A more challenging question, due to the lack of evidence, is the possible conflation of the aorist and future stems of *i-je-to-* and *u̯ei̯h₁-*. The aorist ἐεισάμην / εἰσάμην and the future εἴσομαι attested in Homeric Greek are attributed to the latter root; *cf.* Harđarson (1993: 166-167); *LIV*² *s. u.*

---

24. In Jiménez Delgado (2022), it was noted that *u̯ei̯h₁-* might have originally denoted movement, in accordance with its cognates in other Indo-European languages; *cf.* Ved. *véti* 'to hunt, go after', Av. *vaēiti* 'to hunt, pursue', Lith. *výti* 'to pursue, hunt down'. Be that as it may, the primary meaning of the present stem of this root in Greek is emotive, as can be seen from Homer, not only because examples of this type are more numerous, but also because, when movement is expressed, it is usually accompanied by an emotive element; *cf.* LfgrE II 1157-1159. It is interesting, in this respect, to compare the scholium quoted above with another one to the same passage: Sch.Er. M 274 πρόσω ἵεσθε· τῇ ψυχῇ, οὐ τοῖς σώμασιν 'rush forward: with the soul, not with the body'.

h₁eiṣh₂-. Both stems essentially denote movement[25], which would cause confusion with the defective paradigm of εἶμι 'to go'[26], especially in those cases in which an initial *wau* cannot be reconstructed; *cf. Il.* 13.90, 17.285 (μετεισάμενος), 24.462 (ἐγὼ πάλιν εἴσομαι), *Od.* 15.213 (δεῦρ᾽ εἴσεται)[27], alongisde *Il.* 11.358 (καταείσατο), 15.415 (ἐείσατο), *Il.* 11.367, 20.454, *Od.* 15.504 (ἐπιείσομαι). On this issue, see Chantraine (1958: 142-143, 293-294); Létoublon (1985: 80-81). Certain examples are indicative of this confusion, regardless of the reconstruction of an initial *wau*, *cf.* εἴσομαι ἐξ ἀλόθεν χαλεπὴν ὄρσουσα θύελλλαν 'I will come out of the sea to raise a terrible storm' (*Il.* 21. 335), since the construction with a future participle is characteristic of verbs of motion[28], whereas *ϝῑ́εμαι with an emotive meaning is constructed with an infinitive (ἵετο θυμῷ τίσασθαι 'he desired in his soul to avenge himself', Hom. *Il.* 2.589) or a genitive of cause (ἱέμενοι πόλιος 'longing for the city', Hom. *Il.* 11.168). On the other hand, the forms in which *wau* can be restored have, in general, a clear motion meaning; *cf. Il.* 11.367 τοὺς ἄλλλους ἐπιείσομαι, ὅν κε κιχείω 'I will hurl myself against others, against whoever I meet on my way'.

The relation of these Homeric aorist and future forms to Myc. *i-je-to-* is a matter of conjecture, yet possible, especially after the conflation of /ihiẹtoi̯/ with /u̯ii̯ẹtoi̯/ once the initial *wau* was lost. From a semantic perspective, the examples correspond well with the meaning assigned to /ihiẹtoi̯/. However, from a morphological perspective, some problems remain, since the sigmatic

---

25. With one exception: *cf.* τὼ μὲν ἐεισάσθην χαλκήρεα τεύχε᾽ ἀπ᾽ ὤμων | συλήσειν 'both were eager to strip the bronze armour off his shoulders' (*Il.* 15.544-545), in which the construction with the infinitive could point to an emotive meaning; see Kirk-Janko (1994: 288).

26. Only the present stem of this verb is known, but later examples can be considered as created directly on it, such as the future διείσομαι (Nic. *Th.* 494, 837) or the aorist subjunctive εἴσεται with a short vowel attested in a Delphic inscription of the 2ⁿᵈ/1ˢᵗ c. B.C.; *cf.* ἐν ἡμέραις πέντε ταῖς ἔγγιστα … [αῖς ἂ]ν εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν εἴσεται 'within five days of moving into his post' (*FD* 4.37C.12).

27. Note that the Homeric forms of the present middle stem of ἵημι do not allow the elision of a vowel, except in exceptional cases; *cf.* ἄμφω δ᾽ ἱέσθην ἐπὶ ἵστορι πεῖραρ ἑλέσθαι 'and both were eager to settle the issue through an arbitrator.' (*Il.* 18.501), and in compounds (ἀνίεμαι, ἀφίεμαι, ἐφίεμαι, παρίεμαι, ὑφίεμαι).

28. On the construction of verbs of motion with future participles expressing purpose, see Létoublon (1985: 39); Kölligan (2017).

stem of $*h_1ei̯sh_2$- would be /eisas-/, with vocalisation of the laryngeal of the *set̥* root, or /eiss-/, if we assume that the loss of the laryngeal of the present stem spread to the rest of the paradigm. In the first case, the corresponding aorist and future stems would have evolved into *εἰασα- / *εἰασε/ο- (García Ramón 1986: 505-506). In the second, the simplification of the geminate sibilants, which is common in sigmatic aorists and futures after a long vowel or diphthong[29], would have given *εἶσα- / *εἶσε/ο-, for which there is a parallel in σεῖσα (*Il.* 15.321), σείσατο (*Il.* 8.199) < $*tu̯ei̯s$-s-, whose root ends in a sibilant, as would be the case of $*h_1ei̯sh_2$- after the loss of the laryngeal. If the future and aorist stems of *i-je-to-* were *εἶσα- and *εἶσε/ο-, the confusion with the aorist and future tenses of $*u̯ei̯h_1$- is obvious. However, all this remains uncertain, not least because there are no good parallels for the extension of the loss of the laryngeal from the present stem to other stems, as in the case of the perfect infinitive τέτορθαι of the verb τείρω (< $*terh_1$-$i̯e/o$-)[30] transmitted by Herodian (Hdn.Gr. 3.2.69 Lentz), or of the aorist ἔτειλα from τέλλω (< $*telh_2$-$i̯e/o$-), whose perfect is τέταλκα / τέταλμαι[31].

5. Conclusions

The Mycenaean verb form *i-je-to-* is attested in four instances in a Pylian tablet (PY Tn 316.2, v. 1.4.8), in which offerings are recorded in connection with a rather exceptional religious ceremony, both because of the quality of the offerings themselves and because it involved several deities and sanctuaries.

Three main interpretations have been put forward for *i-je-to-*:

---

29. The simplification of the geminate sibilant is regular after a long vowel or a diphthong, *cf.* Lejeune (1972: 102); on this phenomenon in the Homeric aorists and futures, *cf.* Risch (1974: 247-248, 349-350).

30. This present stem in *yod* could be a Greek innovation which would replace a radical thematic present *τερέω in order to avoid homonymy with the future stem of that root, *cf. LIV²* s. *u.* $*terh_1$-. Note that, according to Byrd (2015: 208-240), Pinault's law only affects h_2 and h_3, not h_1.

31. However, it is often suggested that it is a nasal present stem, *cf. LIV²* s. *u.* $*telh_2$-. Note that in this case the loss of the laryngeal in the present stem, thematized secondarily with full grade ($*tl̥$-neh_2- > $*tel$-ne/o-), would also spread to the rest of the stems.

1. It is a form belonging to the paradigm of ἵημι 'to throw, send', although in this case the middle-passive morphology would be left unexplained.
2. It is a form of a verb *ἵημι 'to consecrate *vel sim.*', unknown in the first millennium and etymologically related to the adjective ἱερός, ά, όν 'sacred', although the cognates of this adjective in other Indo-European languages do not support this etymological connection.
3. It is a form of a verbal paradigm related to the Indo-European root *$h_1ei̯sh_2$- 'to set in motion' from which the adjective ἱερός and the verbs ἰάομαι 'to cure, heal' and ἰνάω / ἰνάω 'to empty, purify' also derive.

This last interpretation is arguably the most convincing from an etymological and morphological perspective, but also because it fits perfectly into the context of the tablet, as it would refer to the high priest or the *wanax*, who puts himself in motion to start the procession for each of the offerings mentioned. In this case, the only stumbling block for considering this interpretation valid is its apparent lack of continuity in the first millennium. To be more precise, this lack of continuity does not necessarily mean that the interpretation of a Mycenaean term is to be rejected, but it certainly casts doubts on its acceptance.

However, a closer look at the phonetic-phonological evolution of this verb suggests that there was continuity. The present stem was confounded with the middle present stem of the verb ἵημι, which exhibits meanings that cannot be traced to its Indo-European root: on the one hand, an emotive meaning 'to long for, desire' related to another Indo-European root *$u̯ei̯h_1$-, which also merged into the middle present stem of ἵημι, and on the other, a motion meaning 'to rush, hurry', which could bear witness to that continuity. In fact, the middle present stem of ἵημι shows lengthening of the *i* of the reduplication that can be explained on the basis of *$u̯ei̯h_1$-, but also, alternatively, on the basis of the present attested by the Mycenaean form, through a process involving the loss of intervocalic aspiration: *i-je-to-* /ihi̯etoi̯/ > ῑ́εται.

Finally, there are Homeric aorist and future forms, ἐεισάμην / εἰσάμην and εἴσομαι, which have been etymologically linked to *$u̯ei̯h_1$- -in fact, some of them preserve traces of the initial *wau*-, even though their meaning is

systematically associated with movement. Therefore, it is possible that the morphosyntactic configuration of these forms was also influenced by the paradigm examined here, although in this case there are certain morphological difficulties which make this relationship more speculative.

References

ALLAN, Rutger J. (2003) *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek. A Study of Polysemy.* Amsterdam: Brill.

BEEKES, Robert S. P. (1969) *The Development of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Greek.* The Hague & Paris: Mouton.

BERNABÉ, Alberto & Eugenio R. Luján. (2020) *Introducción al griego micénico. Gramática, selección de textos y glosario. 2º edición, corregida y aumentada.* Zaragoza: Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza.

BYRD, Andrew M. (2015) *The Indo-European Syllable.* Amsterdam: Brill.

CHANTRAINE, Pierre. (1958) *Grammaire homérique. Tome I: phonétique et morphologie.* Paris: Klincksieck.

CHEUNG, Johnny. (2007) *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb.* Leiden: Brill.

DELG = Chantraine, Pierre. (1968-1980) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque.* Paris: Klincksieck.

DMic. = Aura Jorro, Francisco. (1985-1993) *Diccionario micénico.* Madrid: CSIC.

Documents[2] = Ventris, Michael & John Chadwick. (1973) *Documents in Mycenaean Greek.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DUHOUX, Yves. (2008) "Mycenaean anthology." In: Duhoux, Yves & Anna Morpurgo Davies (eds.) 2008. *A Companion to Linear B. Volume 1.* Louvain-la Neuve: Peeters, pp. 243-393.

GARCÍA RAMÓN, José Luis. (1986) "Griego ἰάομαι." In: Etter, Annemarie (ed.) 1986. *O-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag.* Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 497-513.

GARCÍA RAMÓN, José Luis. (1992) "Griechisch ἱερός und seine Varianten, vedisch iṣirá-." In: Beekes, Robert S. P. (ed.) 1992. *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie (Akten der VII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Leiden 1987).* Innsbruck: Institut für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Innsbruck, pp. 183-205.

GARCÍA RAMÓN, José Luis. (1996) "Sobre la tablilla PY Tn 316 y el pretendido presente radical *i-je-to.*" In: De Miro, Ernesto *et alii* (eds.) 1996. *Atti e memorie*

del secondo cogresso internazionale de micenologia. Roma: Gruppo editoriale internazionale, pp. 261-268.

GODART, Louis. (2010) "I due scribi della tavoletta Tn 316." *Pasiphae* 3, pp. 99-115.

HAJNAL, Ivo. (1996) "Mykenisch *i-je-to*, *i-je-ro* und Verwandtes." In: De Miro, Ernesto *et alii* (eds.) 1996. *Atti e memorie del secondo cogresso internazionale de micenologia*. Roma: Gruppo editoriale internazionale, pp. 267-288.

HARÐARSON, Jón A. (1993) "Griechisch (ϝ)ἵεμαι." In: Meiser, Gerhard (ed.) 1993. *Indogermanica et Italica. Fetschrift für Helmut Rix zum 65. Geburtstag.* Innsbruck: Institut für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Innsbruck, pp. 159-168.

HELLEMANS, Geert. (2005) *Étude phonétique et graphique du [j] (jod) en grec mycénien*. Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. Unpublished doctoral thesis.

JIMÉNEZ DELGADO, José Miguel. (2008) "La situación de **h* en griego micénico." *Kadmos* 47, pp. 73-90.

JIMÉNEZ DELGADO, José Miguel. (2016) *Sintaxis del griego micénico*. Sevilla: Editorial Universidad de Sevilla.

JIMÉNEZ DELGADO, José Miguel. (2022) "Sobre el origen de la escansión larga de la sílaba reduplicada de ἵημι." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 127, pp. 61-74.

KIRK, Geoffrey S. & Richard Janko. (1994) *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: Books 13-16*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KLOEKHORST, Alwin. (2008) *The Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Amsterdam: Brill.

KÖLLIGAN, Daniel. (2017) "From discourse to grammar? Ἔρχομαι + future participle in Greek." In: Lambert, Frédéric *et alii* (coords.) 2017. *The Greek Future and its History / Le futur grec et son histoire*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters, pp. 87-110.

LANE, Michael F. (2016) "Returning to sender: PY Tn 316, Linear B *i-je-to*, Pregnant Locatives, **perH₃-*, and Passing between Mycenaean Palaces." *Pasiphae* 10, pp. 39-89.

LEJEUNE, Michel. (1972) *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.

LÉTOUBLON, Françoise. (1985) *Il allait, pareil à la nuit. Les verbes de mouvement en grec ancient: supplétisme et aspect verbal*. Paris: Klincksieck.

LfgrE = Bruno, Snell *et alii*. (1979-2010) *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

LGM = Piquero Rodríguez, Juan. (2019) *El léxico del griego micénico*. Nancy: A.D.R.A.

LIV² = Rix, Helmut *et alii*. (2001) *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben. Die Würzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. Wiesbaden: Ludwig Reichert.

Melena, José Luis. (2001). *Textos griegos micénicos comentados*. Vitoria: Parlamento Vasco.

Nikolaev, Alexander. (2012) "Homeric ἀάατος: Etymology and Poetics." *Die Sprache* 50/2, pp. 182-239.

Palmer, Leonard R. (1963) *The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Piquero Rodríguez, Juan. (2014) "Hipótesis sobre las funciones y la indumentaria de los *po-re-na* micénicos." *'Ilu. Revista de Ciencias de las Religiones* 19, pp. 193-212.

PTT3 = Melena, José Luis & Richard J. Firth. (2021) *The Pylos Tablets Transcribed. Third Edition*. Vitoria: Universidad del País Vasco.

Risch, Ernst. (1974) *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. De Gruyter: Berlin.

Ruijgh, Cornelis J. (1974) "M. Ventris & J. Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*: 2nd edition by J. Chadwick. Cambridge University Press, 1973." *Mnemosyne* 27/2, pp. 187-192.

Ruijgh, Cornelis J. (1981) "Interprétation hypothétique de la tablette Va 15 de Pylos." *Živa Antika* 31, pp. 47-62.

Solmsen, Felix. (1901) *Untersuchungen zum griechischen Laut- und Verslehre*. Straßburg: Karl J. Trübner.

Southern, Mark R. V. (1997) *Sub-Grammatical Survival: Indo-European s-mobile and its Regeneration in Germanic*. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man.

Varias, Carlos. (2016) "Testi relativi a mobilio e vasi pregiati." In: Del Freo, Maurizio & Massimo Perna (eds.) 2016. *Manuale di epigrafia micenea. Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*. Padova: libreriauniversitaria. it, pp. 551-565.

Willi, Andreas. (2018) *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BIONOTE / NOTA BIOGRÁFICA

José Miguel Jiménez Delgado is Associate Professor of Classical Philology at the University of Seville (Spain). His main research interests are Ancient Greek Linguistics and Mycenology. He is the author of *Sintaxis del griego micénico* (2016) and numerous articles about Greek particles, etymology, and the interpretation of Mycenaean texts.

José Miguel Jiménez Delgado es Profesor Titular de Universidad adscrito al Área de Filología Griega de la Universidad de Sevilla. Su campo de especialización es la lingüística griega, fundamentalmente la sintaxis y la pragmática del griego antiguo, así como la micenología. Sus aportaciones más importantes incluyen una *Sintaxis del griego micénico* publicada en 2016, así como numerosos artículos y trabajos de investigación relacionados con el estudio de las partículas griegas, la etimología y la interpretación de los textos micénicos.