Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Mycenaean *o-/jo-* and the performative Aorist

Ian Hollenbaugh
hian@wustl.edu

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS
Department of Classics / Program of Linguistics

WeCIEC 32
5 November 2021

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Background on *o-/jo-*
The problem with *o-/jo-*

Background on *o-/jo-*

- Some kind of demonstrative or relative adverb/pronoun.

- Commonly translated 'thus' or 'as follows'.

- Read as /hō/ and compared to the relative adv. ὡς 'as, how' (< *io-) or the demonstrative adv. ὥς 'thus' (< *so-); cf. ὥ-δε 'thus', Alcman ὥ-τ'.

- Spelling alternation often said to be "purely scribal" or "graphic."

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Background on *o-/jo-*
The problem with *o-/jo-*

Hooker 1980:63

- Typically text- or clause-initial, almost always immediately followed by a verb.

- Introduces a list of persons/groups and/or quantities of items.

- Verb fronting: "The presence of *o-/jo-* brings the main verb to the beginning of the sentence."

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Background on *o-/jo-*
The problem with *o-/jo-*

The problem with *o-/jo-*

- Spelling alternation:
    - *o-* ($\sim$ 14x)
    - *jo-* ($\sim$ 8x)

- Taken to be etymologically relative ($<$ **i̯o-*) but functionally demonstrative ('thus, as follows').

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Background on *o-/jo-*
The problem with *o-/jo-*

Gallavotti 1956:72, 74–5, 81–2

- *jo-* forms < relative (*$\hat{i}o$-); *o-* forms < demonstrative (*so-).

- Would adhere to Myc. spelling conventions (/h-/ < *s- spelled ∅-, /h-/ < *$\hat{i}$ spelled *j-*; cf. Bozzone 2014:14–22 for discussion).

- But difficult to motivate, since the two seem to match in function and distribution.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Background on *o-/jo-*
The problem with *o-/jo-*

o- and *jo-* < demonstrative **so-*?

- Alternatively, both forms could be demonstrative, such that *j-* is here spelling /h-/ < **s-*.

- This would motivate the demonstrative function ('thus') but *j-* is not usually known to spell /h-/ < **s-*.

  ▶ Yet a likely parallel is *a-ro₂-jo* (KN So 4437+5127), if spelling gen.sg. /ar̥i̯ohos/ 'better' < **ar̥i̯osos* (cf. Probert 2009:127).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Background on *o-*/*jo-*
The problem with *o-*/*jo-*

o- and *jo-* < relative *$*jo-$?

- If we assume that *o-*/*jo-* is an adverb belonging to the relative *$*jo-$, there is a problem of meaning, as Probert (2009:127) points out:

  ▶ "Interpretations of *o-*/*jo-* as an adverb meaning 'thus' face the difficulty that Greek does not generally form demonstratives on the relative stem *$*jo-$."

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Probert's (2009) account

- *o-/jo-* is not an adverb but a relative *pronoun*.

- The variation *o-/jo-* is explained as an orthographic convention to differentiate:

    - m.nom.pl. οἵ (*jo-*)

    - n.acc.sg. ὅ (*o-*)

- These would be free relative clauses (p.130) that are preposed, followed by lists of items or persons.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Probert's (2009) account

- *jo-* interpreted as subject of transitive verbs (plural), followed by lists of *persons* or groups of people (in 5 out of 8 occurrences), often in addition to place names and items owed by each.

- *o-* interpreted as n.acc.sg., followed by lists of *items* (in 12 out of 14 occurrences), which are regularly nominative (cf. p.139).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Probert's (2009) account

(1) M.NOM.PL. REL. FOLLOWED BY PERSONS (MY Ge 602)

.1 ***jo-o-po-ro*** , *a-ro-mo̧*[*do-?*]*şi-mi-jo* / <u>*pe-se-ro*</u> ⟦/ *sa-sa-ma*⟧
.2 <u>*pu₂-ke*</u> / *ma-ra-tu-wo* Z 1[   ] . . .
(8 more lines)

'(People) **who owed** spice. . .
   <u>*Psellos*</u>: ⟦sesame⟧
   <u>*Phuskēs*</u>: fennel seed Z 1 . . .'

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Probert's (2009) account

(2) N.ACC.SG. REL. FOLLOWED BY ITEMS (PY Un 10)

.1 **o-di-do-si** , *du-ru-to-mo*
.2 *a-mo-te-jo-na-de* , <u>*e-pi-*[*pu-*]*ta*</u> 50
.3 <u>*a-ko-so-ne-*</u>q̣ẹ 50
.4 <u>*to-sa-*</u>*de* , *ro-u-si-jo* , *a-ko-ro* , <u>*a-ko-so-ne*</u>
.5 100 , <u>*to-sa-*</u>*de* , <u>*e-pi-*[*pu-*]*ta*</u> 100

'**What** the woodcutters **contribute** to the chariot workshop:
<u>trees</u> 50; <u>axles</u> 50
And the Lousian field (contributes) <u>so many</u>:
<u>axles</u> 100, and <u>so many</u> <u>trees</u>: 100'

- NB: Lack of agreement between *o-* (n.acc.sg.), *to-sa* (n.nom.-acc.pl.), and *a-ko-so-ne* /aksones/ (m.nom.pl.) (pp.139–40).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Probert's (2009) account

- Probert (2009:161–2) suggests that the *j-* of *jo-* was preserved in the m.nom.pl. as "an assimilatory retention... in the vicinity of -*i*-" contained in the diphthong /oi̯/.

- This further provided a convenient graphic contrast to the accusative of the relative pronoun.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

Missing *a-

- It is strange that we never get acc.pl. *a- 'which (things)' in place of acc.sg. o-, especially since texts beginning with this word are typically followed by lists of multiple (quantities of) items.

- By contrast, we do find both to-so 'so much' and to-sa 'so many'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

Contrastive spelling is doubtful

■ The retained *j-* in the spelling of *jo-* being motivated by the presence of /i/ in /hoi/ seems contrary to the what is found elsewhere, where *y- > [h-] despite a following *j* /i̯/ or *i*:

▶ *-i-je-si* /hii̯ensi/ 'they send', *i-je-to-* /hii̯etoi/ 'is sent'(?) < *yi-yēmi (cf. Bernabé and Luján 2006:133)

▶ *o-wi-de* not *jo-wi-de

▶ *o-di-do-si* (PY Un 10.1) but non-contiguous *jo... di-do-[si]* (KN Og(2) <4467>.1)

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

Contrastive spelling is doubtful

- Since initial *j-* seems to some degree optional, Probert (2009:162) still must assume that the two different spellings of the relative pronoun are "conventional" variants.

  - *ja-ke-te-re = a₍₂₎-ke-te-re* (/hakestēres/?) 'repairmen'

  - *ja-sa-ro = a-sa-ro* (/Assaros/?)

  - *i-je-re-u = i-e-re-u* (/ihereus/) 'priest'

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

Verb fronting unexplained

■ Probert (2009) does not explain *o-/jo-*'s clear affiliation with *verbs*.

■ In the 22 examples we have, the verb nearly always immediately follows *o-/jo-* (20x or 91%).

▶ With two exceptions (9%): KN Le 641 +*frr*., where *-a-po-te* 'from afar' (or proper name?) intervenes after *o-*; KN Og(2) <4467>, where *-a-mi-ni-so-de* 'to Amnisos' intervenes after *jo-*.

▶ On the dubious MY Ui 2 and Ue 652+656 see Probert 2009:150–2.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

Verb fronting unexplained

- Nothing about (preposed) free relative clauses seems to require that the verb be fronted in its clause.

- There is no particular tendency for the verb to occur directly after the relative pronoun in these kinds of relative clauses in later Greek (Probert 2015:128–35, 142–4).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

Singular verb with *jo-*

(3) MY Ue 661

.1 ***jo-po-ro-te-ke*** *190* 100 *155*VAS+*NI* 15 (MY Ue 661.1)
.2 **248* 5
.3 *vacat*

'***jo*- (someone) provided/served**: [foodstuff]? 100,
[vessel]+figs 15, ? 5'

■ Noted as a potential problem by Probert (2009:158).

■ Further, the heading seems to be followed by a list of items rather
than persons, contrary to her generalization.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

Singular verb with *jo-*

(4)   KN Gv 863

.1]*q̇ạ-ra* , / ***jo-e-ke***<->*to-q̇o* , *wo-na-si* , *ṣị*[
.2] *we-je-we* *174 420 *su*. ARB 104̣[

'*Ch^wāʹrai*: ***jo-*** <u>the place</u> (/tok^wos/) **has** (/hekhei/) in its
vineyards. . .
vine-shoots(?) ? 420, fig-trees 104'.

■ If correctly interpreted, *jo-* cannot be nom.pl. here (cf. Probert
(2009:159–60)).

■ Further, the heading is again followed by items rather than persons.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

jo- not followed by a list persons/people

(5)   KN Fp(1) 14 + 27 + 28 + *frr.*

.1a   *me-no*   O͟L͟E͟
.1b *a-ma-ko-to* , / **jo-te-re-pa-to** , // *e-ke-se-si* V͟ 1͟ . . .
(one more line)

'In the month of *Amakoto*, **jo- they offered**(?) o͟il to the *E.*
deities: 1͟ ͟u͟n͟i͟t͟'.

■ This tablet "records quantities of oil offered to various deities"
(Probert 2009:159). As such, the *jo-* here is followed not by a list
of persons but of quantities of a substance.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

o- not followed by a list of items

(6) PY Nn 228

.1 **o-o-pe-ro-si** , *ri-no* / *o-pe-ro*
.2 <u>*u-ka-jo*</u> , *SA* 20 <u>*ro-o-wa*</u> , *SA* 35 . . .
(five more lines)

'**o-** **they owe flax** (as a) deficit:
<u>(people) from *Urchaion*</u>, 20 of flax;
<u>(people) from *Rohowā̄*</u>, 35 of flax . . . '

- Probert reads this as a free relative with an internal domain noun *ri-no* (/linon/): 'What flax they owe'.

- The list below the heading consists of place names in the dat.-loc. followed by quantities of flax.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

o- not followed by a list of items

(6) PY Nn 228

.1 **o-o-pe-ro-si** , *ri-no* / *o-pe-ro*
.2 <u>*u-ka-jo*</u> , *SA* 20 <u>*ro-o-wa*</u> , *SA* 35 . . . (five more lines)

■ Though Probert reads the place names as specifying the origin of the flax (i.e., '(flax) from *Urchaion*' etc.), this would leave unspecified the people who owe it.

  ▶ Note that Probert (2009:157–8) takes the opposite stance for *jo-a-se-so-si* '*jo-* they will fatten (pigs)' in PY Cn 608.1, which is also followed by a list of locative place names.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

o- not followed by a list of items

(6)   PY Nn 228

    .1 **o-o-pe-ro-si** , *ri-no* / *o-pe-ro*
    .2 <u>*u-ka-jo*</u> , *SA* 20 <u>*ro-o-wa*</u> , *SA* 35 . . . (five more lines)

■ It thus seems more straightforward to read the place names as
referring to the groups of *people* who owe the various quantities of
flax, a possibility admitted by Probert (2009:144), which makes this
example problematic for her account.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

o- not followed by a list of items

(7)   PY An 37

.1 **o-za-mi**[   ]*e-ne-ka*
.2 *pa-ra-we-wo* , [   ]*-jo*
.3 *a-pi-no-ẹ*[*-wi-jo*   VIR 2
.4 *e-na*[*-po-ro*   VIR] 1

'**o-** they are fined/levied(?)…on account of(?)
Prawēwos(?)…
from Amphinohēwion: 2 men
from Enar(s)phoros(?): 1 man'.

■ If this (dubious) interpretation is correct, it is a potential problem
for Probert's account (cf. *Docs²*:41, Probert 2009:148).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

General issues
Textual issues

Local summary: Problems for Probert 2009

- Neuter plural **a-* is unattested (opp. *o-*).

- Contrastive spelling of *o-*/*jo-* is doubtful and is in any case still "conventional" (not synchronically phonetic).

- Misses the generalization that *o-*/*jo-* fronts verbs.

- *jo-* may occur with singular verbs and head lists of items/quantities rather than persons.

- *o-* may head lists of persons rather than items/quantities.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Claims

- *o-/jo-* is an adverb meaning basically 'thus, as follows' (*Docs²*:563).

- This adverb interacts with the verb, specifically, most often in a performative function, where it can be understood as meaning something like English 'hereby'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Performative speech acts

■ A performative speech act is one whose pronouncement effects a change on the world of the type described by the predicate.

■ Such speech acts occur in all three persons.

(8) PERFORMATIVES IN ENGLISH

    a. *I **now pronounce** you legally wed.*

    b. *You**'re fired**!*

    c. *The court **hereby sentences** you to five years.*

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Performatives in alphabetic Greek

(9)   Performatives in Greek: Aorist or Present

a.   **ἀπώμοσ᾽**[Aor.] ἁγνὸν Ζηνὸς ὑψίστου σέβας (Soph. *Phil.*
1289).

'I **swear**[Aor.] (it) by the pure majesty of Zeus most
high!'

b.   **ὄμνυμι**[Pres.] Γαῖαν... ἐμμενεῖν ἅ σου κλύω (Eur. *Med.*
752–3).

'I **swear**[Pres.] by Earth... that I will abide what I hear
from you'.

■ **NB**: These tend to be verb-initial sentences, as in Myc. with *o-/jo-*.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Present performatives in Mycenaean

- Given the nature of the texts, most Myc. verbs can be understood as performative, which makes better sense of the Present tense in these documents than do alternative interpretations.

  (10) PRESENT TENSE PERFORMATIVE IN MYC.

    .1 **o-di-do-si** , *du-ru-to-mo*
    .2 *a-mo-te-jo-na-de* , *e-pi-*[*pu-*]*ta* 50 . . . (PY Un 10)
    .3 *a-ko-so-ne-qe* 50
    (two more lines)

    'Woodcutters **contribute thus** (i.e., *hereby* **contribute the following**) to the workshop:
    trees 50; axles 50 . . .'

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Present tense in Mycenaean

- If we read Myc. Presents as non-performative, we are left with imperfective interpretations of the Present tense, such as:

  - ▶ habitual: 'they are wont to contribute', which is unlikely given that the documents were by intention ephemeral.

  - ▶ progressive: 'they are (currently) contributing', which would require the transaction to be currently underway (but not completed) at the time of writing.

- Such readings are frequently not supported by the context of the Myc. documents.

  - ▶ Exceptions are mainly stative verbs like 'be' and 'have'.

Performatives in Vedic Sanskrit

- As in Greek, the Present and Aorist of Vedic Sanskrit are both used in performative sentences.

- Unlike alphabetic Greek, however, the Vedic Aorist is always augmentless (injunctive) when used performatively (Hoffmann 1967:251–5, 269 "Koinzidenzfall").

- These performative verbs typically occur in the first verse of the hymn (cf. the text-initial Myc. verbs with *o-*/*jo-*).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Performatives in Vedic Sanskrit: Aorist injunctive

(11)   PERFORMATIVE INJUNCTIVE AORIST IN THE R̥GVEDA

*ápūrviyā purutámāni asmai mahé vīrā́ya taváse turā́ya
virapśíne vajríṇe śáṃtamāni vácāṃsi āsā́ sthávirāya* **takṣam**
(*RV* VI.32.1).

'For him I **fashion** with my mouth these words,
unprecedented, best of many, most wealful— for the great
hero, powerful and precipitous, conferring abundance, bearing
the mace, stalwart' (tr. adapted from Jamison and Brereton
2014:816).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Performatives in Vedic Sanskrit: Present and Aorist

(12) PERFORMATIVES IN THE *R̥GVEDA*
(PRESENT AND INJUNCTIVE AORIST)

a. **prá** te **yakṣi**$_{[\text{Aor.}]}$ **prá** ta **iyarmi**$_{[\text{Pres.}]}$ mánma (*RV* X.4.1a).

'I (hereby) **begin the sacrifice**$_{[\text{Aor.}]}$ to you and I **propel**$_{[\text{Pres.}]}$ my thought to you'.

b. víśvā **pári** priyā́ **bhuvad**$_{[\text{Aor.}]}$ <u>ádha dvitā́</u> (*RV* IX.102.1cd).

'[Soma] **encompasses**$_{[\text{Aor.}]}$ all dear things <u>now once again</u>'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Aorist inj. vs. ind. in Vedic

■ Performative injunctives vs. non-performative indicatives in the *RV*

prá vocam	'I (hereby) proclaim'	(e.g., *RV* I.32.1a)
prá avocam	'I have proclaimed'	(*RV* IV.45.7a)
takṣam	'I (hereby) fashion'	(*RV* VI.32.1d)
átakṣan	'(they) have fashioned'	(*RV* II.31.7b)

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Performative injunctive Aorist in Myc.: an archaism

- The Present and augmentless Aorist that occur in headings of the Myc. documents seem to show a similarly performative function, especially after *o-/jo-*.

- Given that these documents were generally meant to keep track of what was coming into the palace, we may imagine them as a kind of receipt, whose writing constitutes an event of the type described by the verb.

- The contribution is made official by the act of writing it down (hence performative):

    ▶ 'so-and-so hereby contributes such-and-such amount(s)'

- The general lack of augmentation in Myc. may thus be explained as an archaism made especially prominent by text type.

- The lack of any sure examples of the Imperfect is also explicable as an effect of text type:

  ▶ The Myc. documents refer almost uniformly to the present or (less often) future time.

  ▶ The Present, Future, and Aorist are well suited to these time references, whereas the Imperfect and Pluperfect are not.

- Since performative speech acts require a *change* of state, the stative Perfect is likewise dispreferred and accordingly scarce.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Performative injunctive Aorist in Myc.: an archaism

(13)   AUGMENTLESS AORIST PERFORMATIVE IN MYC.

.1 **o-do-ke** , *a-ko-so-ta*
.2 *tu-we-ta* , *a-re-pa-zo-o*
.3 *tu-we-a* , *a-re-pa-te* ⟦*ze-so-me*⟧
.4 *ze-so-me-no* ⟦*ko*⟧
.5 *ko-ri-a₂-da-na* AROM 6 . . . (PY Un 267)
(three more lines)

'*Alksoitās* **hereby contributes**
spices to *Thuestās* the unguent-boiler,
for unguent which is to be boiled:
coriander seed: 6 units' . . .

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Performative injunctive Aorist in Myc.: an archaism

■ Cases problematic for Probert (2009) are readily accommodated
under this account. Recall MY Ue 661:

(14)   AUGMENTLESS AORIST PERFORMATIVE IN MYC.

.1 ***jo-po-ro-te-ke*** *190* 100 *155*$^{\text{VAS}}$+*NI* 15
.2 *248* 5
.3 *vacat* (MY Ue 661)

'**(He) hereby provides**: [foodstuff]? 100, [vessel]+figs 15,
? 5'

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmented vs. augmentless Aorist in Myc.

■ Augmented Aorists pattern differently than the augmentless.

▶ The few augmented aorists that are attested do not occur with *o-/jo-*.

▶ They are not in initial position.

▶ They seem to favor a resultative ("perfect-like") interpretation.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmented Aorist: resultative

(15)   AORIST WITH AUGMENT: RESULTATIVE MEANING

    .1 *ro-o-wa* , *e-re-ta* , <u>*a-pe-o-te*</u> ,
    .2 *me-nu-wa* , **a-pe-e-ke** , . . . (PY An 724)
    (twelve more lines, *a-pe-e-ke* again in .5 and .7)

    'In *Rohowā* the rowers <u>(are) absent</u>. *Menuwās* **has
    discharged/released** (them?)'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmented Aorist: resultative

■ A strong association of the *augmented* aorist with resultative
  meaning is well documented in Homeric Greek (Platt 1891:221–6;
  Bakker 2005, 1999; Hollenbaugh 2021:99–104).

(16)   Resultative augmented Aorist in Homer

νῦν μὲν γὰρ Μενέλαος **ἐνίκησεν** σὺν Ἀθήνηι (*Il*. 3.439).

'This time Menelaus **has beaten** me with Athena's help'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmented Aorist: resultative

■ Vedic again parallels the resultative use of the augmented Aorist.

(17) RESULTATIVE AUGMENTED AORIST IN VEDIC

<u>sámiddho</u> agnír níhitaḥ pr̥thivyā́m pratyáṅ víśvāni bhúvanāni **asthā́t** (RV II.3.1b).

'Agni, <u>kindled</u>, deposited on the earth, **has stood up** facing all beings' (tr. Jamison and Brereton 2014:405).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmented vs. augmentless Aorist in Myc.

(18)   AORIST WITH/WITHOUT AUGMENT AND *o-*/*jo-*

     a.   .1 *ko-ka-ro* **a-pe-do-ke** *e-ra₃-wo* <u>*to-so*</u>
           .2 *e-u-me-de-i* OIL+WE 18
           .3 *pa-ro i-pe-se-wa ka-ra-re-we* 38 (PY Fr 1184)

         '*Ko(k)kalos* **has repaid** <u>so much</u> olive oil
         to *Eumēdēs*: 518.4 l. of oil.
         From *Ipsewās, 38 oil-jars*'.

     b.   .1]**o-a-pu-ḍọ[-ke**
           .2 *tu-na-no* [(KN Wb 8711 (label))

         '(He) **hereby repays** [*textile*]'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmented vs. augmentless Aorist in Myc.

(19) AORIST WITH/WITHOUT AUGMENT AND *o-*/*jo-*

   a. .1 *ri-jo-ni-jo* , / **e-ze-to** , *to-ro-qo* . . . (KN Od(1) 563)
      (one more line)

      '*Hriōnios* **has obtained** (*egento*?) a cord . . .'

   b. .1 **o-ze-to** , *ke-sa-do-ro* *34-to-pi* ,
      .2 *a-ke-a$_2$* . . . (PY Un 130)
      (eleven more lines)

      '*Kessandros* **hereby takes possession of** (*gento*?) ?
      wine-jars(?) . . .'

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmentless Aorist without *o-/jo-*

■ Without *o-/jo-* (and non-initially), the augmentless Aorist may, like
the augmented Aorist, have a resultative interpretation, suggested
by coordination with the Present tense.

(20)   RESULTATIVE AUGMENTLESS AORIST

.10 [*e-*]*ke*-*qe* , *ka-ma* , *o-na-to* , *si-ri-jo*⟨-*jo*⟩ , **ra-ke** , <u>*to-so*</u> ,
<u>*pe-mo*</u> GRA 1 . . . (PY Ep 613.10)
(three more lines)

'(And*) he <u>holds</u>$_{[\text{P}_{\text{RES}}.]}$ the lease of a *kamas*; he **has been
allotted**$_{[\text{AOR}.]}$ (that) of *Sīrios*; <u>so much seed</u>: wheat 1 . . .'

* The -*qe* here may not be the connective (see Bernabé and Luján
2006:199 for discussion and refs.).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmentless Aorist without *o-/jo-*: past reference

- Otherwise, the augmentless Aorist may refer to an event situated entirely in the past.

  (21) AUGMENTLESS AORIST WITH PAST REFERENCE

      .1 *pa-ki-ja-si* , <u>*mu-jo-me-no* , *e-pi*</u> , <u>*wa-na-ka-te*</u> ,
      .2 ***a-pi-e-ke*** , *o-pi-te-ke-e-u* . . . (PY Un 2)
      (four more lines)

      '<u>Upon the lord being initiated</u> in *Sphagiānes*, the overseer-of-*teukhea* **sent around (consecrated?)** (various goods)'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmentless Aorist without *o-*/*jo-*: past reference

- The past-referring Aorist in Homer is regularly augmentless (Chantraine, 1948 [2013]:484).

(22) AUGMENTLESS AOR. IN PAST NARRATION IN HOMER

ἱστία μὲν **στείλαντο**, **θέσαν** δ᾽ ἐν νηῒ μελαίνηι (*Il.* 1.433).

'They **drew** the sails, then they **put** them in the black ship'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Augmentless Aorist without o-/jo-: past reference

■ This again matches Vedic, whose Aorist is regularly augmentless in past narration, alongside augmented Imperfects.

(23)   AUGMENTLESS AOR. IN PAST NARRATION IN THE *RV*

ā́vír bhávann <u>úd atiṣṭhat</u>[IPF.] parāvŕ̥k
práti śroṇá **sthād**[AOR.INJ.] <u>ví</u> anág <u>acaṣṭa</u>[IPF.] (*RV* II.15.7bc).

'The shunned one <u>stood up</u>[IPF.] the lame one **gained firm footing**[AOR.INJ.]; the blind one <u>gained clear vision</u>[IPF.]'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Local summary: Fine-grained contrasts

- The contrast between the resultative augmented Aorist and the performative augmentless Aorist is admittedly slight:

  - ▶ 'so-and-so has now done such-and-such' vs. 'so-and-so hereby does such-and-such'.

- Yet it is a contrast supported by the usage of both Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit.

- Likewise, the distinction between the Present and Aorist is virtually neutralized in their performative functions (again, precisely as in Vedic).

  - ▶ The distinction between these tenses with *o-/jo-* would thus be one of aspect alone.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Contrastive aspect in Myc.: Aorist and Present

(24) CONTRASTIVE ASPECT IN MYC.: AOR. (a) AND PRES. (b)

a. .1 **jo-o-po-ro** , a-ro-mọ[-ta <u>do-</u>]<u>si-mi-jo</u> ... (MY Ge 602)
   (eight more lines)

   '**They are hereby indebted (i.e., come to owe)**$_{[\text{AOR.}]}$
   (with respect to) spice(s) <u>as a result of the tax</u>'
   /dosmion/ (Aura Jorro 1985–93:s.v. *do-so-mo* /dosmos/
   and cf. Probert 2009:156).

b. .1 **o-o-pe-ro-si** , ri-no , <u>o-pe-ro</u>... (PY Nn 228)
   (six more lines)

   '**They thus/hereby (continue to) owe**$_{[\text{PRES.}]}$ flax
   <u>as a deficit (i.e., remaining balance?)</u>'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Summary of tense distribution of verbs with *o-*/*jo-*

<u>Aorist</u>:   10–12 times   (2–3x *jo-*, 8–9x *o-*)

<u>Present</u>:   8 times   (3x *jo-*, 5x *o-*)

<u>Future</u>:   2–3 times   (2x *jo-*, ?1x *o-*)

Total: 22

excluded: *o-da-a$_2$* ($\sim$ 45x), *o-a$_2$*, *o-de-qa-a$_2$*,
                 o-te, *o-qe*, *jo-qi*,
                 o-u-te-ra, *o-wi-de-ta-i*, *o-ku-su-wa-si*

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Claims
Data
Summary

Advantages of this account

■ This provides explanations for:

▶ Many of the occurrences of the Present indicative in the Myc. documents (otherwise strange).

▶ Why the augmentless forms of the Aorist are preferred to the near exclusion of the augmented ones.

▶ Why the Aorist is preferred to the exclusion of the Imperfect.

▶ Why the verb, in particular, seems to be targeted (and fronted) by *o-/jo-*.

▶ Why the Aorist more common with *o-/jo-* than without it (without *o-/jo-* the Present is more common).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Complications for this analysis: Past-referring Aorist with *o-*

- At least one of the two occurrences of *o-wi-de* (/hō wide/) seems to be genuinely past referring.

  (25) PAST-REFERRING AORIST WITH *o-*/*jo-*

    .1 **o-wi-de** , *pu₂-ke-qi-ri* , <u>o-te</u> , *wa-na-ka* , <u>te-ke</u> , *au-ke-wa* , *da-mo-ko-ro* ... (PY Ta 711)
    (two more lines)

    'Thus *Phugegʷrins* **made inspection**, <u>on the occasion when the king <u>appointed</u> *Augēwās* to be a *dāmokoros* ...</u>'

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Past-referring Aorist with *o-*

■ The other occurrence may also be past referring, though *Docs²* (1973:268) translates it, perhaps correctly, as perfect 'has observed'.

(26)   PAST OR PERFECT(?) AORIST WITH *o-*

.1 **o-wi-de** , *a-ko-so-ta* , <u>*to-ro-qe-jo-me-no*</u> , *a-ro-u-ra* , *a₂-ri-sa* ,
.2 *a-ke-re-wa* , *o-ro-jo* , *to-so-de* , *pe-mo* GRA 8 . . . (PY Eq 213)
(four more lines)

'**Thus** *Alksoitās* **(has?) observed** <u>while touring</u> (/trokʷeiomenos/) the fields *a₂-ri-sa* of *Agrē(i)wā*; of the loss, so much (acreage of) seed : 960 1. wheat . . .'

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Past-referring Aorist with *o-*

- There is nothing wrong *in principle* with past referring augmentless Aorists, such as *te-ke* in the *o-te* clause above.

- The augment is dispreferred in past narration in Homeric (Chantraine, 1948 [2013]:484) and Vedic (Avery 1885:330).

- Yet the adverb *o-* cannot be read as 'hereby' in this case.

- So we must admit that *o-* occurs in preterital (rather than presential) contexts and interpret the adverb in its broader sense 'thus, as follows'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Non-performative Stative Present with *o-/jo-*

■ In the following example, since *e-ke* (/hekhei/) appears to refer to
a permanent state rather than one attained at the present moment,
the verb is unlikely to be performative.

(27)   NON-PERFORMATIVE PRESENT WITH *jo-*

.1]q̣ạ-ra , / **jo-e-ke**<->to-qo , wo-na-si , ṣị[
.2] we-je-we *174 420 su. ARB 104̣[(KN Gv 863)

'*Ch^wā́rai*: **thus** the place **has** in its vineyards. . .
vine-shoots(?) ? 420, fig-trees 104'.

■ This example is also problematic for Probert's (2009:159–60)
account.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Future tense with *jo-* (implicit performative)

■ *jo-* occurs once or twice with the future tense (cf. also *jo-a-se-so-si* 'thus they will fatten' at PY Cn(2) 608.1).

(28) FUTURE TENSE WITH *jo-*

.1 ***jo-do-so-si*** , *ko-re-te-re* , *du-ma-te-qe* ,
.2 *po-ro-ko-re-te-re-qe* , *ka-ra-wi-po-ro-qe* , *o-pi-su-ko-qe* ,
o-pi-ka-pe'*e-we-qe*'
.3 *ka-ko* , *na-wi-jo* , *pa-ta-jo-i-qe* , *e-ke-si-qe* , *a₃-ka-sa-ma*
. . . (PY Jn 829) (sixteen more lines)

'The *korētēres* and the *dumantes* and the *prokorētēres* and
the key-bearer(s) and the *opisūkoi* and the *opiskaphēhewes*
are hereby bound to contribute temple bronze (as) points
for javelins and spears . . .'

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Future performatives in Vedic

■ Future performatives are again paralleled in Vedic Sanskrit, with the subjunctive:

  ▶ *prá nú vocā̄* 'Now I (shall) proclaim' (*RV* VI.59.1a).

  ▶ Though far more common is the augmentless Aorist *prá nú vocam* 'Now I proclaim' (e.g., *RV* VI.8.1b).

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Explanatory power of this analysis

- Despite these complications, the vast majority of occurrences of *o-*/*jo-* are consistent with this analysis.

- Two or three occurrences (out of 22) are genuinely incompatible with a performative interpretation, though not with the broader interpretation of *o-*/*jo-* as 'thus, as follows'.

  ▶ One of these is of dubious interpretation in any case (see Probert 2009:159–60): *jo-e-ke-to-qo* (KN Gv 863.1), without word division.

  ▶ The others are the two occurrences of *o-wi-de* 'thus he saw/has seen'.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

Explanatory power of this analysis

- The performative interpretation thus accounts for (or is compatible with) at least 19 of the 22 or 21 occurrences of *o-/jo-* with a verb (i.e., $\sim 90\%$).

- In the remaining examples *o-/jo-* can be interpreted more broadly as 'thus' or 'as follows'.

- Though the spelling alternation of *o-/jo-* cannot be explained with such finality as under Probert's (2009) account, simple orthographic variation is supported by other words beginning optionally with *j-*, and a functional merger of two etymologically distinct adverbs is not unlikely.

Thank you!

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

References I

Aura Jorro, Francisco. 1985–93. *Diccionario griego-micénico.* Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientifícas, Instituto de Filología.

Avery, John. 1885. The Unaugmented Verb-Forms of the Rig- and Atharva-Vedas. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11:326–361.

Bakker, Egbert J. 1999. Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer. In *Euphrosyne: Studies in ancient epic and its legacy in honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis,* edited by John N. Kazazis and Antonios Rengakos, 50–65. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

References II

Bakker, Egbert J. 2005. *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies.

Bernabé, Alberto, and Eugenio R. Luján. 2006. *Introducción al griego micénico: gramática, selección de textos y glosario.* Monografías de filología griega. Saragossa: Prensas Universitarias de Zaragoza.

Bozzone, Chiara. 2014. Initial "Yod" in Greek and the Etymology of Gk. ἵππος 'horse'. In *Proceedings of the 24ᵗʰ Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, 26-27 October 2012,* edited by Stephanie W. Jamison, H. Craig Melchert, and Brent Vine. Bremen: Hempen.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

References III

Chantraine, Pierre. 1948 [2013]. *Grammaire homérique, Tome I: Phonétique et morphologie.* 2nd ed. Edited by Michel Casevitz. Paris: Klincksieck.

Gallavotti, Carlo. 1956. *Documenti e struttura del greco nell'età micenea.* Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Hoffmann, Karl. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda: Eine synchronische Funktionsuntersuchung.* Heidelberg: Winter.

Hollenbaugh, Ian. 2021. Tense and aspect in Indo-European: A usage-based approach to the verbal systems of the *Ṛgveda* and Homer. PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles. https://ihollenbaugh.files.wordpress.com/2021/06/hollenbaugh-diss.pdf.

Ian Hollenbaugh   Mycenaean *o-/jo-* and the performative Aorist

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

References IV

Hooker, J.T. 1980. *Linear B: An introduction.* London: Bristol Classical Press.

Jamison, Stephanie W., and Joel P. Brereton. 2014. *The Rigveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India.* Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Platt, Arthur. 1891. The augment in Homer. *Journal of Philology* 19:211–237.

Probert, Philomen. 2009. Mycenaean *o-* is accusative; *jo-* is nominative. *Glotta* 84:126–168.

———. 2015. *Early Greek Relative Clauses.* Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Introduction
Probert's (2009) account
Problems for Probert (2009)
My proposal
Complications for this analysis
References

References V

Docs^2 (Ventris, Michael, and John Chadwick). 1973. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.