



6-1-2002

Homeric OPHAI (Od. 14.343) and OMEITAI (Il. 9.274): Two of a Kind?

Alan J. Nussbaum

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.colby.edu/cq>

Recommended Citation

Colby Quarterly, Volume 38, no.2, June 2002, p.175-196

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Colby. It has been accepted for inclusion in Colby Quarterly by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Colby.

Homeric OPHAI (Od. 14.343) and OMEITAI (Il. 9.274): Two of a Kind?

By ALAN J. NUSSBAUM

1. The Greek presents (h)orao/e-, (h)orē-, and (h)orēo/e- “see”¹

1.1 The familiar present stem (h)orao/e- “see” reflected in Attic ὁρᾶν, ὁρᾷ, ὁρᾶν, etc. is also found as such not only in relatively dissimilar dialects—Boe. ὁράοντι (SGDI 860), Lac. ὁρᾶν (Alcm. 1.40 PMG), Epidaurian pf. ptcpl. ωρακυιαν (IG IV² .1.122)—but is frequent in Ionic as well, where literary texts appear to provide such instances of this stem as:

Archil. ὁρᾶς (176.1, 177.2), ὄρα (105.1); Semon. ὁρᾷ (7.15, 7.80), ὁρᾶντες (7.111); Theogn. ὁρᾷ (857+), ὁρώης (93), ὁρᾶν (747), ὁρᾶντι (1059), ἔσορᾶν (858); Callin. ὁρώσιν (1.20); Tyrt. ὁρᾶν (12.11); Solon ὁρᾶτε (11.7), ὁρώσι (34.5), Hdt.—to cite a couple of cases without variant—ὁρᾷ (1.119.6), ὁρώσι (9.66.2), etc.

In addition, it is this present stem that appears in Homer, in characteristically “distracted” form,² of course, as ὁρώω (E244+), ὁράας (H448+), ὁρόωτε (Δ347), ὁράασθαι (π107+), ὁρόωντες (P637), etc.

1. It is assumed for the purposes of this discussion that the presents in question simply reflect a Proto-Greek *hor- that goes back in turn to an o-grade *sor- of the root *ser- (so Rix et al. [1998] 483f.). The form that makes difficulties for this reconstruction is the augmented Attic imperfect ἑώρων, which looks as if it ought to come from *ē(h)yor- (type indic. ἑἴδων < *ē(h)yal- vs. infin. ἑλῶναι < *(h)yal- in the aorist of ἀλίσκομαι “be seized”). But if Attic were to have redone the imperfect of ὁράω, it would not be a unique example of the extension of augmentation with ē- from (h)y-initial roots to others. The oīg- of οἶγω/ οἶγνυμι “open,” which goes back to an *oīg- (cf. especially ὠἶγνυτο [B809+] < *ōīg- etc.) beside *oμeīg- (Lesb. infin. οείγην [Schwyzer (1960) no. 620.43])—and thus to *h₃meīg-/h₃miīg- or *o-meīg-/o-miīg- (with preverb *o-)—is another case of an effectively (h)V- initial root that has been given the kind of augmentation (impf. ἀνέωγον Π221+, aor. ἀνέφεα κ389+) that looks like it reflects *ēhV-. In any event, nothing in the discussion that follows would be affected by a reconstruction of the root initial of ὁράω etc. as *(h)yor- rather than the *hor- being adopted here.

2. See, e.g., Chantraine (1973) 75ff.

1.2 Beside present forms that show the stem *(h)orao/e-*, however, there are also forms in *(h)oreo-* and *(h)oreō-*.

1.2.1 Instances occur mostly in Ionic:

ὀρέω Anacr. (346 frag. 4.2 PMG), Hdt. (1.111.3 without variant); *ὀρέομεν* Hp. (*Nat. Puer.*); *ὀρέων* Hdt. (1.68.4, etc., without variant); *ὀρέοντες* Hdt. (*vl* 3.14.3, etc.); *ὀρεούσης* Hp. (*Epid.*); *ὀρεῦσα* Hnd. (4.44), etc.³

1.2.2 Although the stem allomorphs *(h)oreo-* and *(h)oreō-* have sometimes been said to represent the unmolested phonologically regular outcome of Proto-Greek **(h)oraio-* and **(h)oraio̯-*,⁴ the sound law that supposedly operated to produce them from such pre-forms is actually quite doubtful.⁵ And in any case, *(h)oreo-* and *(h)oreō-* are clearly shown to be reflexes of earlier **(h)orēo-* and **(h)orēō-* (with phonologically regular shortening of *ē* to *ē̄* before *ō̄* in Ionic⁶) by clear evidence for **(h)orēe-* and **(h)orēē-* in this present:

ὀρήις/ὀρήϊς (Hp. *Nat. Mul.*, Hnd. 2.67+), *ὀρήι/ὀρήϊ* (Hp. *Carn.*, Callim. frag. 191.5+), *ὀρη* (Hnd. 3.50+), *ὀρήτε* (Hnd. 2.68+), *ὀρήν* (Hp. *Insan.*, Democr. frag. 11 DK)⁷

1.2.3 Whatever else, this evidence makes it unambiguous that a present stem *(h)orao/e-* (**-a-īo/e-*) and a present stem *(h)orēo/e-* (**-ē-īo/e-*) existed side by side in the averbo of “see.”⁸ It is clear at the same time, moreover, that Ionic had forms from both.

1.3 The Ionic **-ē-īo/e-* present *ὀρέω*, *ὀρήις*, etc. is naturally always put beside forms pointing to an athematic present *(h)orē-*.

1.3.1.1 This *(h)orē-* seems to be Aeolic and occurs in:

Sappho: *ὄρημι* (31.11 PLF), Alcaeus *ὄρη[μ]ενα* (F3, b. 5 PLF)
Frag. Adesp.: *ἵορημι* (921.b, iii.1 PMG)

3. The *ὀρέων* read at Alc. 79.2 PMG is in a corrupt passage and is possibly not the real Laconian form in the first place (§1.1). It may, however, be ancient in Alcanian's text if it is the form that authorized similar forms in Theocritus, but only—and this would be the notable point—in the “Severe Doric” poems: *ὀρέοντι* (3 pl. 26.14), *ὀρέωντι* (*vl* 3 pl. 9.35), (*-*)*ὀρεῦσα* (3.18, 5.85, 11.69).

4. See Schmidt (1889) 326ff., followed by Schwyzler (1939) 1.242, 515; Frisk (1955-72) 2.407; Lejeune (1972) 236 (§298, n.3); Chantraine et al. (1999) 813. Chantraine (1973) 210 is undecided.

5. See for now Méndez Dosuna (1985) 223f.

6. Or, to be more precise, the shortening of *ē̄* to *ē̄̄* by sound law (*ὀρέω*, *ὀρέων*, *ὀρέωμεν*, *ὀρέωσι*) and the analogical introduction of *ē̄̄* and *ē̄̄̄* (*ὀρέουσι*, *ὀρέοντες* etc.) in place of (the outcome of) *ē̄̄* and *ē̄̄̄* on the model (*εο*, *εου*, *εω*) of the much more numerous class of presents in original **-ēo/e-*. See, e.g., Lejeune (1972) 253f.

7. See Wackernagel (1916) 71 and, e.g., Bechtel (1921-24) 3.196.

8. Peters (1980) 90f. makes a case for seeing the *-ao/e-* paradigm as an analogical rearrangement of the *-ēo/e-* paradigm. It is not essential for present purposes to take a position on that question.

Theocritus: ποθόρησθα (6.8), ποθόρημι (6.25; *vv.ll.* ποθόρημαι, ποθορώμαι), ὄρη (30.22)
 Hesychius: ὄρημαι (or ὄρημι? Latte HAL, s.v.)

1.3.1.2 It is this same (*h*)*orē-* that has been said⁹ to appear in:

Homer: 2 sg. pres. midd. *vv.ll.* ὄρηαι and ὀρήαι (ξ343)
 3 sg. impf. midd. *vv.ll.* ὄρητο and ὀρήτο (Zenodotus' reading at A 56, 198)
 Creophylus: ὄρηαι (frag. *Oikhalias Hal.* Davies EGF, F1 p. 151), which clearly repeats whichever is the correct form at ξ343 (§2.4.4.1.1 below).

But whether these epic forms go with athematic (*h*)*orē-* obviously depends on what their accent really was. That is unclear and is part of the point of the present exercise.

1.3.2.1 Historically, the athematic present ((*h*)*orē-* (Sa.+)) has generally been said directly to continue an inherited stative present in *-ē- (<*-eh₁-), while Ionic (*h*)*orē-o/e-* is analyzed as the same stem more or less functionlessly expanded by *-iō/e- (*-ē-iō/e-).¹⁰

1.3.2.2 Because of their pattern of distribution among the various dialects, however, the forms that point to a present (*h*)*orē-* do not necessarily establish anything beyond a present with “Aeolic” inflection.¹¹ And a descriptively athematic -ē- present of this kind is no more likely to reflect an inherited stative present in *-ē- (<*-eh₁-) than to continue, *inter alia*, an inherited iterative present of the familiar kind with *o*-grade root and the stem formant *-e-iō/e-. The iterative of the latter type that lies behind Attic-Ionic (etc.) ποιέω, for example, surfaces in Lesbian as “Aeolic” (*)πόημι ([πότημμεν Sa. 24 (a).4 PLF; Alc. πότημενοι 117 F3 (b).21 PLF), just as the *-e-iō/e- denominative that shows up in the average dialect as (ρ)οικέω takes the form οἴκημι in Lesbian (οἴκημ(μ)ι Alc. 130 G 2.31 PLF). In fact, the hypothesis of an iterative origin for the present (*h*)*orē-* would even have the advantage of explaining the stem formant and the *o*-vocalism of the root simultaneously.

1.3.2.3 It is therefore the certainty of a (*h*)*orē-* in Ionic—which rests, in turn, entirely on the existence of such forms as (*h*)ορηῆς, (*h*)ορηῆ, (*h*)ορηῆτε, (*h*)όρη, and (*h*)ορηῖν in that dialect—that suggests an inherited Proto-Greek

9. So, e.g., Chantraine (1973) 305f.

10. Bechtel (1921-24) 3.196, Peters (1980) 91.

11. See Schwyzler (1939) 729 and, more recently, Blümel (1982) 167ff., Dubois (1986) 1.142ff., Hodot (1990) 192ff.

**hor-ē-*, and thus an **-ē-* stative, behind “Aeolic” (*h*)*órημι*. It is not the “Aeolic” present on its own that guarantees this athematic stative present.¹²

2. The Homeric present stem *horē-* (§1.3.1.2 above)

2.1 The second sg. pres. middle

2.1.1 At *Odyssey* §343, in the fictional autobiography related to Eumaeus by Odysseus, a form of some kind of present in *órη-* is certain, even if somewhat problematical in itself and open in any case to more than one historical explanation:

ἐκ μὲν με χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε εἴματ' ἔδυσαν,
ἀμφὶ δέ με ῥάκος ἄλλο κακὸν βάλον ἦδ' ἐ χιτῶνα,
ῥωγαλέα, τὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῆαι.

“They made me take off my clothes—both cloak and tunic,
and put on me instead the mean rags and the shabby tunic
that you see for yourself before your eyes.”

2.1.2 Eustathius seems to read *ῥῆραι* in this line, the *Etymologicum Magnum* transmits *ῥῆραι*, and both these readings, not surprisingly, have some ms. support (Ludwich’s *J* and *H*, respectively¹³). Remarkably, however, the apparent bulk of the tradition (Ludwich’s FGPDULWZ, which are distributed among six of the seventeen manuscript families constructed by Allen¹⁴) actually gives *órῆραι*. And this reading is also at least mentioned as an alternative (“κατὰ δέ τινας”) by Eustathius.

2.1.3 The raw evidence of the overall tradition thus makes it natural to suspect that the modern choice of a proparoxytone reading (whether *ῥῆραι* or *ὀρῆραι*) is at least partly made on the grounds of an implicit identification of the Homeric present stem with the synchronically athematic “Aeolic” stem seen in Sappho’s *ὀρημμι* and the like (§1.3.1.1), and not so much on the basis of what the tradition mostly offers. The adoption of the better supported *ὀρῆραι* would therefore be fairly uncontroversial if that accentuation of the form could be accounted for. To this question we will return later on.

12. The attested forms themselves, in fact, do not even rule out—as a purely theoretical possibility—that beside the (*h*)*orao/e-* of Ionic (and Attic etc.) and the (*h*)*orē-* of Lesbian, it was actually an (Att.?)-Ion. **horāo/e-* (< **horāo/e-*, an instance of the rare and enigmatic **-ā-jo/e-* type) that lies behind the second Ion. present stem indicated by *ὀρέω*, *ὀρή* etc. (and for the type itself see, e.g., Schulze [1892] 367; Meister [1966] 87; Schwyzler [1939] 730; Buck [1955] 124; Chantraine [1973] 361f.; Risch [1974] 322, 329; Peters [1980] 144, 175). This theoretical possibility is to be rejected only because it operates with three pre-forms (**horo/o-* beside **horāo/e-* beside **horē-*) where two will do, and because it more specifically presupposes the especially perplexing coexistence of **horo/o-* and **horāo/e-*.

13. Von der Mühl (1962) duly reports the existence of the *vl ὀρῆραι*, while printing *ὀρῆραι*. Van Thiel (1991) prints *ὀρῆραι* here and gives no information about variants of any kind.

14. Allen (1954-55) xiii. The families that offer *ὀρῆραι* at §343 (with the relevant ms(s). given in each case—first in Ludwich’s notation and then in Allen’s) are *b* (*P*=*Pal.*), *f* (*L*=*L*¹, *W*=*W*), *g* (*F*=*L*⁸, *Z*=*Z*), *k* (*G*=*L*⁴, *U*=*Mon.*), *l* (*D*=*P*¹), *m* (*X*=*V*⁴).

2.2 A third singular imperfect middle?

2.2.1 The line-final form in A56 is transmitted without apparent variant as *órâto*:

κῆδετο γὰρ Δαναῶν, ὅτι ῥα θνήσκοντας ὀράτο

For she (Hera) was concerned about the Greeks, seeing them dying as she did

A scholium to the Venetus A, however, reports that Zenodotus' reading here was *órêto*,¹⁵ which is exactly what would be expected, of course, as the 3 sg. impf. corresponding to 2 sg. pres. *órêai*, if such a form is genuine.

2.2.2 Again at A198—where the usual text runs:

οἷω φαίνομένη, τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὔ τις ὀράτο

appearing to him alone, while none of the others saw her (Athene).

—scholiasts¹⁶ again report that Zenodotus preferred *órêto* to the *órâto* that is offered by the great bulk of the tradition. This time, moreover, *órêto* is also found as the reading of a few manuscripts,¹⁷ and *órêto* (cf. *vl. ὄρηαι* at ξ343) is read in at least one.¹⁸

2.2.3 Whatever may ultimately be made of the form favored by Zenodotus in these two passages where his reading has come down to us,¹⁹ it is apparently to be read *órêto* and not *órêto*. This is not only the direct testimony of the tradition itself, but may also be inferred from the fact that the scholiasts mention Zenodotus' reading only to reject it in both instances explicitly on the grounds that it is a Doric form.²⁰ And since Doric would have a properispomenon *órêto* as the outcome of the **horáeto* that would necessarily be its pre-form, it would certainly appear that that is what Zenodotus was proposing to read.

15. Erbse (1969-83) 1.27: *Ζηνόδοτος "ὀρήτο" γράφει.*

16. Erbse (1969-83) 1.65 and Allen (1931) ad loc.

17. Ludwich (1902-07) *M*, Allen (1931) *B* and "*ut videtur*" *Pal*¹, West (1998-2000) *C* (=Ludwich *M*) and *G*^f.

18. Ludwich (1902-07) *G*, Allen (1931) *Ge* (=Ludwich *G*). The reading *órêto* is reported by Allen from his *C* (=Ludwich *M*, but see previous note).

19. Φ390 reads ὅθ' ὀράτο θεοὺς ἔριδι ξυνιόντας#. In this case neither textual variants nor indirect testimony supports a reading *órêto*.

20. Erbse (1969-83) gives the relevant texts as:

On A56:

ὀράτο:) ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος "ὀρήτο" γράφει. ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ὅτι Δωρικὸν γίνεται. **A**^{im}

On A198:

1. (ὀράτο:) ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει "ὀρήτο." τοῦτο δὲ Δώριον. **A**^{im}

2. Ζηνόδοτος ἀγνόησας τὸ τῆς διαλέκτου ἰδίωμα ὡς Ἰωνικὸν ἐξέθετο ("ὀρήτο"). ἔστι δὲ Δώριον· οἱ γὰρ Δωριεῖς τῆς δευτέρας συζυγίας τῶν περισπωμένων τὸ α εἰς η τρέπονται. **b** (BC) **T**^l

2.3 The accentuation of the Homeric present *horē-*

The further consequence of this is that the two forms in question here are probably *both* to be thought of and explained, if they can be explained at all, as properispomenon—i.e. *óρῆαι* and *óρῆτο*. For the 2 sg. present this seems to be the *prima facie* probability (§2.1.3), for the 3 sg. imperfect it is almost certain (§2.2.2-3), and these two members of one and the same paradigm will not, of course, have differed in this respect.

2.4 A historical account of *óρῆαι* (and *óρῆτο*)?

2.4.1 The canonical explanation²¹ of the two Homeric items under discussion, as already implied (§1.3.1), operates with a *óρηαι* as the present form—the more secure and more frequently discussed of the two—and makes it the 2 sg. middle of an Aeolic (*h*)*orē-* (: Sa. *óρημμι*). This, in turn, is considered, for obvious reasons, to be closely related to Ion. (*h*)*orēo/e-* and to reflect, in this particular case, an inherited athematic **-ē-* stative. But if the accent is really *óρῆαι* (and thus *óρῆτο* in the imperfect), as now seems likely, the canonical explanation is practically ruled out.

2.4.2 The elimination of this analysis, however, is far from making the forms in question inexplicable. For the properispomenon *óρῆαι/óρῆτο* that is evidently to be assumed in this paradigm can be accounted for in at least two other ways.

2.4.2.1 The virtual certainty of an *-ēo/e-* present to this verb in Ionic immediately makes an Ion. 2 sg. middle **(h)orēai > óρῆαι* (§343) a theoretical possibility. Similarly, of course, an Ionic **(h)orēeto* would theoretically account neatly for the *óρῆτο* that Zenodotus wanted to read in place of banal *óρᾶτο* (A56, 198)—a form that has in any case long been suspected²² of having replaced something more foreign to Attic.

To be sure, middle inflection of an inherited stative present in Greek may be notable, but in the particular case of putative **(h)orēai > óρῆαι* and **(h)orēeto > óρῆτο*, it might possibly be seen as an assimilation of this present to the middle inflection shown by two other presents. One of them is *horao/e-* “see” itself (Hom. *óρῶμαι* [N99+], *εἰσοράασθε* [Y495], *εἰσορόωντο* [Y448+] etc.), which is a full-fledged doublet of **(h)orēo/e-*. The other is **(h)oro/e-* “watch over” (Myc. *o-ro-me-no* PY Ae 134+; Hom. *óρονται* [ξ104], *óροντο* [γ471]), which may or may not be derived from the (same form of the) same root,²³ but is a very close semantic relative in any case. It should not be overlooked, however, that the middle inflection of **(h)orēo/e-*

21. Bechtel (1921-24) 3.196; Frisk (1955-72) 2.409; Chantraine (1973) 305f.; Peters (1980) 91; Chantraine et al. (1999) 813.

22. Wackernagel (1916) 71.

23. See note 1 above.

in question here is apparently confined to Homeric language. And this could ultimately put the phenomenon in a special light (§2.4.6.2.1 below).

2.4.2.2 A second way of justifying properispomenon ὀρήαι and ὀρήτο, in any case, is to take the line that these forms are simply examples of a well known type of hyper-Ionic form in Homer.²⁴

2.4.2.2.1 Such cases of hyper-Ionic η for etymologically expectable ā are in fact securely transmitted in three categories of Homeric forms:^{25, 26}

1. Where η- appears instead of or in addition to ā- as the metrical lengthening of an etymological ā-: ἠνεμόεντ- “windy” (: ἄνεμος), ἠγάθεος “most holy” (: ἀγα-), ἠνωρέη “manliness” vs. ἄνερες “men” (ἄνῆρ), etc.

2. Where morphologically non-Ionic forms that showed (or should have showed) -ā- get recruited into epic language with -η-: γοήμεναι (: γοάω) Ξ502, ἀρήμεναι (: ἀράομαι) χ322, etc.

3. Ambiguous instances where -η- has replaced an -ā- that could be non-Ionic either because it is a feature of another dialect altogether or because it is an obsolete feature of Ionic itself: προσανδήτην (Λ136+), φοιτήτην (M266), etc. Here, that is to say, it could be supposed on the one hand that athematic “Aeolic” *-ā-tān was simply redone as hyper-Ionic -ή-την (cf. type γοήμεναι). Equally possible, on the other hand, is the hypothesis that Att.-Ion. *-ǎǎ-tǎn developed regularly to Old Ion. -ǎ-την, but when Ionic lost its dual, foreign-looking forms of this kind were remodeled as hyper-Ionic -ή-την in Homer for the same reason as motivated the same change in historically foreign *γοᾶμεναι, etc.

2.4.2.2.2 Of the forms at issue here, it is clear that at least the 2 sg. present ὀρήαι could belong to the last of the three classes of forms just

24. Wathelet (1970) 48 takes the Zenodotean reading ὀρήτο to be a hyper-Ionicism of this kind (i.e. for ὀράτο), but does not explicitly extend that explanation to ὀρήαι (or mention it at all, in fact).

25. See Schulze (1892) 16, 147ff.; Meister (1966) 38, 171; Chantraine (1973) 97f., 306; Wyatt (1969) 43f., 72ff., 106ff. etc.; Wathelet (1970) 181f.

26. We may set aside the outdated explanation of ὀρηαι (so accented) offered at Meister (1966) 176, which, basing itself on Meister (1966) 171, has it that contracted ā < āǎ was subject “im Ionischen” to the same ā (> ǎ) > ǎ change that “urgriechisches” ā underwent, and that a ὀρη- < ὀρά- is what is seen in Ion. ὀρήν, ὀρήσθαι. It was thus a genuinely Ionic *(h)orǎi < *(h)orǎi < *(h)orǎeai that was, in effect, distracted to ὀρηαι (on the model of, e.g., μέμνη : μέμνηαι = ὀρή : X) in Meister’s account. Although few, it seems to me, would now operate with the sound change āǎ > ā > ǎ > ǎ in some actual variety of Ionic, this is not immediately fatal to Meister’s approach. For some instances of ā < āǎ did get—or certainly might have gotten—redone as ǎ/ǎ in epic language (see §2.4.2.2.1, no.3 just below), even if not by sound law. And once a Hom. *ὀρήη was in place, it could have been perfectly liable, in theory, to the analogical distraction Meister proposed. What makes the idea of seeing ὀρηαι as a distraction of a hyper-Ionic *ὀρήη difficult to accept is rather that only synchronically opaque instances of Ionic-epic ā (and not even all of these) seem to be susceptible to being redone as epic η (cf. §2.4.2.2.3 below).

enumerated—i.e. to the type represented by *προσανδήτην*, etc. This would involve, to be precise, a four-step development:

1. 2 sg. middle **horáēai* (cf. Hom. *όράας*, *όράασθαι*, etc. [§1.1]) contracted to **horâai*. The contraction **-áēai* > **-âai* (and not **-áēai* > **-âēi*) would be predicted as regular on the basis of **-éēai* > **-ēai* (Hom. *μυθείαι* θ180 *et sim.*) and/or explained as analogical by invoking the proportion *μυθείται*, etc. : *μυθείαι*, etc. = *όρâται* : X.

2. Such a comparatively archaic **horâai* was recruited into the expression:

ἴεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν **όρâαι*# (ξ343)

This segment is highly formulaic, as will be more fully discussed below (§2.4.4.1). But for the moment we may make the point by simply putting it beside:

ἴεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν *όρâσθαι*# (Γ306)
ἴεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν *ἴδωμαι*# (A587+).

3. Under the obvious metrical constraint to which the line-end element of this version of the formula was subject, **όρâαι* was maintained uncontracted in this expression.

4. After **horâai* contracted further to *όρâ* in everyday Ionic speech, **όρâαι* would have become more and more opaque and foreign seeming to the poets of the tradition, with the result that it was hyper-Ionicized to *όρῆαι* in much the same way as Old Ionic *φοιτᾶ-την* (if not “Aeolic” **φοιτᾶ-τᾶν*) was hyper-Ionicized to *φοιτήτην*, as above.

2.4.2.2.3 It is of some importance to note, however, that a parallel explanation will not directly account for Zenodotus’ *όρῆτο* at A56 and 198:

1. Unlike the case of 2 sg. present *όρâ*, with the phonological history **-áēai* > **-âai* > *-â*, the development of 3 sg. imperfect *όρâτο* < **horâeto* included no stage at which the form would have had an *-ā-* that was unfamiliar from the Ionic point of view and would thus have been liable to be hyper-Ionicized as *-η-* (as in *γοήμεναι*, *φοιτήτην*).

2. This, in turn, could easily explain why *όρῆαι* (ξ343) hardly even has a competing variant, while *όρητο* (A56, 198) has practically no actual direct ms. authority against its competitor *όρâτο*. It could be supposed, more explicitly, that *όρῆαι* is a hyper-Ionic but genuine epic form, while

Zenodotus' reading $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\tau\omicron$ was merely his conjecture and is thus the sort of variant that did not easily make its way into the mainstream of the Homeric tradition. Zenodotus, we might imagine, aware of real epic $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ at $\xi 343$, could easily have decided that the corresponding 3 sg. imperfect should have been an analogous form—

- $\epsilon\alpha\iota$ (e.g., $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\alpha\iota$ [P404]) : - $\epsilon\tau\omicron$ = - $\epsilon\iota\alpha\iota$ ($\mu\upsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\iota$ [θ180]) : - $\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron$ =
 - $\eta\alpha\iota$ ($\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ [$\xi 343$]) : X (whence $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\tau\omicron$ [A56. 198])^{27, 28}

2.4.3.1 The points to emphasize so far are:

1. Homeric $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ can be accounted for in more than one way. On the one hand, it could be that we simply have in $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ a 2 sg. middle of the *- $\epsilon\omicron/e$ - stative present seen in Ionic $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\nu$, and thus a form whose history is * $hor\acute{\epsilon}eai$ > $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$. Alternatively, it is possible that * $hor\acute{\alpha}eai$, a 2 sg. pres. middle of familiar * $horo\acute{\alpha}/e$ - (cf. Hom. $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ [$\pi 107+$]), contracted regularly to * $hor\acute{\alpha}ai$ and then hyper-Ionicized to $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$, is what the form ultimately represents.

2. Neither of these accounts is inherently less likely than the textually more difficult assumption of an "Aeolic" present form $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ (: * $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\mu\alpha\iota$ cf. $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\mu\iota$) that would continue an inherited athematic stative in this case.

3. The present form is much better supported by the mss. themselves than is the imperfect $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\tau\omicron$, which can straightforwardly be taken to have been analogically generated by Zenodotus.

2.4.3.2 The last point is of some importance. For if imperfect $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\tau\omicron$ is a philological artifact—even if a rather ancient one—that was based on present $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$, and if the reverse is unlikely or even excluded, it means that the choice among the various available explanations of these two forms should be particularly sensitive to what best suits $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$.

2.4.4 An attempt to arrive at a reasoned "best account" of Homeric $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ (and $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\tau\omicron$)—if such can be had—can go no further by looking only at the circumstances of the forms' transmission plus the morphological evidence

27. If Zenodotus proposed to read $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\tau\omicron$ for $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron$ also at $\Phi 390$ and/or, e.g., * $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ for $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota$ at $\Omega 291$, we are not told about it.

28. It was already remarked above (§2.3) that since (1) the 2 sg. pres. and 3 sg. imperfect of the descriptive Homeric present stem $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta$ - will not have had contrasting accents, and since (2) the transmission favors and heavily favors, respectively, a properispomenon $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta$ - in this present and imperfect anyway, it is reasonably clear that both forms were properispomenon. In light of a further conclusion, however, that the imperfect $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\tau\omicron$ owes its existence to an analogy based on the present altogether, it becomes even more likely that that present was of the form $\acute{\omicron}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$.

from extra-Homeric Greek that bears on this verb for “see.” Additional inferences, however, could emerge, as so often happens, from an examination of the status of *ὀρῆαι* (if not *ὀρῆτο* too) in the formulaic repertory of the epics.

2.4.4.1 As already noted (§2.4.2.2.2, no. 2), *ὀρῆαι*, which occurs only once in Homer, and only in the *Odyssey*, is found in a clearly formulaic segment:

... αὐτὸς ἴ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῆαι# (ξ343)

2.4.4.1.1 A fragment of the epic *Oikhalias Halosis*, attributed to Creophylus, has:

... ταῦτα ἴ' γ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῆαι# (Davies *EFG* 151),

which already indicates that the long, non-subdivisible ἴ' . . . # segment of ξ343 is a formula.

2.4.4.1.2 But these two passages, as it happens, jointly constitute only a single component of a sizable formulaic system that pervades all of Homer—*Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Hymns*. The segment seen in ξ343 and the *OH* obviously goes most closely with:

... ἴ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ὀρᾶσθαι\# (\Gamma 306)} \\ \text{ὀρῶσα\# (\theta 459)} \\ \text{ἰδῶμαι \# (A587, \Sigma 190)} \\ \text{ἰδῆαι\# (\Sigma 135)} \\ \text{ἰδέσθαι\# (\kappa 385)} \end{array} \right.$

But also clearly relevant to this inflectable expression is the repeated line:

#—= ἡ μέγα θαῦμα ἴ' τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶμαι#
(N99=O286=Υ344=Φ54=HHerm 219=τ36)

This, in turn, cannot be separated from

... ἴ' ὁ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶτο# (δ226)
... ἴ' ὅσ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδοίτο# (HHerm 202)

and

... ἴ' καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶντο# (ο462)
... μέγα θαῦμα ἴ' καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι# (HApoll 415. Cf. N99, etc.)

2.4.4.1.3 In short, there is to be recognized here an obviously traditional

line segment of the contour, position, and content $\bar{\text{I}} \sim \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \sim -\#$, where the final three syllables are furnished by a form of present ὀράω or aorist ἴδον that has the required shape ($\sim -\#$) and is therefore almost always middle:²⁹ ὀρώμαι, ὀρῆαι, ὀρώντο, ὀρώτο, ὀρᾶσθαι, ἴδωμαι, ἴδῃαι, ἴδοιτο, ἰδέσθαι; but also ὀρώσα.

2.4.4.2 Since this well entrenched formula could have had a long history in the epic tradition, it would not be surprising if it were to include, in the form in which we have it, modernizations of things linguistically more archaic and/or Ionicizations of features contributed to epic language by other dialects. It would therefore not be against reason to hypothesize, for example, that $\bar{\text{I}} \sim \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \text{ ὀρώμαι}\#$ (N99+) has replaced an earlier traditional expression that ended with “Aeolic” $\ast(h)\text{ὀρημι}$ instead, or that $\bar{\text{I}} \sim \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \text{ ὀρᾶσθαι}\#$ (Γ306) is an analogous adjustment of something with final $\ast(h)\text{ορήναι}$, etc. Behind the present middles in the expressions in question, that is to say, it is mostly possible to “recover” athematic active forms of the “Aeolic” type that is most credibly indicated by Lesbian ὄρημμι. But it is important to note, for near-future reference, that such speculation is more implausible than usual in the present case. The reason for saying so is

29. A tangential point is that it is not difficult to find apparent support for the view that the high frequency of middle verb forms in this formula is in fact a dictional artifact. For it is part of a still larger set of expressions. And some of these certainly seem to use middles beside actives not to make real functional distinctions (at least not that I can discern), but rather in order to inflect various different forms of one basic syntagma in a variety of line positions:

Active		Middle
1. $\# \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \text{ ἰδών}\bar{\text{I}}$ (Γ28), etc.	vs.	$\# \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \text{ ἴδοιτ}\bar{\text{I}}$ (κ574)
2. $\# \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \text{ ἴδωσι}\bar{\text{I}}$ (Γ174), etc.	vs.	$\# \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \text{ ὀρώμαι}\bar{\text{I}}$ (Χ169), etc.
3. $\# \dots \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \text{ ἰδών}\bar{\text{I}}$ (Π182), etc.		
4.		$\# \text{σοῖσιν} \delta' \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \text{ ἐπόψει}\bar{\text{I}}$ (ν233)
5. $\bar{\text{I}}$ δὴ γὰρ ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν# (Ο488), etc. and		$\bar{\text{I}}$ καὶ ἐσόνφομαι ὀφθαλμοῖσι# (Ε212), etc.
6. $\bar{\text{I}}$ ἀνὴρ ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν# (Ε770), etc.	vs.	$\bar{\text{I}}$ ὀρώμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖσιν# (δ47+)

Types 1, 2, and especially 6 could easily suggest, that is to say, that the line segment $\bar{\text{I}} \sim \text{ὀφθαλμοῖσιν} \sim -\#$, in which we are directly interested here, is first and foremost a template, and that whether it was closed out with a middle form (which is what usually fits) or with an active form (ὀρώσα θ459) was of secondary importance in the poets' technique for using this segment.

Up to a point, this view of the situation would merely constitute a specification—applied to a particular subset of the material—of the general position of Witte (1912) 111, 148-52, which is that the alternation of ὀρώω, etc. with ὀρώμαι, etc., and ἴδον, etc. with ἰδόμην, etc. in Homer is determined by formulaic dictional factors. It could still stop short, however, of the further claim (Witte [1912] 150-52) that middle forms of “see” are more specifically the conditioned variants of the alternation, used only to provide formulae built around actives with the metrically equivalent verb forms that allow such formulae to be inflected. The 428 pages of Bechert (1964) that are devoted to arguing the opposite—namely that there is a functional distinction (or a set of functional distinctions) to be recognized between the active and middle forms of ὀρώω/ ὀρώμαι and ἴδον/ ἰδόμην in Homer—obviously cannot be meaningfully evaluated here, and especially not for the sake of what is—as noted at the outset—a tangential point.

that nothing analogous can be done to explain away the middle forms that alternate with actives in the various versions of this formula that employ aorists rather than presents:

Active		Middle
# ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδῶν [†] (Γ28), etc.	vs.	# ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδοῖτ [†] (κ574)
# ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδωσι [†] (T174)	vs.	# ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι [†] (§143)
ἴνα μ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδοῦσα# (HDem 409)	vs.	ἴδὸς δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι# (O600), etc.
ἐγὼν ἰδὼν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν# (δ269+), etc.	vs.	ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰωμαι# (A587+), etc.

2.4.4.3 An examination of the status of ὀρῆαι in the context of its dictional status in the Homeric poems thus produces two results. The more general one is that the only occurrence of ὀρῆαι is in a well embedded and presumably traditional expression (§2.4.4.1). In addition, there is good reason to take the view that the transmitted voice of a given verb form occurring in this formula has a plausible claim to antiquity (§2.4.4.2). These results, in turn, may be added to the inference, as drawn earlier (§2.4.3), that present ὀρῆαι—rather than imperfect ὀρῆτο—is the primary form to explain.

2.4.5 The next and main question of this section of the discussion, however, is whether anything in the dictional situation of ὀρῆαι in the epics helps further narrow the field of conceivable explanations of this form. And to this question the answer is unfortunately negative. Given that ὀρῆαι is confined to what certainly seems to be a formulaic half-line, it would obviously do no violence to explain it as an archaism that has been preserved in the usual way at the end of such a segment. The trouble is, of course, that ὀρῆαι can be taken to be more than one kind of archaism. For even if there is a cogent argument (§2.4.1) for seeing the form neither as the 2 sg. middle of the Proto-Greek stative present in *-ē- that gave rise to both “Aeolic” (*(h)órē-* and Ionic (*(h)orēō/-* nor as the specifically “Aeolic” descendant of that present, it is still possible to explain it (§2.4.3.1) in two different ways—either as directly reflecting Ionic **(h)orēēai* > ὀρῆαι or as a hyper-Ionic epic version of an archaic Ionic **horāai* (> later Ionic ὀρᾶ) that was regularly contracted from **horāēai*.

2.4.6 Instead of lending decisive support to either of these accounts, in fact, the investigation of ἴν' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῆαι# (§343) opens up another possibility altogether. This particular half-line, as already pointed out (§2.4.4.1), goes with a considerable number of others, which all together constitute a highly inflectable formulaic expression. The version that features . . . ὀρῆαι#, however, is found only once and that in the *Odyssey*. This means, in turn, that instead of an archaism, ὀρῆαι may perfectly well be an innovation—i.e. a new and purely epic form that was created relatively late in the Homeric tradition simply to provide ἴν' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρᾶσθαι#, etc. with a 2 sg. pres. indicative version—or more precisely to form the second

person of the very well represented first person $\tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{o}\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\iota\#$ (N99=O286=Y344=Φ54=HHerm 219≈T36). And if this was the motivation, it could be more specifically the case that $\acute{o}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ is the result of an analogical process plausible only within Homeric language, where even analogical creations that do not quite conform to the morphological patterns of extra-epic language may be rendered permissible by their usefulness in a given place within a formulaic segment—or, more specifically, if they allow an additional inflectional form of a traditional expression. What that means in the present case is that it is possible to explain $\acute{o}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ as the result of a straightforwardly proportional analogical process that was carried out by some poet(s) of the tradition precisely in the form:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\alpha\iota\# \text{ (A587+)} & : \tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\iota}\delta\eta\alpha\iota\# \text{ (Σ135)} \\ \tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{o}\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\iota\# \text{ (N99+)} & : \mathbf{X}, \end{array}$$

where \mathbf{X} would be “solved,” of course, as $\tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{o}\rho\eta\alpha\iota\#$.³⁰ The new form of the expression would include a 2 sg. present $\acute{o}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$, which—whether or not it was really in use in some real form of Ionic—could be understood, if need be, as a middle form of Ionic $\acute{o}\rho\eta\nu$ (§1.2), even if it might have been somewhat unusual as such (though cf. §2.4.2.1).

3. As a final piece of business here it might be of interest to point to cases that could serve as parallels in support of an explanation of $\acute{o}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$ that would make it an essentially *kunstsprachlich* creation of the Homeric tradition.

3.1 In the more superficial sense—i.e., parallels for the middle inflection of a stem that otherwise makes only active forms—such things are easily pointed to. There are, in fact, a number of well known instances in Homer where “artificial” middle forms appear in place of otherwise regular active ones in order to stretch a needed verb form by a syllable and thereby suit it to—and thus inflect—an expression of predetermined metrical contour and line position. Examples³¹ are cases like . . . ἀκούετο|| λαὸς ἀντῆς# (Δ331),

30. Burkert (1972) 80, note 29 also invokes the proportion $\tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\alpha\iota\# : \tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\iota}\delta\eta\alpha\iota\# = \tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{o}\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\iota\# : \mathbf{X}$ in connection with the genesis of $\tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{o}\rho\eta\alpha\iota\#$ (“... produziert aber ist sie offenbar durch die Formel. . .”). But Burkert operates nevertheless with a proparoxytone $\acute{o}\rho\eta\alpha\iota$, which the analogy envisioned both here and there could never have produced, strictly speaking. Burkert further explains that the product of this analogical process was “akzeptabel” only because it coincided with an actual Aeolic athematic form. But if a 2 sg. pres. middle of Aeolic (*h*) $\acute{o}\rho\eta\mu\iota$ really existed and was known to the tradition, there is not really much reason to insist upon a purely secondary and analogical origin of $\tilde{\iota} \sim \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\acute{o}\iota\sigma\iota\nu \acute{o}\rho\eta\alpha\iota\#$ in the first place.

31. See, e.g., Chantraine (1973) 97; Meister (1966) 19f.; Nussbaum (1987) 232f.

where a virtually unique middle form of pres. ἀκούω is metrically conditioned in this way.

3.2 But a parallel for the more involved claim of a purely dictional proportion that produces analogical epic morphology can also perhaps be supplied. The relevant forms are those of the Homeric future of ὅμνυμι “swear.”

3.2.1 The well attested Attic paradigm—1 sg. ὁμοῦμαι, 3 sg. ὁμεῖται, etc.—would have to go back most immediately, as it stands, to **om-eo/e-*. This, of course, would be a so-called “liquid” future—i.e. an inherited kind of future stem, made with a formant *-*e(h)o/e-* (< *-*h₁s-o/e-*), that is regular in the most familiar Greek dialects for verbs from roots ending in a liquid or a nasal (*inter alia*).³² Typical examples are **stel-e(h)o/e-* “will send” (στελέω [β287]; Att. στελέω, -εῖς), **ker-e(h)o/e-* “will cut” (κερέειν [Υ146]; Att. κερῶ, -εῖς), and **men-e(h)o/e-* “will remain” (μενέω [Λ317+], Att. μενῶ, -εῖς). In the present case, it would be a matter of such a future in *-*e(h)o/e-* to the descriptive root **om-* of present *om-nū-* “swear.” And this would appear to be in complete agreement not only with variantlessly transmitted ὁμεῖται in Homer (I274)³³ and Hesiod (*Erga* 194), but with purportedly Laconian (Ar. *Lys.* 183) ὁμιώμεθα—if it is genuine³⁴—as well:

Homer, Hesiod

ὁμεῖται

Attic

ὁμοῦμαι

ὁμεῖται

“Laconian”

ὁμιώμεθα

3.2.2 The form that complicates the situation, however, is the Homeric 1 sg. ὁμοῦμαι (A233+)—also transmitted without apparent variant—with a contraction product -*ō-* (-*ov-*) that in the context of Homeric language could only be a blatant and intractable Atticism of the written tradition if it were really to reflect an earlier *-*eo-*.

32. See Schwyzler (1939) 784; Chantraine (1973) 449ff.; Risch (1974) 351; Schmidt (1986) 35, 45f. with further references; Sihler (1995) 508f. (§457B).

33. The scattered mss. that read ὁμεῖται (or even ὠμεῖται) in the relevant passage (see especially Ludwig ad loc.) still offer nothing but consistent -εῖται inflection, of course.

34. This is the reading of the mss., and the possibility of a Laconian outcome of -*eo-* (whatever its real phonetic character [Méndez Dosuna (1993) 123 for one view]) that would be spelled -*ω-* is famously strengthened by Heracleian ἐμετρίωμες (SGDI 4629.2.17+) and μετρίωμεναι (SGDI 4629.1.18+) from the present *metreo/e-* “measure.” The form is obviously not, however, recorded in a genuine Laconian document. The question of whether ὁμιώ(με)θα is morphologically plausible as the future of ὁμνῶ- in Laconian reduces to that of whether Laconian had the “liquid” future just mentioned—i.e. futures in *-*e(h)o/e-* to roots synchronically ending in -*L* and -*N* (and historically in -*L*, -*N*, -*LH*, -*NH*) in Greek. I know of no decisive Laconian evidence on that point. See in any case on ὁμιώμεθα Colvin (1999) 156, 215f.

3.2.3 At first sight, it might appear possible to solve this problem by way of a hypothesis that would make Hom. $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ not really an Attic form, but rather a product of an inner-epic analogy of the type:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{-εται} & : & \text{-ομαι} & = & \text{-ηται} & : & \text{-ωμαι} \\ \uparrow & & & & & & \text{X} \\ \uparrow & \text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμεῖται\# (I274)} & & & & & \end{array}$$

The result, of course, would be the expression \uparrow καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota\#$ (A233+), and thus an $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ with an origin analogous to the one sketched above (§2.4.6.1) as the third and final possibility for ὄρηαι.

3.2.4 But there are at least two serious drawbacks to this method of reconciling Homeric $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ with $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$.

1. If Ionic epic language had a 3 sg. future of the form $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ here from the beginning—which is to assume, in other words, that its morphological repertory included the same **om-e(h)o/e-* future as appears in Attic—and if the need that eventually arose in the tradition was to form the first person of the third-person formula \uparrow καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota\#$, it is entirely unclear why the poets had recourse to an analogical solution like the one just laid out at all. For since the tradition clearly had access to monosyllabic Ionic *-εμ-* (*-ευ-*) for eymological *-ῥ-* for a reasonably long time (to judge by the considerable number of forms that are metrically guaranteed to show this treatment³⁵—and note in particular 1 sg. fut. ἀμφιβαλεῖμαι [χ103]), it is hard to see why the solution was not simply \uparrow καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον * $\delta\mu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota\#$.

2. The far more serious difficulty, however, is that the inner-Homeric situation of the relevant formulaic expressions is all against an account that operates with an analogical $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ made to $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ in this way. For $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ occurs in Homer only at I274, as given above, in the segment \uparrow καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota\#$,³⁶ for which instructive analogues are not lacking:

$$\begin{array}{l} \uparrow \text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι\# (A233)} \\ \uparrow \text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι\# (I132)} \\ \uparrow \text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι\# (v229)} \end{array}$$

35. See e.g., Chantraine (1973) 34, 58ff. (esp. 61).

36. The Hesiodic expression that contains $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ —namely \uparrow ἐπὶ δ' ὄρκον $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota\#$ (*Erga* 194)—is scarcely independent of this Iliadic \uparrow καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota\#$ (together with Iliadic \uparrow ἐπὶ δ' ὄρκον ὁμοσσεῖ $\#$ [Ψ42] plus Odyssean \uparrow μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμόσσει $\#$ [ε178+] and \uparrow μέγαν ὄρκον ἀπώμν $\#$ [β377]), and could even be derived from it. What is nominally a second instance of $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ does not therefore really do anything to change the status of this form relative to that of $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ in epic formulaic diction.

—an expression that not only has the variant (also first person)

ἰ κεφαλὴν μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι# (HHerm 274).

but also the slightly shorter by-form (still first person)

ἰ ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ καὶ τόδ' ὁμοῦμαι# (Φ373).

This state of affairs would already strongly suggest on its own that ἰ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμεῖται# is a third-person transformation of what is essentially a first-person formula. But what makes that account of the ὁμεῖται version of this segment a virtual certainty is that at I274 Odysseus is simply reporting to Achilles (“καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμεῖται”) Agamemnon’s exact words (“καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι”) of 142 lines earlier at I132.

The result of considering the Homeric future paradigm ὁμοῦμαι, ὁμεῖται from the dictional point of view is thus that it turns out—despite first appearances—to be highly desirable or even essential to explain ὁμεῖται as analogically made to ὁμοῦμαι, and not the other way around.

3.2.5.1 The first step toward what is now evidently the required sort of account is that of invoking the aorist stem of *omniŭ-* “swear”—namely *omosa-* (Hom., Att. ὠμοσα, etc.). This is unambiguously to be analyzed *omo-sa-*, and that in turn provides a basis for reconstructing an *h*₃-final root³⁷ (most likely **h₃emh₃-*³⁸ > Proto-Gk. **emo-* > *omo-*,³⁹ whence *o*-vocalism in the root throughout the entire averbo) and an aorist that behaves as if it reflects **h₃emh₃-s-*, yielding Greek **emo-s(a)-* and then *omo-s(a)-*.

3.2.5.2 This has crucial implications for the reconstruction of the original future of this verb in Greek. For it is not at all unusual for Greek verbs from

37. So Cowgill (1965) 157f. (*contra* Ruipérez [1950] 395f., 406f.); Beekes (1969) 119, 131, 231, 234; Chantraine (1973) 451; Hauri (1975) 92ff.; Colvin (1999) 215f.

38. The usual reconstruction **h₃emh₃-* (see previous note) operates with a root that begins and ends with the same consonant, a structure of which other examples are vanishingly few. The **h₂emh₃-* reconstructed by Rix et al. (1998) 237 depends upon identifying ὄμνυμι (and Skt. *am-* “anpacken; schwören”) with the root of Latin *amāre* “love” plus Marrucinian *amatens* “haben angenommen.” But even if the semantics can be aligned, it remains to be shown that Italic *am-* could not go back to **h₁ṛh₃-/_V* as easily as to **h₂emh₃-* (since **Cṛh₃V-* could have given Italic *CamV-* even if **h₁ṛC-* gave *emC-*). And though ἄμοιος-κακός. Σικελιοί, also cited in the entry, would probably favor **h₂-* if it is a Greek word, there can be no presumption—given that it is Sicilian only—either that it is in fact Greek or—given its meaning—that it belongs with ὄμνυμι by root etymology at all. Because of **énomā* > **ónomā* in “name” (next note), moreover, *a-o* > *o-o* assimilation in Greek is not nearly as trivial an assumption as is *eNo* > *oNo*. On any theory, assimilated *omo-* will have been the source from which *o* vocalism was spread to the root syllable throughout the averbo of ὄμνυμι.

39. The assimilation **émo-* > *ómo-* is closely comparable to the *éno-* > *óno-* seen in the word for “name:” **énomā* (Lac. Ἐνυμακρατιάδας, Ἐνυμαντιάδας, Ἐνύμαντος [see Fraser-Matthews (1997) 142]) > **ónomā* (ὄνομα/ὄνυμα) in virtually all dialects.

roots of the shape *CERH-* to preserve a future stem that goes directly back to a pre-form of the structure *CERH-so/e-*.⁴⁰

1. Beside the aorist stem *dama-s(a)-* “subdue” (Hom.+ ἐδάμασ(σ)α, etc.), for example, future forms reflecting **dama-so/e- > dama-(h)o/e-* are found not only in such Homeric instances as 3 sg. δαμάα (X271) or 3 pl. δαμώωσι (Z368), but (at least according to the usual analysis) in the Mycenaean participle *da-ma-o-te* (Kn X 1051) as well. So also:

2. aorist **ela-s(a)-* “drive” (Hom.+ ἔλασ(σ)α, etc.): future **ela-(h)o/e-* (Hom. ἐλώωσι [N315], Att. ἐλῶ, ἐλᾶ, etc. [A.+])

3. aorist **pera-s(a)-* “sell” (Hom. ἐπέρας(σ)α, etc.): future **pera-(h)o/e-* (Hom. περάαν [Φ454])

4. aorist **ole-s(a)-* “destroy” (Hom.+ ὤλεσ(σ)α, etc.): future **ole-(h)o/e-* “will perish” (Hom. ὀλέσθε [Φ133])

5. aorist **μεme-s(a)-* “vomit” (Hom.+ ἤμεσ(σ)α, etc.): future **μεme-(h)o/e-* (Att. ἐμῶ [Ar.+], ἐμοῦμαι [A.+]; Ion. ἐμέομαι [Hp.])

6. perfect (**με-mh₁- >*) **μεμῆrē-* “say, tell” (Hom.+ εἶρημαι): future (**μεrh₁-so/e- >*) **μere-(h)o/e-* (Hom. ἐρέω [Δ39], ἐρέει [H91+])

3.2.5.3 Perfectly in line with this pattern—even if constituting a unique example of a *CERh₃-* root that participates in it—would be:

7. aorist **omo-s(a)-* “swear”: future **omo-(h)o/e-*.

And it is this future stem, of an archaic and residual type, that would thus be reasonably seen in the 1 sg. ὁμοῦμαι (< **omo(h)o-mai*) that is essentially limited to a single, evidently traditional line segment in Homer.

3.2.5.4.1 In that case, Attic ὁμοῦμαι, ὁμεῖται and Aristophanes’ Laconian ὁμιώμεθα, which would clearly reflect a future in **-e(h)o/e-* and not the original **-o-(h)o/e-*, must simply show a later and analogical “liquid” future of the usual type. And potential models for such a rearrangement of the future of ὁμνυμι are not lacking. A strictly proportional explanation could even be constructed:

pres. <i>or-nŭ-</i> “arise” (e.g., ὄρνυται E532+)	:	fut. <i>or-eo/e-</i> (e.g., ὀρεῖται Υ140) =
pres. <i>om-nŭ-</i> “swear” (e.g., ὁμνυθι Ψ585)	:	X

The result would be, of course, the acquisition by present *om-nŭ-* “swear” of a new future of the more normal type—namely *om-eo/e-*. And this

40. On futures of this kind see especially Hauri (1975) 13-21, 24f., 62-72, and *passim*; 92ff. on *omo-(h)o/e-* “will swear” in particular.

would be reflected presumably by Attic $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$, $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ and possibly by the allegedly Laconian future $\delta\mu\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ as well.⁴¹

3.2.5.4.2 Alternatively, it could be supposed that it is only Laconian $\delta\mu\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ —if, again, it is authentic enough to show anything⁴²—that shows exactly the kind of analogical “liquid” future that was envisioned just above. It might be, that is to say, that Attic simply redid $om\bar{o}-/ *om\bar{o}-$ (its regular outcome of $*omo-(h)o-/ *omo-(h)e-$) as $om\bar{o}-/ om\bar{e}-$ (as if from $*om-e(h)o-/ *om-e(h)e-$), which was the far commoner pattern, of course, occurring as it did throughout the whole class of verbs that made “liquid” futures in $*-e(h)o/e-$ from the beginning. The actual proportion by which this would have been done is obvious:

$$\begin{array}{lll} -\bar{o}- (\phi\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota \text{ “I will appear,” etc.}) & : & -\bar{e}- (\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota, \text{ etc.}) \\ -\bar{o}- (\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota) & : & \mathbf{X}^{43} \end{array} =$$

3.2.6 To summarize briefly before going on to make a final proposal, two consistent and mutually supportive conclusions about $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota/ \delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ in Homer have now emerged. The first is that the fundamental form in the paradigm of the future of $\delta\mu\nu\upsilon\mu\iota$ in epic language—the form, that is to say, that characterizes the unmarked version of an unquestionably formulaic expression—is the 1 sg. $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$. Furthermore, this is likely to be the direct reflex of $*omo-(h)o-$, and it is this future formation that should be accorded primacy from the historical point of view since it accords best with aorist $*omos(a)-$, is the least costly assumption for Homeric $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ itself, and Attic $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota/ \delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ (and anything else that looks as if it reflects $*om-e(h)o/e-$) is susceptible of one or more analogical explanations.

3.2.7 It remains only to reason further that if Homeric $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\alpha\iota$ is not to be a graphic Atticism and thus reflects $*omo-(h)o-$, and if it is also the fundamental form of this future in epic diction, Homeric and Hesiodic $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ appears to be explicable in only one general sort of way. Since $\delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ occurs, to be precise, in the third-person version of an essentially first-person formula and is thus secondary, it would be supposed that by the time the tradition got around to creating $\mid \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\pi\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\alpha\nu \omicron\rho\kappa\omicron\nu \delta\mu\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota\#$, it had access to a new “liquid” future $*\delta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota, -\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$ (hypothetically produced by the same analogy—to $\delta\rho\nu\upsilon\mu\iota : \delta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, e.g.—envisioned earlier

41. If Laconian had $*-e(h)o/e-$ futures to roots in $-L$ and $-N$ (see note 34 above), this analogy could have worked there as well as in Attic. If not, $\delta\mu\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ can hardly be a genuine Laconian form in the first place and would then be irrelevant to the discussion.

42. See notes 34 and 41.

43. See again Colvin (1999) 215f. with reference to Ruijgh (1975) 85. The only additional point to be emphasized here is that the impossibility of explaining Lac. $\delta\mu\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ by this analogical proportion does not prevent it from being accounted for by a different analogy (§3.2.5.4.1.-2).

[§3.2.5.4.1]), and that this secondary third-person form of the expression made use, reasonably enough, of the more recent form of this future.

To be sure, this account would be more compelling if there were independent evidence for the new and analogical **ὀμέομαι*, -*εῖται* in a dialect—presumably Ionic⁴⁴—that can be counted on to have contributed linguistic features to the epic repertory. But it does have in its favor that there is no evident alternative as long as it is maintained that *ὀμοῦμαι*, as far as Homer is concerned, comes from one (old) paradigm of this future, and *ὀμεῖται* comes from a second (newer) one.

3.2.8 Continuing in this vein, then, the historical hypothesis would be (1) that Homeric language simply preserved archaic *ὀμοῦμαι* beside an *ὀμεῖται* that comes from the more recent paradigm of this future—or in other words that it created its own inflection *ὀμοῦμαι/ὀμεῖται* by the familiar kind of accumulation and side-by-side deployment of chronologically incongruous elements that is characteristic of the epic dialect in any case—and (2) that *ὀμοῦμαι/ὀμεῖται* is thus very specifically not a relatively arbitrarily assumed Atticism of the written tradition that replaced an entirely notional **ὀμεῦμαι/ὀμεῖται* (or an equally notional *ὀμοῦμαι/ὀμοῦται* straight from **omo-(h)o/e-*, for that matter).

3.2.9.1 Synchronically, however, the question is whether it is possible in addition to understand this definitively transmitted -*οῦμαι/-εῖται* pairing as sufficiently well motivated in Homeric language to have actually been at home there as such, which is clearly the ideal solution from the textual point of view. This question reduces, in practical terms, to that of seeing if it can be supposed that it was not so much—or at least not only—the 1 sg./ 3 sg. relationship of *ὀμοῦμαι* and *ὀμεῖται* that was presumably somehow supported and thus justified in Homeric language, but rather the 1 sg./ 3 sg. relationship of | *καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὀμοῦμαι*# and | *καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὀμεῖται*# in the poets' "paradigm" of one of their countless inflectable formulae.

3.2.9.2 The problem of motivating the pairing in question, once put in this way, can perhaps be given a reasonable solution. For these two forms of this inflectable expression in fact belong to an entire class of segments made up of syntactically comparable line-end formulae of various shapes and sizes.

44. *ὀμοῦνται* on an inscription from Smyrna (OGI 229.40) is uninformative. If it were a genuine Ionic form it would point, of course, to the retention of the old future stem **omo-(h)o-*. But the inscription dates only from the period 246–226 BC and is in any case essentially a Koine document, which would make *ὀμοῦνται* here merely another instance of the innovated Attic future.

Among formulaic “paradigms” that would have functioned as a cohort of analogues to our

‡ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμῶμαι# vs. ‡ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμεῖται#

four groups can be identified.

1. The shortest expressions that it is sensible to invoke are inflected expressions like

‖ ὄφρα ἴδωμαι# (Z365+) vs. ‖ ὄφρα ἴδῃται# (E221+)
‖ ὄφρα ἴδωμεν# (K97+) ‖ αἶ κεν ἴδῃται# (P652)
‖ ὄφρα ἴδῃται# (B237)

and

‖ ὄφρ' ἂν ἴκωμαι# (K325+) vs. ‖ ὄφρ' ἂν ἴκηται# (ζ304+)
‖ ὄφρ' ἂν ἴκηται# (O23).

2. A couple of slightly longer inflected formulae comparable in obvious ways to the one at the center of attention here are:

‡ ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλωμαι# (Υ436) vs. ‡ ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλῃται# (M150+)

or

‡ τῶν δῆμον ἴκωμαι# (Z225) vs. ‡ ἐπὶ νῆας ἴκηται# (Z69),
‡ καὶ οἴκαδ' ἴκωμαι# (I393)
‡ τεῦ δώμαθ' ἴκωμαι# (ο509)

and it is to this class, of course, that Hesiod's abbreviated version of the inflected Homeric expression now at issue⁴⁵ belongs:

‡ ἐπὶ δ' ὄρκον ὁμεῖται# (Erga 194).

3. A still longer inflectable formula of this general syntactic type—extending, that is, as far back as the trochaic caesura—is first of all:

‡ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδωμαι# (A587+) vs. ‡ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδῃται# (Σ135)
‡ τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώμαι# (N99+) ‡ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῃται# (ξ343),

which was of central importance to the earlier discussion of ὀρῃται (§2.4.4). But especially interesting because of its relatively close semantic and even

45. See also note 36 above.

lexical (ὄρκια/ ὄρκον) relationship—in addition to its syntactic parallelism—to ἰ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι/ ὁμεῖται# is the inflected expression:

ἰ καὶ ὄρκια πιστὰ τάμωμεν# (Γ94+) vs. ἰ ἔν' ὄρκια πιστὰ τάμητε (Γ252).⁴⁶

An expression of this type that does not happen to be found inflected, but is obviously a close parallel as well is:

ἰ γερούσιον ὄρκον ἔλωμαι (Χ119)

4. Finally, inflectable formulae of the same size, shape, position, and general syntactic structure as ἰ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι/ ὁμεῖται# are:

ἰ ἔναρα βροτόεντα φέρωμαι# (Θ534) vs. ἰ ἔναρα βροτόεντα φέρηται# (Χ245)

and

ἰ σὴν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἵκηται# (δ545+)
ἰ ἦν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἵκηται# (ε26+).

3.2.10 What all of this is meant to lead up to, quite obviously, is a very simple account of Homeric ὁμοῦμαι/ ὁμεῖται in which it could be supposed that when there arose the occasion or need to supply a third person for the well established first-person formula ἰ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι# that contained an archaic and obsolete form of the future of ὁμνυμι, the tradition simply used the ordinary modern ὁμεῖται and was able or willing to tolerate the resulting unusual paradigm in -οῦμαι (-ῶ-): -εῖται (-ῆ-) because a complete and perfect analogy for such a pattern was supplied by -ωμαι (-ῶ-): -ηται (-ῆ-), etc. not only in the abstract, but more precisely and concretely in specific, parallel, line-end inflectable formulae of the types just exemplified.

3.2.11 As an alternative, however, that is very possibly to be preferred, it can be maintained—and this is what would justify seeing ὀρῆαι (ξ343) and ὁμεῖται (I274) as two instances of one phenomenon—that the process of making the third person of the 1 sg. formula ἰ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι# was a matter not so much of using a contemporaneous ὁμεῖται (while declining the services of equally contemporaneous *ὁμεῖμαι), but rather of forming a 3 sg. to 1 sg. ὁμοῦμαι by way of a simple analogy internal to Homeric language. The idea would be that the epic dialect's archaic,

46. It is of considerable interest that more than a few mss. (see especially Ludwig and Allen ad loc.) offer 2 sg. τάμηναι in this passage, a reading that is far from absurd in the context (even if not the best choice). The specifically middle form, however, is remarkable and gives every reason to suspect that we have here a device for making a 2 sg. version of the formula ἰ ~ ὄρκια πιστὰ τάμ- ~ #. As such, ἰ ~ ὄρκια πιστὰ τάμηται# would stand to ἰ ~ ὄρκια πιστὰ τάμωμεν# as does, e.g., ἰ ~ ἰδωμεν# to ἰ ~ ἰδῶμαι# above.

obsolete, unique, and possibly even defective 1 sg. future ὁμοῦμαι, containing an unparalleled and opaque stem-final - \bar{o} -, was given a 3 sg. that was destined to have a stem-final - \bar{e} -, and thus take the form ὁμεῖται, by every factor that could have been in play here. For the regular patterns of the language in general (-ομαι, -εται; -ωμαι, -ηται) were in this case identical to and thus only reinforced by what the parallel inflectable formulaic line segments that were surveyed above had to offer—i.e.:

~ ἴδωμαι# : ~ ἴδηται#	^τ ~ ~ ~ ἴδωμαι# : ^τ ~ ~ ~ ἴδηται#
~ ἴκωμαι# : ~ ἴκηται#	^τ ~ ὄρκια πιστὰ τάμωμεν# : ^τ ~ ὄρκια πιστὰ τάμητε#
^τ ~ ~ ~ ἔλωμαι# : ^τ ~ ~ ~ ἔληται#	^τ ~ ~ ~ ὄρκον ἔλωμαι#
^τ ~ ~ ~ ἴκωμαι# : ^τ ~ ~ ~ ἴκηται#	^τ ~ ~ ~ φέρωμαι# : ^τ ~ ~ ~ φέρηται#

And to |^τ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμοῦμαι# a |^τ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμεῖται# was accordingly made. If the ὁμεῖται created in this way by and for Homeric language really did coincide with an innovated “liquid” future in some dialect(s) of the poets, so much the better. But in this scenario it need not have. The synchronically anomalous \bar{o} -stem 1 sg. ὁμοῦμαι could simply have been supplied with an \bar{e} -stem 3 sg. that did, admittedly, make for a unique \bar{o}/\bar{e} paradigm, but one that was very well supported, in its all-important formulaic domain of employment, by every possible kind of analogue.