CHAPTER 6

Reflexes of *ᵣ and muta cum liquida in Epic Greek

Introduction

So far, we have encountered several compelling pieces of evidence for a regular development *ᵣ > -α‑ in Ionic-Attic: τέταρτος, ταρφύς, καρτερός, and κάρτα. Furthermore, many forms with either -ρα‑ or -α‑ could be explained as analogical: u-stem adjectives such as κρατύς, πλατύς, βραχύς, s-stem nouns and adjectives like κράτος, θάρσος, and forms of comparison such as κράτιστος. In addition to this, we noted that epic forms like κάρτος and κάρτιστος were artificially created.

However, a body of forms remains where -ρα‑ must be the uninterrupted reflex of *ᵣ, as an analogical reshaping is simply not conceivable. Our main remaining task is to account for these forms. The evidence includes, among other forms, the aorists ἔδρακον and ἔπραθον (contrast δέρκομαι, πέρθω), the aorist subjunctive τραπείομεν of τέρπομαι ‘to enjoy oneself’, the verbal noun δρατός ‘flayed’ (contrast δέρω), the adjective θρασύς (contrast θέρσος, and cf. chapter 4); and isolated words like τράπεζα and στρατός.

Upon closer inspection, it appears that many such forms with -ρα‑ < *ᵣ occur exclusively in poetry, and in Epic Greek in particular. Moreover, when there are variant forms with -ρα‑ and -α‑, it is often possible to establish a distribution between these reflexes, as illustrated in Table 12 (next page). In all these cases, the forms with -ρα‑ are found exclusively in poetry, mostly in Epic Greek, and -α‑ is the only reflex found in Ionic and/or Attic prose texts.

The forms with -ρα‑ are normally considered phonological archaisms that were preserved because of their metrical utility. Upon this view, forms like καρτερός, τέταρτος, and καρδίη allegedly arose by analogy in the Ionic vernacular(s) and were then introduced into Epic Greek, where they supplied metrical alternatives for the older forms with -α‑. As we have seen in the previous chapters, however, it is impossible to view καρτερός and τέταρτος as analogical or otherwise secondary formations: they must contain the regular outcome of *ᵣ. I will now first argue that the same holds for καρδίη / καρ‑δία.

1 Exceptions are θρασύς, τράπεζα and στρατός, found all three in Classical prose. As I will argue below, these forms are best explained as epicisms.
### Table 12 Distribution between variant forms with -ρα- and -αρ-

| PGr. pre-form | Prose form  | Poetic form |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| *κτρερό-      | καρτερός (also poetic) | κρατερός |
| *κρτα          | κάρτα       |             |
| *κρταιμό-      |              | κραταιός    |
| *κρτι- >> *κρται- |              | κραται-, καρται- |
| *κρεττό-       | τέταρτος (also poetic) | τέτρατος |
| *κρδία-        | καρδίη, καρδία (also poetic) | κραδίη, κραδία |
| *κρθ-ε/ο-      | κατέθραθον | κατέθραθον |

#### 6.1 The Reflex -ρα- and the Metrical Behavior of κραδίη

The alternation between καρδίη and κραδίη is of cardinal importance for the entire issue. The attestations are as follows. Homer has both forms, but καρδίη is metrically disfavored; it occurs only in a thrice-repeated verse and in the compound θρασυκάρδιος ‘stout-hearted’. In Classical prose, the only form is Attic καρδία, Ionic καρδίη, and the form with this root shape is also predominant in poetry (Archilochus, Alcman and—as a borrowing from Ionic—Sappho). On the other hand, after Homer the form with -ρα- is rare and remains limited to poetry (Pindar, Bacchylides, lyrical passages in tragedy).

The pre-form *κρδία- can be analyzed as an extension in -iā- based on the weak stem of the PIE root noun for ‘heart’, *κῆρ-. It is usually supposed that κραδίη is the regular reflex of *κρδία- and that the classical form καρδία analogically introduced the vowel slot of κῆρ ‘heart’ < PIE nom.-acc. sg. *κήρ(d). There are, however, serious problems with this scenario. First of all, the root of *κρδία ends in -d -, whereas κῆρ had lost its final consonant long before the vocalization of *r. The idea that speakers would conceive of *κρδία as related...
to κῆρ is unmotivated, all the more so as the two forms were never part of the same synchronic paradigm. Secondly, in Homer κῆρ is an archaic relic form (out of 65 attestations, 59 are found in verse-final position), and after Homer it all but disappears even from poetic language. Finally, other dialect groups also have reflexes of *kr̥diā (cf. the Cyprian gloss χορζία: χαρδία. Πάριοι Hsch.). Taken together, these facts suggest that ‘heart’ was *kr̥diā already in Proto-South Greek, perhaps even in Proto-Greek, and that the archaic form κῆρ was preserved only in poetry. It is therefore highly questionable whether κῆρ could have influenced the outcome of *kr̥diā in the Ionic-Attic vernaculars.

In my view, the distribution of the attestations strongly suggests that καρδίη is the regular vernacular outcome. As for κραδίη, I propose that this form originated artificially within the language of epic. This is supported by the odd metrical behavior of κραδίη. As noted by Hoenigswald, forms of κραδίη are rarely used after words ending in a short vowel. When this does happen, the form directly follows the main caesura so that we might be dealing with another license, brevis in longo. In other words, κραδίη is never used to ‘make position’. The peculiar nature of this distribution is highlighted by the use of κραδίη in post-Homeric hexameter poetry. In the Hymns, we do find an instance of position length in the line Τελφοῦσα κραδίην ἐχολώσατο εἶπέ τε μῦθον (h.Ap. 256). In Apollonius Rhodius, on 11 instances of κραδίη, we find 3 cases of position length (ὑπὸ κραδίη 3.287 and 296; ἐνὶ κραδίῃ 3.644). The localization of κραδίη in Homer is remarkable, too: with two exceptions, κραδίη only occurs in the thesis of the second (14 × on 56 = 25%) or third foot (39 × = 69.6%).

5 After Homer, only the artificially distracted form κέαρ is regularly attested (in lyric poetry, in the tragedians, and in two isolated instances in comedy). It is usually assumed that κέαρ was created beside κηρ on the model of ἐαρ ‘spring’ beside ἦρ. Thus, κηρ was no longer recognized as related to καρδία when κέαρ was created.
6 The recessive accentuation of the formulaic Homeric dat.sg. κήρε presupposes that κηρ had been lost from spoken Ionic before Homer.
7 After Homer, the only attestations are Scut. 435 and Thgn. 619 (both times in the Homeric verse-end δρψφνεις κήρ), and A. Choe. 410 (where the vocative φίλον κήρ is clearly an epicism).
8 Hoenigswald (1991: 10); cf. Hoenigswald 1968; 1988.
9 πέμψω δ’ ὅππῃ σε κραδίην ἐγνώσατε ἔτε το μύθον (h.Ap. 256). In Apollonius Rhodius, on 11 instances of κραδίη, we find 3 cases of position length (ὑπὸ κραδίη 3.287 and 296; ἐνὶ κραδίῃ 3.644). The localization of κραδίη in Homer is remarkable, too: with two exceptions, κραδίη only occurs in the thesis of the second (14 × on 56 = 25%) or third foot (39 × = 69.6%).
10 The three exceptions are the verse ends κραδίην δ’ ἐλάφοιο (II. 1.225), κραδίη δὲ μοι ἔξω (II. 13.94) and δόρο δ’ ἐν κραδίη ἐπεπήγει (II. 13.442). Since κραδίη stands after |p in 39 instances,
As Hoenigswald remarks (1991: 10 n. 28), the metrical behavior of κραδίη in Homer “is only apparent if \( r \) [later > ρα] was still the equivalent, in the source formula, of a short vowel after the manner of ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην”.\(^{11}\) Indeed, if we compare words with the same metrical surface structure, the figures for κραδίη appear to be quite exceptional. In χρατερός and προτερός, for instance, the poets regularly made use of the possibility to lengthen a preceding word-final short vowel by position.\(^{12}\) Given the large number of attestations of all these forms, we are very probably dealing with a significant distribution.

Hoenigswald (l.c.) therefore concluded that the metrical behavior of κραδίη “necessitates adjustments in our view of the relative chronology of certain processes in the prehistory of Greek,” but he did not further elaborate his views on this matter in print. The question thus remains how exactly our views of relative chronology must be changed, and which processes are to be envisaged. Is it possible that the vocalization of the syllabic liquids was a comparatively recent sound change in various Greek dialects? It was certainly not very recent in Ionic-Attic: the lack of discernable differences between the Ionic and Attic reflexes shows that we are dealing with a Proto-Ionic sound change, which took place at least before the Ionian migrations to Asia Minor (usually dated to the 11th c.). This means that the form with -αρ had already developed in Proto-Ionic.

How is it possible, then, that the prosodic behavior of the original form *κραδία‑ was preserved in the tradition for such a long time? In my view, the most attractive explanation would be that *\( r \) was retained within Epic Greek

\(^{11}\) The comment “[later > ρα]” is Hoenigswald’s.

\(^{12}\) This implies that *κρητέρ‑ lost its syllabic liquid within the epic tradition at an earlier date than *κραδία‑. Indeed, as argued in chapter 5, χρατερός may have analogically introduced the root allomorph of χρατύς; the regular outcome of *κρητέρ‑ is found in χρατερός. Another relevant example is προσέφη, which is often considered to be a recent replacement of older *ποσέφη or some metrical equivalent (Wathelet 1966: 153, Janko 1979, following Meillet; for criticism of Meillet’s idea, see chapter 7). While προ‑ often fails to make position, the opposite treatment also occurs before προσέφη, e.g. ὡς πού σε προσέφη (Il. 16.842). An explanation of the different treatment with respect to κραδίη could be that the form /pros/ existed in the Ionic vernacular, whereas /kradiē/ did not.
for a considerable period of time after its elimination from the vernaculars, perhaps until one or two generations of poets before the composition of the *Iliad*. Such a scenario may account not only for the metrical behavior of *κραδίη*, but also for the reflex *‑ρα‑* itself—in *κραδίη* and in a number of other words. Thus, I posit a prolonged retention of *r̥* in Epic Greek after its vocalization to *‑αρ‑* in spoken Proto-Ionic, and a subsequent vocalization *r̥ > ‑ρα‑* (*‑ρο‑* after a labial consonant) that was specific to Epic Greek.

Before further elaborating this scenario for a prolonged retention of *r̥* in Epic Greek, we must consider the problem of Homeric *muta cum liquida* scansions (henceforth *McL*) in more detail. A prolonged retention of *r̥* would also allow us to understand the origin of this license, more or less along the lines sketched by Wathelet (1966). Since Wathelet’s idea is sometimes regarded with skepticism, it will be necessary to embark on a longer digression and to review the basic facts concerning *McL* in Homer, as well as previous accounts of it.

### 6.2 Muta cum liquida Scansions in Homer

A convenient summary of the basic details in Attic poetry is given by Allen (1987: 106–108). The phenomenon concerns sequences consisting of a plosive consonant plus a liquid or nasal. A word like πᾰτρός may be realized as /pat.ros/ (heterosyllabic scansion) or /pa.tros/ (tautosyllabic scansion). Phonetically speaking, the syllable boundary may also be located within the occlusive part (cf. Tichy 1981: 28), but from a metrical perspective, all that matters is whether the preceding syllable was closed or not. From a historical point of view, this tautosyllabic scansion is unexpected: all intervocalic sequences of more than one consonant (i.e. /VC₁...CₙV/, with *n > 1*) are normally treated as heterosyllabic in Homer, as they are treated in Vedic.

There is a number of remarkable differences between Attic drama and Homer in the treatment of *PL* clusters:

---

13 See also Devine and Stephens (1994: 32–35), who also include data on the realization of such clusters cross-linguistically.
14 Phonetically speaking, the syllable boundary may also be located within the occlusive part (cf. Tichy 1981: 28), but from a metrical perspective, all that matters is whether the preceding syllable was closed or not.
15 The only other exceptions are a few anomalous tautosyllabic scansions of word-initial ζ‑ and σ‑ in some toponyms and hydronyms (*Ζάκυνθος, Ζέλεια, Σκάμανδρος*) and in the noun *σκέπαρνον* ‘axe’.
16 A good overview of all Homeric instances of *McL* scansion in word-initial position is found...
- tautosyllabic scansion is very common in Attic drama, but fairly rare in Homer (compared to the heterosyllabic treatment). Moreover, there is a more pronounced tendency towards tautosyllabic scansion of word-internal PL in the dialogue parts of tragedy and comedy. Devine and Stephens (1994: 32–35) argue that this feature reflects the syllabification of spoken Attic.

- In Attic drama, tautosyllabic scansion may occur in sequences of plosive plus nasal (if the plosive is not voiced), but in Homer this never occurs.

- In Homer, as we will see, tautosyllabic scansion is structurally applied only in a limited set of lexemes.

In pre-classical poetry, there are considerable differences between individual poets and regions. A general observation is that MCL remains exceptional during the archaic period in regions closer to Asia Minor, whereas its relative frequency is higher on the Greek mainland and in the West, where it increases with time (especially in the 6th century).

Is the Homeric use of MCL governed by more general rules? Some scholars have claimed that the license was applied out of metrical necessity, in order to fit words into the hexameter that could otherwise not be used, as in δράκων ‘snake’ or certain case forms of βροτός (βροτῶν, βροτοῖσι). However, a number of facts are not adequately explained by metrical pressure. First of all, no metrical necessity is involved in light scissions before words like πρός, πρίν, or before forms like θρόνος, θρόνῳ, θρόνοι. According to my counts, in 69 instances of MCL (about 10% of all instances) the word-form by itself could have been used without the license. Almost one half of these instances appears after an uncontracted thesis (e.g. verse-final ὄρμενα πρόσσω, and the repeated first

---

17 This is the origin of the term ‘muta cum liquida’ (where liquida, a translation of the Greek term ὑγρά, originally referred to both liquids and nasals in ancient grammatical theory); see Allen (1987: 39–40).

18 In Hesiod, there are two instances of MCL scansion for the sequence ‘stop plus nasal’: πνέουσαν (Th. 319) and ἀκροκνέφαιος (Op. 567). The line Od. 7.89 is unmetrical (cf. West 2014: 81–82).

19 On the avoidance of MCL scansion in Lesbian and Eastern Ionic archaic poetry (notably Archilochus), see West (1974: 113–114 and 1988: 166); and already Smyth (1897) on Archilochus, Semonides and Hipponax.

20 This goes back to La Roche (1869), the first to produce a list of occurrences of the sequence ‘plosive plus liquid’ in Homer; it was accepted by e.g. Chantraine (1958: 108–112) and Allen (1987: 108).

21 Cf. Hermann (1923: 95), Wathelet (1966: 146).

22 Hermann (1923: 95) counted only 40 such instances in Homer.
hemistich "Εκτορά Πριαμίδην). These numbers suggest that Mc. was indeed avoided to a certain degree (note that tautosyllabic scansions are quite uncommon compared to heterosyllabic scansions), but one may suspect that poets were licensed to use it only under certain conditions. Secondly, words like κράτιστος were unfit by themselves to be used in a dactylic hexameter, but they could have been used by applying the McI license. In various cases, such words are not used in Epic Greek but seem to have been replaced by an alternative formation. Taking κράτιστος as an example, Homer only uses the alternative form of the superlative κάρτιστος ‘strongest’, which was created artificially by analogy (cf. καρτερός beside κρατερός). This strongly suggests that tautosyllabic scansion of PL was, in principle, avoided. A third point is that the phonological restriction to plosive plus liquid (and the exclusion of plosive plus nasal) requires an explanation. In fact, McI is to a large extent restricted to word-initial PL, and it is rarely applied in word-internal position. Moreover, in most word-internal cases, PL is located directly after a morpheme boundary, e.g. ἐξαλίθη (Od. 19.470).

Thus, it is unlikely that metrical necessity alone can account for the limited distribution of McI scansions. In view of the phonological restrictions just mentioned, an alternative account has been put forward, according to which McI was a sandhi phenomenon. In this view, PL was always tautosyllabic in the spoken language of Homer’s time as the onset of a prosodic word, but normally heterosyllabic within a prosodic word. This idea goes back to von Hartel (1873) and has been championed by Tichy (1981: 28–30), followed more recently by Haug (2002: 67) and Hackstein (2010: 416–417). Rephrased in different terms, these authors claim that McI was normally avoided not only within a word, but also at the boundary between two words in close syntactic and/or prosodic connection. An example of a ‘connected group’ given by Tichy is τὸ πρῶτον

---

23 See Ehrlich (1907: 391–392) for more examples.
24 Some illustrative numbers: πρέιβειν has 4 × McI on 195 occurrences in Homer, φαρέτη has McI only once, but is always verse-final (with heterosyllabic PL) in its other 12 instances.
25 Tichy (1981: 30) lists all instances of word-internal McI in the Iliad. Leaving aside Ἀφροδίτη (the only form with a high frequency), I counted word-internal McI 33 × in the Iliad and Odyssey together (for 20 different words), divided evenly between both epics.
26 Sommer (1909: 190) notes that McI within a word is found mainly after a morpheme boundary in compounds (ἀμφιβρότης), after a syllabic augment (ἐκλίθη), and after reduplication syllables (βεβροτωμένα), and hypothesizes that the shift of syllable boundary started in such cases, before being extended to real word-internal cases (Ἀφροδίτη). This is followed by Tichy (1981).
27 “Im Wortinlaut und zwischen zwei im Satz eng miteinander verbundenen Wörtern — im Konnex — bewirkt Plosiv plus Liquida Positionsläge, in Pausa und in der echten Wortfuge fällt die Silbengrenze dagegen mit der Wortgrenze zusammen” (Tichy 1981: 28–29).
‘at first’ (a petrified adverbial phrase containing the proclitic definite article), while a more loosely connected phrase like ἔχε τρόμος might be realized in the vernacular with a prosodic word boundary between its two constituents. Indeed, it is clear that prosodic word boundaries played an important role in epic verse composition—witness, for instance, the tendency to avoid position length in the thesis.

While this explanation looks elegant in theory, in reality it appears that McL also occurs within ‘connected groups’.\(^{28}\) In order to circumvent this problem, Tichy assumes that it was a choice of the individual poet to use tautosyllabic or heterosyllabic scansion within connected word groups.\(^{29}\) She does not note, however, that the tautosyllabic treatment of PL also competes with the heterosyllabic treatment at the boundary of prosodic words. Compare the following cases of heterosyllabic PL (square brackets separating minor phrases):

\[
[\text{ἀλλ’ ὃ μὲν}] [\text{ἐν νῆσῳ κεῖτο}] [\text{κρατέρ’ ὀλγεα}] [\text{πάσχων}]
\]

\text{Il. 2.721}

\[
|T [\text{ἀµύµονα τε}] [\text{κρατέρον τε}]
\]

(formulaic phrase)

Even worse, contrary to the claims of Tichy, tautosyllabic scansion is relatively rare even at the boundary of prosodic words. This neglect of actual distribu-

\(^{28}\) Tichy cites τῶν δὲ τρίτων \text{Il. 12.94} and οὐδὲ Δρύαντος υἱός \text{Il. 6.130} as examples of McL in connected groups. In my view, these might actually contain a prosodic boundary after the particle δὲ, i.e. [τῶν δὲ] [τρίτων]. Nevertheless, there are many other examples where PL is tautosyllabic even if it does not stand at the beginning of a phonological word.

\(^{29}\) “Wie nicht anders zu erwarten, haben sich die Dichter unter dem Zwang des Metrums gelegentliche Freiheiten erlaubt. So tritt Kurzmessung mitunter auch dann auf, wenn die betreffenden Wörter üblicherweise in Konnex gestanden haben dürften (Fälle wie τῶν δὲ τρίτων \text{M 94}, οὐδὲ Δρύαντος υἱός \text{Z 130}). Doch hat auch die metrisch bedingte Übertragung der in der echten Wortfuge regulären Behandlung auf Konnexe, in denen normalerweise die Wortinlautsbehandlung eingetreten wäre, ihren sprachlichen Grund; denn sofern zwei Wörter nicht durch Pausa getrennt oder in Akzenteinheit verbunden sind, steht es zumeist im Ermessen des Sprechers, ob er die Wortgrenze hervorheben oder beide Wörter als phonetische Einheit behandeln will.” (Tichy 1981: 30; my emphasis). Like Tichy, Hackstein assumes that the “two possibilities ... were consciously exploited by the poets for metrical purposes” (2010: 417) and that the rules “may be suspended due to metrical necessity”, citing as examples Ἀφροδίτη, Ἀμφιτρύωνος, and the anapestic scansion of φαρέτρης at \text{Il. 8.323}. Two of these examples, however, are irrelevant: φαρέτρη can be (and is normally) used without McL, and in the case of Ἀμφιτρύωνος the group /truo/ was probably realized with synizesis as /tro/.
tions renders the phonological account of McL practically unfalsifiable, at least in the form advocated by Tichy (and Hackstein, who closely follows her).  

Hermann (1923: 95) went even one step further, claiming that all plosive plus liquid clusters, independent of syntax or prosody, had already undergone a shift in syllable structure in the spoken language. The extremely low incidence of McL in word-internal position is obviously detrimental to this hypothesis. Hermann therefore assumed that the tradition resisted the new syllabification: “nur langsam dringt die Aussprache des Alltags in die Dichtersprache ein”. Again, this idea is difficult to test, but even worse is the fact that McL is attested in various archaic formulae such as Μοῖρα κραταιή or δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν. It would be highly unlikely that these were influenced by the spoken language.

Finally, epic poets are in fact noticeably reluctant to apply McL. First, the license is rarely applied after an uncontracted thesis (i.e. in cases like "Εκτόρα Πριαμίδην, where the patronymic Πριαμίδην could also be used without recourse to McL, e.g. verse-initially). Secondly, the large majority of cases of McL concern a limited set of words with initial plosive plus liquid that would normally be unmetrical. One question here is: how does one expect epic poets to deal with metrically problematic words? One possible avenue was to artificially adapt the shape of these words (e.g. by metrical lengthening); another option was to use synonyms or functionally equivalent alternative forms. Indeed, in many cases where McL scansion is regularly applied, such alternatives were available. For instance, possible alternatives for Αφροδίτη would have been Κύπρις (5 × Hom.) or Κυθέρεια (thus already twice in the Odyssey, then in the Hymns). Instead of δράκων ‘snake’, the normal prose term ὄφις (only 1 × Hom.) would have been metrically fine. Beside κραταιός, epic poets had the frequent and semantically equivalent adjective κρατερός at their disposal. Thus,

30 Hackstein (2010: 416–417). This oversight can be explained in part by a neglect of the data, cf. Tichy (1981: 28 n. 2): “Im folgenden schliesse ich mich an W. Hartel (...) an, nachdem ich mich bei einer durchsicht von II. LIIT von der Richtigkeit seiner Beurteilung überzeugt habe”. Given the low incidence of McL in the Iliad generally (once every 46 lines on average), the evidence contained in these three books (< 2200 lines) is insufficient for drawing a conclusion.

31 Hermann (1923: 95): “Muta + Liquida können in der Sprache des gewöhnlichen Lebens des jonischen Asiens zur Zeit Homers auch im Wortinnern nicht mehr Position gebildet haben; denn der Vers wird durch den Rhythmus zusammengehalten ähnlich wie ein syntaktischer Konnex, wie eine sprecheinheit der Prosa.”

32 Κύπρις is attested only in Iliad 5; on the peculiar status of this book, see Cassio 2012.

33 “Κυθέρεια is an artificial bardic creation meant to supersede such old formulas as φίλομμετιδής Αφροδίτη; it is inseparable from epithets containing -στέφανος and allows an irreproachable inflection of the formula.” (Cassio 2012: 417).
there was no real metrical compulsion to use Ἀφροδίτη, δράκων and κραταιός. I submit that the use of these words was licensed by the fact that they were traditional epic words.

In sum, although synchronic syllabification rules will have to play a role in an account of McL scansion in Homer, such an approach does not by itself allow us to adequately explain the data and distributions. Historical explanations must also be taken into account: words like δράκων and κραταιός are tolerated in Epic Greek because they are part of traditional diction, in a sense to be made more precise below.

6.3 Wathelet’s Proposal for the Origin of McL in Homer

According to Wathelet (1966), McL in Homer originated when *r was vocalized in a limited set of formulae; later on it was generalized as a poetic license.35 His scenario is as follows. In syllables with a mono-consonantal onset *Cr̥-, as in *dr̥kōn, the vocalization of *r yielded a form δράκων or *δρόκων. Such forms violated the normal syllabification rules of the dactylic hexameter. In spite of this, the older scansion as an iamb was simply retained, which amounted to admitting tautosyllabic PL onsets (Wathelet 1966: 172):

Dans les formules anciennes c’est-à-dire achéennes, où le phénomène se produit, il est dû au développement du r(...) au cours de l’histoire de la tradition formulaire de l’épopée. L’anomalie s’est introduite dans les formules parce que les aèdes ont tenu à conserver des expressions traditionnelles, tout en leur laissant suivre l’évolution de la langue.

This scenario requires that a form like δράκων was already current in Epic Greek when it still had the form *dr̥kōn. In Wathelet’s view, *dr̥kōn entered the tradition in the Mycenaean period. When this form developed to *drokōn in spoken Mycenaean, it changed along in the language of epic. Later on, the corresponding Ionic form δράκων would have been substituted, still retaining the original metrical value.

---

34 Tichy’s account is clearly influenced by her support of Berg’s proto-hexameter theory. A devastating criticism of Tichy’s recent variant of this theory (Tichy 2010) is provided by West (2011). For a more general criticism of theories on the prehistory of the hexameter, see Hoekstra (1981) and cf. section 1.5.3.

35 Wathelet cites only one word with McL potentially deriving from *j, the toponym Πλάταια (ll. 2.504). Since this example remains uncertain, we may limit our investigation to forms that once contained *r.
In order to substantiate these claims, Wathelet tries to show that the forms concerned belong to traditional formulaic diction. Some of the evidence, however, does not comply with the scenario, and for such cases Wathelet suggests various sorts of alternative explanations:

- A number of instances of \textit{McL} deriving from pre-forms with \textit{*r}, such as the formulaic verse-final phrases \textit{τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε (3)} and \textit{θρασειάων ἀπὸ χειρῶν (7)} occurred after the trochaic caesura. Noting that other irregularities (e.g. hiatus, \textit{brevis in longo}) may occur at the seam where two hemistichs coalesce, Wathelet suggests that the main caesura may have been accompanied by a pause in recitation, meaning that tautosyllabic word-initial \textit{PL} was more easily tolerated. At this point, forms whose onset had always consisted of plosive plus liquid could also be used after the trochaic caesura, e.g. \textit{Κλυταιμήστρη (Il. 1.113, Od. 11.442), πλέων (Il. 7.88, Od. 4.474)}.

- Originally, a different dialectal form was used in which there was no need to apply the license. The most important example is the preverb and preposition \textit{προ‑}, \textit{πρό‑}, which is generally thought to have replaced an older form \textit{πο‑} or \textit{πο‑}. This idea of Meillet has been widely accepted (cf. Janko 1979; but see chapter 7 for a different possibility).

- The form may have been recently introduced from the Ionic vernacular into Epic Greek. Wathelet (1966: 154–160) calls these cases \textit{abrègements récents} and gives an extensive list of words in which the license is applied once or twice, but normally avoided. Furthermore, he assumes that the regular application of the license in a few of the more frequent instances (e.g. \textit{ἀλλότριος, ἀλλόθροος}) is of recent date too, arguing that the forms in question may have been introduced from spoken Ionic into Epic Greek. These claims, which have been contested by Haug (2002), will be discussed in more detail in section 6.4.

If none of these points applies and the pre-form contained \textit{*r}, Wathelet speaks of \textit{abrègements anciens}. The following list contains all examples of \textit{McL} in Homeric forms with \textit{-ρα‑} or \textit{-ρο‑} (in alphabetical order) which according to Wathelet developed from \textit{*r}:

- \textit{ἀβροτάξομεν ‘we will miss’ (1)}
- \textit{ἀβρότη ‘immortal’ in the phrase νὺξ ἀβρότη (1)}
- \textit{ἀμφιβρότη ‘man-covering’ in the formula ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης (gen., 3)}
- \textit{ἀνδροτῆτα ‘vigor’ (3)}

---

36 Other cases cited by Wathelet are \textit{τρέμον (Od. 11.527), τρέφει (Od. 5.422, 13.410), τρήμος (Od. 21.19), Τρίκης (Il. 4.202), and τρόπος (Od. 4.782, 8.53)}.

37 There is also the form \textit{ἀνδρεῖφόντης ‘man-slaying’ (4 in a repeated formulaic verse), which is probably a re-shaping of \textit{*ἀνδραφόντης} or \textit{*ἀνδροφόντης}.}
– βεβροτωμένα ‘covered with gore’ (1 ×)
– βροτοῖσι ‘mortals’ (28 ×), βροτῶν (44 ×)38
– δράκων ‘snake’ (9 ×)
– θρόνος ‘throne’ (53 ×, of which 23 × with McL)
– κράνεια ‘cornel tree’ (2 ×)
– κραταιός ‘strong’ (13 ×, of which 9 × |Β Μοῖρα κραταιή)
– τράπεζα ‘table’ (35 ×, usually at verse end)
– τραπέσθαι ‘to turn’ intr., also with preverb προ- (7 ×).

For all individual forms in this list, Wathelet argues that their presence in Epic Greek goes back to a time when *r̥ was still part of the language. A recurring argument is that the words in question occur in “traditional” material. In order to establish this traditionality, Wathelet uses three different criteria: the form occurs in formulaic material; it frequently occurs in connection with other typical epic words (some of which may be of Mycenaean origin); or the word has a fixed position in the hexameter.39

After a substantial number of cases of McL had come into being in this way, its use was extended, in Wathelet’s view, to syllables starting with consonant plus liquid followed by an original full vowel. In this way, McL gradually acquired the status of a license. In the theonyms Ἀφροδίτη (42 ×), Κρόνος (24 ×), Κρονίων (44 ×), which have no established etymology and are not used after the main caesura, McL is argued to be due to an early extension of the license. The same holds for the alleged substitution of πρός for *πός and for the examples following the trochaic caesura. At a final stage, incidental light scansions became more frequent also in other positions. Wathelet does not exclude that this final extension was accompanied by a change of syllabification in spoken Ionic, but considers a combination of several other factors, such as the rise of secondary caesuras (i.e. prosodic breaks), to be more likely.40

38 For an analysis of the frequency and metrical behavior of the different case forms of βροτός, see section 7.2.1.
39 For instance, βροτοῖσι, κραταιός, τράπεζα, and τραπέσθαι mostly occur in verse-final position.
40 “... soit par l’apparition, mais alors très timide, d’un changement dans la coupe syllabique, soit plus probablement, par l’effet combiné de diverses analogies, celle des mots qui comportent originellement un r̥, l’exemple de πρός et aussi la multiplication des césures non médianes qui a permis aux aèdes de jouir d’une plus grande liberté de composition et de décaler à l’intérieur des hémistiches des éléments formulaires qui, situés primitivement après la coupe médiane suscitaient un abrègement autorisé par la présence de la césure elle-même.” (1966: 172–173; cf. also 163–161).
6.4 Criticism of Wathelet’s Scenario

Two lines of criticism have been advanced against Wathelet’s argument. First, it has been objected that the conclusion is unlikely for chronological reasons. In his article, Wathelet accepts the widespread view that the syllabic liquids had disappeared from Proto-Ionic and ‘Proto-Achaean’ before the Linear B tablets were inscribed. If this were correct, even substituting Mycenaean forms for the Homeric ones does not resolve the problem of scansion. For instance, if Myc. *to-pe-za is to be interpreted as /torpeda/, it is not a metrical equivalent of τράπεζα. In Wathelet’s words, “On en conclura donc qu’il faut remonter à une forme de l’achéen antérieure à celle de nos tablettes et qui connaissait encore des liquides voyelles” (1966: 170).

If so, the chronological gap between Homer and the assumed age of the formulaic material is at least seven centuries. Haug (2002: 63) rightly argues that the preservation of irregular scansion over such a long period of time would be highly unlikely. However, it must be stressed, with Heubeck (1972), that there is no compelling reason to date the disappearance of *r̥ from Mycenaean or Ionic-Attic as early as the 16th century BCE. As I will argue in chapters 7 and 11, it is possible that *r̥ was preserved until the 12th or even 11th century in Proto-Ionic. This would make the preservation of metrical traces of *r̥ in Homeric words with McL much less problematic. What is more, in my new scenario, forms with *r̥ were retained within Epic Greek longer than in the vernaculars, until not too long before Homer. In this way, then, the chronological objections against Wathelet’s account cease to be compelling.

---

41 Cf. Tichy (1981: 54–55), Haug (2002: 62 ff.), and the doubts in Hackstein (2002: 6–7).
42 This had originally been argued by e.g. Mühlestein (1958) and Ruijgh (1961): see section 1.1.1.
43 In his monograph on the Aeolisms of Greek epic, however, Wathelet (1970: 172–173) prefers to see the vocalization of *r̥ as a more recent, though still pre-Mycenaean, development.
44 Since Haug adheres to a synchronic explanation of word-initial tautosyllabic plosive plus liquid onsets, the argument mainly revolves around the supposed examples of McL scansion in word-internal position, ἀνδροτῆτα and ἀνδρεϊφόντῃ. I will discuss these forms extensively in section 7.3.
45 For a discussion of the Mycenaean data, see chapter 2.
46 In order to avoid misunderstandings, I wish to stress that my present argument does not presuppose the existence of the dactylic hexameter in its Homeric form for several centuries. On the contrary, from the different treatments of *r̥ in Epic Greek and the Ionic vernacular, it follows that the dactylic hexameter had more or less reached its Homeric form when *r̥ vocalized in Proto-Ionic (see chapter 11). This refutes most of the currently available proto-hexameter theories. For another convincing line of criticism against the proto-hexameter, see Hoekstra (1981), and cf. section 1.5.3.
A second line of criticism has been advanced by Haug (2002: 64–67). In his view, Wathelet provides insufficient argumentation in support of the formulaic behavior of individual forms. In order to establish his group of old examples of _McL_ scansion, Wathelet first isolates several incidental and non-formulaic instances. These are either clear linguistic innovations (e.g. thematic δακρύοισι at _Od._ 18.173 for older δάκρυσι, contracted χράτα at _Od._ 8.92 beside uncontracted χράσσα), deviations from the normal prosodic behavior of a word (as in the anapestic scansion of φαρέτρης at _Il._ 8.323, χράτος placed before a consonant at _Il._ 20.121, or πρώτος preceded by a light thesis syllable at _Od._ 3.320 and 17.275), or transformations of traditional material. Haug does not contest Wathelet’s decision in any of these incidental cases. There are, however, also a number of more frequent words that regularly undergo _McL_ but cannot be derived from a pre-form with *r̥*. This makes them potential counterevidence to Wathelet’s thesis. In order to exclude the forms in question from his list of _abrègements anciens_, Wathelet makes certain assumptions regarding their formulaic behavior.

The two most important cases criticized by Haug (2002: 65) are ἀλλότριος ‘someone else’s; foreign’ and ἀλλόθροος ‘of foreign tongue’. According to Haug, there is no clear criterion proving that the first hemistich οἴκῳ ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ (2 ×) is a recent formula, or that verse-final ἀλλότριος φώς (3 ×) was formed later than ἱσόθεος φώς (14 ×), as Wathelet claims. Moreover, Haug observes that recently coined formulae may acquire huge popularity in a relatively brief span of time; in his view this casts doubt on the possibility to discern older from younger formulaic material.

---

47 “Après ce triage tout à fait légitime [i.e. Wathelet’s groups 1 and 2], il reste nombre d’abrègements que Wathelet veut diviser en abrègements récents et abrègements anciens. Pour cela, il se sert de l’analyse formulaire contre laquelle nous avons élevé de critiques d’ordre général dans l’introduction. Cette méthode nous semble peu exacte et elle permet souvent de trouver ce que l’on cherche” (Haug 2002: 65).

48 “formes isolées dans l’épopée […] qui ne sont manifestement pas formulaires” (Wathelet 1966: 155).

49 Haug (2002: 20 and 23) cites the example |B ὠκέα Ἶρις, which occurs 20 times in Homer, but seems to be recent in view of the Ionic shortening of -εῖα to -έα (common in Herodotus, but exceptional in Homer). Another example is the formula |T Κρόνου πάις ἀγκυλομήτεω (on which see chapter 7). I do not think, however, that the existence of such cases should entirely prevent us from distinguishing more ancient from more modern layers in Homeric diction. Concerning the two examples just mentioned, we may observe that |T Κρόνου πάις ἀγκυλομήτεω competes with the metrically and referentially equivalent formula |T πατὴρ ἄνδρων τε θεῶν τε, and that the antiquity of Ἶρις in the tradition may well be questioned; Erbse (1986: 54–65) counts her among the “von den Epikern entdeckte oder umgeschaffene (verwandelte) Gottheiten”.
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I do not share Haug’s doubts concerning the priority of ἰσόθεος φῶς: the epithet ἰσόθεος is clearly generic, and the only one with this metrical structure and function (cf. Parry 1971: 91). This does not mean, however, that ἀλλότριος φῶς cannot have existed as well, because here we are dealing with a particularized epithet. However, even if this point is granted, there are two strong arguments for considering both ἀλλότριος and ἀλλόθροος relatively late intruders into Epic Greek. In terms of word-shape, one expects the first syllable of these words to be placed in the thesis of the third or fourth foot, in which case their use would not necessitate McL. The complete absence of these two words from their expected positions in Homer is odd. Furthermore, as Wathelet has remarked, ἀλλόθροος does not occur at all in the Iliad, and ἀλλότριος occurs only twice in the Iliad, as against 15 × in the Odyssey. Both points mark them out as potentially late intruders; as we will see in chapter 7, an increase in McL in the Odyssey is also found for the plural forms of θρόνος ‘throne’, another word that probably did not originally have *r̥. A final point to note is that ἀλλότριος may have to be scanned with synizesis, al.lot.ri̯os, compare the scansion of words like Αἰγυπτίας and Ἱστίαιαν (cf. West 1997: 220). Indeed, Il. 2.537 Χαλκίδα τ’ Εἰρέτριάν τε πολυστάφυλόν θ’ Ἱστίαιαν possibly contains desyllabification of iota twice in the same line (Εἰρέτριαν, Ἱστίαιαν). As for ἀλλόθροος, this word only occurs in the Odyssey: |τ ἐπ’ ἀλλοθρόους ἄνθρωπους (1 ×), |τ κατ’ ἀλλοθρόους ἄνθρωπους (2 ×), and the line πλάζετ’ ἐπ’ ἀλλοθρόων ἄνθρων δήμων τε πόλιν τε (1 ×). It is not found in Attic prose, but only occurs a few times in the tragedians and in Herodotus. Haug is right that its status as a recent introduction from Ionic cannot be proven, but on the other hand, this scenario cannot be excluded either. As we will see below, this use of ἀλλόθροος fits in a wider picture: the Odyssey poet uses McL word-internally provided that the cluster follows a morpheme boundary, whereas the Iliad poet is still very reluctant to do this.

In sum, Haug’s critique of Wathelet’s argument is partly justified: it is sometimes difficult to prove or disprove the antiquity of a particular phrase or formula. This does not mean, however, that Wathelet’s distinction between abrègements anciens and abrègements récents breaks down. Various words and

50 It goes without saying that Parry was much too rigid in applying his principle of economy, but (pace Haug) I see no reason to doubt the validity of this principle in general terms.

51 Cf. also Tichy 1981: 30, who is right in adducing the forms σχετλίη (Il. 3.414), ἀλλότριος and Εἰρέτριαν τε only with reserve. In Van Beek 2013, I argued that ἀλλότριος could be a relatively late replacement of ἀλλοδαπός ‘foreign’, and that while ἀλλότριος is a recent form, some of the phrases in which it occurs are old elements of the tradition. This is conceivable, but it is unnecessary for the present argument to insist on it.

52 This observation makes the criticism of Haug (2002: 66) irrelevant.
phrases listed by Wathelet, for which *r̥ can be reconstructed, are clearly traditional. This becomes even more clear from a quantitative analysis of the evidence, to which we shall turn now.

6.5 Quantitative and Qualitative Evidence for McL in Homer

Basing myself on a collection and analysis of all instances of McL in Homer and other early Greek epic texts, I conclude that Wathelet's account is basically correct. An exhaustive analysis of the evidence falls outside the scope of this chapter and will be published elsewhere, but the most important data will be presented in order to prove the point.

What follows first is a list of all words or lexemes in which McL occurs at least 3 times in the Iliad.53 If a word occurs only in one single formulaic phrase, its specific case form is cited; otherwise the dictionary entry is given. The number of occurrences in the Iliad is given in brackets; the forms are listed in alphabetical order.

| Word         | Iliad Occurrences | Dictionary Entry |
|--------------|------------------|------------------|
| ἀμφιβρότη    | 4                | πρός, προτι (26) |
| Ἀφροδίτη     | 30               | προσαυδάω (91)   |
| βραχίων      | 5                | πρόσω (3)        |
| βροτός       | 25               | πρόσωπον (4)     |
| δράκων       | 8                | τράπεζα (5)      |
| θρασειάων    | 6                | πρός (4)         |
| Κρονίων      | 23               | τρίτος (3)       |
| Κρόνος       | 17               |                 |
| Πριαμίδης     | 10               |                 |
| πρό σ          | 4                |                 |
| προκείμενα    | 3                |                 |
| πρός          | 3                |                 |
| προσαυδάω     | 91               |                 |
| πρός          | 4                |                 |
| προκείμενα     | 3                |                 |
| πρός          | 4                |                 |
| προσαυδάω     | 91               |                 |
| πρός          | 4                |                 |

From this list, we must leave aside phrases containing the preposition πρός as well as forms of the prefixed verb προσαυδάω, as it is widely agreed that they may be replacements of *πός and *ποσαυδάω (or the like).54

After this reduction, the remaining evidence shows a clear correlation between McL and the presence of *r̥ in the pre-form. The forms for which a reconstruction with *r̥ is certain are cited in bold, and those for which *r̥ can

---

53 In the case of πρό, I only counted instances of the preposition, not of the preverb. I have also left aside the name Ὀτρυντεύς (1 ×) and the patronymic Ὀτρυντείδης (2 ×), which occur within a span of 7 lines (II. 20.383–389). Given the general rarity of internal McL, this small passage (kill scene with biographical details) is highly suspect of being an expansion that was introduced into the text later: cf. Schulze 1892: 103. In any case, these decisions would not drastically alter the numbers or affect the overall conclusion.

54 As I will argue in chapter 7, it may well be that πρός before a long vowel reflects *prs- < *prti-. However, I will not base any conclusions on this.
be excluded with certainty are given in italics. Sorted by decreasing number of attestations, the evidence looks as follows:

| Word       | Frequency |
|------------|-----------|
| Ἀφροδίτη    | 30        |
| βροτός     | 25        |
| Κρονίων     | 23        |
| Κρόνος     | 17        |
| κραταιός   | 11        |
| Πριαμίδης   | 10        |
| δράκων     | 8         |
| θρασειάων   | 6         |
| Βραχίων     | 5         |
| τράπεζα     | 5         |
| ἀμφιβρότη   | 4         |
| πρόσωπον   | 4         |
| θρόνῳ      | 3         |
| κραδαίνω   | 3         |
| προκείμενα  | 3         |
| πρόσω      | 3         |
| τρίτος     | 3         |

The presence of a syllabic liquid is certain in 59 of these 167 cases, which amounts to 35.3%. This does not in any way seem decisive. However, the group of forms with McL for which a syllabic liquid can be excluded is much smaller. The words θρόνος, κραδαίνω, and Κρόνος have no good etymology (see chapter 7), and the reconstruction of *r̥ in βραχίων is uncertain, but possible. Only in Πριαμίδης, πρό, and τρίτος (together making up just about 10% of all tokens) it is certain that McL cannot be related to a syllabic liquid. Moreover, as we will see in chapter 7, there is fairly strong independent evidence for the presence of a syllabic liquid in Ἀφροδίτη, πρόσω, πρόσωπον and the formulaic verse containing προκείμενα. If we add these cases to the group of certain ones, the proportion of words with *r̥ among all instances of McL in the Iliad increases to 59.3%.

But this is not all: the picture becomes even clearer if we leave out the personal names (the use of which could, at least according to previous scholars, be ascribed to metrical compulsion):

| Word       | Frequency |
|------------|-----------|
| βροτός     | 25        |
| κραταιός   | 11        |
| δράκων     | 8         |
| θρασειάων   | 6         |
| βραχίων     | 5         |
| τράπεζα     | 5         |
| θρόνῳ      | 3         |
| πρόσω      | 3         |
| τρίτος     | 3         |

Applying these reductions to the evidence, it appears that five of the six lexical words in which McL occurs most frequently in the Iliad derive from pre-forms with *r. Moreover, three of these forms with *r (βροτός, κραταιός, θρασειάων) are found partly or exclusively in formulae that are clearly archaic; this also holds for ἀμφιβρότη.

55 In the case of τρίτος, one might even envisage whether it could perhaps reflect an archaic *tyto- that was preserved in the epic tradition, but I will refrain from doing so.
In terms of absolute numbers, **McL** is more frequent in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*, and it becomes even more frequent in Hesiod and the *Hymns*. My own counts, which I will present and analyze in a separate article, corroborate Wathelet’s claims to this effect.56 A steady overall increase of **McL** is detectable in Hesiod and the *Hymns*. More importantly, in these sources **McL** remains to a large extent restricted to the same set of lexemes where it is frequent in Homer (Ἀφροδίτη, βροτός, δράκων, κραταιός, Κρονίων, Κρόνος, πρό, πρός, προσ-ηύδα). In other words, there was a fixed set of lexemes for which poets simply learned that **McL** could be (or had to be) applied. These words with ‘traditional’ **McL** mostly have a pre-form with *r̥*. The other, non-traditional cases of **McL** may well be related to a change in syllabification in the spoken language, as Wathelet also admitted, but the exact scenario by which this happened need not further concern us here.

A second important point concerns cases of word-internal **McL** in Homer. As remarked above, these are relatively marginal compared to word-initial **McL**. Apart from Ἀφροδίτη (which occurs 42× in Homer) and potential instances of synizesis (de-syllabified iota or upsilon) such as ἀλλότριος, there are a mere 33 instances of word-internal **McL** in Homer, divided over 20 different lexemes (ἄμφιβρότη and ἀλλόθροος occur 4× each). Sommer (1909: 190–191) has given clear arguments for viewing word-internal **McL** in Epic Greek as secondary with respect to word-initial **McL**. This point has been accepted by various later scholars, including Wathelet (1966) and Tichy (1981),57 but it can be refined in various ways.

In order to make this claim, Sommer had to assume that the name of the goddess Ἀφροδίτη was admitted in epic verse only *metri causa*, by default of alternatives. This assumption is problematic because other important names in which **McL** could have been applied were apparently excluded from hexameter verse at an early stage. This holds in particular for the name of Heracles: in Homer the hero’s name in the nominative never occurs as uncontracted Ἡρακλέης, but instead we find βίη Ἡρακλείη (?Il. 11.690) and βίη Ἡρακλῆος (?Il. 18.117), clearly reflecting an artificial strategy designed in order to avoid the metrically problematic form Ἡρακλέης. By contrast, the nom. sg. Ἡρακλέης appears twice in Hesiod (?Th. 318, 527), while acc. sg. Ἡρακλέα (with the outcome of quantitative metathesis) occurs twice in the *Scutum*. It is unclear whether these post-Homeric forms must be read with synizesis of -έη- and -έα, or rather with

---

56 See Wathelet (1966: 148 with n. 1).
57 For the *Iliad*, Tichy (1981: 30) speaks of word-internal **McL** as “eine nur im Einzelfall wahrgenommene poetische Lizenz”.

---
tautosyllabic word-internal -κλ-, but in either case the fact remains that Ἡρακλέης was apparently not an admissible form in traditional epic diction.

The same point is true even more clearly of the nominative form Πατροκλέης, which the Iliad poet never uses. Instead, he resorts to three different strategies: (1) the periphrasis Πατροκλῆος λάσιον κήρ (II. 16.554), (2) using the vocativus pro nominativo (e.g. ὡς ἐπὶ Κεβριόνη Πατρόκλεες άλσο μεμαώς II. 16.754), and (3) using the nominative of the hypocoristic name Πάτροκλος, the most frequently used option.58 This observation is important since the figure of Patroclus is generally considered to be a relatively late invention (perhaps by Homer himself or a direct predecessor) in the story of the Trojan war. It shows that word-internal Mc1 was not only traditionally disallowed, but still strongly avoided by the Iliad poet himself, even at a morpheme boundary.

Still not considering Ἀφροδίτη for the time being, there are 33 Homeric instances of word-internal McL. How to account for these cases? Interestingly, 10 instances (8 of them in the Iliad) can be ascribed to the vocalization of *r̥:

- ἀμφιβρότη (ἀσπίδος ἀμφιβρότης II. 2.389; 12.402; 20.281; ἀμφιβρότην II. 11.32);
- προτράπεσα (II. 6.336); προτράπηται (Od. 11.18); προτραποίμην (Od. 12.381);
- ἀβροτάξομεν (II. 10.65);
- νύς ἀβρότη (II. 14.78);
- τετράκυκλον ἀπήνην (II. 24.324).

Most of the remaining 23 cases occur at a morpheme boundary (at the seam of compounds, after the augment, and after a reduplication syllable), e.g.

- ἀμφι-δρυφής (II. 2.700);
- τειχεσι-πλῆτα (II. 5.31 = 455);
- ἀλλό-θροος (4 × Od.);
- ἐνέ-κρυψε (Od. 5.488);
- πρωτό-πλοος (Od. 8.35),

as well as several other cases, most of them in the Odyssey. Sommer therefore concluded that the possibility to use Mc1 word-internally started at morpheme boundaries, adding: “Das sind dieselben Fälle, vor denen die attischen Dramatiker höchst ungern die Langmessung zulassen”.

In only 7 lexemes with word-internal McL, no morpheme boundary is involved: Ἀφροδίτη, τετράκυκλον, ἄβροτάξομεν,59 φαρέτρης, Ὀτρυντεύς and Ὀτρυν-

---

58 The vocative Πάτροκλέ μοι δειλῇ appears with McL only once, in the lament of Briseis over the dead body of Patroclus (II. 19.287). The use of this form is not conditioned by metrical considerations exclusively, as the vocative Πατρόκλεες and its contracted version Πατρόκλεις could have been used, too.

59 Sommer wrongly analyzes ἄβροτάξομεν as a compound with ἀ- (in reality, it is related to ἁμαρτάνω and νημερτής, so the alpha belongs to the root, and the PI sequence is word-
However, how feasible is it to include Ἀφροδίτη among the cases of secondary extension of the license, given the high number of occurrences and the manifestly traditional nature of the formulaic system involving this name? I think Sommer’s analysis can be reinforced by the observation that three of the 7 lexemes just mentioned once had (or may have had) *γ: ἄβροτάξομεν, τετράκυκλον, and Ἀφροδίτη. A mention of Ἀφροδίτη in this connection may come as a surprise, but as argued in chapters 3 and 7, we must seriously consider the possibility that her name reflects *Ἀφρ̥δήτη. Thus, the only cases of word-internal McL in Homer which involve neither *γ nor a per-spicuous morpheme boundary are φαρέτρης (II. 8.323), Ὀτρυντείδης (II. 20.383 and 389), Ὀτρυντεύς (II. 20.384) and ἄπλωλώειν (Od. 19.122).

On the other hand, in the Iliad only the following word-forms undergoing word-internal McL do not derive from a pre-form with *γ: ἀμφιδρυφής, Ὀτρυντεύς, Πάτροκλε μοι, προτρέποντο, τεχεσιπλῆτα, and φαρέτρης. Two points must be made regarding these cases. First, most of these tautosyllabic scansions occur in contexts with a secondary appearance: for instance, προτρέποντο may have been influenced by forms of the corresponding aorist προτραπέσθαι (and τραπέσθαι), which occur several times with McL; on the use of Πάτροκλος, see above; and the scansion of ἀμφιδρυφής is counterbalanced by that of ἀμφιδρυ-φοι ... παρεἰαί (II. 11.393) without McL. Finally, the name Ὀτρυντεύς plus the patronymic Ὀτρυντείδης occur three times in one single kill-scene, referring to the father of the hero Ἰφιτίων. In fact, the scene as a whole could easily be a secondary insertion. Note that metrical necessity was not involved: inflected forms of Ὀτρυντεύς could have been used at the beginning or end of the line.

Secondly, there are only 4 cases in the Iliad where word-internal McL can be ascribed to a morpheme boundary (ἀμφιδρυφής, Πάτροκλε μοι, προτρέποντο, and τεχεσιπλῆτα). In fact, 3 of these 4 forms occur in parts of the Iliad that are

60 “Angesichts dieses Tatbestandes kann es kaum zweifelhaft sein, dass die “correptio” im Wortinnern eine jüngere Verlegung der Silbengrenze darstellt, die von den erstgenannten, etymologisch zerelegbaren Fällen ausgegangen ist.”

61 There is a varia lectio δάκρυ πλώειν (accepted by von der Mühll and van Thiel). Perhaps more relevant for present purposes is the fact that Od. 19.122 is absent from two important manuscripts.

62 Cf. Schulze 1892: 100, who notes that the name of the next victim, Δημολέων at line 395, could easily be substituted for that of Ἰφιτίων in line 382, yielding a seamless transition if we delete the 13 lines in between.
suspected to be recent additions for independent reasons: ἀμφιθρυφής occurs in the Catalogue of Ships, while προτρέποντο and τειχεσιπλῆτα are found in Iliad 5, a book whose numerous peculiarities have been highlighted by Cassio (2012).

In the Odyssey, by contrast, word-internal McL is clearly connected with the presence of a morpheme boundary: the only exception is δακρυπλώειν. Moreover, apart from προτράπηται and προτραποίμην, none of the lexemes involved occurs in the Iliad. There is good reason, then, to suppose that word-internal PL was tautosyllabic after a morpheme boundary for the Odyssey poet, but not yet for the Iliad poet. If this is correct, the most plausible explanation for the scansion of word-internal PL in Ἀφροδίτη, ἀβροτάξομεν, ἀβρότη, προτραπέσθαι, τετράκυκλον, and νῦς ἀβρότη is that this phenomenon is indeed due to the vocalization of *r̥.

In sum, the above investigation of quantitative and quantitative aspects of McL in Homer (and other early epic texts) leads to the following conclusions:

– Of all words that occur three or more times with tautosyllabic scansion of PL in the Iliad, a clear majority can be ascribed to the vocalization of *r̥, and only for a small minority any connection with *r̥ is excluded;
– Word-internal PL is normally heterosyllabic in both Iliad and Odyssey;
– Word-internal PL following a morpheme boundary was potentially tautosyllabic for the Odyssey poet, but not yet for the Iliad poet;
– The McL scansion of Ἀφροδίτη, ἀβροτάξομεν, ἀβρότη, ἀμφιβρότης, προτραπέσθαι, and τετράκυκλον is due to pre-forms with *r̥;
– The McL license started to proliferate only after *r̥ had been vocalized; however, in this process a shifting syllable boundary in PL onsets also played a role.

6.6 Avoidance of McL Scansion in Epic Greek

There is another reason to distinguish traditional cases of McL. The existence of artificial formations that were apparently coined in order to avoid McL suggests that this type of scansion was once structurally avoided in Epic Greek. I will discuss three salient cases.

One example is the pair γλυκύς : γλυκερός, both meaning ‘sweet’. The old form is clearly γλυκύς -εῖα -ύ, which also exists in the Classical language. The odd form γλυκερός, which is attested mainly in Homer and occasionally in lyric poetry in dactylic or anapestic meters, was created analogically beside γλυκύς, probably

63 Interestingly, the verse containing δακρυπλώειν is absent from two important manuscripts.
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on the model of the pair κρατύς : κρατερός. Note that κρατερός is a very frequent form and that its formation in -ερός was inherited from Proto-Greek (see chapter 5). Part of the reason for creating a by-form γλυκερός must have been the feminine γλυκεῖα, which could not be used in the epic hexameter. Rather than forcing γλυκεῖα into their verses, epic poets apparently preferred to create the artificial but metrically convenient γλυκερός.

It is clearly the productive form in Epic Greek, being found 20 × in various different case forms of all genders, while γλυκύς, though slightly more frequent (22 ×), is used only in the nom. and acc. sg. m. and n., mainly in traditional material containing the noun phrases γλυκὺς ὑπνός and γλυκὺς ἱμερός.

A second example of artificial word-formation in order to avoid McL is the insertion of a nasal in the θη- aorist of the verbs κλίνω and κρίνω, cf. already Chantraine (1958: 112). The aorist stem κλινθη‑ occurs 16 × in Homer (6 × in the Odyssey), while κλῖθη‑, the stem-form of the spoken language, is attested only 3 times with McL, and only in the Odyssey (forms: ἐκλίθη, κλιθήναι). The aorist stem κρινθη‑ occurs 9 times, while the form διέκρῑθεν without a nasal occurs once (II. 2.815) in a 3rd plural form in -εν (an archaism) that was metrically unproblematic. In other stems of these two verbs, the PL-onset always makes position. Similar phenomena are found in other verbs:

- The normal form of the inagentive aorist of βλάπτω ‘to hinder, drive off course’ in the spoken language was no doubt ἐβλάβην, as usually in Classical Attic, but Homer mostly uses the form in -θη‑ (ἐβλάφθην). The only exception is the 3rd plural ἐβλάβεν (II. 23.461), βλάβεν (II. 23.545), but this is also the only form that easily fits the meter. It looks as if ἐβλάφθην is another artificial formation.

- In active thematic aorist stems with roots of the structure /CraC-/ (e.g. ἔδρα‑κον, ἔτρα‑πον), no participle forms in -ών‑, ‑όν‑ and no subjunctive forms are attested, presumably because these were metrically problematic.

Finally, one lexical item deserves special attention. The superlative κράτιστος ‘best’ is usual in the classical language, but Homer avoids this form (which apparently scanned irregularly), whereas he does use the artificial form κάρ‑τιστος ‘strongest’. This form was created analogically beside the normal form.

---

64 The few occurrences of γλυκερός in lyric poetry are easily interpreted as epicisms.
65 This again shows that the Odyssey poet followed less strict rules compared to the Iliad poet. Similarly, forms with McL containing the root of κρύπτω ‘to hide’ occur only in the Odyssey: ἐνέκρυψε, κεκρυμμένα, κρυφηδόν.
66 Middle aorist forms of τρέπω (τρά‑ποντο, τρα‑πέσθαι, etc.) occur 7 × in verse-final position and can be viewed as archaisms. The same holds for the aorist subjunctive τρα‑πέ‑σιμαι (to τέρ‑πο‑μαι). On these forms, see sections 6.8.5 and 6.8.9.
κράτιστος on the basis of the doublet καρτερός : κρατερός (see chapter 5). Now, it seems enigmatic that McL was apparently a problem in κράτιστος, but not in the etymologically related adjective κραταιός. Why was κραταιός tolerated, and why was κράτιστος inadmissible? The reason must be, I think, that κράτιστος as a superlative originally had an e-grade root (*krētisto‑), while κραταιός reflects a form with *r̥, *kr̥taiu̯ó‑. Again, the presence of *r̥ may explain why McL was acceptable in a formulaic word like κραταιός.67

Without a doubt, this list of structural avoidances could be extended.68 Such cases confirm that the use of McL in a closed group of lexical items (including βροτός, δράκων, κραταιός) requires an explanation. Wathelet’s account, which finds this explanation in the vocalization of *r̥, is attractive because most members of this select group of lexical items indeed once contained *r̥. Homer also uses the McL license in other lexemes, and this may well be related to a concomitant change of syllabification in spoken Ionic at the time of composition of the Iliad and Odyssey; but this is not of our direct concern here.69

6.7 Epic *r̥: ‑φα‑ Is the Regular Reflex of Artificially Retained *r̥

In spite of its attractive sides, certain problems with Wathelet’s scenario remain. In Wathelet’s words, “les aèdes ont tenu à conserver des expressions traditionnelles, tout en leur laissant suivre l’évolution de la langue” (1966: 172, my emphasis). Thus, he thinks that formulaic expressions automatically underwent the phonological developments of the poets’ vernacular, and that forms with McL scansion came into being as a result of the change *r̥ > ‑φα‑ (in Proto-Aeolic or pre-Mycenaean), after which Ionic counterparts with ‑φα‑, when available, would have been substituted later.

However, if the indications that ‑φα‑ was the regular phonological reflex of *r̥ in Proto-Ionic are taken seriously, the outcome ‑φα‑ in forms like δράκων, θρασειάων, κραδίη, τράπεζα, and τραπείομεν cannot be due to a normal Ionic development of *r̥ (as it cannot be explained as an analogical reflex in these

67 The regular application of the license in δράκων ‘snake’ was acceptable because its pre-form was *dr̥kōn. Forms of the thematic aorist ἔδρακον with tautosyllabic δ‑ (e.g. δρακών) are not found in Homer, although they also had a pre-form with *r̥. Their metrical behavior must therefore be explained; see chapter 8.

68 Another example is the avoidance of the gen. pl. in ‑ων when the preceding syllable has the structure /CCVC-/ in which case Homer may use the artificial thematic ending ‑φι(ν), e.g. δακρυόφιν.

69 For further details see Van Beek in prep.
words). As for the forms with -ρα- such as βροτός, an origin as direct borrowings from Mycenaean is now excluded in view of the results obtained in chapters 2 and 3: such forms would have to be Aeolisms. Is it possible to analyze the Homeric forms with -ρα- as Ionicized versions of Aeolic forms with -ρο- (under influence of forms with -αρ- in the spoken language)? This would imply that Aeolic forms such as *κροδία, *δρόκων, *κροτερός, πέτροτος and *τρόπεζα were changed artificially into their Homeric counterparts with -ρα-. In a case like πέτροτος, it is perhaps conceivable that this became τέτρατος by contamination with τέταρτος, in view of the existence of other ordinals in -ατος. However, in cases like *τρόπεζα and *δρόκων it would be gratuitous to assume the existence of older Ionic forms *τάρπεζα and *δάρκων, of which no trace exists.

We must also take into account that the epic aorist ἤμβροτον, corresponding to Ionic (and also Homeric) ἥμαρτον, shows no sign of such contamination, although its temporal augment ἤ- was in fact adapted to Ionic morphophonology.

Some readers will be tempted to conclude from these problems that *f > -ρα- was, after all, the regular Proto-Ionic development. However, they will have to explain, among other things, why and how κράδια was changed into καρδία in the vernacular (cf. section 6.1), how καρτερός, ταρφές and τέταρτος came into being, and why most by-forms with -ρα- are virtually limited to Epic Greek. In order to explain this distribution between prose forms with -αρ- and epic or poetic forms with -ρα- or -ρο-, I propose that the development of *f in Epic Greek differed from that in the vernacular dialects. I assume the following stages of development:

1. When the relevant vernacular dialects (Proto-Ionic, Proto-Aeolic, Mycenaean) vocalized *f, this sound was preserved in Epic Greek.
2. After this point, words with the outcome of the vernacular sound changes (e.g. -αρ- and analogical -ρα- from Ionic) could be introduced into Epic Greek.
3. Later on, perhaps much later, Epic Greek underwent its own conditioned sound change: *f > -ρα-, but -ρο- after labial consonants.

---

70 As we will see in section 7.2.4, another instance of poetic versus prose variants is Epic ἤμβροτον versus Classical ἥμαρτον.

71 The possibility that *f was retained longer in Epic Greek is in fact briefly considered by Haug, but only to be immediately rejected: “Naturellement, on peut admettre que la langue épique a gardé le r voyelle plus longtemps que le vernaculaire, mais même dans une tradition très conservatrice, il semble peu probable que l’on ait gardé longtemps un phonème qui n’existait plus dans le vernaculaire” (Haug 2002: 63). It is unclear to me on what evidence the final claim is based.
Henceforth, I will refer to such cases of retained *ṛ, which underwent an inner-epic development to -rho- and -rho-, as “Epic *ṛ”. This scenario has been introduced and motivated already in section 1.5, and here I will discuss several issues in more detail.

The language of Epic Greek is commonly viewed as an artificial mixture of linguistic forms, consisting of the vernacular of a poet plus a large number of traditional, dialectal, and artificial features. It is usually taken for granted that phonological developments took place in Epic Greek just as they did in the poets’ vernacular(s), unless there was a compelling metrical reason to retain an older form. This is reflected in the principle formulated by Milman Parry (Parry 1971: 331):

> as the spoken language changes, the traditional diction of an oral poetry likewise changes, so long as there is no need of giving up any of the formulas.

This is, clearly, the background of Wathelet’s formulation cited above, “les aèdes ont tenu à conserver des expressions traditionnelles, tout en leur laissant suivre l’évolution de la langue”. Following Parry’s principle, however, one expects words with *ṛ occurring in traditional or formulaic material not to be changed along with the spoken language, but instead to retain this sound because the vocalized forms with -rho- (Ionic), -rho- (Aeolic) or -or- (if that was the Mycenaean reflex) would have distorted the prosodic structure. This means that formulaic phrases like *Moria kr̥taiu̯ā may have been preserved in the tradition when *ṛ was vocalized in the relevant vernacular, e.g. to Mycenaean *kortaiu̯ā or Proto-Ionic *kartaiu̯ā.

However, even if we apply Parry’s formulation (rather than Wathelet’s) to the potential Homeric evidence for *ṛ, it does not account for all the reflexes that we find. One would in this case expect to encounter forms like *dārkōn or *tāρ-πεζα (with the Ionic vocalization), as the attested forms δράκων and τράπεζα do not occur in ostensibly formulaic material. However, no forms like *dārkōn or *tāρ-πεζα survive in Homer, and it would be quite impossible to prove the formulaic status of all epic words with -rho- or -rho- reflecting *ṛ.73

---

72 An exception is στράτος ‘army’ < *stṛtōs.
73 That is, unless one is prepared to argue that the pre-forms of δράκων and τράπεζα were already ‘formulaic’ in some sense of that word. Wathelet’s claim (1966) that all structural cases of muta cum liquida scansion in Homer are part of formulaic material is, in fact, the main problem with his scenario for the origin of this metrical license. See the (partly justified) criticism by Haug (2002: 64–67). The problems with Parry’s conception of the
Nevertheless, it is plausible that at earlier stages, too, the tradition made use of words and forms that no longer existed in the vernaculars (cf. section 1.5.2). If the prosodic structure of such forms would have been altered by a certain sound change, the default treatment may well have been to retain the traditional form; later on, forms reflecting the sound change were introduced from the vernacular whenever this was functionally and metrically useful. To give an example, the traditional form *kr̥dīā was preserved as such (and later developed into κραδίη); later on, the vernacular form καρδίη was introduced, but only marginally, as it was metrically awkward. Indeed, a similar scenario may account for other typical epic forms, such as those containing diectasis. It is plausible that forms like */horaonsi/ ‘they see’ were at first preserved when the poets’ vernacular underwent contraction, yielding */horɔːnsi/. Subsequently, the vernacular form ὀρῶσι (with a different metrical structure) was introduced into Epic Greek; and at a final stage the vocalism of the traditional form *ὁράουσι was adapted to that of ὀρῶσι, yielding the compromise form ὀρόωσι (displaying the phenomenon now known as diectasis).

In my view, then, all traditional elements of epic diction simply retained their traditional pronunciation (and, therewith, prosodic structure) whenever the same form was subject to sound change in the vernacular. Forms containing the outcome of a vernacular sound change also penetrated into Epic Greek, but only by lexical diffusion. I am confident that this new model can also be fruitfully applied to other Ionic sound changes, such as prevocalic shortening / quantitative metathesis and the loss of initial digamma, but to elaborate the evidence for this in full detail would probably require another monograph.

Let us apply this scenario to the vocalization * egret in Proto-Ionic. All traditional epic words with * egret, e.g. *dṛkōn, *tṛpedia, *kṛtaios, were retained at the time of vocalization. Later on, vocalized forms were introduced from the Ionic vernacular, e.g. ταρφέες, καρτερός, ταρπῆναι and, with leveled root vocalism, κρατύς, βραδύς, ἔδραμον. There may have been different reasons for preserving traditional epic forms with * egret. In most instances, the word in question was absent from the (Proto-Ionic, Aeolic) vernacular: in my view this was probably the case in e.g. *dṛkōn, *stṛtōs, and *tṛpedia. Secondly, even when a vernacu-

74 For the suggestion to apply the scenario proposed here to labiovelar developments, see Van Beek 2013.
75 These words occur in the context of heroic exploits (δράκων), banqueting scenes and rituals of hospitality (τράπεζα), and war narrative (στρατός). See further section 6.8 below.
lar counterpart existed, the form with Epic *ᵣ may have been retained in order to preserve the structure of the formula where it occurred, e.g. in ὑπ' ἡμείν ὑπ' ἀναπτυγμένοι, where using ἀναπτυγμένοι would have yielded a different third foot caesura. Thirdly, the vernacular form may have been metrically inconvenient by its own means. For instance, καρδίη could only be used in the nom. and dat. sg. before a vowel; it is in fact used by Homer, but only three times. Note that Epic *ᵣ was retained not only in words which would later develop McK scansion, but also in words whose scansion was never problematic, as στρατός < *str̥tos and κραδίη < *kr̥diā illustrate.

We now have to ask how the inner-epic vocalization of *ᵣ (development 3 above) may be conceived of. Is it possible to point out parallel cases? As a language that was recited and pronounced, Epic Greek was also subject to changes in pronunciation, even if one assumes that it was phonetically more conservative. Since *ᵣ had been eliminated from all Greek vernaculars, Epic *ᵣ apparently became liable to articulatory change at some point. As in some vernaculars, an anaptyctic [ə] grew after the liquid rather than before it, yielding a relatively minor distortion of the original rhythmical and metrical shape. Subsequently, this phonetic change was phonologized when [ra] merged with the already-existing sequence /ra/. Moreover, as I argue in chapter 7, [ra] may have yielded /ro/ by a conditioned change after labial consonants.

Interestingly, a parallel process may have occurred in Indo-Aryan. Sanskrit ᵐ is pronounced as [r̥] in most present-day traditions, while the outcome of ᵐ in Middle Indic dialects was a, i, or u, without an articulatory trace of the rhotic.76 Berger (1955) has convincingly argued that the modern pronunciation of Sanskrit ᵐ cannot be traced back to an intermediary stage [ra] in the vernacular development ᵐ > a, i, u. The conclusions he draws from this for the artificial pronunciation of Sanskrit ᵐ deserve to be quoted in full:

In diesem Zusammenhang muss auch davor gewarnt werden, die heute in Indien gebräuchliche Aussprache von ᵐ als ri mit dem mittelindischen Lautwandel in Verbindung zu bringen. Die neuindische ri-Aussprache ist nur eine künstliche Substitution durch Leute, die in ihrer mittelindischen Muttersprache das ᵐ-Phonem längst nicht mehr kannten, die charakteristische r-Artikulation aber, die durch Prātiśākhya, die Grammatiker

---

76 As established by Berger (1955), the undisturbed reflex of Skt. ᵐ in Pali is a; the reflex i is found in word-initial position, after a palatal stop, and if the following syllable contains a palatal sound, while u is found after p, b and if the following syllable contained a rounded vowel. For an overview, and also on the reflexes in other Middle Indic dialects, see von Hinüber (2001: 126–128).
Table 13 Development of $r$ in Indo-Aryan

| Period          | Sanskrit pronunciation | Vernacular pronunciation |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| Vedic           | $r$                    | $r$                      |
| Middle Indic I  | $r$                    | $a, i, u$                |
| Middle Indic II | $rə$                   | $a, i, u$                |

In other words, $r$ was initially retained in traditional recitations of Sanskrit after the Indo-Aryan vernaculars had ceased to tolerate this type of syllabic nucleus. Later on, too, was subject to a change in articulation. In fact, various modern recitation traditions, e.g. in Maharashtra (Marathi), render Sanskrit /ɪr/ as [ru]. This suggests that the Sanskrit pronunciation first shifted towards [rə] and only later to [r] or [ru], depending on the tradition and/or region.\footnote{See Van Beek (2013: 173–174). Sasha Lubotsky kindly drew my attention to the realization of $r$ as [ru] in present-day Marāṭhī recitations of Sanskrit. A similar remark was made by Berger (1955: 20 n. 18).} Cf. Table 13.

Returning to the developments just posited for Epic Greek, chronologically they can be schematized as in Table 14 (see next page).

As a consequence of the vocalization of Epic *(r)*, a tautosyllabic realization of PL onsets came into being in a number of epic lexemes and formulae. It is possible that this scansion was at first aberrant in normal phrasal sandhi, and that poets accepted a minor prosodic violation in dispensable traditional elements (cf. τράπεζα, βροτοῖσι, etc.). In favor of this view speaks the fact that the ensuing type of scansion was apparently still avoided as far as possible, as we have seen in section 6.6, and will see again later.\footnote{There are no examples of *McL* among active thematic aorists of the type ἔδρακον (chapter 8), and hardly any among those case forms of ἅρτος that could also be used with a heterosyllabic PL onset (chapter 7).}

Let us now delimit the corpus to be treated in the following sections. The treatment of forms with -ρο- < *(r)* will be postponed to chapter 7, because the
Table 14  Chronology of developments involving Epic *r

| Stage               | Relevant forms                                                                 |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| I (12th c. BCE)     | Traditional phrases with Epic *r, e.g.:                                       |
|                     | *Moria kr̥taiu̯ā                                                            |
|                     | *kr̥diān kai tʰûmon hikanu̯ei                                               |
| II (11th–10th c. BCE) | Introduction of vernacular words with -αρ- < *r                        |
|                     | Emergence of doublets like *kteros ~ *karteros                          |
| III (9th or 8th c. BCE) | Vocalization of Epic *r, e.g.:                                           |
|                     | *kr̥taiā > κραταιή, *kr̥diā > κραδίη                                      |
|                     | -ρα- after labials: *ἀμρτε > ἡμ博览会, *πρτο- > βροτός                      |

Problems involved will be easier to address once we have clarified the scenario for the Homeric reflex -ρα-. The following categories of forms with -ρα- will be treated:

- Homeric forms with -ρα- < *r and McL: δράκων, δρασιών, κραταιός, τράπεζα, phrases with (-)τραπέζθαι, the compounds κραταιγύαλος and κραταίπεδος, τραπείομεν (1pl. aor. subj. of τέρπομαι), τετράκυκλον;
- Homeric forms with -ρα- < *r but no McL: κραδίη, τέτρατος, στρατός, δρατός;
- Homeric forms with -ρα- (not necessarily from *r) and McL: βραχίων, κραδαινόμενος, κράνεια, κρατευταί.

Thematic aorists of the type ἔδρακον, ἔπραθον are treated in chapter 8, and forms in ἀνδρα- are treated together with those in ἀνδρο- in chapter 7.

Forms with McL after the trochaic caesura were left out of consideration by Wathelet (1966: 150–151) because they were not of direct relevance for his idea about the preservation of a metrical archaism. However, within the present context all such forms with a reflex -ρα- acquire prime importance as potential counterevidence to the Proto-Ionic vocalization *r > -αν-. Our main task regarding these forms is, therefore, to check whether there is some definite indication that they directly continue a pre-form with *r. The discussion of this corpus will be subdivided as follows. In section 6.8, the compelling evidence in favor of a special vocalization of Epic *r to -ρα- will be discussed. In section 6.9, I will treat the less certain evidence, including forms with -ρα- and McL in which there is no unambiguous evidence for a pre-form with *r. In section 6.10, two isolated occurrences of -ρα- are analyzed as nonce formations.
6.8 The Evidence for -ρα- from Epic *r

I will start with forms with -ρα- that exclusively occur in Epic Greek, or which are typically poetic and absent from spoken Ionic-Attic: δράκων, κραδίη, κραταιός (including compounds with κραται- and κραταιίς), τέτρατος, τραπείομεν. The discussion of these examples is accompanied by an analysis of their metrical behavior in Homer. After that, I will turn to three forms with -ρα- that are also well-attested in Classical prose authors: θρασύς, στρατός, and τράπεζα. I will show that they are deeply embedded in the epic tradition, and also provide arguments for viewing their presence in the spoken language as due to borrowing, either from Epic Greek or from West Greek. Finally, it will be argued that phrases with the middle aorist τραπέσθαι in Homer are traditional.

6.8.1 δράκων

It is widely accepted that δράκων ‘snake, dragon’ is ultimately based on an inherited PIE root noun *dr̥k-, continued in Ved. dr̥ś- f. ‘aspect’ and also preserved in the Homeric adverb ὑπόδρα ‘(looking) sternly’. In the prehistory of Greek, the stem *dr̥k- was extended with a suffix ‑ων, ‑οντ‑ that is probably the same as in γέρων ‘old man’, κρείων ‘ruler’, and μέδων ‘id.’.

The only way to use δράκων in hexameters was by tautosyllabic scansion of its onset. The word is attested 9 × in Homer, has no fixed position in the line, and does not occur in material that is clearly formulaic. This does not mean, however, that δράκων is not a traditional epic word. For the viewpoint of content, epic poets couldn’t do without a word for ‘snake’, and in Homer, δράκων appears to be the only normal word with this meaning. On the other hand, ὄφις, which is the generic word for ‘snake’ in Ionic and Attic prose and also the word inherited from PIE, is attested only once in Homer.

It is not necessary to view δράκων as an element of the Ionic and Attic vernaculars merely on account of its reflex -ρα-. On the contrary, the complete absence of a reflex δάρκων* may indicate that the pre-form *drkont- was absent.

---

79 A more detailed examination of ὑπόδρα will follow in chapter 9.
80 Examples are listed by Risch (1974: 27), but he does not comment on the semantics of the nt-formations. Beekes (1985: 75) discarded the interpretation as an extended root noun without further arguments, stating that δράκων is a substantivized aorist ptc. with retracted accent. Although this cannot be definitively excluded, it seems more likely to me that δράκων has individualizing *-nt-. For the derivation of κρείων from the word for ‘head’, see Van Beek 2014.
81 In Hesiod ὄφις and δράκων occur twice in one and the same phrase: ὄφις κρατεροῖο δράκοντος (Th. 322); ὄφις δεινοῖο δράκοντος (Th. 825).
from Proto-Ionic, and that its use was restricted to the epic tradition early on. Thus, the form *drkont- was retained until the vocalization of Epic *

6.8.2 κραδίη
As we have seen in section 6.1, the metrical behavior of κραδίη in Homer suggests that the form retained *
until not too long before Homer. Within the present framework, the Homeric form can simply be viewed as the regular, inner-epic outcome of *
This traditional form was retained in Epic Greek because introducing the vernacular form created metrical problems: καρδίη could only be used before a following vowel, and only in the nom. and dat. sg. It is true that καρδίη was introduced, both as a simplex and in the compound ἄρσυκάρδιος, but only on a sporadic basis and beside the traditional form *
(>

6.8.3 κραταιός, κραταιίς, Κράταιϊς, κραται-
I will here summarize the reconstructions established in chapter 5. The adjective κραταιός occurs 13× in Homer, almost exclusively in verse-final position (exception: κραταιοῦ θηρός ὑφ’ ὀρμῆς II. 11.119). Until the end of the Classical period κραταιός remains confined to poetry. Therefore, this word (and especially the verse-final noun phrase Μοῖρα κραταιή, 9×) are eminent candidates to display the reflex of Epic *
(input form: *
). The same holds for the noun κραταιίς 'overwhelming force' and the name Κράταιϊς, both hapax eire

As argued in section 5.2.11, κραταίπεδος and κραταιγύαλος (apparently reflecting *
) ultimately reflect *
, an old allomorph of *
(>
) whose metrically lengthened form was changed into *
, perhaps by contamination with *
. This *
- is an archaism in which Epic *
was retained. Whenever possible, the productive allomorphs κρατερό- and καρτερό- were used, but *
- was retained when the second member had a light initial syllable starting with a single consonant (cf. -πεδος and -γύαλος).83 In this case we must ascribe compounds with κραται- in post-Homeric poetry and personal names with Κραται- to epic influence. The outcome -αρ- in καρτερός and κάρτα is the regular vernacular reflex.

82 Apart from its Homeric attestation, Κράταιϊς is mentioned only in A.R. 4.829 as another name of Scylla's mother, who is there called Hecate.

83 Compounds with κρατι- or καρτι- (the expected outcome of *
- in epic and spoken Ionic, respectively) are absent from Epic Greek because they had already been replaced by compounds with κρατερο- or καρτερο-. They may have been preserved in proper names with Κρατι- and Καρτι- (attested in the 5th c. and later).
Another frequent word containing this root and with -ρα- < *\( \gamma \) is κρατερός. There, the onset κρ- is often used to make position, whereas it is hardly ever so used in κραδίη. Since we have argued that the metrical behavior of κραδίη reflects the prolonged presence of Epic *\( \gamma \), the question rises why a similar avoidance of position length is not found in κρατερός. I will return to this issue in chapter 8.

6.8.4 τέτρατος

In section 2.7, it was remarked that τέτρατος is virtually limited to Epic Greek, whereas τέταρτος is the only form attested in Classical Ionic and Attic prose. Since τέταρτος cannot be the result of an analogy, it was then argued that this form regularly reflects *κ\( \wedge \)τρατό- in the vernaculars. Next, we asked whether τέτρατος might have arisen within Epic Greek by analogy with other ordinals, with -ατος taken from δέκατος (as in τρίτατος and similar epic forms). The question is how such an extension can be motivated: there was no inherent metrical problem with the feminine forms of τέταρτος (as there was with those of τρίτος).

Considering the pattern of attestations of both variant forms in Homer, τέτρατος only appears in the neuter τέτρατον (7×), with one exception (nom. sg. m. τέτρατος Il. 23.615). By contrast, τέταρτος (14×) is used in various different case forms, and is clearly the productive form, the 'Ionic default'. These distributions are compatible with various scenarios. One possibility is that τέτρατος was taken from an Aeolic dialect in an older stage of the tradition (cf. Thess. πετροτος), and that the final part -οτος was adapted to the productive ordinal morpheme -ατος. A second possibility is to work with an old metrically lengthened *κ\( \wedge \)τρατό- that was used before vowel-initial words, as in the phrase *κ\( \wedge \)\( \wedge \)τρατόν \( \ddot{a} \)μαρ > τέτρατον \( \ddot{a} \)μαρ. The metrical lengthening may have occurred in phrases like τέτρατον \( \ddot{a} \)μαρ \( \ddot{e} \)γν “it was the fourth day” (2× Od.) or τὸ δὲ τέτρατον ίκετο τέκμωρ “and at his fourth try he reached his goal” (H. 13.20). The hypothetical metrically lengthened *κ\( \wedge \)τρατό- may then have been analogically reshaped to *κ\( \wedge \)τρατό-, following the compositional form τετρα-, on the model of τρι- beside τρίτος. Alternatively, *κ\( \wedge \)τρατό- may have yielded *τετρατό- by vocalization of Epic *\( \gamma \), after which the then-unnecessary metrical lengthening of the first syllable may have been automatically cancelled, yielding τέτρατος. The lack of attestations of τέτρατος with Mcl scansion is not necessarily surprising, as this type of scansion was retained mainly in words that would otherwise not fit the meter.

Another promising instance of Epic *\( \gamma \) is the noun-epithet phrase τετράκυ-κλον ἄπηνυν ‘four-wheeled cart’ (Il. 24.324), because the first compound member is generally reconstructed as *κ\( \wedge \)τρατό-. As shown in section 6.5, word-internal
McL is rare, and exceedingly so when it does not follow a morpheme boundary. Since a number of such cases of word-internal McL appear to reflect *ᵣ (ἀβροτάξομεν, Ἀφροδίτη) it is attractive to view τετράκυκλον ἀπήνην as a relic formula with Epic *ᵣ. This requires that all the other compounds with τετρα- have an innovative scansion, but that is unproblematic: τετρα- was the Ionic default form, and it was metrically convenient to use it before most second compound members.

6.8.5 τραπεῖομεν and ταρπώμεθα
In the Homeric aorist paradigm of τέρπομαι ‘to enjoy oneself’, no less than five different aorist stems are attested:

- η -aorist ἐτάρπην, including the 1pl. subj. τραπεῖομεν (Il. and Od.);
- θη -aorists ἐτάρφθην and ἐτέρφθην (both only Od.);
- s -aorist ptc. τερψάμενος (Od.);
- redupl. aor. τετάρπετο, subj. τεταρπώμεσθα, ptc. τεταρπόμενος (Il. and Od.);
- them. aor. subj. ταρπώμεθα (Il. and Od.).

The form ἐτάρπην never occurs after Homer and is certainly old, but the antiquity of the other four stems is questionable. The forms ἐτάρφθην, ἐτέρφθην (the only one attested after Homer) are clearly secondary as they contain the productive suffix -θη, and various other forms can be analyzed as artificial creations of Epic Greek. Thus, the hapax τερψάμενος may have been formed by inflection of the pres. ptc. τερπόμενος (cf. Beckwith 1996: 70). The reduplicated forms (τετάρπετο, τεταρπώμεσθα, and τεταρπόμενος) only occur in the position after |T, and for this reason Bendahan (1993: 103–105) views them as artificial creations designed for this metrical slot. There is indeed an obvious comparandum for τετάρπετο: the Homeric reduplicated aorist κεχαρε/ο‑ (3pl. κεχαρόντο ‘they rejoiced’, 3sg. opt. κεχάριτο, etc.), which is very close in meaning. This means that τετάρπετο may have been created on the model X : ἐτάρπην = κεχαρε/ο‑ : ἐχάρην.

In the present discussion, the subjunctive forms ταρπώμεθα and τραπείομεν (both limited to Homer) are of immediate relevance. To anticipate my conclusions, τραπείομεν was used after |T in a formula and reflects an old form *τρπέοmen, with Epic *ᵣ, while ταρπώμεθα was created artificially as its counterpart after |P.

84 As Beckwith (l.c.) remarks, the antiquity of ἐτάρπην < *τρφ‑ε‑ is corroborated by the fact that the θη-aorists first occur in the Odyssey.

85 Beckwith (1996: 73) also remarks that this fixed localization is compatible both with an archaism and with an innovation. He thinks that τετάρπετο may be a metrically-induced replacement of older *ἐτάρπετο, but I find the details of his scenario unconvincing.
Starting with τραπείομεν, this occurs only in the hemistich |_ τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε “let us go to bed and get satisfied” (2 × Ἰλ., 1 × Ὀδ.). The root shape τραπ‑ is not attested in any other form derived from τέρπομαι. According to the traditional analysis, τραπείομεν is an archaism showing the regular, unrestored Ionic reflex -ρα‑ < *r̥, whereas in the usual Homeric form ταρπῆναι, the vowel slot of the full grade in τέρπομαι was analogically introduced.

One wonders, however, whether τραπείομεν can really have been a sprachwirklich form in any spoken variety of Greek. From the perspective of the poet and his audience, τραπείομεν was a monstrosity in view of the possibility of confusion with zero grade forms of τρέπω ‘to turn’. It would soon have been replaced in a normal language situation, at least after the elimination of the labiovelars in Proto-Ionic. It makes good sense, then, to relate the origin and preservation of τραπείομεν to its presence in a formula. Indeed, three indications suggest that the hemistich τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε is older than the poets who composed the Ἰλιάδ and Ὀδyssey: the dual ending of the participle εὐνηθέντε, the fact that τραπείομεν preserves the metrical structure of the pre-form *tr̥pēomen that existed before quantitative metathesis took place, and the fact that a phrase |P *ταρπείομεν εὐνηθέντε (with the expected root shape ταρπ‑) would not only be metrically acceptable, but even useful in epic verse composition. Finally, we must note that all three attestations of τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε are used by gods to refer to sexual intercourse. Again, this is compatible with the preservation of traditional material.

Apparently, there was a reason why poets did not introduce the form with the productive root shape ταρ‑ into this concrete hemistich. This reason may well be as follows. In both its attestations in the Ἰλιάδ, τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε is preceded by (ἐν) φιλότητι. Now, as Latacz (1966: 185) has made plausible, φιλότητι was probably part of the original formula because it is a syntactic complement of εὐνηθέντε, rather than of τέρπομαι (which normally governs the geni-

---

86 Such confusion between τραπείομεν and the aorist τραπήναι ‘to turn’ actually seems to have arisen in one of the Homeric instances, οικτρόδιε τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε (Od. 8.292), in which the first two words are most naturally taken to mean “let us turn to bed”. Latacz (1966: 186) objects to this: “wäre dem so, dann entstünde an dieser Stelle die absurde Aufforderung ‘zum Lager wollen wir uns wenden, nachdem wir uns gelagert haben’,” and suggests that εὐνηθέντε here belongs to the intransitive paradigm of a verb of movement εὐνάω, ‘lagern’. In Van Beek (2013) I followed Latacz's interpretation, but it now seems more likely to me that εὐνηθέντε in this passage means ‘having had intercourse’, the normal meaning of this aorist.

87 The root of τρέπω was probably *trekw‑, cf. Myc. to-ro-ge-jo-me-no ‘making tours’.

88 A metrical alternative for |P τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε was indeed created: the formula |P ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντες, with a thematic aorist form that is probably artificial. See below.
tive).\textsuperscript{89} This means that the usual root allomorph ταρπ‑ could not be introduced in *pʰiλoτατί τρεψομεν ευναθεντε.\textsuperscript{90} Therefore, in *pʰiλoτατί τρεψομεν ευναθεντε the form with Epic *r was preserved; only later was this sound vocalized as -ρα‑. The origin of the synonymous form ταρπώμεθα also turns out to be relevant for the prehistory of τραπείομεν.\textsuperscript{91} In my view, it should also be explained by an artificial process.\textsuperscript{92} Its origin becomes clear when we consider the context and its formulaic connections:


\begin{latin}
\text{ὑπνῳ ὑπό γλυκερῷ ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντες}
\end{latin}

\textit{Il}. 24.636; \textit{Od}. 4.295; 23.255

literally: "(so that) we, having gone to rest under the cover of sweet sleep, may find satisfaction [i.e. of our desire to sleep]."

This verse can be directly compared to:


\begin{latin}
(ἐν) φιλότητι τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε
\end{latin}

\textit{Il}. 3.441; 14.314

literally: "let us go to bed in love and satisfy our desire".\textsuperscript{93}

At first sight, satisfaction of sexual desire and replenishment of one's physical reserves are two rather different events, but in reality the aorist of τέρπομαι may denote the agreeable satisfaction of various different types of urgent, mostly physical needs: it may describe persons stilling their hunger (by eating), letting out their grief (by wailing), resting (by sleeping), and getting satisfaction (by

\textsuperscript{89} Furthermore, Latacz compares ἐν φιλότητι λαλάειει εὐνηθήναι (\textit{Il}. 14.331) and ἐν φιλότητι παράπαφεν εὐνηθήναι (14.360), both of which refer to Hera and Zeus making love, and where ἐν φιλότητι is governed by εὐνηθήναι.

\textsuperscript{90} Even if φιλότητι was not originally part of the formula, preserving the metrical structure of the hemistich would have been a sufficient motivation to artificially retain *r.

\textsuperscript{91} A fundamental discussion of the semantics of τέρπομαι and its aorist forms is Latacz (1966: 174 ff.).

\textsuperscript{92} Pace \textit{Liv}² s.v. *terp‑ ‘sich sättigen’, which takes the pairing of Ved. áṭpam (AV) and Hom. ταρπώμεθα to prove the existence of an older root aorist. Cardona’s idea (quoted by Beck-with) that ταρπώμεθα was created as a metrical alternative beside the more frequent reduplicated stem τεταρπε‑ is also hard to substantiate.

\textsuperscript{93} A more prosaic translation of this formula would be “Let us go to bed and have sex”. As remarked by Latacz (1966: 185), in \textit{Od}. 8.292, the innovative use of |₁ τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε without the preceding φιλότητι is clearly secondary with respect to the two Iliadic passages.
having sex). Indeed, lovemaking and sleep are mentioned together as things that satisfy the heart in the verse εὐνής ἡς ἀλόχου ταρπήμεναι ἠδὲ καὶ ὕπνου “[that Odysseus’ heart] had had its fill of his wife’s bed and of sleep” (Od. 23.346).94

As appears from the last example and from phrases like τεταρπώμεσθα γόοιο, the aorists of τέρπομαι normally require a genitive complement. Latacz (1966) therefore concludes that the dative (ἐν) φιλότητι, in the above formula, is a locative satellite to εὐνηθέντε, rather than a complement to τραπείομεν. Indeed, Homer repeats the same construction on two different occasions: ἐν φιλότητι λιλαίει εὐνηθέντε “you desire to make love” (Il. 14.331), ἐν φιλότητι παρήπαφεν εὐνηθέντε “she deceived him into making love” (Il. 14.360). Therefore, the prepositional phrase ὕπνῳ ὑπὸ γλυκερῷ, literally “covered by sweet sleep”, must be analyzed as a complement to κοιμηθέντες. We may suppose that the hemistich ταρπώμεθα κοιμηθέντες was coined so as to match τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε (or its predecessor with *τρ), and that both had the basic meaning “Let us go to bed and satisfy ourselves”.95 In view of its metrical trace of *τρ, φιλότητι τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε is obviously the older variant. The model for creating a new aorist form ταρπώμεθα may have been the pres. subj. 1pl. τερπώμεθα (Od. 1.369, 15.399), which appears in the same metrical slot.96

6.8.6 τράπεζα

On account of the comparison with Myc. to-pe-za, the pre-form of τράπεζα ‘table’ can be reconstructed as *trpedia. Even if τράπεζα does not occur in formulae, the form is traditional in a different way.97 With the exception of

---

94 Cf. also ὕπνου τε γλυκεροῦ ταρπήμεναι (Il. 24.3), with an identical first hemistich to the formula under discussion, except for the genitive case governed by ταρπήμεναι.

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

96 A concrete four-part analogy would be: pres. τραπώμεθα ‘let us turn’: aor. τραπώμεθα = τερπώμεθα ‘let us enjoy’: X, which was solved by X = ταρπώμεθα.

97 Wathelet (1966: 162–164) gives two arguments for counting τράπεζα among his abrégements anciens: it occurs only in verse-final position, and is found in combination with words that are supposed to be of Achaean origin, as in ἠμὲν δέπα’ ἠδὲ τραπέζας (Od. 15.466), where δέπας is to be compared with Myc. di-pa (cf. below). Wathelet is clearly wrestling with the lack of clear formulaic attestations: “Dans les passages qui précèdent, on a pu constater que τράπεζα s’emploie surtout avec des mots qui ne reviennent pas ailleurs dans l’épopée, certains d’entre eux sont uniquement poétiques. De telles considérations tendent à faire penser que τράπεζα entre dans un système de formules anciennes.” (1966: 163).
Od. 11.419, Homer uses τράπεζα (35×) only in verse-final position. It is true that trisyllabic words of the same structure have a strong preference for verse-final position in Homer. Even so, the rate of 97% obtained for τράπεζα is remarkably high in comparison with examples like θάλασσα (75%) and μέλαινα (85%). In these figures, it must also be taken into account that μέλαινα and θάλασσα frequently occur in verse-final formulae, whereas τράπεζα does not. It is plausible, then, that Hom. τράπεζα is a traditional epic lexeme. Hence, we may suppose that its -ρα- is the outcome of Epic *r̥.

If so, how do we account for the absence of a reflex τάρπεζα* in any form of Ionic-Attic? This would be explicable, within the above scenario, if the preform *tr̥pedi̯a was absent from the Proto-Ionic vernacular. However, τράπεζα is widely attested in classical Ionic-Attic, both in literary prose and in inscriptions. The only conceivable explanation of this fact is that τράπεζα is an epicism. But if the word refers to a commonplace domestic object, why would it be a borrowing?

The answer may well be that a τράπεζα was not an everyday utensil at all: it was either a dining table at which guests were entertained on special occasions, or a table on which public offerings to the gods were deposited in temples. A third meaning, a money-changer’s counter or a bank, must derive from the second use, since the oldest banks were located at temples (cf. Der kleine Pauly, s.v. Trapeza). In other words, the τράπεζα had a specific social and ritual function, and may well have denoted a traditional, ornamented object. It is therefore conceivable that the Classical term τράπεζα was taken from the high register of epic.

It is not possible to establish with certainty how and when *tr̥pedi̯a entered the epic language, but the most plausible scenario would be, in my view, that the word and concept were borrowed from Mycenaean culture. The poet of the Odyssey describes polished tables with a ceremonial use (cf. παρὰ δὲ ξεστὴν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν, 6× Od.). A number of other Homeric words for utensils used in ceremonial contexts (rituals of hospitality, feasting, bathing) are attested in

---

98 These figures have been taken from Bowie (1981). When commenting on the same tendency in Sappho and Alcaeus whenever their lines end in “−x”, he states: “it would be tempting, particularly in the case of trisyllabic words in “−x, to look to Homer for the origin of this practice. In Homer and Hesiod, these trisyllables occur finally in 93% of cases, and some 38% of lines in those poets end with a trisyllabic word of this shape” (Bowie 1981: 44–45, referring to O’Neill 1942: 142). Perhaps, the larger mobility of θάλασσα and μέλαινα can be explained by the fact that they remained part of the spoken language all along.
the same form and/or meaning only in Mycenaean, but nowhere in alphabetic Greek. Compare the following lexical correspondences (cf. Lamberterie 2004):

- *ta-ra-nu* ~ θρῆνυς 'footstool': on the continuity between Mycenaean and Homer, see Hajnal (1998: 14–15);
- *di-pa* ~ δέπας 'a drinking vessel', often used in rituals of libation: the word is used only by Homer and a few times in archaic poetry;
- *re-wo-to-ro-ko-wo* ~ λοετροχόος 'kind of tripod for pouring bath-water', used in bathing rituals;
- *to-no* ~ θρόνος '(ceremonial, ornamented) chair' (see section 7.3.4).

A Mycenaean origin of Homeric words is often doubted with the argument that we might simply be dealing with preserved lexical archaisms, or with vocabulary shared by more than one Greek dialect. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that τράπεζαι occur in the context of banquets in the 'palace' of Ithaka (e.g. *Od*. 1.111, 19.61, 20.151). In these banquets, the word occurs in combination with other words that have cognates in the Linear B tablets dealing with utensils used in banquets (such as δέπας, θρῆνυς, and θρόνος). This makes it likely that τράπεζα entered the tradition from Mycenaean in the form *tr̥pedja* in the palatial period.

Another possible objection against a Mycenaean origin of τράπεζα would be that *to-pe-za* is usually interpreted as /torpeddia/. Within the scenario set out above, however, all chronological problems are resolved if we follow Heubeck’s idea (1972: 77–78) that Myc. *to-pe-za* represents /tr̥peddia/. Scholars who reject Heubeck’s scenario are forced to conclude that τράπεζα has nothing to do with Myc. *to-pe-za*, apart from the fact that both derive from Proto-Greek *tr̥pedja*.

6.8.7 στρατός

In view of its etymological isolation within Greek, Ionic-Attic στρατός is an important example for the vocalization of *r̥. At first sight, it seems to furnish strong evidence for -ρα- as the regular outcome. However, in order to judge the relevance of στρατός, we must first consider the dialectal attestations and their semantics.

From Homer onwards, στρατός is a normal word for ‘army’ in Ionic-Attic. The other word for ‘army’ in Homer is λαός (Att. λεώς, Eastern Ion. ληός), but this has

99 According to Wathelet (1966: 162 n. 4), the pre-form *tr̥pedja* regularly developed into τράπεζα in spoken Ionic, and replaced an Aeolic form *τρόπεζα* that allegedly existed in the prehistory of the epic tradition. This Aeolic *τρόπεζα* would have preserved the original scansion of a pre-Mycenaean pre-form *tr̥pedja*. However, this scenario cannot be correct, if the regular Proto-Ionic outcome of *r̥* was -αρ-. 
a broader meaning: it denotes not only a body of warriors, but also the collective of men in the council, or (in the *Odyssey*) the body of subjects under a ruler. In Classical Attic, λεώς retains traces of all these meanings (see *LSJ*, q.v.). On the other hand, from Homer onwards and throughout the classical language, στρατός only denotes an army—most notably the Achaean military expedition against Troy—or an army camp. Even if forms continuing *lāu̯ó‑* are not very frequent in Ionic and Attic, its broader range of meanings suggests that this was the normal generic term for ‘band, clan’ in Proto-Ionic. Importantly, the word also figures in the Mycenaean title *ra-wa-ke-ta* /lāwāgetā/, the second-highest ranking person in the Pylian realm.

Correspondences of στρατός within Greek are found in Aeolic and West Greek dialects. In literary Lesbian, στρότος ‘army; host’ (Sapph.) has the regular Aeolic vocalization to -ρο‑, and the native Lesbian character of the word is confirmed by the title στροτιγχος as attested in inscriptions. In Boeotian inscriptions, we find names in -στροτος, and also the verbal form εσστροτευαθη ‘they are on campaign’, an equivalent of Ionic (mid.-pass. pf.) ἐστρατεύαται. In Cretan, the word is attested in the form σταρτος (Lex Gortyn etc.).

Considering the semantics of the dialectal forms, it appears that the forms στρατός, σταρτος, στρότος as attested in North Greek dialects could refer not only to an army or its camp, but more generally to a band, clan or collective body of men, the “people” in the same sense as λαός, Ionic ληός, Attic λεώς. Pindar regularly uses στρατός in this sense, and the same holds for Cretan σταρτος. This suggests that Proto-North Greek *str̥tó‑* and Proto-South Greek *lāu̯ó‑* occupied the same lexical slot. Another indication for this is the Myc. *ra-wa-ke-ta*

---

100 The military meaning of στρότος is found in Sapph. fr. 16, but the socio-political meaning in Alc. fr. 382. In the Lesbian poets, λαός is attested only in Alc. fr. 356 (καὶ πλείστοισ’ ἐάνασσε λάοισ’). In Pindar, both λαός and στρατός may denote any body of men (Slater 1969, q.v.: ‘people, folk’), but only στρατός is found in the meaning ‘army, expedition’.

101 In my view, the interpretation of the Myc. *PN to-ti-ja* as /Stortiā/ or /Str̥tiā/ (cf. García Ramón 1985: 201 ff.) is too uncertain to be of any value here.

102 See Slater (1969, q.v.), who distinguishes two meanings in Pindar, ‘people, folk’ and ‘army, expedition’. It seems likely to me that the first meaning was preserved in the lyric tradition to which Pindar belongs. In Cretan, the simplex σταρτος occurs only in *Lex Gortyn* ν 5–6 and *IC* iv 80.7 (Gortyn); the latter inscription also has the compound σταρταγεταν (lines 4–5). Although the approximate meaning of σταρτος in Cretan is clear, a more precise definition still has to be found. As Bile states, “La magistrature suprême est le cosmat, dont les membres sont choisis parmi les σταρτοι, au sens précis encore mystérieux” (1988: 338). In the view of Willetts (1967: 10), the σταρτοι may have denoted either political divisions or kinship groups. For present purposes, it is relevant that the Cretan σταρτοι are groups of adult men that are not primarily bands of warriors. This is also confirmed by the gloss στάρτοι· αἱ τάξεις τοῦ πλήθους ‘divisions of the people’ (Hsch.).
“leader of the *lāu̯ó-” which can be compared directly with West Greek στραταγός “leader of the *str̥tó-” (Doric dialects and Arcadian), Lesbian στραταγός, and Cretan στραταγετάς (IC iv 80.7, lines 4–5). These titles may originally have denoted a military function, but often came to denote a political office. It seems plausible, then, that we are dealing with an old isogloss between North Greek *str̥tó- and South Greek *lāu̯ó-. Both denoted the main social group surpassing kinship relations, and both could refer to a body of men under arms.

After these introductory remarks, let us now consider the problems involved in the etymology of στρατός. The formal variation between Homeric and West Greek -ρα-, Cretan -αρ-, and Aeolic -ρο- automatically leads to the reconstruction *str̥tó-. Two PIE roots must be distinguished:

- *sterh3- ‘to strew, spread out’: Ved. stari, pres. str̥ṇāti ‘id.’; Lat. sternere ‘id.’ (ppp. strātus); Gr. στόρνυμι ‘id.’ (στρωτός); OIr. sernaid ‘spreads’, srath ‘valley’ < *strh3-tó-;
- *ster- ‘to lay low, make subject, subdue’: Ved. star, pres. str̥ṇóti ‘id.’; Lat. sternere (ppp. strātus) ‘to throw down, overthrow, prostrate’.

From a phonological point of view, στρατός can only be derived from the second root *ster-. However, the semantic connection between ‘army’ and ‘to lay low, make subject’ has not been satisfactorily clarified thus far. For this reason, it was originally assumed that στρατός derives from the root meaning ‘spread out’, with a semantic development leading from ‘something spread out’ to ‘bed, bivouac’ and thence to ‘camp, army’.

However, as just remarked, this pre-laryngealist view is outdated because the root meaning ‘to strew out’ has the form *sterh3-, which is incompatible with the outcome στρατός. Strunk (1964) therefore accepted that στρατός was derived

---

103 Note, however, that Cretan σταρταγετάς could be an indirect reflex of Myc. /lāwāgetā-/, replacing the first member *lāu̯(o)- with its Cretan counterpart. Arc. στραταγός was probably borrowed from neighboring Doric dialects in view of the reflex -ρα- < *r.

104 Greek does not have a word directly continuing the PIE word *korjo- ‘war band’; it only preserves the title κοίρανος ‘army leader’. It is attractive to assume that NGr. *str̥tó- and SGr. *lāu̯ó- filled the semantic slot ‘war band’ in the respective dialects, at least at some point in their pre-history. If one accepts the etymological connection between PGr. *lāu̯ó- and Hittite lāḥ(h)a- ‘military campaign, journey’ (cf. e.g. Kloekhorst, Edhil s.v. lāḥ(h)a-), it is conceivable that *lāu̯ó- originally denoted a military campaign, whereas *str̥tó- referred to a certain social group (‘clan, band’) that could also be summoned to join an expedition.

105 In Latin, the two originally distinct root have merged into one paradigm, but both meanings kept apart in Vedic can still be distinguished.

106 Thus e.g. delg (s.v.), where Chantraine claims that “Les emplois du crétois sont secondaires et le sens originel est militaire.” Beekes (1969: 280–281) also pleaded for an original meaning ‘camp’, referring to the widely-attested semantic development ‘camp’ > ‘army’ (as in Dutch leger). However, other semantic developments cannot be excluded.
from the root of Vedic star ‘to lay low’. He reconstructed a participle *str-tó-
“niederstreckbar”, i.e. ‘to be lain low’, which would have been substantivized as
‘Feindesheer’, and then developed to ‘army’ in general. This proposal is followed
by Mayrhofer (EWAia s.v. STAR), but it is open to two objections. First, the
assumed semantic development from ‘what can be lain low’ to ‘enemy force’
and then to ‘army’ in general is an emergency solution; the broader meaning
‘clan, band of men’ attested in West Greek dialects speaks against it. Secondly,
the gerundival meaning of *-tó- clearly developed within Greek; in Homer, -tó-
usually does not yet convey potential meaning, as it does in the Classical type
λυτός ‘to be loosened’.108
Starting from the idea that στρατός and λαός both originally referred to a
war band, I propose a different scenario for deriving *str-tó- from *ster- ‘to
make subject’. Since the meaning ‘subjects (of a ruler or leader)’ is attested
for λαός in the Odyssey, it is possible that *strtó- also originally referred to a
band of ‘subjected’ men who owed subservience to their leader (the στρατάγος).
Later, when the various West Greek tribes had settled down, the term acquired
a socio-political meaning, although the subjects of a στρατάγος could still be
summoned to join him on military expeditions.
If this is correct, the lexical meaning of στρατός in Epic Greek asks for an
explanation: all Homeric attestations of στρατός and its derivations (ἐστράτω-
υντό ‘were on campaign’, ἀμφεστρατώντο ‘encamped around, besieged’, στρα-
tiώτης ‘soldier’) have a military meaning.109 This is also the situation of Clas-
sical Greek: common derivatives such as στρατόπεδον ‘army camp’, στρατεύω
‘to march against, campaign, wage an expedition’, στρατεία ‘campaign, military
expedition or service’, or στρατιή ‘army’ all show the same semantic narrowing
as their base form στρατός.110 In my view, this situation is best accounted for
by assuming that in South Greek dialects, *strtó- was retained only in poetry.
As a relic form with the same referents as the regular Proto-Ionic vernacular form *
lāu̯ó- ‘body of subjects, band of men; campaign’ that had ousted it in the

---

107 Strunk (1964) is not mentioned by Beekes in EDG s.v. στρατός, who does not pronounce
himself on the relation between *ster- and *sterh3-, but merely refers to Indo-Iranian forms
deriving from *ster- such as Skt. á-stṛta- ‘unconquered, unconquerable’.
108 For the Homeric material, see Risch (1974: 19–21).
109 Since the verb στρατάομαι is limited to hexameter poetry, Tucker (1990: 232, 249–250)
argues that it is a poetic creation, derived directly from στρατός: “The frequency of the
suffix -táō in such artificial creations is sufficient to explain why in this case we find a
derivative in -dó rather than -éō, which would be regular for a thematic stem.” (1990:
250).
110 Most of these forms are frequently attested in Th., Hdt., inscriptions, etc.
first meaning, the meaning of *str̥tó- may have been narrowed down to ‘expedition, campaign’.\footnote{This is not contradicted by the fact that ‘campaign’ was probably the more original meaning of *lāu̯ó- \footnote{The word occurs 64 ×, with a strong preference (especially in the Iliad) for the position between |H| and |B|. Beekes shows that almost all attestations of the acc.sg. form στρατόν (46 out of 58) can be reduced to the formulas |T| ἀνὰ στρατόν (ἐὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν) and |T| κατὰ στρατόν (ἐυρὺν Ἀχαιῶν).} For a pre-stage of Epic στρατός, we may therefore start from a synchronically isolated pre-form *str̥tó- without any corresponding form in the vernacular, where it had been replaced by (the outcome of) *lāu̯ó-. Since all classical derivations (στρατόπεδον, στρατεύω, στρατεία, στρατιή, etc.) are clearly based on στρατός, it is possible to analyze στρατός as an epicism or even as a Dorism. In this context, we must note that at least one other military term was borrowed from West Greek: λοχάγός ‘leader of an ambush’; in view of its retained ᾱ.

From a metrical perspective, στρατός differs from the other words discussed in this chapter. Its pre-form *str̥tó-, with its double initial consonant, would always yield a heavy preceding syllable, independent of the preceding word end. This implies that the pre-form *str̥tó- can be substituted everywhere for στρατός without damaging the meter, just as in forms with -ρα- and McL scan-sion. The reason for this is the following: already before the vocalization of Epic *r, the word could only be used in the thesis of a foot, and only before a vowel.\footnote{The formulaic behavior of στρατός in Homer has been discussed by Beekes (1969: 281).} Since a variant σταρτός* would have yielded a useful metrical alternative to στρατός, it would certainly have been utilized, had it existed (cf. καρβίη beside κραβίη in Homer).

Thus, all the data are compatible with the following scenario: *str̥tó- did not exist in the Ionic vernacular when *r vocalized to -αρ-. The word originally denoted a body of men subjected to a leader, the *str̥tāgo- (> West Greek στραταγός). In the restricted meaning ‘expedition; army camp’, *str̥tό- > στρατός was an archaism of the epic tradition. Later on, στρατός entered Attic and Ionic prose, either as an epicism or as a borrowing from West Greek.

6.8.8 θρασύς, θρασειάων

That the phrase |T θρασειάων ἀπὸ χειρῶν ‘from their dauntless hands’ (7 × Hom.) is formulaic is suggested by the combination of its thematics (war narrative)
and the old ending -άων. On five occasions, this phrase qualifies the motion of spears that are thrown in battle, or in an encounter with a lion.\(^{113}\)

The tautosyllabic onset scansion of θρ- can be analyzed as a reflex of Epic *τρ. In Wathelet’s view (1966: 150–151), however, the preceding trochaic caesura renders this example non-probative.\(^{114}\) Indeed, given that θρασύς also existed in spoken Ionic and that -άων remained a productive ending in Epic Greek, one might think that the formula could be formed at any time after θρασύς had obtained its eventual phonological shape. However, as we have seen in section 4.5, the form θρασύς is itself in need of an explanation: the root shape θαρσ-, which we find in all other derivatives containing this root, must have once been present in the adjective, too. Therefore, the form with θρασ- probably arose in relative isolation, in an environment where it was protected against reshaping.

A scenario that resolves this problem can now be given. The adjective *θρ̥συ-, *θρ̥σευ- yielded *θαρσυς in the Ionic-Attic vernaculars, and this form was (for whatever reason) replaced or ousted by θαρσαλέος. Relics of the old adjective were preserved in Homer in the formula with θρασειάων < *θρ̥σευιάων, in compounds with a first member *θρ̥συ- (including personal names),\(^{115}\) and in phrases like πόλεμον θρασύν < *p(t)olemon θ̥Άσον. In none of these instances was it possible to substitute a contemporary form, and therefore *θρ̥σ- (with Epic *τρ) regularly developed into θρασ-.\(^{116}\) Thus, the creation of the formulaic phrase θρασειάων ἀπὸ χειρῶν pre-dates the vocalization of *τρ in the relevant vernacular(s). If this is correct, the Attic prose form θρασύς was borrowed from epic poetry. Given its use in martial contexts, this is certainly conceivable.\(^{117}\)

---

113 The use of the formula after a first hemistich ending in ἄλογος is likely to be traditional (on the use of this verb before the main caesura, see Hoekstra 1981: 19–32). The remaining two instances are Od. 5.434, where θρασειάων is a mere ornamental epithet of the hands, and Il. 23.714 where “its use seems slightly strained” (Richardson 1993 ad loc.).

114 Cf. also Lamberterie (1990: 847).

115 It is likely that the phrase ἰπ θρασυμέμνονα θυμολέοντα ‘bold-hearted destroyer of life’, a formula which qualifies Heracles in both of its attestations, has a high antiquity. It is the only Homeric instance, apart from Agamemnon’s name, of a compound in -μέμνων. On the other hand, θρασυκάρδιος (with the Ionic vernacular form of ‘heart’) was probably created at a more recent date. This is not surprising, given that forms containing θαρσ- and θρασ- remained productive in combination with words for ‘heart’ (θαρσαλέον and θαρσύνω occur in combination with ἦτορ in Homer, cf. also θρασείᾳ καρδίᾳ Pi. Pyth. 10.44).

116 This scenario differs slightly from what I proposed in 2013, where I operated with preserved root ablaut in all u-stem adjectives in order to explain analogical reshappings of the root. This forced me, however, to explain the strong case forms of θρασύς (notably the acc. sg. m. θρασύν) in Homer as analogical creations. The present scenario, in which the leveled vocalism in forms like βραχύς, κρατύς is due to the forms of comparison (cf. section 4.3.3), is much more straightforward.

117 Another theoretical option would be that Attic θρασύς was borrowed from West Greek: in
To close this discussion, let us briefly reconsider the semantics. It is thought that θρασύς usually qualifies an agent or his actions, but this is not universally true. Generally speaking, θρασύς means ‘bold, reckless’ already in Homer (see section 4.5), but in the phrase θρασειάων ἀπὸ χειρῶν, the spear-throwing hands are called ‘dauntless, fierce, irresistible’ or the like. This reminds of some attestations of θαρσαλέος (e.g. θαρσαλέον πολεμίστην ‘fierce warrior’), and may reflect the etymological meaning of the PIE root: cognates in Indo-Iranian are used to qualify winds or other irresistible natural phenomena. Similarly, the phrase πόλεμον θρασύν (3 ×, twice followed by ὁρμαίνοντες) is best translated as ‘fierce war’; de Lamberterie (1990: 848) aptly compares the formulaic phrase κρατερὴ ὑσμίνη ‘fierce battle’. Like κρατερός, the qualification θρασύς is neither laudatory nor pejorative in itself, but always potentially ambiguous between ‘bold’ and ‘reckless’. On the other hand, the positive qualification expressed in translations like ‘courageous’ is an innovation.

6.8.9 τραπέσθαι
Among the middle forms of τραπε/ο‑ ‘to turn’, seven instances are scanned with McL, always in verse-final position:
– ἀπονόσφι τραπέσθαι ‘to turn away’ (Od. 5.350 and 10.528). In the first passage, Odysseus is summoned by Calypso to untie his amulet and throw it back into the sea once he has safely reached the shore. Then, he must turn away from the sight of this object. In the second attestation, Odysseus is told to turn

---

some West Greek dialects, -ρα‑ was the regular outcome of *r̥ (cf. above on στρατός). This suggestion cannot be tested, however, due to insufficient data.

118 Cf. the remark “chiefly of persons” in LSJ s.v., and the overview in LfgrE s.v.
119 According to most authorities (e.g. DELG s.v. θάρσος, LfgrE s.v. θρασύς), θρασύς means both ‘bold’ and ‘courageous’. The only acknowledged exception is Od. 10.436, where θρασύς is supposed to mean ‘reckless’. In my view, θρασύς only means ‘bold, reckless’ in Homer, whereas ‘courageous’ is one of the meanings of θαρσαλέος. Concerning the formulaic phrase θρασύν Ἕκτορα, De Jong (2012: 179, ad Il. 22.455) aptly remarks: “Andromache’s use of θρασύν ‘Exetora is significant. Hector is given this epithet six times, and the three instances preceding this one are all contextually significant: Polydamas warns ‘bold Hector’ to follow a more moderate military strategy.” Indeed, Andromache speaks of ‘reckless Hector’ precisely when she begins to suspect that he has entered his fatal duel with Achilles under the walls of Troy. When Zeus argues, later on, that the plan to “steal away bold Hector” from Achilles’ tent is no good, the words θρασύν ‘Exetora may again be significant, for as De Jong remarks (ad 22.457, o.c. 183), “it is part of Hector’s tragedy that his martial overconfidence is due to the support of Zeus”. Finally, in four instances clustered in book 8 of the Iliad, Hector’s charioteer (ἡνίοχος) is called θρασύν ‘reckless’. Two of these cases concern Ἀρχεπτόλεμος, the stand-in charioteer who is killed by one of Teucer’s arrows soon after he has mounted Hector’s chariot.
away from two sacrificial victims. In both instances, the idea seems to be that one should not look back after performing an apotropaic ritual activity:

- ἐπὶ ἔργα τράποντο ‘they turned to their tasks’ (*Il.* 3.422, of servant maids);
- ἐπὶ ἔργα τράπωνται (*Il.* 23.53, of the Achaean warriors);
- Three instances are prefixed with προ-. The first, ἔθελον δ’ ἀχεῖι προτραπέσθαι (*Il.* 6.336), can be translated as “I wanted to surrender to sorrow”. Two other cases, προτράπηται (*Od.* 11.18) and προτραποίμην (*Od.* 12.381), describe the sun’s course and may refer to its turning (τροπαὶ ἥλιος) at the summer solstice.

In Wathelet’s view (1966: 161–162), these instances belong to traditional diction. He remarks that the digamma reflex in ἐπὶ ἔργα and lack of augment in τράποντο are indications of an old formula, but neither argument is conclusive: hiatus before ἔργα is commonplace in Homer, and the augment is usually omitted in narrative. We may add that the preverb is in tmesis (ἐπιτρέπω occurs in the meaning ‘to direct someone’s attention to’), but it cannot be excluded that tmesis was used productively here. Is Wathelet merely seeking confirmation for his thesis?

Taking a closer look at the attested verbal forms, the Homeric aorist paradigm of τρέπω consists of a thematic aorist (ἔτραπον, ἐτραπόμην), and a sigmatic aorist ἔτρεψα, ptc. τρεψάμενος. In both stem forms, the active has causative meaning, and the middle is an anticausative. In these forms, the vowel slot -ρα- is due to that of the present τρέπω. Since the causative active ἔτραπε is not found in Classical prose, it seems likely that the sigmatic form ἔτρεψα had already replaced it in the Ionic vernacular of Homer’s time. In any case, the thematic aorist is clearly the oldest formation of this stem, and partially being replaced by other formations.

Even so, McL scansion is never applied in the active form ἔτραπον. Moreover, τρ- generates position length in the 3sg. middle forms (ἐ)τράπετο, ἐτράπετ’, ἐτρά-πεθ’ (19 ×). Anticipating the discussion of the other active thematic aorists with

120 Kirk (*Comm. Il.* ad loc.) speaks of “the vivid and unusual ἀχεῖι προτραπέσθαι (‘turn myself headlong to grief’). Indeed, the metaphorical meaning ‘to give oneself up’, thus *LSJ*, *LfgRE* can be compared with the military use of προτράπομαι, ‘to flee headlong’. The subject of *Il.* 6.336 avoids confrontations with other people and “flees headlong in sorrow”. The subject of *Il.* 5.700, which notes that the passive aorist forms ἔτραφθην and ἔτράχθην are marginal, and that ἔτραφθην occurs mainly in Herodotus, and once in the *Odyssey*.

121 Apart from Early Greek Epic, the active thematic aorist ἔτραπε only occurs in Pindar. For the replacement of the transitive active thematic aorist with a sigmatic form, one might compare cases like πείθω, aor. ἐπιθέσα ‘to persuade’ beside intransitive πείθομαι, aor. ἐπιθέ-μην ‘to obey’.
-ρα- in chapter 8, it is clear that epic poets in principle never used McL in this specific morphological category, and even actively avoided using this type of scansion. This suggests that the scansion of τραπέσθαι, τράποντο and the like is an archaism, and that these forms contain the regular reflex of Epic *r. Indeed, it is quite possible that ἀπονόσφι τραπέσθαι was part of traditional descriptions of apotropaic rituals, and it would be attractive to view the phrase ἐπὶ ἔργα τράποντο as part of a traditional description of servant activity.

The archaic status of the compounded middle aorist προτραπέσθαι is corroborated by its lexical semantics. The only Homeric instance of the present προτρέπομαι means ‘to flee headlong’:

'Αργείοι δ’ υπ’ Ἄρηϊ και Ἕκτορι χαλκοκορυστῇ
οὔτε ποτὲ προτρέποντο μελαινάων ἐπὶ νηῶν
οὔτε ποτ’ ἀντεφέροντο μάχῃ, ἀλλ’ αἰέν ὀπίσσω
χάζονθ’ , ὡς ἐπύθοντο μετὰ Τρώεσσιν Ἀρηα.

Il. 5.699–702

But the Argives, under the pressure of Ares and bronze-clad Hector, neither did they flee headlong towards the black ships, nor yet could they hold out in fight, but they constantly gave ground backward, having noticed Ares among the Trojans.

The isolated application of McL in this present stem form may have been modelled on the other three, verse-final instances of the aorist προτραπέσθαι.123 The meaning of προτρέπομαι recurs in the adverb προτροπάδην ‘head over heels, headlong’ (Il. 16.304). In the Homeric meaning ‘to flee headlong’, προτρέπομαι is a lexical archaism. In Classical Ionic and Attic, the verb means ‘to be incited, be led on’ (active προτρέπω ‘to incite’) and normally has a middle sigmatic aorist προυτρεψάμην. While the Classical meaning can be productively derived from προ- ‘forward’ and τρεπ- ‘to turn to, direct’, this is not possible for Homeric προτρέπομαι.124

Let us finally consider the two other, similar passages where προτραπέσθαι occurs (Od. 11.14–19 and Od. 12.377–383). It is said that the sun never shines upon the mythical people of the Cimmerians, neither when it goes towards

123 The use of imperfective aspect may have been induced by the negation. Kirk (ad loc.) speaks of a “steady but controlled retreat” of the Achaeans; Ameis-Hentze (ad loc.) draw attention to the assonance of ἀντεφέροντο in the following line.

124 It is conceivable that ‘to flee headlong’ derives from older *to turn or roll forth’ (e.g. like a boulder).
heaven (στείχησι, ἰών), nor even when it "turns again from heaven towards the earth", ἃψ ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἀπ’ οὐρανόθεν προτράπηται (Od. 11.18; inflected as προτρα- 
ποίμην Od. 12.381). The difference between the aorist subjunctive προτράπηται and the present subjunctive στείχησι in the preceding line can be explained if we assume that the former refers to the point of summer solstice (perfective aspect), whereas the latter refers to the sun’s steady ascent during spring (imperfective aspect). It is hard to derive this use of προτραπέσθαι from the military one. We may well be dealing with a traditional description of heavenly phenomena.

In conclusion, all seven instances of the middle τραπέσθαι are located in verse-final position and require the use of McL. Given their contexts, the phrases ἀπονόσφι τραπέσθαι (ritual) and ἐπὶ ἔργα τράποντο (servants) may well be archaisms with Epic *r̥. Three instances have the preverb προ-, and in view of the usual Homeric avoidance of metrically problematic forms with προ-, it is likely that προτραπέσθαι contained Epic *r̥. This is supported by the fact that προτρέπομαι is a lexical archaism in Homer.

6.9 Less Certain Evidence for Epic *r̥  
Since the forms to be discussed in this section have both -ρα- and McL, they are potentially examples of Epic *r̥. Etymologically, however, they are unclear, and none of the forms is frequent in Homer. They cannot be used, therefore, as counterevidence against the scenario proposed in this chapter.

6.9.1 δρατός  
The verbal noun δρατός (beside δέρω ‘to flay’) has played an important role in earlier arguments for -ρα- as the regular, unrestored development of a syllabic liquid in Ionic-Attic. In view of the details presented elsewhere in this book, however, this idea will have to be abandoned. The form is attested only in the phrase περὶ δὲ δρατὰ σώματα νῆει “and around, he heaped up the skinned bod-

ies” (Il. 23.169); it never occurs afterwards in primary literary sources.

In Van Beek 2013, I assumed that δρατός is a nonce formation based on the vernacular form δρατός, just like θράσος occurs once in Homer beside θάρσος, and Κράπαθος beside Κάρπαθος (cf. section 6.10). This is not impossible, but I am now more inclined to view the phrase δρατὰ σώματα as the inner-epic reflex

125 Cf. LjGrE s.v. τρέπω, mg. 11 8aβ.  
126 Among the handbooks, see Schwzyzer (1939: 342), Lejeune (1972: 196), Sihler (1995: 92).
of a traditional *dr̥ta sōmata. A plausible context for the preservation of such a phrase would be descriptions of sacrifice. In the case of Il. 23.169, we must assume that the position length of δὲ caused by δρατὰ σώματα is an innovation of the attested half-line; indeed, there are cases of position length also in other words with Epic *r̥, such as βροτός (see ch. 7).

6.9.2 κραδαίνω and κραδάω

In Homer, the verb κραδαίνω ‘to shake, brandish’ is only attested as a middle pres. ptc. κραδαίνομενη, -μενov ‘quivering’ (3 ×, qualifying αἶχμη and ἕγχος). Until the end of the classical period the verb remains in use in poetry, but it usually appears in the active voice. The related verb κραδάω ‘to brandish’ (4 × Hom.) is attested only in the formulaic phrases κραδάων δολιχοσκιον ἕγχος and ὦ ὄρο κραδάων, and virtually disappears after Homer. The combination of hemistichs in the following verse looks traditional and could well be old:



Il. 7.213

He went with long strides, brandishing his long ash-wood spear.

Does the McL scansion of the initial cluster of κραδαινόμενος imply that the word contains a reflex of Epic *r̥? It is difficult to answer this question because κραδαίνω and κραδάω have no accepted etymology. It has been supposed that κραδάω is derived from the noun κράδη ‘branch’ (cf. DELG s.v. κραδάινω); if so, then κραδάω could be a denominative, or κράδη a backformation (cf. GEW q.v.), but unfortunately κράδη has no solid etymology either. It is therefore uncertain whether the pre-form of κραδαινόμενος contained a syllabic liquid.

It thus appears likely that κραδάω is an archaism in Homer, and that κραδαίνω, the usual form in Attic, was an innovation. Indeed, the use of κραδαινόμενον in Il. 17.524 is untraditional (cf. Edwards 1991 ad loc.), and in the verse αἵε μακρὰ βιβάς, κραδάων δολιχόσκιον ἕγχος Il. 13.504–505, the enjambment separating a preverb in tmesis from its verb (κατὰ ... ᾤχετ’) also speaks against

---

127 The attestation at Il. 16.614, however, is absent from most mss. and papyri; the entire line is a repetition of Il. 13.504.

128 Schulze (see GEW s.v. κραδάω) conjectured that the root of κραδάω, κραδαίνω is that of PIE *kēr, *kr̥d- ‘heart’, but this remains uncertain.

129 The fact that κράδη is similar to κλάδος (m.) ‘branch’ in both form and meaning could point to a foreign origin at least for these two nouns: see Beekes (EB s.v. κλάδος), who thinks that the interchange r/λ may point to Pre-Greek origin.

130 However, the reason for changing the suffix to -αίνω remains unclear.
a high antiquity. In my view, the absence of an active κραδαίνω in Homer might be due to the fact that the traditional epic verb meaning ‘to shake, brandish’ was τινάσσω, with the same metrical shape as κραδαίνω. Possibly, the middle ptc. κραδαινομένη was preferred over τινασσομένη in Il. 13.504 because the latter form usually had a passive meaning (cf. Il. 15.609, Od. 6.43). Therefore, if κραδαινομένη does not derive from a pre-form with Epic *r̥, we may account for its scansion by assuming that the form was introduced from the spoken language by the Iliad poet, who preferred it over the traditional form τινασσομένη.

6.9.3 κρατευταί
κρατευταί (only I τρατευτάων Il. 9.214 with McL, in later literature only in Eup. fr. 183 K-A) designates the supporting blocks of the barbecue on which the spits rested. Its etymology is uncertain, and the fact that a by-form κραδευταί is attested in Attic inscriptions (cf. Threatte 1980: 438) does not inspire confidence in the connection with κράτος advocated by GEW and DELG (q.v.). Folk-etymological influence on either variant would be conceivable, but it is equally possible that both variants are attempts to render a foreign (Pre-Greek) word (cf. Beekes EDG, q.v.).

6.9.4 κράνεια
The tree name κράνεια ‘cornel cherry’ is attested twice in Homer, both times in verse-final position: τανύφλοιόν τε κράνειαν (Il. 16.767) and καρπόν τε κρανείης (Od. 10.242, Circe feeds mast, acorns and the fruit of the cornel tree to Odysseus’ transformed comrades). The only obvious etymological comparandum for κράνεια is Lat. cornus ‘id.’, which can be reconstructed as *kr̥no-. In view of this comparison and the Homeric McL scansion, it could be thought that the pre-form of κράνεια contained Epic *r̥. It is suspect, however, that κράνεια occurs only twice in Homer; moreover, there are other cases of McL following the particle τε that have nothing to do with Epic *r̥.

Problematic for the etymology, moreover, is the fact that Greek (‑εια) and Latin (*‑o‑) have different suffixes. The form κράνον ‘cornel tree’ (Thphr.) would directly match Lat. cornus, but in view of its absence from earlier stages of

---

131 Cf. τίνασσε δὲ χάλκεον ἔγχος Il. 20.163; τινάσσων φάσγανον ὀξύ Il. 22.311; δύο δοῦρε τινάσσων Il. 12.298. Other traditional epic verbs meaning ‘to shake, brandish a weapon’ are πελεμίζω, (part of the attestations of) ἐλελίζω, and σείω, all with a different metrical shape.

132 The epithet τανύφλοιος does not occur elsewhere in Homer. Its precise meaning is unclear: perhaps ‘with thin bark’, see LfgRE s.v.

133 The appurtenance of Lith. Kūnis ‘divine protector of the cherry’ (see the references in Walde-Hofmann, s.v. cornus) seems uncertain to me.
Greek, the value of this form for purposes of reconstruction can be doubted. Tree names in -έη are productively derived from fruit names, as in μῆλόν, σῦκον ‘apple’, σῦκον ‘fig’ (cf. Risch 1974: 133), but this analysis cannot be extended to κράνεια. In fact, the suffix -εια is without parallels in tree names and remains unexplained.

Even so, one could still assume that the pre-form had *kr̥n-, with Epic *ṛ. Now, the occurrences of the word in Classical Ionic-Attic all have the reflex -ρα-. Since the reflex of *ṛ in the Proto-Ionic vernacular was -αρ-, these post-Homeric forms would have to be explained as epicisms, ex hypothesi. A borrowing from Epic Greek, however, does not seem likely for a word with a botanical meaning, and it would leave unexplained the different suffixation of κρανία (Hp.).

Is κράνεια compelling counterevidence against the development *ṛ > -αρ- in Ionic-Attic? We must remember that the species of tree has a geographical distribution that need not have included the Indo-European homeland. Besides, it is problematic that the suffix -εια cannot be easily accounted for. It is therefore a possibility that Greek borrowed the word in a shape with *kran-. A similar case is πράσον ‘leek’ beside Lat. porrum ‘id.’, another botanical word that is attested only in these two branches (see section 9.1.8). Everything taken together, we cannot be sure that the pre-form of κράνεια ever had *ṛ.

6.9.5 βραχίων

Out of 6 attestations of βραχίων ‘(upper) arm’ in Homer, five are located after the trochaic caesura, the natural slot for words of this metrical structure (O’Neill 1942: 143). The remaining instance, δουρὶ βραχίονα τύψεν (Il. 13.529, first hemistich), could be ascribed to an incidental application of the McL. license. Although in Wathelet’s view (1966: 168 n. 3; see section 6.3), the localization after |T would sufficiently explain the tautosyllabic scansion of βρ-, the possibility that -ρα- reflects Epic *ṛ must be seriously considered.

Unfortunately, the etymological reconstruction of βραχίων is not secure. A connection with βραχύς ‘short’ has been advocated and is semantically conceivable. In a number of instances, βραχίων specifically denotes the upper arm, and while the upper arm is longer than the forearm in human beings, it must

134 The Homeric form κράνεια occurs in E. fr. 785 (Nauck), X. Cyn. 10.3, and middle comedy, and must also underlie the derivative κρανέινος ‘made of cornel wood’, which qualifies javelins and bows (h. Herm., Hdt., X.). A by-form κρανία is attested in the Hippocratic corpus.

135 Compare |T βραχεῖαι and |T κραταῖ- in the same position.

136 It is used in opposition to πῆχυς ‘forearm’ in Pl. Ti. 75a and X. Eq. 12.5 (where the parts of a horse’s leg are referred to). Cf. also Hom. πρωμός βραχίων ‘shoulder’.
be taken into account that some sources in antiquity defined the forearm as the distance from the elbow to the tip of the middle finger (see Ruijgh 1968: 147). Furthermore, it is conceivable that βραχίων originally referred to the upper part of the animal leg (e.g. X. Eq. 12.5). Since the shank of most domestic animals is longer than the upper leg, a derivation of the latter from ‘short’ would make good sense. In this context, it is perhaps relevant that the root of Toch. Bräkhwace ‘upper leg, thigh’ can also be reconstructed as *mr̥kʰ-. On the basis of Greek and Tocharian, however, it is only possible to set up a root etymology, so that the comparison remains uncertain.

The exact morphological analysis of βραχίων is also problematic. Chantraine (Delg, s.v. βραχίων) defends the analysis as an old comparative of βραχύς, but he does not explain why the form has a long ῑ in Homer.137 As Seiler (1950: 42) stressed, comparatives in -ιων with a long ῑ are absent from Homer and first appear in Classical Greek (contrast Att. κακῑων with Hom. κακῑων). May the ῑ of βραχίων have come into being by metrical lengthening? In a word with four consecutive short syllables, this would be a distinct possibility, but there is an additional issue. In a comparative one would expect an original full grade root, *mrekh-i(h)on- or *mrekh_i̯oh- (see section 4.1.2).138 Now, if we started from *mrekh-i(h)on- and accept that its root vocalism was at some point influenced by the adjective *mrakʰu- (whose vowel slot had been influenced by *mrekh- in the forms of comparison), it would follow that the word did not contain Epic *r. In this scenario, using βραχίων- after the trochaic caesura would require the combined operation of two metrical licenses.139 It therefore remains difficult to analyze βραχίων as a comparative.

An alternative has been proposed by Ruijgh (1968: 147), who speculated that βραχίων was derived from βραχύς with the suffix *-ιον- forming sobriquets. Ruijgh compares the use of the suffix *-ιον- in πυγεών (sense unclear, perhaps ‘buttocks’) and ποδεών ‘paw which hangs from an animal skin’, which seem to be derived from the body part designations πυγή ‘buttocks’ and πούς ‘foot’, respectively. But since these have the suffix *-ιον-, it is perhaps more pertinent to compare βραχίων with the Homeric sobriquet χυλόποδιών “Lamefoot”,

137 Chantraine comments: “le procédé est inattendu, mais doit être admis, malgré les doutes de Seiler (…)”.
138 Thus, the expected outcome of an inherited comparative form would be *βράσσων. This form is attested in Il. 10.226, but its meaning seems to be ‘slow’, which suggests that it belongs not with βραχύς, but with βραθυς.
139 If the pre-form of βραχίων contained *r, it would be less problematic to explain the ῑ by metrical lengthening: *mrkʰi(h)ona (four consecutive light syllables) → *mrkʰi(h)ona > *mrakahônica (vocalization of Epic *r). This presupposes, however, that the zero grade root could be introduced in the comparative form at an early date.
a nickname of Hephaistos (3 × Hom.). A sobriquet meaning “shorty” would be an appropriate designation for the upper arm in the case of a warrior whose forearm had been chopped off.

If Ruijgh’s idea is correct, it would be natural to consider βραχίων as a case of Epic *γ, given the relic status of the suffix *-ιον- and the regular McL scan- sion of βραχίων in Homer. However, as I will argue in chapter 7, the regular outcome of Epic *γ was -ρο- after labial consonants, and the only form that seems to militate against this distribution is precisely βραχίων. This problem could be resolved by assuming that the semantic connection between βραχύς and βραχίων was still perceived synchronically, and that the expected epic outcome *βροχίων and/or the vernacular form was influenced by βραχύς.

In sum, the metrical behavior of βραχίων seems to furnish an indication in favor of Epic *γ, but the uncertainties regarding its etymology and reconstruction make it difficult to use the form in the present discussion.

6.10 Nonce Formations with -ρα- in Epic Greek

There are two Homeric words with -ρα- instead of the expected form with -αρ- that occur only once, and that may well be nonce formations: θράσος (Il. 14.416) and Κράπαθος (Il. 2.676).

Given that θάρσος ‘persistence; confidence’ originally had an e-grade root, the occurrence of a doublet θράσος has nothing to do with the vocalization of *γ. Rather, θράσος was secondarily created as a variant of θάρσος under the influence of the more frequent alternation between κράτος and κάρτος in Homer, which had a close meaning. Alternatively, it may be viewed as a new abstract derived from θρασύς ‘bold, reckless’.

Κράπαθος occurs only once in the Catalogue of Ships (Il. 2.676); the normal name of the island is Κάρπαθος. Since it has no inner-Greek etymology, it would be completely ad hoc to reconstruct *γ in its pre-form. It therefore seems that the poet of this line decided to extend the alternation known from cases like κράτος beside κάρτος to this toponym. In other words, Κράπαθος is a nonce formation.

6.11 Conclusions

Various forms which have the reflex -αρ- < *γ in Classical prose have by-forms with -ρα-: κραδίη ~ καρδίη, τραπείομεν ~ ταρπῶμεν, τέτρατος ~ τέταρτος, and κραταιός ~ καρτερός. These by-forms with -ρα- appear to be limited to poetry, and
especially to Epic Greek. There are two other peculiarities suggesting that -ρα- in fact arose within the language of the epic tradition: the metrical behavior of κραδίη in Homer (noted already by Hoenigswald), and the fact that McL scansion is most frequent among forms with -ρα- and -ρο- < *τρ (Wathelet 1966). In this chapter, I have proposed to explain these distributions by assuming that *τρ was retained in Epic Greek when it was vocalized in the vernacular. Much later, and not too long before Homer, this so-called ‘Epic *τρ’ developed to -ρα-, and to -ρο- after labial consonants.

An investigation of the complete evidence for McL scansion showed that this phenomenon is irregular in Epic Greek: it is tolerated in a closed and small set of words (e.g. τράπεζα, κραταιός), and structurally avoided in another, much larger group of words and formations (e.g. κράτιστος, βλάπτω, κλίνω). That McL was still actively avoided in Homeric Greek is confirmed by the existence of artificial formations, such as κάρτιστος for κράτιστος. Moreover, it has been shown that in most lexemes that regularly undergo McL scansion, the pre-form contained *τρ. It is therefore natural to infer that the phenomenon originated when *τρ was eliminated from Epic Greek.

After the vocalization of Epic *τρ, McL scansion was occasionally extended to other words with -ρα- and -ρο- that probably never contained *τρ, e.g. κράνεια. This extension may have been promoted by cases such as τραπέσθαι, which contains a reflex of Epic *τρ, but was at the same time a normal word in the vernacular (where it had analogically restored -ρα-). Moreover, the author of the Iliad already applies McL in forms where there was never any *τρ (e.g. in lexemes like πλέω) and even without any metrical necessity. This may show that the syllabification of word-initial plosive plus liquid clusters was shifting, also synchronically in the vernacular. Word-internally, however, plosive plus liquid remained heterosyllabic, at least for the Iliad poet.

Epic *τρ was retained in two types of words. On the one hand, there are lexemes which also existed in the vernacular, but where introducing the vocalized vernacular form would have harmed the traditional metrical structure of the epic word or formula. Therefore, the non-vocalized form with Epic *τρ was retained in Epic Greek, and later vocalized with -ρα-. This happened in the precursors of κραδίη, τραπέσθαι, βραγειών, and τραπείομεν (the latter two occur exclusively in formulaic phrases). On the other hand, various lexemes were already exclusive to Epic Greek when *τρ developed to -αρ- in the Ionic vernacular: this is probably true for δράκων, κραταιός, other forms with κραται-, τράπεζα, and στρατός. This explains why in these cases no traces are found of by-forms with -αρ-, at least not in Ionic-Attic.

A number of words with -ρα- and McL scansion (βραχίων, κραδαίνω, κρατευτάων, and κράνεια) have been left aside because it is not certain that their
pre-forms contained *r. Two hapaxes (θράσος, Κράπαθος beside the usual forms θάρσος, Κάρπαθος) have been analyzed as nonce formations on the model of e.g. κράτος beside κάρτος.

Since words with the vernacular vocalization *r > -αρ- (and analogically restored -ρα-) also made their way into Epic Greek, the new scenario allows us to give a full account of the origin of doublets with -ρα- ~ -αρ-. At the same time, it illuminates how McL scansions became acceptable in Epic Greek, and why they occur so frequently in words with *r. A prolonged preservation of Epic *r may account for the peculiar metrical behavior of κραδίη, which can be explained if the time gap between Homer and the elimination of Epic *r is not too large. Further chronological issues will be discussed in chapter 11. In the next chapter, we will first discuss the evidence for a conditioned development of Epic *r to -ρο-.