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

By ALAN J. NUSSBAUM

1. The Greek presents (h)orao/ε- (h)or-, and (h)orēo/ε- “see”!

1.1 The familiar present stem (h)orao/ε- “see” reflected in Attic ὁρῶ, ὁρᾶ, ὁρᾶν, etc. is also found as such not only in relatively dissimilar dialects—Boe. ὁράοντι (SGDI 860), Lac. ὁρῶ (Alcm. 1.40 PMG), Epidaurian pf. ptcpl. ὀράκων (IG IV 2.1.122)—but is frequent in Ionic as well, where literary texts appear to provide such instances of this stem as:

Archil. ὁρᾶ (176.1, 177.2), ὁρὰ (105.1); Semon. ὁρᾶ (7.15, 7.80), ὁρώντες (7.111), Theogn. ὁρᾶ (857+), ὀρώς (93), ὁρῶν (747), ὁρῶτα (1059), ὑσρᾶ (858); Callim. ὁρῶσ (1.20); Tyrt. ὁρῶ (12.11); Solon ὁρᾶτε (11.7), ὁρῶσ (34.5), Hdt.—to cite a couple of cases without variant—ὁρᾶ (1.119.6), ὁρῶσ (9.66.2), etc.

In addition, it is this present stem that appears in Homer, in characteristically “distracted” form, of course, as ὁρῶ (E244+), ὁρᾶς (H448+), ὁρῶστε (Δ347), ὁρᾶσται (π107+), ὁρῶστες (P637), etc.

1. It is assumed for 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] 483ff.). The form that makes difficulties for this reconstruction is the augmented Attic imperfect ὁρῶν, which looks as if it ought to come from ἐξ(h)or- (type indic. ἐξάλων < ἐξ(h)ομαλ- vs. infin. ἔλαιον < ἐξ(h)ομαλ- in the aorist of ἄλκισκαι “be seized”). But if Attic were to have redune the imperfect of ὁρῶ, it would not be a unique example of the extension of augmentation with -ο- from ὁμιγ-initial roots to others. The οἰγ- of οἷος/οἷουμι “open,” which goes back to an *οιγ- (cf. especially ὀξυρνός [B809+] < *οιγ- etc.) beside *οιγ- (Lesb. infin. ὀείγην [Schwyzer (1960) no. 620.43])—and thus to *hοιγ-/*hοιγ- or *οιγ-/οιγ- (with preverb *ο-)—is another case of an effectively (h)V- initial root that has been given the kind of augmentation (imperf. ἀνείγων [1221+], aor. ἀνείγας [389+]) that looks like it reflects *ηγ-V-. In any event, nothing in the discussion that follows would be affected by a reconstruction of the root initial of ὁρῶ etc. as *(h)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:

\[ \dot{o}p\epsilon o\ \text{Anacr. (346 frag. 4.2 PMG), Hdt. (1.111.3 without variant);} \]
\[ \dot{o}p\epsilon o\mu \text{ Hp. (Nat. Puer.), } \dot{o}p\epsilon o\ Hdt. (1.68.4, etc., without variant); \]
\[ \dot{o}p\epsilon o\upsilon \text{ Hdt. (31.3.14.3, etc.); } \dot{o}p\epsilon o\upsilon s \text{ Hp. (Epid.); } \dot{o}p\epsilon o\upsilon s \text{ Hnd. (4.44), etc.} \]

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 \(*\(h)orajo\)-, 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 \(*\(h)or\epsilon o-\) and \(*\(h)or\epsilon o\)- (with phonologically regular shortening of \(\tilde{e}\) to \(\tilde{e}\) before \(\tilde{o}\) in Ionic\(^6\)) by clear evidence for \(*\(h)or\epsilon e-\) and \(*\(h)or\epsilon e\)- in this present:

\[ \dot{o}p\epsilon i\dot{h}s/\dot{o}p\epsilon i\ (\text{Hp. Nat. Mut.+, Hnd. 2.67+}), \dot{o}p\epsilon i/\dot{o}p\epsilon i\ (\text{Hp. Carn.+, Callim. frag. 191.5+}), \dot{o}p\epsilon i (\text{Hnd. 3.50+}), \dot{o}p\epsilon i\tau (\text{Hnd. 2.68+}), \dot{o}p\epsilon i (\text{Hp. Insan.+, Democr. frag. 11 DK}) \]

1.2.3 Whatever else, this evidence makes it unambiguous that a present stem \((h)orao/e-\) \((*\(a\)-\(o/e-\)) and a present stem \((h)or\epsilon o/e-\) \((*\(\epsilon\)-\(\epsilon\)-\(e-\)) 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 \(*\(\epsilon\)-\(\epsilon\)-\(e-\) present \(\dot{o}p\epsilon o\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon i\), etc. is naturally always put beside forms pointing to an athematic present \((h)or\epsilon i\)-.

1.3.1.1 This \((h)or\epsilon i\)- seems to be Aeolic and occurs in:

- Sappho: \(\dot{o}p\eta \mu \mu (31.11 PLF), \text{Alcaeus } \dot{o}p\eta \mu \mu (F3, b. 5 PLF)\)
- Frag. Adesp.: \(\dot{o}p\eta \mu \mu (921.b, iii.1 PMG)\)

3. The \(\dot{o}p\epsilon o\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon o\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon o\) 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: \(\dot{o}p\epsilon o\upsilon t (3 \text{ pl. 26.14), } \dot{o}p\epsilon o\upsilon t (\text{pl 3 pl. 9.35), } \dot{o}p\epsilon o\upsilon s (3.18, 5.85, 11.69).\)

4. See Schmidt (1889) 326ff., followed by Schwyzter (1939) 1.242, 515; Fisk (1955-72) 2.407; Lejeune (1972) 236 (2998, 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 \(\dot{e}\) to \(\tilde{e}\) by sound law \((\dot{o}p\epsilon o\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon i\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon i\mu o\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon i\mu o\)) and the analogical introduction of \(\tilde{e}\) and \(\tilde{e}\) \((\dot{o}p\epsilon i\mu o\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon i\mu o\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon i\mu o\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon i\mu o\), \(\dot{o}p\epsilon i\mu o\)) in place of (the outcome of) \(\dot{e}\) and \(\tilde{e}\) on the model \((\epsilon o, \epsilon o, \epsilon o, \epsilon o)\) of the much more numerous class of presents in original \(*\(\epsilon\)-\(e\)-\) paradigm. 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 \(-\epsilon l\)- paradigm as an analogical rearrangement of the \(-\epsilon o\)- paradigm. It is not essential for present purposes to take a position on that question.
1.3.1.2 It is this same (h)orē- that has been said6 to appear in:

Homer: 2 sg. pres. midd. vv.II. ὀρημαί and ὀρημαί (ξ343)
3 sg. impf. midd. vv.II. ὀρηστο and ὀρήστο (Zenodotus’ reading at A 56, 192)
Creophylus: ὀρημαί (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- (<*-ēh₁-), while Ionic (h)orē-o/e- is analyzed as the same stem more or less functionlessly expanded by -*jo/e- (*-ē-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)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- (<*-ēh₁-) than to continue, inter alia, an inherited iterative present of the familiar kind with o-grade root and the stem formant -*io/e-. The iterative of the latter type that lies behind Attic-Ionic (etc.) ποιεώ, for example, surfaces in Lesbian as “Aeolic” (%ποημι (Ππόημεν Sa. 24 (a). A PLF; Alc. ποημενι 117 F3 (b). 21 PLF), just as the -*e-io/e- denominative that shows up in the average dialect as (f)oikelw takes the form οίκημι in Lesbian (οικημιμι 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)orēs, (h)orē, (h)orēte, (h)ōrh, and (h)orēn in that dialect—that suggests an inherited Proto-Greek

9. So, e.g., Chantraine (1973) 305ff.
*hor-*e-, and thus an *-ē- stative, behind “Aeolic” (h)óρημ. 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 ε343, in the fictional autobiography related to Eumaeus by Oysseus, a form of some kind of present in ὥρη- is certain, even if somewhat problematical in itself and open in any case to more than one historical explanation:

ἐκ μὲν με ἥξαινε τὲ χιτώνα τὲ εἴμαιτ' ἔδυσαν,
ἄρει δὲ με βάκαν ἄλλο κακὸν βάλον ἥδε χιτώνα.

ποιμαλέα, τὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὥρημι.

“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 ὥρημι in this line, the Etymologicum Magnum transmits ὥρημι, 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 ὥρημι. And this reading is also at least mentioned as an alternative (“κατὰ δὲ τῶας”) 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 ὥρημι or ὥρημι) 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 ὥρημμι 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 ὥρημι 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)óρολε- of Ionic (and Attic etc.) and the (h)óρη- of Lesbian, it was actually an (Att.?)-ion (*horαλε- (< *horαλε-), an instance of the rare and enigmatic *-αλο- type) that lies behind the second ion. present stem indicated by ὥρεω. ὥρη etc. (and for the type itself see, e.g., Schalze [1892] 367; Meister [1966] 87; Schwyzzer [1939] 750; Buck [1955] 124; Chantraine [1973] 36ff.; Risch [1974] 322, 329; Peters [1980] 144, 175). This theoretical possibility is to be rejected only because it operates with three pre-forms (*horαο- beside *horαλε- beside *hor-) where two will do, and because it more specifically presupposes the especially perplexing coexistence of *horαο- and *horαλε-.

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

14. Allen (1954-55 xiii. The families that offer ὥρημι at ε343 (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=1, W=W), g (F=L8, Z=Z), k (G= L4, U=Mon.), l (D=P), 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 ὠρᾶτο:

κηδετῷ γὰρ Δαναῶν, ὥτι ἦνθησκότας ὠρᾶτο

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

2.2.2 Again at A198—where the usual text runs:

ὦ ψαμομένη, τῶν δ' ἄλλων οὗ τις ὠρᾶτο

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

—scholiasts16 again report that Zenodotus preferred ὀρητό to the ὠρᾶτο that is offered by the great bulk of the tradition. This time, moreover, ὀρητό is also found as the reading of a few manuscripts,17 and ὀρητό (cf. vI. ὀρηαί 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 ὀρητό and not ὠρᾶτο. 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 ὀρητό as the outcome of the *horāeto 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 ὀρητό is reported by Allen from his C (= Ludwich M, but see previous note).
19. Φ390 reads ἦν ὀρῆ ὀρηεὶ τοις ἔρῳ ζευγάντας*. In this case neither textual variants nor indirect testimony supports a reading ὠρᾶτο.
20. Erbse (1969-83) gives the relevant texts as:
On A56:
(ὁρᾶτο:) ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος "ὁρητό" γράφει. ἄνωτε δὲ ὅτι Δωρίκον γίνεται. A
On A198:
1. (ὁρᾶτο:) ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει "ὁρητό." τοῦτο δὲ Δωρίκον. A
2. Ζηνόδοτος ἀγγέλει τῇ τὴν διάλεκτον ἰδιωμα ὡς Ἰαϊκόν έξείδετο ("ὁρητό"), ἐστι δὲ Δώριον· οὶ γὰρ Δωρίες τὴς δευτέρας συμφύγας τῶν περισσωμένων το a εἰς τη τρέπων. B (BC) Τ
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. ὄρηαι and ὄρητο. 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 ὄρηαι (and ὄρητο)?

2.4.1 The canonical explanation21 of the two Homeric items under discussion, as already implied (§1.3.1), operates with a ὄρηαι 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. ὄρημμα). This, in turn, is considered, for obvious reasons, to be closely related to Ion. (h)orēo/- and to reflect, in this particular case, an inherited athematic *-ē- stative. But if the accent is really ὄρηαι (and thus ὄρητο 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 ὄρηαι/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 -ēo/- present to this verb in Ionic immediately makes an Ion. 2 sg. middle *(h)orēeai > ὄρηαι (ξ343) a theoretical possibility. Similarly, of course, an Ionic *(h)orēeto would theoretically account neatly for the ὄρητο that Zenodotus wanted to read in place of banal ὄρητο (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)orēeai > ὄρηαι and *(h)orēeto > ὄρητο, 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/- “see” itself (Hom. ὀρῶμαι [N99+], εἰσοράσσει [Ψ495], εἰσορόωντο [Ψ448+] etc.), which is a full-fledged doublet of *(h)orēo/-. The other is *(h)orō/- “watch over” (Myc. o-ro-me-no PY Ae 134+; Hom. ὄρωται [ξ104], ὄρωντο [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/-

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 ὧμηαι and ὧμητο, 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 ἀ are in fact securely transmitted in three categories of Homeric forms:25, 26

1. Where η- appears instead of or in addition to ἀ- as the metrical lengthening of an etymological Ἄ-: ἦμεῦοντες “windy” (: ἦνευς), ἦγάθεος “most holy” (: ἄγα-), ἦνορεπε “manliness” vs. ἦνερεὶς “men” (: ἦνερε¡), etc.

2. Where morphologically non-Ionic forms that showed (or should have showed) -ἀ- get recruited into epic language with -η-: γοῆμεναι (: γοαω) Ξ502, ἀρήμεναι (: ἀραμομαῖ) χ322, etc.

3. Ambiguous instances where -η- has replaced an -ἀ- 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: προσαυδητήν (Λ136+), φοιτήτην (Μ266), etc. Here, that is to say, it could be supposed on the one hand that athematic “Aeolic” *-ἀ-τάν was simply redone as hyper-Ionic -η-τήν (cf. type γοῆμεναι). Equally possible, on the other hand, is the hypothesis that Att.-Ion. *-ἄ-ταν developed regularly to Old Ion. -ἀ-τήν, but when Ionic lost its dual, foreign-looking forms of this kind were remodeled as hyper-Ionic -η-τήν in Homer for the same reason as motivated the same change in historically foreign γοῖμεναι, etc.

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

24. Wathelet (1970) 48 takes the Zenodotean reading ὧμητο to be a hyper-Ionicism of this kind (i.e. for ὧματο, but does not explicitly extend that explanation to ὧμηαι (or mention it at all, in fact).
26. We may set aside the outdated explanation of ὧμηαι (so accented) offered at Meister (1966) 176, which, basing itself on Meister (1966) 171, has it that contracted ἄ < ἄ was subject “in Ionischen” to the same ἦ ῆ as change that “ursprünglicher” ἄ underwent, and that a ὧμητο - ἄμητο - is what is seen in Ion. ὧμηαι, ὧμηται. It was thus a genuinely Ionic *ὕμητο < ἄμητο < ἄμητο that was, in effect, distracted to ὧμηαι (on the model of, e.g., μέμητο: μέμητοι = ὧμητο: ὧμηται) in Meister’s account. Although few, it seems to me, would now operate with the sound change ἄτο > ἄτο > ἄτο in some actual variety of Ionic, this is not immediately fatal to Meister’s approach. For some instances of ἄ < ἄτο did get—or certainly might have gotten—redone as ὧμητο in epic language (see §2.4.2.2.1, no. 3 just below), even if not by sound law. And once a Hom. ὧμητο was in place, it could have been perfectly liable, in theory, to the analogical distraction Meister proposed. What makes the idea of seeing ὧμηαι as a distraction of a hyper-Ionic *ὕμητο difficult to accept is rather that only synchronically opaque instances of Ionic-epic ἄ (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 προσανθήτην, etc. This would involve, to be precise, a four-step development:

1. 2 sg. middle *horáεαι (cf. Hom. ὁράεις, ὁράασθαι, etc. [§1.1]) contracted to *horáαι. The contraction *-αει > *-αι (and not *-εαει > *-αι) would be predicted as regular on the basis of *-εαει > *-αι (Hom. μυθείαι, 8180 et sim.) and/or explained as analogical by invoking the proportion μυθείαι, etc.: μυθεία, etc. = ὄραται : X.

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

\[ | | ὧν ὄρθαλμοσιν ὄρασθαι \ (ξ343) \]

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:

\[ | | ὧν ὄρθαλμοσιν ὄρασθαι \ (Γ306) \]
\[ | | ὧν ὄρθαλμοσιν ἰδωματι \ (Α587+). \]

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

4. After *horáαι contracted further to ὄρα in everyday Ionic speech, *όραται 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 ὀρηαι in much the same way as Old Ionic φοιτᾶ-την (if not "Aeolic" *φοιτᾶ-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’ ὄρητο at A56 and 198:

1. Unlike the case of 2 sg. present ὄρα, with the phonological history *-αει > *-αι > -αι, the development of 3 sg. imperfect ὄρατο < *horáeta included no stage at which the form would have had an -αι- that was unfamiliar from the Ionic point of view and would thus have been liable to be hyper-Ionicized as -η- (as in γοημεναι, φοιτήτην).

2. This, in turn, could easily explain why ὀρηαι (ξ343) hardly even has a competing variant, while ὄρητο (A56, 198) has practically no actual direct ms. authority against its competitor ὄρατο. It could be supposed, more explicitly, that ὀρηαι 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 ὅρηαι at 343, could easily have decided that the corresponding 3 sg. imperfect should have been an analogous form—

-ει (e.g., βούλεω [P404]): -ετο = -εια (μνθεία [θ180]) : -ειτο =
-ηι (ὁρηι [343]): X (whence ὄρητο [A56. 198])27.28

2.4.3.1 The points to emphasize so far are:

1. Homeric ὅρηαι can be accounted for in more than one way. On the one hand, it could be that we simply have in ὅρηαι a 2 sg. middle of the *-εο-ε- stative present seen in Ionic ὅρην, and thus a form whose history is *horεεια > ὅρηαι. Alternatively, it is possible that *horαιει, a 2 sg. pres. middle of familiar *horαιε- (cf. Hom. ὁρασθαί [π107+]), contracted regularly to *horαι and then hyper-Ionicized to ὅρηαι, 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 ὅρηαι (: *ὄρημαι cf. ὅρημι) 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 ὅρηαι, 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 ὅρηαι.

2.4.4 An attempt to arrive at a reasoned “ best account” of Homeric ὅρηαι (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.
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 ὀρθής (if not ὀρθύτω too) in the formulaic repertory of the epics.

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

... αὐτὸς ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρθῆς (ξ 343)

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

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

which already indicates that the long, non-subdivisible segment of ξ 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 ξ 343 and the OH obviously goes most closely with:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ὁρῶθει} & \quad (Γ 306) \\
\text{ὁρῶσα} & \quad (θ 459) \\
\text{ἴδωμαι} & \quad (Α587, Σ190) \\
\text{ἴδωμα} & \quad (Σ 135) \\
\text{ἴδεσθαι} & \quad (κ 385)
\end{align*}
\]

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

\# –– γ' μέγα θαῦμα τόδ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶμαι (Ν99=Ο286=Τ344=Φ54=ΗΗerm 219=Τ36)

This, in turn, cannot be separated from

... [ὁ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶσα] (δ226) \\
... [ὁς ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδοιτο] (ΗΗerm 202)

and

... καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶντο (ο62) \\
... μέγα θαῦμα καὶ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδεσθαι (ΗAroll 415. Cf. Ν99, 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 $\sim \omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$, where the final three syllables are furnished by a form of present $\rho_{\rho} \nu \omega$ or aorist $\dot{\iota} \dot{\omega}$ that has the required shape $\sim \sim$ and is therefore almost always middle: $\omega_{\rho} \mu_{\nu} \alpha_{\iota} \rho_{\iota} \omega_{\nu} \theta_{\sigma} \tau_{\iota} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\nu} \dot{\iota}$, but also $\rho_{\rho} \omega_{\nu}$.  

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 we included, 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 $\sim \omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (N99+) has replaced an earlier traditional expression that ended with “Aeolic” $*(h)\theta_{\rho} \rho_{\iota} \mu_{\nu}$ instead, or that $\sim \omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (G306) is an analogous adjustment of something with final $*(h)\theta_{\rho} \rho_{\iota} \mu_{\nu}$, 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 $\theta_{\rho} \rho_{\iota} \mu_{\nu}$. 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. $\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (G128), etc.</td>
<td>$\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (G574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (G128), etc.</td>
<td>$\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (X169), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (G128), etc.</td>
<td>$\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (G574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (G128), etc.</td>
<td>$\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (G574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (O488), etc.</td>
<td>$\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (E212), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. $\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (E770), etc.</td>
<td>$\omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$ (O474)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types 1, 2, and especially 6 could easily suggest, that is to say, that the line segment $\sim \omega_{\phi} \alpha_{\lambda} \theta_{\mu} \iota_{\nu} \iota_{\sigma} \iota_{\tau}$, 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 ($\omega_{\rho} \mu_{\nu}$ 6459) 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 $\rho_{\rho} \nu \omega$, etc. with $\varphi_{\nu} \mu_{\nu}$, etc., and $\dot{\iota} \dot{\omega}$, etc. with $\varphi_{\nu} \mu_{\nu}$, 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 Recuert (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 $\rho_{\rho} \nu \omega$ and $\dot{\iota} \dot{\omega}$ $\varphi_{\nu} \mu_{\nu}$ 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># ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν ἵδωρ (Γ 28), etc.</td>
<td># ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν ἵδωρι (κ 574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν ἰωσὶ (Σ 174)</td>
<td># ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν ἰδέσθας (ξ 143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵνα μ᾽ ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν ἰδοῦσι (Η 409)</td>
<td>ἰδοὺ δ᾽ ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν ἰδέσθαι (Ο 600), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵνα ἵδον ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν (δ 269+), etc.</td>
<td>ἵνα ἵδον ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν (λ 587+), etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.4.3 An examination of the status of ὧρηα 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 ὧρηα 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 ὧρηα—rather than imperfect ὧρη-—is the primary form to explain.

2.4.4.5 The next and main question of this section of the discussion, however, is whether anything in the dictional situation of ὧρηα 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 ὧρηα 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 ὧρηα 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” (h)óρε- and Ionic (h)σρέο- 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)σρέαi > ὧρηα or as a hyper-Ionic epic version of an archaic Ionic *hχράαi (> later Ionic ὧρα) that was regularly contracted from *hχράεια.

2.4.6 Instead of lending decisive support to either of these accounts, in fact, the investigation of ἵνα ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν ὧρηα (ξ 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 ὧρηα, however, is found only once and that in the Odyssey. This means, in turn, that instead of an archaism, ὧρηα 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 ὧφθαλμοὶσὶν ὧρασθαι, etc. with a 2 sg. pres. indicative version—or more precisely to form the second
person of the very well represented first person \( \ddagger \) – ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὥρμαι# (N99=O286=Τ344=Φ54=ΗΗerm 219=τ36). And if this was the motivation, it could be more specifically the case that ὀρήαι 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 extraepic 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 ὀρήαι as the result of a straightforwardly proportional analogical process that was carried out by some poet(s) of the tradition precisely in the form:

\[
\ddagger \sim \text{ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὥρμαι# (Λ587+)} : \ddagger \sim \text{ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὥηαι# (Σ135)}
\]

where \( X \) would be “solved,” of course, as \( \ddagger \sim \text{ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρήαι#} \). The new form of the expression would include a 2 sg. present ὀρήαι, 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 ὀρήυ (§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 ὀρήαι 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 . . . ἄκοὐετο, λαὸς ἀντής# (Δ331),

30. Burkert (1972) 80, note 29 also invokes the proportion \( \ddagger \sim \text{ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὥηαι#} : \ddagger \sim \text{ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὅρμαι#} : X \) in connection with the genesis of \( \ddagger \sim \text{ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρήαι#} \). But Burkert operates nevertheless with a prepaproxytonē ὀρήαι, 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 ἱθήμη really existed and was known to the tradition, there is not really much reason to insist upon a purely secondary and analogical origin of \( \ddagger \sim \text{ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὄρμαι#} \) in the first place.

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 ὀμεῖται “swear.”

3.2.1 The well attested Attic paradigm—1 sg. ὀμοῦμαι, 3 sg. ὀμεῖται, etc.—would have to go back most immediately, as it stands, to ὄτι-ε(ο)/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- (< *-h₁s-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-(h)o/e- “will send” (στελέω [β287]; Att. στελω, -εις), *ker-(h)o/e- “will cut” (κερέω [Ψ146]; Att. κερω, -εις), and *men-(h)o/e- “will remain” (μενέω [Λ317+], Att. μενω, -εις). In the present case, it would be a matter of such a future in *e(h)o/e- to the descriptive root ὄτι- of present ὄτι-νῦ “swear.” And this would appear to be in complete agreement not only with variantlessly transmitted ὀμεῖται in Homer (1274) and Hesiod (Erga 194), but with purportedly Laconian (Ar. Λύσ. 183) ὀμιώμεθα—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>ὀμεῖται</td>
<td>ὀμοῦμαι</td>
<td>ὀμεῖται</td>
<td>ὀμιώμεθα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2 The form that complicates the situation, however, is the Homeric 1 sg. ὀμοῦμαι (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 *-eo-.

33. The scattered mss. that read ὀμεῖται (or even ὀμεῖται) in the relevant passage (see especially Ludwig ad loc.) still offer nothing but consistent -ειται inflection, of course.
34. This is the reading of the mss., and the possibility of a Laconian outcome of -ει (whatever its real phonetic character [Méadez Dosuna (1993) 123 for one view]) that would be spelled -ιω- is famously strengthened by Heraclean μετροῦμει (SGDI 4629.2.17+) and μετρίωμειαι (SGDI 4629.1.18+) from the present μετροῦμει- “measure.” The form is obviously not, however, recorded in a genuine Laconian document. The question of whether ὀμιώμεθα is morphologically plausible as the future of ὀμυο- 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, -NF) in Greek. I know of no decisive Laconian evidence on that point. See in any case on ὀμιώμεθα 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. ὁμοῦμαι not really an Attic form, but rather a product of an inner-epic analogy of the type:

\[ \text{ epilei } \text{ megan } \text{ orhkon } \text{ omietai} \# \text{(I274)} : X \]

The result, of course, would be the expression \( \kappa ι \) επι μεγαν ὀρκον ὁμοῦμαι \# (A233+), and thus an ὁμοῦμαι with an origin analogous to the one sketched above (§2.4.6.1) as the third and final possibility for ὀρηαι.

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

1. If Ionic epic language had a 3 sg. future of the form ὀμεῖται here from the beginning—which is to assume, in other words, that its morphological repertory included the same \( *om-e(h)ο/e- \) 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 \( \kappa ι \) επι μεγαν ὀρκον ὀμεῖται\#, 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 -εμ- for a reasonably long time (to judge by the considerable number of forms that are metrically guaranteed to show this treatment) and note in particular 1 sg. fut. ἀμφιβαλέμαι [χ103], it is hard to see why the solution was not simply \( \kappa ι \) επι μεγαν ὀρκον ὀμεῦμα\#.

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 ὁμοῦμαι made to ὀμεῖται in this way. For ὀμεῖται occurs in Homer only at I274, as given above, in the segment \( \kappa ι \) επι μεγαν ὀρκον ὀμεῖται\#, 36 for which instructive analogues are not lacking:

\[ \kappa ι \) επι μεγαν ὀρκον ὁμοῦμαι\# (A233) \\
\kappa ι \) επι μεγαν ὀρκον ὁμοῦμαι\# (I132) \\
\kappa ι \) επι μεγαν ὀρκον ὁμοῦμαι\# (v229) \\

35. See e.g., Chattertine (1973) 34, 58ff. (esp. 61).
36. The Hesiodic expression that contains ὀμεῖται—namely \( \varepsilonπι δ' ὀρκον ὀμεῖται\# (Erga 194)—is scarcely independent of this Iliadic \( \kappa ι \) επι μεγαν ὀρκον ὀμεῖται\# (together with Iliadic \( \varepsilonπι δ' ὀρκον ὁμοῦμαι\# [Γ42] plus Odyssean \( μεγαν ὀρκον ὁμοῦμαι\# [ε178+] and \( μεγαν ὀρκον ἀπωμαι\# [8377]), and could even be derived from it. What is nominally a second instance of ὀμεῖται does not therefore really do anything to change the status of this form relative to that of ὁμοῦμαι in epic formulaic diction.
—an expression that not only has the variant (also first person)

\[ \text{kēfai lýν µégaν όρκoν όµóûmai} \] (Hērm 274).

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

\[ \text{έγώ δ' έπι καὶ τόδ' όµóûmai} \] (Φ373).

This state of affairs would already strongly suggest on its own that \[ \text{kai } \text{έπι } \text{µέγαν } \text{όρκoν } \text{όµεîtaι} \] is a third-person transformation of what is essentially a first-person formula. But what makes that account of the \(\text{όµεîtaι} \) version of this segment a virtual certainty is that at 1274 Odysseus is essentially a first-person formula. But what makes that account of the \(\text{όµεîtaι} \) version of this segment a virtual certainty is that at 1274 Odysseus is

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 \(\text{omnî - } \) “swear”—namely \(\text{omo-} \) (Hom., Att. \(\text{òmo} \), etc.). This is unambiguously to be analyzed \(\text{omo-sa-} \), and that in turn provides a basis for reconstructing an \(h_2\)-final root (most likely \(\text{h}_1 \text{emj}_2 \text{s} \) - > Proto-Gk. \(\text{emo- } > \text{omo-} \)) whence \(\sigma\)-vocalism in the root throughout the entire averbo) and an aorist that behaves as if it reflects \(\text{h}_2 \text{emj}_2 \text{s} - \), yielding Greek \(\text{emo-s(a)-} \) and then \(\text{omo-s(a)-} \).

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 \(\text{h}_1 \text{emj}_2 \text{s} \) - (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 \(\text{h}_1 \text{emj}_2 \text{s} \) - reconstructed by Rix et al. (1998) 237 depends upon identifying \(\text{òmu} \) (and Skt. \(\text{am} \) - “empacken; schwören”) with the root of Latin \(\text{amârê} \) “love” plus Marrucinian \(\text{atamêns} \) “haben angenommen.” But even if the semantics can be aligned, it remains to be shown that Italic \(\text{am} \) - could not go back to \(\text{h}_1 \text{emj}_2 \text{s} - \) as easily as to \(\text{h}_2 \text{emj}_2 \text{s} - \) (since \(\text{Cph}_{1} \text{V} \) - could have given Italic \(\text{Cam}_1 \text{V} \) - even if \(\text{h}_2 \text{emj}_2 \text{s} \) - gave \(\text{emC}_2 \) -). And though \(\text{òmu} \) (\(\text{ömus} \) - \(\text{ómus} \)) \(\text{â} \) \(\text{ê} \) \(\text{ê} \) \(\text{ê}\), also cited in the entry, would probably favor \(\text{h} \) - 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 \(\text{òmu} \) by root etymology at all. Because of \(\text{énona } > \text{énona} \) in “name” (next note), moreover, \(\sigma \) - \(\sigma \) - \(\sigma \) - assimilation in Greek is not nearly as trivial an assumption as is \(\epsilon \text{No } > \epsilon \text{No} \). On any theory, assimilated \(\text{omo-} \) will have been the source from which \(\sigma\)-vocalism was spread to the root syllable throughout the averbo of \(\text{òmu} \).

39. The assimilation \(\text{émo- } > \text{omo-} \) is closely comparable to the \(\text{éno- } > \text{ôka-} \) seen in the word for “name”: \(\text{éno} \) (Lac. \(\text{Smykakatidas} \), \(\text{Smykamakatidas} \), \(\text{Smykamakatidas} \), \(\text{Smykamakatidas} \), \(\text{Smykamakatidas} \), \(\text{Smykamakatidas} \), \(\text{Smykamakatidas} \), \(\text{Smykamakatidas} \)) > \(\text{ônoa} \) (\(\text{ônoa} \) \(\text{ônoa} \) in virtually all dialects.

https://digitalcommons.colby.edu/cq/vol38/iss2/7
roots of the shape \textit{CERH}- to preserve a future stem that goes directly back to a pre-form of the structure \textit{CERH}-so/e-.\textsuperscript{40}

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

2. aorist *\textit{ela-s(a)-} “drive” (Hom.+ ἔλαγοσ(ς)ε, etc.) : future *\textit{ela-(h)o/e-} (Hom. ἔλαγωσι [N315], Att. ἔλω, ἔλαγ, etc. [A.++])

3. aorist *\textit{pera-s(a)-} “sell” (Hom. ἔπερασ(ς)α, etc.) : future *\textit{pera-(h)o/e-} (Hom. περεάων [Φ454])

4. aorist *\textit{ole-s(a)-} “destroy” (Hom.+ ὀλεσ(ς)α, etc.) : future *\textit{ole-(h)o/e-} “will perish” (Hom. ὀλέεσθε [Φ133])

5. aorist *\textit{ume-s(a)-} “vomit” (Hom.+ ὑμεσ(ς)α, etc.) : future *\textit{ume-(h)o/e-} (Att. ἐμώ [Αρ.], ἐμομαί [Α.++; Ion. ἐμέμοια [Ηπ.])

6. perfect (*με-μηρτ- >) *μεμερτ- “say, tell” (Hom.+ ἡμερημαί) : future (*μερήσ-so/e- >) *μερήσ-(h)o/e- (Hom. ἡμερῆ [Δ39], ἡμέτει [Η91+])

3.2.5.3 Perfectly in line with this pattern—even if constituting a unique example of a \textit{CERH}_{2} root that participates in it—would be:

7. aorist *\textit{omo-s(a)-} “swear” : future *\textit{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. ὀμοῦμαι (< *\textit{omo(ς)ο-μαί}) 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 ὀμῳμεθα, which would clearly reflect a future in *-e(h)ο/ε- 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 ὀμοῦμαι are not lacking. A strictly proportional explanation could even be constructed:

\text{pres. or-νῦ- “arise” (e.g., ὀρνυταί Ε532+) : fut. or-eo/e- (e.g., ὀρείται Τ140) = \text{pres. om-νῦ- “swear” (e.g., ὀμυνθαί Ψ585) : X}}

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

\textsuperscript{40.} On futures of this kind see especially Hauri (1975) 13-21, 24f., 62-72, and passim; 92ff. on \textit{omo-(h)o/e-} “will swear” in particular.
would be reflected presumably by Attic ὄμοῦμαι, ὄμειται and possibly by the allegedly Laconian future ὄμισωμέθα as well.\(^{41}\)

\[\text{3.2.5.4.2}\] Alternatively, it could be supposed that it is only Laconian ὄμισωμέθα—if, again, it is authentic enough to show anything\(^{42}\)—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 ὀμοῦ-/*ομό- (its regular outcome of *ομο-(h)o-/*ομο-(h)e-) as ὀμῆ- (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:

\[-φ (φανοῦμαι: “I will appear,” etc.) : \text{X}^{43}\]

\[-φ (όμοῦμαι) : \text{X}\]

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

\[\text{3.2.7}\] It remains only to reason further that if Homeric ὄμοῦμαι is not to be a graphic Atticism and thus reflects *ομο-(h)o-, and if it is also the fundamental form of this future in epic diction, Homeric and Hesiodic ὀμεῖται appears to be explicable in only one general sort of way. Since ὀμεῖται 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 ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὀμεῖται\#, it had access to a new “liquid” future ὄμέόρμαι, ὀμεῖται (hypothetically produced by the same analogy—to ὄρνυμι: ὄφομαι, \(\text{e.g.}\)—envisioned earlier.

\(^{41}\) If Laconian had *-ε(ι)δο-/. futures to roots in -\(\i\) and -\(\text{N}\) (see note 34 above), this analogy could have worked there as well as in Attic. If not, ὄμισωμέθα 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 Calvin (1999) 215f. with reference to Ruijgh (1975) 85. The only additional point to be emphasized here is that the impossibility of explaining Lac. ὄμισωμέθα by this analogical proportion does not prevent it from being accounted for by a different analogy (§3.2.5.4.1-2).
[§3.2.5.4.11]), 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 *δυόμαι, -είται 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 δυόμαι, as far as Homer is concerned, comes from one (old) paradigm of this future, and εμείται 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 δυόμαι beside εμείται that comes from the more recent paradigm of this future—or in other words that it created its own inflection δυόμαι/εμείται 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 δυόμαι/εμείται is thus very specifically not a relatively arbitrarily assumed Atticism of the written tradition that replaced an entirely notional *δυόμαι/εμείται (or an equally notional δυόμαι/εμείται straight from *όμο-(ή)οε-, for that matter).

3.2.9.1 Synchronically, however, the question is whether it is possible in addition to understand this definitively transmitted -ούμαι -είται 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 δυόμαι and εμείται that was presumably somehow supported and thus justified in Homeric language, but rather the 1 sg./3 sg. relationship of | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὠρκον δυόμαι# and | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὠρκον εμείται# 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. δυόνται on an inscription from Smyrna (OGl 229.40) is uninformative. If it were a genuine Ionic form it would point, of course, to the retention of the old future stem *όμο-(ή)οε-. But the inscription dates only from the period 246–226 BC and is in any case essentially a Keine document, which would make δυόνται 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

\[ \text{δφρα ἰδωμαι} \] (Z365+) vs. \[ \text{δφρα ἱδηαι} \] (Ε221+)
\[ \text{δφρα ἰδωμεν} \] (Κ97+) vs. \[ \text{ἀι κεν ἱδηαι} \] (P652)
\[ \text{δφρα ἱδηαι} \] (Β237)

and

\[ \text{δφρ' ἄν ἰκωμαι} \] (Κ325+) vs. \[ \text{δφρ' ἄν ἱκηαι} \] (ζ304+)
\[ \text{δφρ' ἄν ἰκηαι} \] (Ο23).

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

\[ \text{ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἱκωμαι} \] (Τ436) vs. \[ \text{ἐκ θυμὸν ἐληται} \] (Μ150+)

or

\[ \text{τὸν δήμον ἰκωμαι} \] (Ζ225) vs. \[ \text{ἐπὶ νῆα ἱκηται} \] (Ζ69),
\[ \text{καὶ σκιδαρ' ἰκωμαι} \] (Ι393),
\[ \text{τεῦ δώμαθ' ἰκωμαι} \] (κ509)

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

\[ \text{ἐπὶ δ' ὁρκὸν ὀμείται} \] (Ἐργα 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:

\[ \text{ἐν ὀφθαλμοίσιν ἰδωμαι} \] (Λ587+) vs. \[ \text{ἐν ὀφθαλμοίσιν ἱδηαι} \] (Σ135)
\[ \text{τὸδ' ὀφθαλμοίσιν ὀρώμαι} \] (Ν99+) vs. \[ \text{ἐν ὀφθαλμοίσιν ὀρηαι} \] (ζ343),

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

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


καὶ ὀρκία πιστὰ τάμωμεν# (Γ94+) vs. ὦν’ ὀρκία 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:

γροῦσιν ὁρκον ἐλωμαι (X119)

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

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

and

ςὴν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἵκνεω# (δ545+)

ἡν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἴκνεαι# (ε26+).

3.2.10 What all of this is meant to lead up to, quite obviously, is a very simple account of Homeric ὄμοῦμαι/ 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 ὁρκον ὄμοῦμαι# that contained an archaic and obsolete form of the future of ὄμνυμι, the tradition simply used the ordinary modern ὀμεῖται and was able or willing to tolerate the resulting unusual paradigm in -όμαι (-φ-): -εἶται (-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 ὀρηται (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 ὁρκον ὄμοῦμαι# 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. ὄμοῦμαι by way of a simple analogy internal to Homeric language. The idea would be that the epic dialect’s archaic,
obsolete, unique, and possibly even defective 1 sg. future ὁμοῦμαι, containing an unparalleled and opaque stem-final -ἡ-, was given a 3 sg. that was destined to have a stem-final -τα-, 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.: 

| ὁμαι# | ἀρκια πιστα τάμωμεν# | ὁρκον ἐομαι# |
| ἐκαιαι# | ἐκηται# | ἐκηται# |

And to και ἐπὶ μέγαν ὁρκον ὁμοῦμαι# a και ἐπὶ μέγαν ὁρκον 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 ὁ-stem 1 sg. ὁμοῦμαι could simply have been supplied with an ἀ-stem 3 sg. that did, admittedly, make for a unique ὁ/ἀ paradigm, but one that was very well supported, in its all-important formulaic domain of employment, by every possible kind of analogue.