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1. The Greek presents (h)ora/o/-, (h)orē-, and (h)orē/o/- “see”!

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

Archil. ὀρᾶς (176.1, 177.2), ὀρὰ (105.1); Semon. ὀρᾶ (7.15, 7.80), ὀρῶτες (7.111), Theogn. ὀρᾶ (857+), ὀρᾶς (93), ὀρῶν (747), ὀρῶτη (1059), ὀρῶ (858); Callim. ὀρᾶσιν (1.20); Tyrt. ὀρῶ (12.11); Solon ὀρᾶτε (11.7), ὀρῶτα (34.5), Hdt.—to cite a couple of cases without variant—ὁρᾶ (1.119.6), ὀρῶτα (9.66.2), etc.

In addition, it is this present stem that appears in Homer, in characteristically “distracted” form,

1.1. The familiar present stem

1.1.1. The Greek presents

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

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 *ier- of the root *ser- (so Rix et al. [1998] 483f.). The form that makes difficulties for this reconstruction is the augmented Attic imperfect ἔωρον, which looks as if it ought to come from *ɪ(h)yor- (type indic. ἔλλων < *ɪ(h) yal- vs. infin. ἔλλαι < *ɪ(h) yal- in the aorist of ἄλλοκτοι “be seized”). But if Attic were to have redone the imperfect of ὄραω, it would not be a unique example of the extension of augmentation with ἔ- from ἔγ- initial roots to others. The oγ- of ὀγνι/ οἶγνι “open,” which goes back to an *ογ- (cf. especially όγνιντο [Β809+] < *ογ- etc.) beside *ειγ- (Lesb. infin. οὐγνι [Schwyzer (1960) no. 620.43])—and thus to *hειγ-/*h;yig- or *o- ογ-/*o- ογ- (with preverb *o)—is another case of an effectively (h)V- initial root that has been given the kind of augmentation (impf. ἄνειγον 1122±, aor. ἄνειξα 389+) that looks like it reflects *eγ-V-. In any event, nothing in the discussion that follows would be affected by a reconstruction of the root initial of ὄραω etc. as *h(yl)or- rather than the *hor- being adopted here.

2. 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 *ier- of the root *ser- (so Rix et al. [1998] 483f.). The form that makes difficulties for this reconstruction is the augmented Attic imperfect ἔωρον, which looks as if it ought to come from *ɪ(h)yor- (type indic. ἔλλων < *ɪ(h) yal- vs. infin. ἔλλαι < *ɪ(h) yal- in the aorist of ἄλλοκτοι “be seized”). But if Attic were to have redone the imperfect of ὄραω, it would not be a unique example of the extension of augmentation with ἔ- from ἔγ- initial roots to others. The oγ- of ὀγνι/ οἶγνι “open,” which goes back to an *ογ- (cf. especially όγνιντο [Β809+] < *ογ- etc.) beside *ειγ- (Lesb. infin. οὐγνι [Schwyzer (1960) no. 620.43])—and thus to *hειγ-/*h;yig- or *o- ογ-/*o- ογ- (with preverb *o)—is another case of an effectively (h)V- initial root that has been given the kind of augmentation (impf. ἄνειγον 1122±, aor. ἄνειξα 389+) that looks like it reflects *eγ-V-. In any event, nothing in the discussion that follows would be affected by a reconstruction of the root initial of ὄραω etc. as *h(yl)or- rather than the *hor- being adopted here.

2. See, e.g., Chastraine (1973) 75ff.
1.2 Beside present forms that show the stem (*h)orao/e-*, however, there are also forms in (*h)oreo- and (*h)oreo-.

1.2.1 Instances occur mostly in Ionic:

\[
{\text{\(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\)} Anacr. (346 frag. 4.2 PMG), Hdt. (1.111.3 without variant); \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\mu\varepsilon\) Hp. (Nat. Puer.); \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\varepsilon\) Hdt. (1.68.4, etc., without variant); \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\) Hdt. (vi 3.14.3, etc.); \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\nu\sigma\sigma\sigma\) Hp. (Epid.); \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\sigma\sigma\) Hnd. (4.44), etc.\]

1.2.2 Although the stem allomorphs (*h)oreo- and (*h)oreo- have sometimes been said to represent the unmolested phonologically regular outcome of Proto-Greek (*h)orajo- and (*h)orajö-, the sound law that supposedly operated to produce them from such pre-forms is actually quite doubtful. And in any case, (*h)oreo- and (*h)oreo- are clearly shown to be reflexes of earlier (*h)orjo- and (*h)orjo- (with phonologically regular shortening of \(\varepsilon\) to \(\varepsilon\) before \(\varepsilon\) in Ionic) by clear evidence for (*h)orjε- and (*h)orjε- in this present:

\[
{\text{\(\omega\rho\varepsilon\sigma\iota/\omega\rho\nu\)} (Hp. Nat. Mul.+, Hnd. 2.67+), \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\sigma/\omega\rho\nu\iota\) (Hp. Carn.+, Callim. frag. 191.5+), \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\iota\) (Hnd. 3.50+), \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\nu\tau\) (Hnd. 2.68+), \(\omega\rho\nu\iota\) (Hp. Insan.+, Democrit. frag. 11 DK).\]

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

1.3 The Ionic *-jο/jε- present \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\), \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\iota\), etc. is naturally always put beside forms pointing to an athematic present (*h)orjε-.

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

Sappho: *ορημιμι (31.11 PLF), Alcaeus *ορημιμι (F3, b. 5 PLF)

Frag. Adesp.: *ορημιμι (921.b, iii.1 PMG)

3. The *ορημι read at Alcm. 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 Alcman'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: *ορημιτι (3 pl. 26.14), *ορημιτι (ol 3 pl. 9.35), (*ορημιτα (3.18, 5.85, 11.69).

4. See Schmidt (1889) 326ff., followed by Schwyzer (1939) 1.242, 515; Frisk (1955-72) 2.407; Lejeune (1972) 236 (8298, a.3); Chantraine et al. (1999) 813. Chantraine (1973) 210 is undecided.

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

6. Or, to be more precise, the shortening of \(\varepsilon\) to \(\varepsilon\) by sound law (\(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\), \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\iota\), \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\mu\varepsilon\), \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\sigma\sigma\)) and the analogical introduction of \(\varepsilon\) and \(\varepsilon\) (\(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\varepsilon\), \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\), \(\omega\rho\varepsilon\omega\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\iota\)) etc.) in place of (the outcome of) \(\varepsilon\) and \(\varepsilon\) on the model (\(\varepsilon\), \(\varepsilon\), \(\varepsilon\), etc.) of the much more numerous class of presents in original *-jο/e-. See, e.g., Lejuene (1972) 253f.

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

8. Peters (1980) 90ff. makes a case for seeing the *-jο/e- paradigm as an analogical rearrangement of the *-jο/e- paradigm. It is not essential for present purposes to take a position on that question.
It is this same (h)orë- that has been said to appear in:

Homer: 2 sg. pres. midd. νυ.2. Ὄρηκαι and Ὄρημαι (ξ343)
3 sg. impf. midd. νυ.2. Ὄρησαν and Ὄρησα (Zenodotus' reading at A 56, 192)
Creophylus: Ὄρηκαί (frag. Οἰκήλας 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)orë- 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)orë- (Sa.+) has generally been said directly to continue an inherited stative present in *-e- (<*-eh₁>), while Ionic (h)orë-o/e- is analyzed as the same stem more or less functionlessly expanded by *-jo/e- (*-e-jo/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)orë- do not necessarily establish anything beyond a present with "Aeolic" inflection.¹¹ And a descriptively athematic -e- present of this kind is no more likely to reflect an inherited stative present in *-e- (<*-eh₁>) than to continue, inter alia, an inherited iterative present of the familiar kind with o-grade root and the stem formant *-eio/e-. The iterative of the latter type that lies behind Attic-Ionic (etc.) ποιέω, for example, surfaces in Lesbian as "Aeolic" (*πόημω (Ἰπόημμεν Sa. 24 (a) PLF; ALC. ποήμενοι 117 F3 (b) 21 PLF), just as the *-e-jo/e- denominative that shows up in the average dialect as (*)οικέω takes the form οἰκημι in Lesbian (οἰκημι'μι ALC. 130 G 2.31 PLF). In fact, the hypothesis of an iterative origin for the present (h)orë- 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)orë- in Ionic—which rests, in turn, entirely on the existence of such forms as (h)ορησ, (h)ορην, (h)ορητε, (h)ορη, and (h)ορην in that dialect—that suggests an inherited Proto-Greek

---

9. So, e.g., Chantraine (1973) 305f.
*hoř-e-*, and thus an *
-θ-*- stative, behind “Aeolic” (h)όρημι. It is not the “Aeolic” present on its own that guarantees this athematic stative present.12

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

2.1 The second sg. pres. middle

2.1.1 At Odyssey 5 343, in the fictional autobiography related to Eumaeus by Oysseus, a form of some kind of present in ὅρη- is certain, even if somewhat problematical in itself and open in any case to more than one historical explanation:

\[\text{έκ μέν με χλαίνων τε χιτώνα τε εἴματ' ἔδυσαν, ἀφαίδε μὲ ῥάκος ἄλλῳ κακὸν βάλον ἦδε χιτώνα, ἐννυράλεα, τὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς οἴρης.}\]

“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 ὅρηαι in this line, the Etymologicum Magnum transmits ὅρηαι, 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 FGPXDULWZ, which are distributed among six of the seventeen manuscript families constructed by Allen14) actually gives ὅρηαι. And this reading is also at least mentioned as an alternative (“κατὰ δὲ τως”) 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 ὅρηαι or ὅρηαι) 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 ὅρημι 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 ὅρηαι 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)όραολ- of Ionic (and Attic etc.) and the (h)όρε- of Lesbian, it was actually an (Att.?)-Ion. *hórao/e- (< *hórao/e-), an instance of the rare and enigmatic *-o/e- type) that lies behind the second Ion. present stem indicated by ὅραο, ὅρη etc. (and for the type itself see, e.g., Schalze [1892] 367; Meister [1966] 87; Schwyzler [1939] 750; 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 (*hórao- beside *hórao/e- beside *hóre-) where two will do, and because it more specifically presupposes the especially perplexing coexistence of *hórao- and *hórao/e-.


14. Allen (1954-55) xiii. The families that offer ὅρηαι at 5 343 (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=L1, W=W), g (P=L8, Z=Z), k (G= L4, U=Mon.), l (D=P1), m (X=V4).
2.2 A third singular imperfect middle?

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

κήδετο γὰρ Δαινών, ὥσπερ θησαυρός ὄρατο

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 ὄρητο,15 which is exactly what would be expected, of course, as the 3 sg. impf. corresponding to 2 sg. pres. ὄρηται, if such a form is genuine.

2.2.2 Again at A198—where the usual text runs:

ὥς φαινόμενη, τῶν δ’ ἄλλων οὐ τις ὄρατο

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

—scholiasts16 again report that Zenodotus preferred ὄρητο to the ὄρατο that is offered by the great bulk of the tradition. This time, moreover, ὄρητο is also found as the reading of a few manuscripts,17 and ὄρητο (cf. vl. ὄρηται 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 ὄρητο and not ὄρατο. 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 ὄρητο 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.

18. Ludwich (1902-07) G, Allen (1931) Ge (＝Ludwich G). The reading ὄρητο is reported by Allen from his C (= Ludwich M, but see previous note).
19. P390 reads ἄθ᾽ ὀρῆτο θεῶς ἐραί Ἐρμήνωτας*. In this case neither textual variants nor indirect testimony supports a reading ὄρατο.
20. Erbse (1969-83) gives the relevant texts as:

On A56:

(ἀράτοι) ὥσπερ Ζηνοδότος "ὀράτο" γράφει. ἀγνοεῖ δὲ ὥσπερ Δαινών γίνεται. A

On A198:

1. (ἀράτοι) ὥσπερ Ζηνοδότος γράφει "ὀράτο." τοῦτο δὲ Δαινών. B
2. Ζηνοδότος ἀγνόησε τὸ τῆς διαλεκτοῦ ἰδίωμα ὡς Ἴλικοῦ ἐξήθετο ("ὀράτο"), ἔτη δὲ Δαινών. γὰρ Δαινών τῆς δευτέρας συνεχείας τῶν περισσομένων τὸ α ἐς τῇ τρέπουσι, b (BC) T
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. ὧρη and ὧρητο. 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 ὧρη (and ὧρητο)?

2.4.1 The canonical explanation of the two Homeric items under discussion, as already implied (§1.3.1), operates with a ὧρη 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. ὧρημιμ). This, in turn, is considered, for obvious reasons, to be closely related to Ion. (h)orē/ε- and to reflect, in this particular case, an inherited athematic *-ε- stative. But if the accent is really ὧρη (and thus ὧρητο 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 ὧρη/ὁρητο 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 -ε/ε-present to this verb in Ionic immediately makes an Ion. 2 sg. middle *(h)orēaι > ὧρη (ξ343) a theoretical possibility. Similarly, of course, an Ionic *(h)orētο would theoretically account neatly for the ὧρητο that Zenodotus wanted to read in place of banal ὧρατο (A56, 198)—a form that has in any case long been suspected 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)orēaι > ὧρη and *(h)orētο > ὧρητο, it might possibly be seen as an assimilation of this present to the middle inflection shown by two other presents. One of them is horæ/ε- “see” itself (Hom. ὧρωμαι [N99+], εἰσοράσθε [Ψ495], εἰσορόωντο [Ψ448+] etc.), which is a full-fledged doublet of *(h)orē/ε-. The other is *(h)orœ/ε- “watch over” (Myc. o-ro-me-no PY Ae 134+; Hom. ὧρωται [ξ104], ὧρωτο γ471]), which may or may not be derived from the (same form of the) same root, but is a very close semantic relative in any case. It should not be overlooked, however, that the middle inflection of *(h)orē/ε-
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 ὀρηMAS and ὀρῆΣτO, 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 α are in fact securely transmitted in three categories of Homeric forms:25, 26

1. Where η− appears instead of or in addition to α− as the metrical lengthening of an etymological ἄ−: ἡμεύοντα− “windy” (ϝανεύομεν), ἱγάθεος “most holy” (ἂγα–), ἱμορέα “manliness” vs. ἰμιρές “men” (ἅμηρ), etc.

2. Where morphologically non-Ionic forms that showed (or should have showed) -α− get recruited into epic language with -η−: γοὴμεναι (γοὰ) Σ502, ἀρήμεναι (ἀράομαι) χ322, etc.

3. Ambiguous instances where -η− has replaced an -α− 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: προσανδήττατον (Λ136+), φοιτήττας (Μ266), etc. Here, that is to say, it could be supposed on the one hand that athematic “Aeolic” *-α−τάυ was simply redone as hyper-Ionic -η−ταυ (cf. type γοήμεναι). Equally possible, on the other hand, is the hypothesis that Att.–Ion. *-δέ–tau developed regularly to Old Ion. -α–ταυ, but when Ionic lost its dual, foreign-looking forms of this kind were remodeled as hyper-Ionic -η–ταυ in Homer for the same reason as motivated the same change in historically foreign *γοήμεναι, etc.

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

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


26. We may set aside the outdated explanation of ὀρηΜας (so accented) offered at Meister (1966) 176, which, basing itself on Meister (1966) 171, has it that contracted α < ατ was subject “in ionischen” to the same α (> ατ) > η change that “ursprichlicher” α underwent, and that a ὀρηι < ὀρει− is what is seen in Ion. ὀρηις. ὀρηθαι. It was thus a genuinely Ionic *[θ]ορηι < *[θθορηι < *[θθθορηι] that was, in effect, distracted to ὀρηΜας (on the model of, e.g., μεμυσ < ὁμυς = ὁμοι : X) in Meister’s account. Although few, it seems to me, would now operate with the sound change ατ > α > η in some actual variety of Ionic, this is not immediately fatal to Meister’s approach. For some instances of α < ατ did get—or certainly might have gotten—redone as ὀρηι in epic language (see §2.4.2.2.1, no. 3 just below), even if not by sound law. And once a Hom. *ὁρηι was in place, it could have been perfectly liable, in theory, to the analogical distraction Meister proposed. What makes the idea of seeing ὀρηΜας as a distraction of a hyper-Ionic *ὁρηι difficult to accept is rather that only synchronically opaque instances of Ionic-epic α (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 προσαναθῆτην, etc. This would invoke, to be precise, a four-step development:

1. 2 sg. middle *horáei (cf. Hom. ὑράς, ὑράσθη, etc. [§1.1]) contracted to *horáei. The contraction *-áei > *-āi (and not *-áeai > *-āi) would be predicted as regular on the basis of *-éai > *-ēai (Hom. μυθέιαι δ180 et sim.) and/or explained as analogical by invoking the proportion μυθέιαι, etc.: μυθείαι, etc. = ὀράται: X.

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

   ἐν ὄφθαλμοῖσιν ὀράθαι# (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:

   ἐν ὄφθαλμοῖσιν ὀράθαι# (Γ306)  
   ἐν ὄφθαλμοῖσιν ιδωματικά# (Α587+).

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

4. After *horáei contracted further to ὀρά in everyday Ionic speech, *όράθαι 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 ὀρηθαί in much the same way as Old Ionic φοιτά-την (if not “Aeolic” φοιτά-ταν) 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’ ὀρηθο at A56 and 198:

   1. Unlike the case of 2 sg. present ὀρά, with the phonological history *-áei > *-āi > -ā, the development of 3 sg. imperfect ὀράτο < *horáeto 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 γοημεναί, φοιτήτην).

   2. This, in turn, could easily explain why ὀρηθαί (ξ343) hardly even has a competing variant, while ὀρητο (A56, 198) has practically no actual direct ms. authority against its competitor ὀράτο. It could be supposed, more explicitly, that ὀρηθαί is a hyper-Ionic but genuine epic form, while
Zenodotus' reading ὄρητο 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 ὄρηαι at §343, could easily have decided that the corresponding 3 sg. imperfect should have been an analogous form—

-εαι (e.g., βούλεια [P404]): -ετο = -ειαί (μουθεία [θ180]) : -ειτο =

-ῃαι (ὄρηι [§343]) : X (whence ὄρητο [A56. 198])27, 28

2.4.3.1 The points to emphasize so far are:

1. Homeric ὄρηαι can be accounted for in more than one way. On the one hand, it could be that we simply have in ὄρηαι a 2 sg. middle of the *-εο/-ε- stative present seen in Ionic ὄρην, and thus a form whose history is *horēei > ὄρηαι. Alternatively, it is possible that *horāeai, a 2 sg. pres. middle of familiar *horāe/- (cf. Hom. ὄρασθαι [π107+]), contracted regularly to *horāai and then hyper-Ionicized to ὄρηαι, 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 ὄῥηαι (: *ʊρημαι cf. ὄρημι) 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 ὄρητο, 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 ὄρητο is a philological artifact—even if a rather ancient one—that was based on present ὄρηαι, 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 ὄρηαι.

2.4.4 An attempt to arrive at a reasoned “best account” of Homeric ὄρηαι (and ὄρητο)—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 ὄρητο for ὄρατο also at Φ390 and/or, e.g., ὄρηται for ὄραται at Ω291, 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 ὄρη- will not have had contrasting accents, and since (2) the transmission favors and heavily favors, respectively, a properispomenon ὄρη- 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 ὄρητο owes its existence to an analogy based on the present altogether, it becomes even more likely that that present was of the form ὄρηαι.
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 ὀρὴαι (if not ὀρὴτο too) in the formulaic repertory of the epics.

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

... αὐτὸς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρὴαι# (§343)

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

... ταῦτα γ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρὴαι# (Davies EFG 151),

which already indicates that the long, non-subdivisible γ'...# segment of §343 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 §343 and the OH obviously goes most closely with:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ὁρῶθαί} & \quad (\Gamma 306) \\
\text{ὁρῶσα} & \quad (\theta 459) \\
\text{ὁδωμαί} & \quad (\Lambda 587, \Sigma 190) \\
\text{ὁφαί} & \quad (\Sigma 135) \\
\text{ιδέσθαι} & \quad (κ 385)
\end{align*}
\]

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

#== μέγα θαῦμα τὸ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀφρομαί#
(N99=O286=T344=P54=HHer 219=τ36)

This, in turn, cannot be separated from

... ὀδ οὕτω ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀφρομαί# (δ226)
... ὀο το ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὑδίμαι# (HHer 202)

and

... καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώτοι# (ο462)
... μέγα θαῦμα 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 \[ \sim \text{o} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \sim \sim \sim \#, \]
where the final three syllables are furnished by a form of present \( \text{ó} \text{p} \text{á} \text{w} \) or aorist \( \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} \) that has the required shape \( \sim \sim \) and is therefore almost always middle: 29 \( \text{ó} \text{r} \text{o} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \), \( \text{ó} \text{r} \text{b} \text{h} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \), \( \text{ó} \text{r} \text{w} \text{t} \text{o} \), \( \text{ó} \text{r} \text{s} \text{b} \text{h} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \), \( \text{i} \text{d} \text{w} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \), \( \text{i} \text{d} \text{h} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \), \( \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} \text{t} \text{a} \), \( \text{i} \text{d} \text{é} \text{s} \text{b} \text{h} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \); but also \( \text{ó} \text{r} \text{ó} \text{s} \text{a} \).

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 \[ \sim \text{o} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \sim \text{ó} \text{r} \text{w} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \# (N99+) \] has replaced an earlier traditional expression that ended with “Aeolic” \( ^*(\text{h}) \text{ó} \text{r} \text{h} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \) instead, or that \[ \sim \text{o} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \sim \text{ó} \text{r} \text{s} \text{s} \text{b} \text{h} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \# (G306) \] is an analogous adjustment of something with final \( ^*(\text{h}) \text{ó} \text{r} \text{h} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \), 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 \( \text{ó} \text{r} \text{h} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \). 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. # ( \text{ó} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} # (G28), etc.</td>
<td># ( \text{ó} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} # ) (X574), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. # ( \text{ó} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} # (T174), etc.</td>
<td># ( \text{ó} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} # ) (X169), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. # ( \text{ó} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} # ) (P182), etc.</td>
<td># ( \text{ó} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} # ) ) (E233), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ( \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} \text{r} \text{h} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} # (O488), etc. and</td>
<td># ( \text{ó} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} # ) (E212), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ( \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} \text{r} \text{h} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} # ) (E770), etc.</td>
<td># ( \text{ó} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} # ) ) (E474), etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types 1, 2, and especially 6 could easily suggest, that is to say, that the line segment \( \sim \text{o} \bar{\text{ph}} \text{al} \text{m} \bar{o} \text{is} \text{t} \text{i} \text{n} \sim \sim \sim \#, \) 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 (\( \text{ó} \text{r} \text{w} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \# 459 \) 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 \( \text{ó} \text{p} \text{á} \text{w} \), etc. with \( \text{ó} \text{r} \text{o} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \), etc., and \( \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} \text{v} \), etc. with \( \text{i} \text{d} \text{w} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \), 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 metrical equivalently verb forms that allow such formulae to be inflected. The 428 pages of Beecroft (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 \( \text{ó} \text{p} \text{á} \text{w} \) \( \text{ó} \text{r} \text{w} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \) and \( \text{i} \text{d} \text{o} \text{u} \text{v} \) \( \text{i} \text{d} \text{w} \text{m} \text{a} \text{i} \text{t} \text{a} \) 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># ὠφθαλμοίσιν ἵδωρ</td>
<td># ὠφθαλμοίσιν ἱδοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># ὠφθαλμοίσιν ἵδωσι</td>
<td># ὠφθαλμοίσιν ἱδόσα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱνα μι' ὠφθαλμοίσιν ἱδοισα(*) (HDem 409)</td>
<td>δὲ δ' ὠφθαλμοίσις ἱδεῖθαι(*) (O600), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵγων ἱδον ὠφθαλμοίσιν</td>
<td>ἵδωσαι(*)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.4.3 An examination of the status of ὀφθαλμῶς 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 ὀφθαλμῶς 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 ὀφθαλμῶς—rather than imperfect ὀφθαλμῶς—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 ὀφθαλμῶς 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 ὀφθαλμῶς 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 ὀφθαλμῶς 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 *-ε- that gave rise to both "Aeolic" (ἡ)ορέ- and Ionic (ἡ)ορέω/- 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 *(ἡ)ορέαι > ὀφθαλμῶς or as a hyper-Ionic epic version of an archaic Ionic *(ἡ)οράαι (> later Ionic ὀφθαλμῶς) that was regularly contracted from *(ἡ)οράει.

2.4.6 Instead of lending decisive support to either of these accounts, in fact, the investigation of ἱνα μ' ὠφθαλμοίσιν ὀφθαλμίςι (Ξ343) 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 . . . ὀφθαλμῖςι#, however, is found only once and that in the Odyssey. This means, in turn, that instead of an archaism, ὀφθαλμῶς 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 ἵνα μ' ὀφθαλμοίσιν ὀφάσθαι#, etc. with a 2 sg. pres. indicative version—or more precisely to form the second
person of the very well represented first person ἄρηαι (\(N99=0286; \gamma344=\Phi54=H\)erm 219=r36). And if this was the motivation, it could be more specifically the case that ὀρὴαι 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 ὀρὴαι as the result of a straightforwardly proportional analogical process that was carried out by some poet(s) of the tradition precisely in the form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ŋ} & \sim \text{όφθαλμοις} \text{ίδιωματι} (\Lambda587+) \\
\text{ŋ} & \sim \text{όφθαλμοις} \text{ιδηαι} (\Sigma135) \\
\text{ŋ} & \sim \text{όφθαλμοις} \text{ιδηαι} (\Pi19+) : \text{x.}
\end{align*}
\]

where \text{x} would be “solved,” of course, as \(\sim \text{όφθαλμοις} \text{ιδηαι}\). The new form of the expression would include a 2 sg. present ὀρὴαι, 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 ὀρὴυ (§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 ὀρὴαι 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. Examples\(^{31}\) are cases like ... ἄκούετο λαὸς ἀντῆς (\(\Delta331\)),

\(^{30}\) Burkert (1972) 80, note 29 also invokes the proportion \(\sim \text{όφθαλμοις} \text{ίδιωματι} : \text{x}
\]

where a virtually unique middle form of pres. ἄκουο 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 ὅμωμαι “swear.”

3.2.1 The well attested Attic paradigm—1 sg. ὅμωμαι, 3 sg. ὅμεῖται, etc.—would have to go back most immediately, as it stands, to ὀμ-εο/ε-. 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/ε- (< *-h_5-o/ε-), that is regular in the most familiar Greek dialects for verbs from roots ending in a liquid or a nasal (inter alia). Typical examples are *stel(eh)o/ε- “will send” (στελέω [β287]; Att. στελῶ, -εῖς), *ker(eh)o/ε- “will cut” (κερέω [Ψ146]; Att. κεφῶ, -εῖς), and *men(eh)o/ε- “will remain” (μενέω [Λ317+], Att. μενῶ, -εῖς). In the present case, it would be a matter of such a future in *e(h)o/ε- to the descriptive root *om- of present om-nū “swear.” And this would appear to be in complete agreement not only with variantlessly transmitted ὅμεῖται in Homer (1274) and Hesiod (Erga 194), but with purportedly Laconian (Ar. Lys. 183) ὄμιωμεθα—if it is genuine—as well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homer</th>
<th>Hesiod</th>
<th>Attic</th>
<th>“Laconian”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὅμεῖται</td>
<td>ὅμωμαι</td>
<td>ὅμεῖται</td>
<td>ὄμιωμεθα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 The form that complicates the situation, however, is the Homeric 1 sg. ὅμωμαι (A233+)—also transmitted without apparent variant—with a contraction product -φ- (-ου-) 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 *-εο-.


33. The scattered mss. that read ὅμεῖται (or even ὅμεῖται) 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 -εο- (whatever its real phonetic character [Méadez Dosuna (1993) 123 for one view]) that would be spelled -λω- is famously strengthened by Heraclean ἐμετρομεθα (SGDI 4629.2.17+) and μετρομεμεθα (SGDI 4629.1.184) from the present metreo(e-) “measure.” The form is obviously not, however, recorded in a genuine Laconian document. The question of whether ὄμιωμεθα is morphologically plausible as the future of ὅμω- in Laconian reduces to that of whether Laconian had the “liquid” future just mentioned—i.e. futures in *e(h)o/ε- 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 ὄμιωμεθα 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. ὄμοῦμαι not really an Attic form, but rather a product of an inner-epic analogy of the type:

\[-\text{εται} : -\text{ομαι} = -\text{ηται} : -\text{ομαι} = \]
\[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμειται} (1274) \equiv X\]

The result, of course, would be the expression \[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμοῦμαι} (A233+),\] and thus an ὄμοῦμαι with an origin analogous to the one sketched above (§2.4.6.1) as the third and final possibility for ὀρήαι.

3.2.4 But there are at least two serious drawbacks to this method of reconciling Homeric ὄμοῦμαι with ὄμειται.

1. If Ionic epic language had a 3 sg. future of the form ὄμειται here from the beginning—which is to assume, in other words, that its morphological repertory included the same *om-e(h)ο/ε- 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 \[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμειται},\] 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 eumological -εθ- for a reasonably long time (to judge by the considerable number of forms that are metrically guaranteed to show this treatment—\[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμειται};\] it is hard to see why the solution was not simply \[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμεθμαι}.

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 ὄμοῦμαι made to ὄμειται in this way. For ὄμειται occurs in Homer only at 1274, as given above, in the segment \[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμειται},\] \[\text{ο.Interop} \text{at.}\] for which instructive analogues are not lacking:

\[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμοῦμαι} (A233)
\[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμοῦμαι} (1132)
\[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμοῦμαι} (v229)\]

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

36. The Hesiodic expression that contains ὄμειταν—namely \[\text{ἐπὶ δ ὅρκον ὄμειταν} (ἔργα 194)—is scarcely independent of this Iliadic \[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμειταν}\] (together with Iliadic \[\text{ἐπὶ δ ὅρκον ὄμοῦμαι} [v142] plus Odyssean \[\text{μέγαν ὅρκον ὄμοῦσαι} [ε178+]\] and \[\text{μέγαν ὅρκον ἀπόμοσι} [8377]), and could even be derived from it. What is nominally a second instance of ὄμειται does not therefore really do anything to change the status of this form relative to that of ὄμοῦμαι in epic formulaic diction.
an expression that not only has the variant (also first person)

| κεφαλήν μέγαν ὁρκον ὀμοῦμαι # (HHeimt 274). |

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

| ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ καὶ τόδ' ὀμοῦμαι # (Φ373). |

This state of affairs would already strongly suggest on its own that | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὁρκον ὀμεῖται# is a third-person transformation of what is essentially a first-person formula. But what makes that account of the ὀμεῖται version of this segment a virtual certainty is that at 1274 Odysseus is simply reporting to Achilles ("καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὁρκον ὀμεῖται") Agamemnon's exact words ("καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὁρκον ὀμοῦμαι") of 142 lines earlier at I132.

The result of considering the Homeric future paradigm ὀμοῦμαι, ὀμεῖται from the dictional point of view is thus that it turns out—despite first appearances—to be highly desirable or even essential to explain ὀμεῖται as analogically made to ὀμοῦμαι, 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 ὀμπεῖ—"swear"—namely omosa- (Hom., Att. ὀμοσα, etc.). This is unambiguously to be analyzed omo-sa-, and that in turn provides a basis for reconstructing an h₃-final root37 (most likely *h₃emhs₃₃ > Proto-Gk. *emo- > omo-39 whence o-vocalism in the root throughout the entire averbo) and an aorist that behaves as if it reflects *h₃emhs₃₃-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

---


38. The usual reconstruction *h₂emhs₂ (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 *h₂emhs₂-reconstructed by Rix et al. (1998) 237 depends upon identifying ὀμοςμυ (and Skt. am- "empacken; 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 *h₂emhs₂-V as easily as to *h₂emhs₂ (since *Chh₂V- could have given Italic Cam-V- even if *h₂emh₂-C gave emC-). And though ὀμοςμυ κακὸς. Συκελιαί, 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—that it is in fact Greek or—given its meaning—that it belongs with ὀμοςμοι by root etymology at all. Because of *ἐνομο > *ἐνομα in "name" (next note), moreover, o-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 ὀμοςμοι.

39. The assimilation *émo- > omo- is closely comparable to the éno- > óno- seen in the word for "name": *ἐνωμα (Lac. ἐνωμακρατίας). ἐνωματάξιας, ἐνωματος (see Fraser-Matthews (1997) 142) > ὀμοςμοι (ὀνομα/ὀνομα) 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-.

1. Beside the aorist stem dama-s(σ)- “subdue” (Hom.+ ὀδάμασ(σ)α, etc.), for example, future forms reflecting *dama-so/e- > dama-(h)ο/e- are found not only in such Homeric instances as 3 sg. δαμάξ (X271) or 3 pl. δαμόωσιν (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(σ)- “drive” (Hom.+ ἡλασ(σ)α, etc.) : future *ela-(h)ο/e- (Hom. ἡλόωσι [N315], Att. ἡλῶ, ἡλᾶ, etc. [A.+] )

3. aorist *pera-s(σ)- “sell” (Hom. ἐπέρασ(σ)α, etc.) : future *pera-(h)ο/e- (Hom. περάειν [F454])

4. aorist *ole-s(σ)- “destroy” (Hom.+ ὀλεσ(σ)α, etc.) : future *ole-(h)ο/e- “will perish” (Hom. ὀλέεσθε [F133])

5. aorist *eme-s(σ)- “vomit” (Hom.+ ἐμεσ(σ)α, etc.) : future *eme-(h)ο/e- (Att. ἐμω [Ar.], ἐμοῦμαι [A.+] ; Ion. ἐμεμοῖ [H.])

6. perfect (*με-μητήτ- >) *μηρε- “say, tell” (Hom.+ μηρημαι) : future (*μηρήτ-ο/e- > *μερε-(h)ο/e- (Hom. ἐρέω [Δ39], ἔρεει [H91+])

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

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

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

3.2.5.4.1 In that case, Attic ὀμοῦμαι, ὀμεῖται and Aristophanes’ Laconian ὀμυώμεθα, which would clearly reflect a future in *e(h)ο/e- and not the original *-o-(h)ο/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 ὀμυωμαι are not lacking. A strictly proportional explanation could even be constructed:

\[
\text{pres. or-nū- “arise” (e.g., ὀρνυται Ε532+) : fut. or-eo/e- (e.g., ὀρεῖται Τ140) =}
\]
\[
\text{pres. om-nū- “swear” (e.g., ὀμυνθη Ψ585) : X}
\]

The result would be, of course, the acquisition by present om-nū- “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 om-eo/e- “will swear” in particular.
would be reflected presumably by Attic ὡμοῦμαι, ὡμεῖται and possibly by the
allegedly Laconian future ὡμώμεθα as well.\footnote{If Lacconian had -ἔθησε- futures to roots in -L and -N (see note 34 above), this analogy could
have worked there as well as in Attic. If not, ὡμώμεθα can hardly be a genuine Laconian form in the first
place and would then be irrelevant to the discussion.}

\subsection*{3.2.5.4.2} Alternatively, it could be supposed that it is only Laconian ὡμώμεθα—if, again, it is authentic enough to show anything\footnote{See notes 34 and 41.}—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 ὀμὸ-/*ομὸ- (its regular
outcome of *όμο-(h)o-/ *όμο-(h)e-) as ὀμή-/*ομή- (as if from *ομ-ε(h)o-//*ομ-ε(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 *-ε(h)o/e- from the beginning. The actual proportion by which this would have been done is obvious:

\begin{align*}
-ο- (φανυμαι: “I will appear,” etc.) & : \quad -φ- (φανεῖται, etc.) = X^{43} \\
-ο- (ὀμοῦμαι) & : \quad X^{43}
\end{align*}

\subsection*{3.2.6} To summarize briefly before going on to make a final proposal,
two consistent and mutually supportive conclusions about ὡμοῦμαι/ὥμεῖται
in Homer have now emerged. The first is that the fundamental form in the
paradigm of the future of ὡμυμαι in epic language—the form, that is to say,
that characterizes the unmarked version of an unquestionably formulaic
expression—is the 1 sg. ὡμοῦμαι. Furthermore, this is likely to be the direct
deflex of *όμο-(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
*όμος(\(a\))- is the least costly assumption for Homeric ὡμοῦμαι itself, and
Attic ὡμοῦμαι/ὥμεῖται (and anything else that looks as if it reflects
*ομ-ε(h)o/e-) is susceptible of one or more analogical explanations.

\subsection*{3.2.7} It remains only to reason further that if Homeric ὡμοῦμαι is not to
be a graphic Atticism and thus reflects *όμο-(h)o-, and if it is also the
fundamental form of this future in epic diction, Homeric and Hesiodic
ὥμεῖται appears to be explicable in only one general sort of way. Since ὡμεῖται 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 \( \text{\textit{kai e\pi \mu\epsilon\varepsilon\nu\kappa\o\nu\ νωμε\epsilon\tau\i\#}} \), it
had access to a new “liquid” future *ὀμέομαι, -ἐται (hypothetically
produced by the same analogy—to ὡμυμαι: ὡμεῖται, e.g.—envisioned earlier
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[§3.2.5.4.11]), 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 ὀμοῦμαι, -εῖται in a dialect—presumably Ionic*—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/ὑμεῖται 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/ὑμεῖται is thus very specifically not a relatively arbitrarily assumed Atticism of the written tradition that replaced an entirely notional *ὅμενοι μαι/ὑμεῖται (or an equally notional ὀμοῦμαι/*ὁμοῦται straight from *ὁμο−(ὑ)ο−ε−, for that matter).

3.2.9.1 Synchronically, however, the question is whether it is possible in addition to understand this definitively transmitted ὀμοῦμαι−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 ὑμεῖται that was presumably somehow supported and thus justified in Homeric language, but rather the 1 sg./3 sg. relationship of ἐ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκον ὀμοῦμαι# and ἐ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκον ὑμεῖται# 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 (ΩΓ 229.40) is uninformative. If it were a genuine Ionic form it would point, of course, to the retention of the old future stem *ομο−(ὑ)ο−ε−. But the inscription dates only from the period 246–226 BC and 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
four groups can be identified.

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

\[ \text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκὸν ὑμῖν} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκὸν ὑμεῖται} \]

and

\[ \text{φρα \ ἔσωμαι} \quad (Z365+) \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{φρα \ ὑμῖν} \quad (E221+) \]
\[ \text{φρα \ ἔσωμε} \quad (K97+) \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{καὶ \ κεῖ \ τὸν \ ὑμῖν} \quad (P652) \]
\[ \text{φρα \ ὑμεῖται} \quad (B237) \]

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

\[ \text{ἀπὸ \ θυμὸν \ έκλωμαι} \quad (Τ436) \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{ἐκ \ θυμὸν \ ἐληταῖ} \quad (M150+) \]

or

\[ \text{τῶν \ θυμὸν \ ἱκώμαι} \quad (Z225) \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{ἐπὶ \ νῆν \ ἱκηταῖ} \quad (Z69), \]
\[ \text{καὶ \ σικάδι \ ἱκώμαι} \quad (1393) \]
\[ \text{τεῦ \ δωμαδι \ ἱκώμαι} \quad (509) \]

and it is to this class, of course, that Hesiod's abbreviated version of the inflected Homeric expression now at issue\(^{45}\) belongs:

\[ \text{ἐπὶ \ δὲ \ ὀρκὸν \ ὑμεῖται} \quad (Erga 194). \]

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:

\[ \text{ἐν \ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν \ ἱκώμαι} \quad (Α587+) \quad \text{vs.} \quad \text{ἐν \ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν \ ὑμῖν} \quad (Σ135) \]
\[ \text{τὸ \ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν \ ὠρώμαι} \quad (N99+) \quad \text{ἐν \ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν \ ὑμῖν} \quad (Ξ343), \]

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

\(^{45}\) See also note 36 above.
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lexical (ὀρκια/ ὀρκον) relationship—in addition to its syntactic parallelism—to | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκον ὁμοῦμαι/ ὀμεῖται# is the inflected expression:

| καὶ ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμωμεν# (Γ94+) vs. | ὑ’ ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμιντε (Γ252).

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

| γερονίσιον ὀρκον ἔλωμαι (X119)

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

| ἐναρα βροτόεντα φέρωμαι# (Θ534) vs. | ἐναρα βροτόεντα φέρηται# (X245)

and

| σὴν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἵκημαι# (δ545+) | 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/ ὀμεῖται 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 | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκον ὁμοῦμαι# that contained an archaic and obsolete form of the future of ὁμμυμι, the tradition simply used the ordinary modern ὀμεῖται and was able or willing to tolerate the resulting unusual paradigm in -οῦμαι (-φ-): -εῖται (-φ-) because a complete and perfect analogy for such a pattern was supplied by -ωμαι (-φ-): -ηται (-φ-), 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 ὀρηαι (Ξ343) and ὀμεῖται (1274) as two instances of one phenomenon—that the process of making the third person of the 1 sg. formula | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκον ὁμοῦμαι# was a matter not so much of using a contemporaneous ὀμεῖται (while declining the services of equally contemporaneous ὀμεῖται), 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. τάμηται 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 | ~ ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμηται ~ ko. As such, | ~ ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμηται# would stand to | ~ ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμωμεν# as does, e.g., | ~ ὁμοῦμαι# to | ~ ὁμηται# above.
obsolete, unique, and possibly even defective 1 sg. future ὀμοῦμαι, containing an unparalleled and opaque stem-final -p-, was given a 3 sg. that was destined to have a stem-final -η-, and thus take the form ὀμεῖται, 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.:

\[
\begin{align*}
| - - ὀμαι\# : | - - ὕπαι\# & | - - ὀηαι\# : | - - ὀηαι\# \\
| - - ἑκαι\# : | - - ἑκαι\# & | - ὀρκία πιστὰ τάμωμεν\# : | - ὀρκία πιστὰ γάμητε\# \\
| - - ἐκοιμαι\# : | - - ἐκταί\# & | - - φέρωμαι\# : | - - φέρητα\# \\
| - - ἑκαί\# : | - - ἑκται\# & | - - ἐκται\# : | - - ἐκται\# \\
\end{align*}
\]

And to | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκὸν ὀμοῦμαι a | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκὸν ὀμεῖται was accordingly made. If the ὀμεῖται 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 ὃ-stem 1 sg. ὀμοῦμαι could simply have been supplied with an ἑ-stem 3 sg. that did, admittedly, make for a unique ὃ/ἐ paradigm, but one that was very well supported, in its all-important formulaic domain of employment, by every possible kind of analogue.