The development of the Proto-Indo-European syllabic liquids in Greek
Beek, L.C. van

Cover Page

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

8. The reflexes -αρ- and -ρα- in the thematic aorist

8.1 Introduction
Most Greek thematic aorists derive from a late PIE or Proto-Greek thematic formation with zero grade root, e.g. λιπεῖν < *lik^w-e/o-, δρακεῖν < *$d\acute{r}k$-e/o-. The following thematic aorists with a root structure *CraC*- are attested in Homer (in alphabetical order of the root):[903]

Homeric thematic aorist with -ρα-	Other attested formations
ἔβραχε 'resounded'	no clear cognates
κατέδραθον 'went to sleep'	Att. pres. καταδαρθάνω, aor. κατέδαρθον
ἔδρακον 'beheld, looked'	pres. δέρκομαι, pf. δέδορκα 'to look'
ἔδραμον 'ran, shot'	pf. ἀνα-, ἐπι-δέδρομε 'runs up / over'
ἀνέκραγον 'spoke up'	post-Hom. pf. κέκραγε 'shrieks'
ἔπραθον 'pillaged'	pres. πέρθω 'to pillage, destroy'
ἔτραπον (tr.), -όμην (intr.) 'turned'	pres. τρέπω 'to direct', pf. mid. τέτραπται
ἔτραφον 'was raised, grew up'	pres. τρέφω 'to nourish', pf. τέτροφα

Besides, the following thematic aorists (either in Homer or in Classical Attic) have a root structure *CarC*- (in alphabetical order of the root):

Thematic aorist with -αρ-	Other attested formations
Hom. ἄμαρτε 'failed, missed'	pres. ἁμαρτάνω; cf. νημερτής 'unfailing'
Attic κατέδαρθον 'slept'	Att. pres. καταδαρθάνω
Attic ἔπαρδον 'farted'	pres. πέρδομαι
Hom. ταρπώμεθα 'let us satisfy ourselves'	pres. τέρπομαι 'to enjoy oneself'

We first have to eliminate the forms which have no relevance for the outcome of *$\mathring{r}$. The Homeric hapax ἀνέκραγον (*Od.* 14.467) contains a secondary zero grade, beside the full grade *CRāC*- in the pf. κέκρηγα.[904] Since ἔβραχε does not have a convincing etymology, it is uncertain whether its pre-form ever contained *$\mathring{r}$; it could be a loanword with *-*a*-. This leaves us with six Homeric thematic aorists with a root of the structure *CraC*- for which a zero grade pre-form *$C\mathring{r}C$-e/o- is etymologically ascertained. For ἔδραμον, ἔτραπον, and ἔτραφον, the existence of a full grade of the type *CreC*- or *CroC*- may explain the vowel slot

---

[903] To this list, one could add the reduplicated aorist πεφραδεῖν (Hom.+), and from Pindar the ptc. δραπών 'reaping'. However, the root φραδ- 'to perceive, think' has no etymology, and the zero grade reflex of δραπών may have been influenced by δρέπω. On ἔπραδες (only attested in Sophron), see below. The Homeric aorist ἔχραον 'dashed, attacked' is probably cognate with χραύω 'to glance off', in which case it does not continue a form with *$\mathring{r}$. For the Homeric 1p. subj. aor. τραπείομεν < *$t\mathring{r}p\bar{e}$-o-men (intr. aor. of τέρπομαι 'to enjoy oneself'), with the reflex -ρα- of Epic *$\mathring{r}$, see section 6.7.5. The intr. aor. 3p. βλάβεν may contain the regular reflex of *$\mathring{l}$, but it may also have introduced the reflex of a vocalized nasal from the present βλάβομαι (see section 10.3.1).
[904] The unprefixed aorist is frequent in Aristophanes, but only in the reduplicated stem κεκραγ-. The present κράζω 'screak' occurs once in Ar. and is probably a late formation; the compounded verb ἀνακράζω occurs only in the them. aor. (Hom., Pi., X., Ar., Aesop.). For secondary vocalism in a thematic aorist, cf. also διέτμαγον 'I crossed', διέτμαγεν 'they separated', beside pres. (ἀπο-)τμήγω, aor. (δια-)τμῆξαι. The aorist τραγεῖν 'to eat' occurs only a few times in the comedians (Ar., Phrynichus, Pherecrates, Theopompus), mostly with prefix, but its relation to the present τρώγω 'to gnaw, chew, eat' cannot be understood in Indo-European terms. If the comparison with Toch. B *tressäṃ* 'chews' is taken to imply a PIE root *trh_3g- (*LIV*[2], following Hackstein 1995), the *a*-vocalism of τραγεῖν must be secondary. It could be assumed that τραγεῖν was influenced by φαγεῖν; the same root shape is also found in τράγος 'he-goat'.

of the zero grade (δέδρομε, τρέπω, and τρέφω, respectively). Likewise, among the forms with -αρ-, the vocalization of Att. ἔπαρδον and Hom. ταρπώμεθα can be ascribed to the full grade presents πέρδομαι and τέρπομαι. In ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον, and ἔπραθον, on the other hand, we seem to be dealing with the regular reflex of *r̥: ἔδραθον has no cognates with a full grade root within Greek, and ἔδρακον, ἔπραθον have cognates with a full grade of the structure *CerC-*. These three forms seem to contradict our hypothesis that -αρ- is the regular Proto-Ionic reflex.

There are, however, serious reasons to doubt that -ρα- is the regular vernacular outcome of *r̥ in these three thematic aorists. First of all, it is difficult to give a convincing analogical explanation for the reflex -αρ- in Attic κατέδαρθον and ἥμαρτον (Hom. ἅμαρτε). It is also conspicuous that ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον, and ἔπραθον are typical Homeric forms, and unattested in Classical prose. We therefore have to consider the possibility that these forms contain the reflex of Epic *r̥, within the framework elaborated in chapter 6.[905] I will first argue that the forms with -αρ- contain the regular reflex of *r̥ in Proto-Ionic (section 8.2), then discuss the actual evidence for -ρα- < *r̥ in the type ἔδραθον (section 8.3), and finally explain how such forms came into being within Epic Greek (section 8.4).

8.2 The regular development *r̥ > -αρ- in the thematic aorist

8.2.1 ἔδραθον, κατέδαρθον, and καταδαρθάνω
In Homer, the thematic aorist ἔδραθον 'went to sleep, slept' is attested once as a simplex (*Od.* 20.143), but otherwise only with preverb: κατέδραθον (5x), παρέδραθον 'lay down beside' (2x).[906] After Homer, the aorist stem δραθ- is found only in Epic poetry (Antimachus), and later reappears in Hellenistic poetry (Theoc., Call.). The only genuine Attic form, on the other hand, is κατέδαρθον 'slept, fell asleep' (both in prose authors and in Aristophanes; it is unattested in Ionic prose). Thus, there is a perfect distribution in genre between Epic -δραθε/ο- and the prose form -δαρθε/ο-.

Let us first consider the possibilities to explain the different vocalizations by influence of a full grade of the root. Taken at face value, κατέδαρθον / κατέδραθον is a primary thematic aorist without further direct cognates, neither in Greek nor in other languages. It could be an inherited formation in view of the similar IE roots *drem-* (Lat. *dormiō* 'to sleep', CS *drěmati* 'to doze, slumber') and *dreH-* (Skt. opt. 3s. *ni-drāyā́t* 'to sleep, slumber').[907] Thus, the Greek verb could be derived from a root extension *dr̥dʰ-*, or perhaps rather *dr̥-dʰh₁-* (cf. below on πέρθω).[908]

Is it possible to determine the full grade slot of this root? In the *LIV²*, Kümmel mechanically reconstructs a root *derdʰ-*, with the argument: "für Vollstufe I spricht die analogische R(z) gr. att. δαρθ-." But while the Homeric attestation is older, it does not necessarily contain the regular vernacular reflex of *r̥. In fact, given the full grade II in the root variants *drem-* and *dreH-*, one could also argue that the full grade was *dredʰ-*, and that Attic ἔδαρθον has the regular outcome of *dr̥dʰ-e/o-*.

---

[905] Hirt already remarked: "Man muss im Griechischen natürlich auch mit dem Einfluss verwandter Bildungen rechnen. (…) Auch hier kann die Sache nur an einzelnen Kategorien klar werden" (1897: 157). He distinguishes, among others, the thematic aorists ("zeigen fast durchweg ρα") and the *u*-stem adjectives ("zeigen meistens ρα").

[906] For the Homeric semantics, see the discussion in Kölligan (2007: 173-9), especially his remark that "der … Bedeutungsansatz 'einschlafen' lässt sich bei Homer nicht belegen. ἔδραθον bedeutet entweder 'sich schlafen legen' oder fungiert als komplexiver Aorist zu εὕδω und bedeutet dann '(eine Zeit lang) schlafen'." (o.c. 174). In my view, the simplex ἔδραθον *Od.* 20.143 could be analyzed as in tmesis with the preceding ἐν ἀδεψήτῳ βοέῃ καὶ κώεσιν οἰῶν (line 142), cf. χλαῖναν … καὶ κώεα, τοῖσιν ἐνεῦδεν (*Od.* 20.95), and also *Od.* 3.349-51, *Od.* 10.11-12.

[907] CS *drěmati* derives from a lengthened grade formation *drēm-*, see Derksen (*EDSIL*, q.v.).

[908] Note that the Attic form with -δαρθ- excludes a reconstruction *dr̥m-dʰ- for Hom. ἔδραθον.

In any case, it is unwarranted to invoke the influence of an ablauting full grade form, because the only old formation within Greek is the thematic aorist *$dr̥d^h$-e/o-. The outcome of this aorist is used in suppletion with the pres. εὕδω (in Homer) or καθεύδω (in Classical Greek), which has stative semantics. As Kölligan remarks (2007: 172ff.), the first author to attest the paradigm καταδαρθάνω : κατέδαρθον 'to fall asleep' is Plato, who uses the new present form to specifically refer to catching sleep as an ongoing process.[909] Since a suppletive pair καθεύδω : κατέδαρθον 'to sleep' (ingressive or complexive aorist) was in use throughout the classical period, it is unlikely that earlier stages of Greek required a separate present form καταδαρθάνω. The intransitive aorist -δαρθῆναι is a late formation, too.

Thus, the only reconstructible form for Proto-Ionic is the thematic aorist. Even if the form κατέδαρθον does not occur before the fifth century, there is no reason to doubt that it contains the regular vernacular reflex of PGr. *-$dr̥t^h$-e/o-.[910] It remains, then, to explain ἔδραθον within Epic Greek.

8.2.2 ἁμαρτάνω, aor. ἥμαρτον, ἤμβροτον

The present ἁμαρτάνω and the thematic aorist ἥμαρτον, ἁμαρτεῖν are attested in Homer and Classical Ionic-Attic alike. Beside these forms, Homer also has ἤμβροτον and the hapax ἀβροτάξομεν, which have the reflex -ρο- and cannot have originated in the Proto-Ionic vernacular. Of these, ἀβροτάξομεν has already been discussed in chapter 7, and will be left out of further consideration here.

Most previous scholars have tried to explain the vowel slot of ἥμαρτον as analogical. However, analogy with the full grade attested in νημερτής 'unfailing' is an emergency solution, because this compound is only attested in Early Greek Epic and three times in Aeschylus. But a relic form cannot be expected to have influenced the shape of the verbal stem in the vernacular, and an analogical explanation would be feasible only if full grade forms of the verb were still in use when *$r̥$ vocalized in Proto-Ionic. Such a scenario has been proposed by Ruijgh (1992: 91). Being unable to explain the vocalization of δαρθάνω, he assumed that the zero grade root of the present is secondary for *δερθάνω. The model for the introduction of the zero grade would have been the aorist ἔδραθον, which is supposed to have had a zero grade root all along.[911] In a similar vein, Ruijgh claims that ἁμαρτάνω must be secondary for *ἀμερτάνω after a hypothetical *ἄμ(β)ρατον.[912]

This explanation cannot be upheld. As we have just seen, the present καταδαρθάνω is a late creation based on the aorist κατέδαρθον. Similarly, ἁμαρτάνω looks like a relatively recent present formation beside ἥμαρτον, according to a productive pattern. Beside this general objection, Ruijgh's scenario has other serious drawbacks. First of all, a full grade root is completely out of place in an inherited nasal present: wherever such a full grade nasal present is attested, it must be secondary after the aorist (cf. δείκνυμι 'to point out' beside ἔδειξα, πέρνημι 'to sell' beside ἐπέρασα).[913] Moreover, the assumed combination of

---

[909] See Kölligan (2007: 181-2): "Gegenüber dem homerischen Zustand, in dem εὕδω und ἔδραθον sowohl in der Bedeutung 'schlafen' als auch 'sich schlafen legen' belegt sind, findet sich seit klassischer Zeit bei ἔδραθον [sic; but the only classical form is ἔδαρθον] zusätzlich die Bedeutung 'einschlafen'."

[910] For this reason, O'Neil (1971: 19) is mistaken when he asserts that the Attic aorist -δαρθεῖν may have replaced the older form -δραθεῖν after the present -δαρθάνω.

[911] "Noter qu'une forme comme δαρθάνω 'je m'endors' doit avoir pris la place d'un plus ancien *δερθάνω: le vocalisme α a été tiré de l'aoriste ἔδραθον (Hom.; ρα < $r̥$)." Ruijgh explains the distribution between thematic nasal presents in -άνω (e.g. ληθάνω) and -νω (e.g. δάκνω) by the Sievers effect. In his view, this effect remained productive well into Alphabetic Greek.

[912] "De même, att. ἁμαρτάνω doit s'être substitué à *ἀμερτάνω d'après aor. *ἄμ(β)ρατον (cf. lesb. ἤμβροτον), forme remplacée plus tard par ἥμαρτον d'après ἁμαρτάνω."

[913] Except for the two verbs κευθάνω and ληθάνω, all thematic nasal presents cited by Ruijgh have a zero grade root. In fact, both ληθάνει (hapax, verse-initial in *Od.* 7.221) and ἐκεύθανον (hapax, after |ᴛ in *Il.* 3.453) look like artificial extensions of λήθω and κεύθω, respectively.

analogical influences is unlikely. As a first step, the zero grade must have spread from the hypothetical aorist *āmrat-e/o- into the present, but with a different vowel slot (ἁμαρτάνω). Then, the vowel slot of the present must have been introduced into the thematic aorist. Apparently, Ruijgh devised this construction only because he believed that the reflex -αρ- in ἁμαρτεῖν had to be secondary. In reality, the only straightforward way to explain both δαρθάνω and ἁμαρτάνω is to assume that these presents were created beside the thematic aorists *after* the vocalization *r̥ > -αρ- had taken place in Proto-Ionic. The vernacular form ἁμαρτάνω was created early enough to be introduced into Epic Greek.

It remains to explain the alternative Epic aorist form ἤμβροτον. It is generally assumed that ἤμβροτον is of Lesbian origin, because an infinitive αμβροτην is attested in epigraphic Lesbian (section 3.4.2). Indeed, the combination of -ρο- < *r̥ and psilosis in ἤμβροτον could hitherto only be explained in this way. But in section 7.2.4, I have suggested that ἤμβροτον is better analyzed as the Epic reflex of an augmented pre-form *āmr̥ton. We may depart from the following scenario. When the vocalization to -αρ- took place in the vernacular, the augmented pre-form *āmr̥ton was retained in Epic Greek. The non-etymological aspiration was then added to the vernacular outcome ἥμαρτον and to the derived present ἁμαρτάνω in spoken Ionic-Attic, and these vernacular forms were introduced into Epic Greek.[914] When Epic *r̥ regularly developed to -ρο- after a labial consonant, the ensuing form *ǣmroton > ἤμβροτον did not look like an Ionic form, so that there was no reason to introduce the aspiration.

Thus, the similarity between Epic ἤμβροτον and Lesbian ἄμβροτε, αμβροτην is purely accidental.[915] It appears that ἥμαρτον : ἤμβροτον is another case where the Ionic vernacular outcome and the artificial Epic form appear side by side in Homer, as in καρδίη : κραδίη, τέταρτος : τέτρατος, ταρπῆναι : τραπείομεν, and καρτερός : κρατερός.

8.2.3 Hom. ταρπώμεθα

As we have noted above, the reflex -αρ- in Hom. ταρπώμεθα 'let us satisfy ourselves' can be ascribed to the full grade slot of τέρπομαι. Although it is not strictly necessary, then, to discuss ταρπώμεθα any longer in the present context, its origin turns out to be extremely interesting for the prehistory of the synonymous τραπείομεν (see chapters 6 and 11). A fundamental discussion of the semantics of τέρπομαι and its aorist forms is found in Latacz (1966: 174ff.).[916] No less than five different aorist formations are attested in Homer:

ἐτάρπην, together with the relic 1p. subj. τραπείομεν (*Il.* and *Od.*)
ἐτάρφθην, ἐτέρφθην (only *Od.*)
ptc. τερψάμενος (hapax, *Od.*)
τετάρπετο, τεταρπώμεσθα, τεταρπόμενος (*Il.* and *Od.*)
ταρπώμεθα (*Il.* and *Od.*)

It is clear that these formations cannot all be old, and that some of them must be artificial creations of Epic Greek. The intransitive aorist ἐτάρπην is certainly old, but τερψάμενος (after pres. ptc. τερπόμενος, Beckwith 1996: 70) and ἐτάρφθην, ἐτέρφθην are clearly secondary.[917]

---

[914] Although it is difficult to indicate a convincing origin of the aspiration, it was probably secondarily adopted from a different lexeme. At any rate, the relic adjective νημερτής 'unfailing' rules out that the aspiration is old (cf. Beekes 1969: 109).

[915] Note that the scenario proposed here explains quite naturally why only augmented forms of ἤμβροτον are attested in Homer, and why the augmented initial vowel turns up as ἤ- rather than ἄ-.

[916] The transitive active τέρπω 'to delight' is a secondary causative to the intransitive middle τέρπομαι 'to enjoy', cf. πείθω 'to persuade' beside middle πείθομαι 'to give ear to, obey' (Latacz 1966: 174, Beckwith 1996: 70, *LIV*² s.v. *terp- 'sich sättigen').

[917] As Beckwith (l.c.) remarks, ἐτάρπην < *tr̥p-ē- is probably the only old formation, because the θη-forms first occur in the *Odyssey*. Moreover, the only Classical Greek form is ἐτέρφθην, which implies that ἐτάρπην is an archaism.

The antiquity of the reduplicated thematic aorist τετάρπετο and the thematic aorist (only attested as 1p. subj. ταρπώμεθα) is debated. Note that the only form attested after Homer is ἐτέρφθην, while ἐτάρπην (only attested in dual and plural forms), τετάρπετο, and ταρπώμεθα never occur after Homer.

The reduplicated forms (τετάρπετο, τεταρπώμεσθα, and τεταρπόμενος) only occur in the position after |T, and ταρπώμεθα only occurs after |P in one single formula (see below). As Beckwith (1996) remarks, this fixed localization is compatible both with an archaism and with an innovation.[918]

The pre-form of τετάρπετο cannot have existed in Epic Greek before the vocalization of *r̥ in Proto-Ionic, because of its four consecutive light syllables. Therefore, τετάρπετο was either introduced from the vernacular after the vocalization *r̥ > -αρ- (as in ἁμαρτεῖν), or due to an inner-Epic analogical process. From a morphological perspective, there is only one obvious comparandum for τετάρπετο: the Homeric reduplicated aorist 3p. κεχάροντο 'cheered', 3s. opt. κεχάροιτο. Thus, τετάρπετο could be analogical within Epic Greek, the model being X : ἐτάρπην = κεχαρε/ο- : ἐχάρην. Alternatively, τετάρπετο was introduced from the vernacular, and κεχάροντο is an analogical Epic creation. It is hard to decide between both scenarios.

Given the fixed metrical slot of unreduplicated ταρπώμεθα, its pre-form with *r̥ is not likely to have existed either, because it had a different metrical structure. In my view, ταρπώμεθα must be explained by an artificial process.[919] Its origin becomes clear when we consider its exclusive attestation, the formulaic verse ὕπνῳ ὕπο γλυκερῷ |P ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντες, literally "(so that) we, having gone to rest under the cover of sweet sleep, may find satisfaction [i.e. of our desire to sleep]" (Il. 24.636, Od. 4.295 and 23.255). This verse must be compared to (ἐν) φιλότητι |T τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε, literally "let us go to bed in love and satisfy ourselves" (2x Il.).[920] At first sight, satisfaction of sexual desire and replenishment of one's physical reserves are two rather different events, but in his extensive discussion of the semantics, Latacz (1966) shows that the aorists of τέρπομαι always denote the agreeable satisfaction which arises when some urgent, mostly physical need has been met. Thus, we find these aorists in the meaning 'to still one's hunger' (by eating), 'to let out one's grief' (by wailing), 'to rest' (by sleeping), and 'to find satisfaction' (by having sex). In fact, lovemaking and sleep are mentioned together as causes of satisfaction in εὐνῆς ἧς ἀλόχου ταρπήμεναι ἠδὲ καὶ ὕπνου "[that Odysseus' heart] had had its fill of his wife's bed and of sleep" (Od. 23.346).[921]

As appears from the last example and from cases like τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο, the aorists of τέρπομαι normally require a genitive complement. Latacz therefore concludes that the

---

[918] Beckwith's idea that τετάρπετο replaced an older *ἐτάρπετο for metrical reasons cannot be correct for at least two reasons. He departs from a pre-form *e-tr̥p-onto, and inspired by his analysis of πεπύθοιτο as secondary for ἐπύθοντο, he argues that a reduplicated *tetr̥poito could have been based on *etr̥ponto. After the vocalization of *r̥ to -αρ-, the ensuing form *τετάρποντο was metrically awkward in the dactylic hexameter. Beckwith assumes that it subsequently came to be used with different endings and in different metrical slots. This assumption is difficult for at least two reasons. First, the example of τραπείομεν suggests that the metrical problem could have been avoided in Epic Greek by preserving a form with *r̥ (⁺⁺τετράποντο, with McL scansion). Second, artificial forms do not easily change their localization, precisely because they were created for a specific metrical slot.

[919] Pace LIV² s.v. *terp- 'sich sättigen', which takes the side-by-side of Ved. átr̥pam (AV) and Hom. ταρπώμεθα to prove the existence of an older root aorist. Cardona's idea (quoted by Beckwith) that ταρπώμεθα was created as a metrical alternative beside the more frequent reduplicated stem τεταρπε/ο- is also hard to substantiate.

[920] A more prosaic translation of this formula would be "Let us go to bed and have sex". In my view, it is conceivable that εὐνηθῆναι on itself means 'to have sex' and that εὐνή is an old word for the vagina, but this is hard to prove. As remarked by Latacz (1966: 185), in Od. 8.292, the innovative use of |T τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε without the preceding φιλότητι is clearly secondary with respect to the two Iliadic passages.

[921] Cf. also ὕπνου τε γλυκεροῦ ταρπήμεναι (Il. 24.3), with an identical first hemistich to the formula under discussion.

locative (ἐν) φιλότητι, in the above formula, is a complement to εὐνηθέντε, not to τραπείομεν. Indeed, Homer repeats the same construction on two different occasions: ἐν φιλότητι λιλαίεαι εὐνηθῆναι "you desire to go to bed in love" (*Il.* 14.331), ἐν φιλότητι παρήπαφεν εὐνηθῆναι "she deceived him into going to bed in love" (*Il.* 14.360). Therefore, the prepositional phrase ὕπνῳ ὕπο γλυκερῷ, literally "covered by sweet sleep", must be analyzed as a complement to κοιμηθέντες. In view of the syntactic parallels with hyperbaton, there can be no doubt that the hemistich |ₚ ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντες was created on the basis of |ₜ τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε (or its predecessor with *ṛ), and that both had the basic meaning "Let us go to bed and satisfy ourselves".[922] In view of its metrical trace of *ṛ, φιλότητι |ₜ τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε is obviously the older variant. A model for the creation of ταρπώμεθα may have been the pres. subj. 1p. τερπώμεθα (*Od.* 1.369, 15.399), which appears in the same metrical slot.[923]

Thus, the thematic aorist ταρπώμεθα is artificial, and there is no reason to assume the existence of an older indicative form *ἐτάρπετο. Once again, it appears that the artificial creation of a by-form with -αρ- could only take place if a concrete analogical model existed.

8.3 The pattern of attestation of the thematic aorists with -ρα-

Having seen that -αρ- must be the regular outcome of *ṛ in ἔδαρθον and ἥμαρτον, let us now discuss the attestations and genre distributions of the thematic aorists with -ρα-, and determine their oldest reconstructible paradigm within Greek. For obvious reasons, we will focus on the potential counterevidence, which consists of those forms with -ρα- that cannot be explained by a simple analogy: ἔδρακον, ἔδραθον, ἔπραθον, and the hapax ἔπραδες 'you broke wind'.

Of the thematic aorists where -ρα- is expected by analogy, both ἔδραμον and ἔτραπον must have been present in Proto-Ionic. They regularly occur in Classical prose: in the latter form, the transitive active ἔτραπον was replaced by ἔτρεψα, but the middle ἐτραπόμην remained the current intransitive form. On the other hand, ἔτραφον 'grew up, was nourished' is probably an artificial form of Epic Greek, because the form is attested only there, and because the normal vernacular form ἐτράφην was hard to use in the Epic hexameter.[924] We do find ἐτράφην in Epic Greek, but only in front of a vowel in the 3p. τράφεν, ἔτραφεν and the 3s. τράφη.[925] The poet of the *Odyssey* seems to have extended the use of thematic ἔτραφον, given that he used it to replace the vernacular 3p. ind. form in the formula τράφεν ἠδ'

---

[922] It is to be noted, however, that κοιμάομαι never refers to sexual activities, but always means 'to go to sleep'. On the other hand, εὐνάομαι, εὐνάζομαι may either mean 'to go to sleep' (only *Od.*), or refer to the sexual act. Thus, the motivation for creating ταρπώμεθα may have been semantic as well as metrical. The specific sexual associations of εὐνάω might also explain why the alternative formula was not created by transforming |ₜ τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε into |ₚ ⁺⁺ταρπείομεν εὐνηθέντε.

[923] A concrete four part analogy would be pres. τρεπώμεθα 'let us turn' : aor. τραπώμεθα = τερπώμεθα 'let us enjoy' : X, which was solved by X = ταρπώμεθα.

[924] A similar picture is shown by the intransitive aorist of βλάπτω, which is most frequently ἐβλάβην in Classical Ionic-Attic, but ἐβλάφθην in Homer (with the exception, again, of the 3p. βλάβεν, ἔβλαβεν). Perhaps, the θη-form was avoided in the case of τρέφω because it was too ambiguous (ἐτράφθην, ἐτρέφθην could also be thought to belong to τρέπω, and τραφθῆναι is indeed used in this way, though only at *Od.* 15.80). In the case of βλάπτω, on the other hand, a thematic aorist may have been avoided because of possible confusion with the middle present βλάβομαι.

[925] There is one possible instance of ἐτράφημεν (*Il.* 23.84, with *McL* scansion), which is given by a number of mss. and papyri and accepted by some editors. However, the reading of the text is quite unclear: the vulgate has ὡς ἐτράφην περ, and a quotation in Aeschines (who also has two additional lines in front 84) has ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐτράφεμέν περ |ₜ. Other editors have therefore preferred ὡς τράφομέν περ, suggested by La Roche on the basis of a comparison between the various readings. It is remarkable that a few lines later, the transitive semantics of the 3s. ἔτραφε (*Il.* 23.90) deviate from the intransitive semantics of all other attestations of this thematic aorist. For this reason, the v.l. ἔτρεφε may have to be preferred (cf. the variation between ἔτρεφε and ἔτραφε at *Il.* 6.282, and the use of the imperfect ἔτρεφε at *Il.* 22.421).

ἐγένοντο (*Il.* 1.251) → τράφον ἠδ' ἐγένοντο (3x *Od.*).[926] We may therefore leave ἔτραφον out of further consideration.

8.3.1 δέρκομαι, ἔδρακον, pf. δέδορκα

It is customary to translate this Homeric verb with 'to look, see', but the situation is actually much more complex. Let us therefore consider the attestations and their semantics more closely. In Homer, the following stems are attested: pres. δέρκομαι, aor. ἔδρακον, pf. δέδορκα. The aorist only appears in combination with the preverbs ἀνα-, ἐσ-, and δια- and means 'to look (at, up, towards, through); to behold'.[927] This meaning is also attested for the present δέρκομαι 'to look or gaze at, behold', either with or without preverb.

On a number of occasions, the present and perfect are used with a special adverbial construction, in the meaning 'to look like, have a conspicuous appearance': σμερδαλέον δὲ δέδορκεν ἑλισσόμενος περὶ χειῇ (*Il.* 22.95) "and he glares terribly as he crawls around in his lair" (of a snake), or δεινὸν δερκομένη (*Il.* 11.37, cf. 3.342 and 23.815) "glaring terribly, with a fearsome gaze" (of warriors).[928] The stative semantics of these aspectual stems is a clear archaism. There is a complementary distribution between Epic Greek and Classical Greek: δέρκομαι occurs in Epic Greek and occasionally in later poetry, whereas Classical Attic uses βλέπω in the meanings 'to look, behold' as well as 'to gaze; look like' (see Kölligan 2007: 273-4). Clearly, βλέπω, which has no good etymology, replaced δέρκομαι, δέδορκα in the latter meaning.

Let us now consider the six attestations of the aorist. An ingressive aorist based on the meaning 'to gaze' of the present δέρκομαι is attested in ἀνέδρακον 'looked up again' (*Il.* 14.436, of Hektor who has just regained his conscience). This use seems old: ὁράω / εἶδον is unattested in combination with ἀνα-, and Classical Greek uses ἀναβλέπω.[929] Moreover, when Eurykleia tries to make eye contact with Penelope, Homer uses ἐσέδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι, πεφραδέειν ἐθέλουσα (*Od.* 19.476-7), which again looks like an ingressive use of δέρκομαι.

On the other hand, there are clear indications that ἔδρακον was used in the same meaning as εἶδον. Kölligan (2007: 264-5) gives two probative examples: 1. ἐσέδρακον ἄντην 'looked [him] in the eyes' (*Il.* 24.223) beside ἄντην εἰσιδέειν (*Il.* 19.15), 2. καπνὸν … ἔδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι (*Od.* 10.197) with καπνὸν … ὁρῶμεν (*Od.* 10.99) and ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἴθοπα καπνόν (*Od.* 10.152). In the second example, the first hemistich ἔδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι is a clear transformation of the second, formulaic hemistich |ᴛ ἀνέδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι, |ᴛ ἐσέδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι. On the other hand, 1. ἐσέδρακον ἄντην seems to be an ingressive aorist of the same type as ἀνέδρακον. Moreover, the use of the suppletive pair ἐσοράω, εἰσιδέειν in the meaning 'to look at' cannot be old because ὁράω etymologically means 'to observe, oversee'. Thus, ἄντην εἰσιδέειν is more recent than ἐσέδρακον ἄντην.

It is attractive to think that *$d\mathring{r}ke/o$- was originally used as an ingressive aorist beside the stative present δέρκομαι 'to gaze, look'. It would mostly be used with preverbs, as in

---

[926] This reduction leaves us with only three attestations of the thematic aorist indicative (ἐτραφέτην *Il.* 5.555, τράφ' *Il.* 2.661, ἔτραφ' 21.279), plus the infinitive τραφέμεν (in the repeated hemistich γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε *Il.* 7.199, 18.436 and *Od.* 3.28).

[927] A seeming exception is ἔδρακον *Od.* 10.197, which stands in tmesis with following δία and means 'discerned'.

[928] This use of the perfect is also found after Homer, e.g. τὸ δὲ κλέος τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις Πέλοπος (Pi. *Ol.* 1.93-5), "The fame of Pelops shines from afar in the races of the Olympic festivals (…)", which can be compared with e.g. λάμπει δέ οἱ κλέος (Pi. *Ol.* 1.23). Cf. also τίν γε μέν … Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ' ἄπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος (Pi. *Nem.* 3.83-4) "For you … a light shines from Nemea, Epidauros and Megara", and πᾶσα γὰρ Τροία δέδορκεν Ἕκτορος τύχης διαί (A. *fr.* 296 Radt) "For all of Troy shines due to the luck of Hektor".

[929] See Kölligan (2007: 264-5).

ἀνέδρακον 'looked up', ἐσέδρακον 'gazed at', διαδράκοι 'would discern'.[930] Note that the instrumental dative ὀφθαλμοῖσι is not redundant in these cases, as it mostly is when preceded by ἴδον.[931] The use of δέρκομαι, ἔδρακον as a metrical alternative for ὁράω, εἶδον originated in cases like ἐσέδρακον ~ εἰσιδέειν and προσ-, ποτιδέρκομαι ~ εἰσορόων, εἰσοράασθαι. Generally speaking, forms of δέρκομαι, ἔδρακον were only retained if the corresponding forms of ὁράω, εἶδον would have been metrically problematic. This explains why we find only a few remnants of this verb in Homer. Finally, καπνὸν ἔδρακον must be due to a secondary extension of the perceived equivalence ἔδρακον = εἶδον.

After Homer, ἔδρακον remains rare: there is only one attestation in Pindar (κατέδρακεν 'looked down' *Nem.* 4.23, again with preverb), one in Stesichorus (δ]ρακοῖσα fr. S135.9), and a small number in Aeschylus and Euripides.[932] On itself, the paucity of attestations in post-Homeric Greek already suggests that we are dealing with an epicism. In addition, it is remarkable that two alternative aorist formations are found. Pindar attests the participle δρακέντ-, to be analyzed synchronically as an intransitive aorist. Furthermore, ἐδέρχθη 'looked at' is attested seven times in Sophocles and the author of the *Prometheus Vinctus*.[933] While the latter form is clearly an innovation on the basis of δέρκομαι, the Pindaric form δρακέντ- has played a prominent part in reconstructions of the PIE paradigm. Since Forssman (1964), it is usually analyzed as deriving from an archaic PIE root aorist ptc. *dŕḱ-ént-. As I will argue below, however, δρακέντ- must be explained as a formation of inner-Greek origin.

For now, we may conclude that ἔδρακον is a rare Epic form which is typically found in combination with a preverb. It remains rare after Homer, and is unattested in prose.

8.3.2 ἔπαρδον, ἔπραδες

The normal Attic aorist form of πέρδομαι 'to fart' was ἔπαρδον, which is attested mostly with preverb, and mainly in Aristophanes (but already in Cratinus, fr. 25-26.2 Kock). The *LIV*² reconstructs a PIE root aorist *perd- / *pr̥d- on the basis of YAv. pərədən and the Greek thematic aorist ἔπαρδον.[934] Whether this is correct or not, it is plausible that ἔπαρδον continues a thematic aorist *pr̥d-e/o- of considerable antiquity within Greek. But since ἔπαρδον may have adopted the vowel slot of πέρδομαι, it is of no further importance in the present discussion.

It remains to briefly discuss the 2s. aor. ind. ἔπραδες. This is attested only in Sophron (fr. 144 Kaibel), a 5th c. author from Syracuse who wrote mimes in some form of literary Doric.[935] It would be unwarranted to base any conclusions regarding the regular Ionic vocalization of *r̥ on this single attestation of ἔπραδες in a non-Ionic, literary dialect.

---

[930] Cf. also the present stems ποτιδέρκομαι 'to look at, behold' (*Il.* 16.10, *Od.* 17.518, 20.385), διεδέρκετο 'discerned' (*Cypr.* fr. 11.3).

[931] It also seems attractive to assume that a metrically avoided ptc. δρακών underlies ἰδών whenever this means 'looking', rather than 'having seen'.

[932] Only six times: τούτου φέγγος ἥδιον δρακεῖν (A. *Ag.* 602), δεινὰ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖς δρακεῖν (A. *Eum.* 34), γᾶς <τ'> ὀμφαλὸν προσδρακεῖν (A. *Eum.* 166), ἄφυκτον ὄμμα προσδράκοι ([A.] *PV* 903b), ἄλλος εἰς ἄλλον δρακών (E. *Herc.* 951), ἔδρακον (E. *Or.* 1456). The meaning is 'to behold', always of spectacular or horrid sights, or of eye-contact. Sophocles does not have δρακεῖν but uses δερχθῆναι instead.

[933] δέρχθητ(ε) ([A.] *PV* 93 and 141), ἐδέρχθης (ibid. 547), δέρχθη (S. *Aj.* 425), δερχθέντες (S. *fr.* 387.2), and two with preverb, προσδερχθῇ ([A.] *PV* 53), καταδερχθῆναι (S. *Tr.* 999). Again, note that Sophocles only uses δερχθῆναι, and that Euripides and Aeschylus only use δρακεῖν (except for the *Prometheus Vinctus*, of which Aeschylus was probably not the author).

[934] For further cognates, see *LIV*² (s.v. *perd-). It is remarked there that Kellens analyzed the Avestan form as a present; cf. also the doubts of Allan (2003: 209 n. 362) concerning the reconstruction of the PIE aorist.

[935] Sophron's fragment is known from Hesychius, ν 734. Further, the Suda has: Ἀπέπαρδε· καὶ Ἀποπαρδεῖν. Ἐπράδειν δὲ, προτεταγμένου τοῦ ρ, and Ἐπράδει· ἀπέπαρδε. καὶ ἀποπαρδεῖν λέγεται. ἐπράδειν δὲ

8.3.3 πέρθω, ἔπραθον

As Forssman (1997) remarks, πέρθω 'to raze, pillage' is a relic of Epic Greek and poetry, and is not attested in Classical prose.[936] The normal verb derived from this root in Classical Attic is πορθέω, with the same meaning as πέρθω. Since its meaning is typical for the thematics of heroic poetry, πέρθω is probably an epicism in authors like Pindar.[937] We may therefore concentrate on the Homeric forms.[938]

The most frequent formations in Homer are the thematic aorist πραθε/ο- (9x, including prefixed forms) and especially the sigmatic stem περσ(α)- (35x, including prefixed forms). The only genuine attestation of the present stem is the dual πέρθοντε (*Il.* 18.342), a precious archaism.[939] As in Classical prose and poetry, the productive present formation was πορθέω already in Homer (5x, including prefixed forms): the contracted 3p. impf. ἐπόρθουν (*Il.* 4.308) was preferred over *ἐπέρθον.[940]

Thus, the oldest paradigm was clearly pres. περθε/ο- : aor. πραθε/ο- : fut. περσε/ο-. The productive aorist stem περσα- is an innovation beside πέρθω and the future πέρσω.[941] For present purposes, it is important that πραθε/ο- < *$p^{(h)}r̥t^h$-e/o- occurs without preverb only in |P πόλιν ἔπραθον (2x), and that the other attestations have the preverbs δια- (6x) or ἐξ- (1x). The use of ἐκπέρθω, semantically undistinguishable from the simplex πέρθω, is typical for Epic Greek and may ultimately have a metrical explanation.[942] Beside πέρθω, we may therefore have to reckon with an old prefixed verb διαπέρθω.[943]

The etymology of πέρθω is unclear. Janda (2000: 229-40) reconstructed *b^her-d^hh_1- "*Beute machen*" > *erbeuten* (i.e. 'to seize, capture', of a town), where *b^her- would be the root continued in φέρω 'to carry'. Such an analysis is formally possible because several other Greek aorists may continue a "Funktionsverb" extension in *-d^hh_1-.[944] There are, however, no

---

προτεταγμένου τοῦ ρ. Note the odd combination of augment and primary endings, which makes the value of these attestations unclear.

[936] "auch nach Homer nur dichtersprachlich überliefert" (1997: 42).

[937] *LSJ* translates "*waste, ravage, sack*, in Homer only of cities". Janda's proposal (2000: 229-40) to translate πέρθω with 'erbeuten', i.e. 'to capture, seize' (a citadel) cannot be upheld: see below.

[938] The them. aorist πραθε/ο- occurs 4x in Pindar, alongside the *s*-aorist περσα- (also 4x) and the pres. ptc. περθόμενοι (1x). The tragedians only use the sigmatic stem περσ-.

[939] There are only three forms of the thematic stem περθε/ο-: πέρθοντε, πέρθετο, περθομένη, the latter two with passive meaning. Meillet speculated that πέρθετο and περθομένη recover older thematic aorists *πάρθετο, *παρθομένη (see Chantraine 1942: 384 and 389-90, with further references), but this cannot be further substantiated. Forssman (1997) agrees that the hapax πέρθετο is an aorist formation, and suggests an interesting scenario for its artificial creation. In addition, he argues that the aor. inf. πέρθαι is an artificial form. περθομένη was probably an aorist, too, because it only occurs in conjunction with the aorist ptc. ἁλοῦσα. This leaves us with πέρθοντε as the only attestation of the present πέρθω.

[940] πορθέω may be an old iterative verb, but it could also be a denominative derived from the old compound πτολίπορθος 'destroying cities' (frequent in poetry from Hom. onwards).

[941] As for the motive and model for the creation of the aorist stem περσ(α)-, it is conceivable that a ptc. πέρσαντες was created as an alternative for metrically problematic πραθόντες on the basis of the fut. πέρσω.

[942] Note that ἐκπέρθω only occurs in the *Iliad*, not in the *Odyssey*. After Homer, both prefixed forms are rare. ἐκπέρθω occurs only 7x in the tragedians, of which 6x in a Homeric form or construction (aorist inf. or ptc.). In 8 out of 15 cases of a sigmatic stem form of ἐκπέρθω in Homer, this verb is placed between the first foot and the caesura and is preceded by the As. or Gs. of Ἴλιος (e.g. 4x Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ- |P). In my view, it is likely that ἐκ- in ἐκπέρθω was taken from the relic verb ἐξαλαπάζω, because Ἰλίου ἐκπέρσαντες |T ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον looks like an inflected form of Ἰλίου ἐξαλαπάξαι |T ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον (*Il.* 4.33, 8.288). A new infinitive verse Ἰλίου ἐκπέρσαι |P εὖ ναιόμενον πτολίεθρον (only *Il.* 2.133) was the last to be created.

[943] The preverb δια- also occurs in the *s*-aorist διαπέρσα (7x Hom.), but after Homer it is found only in διέπερσεν Ἰλίου πόλ[ιν (Pi. fr. 52f.104) and διεπέρσατε Δύμιον ἄστυ (Antimachus fr. 28.2).

[944] Cf. μαθεῖν 'to learn' < *mn-d^hh_1-e/o-, αἰσθέσθαι 'to perceive' < *h_2euis-d^hh_1-e/o-. In view of the old ablaut in λαθεῖν 'to escape notice' < *lh_2-d^hh_1-e/o- beside pres. λήθω, pf. λέληθα 'to be hidden', it is possible that both the present stem περθ- and the thematic aorist πραθε/ο- were inherited.

directly comparable formations in other IE languages that could confirm this idea.[945] Moreover, Janda's semantic analysis is imprecise: the object of πέρθω is always a city, never the booty contained in it, and the synchronic Homeric meaning is simply 'to raze, pillage'.[946] That this meaning is old is strongly suggested by a number of post-Homeric attestations, especially κεφαλὰν ἔπραθε φασγάνου ἀκμᾷ "[when] he cut off the head with the edge of his sword" (Pi. *Pyth.* 9.80-81), and καί μοι γενείου πέρθε λευκήρη τρίχα "cut the white hairs of my chin" (A. *Pers.* 1056). For the semantic development, compare κείρω 'to cut off, shave', which is also used in the secondary meaning 'to raze, pillage a country' (e.g. in Hdt., Th.). In my view, it is conceivable that PIE had a verbal root $*b^herd^h$- in the meaning 'to shear, lop' (hairs, crops, foliage).[947] But whatever the concrete etymology of ἔπραθον 'razed, pillaged', we may conclude that its reconstruction as a thematic aorist PGr. $*pr̥t^h$-*e/o*- is ascertained, and that the older meaning was probably 'sheared, lopped'.

8.3.4 Conclusion

The form ἔπραδες is attested only in literary Doric, and therefore not directly relevant for the Ionic reflex of $*r̥$. It is noteworthy that the three deviant Homeric forms with -ρα- are limited to the poetry, and rarely attested outside of Early Greek Epic: ἔδραθον is exclusively Epic, ἔπραθον occurs only four times in Pindar and once in Corinna, and ἔδρακον is attested once in Pindar and a few times in the tragedians, where it has competition from other forms.[948] We may therefore conclude that the forms are epicisms.

8.4 Epic $*r̥$ in the thematic aorist

In view of the prose forms Attic ἔδαρθον and Ionic-Attic ἥμαρτον, we have to consider the possibility that the reflex -ρα- in the Epic words ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον, and ἔπραθον is artificial, and that their pre-forms contained Epic $*r̥$ (i.e. $*r̥$ which was not subject to the Proto-Ionic vernacular vocalization to -αρ-). This idea is corroborated by the distribution between κατέδαρθον (Attic prose) and κατέδραθον, παρέδραθον (only Epic). Moreover, ἥμαρτον must have been introduced into Epic Greek from the Ionic vernacular, while ἥμβροτον can be analyzed as the regular outcome of a pre-form with Epic $*r̥$.

As we have seen in chapter 6, it is legitimate to assume Epic $*r̥$ in a specific form if its absence from the vernacular at the time when $*r̥$ > -αρ- took place can be made probable (cf. κραταιός). If the vernacular form with -αρ- did exist, we may also assume forms with Epic $*r̥$ if we can indicate why the introduction of the vernacular form was avoided (cf. the near-absence of καρδίη from Homer). Since there would have been no motive for avoiding forms like κατέδαρθον,[949] we have to assume that the precursors of ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον, and ἔπραθον were absent from the vernacular when $*r̥$ > -αρ- took place. This is unproblematic for ἔδρακον and ἔπραθον inasfar as these are clear Epic forms. More problematic is the existence

---

[945] Janda's comparison (2000: 240) between ἠὲ φέροιεν ἤ κεν ἄγοιεν (*Il.* 5.484) and τὴν δὲ διεπράθομέν τε καὶ ἤγομεν ἐνθάδε πάντα (*Il.* 1.367) does not prove anything, because the object of διεπράθομεν is a city which is stripped of all its valuables, that of ἤγομεν the possessions contained in it. The single attestation of *bháre dhā-* in the *Rigveda* (Janda 2000: 241) does not prove anything either.

[946] Note that ἐκπέρθω and ἐξαλαπάζω govern an accusative object, which shows that the preverb ἐκ- has no local value. The only possible attestation of ἐκπέρθω with a genitive is *Il.* 1.125 τὰ μὲν πολίων ἐξεπράθομεν "the things we pillaged from citadels", perhaps better read as τὰ μὲν πολίων ἐξ ἐπράθομεν. But in my view, Janda puts too much emphasis on this single instance.

[947] Possibly a *Funktionsverb* extension of the root $*b^her$- found in e.g. Lat. *feriō* 'to strike'. The regional Northern European word $*b^hord^h$-*éh₂*- 'beard', reflected in e.g. OPr. *bordus*, Lith. *barzdà*, Ru. *borodá*, OHG *bart*, could also be explained from this root if its original meaning was '(hair)cut'. Note, however, that Lat. *barba* 'beard' complicates the reconstruction of this etymon in view of its word-initial *b-* and *a*-vocalism.

[948] After the Classical period, these thematic aorists are restricted to Hellenistic poetry: δραθε/ο- (Theoc. 18.9, Call. *Hecale* 63), δρακε/ο- (Theoc. 25.233, 30.7, Call. fr. 186.7, A. R. *passim*, Nic.), πραθε/ο- (unattested).

[949] Quite on the contrary: forms with preverb like $*kated_r̥t^hon$ were excluded in Epic verse.

of vernacular Att. κατέδαρθον beside Hom. ἔδραθον. The Ionic vernacular, however, does not preserve any traces of this form: Herodotus and the Hippocratic Corpus use the aorist κατεκοιμήθην, a form also attested in Homer but absent from Attic prose. It is therefore possible that the late Proto-Ionic vernaculars in which the Epic tradition flourished had already lost κατέδαρθον. In what follows, I will therefore depart from pre-forms *$dr̥t^he/o$-, *$dr̥ke/o$-, and *$pr̥t^he/o$- that were initially retained in Epic Greek after the vernacular development *$r̥$ > -αρ-.

8.4.1 The metrical behavior of thematic aorists with -ρα-

Before sketching a more precise scenario for the development that led to ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον, and ἔπραθον, it is necessary to address two metrical problems with the assumption of Epic *$r̥$ in these forms.

(1) There are no traces of *McL* scansion in the active thematic aorists with -ρα-.[950] Forms which would have required *McL* scansion, such as the 3p. subj. δράθωσι or the ptc. δρακών, are completely unattested. Given the large number of attestations (85x), this is unlikely to be due to chance, and it seems attractive to assume that such forms were regularly avoided in Epic Greek. But then, the difference with the regular *McL* scansion in traditional Epic forms like δράκων 'snake' and βροτοῖσι requires an explanation: if δράκων was tolerated, why were δρακών and structurally identical participle forms disallowed?

(2) In all thematic aorists with -ρα-, Homer gratefully uses the opportunity to create length by position, i.e. to use Cρα- after a syllable-final short vowel in the arsis. This is, of course, especially frequent in forms with augment and/or preverb such as κατέδραθον, διαδράκοι, and also in the middle aorist ἐτράπετ(ο). The same applies to κρατερός, which regularly generates length by position, and at the same time seems to derive from a pre-form with Epic *$r̥$. On the other hand, κραδίη < *$kr̥diā$- was not used at all to generate length by position, and βροτός < *$mr̥to$- very rarely.[951] Again, the large number of attestations of κραδίη and κρατερός seems to exclude a coincidence.

Both problems point in the same direction, and may be rephrased as follows: why do aorists like ἔδρακον behave metrically as if they are *not* the regular outcome of pre-forms with Epic *$r̥$? A related question is: why is *McL* scansion tolerated, among thematic aorists with -ρα-, only in the middle form τραπέσθαι?

Let us first consider κραδίη and κρατερός. Given their high number of attestations, the difference in their metrical behavior cannot be due to chance. I propose that the precursor of κραδίη was retained unaltered in the form *$kr̥diā$- until the sound change Epic *$r̥$ > -ρα-, and that κρατερός was influenced at a much earlier date by κρατύς. As we have seen in chapter 5, κρατύς had acquired -ρα- already in Proto-Ionic by inner-paradigmatic leveling, well before the vocalization of Epic *$r̥$. The fact that Epic κρατερός has taken over some of the meanings to be posited for κρατύς suggests that the two functioned as metrical alternatives at some pre-stage of Epic Greek. The introduction of the root shape κρατ- into *$kr̥teró$- was highly attractive, because this enabled Epic poets to use words ending in a short vowel in front of the new creation κρατερός.

The peculiar metrical behavior of the type ἔδρακον can be explained in a similar vein, provided that we are able to indicate a model and a motive for the early introduction of -ρα- into these thematic aorists.

---

[950] Such traces are found only in the middle aorist τραπέσθαι, as discussed in section 6.7.9.

[951] See section 6.7.2 and section 7.2.1, respectively.

8.4.2 The origin of -ρα- in ἔδρακον, ἔδραθον, ἔπραθον

Most of the approximately 60 active thematic aorists have a light root syllable, as can be expected for zero grade formations.[952] The structure of the stem in these cases is *VCVC-e/o-*, *CVC-e/o-*, or *CCVC-e/o-*. Only the last two types are of interest here: forms like *$d\mathring{r}k$-e/o-* had the structure *CVC-e/o-*, while the Homeric outcome δρακε/ο- had the structure *CCVC-e/o-*. As we will see, the elimination of Epic *$\mathring{r}$ in the thematic aorists changed the possibilities to use these stems in the Epic hexameter in an important way.

Let us consider the token frequency of the relevant thematic aorist forms, as summarized in the table below. I have not included forms of ἔτραφον (a recent, analogical formation: see above), nor those of τραπέσθαι which undergo *McL* scansion (and have their root syllable in the 2nd part of the biceps). Thus, all included forms have their root syllable in the 1st part of the biceps. This yields a total of 85 instances:

Stem placed in:	4th biceps		5th biceps	Elsewhere		Total
	+ preverb	– preverb		+ preverb	– preverb	
δραθε/ο-	6			1	1	8
δρακε/ο-	4		1		1	6
πραθε/ο-	3	2		4		9
δραμε/ο-	20		2	5	2	29
τραπε/ο-	3	6	3			12
ἐτράπετο[953]	6	4	7		4	21
Total	**42**	**12**	**13**	**10**	**8**	**85**

Table 8.1: The pattern of attestation of Homeric thematic aorists of the type CraCe/o-

In 62 instances (72.9%), the stem is identical to the corresponding vernacular form: δραμε/ο-, τραπε/ο- (active and middle).[954] In these two frequent stems, -ρα- is expected as the analogically restored reflex of *$\mathring{r}$ in Proto-Ionic. On the other hand, the stem of only 23 instances (27.1%) does not appear in the vernacular (δρακε/ο-, πραθε/ο-), or in a different shape (δραθε/ο-).[955]

I have separately indicated the attestations of forms with preverb, because they are frequent in Homer: note that only four instances of δρακε/ο-, πραθε/ο-, and δραθε/ο- are uncompounded, and only four cases of δραμε/ο-.[956] The high relative frequency of occurrences in the fourth foot (54x, or 63.5%) is mainly due to forms with preverb (42x, or 49.4%): forms like |T κατέδραθον |B fit exactly in this slot, and could hardly be used in other

---

[952] I gathered the material from Risch (1974: 238ff.). The only synchronic exceptions are ἦλφον, ἦλθον (beside ἤλυθον), εὗρον, ἔχραισμε, ἔειπον, ἐπαυρεῖν, ὄλισθε(ν), ἔνεικα, and ἅμαρτε. The only middle thematic aorist taken into consideration here is τράπετο 'turned'. This is an exceptional case: whereas active thematic aorists normally have intransitive meaning, τράπε has a transitive meaning 'turned, changed the direction of', where the object is e.g. a horse or an enemy. There are no other middle thematic aorists of the same metrical structure.

[953] Mostly ἐτράπετ'; the unelided middle ἐτράπετο occurs only 4x.

[954] I have counted both the active and middle forms of the thematic aorist τραπε/ο-, but excluded the middle forms with *McL* scansion that were discussed in section 6.7.9. The opposition between an active τραπέειν and a middle τραπέσθαι is unique among the six thematic aorists under discussion, as are the transitive semantics of τραπέειν.

[955] Further, compare ἤμβροτον (10x), occurs within Homer beside ἡμάρτανον (3x), ἅμαρτον (24x).

[956] ἔπραθον occurs only in the syntagm |P πόλιν ἔπραθον (2x), ἔδραθον only in ἔδραθ' ἐνὶ προδόμῳ |P (*Od.* 20.143, never again in later Greek), and ἔδρακον only in ἔδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι |T (*Od.* 10.197). Note that ἔδρακον stands in tmesis with δία in the second hemistich, and that the first hemistich is based on |T ἀνέδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι, |T ἐσέδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι. Furthermore, ἔδραθ' may stand in tmesis with ἐν in the preceding line (see above), and all three Homeric instances of ἔδραμον are in tmesis. This leaves us only with one instance of πόλιν ἔπραθον (against 6x δια-πραθε/ο-).

places.[957] The relatively rare dactylic forms (ἔδραμον with tmesis, simplex ἔτραπον) naturally occupy the 1st, 4th or 5th foot.[958] Thus, the localization of the forms follows directly from their synchronic metrical structure.

The interesting question is, however, how the prehistoric forms with *$r̥$ would have been used in Epic verse. As we have seen, it is likely that *-$dr̥t^he$, *-$dr̥ke$, and *-$dr̥me$ were originally used with preverb only; *$tr̥k^we$ and *$pr̥t^he$ were also frequently used with preverb. However, forms like *$anedr̥ke$ or *$epedr̥me$, with their sequence of four light syllables, could not have been used at this stage of Epic Greek. At first sight, it seems that this problem could be mended by means of metrical lengthening of the second of four consecutive light syllables.[959] But this cannot have been the case, because there are no traces of a metrically lengthened augment in other roots of the structure *CVC-.[960] Quite on the contrary, there are indications that such metrical lengthening was avoided: Epic Greek has dactylic forms of the thematic aorist indicative which were artificially formed with the apocopated preverb κατ- or ἐκ-. Thus, κάλλιπε, κάββαλε, and κάππεσε have the same meanings as Class. ἔλιπε, ἔβαλε, ἔπεσε, and ἔκφυγε (when it governs the accusative, not the genitive) has the same meaning as φύγε 'escaped'.[961]

If forms like *$anedr̥ke$ were disallowed in Epic Greek before the roots in question had acquired -ρα-, how were the prefixed thematic aorist indicatives formed? It is instructive to compare the thematic aorist stem θορε/ο- 'to jump', because this is almost exclusively attested with preverb,[962] and is semantically close to δραμε/ο-. Its indicative is formed in two basic ways:

---

[957] In view of Hermann's bridge, prefixed forms are hardly used in the fifth foot. An exception is |H καὶ ἐσέδρακον ἄντην (Il. 24.223), which is made possible by the prepositive conjunction καί in front of a vowel-initial preverb. Another factor favoring the occurrence of these thematic aorists in the fourth foot is the general preference for using verbal forms in the fourth foot, to which Parry (1971: 41) already pointed.

[958] For instance, out of three attestations of the simplex ἔδραμον, two occur in the 5th foot, and one in the 1st foot. A similar distribution is found for ἔχραον 'attacked'. The 3s. ind. ἔχραε is found only three times after |B and once in verse-initial position, but prefixed ἐπέχραον 'id.' only three times in front of |B. This has an obvious explanation: the use of ἐπέχραον after the fourth trochee is precluded by Hermann's bridge (word-end in this position is avoided).

[959] One preposition has an old variant ending in a diphthong: παραί beside παρά, παρ- 'beside'. As a preverb, this variant appears in the verbal forms παραιπεπιθοῦσα, παραιφάμενος and the derivative παραίφασις. The form with -αι- then spread from παραι- to καταιβαταί (only Od. 13.110), and after Homer to e.g. διαι-. It is theoretically possible, then, to assume that παρέδραθεν (Od. 20.88) and παραδραθέειν (Il. 14.163) recover an older form *$parai$-$dr̥t^he$. However, the prefixed forms of δρακ- (ἀνέδρακον, διαδράκοι, ἐσέδρακον) and πραθ- (ἐξεπράθομεν, διαπραθέειν) never occur with παρα-, and cannot be explained in this way. Therefore, this scenario leads nowhere.

[960] The only such case attested in Homer is perhaps ἔμμαθεν 'he learned' (Od. 17.226), ἔμμαθες (Od. 18.362) as against μάθον (Il. 6.444). In Early Greek Epic after Homer, a non-etymological geminated root-initial liquid is found only in ἔλλαχε 'he obtained' (h. Cer. 86 and 87). However, the forms ἔμμαθε and ἔλλαχε must both be recent. Homer only attests ἔλαχον or λάχον without a metrical geminate, and the traditional Epic aorist in the meaning 'to learn' is δαῆναι, not ἔμαθον. In fact, the use of ἔμμαθε stands in marked contrast with the metrical behavior of λιπε/ο- 'to leave', where root-initial λ- generally counts as a single consonant: the only exception on 73 instances of λιπε/ο- with a light second syllable is ἐνὶ πτόλεϊ λίπετ' ἀνήρ (Il. 24.707). Note, finally, that -λλ- in ἔλλαβον 'took' is the reflex of etymological *-hl-, and that εὔαδε reflects *e-$hwad$-e. Of course, word-initial resonants could be geminated for metrical purposes even if there was no etymological *s- (see Chantraine 1942: 176-7), but this did not apply to all lexemes, as the behavior of λιπε/ο- shows. As Chantraine remarks, "grand nombre de mots ne présentent jamais l'allongement devant la sonante initiale." Further research is necessary to establish the concrete distributions and the analogical mechanisms which could lead to the spread of resonant doubling.

[961] This explains why Homer could use unaugmented κάτθανε (Il. 9.320) as a gnomic aorist, instead of unmetrical ἔθανε (for the problem, see already Meister 1921: 35, in whose view κάτθανε stands for κατέθανε). There are only 3 augmented forms of the aorist ind. ἔθανον, against 14x unaugmented θάνον and 2x κάτθανε.

[962] The only exception is χαμᾶζε θορών (Il. 10.528), in the Doloneia.

1. with preverb, e.g. ὑπέρθορον (*Il.* 9.476), |ₚ ὃ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔσθορε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ (*Il.* 12.462), |ₜ ὃ δ᾽ ἔσθορε δαίμονι ἶσος (*Il.* 21.18), |ᴮ ἔνθορε μέσσῳ (*Il.* 21.233), |ᴮ ἔνθορ᾽ ὁμίλῳ (*Il.* 15.623), |ᴮ ἔκθορε δίφρου (*Il.* 16.427)

2. in tmesis, e.g. κὰδ δ᾽ ἔθορ᾽ ἐς μέσσον (*Il.* 4.79), ἐκ δ᾽ ἔθορε προμάχων (*Il.* 15.573), ἐκ δ᾽ ἔθορε κλῆρος κυνέης (*Il.* 7.182), ἐκ δὲ |ₚ κλῆρος θόρε (*Il.* 23.353), ἐκ δ᾽ ἔθορε κλῆρος (*Od.* 10.207), ἐκ δίφροιο χαμαὶ θόρε (*Il.* 8.320 = 23.509).

Thus, when *r̥ was still around in the thematic aorists in question, one would find dactylic forms of the type *katdr̥tʰe, *andr̥ke, and also forms with tmesis such as *ana … dr̥me or *an d᾽ edr̥me. At first sight, it seems problematic that there is no evidence for such forms among the roots πραθ-, δρακ-, and δραθ-, apart from one instance of the 3du. καδδραθέτην (*Od.* 15.494). But this lack of attestations is clearly due to the metrical convenience of augmented forms with -ρα- of the type ἀνέδρακον.[963]

For a model for the introduction of -ρα- into *-dr̥ke/o-, *-dr̥tʰe/o-, and *pr̥tʰe/o-, we have to turn to the forms ἔτραπε and -έδραμε. Given the higher metrical convenience of these vernacular forms with -ρα-, we may expect that they replaced the traditional forms with *r̥ in Epic Greek once they became available. Note that -έδραμε is not only the most frequent form with -ρα-, but also that it was exclusively used with preverb (ἀνα-, δια-, ἐπι-, ὑπο-, etc.). For most of these preverbs, apocope was metrically (δια-) or phonotactically (ἐπι-, ὑπο-) excluded. This means that a pre-form *dr̥me/o-, used mainly with tmesis, was replaced by |ₜ ἀνέδραμε(ν), |ₜ διέδραμε(ν), and so on. The same holds for the replacement of *epi … tr̥kʷe with e.g. ἐπέτραπε(ν). We may now suppose that the two frequent stems -δραμε/ο- and τραπε/ο- dragged the other three forms *-dr̥ke/o-, *-dr̥tʰe/o-, and *pr̥tʰe/o- along with them. That is, when the forms -έδραμε and ἔτραπε were in the process of replacing the pre-forms *-dr̥me and *(e)tr̥kʷe, the forms -έδραθε, -έδρακε, and -έπραθε could be created as metrical alternatives for the inconvenient *-dr̥ke, *-dr̥tʰe, and *-pr̥tʰe, thus greatly facilitating the use of preverbs.

However, the introduction of -ρα- also generated a problem that has already been discussed in the previous section. In their newly-introduced vernacular form, the aorists -έδραμον and ἔτραπον could not form participle or modal forms[964]: at this stage, well before the vocalization of Epic *r̥, *McL* scansion was still out of the question. Likewise, the introduction of -ρα- into *-dr̥ke/o-, *-dr̥tʰe/o-, and *pr̥tʰe/o- entailed that the participle and modal forms of these verbs could no longer be used. But this was probably not detrimental. Before the replacement, only the simplex participle forms *dr̥kont-, *dr̥tʰont-, *pr̥tʰont- could be used anyway, and the obligatory or frequently occurring preverb had to be placed in tmesis. It is therefore likely that alternative traditional forms or phrases had been coined already before the introduction of -ρα-. Relics of this situation are indeed attested in Homer. The ptc. (ἐκ)πέρσαντ- may have provided an early alternative for *pr̥tʰont-, and ἰδών in the meaning ‘looking, glancing (at)’ is traditional in the well-known formula τὸν δὲ ὑπόδρα ἰδών, where the adverb ὑπόδρα suggests that ἰδών is used as an equivalent of earlier *dr̥kōn. Similarly, the relic middle root aorists μετάλμενος, ἐπάλμενος ‘jumping among/at’ are used to solve the problem of unmetrical *μεταθορών, *ἐπιθορών (see above).

It remains to explain why the replacement of Epic *r̥ by -ρα- was not carried through in the thematic aorist ἤμβροτον. The reasons are simple: its augmented pre-form *āmr̥te already had a dactylic structure, so that there was no motive for introducing -ρα-. Moreover,

---

[963] Note that apocope was not an available option for the pre-forms with *r̥ of διέπραθον, διέδρακον, διέδραμον, περίδραμον, nor for those of ἐπέδραμον, ἀπέδραμον or a putative *ἐπέδρακον (cf. ἐπιδέρκομαι). For these pre-forms, tmesis would have been the only option. In the case of ἐπιθρώσκω, there are no cases of ἐπί … θορε/ο- in tmesis: the poets preferred to resort to the archaism ἐπᾶλτο ‘jumped onto’, ἐπάλμενος.

[964] With ‘modal forms’, I am referring to all subjunctive and optative forms except for the 1s. subj. in -ω, the 3s. in -ῃ, and the 3s. opt. in -οι, all of which could of course be used in front of a vowel.

the root structure of *am̥t- was different from that of *dr̥m-, so that there was no clear model. After the vernacular vocalization to -αρ-, the introduction of ἅμαρτε furnished a convenient metrical alternative to *ām̥te, which was preserved as such and, much later, joined the regular vocalization of Epic *r̥.

8.5 Pindaric δρακέντ-

It remains to explain the reflex -ρα- in the Pindaric participle δρακέντ-.[965] Traditionally (e.g. *LSJ* s.v. δέρκομαι), this form has been interpreted as what it appears to be from a synchronic perspective, namely an intransitive aorist of the type ἐφάνην 'appeared', ptc. φανέντ-. But in a brief and highly influential contribution, Forssman (1964) argued that δρακέντ- continues an older athematic root aorist ptc. *dr̥ḱ-ént-. In his view, the participle survived as a relic form only in Pindar, whereas the indicative had already been thematicized already in Homer. Following Hoffmann's remarks (1960) on Sanskrit *ádarśam*, which he analyzes as an inherited root aorist, Forssman concludes: "Für das Griechische ergibt sich daraus die Folgerung, dass die thematische Flexion ἔδρακον, -ες usw. sekundär aus der athematischen entstanden sein muss." (1964: 17).

This analysis has found broad acceptance among Indo-Europeanists. If it is correct, δρακέντ- would have to directly continue PIE *dr̥ḱ-ént- in non-Epic Greek, and constitute a counterexample to the regular vernacular vocalization to -αρ- defended here. For this reason, I will subject Forssman's argumentation to close scrutiny. Is it really necessary, on the basis of the inner-Greek facts, to reject the traditional interpretation of δρακέντ- as an intransitive aorist?[966] Forssman's first argument is that δρακέντ- takes an accusative object in all three attestations. These are the following:[967]

> τὰς δὲ Θεοξένου ἀκτῖνας πρὸς ὄσσων
> μαρμαρυζοίσας δρακείς
> ὃς μὴ πόθῳ κυμαίνεται, ἐξ ἀδάμαντος
> ἢ σιδάρου κεχάλκευται μέλαιναν καρδίαν
> ψυχρᾷ φλογί.   (Pi. *fr.* 123.2-6)

"but whoever has seen those rays flashing from Theoxenos' eyes and is not flooded with desire, has a black heart forged from adamant or steel with a cold flame."

> Ἐλείθυια, πάρεδρε Μοιρᾶν βαθυφρόνων,
> παῖ μεγαλοσθενέος, ἄκου-
>   σον, Ἥρας, γενέτειρα τέκνων· ἄνευ σέθεν
> οὐ φάος, οὐ μέλαιναν δρακέντες εὐφρόναν
> τεὰν ἀδελφεὰν ἐλάχομεν ἀγλαόγυιον Ἥβαν. (Pi. *Nem.* 7.1-4)

---

[965] The isolated εὐδρακής 'seeing well' (only S. *Phil.* 846) is a deverbal compound derived from δρακεῖν (cf. Meissner 2006: 216). It is distinguished in both form and meaning from old compounds like εὐδερκής 'well visible', and clearly secondary.

[966] There are other reasons to doubt the preservation of an inherited root aorist in Pindar. First, this would presuppose that the thematicization took place at a fairly recent date, but it is not so easy to indicate parallels. Forssman compares κτίζω 'to colonize', where only κτίμενος '(good) to live' is preserved in Homer, whereas Mycenaean still has the athem. ind. *ki-ti-e-si* /ktiensi/. But the parallel does not work, because there is no thematicized variant of κτίμενος. In fact, κτίζω must have been created on the basis of the factitive *s*-aorist κτίσαι, the only stem of this root to attest finite verbal forms in Homer. Second, there are good reasons to doubt the antiquity of the root aorist in Vedic: the *Rigveda* only attests the 1s. *darśam*. In my view, the reconstruction of the defective verbal paradigm of *derḱ- in PIE could benefit from a fresh treatment on the basis of the Greek evidence. But since this is not strictly relevant for present purposes, I will refrain from pursuing this matter here.

[967] The translations are by Race (1997).

"Eleithuia, enthroned beside the deep-thinking Fates, daughter of mighty Hera, hear me, giver of birth to children. Without you we behold neither light nor the darkness of night, nor are we allotted your sister, splendid-limbed Hebe."

> σὲ δ', ὦ Δεινομένειε παῖ, Ζεφυρία πρὸ δόμων
> Λοκρὶς παρθένος ἀπύει,
>   πολεμίων καμάτων ἐξ ἀμαχάνων
> διὰ τεὰν δύναμιν δρακεῖσ' ἀσφαλές·   (Pi. *Pyth*. 2.18-20)

"But you, O son of Deinomenes, the maiden of Western Lokroi invokes in front of her house, for after desperate toils of war she has a look of security in her eyes thanks to your power."

The first two attestations are grammatically clear: the accusatives ἀκτῖνας πρὸς ὄσσων μαρμαρυζοίσας and φάος, μέλαιναν … εὐφρόναν are the direct objects of δρακείς and δρακέντες, respectively. Moreover, both uses of δρακέντ- agree semantically: the grammatical object does not refer to a physical object, but to a source of light. In the third passage, however, δρακέντ- does not govern a direct object, but the adverb ἀσφαλές. Forssman refers to Farnell's commentary (ad Pi. *Pyth*. 2.20), who says about ἀσφαλές: "I take the neut. adjective here as a noun, a direct accusative after the verb = "having seen safety" (...)." Consequently, Farnell translates: "having, thanks to thy might, beheld the light of safety after desperate straits of war." But this can hardly be correct, because the substantive for 'safety' would be ἀσφαλεῖα also in Pindar.

The real issue is how to interpret the construction δέρκομαι + adverb. Both in Homer and in Pindar, there are clear parallels for this construction, e.g. δεινὸν δερκόμενος "having a fearsome appearance" (*Il*. 3.342, 11.37, and 23.815) or ὄμματι δέρκομαι λαμπρόν "my eye shines brightly" (Pi. *Nem*. 7.66). Farnell rejects this comparison since, in his view, the aorist speaks against a "steady gaze".[968] But the aorist in *Pyth*. 2.20 is ingressive: it refers to the renewed possibility for the Locrian maiden to confront the things around her, and to look strangers in the eyes again. For such an ingressive aorist, a Homeric parallel is ὃ δ' ἀμπνύνθη καὶ ἀνέδρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν (*Il*. 14.436), where wounded Hektor "regained his conscience and looked up [again]".[969]

A second argument for Forssman to doubt that δρακέντ- is an intransitive aorist is that the indicative ⁺⁺ἐδράκην is not attested anywhere else in Greek. Against this *argumentum e silentio*, it may be remarked that δέρκομαι has a low overall frequency in Greek. It cannot be excluded that the single attestation of the thematic aorist indicative δρακε/ο- in Pindar is a Homerism.[970]

---

[968] In the latter instance, Slater's translation "with secure gaze" (s.v. δέρκω) seems to be factually correct, even if the English sounds somewhat artificial to my non-native ears.

[969] See above. The root meaning of δερκ- can be set up as "avoir telle ou telle expression dans le regard" (Chantraine 1927: 11), or "einen bestimmten Blick, Gesichtsausdruck haben" (Kölligan 2007: 260). Apart from that, I think that we have to assume a more basic meaning 'to radiate, shine', as attested for the perfect δέδορκε in a number of passages in Pindar (*Ol*. 1.93, *Nem*. 3.84, *Nem*. 9.41) and in Aeschylus (*fr*. 296 Radt). Note also the construction with adverb or internal accusative, in the meaning 'to look like, have a conspicuous appearance' in Homer (*Il*. 22.95) and in Aeschylus (*Sept*. 53, *Pers*. 1007).

[970] φίλοισι γὰρ φίλος ἐλθὼν ξένιον ἄστυ κατέδρακεν Ἡρακλέος ὀλβίαν πρὸς αὐλάν (*Nem*. 4.22-4). Note that an Epic form κατέδρακεν may have been preserved because it could not be replaced by unmetrical *katewiden or *katwiden. The interpretation of these Pindaric lines continues to present problems, a fact which is reflected in the wide range of proposed translations. Willcock (1995: 97) even remarks that "the expression is awkward". Taking ξένιον ἄστυ with κατέδρακεν and ὀλβίαν πρὸς αὐλάν with ἐλθών requires quite a heavy hyperbaton. In my view, the emendation of αὐλάν to a Gp. αὐλᾶν is worthy of consideration, because this yields a natural interpretation of πρός: "For coming as a friend to friends, he looked down upon a hospitable city *from* the blessed halls of Herakles."

As Forssman remarks (1964: 17), from the side-by-side of δρακέντ- and ἔδρακον "lässt sich zunächst entweder der Schluss ziehen, dass δρακέντ- eine altertümliche Form, oder dass es nach irgendeinem Muster aus dem normalen δρακόντ- umgebildet ist".[971] Let us consider whether a reshaping of δρακόντ- is likely. Another intransitive aorist of δέρκομαι is ἐδέρχθη, attested seven times in the tragedians (see above), and always in the indicative in the meaning 'to look at, behold'. In five of these cases, ἐδέρχθη governs a direct object.[972] Formally, it is clearly an innovation on the basis of the present δέρκομαι. Its creation may be explained by Allan's observation (2003: 159) that δέρκομαι is non-volitional in Classical Greek. For this reason, its aorist (ἐδέρχθην) could be aligned with other "mental process middles" that formed an intransitive aorist in Classical Greek, such as ἐφράσθην 'I observed' to φράζομαι. In order to explain Pindaric δρακέντ- as a secondary creation, Allan compares the replacement of ἔτραφον 'I grew up' (Hom.) with ἐτράφην (Hom.+), which is the only aorist of τρέφομαι attested in Pindar.[973] Although we have seen that ἔτραφον is probably an artificial Homeric form, the possibility exists that Pindar conceived of Homeric ἔδρακον in a similar way, that is, as a typical Homeric thematic aorist where an intransitive aorist would be expected. Note, too, that δρακέντ- is semantically very close to φανέντ-, and that the same replacement seems to have occurred in the ptc. ἐριπών 'collapsing' (Hom.) → ἐριπέντ- (Pi.).[974] Finally, the creation of a novel ptc. δρακέντ- in Pindar on the basis of the Homeric indicative ἔδρακον (also attested once in Pindar) may have been favored by the absence of the participle δρακόντ- in Homer.[975]

8.6 Conclusions

In thematic aorist forms, Classical prose has *r̥ > -αρ- in κατέδαρθον 'went to sleep' (only Attic), ἔπαρδον 'broke wind' (only Attic), and ἥμαρτον 'committed a mistake' (Att., Hom., Hdt.). While ἔπαρδον may be analogical after πέρδομαι, this explanation is not available for κατέδαρθον and ἥμαρτον, which both are primary thematic aorists from an inner-Greek perspective. I therefore conclude that κατέδαρθον and ἥμαρτον contain the regular (Ionic-)Attic outcome of *r̥. The vowel slot of ἔδραμον 'ran' must be due to the perfect δέδρομε (Hom.) or to δρόμος 'track', and that of ἐτραπόμην 'turned' due to τρέπω. We have also seen that Homeric ἔτραφον and ταρπώμεθα are artificial formations.

As for -ρα- in ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον, and ἔπραθον, I have shown that these forms are all but restricted to Epic Greek, and typically occur with preverbs. There are sufficient reasons to assume that corresponding forms with -αρ- were not available anymore to Epic poets in late Proto-Ionic, which means that they initially kept the forms with *r̥. However, in combination with preverbs, these forms were metrically inconvenient. On the other hand, the vernacular forms δραμε/ο- and τραπε/ο- did facilitate the use of preverbs, and were quickly introduced into Epic Greek after the Proto-Ionic vocalization. I therefore assume that ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον, and ἔπραθον were influenced within Epic Greek by ἔδραμον and ἔτραπον. This explains why

---

[971] Forssman speaks of the normal form δρακών, but in reality, there are only two attestations of this form in all of Archaic and Classical Greek up till Plato: δ]ρακοῖσα (Stes. S135.9) and δρακών (E. *Herc*. 951).

[972] E.g. ὡς τρισόλβιοι κεῖνοι βροτῶν, οἳ ταῦτα δερχθέντες τέλη μόλωσ' ἐς Ἄιδου (S. *fr*. 387).

[973] With Slater, τράφε (*Nem*. 3.53) may be analyzed as an imperfect.

[974] Forssman (1964: 18 n. 6) remarks: "δρακέντ- ist also nicht mit ἐριπέντι (dat.) 'stürzend, fallend' Pi. Ol. II 43 aud eine Stufe zu stellen (…), das gegenüber hom. ἐριπών (zu ἤριπε) auf ἐριπείς weist: Hier handelt es sich um ein intransitives Verbum. Überdies wäre die Frage zu stellen, ob nicht auch ἤριπε einen alten Wurzelaorist fortsetzen kann." But there is no reason why δρακέντ- and ἐριπέντ-, attested more than two centuries after Homer, could not be replacements of older thematic aorist forms.

[975] Henry (2005: 33) suggests that "Pindar may have used δρακείς (etc.) rather than δρακών (etc.) in order to avoid confusion with forms of the substantive δράκων, indistinguishable in strophic song from those of δρακών. There was no danger of such a confusion outside the participle." But I fail to understand how δρακών and δράκων, with their opposite accents, could ever be confused in Classical Greek (except in some case forms, e.g. Gp. δρακόντων), let alone why the category "strophic song" would be relevant here.

we find no traces of *McL* scansion among these forms, and why the root-initial cluster is regularly used to create length by position. A similar explanation can be given for the different metrical behavior of κρατερός as opposed to κραδίη.