CHAPTER 8

The Reflexes -αρ- and -ρα- in Aorist Stems

Introduction

Since most Greek aorist stems have an etymological zero-grade root, the aorist is an important source of reflexes of *r. Although the extent to which thematic and reduplicated aorists reflect PIE formations may be debated, it is certain that reconstructions like *likw-e/o- (λιπεῖν) and *dfrk-e/o- (δρακεῖν) pre-date the vocalization of the syllabic liquids.

8.1 The Evidence

Aorists with a root of the phonological shape /CraC-/ are presented in Table 23 (when attested in Homer, no first attestation is indicated) on p. 357.1 Aorist stems (attested in Homer, classical Attic or both) with a root of the phonological shape /CarC-/ are presented in Table 24 (on p. 358).

Of the verbs mentioned in these Tables, the following forms have no bearing on the issue of the double reflex of *r in Ionic-Attic:

- In six aorist stems, the reflex of *r may have been influenced by the full grade in a corresponding present or perfect stem: ἔδραμον (‑δέδρομε), δραπών (δρέπω), ἔπαρδον (πέρδομαι), ἐτάρπην, ταρπώμεθα and τετάρπετο (τέρπομαι), ἔτραπον (τρέπω), ἔτραφην and ἔτραφον (τρέφω).
- No conclusions regarding the regular Ionic-Attic vocalization of *r can be based on the form ἔπραδες in Sophron, the 5th c. Syracusan poet who composed mimes in a form of literary Doric.2 The normal aorist of Attic πέρδομαι ‘to fart’ was ἔπαρδον (mostly with preverb). On the other hand, for assessing the regular vocalization in Syracusan or Corinthian the form ἔπραδες is highly relevant (see chapter 3).
- The Homeric hapax ἀνέκραγον (Od. 14.467) contains a secondary zero grade beside the full grade CRāC- in the pf. χέκραγα, which is either onomatopoetic

---

1 On the intr. aor. 3pl. βλάβεν, which may contain the regular reflex of *l or have introduced the reflex of a vocalized nasal from the present βλάβομαι, see section 10.3.1.
2 Sophron’s fragment is known through Hesychius ν 734. In addition, the Suda has the forms ἐπράδει, ἐπράδειν (without dialect indication), which look like imperfects of a contract verb.
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or reflects a root *krh₂g-. The model for such a reshaping was provided by roots of the shape *Ceh₂C-, e.g. πήγνυμι, ἐπάγγην.

- Another secondary zero grade is ὑπερράγη, which stands beside the root ῥηγ- < *yreh₁g- (LIV² 698).

- The relation between the present stem τρώγω and aorist stem ἔτραγον cannot be understood in terms of Indo-European morphophonology. Assuming ὸ-vocalism in a thematic root present would be entirely unmotivated. Hackstein (1995; taken over by LIV²: 647) reconstructs a PIE root *trh₃g- on the basis of a comparison with Toch. B treshām ‘chews’; in this case, the zero-grade vocalism of ἔτραγον must be secondary. If one insists on reconstructing a Proto-Greek thematic aorist stem *try-e/-o-, the vowel slot of τραχ- may have been influenced by that of the present stem τρώγω. However, the vocalism of ἔτραγον may also have been influenced by its near-synonym ἔφαγον.

- Homeric ἔβραχε does not have a convincing etymology; it is therefore uncertain whether its pre-form contained *r.

- The Homeric aorist ἔχραον ‘dashed, attacked’ has no ascertained cognates either (its relation with χραύω ‘to glance off’ is uncertain), and there is no indication that the pre-form contained *r.

- The same holds for πέφραδε, which belongs to a non-ablauting root φραδ- without established etymology.

- The Homeric reduplicated aorist τετάρπετο and the 1st plural subjunctive forms τραπείομεν < *tr̥pē-o-men and ταρπώμεθα (all belonging to τέρπομαι) have been discussed in section 6.8.5. It was shown there that ταρπώμεθα and τετάρπετο may be analogical creations, and that τραπείομεν has the reflex -ρα- of Epic *r.

This leaves us with three Homeric aorists with a root of the shape /CraC-/ (from *CrC-e/o- that cannot be an analogical reflex: ἔδραθον (no cognates with a full grade root), ἔδρακον (δέρκομαι) and ἔπραθον (πέρθω). At first sight they seem to contradict our hypothesis that -αρ- is the regular Proto-Ionic reflex of *r.

There are, however, serious reasons to doubt that -αρ- is the vernacular outcome of *r in these three thematic aorists. First of all, as we will see it is difficult to give a convincing analogical explanation for the reflex -αρ- in Attic κατέδαρ-
### Table 23: Aorist formations with -ρα- in Greek

| Aorist with -ρα- | Other attested formations |
|------------------|---------------------------|
| ἔβραχε 'resounded' | no clear cognates |
| κατέδραθον 'went to sleep' | Att. καταδαρθάνων, aor. κατέδραθον |
| ἐδρακόν 'beheld, looked' | pres. δέρκομαι 'look', pf. δέδορκα |
| ἐδραμον 'ran' | pf. ἰνα-, ἐπι-δέδρομε 'runs up / over' |
| ptc. δραπών (Pi.)⁵ | pres. δρέπω 'reap' |
| ἄνεκραγόν 'spoke up' | pf. κέκραγε 'shrieks' (post-Hom.) |
| ἐπραδές (Sophr.)⁶ | pres. πέρδομαι 'fart', aor. ἔπαρδον |
| ἐπραθόν 'pillaged' | pres. πέρδοψ 'pillage, destroy' |
| (ὑπ-)ερράγη 'broke up' | pres. βήγνυμι 'break', pf. ἔρρωγα |
| ἐτραγόν 'ate' | pres. τρόγω 'gnaw, chew, eat' |
| τραπείομεν 1pl. subj. < *tr̥pē-o-men | pres. τέρπομαι 'to enjoy oneself' |
| ἔτραπον 'was raised, grew up' | pres. τρέψω 'turn, direct', pf. mid.-pass. τέτραπται |
| ἔτραφον 'dashed, attacked' (?) | pres. τρέφω 'rear' |
| ἐτράφην 'id.; got thick/fat, etc.' | mid. τρέφομαι 'get thick/fat, etc.' |
| πέφραν 'showed' | pres. φράζω 'show', φράζομαι 'notice' |
| ἔχραον 'dashed, attacked' (?) | pres. χραύω 'to glance off' |

βον and ἥμαρτον (Hom. ἅμαρτε). Secondly, and crucially, ἔδραθον, ἔδρακόν and ἐπραθόν are typical Homeric forms, unattested in Classical prose. For these reasons, we must consider the possibility that these forms contain the reflex of Epic *r̥, following the framework elaborated in chapter 6.⁷

I will now first argue that the forms κατέδαρθον and ἥμαρτον display the regular reflex of *r̥ in Proto-Ionic (section 8.2), then discuss the actual evidence for -ρα- < *r̥ in the type ἔδραθον (section 8.3), and finally explain how such forms may have come into being within Epic Greek (section 8.4).

---

⁵ Cf. also Aeol. aor. subj. 3pl. δρόμωσι.
⁶ The Liv² (s.v. *perd-*) reconstructs a PIE root aorist *perd- / pr̥d- on the basis of YAv. paradon and the Greek aorist aorist ἔπαρδον. It is remarked there that Kellens analyzed the Avestan form as a present; cf. also the doubts of Allan (2003: 209 n. 362) concerning the reconstruction of the PIE aorist. However this may be, the inner-Greek variation between Att. ἔπαρδον and the 2sg. aor. ind. ἐπραδές (attested in Sophron fr. 136 K-A) guarantees the antiquity of a zero-grade thematic aorist *pr̥d-e/o- within Greek.
⁷ Cf. in particular the table at the start of chapter 6.
8.2 The Regular Development *r > -αρ- in the Thematic Aorist

8.2.1 Homeric ἔδραθον versus Attic καταδαρθάνω, κατέδαρθον

In Homer, the thematic aorist ἔδραθον ‘went to sleep; slept’ is attested once as a simplex (Od. 20.143), but otherwise only with preverb: κατέδραθον (5 ×), παρέδραθον ‘lay down beside’ (2 ×).8 After Homer, the aorist stem δραθ‑ is found only in the epic poet Antimachus and later in Hellenistic poetry (Theoc., Call.). The only genuine Attic form, on the other hand, is κατέδαρθον ‘slept, fell asleep’ (attested in Attic prose and Aristophanes, but absent from Ionic prose). Thus, we have a genre distribution: ἔδραθον is epic, whereas κατεδαρθον is the non-poetic classical form.

Let us first consider whether the different vocalizations can be explained by influence of a full grade root. The thematic aorist κατεδαρθον / κατεδαρθον has no direct cognates, neither in Greek nor in other languages, and is therefore primary, at least from a Greek perspective. It could be an inherited formation in view of the similar Indo-European roots *drem‑ (cf. Lat. dormiō ’sleep’, CS drēmati ’doze, slumber’) and *dreH‑ (Ved. opt. 3sg. ni-drāyā́t ‘to sleep, slumber’).9 Thus, for the Greek aorist we may start from a zero grade root *dr̥dh‑.10

---

8 For the Homeric semantics, see the discussion in Kölligan (2007a: 173–179), especially his remark that ‘der ... Bedeutungsansatz ‘einschlafen’ lässt sich bei Homer nicht belegen. ἔδραθον bedeutet entweder ‘sich schlafen legen’ oder fungiert als komplexiver Aorist zu εὕδω und bedeutet dann ‘(eine Zeit lang) schlafen.’ (o.c. 174). In my view, the simplex ἔδραθον Od. 29.143 could be analyzed as in tmesis with the preceding ἐν ἀδεψήτῳ βοέῃ καὶ κώεσιν οἰῶν (line 142), cf. χλαῖναν ... καὶ κώεα, τοῖσιν ἐνεῦδεν (Od. 29.95), and also Od. 3.349–351, Od. 10.11–12. This means that ἔδραθον is attested only as a compound.

9 CS drēmati derives from a lengthened grade formation *drēm‑ (see EDSIL, q.v.).

10 Note that Attic -δαρθ‑ excludes a reconstruction *drm‑drh‑ for Hom. ἔδραθον.
Is it possible to determine the full grade slot of this root? In the *LIV*, Kümmel mechanically reconstructs a root *dṛdh-*, adding the comment: “für Vollstufe i spricht die analogische R(z) gr. att. δαρθ-.” However, although δαρθ- is attested earlier, it does not follow that δαρθ- arose as a reshaping. On the contrary, given the full grade slot of the Indo-European root variants *drem- and *dṛdh- just mentioned, one could argue for an original full grade *dṛdh-*, in which case Attic δαρθ- must be the regular outcome of *dṛdh-.

In any case, to invoke the influence of a hypothetical ablauting full grade form is unwarranted: the only old formation within Greek is the non-ablauting thematic aorist, PGr. *dr̥t h-e/o-. This aorist was used in suppletion with εὕδω (Homer), καθεύδω (Classical Attic); beside this stative present, the aorist has complexive value. As Kölligan (2007a: 172) notes, the first author to attest the paradigm καταδαρθάνω : κατέδαρθον ‘to fall asleep’ is Plato, who uses the new present stem to specifically refer to catching sleep as an ongoing process.11 That is, καταδαρθάνω was based on the ingressive reading of the aorist κατεδάρθον, and is therefore unlikely to be of high antiquity. The same holds, mutatis mutandis, for the intransitive aorist καταδαρθῆναι.

Thus, the only form reconstructible for Proto-Ionic is the thematic aorist. Even if κατεδαρθον does not occur before the fifth century, it must be the regular reflex of PGr. *-dr̥t h-e/o- in the Attic vernacular.12 The variant ἔδραθον, on the other hand, must have an artificial epic reflex (see section 8.4 below).

8.2.2 ἁμαρτάνω, aor. ἥμαρτον and Homeric ἱμμύρσουν

The present ἁμαρτάνω and the thematic aorist ἥμαρτον (ἁμαρτεῖν) are attested in Homer and Classical Ionic and Attic alike. Beside these forms, Homer also has an aorist ἤμβροτον, with an o-colored reflex that cannot have originated in the Proto-Ionic vernacular.13 Most scholars have explained the vowel slot of ἥμαρτον as analogical, invoking analogy with the full grade attested in νημερτής ‘unfailing’. This is an emergency solution, because νημερτής is a fossilized nominal compound, attested only in early Greek epic and three times in Aeschylus. Since a relic nominal form can hardly be expected to have influenced the shape of the verbal stem in

11 See Kölligan (2007a: 181–182): “Gegenüber dem homerischen Zustand, in dem εὕδω und ἔδραθον sowohl in der Bedeutung ‘schlafen’ als auch ‘sich schlafen legen’ belegt sind, findet sich seit klassischer Zeit bei ἔδραθον [sic; the only classical form is κατεδάρθον] zusätzlich die Bedeutung ‘einschlafen’.”
12 For this reason, O’Neil (1971: 19) is mistaken when he asserts that the Attic aorist -δαρθεῖν may have replaced the older form -δραθεῖν after the present -δαρθάνω.
13 The hapax ἀβροτάξομεν has already been discussed in chapter 7 and will be left out of further consideration here.
the vernacular, an analogical explanation of ἥμαρτον would be feasible only if full grade forms of the verb were still in use when *ᵣ vocalized in Proto-Ionic.

Such a scenario has in fact been proposed by Ruijgh (1992: 91). Being unable to explain the vocalization to -α‑ in δαιρθάνω, he assumed that the present secondarily acquired a zero grade root, replacing *δερθάνω. The alleged model for introducing this zero grade is the aorist ἔδραθον, which had a zero grade root all along. In a similar vein, Ruijgh claims that ἁμαρτάνω is secondary for *ἀμερτάνω after a hypothetical *ἄμ(β)ρατον, a form which itself was supposedly superseded by ἥμαρτον (after ἁμαρτάνω).

This scenario cannot be upheld. First of all, as we have just seen, the present καταδαιρθάνω is probably a late creation based on the aorist κατεδαιρόθην. Similarly, ἁμαρτάνω beside the aorist ἥμαρτον follows a productive pattern and looks like a relatively recent formation. Secondly, a full grade root would be out of place in an inherited nasal present: wherever such a full grade nasal present is attested, it must have been influenced by the aorist (cf. δείκνυμι ‘point out’ beside ἔδειξα, πέρνημι ‘sell’ beside ἐπέρασα).14 Thirdly, the assumed chain of analogical influences is too complicated to be credible: supposing the existence of an aorist *amrat-e/o‑, the a-vocalism would first have spread into the present stem, but maintaining a different vowel slot (άμαρτάνω); after that, the vowel slot of the present stem would have been introduced into the thematic aorist.

Clearly, scenarios like the one advocated by Ruijgh are developed only in order to maintain the claim that -α‑ (in forms like ἁμαρτεῖν) cannot be the regular reflex of *ᵣ. In reality, the only straightforward way to explain δαιρθάνω and ἁμαρτάνω is to assume that these presents were created (or reshaped) on the basis of the corresponding thematic aorists after the vocalization *ᵣ > -α‑ had taken place in Proto-Ionic. The vernacular form ἁμαρτάνω was then also introduced into Epic Greek.

It remains to explain the origin of epic ημβροτον, the alternative thematic aorist form. It is generally assumed to be of Aeolic origin, because an infinitive αμβροτην is attested in epigraphic Lesbian (see section 3.3.2). Indeed, thus far this has been the only way to make sense of the combined appearance in ημβροτον of the reflex -φο‑ < *ᵣ and psilosis. In section 7.2.4, however, I pointed out that ημβροτον can be analyzed as the regular epic reflex of an augmented preform *ἀμφτον. This *ἀμφτον was a traditional element of Epic Greek. In spoken Ionic-Attic, the same form vocalized with -α‑ and a non-etymological initial aspiration was added, yielding ἁμαρτάνω, ἥμαρτον. These vernacular forms were

14 Apart from κευθάνω and ληθάνω, all thematic nasal presents cited by Ruijgh have a zero grade root. In fact, both ληθάνει (verse-initial in Od. 7.221) and ἐκεύθανον (Il. 3.453) are hapax legomena that look like artificial extensions of λήθω and κεύθω, respectively.
introduced at some point into the epic tradition.\(^\text{15}\) When Epic \(^*\alpha\) developed to \(-\rho\)- after labial consonants, the ensuing form \(^*\alpha\varepsilon\mu\beta\rho\tau\omicron\ > \ \epsilon\mu\beta\rho\tau\omicron\) no longer resembled the Ionic aorist, so there was no reason to introduce the aspiration.

Thus, the similarity between epic \(\epsilon\mu\beta\rho\tau\omicron\) and Lesbian \(\alpha\mu\beta\rho\tau\omicron\) \((\alpha\mu\beta\rho\tau\omicron\) \(\nu\eta\mu\varepsilon\rho\tau\omicron\)) \(\text{might}\) be accidental. The pair \(\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\) beside \(\epsilon\mu\beta\rho\tau\omicron\) is another Homeric doublet consisting of an Ionic vernacular form and an artificial epic form \((\text{compare} \ xa\deltai\eta\ > \ xa\kappa\deltai\eta, \ te\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\ > \ te\tau\rho\tau\alpha\tau\omicron, \ etc.)\).

### 8.3 The Pattern of Attestation of the Thematic Aorists with \(-\rho\alpha\)-

If \(-\rho\alpha\)- is the regular outcome of \(^*\alpha\) in \(\epsilon\delta\alpha\rho\omicron\) and \(\eta\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\), the appearance of \(-\rho\alpha\)- in a number of other aorists must be accounted for. The focus of this section will be on the three forms singled out earlier in this chapter, \(\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\), \(\epsilon\delta\beta\rho\alpha\omicron\), and \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\theta\omicron\), in which \(-\rho\alpha\)- cannot be explained by a simple analogy with other verbal stems.

Before discussing these forms, let us first consider three other aorists where \(-\rho\alpha\)- is the expected analogical reshaping: \(\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha\μ\omicron\), \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\π\omicron\), and \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\). The first two regularly occur from Homer onwards, and must have been present in Proto-Ionic. The transitive active \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\π\omicron\) was replaced in Classical Greek by the sigmatic form \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\psi\omicron\), but the middle \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\π\omicron\) remained current as an intransitive counterpart denoting body motion.

The antiquity and provenance of the third form, \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\) ‘grew up, was reared’ \((\text{beside Hom. and Class.} \ \epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\ ‘id.’)\), are less clear. West (1998: xxxvi) thinks the thematic form is old and pleads, following an old proposal by Buttman, for restoring \(3\text{sg.} \ \tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\), \(3\text{pl.} \ \tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\) in place of \(3\text{sg.} \ \tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron, \ 3\text{pl.} \ \tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\) in the Homeric text \((\text{in many places against the entire tradition).} \) It is true that the thematic aorist looks old in the verse-end \(\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\epsilon\tau \ \tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\ \tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\ \text{‘to be born and raised’} \ (2 \times \text{Il.}, 1 \times \text{Od.}).\) However, it is difficult to see why and how the vernacular form \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\) would have been created secondarily as a replacement for \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\). It is conceivable that there were originally two aorist stems, perhaps reflecting a semantic difference: \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\ ‘was raised’ versus \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\ ‘got thick’.\) Alternatively, \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\) could be a traditional form that came from a different dialect contributing to the epic language. Finally, \(\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\φ\omicron\) could be

\(^{15}\) It is not straightforward to indicate the origin of this aspiration, which may have been adopted from a different lexeme. Even so, the relic adjective \(\nu\eta\mu\varepsilon\rho\tau\omicron\ ‘unfailing’ shows that the aspiration cannot be old \((\text{cf.} \ \text{Beekes} \ 1969: 109)\).
viewed as an artificial creation of Epic Greek: the form is attested only there, and the normal vernacular form ἐτράφην was hard to use in the hexameter.\textsuperscript{16} We do find ἐτράφην in Epic Greek, but only before vowels in the 3pl. τράφεν, ἐτραφεν and the 3sg. τράφη.\textsuperscript{17}

8.3.1 ἔδρακον

It is customary to translate this Homeric verb with ‘to look, see’, but the situation is actually much more complex. Let us therefore consider the attestations and their semantics more closely.

In Homer, the present δέρκομαι ‘to look, gaze; behold’ (also with preverbs) denotes the volitional activity of directing one’s eyes at something: δεινὸν δέρκομαι (\textit{Il.} 3.342, cf. 23.815) denotes the “fearsome gaze” of warriors. The aorist appears mainly in combination with preverbs (ἀνα-, ἐσ-, δια-) and has complexive or ingressive value, as will be illustrated below. The perfect δέδορκα is stative and, combined with adverbials, means ‘to have a certain appearance’: cf. σμερδαλέον δὲ δέδορκεν ἑλισσόμενος περὶ χειῇ “and it [a snake] looks terrible as it crawls around in its lair” (\textit{Il.} 22.95).\textsuperscript{18} While δέρκομαι occasionally retains these meanings in later poetry, Classical Attic expresses the same types of events with βλέπω ‘to look, gaze; behold; to look like’ (see Kölligan 2007a: 273–274). Clearly, βλέπω (a verb without a decent etymology) has replaced the poetic archaism δέρκομαι.

Let us now consider the Homeric uses of the aorist more closely. There are two clear instances of an ingressive aorist:

\textsuperscript{16} A similar picture is shown by the intransitive aorist of βλάπτω, which is usually ἐβλάφην in Classical Ionic-Attic, but ἐβλάφην in Homer (with the exception, again, of the 3pl. forms βλάβεν, ἐβλαβεν). Perhaps, the θ- form was avoided in the case of τρέφω because it was too ambiguous (ἐτράφην, ἐτρέφθην could also be thought to belong to τρέφω; cf. τραφθῆναι at \textit{Od.} 15.83). In the case of βλάπτω, on the other hand, creating a thematic aorist may have been avoided in view of possible confusion with the archaic thematic root present βλάβωμαι.

\textsuperscript{17} At \textit{Il.} 23.84 van Thiel prints ἀλλ’ ὁμοῦ, ὡς ἐτράφημεν ἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισι (with McL); there is also a well-attested variant reading ἐτράφην περ (the reading of the vulgate). However, the problem is that Aeschines, \textit{Contra Timarchum} cites this passage with two plus-verses after line 83, and has our line 84 start with ὡς ὁμοῦ ἐτράφιμεν περ (ἐτράφιμεν περ conj. Scaliger). West prints ἀλλ’ ὁμοῦ, ὡς ἐτράφιμεν περ, a conjecture by Buttmann that was also accepted by La Roche. See for further discussion Richardson ad loc., with reference to Van der Valk.

\textsuperscript{18} The Homeric perfect can translated as “avoir telle ou telle expression dans le regard” (Chantraine 1927: 11), or “einen bestimmten Blick, Gesichtsausdruck haben” (Kölligan 2007a: 260). After Homer, the perfect occurs absolutely in the meanings ‘to be visible’ (e.g. κλέος… ἔδερκε, \textit{Pi. Ol.} 1.93) and, in the tragedians, ‘to have eyesight’ (as opposed to being blind).
the reflexes -αρ‑ and -ρα‑ in aorist stems

- ἀνέδρακον ‘looked up again’ (II. 14.436, of Hector who has just regained his conscience). The form is an archaism: ὄραω / εἶδον is not attested in combination with ἄνα-, and Classical Greek uses ἀναβλέπω.19
- ἐσέδρακον ἄντην ‘I looked [the god] in the face’ (II. 24.223).

The other four attestations are complexive aorists:
- When the maid Eurycleia tells how she tried to make eye contact with Penelope, she phrases this as follows: Πηνελόπειαν ἐσέδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν, πεφραδέ-/feed/ν ἐθέλουσα “I looked towards Penelope with my eyes, wishing to give her a sign” (Od. 19.476–477); this is a complexive use of the activity verb ἐσδέρκο-/feed/mai.
- καπνὸν ... ἔδρακον ... διὰ δρυμά τυκνᾶ καὶ ὕλην “I saw smoke through the thick forest” (Od. 10.197), where discerning the smoke is the result of a volitional action.
- ἐνθ' οὐ τις τὴν νήσον ἐσέδρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν “At that point, no one could see the island with his eyes” (Od. 9.146); again the subjects are performing a volitional action (trying to discern the island through a thick mist).
- συδ' ἄν νωτὶ διαδράκοι ‘Ἡλίος περ “not even Helios could discern us (through the clouds)” (II. 14.344).

There are indications that ἔδρακον and εἶδον ‘saw’ were occasionally used as metrical alternatives. Kölligan (2007a: 264–265) compares ἐσέδρακον ἄντην (II. 24.223) with ἄντην εἰσιδέειν (II. 19.15), and καπνὸν ... ἔδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι (Od. 10.197) with καπνὸν ... ὁρῶμεν (Od. 10.99), ἐπεὶ ἴδον αἴθοπα καπνόν (Od. 10.152). It seems as if the old form ἔδρακον was retained when corresponding forms of εἶδον were metrical problematic. This would account for the formulaic phrases |T ἀνέδρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι and |T ἐσέδρακεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι (2 ×): they were metrically distinct from the corresponding compounds of εἶδον. Interestingly, the instrumental dative ὀφθαλμοῖσι is not redundant in these cases, whereas it often seems superfluous when preceded by ἴδον. It is therefore possible that certain instances of the ptc. ἴδων are replacements of δρακών, which was metrically awkward as it required tautosyllabic scansion of δρ-. This would explain why so few remnants of the aorist ἔδρακον are left in Homer.

After Homer, ἔδρακον remains rare: there is only one attestation in Pindar (κατέδρακεν ‘looked down’ Nem. 4.23, again with preverb), one in Stesichorus (pts δ]ρακότισσα fr. Si35.9), and six cases in Aeschylus and Euripides.20 In addition, two alternative aorist formations are found: Pindar uses the participle δρακέντ- of the η-aorist; furthermore, ἐδέρχθην ‘looked at’ is attested seven times

19 See Kölligan (2007a: 264–265).
20 τούτου φέγγος ἥδιον δρακεῖν (A. Ag. 602), δεινὰ δʹ ὀφθαλμοῖς δρακεῖν (A. Eum. 34), γάς ᾶτης ὀμφαλὸν προσδρακεῖν (A. Eum. 166), ἄφυκτον ὄμμα προσδράκοι ([A.] PV 903b), ἄλλος εἰς ἄλλον
in Sophocles and the author of the *Prometheus Vinctus*. While the latter form is clearly an innovation on the basis of δέρκομαι, the Pindaric form δρακέντ- has played a prominent part in reconstructions of the PIE verbal paradigm. Since Forssman (1964), it is usually analyzed as deriving from an archaic PIE root aorist ptc. *dr̥ḱ-ént-. As I will argue below, however, δρακέντ- may have been created within Greek.

In sum, δέρκομαι often occurred with preverbs, especially in the aorist (cf. ἀνέδρακον, ἐσέδρακον, διαδράκοι) but also in the present stem (ποτιδέρκομαι *Il. 16.10, Od. 17.518, 20.385). The present stem refers to a volitional activity; the aorist has ingressive or complexive value, and the perfect denotes a state. Contrary to what is usually stated, the present stem δέρκομαι must be inherited from PIE. The restriction of the verb to poetic texts and the general paucity of attestations in post-Homeric Greek (even in poetry) are compatible with the assumption that ἔδρακον is an epicism. The low frequency of ἔδρακον in Epic Greek can be due to its ongoing replacement by εἶδον.

8.3.2 ἔπραθον and the Etymology of πέρθω
The verb πέρθω ‘to raze, pillage’ is a relic of Epic Greek and the poetic language; it is not attested in Classical prose. The normal verb derived from this root in Classical Attic, with the same meaning, is πορθέω. Given that its meaning is typical for heroic poetry, πέρθω may well be an epicism in authors like Pindar. I will therefore concentrate on the Homeric forms.

The most frequent stems in Homer are the thematic aorist ἔπραθον (9 ×, including prefixed forms) and especially the sigmatic stems aor. ἔπερσα, fut. πέρσω (35 ×, including prefixed forms). The only genuine attestation of the present stem is the dual πέρθοντε (*Il. 18.342), a precious archaism. As in Classi-
cal prose and poetry, the productive present stem formation was περθέω already in Homer (5×, including prefixed forms): the 3pl. impf. ἐπόρθεον (II. 4.308, with synizesis of εο) was preferred over ἔπερθον. The productive aorist stem περσα‑ may well be an innovation (cf. also the future πέρσω). Thus, the oldest paradigm seems to be pres. πέρθω, aor. ἔπραθον, fut. πέρσω.

The etymology of πέρθω is not quite clear. Janda (2000: 229–240, followed by LIV2 s.v. *bherdh‑) reconstructed *bher‑dh‑h1‑ “Beute machen” > erbeuten (i.e. ‘to seize as booty, capture’), where *bher‑ would be the root of φέρω ‘to carry’. Such an analysis is possible in theory, because several other Greek verbs (both presents and aorists) have an extension -θω. There are, however, no directly comparable formations in other IE languages that could confirm this idea. An important objection against Janda’s analysis is that the object of πέρθω is (with one exception) always a city, rather than the booty contained in it; the synchronic Homeric meaning is therefore ‘to raze, pillage’.

In fact, a number of post-Homeric attestations suggest that the meaning ‘to raze’ may have developed from ‘to cut off’, cf. especially κεφαλάν ἔπραθε φασγάνου ἀκμᾷ “[when] he cut off the head with the edge of his sword” (Pl. Pyth. 9.80–81), and καί μοι γενείου πέρθε λευκήρη τρίχα “cut the white hairs off my chin” (A. Pers. 1056). For this semantic development we may compare for instance κείρω, which according to LSJ (s.v.) occurs in the following meanings:

older thematic aorists *πάρθετο, *παρθομένη (see Chantraine 1958: 384 and 389–390, with further references). As for the hapax πέρθετο, Forssman (1997) agrees that this is an aorist formation, and suggests a conceivable scenario for its artificial creation. In addition, he argues that the aor. inf. πέρβαι is artificial. The participle περθομένη was probably an aorist, too, because it only occurs in conjunction with the aorist ptc. ἀλοῦσα. This leaves us with the dual form πέρθοντε as the only ascertained attestation of the present περθόν.

As for the motive to create the aorist stem περσ(α)‑, it is conceivable that the ptc. πέρθοντες was first made as an alternative for metrically problematic παρθομένης. For the root *bher‑, see Chantraine 1958: 384 and 389–390, with further references. As for the hapax πέρθετο, Forssman (1997) agrees that this is an aorist formation, and suggests a conceivable scenario for its artificial creation. In addition, he argues that the aor. inf. πέρβαι is artificial. The participle περθομένη was probably an aorist, too, because it only occurs in conjunction with the aorist ptc. ἀλοῦσα. This leaves us with the dual form πέρθοντε as the only ascertained attestation of the present πέρθον.

25 As for the motive to create the aorist stem περσ(α)‑, it is conceivable that the ptc. πέρθοντες was first made as an alternative for metrically problematic παρθομένης. 26 Cf. e.g. πλήθω ‘to be filled’, αἰσθέσθαι ‘to perceive’ < *h2eu̯is-dh(h1)‑e/o‑, λήθω ‘to go unnoticed, be hidden’, aor. λαθεῖν ‘to escape notice’; in all such cases, -θ‑ has become part of the verbal stem. 27 Janda’s comparison (2000: 240) between ἥ φέροιεν ὥ χεν ἤγοιεν (II. 5.484) and τὴν δὲ διεπράθομεν τε καὶ ἤγομεν ἐνθάδε πάντα (II. 1.367) does not prove anything: in the second phrase, the object of διεπράθομεν is a city which is stripped of all its valuables, that of ἤγομεν the possessions contained in it. The single attestation of bháre dhā‑ in the Rigveda (Janda 2000: 241) does not prove anything either. 28 Cf. LSJ s.v. πέρθω: “in Hom. only of towns”; s.v. διαπέρθω: “always of cities”. The only exception occurs with ἐκπέρθω: τὰ μὲν πολίων ἐξεπράτθησαν ‘that [booty] which we took from cities’, II. 1.125. Janda puts too much emphasis on this single instance: usually ἐκπέρθω (like ἐξαλαπάζω ‘id.’) governs an accusative object, which shows that the preverb ἐκ‑ has no spatial value.
1. “cut short, shear, clip, esp. of hair”;
2. “cut down” (of trees), whence “ravage a country, esp. by cutting down crops and fruit-trees” (thus in Hdt., Th.);
3. “generally, destroy, consume”.

Thus, if the verb’s original meaning was ‘to cut off’, especially of hairs and plants, the development of meaning to ‘raze’ (of cities) is straightforward. In PIE terms, we would have to posit a verbal root *bʰerdʰ- meaning ‘to shear, lop’ (of hairs, crops, foliage). Interestingly, there is perhaps further evidence for such a root in Italic: Umbrian furfa- denotes an action carried out on sheep as a direct object, and has consequently been translated as ‘shear’ (cf. Meiser 1986: 101). What is more, the noun for ‘beard’, reflected only in European branches (e.g. OPr. bordus, Lith. barzdà, Ru. borodá, OHG bart), can also be derived from this root. This would semantically be very attractive: the original meaning would be something like ‘haircut’ (cf. again γενείου πέρθε ... τρίχα, just quoted from Aeschylus). The internal sibilant of Lithuanian barzdà complicates the reconstruction, but we may posit a root *bʰersdh- and assume that Greek lost the sibilant in the e-graded root (*pʰerstʰ- > *pʰertʰ-), after which the aorist *pʰr̥stʰ- may have been changed along to *pʰr̥th-.31

Irrespective of the etymology just proposed, the thematic aorist ἐπραθον is old within Greek and its zero grade reflex requires an explanation. In what follows, it will be of some importance that this form occurs either with a preverb (δια- 6 ×, ἐξ- 1 ×) or in the phrase πόλιν ἐπραθον (2 ×).

8.3.3 Conclusion

The aorist forms with -ρα- in which Homer deviates from Classical Ionic and Attic are limited to poetry, and rarely attested outside of epic. The forms ἐδραθον and τραπείομεν are exclusively epic. After Homer and before the end of the Classical period, the aorist ἐπραθον is found only in Pindar (4 ×) and Corinna (1 ×), while ἐδρακον is attested only in Pindar, Stesichorus (each 1 ×) and the tragedians (6 ×).32 However, the last two forms also compete with other formations

29 Another semantic development undergone by πέρθω is to ‘destroy, slay’, cf. Τιρύνθιον ἐπέρθαν ... στρατόν (Pi. Ol. 10.32), ἐπερσίαν ἀνθρώπους (S. Aj. 1198).
30 Lat. forfex ‘tongs, pincers; shears, scissors’ is semantically close, but its -rf- cannot be the result of regular sound change in Latin, so it could be a borrowing (from a Sabellic language? See ELDS s.v. forfex). De Vaan (l.c.) also compares the Umbrian form furfa- to Greek πέρθω, but does not comment on the semantics, which makes the proposal gratuitous.
31 The phonology of Lat. barba ‘beard’ (word-initial b-; a-vocalism) is not well understood, and its analysis remains uncertain.
32 After the Classical period, ἐδραθον and ἐδρακον are used exclusively in Hellenistic poetry, and ἐπραθον is no longer current.
the reflexes -αρ‑ and -ρα‑ in aorist stems. It is therefore plausible that the thematic aorists with -ρα‑ are epicisms.

8.4 Epic *r in the Thematic Aorist?

No analogical account of the reflex -αρ‑ in the prose forms κατέδαρθον (Attic) and ώμαρτον (Ionic and Attic) seems within reach. On the other hand, ex hypothesis the forms ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον, ἔπραθον cannot have the regular Ionic outcome of *r. We must therefore consider the possibility that -ρα‑ in the poetic forms ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον, ἔπραθον is an artificial epic reflex, as in τραπείομεν. This idea receives support from the distribution between δαρθ‑ (Attic prose) and δραθ‑ (only epic). The pair ώμαρτον (Attic, Ionic and epic) versus ώμβροτον (epic) can also be interpreted in this way.

I can see two basic ways to account for an artificial reflex -ρα‑ in ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον and ἔπραθον: (i) -ρα‑ in these aorists reflects Epic *r; (ii) it arose as a secondary reshaping of -ρο‑, which was the regular reflex of *r in varieties of Aeolic that contributed to the tradition at an early stage. Before investigating these possible scenarios in more detail, it is necessary to consider the distributions and rhythmical behavior of these aorist stems.

8.4.1 Distributions and Metrical Behavior of Thematic Aorists with -ρα‑

As argued in chapter 6, the one-time presence of Epic *r in a specific Homeric form can be assumed if it is plausible that the lexeme in question was absent from the vernacular at an early date (e.g. κραταιός) or if there was a plausible motive for not introducing the vernacular form (e.g. metrically awkward καρβίη). Since there would have been no motive for avoiding forms like κατέδαρθον, *ἔδαρκον and *ἔπαρθον on the basis of their rhythmical structure, we must assume that these forms no longer existed in Ionic when other forms with -αρ‑ became available for introduction into Epic Greek (such as the pre-forms of καρβίη, καρτερός, ταρφέες). This assumption is unproblematic for ἔδρακον and ἔπραθον which, as we have seen, are poetic relic forms.

More remarkable is the coexistence of Attic κατέδαρθον and Epic ἔδραθον. The Attic form presupposes that Proto-Ionic preserved this word when *r developed into -αρ‑. Ionic prose, however, preserves no trace of this verb: Herodotus and the Hippocratic Corpus use the aorist κατεκοιμήθην ‘to go to sleep’, an innovative form that also occurs in Homer but is absent from Attic prose. It therefore seems that the vernaculars of Homer and his immediate Ionian predecessors had already lost κατέδαρθον (and replaced it by κατεκοιμήθην), but also that the tradition resisted the introduction of Ionic forms at an earlier stage, when κατέ-
δράκων was still current in spoken Ionic. If this reasoning is correct, it shows that, at the stage when *r̥ had just developed to -αρ- in Proto-Ionic, Ionic was not yet the default language of epic poets.\(^{33}\)

Turning to prosodic issues concerning the active thematic aorists with -ρα-, the problems can be summarized as follows: the rhythmical behavior of these forms is at odds with a prolonged presence of *r̥, but their phonological reflex -ρα- (instead of expected -αρ-) is explained most naturally as the regular outcome of Epic *r̥.

One prosodic issue is that we find no traces of McL scansion in the thematic aorists with -ρα-. This means that participle forms such as δρακών, δρακόντος are unattested. Given the large number of attestations of these aorists, this is probably not due to chance: apparently the forms with McL were actively avoided, in line with the general tendency to avoid McL when possible (cf. chapters 6 and 7, especially concerning βροτός and its derivatives).\(^{34}\) Nevertheless, one wonders why δρακών and similar participle forms were apparently disallowed, while traditional epic forms like δράκων ‘snake’ and βροτοῖσι were tolerated.

This distribution between forms with McL and forms without McL would receive a natural explanation if we assume that the thematic aorists with -ρα- arose from a reshaping of earlier Aeolic forms with -ρο-, while δράκων ‘snake’ and βροτοῖσι continue pre-forms with Epic *r̥. On the other hand, the distribution does not by itself exclude that the pre-forms of ἔδρακον, ἔδρακον, ἐπραθον had Epic *r̥. For one thing, it is conceivable that poets found a workaround for undesired McL scansion in the thematic aorists, but not in the case of δράκων ‘snake’ and βροτοῖσι. For instance, as we have just seen it is plausible that δρακών was replaced by ἰδών. Another relevant factor is that word-internal McL (in augmented indicatives like ἔδρακον and in prefixed forms) was much more strongly avoided than word-initial McL (in δράκων and βροτοῖσι).

---

33 This does not imply the existence of an Aeolic phrase. However, I am no longer certain of the claim (which I made in Van Beek 2013) that there was an uninterrupted Ionian tradition. In the wake of works like Hooker 1977 and Hoekstra 1981, I would now rather assume a conservative poetic language that was preserved from Mycenaean times, containing both Mycenaean and (continental) Aeolic elements. During the Dark Ages this traditional language became popular especially with Ionian poets, who introduced forms with αρ < *r̥ such as χαρτερός, ταρφέες and χάρμη. At a certain point, probably in the 9th or 8th c. BCE, they also started to modernize or update the language more structurally. This would be a natural period in which to date the vocalization of Epic *r̥.

34 The middle aorist τραπέσθαι is used 7 × with McL (see section 6.8.9); note that this form may have been protected against replacement because it also remained current in the vernacular.
Another noteworthy prosodic fact concerns the opportunity to generate length by position. This option is widely used in all thematic aorists under discussion, especially in forms with augment and/or preverb such as κατεδράθον, διαδράκοι, ἔτραπετ(ο). Again, this behavior seems to be at odds with the idea that pre-forms of these aorists had Epic *r̥. The same issue is at play in κρατερός ‘fierce’, which seems to reflect a pre-form with Epic *r̥ (given its reflex -ρα- < *r̥), but at the same time has an onset that often generates length by position. On the other hand, we have seen that κραδίη < *krdiā- and βροτός < *myto- were hardly used to generate length by position.35 Again, the high number of attestations of κραδίη, κρατερός and βροτός virtually excludes a coincidence.

Let us zoom in on κραδίη versus κρατερός. Given the high number of attestations of both forms, the difference in their rhythmical behavior cannot be due to chance. As argued in chapter 6, the precursor of κραδίη was retained unaltered in the form *krdiā- until Epic *r̥ developed into -ρα-. As for *kytérós, I propose that its root vocalism may have been influenced by the related form κρατύς, which had acquired -ρα- already in Proto-Ionic by analogical leveling (see chapters 4 and 5). Introducing the root shape κρατ- into *kytéró- was highly attractive, as it enabled poets to use κρατερός after words ending in a short vowel, including prepositions like κατά and ἐνί. This development also led to a marginalization of κρατύς, which is retained only in the name-epithet formula κρατύς Ἀργειφόντης. In *krdiā-, on the other hand, no model for an early introduction of -ρα- was available.

We will now consider whether the metrical behavior of thematic aorists like ἔδρακον can be explained like that of κρατερός, looking first at the reconstruction with Epic *r̥, and then turning to the possibility of an Ionicized Aeolic form.

### 8.4.2 A Possible Origin of -ρα- in ἔδρακον, ἔδραθον, ἔπραθον

Most of the approximately 60 active thematic aorist stems have a light root syllable before the thematic vowel.36 In such cases, the structure of the stem is VCVC-e/o- or CCVC-e/o-. Only the last two types are of interest here: at first, forms like *dr̥k-e/o- had the structure CCVC-e/o-, whereas the Homeric

---

35 See section 6.1 and 7.2.1, respectively.
36 The only exceptions to this claim are ἠλφόν, ἠλθόν (beside ἠλυθόν), εὕρον, ἔχραισμε, ἔειπόν, ἐπαυρεῖν, ὄλισθε(ν), ἐνεικα, and ἅμαρτε (see Risch 1974: 238 ff. for the Homeric forms). The only middle thematic aorist taken into consideration here is τράπετο ‘turned’. This is an exceptional case: whereas active thematic aorists normally have intransitive meaning, τράπε has a transitive meaning ‘turned, changed the direction of’, where the object is e.g. a horse or an enemy. There are no other middle thematic aorists of the same metrical structure.
outcome δρακε/ο‑ had the structure CCVC-e/o‑. If we reconstruct the pre-forms of these thematic aorists with Epic *r̥, the elimination of this sound would have changed the possibilities to use them in the epic hexameter quite drastically.

In order to show this, let us consider the token frequency and localization of the relevant thematic aorist forms, as summarized in Table 25. I have not included forms of ἔτραφον in view of the numerous variant readings such as aor. ἐτράφη or impf. ἔτρεφεν (see above), nor forms of τραπέσθαι with McL, of which the root syllable is placed in the 2nd half of the thesis. Thus, all forms included in the table have their root syllable in the 1st thesis syllable.

In ἔδραμον and ἔτραπον (active and middle), the Homeric stem is identical to that of the corresponding vernacular form. These two frequent stems account for 62 instances (72.9 %). Moreover, in both stems -ρα‑ was also present in the Ionic vernacular as the analogically restored reflex of *r̥. On the other hand, the stem of the other 23 instances (27.1 %) did not appear in the vernacular (ἔδρακον, ἔπραθον), or had a different shape there (ἔδραθον vs. Att. κατέδαιρ‑θον).

The high number of forms occurring in the fourth foot (54 ×, or 63.5 %) can be ascribed to two factors: a general tendency to put clause-final verb forms in
the reflexes -αρ‑ and -ρα‑ in aorist stems
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the fourth foot (cf. Parry 1971: 41) and the high number of forms with preverb (42 ×, or 49.4 %). I have listed such forms with preverb separately, as they strongly determine the localization: forms like ἀνέδρακον fit exactly between the third foot caesura and the bucolic dieresis, and they could hardly be used in other places.39 The augmented simplex forms (e.g. ἔδραμον, ἔτραπον), given their dactylic structure, naturally tend to occupy the 1st, 4th or 5th foot.40 Thus, the localization of the forms follows directly from their rhythmical structure. Note that only τραπε-/ο‑ is frequent as a simplex; the other four stems (δρακε/-ο‑, πραθε/-ο‑, δραθε/-ο‑, δραμε/-ο‑) mainly occur with preverbs, with 8 exceptions.41

In order to test the hypothesis that these thematic aorists had Epic *r̥, we must now ask how the prehistoric forms *dr̥ke, *dr̥me, *pr̥the and *tr̥kwe would have been used in epic verse. First of all, prefixed forms could not have been used in forms like *anedr̥ke or *epedr̥me, with four consecutive light syllables. Thus, if these stems were predominantly used with preverbs already at an early stage of the tradition, the question becomes how they could have been used at all.

At first sight, it seems that this problem could have been resolved by means of metrical lengthening of the second of four consecutive light syllables. Upon closer consideration, however, this idea appears to be problematic: there are no secure traces of a metrically lengthened augment with other roots of the structure *CVC-, where the same problem would have occurred.42 On the contrary, a different traditional means of creating heavy prefixed syllables appears to have been used, involving the apocopated preverbs κατ‑ and ἐκ‑. For instance,

39 In view of Hermann's bridge, prefixed forms are used in the fifth foot only when they are vowel-initial and preceded by a prepositive word, as in καὶ ἐσέδρακον ἄντην (Il. 24.223).
40 A similar distribution is found for ἔχραε 'attacked' (ἔχραε 3 × in the 5th foot, once verse-initially; ἔπέχραον 3 × in the 4th foot).
41 Most of these cases are in tmesis; they include the phrase πόλιν ἔπραθον (2 ×), ἔδραθ' ἐνὶ προδόμῳ (Od. 20.143, nowhere in later Greek), and ἔδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι (Od. 10.197), which looks like a truncated form of the second hemistichs ἀνέδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι and ἐσέδρακον ὀφθαλμοῖσι.
42 Even the phenomenon of ‘resonant lengthening’ cannot be adduced as a parallel. In ἔμμαθεν (Od. 17.226) and ἔμμαθες (Od. 18.362) as against μάθον (Il. 6.444) the phenomenon is exceptional and clearly secondary; the same holds for the non-etymological gemination in ἔλλαξε (h. Cer. 86 and 87), against which Homer only has ἔλαχον or λάχον without resonant lengthening. Contrast the metrical behavior of λιπε/-ο‑ ‘to leave’, where root-initial λ- generally counts as a single consonant (72 × λιπε/-ο‑ in the first thesis syllable, against only once ἔνὶ πτόλεϊ λίπετ' ἀνὴρ Il. 24.707). In ἔλλαβον ‘took’ the geminate reflects etymological *hl− < *sl−, and εὔαδε ‘it was agreeable’ reflects *e-hu̯ad-e. See Chantraine (1958: 176–177), and Eben (2004) for a more extensive discussion of ‘resonant lengthening’ in Homer.
in Homer ἱλιπε, ἐβολε, ἔπες. Likewise, ἐκφυγε + acc. functions as a metrical alternative for φύγε 'escaped'.

A second option, again merely theoretical, might have been to use alternative forms of the preverb in -αι-. Thus, a preverb παραι- (instead of παρα-, παρ-) appears in παραιπεπιθοῦσα, παραιφάμενος and in the nominal derivative παραιφασις. Therefore, we might in theory account for παρέδραθεν (Od. 20.88) and παραδραθείν (Il. 14.163) by positing a pre-form *parai-dr̥the. However, in Homer the alternative form with -αι- is practically limited to παραι-: the only exception is the compound καταιβαταί (Od. 13.110); the alternative form διαι- beside δια- first develops after Homer. Since the prefixed forms of δρακ‑ (ἀνέδρακον, δια‑δράκοι, ἐσέδρακον) and πραθ‑ (ἐξεπράθομεν, διαπραθέειν) never occur with παρα‑, they cannot reflect pre-forms in *-ai-.

In view of these problems, let us consider how the problem of using preverbs was solved with other thematic aorist indicatives to roots of the structure *CVC-. It is instructive to compare the aorist stem θορε/ο‑ 'to jump', because this is attested almost exclusively with preverb and semantically close to δραμε/ο‑. Its indicative is used mainly in two ways:

– with a prefixed preverb if this ended in a consonant: e.g. ὑπέρθορον (Il. 9.476), δ δ' ἂρ' ἐθορ θοιδίμος "Εκτωρ (Il. 12.462), δ δ' ἐθορ δαίμονι ἵσος (Il. 21.18), ἐθορ μέσσο (Il. 21.233), ἐθορ' ὑμίλω (Il. 15.623), ἐθορ δίφρο (Il. 16.427);

– with a preverb in tmesis: e.g. χάδ δ' ἐθο' ἐς μέσσον (Il. 4.79), ἐκ δ' ἐθορ προμά‑χον (Il. 15.573), ἐκ δ' ἐθορ κλήρος κυνέης (Il. 7.182), ἐκ δ' κλήρος δόρο (Il. 23.353), ἐκ δ' ἐθορ κλήρο (Od. 10.207), ἐκ δίφρο χαμαι δόρο (Il. 8.320 = 23.509).

Thus, when *γ was still current, one would expect to find dactylic forms of the type *katdr̥the, *andr̥ke, alongside forms with preverb in tmesis such as *ana ... dr̥me or *an d' edr̥me. There is, however, no evidence for such forms among the roots πραθ‑, δρακ‑ and δραθ‑, apart from one instance of the 3rd dual καθραστέ‑την (Od. 15.494).

At first sight, this seems detrimental to the idea that these aorists reflect pre-forms with Epic *γ, for wouldn't one expect to find more instances of tmesis in Homer? On second thoughts, however, this lack of attestations could be due to the metrical convenience of compounded forms like ἀνέδρακον once these

43 This explains why Homer could use unaugmented κάτθανε (Il. 9.320) as a gnomic aorist, instead of metrically difficult ἔθανε (for the problem, see already Meister 1921: 35, in whose view κάτθανε stands in for κατέθανε).

44 The only exception is χαμᾶζε δορών (Il. 10.528).
became available, and the metrical inconvenience of the tmesis construction.\textsuperscript{45} The main question is therefore: how could forms like ἀνέδρακον develop?

In Van Beek 2013, I proposed that -ρα- was introduced into *dr̥ke/o-, *drtʰe/o- and *pr̥thε/o- from the vernacular forms ἔτραπον and ἔδραμον. Given the metrical convenience of the latter two forms (and compounds), one could expect that they ousted the traditional forms with *γ from Epic Greek soon after they became available. Not only was ἔδραμον the most frequent thematic aorist with -ρα- in Homer, but it was used exclusively with preverb (ἀνα-, δια-, ἐπι-, ὑπο-, etc.). This means that pre-forms like *ana / dia ... dr̥me (with tmesis), which were difficult to use, were ousted by ἀνέδραμε(ν), διἐδραμε(ν) once these became available. The same holds for the replacement of *epi ... tr̥kʷe with e.g. ἐπέτραπε(ν). I therefore supposed that the two frequent stems δραμε/o- and τραπε/o- dragged the other three forms *dr̥ke/o-, *drtʰe/o-, and *pr̥thε/o- along with them. That is, when the forms ἔδρακε, ἔδραθε and ἔπραθε had become available as alternatives for *dr̥me and *(e)tr̥kʷe and were in the process of replacing them, the forms ἐδρακε, ἐδραθε and ἐπραθε were artificially created as metrical alternatives for forms with preverb of *dr̥ke, *drtʰe and *pr̥thε, which were inconvenient to use because the preverb usually had to be placed in tmesis.

If this possibility is granted, the introduction of -ρα- also generated a problem that has already been discussed in the previous section. Participles and many subjunctive and optative forms of the aorists δραμε/o- and τραπε/o- could not be used: at this early stage, McL was still out of the question. An artificial introduction of -ρα- into *dr̥ke/o-, *drtʰe/o- and *pr̥thε/o- would have entailed that their participles and many modal forms could no longer be used. However, this probably would not have been detrimental: these verbs mainly occurred as compounds anyway, and compounded participle forms like *anadr̥kont‑ could not be used either. In reality, it is likely that alternative ways of expression had emerged already at earlier stages of the tradition: consider the ptc. (ἐκ)πέρσαν‑ of the sigmatic aorist, which occurs instead of the reflex of *pr̥thont‑; ἰδὼν in the meaning ‘looking, glancing (at)’ instead of the reflex of *d̥kont‑; and μετάλμενος, ἐπάλμενος ‘jumping among/at’ instead of unmetrical *μεταθορών, *ἐπιθορών.

It remains to explain why -ρα- was not introduced in the thematic aorist ἠμβροτον. If we assume that this form reflects *āmr̥te/o- with Epic *γ, the reasons are not difficult to find: the augmented pre-form *āmyte already had a dactylic structure, so there was no clear motivation to introduce -ρα-. Moreover,

\textsuperscript{45} Note that apocope of the preverb was not an available option for pre-forms with ἐπι- (ἐπέ- δραμον), ἀπο- (ἀπέδραμον), δια- (διέπραθον, διέδρακον, διέδραμον), and περι- (περιλαμβανόμενος, ἐπιλαμβανόμενος ‘jumping among/at’ instead of unmetrical *μεταθορών, *ἐπιθορών.
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since the root structure of *amṛt- was different from that of *dṛm- and other similar forms, there was no obvious model. At some point the Ionic vernacular form ἅμαρτε was introduced as a convenient metrical alternative to *āmr̥te. We may assume that the latter form was preserved as such, and that it eventually took part in the regular vocalization of Epic *ṛ, yielding ἤμβροτον.

8.4.3 Reconsidering the Possibility of Aeolisms
The form ἤμβροτον, with its reflex -ρο- < *ṛ, could also be an Aeolism. In view of the problems involved in reconstructing Epic *ṛ for the thematic aorists with -ρα-, let us reconsider whether these can be accounted for as Aeolisms. The simplest scenario would be that their stems, at an early pre-stage of Epic Greek, had the Aeolic vernacular reflex -ρο- < *ṛ, and that their vocalism was changed into -ρα- under influence of corresponding Ionic vernacular forms. This would indeed work well for ἔτραπον and ἔδραμον, cases where the aorist stem is attested both in Ionic and in Aeolic (cf. τρόπην Alc. fr. 70.9, ὀνέτροπε fr. 72.8, πεδέτροπ[ε fr. 75.11; δρό[μωμεν Alc. fr. 6.8). Such a scenario would be the easiest way of accounting for the rhythmical behavior of the thematic aorists with -ρα- in Epic Greek: as we have seen, their root-initial PL-onset is always heterosyllabic in Homer.

However, it is less trivial to view ἔδρακον, ἔπραθον and ἔδραθον as Ionicized versions of original Aeolic forms with -ρο-. Such forms are not attested in literary Lesbian or in inscriptions from the Aeolic dialects, and the aorists ἔδρακον and ἔπραθον are poetic relics. Furthermore, ἔδραμον is unattested in this specific shape in Attic-Ionic: the verb is absent from Ionic, and found only in the form κατέδαρθον in Attic. If we assume that ἔδαρθον influenced the vocalism of an older Aeolic *ἔδροθον (with a different vowel slot), we are confronted with several further questions. For instance, why wasn’t ἤμβροτον changed into *ἤμβρατον under the influence of ἥμαρτον? Why wasn’t ἔδαρθον introduced into Epic Greek?

In order to avoid such problems, I propose the following scenario: when ἔτροπον, ἔδραμον were in the process of being replaced by their Ionic counterparts ἔτραπον, ἔδραμον in the epic tradition, the root vocalism of the other three thematic aorists *ἔδρακον, *ἔπραθον and *ἔδροθον (stemming from some early Aeolic dialect) was changed accordingly. Phrased differently, given the existence of two frequent thematic aorists with Ionic ρα beside Aeolic ρο, it is conceivable that Ionic poets extended the same equivalence to other thematic aorists with ρο that were current in the tradition.

If this is accepted, we must note that a similar scenario will not account for the forms with ρα discussed in chapter 6. There is no evidence that poetic relic forms like δράκων ‘snake’, κραταιός ‘strong’ and τραπείομεν ‘let us get satisfac-
tion’ originally had o-vocalism (corresponding Aeolic forms with -ρο- are non-existent), or that they owe their α-vocalism to a now-lost Ionic counterpart. Furthermore, an important reason for not reconstructing Aeolic predecessors with -ρο- of these forms, but instead to posit pre-forms with Epic *ṛ, is their prosodic behavior (McL scansion) in Homer.

Thus, if this scenario is correct, the following picture emerges. For an Early Dark Age stage of the epic tradition, we must assume a coexistence of forms preserving *ṛ (some of which were of Mycenaean origin) with forms showing the Aeolic vernacular reflex -ρο- < *ṛ. At a later stage, Ionic forms with -αρ- (and analogical -ρα-) < *ṛ were also introduced. In cases where an appropriate model existed, Aeolic forms with -ρο- < *ṛ had their vocalism changed into -ρα-. In addition, new instances of -ρα- and -ρο- came into being when Epic *ṛ was vocalized.

8.5 Pindaric δρακέντ-

It remains to explain the reflex -ρα- in the Pindaric participle δρακέντ-.

Traditionally (e.g. LSJ s.v. δέρκομαι), this form has been interpreted as what it appears to be: a participle of the η-aorist. However, in a brief and influential contribution, Forssman (1964) argued that δρακέντ- reflects a relic ptc. form PIE *dr̥ḱ-ént- of the athematic root aorist. In his view, the participle survived only in Pindar, whereas the indicative had been thematicized already in Homer.

This analysis has become widely accepted among Indo-Europeanists. If it is correct, δρακέντ- could directly continue PIE *dr̥ḱ-ént- in non-Epic Greek and thus constitute a potential counterexample to the regular vernacular vocalization to -αρ- defended here. However, it is not quite clear from which variety of Greek δρακέντ- stems. The origins of Pindar’s poetic language are notoriously difficult to pin down, and if -ρα- was indeed the regular outcome in some West Greek dialect (cf. chapter 3), δρακέντ- might stem from there and thus lose its probative force for Ionic-Attic.

Moreover, I wonder whether the traditional interpretation of δρακέντ- as an η-aorist can really be rejected. Forssman’s first objection against this interpretation is that δρακέντ- takes a direct object in all three attestations. In reality, this is true for two instances, ἀκτίνας … μαρμαρυζοίσας δρακεῖς (fr. 123.2–3) and οὐ

---

46 The isolated εὐδρακής ‘seeing well’ (only S. Phil. 846) is a deverbal compound derived from δρακέν (cf. Meissner 2006: 216). It is distinguished in both form and meaning from old compounds like εὐδερκής ‘well visible’, and clearly secondary.

47 Cf. e.g. Peters (2004); Willi (2018: 294).
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φάος, οὐ μέλαιναν δρακέντες εὑφρόναν (Nem. 7.3), but not for the third: in δρα-

κεῖσ' ἄσφαλές (Pyth. 2.20) “looking with a straight gaze”, we find an internal accusative construction that is clearly old and frequent with this verb.48 However this may be, the direct object is not an argument for reconstructing an old root aorist, as the thematic aorist ἔδρακον is often transitive, too: thus, Home-

ric ἔδρακον may also have a direct object (κάτιν πόν ... ἔδρακον, Od. 10.196–197). Moreover, the construction of δέρκομαι without preverb and with direct object is found mainly with the aorist stem and may well be a secondary syntactic development of this aspectual form.

Forssman’s second argument against viewing δρακέντ‑ as an intransitive aorist is that the indicative *ἐδράκην is not attested anywhere else in Greek. This argumentum e silentio is weak: δέρκομαι has a low overall frequency in Greek, and the single attestation of the thematic aorist indicative κατέδρακεν in Pindar could easily be an epicism.49

Is it really excluded that δρακέντ‑ originated as a reshaping of δρακόντ‑? In my view, it is not. Another intransitive aorist ἐδέρχθην is attested in the tragedians, always in the indicative, meaning ‘to look at, behold’. In fact, in five out of seven attestations, ἐδέρχθην governs a direct object, thus completely under-

mining Forssman’s argument concerning δρακέντ‑.50 Its analogical creation (on the basis of the present) may be explained by the observation of Allan (2003: 159) that δέρκομαι becomes non-volitional in Classical Greek; for this reason, its aorist could be aligned with other mental process middles that formed an intransitive aorist in Classical Greek, such as ἐφράσθην ‘I noticed’ to φράζομαι.

Allan, too, thinks that Pindaric δρακέντ‑ is a secondary creation. He com-

pares the replacement of thematic ἔτραφον (Hom.) with ἐτράφην (Hom.+), where only the latter is used by Pindar as a medio-passive aorist of τρέφω.51

48 Cf. especially πῦρ δ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσι δεδορκώς “looking like fire with his eyes”, i.e. “blazing fire” (of a boar, Od. 19.446). See also δεινόν δερκόμενος “with a fearsome gaze” (Il. 3.342, 11.37, and 23.815), ἄμμιτι δερκόμαι λαμπρόν lit. “I look bright with my eye” (Pi. Nem. 7.66), and σμερδαλεόν δε δέρκες “(the snake) looks terrible” (Il. 22.95).

49 Note that the preservation of κατέδρακεν in hexameter verse would be well-motivated:

*katεyiden would be unmetrical. The Pindaric passage goes: φίλοικε γάρ φίλος ἐλών ἔξων ἄττυ κατέδρακεν Ηρακλέος ὄλβιαν πρός αὔλαν (Nem. 4.22–24). The interpretation of these lines continues to present problems: Willcock (1995: 97) even states that “the expression is awkward”. Taking ἔξων ἄττυ with κατέδρακεν and ὄλβιαν πρός αὔλαν with ἐλών requires a heavy hyperbaton. In my view, the idea to emend αὔλαν to a gen. pl. αὐλᾶν is worthy of consideration, because this yields a natural interpretation of πρός: “For having come as a friend to friends, he looked down upon a hospitable city from the blessed halls of Hera-

cles.”

50 E.g. ὡς τρισόλβιοι κεῖνοι βροτῶν, οἳ ταῦτα δερχθέντες τέλη μόλωσ' ἐς Αἰθέ (S. fr. 387).

51 The form τράφε (Nem. 3.33) is best analyzed as an imperfect: cf. Slater (1969, s.v. τρέφω).
In my view, it is conceivable that Pindar viewed the archaism ἔδρακον as a typical epic form, like ἔτραφον. Moreover, the creation of a ptc. δρακέντ- beside the Homeric indicative ἔδρακον may have been favored by the absence of the participle δρακόντ- from Homer.\footnote{Henry (2005: 33) suggests that “Pindar may have used δρακείς (etc.) rather than δρακών (etc.) in order to avoid confusion with forms of the substantive δράκων, indistinguishable in strophic song from those of δράκων. There was no danger of such a confusion outside the participle.” However, I fail to understand how δράκων and δρακών, given their different accents, could ever be confused.} A final point is that the same replacement seems to have occurred in the ptc. ἐριπών ‘collapsing’ (Hom.) → ἐριπέντ- (Pl.).\footnote{Forssman (1964: 18 n. 6) remarks: “δρακέντ‑ ist also nicht mit ἔριπεντι (dat.) ‘stürzend, fallend’ Pi. Ol. 11 43 auf eine Stufe zu stellen (...), das gegenüber hom. ἔριπών (zu ἠρίπε) auf ἐριπέντ‑ weist: Hier handelt es sich um ein intransitives Verbum.” However, I see no reason why δρακέντ‑ and ἐριπέντ‑, attested more than two centuries after Homer, could not be replacements of older thematic aorist forms.}

In conclusion, I think that Forssman was wrong in viewing the Pindaric ptc. δρακέντ‑ as an archaism; and even if he were right, it cannot be excluded that δρακέντ‑ is a West Greek element of Pindar’s language.

\section*{8.6 Conclusions}

In thematic aorist forms, Classical prose has *γ > -αρ‑ in the following forms:

- κατέδαρθον ‘went to sleep’ (only Attic);
- ἔπαρδον ‘broke wind’ (only Attic);
- ἥμαρτον ‘missed; erred’ (Att.-Ion., Hom.).

While ἔπαρδον may be analogical beside πέρδομαι, this explanation is not available for κατέδαρθον and ἥμαρτον which are both, from a Greek perspective, primary thematic aorists. From this fact, I have concluded that κατέδαρθον and ἥμαρτον have the regular outcome of Proto-Greek *γ.

A number of aorist forms with -ρα‑ can easily be explained as analogical. For instance, the vowel slot of ἔδραμον ‘ran’ corresponds to that of the perfect δέδρομε (Hom.) and the noun δρόμος ‘course’, while the vowel slot of ἔτραπον, ἔτραπόμην ‘turned’ and ἔτραφον, ἔτραφην ‘was reared’ matches that of τρέπω and τρέφω.

The reflex -ρα‑ in ἔδραθον ‘slept’, ἔδρακον ‘looked, saw’ and ἔπραθον ‘razed, pillaged’ causes more difficulties. These forms are virtually restricted to Epic Greek. Moreover, there are good reasons to assume that ἔδρακον and ἔπραθον were restricted to poetry at an early date: this allows us to account for the...
absence of by-forms with -αρ- in Homer. We have considered in detail two sce-
narios accounting for the reflex -ρα- in ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον and ἔπραθον:
– to reconstruct pre-forms with Epic *r̥ (archaisms of the epic tradition) whose
root vocalism was adapted to ρα at an early date under the influence of the
thematic aorists ἔδραμον ‘ran’ and ἔπραπον ‘turned’;
– to reconstruct pre-forms with ρο of Aeolic origin, which were turned into
Ionic-sounding forms with ρα under the influence of the correspondences
ἔδραμον ~ Αεολ. ἔδρομον and ἔπραπον ~ Αεολ. ἔτροπον.
In both scenarios it must be assumed that the reflex -ρα- in ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον
and ἔπραθον is a secondary adaptation to the vocalism of ἔδραμον and ἔπραπον,
verbs which are not only frequent in Homer but also remained current in spo-
ken Ionic. In the first scenario, ρα cannot be the regular outcome of Epic *r̥,
as this would fail to account for the prosodic behavior of ἔδραθον, ἔδρακον
and ἔπραθον (absence of McL; regular position length). The second scenario, Ioni-
cized Aeolisms, is preferable because it accounts for this prosodic behavior
without a problem.

The scenario sketched in this chapter allows us to view the vocalism of κατέ-
δαρθον and ἦμαρτον as the regular vernacular reflex of *r̥ in Proto-Ionic. At the
same time we may account for the restriction of ἔδρακον and ἔπραθον to poetry,
and for the distribution between ἔδραθον (epic) and κατέδαρθον (Attic). I have
also proposed an account of the prosodic behavior of κρατέρος (which nor-
maUy makes position in Homer) as opposed to that of κραδή (which hardly ever
makes position). A traditional form *κρατός may have been changed into κρα-
τερός under the influence of κρατύς (with an analogical vowel slot) well before
the elimination of Epic *r̥. A similar substitution was not possible in the iso-
lated noun *κραδία. It was therefore retained in this form, and yielded κραδή
only later, when Epic *r̥ was vocalized.