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

1.1 The familiar present stem (h)orao/e- “see” reflected in Attic ὧρω, ὧρᾳ, ὧρῶν, etc. is also found as such not only in relatively dissimilar dialects—Boe. ὧραοντι (SGDI 860), Lac. ὧρῳ (Alcm. 1.40 PMG), Epidaurian ptcpl. ὦρακιναν (IG IV2 11.122)—but is frequent in Ionic as well, where literary texts appear to provide such instances of this stem as:

Archil. ὧρᾳς (176.1, 177.2), ὧρα (105.1); Semon. ὧρᾳ (7.15, 7.80), ὧρῳτες (7.111), Theogn. ὧρα (857+), ὧρᾳς (93), ὧρῶν (747), ὧρῳτι (1059), ὧρῃν (858); Callim. ὧρόσυμ (1.20); Tyrt. ὧρῳ (12.11); Solon ὧρατε (11.7), ὧρᾳ (34.5), Hdt.—to cite a couple of cases without variant—ὁρᾷ (1.119.6), ὧρῳτι (9.66.2), etc.

In addition, it is this present stem that appears in Homer, in characteristically “distracted” form, of course, as ὧρω (E244+), ὧρας (H448+), ὧρῳτε (Δ347), ὧρασται (π107+), ὧρῳτες (P637), etc.

1. It is assumed for the present 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 ἔχω, which looks as if it ought to come from *ἔχ(h)or*—(type indic. ἔδωκα < ἔχ(h)ματι vs. infin. ἔλαβα < ἔχ(h)μα in the aorist of ἔλαβα “be seized”). But if Attic were to have redone the imperfect of ὧρῳ, it would not be a unique example of the extension of augmentation with ἔ from (h)ig-initial roots to others. The oig- of ὅγω/ ὅγημι “open,” which goes back to an *οηγ*—(cf. especially ἄγημα [B809+] < ἄηγ—etc.) beside *οηχ*—(Lesb. infin. ὀηχημ [Schwyzer (1960) no. 620.43])—and thus to *οηχ*—< *οηχ*—or *οηχ*—< *ο-ηχ*—(with preverb *ο*)—is another case of an effectively (h)V- initial root that has been given the kind of augmentation (impf. ἀνεῖχαν [Π221+], aor. ἀνείχαξα [389+]) that looks like it reflects *ηχV-. In any event, nothing in the discussion that follows would be affected by a reconstruction of the root initial of ὧρῳ etc. as *(h)or*- rather than the *hor-* being adopted here.

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

1.2.1 Instances occur mostly in Ionic:

*orpho Anacr. (346 frag. 4.2 PMG), Hdt. (1.111.3 without variant);
*orphos Hpd. (Nat. Puer.); *orphos Hdt. (1.68.4, etc., without variant);
*orphoi Hdt. (vi. 3.14.3, etc.); *orphoi Hpd. (Epid.); *orphoi Hnd. (4.44), etc.3

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

*ôrôs/ôrôs (Hpd. Nat. Mul.+, Hnd. 2.67+), *ôrôs/ôrôs (Hpd. Carn.+, Callim. frag. 191.5+), ôrôs (Hnd. 3.50+), ôrôs (Hnd. 2.68+), ôrôs (Hpd. Insan.+, Democr. frag. 11 DK)7

1.2.3 Whatever else, this evidence makes it unambiguous that a present stem (h)oraio/- (*-a-jo/-) and a present stem (h)orêo/- (*-ê-jo/-) 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 *-ê-jo/- present ôrôw, ôrôs, etc. is naturally always put beside forms pointing to an athematic present (h)orê-.

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

Sappho: ôrômû (31.11 PLF), Alcaeus ôrômû (F3, b. 5 PLF)
Frag. Adesp.: ôrômû (921.b, iii.1 PMG)

3. The ôrôw 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 Alcmán’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: ôrôpû (3 pl. 26.14), ôrôpû (vol 3 pl. 9.35). (ôrôpû) (3.18, 5.85, 11.69).

4. See Schmidt (1889) 326ff., followed by Schwyzter (1939) 1.242, 515; Frisk (1955-72) 2.407; Lejeune (1972) 236 (2998, n.3); Chantraine et al. (1999) 813. Chantraine (1973) 210 is undecided.

5. See now Méndez Dosuna (1985) 223f.

6. Or, to be more precise, the shortening of ôô to ôô by sound law (ôrôw, ôrôw, ôrôw, ôrôw, ôrôw) and the analogical introduction of ôô and ôô (ôrôw, ôrôw, ôrôw, ôrôw, ôrôw etc.) in place of (the outcome of) ôô and ôô on the model (ôô, ôóu, ôó) of the much more numerous class of presents in original *-êôe-. See, e.g., Lejeune (1972) 253f.

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

8. Peters (1980) 90f. makes a case for seeing the -ôi- paradigm as an analogical rearrangement of the -êôe- paradigm. It is not essential for present purposes to take a position on that question.
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Theocritus: ποιήσομαι (6.8), ποιήσῃμι (6.25: νυ.Ι. ποιήσῃμαι, ποιήσῃμαι). ὁρη (30.22)
Hesychius: ὁρημαι (or ὁρημα? Latte HAL, s.v.)

1.3.1.2 It is this same (h)ορη- that has been said<sup>9</sup> to appear in:

Homer:  2 sg. pres. midd. νυ.Ι. ὁρημαι and ὁρημαι (ξ343)
3 sg. impf. midd. νυ.Ι. ὁρητο and ὁρητο (Zenodotus’ reading at A 56, 197)
Creophylus: ὁρημαι (frag. Ὀικχάλιας Ἁλ. 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)ορη- 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)ορη- (Sa.+)) has generally been said directly to continue an inherited stative present in *-e- (<*-eh₁>), while Ionic (h)ορη-ο/ε- is analyzed as the same stem more or less functionlessly expanded by *-jo/e- (*-e-jo/e-).<sup>10</sup>

1.3.2.2 Because of their pattern of distribution among the various dialects, however, the forms that point to a present (h)ορη- do not necessarily establish anything beyond a present with “Aeolic” inflection.<sup>11</sup> 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 *-ejo/e-. The iterative of the latter type that lies behind Attic-Ionic (etc.) ποιεω, for example, surfaces in Lesbian as “Aeolic” (*πόημι (Πόημμεν Σα. 24 a.) PLF; Alc. ποήμμενοι 117 F3 (b) 21 PLF), just as the *e-jo/e- denominative that shows up in the average dialect as (*οικεω takes the form οικημι in Lesbian (οικημα(L) Alc. 130 G 2.31 PLF). In fact, the hypothesis of an iterative origin for the present (h)ορη- 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)ορη- in Ionic—which rests, in turn, entirely on the existence of such forms as (h)ορηθαί, (h)ορηθα, (h)ορηθε, (h)ορηθαι, and (h)ορηθυν in that dialect—that suggests an inherited Proto-Greek

---

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

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

2.1 The second sg. pres. middle  

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

> 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 ὀρηαι in this line, the *Etymologicum Magnum* transmits ὀρηαι, and both these readings, not surprisingly, have some ms. support (Ludwich’s J and H, respectively14). Remarkably, however, the apparent bulk of the tradition (Ludwich’s FGXPULWZ, which are distributed among six of the seventeen manuscript families constructed by Allen14) actually gives ὀρηαι. 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 ὀρηαι or ὀρηαι) 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 ὀρημι 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 ὀρηαι 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)οραοε- of Ionic (and Attic etc.) and the (h)ορε- of Lesbian, it was actually an (Att.?)-lo. *horatoe- (< *horo/e-, an instance of the rare and enigmatic *-hore- type) that lies behind the second Ion. present stem indicated by όρωο. ὀρη etc. (and for the type itself see, e.g., Schalze [1892] 367; Meister [1966] 87; Schwyzner [1939] 730; Buck [1955] 124; Chantraine [1973] 361f.; Risch [1974] 322, 329; Peters [1980] 144, 175). This theoretical possibility is to be rejected only because it operates with three pre-forms (*horaoe- beside *horale- beside *hor-*) where two will do, and because it more specifically presupposes the especially perplexing coexistence of *horaoe- and *horale-.

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

14. Allen (1954-55) xiii. The families that offer ὀρηαι at §343 (with the relevant ms(s). given in each case—first in Ludwich’s notation and then in Allen’s) are b (P=Pal.), f (L=1, W=W), g (P=L8, Z=Z), k (G= L4, U=Mon.), l (D=P), m (X=V).
2.2 A third singular imperfect middle?
2.2.1 The line-final form in A56 is transmitted without apparent variant as ὀρᾶτο:

κῆδετο γὰρ Δανάων, ὦτι ιὰ θυνήκοιται ὀρᾶτο

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

2.2.2 Again at A198—where the usual text runs:

ὁὐν φανομένη, τῶν δ ἄλλων οὖ τις ὀρᾶτο

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

—scholiasts again report that Zenodotus preferred ὀρῆτο to the ὀρᾶτο that is offered by the great bulk of the tradition. This time, moreover, ὀρῆτο is also found as the reading of a few manuscripts, and ὀρῆτο (cf. vl. ὀρήσα at ξ343) is read in at least one.

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, it is apparently to be read ὀρῆτο and not ὀρᾶτο. 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. And since Doric would have a properispomenon ὀρῆτο as the outcome of the *horaeto 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 ὀρῆτο is reported by Allen from his C (= Ludwich M, but see previous note).
19. Philo reads ὁ’dó ὀρῆτο βοεῶν ἐρώθη κυνῆστας*. In this case neither textual variants nor indirect testimony supports a reading ὀρᾶτο.
20. Erbe (1969-83) gives the relevant texts as:
On A56:
(Ἀρᾶτο) ὦτι Ζηνοδοτος ὀρᾶτο γράφει. ἄγνοικι δε ὢτι Δώρου γίνεται. Α
On A198:
1. ὀρᾶτο: ὦτι Ζηνοδοτος γράφει ὀρᾶτο. τοῦτο δε Δώρου. Α
2. Ζηνοδοτος ἀγοράσεις το διαλέγετο  ἀδώνων ὦ των ἰσιννων ἐξικτέτο (Ἀρᾶτο). ἦτε δε Δώρουν οὐ γὰρ Δωρικὸς τὰς δευτέρας συνυγιας τὰς περιπατομένων τὸ δ ἐν τῇ τρέπωσιν. Β (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. ὤρηαι and ὤρητο. 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 ὤρηαι (and ὤρητο)?

2.4.1 The canonical explanation21 of the two Homeric items under discussion, as already implied (§1.3.1), operates with a ὤρηαι as the present form—the more secure and more frequently discussed of the two—and makes it the 2 sg. middle of an Aeolic (ἡ)ορέ- (Sa. ὤρημμα). This, in turn, is considered, for obvious reasons, to be closely related to Ion. (ἡ)ορέθο- and to reflect, in this particular case, an inherited athematic *-e- stative. But if the accent is really ὤρηαι (and thus ὤρητο 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 ὤρηαι/ὀρητο 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 -εο/ε- present to this verb in Ionic immediately makes an Ion. 2 sg. middle *(h)ορέεαι > ὤρηαι (ξ343) a theoretical possibility. Similarly, of course, an Ionic *(h)ορέτο would theoretically account neatly for the ὤρητο that Zenodotus wanted to read in place of όράτο (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)ορέεαι > ὤρηαι and *(h)ορέτο > ὤρητε, it might possibly be seen as an assimilation of this present to the middle inflection shown by two other presents. One of them is ἡραο/ε- “see” itself (Hom. ὤρωμαι [N99+], εἰσοράσθε [Ψ495], εἰσορώμωτο [Ψ448+] etc.), which is a full-fledged doublet of *(h)ορέθο-/. The other is *(h)ορο/ε- “watch over” (Myc. o-ro-me-no PY Αθ 134+; Hom. ὤρουται [ξ104], ὤρουτο [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)ορε/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 ὀρήματι and ὀρήτορι, 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 δ-: ἡνεκοῦντι- “windy” (δ' ἄνεμοὸς), ἡγάθεος “most holy” (ἀγα-), ἡμορέπα “manliness” vs. ἀνεῖν “men” (ἀνήρ), etc.

2. Where morphologically non-Ionic forms that showed (or should have showed) -α- get recruited into epic language with -η-: γονήμεναι (γοαῶ) Ξ502, ἄρημεναι (ἀράομαι) ξ322, 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: προσαναθήτησιν (Λ136+), φοιτήτησιν (Μ266), etc. Here, that is to say, it could be supposed on the one hand that athematic “Aeolic” *-α-ταύ was simply redone as hyper-Ionic -η-ταύ (cf. type γονήμεναι). Equally possible, on the other hand, is the hypothesis that Att.-Ion. *-ακέταν developed regularly to Old Ion. -α-ταύ, but when Ionic lost its dual, foreign-looking forms of this kind were remodeled as hyper-Ionic -η-ταύ in Homer for the same reason as motivated the same change in historically foreign *γοαῆμεναι, etc.

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

24. Wathelet (1970) 48 takes the Zenodotean reading ὀρήτορι to be a hyper-Ionicism of this kind (i.e. for ὀράτο), but does not explicitly extend that explanation to ὀρήματι (or mention it at all, in fact).
26. We may set aside the outdated explanation of ὀρήματι (so accented) offered at Meister (1966) 176, which, basing itself on Meister (1966) 171, has it that contracted α < αε was subject “in Ionischen” to the same α (> ας) > ι change that “urzweckischer” α underwent, and that a ὀρή- < ὀρε- is what is seen in Ion. ὀρηῦς, ὀρηθαῖα. It was thus a genuinely Ionic *(ὁ)ρηῦς < *(ὁ)ρεῖς < *(ὁ)ροῖς that was, in effect, distracted to ὀρήματι (on the model of, e.g., μέμνης : μέμνημα = ὀρή : ὀρήμα) in Meister’s account. Although few, it seems to me, would now operate with the sound change ας > α > ι in some actual variety of Ionic, this is not immediately fatal to Meister’s approach. For some instances of α < αε did get—or certainly might have gotten—redone as αεις in epic language (see §2.4.2.2.1, no. 3 just below), even if not by sound law. And once a Hom. *(ὁ)ρή was in place, it could have been perfectly liable, in theory, to the analogical distraction Meister proposed. What makes the idea of seeing ὀρήματι as a distraction of a hyper-Ionic *(ὁ)ρή 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 \( \pi\rho\sigma\alpha\nu\nu\eta\tau\nu \), etc. This would involve, to be precise, a four-step development:

1. 2 sg. middle \(*\text{hora}a\jmath\) (cf. Hom. \( \delta\rho\alpha\varsigma \), \( \delta\rho\alpha\alpha\sigma\theta\alphai \), etc. [§1.1]) contracted to \(*\text{hora}âi\). The contraction \(*\text{aeai} > *\text{-}âai\) (and not \(*\text{aeai} > *\text{-}âi\)) would be predicted as regular on the basis of \(*\text{aeai} > *\text{-}âi\) (Hom. \( \mu\nu\beta\varepsilon\iota\alphai \) \( \theta180 \) et sim.) and/or explained as analogical by invoking the proportion \( \mu\nu\beta\varepsilon\iota\alphai \), etc.: \( \mu\nu\beta\varepsilon\iota\alphai \), etc. = \( \delta\rho\varepsilon\tau\alphai : X \).

2. Such a comparatively archaic \(*\text{hora}âi\) was recruited into the expression:

\[ \|\varepsilon\nu\  \omega\phi\tau\alpha\\lambda\mu\nu\iota\omicron\ion{a}{i} *\delta\rho\varepsilon\tau\alphai\# (\zeta343) \]

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:

\[ \|\varepsilon\nu\  \omega\phi\tau\alpha\\lambda\mu\nu\iota\omicron\ion{a}{i} \text{\omicron}\sigma\theta\alphai\# (\Gamma306) \]
\[ \|\varepsilon\nu\  \omega\phi\tau\alpha\\lambda\mu\nu\iota\omicron\ion{a}{i} \text{\iota}\omega\mu\omicron\alphai\# (A587+). \]

3. Under the obvious metrical constraint to which the line-end element of this version of the formula was subject, \(*\delta\rho\varepsilon\tau\alphai\) was maintained uncontracted in this expression.

4. After \(*\text{hora}âi\) contracted further to \( \delta\rho\varepsilon\) in everyday Ionic speech, \( *\delta\rho\varepsilon\tau\alphai \) 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 \( \delta\rho\eta\alphai \) in much the same way as Old Ionic \( \phi\omega\iota\alpha\tau\alpha \text{-} \tau\eta\nu \) (if not \( \text{"Aeolic"} *\phi\omega\iota\alpha\tau\alpha \text{-} \tau\omicron \)) was hyper-Ionicized to \( \phi\omega\iota\eta\tau\eta\nu \), 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’ \( \delta\rho\eta\tau\omicron \) at A56 and 198:

1. Unlike the case of 2 sg. present \( \delta\rho\varepsilon \), with the phonological history \(*\text{aeai} > *\text{-}âai > -\alpha\), the development of 3 sg. imperfect \( \delta\rho\alpha\tau\omicron < *\text{hora}âeto \) included no stage at which the form would have had an -\( \alpha\) - that was unfamiliar from the Ionic point of view and would thus have been liable to be hyper-Ionicized as -\( \eta\) - (as in \( \gamma\omicron\rho\mu\mu\varepsilon\nu\alphai \), \( \phi\omega\iota\eta\tau\eta\nu \)).

2. This, in turn, could easily explain why \( \delta\rho\eta\alphai \) (\( \zeta343 \)) hardly even has a competing variant, while \( \delta\rho\eta\tau\omicron \) (A56, 198) has practically no actual direct ms. authority against its competitor \( \delta\rho\alpha\tau\omicron \). It could be supposed, more explicitly, that \( \delta\rho\eta\alphai \) is a hyper-Ionic but genuine epic form, while
Zenodotus' reading ὀρητό 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 ὀρηαί at ξ343, could easily have decided that the corresponding 3 sg. imperfect should have been an analogous form—

-eai (e.g., βούλεια [P404]): -eτο = εῖαι (μνητεία [θ180]): -eῖτο =
-ṟαι (ὀρηαί [ξ343]): X (whence ὀρητό [A56. 198])

2.4.3.1 The points to emphasize so far are:

1. Homeric ὀρηαί can be accounted for in more than one way. On the one hand, it could be that we simply have in ὀρηαί a 2 sg. middle of the *-ο/ε- stative present seen in Ionic ὀρην, and thus a form whose history is ὀρηαί > ὀρηαί. Alternatively, it is possible that ὀρηαί, a 2 sg. pres. middle of familiar *horiaελ- (cf. Hom. ὀράεσθαι [π107+]), contracted regularly to ὀρηαί and then hyper-Ionicized to ὀρηαί, 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 ὀρηαί (: *ὅρημα cf. ὀρήμα) 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 ὀρητό, 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 ὀρητό is a philological artifact—even if a rather ancient one—that was based on present ὀρηαί, 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 ὀρηαί.

2.4.4 An attempt to arrive at a reasoned "best account" of Homeric ὀρηαί (and ὀρητό)—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 ὀρητό for ὀρᾶτο also at Φ390 and/or, e.g., ὀρῆμα for ὀρᾶται 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 ὀρή- will not have had contrasting accents, and since (2) the transmission favors and heavily favors, respectively, a properispomenon ὀρή- 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 ὀρητό owes its existence to an analogy based on the present altogether, it becomes even more likely that that present was of the form ὀρήαί.
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 ὁρῄα (if not ὁρῄτο too) in the formulaic repertory of the epics.

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

\[
\ldots \text{αὐτός} \parallel \text{ἐν ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῄα} (\xi 343)
\]

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

\[
\ldots \text{ταῦτα} \parallel γ \text{ ἐν ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῄα} (\text{Davies EFG 151}),
\]

which already indicates that the long, non-subdivisible \[ \ldots \# \] segment of \xi 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 \xi 343 and the OH obviously goes most closely with:

\[
\ldots \text{ἐν ὁφθαλμοῖσιν} \begin{cases}
\text{ὁρῴθαι} (\Gamma 306) \\
\text{ὁρῴσα} (\Theta 459) \\
\text{ἱσωμαι} (\Lambda 587, \Sigma 190) \\
\text{ἱσῷα} (\Sigma 135) \\
\text{ἱδεῖσθαι} (\kappa 385)
\end{cases}
\]

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

\[
\text{#} \rightarrow \text{μέγα} \text{βαῤῥα} \parallel \text{τὸ δ' ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὁφρῶμαι} (\text{N99=O286=Γ344=Φ54=Herm 219=Τ36})
\]

This, in turn, cannot be separated from

\[
\ldots \text{ὁ δ' ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὁφτω\#} (\delta 226) \\
\ldots \text{ὁσ' ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὁδικτο\#} (\text{Herm 202})
\]

and

\[
\ldots \parallel \text{καὶ ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρφω\#} (\sigma 462) \\
\ldots \text{μέγα} \text{βαῤῥα} \parallel \text{καὶ ὁφθαλμοῖσιν ἱδέσθαι} (\text{Harpoll 415. Cf. N99, etc.})
\]

2.4.4.1.3 In short, there is to be recognized here an obviously traditional
line segment of the contour, position, and content \[ \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \sim \text{#,} \]
where the final three syllables are furnished by a form of present οράω or
aorist ἰδον that has the required shape (\( \sim \sim \)) and is therefore almost always
middle: \( \text{όρωμα}, \text{όρημα}, \text{όρωντω}, \text{όρωτο}, \text{όράσθω}, \text{ἰδώμα}, \text{ἰδημα}, \text{ἰδού}, \text{ἰδούτο}, \text{ἰδέσθαι}, \text{but also ορώς} \).

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 \( \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \text{όρωμα#} \) (N99+) has replaced an earlier traditional
expression that ended with “Aeolic” *\( \text{αεις} \) instead, or that
\( \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \text{όρασθω#} \) (Γ306) is an analogous adjustment of something
with final *\( \text{αεις} \) 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 ορημα.
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. # φθαλμόης ἰδον</td>
<td>1. # φθαλμόης ἰδον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \text{όρωμα#} ) (Γ28), etc. vs. ( \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \text{όρασθω#} ) (κ574)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. # φθαλμόης ἰδον</td>
<td>2. # φθαλμόης ἰδον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \text{όρωμα#} ) (Τ174), etc. vs. ( \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \text{όρασθω#} ) (Χ169), etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. # φθαλμόης ἰδον</td>
<td>3. # φθαλμόης ἰδον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \text{όρωμα#} ) (Π182), etc. vs. ( \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \text{όρασθω#} ) (Γ574), etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. δὴ γὰρ ἱδον φθαλμόης#</td>
<td>4. δὴ γὰρ ἱδον φθαλμόης#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sim \text{ορωμα#} \sim \text{επόντες} ) (κ323) vs. ( \sim \text{ισθόμα#} \sim \text{αεις} ) (Ε212), etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ἰδον φθαλμόης#</td>
<td>5. ἰδον φθαλμόης#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sim \text{ορωμα#} \sim \text{επόντες} ) (Ο488), etc. and ( \sim \text{ισθόμα#} \sim \text{αεις} ) (Ε212), etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ἰδον φθαλμόης</td>
<td>6. ἰδον φθαλμόης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sim \text{ορωμα#} \sim \text{επόντες} ) (Ε770), etc. vs. ( \sim \text{ισθόμα#} \sim \text{αεις} ) (Ο474), etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types 1, 2, and especially 6 could easily suggest, that is to say, that the line segment
\( \sim \text{φθαλμόης} \sim \sim \text{#,} \) 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 (ορώμα 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
άρωμα, etc. with ορώμα, etc., and ἰδον, etc. with ἱδομα, 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 metricaly equivalent verb forms that allow such formulae to be inflected. The 428 pages of
Bec right (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 ορώμα and ορώμα/ιδομα
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># ὂφθαλμοίσιν ἵδωρ</td>
<td># ὄφθαλμοίσιν ἵδοι (k574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># ὂφθαλμοίσιν ἰδωσί</td>
<td># ὄφθαλμοίσιν ἵδοσε (ξ143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰνα μ' ὄφθαλμοίσιν ἵδωσε (HDem 409)</td>
<td>δος δ' ὄφθαλμοίσιν ἰδέσθαι (O600), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἵγων ἵδον ὄφθαλμοισίν (δ569+), etc.</td>
<td>ἐν ὄφθαλμοισίν ἰδωσί (Λ587+), etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.4.3 An examination of the status of ὀρηαι 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 ὀρηαι 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 ὀρηαι—rather than imperfect ὀρητο—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 ὀρηαι 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 ὀρηαι 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 ὀρηαι 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 *-e- that gave rise to both “Aeolic” (h)ορε- and Ionic (h)ορεοε- 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)ορεαι > ὀρηαι or as a hyper-Ionic epic version of an archaic Ionic *horâai (> later Ionic ὀρα) that was regularly contracted from *(h)orkeai.

2.4.6 Instead of lending decisive support to either of these accounts, in fact, the investigation of ἐν ὄφθαλμοισίν ὀρηαι (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 ὀρηαι, however, is found only once and that in the Odyssey. This means, in turn, that instead of an archaism, ὀρηαι 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 ὀφθαλμοισίων ὀρασθαι, etc. with a 2 sg. pres. indicative version—or more precisely to form the second
person of the very well represented first person \( \overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ορώμαι} \) (N99=O286=Τ344=Φ54=ΗHerm 219=τ36). And if this was the motivation, it could be more specifically the case that \( \text{ὁρηαι} \) 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 \( \text{ὁρηαι} \) as the result of a straightforwardly proportional analogical process that was carried out by some poet(s) of the tradition precisely in the form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ἵδωμαι} (\Lambda587+) & \quad : \quad \overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ἰδηαι} (\Sigma135) \\
\overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ὁρώμαι} (N99+) & \quad : \quad \text{X}.
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \text{X} \) would be “solved,” of course, as \( \overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ὁρηαι} \). The new form of the expression would include a 2 sg. present \( \text{ὁρηαι} \), 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 \( \text{ὁρηυ} \) (§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 \( \text{ὁρηαι} \) 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 \ldots \text{ἀκούετο} || \text{λαός ἀυτῆς} \) (Δ331),

---

\(^{30}\) Burkert (1972) 80, note 29 also invokes the proportion \( \overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ἱδωμαι} : \overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ἰδηαι} = \overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ὁρῶμαι} : \text{X} \) in connection with the genesis of \( \overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ὁρηαι} \) ("... produziert aber ist sie offenbar durch die Formel... "). But Burkert operates nevertheless with a proparoxytone \( \text{ὁρηαι} \), 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 (ἡθήμι) really existed and was known to the tradition, there is not really much reason to insist upon a purely secondary and analogical origin of \( \overset{\text{1}}{\sim} \text{οφθαλμοίσων ὁρηαι} \) in the first place.

where a virtually unique middle form of pres. ἀκοῦω 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 ὁμνυμι “swear.”

3.2.1 The well attested Attic paradigm—1 sg. ὁμοῦμαι, 3 sg. ὁμεῖται, etc.—would have to go back most immediately, as it stands, to ἐ-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))ο/ε- (< *h2ο-ο/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-(e(h))ο/ε- “will send” (στήλεω [β287]; Att. στελ-, -είς), *ker-(e(h))ο/ε- “will cut” (κερέων [Ψ146]; Att. κερ-, -είς), and *men-(e(h))ο/ε- “will remain” (μενεό [Λ317+], Att. μεν-, -είς). In the present case, it would be a matter of such a future in *(e(h))ο/ε- to the descriptive root *ομ- of present *ομ- “swear.” And this would appear to be in complete agreement not only with variantlessly transmitted ὁμεῖται in Homer (1274) and Hesiod (Erga 194), but with purportedly Laconian (Ar. Lyg. 183) ὁμιώμεθα—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>ὁμεῖται</td>
<td>ὁμοῦμαι</td>
<td>ὁμεῖται</td>
<td>ὁμιώμεθα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


33. The scattered mss. that read ὁμεῖται (or even ὁμεῖται) in the relevant passage (see especially Ludwig ad loc.) still offer nothing but consistent -είται 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 -εω- is famously strengthened by Heraclean ἐμετρίωμε (SGDI 4629.2.17+) and μετρίωμεται (SGDI 4629.1.18+) from the present μετρεο-/ “measure.” The form is obviously not, however, recorded in a genuine Laconian document. The question of whether ὁμιώμεθα is morphologically plausible as the future of ὁμο- in Laconian reduces to that of whether Laconian had the “liquid” future just mentioned—i.e. futures in *(e(h))ο/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 ὁμιώμεθα Colvin (1999) 156, 215f.
3.2.3 At first sight, it might appear possible to solve this problem by way of a hypothesis that would make ὅμοιομαι not really an Attic form, but rather a product of an inner-epic analogy of the type:

-εται : -ομαι = -ηται : -ομαι =
                    | καὶ ἔτι μέγαν ὅρκον ὀμεῖται# (1274) : X

The result, of course, would be the expression | καὶ ἔτι μέγαν ὅρκον ὅμοιομαι# (A233+), and thus an ὅμοιομαι with an origin analogous to the one sketched above (§2.4.6.1) as the third and final possibility for ὅρηαι.

3.2.4 But there are at least two serious drawbacks to this method of reconciling Homeric ὅμοιομαι 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/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 | καὶ ἔτι μέγαν ὅρκον 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- (έν-) for eymological -ἐθ- for a reasonably long time (to judge by the considerable number of forms that are metrically guaranteed to show this treatment35—and note in particular 1 sg. fut. ἀμφιβαλεύμαι [χ103]), it is hard to see why the solution was not simply | καὶ ἔτι μέγαν ὅρκον ὅμεθμαι#.

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 ὅμοιομαι made to ὀμεῖται in this way. For ὀμεῖται occurs in Homer only at I274, as given above, in the segment | καὶ ἔτι μέγαν ὅρκον ὀμεῖται#,36 for which instructive analogues are not lacking:

| καὶ ἔτι μέγαν ὅρκον ὅμοιομαι# (A233)
| καὶ ἔτι μέγαν ὅρκον ὀμοιομαι# (1132)
| καὶ ἔτι μέγαν ὅρκον ὀμοιομαι# (v229)

35. See e.g., Chaniotis (1973) 34, 58ff. (esp. 61).
36. The Hesiodic expression that contains ὀμεῖται—namely | ἔτι δ' ὅρκον ὀμεῖται# (Ἑρμ. 194)—is scarcely independent of this: Hesiodic | καὶ ἔτι μέγαν ὅρκον ὀμεῖται# (together with Hesiodic | ἔτι δ' ὅρκον ὀμοιομαι# [V'42] plus Odyssean | μέγαν ὅρκον ὀμοιομαι# [178+] and μέγαν ὅρκον ἀπώμαι# [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 ὅμοιομαι in epic formulaic diction.
—an expression that not only has the variant (also first person)

\[\text{κεφαλὴν μέγαν ὅρκον ὤμουμαι} \] (\textit{Herm} 274).

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

\[\text{ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ καὶ τὸδ' ὤμουμαι} \] (\textit{Ψ373}).

This state of affairs would already strongly suggest on its own that \[\text{καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὤμεῖται} \] is a third-person transformation of what is essentially a first-person formula. But what makes that account of the ὤμεῖται version of this segment a virtual certainty is that at 1274 Odysseus is simply reporting to Achilles ("καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὤμεῖται") Agamemnon’s exact words ("καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὅρκον ὤμουμαι") of 142 lines earlier at 1132.

The result of considering the Homeric future paradigm ὤμουμαι, ὤμεῖται from the dictional point of view is thus that it turns out—despite first appearances—to be highly desirable or even essential to explain ὤμεῖται as analogically made to ὤμουμαι, 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 ὤμην—"swear"—namely ὤμοσα (Hom., Att. ὤμοσα, etc.). This is unambiguously to be analyzed ὤμο-sa-, and that in turn provides a basis for reconstructing an \textit{h}$_{3}$-final root\(^{37}\) (most likely \textit{h}$_{3}emh$_{3}\) > Proto-Gk. *emo- > omo-\(^{38}\)) whence o-vocalism in the root throughout the entire averbo) and an aorist that behaves as if it reflects \textit{h}$_{3}emh$_{3}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 \textit{h}$_{3}emh$_{5} (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 \textit{h}$_{3}emh$_{5}—reconstructed

---

https://digitalcommons.colby.edu/cq/vol38/iss2/7
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(a)- “subdue” (Hom. + ὑδάμασ(σ)α, etc.), for example, future forms reflecting *dama-so/e- > dama-(h)o/e- are found not only in such Homeric instances as 3 sg. δαμάξ (Χ271) or 3 pl. δαμώσατι (Ζ368), but (at least according to the usual analysis) in the Mycenaean participle da-ma-o-te (Kn X 1051) as well. So also:

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

3. aorist *pera-s(a)- “sell” (Hom. ἐπέρασ(σ)α, etc.) : future *pera-(h)o/e- (Hom. περάσαν [P454])

4. aorist *ole-s(a)- “destroy” (Hom. + ὁλεσ(σ)α, etc.) : future *ole-(h)o/e- “will perish” (Hom. ὅλεσσῃ [P133])

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

6. perfect (*με-μήρθ-) > *μεμηρ- “say, tell” (Hom. + μερημαι [A.+] : future (*μερήρισ(o)e- > *μερή-(h)o/e- (Hom. μερεῦ [Δ39], μερεῖ [Η91+])

3.2.5.3 Perfectly in line with this pattern—even if constituting a unique example of a CERH3 root that participates in it—would be:

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

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

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

| pres. or-nū- “arise” (e.g., ὁρνυται Ε532+) | fut. or-eo/e- (e.g., ὀρεῖται Τ140) =
| pres. om-nū- “swear” (e.g., ὀμνυθη 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-(h)o/e- “will swear” in particular.
would be reflected presumably by Attic ὁμοῦμαι, ὁμεῖται and possibly by the allegedly Laconian future ὁμῶμεθα as well.41

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

-ό- (ὁμοῦμαι: “I will appear,” etc.) : -έ- (ὁμεῖται, etc.)

-ό- (ὁμοῦμαι) : X

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

3.2.7 It remains only to reason further that if Homeric ὁμοῦμαι is not to be a graphic Atticism and thus reflects *omo-(h)o-, and if it is also the fundamental form of this future in epic diction, Homeric and Hesiodic ὁμεῖται appears to be explicable in only one general sort of way. Since ὁμεῖται 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 ἦ καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμεῖται#, it had access to a new “liquid” future ὁμέομαι, ἐῖται (hypothetically produced by the same analogy—to ὄρνυμι: ὁρέομαι, e.g.—envisioned earlier

41. If Laconian had *-είδη/εί- futures to roots in -I, and -N (see note 34 above), this analogy could have worked there as well as in Attic. If not, ὁμῶμεθα 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. ὁμῶμεθα 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 *δμόχυμαι, -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 ὰμοϊμαι, as far as Homer is concerned, comes from one (old) paradigm of this future, and ὰμείται 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 ὰμοϊμαι beside an ὰμείται that comes from the more recent paradigm of this future—or in other words that it created its own inflection ὰμοϊμαι/ ὰμείται 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 ὰμοϊμαι/ ὰμείται is thus very specifically not a relatively arbitrarily assumed Atticism of the written tradition that replaced an entirely notional *δμέναι/ ὰμείται (or an equally notional ὰμοϊμαι/ *δμόνται straight from ὀμο-(η)ο/-, for that matter).

3.2.9.1 Synchronically, however, the question is whether it is possible in addition to understand this definitively transmitted -σμαῖ/-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 ὰμοϊμαι and ὰμείται that was presumably somehow supported and thus justified in Homeric language, but rather the 1 sg./ 3 sg. relationship of ὰμοϊμαι and ὰμείται# 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. ὰμοϊβνται 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 *omο-(η)ο/. But the inscription dates only from the period 246–226 BC and is in any case essentially a Keine document, which would make ὰμοϊβνται 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

| δφρα ἰδωμαι# (Z365+) vs. δφρα ἰδηαι# (Σ221+) |
| δφρα ἱδωμεν# (K97+) vs. αἱ κεν ἰδηαι# (P652) |
| δφρα ἰδηαι# (B237) |

and

| δφρ' ἄν ἰκωμαι# (K325+) vs. δφρ' ἄν ἱκηαι# (ζ304+) |
| δφρ' ἄν ἱκηαι# (Ο23) |

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

| ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἐκωμαι# (Τ436) vs. ἐκ θυμὸν ἐληται# (Μ150+) |
| or |

| τῶν δήμων ἱκωμαι# (Z225) vs. ἐπὶ μήας ἱκηται# (Ζ69), |
| καὶ σίκαδ' ἱκωμαι# (1393) |
| τεῦ δώμαθ' ἱκωμαι# (ζ509) |

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

| ἐπὶ δ’ ὄρκον ὁμεῖται# (Εργα 194). |

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

| ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἱδωμαι# (Λ587+) vs. ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἱδηαι (Σ135) |
| τὸδ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώμαι# (Ν99+) vs. ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρηῖαι# (ζ343), |

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

⁴⁵. See also note 36 above.
lexical (ὁρκια/ ὀρκον) relationship—in addition to its syntactic parallelism—to | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκον ὀμοῦμαι/ ὀμείται is the inflected expression:

| καὶ ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμωμεν# (Γ94+) vs. | ὄν ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμητε (Γ252).

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

| γερονσιον ὀρκον ἐλωμαι (Χ119)

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

| ἐναρχ βροτέεντα φέρωμαι# (Θ534) vs. | ἐναρχ βροτέεντα φέρηται# (Χ245)

and

| σήν πατρίδα γαίαν ἱκημαι# (δ545+)
| ἱν πατρίδα γαίαι ἱκτημαι# (ε26+).

3.2.10 What all of this is meant to lead up to, quite obviously, is a very simple account of Homeric ὀμοῦμαι/ ὀμείται 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 ὀμοῦμαι# that contained an archaic and obsolete form of the future of ὀμυμει, the tradition simply used the ordinary modern ὀμείται and was able or willing to tolerate the resulting unusual paradigm in ὀμυμαι (-ὁμοθ ηται). because a complete and perfect analogy for such a pattern was supplied by ὀμοῖαι (-ὁμοθ ηται), 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 ὄρηαι (Ξ343) and ὀμείται (1274) as two instances of one phenomenon—that the process of making the third person of the 1 sg. formula | καὶ ἐπὶ μέγαν ὀρκον ὀμοῦμαι# was a matter not so much of using a contemporaneous ὀμείται (while declining the services of equally contemporaneous *ὁμεῖμαι), but rather of forming a 3 sg. to 1 sg. ὀμοῦμαι 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. τάμητα 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 τάμευμαι# as does, e.g., | ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμητα# would stand to | ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμωμεν# as does, e.g., | ὀρκια πιστὰ τάμητα# above.
obsolete, unique, and possibly even defective 1 sg. future ὁμοῦμαι, containing an unparalleled and opaque stem-final -φ-, was given a 3 sg. that was destined to have a stem-final -θ-, 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.:

| -~ ὀμαι#: | -~ ὑται# |
| -~ ἐκμαι#: | -~ ἐκται# |
| -~ ὑρκια πιστα τάμωμεν#: | -~ ὑρκια πιστα γάμητε# |
| ~-- ὑρκον ἐλωμαι# |
| ~-- ἐλωμαι#: | ~-- ἐλται# |
| ~-- ἐκμαι#: | ~-- ἐκται# |
| ~-- φέρωμαι#: | ~-- φέρηηται# |

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