CHAPTER 7

Epic Forms with -ρο-

Introduction

For forms like δράκων and χραταιός, which combine the reflex -ρα- < *r with McL scansion, an inner-epic explanation has been proposed in the previous chapter. The present chapter discusses Homeric forms with -ρο- for which there is reason to suppose that it reflects *r. Are such forms Aeolisms, or is it more likely that -ρο- is the regular reflex of Epic *r after labials, along the lines sketched in the previous chapter?

The material consists of the following types of words:1

1 Forms with a metrical peculiarity (McL or a more serious irregularity) as well as strong etymological indications for *r:
   - ἀβροτάξομεν aor. subj. ‘we will miss’ < *amr̥t-ak-s- (cf. ἁμαρτάνω, aor. ἡμάρτων, Hom. ἡμιμάρτων);
   - ἀνδροτήτα acc.sg. ‘vigor’ < PGr. *anr̥tāt- < PIE *h₂nr-téh₂t-;
   - βροτός m./f. ‘(mortal) man, human being’ < PGr. *mr̥tó- (cf. Arm. mard ‘man, human being’), along with compounds; note especially:
     - the formulaic 1st hemistich ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης ‘man-covering shield’ (Il.);
     - ἀμβρότος ‘immortal’ (vel sim.), ἀμβρόσιος ‘id.’;
     - ἀμβροτος in the hapax νὺξ ἀμβρότη ‘immortal night’.
   To this list we must add ἀνδρεϊφόνῃ, epithet of Enualios, which is probably a replacement of *ἀνδραφόνη < PGr. *anr̥-kwhon-tā‑ ‘man-slayer’ (cf. Myc. PN a-no-qo-ta).

2 Forms for which a reconstruction with *r is possible and which have dialectal variants with -or‑ / -ar‑ / -ra‑:
   - Ἀφροδίτη ~ Cret. Αφορδιτα, Pamph. Αφορδίσιος;
   - θρόνος ‘luxurious/ornamented chair’ ~ Myc. to-no / thornos / ‘id.’;
   - πρός and προτί ‘towards’ ~ Cret. πορτί ‘id.’;

1 From the examples with McL scansion listed in section 6.3, I leave aside the hapax βεβρο‑
tωμένα ‘covered with gore’ (Il. 11.41) because the base form βρότος ‘gore’ (4 × Il. in verse-final βρότων ἀμφιβρότης) has no etymology; nor is there any other indication that the pre-form had *r. In βρότος and in the formula ἐναρα βροτόντα ‘blood-stained spoils’ (5 × verse-final in the Iliad, also 3 × after |p|), initial βρ‑ regularly makes position.
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– πρόσωπον ‘face’;
– πρόσω ‘forward, further’ ~ πόρσω ‘id.’, Att. πόρρω;
– ῥόδον ‘rose’, ῥοδόεν‑ ‘rose-scented’ ~ Myc. wo-do˚, wo-do-we;
– πρόκες and προκάδες ‘deer’ ~ πράκες· (…) ἐλάφοι and πόρκας· ἐλάφους (Hsch.).

(3) Forms for which a reconstruction with *ᵣ must be considered because they undergo McL scansion:
– κροαίνων ‘galloping’, only in a repeated simile;
– forms of Κρονίων ‘Zeus’ with long ῑ (mostly in the nom.sg.);
– forms of Κρόνος (gen.sg. Κρόνοιο, Κρόνου);
– Certain instances of the preverb προ‑: below I will suggest that the middle participle προκείμενα (said of comestibles in a repeated formula) derives from *pr̥-keimena, where *pr̥- is the pre-form of παρ‑ (cf. παρά).

Most forms in groups (2) and (3) have a peculiarity of scansion (McL) which could be ascribed to an earlier *ᵣ. However, the former presence of *ᵣ cannot always be taken for granted. The following discussion aims to find additional arguments for and/or against the erstwhile presence of *ᵣ in these forms. Before embarking on a treatment of the metrical issues, I will address the problem of the dialectal origin of Homeric forms with -ρο-.

7.1 The Dialectal Origin of Forms with -ρο-

From Homer onwards, the noun βροτός is firmly anchored in Greek poetic tradition, and especially in epic poetry. Since βροτός cannot be the regular reflex of its pre-form *mr̥tó‑ in Ionic-Attic, it is usually taken to be an archaism, retained from Aeolic3 or Mycenaean4 poetry. The same origin is assumed for the negated form ἄμβροτος ‘immortal’ and other derived forms like ἀμβρόσιος.

This account of the phonologically aberrant outcome of *ᵣ is also applied

2 Cf. Lamberterie (2004: 245) on δρόνος: “… la correptio du groupe δρ‑ (…) 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 in my view the second restriction is too rigorous.
3 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 > ρο that is to be found.” See further e.g. Wathelet (1970: 169), GEW and DELG (both s.v.), although the latter adds that the form may also be Achaean.
4 DELG (s.v., see previous note), Strunk (1957), Ruijgh (passim), West (1988: 156–157). The analysis of Heubeck (1972) will be discussed below.
to other epic forms with -ρο-, like ἄβροτάξομεν or ἀνδροτήτα. Some scholars even assume that θρόνος derives from a pre-form with *ṛ.\(^5\)

In favor of such an analysis, it can be said that -ρο- is indeed the regular reflex of *ṛ in the Aeolic dialects.\(^6\) A minor problem concerns the non-recessive accentuation of forms like βροτός, which conflicts with the regularly recessive accent in the Lesbian tradition. This could be mended by assuming that the epic tradition picked up these forms from mainland Aeolic poetry (and that Thessalian did not have recessive accent), or that Lesbian acquired its recessive accent not long before the time of Sappho and Alcaeus.

However, for the Homeric forms βροτός and ἄμβροτος an Aeolic origin is not at all straightforward. 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 θνᾶτος (attested 4×) and ἀθάνατος (5×, with the metrical lengthening of the initial ἀ- characteristic for Epic Greek). The only evidence for the stem βροτο- in Lesbian poetry are ἀμβρόσιος (Alc. fr. 296b.4) and the substantivization ἀμβροσία ‘divine food’ (Sapph. fr. 141.1), but these forms can easily be epicisms. Of course, given that only a relatively small corpus of fragments of Lesbian poetry has been preserved, it cannot be excluded that βροτός and ἄμβροτος are absent from Sappho and Alcaeus by chance. Nevertheless, it is remarkable that they appear to regularly use θνάτος and ἀθάνατος instead. Furthermore, assuming Aeolic provenance would be unmotivated for ἀνδροτήτα and θρόνος (which are unattested in Lesbian poetry).\(^7\) The only Homeric form where -ρο- certainly derives from *ṛ and which has a clear counterpart in Lesbian dialect is the aorist ἤμβροτον ‘missed’, which appears in epigraphic Lesbian as an infinitive αμβροτην. However, I will argue below (and in chapter 8) that ἤμβροτον can be the inner-epic reflex of *āmr̥ton (the form underlying both Aeol. ἄμβροτον and Ion. ἦμαρτον) and that the similarity to the actual Lesbian form is a coincidence.

---

5 E.g. Wathelet (1966).

6 Wathelet (1966: 166) overstates the case for an Aeolic phase by emphasizing "passages" where βροτοῖσι(ν) co-occurs with another alleged Aeolism. Out of 28 attestations in Homer, βροτοῖσι(ν) occurs in combination with Aeolic epsilon-datives only twice: μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν (Il. 2.285) and πάνεσσι βροτοῖσι (Od. 13.397). These numbers prove nothing, because we also find e.g. πασι βροτοῖσι (Od. 15.255), with the Ionic dative form, and because the epsilon-dative is productive in Homer. In fact, μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν may well be an inflected form of the more frequent μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

7 In my view, ποικιλόθρον’ (Sapph. fr. 1.1) contains the word θρόνα ‘embroideries’ vel sim., on which see section 2.5.2. Another word with numerous attestations in Sappho is ῥόδον (transmitted several times in the form ῥόδον, both as a simplex and in compounds). It is plausible, but not entirely certain, that this derives from *u̯r̥do- (see section 7.2.9). Apart from these, no other Homeric form with -ρο- discussed in this chapter is attested in the Lesbian poets.
In sum, the idea that epic forms with -ρο- < *γ stem from Aeolic is not clearly borne out by the Aeolic evidence itself.\(^8\)

A second potential problem is that *McL* scansion, as regularly applied in Homer in formulaic material containing the forms βροτῶν and βροτοίσι, is virtually unknown in the Lesbian poets.\(^9\) It would be problematic if precisely those forms of βροτός that are most deeply entrenched in epic diction could not be used in the literary dialect (alleged Aeolic hexameter poetry) from which they are supposed to have been borrowed. There are only four certain cases of *McL* in Lesbian lyric, all in Sappho: κἀν ὅπλοισι (fr. 16.19), ἔλγματα χρύσια (fr. 44.8), παίς ὀχλος (fr. 44.14), and μαλαδρόπηες (fr. 105a.2). Of these, the last can be ascribed to epic influence. Not only is fragment 105a composed in hexameters, but the suffix -εύς does not normally occur in compounds (one expects δροτεύς 'reaper' beside unattested *μαλαδρόπος 'who reaps apples'). In combination with the placement of μαλαδρόπηες after the bucolic dieresis, the form is highly suspect of being an artificial extension that was coined specifically for this metrical slot, as in Homeric forms like ἡνιοχῆες (*Il. 5.505*), ἡνιοχῆα (*Il. 8.312, 16.737, 19.401*) beside the normal and morphologically regular form ἡνιοχος 'charioteer'.\(^10\) In other words, μαλαδρόπηες is an epic form. The tautosyllabic scansion in χρύσια and ὀχλος, too, appears in a fragment well-known for its linguistic elements characteristic of Epic Greek (cf. Miller 2013: 244–247 for a brief linguistic commentary).

At first sight, one could surmise that these cases are remnants of a Aeolic (Lesbian) epic tradition in which *McL* was acceptable. One would have to assume that *McL* originated when *γ* vocalized in this putative Lesbian epic tradition. However, for the Sapphic instances of *McL* this would mean that

---

\(^8\) The possible dialectal origins of ἀβροτάξομεν are difficult to determine. The form has been seen as an 'Achaean' element of Epic Greek in view of the velar suffix -αξ- (Ruijgh 1957: 74), which is found also in Arcadian, all West Greek dialects, and in part of Boeotian and Thessalian (in these Aeolic dialects it is perhaps due to West Greek or Koine influence). Of these dialects, only 'Achaean' (as continued in Arcadian) would be a likely source for the epic forms, Ruijgh's reasoning goes. However, Wathelet (1970: 307–308) and Garcia Ramon (1975: 95) are more cautious regarding the possibility that some of the Thessalian aorists and futures in -αξ-, -ιξ-, -ασσ-, -ισσ- (only if the syllable preceding the suffix contained a velar) is attested in the earliest Argolic inscriptions: see Nieto Izquierdo (2008: 486–489).

\(^9\) On the virtual absence of *McL* scansion in Lesbian, see Wathelet (1966: 148–149); on that in Eastern Ionic elegiac and iambic poetry, see West (1974: 113–114 and 1988: 166). Wathelet (1966: 166 n. 5) already concluded that *McL* in βροτοίσιν could not be ascribed to Aeolic influence.

\(^10\) For similar artificial forms, cf. Hackstein (2010: 409–413) with further references.
the license was extended far beyond its normal use in Epic Greek: three out of four cases in Sappho have McL word-internally, a position where the license is still extremely rare in Homer (see section 6.5). Moreover, in ὅπλοις, χρύσια and ὄχλος the tautosyllabic scansion is not necessitated by the metrical structure of the word. It is therefore more plausible, in my view, that Sappho resorted to tautosyllabic scansion in the fragments in question because she associated this license with epic, and that McL scansion was still an intrusive element in the Lesbian poetic tradition.

Seen from a diffusionist standpoint, the above conclusion implies that the tautosyllabic scansion of plosive plus liquid in frequent epic forms like βροτῶν, βροτόισι is unlikely to have been borrowed together with the forms from a putative Aeolian epic tradition. If such scansion were introduced in order to accommodate for Aeolic borrowings, one would not expect a predominance of words with -ρο- and -ρα- among words with this scansion. One would rather expect an avoidance of forms like βροτῶν, βροτοίσι (and a predominance of metrically unproblematic case forms like βροτός, βροτόν, etc.).

On the other hand, if one assumes that the vocalization of Epic *ᵣ took place in an Aeolic phase, other problems arise: why would -ρα- have been introduced in most forms reflecting Epic *ᵣ (cf. chapter 6), and even in cases such as δράκων, ἔδρακον and ἔπραθον, where an Ionic equivalent probably never existed? And why was ἤμβροτον not changed into ἥμ(β)ρατον in spite of the presence of Ion.-Att. ἥμαρτον?

Another option would be to assume a Mycenaean origin for certain Homeric forms with -ρο-. Indeed, for the forms ῥοδόεντι and ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ, there are positive indications of such an origin, as we shall see below. This option is therefore more plausible, but not ascertained either. For one thing, a borrowing of these words from Mycenaean in a shape with -ρο- would be entirely implausible, because -ro- was not the regular reflex of *ᵣ in Mycenaean (cf. chapter 2). This problem can be avoided by assuming that an early stage of the tradition inherited the pre-forms of ῥοδόεντι and ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ from Mycenaean, in the late 13th or early 12th c., in a form with *ᵣ. However, it must be admitted that other dialects that retained *ᵣ at the relevant time (e.g. Proto-Ionic) would also be conceivable donors of these forms.

7.2 -ρο- as a Conditioned Reflex of Epic *ᵣ

The above arguments justify a fresh look at other possibilities to explain forms with -ρο- < *ᵣ in Homer. The case of βροτός is comparable to various words discussed in chapter 6: *ᵣ was present in the pre-form *mrtó-, and McL scansion
is regularly applied in the most frequent case forms βροτῶν and βροτοῖσι, which occur in old formulae. We may therefore ask whether βροτῶν and βροτοῖσι (and hence forms of βροτός more generally) contain an artificial reflex of retained Epic *ר. Since βροτός is a typical poetic word and is no longer current in any attested vernacular dialect of Greek, we may surmise that this situation was valid also for the pre-form *mrтó- at the time when *ר vocalized in the relevant vernaculars. This means that a traditional form *mrтó- would have simply been preserved in the epic tradition.

But how to account for the reflex -ρο-? By assuming an Aeolic origin we do not account for the structural presence of McL in these old formulaic words. I hypothesize that the vocalization *mrтó- > βροτός originated by the same process that yielded -ρα- in forms like τράπεζα, and that the specific reflex -ρο- of Epic *ר developed under the influence of preceding labial consonants. Phonetically, this means that epic poets developed a vowel [ə] after the liquid, the pronunciation of which merged at some point with that of the existing phonemes /a/ and /o/, depending on the environment. This is reminiscent of the development in Cretan, where -ορ- was probably conditioned by preceding labial consonants (cf. section 3.1.2).

The actual evidence in favor of this conditioning, to be discussed in detail in the remainder of this chapter, consists of the following forms:

- ἀβροτάξον < *amr̥t‑;
- ἤμβροτον < *āmr̥te/o‑;
- βροτός < *mr̥tó‑ in all its case forms;
- ἀμβρότος < *āmr̥to‑ or metrically lengthened *āmr̥to‑, ἀβρότη < *amŕ̥tā‑;
- ἀμφιβρότη ‑ < *amphimŕ̥tā‑;
- πρός < *pr̥s < prevocalic *pr̥ti, also προτί < *pr̥ti, προσηύδα ‘(s)he said’, etc.;
- πρόσω and πρόσσω < *pŕ̥tsō < *pŕ̥tiō;
- πρόσωπον ‘face’ < *pŕ̥tio̯kʷo‑.

11 It is not directly relevant from which dialect the forms with Epic *ר come; the key point is that they are retained archaisms. There are two basic scenarios: (1) the epic tradition was an affair of Ionian singers throughout the Dark Ages, reaching back to a time before the vocalization of *ר in the Proto-Ionic vernacular (terminus ante quem: 11th c. BCE); (2) the tradition evolved in Achaean and Aeolic environments in the early Dark Ages (retaining *ר in traditional lexemes and formulas) and then underwent an Ionicization at some time after the vocalization of *ר in the Proto-Ionic vernacular.

12 But not by a following labial consonant, as appears from τράπεζα.

13 A conditioned reflex of syllabic liquids after labials or labialized consonants is phonetically natural and has plausible parallels in various other Indo-European languages: cf. Balto-Slavic ul, ur after labiovelars beside il, ir elsewhere (Kortlandt 2007, following Vaillant) and Indo-Iranian ār from *ṛH, *ḥr after labiovelar and labial stops, as against ār elsewhere.
The metrical behavior of the prepositions πρό ‘forth; forward’ and πρός ‘towards’ (and the corresponding preverbs) presents difficulties. The preform of πρό clearly did not have a syllabic liquid, but as I will argue below, at least the form προκείμενα (attested in an old formulaic verse) reflects *pr̥-, the zero-grade underlying παρ-. Moreover, I will argue that πρός and frequent compounds like προσηύδα ‘said (s)he’ might well reflect prevocalic *pr̥ti̯-, rather than *proti̯-. An important argument for this claim is the vocalism of Cretan πορτι (and more distantly Hitt. -parza ‘-wards’), which points directly to *pr̥ti. The other arguments are more intricate and will be discussed below. The evaluation of πρός and προς- is important because together they are responsible for 240 instances (i.e. over one third of all instances) of McL scansion in Homer.

The new scenario also enables us to account for forms such as ἕμβροτον, which have -ρο‑ < *r̥ but no McL scansion. As I will elaborate below, the following examples can be added to the plausible evidence for Epic *r̥:

– Ἀφροδίτη < *Aphr̥dītā-;
– πρόξ ‘deer’ < *pr̥k-;
– ρόδον ‘rose’ < *μυρ̥do-.

There is, of course, potential countervidence to the scenario just proposed. First of all, the following two Homeric words have -ρα‑ after a labial consonant: βραχίων ‘upper arm’ and ἔπραθον ‘to destroy, pillage’. The etymology and reconstruction of βραχίων are problematic, as we have seen in section 6.9.5.14 As for ἔπραθον, although this is a typical epic form and an archaism, its a-vocalism can be explained by analogical influence of other thematic aorists like ἔτραπον, ἔδραμον, as I will argue in section 8.4. The aorist ἕμβροτον did not undergo this influence, but that may have various reasons: unlike the other thematic aorists with -ρα- it had a disyllabic root, and its present ἁμαρτάνω has a different stem formation compared to the thematic root presents πέρθω, δέρκομαι, τρέπω. Moreover, the form was not completely obsolete: ἄμβροτον actually existed in the Lesbian vernacular (cf. αμβροτην), and poets aware of this fact may have felt less inclination to reshape the form.

Another group of potential counterexamples has -ρο‑ < *r or McL scansion after non-labial consonants. In some cases, the vocalism may have been analogically influenced by similar forms or formations: in ἀνδροτῆτα, for instance, we should reckon with the possibility that the o-vocalism was introduced from compound formations with ἀνδρο‑ < *anr-o-, with a linking vowel -o-. Other potential pieces of counterevidence are βρόνος, Κρόνος and Κρονίων; they

14 Possibly, βραχίων originated as a sobriquet in *-iôn- based on the adjective βραχύς, as suggested by Ruijgh.
involve specific problems that will be discussed in more detail below. Anticipating these discussions, I find no compelling reason to doubt the possibility of a special outcome -ро- < Epic *ř conditioned by preceding labial consonants.

7.2.1 βροτός

The pre-form underlying βροτός 'man; mortal', *mrtó-, is presupposed also by Arm. mard 'man; human being'. This may perhaps point to a common innovation of Greek and Armenian (gew s.v. βροτός; Lambarterie 1997: 73). In Greek, from Homer onwards, βροτός clearly belongs to a poetic register. However, as was noted by McDevitt (1967) and Heubeck (1970), the oldest attested reflex of *mrtó- is attested epigraphically as μροτός, without epenthetic -β-. Barnes (2011) collected further evidence for this form μροτός in inscriptions from the archaic period, noting that it occurs in three different dialect areas (Italian colonies, Thessaly, Insular Ionic) and that they "are among the earliest inscriptions from their respective areas." (2011: 10).

From these facts, combined with the absence of compelling Mycenaean evidence, Heubeck already concluded that the b-epenthesis in -mr- may well have been a relatively recent phenomenon. Indeed, this development, being phonetically natural, may well have occurred independently in different dialects at different times; the retention of -µ- in isolated pockets, as a shared archaism, would be unsurprising. Heubeck also states that the terminus ante quem for the epenthesis was the formative period of the epic language, the argument being that this language took over the Aeolisms βροτός and άμβροτος, which already display the outcome of the sound change. This presupposes, however, that epic forms could not undergo further phonological developments after they had entered the epic language, which is not certain at all.

In fact, taking into account the appellative form μροτοισιν from Naxos (CEG 402, 7th c.), it seems quite possible that onset /mr-/ was still current in the epic tradition when the Iliad was composed. A prolonged retention of such onsets

---

15 Ved. mṛtā- 'dead' is generally supposed to preserve the older meaning of PIE *mṛtó-, whereas PGr. and PArm. *mṛtō- 'mortal' may have been created under influence of the antonym *y-mṛ-to- 'immortal' (cf. Lat. mortālis after immortālis). A different view is found in Thieme (1952: 15–34).

16 μροτοισιν (CEG 402, Naxos, 7th c.), Κλεομροτος (Dubois 2002: 23 ff., bronze tablet dedicated by an Olympic victor from Sybaris and dated to appr. 600 BCE), Σωμροτιδας (name of a physician in Megara Hyblaea, an Achaean colony in Magna Graecia, IGDS 22, ca. 550 BCE), Φιλομροτος (SEG 24.405, Pelasgiots, early 5th c.), and with a different root cf. also Μροχο Ινεα (woman's name from Perrhaebia, SEG 24.406, first half 5th c.).

17 A comparable case is the distinction between /ǣ/ and /ē/, which is never made in the available textual evidence for Homer, but is preserved in the orthography of a 7th c. hex-
may also help us account for the word-internal reflex -βρ‑ (fairly consistently spelled this way in the manuscripts) in forms like ἀβρότη, ἀμφιβρότη, ἀβροτάξο-μέν. Mühlestein (1958: 226) called these forms “Notlösungen” that were created in order to avoid the metrically problematic outcomes of the sound change with -μβρ‑. However, the outcome of /mr/ may have depended on its syllabification: heterosyllabic /m.r/ (the default rendering) or tautosyllabic /.mr/ (the artificial rendering of vocalized Epic *r̥). As an onset, /.mr/ apparently developed into βρ, possibly after the completion of the Iliad.

Let us now consider the use of βροτός in the Homeric hexameter. Table 15 shows the number of attestations of the different case forms, adding remarks about their localization and occurrence in formulae. Among the forms with a second syllable that is long by nature, βροτοῖο, βροτούς, βροτῶν and βροτοῖσιν, only the gen. pl. and dat. pl. are frequently used. Both have their own preferred position in the line: βροτοῖσιν is verse-final on 24 of 28 occasions, βροτῶν directly follows |T in 39 out of 44 cases. The localization of βροτοῖσιν is expected for a form of this metrical structure, but the almost consistent use of βροτῶν after the third foot caesura can hardly be predicted from its iambic structure (generally, between 50 and 60 % of such forms stands after |T, see O’Neill 1942: 140). This placement suggests that βροτῶν is an archaism.

Interestingly, the other case forms of βροτός (i.e. the entire singular and the nom. pl.) are always followed by a vowel, with epic correction of a final diphthong if applicable. That is, these forms are positioned in such a way that applying McL was not necessary: they normally occupy the thesis of the fourth or fifth foot.18 There is only one exception: the verse αἶψα γὰρ ἐν κακότητι βροτοὶ καταγηράσκουσιν (Od. 19.360).19 Taken together, they are less frequent in Homer (42 ×) than the gen. pl. and dat. pl.20 In sum, McL scansion in βροτός was avoided in early Greek epic whenever the word shape allowed this.21

18 Compare the localization of the indicative forms of the thematic aorist (chapter 8).
19 In early Greek epic after Homer, we also find the verse ends βροτόν κρατερὸν τε μέγαν τε (Scut. 106) and οὔ τι βροτοὶ κείρουσι σιδήρῳ (h. Aphyr. 268). In these cases, βρ‑ directly follows the trochaic caesura, the traditional and usual place of the gen. pl.
20 The picture in Theogony and Works and Days taken together is similar: the gen. pl. and dat. pl. (9 ×) account for more than half of the attestations of βροτός (16 ×).
21 The high frequency of McL scansion in forms of βροτός, βρόνος and Κρόνος clearly stands out when we compare the number of occurrences of this license in thematic nominal forms of the same rhythmical structure (CIVCo‑) in Homer. In such forms, the license
| Case     | Form      | # | Formulaic behavior                  |
|----------|-----------|---|-------------------------------------|
| nom. sg. | βροτός    | 16 | 5 × verse-final βροτός ἄλλος; otherwise no fixed position |
| acc. sg. | βροτόν    | 6  | 5 × before |β, of which 2 × βροτόν ἄνδρα 1 × verse-final βροτόν ἄλλον (Il. 2.248) |
| gen. sg. | βροτοῖο   | 1  | σῆμα βροτοῖο |T (Il. 23.331) |
| gen. sg. | βροτοῦ     | 1  | |Τ βροτοῦ ἄνέρος (Il. 18.85) |
| dat. sg. | βροτῷ     | 4  | always before |β; 3 × βροτῷ ἄνδρι |
| nom. pl. | βροτοὶ    | 15 | οἷοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσ’ |P (4 × Il.) δύσσι νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσίν |Τ (1 × Od.) verse-final βροτοὶ ἄλλοι (3 × Il.) |
| acc. pl. | βροτοὺς   | 1  | |Τ βροτοὺς (Il. 24.464) |
| gen. pl. | βροτῶν    | 44 | 39 × after |Τ |
| dat. pl. | βροτοῖσιν(ν) | 28 | 24 × verse-final; 4 × before |Τ | δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν(ν) (6 ×) θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν(ν) (3 ×, also Hes., hymns) |

The relic status of dat. pl. βροτοῖσι(ν) is confirmed by its place in the system of formulae for ‘mortals’ or ‘human beings’, which is as depicted in Table 16 on the next page (cf. Parry 1971: 114–115). In the gen. pl., ἀνθρώπων (96 × Hom.) is frequent in verse-final position (61 ×), notably in the formulae μερόπων ἀνθρώπων and (κατά)θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων. In the dat. pl. (38 ×), we find the spondaic

appears to be exceedingly rare. On a total of 111 instances, it is applied only three times: the first half-lines ὡς μεμνέω τοῦ δρόμου (Il. 23.361), ἀρνειούς τε τράγου τε (Od. 9.239), οὐδὲ τροφοῦ οὔσης (Od. 19.489).

22 Cf. σῆμα βροτοῖσιν in the same position (Il. 13.244), one of the few cases where the dat. pl. does not stand in verse-final position.

23 Only in the verse νύκτα δι’ ὀρφανίαν (ἀμβροσίαν), ἥτε θ’ εὔδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι, which occurs twice in the Doloneia and at Il. 24.363.

24 The other 5 instances may be modifications: 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.

25 Of these 4 instances, 2 identical verses have θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν (Od. 3.3 and 12.386), a phrase which also occurs in verse-final position (Od. 7.210, 3 x Hes. Th.) and is an inflected form of θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων. The same holds for μερόπεσσι βροτοῖσιν beside the frequent μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.
TABLE 16  Verse-final Homeric NPs meaning ‘men, mortals’ in gen. and dat.

| Position after | Dative plural | Genitive plural |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| B              | ἀνθρώποισιν (12 ×) | μερόπων ἀνθρώπων (10 ×) |
| H              | δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν (6 ×) | ὕνητων ἀνθρώπων (9 ×) |
| T              | διζυροῖσι βροτοῖσιν (2 ×) | καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων (7 ×) |

clausula ἀνθρώποισι(ν) (12 ×), but there are no extended epithet plus noun formulae ending in ἀνθρώποισι(ν). Instead, the normal dat. pl. form of ‘mortals’ used in formulae is βροτοῖσι(ν): the accompanying traditional epithets are δειλοῖσι and διζυροῖσι, both meaning ‘miserable’ vel sim.

Whether βροτός entered the tradition from Aeolic or a Mycenaean-like dialect is not all-important. I propose that an early stage of the epic tradition inherited the pre-form *mrtó-. At that point, the root syllable could be localized in the first or second thesis syllable (only the second option was available for forms ending in -ῶν, -οίσι(ν), etc.). After the development of Epic *r̥ to ‑ρο‑, using the forms βροτοί, βροτος, βροτῶν, βροτοῖσι(ν) required applying McL, but in the other case forms McL was avoided as far as possible: their root syllable was henceforth placed exclusively in the first thesis syllable.

A final interesting detail concerns the word-ends preceding forms of βροτός. There are only four instances (out of 41 possible ones) where β‑ demonstrably lengthens a preceding short vowel: ὅ με βροτὸς οὔτασεν ἀνήρ (Il. 5.361), μὴ δὲ βρο‑

7.2.2 ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης and the Compounds in -μ)βροτος

Let us now consider the use of βροτο‑ in compounds, in order to see whether this can be reconciled with the idea that the word entered the tradition in the form *mrtó-. 

26 In ἐρίσσει βροτὸς ἄλλος (Il. 3.323, Od. 15.321 and 19.286) and ὅτε θ’ εὕδουσι βροτοὶ ἄλλοι (Il. 19.22), οἷα βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ἔδουσιν (Od. 5.197), ὅτε με βροτοὶ οὐ τί τίουσι (Od. 13.129). This low incidence of position length may be another remnant of the pre-form *mrtó-, as with κραδή (sections 6.1 and 6.8.2).27

27 Cf. also section 8.4.1 for a comparison between the prosodic behavior of κραδή and κρα‑

τερός.
As a first compound member, βροτο- only occurs in βροτολοιγός (13×), epithet of Ares. In 5 instances the word occurs in the old formula |p βροτολοιγῷ Ἰσο‑ Άρηϊ, which serves as a generic qualification of warriors in action. In 2 of these 5 instances βρ- is preceded by a word-final short vowel, but since the medial caesura intervenes, these are not necessarily to be seen as instances of position length. In 4 of the 8 remaining cases, βρ- lengthens a word-final short vowel by position, but since these cases are isolated in terms of formulaic language, the position length can be viewed as a natural consequence of the synchronic metrical structure of βροτολοιγός. Therefore, the option of position length in front of βροτολοιγός is not demonstrably old.

As a second compound member, βροτό- is more frequent. There are three Homeric compounds in -μβροτος: τερψίμβροτος, φαεσίμβροτος, and φθεισίμβρο‑
tος. In these forms a short vowel preceding -μβροτος is metrically long. These compounds surely have some antiquity, but they need not be very old: they are not an inalienable part of formulaic systems, and the type with a first member in -σι- is productive. It is therefore conceivable that their creation post-dates the vocalization of Epic *r̥.

To be contrasted with these compounds in -μβροτος is the formula ἀσπί‑
dος ἀμφιβρότης, which occurs in three different verses (Il. 2.238, 12.402, 20.281), each time occupying the first hemistich. Besides, there is also one instance of ἀμφιβρότην ... ἀσπίδα (Il. 11.32). Wathelet (1966: 167–168) 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. Two objections can be advanced against this identification. First, as remarked by Tichy (1981: 32–33), the formula ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης never explicitly refers to the “tower shield” in the Iliad: the context of some passages makes clear that it refers to a round shield. Secondly, the actual use of ἀμφιβρότη does not favor the

---

28 The attestations are as follows. The second hemistichs τερψιμβρότου ἠελίοιο (Od. 12.269, 274) and φαεσιμβρότου ἠελίοιο (Od. 13.138) are unlikely to be very old, in view of the epic corruption of -ov in combination with the genitive in -oio. Furthermore, φαεσιμβρότος ἡς (Il. 23.285) need not be an old noun-epithet formula, because ἡς has an extensive traditional formulaic system with a different nominative form (see below). The other attestations are ἠέλιος φαεσιμβρότος (Od. 10.191), μάχη φθεισίμβροτος (Il. 13.339), and φθεισίμβροτον αἰγίδ’ (Od. 22.297).

29 This is in accordance with Knecht (1946: 7–9), who thinks that φθεισίμβροτος, τερψιμβρότος and φαεσιμβρότος are based on compounds in -ήνωρ: ῥηξήνωρ and in particular φθεισήνωρ.

30 Cf. LfgrE s.v. The so-called “tower shield” (σάκος ἠύτε πύργον) is associated with Ajax in the Iliad. According to archaeologists, it fell into disuse around 1300 BCE.

31 As Van Wees (1992: 320 n. 32) remarks, the phrase ἠύτε 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’.
connection with the tower shield. Tichy argues that the first member ἀμφι‑
must mean ‘around’, because shields and other weapons are typically hung
around a warrior’s shoulders (1981: 33–34, with examples of Homeric phrase‑
ology). Thus, ἀμφιβρότη ‘[hung] around a man’ may have referred to any shield
and, as far as its meaning is concerned, could have been formed at any time.

This does not imply, however, that ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης is a recent creation.
Since McL. scansion is avoided where possible in the simplex βροτός, the short
scansion of -φι‑ in the compound ἀμφιβρότη is suggestive of a pre‑form *ampʰi‑
myr̥tā‑.32 Moreover, the explicit marking of feminine gender in ἀμφιβρότη, which
is paralleled in νὺξ ἀβρότη (see below), is remarkable. Tichy remarks that comp‑
pounds with a governing prepositional first member generally have no such
marking, and she argues for an ad hoc creation of ἀμφιβρότη‑.33 However,
her scenario requires a number of additional assumptions; in particular, it is
unlikely that ἀμφιβρότη‑ was formed at a recent date, as Epic Greek disposes of a
metrical alternative: the epithet εὔκυκλος ‘well‑rounded’ (5 ×, once in gen. ἀσπί‑
δος εὐκύκλου II. 5.797). This clearly shows that ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης is an archaic
formula that was in the process of being replaced.

It is therefore highly probable that the syllabification of ἀμφιβρότη continues
that of a pre‑form *ampʰi‑myr̥tā‑. Whereas other compounds in -(μ)βροτός
were created after the noun had acquired a phonological form /mroto‑/, the
relic form *ampʰimyr̥tās was automatically syllabified as /am.pʰi.mro.tās/ when
Epic *r̥ was vocalized. The feminine gender marking in a compound may well
be an archaism, too.34

32 Cf. West’s remark concerning ἀμφιβρότη‑ that “short scansion before βρ, though admiss‑
able at a pinch, is a departure from the epic norm” (1988: 157). In addition, note that in ἀμφι‑
broτή‑ the PL‑onset is word‑internal.

33 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 a
metrically conditioned secondary creation beside the ubiquitous masculine ἀντίθεος (60 ×
Hom.), Tichy proposes to explain ἀμφιβρότη‑ as a recent hypostasis of a phrase ἀμφὶ βροτῷ.
It would have assumed the gender marking of other compounds with ἀμφι‑ (e.g. ἀμφιφρότη, 
in her view a “Zusammenrückung”) and of other feminine modifiers of ἀσπίς.

34 While finishing the final manuscript, I discovered the proposal of Bernabé (1998) that
Homeric ἀμφιβρότη‑ reflects the Mycenaean term a‑pi‑qo‑to, which qualifies to‑pe‑za
‘table’. According to Bernabé, the common feature of these tables and the Homeric shields
is their eight‑figured shape, and the adjective would refer to this shape. Bernabé analyses
the Mycenaean form as a compound with the root of βαίνω, assumes that the expected
outcome *ἀμφιβοτο‑ was transformed by folk etymology into *ἀμφιβροτο‑ in the epic tra‑
dition, and that the marking of feminine gender was also a secondary development of
Epic Greek. In my view, the etymological connection with βαίνω remains conjectural. I do
7.2.3 ἄμβροτος, ἀμβρόσιος and νυξ ἀβρότη

The adjective ἄμβροτος ‘immortal; refreshing’ continues an inherited formation: like Ved. amṛta- ‘immortal’, Av. amaśa- ‘id.’, Lat. immortālis, it reflects PIE *ṛ-mṛto-. The only possible metrical trace of the pre-form PGr. *ámṛto- is the phrase νυξ ἀβρότη (II. 14.78); in all other instances of ἄμβροτος (20 ×) and also ἀμβρόσιος (37 ×), *-mr- has a heterosyllabic reflex.

At first sight, this distribution seems to imply that ἄμβροτος and ἀμβρόσιος entered the tradition from Aeolic in exactly these forms, with the reflex -ro- in place. However, it must be taken into account that dactylic ἄμβροτος may also directly reflect the rhythmical structure of *ámṛtos. Like PGr. nom. pl. *anéres ‘men’, *ámṛtos was a tribrachic form before vowels. Moreover, like acc. sg. *anéra, the n. pl. form *ámṛta (which occurred in formulaic phrases: Hom. ἄμβροτα εἵματα and ἄμβροτα τεύχεα followed by a verbal form at verse end) was tribrachic before consonants. Therefore, in an earlier stage of Epic Greek, anapestic *anéres and *ámṛtos (before consonants) would have competed with metrically lengthened dactylic forms like *ánéres, *ámṛtos (before vowels) and *ánéra, *ámṛta (before consonants). In the case of Hom. ἀνέρες, all instances without metrical lengthening were replaced by the secondary form ἄνδρες (the only form to survive in first millennium Greek). However, thanks to the preservation of ἀνέρες with metrical lengthening, we can infer that metrically lengthened *ámṛtos would have occurred (especially in the neuter plural) if and when this word still had *ṛ.

Similar considerations hold for the precursor of ἀμβρόσιος, which must have coexisted with that of ἄμβροτος at an early date. This adjective could only be used with a metrically lengthened first syllable, i.e. *ámṛsio- (cf. themetrical lengthening in ἀθάνατος ‘immortal’). It stands in for impracticable case forms of ἄμβροτος ending in long vowel (or diphthong) plus consonant, as in ἄμβροσίην διὰ νύκτα, but is also used before consonants in most of the masculine forms, e.g. ἀμβροσίου διὰ πέπλου (II. 5.338). The availability of both ἄμβρο-
σιος and ἀμβρότης may have contributed to the elimination of phrases like νὺξ ἄβρότη, which were already disfavored after the vocalization of Epic *ɾ (due to the avoidance of McL).37 Thus, my scenario is as follows. The forms *άμρο‑ and *αμρίσιο‑ were restricted to poetry and unknown to the Proto-Ionic vernacular (or to any other vernacular of the Dark Ages). When Epic *ɾ vocalized, they yielded *άμρο‑ and *αμρίσιο‑. These forms were then automatically shortened to ἀμρό‑ and ἀμρίσιο‑, either because the metrical lengthening was cancelled once it had become superfluous, or regularly by Osthoff’s Law.38 They eventually appear in our Homeric texts as ἄμβροτος and ἀμβρόσιος.

In view of this systematic alternation between ἄμβροτος and ἀμβρόσιος, there would have been no need to create a phrase νὺξ ἄβρότη. It requires a scansion of the cluster βρ that was not only avoided in the simplex βροτός, but also very rare in word-internal position generally. Moreover, νὺξ ἄβρότη has explicit morphological marking of feminine gender. The claim that ἄμβροτος is an adjective of two endings in Homer is based only on one single instance (νὺξ φθῖτ’ ἄμβροτος, Od. 11.330), and the absence of feminine marking is synchronically expected in a Greek compound. It is not obvious at all, then, that νὺξ ἄβρότη is secondary with respect to νὺξ ... ἀμβρότος: it is much more plausible that the aberrant scansion, phonology, and morphology of ἄβρότη represent an archaism.

A different reasoning was applied by Tichy (1981: 34–37), who argued that the phrase νὺξ ἄβρότη is a nonce formation. Her 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 marking from a co-occurring simplex. (3) In νὺξ ἄβρότη, this explanation is impossible because the simplex βροτός uses the same form for masculine and feminine. (4) Therefore, νὺξ ἄβρότη must be a recent “Zusammenrückung” of ἀ‑ 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 ἀμβρότος f.” (1981: 35).

If νὺξ ἄβρότη was indeed a nonce formation at Il. 14.78 (replacing the regular nom. sg. form ἀμβροσίη νὺξ), a motive for its creation must be indicated.

37 In Homer, we find the phrases ἀμβροσίη νὺξ (Od. 4.429 and 574, 7.283), νὺξ ... ἀμβροσίη (Il. 18.268–269), ἀμβροσίην διὰ νύκτα (Il. 2.57), and νύκτα δι’ ἀμβροσίην (Il. 10.41 and 142, 24.363, Od. 9.434, 15.8). See Comm. Il. ad Il. 14.78.

38 The same environment is found in Ion. μεσαμβρίη ‘mid-day’ (Att. μεσημβρία with analogical ‑η‑ after the base word, cf. Peters 1980: 256). That *ἄμρο‑ντο ends up as ἦμβροτον ‘I missed’ may be due to a productive (re)introduction of the augment.
In Tichy’s view, the reason would be that the poet wanted to insert the idea ‘immortal night’ before the continuation ἢν καὶ τῇ ἀπόσχωνται πολέμοιο / Τρῶες “if even then the Trojans refrain from war” (tr. Wyatt 1999). In conclusion, she asks: “... ist es verwunderlich, wenn als Ergebnis seiner wohl weitgehend unbe- wussten Bemühungen νὺξ ἄβρότη zustande kam?” (1981: 37). This line of reasoning is highly speculative. Although Tichy does show that the following phrase ἢν καὶ τῇ ἀπόσχωνται 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 the phrase νὺξ ἄβρότη. Moreover, the possibility of a proportional analogy based on ἀμφιβρότη : φαεσίμβροτος is not evident either, as this pair contains two different types of compounds (prepositional compound vs. V1 compound), whereas the stem of ἄβρότη is merely a phonological variant of that of ἁμβρότος. Finally, precisely in view of νὺξ ... ἄμβροτος as used in the Odyssey, it is hardly comprehensible why the poet would have preferred νὺξ ἄβρότη, a form with explicit gender marking, over *νὺξ ἄβροτος.

In conclusion, it seems likely to me that the feminine ἄβροτῆ represents a relic form *amr̥tā. It is conceivable that νὺξ ἄβρότη is an old runover formula stretching from the beginning of the line to the trihemimeral caesura. However, some caution is necessary because we are dealing with a hapax.

7.2.4 ἄβροτάξομεν and ἡμβροτον beside ἁμαρτεῖν

The aorist ἡμβροτον ‘missed’ can be analyzed as the direct reflex of *āmr̥ton within Epic Greek. It is a clear example in favor of the conditioned change posited here; for a more detailed treatment, see section 8.2.2.

The form ἄβροτάξομεν is used only once, by the author of the Doloneia, when Agamemnon speaks to Menelaus:

αὖθι μένειν, μὴ πως ἄβροτάξομεν ἀλλήλοιιν ἐρχομένω· πολλαὶ γὰρ ἀνὰ στρατόν εἰσι κέλευθοι
Il. 10.65–66

As argued in section 7.2.1, given the 7th c. Naxian form μροτοισιν I consider it plausible that Homer still pronounced *-mro-; this also holds for the author of the Doloneia. The change into -βρο- for phonotactic reasons (still preserving the metrical structure) took place within the post-Homeric rhapsodic tradition. Throughout her article, Tichy cites the form as ἀ(μ)βροτάξομεν, even if the v.l. ἁμβροτάξομεν is “nur schwach bezeugt” (1981: 31), namely in West’s ms. H (Vindob. phil. gr. 117, 13th c.). It is therefore better to render the form as ἄβροτάξομεν. The problem is similar to ἄνδροτη beside the weakly attested v.l. ἁμδρότητα, but the difference is that ἄβροτάξομεν is a lectio difficilior, and ἁμδρότητα a lectio facilior.

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; a more recent treatment is Danek 2012).
Stay there, lest by chance we miss each other as we go: for many are the paths throughout the camp.

tr. wyatt 1999

Morphologically, ἀβροτάξομεν is a short vowel subjunctive of the s-aorist. The stem ἀβροταξ‑ is based on an extension of the root of ἁμαρτεῖν ‘to miss, fail’; it could be a denominative in -ἀξ‑ to an abstract noun *amytā‑ ‘fault’. The velar in the suffix -αξ‑ has been viewed as an ‘Achaean’ element of Epic Greek (cf. Ruijgh 1957: 71–89),41 and seen from this perspective the form ἀβροτάξομεν would contain a metrical and phonological trace of the pre-form *amytάksomen.

It is difficult, however, to identify the dialectal origin of ἀβροτάξομεν. Therefore, Tichy (1981: 64), in her crusade against the idea that Homeric forms with -ρο‑ and Mcl. may be the direct reflexes of older forms with a syllabic liquid, tried to explain away ἀβροτάξομεν as an artificial epic “Streckform”.42 She correctly points out (1981: 37–38) that a putative 1pl. subj. of the Aeolic aorist stem, ἀμβρότωμεν, could not be used in hexameter verse, and she agrees that the suffixation in -αξ‑ is “völlig abnorm”. In my view, the conclusion to be drawn from these points is simply that ἀβροτάξομεν is an archaism. Since the suffixation -αξ‑ cannot have been made productively in Ionic or in Epic Greek, the

41 The innovative velar in the sigmatic stems of verbs in -ἀξ‑ and ἰ‑ is found in all of West Greek and is also found in Arcadian, and parts of Boeotian and Thessalian. However, in Boeotian and Thessalian the feature may be due to contact with West Greek. Moreover, in spite of West (1988: 167–168), it is unlikely that early Greek Epic structurally contained West Greek elements. Therefore, the only option entertained by Ruijgh is an ‘Achaean’ origin of the velar flexion. However, against what I said about this earlier (Van Beek 2013: 201), I now think that this idea cannot be proven: for criticism, see e.g. Wathelet (1970: 307–308) and Peters (1986: 308 n. 20).

42 “Aus dem erhaltenen griechischen Sprachmaterial kann m.W. weder eine Bildeparallele noch ein Analogiemuster beigebracht werden, es sei denn, die reguläre Form ἀμβρό‑ τωμεν wäre in Imitation nach dem Versausgang φυλάξομεν ἡμέας αὐτούς Θ 529 künstlich “gestreckt” worden.” (o.c. 37–38). In Tichy’s view, which has nothing to recommend itself, ἀμβρότωτομεν would have originally occupied the slot following |H in a verse-end like ἀμβρό‑ τωμεν ἑταίρων* (o.ä.)” (o.c. 64). This proposal is guided by her idea that the cretic sequence ἀμβρό‑ was metrically regular in this specific slot in a pre-stage of Epic Greek. In Berg’s proto-hexameter, a trochaic sequence like ἀμβρο‑ could be placed at the beginning of an original verse-final pherecratean. However, even if one were inclined to accept this theory (which I am not: see section 1.5.3), there is no basis whatsoever for the assumption that ἀβροτάξομεν ἀλλήλοιιν replaced an earlier ἀμβρότωμεν ἑταίρων. As Tichy herself admits, no clear inner-epic model can be indicated for the assumed replacement of ἀμβρό‑ τωμεν with ἀβροτάξομεν. Thus, Tichy’s scenario explains neither the morphological nor the metrical problems posed by ἀβροτάξομεν.
form must have originated in another dialect, and at a time when it preserved *-r̥-. Thence, it entered the tradition in the shape *amptáksomen. The reflex -βρο‑ < *‑mro‑ < *‑mr‑ is due to the vocalization of Epic *r, with an artificial retention of the syllabification /mro/. The genitive dual form ἀλλήλοιιν following ἀβροτάξομεν may corroborate the antiquity of the hemistich: note that 4 out of 7 instances of ἀλλήλοιιν at verse end are preceded by a verb form in the dual (ὁρίζετον, ἐρίδαίνετον, ἐρίζετον, ἐμβλήτην); this is relevant because dual forms tended to be replaced by plurals when metrically possible.

In view of its morphological, phonological and metrical deviations, ἀβροτά‑ξομεν is very probably a real archaism. Having said that, it must not be forgotten that the form is a hapax, and that we do not know in which dialect it was coined.

### 7.2.5 πρός, προσ‑ and πρόσωπον

The reconstruction of πρός, προσ‑ ‘towards, against, by; in addition’ and related forms presents several problems. The three Homeric forms are πρός, προτί, and ποτί. In the dialects, we find πρός (Ionic-Attic, Lesbian), po‑si (Mycenaean), πος (Arcado-Cyprian), ποτί (Thessalian and Boeotian), πορτί (Cretan), and ποτι, ποτ, ποι in other West Greek dialects. On this basis, we can reconstruct neither a common South Greek form, nor a common North Greek one. It therefore seems that Proto-Greek had at least two forms, traditionally reconstructed as *poti and *proti and considered to be etymologically distinct. The same duality is found in Indo-Iranian: Vedic práti ‘against, towards, etc.’ stands against Avestan paiti ‘against, towards; also’ and other Iranian forms.

That PGr. had a preposition *poti is beyond doubt. The reconstruction PGr. *proti, however, is subject to two problems. First, such a pre-form does not account for Cret. πορτί except if we are prepared to assume an irregular liq-

---

43 This dialect may have been Mycenaean, but we do not have sufficient information to determine this.

44 The often-cited Argolic form προτή is a mirage (cf. Wyatt 1978: 89 n. 1). In view of our insufficient knowledge of the prehistory of Pamphylian, it would be unwise to use the form περτ’ (also as a preverb in περτέδωκε, see Brixhe 1976: 61) for purposes of reconstruction (cf. section 3.5). I also leave out of consideration the forms πρές ‘in addition’ (cited as Aeolic in Joh. Gramm.) and πρέσβυς ‘elder’ (Hom.), which have a different meaning compared to πρός. If πρές and πρέσβυς derive from PGr. *préti(‑), the root 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. The coexistence of PIE *préti and *pṛtī (on which see below) can be motivated by assuming that they were the orthotonic and clitic forms, respectively, of the same adverb.

45 Thus e.g. Janko (1979), GEW and DELG (both s.v. πρός). The view that *poti derives from *proti by dissimilation (against another *r/ in certain syntagms, e.g. *protiderk, *proti prek, cf. Dunkel, LIPP 11, 660 with lit.) seems unlikely to me.
uid metathesis; however, as we have seen in section 3.1.2, the Cretan form is best explained from *prti. Secondly, the evidence for McL scansion in Homeric πρός, προς- and especially in πρόσω and πρόσωπον offers further support for a reconstruction *prti.46 Another form reflecting *prti is the Hittite adverb -parza 'wards' (see EDHIL s.v.). Indeed, the existence of ablauting zero grade forms, probably reflecting an original difference between orthotonic and clitic forms, is not unexpected in a local adverb (cf. Myc. o-pi besides alph. Gr. ἐπί).

With the Argive attestation gone, the only direct evidence for PGr. *proti is apparently Homeric προτι.47 It is therefore of the utmost importance to analyze the distribution between προτι, ποτι, and πρός in Homer. The two main analyses of the metrical behavior of these forms in Homer are Wyatt (1978) and Janko (1979). There are two basic ways in which προτι is used in the thesis: before vowel-initial words (e.g. formulaic προτι ἄστυ and προτι ὶλιον),48 and as a metrical variant of ποτι used in order to cause position length of a preceding short vowel, e.g. ὀρωρέχατο προτὶ δειρήν (Il. 11.26). In all other cases before an initial consonant, ποτι was the default choice, e.g. in the formula Διὸς ποτὶ χαλκοβατὲς δῶ (passim). When position length in the arsis is required, ποτι was always used, e.g. στάντε ποτὶ πνοιήν (Il. 11.622); the only exception is τὴν δὲ προτὶ οἷ (Il. 21.507), where the rule is apparently trumped by the demand that προτι is to be preferred over ποτι before vowels. There are a few other peculiarities and exceptions, but by and large the distributions just given hold good.

Since the use of προτι to create position length is rare and can be easily explained as secondary, Wyatt claimed that προτi originated as a metrical replacement of πρός:49 πρός ἄστυ would have been changed into προτὶ ἄστυ after the loss of initial digamma, in order to repair the meter. Janko (1979) turns

---

46 The derivation of Hom. πρός from prevocalic *prti- is not contradicted by the possibility that ἔρρω 'to get lost' reflects *uertiō (Forssman 1980), because in the latter form, /r/ was non-syllabic. Furthermore, Myc. po-si ‘in addition’ is commonly interpreted as /posi/ in view of Arcadian πος, but it cannot be excluded that the underlying form is /psi/ or /posi/ < *prti. Some earlier scholars have suggested /posi/ as a possibility (see DMic. s.v. po-si), but they accounted for this form by means of liquid metathesis operating on a pre-form *proti.

47 The Ionic-Attic vernacular form πρός can be explained as a contamination of *prti 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 πρός can be due to Ionic influence (apart from Wyatt, see e.g. Risch 1955, Janko 1979).

48 Meister (1921: 256) already drew attention to the fact that most instances of vowel-initial words following προτι had *ψ-

49 Wyatt concludes: *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).
the argument around, claiming that προτί before words with *υ- is an archaism that was not replaced by πρός because digamma had already been lost when the opportunity of replacement arrived. Against what I wrote in Van Beek 2013, I now think that Janko’s position is partly correct, in the sense that προτί is an archaism that was not replaced by πρός because this would have introduced prosodic issues. One of the problems with Wyatt’s account is that one would expect *ποτὶ ἄστυ as the default form if προτί was indeed an artificial expedient. It is more plausible that the frequent phrases προτὶ ἄστυ and προτὶ Ἰλιον were left unchanged because they were traditional.

If so, is the form προτί itself necessarily old? A reason for doubting this is the structural McL scansion of Homeric πρός. As already observed in section 6.5, the metrical behavior of πρός is different from that of πρό: πρός / προσ- frequently undergoes McL scansion (240×, of which προσηύδα 163×), whereas the license is applied much more rarely with πρό / προ-50 Now, since Meillet (1913: 177) the Homeric scansion of πρός is widely explained by assuming that the Ionic vernacular form πρός replaced an earlier epic form *πός (the prevocalic sandhi variant of ποτί) that is known also from Arcadian. Although this view is widely accepted,51 there are several problems with it.

First of all, the replacement of an older *πός does not account for the McL scansion of isolated words with πρόσ-, namely πρόσωπον, πρόσωπα ‘face’ (10×, of which 6× verse-final) and πρόσω ‘forward’ (5×). According to its surface form, πρόσω should be used before vowel-initial words (with epic corretion), occupying the two thesis syllables, but as a matter of fact it is never so used in Homer. Moreover, the form πρόσσω was available as a metrical alternative (it occurs in the old verse-final formula πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω, 4× Hom.). There was, in other

---

50 See Janko (1979: 24) for numbers. In his count, McL scansion before πρό or προ- occurs 7× Il. (3.8% of all cases where a short vowel precedes πρό) and 2× Od. (2.3%). The figures for McL scansion before πρός / προσ-, 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 (on this word, see section 7.2.7). As far as I can see, he included only the following cases: |Π πρὸ ἄστεος (2× Il., 2× Od.), |Π πρὸ κούρων (II. 17.726), and |Π πρὸ μὲν τε (II. 13.799), |Π προσηύδα (II. 2.588, with an otherwise rare type of metrical lengthening of -ι-), |Π ηῆς τε προπάσας (II. 2.493), προήκε (II. 17.545); he forgot to count |Π προήκεα (Od. 12.205), προδτης (2× Od.). It is noteworthy that in most of these cases, McL scansion before πρό occurs in combination with a preceding trochaic caesura. This may suggest that McL scansion before πρό was originally completely avoided in Epic Greek, and that the license could spread due to |Π προκείμενα and |Π προσηύδα. Pointing to the higher absolute frequency of the license before πρό in Hesiod (Th. + Op.), Janko, too, concludes: “We may presume that the licence spread by analogy with πρός: Hesiod’s diction is as usual more advanced than Homer’s”.

51 Cf. Wathelet (1966), Wyatt (1978), Janko (1979), Miller (1982: 87 E.), West (1988).
words, no necessity to apply *MCL in πρόσω. Note that in πρόσω, πρ‑ may make position length and is therefore metrically secure. Moreover, the Attic vernacular form πόρρω ‘further’, whatever its precise explanation, requires a pre-form containing *r̥.52 As for πρόσωπον, assuming a pre-form *πόσωπον also leads into trouble. The cognate forms Ved. prátīka- n. ‘face’ < *pré/óti-h₃kʷ-o‑ and Toch. A pratsak, B pratsāko ‘breast’ confirm that the pre-form contained an -r‑.53 It can be excluded, therefore, that πρόσω and πρόσωπον replaced *πόσω and *πόσωπον.

In an attempt to explain *MCL in πρόσω and πρόσωπον without recourse to *r̥, one would therefore have to assume that the forms πρόσω and πρόσωπον as such are old, but that these words did not enter the tradition until the moment when πρός, προ‑ replaced *πός, *ποσ‑. This assumption is difficult to reconcile with the actual use of πρόσωπα, which is mostly used in verse-final position (e.g. in the formula |B καλὰ πρόσωπα 3 ×) and even has an artificially extended form προσώπατα (2 ×) before the bucolic dieresis.54

Returning to Meillet’s original assumption, it is true that obsolete forms were frequently replaced with metrically equivalent forms that were current in the poets’ vernacular. However, this never happened if the replacement entailed a violation of metrical rules. In view of the poets’ manifest reluctance to use *MCL scansion, it would be unclear why they permitted themselves to use this license with πρός, and on such a large scale. Furthermore, it is unlikely that *ποσ‑ would have been difficult to understand for an Ionian audience (as surmised by Wathelet), as it would be matched by ποτί just like πρός stands beside προτί.

Within the present framework, Meillet’s replacement hypothesis turns out to be unnecessary as an explanation of *MCL in πρός. Monosyllabic πρός with *MCL before long vowels (as in προσηύδα) directly reflects *prs < *pr̥t̥, with the regular outcome of Epic *r̥ after a labial consonant.55 Similarly, we may

52 The problematic relation between Att. πόρρω and Ion. πρόσω is discussed in section 9.3.
53 To be sure, in Vedic prátīka-, pr‑ could in theory be due to the influence of práti‑ (cf. Ved. pratippām (adv.) ‘against the current’ beside Av. paiṭi.āpam ‘id.’), but Toch. A pratsak, B pratsāko ‘breast’ is isolated within that language, and confirms the PIE status of *pr‑. The Vedic word forms a near-perfect match with πρόσωπα if the proposal that unaccented *CiH₂₂C > Greek Ćiā/ōC‑ (Olsen 2009) is correct. The Tocharian word is usually reconstructed as PIE *pr̥t̥ith₃kʷ‑o‑, with a-umlaut of the first syllable.
54 See Meister 1921: 23.
55 There was, in fact, probably a secondary expansion of Ionic πρός at the expense of ποτί and προτί < *pr̥t̥‑. Janko (1979: 24–26) gives three arguments: (1) the high incidence of πρός in the thesis before a consonant; (2) the use of ποτί / προτί in the thesis before vowels, where the introduction of πρός was impossible or undesirable and προτί / ποτί was retained as
reconstruct πρόσω and πρόσωπον as PGr. *pr̥ti̯ō and *pr̥ti̯ōkwo-, respectively. This seems to be the only plausible way to account for the consistent use of πρόσω with McI scansion in Homer, and for the occurrence of πρόσωπον in traditional epic material. The only forms that militate against this reconstruction are the vernacular forms Ion.-Att. πρός, Ion. πρόσω (Hdt., Hp.) and Ion.-Att. πρόσωπον. For these forms, however, a different explanation is available. We may assume that the vocalization of *pr̥ti̯- > *pr̥s- was influenced by the preverbs πρό and/or ποτί, yielding πρός. The existence of πάρσω, πόρρω ‘further, forward’ beside πρόσω confirms this scenario.

In sum, the epic tradition acquired the forms *poti and *pr̥ti, both inherited from Proto-Greek, and retained them even when all vernacular dialects had generalized one of both forms. There was probably once a semantic difference between both forms, but this was eventually lost in Homeric Greek. Prevocalic variant forms *pos- and *pr̥s- also developed, but of these *pos- was completely ousted. The forms *pr̥ti and *pr̥s yielded προτί and πρός by vocalization of Epic *r̥; in the latter case this led to a merger with the vernacular form. In view of the frequency of πρός, this coincidence may well have been instrumental in making tautosyllabic scansion of plosive plus liquid more acceptable.

7.2.6 πρόξ

Another unexpected piece of evidence for the vocalization of Epic *r might be the noun πρόξ (gen. προξός) ‘deer’. The regular vowel slot of its root is περκ-, as attested in nominal derivatives like περκνός ‘a bird of prey’ (Hom.+ ) and περκάζω ‘to ripen’ (of grapes), which suggest that the root originally furnished a color adjective. We must also compare the glosses πράκες· (…) ἔλαφοι ‘deer’ and πόρκας· ἐλάφους (both Hsch.). On the basis of these forms, Schindler (1972: an archais;

Note that πόρκας· ἐλάφους does not prove the presence of o-vocalism in the root noun, because it may stem from an Achaean or Aeolic dialect (from the latter only if we assume analogical leveling of the full grade slot). As for πράκες, again without an indication of dialect, a West Greek origin cannot be excluded. For a discussion of other related forms (including πρακνόν· μέλανα ‘black’ Hsch.) see section 9.7.
34 and 36) reconstructed an ablauting root noun *pork-, *prk- that in his view developed as follows: *pork-, *prak- was changed into *prok-, *prak- and then levelled out as πρόξ. This series of analogies looks like an exercise on paper. Starting from a paradigm *pork-, *prak-, one expects either that one of both stems was levelled, or that *prak- was changed into *park- following the model of the full grade *pork-.

It is not impossible to view πρόξ as an Aeolism, reflecting zero grade *prk-, but this remains a guess. Given that the reflex -ρο- in this word occurs after a labial consonant, a different scenario must be taken seriously. Before the end of the Classical period, the noun πρόξ occurs only in the verse-end ἠδὲ πρόκας ἠδὲ λαγωούς ‘both deer and hares’ (Od. 17.295). The derived ἄδ-stem προκάς occurs only in the phrase προκάδων ἀκόρητοι ‘whose desire for deer cannot be satisfied’ (h. Aphr. 71). It is therefore possible (and in my view attractive) to regard πρόξ and προκάς-as the regular outcomes of pre-forms with *prk- in Epic Greek, the reflex -ρο- being conditioned by the preceding labial stop. The retention of Epic *l in this word would have an obvious motivation: given that the normal word for ‘deer’ in Ionic-Attic was ἐλαφος, the root noun *prk- would be an archaism of Epic Greek.58

7.2.7 προσεέμενα
An unexpected confirmation of an inner-epic phonological development “ρο < *l after labial consonants” is furnished by the following formulaic verse, which is part of traditional typical scenes describing the preparation of a meal:

οἱ δὲ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον
3 × Il., 11 × Od.

and they stretched out their hands to the ready-lying delicacies that had been served.

In Homeric Greek, the verb προκεῖμαι is attested only in this verse.59 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’.60 Is it possible that Homeric προκεῖμαι originally belonged to the

58 The word was retained in other dialects, witness the glosses on πράκες and πόρκας just cited.
59 After Homer, προκεῖμαι 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.
60 Cf. the following instances: γρηῒ σὺν ἀμφιπόλῳ, ἥ οἱ βρῶσίν τε πόσιν τε παρτιθεῖ (Od. 1.191–
same verbal paradigm? In my view this is likely, for in the following illustrative passage, the verbal forms πάρθεσαν and προκείμενα, both referring to the serving of food, occur within one line’s distance:

ὣς φάτο, καὶ σφιν νώτα βοὸς παρά πίνανα θήκεν
ὅπτ’ ἐν χερσὶν ἐλὼν, τὰ ρά οἱ γέρα πάρθεσαν αὐτῷ.
οἱ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοίμα προκείμενα χείρας ἰαλλον

Od. 4.65–67

Thus he [Menelaus] 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 delicacies that had been served.

In view of such cases, it is attractive to regard προκείμενα as the regular inner-epic outcome of *pr̥-keimenena, with the older form *pr̥ of the preverb παρ‑, παρα‑. Note that παρά is probably an extended form of πάρ (i.e. πάρ is original and did not arise by apocope): cf. Van Beek (2018: 46–47 with n. 33) for further details.61

As a potential objection, on one occasion the aorist of προτίθημι in Homer seems to mean ‘to serve as food’.62 However, the context is rather atypical:

η ἐτι πάρ νήσσον ἐμὸς πάϊς, ἢ μιν ἢδη
ἡσι κυσίν μελεῖστι ταμών προύθηκεν Ἀχιλλεύς

Il. 24.409

(Priam to Hermes:) whether my son is still by the ships, or whether Achilles has already chopped him up limb by limb and served him to the dogs.

61 PIE *pr̥- 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’.

62 Apart from this, προτίθημι appears once more in Homer: οἱ δ’ αὐτες σπόγγοισι πολυτρήτοισι τραπέζας νίζον καὶ πρότιθεν, τοι 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 the object of πρότιθεν in this phrase are tables, not comestibles.
This passage need not contradict the foregoing observations: it is difficult to exclude that προτίθημι has a more general meaning ‘put forward’ here; cf. the translation “threw him to the dogs” proposed by *LSJ* (s.v. i.1b.). Moreover, since Achilles is treating the dead body of Hector here, we must take into account that προτίθημι is the normal Greek verb for letting a deceased person lie in state (*LSJ* s.v. II.1).

Returning to the formula containing προκείμενα, a direct connection with παράκειμαι strongly imposes itself because that is the verb normally used in Homeric scenes describing the serving of a dinner. At the same time, after προκείμενα had come into being by the vocalization of Epic *r* in this formula, its retention is comprehensible: after all πρόκειμαι, though unidiomatic in this phrase, was a normal Greek word with a broad range of meanings. The case may be compared to that of the subjunctive τραπείομεν of τέρπομαι, a form whose distorted phonological shape was preserved exclusively in a relic formula (cf. chapter 6).

7.2.8 Ἀφροδίτη

The name of the goddess Ἀφροδίτη is attested in Classical Ionic-Attic from Homer onwards. Since its etymology is debated, there is uncertainty about the pre-form. Nevertheless, there are two reasons to include it in the present discussion.

First of all, its metrical and formulaic behavior. In view of its long ἅ, using Ἀφροδίτη in the hexameter automatically entails McL scansion of -φρ-, and it is the only instance of word-internal McL with a large number of attestations in Homer. As we have seen in chapter 6, Homer incidentally makes use of McL to fit a word into the hexameter, but in other forms with -ρα- or -ρο- where McL scansion is regular and appears in large quantities, the pre-form usually contains *r*. For this reason, a pre-form *Aphr̥dītā deserves serious consideration.

Secondly, the formulaic system of which Ἀφροδίτη is part is suggestive of a considerable antiquity within the epic tradition. Of its 42 occurrences in Homer, 40 are in verse-final position; it always occupies verse-final position in Hesiod and the Homeric hymns. More importantly, Ἀφροδίτη has a system of name-epithet formulae, as shown in Table 17 (next page). An indication of the antiquity of this system is the resistance of the traditional and particularized epithet φιλομμειδής against a replacement by the generic epithet Δίως θυγάτηρ.

---

63 For this reason, the name is also discussed by Wathelet (1966: 171–172).
A third reason for reconstructing *Aphr̥dītā is the Cretan form Ἀφροδίτα (and Pamphylian Ἀφορδίσιος and Φορδίσιος). The handbooks ascribe these forms with ‑ο‑ to liquid metathesis, but as was shown in chapter 3, ‑ο‑ was probably the regular development of *r after a labial consonant in Cretan, as against ‑α‑ in other environments (the regular development of the syllabic liquids in Pamphylian cannot be determined with certainty). Moreover, we found that there is no secure evidence for liquid metathesis in Cretan, and quite some counterevidence.

A potential objection to reconstructing *Aphr̥dītā is that no forms with ‑α‑ or ‑ρ‑ are attested in Ionic-Attic or West Greek. This is not cogent, because the name may be a relic that was retained only in pockets and then disseminated through the epic tradition, or through poetry more generally. The lack of attestations in Mycenaean does not prove a late or foreign origin either (this is an argumentum e silentio).

Since there are no formal correspondences in other IE languages, many scholars have considered the name of Aphrodite to be of Near-Eastern provenance. However, in spite of the numerous and indubitable traces of influence of the cult of Astarte (Ishtar) on that of Aphrodite, a convincing Semitic origin.

---

64 The epithet φίλομμειδής is virtually restricted to Aphrodite.
65 The spelling of the Cyprian Ῥν a-po-ro-ti-si-jo (ICS2 327) is ambiguous: it could represent either /Apbrodisio‑/ or /Apbordisio‑/.
66 See e.g. Buck (1955: 64), Lejeune (1972: 142–143).
67 See also section 3.5.
68 Thus also DELG s.v.; see especially the summary in Burkert (1985: 152–153 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.
of her name has not be pointed out yet. On the other hand, most attempts to etymologize the name of Aphrodite in Indo-European terms have been speculative or gratuitous. In my view, Indo-European etymologies for divine names are only acceptable if there is a direct formal correspondence to a similar deity in another IE language (as with *dieu- ph2ter-), 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 attempts to analyze Aphrodite as a compound with first member ἀφρός ‘foam’ to be futile. On a phonological level, a compound with ἀφρός explains neither the Cretan form Αφορδιτα nor the peculiar Homeric scansion of Ἀφροδίτη.

There is, in fact, an Indo-European etymology for Ἀφροδίτη that makes quite good sense and is phonologically impeccable. Witczak (1993) 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, as Aphrodite is. Moreover, the identification with the planet Venus is the single most important aspect of Aphrodite’s Near-Eastern and Egyptian counterparts. Once the identification with Astarte had been made, Aphrodite’s cult on Cyprus could easily be influenced by that of her foreign counterpart.

Maintaining the analysis of the second member *-dītā- as deriving from PIE *dih2- and identifying the first member with Germanic and Celtic words meaning ‘very’, Witczak proposes an original meaning “sehr glänzend”. How-

69 Attempts to derive it from Semitic roots such as prt ‘dove’ or prd ‘be fruitful’ (literature in Burkert 1985: 408 n. 18) are unconvincing: see the criticism in West 2000, whose own attempt remains mere speculation, too. In the case of complete borrowing of the deity and her name, the Greeks would probably have taken over a widespread name like 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.

70 An overview of earlier attempts can be found in Witczak (1993).

71 While ἀφρο- was analyzed as ‘foam’, the second member was connected in antiquity with δῶνα ‘to submerge’ by folk-etymology, for instance in Plato’s Cratylus (hence the later Ἀφρο-δίτη 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 Kölligan (2007b) and Janda (2010: 65) maintained the analysis as a compound with a first member ἀφρός, seeing in the second member a participle *dītā- ‘shining’, from the PIE root *dih2- (as in Hom. ἔλευθο ‘appeared’). A negative evaluation of the older attempts is given, among others, by delg (s.v.) and Witczak (1993), though the latter does reconstruct a second compound member *-dītā- ‘shining’: see below.

72 This was also noted by Witczak (1993).

73 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.
ever, his reconstruction of “a Proto-Indo-European epithet *Abʰro-dītā, *Abʰor-dītā” (sic) cannot be correct. The variation between his *abʰro- and *abʰor- ‘very’ raises more problems than it solves, and in fact masks the problem posed by the Cretan and the Pamphylian forms.74 This problem could be mended, however, by reconstructing the first member as an inherited adverb *h₂eʰbʰr̥ as reflected in the poetic Greek adverb ἄφαρ ‘swiftly, forthwith’.75 The Early Greek name *Apʰr̥-dītā would then mean ‘who appears forthwith’ (i.e. after sunset). The plausibility of this etymology obviously depends on the question whether one is willing to grant that *-dītā could reflect a zero grade form of the verb ἔξχω ‘appeared’. Its root can be reconstructed as *dih₂- and compared with Ved. dīdāya ‘shines, radiates’. The compound in *-dītā- (feminine of *-dīto-) could be compared with Ved. su-dīti- ‘shining beautifully’.76

In sum, although the reconstruction *Apʰr̥dītā cannot be regarded as certain, it does provide a plausible original meaning for an epithet of the morning star, and it would explain the dialectal variation as well as the highly irregular scan-
sion of the name in Epic Greek (cf. section 6.5). How could a pre-form *Apʰr̥dītā turn up as Αφροδίτη in Epic Greek? An Aeolic vernacular origin is merely a the-
eoretical possibility, as this would not account for the McL scansion.77 The most
natural scenario is therefore to assume a retention of the name with Epic *r,78 followed by a regular vocalization to -ρο- after a labial consonant.

74 Witzczak supposes *abʰor to be reflected in PGmc. *abar ‘very’ and PCelt. *abor ‘id.; and that *abʰro- is found in Thracian names with Αβρα-. With a question mark, he also com-
pares Greek ἄφαρ. Note that the only evidence cited for *abʰro- would come from Thracian, a language about the historical phonology of which we know next to nothing.

75 I see no reason to follow the speculation of Beekes (EDG s.v.) that ἄφαρ is of Pre-Greek
origin.

76 Within Greek, PIE *dih₂- might be reflected in the second member of ἄριζηλοσ ‘very bright’
(7 × Hom.). This adjective qualifies the rays of a star in ll. 13.244 and 22.27, and modifies ἀστῆρ in its only Pindaric attestation (Ol. 2.55). The etymology depends on whether one accepts the phonological development known as “laryngeal breaking” in Greek: cf. Olsen (2009), who argues that the breaking in ἄριζηλοσ is due to the unaccented position of *-ih₂-.

77 Sappho uses the name a fair number of times, but this is obviously related to the subject
matter of her poems. Interestingly, she also uses Κύπρις on four occasions (always in the vocative), a form which in Homer is restricted to iliad book 5.

78 It is possible that the precursor of ἑωςφόρος ‘morning star’ (Hom. only ll. 23.226, with synizesis of -ω-) had replaced *Apʰr̥dītā in spoken Ionic long before Homer.
7.2.9 ῥόδον, ῥόδοεις — Myc. wo-do-we

As a simplex, ῥόδον ‘rose’ is mainly attested in poetry, but it does not occur in Homer or Hesiod. The only occurrences of the etymon in early Greek epic are the adjective ῥόδοεις ‘rose-scented’ (qualifying fragrant oil) at ll. 23.186 and the epithets ῥοδοδάκτυλος ‘with rose-colored fingers’ (Hom.+ and ῥοδόπηχυς ‘with rose-colored arms’ (Hes.). The last two are clearly traditional epithets referring to the beauty of young women; they are also used by Sappho in the shapes βροδάκτυλος and βροδόπαχυς. The simplex is found at least three times in the preserved fragments of Sappho in the form βρόν (fr. 2.6, 55.2, 96.13, and possibly 94.13). Finally, Mycenaean attests wo-do-we /wordowen/ or /wr̥dowen/ ‘rose-scented’, again qualifying oil.

It is attractive to suppose that the Mycenaean form is directly reflected in the Homeric phrase ῥόδοεντι … ἐλαίῳ, as the production of fragrant oil (a luxury product) is no doubt a reminiscence of the Mycenaean period. The two forms are directly superimposable only if the original form was /wr̥dowent-. This would require that Ionic-Attic ῥόδον is an epicism with ῥο- < *u̯r̥- with Epic *r̥, which is conceivable. Unfortunately, it is difficult to find independent evidence for or against such a reconstruction. Outer-Greek etymological comparanda offer no immediate help. The etymological handbooks compare the Iranian pre-form *u̯r̥da- to be reconstructed for e.g. MoP gul ‘id.’ and Arm. vard ‘id.’ (an Iranian borrowing). This means that the word could have been borrowed as *u̯r̥do- into Mycenaean from some Near-Eastern source, but other scenarios cannot be excluded. Metrical evidence from Early Greek Epic does not offer much help (because the simplex is relatively rare), but it is certainly compatible with Epic *r̥.
Let us briefly consider the derived forms, some of which occur in old formulaic phrases. The only Homeric attestation of ῥοδόεις, in the half-verse ῥοδόεις δὲ χρῖεν ἐλαίῳ (Il. 23.186), is metrically uninformative. The compound ῥοδοδάκτυλος is exclusively found in the verse-final noun-epithet phrase ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς (27 ×), which mostly (and probably originally) occurred in a formulaic half-verse preceded by the finite verb form φάνη (25 ×). Again, this is compatible with both reconstructions, *u̯rdo‑ and *urodo‑.85

Fortunately, the evidence for ῥοδόπηχυς is more compelling. This is a traditional epithet of young women in Hesiod’s catalogue of Nereids (Ἱππονόη ῥοδόπηχυς Th. 246, Εὐνίκη ῥοδόπηχυς Th. 251) and in other catalogue fragments (fr. 35.14, 46.13, 251a.1), always verse-final. As an epithet, ῥοδόπηχυς is certainly old in the tradition because it also occurs as βροδόπαχυς in Sappho.86 Now, the fact that ῥοδόπηχυς in catalogue poetry is always preceded by a long syllable (female proper names in -η) favors a reconstruction *u̯rdopʰākhus because a pre-form *urodo‑ would imply overlength in the final part of the line, a phenomenon which is strongly avoided in traditional phraseology.87

In view of the above arguments, the possibility that ῥόδον contains an artificial epic reflex of *u̯rdo‑ deserves serious consideration. The metrical evidence from early Greek epic is at the very least fully compatible with such an assumption, and it finds positive support in the verse-end -η ῥοδόπηχυς in traditional catalogue entries. Moreover, it is supported by the correspondence between Hom. ῥοδόεις and Myc. wo-do-we, which both qualify a fragrant oil, a luxury...
product. This match is best accounted for if the epic tradition retained a preform /wr̥dowent-/ from the Mycenaean period. Conversely, it would be pure speculation to explain the difference between Myc. *wo-do* and the alphabetic forms by assuming liquid metathesis.

### 7.3 Other Forms with -ρο-

#### 7.3.1 ἀνδροτῆτα

The verse-end ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην, with ἀνδρο- occupying the thesis of the fourth foot, is metrically anomalous. It occurs in the two most important and most elaborate death scenes of the *Iliad*, those of Patroclus and Hector:

ψυχὴ δ’ ἐκ ῥεθέων πταμένη Ἀιδός δὲ βεβήκει
ὅν πότμον γοόωσα λιποῦσ’ ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην.

*Iliad* 16.856–857; 22.362–363

And his soul flew out of his nostrils and went to Hades, bewailing its fate, having left behind vigor and juvenile strength.

The form ἀνδροτῆτα occurs once more in the following verse, where Achilles mourns over his lost comrade:

Πατρόκλου ποθέων ἀνδροτῆτά τε καὶ μένος ἠύ

*Iliad* 24.6

longing for the vigor and great energy of Patroclus

This is mostly considered a secondary adaptation based on the other two places, but however that may be, it proves that ἀνδροτῆτα was not limited to a single relic formula.

---

88 The fact that βρόδον, βροδόπαχυς, and βροδοδάκτυλος are all attested in Sappho does not guarantee that they contain the Lesbian vernacular reflex of *u̯r̥do*; they may also be epicsisms. In any case, the metrical behavior of the epic compounds is more neatly explained if *u̯r̥do* was preserved in its older form in the tradition.

89 West (1998–2000) considers *Iliad* 22.363 to be interpolated from 16.857 because it is lacking in two early papyri.

90 The meaning of ῥέθεα is uncertain, either ‘face; nostrils’ or ‘legs, limbs’.
Interpretations of the verse-end ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην have almost become articles of faith among Homeric scholars: some have used it to plead for pre-Mycenaean origins of the epic tradition, others in support of the proto-hexameter hypothesis. There are four problems regarding the form ἀνδροτῆτα:

1. ἀνδροτῆτα has variants ἀδροτῆτα and ἁδροτῆτα in the manuscript tradition. Which is the oldest form?
2. What is the meaning of ἀνδροτῆτα?
3. What is the word-formation of ἀνδροτῆτα?
4. How to explain the irregular scansion of ἀνδροτῆτα?

I contend that ἀνδροτῆτα entered the tradition at an early stage, in the shape *anrtāta*, but I agree with Heubeck (1972) that its introduction may have been relatively late, i.e. even in the 12th century. The abstract *anrtāt-* is a relic form derived from an old adjective meaning ‘vigorous’, and accordingly I think it is best rendered as ‘vigor’ (as appears from the translations just given). The form *anrtāt-* was retained with Epic *r* and then regularly developed into *anratāt-*. This form was at some point reshaped into ἀνδροτητ‑, possibly via an intermediate stage *adratāt‑ or *anrotāt‑, *adrotāt‑, in order to better align it with compounds in ἀνδρο‑. I will now argue for these points in more detail, starting with the manuscript evidence.

1. Apart from ἀνδροτῆτα, textual variants ἀδροτῆτα and ἁδροτῆτα are attested, though only in 21 younger manuscripts, and (in most individual manuscripts) only at one of the three places of attestation. The reading ἀνδροτῆτα is ubiquitous in the Vulgate and in testimonia. A number of 19th century scholars printed ἁδροτῆτα, from the adjective ἁδρός ‘ripe, mature’, but this variant may easily have arisen secondarily from ἀδροτῆτα and is clearly a lectio facilior. As for the other two forms, two approaches are possible. Some scholars have assumed that ἁδροτῆτα is a late and incidental correction, designed to mend

---

91 See Latacz (1965).
92 Latacz remarks that he could not easily determine, on the basis of the editions, which mss. had ἀδρ‑ and which had ἁδρ‑ (1965: 62–63 n. 2).
93 See Latacz (1965: 67–68 with n. 5).
94 See Latacz (1965: 76) and Wathelet (1966: 170 n. 5). Latacz noted that ἁδρότης first occurs in Theophrastus, but this chronological point is not by itself decisive, because ἁδροσύνη occurs in Hesiod. Beekes (1971: 353–355) thinks that ἁδροτῆτα was the original form, arguing that ἁδρός ‘ripe, mature, full-grown’ and ἥβη have a similar, physical sense, but he does not further specify the meaning of ἁδροτῆτα. From a semantic viewpoint, the connection with ἁδρός fits well, but there are various problems: the aberrant suffixal accent of ἁδρο‑ ὁ‑ and the Mcl. scansion of word-internal -δρ‑. An insurmountable objection, finally, is that ἁδροτῆτα is the lectio facilior: of all three variants, only ἁδροτῆτα is a regular derivation in -τητ‑ from an adjective (except for the accentuation).
the metrical problem apparent in the traditional form ἀνδροτῆτα.95 In favor of this, one could mention that the manuscript tradition of Plato only presents the form ἀνδροτῆτα. Others think that ἀνδροτῆτα and ἁδροτῆτα are trivial normalizations of the odd word ἂδροτῆτα, and that the latter form was sung by Homer.96 In any case, even if we admit that the manuscript evidence can be traced back to a proto-form ἀνδροτῆτα, the earliest Homeric transmission may well have had ἂδροτῆτα or even ἄνροτῆτα for a certain period of time before this form was replaced by ἀνδροτῆτα in one authoritative Homeric text early enough to influence (almost) the entire subsequent tradition.97

2. Semantics. When the form ἀνδροτῆτα was first used in the tradition, its sense must have been clear—as it probably still was to the author of the Iliad, because the word is used emphatically on two decisive points in the story. Although it is difficult to be very precise, ‘vigor’ seems a good approximation, not only in view of the etymological reconstruction.98 Beekes (1971: 354) notes

95 It does not seem impossible to me that 21 copyists independently corrected the unmetrical form ἂδροτῆτα into ἁδροτῆτα (or ἂδροτῆτα). However, according to Latacz, in most of the 21 mss. with ἂδροτῆτα / ἁδροτῆτα that he found, the form occurs only in once place, and the other two places have ἁνδροτῆτα; only two mss. have ἁδροτῆτα or ἂδροτῆτα in all three places (1965: 62–63). If all individual copyists independently made the metrical correction to ἁδροτῆτα, one would in Latacz’s view expect more consistency on their part. One also wonders whether ἂδροτῆτα could have been changed into the aspirated form ἁδροτῆτα without the intermediary of ἂδροτῆτα, as Tichy supposed (1981: 41 and 46). Barnes (2011: 1) states that the variant ἂδροτῆτα was “designed to heal the problem, and therefore clearly secondary, as all editors have recognized.” The last remark is factually incorrect: for editions which print ἁδροτῆτα, see Latacz (1965: 67 n. 2). The first inference is circular: one might just as well argue (with Latacz) that ἂδροτῆτα was designed to heal the fact that ἂδροτῆτα was a vox nihili.

96 E.g. Wackernagel (1909: 58 with n. 1), Chantraine (1958: 110), Latacz (1965); the latter cites other predecessors. In the view of Latacz (1965: 66), “Der Grund dafür (…), dass die Hauptmasse der uns überlieferten Hss. dennoch ἂνδροτῆτα mit Nasal hat, wird darin zu suchen sein, dass die deutlich empfundene Zugehörigkeit des Wortes zum Stamme *anr̥a auch im Schriftbild unmissverständlich zum Ausdruck gebracht werden sollte.” Ruijgh (1995: 89 n. 31) reasons as follows: “Parfois, on trouve ἁδροτῆτα: certains philologues y ont vu le dérivé de ἄδρας ‘solide, robuste’. Si la vulgate fournit la graphie ‘étymologique’ ἂνδροτῆτα, c’est sans doute pour éviter de telles confusions.”

97 It is sometimes thought that ἂδροτῆτα came into being when epic singers, before the fixation of the Iliadic text, substituted it for the phonologically expected outcome ἂνδροτῆτα 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 ἂδροτῆτα (…).” Two years before, Ruijgh speculated that the pair ἄβροτος : ἄμβροτος may have been a model for the creation of an artificial form ἂδροτῆτα, as well as for ἂδροταξιμεν (1995: 89, following Wathelet 1966).

98 This is also the translation given by e.g. l.s. s.v.
that this meaning would agree remarkably well with that of ἤβη. Moreover, the fact that μένος ἡ is semantically close to ἤβη suggests that poets had a clear conception of the meaning of ἀνδροτῆτα.

A different interpretation is given by Latacz (1965): ἀνδροτῆτα is that which is left behind by the soul upon death, i.e. the fact of being a man, ‘manhood’. For this he refers to the scholia, who expressly state that ἀνδροτῆτα is not the same as ἀνδρεία ‘manliness, courage’ or the epic word ἴνορή, but that it rather means ἀνθρωπότητα. However, as remarked by Beekes (1971: 353–354), the concept of ἀνθρωπότης ‘manhood’ is far too abstract for Homer and seems a scholastic construct.99

Although I disagree with Latacz’s conclusions on these semantic issues, his approach to compare other descriptions of the soul leaving the body upon death is at least partly right. In his view, the ψυχή first comes into being when a person dies, and at this moment leaves not only the body but also some other essential feature: “Es [i.e. ἀνδροτῆτα] muss etwas wesenhaftes sein, dessen Fehlen die ψυχή erst zur ψυχή macht” (1965: 71). These essential attributes are corporeality and force (“Körperlichkeit und Kraft”). Problems arise when Latacz interprets ἀνδροτῆτα as referring to corporeality: “das für einen (lebendigen) Mann wesenhaft, das Mann-Sein (und das bedeutet: die Körperlichkeit)”. On this basis, he returns to the scholiasts’ interpretation of ἀνδροτῆτα as ἀνθρωπότητα which, as just remarked, seems highly artificial.

A more likely interpretation of ἀνδροτῆτα emerges when we depart from the tripartition of human nature into body (σῶμα), spirit/energy/vital force (θυμός, for which various synonyms are in use in Homer) and soul (ψυχή). Upon death, a person or his body is left not only by the ψυχή, but also by the θυμός:

99 The same holds for the translation of ἀνδροτῆτα as ‘the fact of not dying’ (Barnes 2011). Barnes compares the phrase ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἤβην with the Avestan pair amaratāt-hauruwaatāt ‘principle of not-dying and wholeness/health’, where amaratāt- arose from amaratātāt- by haplogony. He assumes that PIE *ŋmrt-o-teh₂-t- underwent haplogony also at a pre-stage of Greek, yielding *αμ(β)ροτῆτ-, 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 (‘αμ(β)ροτῆτ- → ἀνδροτῆτ-)” (2011: 12). This account is untenable for several reasons (which cannot all be discussed here). For one thing, ἀνδροτῆτα does not demonstrably mean ‘the fact of not dying’: as just argued, this is far too abstract for Homer. The main problem, however, is that there would never have been a compelling motive to ‘update’ the formula if it originally had *αμ(β)ροτῆτ. Thieme (1952: 15–34) discussed all instances of ἄμβροτος and ἀμβρόσιος in Homer; from this discussion it appears that ἀνδροτῆτα ‘vigor’ may have been quite close in meaning to these adjectives (whether or not one accepts the details of Thieme’s analysis). Finally, to assume a haplogony *ŋmrtotoeh₂-t- > *ŋmrtotēh₂-t- already in Proto-Indo-European is a rather costly assumption.
The soul and vital force are sometimes said to leave the body simultaneously: in the following phrases, μένος ‘energy’ and αἰῶν ‘vital force’ are used as synonyms of θυμός:

τοῦ δ’ αὐθι λύθη ψυχή τε μένος τε
Il. 5.296, 8.123

tόν γε λίπη ψυχή τε καὶ αἰῶν
Il. 16.453

Interestingly, in some passages the θυμός of a dying man is called ἀγήνωρ ‘vigorous’. This compound, in my view consisting of ἀγα‑ ‘great’ and *‑ānōr ‘vigor’, contains precisely the etymon of ἀνδροτῆτα as its second member:

τόν γ’ ἐρυγόντα λίπ’ ὀστέα θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ
Il. 20.406

λίπε δ’ ὀστέα θυμός ἀγήνωρ
Od. 12.414

We may conclude that the ψυχή not only leaves behind the body, but also its vital force. This view is confirmed by other traditional material. The souls in Hades are referred to with the traditional formula νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, ‘the powerless heads of the dead’. The state of Agamemnon’s ψυχή after his death is described as follows:

ἀλλ’ οὐ γάρ οἱ ἔτ’ ἦν ἰς ἐμπεδὸς οὐδ’ ἔτι κίκυς
οὕρ περ πάρος ἔσκεν ἐνὶ γαμπτοῖσι μέλεσσι.
Od. 11.393–394

But no longer was there any force available to him, nor any might, such as there used to be before in his curved limbs.
In view of this, it is plausible that ἀνδροτῆτα, like the terms ἥβη and μένος ἥυ with which it appears in conjunction, refers to an aspect of the vital force which a man's soul loses upon death.

3. Morphology. The view that ἀνδροτῆτα reflects *an(d)ro-tāt-, with a thematic vowel, is problematic for more than one reason. Since epenthesis in the cluster *-nr- was a pre-Mycenaean development, and since -o- was not yet productive as a linking vowel at this stage, one would have to assume that the oldest form was a post-Mycenaean *andro-tāt-, and that the nasal in this form could be omitted from pronunciation or recitation, yielding [a.dro.tē.ta]. The last-mentioned assumption is clearly ad hoc. Moreover, as we have seen in section 6.5, word-internal McL is rare in Homer, and when it occurs, this mostly happens when PL is preceded by a morpheme boundary. Since there is no morpheme boundary before -δρ- in ἀνδροτῆτα, the form would have to be a one-off creation. This, however, is at odds with the apparent traditionality of the verse end ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην (occurring in the monumental description of a heroic death). Moreover, the extended form ἀνδροτῆτα τε καὶ μένος ἥυ shows that poets did not hesitate to use the form in a modification of this traditional phrase. A nonce creation of the metrically irregular phrase ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην is unacceptable.

Instead, we must start from a pre-form *anr̥-tāt-. Barnes (2011: 5) objects that abstracts in -tāt- are, as a rule, only derived from adjectives, whereas in Greek the stem ἀνδρ- only occurs as a noun. This problem disappears, however, if *anr̥-tāt- was derived much earlier, at a stage when *hǐner- or its reflex could still be used as an adjective meaning ‘vigorous’. This has been proposed by Pike (2011: 175) on the basis an analysis of derivatives of *h2ner- in Indo-Iranian. Pike also addresses the suffix accent of ἀνδροτῆτα, which is synchronically unproductive in Homeric Greek. Just as the formation and meaning of ἀνδροτῆτα...
τῆτα may be considered archaism, so should its accentuation: as expected on general principles of PIE accent and ablaut, the only full grade of the pre-form *h₂n̥r̥-tēh₂t- carries the accent, and pretonic vowels are reduced to zero.

4. Metrics. Wackernagel (1909: 58 n. 1) was the first to remark that the scansion of ἀνδροτῆτα can be understood if the original (Homeric) form was actually ἀδροτῆτα. At this stage, his view seems to have been that this ἀδροτῆτα could reflect an older *anrotāta, with a tautosyllabic realization of the sequence nasal plus liquid.106 For the reasons given above, such a scansion of word-internal plosive plus liquid would be unlikely at an early stage unless the pre-form had *r. Indeed, a few years later Wackernagel explicitly claimed that ἀνδροτῆτα entered the tradition in a form with *r.107 In this he has been followed by Mühlestein (1958) and many other scholars.

Since it was thought that Mycenaean no longer had *r, ἀνδροτῆτα was subsequently used by Ruijgh and Wathelet as an argument in favor of a pre-Mycenaean origin of epic poetry, in a verse-form much like the dactylic hexameter. These scholars were later followed by West (1988) and Janko (1994). Mühlestein (1958: 224 n. 20), however, was much more careful and explicitly reckoned with the possibility of a prolonged retention of *r in the epic tradition (or in a dialect which retained *r):

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.

---

106 “Ohne Grund hat man sich über die Kurzmessung der ersten Silbe von ἀνδροτῆτα ereifert; das sicher auf amr̥t- 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).

107 At first, Wackernagel did not yet believe this: “Kaum kann für die älteste Phase der epischen Sprache geradewegs noch sonantisches r vorausgesetzt werden” (1914: 113). Two years later, however, he speaks of the “pyrrhischen Messung von ἀνδρο-, die doch gemäß ἀνδροτῆτα ἀμβροτάξομεν, wo ἀνδρο- ἀβρο- aus anr-, amr- als zwei Kürzen gemessen werden, ganz normal ist.” (1916: 172).
Other scholars, however, considered the proposed time lapse of seven or eight centuries to be implausible. 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, supposing that the lines in question originally had a trochaic fourth foot. This view has found a number of adherents, but it is unlikely to be correct for a very simple reason: all alleged examples for preserved pherecratean line-ends are also candidates to have contained *r̥ at an earlier stage. The idea can therefore be rejected on the basis of Occam’s razor.

Thus, only a pre-form *anr-tāt- inherited from PIE *h₂nr-tēh₂t- would account for the semantics, accentuation, word-formation, and aberrant scansion of ἀνδροτῆτα. This leaves us with a problem of chronology: until when was *r̥ available?

Before answering this question within the scenario proposed here, we have to discuss a detail that has played a significant role in previous discussions: consonant epenthesis. It is usually stressed that not only the vocalization of *r̥, but also the epenthesis of -d- in the group *-nr- had already taken place in Mycenaean. This has in fact been the main reason for viewing the scansion of ἀνδροτῆτα as a remnant of pre-Mycenaean epic. However, while Mycenaean does indeed furnish good examples for d-epenthesis, they all concern *-nr- between original vowels (the nasal belonging to the coda of the preceding syllable). These cases are not necessarily relevant for judging the outcome of *-nr-, with a syllabic liquid. In this connection it is highly relevant that the outcome of *-nr- in Mycenaean does not show epenthesis: cf. the PN a-no-qa-ta < *anr-kwhontā- and especially the abstract a-no-qa-si-ja. Moreover, all examples of μρο- in archaic inscriptions derive from a pre-form with *mr̥. We may con-
clude that both *-nr- and *-mr- were simply maintained without an epenthetic consonant in Epic Greek until after *r vocalized.113

The question then becomes what happened to these sequences after Epic *r developed into -ρα- and -ρο-. The problem of scansion in ἀνδροτήτα would only occur when, following the vocalization of Epic *r, epenthesis took place in the ensuing sequences *-mro- and *-nro- (or *-nra-). This epenthesis probably never happened in the case of *-mro-, as the tradition has the outcome -βρο- in both ἀβρότη and ἀβροτάξομεν.114 In other words, as already surmised by Wackernagel (1909: 58 n. 1), ἀβρότη is the phonetic reflex of a pre-form [a.mro.tā] with an artificial tautosyllabic realization of the cluster. This means that -δρ- in the variant ἀδροτήτα may also represent the phonetic outcome of a.nro.tā.ta, and that Homer may have pronounced the following:

βροτοῖσιν, βροτῶν, etc = mro.tān, mro.toi.si
ἄβροτάξομεν = a.mro.tak.so.men
ἀνδροτήτα (or ἀδροτήτα) = a.nra.tē.ta or a.dra.tē.ta115
ἀνδρεἶφόντῃ = a.nra.phōn.tēi or a.dra.phōn.tēi.

From a phonetic perspective, the following objection could be made. One might expect the epenthesis in Epic *-nra- < *-nr- to have preceded that in Epic *-mro- < *-mr-, because [n] and [r] are homorganic, while [m] and [r] are not. However, this need not have been the case, and it is not even possible to exclude that Homer preserved the pre-form of ἀνδροτήτα / ἀδροτήτα with a tautosyllabic onset .nr. We must not forget that ἀνδροτήτα is one of the few pieces of evidence we have for the reflex of word-internal *-nr- in Alphabetic Greek. The main difference between ἀνδροτήτα and ἀβροτάξομεν is that ἀβροτάξομεν was Egetmeyer (2010: 203) draws attention to the Myc. proper name i-mi-ri-jo /Imrios/, and contrasts this with Cypriot names like ne-wa-pi-ri-o /new-ā(m)brios/, which he analyzes as a compound with *āmr- ‘day’.

113 In view of cases like 7th c. Naxian μροτοῖσιν, Barnes (2011: 10) sees a chronological contrast between the development of *-mr- and that of *-nr-. This conclusion does not follow, because both Mycenaean examples for d-epenthesis concern *-nr- before a Proto-Greek vowel, whereas all examples of μρ in alphabetic Greek reflect a pre-form with *r.

114 Thus, I partly agree with Barnes (2011: 10), who concludes from the inscriptions preserving prevocalic 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 (…)”.

115 Alternatively, a.nro or a.dro: it is hard to tell when exactly -o- was introduced. Cf. Wackernagel (1916: 172).
maintained in the manuscript tradition, while ἀνδροτῆτα was eventually ousted by ἀνδροτῆτα. The reason for this different treatment need not have been phonetic.

The final question is: when and from which dialect did *anṛtāt- enter the tradition? To mechanically view ἀνδροτῆτα as an Aeolism would be problematic because McL scansion is alien to the Lesbian tradition (see section 7.1). Moreover, ἀνδροτῆτα has a non-recessive accentuation that must be old. A Mycenaean origin has been broadly assumed, but it would be hard to reconcile this with an outcome -or- < *ṛ in that dialect (cf. the compounds with a-no- cited above). On the contrary, if ἀνδροτῆτα was preserved in Mycenaean (or another dialect of the same period contributing to the tradition), this would make perfect sense. 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 ṛ was still preserved. Then, with and after the consolidation of the tribes and ethnic groups in their later habitats, the vocalization of ṛ may have ensued, besides many other phonetic developments which contributed to the dialectal differentiation of these groups. That it did not result in *anṛtāta > *ἀνδρατῆτα may be due to the analogical influence of recent compounds with thematized ἀνδρ-ο- as their first part, like Ἀνδροκλέης (in contrast to the correct Ion. development *anṛkas > ἀνδροκάς etc.); ...”.

Heubeck’s scenario is different from mine in the sense that ἀνδροτῆτα in his view contains a vernacular reflex of *ṛ, while in my view it was retained longer in the tradition with Epic *ṛ. Nevertheless, I fully agree with his conclusion that *ṛ may have been preserved much longer in most Greek vernaculars than is usually admitted. Within the present framework, a stem *anṛtāt- entered the epic tradition from some Greek dialect preserving *ṛ in the late Mycenaean or sub-Mycenaean period. The form then underwent the regular phonological development of Epic *ṛ to -ρα-, and was subsequently contaminated with compounds in ἀνδρο-.

7.3.2 Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ
The four-word verse Μηριόνης ἀτάλαντος Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ ‘Meriones equal to man-slaying Enualios’ occurs four times in the Iliad. As it stands, drastic measures (such as crasis of -ῳ ἀ ‑) are required to fit this into
epic metre. Moreover, in this compound ἀνδρεϊ- as a first member is a morphological monstrosity. It is therefore widely agreed that the formula originally looked different: as first noted by Wilamowitz (1884: 299 Anm. 10), ἀνδρεϊ-φόντῃ may have replaced ἀνδροφόντῃ. Wackernagel (1916: 172) was the first to remark that the scansion of *ἀνδροφόντῃ may be explained from a pre-form *anr̥kwhontāi. He also noted that ἀνδρο- may have replaced an older ἀνδρα-, as in the form ἀνδραφόνος ‘man-slayer, murderer’ (for Homeric ἀνδροφόνος) that is ascribed to Solon.

After the decipherment of Linear B, it soon become clear that the naming-verse for the Cretan leader Meriones could be a survival from Mycenaean times (Mühlstein 1958). Not only do the Linear B archives contain the name of the war-god e-nu-wa-ri-jo /Enualios/; the pre-form of ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ was plausibly identified by Mühlstein with the Mycenaean PN a-no-qo-ta, to be interpreted as /Anorkwhontā-/ (or possibly still /Anr̥kwhontā-/). Mühlstein further noted that names in -qo-ta (e.g. da-i-qo-ta) are frequent in the tablets, but not in later Greek. Thus, Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρεϊφόντῇ is best analyzed as a reshaping of the outcome of *Enūaliōi anr̥kwhontāi, a pre-form which would solve the metrical and morphological problems in a natural way.

The model for the substitution of ἀνδρεϊ- was clearly διάκτορος Ἀργεϊφόντῃς, the frequent verse-final naming formula for Hermes. Although the reconstruction and original lexical meaning of Ἀργεϊφόντῃς are contested, it is important that the formula in which it occurs is metrically unproblematic. As remarked e.g. by Ruijgh (2011: 288), the first member ἀργεϊ- could be analyzed as a metrical alternative for ἀργο-; hence, ἀνδρο- could be replaced by ἀνδρεϊ-.

116 Emergency solutions that cannot be upheld (because they are unparalleled) are: (1) reading Ἐνυάλyῳ, with -λy‑ functioning as a single consonant, accepted by Tichy (1981: 40); (2) assuming synizesis of -ω‑. Cf. Watkins (1987: 289).
117 “Ungeheuerlich”, in the words of Wackernagel (1914: 113 Anm. 1).
118 Mühlstein’s proposal has been approvingly cited by many scholars, including Wathelet (1966), Heubeck (1972), West (1982), Watkins (1987), Leukart (1994: 51–56), and Ruijgh (1995: 85–88; 1997: 41–42; 2011: 287–289). Ruijgh bases his analysis of ἀνδροτῆτα on that of Ἀργεϊφόντῃς because the latter is more ostensibly of Mycenaean origin. Untenable speculations about a recent creation of the line itself are found in Tichy (1981: 40).
119 See e.g. Lamberterie (1990: 326–327), Leukart (1994: 51–56), Watkins (1995: 383–384), Ruijgh (2011: 288).
120 Tichy (1981: 40) claims that the replacement of ἀνδρο- with ἀνδρεϊ- (on the model of Ἀργεϊφόντῃς) could only take place if original *ἀνδροφόντῃ stood in the same metrical slot as Ἀργεϊφόντῃς, i.e. after Ἀ. 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 Ἀργεϊφόντῃς.
A pre-form *anṛkʷhontāi 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 *anṛ‑ < *h₂nr‑ would be paralleled by Ved. nr-hán‑ ‘man-slaying’ < PIE *h₂nr‑gʷhén‑, epithet of vadáḥ‑, the lethal weapon of the Maruts. In lexical terms, we have to ask why poets would have formed a metrically and morphologically problematic adjective meaning ‘man-slaying’ if they already disposed of the synonymous ἀνδροφόνος (15 ×), which suits the demands of verse-composition well. In fact, the addition of -tā‑ in compounded agent nouns is typically found in Mycenaean, and given that both the war god Enualios and the PN a-no-qo-ta are attested in Linear B, the conclusion that *Enualiōi anṛkʷhontāi originated in a Mycenaean context seems inescapable.

If the formulaic verse is indeed of Mycenaean origin, it remains to determine how and when ἀνδρεϊ‑ was introduced. Taking *anṛkʷhontā‑ as a starting point, Ruijgh sketches the following scenario (1995: 87):

Comme dans les tablettes mycéniennes, les traitements -r‑ > -rö‑ et -vr‑ > -dër‑ sont déjà des faits acquis, il faut conclure qu’en mycénien historique, ἀνρχόντας avait déjà abouti à ἀνδροχλόντας. À cette époque, la syllabe initiale du composé était donc devenue longue, ce qui a obligé les aèdes à prononcer -ῳ ἀν‑ comme une seule syllabe. Comme le vers exigeait deux syllabes brèves entre ἀν‑ et -χον‑, ils ont fabriqué la forme artificielle ἀνδρεχιχόντας sur le modèle de Ἀργεχιχόντας, épithète d’Hermès.

Thus, Ruijgh assumes that both the vocalization of *r and the replacement by ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ had taken place already before our attestations of Mycenaean.124

---

121 Cf. Schmitt (1967: 124–128), Watkins (1987: 289), Ruijgh (1995: 85).

122 Apart from Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ and ἀργεϊφόντης, compounds in -φόντης are limited to person names (Βελλερό‑, Πολω‑, Κρεσ‑, Λυκο‑φόντης, from Homer onwards) and to the poetic forms ἀνδροφόντης (A. Sept. 572), πατροφόντης (S.), μητροφόντης (E.).

123 Beside the form ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ printed in our editions, a minor varia lectio is ἀνδριφόντῃ. In one manuscript at Il. 8.264 the form is written in the form ἀδριφόντῃ, about which Latacz (1965: 66) cautiously says: “ist auch hier sicher eine der ursprünglichen Aussprache näherkommende Schreibweise”. This may well be true as far as the beginning ἀδ‑ is concerned, but the -ι‑ can hardly be original. Since the variant occurs only in one ms., it is unlikely to directly transmit an older form.

124 In one of his later publications, Ruijgh 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...”
This would require that the verse was preserved in a defective form for some seven centuries.

Although this interpretation is widely accepted,\textsuperscript{125} its logical conclusion is unlikely and has been challenged on chronological grounds by Haug (2002: 62–64). Haug agrees with Ruijgh that the reshaping to ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ would have had to take place soon after the vocalization of \( *r \), which he also dates to an early phase of the palatial period. However, he also points out that synizesis of -\( \varphi \) ἀ- could not have been tolerated at that time, because yod still functioned as a full-fledged consonant. Another problem is that the attested Mycenaean name a-no-qo-ta\textsuperscript{126} shows no trace of the change \( *r > -\varphi \)- that is supposed to be reflected in the Homeric form.

Still assuming that the formula originated in a Mycenaean orbit, the framework proposed here is able to resolve all the problems connected with previous solutions. First of all, if \( *r \) was still present in Mycenaean, the period to be bridged is much smaller. The verse containing *ENuaiioi anykʰwontαι may have entered the epic tradition in that form in the late Mycenaean period, and it would have been retained in a metrically unproblematic form with Epic \( *r \) until this sound was eliminated. At that point, an intermediate form \( *\acute{\alpha}νραφόντη \) may have come into being, with tautosyllabic rendering of onset \( nr \). Later, when this onset became difficult to render and the form developed to \( *\acute{\alpha}δραφόντη \), a certain poet tried to retain the connection with ‘man’ and took more drastic measures: he created ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ on the model of Ἀργεϊφόντῃ, and applied crasis at the same time. It is hard to tell whether this last replacement was the work of the poet of our \textit{Iliad}, of a poet working not long before him, or even whether the form entered the text of the \textit{Iliad} after its first fixation.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{125} See e.g. West (1988: 156 f.), Leukart (1994: 54), Lamberterie (2004: 239–241).

\textsuperscript{126} Ruijgh’s claim that the first member of a-no-qo-ta was the adverb /anō-/ ‘up’ is extremely unlikely, and has rightly been discarded by most scholars.

\textsuperscript{127} With Haug, I am inclined to think that the replacement ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ could come into being only after synizesis of long vowels over a word boundary had become tolerable—that is, after Homer: “En effet, cette synizése ne semblerait guère acceptable à l’époque d’Homère, si elle n’était pas de facto attestée dans le texte” (2002: 64). Bechtel (1914: 44), followed by Wackernagel (1916: 172), surmised that Aeschylus, who uses the form ἀνδρο-φόντῃ, read this form in his private copy of the \textit{Iliad}. Clearly, it is difficult to arrive at more than speculations, but it is also important to stress that we remain in the dark about many details, including the question whether ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ was actually sung during the compositional stages of our \textit{Iliad}.\textsuperscript{127}
rate, the change *-nr- > -dr- could theoretically be post-Homeric (cf. what has been said above on the readings ἀδροτήτα versus ἀνδροτήτα).

7.3.3  **Other Homeric Forms with ἀνδρ- and ἀνδρα-**

There are four other forms whose phonology or morphology is suggestive of an older *anr̥-*. Hom. ἀνδρόμεος ‘human’, the nouns ἀνδράποδον ‘slave’ and ἀνδραφόνος ‘murderer’ (a variant of ἀνδροφόνος), and the adverb ἀνδρακάς ‘man by man, each man apart’.

Can the reflex -ρα- in the last three forms be the regular outcome of Epic *r̥*? That is, can an origin of these forms in the epic tradition be motivated? As we will see, this is quite conceivable for ἀνδρόμεος and ἀνδρακάς in view of their pattern of attestation, but less evident for ἀνδράποδον and ἀνδραφόνος.

A second way to account for ἀνδρα- as the outcome of *anr̥* in Ionic-Attic is to assume that the expected reflex *anər* was analogically reshaped at an early stage as *an(d)rə-* after other forms with andr- in prevocalic position. This allomorph andr- was already present in oblique case forms of the simplex (cf. ἀνδρός, ἀνδρί), and also in compounds with a prevocalic first member ἀνδρ- or a second member -ανδρος. Indeed, it would be plausible if a discrepancy between preconsonantal *anər-* and prevocalic *an(d)r*- was eliminated soon after the vocalization of *r̥*, and it would be logical if *anər- was changed into *an(d)rə-* under influence of the prevocalic form. If this second scenario is accepted, it allows us to avoid the unnecessary assumption of epicsims.

Let us examine the words in more detail. According to Photius,128 Solon regularly used ἀνδραφόνος instead of ἀνδροφόνος ‘man-slaying; murderer’. In both its forms, the word is a clear archaism, as reflexes of PIE *gʷwen*- in the meaning ‘kill’ had been replaced by the root κτεν-.129 In Homer, ἀνδροφόνος is an epithet of warriors (notably Hector) who habitually kill men. In the Classical language, 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.130

---

128  Lemma 1753 of Photius’ Lexicon runs: ἀνδραφόνων· οὔτως Σόλων ἐν τοῖς Ἀξοσιν ἄντι τῶν ἀνδροφόνων ἀεί φησιν.

129  As Watkins (1995) stresses on various occasions, the root allomorph φον- is unproductive. Contrast the relic status of compounds in -φόνος with the productivity of compounds in -κτόνος in the tragedians and Hdt. (e.g. πατροκτόνος, μητροκτόνος, αὐτοκτόνος).

130  See Watkins (1995: 497–498) and García Ramón (2007a: 117). The unmarked Classical Greek word for ‘murderer’ was φονεύς. A similar difference in register is found between the poetic word ἀνδροκτασίη ‘manslaughter’ (at least when used in the singular, cf. García Ramón 2007a: 116) and the vernacular word φόνος ‘murder’ (normal in Classical prose; in Homer it mostly means ‘slaughter’, but ‘murder’ at Od. 4.771). Obviously, ἀνδροφονία (first attested in Aristotle) was productively derived from the legal term ἀνδροφόνος.
The innovative form ἀνδροκτόνος (trag., Hdt., B.) is used in the same way as ἀνδροφόνος in Homer.

Solon’s ἀνδραφόνος has been adduced as evidence for the regular reflex of *anr– in Ionic-Attic. However, given that ἀνδροφόνος is a high-register legal term in Classical Attic, it is not impossible that the form was taken from the language of epic. This is also the view of Watkins (1995: 390), who notes that before the vocalization of *r, the epic form would have been *anrpʰono–, withmetrical lengthening of the first of three consecutive short syllables. According to Watkins, this regularly resulted in ἀνδραφόνος (the metrical lengthening was made undone after the vocalization of *r), which was subsequently reshaped into ἀνδροφόνος after other compounds with ἀνδρο–. If Solon did not use the Homeric form ἀνδραφόνος, this could be an instance of Attic being more conservative than Ionic. Accepting that Solon’s ἀνδραφόνος is an epicism, however, implies that it was borrowed into Attic legal language before it was replaced by ἀνδροφόνος in the epic tradition.

For Watkins, as for most other scholars, Attic ἀνδραφόνος may unproblematically reflect *anrpʰono–, but the development *r– > -ra- has become problematic for my present argument. Rather than explaining this as an epicism, we might therefore suppose that the vocalization *anr– > *andrə– was influenced by the widely-used prevocalic stem andr–.

Further testimony for the prolonged presence of *anr– in Epic Greek is perhaps furnished by the abstract noun 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 (gen.sg.) /anrkʰasiː/ ‘manslaughter’ (García Ramón 2007a). As Mühlestein (1958) remarked, this has metrical reasons: *anrkʰasiː contained four consecutive short syllables. Epic Greek apparently introduced -κτ- from the root of

---

131 E.g. Ruijgh (1995: 87 n. 304).
132 Schmitt (1967:126) assumes that an impracticable epic form *anrpʰono– was replaced early on by a thematicized *anr-o-pʰono–.
133 Watkins (1995: 389–390) compares the metrical lengthening to be assumed for *anrpʰono– with that in ἀνέρ(ς), ἀνέρα (in the same metrical slot in Homer), and with the instrumental and locative plural forms *anrʰi, *anrʰi of the simplex, which would no doubt have been realized in epic with metrical lengthening before the vocalization of *r.
134 Mühlestein (1958: 226, Nachtrag): “Homer kennt (...) keine athematischen [Formen] mit dem mykenischen Lautwandel *r > ṣ. Lehrreich ist auch das aus a-no-qa-si-ja erschlossene Abstraktum fürs “Männermorden”. Dieses war sowohl in der alten athematischen Form *anrpʰasia (mit vier Kürzen) [a]s auch in der thematischen *anr-o-pʰasia (mit drei Kürzen) verswidrig, dagegen im [m]ykenischen Fortsetzer der athematischen Form, a-no-qa-si-ja = ἀνδρο–-ματαίη durchaus versgerecht. Gleichwohl kennt das Epos diese Form nicht, sondern hat das Wort durch ἀνδρο–-κτασίη ersetzt, und zwar trotzdem von den
κτείνω, in spite of the fact that no other compounds in -κτόνος or -κτατος are attested in Homer. The choice for this emergency solution implies that a first member *anar- or *anor- was not available at the appropriate time.

The possible explanations of ἀνδραφόνος can be extended to the adjective ἀνδρόμεος 'human, of men', which is attested exclusively in Homer. 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 *h₂nṛ-mēj-o > PGr. *anṛmejo- (cf. Tichy 1981: 47–48). It cannot be excluded that ἀνδρόμεος is the regular Aeolic reflex of PGr. *anṛmejo-, but the alternative inner-epic scenario along the lines just sketched (original metrically lengthened *anṛmejo- with Epic *ṛ) might also be considered. However, this second option requires that the productive allomorph ἀνδρο- was introduced even if -μεος was not a productive suffix.

The pre-form to be reconstructed for the collective ἀνδράποδα 'slaves' (in Homer only ἀνδραπόδεσσι Il. 7.475) would be *anṛ-pod-a. Given its three consecutive light syllables, the scenario with metrical lengthening of initial ἀ- and retention of Epic *ṛ is conceivable. However, given that the form is not typical for epic, the alternative (generalization of *andra- before consonants after andr- before vowels) is perhaps preferable. Unlike ἀνδροφόνος, ἀνδράποδα was not influenced by compounds with ἀνδρο-; this can be ascribed to influence of the semantically close τετράποδα 'cattle'. It is even possible that ἀνδράποδα itself was analogically created on the basis of τετράποδα (rejected without argumentation by Tichy 1981: 47 n. 44): see GEW and DELG s.v., with further references.

It remains to explain the adverb ἀνδρακάς, which in early Greek is attested only at Od. 13.14 and A. Ag. 1595. It is quite possible that this relic form was

Adjectiven nur ἀνδροφόνος episch ist, nicht auch ἀνδροκτόνος. Der Weg zur homerischen Sprache geht also nicht durchs Mykenische hindurch, sondern am Mykenischen vorbei. This final conclusion is premature, for one could also reason in a different way: the emergency solution applied in ἀνδροκτασίη may show that there never was a form like Myc. *anorkwiskia or Ionic *anaphasia. In other words, ἀνδροκτασίη could be seen as indirect evidence for the retention of *ṛ in Mycenaean.

135 Cf. the formulaic phrase χροὸς ἀνδρομέοι (Il. 17.571, 20.100, 21.70), as well as the remarkable and otherwise isolated δύμλον ἀνδρόμεον (Il. 11.538).

136 An Aeolism might also explain the barytone accentuation of ἀνδρόμεος (compare accented Vedic -māya-), but it is not certain that the phenomenon of epic barytonesis derives from Aeolic.

137 A noun ἡ ἀνδρακάς is attested in the meaning 'group of ten men' for Phrynichus (2nd c. CE), and in the meaning 'portion; shared contribution' for Nic. Th. 643; the latter is perhaps due to a learned reinterpretation of the Homeric passage, cf. Leumann 1950: 266.
preserved in the epic tradition. The suffix -κάς is a morphological archaism, otherwise found only in ἑκάς ‘set apart, at a distance’ (< PGr. *hwe-kas) and its extension ἐκατός ‘each’. It is etymologically related to the Indo-Iranian morpheme *-ćás ‘X times’, e.g. Ved. sahasra-śás ‘a thousand times’ (RV+), Av. nauua.śás ‘nine times’. Clearly, the reflex -ρα- in ἀνδρακάς is an archaism, just as in ἀνδραφάνος.

The deviating place of the anaptyctic vowel can be explained in the two ways sketched above. On the one hand, we may assume that a relic pre-form *anrkás was restricted to Epic Greek, and that before vowels this tribrach was used with metrical lengthening of the first syllable. Eventually, after the vocalization of Epic *r the form would have been adopted by Aeschylus and later authors. Alternatively, we might assume that *anrkás existed in the Ionic-Attic vernaculars, and that it was vocalized analogically as *an(d)rəkás rather than *anarkás on the model of prevocalic *an(d)r- in the simplex and in compounds.

As for the oxytone accentuation of ἀνδρακάς, it could suggest that the development of (Epic) *r took place after Wheeler’s Law. However, the ancient grammarians (e.g. Ap. Dysc.) already remarked that all adverbs in -άς are oxytone. Therefore, it cannot be excluded that the accentuation of ἀνδρακάς was influenced by forms like ἑκάς.

7.3.4 θρόνος
Alphabetic Greek θρόνος ‘ornamented chair, throne’ (Hom. and Class.) is clearly the same etymon as Mycenaean to-no /tʰorno-/ or /tʰr̥no-/ (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, while κλισμός refers to a kind of couch or sofa.

Let us first consider the evidence for the different attested forms. The Mycenaean simplex is consistently written to-no, never to-ro-no*. As we have seen in section 2.5.2, it is possible that Myc. to-ro-no-wo-ko contains the ety-

---

138 According to Wheeler’s Law, an oxytone word becomes paroxytone if it has a dactylic shape (e.g. ποικίλος < *πεσιλός, cf. Ved. peśalá- ‘adorned’). The pre-from *anrkás did not have a dactylic shape yet, which could explain why it escaped Wheeler. Note that ἀνδράς < *anrśi is not a counterexample to this chronology either, because this noun may have generalized a columnar accent in the weak cases (ἄνδρος, ἀνδρί, ἀνδρῶν). As far as I have seen, the example ἀνδρακάς has so far gone unnoticed in this connection: it is not mentioned in Meier-Brügger (1992b).

139 In post-Homeric Greek, βρόνος 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.
mon of Hom. ἰρόνα, which could mean ‘colored or dyed threads of wool’.

I therefore leave to-ro-no-wo-ko out of further consideration. The other Mycenaean form to-no has been compared with the gloss θόρναξ; ὑποπόδιον ‘footstool’ (Hsch.), and with the mountain name Θόρναξ in Laconia (Hdt., Paus.).

How can Hom. βρόνος and Myc. to-no be reconciled phonologically? Some scholars have assumed liquid metathesis, in which case either form could be original (see e.g. Hajnal-Risch 2006: 102–103 and 202–205), but as I have stressed throughout this book, this assumption is hard to substantiate. Given that Homer applies Mcl scansion in various case forms of βρόνος, a reconstruction *thr̥no- also deserves consideration (thus e.g. Wathelet 1966: 165). Upon this view, Myc. to-no and the gloss θόρναξ would display the regular Achaean reflex of *r̥, while epic βρόνος would have the Aeolic outcome. This scenario requires that Ionic-Attic βρόνος is an epicism, which seems possible. As with βροτός, however, there are no concrete indications for an Aeolic origin of βρόνος: it is unattested in the Lesbian poets (on Sappho’s ποικιλόθρονος, see section 2.5.2) and the evidence for Mcl scansion in Homer would remain unexplained.

Another proposal (Viredaz 1983, followed by Lamberterie 2004) is that Myc. to-no /θόρνο-/ represents the original form, while Ion.-Att. βρόνος developed by contamination with the related word βρῆνυς ‘footstool’. Indeed, in the Pylos tablets ta-ra-nu-we is found in the same contexts as to-no, just as βρῆνυς and βρόνος appear together in the same Homeric passages. This scenario is interesting, but alternative explanations cannot be excluded beforehand. In particular, referring as it does to an item of material culture, βρόνος ~ to-no may be a loanword which was borrowed on two different occasions.

This brings us to the fact that βρόνος has no generally accepted Indo-European etymology. Previous suggestions and their problems are summarized by Lamberterie (2004: 242–243); they all start from the PIE root *dher- ‘support’.

Pace Lamberterie, who 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˚ correspond à celle de θόρναξ et de βρόνος” (2004: 242).

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. § 646–667).

This possibility is denied explicitly by Haug (2002: 67) on the ground that βρόνος occurs not only in poetry, but also in prose authors. This objection is not compelling because a βρόνος is always an object of high status.

Lamberterie notes that the initial β- makes position in the majority of Homeric instances of βρόνος, “notablement dans un tour visiblement formulaire comme ἐπὶ βρόνοι ἄργυρο-λαυ # (4 x)” (2004: 244). As he remarks, this scansion is hard to reconcile with the idea that βρόνος contains metrical traces of *r. The metrical evidence from Homer (including the compounds in -βρόνος) will be considered in more detail below.
Some scholars consider θρόνος to be the oldest form, and assume a derivation in -όνο‑ from the zero grade of *$dʰer‑$, comparing χρόνος ‘time’ and κλόνος ‘battle din’. This analysis is very shaky because a suffix -όνο‑ cannot be understood in Indo-European terms. On the other hand, Saussure had already proposed that θορν‑ (which later turned up as Myc. to‑no‑) was the oldest form, assuming a no‑derivative from the o‑grade root, *$dʰór‑no‑$. Wathelet (1966) and Heubeck (1972), starting from the evidence for Myc. scansion in Homer, assumed a pre‑form *$dʰγ‑no‑$.

More recently, Lamberterie (2004: 246) has argued that θρόνος and Myc. to‑no‑ cannot be separated etymologically from Hom. θρῆνυς (Myc. ta‑ra‑nu‑, Att. θράνος). Deriving both words from the same root *$dʰerh_{2}‑$, he starts from the respective pre‑forms *$dʰorh_{2}‑no‑$ and *$dʰrh_{2}‑no‑$ (or *$dʰrh_{2}‑nu‑$), where the former would lose its laryngeal due to the Saussure Effect. The reconstruction *$dʰorh_{2}‑no‑$ is, however, subject to two additional objections. First of all, Indo‑Iranian has an anīṭ root (Ved. dhar ‘to hold, support’). Secondly, in order to reconstruct *$dʰorh_{2}‑no‑$ beside *$dʰrh_{2}‑no‑$, Lamberterie must assume that Attic θράνος is an older form than Hom. θρῆνυς 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 θράνος was influenced by θρόνος. Note that u‑stem nouns were not productive in Greek.

In my view, all previous proposals suffer from the same problem: neither a root *$dʰerh_{2}‑$ nor *$dʰer‑$ ‘support’ is securely reflected in Greek. Furthermore, the proposed no‑formation would be unparalleled in other Indo‑European lan-

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

145 In my view (Van Beek 2011b), the Saussure Effect in Greek may have to be formulated differently: in examples like πόρνη, τόρμος, but also in e‑grade forms like στέρνον and τέρμα, the laryngeal was lost in the environment *$VLHN$. Lamberterie’s proposal to reconstruct *$θόρνος$ as *$dʰorh_{2}‑no‑$ could also be interpreted along these lines, but as explained in the main text, I do not think that his root reconstruction is correct.

146 It is uncertain whether θρησκεύω ‘to perform religious duties’ (Hdt.) contains the root of θρῆνυς ‘footstool’. Theoretically, this verb could derive from a noun *$θρηνικός$ or *$θρησκεύς$ ‘supporter’, but it remains unclear why the suffix -sk‑ would appear in these derivations. García Ramón (1999) recognizes the root *$dʰer‑$ in Thess. θροσσα, but this remains conjectural as well (see section 3.3.2). I have elsewhere (Van Beek 2018: 60–61) subscribed to the view that διψάω ‘to observe’ contains the root θρη‑, and proposed that the initial vowel contains a trace of the preverb *$ad‑$. As for the root shape θρή‑, as explained there (o.c. 61 with n. 78), there are at least two ways to obtain it secondarily within Greek from an original PIE *$dʰer‑$. The root θρη‑ is also found in the glosses θρήσκω· νοῶ ‘perceive, take notice’ and ἐνθρεῖν· φυλάσσειν ‘guard’ (both Hsch.).
Table 18: The pattern of attestation of θρόνος in Homer

| Form   | # | Significant attestations                                                                 | Remarks                  |
|--------|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| θρόνος | 1 | *Od*. 6.308, with *McL*                                                                  | Only *Od*.               |
| θρόνον | 10| θρόνον |B* (6 ×)                                                                                  | *Il*. and *Od*.          |
|        |   | ες θρόνον ίζε (εἶςεν) |T* (3 ×)                                                                 | Never *McL*              |
| θρόνου | 19| ἐπὶ θρόνου ἄργυροήλου (*Il.*, *Od.*)                                                    | *Il*. and *Od*.          |
|        |   | ἰδὲ θρόνου ἄργυροήλου (*Od*. 22.341)                                                   | Never *McL*              |
|        |   | ἐπὶ θρόνου ίζε φαεινοῦ (*Il.*)                                                         |                          |
|        |   | ἀπὸ θρόνου ὄρτο φαεινοῦ (*Il.*)                                                        |                          |
|        |   | ἐπὶ θρόνου εἰςε φαεινοῦ (*Od.*)                                                       |                          |
| θρόνῳ  | 4 | 3 × with *McL*                                                                          | *Il*. and *Od*.          |
|        |   | # σείσατο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνῳ (*Il*. 8.199)                                                   |                          |
|        |   | # ἔξετο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνῳ (*Il*. 15.150)                                                    |                          |
|        |   | |T θρόνῳ ἐν (*Il*. 15.142)                                                              |                          |
|        | | 1 × without *McL*:                                                                  |                          |
|        |   | # εν θρόνῳ ἱδρύσασα (*Od*. 5.86)                                                       |                          |
| θρόνοι | 1 | *Od*. 7.95, with *McL*                                                                  | Only *Od*.               |
| θρόνους| 11| κατὰ κλισμοῦς τε θρόνους τε # 8 ×                                                      | Only *Od*.               |
| θρόνων | 2 | προπάροιθε θρόνων                                                                       | Only *Od*.               |
|        |   | # εκ δὲ θρόνων                                                                          |                          |
| θρόνοις| 5 | καθίζον ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι θρόνοισιν #                                                       | Only *Od*.               |
|        |   | καθίζον ἐν ύψηλοίσιν θρόνοισιν #                                                        |                          |
|        |   | ράσσατε τ' ἐν τε θρόνοισι' εὐποιήτοισι τάπητας #                                       |                          |
|        |   | ἔβαλλε θρόνοισ' ἐνι ῥήγεα καλά #                                                       |                          |
|        |   | κώεα καστορνύσα θρόνοις' ἐνι δαιδαλέοισι #                                             |                          |

Guages, so that we are ultimately left with a conjectural root etymology. As Heubeck already remarked, “in this case, certainty is not possible” (1972: 78).

In order to assess the likelihood of a pre-form *thryno-* let us now discuss the metrical peculiarities of the Homeric attestations in more detail. Table 18 contains information about the number of attestations per case form, as well as remarks on metrical behavior and pattern of attestation (presence in *Iliad* and/or *Odyssey*).

---

147 According to Chantraine (1953: 108), there is no perceptible difference in use between the genitive and dative with ἐπὶ.
The phonological surface structures of θρόνος and βροτός are rhythmically identical. Since βροτός contained *r̥, and since McL frequently occurs in both words, it seems attractive at first sight to derive θρόνος from a pre-form with *r̥, too. There are, however, clear differences between the metrical behavior of θρόνος and that of βροτός. In general, McL 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 between the respective forms with McL. Whereas the gen. pl. βροτῶν is extremely frequent, θρόνων only occurs twice in Homer, and while the frequent dat. pl. βροτοῖσι is almost exclusively verse-final, only 2 out of 5 attestations of θρόνοισ(ι) are verse-final. What is more, all instances of θρόνοισ(ι) could be secondary modifications by the Odyssey poet of older phraseology with the words λίθοισι and δόμοισιν;148 compare:

– καθῖζον ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι θρόνοισιν (Od. 16.408) beside καθῖζον ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι λίθοισιν (Od. 8.6). The latter phrase also appears in modified shape as κατ’ ἥν’ ἔξετ’ ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι λίθοισιν (Od. 3.406), and as a first hemistich in ἔλατ’ ἐπὶ ξεστοῖσι λίθοισ’ ἐθραφ’ ἐνι κώκλω (Il. 18.504). The use of polished stones as seats on specific occasions (e.g. legal sessions, as on the shield of Achilles) is likely to be a traditional feature of epic diction.

– ἔν ψηληοίσι βρόνοισι (Od. 8.422) beside ἔν ψηληοίσι δόμοισιν (Il. 6.503, Od. 17.110).

– ἐν τε βρόνοισ’ εὐποιήτοισι (Od. 20.153), βρόνοισ’ ἐν δαιδαλέοισι (Od. 17.32) and βρόνοισ’ ἐν (Od. 10.352) beside δόμοισ’ ἐν (6 ×), in particular δόμοισ’ ἐν ποιητοίσι (Il. 5.198, Od. 13.106).

Other case forms of θρόνος are also used in a very different way compared to those of βροτός. The nom. pl. θρόνοι and the nom. sg. θρόνος are attested only once, both scanning as an iamb with McL, whereas the same case forms of βροτός are frequent and are regularly placed before vowels, avoiding McL. The acc. pl. βροτοῦσ is attested only once, whereas θρονοὺς appears with McL in the frequent formula |P κατὰ κλισμοὺς τε θρόνους τε. Wathelet’s view that this phrase is an old formula is hard to prove: Gallavotti’s suggestion (1968: 846) that it represents an adaptation of a *κατὰ κλισμοὺς θόρνους τε (with the Mycenaean form)

148 Hoekstra (1965: 145) goes too far in his treatment of this word. He claims that the T2-expression βρόνοισ’ ἐν δαιδαλέοισι was based on an old P2 counterpart *θόρνοισ’ ἐν δαι- δαλέοισι (“resulting from conjugation of a narrative T1-formula”), and that ἔν τε βρόνοισ’ εὐποιήτοισι reflects an older phrase without τε, i.e. *ἔν βόρνοισ’ εὐποιήτοισι. There is no concrete indication that these claims are correct.
seems somewhat speculative, but cannot be excluded. In the acc. pl. McL scansion is further attested in θρόνοις |, περικαλλέας (2 ×, in the repeated verse Od. 22.438 = 452) and ες ρα θρόνοις ἔζροντο (Od. 4.51), which may have been modelled on an older phrase ες θρόνον ἐς / εἶσεν (3 ×).

All 20 instances of θρόνος with McL discussed so far (in the nom. sg. and all cases of the plural) are attested exclusively in the Odyssey. Generally speaking, θρόνος is more frequent in the Odyssey (39 ×, against 14 × 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 telling. Even so, it is conceivable that the productive extension of McL scansions in the Odyssey is an innovation of that epic. In order to further investigate this hypothesis, let us restrict ourselves to the case forms that are attested in both Iliad and Odyssey.

The acc. sg. θρόνον (10 ×) and the gen. sg. θρόνου (19 ×) are used only before a following vowel, and occur in formulaic phrases like ἄπο θρόνου δῶτο φαεινοῦ and καθείσεν ἐπί θρόνου ἀργυροήλου. This is consistent with the avoidance of McL in ἐν θρόνῳ. The dat. sg. θρόνῳ, on the other hand, occurs only in the Iliad and undergoes McL in each of its three occurrences. Leaving aside |Τ θρόνῳ ἔνι (Il. 15.142, with McL after the caesura), the remaining two attestations of the dat. sg. have played an important role in previous discussions (see Heubeck 1972: 78):

# σείσατο δ’ εἰνὶ θρόνῳ
Il. 8.199

# ἐζέτο δ’ εἰνὶ θρόνῳ
Il. 15.150

The simultaneous occurrence of metrical lengthening in the preposition εἰνὶ and McL in θρόνῳ is odd and asks for an explanation. As ἐν θρόνῳ ἰδρύσασα |p

---

149 At verse end, we find phrases of the structure A B τε, e.g. ἵππους ἡμιόνους τε (Il. 24.576 and 690), βάσας ἡμιόνους τε (Il. 24.782); but there are more examples of A τε B τε, e.g. ἀρνειούς τε τράγους τε (Od. 9.239, note the McL scansion in τράγος), καλούς τε μεγάλους τε (Od. 18.68). The former structure is clearly an archaism.

150 Thus, I agree with Lamberterie (2004: 244) when he remarks: "les exemples de correptio, qui pour la plupart sont attestés dans l’Odyssee, ne semblent guère anciens".

151 The verse-final genitives in -οω contain irresolvable contractions, but this need not imply a recent creation of such phrases; the forms might reflect older ablative-instrumentals in -οω, an ending preserved in the Myc. thematic ‘genitive’ in -o.

152 Thus already Lee (1959: 7).
(Od. 5.86) shows, the dat. sg. was in fact used before vowel-initial words, again consistent with the use of βροτῷ (4 × thus in Hom.). It would have been unproblematic to start a hexameter with a participial clause like *ἐν βρόνῳ ἔξημεν |P. It is also noteworthy that the colon ἐς θρόνον ἴς (εἶσεν) |Τ (3 ×) has no parallel in the dative.

To reconstruct a noun phrase *eni ῥὴνοι with metrical lengthening of the first syllable would, however, be premature. Lee (1959: 7), followed by Hoekstra (1965: 145) and Lamberterie (2004: 244–245), suggested to explain the hemistich ἕζετο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνῳ |P as a late modification of an obsolete *ἐν θόρνῳ, with the Mycenaean form. This is possible, but since there is certainly an element of speculation in this suggestion, I propose an alternative: to explain ἕζετο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνῳ as a modification of the first hemistich ἕζετο δ' ἐν κλισμῷ "seated himself on a bench" (Il. 24.597, Od. 4.136).153

In conclusion, the general picture obtained from the metrical evidence is quite different from that found for βροτός. Potential indications that the pre-form of θρόνος contained *ρ̥ are concentrated in the Odyssey, and none of the instances concerned must be very archaic. I therefore agree with Lamberterie that the McL scansion in θρόνος is due to a recent extension of the licence in the Odyssey ("abrègements récents", 2004: 244), and that there is no compelling evidence for a pre-form *tʰr̥no-. On the other hand, I agree with Wathelet and Heubeck that no certainty can be reached about the etymology of θρόνος.

7.3.5 Κρόνος
The name of Kronos, the father and predecessor of Zeus, has no convincing etymology.154 This would be a sufficient reason to exclude it from the present discussion, if it were not for the fact that the frequent nominative Κρονίων (referring to Zeus, always with long ῧ in Homer) and some case-forms of Κρόνος occur with McL scansion in Epic Greek. However, are the formulae involving forms of Κρόνος with McL scansion really old? The case of θρόνος has taught us that no conclusions can be drawn before we have made a thorough analysis

153 As Perpillou (1981: 228–229) has shown, the difference between a κλίσμα (a normal seat) and a βράνος (a honorific chair) was made in both the iliad and the Odyssey. The word κλίσμα is further found in the dat. pl. in the second hemistich ἐπὶ κλίσμαι καθίζον (Il. 8.436 and 11.623, Od. 17.90), in the first hemistich εἶσεν δ' ἐν κλίσμασι |Τ (Il. 9.200), as well as in the formula |Π κατὰ κλίσματα τε θρόνους τε (8 × Od.).

154 Janda’s proposal (2010: 50–51) to reconstruct *kr-ono- ‘cutter’ (a name which would refer to the castration by Kronos of his father Ouranos) suffers from the lack of compelling evidence for a suffix *-ono-: see above on θρόνος. In addition, a suffix with two full grade vowels is morphologically awkward.
of its metrical behavior. In this investigation of Kronos, I also include material from Hesiod because the name has a high relative frequency especially in the *Theogony.*155

Let us first consider instances where forms of Κρόνος are not used with *McL.* In our analysis of βροτός, we have seen that cases of β‑ making position length are relatively rare in Homer. I have related this to the fact that βροτός had Epic *γ* at an earlier stage. In the case of Κρόνος, the situation is completely different. First limiting our attention to 13 instances of the nom. and acc. sg. forms in Homer and Hesiod, we find that KP‑ makes position in the following 5 expressions:

– τέκετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης Il. 4.59 (cf. also *h. Aphr.* 22 and 42);
– ἰδὲ Κρόνον ἀγκυλομήτην Th. 18;
– γένετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης Th. 137;
– πατέρα Κρόνον Th. 73;
– ὅτε τε Κρόνον εὐφύσα Ζεὺς Il. 14.203.

In all these cases, Κρόνος or Κρόνον is localized in the fourth thesis. This is also the case in the following formulaic uses:

– μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης ‘Kronos of crooked plans’ (Th. 168, 473 and 495);
– μέγας Κρόνος without following ἀγκυλομήτης (Th. 459);
– θεοὶ Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἐόντες ‘the gods that surround Kronos’ (II. 14.274 and 15.225);
– Τιτῆνες θ’ ὑποταρτάριοι Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἐόντες (Th. 851).

Thus, we have evidence for two formulaic phrases, Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης (preceded by a middle verb form in ‑ετο, by μέγας or by ἰδὲ) and Κρόνον ἀμφὶς ἐόντες modifying a preceding nominative plural form. Both are attested in Homer and Hesiod, and everything suggests that both are old.156 It follows that the option of Κρόνος making position in the fourth foot is old, too.

This conclusion is confirmed to a large degree by the behavior of the genitive form Κρόνου. In Hesiod this form occurs 7 ×, always without *McL*; on five occasions it again occupies the fourth thesis (three times in the second verse half ὅσι Κρόνου ἐξεγένοντο / ἐκγενόμεσθα). In Homer, there is one instance of Κρόνου in this position: δύω Κρόνου υἷε κραταιώ (Il. 13.345); in spite of its isolation the phrase might well be traditional (note the dual υἷε with barytone accentuation and κραταιώ with *McL* reflecting Epic *γ*). Position length occurs in the prepositional phrases ὑπὸ Κρόνου (Th. 395) and ἐπὶ Κρόνου (Op. 111).

---

155 I include only the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*, without the intention of making any claims about Hesiod’s authorship of other works and fragments. I have not systematically included the *Homeric hymns*, as this would not change the picture in a substantial way.

156 Cf. Hoekstra (1957: 213–214) on Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης.
Somewhat surprisingly, Homer (and in particular the poet of the *Iliad*) is the outlier in that he uses the genitive Κρόνου almost exclusively with *McL*. This form occurs in the following formulae:

- *|T* Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω (7 × *Il.*, 1 × *Od.*.) referring to Zeus in the nom. sg;\(^{157}\)
- *|T* Κρόνου πάϊς without the verse-final epithet (5 × *Il.*).

A second instance of *McL* is found in the formulaic naming verse and verse of address for Hera:

- "Ἡρη πρέσβα θεὰ θύγατερ μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο (*Il.* 14.194 and 243);
- "Ἡρη πρέσβα θεὰ θυγάτηρ μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο (*Il.* 5.721 and 8.383).

Finally, there is one isolated instance of *McL* in the verse-end ἵν' Ἰάπετός τε Κρόνος τε (*Il.* 8.479). However, since this is the only exception to the consistent localization of the nom. and acc. of Κρόνος in the fourth thesis, and since the elided form ἵν preceding Ἰάπετός also belongs to the same colon, it is probably a one-off creation.

The verse for Hera and the phrase |Τ Κρόνου πάϊς without following ἀγκυλομήτεω are found only in the *Iliad*. The formula |Τ Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω also occurs once in the *Odyssey*, but is much more frequent in the *Iliad* and absent from Hesiod. I will now argue that the *Iliad* poet is responsible for the creation of these phrases.

As was seen by Hoekstra (1957: 213–214 and 1965: 35–36 with n. 1), the combination of quantitative metathesis in ἀγκυλομήτεω and the irresolvable contraction of the ending in Κρόνου strongly suggest that Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω is a recent creation. It is a combination of the phrase Κρόνου πάϊς and a declined form of ἀγκυλομήτης, which occurs in the old formula |Η Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης. Crucially, there is another formula of the same metrical structure that refers to Zeus in the nominative, πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε. This is attested 15 × in Homer, 4 × in Hesiod (Th. and Op.), and is widely used in Hesiodic catalogue fragments. Thus, everything suggests that the extension of |Τ Κρόνου πάϊς with ἀγκυλομήτεω is a recent creation of the *Iliad* poet.

The shorter phrase |Τ Κρόνου πάϊς is not traditional either. First of all, we must note that the metrical slot of Κρόνου πάϊς is also filled by Κρονίων, and that the latter actually occurs there 4 times in Homer.\(^{158}\) It is remarkable that verse-final Κρονίων is usually preceded by an aorist indicative form (see the next section), and that the same is true without exception for |Τ Κρόνου πάϊς in the *Iliad* and for

---

\(^{157}\) In the *Hymn to Demeter*, we also find |Τ Κρόνου πολυώνυμος υἱός (in the repeated line *h. Dem.* 18 = 32), referring to Hades.

\(^{158}\) These places are *Il.* 17.269; *Od.* 17.424, 19.80 and 20.273. Note that Κρόνου πάϊς cannot be used before words starting with a consonant, while Κρονίων can (and actually is so used at *Od.* 20.273).
the three occurrences of \(\text{T} \text{Κρονίων} \) in the *Odyssey*.\(^{159}\) The only occurrence of \(\text{T} \text{Κρονίων} \) in the *Iliad* (17.269), on the other hand, is preceded by the noun phrase \(\text{λαμπρῇσιν κορύθεσι} \). That \(\text{T} \text{Κρονίων} \) was originally more frequent in this position is also suggested by the fact that the gen. \(\text{T} \text{Κρονίονος} \) occurs twice. In view of these distributions, it is likely that \(\text{Κρόνου πάϊς} \) is a relatively late replacement of \(\text{Κρονίων} \) in its position after the trochaic caesura.

What about the second verse half \(\text{θύγατερ / θυγάτηρ μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο} \)? must the scansion of \(\text{Κρόνοιο} \) be a reflex of Epic *\(\text{r} \)? Again, attestations are limited to the *Iliad*. The ending -\(\text{o} \) in verse-final position gives the verse an archaic appearance, but we must keep in mind that -\(\text{o} \) is productive in Epic Greek. Furthermore, the nominative verse is probably a transformation of the vocative verse, because \(\text{πρέσβα `Venerable Lady’} \) seems to be an original vocative (probably after \(\text{πότνα `Lady’} \)). Once \(\text{πρέσβα} \) had been transformed into a nominative, it was also used in the phrases \(\text{πρέσβα Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀτη (Il. 19.91) and πρέσβα Κλυμένοιο θυγατρῶν (Od. 3.452).} \)

As for the genesis of the phrase \(\text{θύγατερ μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο} \) referring to Hera, I propose it was formed on the model of \(\text{T} \text{Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω} \), which refers to her husband Zeus. The motive for creating a new formula may have been the masculine caesura after \(\text{Ἥρη πρέσβα θεά:} \) there is no other verse-final formula in this slot referring to Hera. An additional argument is the following: if the formula for Zeus were based on that for Hera, one would expect \(\text{θυγάτηρ μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο} \) to be mirrored as *\(\text{πάϊς μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο} \), rather than the attested \(\text{Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω} \). By creating a vocative verse ending in \(\text{θύγατερ μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο} \), the *Iliad* poet permitted himself an incidental use of \(\text{McL} \), probably encouraged by his use of the same license in \(\text{T} \text{Κρόνου πάϊς} \). Moreover, the acceptability of \(\text{Κρόνοιο} \) at verse end was no doubt enhanced by the existence of \(\text{Κρονίων} \) in the same position. The generic epithet \(\text{μεγάλοιο} \) may have been taken over from the older phrase \(\text{T} \text{μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης} \), the oldest shape of the formula.

In sum, the formulae \(\text{T} \text{Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω} \) and \(\text{θύγατερ μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο} \) both show signs of recent modification; they presuppose the existence of the formula \(\text{T} \text{μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης} \), and hence also the traditional localization of \(\text{Κρόνος} \) before the bucolic dieresis. The unextended phrase \(\text{T} \text{Κρόνου πάϊς} \) is a replacement of \(\text{Κρονίων} \) in the same position. Thus, nothing requires us to posit Epic *\(\text{r} \) for \(\text{Κρόνος} \), and the use of \(\text{Κρόνος} \) in the fourth thesis speaks against this. For \(\text{Κρονίων} \) the situation is different, as we shall now see.

---

\(^{159}\) With the exception of *Il.* 16.431, \(\text{T} \text{Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω} \) is always preceded by a -\(\text{o} \)-aorist.
Table 19. Attestations of the stem Κρονίων- in Homer + Hesiod

| Case   | Form   | # #  | Noteworthy phrases |
|--------|--------|------|-------------------|
| nom. sg. | Κρονίων | 42+3 | Usually verse-final after finite verb, e.g. (|H κατέ-)|B νεῦσε Κρονίων (3×Il.) |H ἐτέλεςσε Κρονίων (2×Od.) |H ἐτάνυσσε Κρονίων (2×Il.) |T ἐπεκραίαινε Κρονίων (2×Il.) Also 4× after |T |
| gen. sg. | Κρονίονος | 2+0  | Both times after |T, in apposition to a preceding gen. Ζηνός. Cf. Μολίονε in the same position. |

7.3.6 Κρονίων
The theonym Κρονίων, which is used as an metrical alternative for Ζεύς, is commonly analyzed as a patronymic formation in -ιων meaning ‘son of Kronos’. Remarkably, it occurs in two different stem forms, one in -ιων, -ιονος (with long ῑ), the other in -ιων- (with short ι). McL scansion is applied only in the first stem with long ῑ. These stems are attested as represented in Tables 19 (above) and 20 (next page).

The long ῑ of nom. Κρονίων is usually explained as a metrical lengthening.160 This assumption is problematic for several reasons. First of all, it would entail that two metrical peculiarities (metrical lengthening and McL) were introduced at the same time in a form that would normally scan without a problem. Κρονίων with short -ι- was eminently suited for use in the dactylic hexameter, and its complete absence from Homer may well be due to a secondary replacement by Κρονίδης, which has the productive patronymic suffix -ίδης and occurs 37× in Homer.161 Secondly, the number of parallels for metrical lengthening in the sixth arsis in Homer is small, and many cases can be analyzed as secondary nonce-forms (cf. Wyatt 1969: 222–232).162

---

160 E.g. Ruijgh (1968: 146), Chantraine (1958: 104), Solmsen (1901: 55).
161 The same goes for the vocative Κρονίδη. In Homer, Κρονίων is never used as a vocative, but Pindar does have a vocative Κρονίων (Pyth. 1.71, Nem. 9.28, 10.76).
162 For instance, verse-final Στυγός ὕδωρ (only Il. 14.271) is an incident: it may be due to a displacement of |P Στυγός ὕδατος (Il. 15.37, Od. 5.185), which itself is probably due to declension of |P Στυγός ὕδατος (Il. 2.755, 8.369, Od. 10.514), where the metrical lengthening in a tribrach is regular. Differently, Solmsen (1901) judges the metrical lengthening in forms like ὕδωρ, ἄνηρ to be an old license at verse end and before |B.
This means that the $McL$ scansion of verse-final $\text{Κρονίων}$ is structural and traditional, and therefore to be analyzed as a trace of Epic $*\tau$. Since the same does not hold for $\text{Κρόνος}$, this means that $\text{Κρονίων} - \text{-ίωνος}$ and $\text{Κρονίων} - \text{-ίωνος}$ are originally two distinct lexemes. This conclusion may come as a surprise, but it is reinforced by various other considerations.

First of all, considering the Homeric names in $-\text{ίων}$ generally, we find two synchronically distinct types: (1) patronymics in $-\text{ίων}$, which have short $-\text{-ι}$- and maintain long $-\text{-ω}$- in all case forms; (2) forms in $-\text{ίων}$ which have a long $-\text{-ι}$- throughout and display suffix ablaut (gen. $-\text{-ιονος}$). As Ruijgh (1968) has argued, the two types may have different etymological origins. The patronymic type was historically derived from the adjectives of appurtenance in $-\text{ιος}$ (cf. Mycenaean patronymics in $-\text{-i-jo}/-\text{-ios}$/) with the individualizing suffix $-\text{-ων}$. The second type contains a suffix $*-\text{-ιυ̯ον-}$, attested in Mycenaean in the PN s $\text{a-ri-wo} / \text{Ariwōn} / (= \text{Hom. Ἀρίων})$ and $\text{a-ki-wo-ni-jo} / \text{Alkīwonios} /$.

---

### Table 20 Attestations of the stem Κρονίων- in Homer + Hesiod

| Case    | Form     | ##   | Noteworthy phrases                                                                 |
|---------|----------|------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| gen. sg.| Κρονίωνος | 3+1  | $\uparrow$ ἐρισθενέος Κρονίωνος (1 × Il., 1 × Od., 1 × Th.)                         |
| dat. sg.| Κρονίωνι  | 16+3 | $\uparrow$ Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι (4 × Il., 1 × Op., $\uparrow$ ὑπερμενέι Κρονίωνι (4 × Il., 1 × Th.)) |
|         |          |      | $\uparrow$ κελαινεφέϊ Κρονίωνι (3 × Il.)                                            |
| acc. sg.| Κρονίωνα  | 10+0 | $\uparrow$ Δία Κρονίωνα + verb (3 × Il., 1 × Od.)                                |
|         |          |      | $\uparrow$ υπερμενέα Κρονίωνα (2 × Il.)                                            |
|         |          |      | $\uparrow$ κέλαινεφα Κρονίωνα (1 × Il.)                                          |
|         |          |      | $\uparrow$ Δία Κρονίωνα ἄνακτα (1 × Il.)                                          |

This means that the $McL$ scansion of verse-final $\text{Κρονίων}$ is structural and traditional, and therefore to be analyzed as a trace of Epic $*\tau$. Since the same does not hold for $\text{Κρόνος}$, this means that $\text{Κρονίων} - \text{-ίωνος}$ and $\text{Κρονίων} - \text{-ιωνος}$ are originally two distinct lexemes. This conclusion may come as a surprise, but it is reinforced by various other considerations.

First of all, considering the Homeric names in $-\text{ιων}$ generally, we find two synchronically distinct types: (1) patronymics in $-\text{ιων}$, which have short $-\text{-ι}$- and maintain long $-\text{-ω}$- in all case forms; (2) forms in $-\text{ιων}$ which have a long $-\text{-ι}$- throughout and display suffix ablaut (gen. $-\text{-ίονος}$). As Ruijgh (1968) has argued, the two types may have different etymological origins. The patronymic type was historically derived from the adjectives of appurtenance in $-\text{ιος}$ (cf. Mycenaean patronymics in $-\text{-i-jo} / -\text{-ios}$/) with the individualizing suffix $-\text{-ων}$. The second type contains a suffix $*-\text{-ιυ̯ον-}$, attested in Mycenaean in the PNs $\text{a-ri-wo} / \text{Ariwōn} / (= \text{Hom. Ἀρίων})$ and $\text{a-ki-wo-ni-jo} / \text{Alkīwonios} /$.

---

163 Attested both in Th. + Op., but not in Od.
164 Also in the Hymns and the pseudo-Hesiodic Scutum.
165 The accusative formulae with Δία are probably transformations of the corresponding dative formulae (since Δία is analogical for older Ζῆν, Ζῆνα), but this is irrelevant for present purposes.
166 Also 1 × h. Aphr.
167 As Ruijgh (1968: 145) notes concerning the names in $-\text{-ιων}$, “... 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 $-\text{-ιων}$-, eux aussi, appartiennent à la vieille tradition épique, représentant une formation qui n’est plus productive à l’époque classique’. The origin of the suffix $-\text{-ιον-}$ seems identical to that of $-\text{-ιον-}$, which is more frequently attested,
Importantly, the ablaut of types (1) and (2) is meticulously kept distinct in Homeric Greek—with the sole exception of Κρονίων. In Homer, type (2) is residual; apart from Κρονίων it is attested only in a few names (Ἀρίων, Ἀμφίων, Ἰξιόνιος, Μολίσε, perhaps Ὑπερίων) and in the invective κυλλοποδίων ‘lame-foot’ (nickname of Hephaestus). These names are not patronymics, but sobriquets; in most cases, they look like truncated forms of compounds with a first member in -ι-.168

Secondly, assuming that only the patronymic Κρονίων -ίωνος (with metrical lengthening of iota in the nominative) is old would mean that the genitive form Κρονίονος was secondarily formed. This is, however, unlikely given the predominance of the long-vowel stem Κρονίων. It was rather the stem with long iota that was being replaced: as we have seen, after the trochaic caesura Κρόνου παίς was in the process of replacing Κρονίων in the Iliad. Thus, Κρονίονος looks like a retained archaism, and a fortiori the coexistence of both stem-forms is a relic. Note that Pindar, the only non-epic author to use Κρονίων, uses only the nominative form, both with long and short iota.171

Thirdly, there is an interesting distribution between both stems: while formulae with Κρονίωνα, Κρονίωνος, Κρονίωνι are usually accompanied by an inflected case-form of Ζεύς earlier in the same sentence, the frequent nom. sg. Κρονίων usually stands on its own, and refers to Zeus by itself.

168 Perhaps also in βραχίων ‘upper arm’ if this was originally an invective ‘shorty’ (see section 6.9.5).
169 For instance, Ἰξίων may be thought to derive from a verbal governing compound with first member *hiksi- (ἱκέτης ‘supplicant’: the mythological figure Ἰξίων was the first one to supplicate Zeus), Ἀρίων from a compound with first member ἀρι- , and Ἀμφίων from a prepositional compound with ἀμφι-.
170 A final remarkable difference is the following. Upon 38 verse-final cases of the nom. sg. Κρονίων, the form Ζεύς never occurs earlier in the same verse, with only one exception (Od. 21.102). In three of the four non-verse-final instances, Κρονίων stands in apposition to a preceding Ζεύς (Od. 17.424 = 19.80, 20.273; without Ζεύς in ll. 17.269). This shows that verse-final Κρονίων was originally used without a preceding Ζεύς (thus always in the Iliad). On the other hand, the patronymics Κρονίων- and Κρονίδης are regularly accompanied by forms of Ζεύς.
171 The -ι- of Κρονίων 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.
For these reasons, I suggest that nom. Κρονίων (gen. Κρονίονος) belongs to the derivational type in *‑ίον‑, whereas acc. Κρονίωνα (etc.) is a patronymic in -iōn-. The attested nom. Κρονίων was originally not a patronymic, but a sobriquet derived from a form starting with *⁵kr̥n‑ or *⁵kr̥ni‑, possibly a compound. Though its further etymology, unfortunately, remains uncertain, only an analysis involving *⁵r̥ allows us to explain the structural McI scansion. When Epic *⁵r̥ was eliminated, *⁵Kr̥nιόν would have developed to *Κρανίων according to the rules posited in this chapter. We may assume that this *⁵Kr̥nιόν was reshaped as Κρονίων once the nickname was identified with the patronymic Κρονίων‑ ‘son of Kronos’, which had never contained a syllabic liquid. Note that the ongoing replacement of Κρονίων by Κρόνου πάϊς after the trochaic caesura presupposes that this identification was made.

This scenario involving two etymologically different words may look overly complicated, but I feel that the metrical evidence asks for such a drastic solution.

7.3.7 κροαίνω
In Homer, the verb κροαίνω is attested only in a simile (Il. 6.506–511, repeated verbatim at Il. 15.263–268) that starts as follows:

ὡς δ’ ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνη
dεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείῃ πεδίοιο κροαίνων
eἰσώθως λούεσθαι ἑὔρρειος ποταμοῖο

Il. 6.506–508

As when a stalled horse that has fed its fill at the manger breaks its halter and runs κροαίνων across the plain, being used to bathe in the river with its beautiful streams (...).

The context of the simile does not allow us to recover the precise meaning of κροαίνων. This is reflected in the diverging opinions of scholiasts and ancient grammarians: some connect κροαίνων with κρούω ‘to stamp’ or with κροτέω ‘to stamp the feet’, and take πεδίοιο as a genitivus loci with θείῃ; others interpret πεδίοιο as a complement of κροαίνων, and translate this phrase as ‘longing (ἐπιθυμῶν) for the plain’. Later Greek does not help in narrowing down the meaning:

172 From a phonological perspective, there is one obvious candidate: PIE *⁵kr̥no‑ ‘horn’, attested in Germanic, Celtic, and Italic (Lat. cornu). An original meaning ‘horny’ might fit the adulterous character of Zeus, but of course, this remains pure speculation.
after Homer, the word is used only by Oppian (κροαίνοντες πεδίοιο Cyn. 1.279, clearly based on the Homeric phrase).

In terms of formulaic language, the hemistich πολέος πεδίοι θέουσαι (Il. 4.244), in which a participle form of θέω takes the place of κροαίνων. The etymology of κροαίνω is problematic, too. It is mostly thought to be related within Greek to κρούω ‘to beat, stamp’, which has possible Slavic cognates (e.g. Ru. krušit’ ‘to stamp, pound’, kroxa ‘crumble’; see GEW s.v. κρούω, reconstructing a PIE root *krous-). This reconstruction requires that Homeric κροαίνω arose from *krọ̄u̯ai̯ne/o‑ by prevocalic shortening after digamma loss. The suffix -αίνω might have been taken over from a few other verbs with comparable semantics (μενεαίνω ‘to rage’, βλεμεαίνω ‘to exult’, κραδαίνω ‘to brandish’). It is remarkable, however, that these verbs are all epic, while the assumed prevocalic shortening is a late development of the Ionic vernacular.

Thus, the value of the quasi-hapax κροαίνων in our present discussion is problematic: it is unclear what the pre-form was, and the meaning is not entirely certain. Therefore, the scansion of κροαίνων is best viewed as an incidental instance of McL.

173 It is unlikely, given the context of the simile, that θείη reflects an aorist subjunctive form * dheu̯-e/o-. Moreover, no other aorist forms of θέω are attested in Greek (except for a very late instance), and the Vedic cognate dhā́vati does not form an old aorist either. Moreover, δραμεῖν is the normal aorist beside θέω, both in Hom. and Hdt. (see Kölligan 2007a: 186–193). The verb thus appears to be atelic in origin. It has been assumed that θείω reflects an alternative present formation *dheu̯-je/o- beside *dheu̯-e/o- (e.g. LIV2), and Kölligan (2007b: 195) derives θείω from a lengthened grade (‘Narten’) present *dheu̯-e/o-. A third possibility, which is more likely in my view, is that the variant θείω arose within Epic Greek (cf. already Chantraine 1958: 346 and 492). The idea is that 6 out of 8 attestations of θείω concern the pres. inf. θείειν, which always occurs before a consonant, with the root syllable θει‑ occupying the thesis. This infinitive may be reconstructed as *tʰeueken, whose ending *-eun was retained within Epic Greek after the contraction to -ēn in the vernacular. After the subsequent digamma loss and contraction of *-eue-, the ensuing form *tʰeien was eventually replaced with tʰeien, written θείειν, with the normal infinitive ending. The subjunctive θείη in our repeated verse (the only remaining evidence for θείω) may have been based on this infinitive. If this is correct, the verse containing κροαίνων is a recent creation.
7.4 Conclusions

We started this chapter with the question whether an Aeolic origin may account for Homeric words with *ᵣ ~ -rho-, or whether these words are better explained within the framework proposed in chapter 6. There are two general arguments against an Aeolic origin. First, and crucially, an Aeolic origin does not explain the McI scansion found in most such words. Secondly, some of the words in question (e.g. βροτός) are in fact unattested in Aeolic poetry, or they cannot be Aeolic for morphological reasons and have characteristics that are more reminiscent of Mycenaean or a similar dialect (e.g. ἀνδρείφόντη).

Having reviewed the evidence in this chapter, we may conclude that there is indeed a correlation between -rho- in typical Homeric words and a preceding labial consonant. The clearest cases are βροτός < *mr̥tó- and its various derivatives, ήμμβροτον < *āmyton and ἀβροτάξεμεν. Furthermore, I have argued that Ἀφροδίτη, ὅδειντ-, πρός (plus πρόσω and πρόσωπον) and perhaps πρόξ also derive from pre-forms with *ᵣ (*Aphr̥dītā, *u̯r̥dou̯ent-, *pr̥t̥- and *pr̥k-). These reconstructions allow us to explain the existence of by-forms with -or- in other dialects (Cretan Αφορδιτα, πορτι; Myc. wo-do-we) without taking recourse to liquid metathesis, to avoid positing unlikely analogical developments (πρόξ), and most importantly, to explain the structural occurrence of McI scansion in Ἀφροδίτη (word-internal), πρός, πρόσω and πρόσωπον.

As for the counterevidence to the claim that ρο is a conditioned reflex of Epic *ᵣ, the metrical behavior of θρόνος in the Odyssey can be secondary, and its pre-form probably did not contain *ᵣ. In ἀνδροτῆτα, the reflex -rho- instead of expected -rho- is probably due to a recent reshaping, as in some other words with ἀνδρο-. We also find a reflex of *ᵣ in Κρονίων, but the etymology of this name is unknown, and I have argued that Κρονίων -ονος < *Kρ̥n̥ion- and Κρονίων -ωνος < *Kρ̥n̥ion- were originally two different words. I assume that the regular reflex of *Kρ̥n̥ion- was influenced by *Kρ̥n̥ion-.

It is therefore possible to posit a conditioned development Epic *ᵣ > -rho- after labials, but -rho- elsewhere. This phonetically natural development was not paralleled in the Proto-Ionic vernacular, where a-coloring is regular also after labial consonants (cf. ἁμαρτεῖν beside Epic ἠμμβροτον, ἠβροτάξεμεν). This shows that an independent phonetic change took place within Epic Greek, posterior to the Proto-Ionic vocalization *ᵣ > -ar-. The Cretan parallel for preceding labials as a conditioning factor is not pertinent: in Cretan the anaptyctic vowel developed before the liquid, in Epic Greek after the liquid.

---

174 On the problematic reflex -or- in Att. πόρρω < πόρσω < *pr̥sō, see section 9.3.
Another important issue for which a solution has been proposed in this chapter is the irregular scansion of ἀνδροτῆτα and ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ, which has divided Homeric scholarship for a long time. This scansion is explained in a natural way by positing Epic *r̥. The developments can be schematically represented as in Table 21.

It is likely that forms of the type μροτο‑ were sung by the Iliad and Odyssey poets and that βροτός, though ubiquitous in the textual transmission of the epics, developed only after the monumental compositions had taken shape. Forms like ἀβρότη resulted from the syllabification /a.mro/, with a light initial syllable and no epenthetetic stop. It is conceivable that the situation for *nr (from *nr̥) was similar, i.e. that the ‘monumental composer’ of the Iliad still sang /a.nra.tā.ta/ and /a.nra.pʰon.tāi/, or respective forms with /a.nro-/ . The lack of consonant epenthesis in *nr that developed from *nr̥ within Epic Greek can be explained by relative chronology; compare the developments shown in Table 22.

The new scenario resolves various issues at once. It explains the divergent vowel slot of various Homeric words containing -rho- or -rho-, but also the aberrant scansion of many of these words, in particular those with word-internal
McL (Ἀφροδίτη, ἀβροτάξομεν, νῦξ ἀβρότη, ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης) and the forms ἀνδροτήτα, ἀνδρεῖφόντη. Finally, it explains the occurrence of προκείμενα < *pr̥-keimena, a word that would never have been integrated into a vernacular as long as the verb παρατίθημι, παράκειμαι was current. It must have arisen artificially within the formulaic verse in which it occurs, and is comparable to the case of τραπείσομεν discussed in chapter 6.

As for the dialect from which the forms with *r entered the epic tradition, for some words this may well have been Mycenaean, as Heubeck (1972) already suggested. The following epic forms have a remarkable parallel in Mycenaean: τράπεζα ~ Myc. to-pe-za, ἀνδρεῖφόντη ~ Myc. pn a-no-go-ta, ῥοδόεντι ~ Myc. wo-do-wo, and cf. also ἀνδροκτασίη beside Myc. a-no-qa-si-ja. On the other hand, there are no Homeric forms with -or < *r. Now, in chapter 2, we concluded from a scrutiny of the entire evidence that the regular Mycenaean reflex of *r was certainly not -ro-, but either -or- or retained -r-. If we suppose that the regular outcome is -or-, it would follow that the forms just quoted do not come from Mycenaean, but from some other dialect which retained *r. Though this cannot be completely excluded, it would be a highly artificial assumption. It is therefore probable that Mycenaean preserved *r. Note that the development *r > -po- in Proto-Aeolic (cf. chapter 3) must have already taken place in the 12th century or earlier.