



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **The development of the Proto-Indo-European syllabic liquids in Greek**

Beek, L.C. van

### **Citation**

Beek, L. C. van. (2013, December 17). *The development of the Proto-Indo-European syllabic liquids in Greek*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/22881>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/22881>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/22881> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

**Author:** Beek, Lucien van

**Title:** The development of the Proto-Indo-European syllabic liquids in Greek

**Issue Date:** 2013-12-17

## 7. Epic forms with -ρο-

For forms like δράκων and κραταίος, which combine the reflex -ρα- < \**r* with *McL* scansion, an inner-Epic explanation has been proposed in the previous chapter. In the present chapter, those Homeric forms are discussed in which -ρο- potentially derives from \**r*. The material consists of the following forms:<sup>726</sup>

- (1) the form undergoes *McL* scansion and derives from a pre-form with \**r*:  
 ἀβροτάξομεν ‘we will miss’ < \**amrt-ak-* (cf. ἀμαρτάνω, ἡμβροτον)  
 ἀνδρεϊφόντης epithet of Eualios < \*ἀνδροφόντης < PGr. \**anr-k<sup>wh</sup>on-tā-* ‘man-slayer’  
 (Myc. PN *a-no-qo-ta*)  
 ἀνδροτιῆτα ‘vigor’ < PGr. \**anrtāt-* < PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>nr-teh<sub>2</sub>t-*  
 βροτός ‘mortal’ < PGr. \**mrtó-* (Arm. *mard* ‘man’), together with ἀσπίδος  
 ἀμφιβρότης, νύξ ἀβρότη  
 προκείμενα ‘served’ (of comestibles, in a repeated formula) < \**pr-keimena*.
- (2) the form undergoes *McL* scansion; \**r* is suggested by Greek dialectal material with -or-:  
 Ἀφροδίτη ~ Cret. Αφορδίτα  
 θρόνος ‘throne, luxurious chair’ ~ Myc. *to-no* ‘ornamented chair, throne’  
 πρὸς ‘towards, etc.’ ~ Cret. πορτι, also in πρόσωπον ‘face’  
 πρόσω ‘forward, further’ ~ Att. πόρρω, πόρσω
- (3) reconstruction of \**r* deserves consideration for some other reason:  
 κροαίων ‘galloping’, verse-final quasi-hapax with *McL* scansion  
 Κρονίων ‘Zeus’, with long ī and pervasive *McL* scansion only in the Ns.  
 Κρόνος, only the G. Κρόνοιο undergoes regular *McL* scansion  
 ῥοδόεντ- ‘rose-scented’ (~ Myc. *wo-do-we*, with a different vowel slot)

Apart from ῥοδόεντ-, all forms in groups 2 and 3 have an irregular Homeric scansion which could be ascribed to an earlier \**r*. However, the former presence of \**r* cannot always be taken for granted.<sup>727</sup> The following discussion aims to find additional arguments in favor of or against the erstwhile presence of \**r* in these forms. Before we can embark on a treatment of the metrical issues, the problem of the dialectal origin of Homeric forms with -ρο- must be addressed.

### 7.1 The dialectal origin of forms with -ρο-

The substantive βροτός is firmly anchored in the Ionic Epic and poetic tradition from Homer onwards. Since βροτός cannot be the regular reflex of the pre-form \**mrtó-* in Ionic-Attic, the

<sup>726</sup> From the examples listed in section 6.3, I have left out the hapax βεβροτωμένα ‘covered with gore’ (*Il.* 11.41). There is no etymology for its base form βρότος (4x *Il.* in verse-final ἄπο βρότον αἱματόεντα, 1x *Od.*), nor is there any other indication that its pre-form contained a syllabic liquid. On the contrary, the initial βρ- regularly generates length by position in the simplex βρότος as well as in the formula ἔναρα βροτόεντα ‘blood-stained spoils’ (5x verse-final in the *Iliad*, also 3x after |<sub>p</sub>). On the possibility that the pre-form of ἀολλέες ‘thronged, all together’ contained \**l*, see section 10.5.2.

<sup>727</sup> Cf. de Lamberterie (2004: 245) on θρόνος: “... la *correptio* du groupe θρ- (...) ne saurait être considérée à elle seule comme une preuve suffisante pour poser un /*r*/. Il faudrait encore, pour cela, que la sonante-voyelle soit garantie par l’étymologie”, referring to the example of βροτός beside Arm. *mard*. I agree with the first statement, but feel that the second restriction is too rigorous.

form is usually taken to have originated in Aeolic<sup>728</sup> or Mycenaean<sup>729</sup> poetry. The same origin is assumed for the negated form ἄμβροτος ‘immortal’ and other derived forms like ἀμβρόσιος.<sup>730</sup> This explanation of the phonologically aberrant outcome of \**r* is then extended to other Epic forms with -po-, like ἀβροτάζομεν or ἀνδροτήτα. Some scholars even assume that θρόνος derives from a pre-form with \**r*.<sup>731</sup>

It is true that -po- is the regular reflex of \**r* in the Aeolic dialects, at least in Boeotian and Lesbian (see section 3.4). For the Homeric forms βροτός and ἄμβροτος, however, an Aeolic origin is not straightforward at all. First of all, there is no unambiguous trace of a \*βρότος or ἄμβροτος in the Lesbian poets: the normal words for ‘mortal’ and ‘immortal’ are clearly θνᾶτος (attested 4x) and ἀθάνατος (5x, with the metrical lengthening of the initial ἄ-characteristic for Epic Greek). The only evidence for ἀμβρόσιος is Alc. fr. 296b.4.<sup>732</sup> In view of the small corpus of fragments of Lesbian poetry, it cannot be entirely excluded that βροτός and ἄμβροτος are absent from Sappho and Alcaeus by chance. Nevertheless, the fact that these authors regularly use θνᾶτος and ἀθάνατος is remarkable. Furthermore, Aeolic provenance is hardly an option for ἀβροτάζομεν (in view of the Achaeian velar suffix), and unmotivated for ἀνδροτήτα and θρόνος (unattested in Lesbian poetry).<sup>733</sup>

A second problem with an Aeolic origin of βροτός concerns the accent. Since the Lesbian accent is regularly recessive, the epic form βροτός as such cannot be of Lesbian origin. To mend this problem, one would have to assume either a form borrowed by Ionic Epic from mainland Aeolic poetry, or a blend of an older Ionic form with an Aeolic one, which retained the Ionic accent but took over the Aeolic vocalism. Neither assumption can be further substantiated. A third argument against an Aeolic origin of βροτός will be established in chapter 8: some Epic forms have -ρα- as the reflex of original \**r*, but behave metrically as if they never contained \**r* (κρατερός and the thematic aorists with -ρα-). These forms must have arisen analogically within an Ionic Epic tradition, but at the same time the introduction of -ρα- in these forms must have taken place at an early date. This renders the concept of an Aeolic phase itself highly improbable. In order to stick to the idea that the group of βροτός is of Aeolic origin, one would have to assume that it was a lexical borrowing from Aeolic poetry, but this seems highly unlikely: the *McL* licence, which is regularly applied in the most frequent case forms of βροτός, is unknown in the Lesbian poets.<sup>734</sup>

For some of the forms with -po- (ἀβροτάζομεν, ῥοδόεντ-, θρόνος, and ἀνδρεϊφόντης), there are concrete indications pointing in the direction of a Mycenaean origin. However, a borrowing from Mycenaean or a continuation of a form from a putative Achaeian Epic

<sup>728</sup> E.g. Heubeck (1972: 76): “it is to be noticed that in all these cases it is not the Ionic, but the Aeolic development \**r* > po that is to be found.” See further e.g. Wathelet (1966 and 1970), Frisk and *DELG* (s.v.), although the latter adds that the form may also be Achaeian.

<sup>729</sup> *DELG* (s.v., see previous note), Strunk (1957), Ruijgh (*passim*), West (1988: 156-7). Heubeck’s (1972) analysis will be discussed below.

<sup>730</sup> For a discussion of the meaning of ἄμβροτος and ἀμβρόσιος, see Thieme (1952: 15-34).

<sup>731</sup> For θρόνος see e.g. Wathelet (1966). Proponents of the proto-hexameter hypothesis (e.g. Tichy 1981) have tried to explain ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἦβην and ἀβροτάζομεν by starting from an older epic verse with a trochaic fourth foot. This hypothesis is unnecessary, and the idea is unfalsifiable.

<sup>732</sup> As well as one instance of the substantivization ἀμβροσία ‘divine food’ (Sapph. fr. 141.1).

<sup>733</sup> The famous ποικιλόθρον’ (Sapph. fr. 1.1) probably contains the different Homeric word θρόνα ‘embroideries’. The only Homeric form where -po- certainly derives from \**r* and which has a clear analogon in Lesbian is the aorist ἤμβροτον ‘missed, made a mistake’. Below and in chapter 8, however, I argue that ἤμβροτον is the inner-Epic reflex of a Proto-Ionic word with \**r*. Furthermore, there are numerous attestations of ῥόδον in Sappho (a number of times in the form βρόδον, both as a simplex and in compounds). It is possible, but not entirely certain, that this form derives from \**wrdo-* (see section 7.2.8). No other Homeric form with -po- discussed in this chapter is attested in the Lesbian poets.

<sup>734</sup> On the avoidance of *McL* scansion in Lesbian, see Wathelet (1966: 148-9); on that in Eastern Ionic elegiac and iambic poetry, see West (1974: 113-4 and 1988: 166). This means that the scansion of βροτῶν, βροτοῖσι cannot have been borrowed together with the forms.

tradition does not solve the origin of -po- either, because it can be excluded that -ro- was the regular reflex of \**r* in Linear B (chapter 2). To be sure, a form like βροτός may theoretically be of Mycenaean origin, but only if Ionic Epic borrowed it in a form with \**r*. The only remaining explanation, then, is that forms with -po- < \**r* are archaisms of Epic Greek.

## 7.2 -po- as a conditioned reflex of Epic \**r*

The above arguments justify a fresh look at other possibilities to explain forms with -po- < \**r* in Homer. A cardinal issue remains the application of *McL* scansion in a number of these forms. We found that Homeric Greek applies various strategies to avoid *McL* scansion, and that all words with -pa- which have *McL* scansion on a regular basis directly continue a pre-form with \**r*. Where *McL* scansion could not be related to the former presence of \**r*, this could often be ascribed to an incidental (and therefore secondary) application of the licence.<sup>735</sup> In βροτός, however, the regular application of *McL* scansion in the most frequent case forms (Gr. βροτῶν and Dp. βροτοῖσι) coincides with the reconstruction of a pre-form with \**r* (\**mrtó*-). This suggests that βροτῶν and βροτοῖσι contain an artificial reflex of \**r*.

Let us try to explain the *o*-vocalism of βροτός by the same process as -pa- in τράπεζα and similar forms. We depart from input forms \**tr̥pedia*, \**mrtó*-, with preserved \**r*, into Ionic Epic.<sup>736</sup> When this Epic \**r* was eventually eliminated, the default reflex was obviously *a*-colored (κραδίη, κραταῖός, τράπεζα, etc.). Note that Ionic Epic even has an *a*-colored reflex in words which existed in Aeolic poetry (cf. στρατός beside Lesb. and Boeot. στρότος). In order to explain the divergence between -po- and -pa-, I propose that -po- was conditioned by a directly preceding labial consonant.<sup>737</sup> The evidence in favor of this rule consists of the following forms:

- ἄβροτάξομεν < \**amrt-ak*-, ἥμβροτον < \**ām̥rte/o*-
- βροτός < \**mrtó*-, and also ἄμβροτος ~ ἄβρότη < \**ām̥rto*-, \**ām̥rto*-, ἀμφιβρότη < \**amp<sup>h</sup>im̥rtā*-
- πρόσω < \**pr̥sō* < \**pr̥tiō*
- |<sub>T</sub> προκείμενα < \**pr̥keímena* in a formulaic verse (14x).

It is attractive to add the following examples to the evidence:

- Ἀφροδίτη < \**Ap<sup>h</sup>rdítā*
- ῥόδον < \**w̥r̥do*-
- πρὸς < \**pr̥s* < prevocalic \**pr̥ti*-, προσήδα ‘said (s)he’.

Note that πρὸς and προσ- are, together, responsible for 240 instances of *McL* scansion in Homer, on a total of approximately 782 instances, and that Ἀφροδίτη takes care of 42 instances. In the few remaining forms with -po-, the *o*-vocalism may have been introduced by analogy with similar forms or formations. For instance, in ἀνδροτήτα, ἀνδρο- was preferred

<sup>735</sup> The application of the *McL* licence on an incidental basis must be separated, as a recent phenomenon, from systematically occurring *McL* scansions in artificial Epic forms with -pa- and -po- < \**r*.

<sup>736</sup> Such forms may have been present in Ionic Epic prior to the vocalization to -ap- in spoken Ionic, but they may also have been introduced after this change had taken place if we assume that \**r* was maintained longer within Epic Greek. All we have to require is that Epic input forms like \**tr̥pedia* were no longer current in the vernacular when \**r* vocalized to -ap- in Proto-Ionic. It is immaterial whether the form in question was inherited from Proto-Ionic (or Proto-South Greek), or whether it was adopted from Mycenaean Epic.

<sup>737</sup> But not by a following labial consonant, as appears from the *a*-vocalism of τράπεζα. In section 3.2, I have already suggested that the Cretan development to op (beside regular ap) was conditioned by the feature [+labial] of the preceding consonant (examples: πορτι, Αφροδίτα, -μορτος). The Ionic vernacular development seen in ἥμαρτον (as opposed to Epic ἥμβροτον) was not subject to the same condition. As we will see, this proves that an independent sound change took place within Epic Greek, posterior to the Proto-Ionic vocalization to -ap-. On the problematic reflex -op- in Class. πρόσω < \**pr̥sō*, see section 9.1.9.

over the regular outcome ἀνδρα- (attested in ἀνδρακάς) because ἀνδρο- was already normal as the first member of compounds, which introduced the compositional vowel -o- (\**anr-o-* for older \**anr-*). The cases θρόνος ~ Myc. *to-no* and Κρόνος, Κρονίων have their own particular problems, to be discussed in more detail below.

The only potential counterexamples with Epic -ρα- after a labial consonant are βραχίων ‘upper arm’ and πραθεῖν ‘to destroy, pillage’. For πραθεῖν, the influence of other thematic aorists like τραπεῖν provides an easy way out (see section 8.3.3). The etymology and reconstruction of βραχίων are problematic, as we have seen in section 6.8.4.<sup>738</sup> These two forms, then, offer no cogent reason to doubt that the development Epic \**r* > -po- may have been conditioned by a preceding labial consonant.

### 7.2.1 The metrical evidence for βροτός

The forms discussed in this section all ultimately derive from \**mrtó-* ‘man, mortal’. The same pre-form is presupposed by Arm. *mard* ‘id.’, which may point to a common innovation of Greek and Armenian (Frisk s.v. βροτός, de Lamberterie 1997: 73).<sup>739</sup> As has recently been stressed by Barnes (2011), the oldest attested reflex of \**mrtó-* is μροτός, -μροτο- (without the epenthetic -β-) as found in archaic inscriptions from several different dialects and regions.<sup>740</sup> The epenthesis of -β- in -μρ- is a natural phonetic development. It may have come about as an independent innovation in different dialects at different times, and the retention of the shared archaism -μρ- in a few isolated pockets is not strange at all. In view of the 7<sup>th</sup> c. Naxian form μροτοισιν, it is likely that μροτός and μροτοῖσι were still pronounced in Homeric times.<sup>741</sup> If so, the fairly consistent manuscript spelling -βρ- in forms like ἀβρότη, ἀμφιβρότη, ἀβροτάζομεν must have been introduced in a later, but relatively early authoritative written version of the Homeric text.<sup>742</sup>

The following table shows the number of attestations of the different case forms of βροτός in Homer, as well as their metrical behavior:

Case	Form	##	Formulaic behavior
Ns.	βροτός	16	verse-final βροτὸς ἄλλος (5x); otherwise no fixed position
As.	βροτόν	6	5x before   <sub>B</sub> , e.g. βροτόν   <sub>B</sub> ἄνδρα (2x) For verse-final βροτόν ἄλλον ( <i>Il.</i> 2.248), cf. Ns.
Gs.	βροτοῖο	1	σῆμα βροτοῖο   <sub>T</sub> ( <i>Il.</i> 23.331) <sup>743</sup>

<sup>738</sup> Possibly, βραχίων originated as a sobriquet in \*-*īwon-* based on the adjective βραχύς, as suggested by Ruijgh.

<sup>739</sup> Ved. *mṛtá-* ‘dead’ is generally supposed to preserve the older meaning of PIE \**mrtó-*, whereas PGr. and PArm. \**mrtó-* ‘mortal’ may have been created under influence of the antonym \**ṇ-mṛ-to-* ‘immortal’ (cf. Lat. *mortālis* after *immortālis*). A different view is found in Thieme (1952: 15-34).

<sup>740</sup> μροτοισιν (*CEG* 402, Naxos, 7<sup>th</sup> c.), Κλεομοροτος (Dubois 2002: 23ff., bronze tablet dedicated by an Olympic victor from Sybaris and dated to appr. 600 BC), Σωμοροτιδας (name of a physician in Megara Hyblaea, an Achaean colony in Magna Graecia, *IGDS* 22, ca. 550 BC), Φιλομοροτος (*SEG* 24.405, Pelasgiotis, early 5<sup>th</sup> c.), and Μροχο Ιηερ[ογ]ενέα (woman’s name from Perrhaebia, first half 5<sup>th</sup> c. *SEG* 24.406). A name Κλεομοροτος is also attested twice (Aeolis, 2<sup>nd</sup> c. and Cyclades, 3<sup>rd</sup> c.), see the details in Masson (1963: 219). As Barnes remarks, these five forms “may seem like a small amount of evidence, but it must be stressed that these inscriptions come from three totally different dialect areas (Italian colonies, Thessaly, Insular Ionic) and are among the earliest inscriptions from their respective areas.”

<sup>741</sup> This is not entirely certain, however, because 7<sup>th</sup> c. Naxian also preserves a distinction between /*ǣ*/ and /*ē*/ which has been lost in Homer.

<sup>742</sup> Contra Mühlestein (1958: 226): “Notlösungen sind auch ἀβρότη, ἀμφιβρότη, ἀβροτάζομεν, wo überall zur Zeit der Niederschrift der Lautwandel längst zu verswidrigen Formen mit -μρ- geführt hatte (vgl. ἄμβροτος, τερψίμβροτος, ἥμβροτον).”

<sup>743</sup> Cf. σῆμα βροτοῖσιν |<sub>T</sub> in the same position (*Il.* 13.244), itself one of the few cases where the Dp. does not stand in verse-final position.

Gs.	βροτοῦ	1	<sub>T</sub> βροτοῦ ἀνέρος ( <i>Il.</i> 18.85)
Ds.	βροτῶ	4	always before   <sub>B</sub> ; βροτῶ ἀνδρί (3x)
Np.	βροτοί	15	οἷοι νῦν βροτοί εἰς'   <sub>P</sub> (4x <i>Il.</i> ) ὅσσοι νῦν βροτοί εἰσιν   <sub>T</sub> (1x <i>Od.</i> ) verse-final βροτοὶ ἄλλοι (3x <i>Il.</i> ) <sup>744</sup> , see Ns.
Ap.	βροτούς	1	<sub>T</sub> βροτούς ( <i>Il.</i> 24.464)
Gp.	βροτῶν	44	39 after   <sub>T</sub> ; the other 5 instances may be modifications. <sup>745</sup>
Dp.	βροτοῖσι(v)	28	verse-final (24x); before   <sub>T</sub> (4x) <sup>746</sup> δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι(v) (6x) θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσι(v) (3x, also Hes., hymn.)

Table 7.1: Pattern of attestation of βροτός in Homer

Among the forms with a second syllable that is long by nature, only Gp. βροτῶν (44x) and Dp. βροτοῖσι(v) (28x) are frequently used. Each of them has its own preferred position in the line: βροτοῖσι(v) is verse-final on 24 of 28 occasions, as expected for a form of this metrical structure. The Gp. βροτῶν (44x, the most frequent case form of βροτός in Homer) is found directly following |<sub>T</sub> in 39 cases. The frequency of βροτῶν, in combination with its consistent localization, can hardly be predicted from its iambic structure (generally, between 50 and 60% of such forms stands after |<sub>T</sub>, see O'Neill 1942: 140). This suggests that its scansion reflects an archaism.

Apart from βροτῶν and βροτοῖσι(v), *McL* scansion is found only in two forms which otherwise would not scan: the Ap. βροτούς and the Gs. βροτοῖο, each attested once in Homer. All other case forms of βροτός, i.e. the entire singular and the Np., are always followed by a vowel, with only one exception.<sup>747</sup> This shows that *McL* scansion in βροτός was generally avoided as far as possible in the Homeric epics.<sup>748</sup>

That the Dp. βροτοῖσι contains a relic scansion is perhaps confirmed by the inflecting system of formulae for 'mortals' or 'human beings'. In the Gp., ἀνθρώπων (96x) is frequent in verse-final position (61x), notably in the formulae |<sub>H</sub> μερόπων ἀνθρώπων and |<sub>T</sub> (κατα)θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων. In the Dp. (38x), we find the spondaic clausula |<sub>B</sub> ἀνθρώποισι(v) (12x), but there are no noun-epithet formulae ending this way. It is clear, then, that the normal Dp. form of 'mortals' used in formulae is βροτοῖσιν. The accompanying traditional epithet

<sup>744</sup> Only in the quasi-formulaic verse νύκτα δι' ὀρφναῖν (ἀμβροσίην), ὅτε θ' εὐδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι, which only occurs in the *Doloneia* (2x) and at *Il.* 24.363.

<sup>745</sup> *Od.* 15.253 after e.g. *Od.* 13.297; *Il.* 6.142 and *Od.* 6.153 after e.g. *Il.* 7.446, *Od.* 1.66, 11.218, 13.297; *Od.* 15.492, 16.63, and 19.170 perhaps after *Od.* 23.267.

<sup>746</sup> Of the 4 non-verse final attestations, 2 identical verses have θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν (*Od.* 3.3 and 12.386), which also occurs in verse-final position (*Od.* 7.210, 3x Hes. *Th.*) and is a transformation of θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων. The same holds for μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν beside the frequent μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

<sup>747</sup> The only exception in Homer is αἶψα γὰρ ἐν κακότητι |<sub>T</sub> βροτοὶ καταγυράσκουσιν (*Od.* 19.360). After Homer, we find |<sub>T</sub> βροτὸν κρατερόν τε μέγαν τε (*Scut.* 106), οὗ τι |<sub>T</sub> βροτοὶ κείρουσι σιδήρῳ (*h. Aph.* 268). In all these cases, βροτο- stands directly after the trochaic caesura, where the use of the licence may have been extended from the Gp. The prevocalic forms have a preference for the biceps of the fourth or fifth foot. Taken together (42x), they are less frequent than the Gp. and Dp. A similar ratio is found if we consider the *Theogony* and *Works and Days* together: the Gp. and Dp. (9x) make up more than half of the attestations of βροτός (16x); the Gs. βροτοῖο is not used.

<sup>748</sup> In order to cross-check the statistical relevance of the high frequency of *McL* scansion in θρόνος and βροτός, I counted the occurrence of this licence in thematic nominal forms of the same metrical structure (*CLVCo-*) in Homer. On a total of 111 attestations, the vast majority of forms is used in front of a following vowel. The licence is applied only in three cases: ὥς μεμνέφτο δρόμους |<sub>P</sub> (*Il.* 23.361), ἀρνειούς τε τράγους τε |<sub>T</sub> (*Od.* 9.239), and οὐδὲ τροφοῦ οὔσης |<sub>P</sub> (*Od.* 19.489). The licence found in the inflected forms of θρόνος, βροτος and Κρόνος is exceedingly rare in other words of the same metrical structure.

may be |<sub>T</sub> ὀϊζυροῖσι (2x) or |<sub>H</sub> δειλοῖσι (6x), both ‘miserable’. We can therefore reconstruct the following system for ‘mortals’ (cf. Parry 1971: 114-5):

Placed after	Dative plural	Genitive plural
<sub>B</sub>	ἀνθρώποισιν (12x)	
<sub>H</sub>	δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν (6x)	μερόπων ἀνθρώπων (10x) θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων (9x)
<sub>T</sub>	ὀϊζυροῖσι βροτοῖσιν (2x)	καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων (7x) ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων (5x)

Table 7.2: Homeric formulae for ‘men, mortals’ in the genitive and dative

Whereas βροτοῖσιν is normal in verse-final position, the Dp. θνητοῖσι is avoided in this slot.<sup>749</sup> Since the use of βροτοῖσιν requires the use of a metrical licence, this distribution requires an explanation. One could point out that a dactylic fifth foot was generally preferred over the spondaic cadence which θνητοῖσι would have yielded. However, if βροτοῖσιν violated metrical rules, the spondaic cadence yielded by θνητοῖσι would certainly have been preferred. In other words, |<sub>H</sub> δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν and |<sub>T</sub> ὀϊζυροῖσι βροτοῖσιν (with *McL* scansion) would not have been created unless they scanned regularly at some pre-stage of Epic Greek. It also seems clear that both δειλοῖσι and ὀϊζυροῖσι are traditional ornamental epithets.

As explained in section 7.1, it is unlikely that βροτός is an Aeolic form.<sup>750</sup> Departing from *\*mrtó-*, inherited by Epic Greek in this form, I propose the following scenario. In the forms where the thematic ending was long by nature, the first syllable of *\*mrtó-* had to be placed in the second half of the biceps. The other forms would have a preference for the biceps of the fourth or fifth foot, where they could be used in front of a heavy syllable starting with a vowel.<sup>751</sup> After the development of Epic *\*r* to -ρο-, the forms βροτῶν and βροτοῖσι could only be used with *McL* scansion, while in most other forms the *McL* licence was avoided as far as this was possible: they were henceforth only used in prevocalic position.

### 7.2.2 ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης and the compounds in -(μ)βροτος

In the two Homeric compounds in -μβροτος (τερνίμβροτος, φαεσίμβροτος), a preceding short vowel is scanned long. Their existence proves that the synchronic form underlying Homeric βροτός was /mrotó-/ rather than /mrtó-/.<sup>752</sup> But this does not contradict the conclusion that βροτῶν and βροτοῖσι contain a direct metrical trace of the older pre-form *\*mrtó-*: the two compounds are probably recent creations, as an inspection of their attestations shows.<sup>753</sup> The

<sup>749</sup> The dative in -οῖσι before a consonant is a recent and marginal phenomenon in Homer: see Chantraine (1942: 194-6).

<sup>750</sup> As Wathelet remarks (1966: 166 n. 5), “L’absence d’abrègement chez Alcée et Sappho et le fait que βροτοῖσιν soit l’unique cas d’abrègement dans un contexte éolien, indiquent à suffisance que l’abrègement ne saurait provenir d’une influence éolienne.” In his discussion of the dative βροτοῖσιν, however, Wathelet overinterprets the evidence by emphasizing “passages” with Aeolic forms. Out of 28 attestations in Homer, βροτοῖσι(v) occurs in combination with Aeolic εσσι-datives only twice: μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν (*Il.* 2.285) and πάντεσσι βροτοῖσι (*Od.* 13.397). These numbers prove nothing, because we also find πᾶσι βροτοῖσι (*Od.* 15.255), with the Ionic dative form. The dative in -οῖσι need not be of Aeolic provenance, but may also continue the old South Greek locative ending. Finally, μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν is clearly a transformation of the more frequent μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

<sup>751</sup> Compare the localization of the indicative forms of the thematic aorist (chapter 8). It is possible that *\*mrtó-* was only current in its Gp. and Dp. forms until rather recently before Homer.

<sup>752</sup> Personal names in -(μ)βροτος are frequent in Greek inscriptions (see Bechtel 1917: 298-9), but the existence of names in -μροτος in some dialects (see section 3.2.2) shows that the pre-form had *\*-mrtó-*.

<sup>753</sup> One might even speculate that the low frequency of words ending in a short vowel in front of βροτό- is another metrical trace of *\*mrtó-* (cf. the case of κραδίη, section 6.7.2). In ἐρίσσειε βροτὸς ἄλλος (*Il.* 3.323, *Od.*



hemistichs |<sub>P</sub> τερψιμβρότου ἡελίοιο (*Od.* 12.269, 274) and |<sub>P</sub> φαεσιμβρότου ἡελίοιο (*Od.* 10.138) cannot be very old, in view of the epic correption of -ου in combination with the genitive in -οιο. Furthermore, φαεσίμβροτος ἡώς (*Il.* 24.785) is not an old noun-epithet formula, because ἡώς has an extensive traditional formulaic system with a different nominative form (see below).<sup>754</sup>

To be contrasted with these compounds of relatively recent date is the formula ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης, which occurs in three different verses (*Il.* 2.389, 12.402, 20.281, each time occupying the first hemistich). Besides, there is also one instance of ἀμφιβρότην ... ἀσπίδα (*Il.* 11.32). Wathelet (1966) stands in a long tradition when he views ἀσπίς ἀμφιβρότη as referring to the “tower shield”, which according to archaeologists dates back to Mycenaean times.<sup>755</sup> Two objections can be advanced against this identification. First, as remarked by Tichy (1981: 32-3), the formula ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης is never explicitly used for the “tower shield” in the *Iliad*: the context of all passages makes clear that it refers to a round shield.<sup>756</sup> Secondly, the actual meaning of ἀμφιβρότη does not favor the connection with the tower shield. Tichy convincingly argues that the first member ἀμφι- must mean ‘around’, because shields or weapons are typically hung around a warrior’s shoulders (1981: 33-4, with examples of Homeric phraseology). Thus, ἀμφιβρότης ‘[hung] around a man’ may have referred to any shield and, as far as the semantics are concerned, may have been formed at any time.

This does not imply, of course, that ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης is a recent creation. Since *McL* scansion is avoided as far as possible in the simplex βροτός, the scansion of the compound ἀμφιβρότη- suggests a pre-form *\*amp<sup>h</sup>i-mṛtā-*.<sup>757</sup> Moreover, the motional feminine in ἀμφιβρότη-, which is paralleled by νύξ ἀβρότη (see below), is remarkable. Tichy remarks that compounds with governing prepositional first member generally have no motional form, and feels that an *ad hoc* explanation for ἀμφιβρότη- is justified.<sup>758</sup> But Tichy’s analysis requires a number of additional assumptions, and it is unproblematic to assume that the scansion of ἀμφιβρότη- reflects older *\*amp<sup>h</sup>i-mṛtā-*. Whereas the more recently created compounds in -(μ)βροτος were based on the underlying synchronic form /mroto-/, the relic form *\*amp<sup>h</sup>i-mṛtā-* was automatically resolved as ἀμφιμρότη- when Epic *\*r* was vocalized. In

---

15.321 and 19.286) and ὅτε θ’ εὔδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι (*Il.* 10.83, 10.386 and 24.363), the verbal form may originally have ended in ephelcystic -v. If we disregard these six cases, there are only four instances (out of 41 possible ones) where βρ- demonstrably lengthens a preceding short vowel: ὃ με βροτὸς οὔτασεν ἀνὴρ (*Il.* 5.361), μὴ δὲ βροτὸν ἄνδρα τελέσσει (*Il.* 19.22), οἷα βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ἔδουσιν (*Od.* 5.197), ὅτε με βροτοὶ οὐ τι τίουσιν (*Od.* 13.129). It is hard to decide whether this low frequency is statistically significant; cf. the comparison between κραδίη and κρατερός in chapter 8.

<sup>754</sup> The first member φαεσί- was based on the thematic aorist φάε (only *Od.* 14.502 φάε δὲ χρυσόθρονος ἡώς), like ταμεσίχρως on the aorist ταμεῖν. As a first member, βροτο- is only found in βροτολογός, epithet of Ares (13x, on four of which βρ- lengthens a word-final short vowel by position). This epithet is old in the generic noun-epithet formula |<sub>P</sub> βροτολογῶ ἴσο- Ἄρηϊ “equal to man-destroying Ares” (5x).

<sup>755</sup> Cf. *Lfgre* s.v. The so-called “tower shield” (σάκος ἡύτε πύργον) is associated with Ajax in the *Iliad*. According to archeologists, it fell into disuse around 1300 BC. Wathelet concludes: “Nous nous trouvons ici en présence d’une remarquable coïncidence des faits linguistiques et archéologiques: l’archaïsme du modèle de bouclier, correspond à la formule archaïque (...)” (1966: 167-8).

<sup>756</sup> As van Wees (1992: 320 n. 32) remarks, the phrase ἡύτε πύργον which gave rise to the term “tower shield” is more likely to refer to a thick or impenetrable shield: the actual meaning of πύργος in Homeric Greek is not ‘tower’, but ‘bulwark, fortification’.

<sup>757</sup> Cf. West’s remark concerning ἀμφιβρότη- that “short scansion before βρ, though admissible at a pinch, is a departure from the epic norm” (1988: 157).

<sup>758</sup> The only two motional forms among prepositional compounds with a governing first member are ἀμφιβρότη- and the quasi-hapax ἀντιθέην ἄλοχον. Since the latter is clearly secondary beside the ubiquitous masculine ἀντίθεος (60x Hom.), Tichy proposes to explain ἀμφιβρότη- as a recent hypostasis of a phrase ἀμφὶ βροτῶ. It would have assumed the gender of other compounds with ἀμφι- (e.g. ἀμφιρύτη, in her view a “Zusammenrückung”) and of other feminine qualifications of ἀσπίς.

my view, then, the scansion of ἀμφιβρότη-, in combination with the motional feminine, must be considered an archaism.

### 7.2.3 ἄμβροτος, ἀμβρόσιος and νῦξ ἄβρότη

The adjective ἄμβροτος ‘immortal; refreshing’ continues an inherited formation: like Ved. *amṛta-*, Av. *amāša-* ‘id.’, Lat. *immortālis*, it reflects PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>-mrto-*. Since the metrical behavior of βροτός can be related to the fact that its pre-form is *\*mrto-*, one might also expect to find metrical traces of the pre-form *\*ámrto-*. However, the only direct trace is the hapax νῦξ ἄβρότη (only *Il.* 14.78, with *McL* scansion of βρ-); elsewhere, *\*-mr-* always closes the preceding syllable in ἄμβροτος (20x) and ἀμβρόσιος (37x).

At first sight, this near-absence of instances of *McL* scansion seems to imply that ἄμβροτος and ἀμβρόσιος do in fact contain an Aeolic reflex -ρο-, as the *communis opinio* has it. But once the metrical difference between dactylic ἄμβροτος and its pre-form *\*ámrto-* is taken into account, the picture changes. Like the inherited form ἀνέρες < PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>nér-es*, *\*ámrtos* was a tribrachic form. In an earlier stage of Epic Greek, *\*ámrto-* (either with a long final syllable, or when followed by a consonant) would have competed with the metrically lengthened dactylic form *\*ámrto-* (cf. *ānéres*). The stem *\*ámrto-* would have occurred especially in the neuter plural (as in Hom. ἄμβροτα εἶματα, ἄμβροτα τεύχεα followed by a verbal form). Besides, the precursor of ἀμβρόσιος coexisted with that of ἄμβροτος at an early date.<sup>759</sup> This adjective could only be used with a metrically lengthened first syllable, i.e. *\*āmrsio-* (cf. the metrical lengthening in ἀθάνατος ‘immortal’).<sup>760</sup> Taken together, the existence of *\*āmrsio-*, the high relative frequency of metrically lengthened *\*ámrto-*, and the fact that *McL* scansion was avoided as far as possible after the vocalization of Epic *\*r* may have favored the decline of anapestic *\*ámrtos C-*.

The poetic forms *\*ámrto-* and *\*āmrsio-* were unknown in the Proto-Ionic vernacular, or in any other vernacular of the Dark Ages. When Epic *\*r* vocalized, they yielded *\*ámroto-* and *\*āmrosio-*. These forms were then shortened to *ámroto-* and *amrosio-*, either by cancelling the metrical lengthening once it had become superfluous, or even regularly by Osthoff’s Law.<sup>761</sup> They ultimately appear in our Homeric texts as ἄμβροτος and ἀμβρόσιος. The latter was used as a metrical variant which originally supplied the case forms of ἄμβροτος ending in long vowel or diphthong plus consonant, as in ἀμβροσίην διὰ νύκτα. It could then also be used in front of a consonant in most of the masculine forms (e.g. ἀμβροσίου διὰ πέπλου *Il.* 5.338).<sup>762</sup>

In view of this systematic alternation between ἄμβροτος and ἀμβρόσιος, there would have been no need to create a syntagm νῦξ ἄβρότη. It requires the use of a metrical licence that was otherwise avoided in the simplex βροτός. Moreover, νῦξ ἄβρότη has a motional feminine. According to our grammars, ἄμβροτος is an adjective of two endings in Homer, but this statement is based only on one single instance (νῦξ φθῖτ’ ἄμβροτος, *Od.* 11.330), and the

<sup>759</sup> See Thieme (1952: 16), who remarked that ἀμβρόσιος never clearly means ‘immortal’ in Homer, but rather “*Lebenskraft enthaltend*”, i.e. ‘refreshing’. It can be derived from a neuter substantive *\*ámbrōton* with the same meaning as Ved. *amṛta-* (n.) ‘vital force’. On the other hand, ἄμβροτος does not only mean ‘refreshing’ (like ἀμβρόσιος), but also ‘immortal’ in the colon θεὸς ἄμβροτος (4x, Ns. and As.), and only here (cf. West 2007: 127).

<sup>760</sup> Note that ἀμβρόσιος is metrically equivalent to ἀθάνατος, but that the two adjectives do not qualify the same nouns.

<sup>761</sup> The same environment is found in Ion. μεσαμβρίη ‘mid-day’ (Att. μεσημβρίη with analogical -η- after the base word, cf. Peters 1980: 256). That *\*ámrtōn* ends up as ἡμῖς ‘I missed’ may be due to a reintroduction of the augment after the application of Osthoff’s Law.

<sup>762</sup> In Homer, we find the syntagms ἀμβροσίη νύξ (*Od.* 4.429 and 574, 7.283), νύξ ... ἀμβροσίη (*Il.* 18.268-9), ἀμβροσίην διὰ νύκτα (*Il.* 2.57), and νύκτα δι’ ἀμβροσίην (*Il.* 10.41 and 142, 24.363, *Od.* 9.404, 15.8). See *Comm. Kirk* ad *Il.* 14.78.

epicene inflection is synchronically expected in Greek. It is not obvious at all, then, that νῦξ ἄβρότη is secondary to the single instance of νῦξ ... ἄμβροτος.<sup>763</sup> In my view, it is much more plausible that the aberrant scansion, phonology, and morphology of ἄβρότη represent an archaism.

On the other hand, one could also reason differently. It cannot be entirely excluded that the hapax νῦξ ἄβρότη is a nonce formation. This option has been argued for in detail by Tichy (1981: 34ff.), whose argument runs as follows. (1) Most determinative compounds have no separate feminine form. (2) In most of the exceptions to this rule, the compound may have taken over the feminine flexion from a co-occurring simplex. (3) In νῦξ ἄβρότη, this explanation is impossible because the simplex βροτός has no motional feminine itself. (4) Therefore, νῦξ ἄβρότη must be a recent “Zusammenrückung” of ἄ- and βροτός, and is a “metrisch bedingte Ersatzbildung für ἀμβροσίη (...); vermutlich hat dabei ἀμφιβρότη- als Analogiemuster gewirkt, das in ähnlicher Weise neben φαεσίμβροτος f. und φθισίμβροτος f. steht wie im Ergebnis ἄβρότη neben ἄμβροτος f.” (1981: 35).

If νῦξ ἄβρότη is indeed a nonce formation (replacing the regular Ns. form ἀμβροσίη νύξ), a motive for its formation must be indicated. In Tichy’s view, the reason would be that the poet wanted to insert the idea ‘immortal night’ before ἦν καὶ τῇ |<sub>T</sub> ἀπόσχονται πολέμοιο || Τρῶες. In conclusion, she asks: “... ist es verwunderlich, wenn als Ergebnis seiner wohl weitgehend unbewussten Bemühungen νῦξ ἄβρότη zustande kam?” (1981: 37). This line of reasoning is rather speculative. Although Tichy does show that ἦν καὶ τῇ |<sub>T</sub> ἀπόσχονται πολέμοιο || Τρῶες is a transformation of traditional Epic material, she does not explain how exactly the poet’s “unconscious” calculations may have led him to fashion νῦξ ἄβρότη. The possibility of a proportional analogy “ἀμφιβρότη- : φαεσίμβροτο- = X : ἄμβροτος → X = ἄβρότη-” (thus Tichy) is not evident either: the first pair contains two different types of compounds (prepositional compound vs. compound of verbal government), whereas the second pair are mere phonological variants. Finally, precisely because of the existence of νῦξ ... ἄμβροτος, it is hardly comprehensible why the poet would have preferred νῦξ ἄβρότη over \*νῦξ ἄβροτος.

In conclusion, it seems likely to me that the feminine ἄβρότη represents a relic motional form \*amrtā, but some caution is necessary because we are dealing with a hapax.

#### 7.2.4 ἀβροτάζομεν and ἥμβροτον beside ἀμαρτεῖν

In section 8.4.4, ἥμβροτον ‘missed’ will be analyzed as the Epic reflex of a pre-form \*āmrtōn. This explains both the exclusive use of specifically Ionic augmented forms (ῆ-) and the distribution between augmented and unaugmented forms of the root. Thus, ἥμβροτον is an excellent example for the conditioned change described here. The form ἀβροτάζομεν is used only once, by the author of the *Doloneia*,<sup>764</sup> when Agamemnon speaks to Menelaos (*Il.* 10.65-66):

αὖθι μένειν, μή πως ἀβροτάζομεν ἀλλήλοιν  
ἐρχομένω· πολλὰ γὰρ ἀνὰ στρατόν εἰσι κέλευθοι

“Stay there, lest by chance we miss each other as we go: for many are the paths throughout the camp.” (transl. Wyatt)

<sup>763</sup> It is also to be noted that νῦξ ἄβρότη is attested in the *Iliad*, and νῦξ φθῖτ’ ἄμβροτος in the *Odyssey*.

<sup>764</sup> The *Doloneia* is almost universally agreed to be a post-Homeric addition to the *Iliad* (see Danek 1988: 9-18 for an overview of the literature). Throughout her 1981 article, Tichy cites the form as ἀ(μ)βροτάζομεν (the v.l. ἀμβροτάζομεν is “nur schwach bezeugt”, 1981: 31). However, there is no evidence for such a *varia lectio* in the group of mss. utilized by van Thiel for his edition, nor is it mentioned in the apparatus of the edition by Monro and Allen. It is therefore better to stick to the notation ἀβροτάζομεν. The problem is similar to ἀνδροτῆτα beside the weakly attested v.l. ἄδροτῆτα, but the difference is that ἀβροτάζομεν is a *lectio difficilior*, and ἀνδροτῆτα a *lectio facillior*.

Formally, ἀβροτάζομεν is a short vowel subjunctive of the *s*-aorist.<sup>765</sup> The stem ἀβροτάζ- is an extension of the root of ἀμαρτεῖν ‘to miss, fail’, probably a denominative based on the abstract noun \*amrtā- (cf. Ion.-Att. ἀμαρτή). Unless ἀβροτάζομεν would be a nonce formation of some sort, the velar aorist suffix -αζ- can hardly be anything but an Achaeian element of Epic Greek (cf. Ruijgh 1957: 71-89).<sup>766</sup> The canonical interpretation, then, is that ἀβροτάζομεν contains a metrical and phonological trace of an Achaeian pre-form \*amrtáksomen. However, in her crusade against the idea that metrically irregular forms with -ρο- continue older forms containing a syllabic liquid, Tichy (1981: 64) tried to explain away ἀβροτάζομεν as an artificial Epic “Streckform”.<sup>767</sup> She correctly points out (1981: 37-8) that the subjunctive of the Aeolic aorist stem, <sup>++</sup>ἀμβρότωμεν, could not be used in hexameter verse, and agrees that the suffixation in -αζ- is “völlig abnorm”. In my view, the only possible conclusion to be drawn from these remarks is that ἀβροτάζομεν is an archaism. Since there is no explanation for -αζ- within Ionic, the form must have originated in Mycenaean and entered Ionic Epic as \*amrtáksomen. The reflex -βρο- for -μρο- < \*-mr- is due to the vocalization of Epic \*r. Incidentally, this provides circumstantial evidence for the idea that Mycenaean still preserved \*r.<sup>768</sup> The genitive dual form ἀλλήλου following ἀβροτάζομεν could corroborate the antiquity of the hemistich.

In view of its morphological, phonological and metrical deviations, the *communis opinio* that ἀβροτάζομεν is a real archaism is probably correct. Having said that, it must not be forgotten that ἀβροτάζομεν is a hapax, attested in the *Doloneia*, which is most probably a post-Homeric addition to the *Iliad*.

### 7.2.5 πρὸς, πρόσω and πρόσωπον

The reconstruction of πρὸς, πρόσ- ‘towards, against, by; in addition’ and its relatives is a difficult problem. The three Homeric forms are πρὸς, προτί, and ποτί. In the vernacular dialects, we find πρὸς (Ionic-Attic, Lesbian), *po-si* (Mycenaean), πος (Arcado-Cyprian), ποτι (Thessalian and Boeotian), πορτι (Cretan), and ποτι, ποτ, ποι in the other West Greek dialects.<sup>769</sup> On this basis, we can reconstruct neither a common South Greek form, nor a

<sup>765</sup> The form is sometimes cited as ἀ(μ)βροτάζομεν, e.g. by Tichy. This is misleading, because almost all Homeric manuscripts offer the reading ἀβροτάζομεν (with a minor v.l. ἀβροτάζομεν). Homer probably still had -mro- as a reflex of Epic \*r. After the sequence \*-mr- had become disallowed for phonotactic reasons, it may have been rendered as -βρο- (the closest form which still preserved the metrical structure) within the post-Homeric tradition. This is the form which appears in our Homeric texts and manuscripts, but given the 7<sup>th</sup> c. Naxian form μροτοισιν discussed above, even the author of the *Doloneia* may still have pronounced \*-mro-.

<sup>766</sup> The guttural aorist flexion is an innovation of the Achaeian dialect group, not a preserved archaism. The innovation also took place with West Greek, but in spite of West (1988: 167-8), it is unlikely that Early Greek Epic structurally contained West Greek elements. Therefore, the only option to be seriously entertained is a Mycenaean origin.

<sup>767</sup> “Aus dem erhaltenen griechischen Sprachmaterial kann m.W. weder eine Bildeparallele noch ein Analogiemuster beigebracht werden, es sei denn, die reguläre Form \*ἀμβρότωμεν wäre in Imitation nach dem Versausgang φυλάζομεν ἡμέας αὐτοὺς Θ 529 künstlich “gestreckt” worden.” (o.c. 37-8). In Tichy’s view, which has nothing to recommend itself, \*ἀμβρότωμεν would have originally occupied the slot following |<sub>H</sub> in a verse-end like “\*ἀμβρότωμεν ἐταίρων\* (o.ä.)” (o.c. 64). This proposal is guided by her idea that the cretic sequence \*ἀμβρότω- was metrically regular in this specific slot in a pre-stage of Epic Greek. Indeed, in Berg’s proto-hexameter, a trochaic sequence like ἀμβρο- could be placed at the beginning of an original verse-final pherecratean. But even if one were inclined to accept this theory, there is no basis whatsoever for the assumption that ἀβροτάζομεν ἀλλήλου replaced an earlier <sup>++</sup>ἀμβρότωμεν ἐταίρων. Moreover, as Tichy herself admits, no real inner-Epic model can be indicated for the assumed replacement of \*ἀμβρότωμεν with ἀβροτάζομεν. Thus, Tichy’s version of the proto-hexameter hypothesis explains neither the morphological nor the metrical problems posed by ἀβροτάζομεν.

<sup>768</sup> Scholars wishing to avoid this conclusion would have to argue that Ionic Epic took the form from some earlier form of Mycenaean, prior to the tablets. This seems both unnecessary and unlikely to me.

<sup>769</sup> As Wyatt (1978: 89 n. 1) remarks, the Argive form πορτι is a mirage. Like Wyatt, I leave out of consideration the forms πρὲς ‘in addition’ (cited as Aeolic in Joh. Gramm.), Pamph. περτ’ (also as a preverb in περτεδωκε, see

common North Greek one. It seems, then, that Proto-Greek had at least two forms, which are traditionally reconstructed as *\*poti* and *\*proti* and considered to be etymologically distinct.<sup>770</sup> A similar situation is found in Indo-Iranian: Ved. *prāti* ‘against, towards, etc.’ is from PIIr. *\*prāti*, whereas Av. *paiti* ‘against, towards; also’ and other Iranian forms derive from PIIr. *\*pati*.

That PGr. had a preposition *\*poti* is beyond doubt. Problematic for the reconstruction of PGr. *\*proti*, however, is that such a pre-form would not yield Cret. πορτι. As we have seen in section 3.2.2, Cret. πορτι could be explained from *\*prtī*, a pre-form which also underlies the Hittite adverb *-parza* ‘-wards’. In what follows, I will argue that the evidence for *McL* scansion in Homeric πρὸς, προσ- offers further support for a reconstruction *\*prtī*.<sup>771</sup>

The only direct evidence for PGr. *\*proti* is Homeric πορτί.<sup>772</sup> It is therefore of the utmost importance to analyze the distribution between πορτί, ποτί, and πρὸς in Homer. A groundbreaking treatment of the metrical and syntactic behavior of these forms has been provided by Wyatt (1978), a much-neglected article. He reaches the following conclusion: “*\*poti* is an inherited form, and *pros* entered the tradition from contemporary Ionic: *proti* seems to be somehow intermediate between the two, and is used only for metrical purposes – it seems a purely epic device” (1978: 115). Wyatt demonstrates that πορτί is only used in two ways: (1) in front of vowel-initial words, e.g. πορτί ἄστρ, πορτί Ἴλιον;<sup>773</sup> (2) as a metrical variant of ποτί when the preceding word ends in a short vowel. Since (2) is rare and can be easily explained as secondary, he concludes that πορτί originated as a metrical replacement of πρὸς in cases like πορτί ἄστρ, where a long scansion of πρὸς before the once-digammated ἄστρ was apparently not tolerated.<sup>774</sup>

Once the evidence for PGr. *\*proti* has been eliminated, one wonders whether it is possible to depart from a single Proto-Greek form *\*poti*, reflexes of which are found in Homer, in mainland Aeolic, West Greek, and Arcado-Cyprian. This is indeed the position taken by Wyatt: he explains Homeric, Ionic-Attic πρὸς (whence Lesbian) and Cretan πορτι as due to contamination with other prepositions such as πρό, παρά, περί. It remains, then, to explain the structural *McL* scansion of Homeric πρὸς. As already observed in section 6.5, the metrical behavior of πρὸς and πρό is quite different: πρὸς / προσ- frequently undergoes *McL* scansion (240x in total, of which προσήυδα 163x), whereas the licence is all but completely avoided with πρό / προ-.<sup>775</sup>

---

Brixhe 1976: 61), and πρέσβυς ‘elder’ (Hom.+). Of these, πρές and πρέσ(-βυς) have a different meaning compared to πρὸς. The status of Pamphylian is too uncertain for purposes of reconstruction (section 3.6). If πρές and πρέσβυς derive from PGr. *\*préti(-)*, its *e*-vocalism can be compared with that of Latv. *pretī* (adv.) ‘towards, opposite’, *pret* (prep.) ‘against, before’, Lat. *pretium* ‘reward, prize’, and perhaps with Ved. *prāti*.

<sup>770</sup> Thus e.g. Janko (1979), Frisk and *DELG* (s.v. πρὸς).

<sup>771</sup> The derivation of Hom. πρὸς from *\*prtī*- V- is not contradicted by Forssman’s analysis (1980) of ἔppw ‘to get lost’ < *\*wertjō*, because *\*-rtj-* and *\*-rtj-* may have developed differently. Furthermore, Myc. *po-si* ‘in addition’ is commonly interpreted as /posi/ in view of Arcado-Cyprian πος. It cannot be excluded, however, that the underlying form is /p̥si/ or /p̥orsi/ < *\*prtī*. Some earlier scholars have admitted the possibility of /p̥orsi/ (see *DMic.* s.v. *po-si*), but they assume that liquid metathesis operated on a pre-form *\*proti*, which is both unlikely and unnecessary.

<sup>772</sup> The Ionic-Attic vernacular form πρὸς can be explained by a contamination of *\*prtī* with (the outcome of) *\*poti* or with πρό ‘forward’ (for a similar scenario, see Wyatt 1978: 120, 122). In addition, most scholars admit that Lesbian πρὸς can be due to Ionic influence (beside Wyatt, see e.g. Risch 1955, Janko 1979).

<sup>773</sup> Wyatt denies a connection between the use of πορτί before vowel-initial words and the historical presence of *\*w-* in many of these words, a fact to which Meister (1921: 256) had already drawn attention.

<sup>774</sup> Wyatt’s argument is rather intricate and cannot be repeated in its full form here. The lack of assibilation in Hom. ποτί is a different and difficult question. Miller (1982) argues that the South Greek assibilation only took place in words with more than two syllables. Wyatt (1978: 118-9, with ample discussion) also hints at this possibility, comparing ἀντί ‘against’ and ἔτι ‘again’. The issue cannot be further pursued here.

<sup>775</sup> See Janko (1979: 24) for numbers. In his count, *McL* scansion before πρό or προ- occurs 7x *Il.* (3.8% of all cases where a short vowel precedes πρό) and 2x *Od.* (2.3%). The figures for *McL* scansion before πρὸς / προσ-

As is well-known, Meillet (1913: 177) explained the Homeric scansion of *πρός* by assuming that the Ionic vernacular form *πρός* had replaced an earlier epic form *\*pos-* < *\*poti-*, the prevocalic variant of *ποτί* which was generalized in Arcado-Cyprian. This view has gained universal acceptance, and is also invoked by Wyatt.<sup>776</sup> There are, however, certain problems with Meillet's scenario. If the replacement of an older *\*πός* is invoked to explain the scansion of the preposition and preverb *πρός*, then the scansion of other words with *πρός-* would have to be explained in the same way. This is indeed the scenario envisaged by Wathelet (1966) when he leaves all words with *πρός-* out of consideration in his enquiry into the origin of *McL* scansions:

“Il est possible que des aèdes qui trouvaient *ποσηύδα* dans la tradition aient opéré la substitution pour rendre une formule si fréquente intelligible à leur auditoire ionien. Dans la même catégorie figurent *πρόσωπον* (...) *πρόσωπα* formulaire surtout en fin de vers (...). On ajoutera *προσφάσθαι* (...), *πρόσσω* (...), et *πρόσω* (...) et enfin *ἄλλοπρόσαλλον* (...). Dans tous les passages où *πρός* provoque l'abrègement, *ποσί* peut le remplacer, ce qui élimine *ipso facto* l'abrègement. En conclusion, la *correptio* provoquée par l'emploi de *πρός* peut être due simplement à un changement dialectal dans l'évolution de la tradition formulaire” (1966: 154).

Of the words containing *πρός-* mentioned by Wathelet, *McL* scansion is found without exception in *πρόσωπον*, *πρόσωπα* ‘face’ (10x, of which 6x verse-final), *πρόσω* ‘forward’ (5x), and *ἄλλοπρόσαλλον* ‘to each other’ (2x).<sup>777</sup> Wathelet's explanation of the *McL* scansion in *πρόσω* and *πρόσωπον* seems unlikely to me. For *πρόσω*, an earlier form *\*πόσω* can be excluded in view of the by-form *πρόσσω* (formulaic in *|<sub>H</sub> πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω*, 4x Hom.), which suggests that the *-p-* is old. The vernacular form *πόρσω*, whatever its precise explanation, points in the same direction.<sup>778</sup> The assumption of a pre-form *\*πόσωπον* also leads into difficulties. The related forms Ved. *prātika-* (n.) ‘face’ < *\*pré/óti-h<sub>3</sub>k<sup>w</sup>-o-* and Toch. A *pratsak*, B *pratsāko* ‘breast’ confirm that the pre-form contained an *-r-*.<sup>779</sup> To be sure, the *pr-* in Vedic could be due to the influence of *prāti-*, cf. Ved. *pratīpām* (adv.) ‘against the current’ beside Av. *paiti.āpām* ‘id.’. But the Tocharian word is isolated within that language, and confirms the PIE status of *\*pr-*.

In order to save Wathelet's argument, one would have to assume that the *forms* *πρόσω* and *πρόσωπον* as such are old, but that they entered Epic Greek only after *πρός*, *προσ-* had replaced *\*πός*, *\*ποσ-*. But this assumption can hardly be reconciled with the formulaic behavior of *πρόσωπα*, which is mostly verse-final (e.g. *|<sub>B</sub> καλὰ πρόσσωπα* 3x) and has an

---

on the other hand, are almost 60% in both epics. When I checked the numbers for *προ-*, it appeared that Janko did not include any instances of *προκείμενα* in his count. As far as I have been able to see, he included only the following cases: *|<sub>T</sub> πρὸ ἄστεος* (2x *Il.*, 2x *Od.*), *|<sub>T</sub> πρὸ κούρων* (*Il.* 17.726), and *|<sub>T</sub> πρὸ μέν τε* (*Il.* 13.799), *|<sub>T</sub> προθυμήσι* (*Il.* 2.588, with an otherwise rare type of metrical lengthening of *-i-*), *|<sub>H</sub> νῆας τε προπάσας* (*Il.* 2.493), *προῆκε* (*Il.* 17.545); he also forgot to count *|<sub>T</sub> προήκεα* (*Od.* 12.205), *προίκτης* (2x *Od.*). Janko points at the higher absolute frequency of the licence in front of *πρό* in Hesiod (*Th. + Op.*): “We may presume that the licence spread by analogy with *πρός*: Hesiod's diction is as usual more advanced than Homer's.” It is noteworthy that in most of the Homeric cases, *McL* scansion in front of *πρό* occurs in combination with a preceding trochaic caesura. In combination with the various strategies for the avoidance of *McL* scansion in compounded verbs (section 6.5), this suggests that *McL* scansion before *πρό* was originally completely avoided in Epic Greek, and that the licence could spread due to *|<sub>T</sub> προκείμενα* and *|<sub>T</sub> προσηύδα*. On *προκείμενα*, see the next section.

<sup>776</sup> Cf. Wathelet (1966), Wyatt (1978), Janko (1979), Miller (1982: 87f.), West (1988).

<sup>777</sup> Noteworthy is *πρόσω ἔσθε* (*Il.* 12.274, with long *ĩ-* and preserved hiatus, probably from *\*wīest<sup>h</sup>e*). The one instance of *McL* scansion in *πρόσσω* (*Il.* 11.572, on 14x Hom.) is due to an incidental application of the licence. The single case of *McL* scansion of *προσφάσθαι* when standing in the arsis (*Od.* 23.106) is better left aside as incidental, too.

<sup>778</sup> The problematic relation between Att. *πόρρω* ‘further’ and Ion. *πρόσω* is discussed in section 9.1.9.

<sup>779</sup> The Vedic word forms a near-perfect match with *πρόσωπον* if Olsen's proposal that unaccented *\*CiH<sub>2/3</sub>C* > Greek *Cīā/ōC-* (Olsen 2009) is correct. Toch. A *pratsak*, B *pratsāko* ‘breast’ is usually reconstructed as PIE *\*próti<sub>h</sub>k<sup>w</sup>-o-*, with *a*-umlaut of the first syllable.

artificially extended form |<sub>T</sub> προσώπατα |<sub>B</sub> (2x). It would also remain unclear why Epic poets did not avoid *McL* scansion in πρόσω, which could have been easily accomplished by using the word in prevocalic position only. Note, in addition, that πρόσσω existed as a metrical alternative.<sup>780</sup>

Let us return to Meillet's original assumption. It is clear that obsolete forms were frequently replaced with metrically equivalent forms that were current in the vernacular. But this never happened if the replacement entailed a violation of metrical rules. In view of the general avoidance of *McL* scansion, it would be unclear why Epic poets permitted themselves this licence on such a large scale with πρόσ, but avoided it almost completely in the case of πρό. It is also unclear why ποσ- would be difficult to understand for an Ionian audience, as argued by Wathelet: given the existence of ποτί in Homer, a \*ποσ- would have been sufficiently perspicuous.

Within the present framework, Meillet's replacement hypothesis turns out to be unnecessary. Epic πρόσ may preserve the reflex of \**pṛti* in front of long vowels (cf. προσήδα), with the regular outcome of Epic \**r* after a labial consonant.<sup>781</sup> A direct vernacular reflex of the same pre-form was also preserved in Cretan πορτι. In this way, we may now also reconstruct πρόσω and πρόσωπον as PGr. \**pṛt̥iō* and \**pṛt̥iōk<sup>w</sup>o-*, respectively. This is the only way to explain the consistent use of πρόσω with *McL* scansion, and the non-avoidance of πρόσωπον in Homer. To be sure, the vernacular forms Ion. πρόσω (Hdt., Hp.) and Ion.-Att. πρόσωπον cannot be explained in the same way, but it is possible that the (Proto-)Ionic vernacular introduced -o- in the respective pre-forms \**pṛt̥iō* and \**pṛt̥iōk<sup>w</sup>o-*, just like it replaced the outcome of prevocalic \**pṛti-* with πρόσ, probably under influence of πρό or \**poti*. Epic Greek resisted this introduction for metrical reasons, and initially retained the inherited form \**pṛt̥i-*.

It may finally be asked how the coexistence of \**pṛti*, \**pr̥ti*, and \**poti* in PIE can be motivated. I think that the answer can be found in Wyatt's analysis. After eliminating a few minor exceptions, he establishes that ποτί never governs the genitive in Homer, while πρόσ does not occur with the dative in combination with a verb of motion (1978: 97-8). He notes that Avestan *paiti* "does occur with the genitive (...) but this may be an inner-Avestan matter." (o.c. 108, referring to Reichelt's *Elementarbuch*). It is therefore possible that PGr. \**poti* (+ D.) 'to, against', modifying verbs of motion, is a syntactic archaism inherited from PIE. This construction was retained in Epic Greek, because after ποτί had been lost from Proto-Ionic, \**pṛti* or πρόσ could not be used with this syntax. On the other hand, \**pṛti* (+ A.) 'towards, against', the synchronically normal construction in Ionic-Attic, may also reflect inherited syntax. It is possible, finally, that \**pr̥ti* was the original adverb corresponding to

<sup>780</sup> The verb πορσύνω ~ πορσαίνω 'to prepare', attested three times in Homer (each time with λέχος as its object), may further corroborate that πρόσω is an artificial form. Given that *McL* scansion was unproblematic in πρόσω, there would have been no metrical reason to reshape a putative \*πορσύνω to πορσύνω. So if πορσύνω ~ πορσαίνω was taken from the vernacular (where it was derived from πόρσω), πρόσω must be a product of Epic Greek.

<sup>781</sup> Apart from the frequent *McL* scansion in front of πρόσ, Janko (1979) advances three arguments for the supposed replacement of πορτί and ποτί. (1) The high number of instances of *Silbenwägung*, i.e. "the 'lengthening' of a naturally light syllable in thesis before a following consonant" (1979: 24-5). Janko remarks that πρόσ is responsible for about 50% of the total amount of occurrences of this uncommon phenomenon in the second foot. But this may be due to a secondary extension of the use of πρόσ; it does not prove that the form itself is recent. (2) The use of πορτί / ποτί in the thesis before vowels, especially if the hiatus was caused by the loss of digamma (e.g. πορτί ἄστν, πορτί Ἰλιον). But this leaves unexplained Wyatt's strange distribution between πορτί (before a hiatus caused by the loss of digamma, and also if the preceding word ended in a short vowel) and ποτί (elsewhere). This distribution could rather point to the reverse conclusion: πορτί is a secondary form, due to a blend of ποτί and πρόσ. (3) The absence of πρόσ in the thesis of the fifth foot. However, the avoidance of a spondaic cadence may have been generalized at any given time. Thus, Janko's arguments do not contradict an original situation where Epic Greek only had ποτί (or even \**pṛti*) before C-, and \**pṛs-* before V-.

\**prti*: for a different ablaut grade in the adverb, cf. ἐπί ‘on, at, by’ beside Myc. *o-pi*, Hom. ὀπίσσω ‘backwards’.

### 7.2.6 προκείμενα

An unexpected confirmation of the idea that -po- is the inner-Epic outcome of \**r* after a labial consonant is furnished by the formulaic verse οἱ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἐτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἱάλλον, “and they stretched out their hands to the ready-lying lavishments that had been served” (3x *Il.*, 11x *Od.*). In Homeric Greek, the verb προκείμεναι is attested only in this verse.<sup>782</sup> The normal verb in the meaning ‘to serve food’, both in Homeric and in Classical Ionic-Attic, is παρατίθημι, with a suppletive passive perfect (σῖτον) παρακεῖται ‘(the food) has been served’.<sup>783</sup> It is therefore highly attractive to regard προκείμενα as the regular inner-Epic outcome of \**pr-keimena*, with the older form \**pr* of the preverb παρ-, παρα-.<sup>784</sup> An illustrative passage is the following, where πάρθεσαν and προκείμενα refer to the same event:

ὦς φάτο, καὶ σφιν νῶτα βοὸς παρὰ πίονα θῆκεν  
ὅπτ’ ἐν χερσὶν ἐλών, τὰ ρά οἱ γέρα πάρθεσαν αὐτῷ.  
οἱ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἐτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἱάλλον (*Od.* 4.65-7).

“Thus he [Menelaos] spoke, and took in his hands the roast meat and served it to them [his guests], the fat ox-chine which they [the servants] had served to him as a part of honor. Then they stretched out their hands to the ready-lying lavishments that had been served.”

There is one instance of προτίθημι in Homeric Greek that seems to mean ‘to serve as food’, but the context is rather atypical: ἢ ἔτι πὰρ νήεσσιν ἐμὸς πάϊς, ἢ ἐ μιν ἤδη ἦσι κυσὶν μελεῖσσι ταμὼν προύθηκεν Ἀχιλλεύς “whether my son is still by the ships, or whether Achilles has already chopped him up limb by limb and served him to his dogs” (Priam to Hermes, *Il.* 24.409).<sup>785</sup> This passage does not contradict the foregoing observations: it shows that the form προκείμενα had been reinterpreted by the author of these lines as containing the preverb προ-, rather than an archaic variant of παρ-. This is, of course, precisely what one would expect. The consequence of this discovery is that no old instances of *McL* scansion are found with the preverb προ- (see also the preceding discussion of πρόσ).

### 7.2.7 Ἀφροδίτη

The name of the goddess Ἀφροδίτη is attested in Classical Ionic-Attic from Homer onwards. Since it has no clear etymology, its pre-form is difficult to reconstruct. The reason to include it in the present discussion is twofold. In view of its long ī, the use of Ἀφροδίτη in Early Greek Epic automatically entails *McL* scansion of -φρ-.<sup>786</sup> Out of its 42 occurrences in Homer, 40 are in verse-final position, and it always occupies verse-final position in Hesiod and the

<sup>782</sup> After Homer, προκείμεναι is a current form, but in the meaning ‘to be served’ (of food and drinks), it only occurs in Herodotus, where it could be due to Homeric influence.

<sup>783</sup> Cf. the following instances: γρηῖ σὺν ἀμφιπόλῳ, ἢ οἱ βρῶσιν τε πόσιν τε παρτιθεῖ (*Od.* 1.191-2), δαιτρὸς δὲ κρειῶν πίνακας παρέθηκεν ἀείρας παντοίων, παρὰ δὲ σφι τίθει χρύσεια κύπελλα (*Od.* 1.141-2), τράπεζαν, τὴν ἦν οἱ παρέθηκεν (*Od.* 21.29), ἄρτους ἐκ κανέοιο δῶω παρέθηκεν ἀείρας (*Od.* 18.120-1), καὶ δέπαϊ χρυσέῳ δειδίσκετο φώνησέν τε, σῖτον δ’ αἰδοίη ταμίη παρέθηκε φέρουσα (*Od.* 1.139-40 and elsewhere). Most instances of παρατίθημι (25x) are found in the *Odyssey*, and it appears only 3x in the *Iliad*, but this fact can be related to the thematic differences between the two Homeric epics.

<sup>784</sup> PIE \**pr-* is also continued in the Latin preverb *por-* ‘forth’ and may also underlie Germanic \**fur-* (Go. *faur-* and so on) whenever this means ‘forth, forward’.

<sup>785</sup> Besides, προτίθημι reappears only once: οἱ δ’ αὖτε σπόγγοισι πολυτρήτοισι τραπέζας νίζον καὶ πρότιθεν, τοὶ δὲ κρέα πολλὰ δατεῦντο “some [servants] washed the tables with porous sponges and put them in front [of the suitors], and others were portioning out meats in abundance” (*Od.* 1.112). Note that in this case, the object of πρότιθεν are tables rather than comestibles.

<sup>786</sup> For this reason, it is also discussed by Wathelet (1966: 171-2).



Homeric hymns. Moreover, the following system of name-epithet formulae proves a considerable antiquity of Ἀφροδίτη within the epic tradition:

- N. φιλομμειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη<sup>787</sup>, Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη
- A. χρυσῆν Ἀφροδίτην
- G. πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης, (φιλο-, καλλι-)στεφάνου Ἀφροδίτης
- D. (ικέλη) χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ.

As we have seen in chapter 6, Homer incidentally makes use of the *McL* licence to fit a word into the hexameter. But in all other forms with -πα- or -πο- where *McL* scansion is regular and appears in high quantities, the pre-form contained *\*r*. Therefore, a pre-form *\*Ap<sup>h</sup>rdītā* deserves serious consideration. A second reason for reconstructing *\*Ap<sup>h</sup>rdītā* is the Cretan form Αφορδιτα. This is mostly compared with Pamph. Αφορδισιως (~ Φορδισιως). The handbooks unanimously ascribe both forms with -ορ- to liquid metathesis.<sup>788</sup> But as was shown in chapter 3, -ορ- was probably the regular development of *\*r* after a labial consonant in Cretan (-αρ- in other environments), and the regular development of the syllabic liquids in Pamphylian cannot be determined with certainty. Neither in Cretan, nor in Pamphylian is there any secure evidence for liquid metathesis.<sup>789</sup> The Cyprian PN *a-po-ro-ti-si-yo* (*ICS*<sup>2</sup> 327) is ambiguous: it could represent either /Ap<sup>h</sup>rodīsio-/ or /Ap<sup>h</sup>ordīsio-/.

One could object to a pre-form *\*Ap<sup>h</sup>rdītā* that no forms with -αρ- or -πα- are attested in Ionic-Attic or West Greek. This is not a cogent objection, because the name may be a relic form that disseminated from Epic Greek.<sup>790</sup> The lack of attestations in Mycenaean does not prove a late, foreign origin either: this would be a mere *argumentum e silentio*.

Most attempts to etymologize the name of Aphrodite in IE terms are speculative or gratuitous.<sup>791</sup> In my view, IE etymologies for divine names are only acceptable if there is a direct formal correspondence to a similar deity in another IE language (e.g. *\*dieu- ph<sub>2</sub>ter-*), or if the name clearly refers to an important characteristic of the deity (as with Lat. *Venus*, which also means ‘love, charm’ as an appellative). For this reason, I consider all attempts to analyze Aphrodite as a compound with first member ἄφρος ‘foam’ to be futile.<sup>792</sup> Note that on a phonological level, this analysis explains neither the Cretan form Αφορδιτα<sup>793</sup> nor the Homeric scansion of Ἀφροδίτη. On the other hand, since there are no formal correspondences in other IE languages, a large number of scholars have thought that Aphrodite is of Near-Eastern provenance. But in spite of the numerous and indubitable traces of influence of the cult of Astarte on that of Aphrodite, a Semitic origin for her *name* could not be pointed out.<sup>794</sup>

<sup>787</sup> The epithet φιλομμειδῆς is practically restricted to Aphrodite.

<sup>788</sup> See e.g. Buck (1955: 64), Lejeune (1972: 142-3).

<sup>789</sup> See section 3.6.

<sup>790</sup> For a different explanation, see the end of this section.

<sup>791</sup> An overview of earlier attempts can be found in Witczak (1993).

<sup>792</sup> While ἄφρο- was analyzed as ‘foam’, the second member was connected in antiquity with δύω ‘to submerge’ by folk-etymology, for instance in Plato’s *Kratylos* (hence the later Ἀφροδίτη Ἀναδυομένη ‘Emerging Aphrodite’). As is well-known, this idea ultimately goes back to Hesiod’s story of Aphrodite’s birth in the *Theogony*. In more recent times, Maass, Pisani, and most recently Janda (2010: 65) maintained the analysis as a compound with a first member ἄφρος, seeing in the second member a participle *\*dītā-* ‘shining’, from the PIE root *\*dih<sub>2</sub>-* (as in Hom. δέατο ‘appeared’). A negative evaluation of these attempts is given, among others, by Witczak (1993, but he does accept *\*-dītā-* ‘shining’: see below) and *DELG* (s.v.).

<sup>793</sup> This was also noted by Witczak (1993).

<sup>794</sup> Thus also *DELG* s.v.; see especially the summary in Burkert (1985: 152-3 and the accompanying notes). There can be no doubt that Aphrodite and her cult took over many characteristics from the Near-Eastern goddess Astarte and her cult. But this does not imply that her name is of Near-Eastern origin. Attempts to derive it from Semitic roots such as *pṛt* ‘dove’ or *prḏ* ‘be fruitful’ (see the literature in Burkert 1985: 408 n. 18) are unconvincing. In the case of complete borrowing, the Greeks would most certainly have taken over a name like

The only IE etymology for Ἀφροδίτη that could make sense has been proposed by Witczak (1993). He suggested that the name is originally an epithet of the planet Venus. As the brightest object in the morning or evening sky, this heavenly body is closely associated with Dawn, and it is the single most important aspect of Aphrodite's Near-Eastern and Egyptian counterparts.<sup>795</sup> Once the identification with Astarte had been made, Aphrodite's cult on Cyprus could be influenced by that of her counterpart.

However, Witczak's reconstruction of "a Proto-Indo-European epithet *\*Ab<sup>h</sup>ro-dītā*, *\*Ab<sup>h</sup>or-dītā*" cannot be correct. The variation between his *\*ab<sup>h</sup>ro-* and *\*ab<sup>h</sup>or-* 'very' cannot be explained in PIE terms, and only masks the problem posed by the Cretan (and the Pamphylian) form.<sup>796</sup> But this problem could be mended if one reconstructs a PIE adverb *\*h<sub>2</sub>eb<sup>h</sup>-r* 'quickly, very' on the basis of the Celtic, Germanic, and Greek forms cited by Witczak.<sup>797</sup> The Early Greek name *\*Ap<sup>h</sup>r-dītā* would then mean 'sehr glänzend' (Witczak) or even 'who appears soon' (i.e. after sunset). The possibility of this etymology obviously depends on the question whether *\*-dītā-* can belong to δέατο 'appeared'. Its root can be reconstructed as *\*dih<sub>2</sub>-* and compared with Ved. *dīdāya* 'shines, radiates'. The compound in *\*-dītā-* could be compared with Ved. *su-dītī-* 'shining beautifully', and within Greek perhaps with ἀρίζηλος 'very bright' (7x Hom.).<sup>798</sup>

But an alternative possibility deserves consideration. It is not impossible that the variation attested in Pamphylian Αφορδισιως ~ Φορδισιως is due to substrate origin. In fact, Pamphylian attests the so-called "α-aphaeresis" only in the theonyms Athena, Aphrodite and Apollo (see Brixhe 1976: 43 for attestations), never in appellatives or in other proper names. This possibility is not mentioned by Beekes (*EDG* s.v.), but it would make excellent sense in the framework of his idea that the "prothetic α" in variants like ἀστραπή ~ Arc. στορπα is due to substrate influence. It could be assumed that the α-less forms are genuine dialectal Pamphylian, and that the forms with α-prothesis were influenced by another Greek dialect.

Whatever the ultimate origin of Aphrodite, how could a pre-form *\*Ap<sup>h</sup>r-dītā* turn up as Ἀφροδίτη in Epic Greek? An Aeolic origin is merely a theoretical possibility, because this does not explain the scansion of the form in Epic Greek.<sup>799</sup> Another possibility, given the importance of her cult on Cyprus, would be that a Cyprian outcome Ἀφροδίτα < *\*Ap<sup>h</sup>r-dītā* was eventually substituted for the Epic form which had retained *\*r* for some time. But structural influence of Cyprian on Ionic Epic is hard to substantiate. Again, by far the most natural scenario is a regular vocalization of Epic *\*r* to -po- after a labial consonant. It is quite possible that the precursor of ἑωσφόρος 'morning star' had replaced *\*Ap<sup>h</sup>r-dītā* in spoken Proto-Ionic, which would make *\*Ap<sup>h</sup>r-dītā* a poetic relic form. Indeed, in its only Homeric

---

Astarte or Ishtar. The discussion in Beekes ("As the goddess seems to be of oriental origin, the name probably comes from the East too", *EDG* s.v.) is inconclusive.

<sup>795</sup> Astarte is called Queen of Heaven in Near Eastern traditions, and etymologically means 'star'. Egyptian Hathor, often depicted as the goddess that carries the sun, is also the morning or evening star. The Greeks were well-aware of the Near Eastern influence on Aphrodite's cult: cf. [Pl.] *Epinomis* 987b.

<sup>796</sup> He supposes *\*ab<sup>h</sup>or-* to underlie both PGm. *\*abar* 'very' and PCelt. *\*abor* 'id.', and that *\*ab<sup>h</sup>ro-* is found in Thracian names with Αβρα-. With a question mark, he also compares Greek ἄφαρ 'suddenly, swiftly'. Note that the only evidence cited for *\*ab<sup>h</sup>ro-* (supposedly contained in Ἀφροδίτη) comes from a language about the historical phonology of which next to nothing is known.

<sup>797</sup> According to Beekes (*EDG* s.v.), ἄφαρ is Pre-Greek.

<sup>798</sup> This adjective qualifies the rays of a star in *Il.* 13.244 and 22.27, and modifies ἀστήρ in its only Pindaric attestation (*Ol.* 2.55). Its inclusion depends on whether one accepts the phonological development known as laryngeal breaking in Greek: cf. Olsen (2009), who argues that the breaking in ἀρίζηλος is due to the unaccented position of *\*-ih<sub>2</sub>-*.

<sup>799</sup> Indeed, Sappho uses the name a fair number of times, but this is obviously related to the subject matter of her poems. She also uses Κύπρις on four occasions (always in the vocative), a form which is much less frequent in Homer.

attestation (*Il.* 23.226), ἑωσφόρος is scanned with synizesis of -εω-, which is the expected vernacular outcome of \**āwos-* in polysyllabic words (cf. Haug 2002: 122-136).

### 7.2.8 ῥόδον, ῥοδόεντ- ~ Myc. *wo-do-we*

The simplex ῥόδον ‘rose’ is mainly attested in poetry, but it does not occur in Homer or Hesiod.<sup>800</sup> The only occurrences of the etymon in Early Greek Epic are the adjective ῥοδόεντ- ‘having roses in it’ (i.e. ‘rose-scented’) and the compounded epithets ῥοδοδάκτυλος ‘with rose-colored fingers’ (Hom.+) and ῥοδόπηγος ‘with rose-colored arms’ (Hes.). This suggests that the simplex ῥόδον was not alive anymore in the Epic tradition. In the form βρόδον, however, it is found at least three times in the preserved fragments of Sappho (fr. 2.6, 55.2, 96.13, and possibly in 94.13).<sup>801</sup> Like Ionic Epic, Sappho also attests the compounds βροδόπαγος and βροδοδάκτυλος. Finally, Mycenaean attests *wo-do-we* /wordowen/ or /wṛdowen/ ‘rose-scented’.

The Mycenaean form, which can be directly compared with Hom. ῥοδόεντ-, raises the question whether the original form may have been \**wṛdo-*. Lesbian βρόδον could be the regular outcome of \**wṛdo-* in that dialect, and Ionic-Attic ῥόδον would have to be an epicism. It is difficult, however, to find independent evidence for or against the assumption that ῥο- < \**wro-* derives from Epic \**r*. Since the word is relatively rare, the metrical evidence from Early Greek Epic cannot decide the issue.<sup>802</sup> Etymological comparanda offer no immediate help either. The etymological dictionaries (Frisk, *DELG* s.v.) compare the Iranian pre-form \**wṛda-* to be reconstructed for e.g. Pers. *gul* ‘id.’ and the borrowing Arm. *vard* ‘id.’.<sup>803</sup> Thus, the word may have been borrowed as \**wṛdo-* into Mycenaean from some Near-Eastern source, but this is not quite certain.

The only Homeric attestation of ῥοδόεντ- is |<sub>P</sub> ῥοδόεντι δὲ χρίεν ἐλαίῳ (*Il.* 23.186), after the main caesura. The compound ῥοδοδάκτυλος is exclusively found in the verse-final formula ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥώς (27x), which is always preceded by a long syllable except in *Od.* 5.121. Given the metrical behavior of κραδίη (section 6.1), it is interesting that ῥ- is hardly used to generate length by position in this formula: this could be a coincidence, but it is at least compatible with a pre-form \**wṛdo-daktulo-*.<sup>804</sup> The compound ῥοδόπηγος is attested as a traditional epithet of young women in Hesiod’s catalogue of Nereids (Ἰππονόη ῥοδόπηγος *Th.*

<sup>800</sup> In prose, ῥόδον is attested in Hdt. (twice) and Hp.

<sup>801</sup> The digamma generates length by position in ἄ δ’ <ἐ>έρσα κάλα κέχεται τεθά|λαισι δὲ βρόδα κᾶπαλ’ ἄν|θρυσκα καὶ μελίλωτος ἀνθεμώδης (fr. 96.12-4). On the spelling βρόδον in Sappho, and on the loss of digamma in the Lesbian vernacular, see the extensive discussion in Bowie (1981: 74-87).

<sup>802</sup> If the original form was \**wrodo-*, we would expect to find traces of avoidance of *McL* scansion, and a restriction of the available case forms to the biceps. On the other hand, in case of an original \**wṛdo-*, one would expect to find that the form is used in all possible case forms, including those of which the ending is long by nature, and which require *McL* scansion. In support of the second option, there are some indications that the Gs. and Gp. were used with *McL* scansion after |<sub>T</sub>: οἷα φέρουσ’ ὄραι, ἔν τε κρόκῳ, ἔν θ’ ὑακίνθῳ, ἔν τε ἴφ θαλέθοντι ῥόδου τ’ ἐνὶ ἄνθει καλῶ (*Cypr.* fr. 4.4), and ὄζει ἰών, ὄζει δὲ ῥόδων, ὄζει δ’ ὑακίνθου (Hermippus Com. fr. 82.8 Kock, geometric verse), and also in some post-Classical sources. Cf. also the colon στεφάνοισι ῥόδων (*Simon.* fr. 1.2), which consists of two anapests. Finally, one could point at *h. Dem.* 6 and *Thgn.* 1.537, where the plural ῥόδα is placed after |<sub>P</sub>, but ῥ- does not cause length by position. All in all, however, this evidence is too scanty.

<sup>803</sup> The Armenian form cannot be directly compared with Greek \**wṛdo-*, because \**w-* would yield *g-* in inherited Armenian words. To compare ῥόδον within Greek with ῥαδινός ‘supple’, of plants, their stalks, spears, a whip, and human feet or hands (poetic, Hom.+) or ῥοδανός (Homeric hapax, qualifying a reed) would be unwarranted, because of the semantic difference and the fact that these forms have no clear etymology of their own.

<sup>804</sup> In this context, the occurrence of χρυσόθρονος Ἥώς (in the same metrical slot only in *Od.* 14.502, where χρ- generates length by position) is interesting. This syntagm further occurs in a repeated verse ending in χρυσόθρονος ἦλυθεν Ἥώς (4x *Od.*, χρ- again generates length by position), with a variant χρυσόθρονος ἦρπασεν Ἥώς (*Od.* 15.250). One wonders whether this points to an original distribution between the two traditional epithets \**k<sup>h</sup>rūsot<sup>h</sup>ronos* (CC-) and \**wṛdodaktulos* (CV-), where \**wṛdodaktulos* was used to avoid overlength. This would, of course, require a more extensive discussion of the avoidance of overlength in Homer.

246, Εὐνίκη ῥοδόπηγος *Th.* 251) and in other Hesiodeic fragments (fr. 35.14, 46.13, 251a.1). Again, the fact that ῥοδόπηγος is always preceded by a long syllable (proper names in -η) is compatible with a pre-form *\*wṛdo-p<sup>(h)</sup>āk<sup>h</sup>us*.<sup>805</sup>

The difference between Myc. *wo-do*<sup>o</sup> and the alphabetic forms is usually accounted for by assuming liquid metathesis, but this remains pure speculation. In view of the above, the possibility that ῥόδον contains an artificial Epic reflex of *\*wṛdo-* deserves serious consideration. The metrical evidence from Early Greek Epic is fully compatible with such an assumption, even if it does not offer any conclusive positive support. In this context, it is important that Hom. ῥοδόεντ- and Myc. *wo-do-we* both qualify a fragrant oil, which is a typical item of high culture.<sup>806</sup> This perfect semantic match between Homer and Mycenaean is best explained by assuming that a pre-form */wṛdowent-/* was borrowed from Mycenaean (or Mycenaean Epic) by the Ionic Epic tradition. The absence of *\*wṛdo-* in the Proto-Ionic vernacular need not surprise if the word is indeed a Mycenaean borrowing from Near-Eastern luxury culture.<sup>807</sup>

### 7.3 Other forms with -po-

#### 7.3.1 ἀνδροτήτα

The metrically anomalous line-end |<sub>H</sub> ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἦβην (with trochaic ἀνδρο- occupying the biceps of the fourth foot) only occurs in the two most important and most elaborate death scenes of the *Iliad*, those of Patroklos (16.856-7) and Hektor (22.362-3):

ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ ῥεθέων παμένη Ἀΐδος δὲ βεβήκει  
ὄν πότμον γοόωσα λιποῦσ' ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἦβην.

“And his soul flew out of his nostrils and went to Hades, bewailing its fate, having left behind masculine vigor and the force of youth.”

Beside this repeated pair of lines, ἀνδροτήτα occurs once more in the verse Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτήτά τε καὶ μένος ἦϋ “longing for the masculine vigor and good spirit of Patroklos” (*Il.* 24.6), where Achilles mourns over his lost comrade. This is mostly considered a secondary adaptation of the other attestation.<sup>808</sup> Although there is some discussion about the precise meaning of ἀνδροτήτα, I think that ‘(masculine) vigor’ is the best approximation.<sup>809</sup> On the surface, there are three problems with |<sub>H</sub> ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἦβην in Homeric Epic:

<sup>805</sup> Leumann (1950: 18 n. 9) thinks that ῥοδόπηγος was secondarily formed after ῥοδοδάκτυλος, but his reasoning, based on an argument from silence (ῥοδόπηγος would not have originally referred to a *Naturerscheinung*, as Hom. ῥοδοδάκτυλος does), does not seem cogent to me. On the contrary, the fact that ῥοδόπηγος is found in both Hesiod and Sappho (βροδόπαχος) suggests that the epithet is traditional.

<sup>806</sup> After Homer, the stem ῥοδόεντ- only occurs in B. *Dith.* 2.34 and E. *IA.* 1297.

<sup>807</sup> Given that βρόδον, βροδόπαχος, and βροδοδάκτυλος are all attested in Sappho, and that βρόδο- /wṛdo-/ would be the regular Lesbian outcome of *\*wṛdo-*, an alternative explanation of ῥόδον could depart from an Aeolic intermediary. But: (1) the word may have been preserved in the Aeolic and Ionic traditions independently after the collapse of Mycenaean civilization; (2) ῥόδον may be explained within Ionic Epic if we assume that Epic *\*r* developed to -po- after labial consonants (including *\*w*); (3) the assumption of an Aeolic intermediary is impossible or unlikely in most other Epic words with -po-.

<sup>808</sup> In *Il.* 24.6, τε καὶ μένος ἦϋ ‘and good spirit’ is clearly used as an equivalent of καὶ ἦβην.

<sup>809</sup> In Latacz’s view (1965), ἀνδροτήτα means ‘corporeal existence’. *LSJ* translates ‘manhood’ (in the archaic English sense of “the unity of Godhead and manhood in Christ”). This translation is ultimately based on the scholia, where ἀνδροτήτα is glossed with ἀνθρωπότητα. The scholia expressly state that ἀνδροτήτα is not the same as ἀνδρεία ‘manliness, courage’. Leaf (ad loc.) assumed only a vague difference in sense between ἡνορέη ‘manliness, courage’ and ἀνδροτής ‘manhood’, “retaining the vaguer sense”. But as Latacz remarks, it is impossible that the sense of ἀνδροτήτα was vague, because it was pregnantly used on two decisive occasions in the story of the *Iliad*.

A slightly different description of Patroklos’ death is τὸν γε λίπη ψυχὴ τε καὶ αἰὼν “[when] his soul and vital force will leave him” (*Il.* 16.453). In view of this, the meaning of ἀνδροτήτα can be clarified by juxtaposing

1. ἀνδροτῆτα does not scan properly
2. ἀνδροτῆτα seems to have a non-Ionic vocalization πο < \**r*
3. the word-formation and meaning of ἀνδροτῆτα are synchronically opaque.

Interpretations of the line-end ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἦβην have almost become articles of faith, not only for scholars pleading for Mycenaean origins of the Epic tradition, but also for proponents of the proto-hexameter hypothesis.<sup>810</sup> It is not my aim to discuss all previous explanations of ἀνδροτῆτα, but only to review those arguments relevant to the present discussion. As is well-known, Mühlestein (1958) argued that the scansion of ἀνδροτῆτα can only be explained if the form entered Epic Greek as \**anrāt-*. This was subsequently utilized by scholars like Ruijgh and Wathélet as an argument in favor of a pre-Mycenaean origin of epic poetry, in a verse-form much like the dactylic hexameter.<sup>811</sup> This line of reasoning was followed by West (1988) and canonicized in Janko (1992 = *comm. Kirk*, part IV). Many other scholars, however, found the time lapse of seven or eight centuries unlikely.<sup>812</sup> Tichy (1981) argued that ἀνδροτῆτα is not a phonological but a metrical archaism, and used the form to argue for Berg's proto-hexameter theory. She supposes that the lines in question had a trochaic fourth foot in the proto-hexameter. This view has found a number of adherents in the secondary literature, but it cannot be upheld for a very simple reason. As has recently been stressed, all Tichy's examples for supposedly preserved pherecratian line-ends are also candidates to have contained \**r* at an earlier stage.<sup>813</sup> The idea can therefore be rejected on the basis of Occam's razor.<sup>814</sup>

Let us start with the morphology of ἀνδροτῆτα. Latacz assumed that the first member of ἀνδροτῆτα always contained the thematic vowel: he thinks that the form was “bewusst für gerade diesen Zusammenhang geprägt” and “fraglos eine Augenblicksbildung” (1965: 69). This is problematic for more than one reason. First of all, it presupposes that a nasal could be omitted from pronunciation or oral recitation (“Auslassung des *N*”, Latacz 1965: 66, or “débilité de la nasale en grec”, Chantraine 1942: 110), which is difficult to accept. Furthermore, in words that never contained \**r*, *McL* scansion would only be tolerated as an incidental licence. But ἀνδροτῆτα occurs three times, in two different metrical slots, and in verses that are clearly designed to describe a heroic death in a monumental manner. Few scholars would be inclined to accept a recent creation of ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἦβην, in view of the central thematic role of the passages involved in the *Iliad* as a whole (the wrath and imminent death of Achilles). A final counterargument against a recent formation is the relic meaning ‘vigor’, which is perhaps preserved in a compound like ἀγήνωρ, but not in ἀνὴρ ‘man’.

---

passages comparing the fate of the ψυχή with that of the θυμός after death. I would compare especially τὸν γ' ἐρυγόντα λίπ' ὅστέα θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ (*Il.* 20.406) and λίπε δ' ὅστέα θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ (*Od.* 12.414). Here, the compound ἀγήνωρ ‘vigorous’, probably from \**aga-* + \**ānōr* ‘having great vigor’, contains precisely the etymon of ἀνδροτῆτα.

<sup>810</sup> Heubeck's proposal (1972) that \**r* was retained until the Early Dark Ages has not been taken very seriously thus far. I think, however, that he was essentially right (see below).

<sup>811</sup> In fact, Mühlestein himself notes (1958: 224): “Demnach muss schon vor der Mitte des zweiten Jahrtausends in griechischen Hexametern von Mannheit gesungen und ein Teil des epischen Formelschatzes geprägt worden sein, oder *r* hätte in der frühen Epik länger gelebt als im Mykenischen der Archive.”

<sup>812</sup> In the words of Heubeck (1972: 75): “The accusative \**anrātā* shows the prosodical sequence u u – u, which is usable within the metrical structure of the hexameter and fits the formula. But since, according to the current opinion, the vocalization of *r* is already to be found in Mycenaean times, we should be obliged to date the origin of the formula and at least of a certain part of epic formulaic diction as Pre-Mycenaean. Many scholars, it is true, are inclined to trace the tradition of epic diction back into the Mycenaean period, but are they willing to extend this line backwards into the middle of the second millennium B.C.?”

<sup>813</sup> Barnes (2011: 9-10): “A problem with Tichy's approach to these scansions has always been the implausibility of a scenario whereby not a single example of the phenomenon goes back to a form that would *never* have scanned properly.” Cf. also West (2011).

<sup>814</sup> See section 6.2 for other points of criticism of Tichy's approach.

We may therefore depart from a pre-form *\*an̥r-tāt-*. But what was the morphological makeup of this form? Barnes (2011: 5) objects to this reconstruction that abstracts in *-tāt-* may, in Greek but also in Indo-Iranian and Latin, in principle only be formed to adjectives.<sup>815</sup> In Greek, however, the stem *ἀνδρ-* only occurs as a substantive.<sup>816</sup> But this is only a seeming problem, because the possibility must be considered that *\*an̥r-tāt-* was derived already in PIE from an adjective *\*h<sub>2</sub>ner-* ‘vigorous’, as has recently been proposed by Pike (2011: 175) on the basis of a consideration of derivatives of *\*h<sub>2</sub>ner-* in Indo-Iranian.<sup>817</sup> Pike also addresses the suffixal accent of *ἀνδροτιῆτα*, which is synchronically unproductive in Homeric Greek.<sup>818</sup> But just like the formation and meaning of *ἀνδροτιῆτα* may be considered archaisms, so can its accentuation: as expected on general grounds, the only full grade of the pre-form *\*h<sub>2</sub>n̥r-téh<sub>2</sub>t-* carries the accent.

In conclusion, there is nothing wrong with an inherited formation *\*h<sub>2</sub>n̥r-téh<sub>2</sub>t-*. This leaves us with a problem of scansion, to be solved within the framework of the dactylic hexameter. But before we depart from *ἀνδροτιῆτα*, it is necessary to address an editorial problem. A widespread view has it that the v.l. *ἀδροτιῆτα* (with *McL* scansion), rather than the most frequent ms. form *ἀνδροτιῆτα*, was the form sung by Homer.<sup>819</sup> The evidence for the different readings has been treated by Latacz (1965). The most frequent reading in the mss.

<sup>815</sup> A few remarks on Barnes’ recent article on *ἀνδροτιῆτα*. He translates *ἀνδροτιῆτα* as ‘the fact of not dying’, and then compares the Homeric formula *ἀνδροτιῆτα καὶ ἥβην* with the Avestan pair *aməratāt- hauruuatāt-* ‘principle of not-dying and wholeness/health’. The expected corresponding Greek form to Av. *aməratāt- < aməratātāt- < PIE \*n-mrto-teh<sub>2</sub>t-*, after liquid vocalization, would be *\*ἄμβροτοτιῆτ-*. Barnes then assumes that haplology yielded a Greek form *\*ἄμ(β)ροτιῆτ-*, and reasons that “since Greek nowhere attests derivatives of *ambroto-* in a similar meaning (they always mean ‘immortal’), it is easy to see how our formula became incomprehensible at a certain point, and hence in need of further updating (*\*ἄμ(β)ροτιῆτ- → ἀνδροτιῆτ-*)” (2011: 12). He rejects the traditional reconstruction *\*h<sub>2</sub>n̥r-téh<sub>2</sub>t- > ἀνδροτιῆτ-*, objecting that its accentuation is unexpected (as opposed to barytone *κακότης*), and that the unmetrical form *ἀνδροτιῆτα* would have come about too early to be preserved into the *Iliad*. The latter objection rests on the claim that the *d*-epenthesis in *ἀνδροτιῆτ-* was pre-Mycenaean, whereas the *b*-epenthesis in *ἄμβροτος* is relatively late. As we will see below, however, the former assumption does not follow from the evidence. Barnes’ proposal requires us to make several non-trivial assumptions, to say the least. Does it make sense to translate *ἀνδροτιῆτα* as ‘the fact of not dying’ in any of the Homeric passages? Did *ἄμβροτος* always mean ‘immortal’ in Homeric Greek, or was Thieme right when he translated this word and *ἄμβρόσιος* as ‘Lebenskraft enthaltend’? In the latter case, there would have been no compelling semantic reason to “update” the formula. Last but not least, the assumed haplology *\*ἄμβρο(το)τιῆτ- > \*ἄμβροτιῆτ-* is not evident at all. Since the traditional reconstruction of *ἀνδροτιῆτ-* from *\*h<sub>2</sub>ner-* ‘vigorous, virile’ does not yield any chronological problems, as we will see below, Barnes’ construction can be left aside.

<sup>816</sup> This objection has sometimes been answered by pointing at the predicative usage of *ἀνὴρ*, as in Homeric *ἀνέρες ἔστε, φίλοι* ‘Be men, my friends!’, i.e. ‘be brave!’ (cf. Ruijgh 1997: 42). But as Barnes points out, such an inner-Greek derivation from *ἀνὴρ* is problematic because *ἀνδροτιῆτα* does not mean ‘courage, bravery’.

<sup>817</sup> Cf. Av. *hunara-* ‘art, skill’, OP. *uvnr /ūnara-* (n.) ‘ability’, Ved. *sūnára-* ‘vigorous, beautiful’. In Pike’s view, the Iranian forms are possessive formations, derived from an adjective *\*h<sub>1</sub>su-h<sub>2</sub>ner-* by adding *\*-ó-*. The Vedic adjective would be a thematized form of the same underlying adjective. Further, Ved. *sūn̥rta-* ‘in full vigor’ and OIr. *nert* ‘strength’ are taken to point to a PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>nr-tó-*. Departing from these forms, Pike proposes that OAv. *hunarātāt-* ‘skill, talent’ < *\*h<sub>1</sub>su-h<sub>2</sub>ner-teh<sub>2</sub>t-* “could then reflect a relatively old *tāt*-abstract built directly to the adjective stem without any intervening vowel, just like Hom. *ἀνδροτιῆτα < \*h<sub>2</sub>n̥r-tāt-*. There is no need to invoke independent haplological developments in the preforms *\*h<sub>1</sub>su-h<sub>2</sub>ner-to-tāt-* and *\*h<sub>2</sub>n̥r-to-tāt-*. Instead, *hunarātāt-* and *ἀνδροτιῆτα* could be very old examples of the *tāt*-suffix added directly to a consonant stem. In fact, *ἀνδροτιῆτα < \*h<sub>2</sub>n̥r-tāt-* and *hunarātāt- < \*h<sub>1</sub>su-h<sub>2</sub>ner-tāt-* might be the only *tāt*-abstract word-equation datable to PIE, though showing different root vocalism” (2011: 175) Even if Pike’s genetic equation between *ἀνδροτιῆτα* and OAv. *hunarātāt-* is difficult to prove, the idea that *ἀνδροτιῆτα < \*h<sub>2</sub>n̥r-teh<sub>2</sub>t-* contains a relic use of *\*h<sub>2</sub>ner-* as an adjective ‘strong, vigorous’ seems attractive to me.

<sup>818</sup> The only other oxytone Greek forms in *\*-tāt-* are Homeric *βραδυτής*, *ταχυτής*, and *δυσιότης*. It is likely that *ταχυτής* ‘fastness’ arose beside *τάχος* ‘speed, fastness’ after *βραδυτής* ‘slowness’. The hapax *βράδος* (X.) is a late nonce formation. For this functional difference between *τάχος* and *βραδυτής*, see de Lamberterie (1989). Pike further suggests that the productive barytone accentuation of Greek abstracts in *\*-tāt-* may have originated in forms derived from thematic stems, such as *φιλότης*.

<sup>819</sup> E.g. Wackernagel (1969: 1116), Chantraine (1942: 110), and Latacz (1965).

(ubiquitous in the Vulgate and the testimonia) is ἀνδροτήτα. According to Latacz's count, the two variants ἀδροτήτα and ἀδροτήτα are only found in 21 younger mss.<sup>820</sup> Of these, the form ἀδροτήτα is clearly due to secondary influence of the adjective ἀδρός, which means 'ripe, mature' (e.g. of plants).<sup>821</sup> As for the other two forms, some scholars have assumed that ἀδροτήτα is an incidental and late metrical correction, and that ἀνδροτήτα was Homeric.<sup>822</sup> Others think that ἀνδροτήτα is a trivial normalization of ἀδροτήτα, and that the latter form was sung by Homer.<sup>823</sup> The questions involved are intricate, and the issue need not be resolved here. Even if the ἀνδροτήτα of our editions is justified, the early Homeric transmission may well have had ἀδροτήτα or \*ἀνροτήτα for a certain period of time, before this form was replaced by ἀνδροτήτα in one authoritative Homeric text early enough to influence almost the entire subsequent tradition.<sup>824</sup>

As we will now see, there is no chronological problem with the assumption that the scansion of an original \**anr̥tāt*- lives on in Homeric ἀνδροτήτα, or even with the assumption that Homer still pronounced [anrotēta]. Most previous treatments of ἀνδροτήτα have stressed that both the vocalization of \**r* and the epenthesis of *-d-* in original \**-nr-* had already taken place in Mycenaean (e.g. Ruijgh 1995, recently Barnes 2011).<sup>825</sup> The scansion of ἀνδροτήτα would then have to be a remnant of pre-Mycenaean Epic. Indeed, the *d*-epenthesis appears in Mycenaean in the forms *a-di-ri-ja-te* /andriantei/ (or /-tē/) 'with the image of a man' (Ds. or Is., to be compared with Class. ἀνδρίας 'statue of a man') and PN *a-re-ka-sa-da-ra* /Aleksandrā/. On the other hand, Barnes shows that the epenthesis in inlauting *-mr-* (> -μῆρ-) and anlauting *mr-* (> βρ-) postdates our first attestations of many Greek dialects (see section 3.2.2), among others in Naxian μροτοισιν (7<sup>th</sup> c.). He therefore contrasts the development of

<sup>820</sup> The conjecture \*δροτήτα, found in the older literature, is clearly incorrect and can be discarded (see Latacz 1965: 63f. for discussion). Latacz further remarks that he could not easily determine, on the basis of the editions, which mss. had ἀδρ- and which had ἀδρ- (1965: 62f. n. 2).

<sup>821</sup> See Latacz (1965: 76) and Wathelet (1966: 170 n. 5). The abstract ἀδρότης first occurs in Thphr.

<sup>822</sup> On itself, it is possible to assume that 21 copyists independently corrected the unmetrical form ἀνδροτήτα into ἀδροτήτα or ἀδροτήτα. However, in most of the 21 mss. with ἀδροτήτα or ἀδροτήτα, this form occurs only in once place, and the other two places have ἀνδροτήτα; only two of these mss. have ἀδροτήτα or ἀδροτήτα in all three places (Latacz 1965: 62-63). If all individual copyists independently made the metrical correction to ἀδροτήτα, one would in Latacz's view expect more consistency on their part. One also wonders whether an ἀνδροτήτα could be changed into the aspirated form ἀδροτήτα without the intermediary of ἀδροτήτα, as Tichy supposed (1981: 41 and 46). Barnes (2011: 1) states that the variant ἀδροτήτα was "designed to heal the problem, and therefore clearly secondary, as all editors have recognized." The last remark is factually incorrect: on the editions which print ἀδροτήτα, see Latacz (1965: 67 n. 2). The first inference is circular: one might just as well argue (with Latacz) that ἀνδροτήτα was designed to heal the *lexical* problem presented by ἀδροτήτα.

<sup>823</sup> In Latacz's view, "Der Grund dafür (...), dass die Hauptmasse der uns überlieferten Hss. dennoch ἀνδροτήτα mit Nasal hat, wird darin zu suchen sein, dass die deutlich empfundene Zugehörigkeit des Wortes zum Stamme \**anr̥* auch im Schriftbild unmissverständlich zum Ausdruck gebracht werden sollte." (1965: 66). Ruijgh reasons as follows: "Parfois, on trouve ἀδροτήτα: certains philologues y ont vu le dérivé de ἀδρός 'solide, robuste'. Si la vulgate fournit la graphie 'étymologique' ἀνδροτήτα, c'est sans doute pour éviter de telles confusions" (1995: 89 n. 311). If the first fixed text of the *Iliad* had ἀδροτήτα, one would have to assume that this opaque form was subsequently normalized as ἀνδροτήτα in most of the tradition (because the mss. of Plato only have this form), but that it also remained alive, be it marginally, in some part of the manuscript tradition. It is difficult to say whether this scenario is viable.

<sup>824</sup> It is sometimes thought that ἀδροτήτα came into being when epic singers, before the fixation of the Iliadic text, substituted it for the phonologically expected outcome ἀνδροτήτα under metrical pressure. In the words of Ruijgh (1997: 43): "Les aèdes y ont remédié en omettant la prononciation de la nasale. Les manuscrits du texte homérique présentent en effet la variante ἀδροτήτα (...)." Two years before, Ruijgh speculated that the pair ἄβροτος : ἄμβροτος may have been a model for the creation of an artificial form ἀδροτήτα, as well as for ἄβροτάζομεν (1995: 89, following Wathelet 1966). This is unlikely (ἄβροτος is a hapax) and, as we have seen, unnecessary.

<sup>825</sup> Interestingly, Ruijgh recalled the early date for the vocalization in his 1997 article (p. 41, with reference to Risch's theory of an undifferentiated South Greek in the Mycenaean Era).

the epenthetic consonant in *\*-mr-* with that in *\*-nr-*.<sup>826</sup> This argument is not cogent, because both Mycenaean examples for *d*-epenthesis concern *\*-nr-* of intervocalic origin, and because the outcome of *\*-nr-* in Mycenaean does not show epenthesis, cf. the PN *a-no-qo-ta* < *\*anr<sub>h</sub>-k<sup>wh</sup>ontā-* and the abstract *a-no-qa-si-ja* (both with /anor-/ or /anr<sub>h</sub>-/).<sup>827</sup> Moreover, all examples for *μρo-* in archaic inscriptions derive from a pre-form with *\*mr<sub>h</sub>-*. This means that both *\*-nr<sub>h</sub>-* and *\*-mr<sub>h</sub>-* may have remained intact without an epenthetic consonant in Epic Greek, where *\*r<sub>h</sub>* was retained longer until after the Mycenaean period. In other words, Homer may have preserved not only *μροτοῖσιν*, *μροτῶν*, *ἀμρόταξομεν*, but even *\*ἀνρακάς*, *\*ἀνρατῆτα* καὶ ἦβην, and *Ἐνυαλίῳ* *\*ἀνραφόντη*.<sup>828</sup> There is no reason, then, to separate the scansion of *ἀνδροτῆτα* from that of *ἀβροτάξομεν*: the only difference between the two forms found in our editions is that *ἀβροτάξομεν* was maintained in the ms. tradition, while *ἀδροτῆτα* was eliminated.<sup>829</sup> Already Wackernagel did not consider the metrical issue to be of too much importance.<sup>830</sup>

We now have to ask how an Epic input form *\*anr<sub>h</sub>tāt-* may have turned up as *ἀνδροτῆτα*. Upon a mechanical reconstruction, the form could be taken to be an Aeolicism. This is unlikely for three reasons with which we are already familiar (see section 7.2): *ἀνδροτῆτα* is absent from Lesbian poetry, *McL* scansion is unknown in that genre, and the form has non-recessive accentuation. A Mycenaean origin has been broadly assumed (e.g. Ruijgh, *passim*), but this is hard to reconcile with the result obtained in chapter 2: the regular outcome of *\*r<sub>h</sub>* in Mycenaean was either preserved *r* or *-or-* (cf. the compounds with *a-no-* cited above). If Mycenaean did preserve *r<sub>h</sub>*, the Epic form *\*anr<sub>h</sub>tāt-* may have originated there. But whether this is true or not is perhaps a secondary question, because the form can also be explained within Ionic Epic. Heubeck's solution (1972: 76) deserves to be quoted in full:

“It seems better to assume an origin of epic poetry in the period of migrations between 1200 and 1000 at the earliest; the formula whose later-developed form is found in Π 857 = X 363 and Ω 6 may have been amongst others to be formed at this time when spoken *r<sub>h</sub>* was still preserved. Then, with and after the consolidation of the tribes and ethnic groups in their later habitats, the vocalization of *r<sub>h</sub>* may have ensued, besides many other phonetic developments which contributed to the dialectal differentiation of these groups. That it did not result in *\*anratāta* > *\*ἀνδρατῆτα* may be due to the analogical influence of recent compounds with thematized *ἀνδρ-o-* as their first part, like *Ἀνδροκλῆς* (in contrast to the correct Ion.

<sup>826</sup> “... the development (...) happened considerably later in (-)mr- sequences. Evidence for a relatively late development of epenthesis in (-)mr- sequences contrasts with the complete absence of any instances of -nr- (where epenthesis was very early)” (Barnes 2011: 10).

<sup>827</sup> In spite of Barnes' tendentious remark (2011: 2) that “no one seriously believes this today”, an /anr<sub>h</sub>-/ may underlie the Mycenaean forms with *a-no-* (see chapter 2).

<sup>828</sup> I agree with Barnes (2011: 10), who concludes from the inscriptions preserving (-)μρ- that “The eventual development of epenthesis will have been (...) a development properly speaking of the earliest oral and/or written transmission of a relatively fixed text (...)” I disagree, however, with his separate treatment of forms continuing *\*-nr<sub>h</sub>-*.

<sup>829</sup> It is possible that *d*-epenthesis in intervocalic *\*-nr-* was earlier than *b*-epenthesis in intervocalic or prevocalic (-)mr- (cf. perhaps Myc. *o-mi-ri-o-i*). It is not possible, however, to tell with certainty whether the epenthesis in Epic *\*-nro-* < *\*-nr<sub>h</sub>-* was earlier than that in Epic *\*-mro-* < *\*-mr<sub>h</sub>-*. On phonetic grounds, to be sure, this could be expected because [n] and [r] are homorganic, [m] and [r] are not. But in any case, the problem of scansion in *ἀνδροτῆτα* first occurred after (1) the vocalization of Epic *\*r<sub>h</sub>* and (2) the epenthesis in the ensuing sequences *\*-mro-* and *\*-nro-* (*\*-nra-*). It is therefore possible to return to Wackernagel's view (see the next footnote) on the spelling -δρ- and -βρ-.

<sup>830</sup> “Ohne Grund hat man sich über die Kurzmessung der ersten Silbe von *ἀνδροτῆτα* ereifert; das sicher auf *amr<sub>h</sub>t-* beruhende *ἀβροτάξομεν* K 65 zeigt unwiderleglich, dass eine Silbe mit kurzem Vokal, dem ursprünglich Nasal + *r* folgte, bei Homer vor der Silbenfolge u – u kurz gemessen werden konnte. Wie man das in der Schreibung zum Ausdruck bringen soll, ist eine Frage für sich. Wegen *ἀβροτάξομεν* ist *\*ἀδροτῆτα* das Wahrscheinlichste.” (Wackernagel 1909: 58 n. 1). Note that we are dealing with a unique example: the scansion of *ἀ(ν)δροτῆτα* is the only direct trace of *\*-nr<sub>h</sub>-* in Alphabetic Greek.



development *\*anrkas* > ἀνδρακάς etc.); but ἀνδροτήτα could also be a loan-form from Aeolic, where this form would be normal: *\*anrtāta* > *\*anrotāta* > ἀνδροτήτα.”

Apart from the possibility of a loan from Aeolic, which I consider to be unlikely, I fully agree with Heubeck. In my view, then, ἀνδροτήτα is an archaism of Ionic Epic that underwent the regular phonological development of Epic *\*r* to -ρα-, and was subsequently influenced by compounds with ἀνδρο-. We may conclude that ἀνδροτήτα ‘vigor’ is a semantic, metrical, and morphological archaism. It was fixed in its metrical slot when the form was still *\*anrtāta*. Within the confines of Epic Greek, this form was maintained much longer than is usually assumed.

### 7.3.2 Ἐνυαλίῳ Ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ

The four-word verse Μηριόνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ Ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ ‘Meriones equal to man-slaying Enualios’ is repeated four times in the *Iliad*. As it stands, drastic measures are required to fit this verse into Epic metre, e.g. a combination of epic correption and crasis in -ῶ ἄ-.<sup>831</sup> It is therefore widely agreed that the formula originally looked different.

Since Mühlestein (1958), it is clear that this naming-verse for the Cretan leader Meriones is a survival from Mycenaean times.<sup>832</sup> Not only do the Mycenaean archives contain the name of the war-god *E-nu-wa-ri-jo* /Enūalio-/; the pre-form of Ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ was identified by Mühlestein with the Mycenaean PN *A-no-qo-ta*, to be interpreted as /Anork<sup>wh</sup>ontā-/ or /Anrk<sup>wh</sup>ontā-/. He further noted that names in -*qo-ta* (e.g. *da-i-qo-ta*) are frequent in the tablets. Thus, Ἐνυαλίῳ Ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ is best analyzed as a substitution for (the outcome of) *\*Enūaliōi anrk<sup>wh</sup>ontāi*, a pre-form which would solve all metrical problems in a natural way. The model for the substitution of ἀνδρεϊ- was clearly διακτόρῳ ἀργεϊφόντης, the frequent verse-final naming formula of Hermes. Although the reconstruction and original lexical meaning of ἀργεϊφόντης are contested as well,<sup>833</sup> it is important that this formula is metrically unproblematic.<sup>834</sup>

The pre-form *\*anrk<sup>wh</sup>ontāi* also solves problems of morphology and lexicon. Whereas a first member ἀνδρεϊ- cannot be accounted for by normal patterns of Greek word formation, the reconstructed form with first member *\*anr-* < *\*h<sub>2</sub>nr-* would be paralleled by Ved. *nṛ-hán-* ‘man-slaying’ < PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>nr-g<sup>wh</sup>en-*, epithet of the *vadhá-* ‘lethal weapon’ of the Maruts.<sup>835</sup> In lexical terms, it must be asked why Homer would form another adjective meaning ‘man-slaying’ if he already disposes of the synonymous ἀνδροφόνος (15x), which suits the demands of the hexameter well. Since the addition of -*tā-* in agent nouns is typical for Mycenaean, it seems likely that ἀνδροφόνος was the form inherited by Ionic Epic, and that *\*Enūaliōi anrk<sup>wh</sup>ontāi* was borrowed from Mycenaean.<sup>836</sup>

<sup>831</sup> Emergency solutions that cannot be upheld are: (1) to read Ἐνυάλῳ, where -λυ- would function as a single consonant (thus Tichy 1981: 40), (2) to scan Ἐνυαλίῳ with synizesis of -υα-. Cf. Watkins (1987: 289).

<sup>832</sup> Mühlestein’s proposal has been approvingly cited by many scholars, including Wathélet (1966), West (1982), Watkins (1987), Leukart (1994: 51-6), and Ruijgh (most recently 1995: 85-88 and 1997: 41-2). Ruijgh bases his analysis of ἀνδροτήτα on Ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ because the latter is more ostensibly of Mycenaean origin. Untenable speculations about a recent origin of the line are found in Tichy (1981: 40).

<sup>833</sup> See e.g. de Lamberterie (1990: 326-7), Leukart (1994: 51-6), Watkins (1995: 383-4).

<sup>834</sup> Tichy (1981: 40) states that the replacement of ἀνδρο- with ἀνδρεϊ- (after the model of Ἀργεϊφόντῃ) could only take place if original *\*Ἀνδροφόντῃ* stood in the same metrical slot as Ἀργεϊφόντῃ, i.e. after |<sub>B</sub>. This objection is not cogent: at best, we can infer that the scansion of the replacing form Ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ must have been modelled on that of Ἀργεϊφόντῃ.

<sup>835</sup> Cf. Schmitt (1967: 124-8), Watkins (1987: 289), Ruijgh (1995: 85).

<sup>836</sup> Beside Ἐνυαλίῳ Ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ and ἀργεϊφόντης, compounds in -φόντης are limited to personal names (Βελλερο-, Πολυ-, Κρεσ-, Λυκο-φόντης, from Homer onwards) and to the secondary poetic formations ἀνδροφόντης (A. Sept. 572), πατροφόντης (S.), μητροφόντης (E.).

Thus, it cannot be doubted that pre-form of ἀνδρεϊφόντης was a Mycenaean *\*anrk<sup>wh</sup>ontā-*. It remains to determine when ἀνδρεϊ- was introduced.<sup>837</sup> Ruijgh formulates the following scenario (1995: 87): “Comme dans les tablettes mycéniennes, les traitements -r- > -po- et -vp- > -vδp- sont déjà des faits acquis, il faut conclure qu’en mycénien historique, ἀνρχ<sup>w</sup>όντᾱς avait déjà abouti à ἀνδροχ<sup>w</sup>όντᾱς. À cette époque, la syllabe initiale du composé était donc devenue longue, ce qui a obligé les aèdes à prononcer -ω ἀν- comme une seule syllabe. Comme le vers exigeait deux syllabes brèves entre ἀν- et -χ<sup>w</sup>όν-, ils ont fabriquée la forme artificielle ἀνδρελχ<sup>w</sup>όντᾱς sur le modèle de Ἀργελχ<sup>w</sup>όντᾱς, épithète d’Hermès.”

Ruijgh assumes that both the vocalization of *\*r* and the replacement by ἀνδρεϊφόντη had taken place already before our attestations of Mycenaean.<sup>838</sup> Thus, the irregular verse would have been preserved in its defective form for some seven centuries. This interpretation is widely accepted.<sup>839</sup> However, its logical conclusion is unlikely and has been challenged on chronological grounds by Haug (2002: 62-4). He agrees with Ruijgh that the reshaping to ἀνδρεϊφόντης would have had to take place quickly after the vocalization of *\*r*, which he also dates well before Mycenaean. However, in his view the synizesis of -ω ᾱ- could not have been tolerated at that time because in *\*-ōi a-*, the *yod* still functioned as a full-fledged consonant.<sup>840</sup>

But there is another chronological problem with all previous explanations. The assumed change *\*r* > -po- for Mycenaean is contradicted by the actually attested Mycenaean form, *A-no-qo-ta*. This shows that Mycenaean had neither the change *\*r* > -po-, nor the consonant epenthesis in this concrete form. So if the form *\*anrk<sup>wh</sup>ontāi* originated in Mycenaean, which seems inescapable, there are two options. Either Mycenaean retained *r* as an allophone of /r/ between two consonants, or an Achaean Epic tradition existed which preserved *\*r*, much like the later Ionic one. In other words, the *d*-epenthesis had indeed taken place in Mycenaean, but only in intervocalic *\*-nr-* (as in *A-re-ka-sa-da-ra*), not in *\*-nr-*.

The present framework automatically eliminates all problems: if *\*r* was still present in Mycenaean, the period to be bridged is much smaller. The formula containing *\*Enūaliōi anrk<sup>wh</sup>ontāi* entered Ionic Epic in the early Dark Ages, and was retained in this form until Epic *\*r* was eliminated, not long before Homer. An intermediate form like *\*ἀνραφόντη* or *\*ἀνροφόντη* may have existed for some time. But after the epenthesis had led to ἀνδροφόντη, some poet felt the necessity to take more drastic measures, and created Ἀνδρεϊφόντη on the model of Ἀργεϊφόντη. It is hard to tell whether the last replacement is due to the poet of the *Iliad*, or whether it belongs to the vicissitudes that occurred in the recitation of the Homeric

<sup>837</sup> Beside the form ἀνδρεϊφόντη printed in our editions, a minor *varia lectio* is ἀνδριφόντη. I do not agree with Latacz, who makes too much of the attestation of ἀδριφόντη (only in one ms. at *Il.* 8.264) when he says: “ἀδριφόντη (...) ist auch hier sicher eine der ursprünglichen Aussprache näherkommende Schreibweise” (1965: 66). There is no indication that there was ever an intermediate stage with -i-.

<sup>838</sup> In one of his latest publications, Ruijgh has changed his opinion on the early date of the vocalization. He suddenly adheres to Risch’s claim that there are no provable distinctions between Ionic-Attic and Achaean around 1200: “(...) ce changement s’est probablement effectué peu de temps avant l’époque des tablettes. En effet, d’après la théorie de Risch (1955), les différences entre le mycénien (...) et l’ionien-attique de l’époque mycénienne (...) étaient encore peu nombreuses: les deux dialectes constituaient ensemble le grec ‘méridional’ (...). La distinction entre le traitement ionien-attique *\*r* > πα et le traitement achéen *\*r* > πο a donc chance d’être relativement récent” (Ruijgh 1997: 41).

<sup>839</sup> See e.g. West (1988: 156f.), Leukart (1994: 54), de Lamberterie (2004: 240-1).

<sup>840</sup> Haug (l.c.) considers the possibility that *\*r* was retained longer in Epic Greek, but only to reject it outright. I would add the following objection to the generally accepted chronology: if the Mycenaean name were indeed to be interpreted as /Anork<sup>wh</sup>ontā-/ , one wonders why we find no trace of it in Homer: it could have been utilized in verse-final position (with metrical lengthening of the initial vowel, as in e.g. |<sub>B</sub> Ἀπόλλωνος).

text after its first fixation. Note, again, that the *d*-epenthesis in the outcome of *\*-nr-* could theoretically be post-Homeric.<sup>841</sup>

### 7.3.3 Other Homeric forms with ἀνδρο- and ἀνδρα-

A reflex of *\*anr-* is found not only in the metrically irregular forms ἀνδροτήτα and ἀνδρεϊφόντη, but also in Hom. ἀνδρόμεος ‘human’ and in three forms with ἀνδρα-: the substantives ἀνδράποδον ‘slave’, ἀνδραφόνος ‘murderer’ (attested for Solon, beside Hom.+ ἀνδροφόνος ‘man-slaying; murderer’), and the adverb ἀνδρακάς ‘man by man’. The vocalization -ρα- in the last three forms can only be the product of Epic *\*r*. We therefore have to ask whether the preservation of pre-forms with *\*anr-* in Epic Greek can be motivated.

The clearest example is ἀνδραφόνος ‘man-slaying; murderer’. According to Photius’ *Lexicon*, this word was regularly used by Solon instead of the Classical form ἀνδροφόνος.<sup>842</sup> Before judging the phonological evidence, it is important to note that ἀνδροφόνος in Homer denotes a warrior who habitually kills men and has adjectival value, ‘man-slaying’. In Classical Greek (Pi. *Pyth.* 4.252, Pl., Lys.), on the other hand, ἀνδροφόνος is a technical, high-register legal term for a ‘murderer’: someone who has *in fact* murdered a fellow human being.<sup>843</sup> When the innovative form ἀνδροκτόνος is attested in the tragedians (4x, including the denom. verb ἀνδροκτονέω A. *Eum.* 602), in Hdt. (4.110), and in B. (*Dith.* 4.23), it has the same adjectival and habitual value that ἀνδροφόνος has in Homer.<sup>844</sup>

Solon’s form ἀνδραφόνος is often cited as evidence for the regular reflex of *\*anr-* in Ionic-Attic (e.g. Ruijgh 1995: 87 n. 304). But given that ἀνδροφόνος is a high-register legal term in Classical Attic, it is possible to assume that the form was taken from the language of Epic.<sup>845</sup> Watkins (1995: 390) notes that before the vocalization of *\*r*, the epic form would have been *\*ānrp<sup>h</sup>ono-*, with metrical lengthening of the first of three consecutive short syllables.<sup>846</sup> This regularly yielded ἀνδραφόνος (epic vocalization followed by Osthoff’s Law), which was subsequently replaced by ἀνδροφόνος on the model of other compounds with ἀνδρο-.<sup>847</sup> If Solon did not use the Homeric form ἀνδροφόνος, this could be due to the

<sup>841</sup> With Haug, I am inclined to think that the replacement ἀνδρεϊφόντη could come into being only after crasis of long vowels had become tolerable – that is, after Homer: “En effet, cette synizèse ne semblerait guère acceptable à l’époque d’Homère, si elle n’était pas *de facto* attestée dans le texte” (2002: 64).

<sup>842</sup> Photius is a 9<sup>th</sup> c. AD Byzantine author. Lemma 1753 of his *Lexicon* runs: Ἀνδραφόνων· οὕτως Σόλων ἐν τοῖς Ἀξοσιν <ἀντι> τῶν ἀνδροφόνων αἰεὶ φησιν. An interesting discussion of the semantic value of ἀνδροφόνος in Lysias 10 has been given by Watkins (1995: 497-8).

<sup>843</sup> See Watkins (1995: 497-8) and García Ramón (2007a: 117). The unmarked Classical Greek word for ‘murderer’ was, of course, φονεύς. A similar difference in register is found between the poetic word ἀνδροκτασίη ‘manslaughter’ (at least when used in the singular, cf. García Ramón 2007: 116) and φόνος ‘murder’ (normal in the Classical language; in Homer mostly ‘slaughter’, but ‘murder’ in *Od.* 4.771). Note that ἀνδροφονίη (first attested in Aristotle) must be an innovation based on ἀνδροφόνος.

<sup>844</sup> In my view, the creation of ἀνδροκτόνος was due to an attempt to avoid ἀνδροφόνος, which had undesired overtones in the Ionic-Attic vernacular. I do not believe, then, that the hapax ἀνδροφόντης (A. *Sept.* 572, epithet of Tydeus) implies that Aeschylus had a copy of Homer which contained this very form: it may also be due to the avoidance of ἀνδροφόνος. Other artificial creations are As. πατροφονῆα (*Od.*), μητροφόντης (only in E. *Or.*) and πατροφόντης (hapax, S. *OT* 1441).

<sup>845</sup> As Watkins (1995) stresses on various occasions, the root allomorph φον- is unproductive. Compare the relic status of compounds in -φόνος with the productivity of compounds in -κτόνος in the tragedians and Hdt. (e.g. πατροκτόνος, μητροκτόνος, αὐτοκτόνος, also with sacrificial victims as a first member).

<sup>846</sup> Schmitt’s scenario (1967: 126) that an impracticable *\*anrp<sup>h</sup>ono-* was replaced early on by a thematicized *\*anr-o-p<sup>h</sup>ono-* is impossible, because it leaves the form ἀνδραφόνος in Solon unexplained.

<sup>847</sup> Watkins (1995: 389-90) compares the metrical lengthening to be assumed for *\*ānrp<sup>h</sup>ono-* with that in ἀνέρε(ς), ἀνέρα (in the same metrical slot in Homer), and with the instrumental and locative plurals, which were realized as Epic *\*ānrp<sup>h</sup>i*, *\*ānr<sup>h</sup>si* before liquid vocalization. He further suggests that ὑπ’ ἀνδροφόνου Λυκούργου (*Il.* 6.134, the only Homeric instance of the contracted form of Λυκούργος ‘Lycurgus’) recovers an earlier form *\*[ὑπ’] ἀνδραφόνου Λυκούργου* in the instrumental case, and with the reflex -ρα-. The suggestion is interesting, but ultimately hard to prove or disprove.

fact that Attic was more conservative than Ionic here. It is also possible, but ultimately hard to prove or disprove, that the first Homeric text still had ἀνδραφόνος, and that ἀνδροφόνος was introduced in a later redaction.

Further testimony for the prolonged presence of \*anr̥- in Epic Greek is furnished by ἀνδροκτασίη. Apart from A. Sept. 693 (in a lyrical passage) and probably Stes. fr. 22.6, the word is exclusively Epic. It has clearly replaced the form attested in Mycenaean as *a-no-qa-si-ja* /anr̥k<sup>wh</sup>asiā/ ‘manslaughter’ (García Ramón 2007a). As Mühlestein (1958) remarked, ἀνδροκτασίη is a metrical replacement for \*anr̥k<sup>wh</sup>asiā, which would have contained four consecutive short syllables.<sup>848</sup> Apparently, Epic Greek introduced -κτ- from the root of κτείνω in spite of the fact that no ἀνδροκτόνος (or in fact any other compound in -κτόνος or -κτατος) is attested in Homer. This implies that a first member \*anar- was never available, and that the Ionic vernacular introduced \*anr-o- in compounds prior to the vocalization of \*r̥. This neatly confirms our conclusion that the forms with \*anr̥- were retained within Epic Greek after the vocalization of \*r̥ in the vernacular.

The explanation of ἀνδραφόνος can be extended to the adjective ἀνδρόμεος ‘human, of men’, which is attested exclusively in Homer.<sup>849</sup> Its formation is synchronically opaque, but the suffixation can be compared diachronically with Vedic -māya-, as in mṛn-māya- ‘made of earth, earthen’, go-māya- ‘consisting of cows’. Since ἀνδρόμεος is morphologically isolated within Greek, it probably contains the regular reflex of a PIE pre-form \*h<sub>2</sub>nr̥-meio- > PGr. \*anr̥meio- (cf. Tichy 1981: 47-8). It cannot be entirely excluded that ἀνδρόμεος is the regular Aeolic reflex of PGr. \*anr̥meio-.<sup>850</sup> But since ἀνδρόμεος is not attested outside of Homer, an alternative scenario within Ionic Epic along the lines just sketched seems preferable. A pre-form \*anr̥meio- (with three consecutive light syllables) would require a metrical lengthening in order to be used in the dactylic hexameter, i.e. \*ānr̥meio-. Upon the elimination of Epic \*r̥, the resulting form was \*ān(d)r̥ameo-, which would undergo Osthoff’s Law to yield \*andr̥ameo- (see above on ἄμβροτος). The o-coloring was then taken over from the compounds with ἀνδρο- < \*anr-o-, as in ἀνδροφόνος.<sup>851</sup>

The pre-form to be reconstructed for the collective ἀνδράποδα ‘slaves’ (in Homer only ἀνδραπόδεσσι Il. 7.475) would be \*anr̥-pod-a. Again, this form with three consecutive shorts would regularly lengthen its initial ᾱ- in a pre-stage of Epic Greek, and after the vocalization of Epic \*r̥ would regularly yield the attested ἀνδράποδα. The question remains why the form was not influenced by compounds with ἀνδρο-, as in the two preceding examples. The answer

<sup>848</sup> Mühlestein (1958: 226, *Nachtrag*): “Homer kennt (...) keine athematischen [Formen] mit dem mykenischen Lautwandel *r̥* > op. Lehrreich ist auch das aus *a-no-qa-si-ja* erschlossene Abstraktum fürs “Männermorden”. Dieses war sowohl in der alten athematischen Form \*ἀνρ̥φασία (mit vier Kürzen) [al]s auch in der thematischen \*ἀνδρ-ο-φασία (mit drei Kürzen) verswidrig, dagegen im [m]ykenischen Fortsetzer der athematischen Form, *a-no-qa-si-ja* = †ἀνορ-φασία (u – u u –) durchaus versgerecht. Gleichwohl kennt das Epos diese Form nicht, sondern hat das Wort durch ἀνδρο-κτασίη ersetzt, und zwar trotzdem von den Adjektiven nur ἀνδροφόνος episch ist, nicht auch ἀνδροκτόνος. Der Weg zur homerischen Sprache geht also nicht durchs Mykenische hindurch, sondern am Mykenischen vorbei.” In my view, the final conclusion of Mühlestein’s argument is premature. One could also reason in a different way: the emergency solution applied in ἀνδροκτασίη may show that there never was a form \*ἀνορφασία, just like an Ionic form \*ἀναρφασία never existed. Viewed in this way, ἀνδροκτασίη would furnish indirect evidence for the retention of \*r̥ in Mycenaean.

<sup>849</sup> In the *Iliad*, we only find the syntagms χροὸς ἀνδρομέοιο (17.571, 20.100, 21.70) and ὄμιλον ἀνδρόμεον (11.538, “eine nach dem übrigen Gebrauch von ἀνδρόμεος auffallende Verbindung”, Ameis-Hentze ad loc.).

<sup>850</sup> This would indeed explain the retracted accent. But the different accentuation of Greek may also have another cause.

<sup>851</sup> Of course, the metrical lengthening of the initial vowel in \*ān(d)r̥ameo- may have been analyzed as superfluous, and led to the replacement by ἀνδρόμεο- (with the productive allomorph).

may well be that this influence was annulled by the semantically close τετράποδα ‘cattle’. It is also possible that ἀνδράποδα itself was analogically created after τετράποδα.<sup>852</sup>

It remains to explain the adverb ἀνδρακάς. This is attested only in *Od.* 13.14, and after Homer only in *A. Ag.* 1595.<sup>853</sup> We are probably dealing, then, with an epic relic form. The suffix -κάς is a morphological archaism, which is further only found in ἐκάς ‘set apart, at a distance’ < PGr. \**hwe-kas* and its extension ἑκαστος ‘each’. It is probably etymologically related to the Indo-Iranian element \*-ćás ‘X times’, e.g. Skt. *sahasra-sás* ‘a thousand times’ (RV+), Av. *nauiua-sās* ‘nine times’.<sup>854</sup>

As opposed to ἀνδροτήτα, ἀνδρόμεος, and ἀνδροφόνος, the *a*-vocalism of ἀνδρακάς must be considered an archaism, whatever the ultimate rationale behind the retention of -ρα- in this form. The deviating place of the anaptyctic vowel can be explained from a pre-form \**anrkás* that was restricted to Epic Greek. In the position before a vowel, this tribrach would have undergone metrical lengthening of the first syllable, and the same scenario which explains ἀνδροφόνος and ἀνδρόμεος can be invoked.

The oxytone accent of ἀνδρακάς could suggest that the development of Epic \**r* took place after Wheeler’s Law.<sup>855</sup> However, the Ancient grammarians (e.g. Ap. Dysc.) already remark that all adverbs in -άς are oxytone. Therefore, it cannot be entirely excluded that the accent of ἀνδρακάς is analogical after ἐκάς.

### 7.3.4 θρόνος

Within Greek, θρόνος ‘ornamented chair, throne’ (Hom. and Class.) is clearly the same etymon as Mycenaean *to-no* /t<sup>h</sup>orno-/ or /t<sup>h</sup>ino-/ (PY Ta 707, 708, 714). The tablets in question contain lists about chairs (*to-no*), benches or footstools (*ta-ra-nu-we*) and their embellishments (ivory incrustations, etc.). In the *Odyssey*, θρόνος is the normal word for a (luxurious) chair used in banquets. Beside it, κλισμός must have denoted a kind of couch or sofa.<sup>856</sup>

Let us first consider the evidence for the different attested forms. The Mycenaean simplex is consistently written *to-no*, never <sup>++</sup>*to-ro-no*. As we have seen in section 2.1.1, it is possible that Myc. *to-ro-no-wo-ko* contains the etymon of Hom. θρόνα, which could mean

<sup>852</sup> Thus Frisk: ἀνδράποδα “wurde nach τετράποδα ... geschaffen” (q.v., with further references). This explanation, also given by *DELG*, is rejected without any argumentation by Tichy (1981: 47 n. 44).

<sup>853</sup> A substantive ἀνδρακάδ- is attested for Phrynichus (2<sup>nd</sup> c. AD) and in Nic. *Th.* 643. The Homeric adverb is also quoted for Cratinus.

<sup>854</sup> Based on this correspondence, Klingenschmitt (1975) reconstructs PIE \*-*kas*. His only argument against a reconstruction \*-*kns* is the full grade root of *śásīyas-*, comparative of *śásvat-* ‘frequent, continuous, uninterrupted’. Since the comparative regularly takes a full grade root, “[ist] eine an sich lautlich mögliche Zurückführung von \**śás-* auf \**ćnć-* somit aus morphologischen Gründen ausgeschlossen” (1975: 68): in his view, one would expect <sup>++</sup>*śámśīyas-* as a corresponding full grade form. It is true that the comparative *śásīyas-* is attested already in the *Rigveda*, but the semantics of the adjective do not favor the assumption of an *inherited* comparative. It cannot be excluded, then, that *śásīyas-* was created secondarily after the vocalization of the nasal in *śásvat-*. I therefore see no objection to a reconstruction \*-*kns*.

<sup>855</sup> According to Wheeler’s Law, an oxytone word becomes paroxytone if it has dactylic shape (e.g. ποικίλος < \*ποικίλος, cf. Ved. *peśalá-* ‘adorned’). The pre-form \**anrkás* did not have a dactylic shape yet, which could explain why it escaped Wheeler. Note that ἀνδράσι < \**anrsí* is not a counterexample, because this may have a generalized columnary accent (ἀνδρός, ἀνδρί, ἀνδρῶν). As far as I have seen, the example ἀνδρακάς has gone unnoticed so far: it is not discussed in Meier-Brügger’s treatment (1992) of the relative chronology of accentual developments in Greek.

<sup>856</sup> In post-Homeric Greek, θρόνος belongs to a high register: it is always the throne of a king, the seat of a deity, or the chair of a judge. It hardly occurs in archaic lyric: Pindar only uses it three times in the meaning ‘throne’ as a symbol of power.

‘colored or dyed threads of wool’.<sup>857</sup> I therefore leave this compound out of consideration here. The Mycenaean form *to-no* has further been compared with the gloss θόρναξ· ὑποπόδιον ‘footstool’ (Hsch.), and with the mountain name Θόρναξ in Laconia (Hdt., Paus.).

How can Hom. θρόνος and Myc. *to-no* be reconciled phonologically? Some scholars have assumed liquid metathesis, in which case either θρόνος or *to-no* could be the original form (e.g. Hajnal-Risch 2006: 102-3 and 202-205). But as we have repeatedly remarked, such an assumption cannot be further substantiated. Given that Homer applies *McL* scansion in various case forms of θρόνος, a pre-form *\*t<sup>h</sup>rno-* also deserves serious consideration (thus e.g. Wathélet 1966).<sup>858</sup> Upon this view, Myc. *to-no-* and the gloss θόρναξ would contain the regular Achaeian reflex of *\*r*, while Epic θρόνος would be the Aeolic outcome of *\*t<sup>h</sup>rno-*.<sup>859</sup> This scenario requires that in post-Homeric Ionic-Attic, θρόνος is an epicism, which seems possible.<sup>860</sup> As with βροτός, however, there are no concrete indications for an Aeolic origin of θρόνος: it is unattested in the Lesbian poets (on Sappho’s ποικιλόθρονος, see below), and the evidence for *McL* scansion in Homer is left without an explanation.

Viredaz (1983, followed by de Lamberterie 2004) proposed that Myc. *to-no* /t<sup>h</sup>órno-/ represents the original form, and that Ion.-Att. θρόνος developed by contamination with the related word θρήνυς ‘footstool’. Indeed, in the tablets Myc. *ta-ra-nu-we* is found in the same contexts as *to-no*, just as θρήνυς and θρόνος appear together in the same Homeric passages.<sup>861</sup> This scenario may be correct, but alternative explanations cannot be excluded on forehand. In particular, referring as it does to an item of high culture, θρόνος ~ /t<sup>h</sup>órno-/ may be a loan or a substrate word which was borrowed on two different occasions.

This brings us to the fact that θρόνος has no generally accepted Indo-European etymology.<sup>862</sup> All attempts thus far depart from the PIE root *\*d<sup>h</sup>er-* ‘support’. Some scholars consider θρόνος to be the oldest form, and assume a derivation in -óno- from the zero grade of *\*d<sup>h</sup>er-*, comparing χρόνος ‘time’ and κλόνος ‘battle din’. This analysis is ultimately unfounded, because a suffix *\*-ono-* cannot be understood in Indo-European terms.<sup>863</sup> De Saussure already proposed that θορν- (now also attested in Myc. *to-no*) was the oldest form, assuming a *no*-derivative from the *o*-grade root, *\*d<sup>h</sup>ór-no-*. Wathélet (1966) and Heubeck (1972), departing from the evidence for *McL* scansion in Homer, assumed a pre-form *\*d<sup>h</sup>r-no-*. More recently, de Lamberterie (2004: 246) has argued that θρόνος and Myc. *to-no* can hardly be separated from Hom. θρήνυς (Myc. *ta-ra-nu*, Att. θράνος). Deriving both words

<sup>857</sup> I therefore disagree with de Lamberterie when he states: “Le seul élément incontestable, et sur lequel tout le monde s’accorde, est que l’alternance de *to-no* et de *to-ro-no*° correspondre à celle de θόρναξ et de θρόνος” (2004: 242).

<sup>858</sup> In Wathélet’s words (1966: 165), Myc. *to-no* “évoque plutôt la présence d’un *r* sans, pour la cause, exclure l’hypothèse d’une métathèse. L’examen des emplois du terme qui nécessitent l’abrègement (...) suggère l’existence de plusieurs formules ou éléments formulaires qui pourraient être anciens”.

<sup>859</sup> It has been proposed that the gloss θόρναξ is Cyprian, but this presupposes that the dialect indication Κύπριοι has been transferred to the preceding gloss, which is not evident (see Chantraine 1962: 169 and Latte on Hsch. θ 646-7). In this case, it could contain the regular vocalization to -op- in that dialect. Since the Arcadian reflex of *\*r* was probably -op-, the mountain name θόρναξ in Laconia could be ascribed to an Achaeian dialect. No compelling conclusions can be drawn from this evidence.

<sup>860</sup> This possibility is denied explicitly by Haug (2002: 67) on the ground that θρόνος occurs not only in poetry, but also in prose authors. This objection is not compelling, because θρόνος only occurs in high register prose (Hdt., X. and Pl.). In my view, neither a genuine Ionic-Attic word nor an epicism can be excluded.

<sup>861</sup> From a phonological point of view, this scenario would eliminate the need for assuming a pre-form with *\*r*. De Lamberterie notes that the initial θρ- generates length by position in the majority of Homeric instances of θρόνος, “notablement dans un tour visiblement formulaire comme ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροῦλου # (4x)” (2004: 244). In his view, this scansion is hard to reconcile with the idea that θρόνος contains a trace of *\*r*. The metrical evidence from Homer (including the compounds in -θρονος) will be considered in more detail below.

<sup>862</sup> Various earlier suggestions and their problems are summarized by de Lamberterie (2004: 242-3).

<sup>863</sup> The other two examples of this suffix are doubtful, too: the etymology of χρόνος is unknown, and the derivation of κλόνος ‘battle din’ from κέλωμαι ‘to spur on’ is just a possibility.

from the same root  $*d^h erh_2-$ , he departs from the respective pre-forms  $*d^h orh_2-no-$  and  $*d^h rh_2-no-$  (or  $*d^h rh_2-nu-$ ), where the former would lose its laryngeal due to the Saussure Effect.<sup>864</sup>

In my view, all these proposals suffer from the same problem: neither a root  $*d^h erh_2-$  nor  $*d^h er-$  ‘support’ is securely attested in Greek.<sup>865</sup> Furthermore, the proposed *no*-formation would be unparalleled in other IE languages, so that we are ultimately left with a conjectural root etymology. As Heubeck already admitted, “in this case, certainty is not possible” (1972: 78).

### 7.3.5 The Homeric attestations of θρόνος

Let us now discuss the metrical properties of the Homeric attestations in more detail, in order to see how serious the evidence for a pre-form  $*t^h jno-$  is. The following table contains information about the number of attestations per case form, as well as remarks on their metrical behavior and their presence in *Iliad* and/or *Odyssey*.

Case	Form	##	Significant attestations	Remarks
Ns.	θρόνος	1	<i>Od.</i> 6.308	With <i>McL</i> Only <i>Od.</i>
As.	θρόνον	10	Two positions: θρόνον   <sub>B</sub> (6x) ἐς θρόνον ἵζε (εἷσεν)   <sub>T</sub> (3x).	Never with <i>McL</i> Both <i>Il.</i> and <i>Od.</i>
Gs.	θρόνου	19	ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροῦλου ( <i>Il.</i> , <i>Od.</i> ) μεσσηγὺς κρητῆρος ἰδὲ θρόνου ἀργυροῦλου ( <i>Od.</i> 22.341) ἐπὶ θρόνου ἵζε φαεινοῦ ( <i>Il.</i> ) ἀπὸ θρόνου ὦρτο φαεινοῦ ( <i>Il.</i> ) ἐπὶ θρόνου εἶσε φαεινοῦ ( <i>Od.</i> )	Never with <i>McL</i> Both <i>Il.</i> and <i>Od.</i> Always before   <sub>B</sub> . <sup>866</sup>
Ds.	θρόνω	4	σεῖσατο δ’ εἰνὶ θρόνω   <sub>P</sub> ( <i>Il.</i> 8.199) ἔξετο δ’ εἰνὶ θρόνω   <sub>P</sub> ( <i>Il.</i> 15.150)   <sub>T</sub> θρόνω ἔνι ( <i>Il.</i> 15.142) ἐν θρόνω ἰδρύσασα   <sub>P</sub> ( <i>Od.</i> 5.86)	3x with <i>McL</i> ( <i>Il.</i> ) Without <i>McL</i> ( <i>Od.</i> )
Np.	θρόνοι	1	<i>Od.</i> 7.95	With <i>McL</i> Only <i>Od.</i>

<sup>864</sup> In my view (formulated in van Beek 2011), the Saussure Effect in Greek may have to be formulated differently. I prefer to explain the loss of laryngeal in πόρνη, τόρμος, στέρνον, and τέρμα as due to the environment  $*VLHNV$ . If de Lamberterie’s proposal to reconstruct  $*\theta\acute{o}rno\varsigma$  as  $*d^h orh_2-no-$  is correct, it would furnish another instance of the same development. The reconstruction  $*d^h orh_2-no-$  is, however, subject to two additional objections. First of all, Indo-Iranian has an *aniṭ* root (Ved. *dhar-* ‘to hold, support’). If related, Lith. *derù* (*derėti*) ‘to be fitting’ (see *LIV*<sup>2</sup> s.v. with lit.) further confirms the *aniṭ* root. Secondly, in order to reconstruct  $*d^h orh_2-no-$  beside  $*d^h rh_2-no-$ , de Lamberterie has to assume that Attic θρᾶνος is an older form than Hom. θρῆνος and Myc. *ta-ra-nu-we*. However, the chronology of the attestations clearly favors the converse view, and it would be much easier to assume that Attic θρᾶνος was influenced by θρόνος. Note that *u*-stem substantives were not a productive category in Greek.

<sup>865</sup> It is uncertain whether θρησκεύω ‘to perform religious duties’ (Hdt.) contains the root of θρῆνος ‘footstool’. Theoretically, the verb could derive from a noun  $*\theta\rho\eta\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$  or  $*\theta\rho\eta\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$  ‘supporter’. García Ramón (1999) recognizes the root  $*d^h er-$  in Thess. θροσια, but in my view this remains conjectural as well (see section 3.4.2).

<sup>866</sup> Chantraine (1953: 108) remarks that there is no perceptible difference between the use of genitive and dative with ἐπί.

Ap.	θρόνους	11	Formulaic second hemistich (8x)   <sub>P</sub> κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε	With <i>McL</i> Only <i>Od.</i>
Gp.	θρόνων	2	προπάροιθε   <sub>T</sub> θρόνων ἐκ δὲ θρόνων	With <i>McL</i> Only <i>Od.</i>
Dp.	θρόνοισι(ν), θρόνοισ'	5	verse-final: καθίζον   <sub>T</sub> ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι θρόνοισιν καθίζον   <sub>T</sub> ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι θρόνοισι after   <sub>T</sub> : θρόνοισ' ἐνὶ ῥήγεα καλὰ θρόνοισ' ἐνὶ δαιδαλέοισι	With <i>McL</i> Only <i>Od.</i>

Table 7.3: The pattern of attestation of *θρόνος* in Homer

The phonological surface structures of *θρόνος* and *βροτός* are identical. Since *βροτός* contained *\*r*, and since *McL* scansion frequently occurs in both words, it seems attractive at first sight to derive *θρόνος* from a pre-form with *\*r*, too. There are, however, clear differences between the metrical behavior of *θρόνος* and that of *βροτός*. In general, *McL* scansion is more widespread with *θρόνος* than with *βροτός*. However, for *βροτός* there is a distribution between case forms that regularly avoid *McL* scansion and case forms that allow *McL* scansion. Such a distribution cannot be indicated for *θρόνος*.

First of all, there is a difference in frequency. Whereas the Gp. *βροτῶν* is extremely frequent, *θρόνων* only occurs twice in Homer, of which only once after |<sub>T</sub>, the regular position of *βροτῶν*. And while the frequent Dp. *βροτοῖσι* is almost exclusively verse-final, only 2 out of 5 attestations of *θρόνοισι* are verse-final. Both these cases could be secondary: ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι *θρόνοισι* (*Od.* 8.422) stands beside ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι *δόμοισιν* (*Il.* 6.503, *Od.* 17.110), and καθίζον ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι *θρόνοισιν* (*Od.* 16.408) may have been modelled on καθίζον ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι *λίθοισι* (*Od.* 8.6).<sup>867</sup>

Thus, it appears that the only case forms of *βροτός* which regularly undergo *McL* scansion (the Gp. and Dp.) are used in a very different way with *θρόνος*. A similar difference is found in other case forms. The Np. *θρόνοι* and the Ns. *θρόνος* are attested only once (both undergo *McL* scansion), whereas the same case forms of *βροτός* are frequent and regularly avoid *McL* scansion. By way of contrast, the Ap. *βροτούς* is attested only once, whereas *θρόνους* appears with *McL* scansion in the frequent formula |<sub>P</sub> κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε. Wathelet's view that this is an old formula is hard to prove.<sup>868</sup>

All forms with *McL* scansion discussed so far (20x: Ns. *θρόνος*, Np. *θρόνοι*, Ap. *θρόνους*, Gp. *θρόνων*, and Dp. *θρόνοισι*) are attested exclusively in the *Odyssey*. Generally speaking, *θρόνος* is more frequent in the *Odyssey* (39x, against 14x in the *Iliad*). Given the much higher frequency of rituals of hospitality in the *Odyssey*, the fact that certain formulae containing *θρόνος* only occur there and not in the *Iliad* is not necessarily informative. Even so, it is conceivable that the productive extension of *McL* scansions in the *Odyssey* is an

<sup>867</sup> The latter formula also appears in κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετ' ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι *λίθοισιν* (*Od.* 3.406), and in a different position in εἴατ' ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι *λίθοισ'* *ιερῶ ἐνὶ κύκλῳ* (*Il.* 18.504). Influence of *δόμος* on *θρόνος* may also be assumed in ἐν τε *θρόνοισ'* *εὐποιήτοισι* (*Od.* 20.150) beside *δόμοισ'* *ἐνὶ ποιητοῖσιν* (*Il.* 5.198, *Od.* 13.106). This leaves us only with |<sub>T</sub> *θρόνοισ'* *ἐνὶ δαιδαλέοισι* (*Od.* 17.32), |<sub>T</sub> *θρόνοισ'* *ἐνὶ* (*Od.* 10.352), both of which occur after the main caesura.

<sup>868</sup> It may be useful to compare other similar syntagms: ἵππους ἡμιόνους τε (*Il.* 24.576 and 690), βόας ἡμιόνους τε (*Il.* 24.782), ἀρνειούς τε τράγους τε (*Od.* 9.239, note the *McL* scansion in the Homeric hapax τράγος), καλοὺς τε μεγάλους τε (*Od.* 18.68). The *McL* scansion in the Ap. is further attested in *θρόνους* |<sub>P</sub> *περικαλλέας* (2x, in the repeated verse *Od.* 22.438 = 452) and ἐς ῥα *θρόνους* ἔζοντο (*Od.* 4.51), which may have been modelled on the singular ἐς *θρόνον* ἵζε / εἴσεν (3x).



innovation of that epic.<sup>869</sup> Let us therefore restrict ourselves to the case forms that are attested in both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

The As. θρόνον (10x) and the Gs. θρόνου (19x) are used only in front of a vowel. This is consistent with the behavior of βροτός, which synchronically avoids *McL* scansion as far as possible. The Ds. θρόνω, on the other hand, undergoes *McL* scansion in all of its three occurrences in the *Iliad*. Leaving aside |<sub>T</sub> θρόνω ἐνι (*Il.* 15.142, with *McL* scansion after the caesura), the remaining two attestations of the Ds. have played an important role in previous discussions (see Heubeck 1972: 78):

σεῖσατο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνω |<sub>P</sub> (*Il.* 8.199)  
ἔζετο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνω |<sub>P</sub> (*Il.* 15.150)

The simultaneous occurrence of metrical lengthening in the preposition εἰνὶ and of the *McL* licence in front of θρόνω is odd, and asks for an explanation. As ἐν θρόνω ἰδρύσασα |<sub>P</sub> (*Od.* 5.86) shows, the Ds. was in fact used in front of vowel-initial words, again consistent with the use of βροτῶ (4x prevocalic in Hom.). It would have been unproblematic to start a hexameter line with a participial clause like <sup>++</sup>ἐν θρόνω ἐζόμενος |<sub>P</sub>. It is also noteworthy that the colon ἐς θρόνον ἴξε (εἶσεν) |<sub>T</sub> (3x) has no parallel in the dative.

One could be tempted to conclude that εἰνὶ θρόνω is an archaism dating from a pre-stage of Epic Greek when prevocalic shortening in the Ds. was not yet admissible, and to reconstruct a noun phrase *\*eni t<sup>h</sup>ronōi*, with metrical lengthening of the first syllable. This would, however, be premature, because a first hemistich ἔζετο δ' ἐν κλισμῶ |<sub>P</sub> “seated himself on a bench” is also found (*Il.* 24.597, *Od.* 4.136).<sup>870</sup> This implies that the hemistich ἔζετο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνω |<sub>P</sub> can be explained as a late creation by analogy with ἔζετο δ' ἐν κλισμῶ |<sub>P</sub>. This considerably weakens the argument for the antiquity of the *McL* scansion in εἰνὶ θρόνω.<sup>871</sup>

In conclusion, the only remaining indication for an earlier *\*r* is the formula |<sub>P</sub> κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε. But this is only attested in the *Odyssey*, and the rest of the metrical evidence for *\*r* in θρόνος is hard to reconcile with the general picture obtained for βροτός. I therefore agree with de Lamberterie that the *McL* scansion in θρόνος is due to a recent extension of the licence in the *Odyssey* (“ils appartiennent à la catégorie des abrègements récents”, 2004: 244), and that the cases do not provide evidence for a pre-form *\*t<sup>h</sup>rono-*. On the other hand, I agree with Wathelet and Heubeck that no certainty can be attained about the pre-form of θρόνος.

### 7.3.6 The compounds in -θρονος

The possessive compounds χρυσόθρονος and ἐϋθρονος occur in traditional Homeric formulae. If they contain θρόνος ‘throne’, as is mostly thought, it would be attractive to look for traces of the older scansion of this etymon. Given that -θρ- closes the final short vowel of the first member in both compounds, a syllabic liquid in θρόνος would be hard to defend.

It is unlikely, however, that the second member is to be etymologically identified with θρόνος. Leaf (ad *Il.* 22.441) already suggested to compare ποικιλόθρονος ‘with varicolored

<sup>869</sup> Thus, I agree with de Lamberterie (2004: 244) when he remarks: “les exemples de *correptio*, qui pour la plupart sont attestés dans l’*Odyssee*, ne semblent guère anciens”. The fact that the plural of θρόνος is not used in the *Iliad* could even point to a semantic development: ‘throne’ (*Il.*) > ‘luxurious chair’ (*Od.*). Note that θρόνοι are mainly used by the *plurality* of suitors in the *Odyssey*.

<sup>870</sup> As Perpillou (1981: 228-9) shows, the difference between a κλισμός (a normal seat) and a θρόνος (a honorific chair) was made in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The word κλισμός is further found in the Dp. in the second hemistich ἐπὶ κλισμοῖσι καθίζων (*Il.* 8.436 and 11.623, *Od.* 17.90), in the first hemistich εἶσεν δ' ἐν κλισμοῖσι |<sub>T</sub> (*Il.* 9.200), as well as in the formula |<sub>P</sub> κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε (8x *Od.*).

<sup>871</sup> The assumption that εἰνὶ θρόνω replaced an older *\*ἐν θρόνω* (entertained by de Lamberterie 2004: 244-5, following Hoekstra) seems unnecessary to me from an inner-Epic perspective.

dress', epithet of Aphrodite in Sappho (fr. 1.1),<sup>872</sup> with the phrase ἐν δὲ θρόνα ποικίλ' ἔπασσε "and on it she embroidered varicolored threads" (*Il.* 22.441).<sup>873</sup> This was further elaborated by Lawler (1948), who argued that χρυσόθρονος and ἑϋθρονος are to be analyzed in the same way. She was followed in this analysis by the etymological dictionaries (Frisk, *DELG*), but not by Jouanna (1999), who maintains the traditional identification with θρόνος 'throne'.<sup>874</sup>

In my view, Lawler's idea is proven correct by the formulaic behavior of the compounds in Homer.<sup>875</sup> ἑϋθρονος (6x) is an exclusive epithet of Dawn.<sup>876</sup> χρυσόθρονος occur 15x and qualifies Dawn (10x), Hera (3x),<sup>877</sup> and Artemis (2x). Since Artemis and Hera have different traditional epithets, it is clear that χρυσόθρονος originally qualified Dawn, too.<sup>878</sup> The following system of formulaic epithets can be set up for 'Dawn' in Early Greek Epic:

Ns.	<sub>P</sub> χρυσόθρονος (ἦλυθεν) Ἡώς 'golden-threaded Dawn (appeared)' (  <sub>T</sub> φάνη)   <sub>H</sub> ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς 'rose-fingered Dawn (appeared)'
As.	<sub>P</sub> χρυσόθρονον Ἡῶ (μίμνε/ο-, ἵκε/ο-) '(await, reach) golden-threaded Dawn'   <sub>T</sub> ἑϋθρονον Ἡῶ (μίμνε/ο-, ἵκε/ο-) '(await, reach) beautiful-threaded Dawn'   <sub>B</sub> Ἡῶ δῖαν 'heavenly Dawn'
Gs.	<sub>P</sub> (μέσφ') Ἡοῦς ἠριγενείης '(till) early-born Dawn'
Ds.	<sub>P</sub> ἅμα δ' Ἡοῖ φαινομένηφι 'when Dawn appeared'   <sub>T</sub> ἅμ' Ἡοῖ φαινομένηφι 'id.'

This system dates from before the contractions of vowels in hiatus due to the loss of \**h*.<sup>879</sup>

Let us now consider the semantic interpretation of the compounds in -θρονος more precisely. Since they originally appeared in formulae with Ἡώς, the connection with θρόνα is much more attractive than that with θρόνος: cf. Ἡώς ... κροκόπεπλος 'with saffron-colored dress' (3x *Il.*) and probably ποικιλόθρον' ἀθανάτ' Ἀφροδίτα 'immortal Aphrodite with varicolored threads' (Sapph. 1.1). The image of the sisters Dawn and Night wearing resplendent clothes is also widespread in Vedic poetry, and may well have been inherited from PIE poetry. Most other compounds with a first member χρυσο- denote attributes that are

<sup>872</sup> The reading ποικιλόθρον' is certainly to be preferred over ποικιλόθρον, since it is the *lectio difficilior* and is better attested in the ms. tradition (cf. Jouanna 1999: 101-3). The most widely accepted translation is 'on richly-worked throne' (*LSJ*), adopted e.g. by Page (1955: 4).

<sup>873</sup> For reasons that are unclear to me, Risch (1972, followed by Nordheider *Lfgre* s.v. ἑϋθρονος, θρόνα) wants to derive θρόνα secondarily from a misunderstood compound ποικιλόθρονος. This is problematic because ποικιλόθρονος is unattested in Homer. Jouanna (1999) and Wartelle (2000) contain no new insights.

<sup>874</sup> The traditional interpretation is found in e.g. *LSJ* (s.v. ποικιλόθρονος) and in Page's commentary on Sappho (1950). The *Lfgre* (s.v. χρυσόθρονος) does not make a decision, and gives both 'mit goldenem Thron' and 'mit goldenem Gewand / Verzierungen' as possible interpretations. Intermediate positions, deriving some of the θρονος-compounds from θρόνος and others from θρόνα, have also been defended (cf. the literature in Jouanna 1999: 103).

<sup>875</sup> For the sake of uniformity, I have chosen to write Ἡώς (etc.) rather than ἠώς.

<sup>876</sup> In Pindar, ἑϋθρονος is also an epithet of the Horai, the Charites, Kleo, and Aphrodite.

<sup>877</sup> Only χρυσόθρονος Ἥρη (*Il.* 1.611), Ἥρη ... χρυσόθρονος (*Il.* 14.153), and gen. παρὰ χρυσοθρόνου Ἥρης (*Il.* 15.5). Two further examples are found in the hymns.

<sup>878</sup> The formulaic nominatives of Hera are (θεᾷ) |<sub>H</sub> λευκώλενος Ἥρη (*Il.*, very frequent), and (βοῶπις) |<sub>B</sub> πότνια Ἥρη (*Il.*, also very frequent); both remain current in Hesiod and the hymns. For Artemis, among others, the verse-final Ns. Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα (9x Hom., 2x hymn.), and Ἄρτεμις ἄγνη 'virgin Artemis' (3x *Od.*).

<sup>879</sup> Only the Ns. Ἡώς can be verse-final, while it does not occur in this position in the other case forms (Ἡῶ, Ἡοῦς, Ἡοῖ). This can only be understood if the entire system developed before the aforementioned contraction took place. This is confirmed by the formula |<sub>B</sub> Ἡῶ δῖαν < \**āwoha diwjan* (< \**ahwoha*): as is well-known, this must have been created when the fifth foot was not yet spondaic.

worn on the body, both by masculine and feminine figures.<sup>880</sup> The precise meaning of θρόνα may be debated, but in my view (see section 2.1.1), ‘threads colored by dying’, whence ‘embroideries’, is the most likely. Note that χρυσόθρονος ‘golden-threaded’ and ῥοδοδάκτυλος ‘rose-fingered’ can both be understood to refer to the emerging rays of the new-born sun.

It cannot be denied, on the other hand, that χρυσόθρονος synchronically means ‘golden-throned’ when it qualifies Hera.<sup>881</sup> However, this may be a recent creation made possible by a reinterpretation of its meaning. Against the view that ‘golden-throned’ is the original meaning, Lawler (1949: 82) already argued that χρυσόθρονος is an exclusively feminine epithet, whereas the throne was originally a symbol of masculine power and authority.<sup>882</sup> Thus, I agree with West when he states: “it is conceivable that [χρυσόθρονος] originally meant ‘gold-patterned’ (from θρόνα), referring to Dawn’s robe, and that after reinterpretation as ‘gold-throned’, the epithet was then extended to other goddesses, such as Hera.” (2007: 219ff., 221 n. 90). We may conclude that the compounds in -θρονος have no bearing on the reconstruction of θρόνος ‘chair’.

### 7.3.7 Κρόνος

Kronos, the father and predecessor of Zeus, has no convincing IE etymology, nor any cognates within Greek itself.<sup>883</sup> This would be a sufficient reason to exclude the name from the present discussion, if it were not for the *McL* scansion which Κρονίων and some case-forms of Κρόνος undergo in Epic Greek. The frequent nominative Κρονίων ‘Zeus’ always has a long ī in Homer, so that its Κρ- regularly counts as tautosyllabic for metrical purposes. Moreover, the Gs. of Κρόνος itself (in the form Κρόνοιο) and the Ds. Κρόνω may also undergo *McL* scansion. Although these facts are suggestive of a pre-form with syllabic liquid, the case of θρόνος has taught us that no conclusions can be drawn before we have analyzed the metrical evidence more thoroughly.

In the following table, the evidence for Κρόνος from Homer and Hesiod is treated simultaneously, because the name has a high relative frequency in the *Theogony*. The numbers for Hesiod (in brackets) follow those for Homer.<sup>884</sup>

<sup>880</sup> χρυσ-άμυξ ‘with golden headband’, χρυσο-πήληξ ‘with golden helmet’, χρυσό-ζωνος ‘with golden girdle’, χρυσο-κόμης ‘with golden hair’, χρυσο-πέδιλος ‘with golden sandals’, χρυσο-πλόκαμος ‘with golden braids’, χρυσο-στέφανος ‘with golden wreath’, etc. (all Hom.+).

<sup>881</sup> Hera is the spouse par excellence, especially the spouse of Zeus, sitting beside him. When we encounter the image of Zeus sleeping beside χρυσόθρονος Hera (*Il.* 1.611 and 15.5), it is not really clear whether this epithet refers to her sitting on a throne. This image is found, however, in σείσατο δ’ εἰνὶ θρόνῳ, ἐλέλιξε δὲ μακρὸν Ὀλύμπῳ (*Il.* 8.199), where angry Hera is shaken while sitting on her throne; similarly ἔζετο δ’ εἰνὶ θρόνῳ (*Il.* 15.150). Zeus, too, sits down on a ‘throne of gold’: αὐτὸς δὲ χρύσειον ἐπὶ θρόνον εὐρύσπα Ζεὺς ἔζετο (*Il.* 8.442-3). When Hera asks Hypnos to lull Zeus asleep, she offers him a golden chair: δῶρα δὲ τοι δώσω καλὸν θρόνον ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ χρύσειον (*Il.* 14.238-9). For a discussion of this argument, see Jouanna (1999: 114). It cannot be denied, then, that χρυσόθρονος had already been reinterpreted as ‘having a golden throne’ in the two passages about Hera. Even so, the fact that χρυσόθρονος was originally an epithet of Dawn proves that its reanalysis as ‘having a golden throne’ was relatively recent.

<sup>882</sup> Jouanna remarks (1999: 114) that female deities are represented as seated on thrones in Epic and later Greek poetry. Indeed, the image of throning females has clearly spread in ὑψιθρόνων ... Νηρείδων (*Pi. Nem.* 4.65) ‘of the high-seated Nereids’, ὁμοθρόνου Ἥρας (*Pi. Nem.* 11.2) ‘of Hera who shares a throne’ (i.e. with Zeus). But this does not invalidate Lawler’s point that none of the compounds in -θρονος ever qualifies a masculine deity. In Homer, the two cases where χρυσόθρονος qualifies Hera are the only evidence for the meaning ‘-throned’.

<sup>883</sup> My main objection to Janda’s recent proposal (2010: 50-1) to reconstruct \*kr-ono- ‘cutter’ is morphological. There is hardly any evidence that a Greek suffix -ono- could be added to a zero grade root (see above on θρόνος), and the suffix is unclear in terms of IE morphonology.

<sup>884</sup> In the figures for Hesiod, I include only the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*, without making any claims about Hesiod’s authorship of other works and fragments. I have not included the *Homeric hymns*, because this would not change the picture in a substantial way, as the reader can check for himself.

Case	Form	##	Formulaic material	Remarks
Ns.	Κρόνος	2 (5)	<sub>H</sub> Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης (1x <i>Il.</i> , 4x <i>Th.</i> ), preceded by τέκετο or γένετο, or the extended form   <sub>T</sub> μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης ( <i>Th.</i> 168, 473, 495).	<i>McL</i> scansion avoided, except <i>Il.</i> 8.479. <sup>885</sup>
Gs.	Κρόνοιο	4 (0)	Ἦρη πρέσβα θεὰ θύγατερ μέγαλοιο Κρόνοιο Ἦρη πρέσβα θεὰ θυγάτηρ μέγαλοιο Κρόνοιο <sup>886</sup>	<i>McL</i> scansion Only <i>Il.</i>
	Κρόνου	15 (7)	<sub>T</sub> Κρόνου πάϊς   <sub>B</sub> ἀγκυλομήτεω (7x <i>Il.</i> , 1x <i>Od.</i> )   <sub>T</sub> Κρόνου πάϊς   <sub>B</sub> ... (5x <i>Il.</i> )  In Hesiod, Κρόνου (mostly before   <sub>B</sub> ) is always followed by a vowel. In Homer, this happens only in   <sub>T</sub> δῶν Κρόνου νῆε κραταιῶ ( <i>Il.</i> 13.345)	
Ds.	Κρόνω	0 (3)	Prevocalic ( <i>Th.</i> 634),   <sub>T</sub> Κρόνω ( <i>Th.</i> 453), <i>McL</i> scansion ἀμφὶ Κρόνω βασιλῆϊ ( <i>Th.</i> 476)	Not in Hom.
As.	Κρόνον	3 (3)	<sub>T</sub> θεοὶ Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἔδοντες (2x <i>Il.</i> , 1x <i>Th.</i> )	Always before   <sub>B</sub> .

Table 7.4: The pattern of attestation of the name Κρόνος in Homer and Hesiod

There are some noteworthy similarities between Homer's and Hesiod's use of Κρόνος. Both authors use the formulae |<sub>T</sub> θεοὶ Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἔδοντες 'the gods [of the netherworld] that surround Kronos' and |<sub>H</sub> Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης 'Kronos of crooked plans' (Homer only N., Hesiod also A.), which are probably old. Κρόνος prefers the prevocalic position before |<sub>B</sub> not only in these formulae, but also more generally. With the sole exception of Ἰάπετός τε Κρόνος τε (*Il.* 8.479), all attestations of the N. and A. occupy this position, and the same holds for the G. in -ου in Hesiod.

There are also some remarkable differences between Homer and Hesiod. The verse of address for Hera and the colon |<sub>T</sub> Κρόνου πάϊς |<sub>B</sub> (without following ἀγκυλομήτεω) are found only in the *Iliad*. The frequent formula |<sub>T</sub> Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω (Ns. of 'Zeus', also once in *Od.*) is also absent from Hesiod. That the D. Κρόνω is unattested in Homer may be due to chance, because Kronos does not play a thematic role in the Homeric poems. Similarly, Homer uses the G. Κρόνου, Κρόνοιο only in constructions describing descent from Kronos, while Hesiod also uses the G. in other constructions. The single instance of *McL* scansion for the D. in Hesiod (ἀμφὶ Κρόνω βασιλῆϊ, *Th.* 476, beside two other instances of Κρόνω) may be ascribed to an incidental application of the licence.

In the specifically Homeric |<sub>T</sub> Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω, the use of Κρόνου before a following consonant is made possible by the preceding caesura.<sup>887</sup> The combination of quantitative metathesis in ἀγκυλομήτεω and the irresolvably contracted Gs. in Κρόνου ensures that this formula is a recent creation, based on a conflation of the colon |<sub>T</sub> Κρόνου πάϊς and the formula |<sub>H</sub> Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης.<sup>888</sup> Since it is unlikely that |<sub>T</sub> Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω is absent from Hesiod by chance, Homer probably innovated here.

<sup>885</sup> Only in Ἰάπετός τε Κρόνος τε (*Il.* 8.479), which may be due to an incidental application of the licence.

<sup>886</sup> The nominative verse (*Il.* 5.721 and 8.383) is clearly a transformation of the older vocative verse (*Il.* 14.194 and 243), because πρέσβα 'Venerable Lady' is best explained as a vocative which developed on the basis of πότνα 'Lady'. After that, πρέσβα was used as a nominative in πρέσβα Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἄτη (*Il.* 19.91) and πρέσβα Κλυμένοιο θυγατρῶν (*Od.* 3.452, with a different meaning 'most venerable').

<sup>887</sup> Cf. also |<sub>T</sub> Κρόνον πολυώνυμος υἱός (2x *h. Cer.*), referring to Hades.

<sup>888</sup> Except for *Il.* 16.431, |<sub>T</sub> Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω is preceded by a κ-aorist in all its attestations. This may corroborate a recent productivity of the formula.

We are therefore left only with  $|_P$  θύγατερ μέγαλοιο Κρόνοιο as a candidate to contain a relic scansion of  $*_r$ . In view of the repeated Gs. ending -οιο in verse-final position, the verse has an archaic appearance. But how serious is this evidence? The motional vocative πρέσβα is not necessarily old, because it may have been influenced by πότνα (see above). I propose that  $|_P$  θύγατερ μέγαλοιο Κρόνοιο was formed after  $|_T$  Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω, which is structurally identical: if Zeus is regularly called ‘child of Kronos’, his spouse could be called ‘daughter of Kronos’. The motive for creating a new formula was the different caesura after Ἥρη πρέσβα θεά.<sup>889</sup> In doing so, Homer permitted himself an incidental use of the *McL* licence. The subsequent iterability of the verse-end μέγαλοιο Κρόνοιο, apparent from the transformation of the line into a nominative, was probably promoted by verse-final Κρονίων (on which see below). The epithet μέγαλοιο may have been taken over from  $|_T$  μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης (3x Hes., also once  $|_T$  μέγας Κρόνος  $|_B$  without following ἀγκυλομήτης), the extended and oldest form of the formula. In other words, both  $|_T$  Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω and  $|_P$  θύγατερ μέγαλοιο Κρόνοιο presuppose the prior existence of  $|_T$  μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης.

### 7.3.8 Κρονίων

The theonym Κρονίων ‘son of Kronos’, which is used as a metrical alternative for Ζεύς, is commonly analyzed as a patronymic formation in -ίων. Its attestations are as follows:

Case	Form	##	Formulaic material	Remarks
Ns.	Κρονίων	42 (3)	Some combinations occur more than once: ( $ _H$ κατέ-) $ _B$ νεῦσε Κρονίων (3x <i>Il.</i> ) $ _H$ ἐτέλεσσε Κρονίων (2x <i>Od.</i> ) $ _H$ ἐτάνυσσε Κρονίων (2x <i>Il.</i> ) $ _T$ ἐπεκράεινε Κρονίων (2x <i>Il.</i> ), etc.	Verse-final (except 1x <i>Il.</i> , 3x <i>Od.</i> ). Mostly unaccompanied by Ζεύς.
Gs.	Κρονίωνος	3 (1)	$ _T$ ἐρισθενέος Κρονίωνος (1x <i>Il.</i> , 1x <i>Od.</i> )	Verse-final except <i>Il.</i> 21.230.
	Κρονίονος	2 (0)	<i>Il.</i> 14.247, <i>Od.</i> 11.620. Both after $ _T$ and with preceding G. Ζηνός.	Cf. Μολίωνε in the same position.
Ds.	Κρονίονι	16 (3)	$ _T$ Διὶ Κρονίονι μάχεσθαι (2x <i>Il.</i> ) $ _T$ ὑπερμενεί Κρονίονι (4x <i>Il.</i> , 1x <i>Th.</i> ) $ _T$ κελαινεφεΐ Κρονίονι (3x <i>Il.</i> ) $ _T$ Διὶ Κρονίονι ἄνακτι (4x <i>Il.</i> , 1x <i>Op.</i> )	Never in <i>Od.</i>
As.	Κρονίωνα	10 (0)	$ _T$ Δία Κρονίωνα + verb (3x <i>Il.</i> , 1x <i>Od.</i> ) $ _T$ ὑπερμενέα Κρονίωνα (2x <i>Il.</i> ) $ _T$ κελαινεφέα Κρονίωνα (1x <i>Il.</i> ) $ _T$ Δία Κρονίωνα ἄνακτα (1x <i>Il.</i> )	Only twice in <i>Od.</i>

Table 7.5: The pattern of attestation of Κρονίων in Homer and Hesiod

Some of the accusative formulae must be transformations of dative formulae, but that is irrelevant for present purposes.<sup>890</sup> Leaving aside the genitive form Κρονίωνος, which is

<sup>889</sup> If  $|_P$  θύγατερ μέγαλοιο Κρόνοιο were the older formula of the two, one would expect a  $T_2$ -formula  $^{++}$ πάϊς μέγαλοιο Κρόνοιο, rather than Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω.

<sup>890</sup> For instance,  $|_T$  Δία Κρονίωνα ἄνακτα and  $|_T$  Δία Κρονίωνα + verb form contain the historically more recent As. form Δία (further only 6x Hom., 3x Hes.), replacing older Ζῆν(α) (10x Hom., 5x Hes.).

probably a secondary creation on the basis of verse-final Κρονίων,<sup>891</sup> we are left with a remarkable distribution N. Κρονίων (with long ī) beside Κρονίων- (with short ι) in the other case forms. Parallel to this distribution, *McL* scansion is applied only in Κρονίων, not in any of the other forms.

The long ī of the N. Κρονίων is usually explained as a metrical lengthening.<sup>892</sup> This assumption is quite problematic in itself, because there was no clear motive: Κρονίων with short -ī- is anapestic, and therefore eminently suited for use in the dactylic hexameter. Other verse-final cases like Στυγὸς ὕδωρ (only *Il.* 14.271) or αἰόλον ὄφιν (only *Il.* 12.208), which have been explained by Ancient commentators as στίχοι μείουροι, are merely incidental; moreover, verse-final Στυγὸς ὕδωρ may be due to a dislocation of |<sub>P</sub> Στυγὸς ὕδωρ (*Il.* 15.37, *Od.* 5.185), which itself is probably due to declension of |<sub>P</sub> Στυγὸς ὕδατος (*Il.* 2.755, 8.369, *Od.* 10.514) with metrical lengthening in a tribach. Finally, if verse-final Κρονίων arose by metrical lengthening, this would entail that a metrical irregularity (*McL* scansion) was introduced at the same time. Given the large number of attestations of verse-final Κρονίων, this scenario is unacceptable.<sup>893</sup>

In view of these problems, one can hardly avoid the conclusion that the Ns. Κρονίων and the other case forms with Κρονίων- originally belonged to two different paradigms.<sup>894</sup> This conclusion may come as a surprise, but it is reinforced by various other considerations. First of all, Pindar, the only non-epic author to use Κρονίων, only attests the nominative form.<sup>895</sup> Beside this form, Pindar uses Κρονίδας, the only form current in non-epic poetry. Secondly, it must be asked what happened to the nominative with short -ī- belonging to the other case forms of Κρονίων-. It is not difficult to find the answer: it was replaced by Κρονίδης, which has the productive suffix and occurs 37x in Homer. The same goes for the vocative Κρονίδη (in Homer, verse-final Κρονίων is never used as a vocative).<sup>896</sup> The weak cases of Κρονίδης, on the other hand, are only marginally attested in Homer (D. 3x, G. does not occur). These distributions can be explained if we assume that the N. Κρονίων (with long ī) is an archaic name of Zeus, which was drawn into the orbit of the patronymic Κρονίων- relatively recently.<sup>897</sup>

<sup>891</sup> This is proven by the fact that both instances of the form are preceded by the analogical form Ζηνός earlier in the verse. By contrast, the N. Κρονίων is regularly used without a preceding Ζεύς, as we will see below.

<sup>892</sup> This is indeed assumed by Ruijgh (1968: 146), referring to Chantraine (1942, I: 104) for metrical lengthening in the sixth foot (“allongement métrique du 6<sup>e</sup> temps fort”).

<sup>893</sup> Thus, a metrical lengthening could only be reconciled with a pre-form \*Κῆρνιῶν. But as we have just seen, there is no compelling evidence to reconstruct Κρόνος as \*Κῆρνο-.

<sup>894</sup> It is commonly agreed that the Ns. Κρονίων is a patronymic in -ίων, and a relic form beside the metrical alternative Κρονίδης. But the status of Κρονίων- as a patronymic cannot be easily confirmed by parallel cases. Within Homer, Risch (1974: 57) compares Βουκολίων beside Βουκολίδης, Δευκαλίων beside Δευκαλίδης, Ἰασίων beside Ἰασίδης, and Ἰφιδίων beside Ἰφιδίδης. Note, however, that in none of these pairs the form in -ίων is a genuine patronymic. For instance, Δευκαλίδης refers to Ἰδομενεύς, the son of Δευκαλίων (PN); Ἰασίδης means ‘son of Ἰασός’, but Ἰασίων (PN) is not a patronymic synchronically. The two remaining examples of patronymics in -ίων are Ἀτρείων beside Ἀτρείδης ‘Agamemnon’ and Πηλεΐων beside Πηληϊάδης ‘Achilles’, where Πηλεΐων is old, and Ἀτρείων clearly secondary. In view of its problematic short -ε-, the precise derivational history of Πηλεΐων is debated.

<sup>895</sup> In Κρονίων, the -ι- is scanned long in *Pyth.* 1.71, *Nem.* 9.19, but short in *Pyth.* 3.57, 4.23, *Nem.* 1.16, 9.28, and 10.76. It is also noteworthy that the non-nominative forms are rare in the *Odyssey*, which has 20x N. Κρονίων (against *Il.* 22x), but only 3x the other three case forms taken together (against *Il.* 26x).

<sup>896</sup> But Pindar does have a vocative Κρονίων (*Pyth.* 1.71, *Nem.* 9.28, 10.76).

<sup>897</sup> The formulaic character of Κρονίων is shown not so much by its localization property (see section 6.7.6 on τράπεζα), as by the frequency of a preceding 3s. aor. in -ε (28x). Of the 38 verse-final cases, the Ns. Ζεύς does not occur earlier in the same verse, with only one exception (*Od.* 21.102). On the other hand, in three of the four non-verse-final instances, Κρονίων is preceded by Ζεύς (*Od.* 17.424 = 19.80, 20.273; without Ζεύς in *Il.* 17.269). This shows that Κρονίων was restricted to verse-final position earlier in the tradition, and was originally used without a preceding Ζεύς (thus always in the *Iliad*).

Among the Homeric names in -ίων, there are two synchronically distinct types: (1) the patronymic in -ίων, which maintains the long -ω- of the nominative in the other case forms; (2) forms in -ίων which have a long -ī- throughout and which display suffixal ablaut (Gs. -ίονος). As Ruijgh (1968) shows, this difference cannot be due to metrical lengthening, because the two types have different etymological origins. The patronymic type was historically derived from the adjectives of appurtenance in -ιος (type στραβών : στραβός), which has corresponding Mycenaean forms in -i-jo. The second type contains the suffix \*-īwon-, attested in Mycenaean as -i-wo in the PNs *a-ri-wo* /Arīwōn/ (= Hom. Ἀρίων) and *a-ki-wo-ni-jo* /Alkīwonios/.<sup>898</sup> In Homer, this type is residual, and (beside Κρονίων) attested only in a few names (Ἀρίων, Ἀμφίων, Ἰξίωνιος, Μολίωνε, Ὑπερίων) and in the invective κυλλοποδίων ‘lame-foot’ (nickname of Hephaistos).<sup>899</sup> Note that both κυλλοποδίων and Κρονίων occur in verse-final position. These names are not patronymics, but sobriquets; in most cases, they were derived from truncated stems in -i-.<sup>900</sup>

The metrical behavior of the N. Κρονίων confirms that the form contains original \*-ī-. I therefore submit that it belongs to the second type in \*-īwon-, whereas Κρονίων- belongs to the patronymic type in -iōn-. The N. Κρονίων was originally not a patronymic, but a sobriquet derived from a form starting with \*kryn- or \*kryni-, possibly a compound. Its etymology, however, must remain uncertain.<sup>901</sup> This analysis allows us to explain the *McL* scansion of the N. Κρονίων by the earlier presence of \*r̥. When Epic \*r̥ was eliminated, \*Krynīwōn vocalized as \*Κρανίων, but this form was reshaped to Κρονίων because the name was identified with the patronymic Κρονίων- ‘son of Kronos’, which never contained a syllabic liquid. This scenario may look overly complicated, but I feel that the metrical evidence asks for such a drastic solution.

### 7.3.9 κροαίνω

In Homer, the verb κροαίνω is attested only in the formula |<sub>P</sub> θεῖη πεδίοιο κροαίνων ‘(when a horse) runs κροαίνων across the plain’ (*Il.* 6.507, in a simile 506-11 which is repeated in its entirety at *Il.* 15.263-8). After Homer, the word is taken up only by Oppian (κροαίνοντες πεδίοιο *Cyn.* 1.279, clearly built on the Homeric phrase). The precise meaning of κροαίνων cannot be derived from the context of the simile, a fact which is illustrated by the diverging opinions of Ancient scholiasts and grammarians. Some of them connect κροαίνων with κρούω ‘to stamp’ or with κροτέω ‘to stamp the feet’, and take πεδίοιο as a *genitivus loci* with θεῖη. Others interpret πεδίοιο as a complement of κροαίνων, and translate this syntagm as ‘longing (ἐπιθυμῶν) for the plain’.

<sup>898</sup> The origin of the suffix \*-īwon- must be identical to that of \*-āwon-, which is more frequently attested, e.g. in Myc. Ds. *o-qa-wo-ni*, Hom. ὀπάων ‘member of the retinue’, PNs Myc. *a-mu-ta-wo* = Hom. Ἀμυθάων, cf. Ἀπισάων. The \*-āwon- type derives personal names from ā-stems, and makes sobriquets, invectives, and appellatives belonging to social terminology (ὀπάων). An original suffix \*-won- which lengthened a preceding vowel (in IE terms, \*-Huon-) was added to forms ending in \*-ā- and \*-i-. Subsequently, \*-īwon- was reanalyzed as an independent suffix which created sobriquets and invectives. The ablaut of types (1) and (2) is meticulously kept distinct in Homeric Greek – that is, with the sole apparent exception of Κρονίων. As Ruijgh notes concerning the names in -ίων-, “... on observe que tous ces noms appartiennent aux récits mythologiques, et que 9 d’entre eux figurent déjà chez Homère. Ceci prouve que les noms en -ίων-, eux aussi, appartiennent à la vieille tradition épique, représentant une formation qui n’est plus productive à l’époque classique” (1968: 145).

<sup>899</sup> Perhaps also in βραχίων ‘upper arm’ if this was originally an invective “shorty” (see section 6.8.4).

<sup>900</sup> For instance, Ἰξίων is thought to derive from a verbal governing compound with first member \*hiksi- (ικέτης ‘suppliant’: the mythological figure Ἰξίων was the first one to supplicate Zeus), Ἀρίων from a compound with first member ἄρι-, and Ἀμφίων from a prepositional compound.

<sup>901</sup> From a phonological perspective, there is of course one perspicuous candidate: the IE word \*kryno- ‘horn’, attested in Germanic, Celtic, and Italic. An original meaning ‘horny’ would excellently fit the adulterous character of Zeus, but this idea must remain pure speculation, because the semantic development found in English ‘horny’ may well be highly specific.

The status of κροαίνων as evidence for *McL* scansion is problematic: it is unclear what the pre-form was, we are dealing with a quasi-hapax, and the meaning is not entirely certain. Still, there are some indications that the hemistich is traditional and contains a relic scansion due to \**ɣ*. The *genitivus loci* πεδίοιο ‘across the plain’ is frequent in Homer, but disappears afterwards (Chantraine 1953: 58f.). In terms of formulaic language, we have to compare it with |<sub>P</sub> πολέος πεδίοιο θέοντος (*Il.* 23.521) and |<sub>P</sub> πολέος πεδίοιο θέουσαι (*Il.* 4.244), where a participle form of θέω takes the place of κροαίνων. Finally, the use of the long vowel stem-form in the subjunctive θείη is odd, although several explanations are theoretically possible.<sup>902</sup>

The etymology of κροαίνω, however, is problematic. It is mostly thought to be related within Greek to κρούω ‘to beat, stamp’. Frisk (s.v. κρούω) suggests that all Greek forms may derive from a PIE root \**krous-*, and points at possible Slavic cognates (e.g. Ru. *krušit* ‘to stamp, pound’, *kroxa* ‘crumble’). This reconstruction leads into trouble, because the Homeric form would have undergone prevocalic shortening \**krō(w)aniē/o-* > \**kroaine/o-*, whereas the vernacular form κρούω always keeps (i.e. restores) the prevocalic diphthong in later Ionic-Attic. In order to save the connection with κρούω, one would have to assume that the unrestored outcome of prevocalic shortening, \**kroaine/o-*, was taken by Homer from his contemporary vernacular. However, it would be difficult to productively add the suffix -αίνω in the Ionic vernacular. Its appearance can only be explained within Epic Greek, where a few verbs in -αίνω with similar semantics are found: μενεαίνω ‘to rage’, βλεμεαίνω ‘to exult’, κραδαίνω ‘to brandish’. In sum, I have no explanation for the scansion of κροαίνων if |<sub>H</sub> πεδίοιο κροαίνων is indeed an old formula.

## 7.4 Conclusions

We may conclude with confidence that the regular reflex of Epic \**ɣ* after a labial consonant was -ρο-. The main pieces of evidence are βροτός < \**mrtó-* and related forms (Dp. βροτοῖσι, ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης, ἄμβροτος, ἀμβρόσιος, νύξ ἀβρότη), ἡμβροτον < \**āmṛton* (and ἀβροτάξομεν), πρὸς < \**pṛtj-* (and πρὸς- as a preverb, πρὸσω, πρὸσωπον), προκείμενα < \**pṛ-keimena* in the formulaic verse in which it occurs, Ἀφροδίτη < \**Ap<sup>h</sup>rdītā*, and ῥοδόεντι < \**wṛdowent-*. This development was probably not paralleled in the Proto-Ionic vernacular: in spite of the *o*-vocalism of πόρσω, forms like μάρναμαι and ἁμαρτεῖν prove that *a*-coloring was regular also after a labial consonant. The remaining instances of -ρο- in combination with *McL* scansion can be explained in various ways. The old Epic word ἀνδροτήτα may have

<sup>902</sup> It is unlikely that θείη continues an aorist subjunctive form \**t<sup>h</sup>ews-e/o-*, because no other aorist forms of θέω are attested in Greek (except for a very late instance): δραμεῖν is the normal synchronic aorist to θέω, both in Homer and in Hdt., see Kölligan 2007), and the Vedic cognate *dhāvati* does not form an old aorist either. It has been assumed that θέω is an alternative present formation \**d<sup>h</sup>eu-ie/o-* beside \**d<sup>h</sup>eu-e/o-* (e.g. *LIV*<sup>2</sup>). Kölligan (2007: 195) prefers to derive θέω from a Narten present \**d<sup>h</sup>ēu-e/o-*. Before either conclusion is drawn, however, we have to try and explain θέω within Epic Greek. Out of 8 attestations of θέω, 7 are found after the trochaic caesura. A theoretically possible interpretation of this distribution is that θέω originated from the expected form θέω in a T<sub>2</sub>-formula, that was utilized after a P<sub>1</sub>-formula. But another explanation is more likely in my view: 6 attestations of θέω concern the pres. inf. θείειν, which always occurs in front of a consonant, the root syllable θει- occupying the biceps. For this idea, cf. already Chantraine (1942: 346 and 492). The attestations are |<sub>P</sub> θείειν ταχὺς ἡδὲ μαχητῆς (3x Hom. in Ns. and As.), on which are based βάρδιστοι θείειν |<sub>P</sub> (1x *Il.*), ἐλαφρότατοι |<sub>P</sub> θείειν (1x *Od.*), and |<sub>P</sub> θείειν δ’ ἀνέμοισιν ὁμοῖοι (1x *Il.*), all of which qualify the racing qualities of a horse. This infinitive may be reconstructed as \**t<sup>h</sup>ewehen*, where the ending -εεν was retained within Epic Greek after the contraction to -ēn in the vernacular. After the subsequent contraction of -ewe- to <-ει->, the ensuing form \**t<sup>h</sup>ēēn* (then written ΘΕΕΝ) was replaced with *t<sup>h</sup>ēēn*, which was eventually written θείειν. This leaves us only with the subjunctive form θείη, in our present verse, as evidence for the stem θει-. It may either be an archaism or, if the author of the *Iliad* already sung /*t<sup>h</sup>ēēn*/, θείη may have been based on the artificial form θείειν. In that case, the hemistich as a whole would be recent, but nevertheless, the smaller chunk |<sub>H</sub> πεδίοιο κροαίνων could be traditional: compare πολέος πεδίοιο δίενται (*Il.* 23.475, also of horses).



replaced an intermediate form with ἀνδρα-. The metrical behavior of θρόνος in the *Odyssey* may be due to a secondary development, and the pre-form probably did not contain \**r*. Κρονίων may be a conflation of two etymologically distinct words, where the etymon with \**ro* may have influenced that with \**r*.

In my view, Heubeck (1972) was right in assuming \**r* for Mycenaean, but for a different reason. In chapter 2, it was concluded that the regular Mycenaean reflex of \**r* cannot have been -*ro*-. On the basis of the Mycenaean material alone, it is impossible to decide whether the spelling <Co-> (as in e.g. *to-pe-za* and *wo-ze*) represents -*or*- or -*r*-. If we suppose that the regular outcome is -*or*-, it would follow that no Mycenaean scansion can be found in Epic Greek, because there are no Epic forms with -*op*- from \**r*. On the other hand, if we assume that \**-r*- remained intact in Mycenaean, the following lexical isoglosses with Epic Greek would receive a natural explanation: τράπεζα ~ Myc. *to-pe-za*, ἀνδρεϊφόντης ~ Myc. PN *a-no-qo-ta*, ῥοδόεντ- ~ Myc. *wo-do-we*, as well as ἀβροτάξομεν with its guttural suffix. The divergent vowel slot of these forms with -*pa*- and -*po*- can be accounted for as the development of Epic \**r*. At the same time, this explains the aberrant scansion of τράπεζα, ἀνδρεϊφόντης, and ἀβροτάξομεν.