

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

VOLUME XLIV

2025

ISSN 0334-4509 (PRINT)

2731-2933 (ONLINE)

The appearance of this volume has been made possible by the support of

Bar-Ilan University
Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
The Open University
Tel Aviv University
University of Haifa

PUBLISHED BY
THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

<http://www.israel-classics.org>

Manuscripts in the form of e-mail attachments should be sent to the e-mail address rachelze@tauex.tau.ac.il. For reviews, contact fassberg@tauex.tau.ac.il. Please visit our website for submission guidelines. All submissions are refereed by outside readers.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor at the following address: Book Review Editor, Dr. Teddy Fassberg, Department of Classics, Tel Aviv University, P.O. Box 39040, Tel Aviv, 6997801, Israel.

Price \$50

© 2025 The Israel Society for the Promotion of Classical Studies
All Rights Reserved

Camera-ready copy produced by the editorial staff of *Scripta Classica Israelica*
Printed in Israel by Magnes Press, Jerusalem

SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA

YEARBOOK OF THE ISRAEL SOCIETY
FOR THE
PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

Editor-in-Chief: RACHEL ZELNICK-ABRAMOVITZ

Editorial Board:
ORY AMITAY
ALEXANDER YAKOBSON
TEDDY FASSBERG

Editorial Assistant: Hila Brokman

INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD
OF *SCRIPTA CLASSICA ISRAELICA*

François de Callataÿ, École Pratique des Hautes Études (Paris)
Averil Cameron, University of Oxford
Hannah M. Cotton, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Ephraim David, University of Haifa
Werner Eck, Universität zu Köln
Denis Feeney, Princeton University
Margalit Finkelberg, Tel Aviv University
John Glucker, Tel Aviv University
Erich Gruen, University of California, Berkeley
Benjamin Isaac, Tel Aviv University
Ranon Katzoff, Bar-Ilan University
Jaap Mansfeld, Utrecht University
Doron Mendels, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Maren Niehoff, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
John North, University College, London
Hannah Rosén, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Brent Shaw, Princeton University
Greg Woolf, The Institute for the Study of the Ancient World, NYU

THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION
OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

OFFICERS 2024–2025

President:	Yulia Ustinova
Secretary:	Merav Haklai
Treasurer:	Shimon Epstein

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Moshe Blidstein
Stephanie Binder
Yakir Paz
Jonathan Price
Iris Sulimani
Merav Haklai

HONORARY MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

Hannah Cotton	Ranon Katzoff
Joseph Geiger	

CONTENTS

	PAGE
RINA TALGAM, <i>The Ekphrasis on the Water Clock: Art, Rhetoric and Measurement of Time in Sixth-Century Gaza</i>	1
NOAM RYTWO, <i>Firmarent velut foedus</i> (Tac. <i>Ann.</i> 6.30): Prolegomenon to the Language of Compromise in Rome.....	33
ALON DEUTSCH, <i>Revisiting Virgil's Heroes' Parade: An Apocalyptic Historical Review</i>	57
Yael Young, <i>The Invention of the Strigil in Athenian Iconography</i>	73
ANDREW WOLPERT, <i>Sex, Lies, and Murder in Lysias 1</i>	93
ALAN JEFFREY NUSSBAUM, <i>Homeric γόοις 'bewailed' (Z 500)</i>	115
RIVKA GERSHT AND PETER GENDELMAN, <i>Sidewalk Inscriptions from Caesarea Maritima</i>	143
CHRISTOS TSAGALIS, <i>Proemic Bridges: An Intratextual Association Activating an Intertextual Reference</i>	157
ZOIA BARZAKH, <i>On the First Stasimon of Sophocles' OT</i>	175
ARI BELENKIY AND PAVEL KUZENKOV, <i>Ketubah of Antinoopolis, Letter of Resh Galuta and Aramaic Tombstone Inscriptions from Zoar, or: What was the Original Molad Calendar of Hillel Bar Yehuda?</i>	183
BOOK REVIEWS	
Guy Darshan, <i>Stories of Origins in the Bible and Ancient Mediterranean Literature</i> (by Johannes Haubold).....	217
Irad Malkin, Josine Blok, <i>Drawing Lots: From Egalitarianism to Democracy in Ancient Greece</i> (by Nina Roux).....	219
Abraham Arouetty, <i>Prolegomena ad Linguam Latinam: liber ad elementa Latinitatis discenda</i> (by Nir Stern).....	221
Melanie Racette-Campbell, <i>The Crisis of Masculinity in the Age of Augustus</i> (by Jaclyn Neel).....	224
Giulio Iovine (ed.) <i>Latin Military Papyri of Dura-Europos (P.Dura 55-145): A New Edition of the Texts, with Introduction and Notes</i> (by Haggai Olshanetsky).....	226
Walter Ameling, Hannah M. Cotton, Werner Eck, Avner Ecker, Johannes Heinrichs, Benjamin Isaac, Alla Kushnir-Stein (†), Jonathan Price, Peter Weiß, Ohad Abudraham, and Ada Yardeni (†) (eds.), <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae, Volume V: Galilaea and Northern Regions</i> (by Michael Zellmann-Rohrer).....	228
OBITUARIES: DAVID KONSTAN (BY PHILLIP MITSIS)	
JOHN GLUCKER (by RACHEL ZELNICK-ABRAMOVITZ AND YOSEF Z. LIBERSOHN).....	237
GABRIEL HERMAN (by ALEXANDER YAKOBSON).....	241
HANNAH ROSÉN (by DONNA SHALEV).....	245
DISSERTATIONS IN PROGRESS	
PROCEEDINGS: THE ISRAEL SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF CLASSICAL STUDIES	
	261

Homeric γόον ‘bewailed’ (Z 500)

Alan J. Nussbaum

Abstract: The 3rd pl. indicative γόον at *Iliad* Z 500 has always presented problems. It means ‘bewailed’ and belongs to present γοάω but might be imperfect and might be aorist. Neither is straightforward in form. Imperfect, the analysis of most of the ancients because it is ‘κάλλιον,’ is shown here in addition to conform to a particular pattern of Homeric narration, while aorist, following the minority ancient view, requires either an indefensible, effectively pre-Greek, ancestral form or a morphological analogy that is unworkable. The form taken by this consequently demonstrable imperfect has most often been explained *via* an elaborate phonological scenario that is questionable, it is argued, in both of its key points. It has also, less usually, been morphologically accounted for as a slightly disguised version of the expected 3rd pl. imperfect of the “Aeolic” inflection of Ionic etc. γοάω. This is the correct view, it is maintained here, but can be made a much stronger hypothesis by a demonstration that there are two (but not three) additional pieces of evidence for the “Aeolic” inflection of this very verb in epic language—one of which, pres. infinitive γοήμεναι, is standardly recognized as “Aeolic,” but never evaluated and deployed in the discussion of γόον; while the other, the irregularly short iterative imperfect form γόασκε in the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, has never been utilized as evidence bearing on the problem of γόον at all.

Keywords: Homeric language, Greek dialects, Greek phonology, Greek verb, “Aeolic” inflection

1. The passage in the *Iliad* where the peculiar-looking verb form γόον appears¹ is in Book Z right after the meeting between Hector and Andromache:

... κικήσατο δ' ἔνδοθι πολλὰς
ἀμφιπόλους, τῆσιν δὲ γόον πάσησιν ἐνῶρσεν.
αἶ μὲν ἔτι ζῶν γόον Ἔκτορα ᾗ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ· (500)
οὐ γάρ μιν ἔτ' ἔφαντο ὑπότηροπον ἐκ πολέμοιο
ἵξεσθαι προφυγόντα μένος καὶ χεῖρας Ἀχαιῶν.

Andromache goes home, joins her maidservants there, and starts them lamenting. Then comes the sentence with the anomalous form: ‘And they bewailed Hector, while still alive, in his own house.’

¹ A number of mss. offer γόων, unambiguously 3rd pl. imperfect of γοάω, in this line. See Ludwig (1902–7); Allen (1931), ad loc. This reading, with its iambic shape, would manifestly be unmetrical in this spot. But Meister (1921), 61², stressing the occurrence of γόον beside γόον, audaciously proposes a γόων scanning as a single long by synizesis in this third biceps—a marked versification, to be sure, inasmuch as metrically monosyllabic words scanning as a long are so placed only about 4% of the time in Homer (O’Neill 1942, 139 [Table Two]).

2. The conspicuous difficulty is that beyond the identification of the form as a 3rd plural belonging somewhere in the *averbo* of γοάω ‘(be)wail’ (< *gow-ayo/e-²), it is not immediately clear how to parse this γόον. For a γόον scanning as $\sim\sim$ is not trivially analyzable either in form or in meaning. It would obviously help if we could decide for sure whether its meaning is that of an imperfect or an aorist. It would also solve the problem if the surface shape of the form were unambiguous. But neither a 3rd pl. imperfect nor a 3rd pl. aorist, since both would be morphologically problematical, seems the obvious choice at first glance.³

The three aims of this note, in connection with this difficulty, are (1) to support the parsing of the form as an imperfect, (2) to point out a difficulty with what may fairly be called the standard phonological and morphological account of how a 3rd pl. imperfect *góason acquired the metrical shape that γόον exhibits here and (3) to defend an old but rarely adopted analysis of the form.

3. Uncertainty surrounded the question already in antiquity, as is shown by the relevant entry in the *Etymologicum Magnum*:

Γόον: Οἱ μὲν ἔτι ζωὸν γόον Ἐκτορα δῖον.

Ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐγόνων, ἐθρήνουν. Ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος
 δευτέρως συζυγίας αὐτὸ εἶναι λέγει, καὶ παρατα-
 τικοῦ· ὁ δὲ Ἡρωδιανὸς, δευτέρως ἀορίστου· ὥσπερ
 κτυπῶ ἔκτυπον, οὕτω γοῶ, ἔγοον. Κάλλιον οὖν κατὰ
 συστολήν λέγεσθαι παρατατικοῦ χρόνου. Πειθόμεθα
 Ἀπολλωνίῳ. Οὕτω Ζηνόδοτος.

3.1 The entry analyzes the form (exampled in a partial line containing an expression that is neither quite identical to the one in Z 500 nor found elsewhere) as an imperfect (Ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐγόνων) and glosses it as one as well (ἐθρήνουν). The further points made⁴ are (1) that

² The root, at any rate, is inherited. See *IEW*, 403; *LIV*², 189; *GEW* 1, 317; *DELG*², 22. Also *EDG* s.v., where it is proposed, however, that βοάω and γοάω jointly reflect a *g^w-initial root, with *g^w- > *g- in zero-grade *g^wu- somewhere in the prehistoric *averbo* of γοάω, and a semantic differentiation between the two presents that ‘can easily be secondary’ despite the certainly accurate observation that they ‘se distinguent franchement’ (*DELG*², 222). The problems besetting this scenario would be to identify some cogently reconstructible form(s) in *g^wu- that triggered the paradigm split, and to offer an adequate explanation of the semantic divergence of the two verbs, inasmuch as βοάω seems to be punctual and perfective (as suggested by its well-attested aorist forms in Homer—beside only a small number of present forms) while γοάω (with no Homeric aorist forms at all) apparently has processual and imperfective value.

³ *GEW* 1, 317 is judiciously neutral on the imperf. vs. aor. question, as is *DELG*², 221 (in accord with Chantraine 1958, 392¹ and Chantraine 2013, 379⁵), both s.v. γοάω. So too Risch (1974), 240⁷.

⁴ Much the same information and analysis, with some omissions and some additions, is presented in the scholia to Z 500 and in Eustathius 658, 3ff. ad Z 499–500.

this was the analysis favored by Apollonius Dyscolus; (2) that Herodian, on the other hand, took it as a thematic aorist (ἐγχοον to pres. γοῶ like ἐκτυπον to κτυπῶ); but (3) that an imperfect with shortening (συστολή) of (ἐ)γούον to γούον gives better sense (κάλλιον); (4) that the *EM* itself, as the entry already implicitly says at the top, is following Apollonius, and (5), apparently, that “Zenodotus” did too.⁵

3.2 A couple of comments on the *EM*’s treatment are perhaps in place. One is that it does seem, in agreement with *EM*’s ‘κάλλιον,’ that an imperfect gives better sense than an aorist in Z 500.⁶ Only one line before, Homer uses an aorist to describe Andromache’s prompting of the bewailing (γούον ... ἐνῶρσεν).⁷ And it would be attractive to think that γούον in line 500 indicates that once Andromache got them going, the women were carrying on with it as the scene closes (‘And so they were bewailing Hector, though still alive, in his own house’).

3.3 More than this, however, there is positive support in Homeric usage for a pattern of narration in which a character specifically arouses a γόος with aorist ῥσε—or it spontaneously arises with aorist ῥτο—and the action consequent to the arousal is regularly imperfect, at least if that action is weeping or the like:⁸

- “Ὡς φάτο, τῷ δ’ ἄρα πατρὸς ὑφ’ ἡμερον ῥσε γόοιο· (Ω 507)

...

⁵ According to Schneider (1910) (= *Grammatici Graeci* II.3: Apollonius Dyscolus, fragments; see II.3, 111), this *EM* entry incorrectly attributes to “Zenodotus” (fourth century BCE) a judgment that was really that of Zenobius (second century CE)—if, indeed, Οὔτω [Ζηνόβιος] was really meant to attribute an opinion to Zenobius in the first place, and not just to credit him as the source of the view reported as that of Apollonius.

⁶ So too Monro (1891), 37 (§32.3): ‘γούον ... makes better sense as an Impf.,’ as well as Bechtel (1906), 319.

⁷ The unique expression |^r γούον πάσησιν ἐνῶρσεν# in Z 499 is highly reminiscent of the much better embedded |^r ὑφ’ ἡμερον ῥσε γόοιο# (Ψ 108, 153; Ω 507; δ 113, 183; τ 249; ψ 231) and is obviously related also to |⁷ γόου ἡμερον ῥσε#, which is also unique (Ψ 14).

⁸ Though one may note that this aorist + imperfect sequence occurs more generally—as in, to take one example at random (cf. Chantraine 1963, 193 [§287]):

Καὶ τότε δὴ θάρσησε καὶ ἠῦδα μάντις ἀμύμων·(A 92)

When somebody arouses something emotional in others with the aorist ῥσε, the consequence of this arousal, in the progress of the narrative, can also be an aorist—if that consequence is the kind of action that would be most naturally expressed by an aorist anyway and/or the verb in question is an actual or virtual *aoristus tantum*:

- Ἄψ δ’ αὖτις Τρώεσσιν Ὀλύμπιος ἐν μένος ῥρσεν· (Θ 335)

οἱ δ’ ἰθὺς τάφροιο βαθείης ῥσαν Ἀχαιοῦς·

Conversely, it would seem anomalous at first glance that the action of starting up (ἐξάρχειν) a γόος or anything else is always expressed either by an imperfect or a present participle:

|⁷ ἐξῆρχε γόοιο# (Σ 51+) and |⁵ ἀδινού ἐξῆρχε γόοιο# (Σ 315+)

μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντες|^r (Σ 606 = δ 19)

But ἐξάρχειν has no forms but these in Homer and no aorist forms at all (which remain very rare even after Homer).

... ὃ μὲν Ἴκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο

κλαῖ' ἀδινὰ ...

αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς **κλαῖεν** ἐὸν πατέρ' ...

• ὡς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἴμερον **ῶρσε** γόοιο. (δ 183)

κλαῖε μὲν Ἀργεῖη Ἑλένη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,

κλαῖε δὲ Τηλέμαχος τε καὶ Ἀτρεΐδης Μενέλαος

• ὡς φάτο, τῷ δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑφ' ἴμερον **ῶρσε** γόοιο (ψ 231)

κλαῖε δ' ἔχων ἄλοχον θυμαρέα, κεδνὰ ἰδυῖαν.

• ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ τοῖσιν ὑφ' ἴμερος **ῶρτο** γόοιο. (π 215)

κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως, ἀδινώτερον ἢ τ' οἰωνοί

This extends to a case in which weeping as a consequence of the instigation of a γόος is only indirectly noted:

... μετὰ δέ σφι θέτις γόου ἴμερον **ῶρσε**. (Ψ 14)

δεύοντο ψάμαθοι, **δεύοντο** δὲ τεύχεα φωτῶν

δάκρυσι· ...

3.4. A positive drawback, moreover, to the analysis of γόον as an aorist is that if it is one, it is virtually the only aorist form of γοάω—regardless of morphological type—ever found, at least until very late. Although a future γοήσεται is already Homeric in the repeated line segment # ἐνθεμένη λεχέεσσι γοήσεται (Φ 124, X 353), the only aorists one may cite are a γοῆσαι from the *AP* (VII 608.3) and on an undated inscription in hexameters from Amorgos (*IG* VII,7: 445); a γοησάμενοι on an inscription in elegiacs, also undated, from Teos (*SEG* 2: 616. 5); as well as an ἐγόησαν, also from the *AP* (VII 611.3); and a γοήσατο from the third century CE Quintus Epicus (10.465).⁹ It is thus difficult to avoid the conclusion that γοάω denoted an activity that was so processual as to make an aorist unuseful and an imperfect exactly right.¹⁰ Herodian's justification, moreover, of a thematic aorist parsing (ὥσπερ κτυπῶ ἔκτυπον, οὕτω γοῶ, ἔγοον [Περὶ ῥημάτων 3.2: 802.22]) makes crucial use of an Attic present form κτυπῶ, which can scarcely be invoked either in a parallel to or in a model for a pairing to which a Homeric ἔγοον/ γόον could have belonged.

3.5. Taking all of this into consideration, the “bottom line” of what is said in this *EM* entry is that an imperfect parsing is supported by native intuitions of the aspectual value of γόον

⁹ A [γ]ό[η]σε is read on *IG* II² 6983, an Attic inscription.

¹⁰ The only verb forms from this root that *LIV*², 189 registers as even potentially reconstructible for PIE are a neutral present and an intensive present.

in Z 500, which is further buttressed by Homeric narrative patterns more generally.¹¹ In contrast, the analysis as an aorist, for which the language demonstrably had no use anyway, was motivated only by an attempt to see the form as belonging to a pattern that a single ancient authority aligned, unworkably, with what seemed to be a parallel pattern elsewhere.

4. To finish up the preliminaries, it is necessary to make specific mention of one other form that will obviously be relevant to 3rd pl. γόων. It occurs in the *Odyssey*:

ὥς ἐφράμην, τοῖσιν δὲ κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ,
ἐζόμενοι δὲ κατ' αὔθι γόων τίλλοντό τε χαιίτας· (κ 567)

This tells of the unenthusiastic reception that Odysseus' men give to the news that there will be a detour to Hades on their way home: 'sitting down on the spot, they kept wailing and tearing their hair.' The 3rd pl. γόων in this line, transmitted without notable variant,¹² will clearly have to figure somehow in any verdict on 3rd pl. γόων. In function it is practically certain to be an imperfect. Still more so is the shape of the form as transmitted. But there are two possible accounts of it. The simplest is just to see this γόων as the contracted outcome of the "normal" imperfect: *γόων > γόων,¹³ and thus simply a "recent" form. A more involved scenario, but not decisively a better one,¹⁴ would be to assume that γόων, the peculiar imperfect that we saw in the *Iliad*, has gotten replaced here, in a typical kind of normalization, by exactly that same contracted imperfect—no matter what we end up doing about the Iliadic form: *γόων τίλλοντό τε >> γόων τίλλοντό τε. The only important point is that whatever is made of γόων in κ 567, it shows either directly or indirectly that Homeric language eventually had access to what we would call the normal Ionic imperfect of γόω—unless, indeed, we insist somewhat arbitrarily upon supposing that this γόων is merely an artifact of the very early textual transmission, and that a γοον (= γόων) in a "prehistoric" exemplar written in an alphabet with no ω (epichoric Attic as the default) was eventually transcribed as the equally metrical γοων, the only form by then, when the text was put into the Ionic alphabet.

5. May we then simply proceed on the understanding that γόων is an imperfect?¹⁵ Not quite. The aorist analysis, though not well vindicated, as noted above, by the purely verbal present – aorist analogue proposed by Herodian, has been recast by some modern scholarship in a denominal—or, at least, nominal-involved—form.

5.1 One reads already in Monro (1891), 37 (§32.3), in substance, that γόων may belong to a small class of thematic aorists derived from thematic nominals (though the paragraph

¹¹ Most recently adopting the impf. analysis is Forssman (2019), 112 (§9.3.2).

¹² See, e.g., Ludwich (1889); West (2017), ad loc.

¹³ So, most recently, Forssman (2019), 112 (§9.3.2).

¹⁴ In its favor is only that irresolvably contracted -ων < -aon is a markedly rare thing in Homer. See Forssman (2019), 112 (§9.3.2).

¹⁵ A theoretically possible but barely advocated view is that beside present stem *gowao/e-Greek just happened to have a simple thematic with o-grade root—i.e., a *gowo/e-. On this Forssman (2019), 109 (§9.2.2 I) says that 'Eine Nebenform γοε- wegen Inj. γόων ... ist unwrsch.' It would be difficult to disagree.

actually says, but does not mean, ‘nouns’). Putative aorists of this type, according to Monro, would be *θέρμετε* ‘warm!’ (pl. inv. θ 426) and *θέρμετο* ‘grew warm’ (Σ 348, θ 437), from *θερμός* ‘warm’; *ὄπλεσθαι* (T 172, Ψ 159) ‘get ready’ from *ὄπλον* ‘implement’ (: pres. *ὀπλέω*); our *γόον* (Z 500) ‘bewailed’, from *γόος* ‘a wail’ (: pres. *γοάω*); and *ἀμαρτεῖν* ‘miss’ from an **amarto-* (viz. **η-μη-το-*) ‘with no part in’ (apparently invoking the **mer-* of, e.g., *μέρος*). In the note to this section, however, Monro adds that ‘[s]ome at least of these instances may be otherwise explained,’ pointing out, i.a., that ‘[f]or *ὄπλεσθαι* we may read [pres.] *ὀπλεῖσθαι*,’ and that *γόον* may perfectly well be an imperfect rather than a thematic aorist (on which more below). For the record, Monro’s privative compound **amarto-* as the basis of aor. *ἤμαρτον* etc. is an obsolete construct at best and is not even mentioned in modern handbooks, which treat the etymology of the verb as unknown.¹⁶ Now the thematic verb stem that appears in Homer as the active inv. *θέρμετε* (with factitive meaning [θ 426: || *θέρμετε δ’ ὕδωρ*#]) and as the dictionally related middle indic. *θέρμετο* (with fientive value [Σ 348 = θ 437: || *θέρμετο δ’ ὕδωρ*#]) indubitably shows the *-m-* of the unambiguous nominal formant of *θερμός* ‘warm’. There is consequently no denying that this adjective was directly involved in the creation of the verbal stem.¹⁷ But *θέρμετο* all by itself is enough to show by its meaning that these are forms of a thematic present stem rather than aorist.

5.2 The derivation of a very small number of thematic aorists from nominals is also mentioned, though as a mere possibility, in Leaf (1900), ad Z 500, where Monro’s *ὄπλεσθαι* : *ὄπλον* and *θέρμετο* : *θερμός* are repeated, and a new example, which should have been given as *ἔκτυπε* (Θ 75+) ‘crashed, thundered’ : *κτύπος* (*Il.*+) ‘sound, noise’,¹⁸ is added. But *ὄπλεσθαι*, even if real, is still not an assured aorist, and *θέρμετε*, *θέρμετο* are positively best taken as forms of a thematic present. Aor. *ἔκτυπε* : nominal *κτύπος*, however, would in fact be parallel to aor. *γόον* : nominal *γόος*—if an explanation by way of a model for the creation of an aorist *γόον*, rather than an imperfect, were really wanted. In addition, the extreme rarity of a pairing like *ἔκτυπε* : *κτύπος* must cast some doubt upon the theory of its recruitment as a model for further examples.

Nevertheless, the idea not only of making *γόον* an aorist, the less satisfactory option, but also of explaining it as directly derived from the verbal abstract *γόος* on the model—uniquely deployed here—of *ἔκτυπε* : *κτύπος* was adopted in Chantraine (1948), 392, 392¹ (§186). It appears in all the re-issues of the original version of this fundamental work and has been retained without change in the revised Chantraine (2013), 379, 379¹ (§186).

5.3 Leumann (1950), 186–7 envisions ‘ein primäres Praeteritum 3. sg. *γόε*, 3. pl. *γόον*,’ which apparently amounts to an underived thematic aorist on the root (necessarily non-ablating, if so) of *γόος* ‘lamentation’. The pres. *γοάω* (Hom. *γοάοιμεν*, *γοόοντες* etc.) that goes with this aor. **γόε*, *γόον* is explained, in this scenario, as a denominative to *γόος* that has been redone as an *-άω* pres. on the model of *βοάω* ‘shout, roar’ (Hom. *βοάα*, *βοόωσι* etc.), a regular denominative to *βοή* ‘a cry’ (Hom.+). Neither the ancient

¹⁶ See *GEW* 1, 87; *DELG*², 68; *GED* s.v. *ἀμαρτάνω*; Sommer (1905), 30–8; Schwyzer (1939), 704⁷.

¹⁷ See Rau (2009), 116.

¹⁸ What Leaf’s note here actually says is ‘cf. “κτύπε” by “κτυπέω”,’ which is not intelligible in the context.

preference for an imperfect meaning of γόον nor the peculiarity of an *o*-grade in a primary thematic aorist is addressed.

6. Even if it can be said with some cogency, however, that γόον at Z 500 is an imperfect, nailing down the precise history of that imperfect is somewhat more difficult. For two different accounts—neither decisively vindicated—have been proposed in the past.

6.1 One way of explaining an imperfect that takes the shape γόον in the text, and which may fairly be labeled the standard view, seems to go back to Bechtel¹⁹ and involves a two-step phonological development: *γόαον > *γόεον followed by *γόεον > γόον by “hyphaeresis.”

6.1.1 The first step is to invoke a sound law first formulated by Johannes Schmidt,²⁰ by which a Proto-Greek short *a* became *e* in hiatus before any kind of *o* vowel. The effects of this rule, according to Schmidt, would be conspicuously displayed in Delphian inscriptions, for example, where they would be especially frequent in forms of σῶλάω ‘take away; rescue’:

ἐπιτιμεων (*IG IX,1²*: 1.95 etc., none before third century); σῶλεων (*BCH* 110 [1986], 438.4 etc.); σῶλεοντες (*BCH* 91 [1967], 87A.15 etc.); σῶλεοι (*SGDI* II: 1696) vs. σῶλητω (*SGDI* II: 1705); σῶλην (*SGDI* II: 1802).

But putative examples can be quoted from other dialects as well.²¹ In Cretan, for instance, they are not uncommon:

Gortyn Law (*IC IV*: 72) μοικιδῶν, ἔβιδῶν, ἐπαριομενον (all with *aō̃* > *eō̃* and then regular Cretan *eō̃* > *iō̃* where the *eō̃* sequence results from lost intervocalic **s* (> **h*) or **γ* but not **γ*²²).

And a number of other Doric (including NW Greek) dialects also exhibit presumptive traces.²³

Outside of Doric, the dialect that shows a good number of apparent cases in one way or another is, in fact, Ionic,²⁴ where the examples all come from two morphological categories. Contract presents of the *-aō̃-* type show *-eō̃-* or its outcome in a fairly large number of forms:

ἦντεον, ἐσῶλεον (Hom.); μωμεύμενος (Theogn.); ἐφοίτεον (Hdt.) etc.

The peculiar thing about these verb forms is that *eō̃* for *aō̃* is found only in forms transmitted in literary Ionic texts. Inscriptional forms regularly show *-aō̃-* or its contraction:

¹⁹ Bechtel (1906), followed without comment by Schwyzer (1939), 252, 683. Most recently, Forssman (2019), 117 (§9.3.11) supports the view that ‘3. Plur. I γόον Z 500 zeigt wohl Hyphärese (*γόαον oder *γόεον),’ though without confronting the issues that that account entails.

²⁰ Schmidt (1889), 321–37.

²¹ Buck (1955), 125 (§161.2).

²² Buck (1955), 22 (§9.7); Bile (1988), 80 (§21.11), 83–5 (§21.121).

²³ See Méndez Dosuna (1985), 223–5.

²⁴ Schwyzer (1939), 242–3; Buck (1955), 125 (§161.2); *HGD* 2, 275 (§312 9b); Stüber (1996), 113–5.

ἐνίκων (Ceos *IG* XII,5: 608; *IG* XII,5: 444 Paros etc.), αἰσυνῶν (Teos *SGDI* III.2: 5632), αἰσυνῶντος (*SEG* 4, 427.1; *Syll*³: 57), ἀδικῶνται (Delos *IG* XI,4: 599 late 4c) etc.

The other place where the rule is said to be reflected in Ionic is the paradigm of neuter nouns in -ας, -α-ος etc. Descriptively, these switch, outside the nom.-acc. singular, to the more common -ε-ος etc. type in Ionic:

τέρας: τέρεος, τέρεα (Hdt.); γέρας: γέρεα (20x Hdt., inscr. Miletus [*SEG* 15: 677, *SEG* 4: 445, *SGDI* III.2: 5496, Dittenberger *Syll*³: 1037] 4c and Cos [*IG* XII,4 1: 297]; κέρασ: κέρεος κέρει κέρεα κερέων (Hdt.).

The idea is that these represent a generalization based on the gen. singular and plural, where the -e- was phonologically regular:

-a-os, -a-ōn > *-e-os, -e-ōn* ⇒ *-e-i, -e-a, -e-si*.

And this time, in contrast to the situation in the -aō- verbs, there is at least some evidence, even if indirect, for *e* in place of etymological *a* beyond textually transmitted cases:

γερεα (inscr. Miletus and Cos, as above).

On the basis of this kind of evidence, in any event, Schmidt suggested the Proto-Greek rule described above, supposing in addition that the dialects that show practically no traces of it (e.g., Attic [regularly τῆμῶμεν, τῆμῶσι etc.] or Laconian [ἡβόντι, εὐηβόηαις with ἡβο- = *hēbō- < *hēbaō-]) and others²⁵ have eliminated the *eō* forms that would have been phonologically regular under this theory by paradigmatic leveling.²⁶

6.1.2 But whatever else may be thought of this sound law, it can no longer be considered Proto-Greek. The only parallels in Greek for dissimilatory vocalic fronting and raising—of /e/ before both /o/ and /a/, as it happens—are (1) the *eō* > *iō* rule mentioned above for Cretan but found in many other dialects as well (Thess. θιος [θεός], Boe. ἰοντος [ἔόντος], Lac. ἀνιοχιῶν [ἠνιοχέων], Heracl. ἀδικίων [ἀδικέων])²⁷ and (2) a rarer but analogous *ea* > *ia* development (Cypr. *we-pi-ja* [ἔπεα] *ICS* 217.B 26). And since this lone parallel is evidently a vowels-in-hiatus kind of phenomenon, an *ao* > *eo* development, also amounting to a dissimilatory fronting, would lose the support of its only parallel if it too were not limited to a *v*₁*_v*₂ environment. But it has long been the *communis opinio* that Proto-Greek had neither *h*-loss nor *y*-loss hiatuses. For the former, the settled doctrine (1) that the Mycenaean sign *a*₂ spells /ha/ (e.g., *a*₂-*te-ro* = ἄτερος '[the] other'), and (2) that *pa-we-a*₂ therefore represents *p^harweha* 'cloaks' (Hom. φᾶρεα),²⁸ which entails *h* > *∅* / *v*₁*_v*₂ much later than Proto-Greek. The chronology of *y*-loss between vowels is less easy

²⁵ See, e.g., Buck (1955), 37 (§41.2).

²⁶ It is fair to doubt, however, that very frequent Ion. γέρεα has really gotten its stem-final -ε- from the gen. sg. and pl.

²⁷ Buck (1955), 21–3 (§9).

²⁸ Cf. also *we-a*₂-*no* 'robe' (: **wes* 'wear, be dressed' [*LIV*², 692–3; *IEW*, 1172–3]).

to pin down,²⁹ but the weight of contemporary opinion³⁰ is that $y > \emptyset / v_v$ was still ongoing in the Bronze Age—though even the completion of $y > \emptyset / v_v$ by the time of the Linear B tablets would not, of course, show that the loss was Proto-Greek. This means, naturally, that the $a\check{d} > e\check{d}$ rule proposed by Schmidt was at best an independent development of the dialects that show it—or, in other words, more or less the same sort of thing as the $e\check{d}/a\check{d} > i\check{d}/i\check{a}$ change that happened in quite a few dialects too. For the dialects with no evidence of Schmidt’s sound law, it could still be assumed that the traces were leveled out. But if the whole thing is now a post-Proto-Greek matter altogether, there is no reason to suppose that an $a\check{d} > e\check{d}$ ever happened in those dialects in the first place.³¹

6.1.3 Getting back to Bechtel’s explanation of γόον, this all means that the first step in that proposed development, and therefore the whole process, can only have happened within the history of some dialect. And for the scenario to work, three things now have to be true of that dialect: 1. It obviously must be a dialect that contributed to epic language. 2. It must be a dialect that had the putative sound change $a\check{d} > e\check{d}$. 3. It must be a dialect that kept thematic inflection of “contract” presents, at least up until the time when putative $a\check{d} > e\check{d}$ was effectuated.

²⁹ This question is obviously too complicated to be addressed here in any detail. But as an illustration of what is involved, we may point out that some of the most conspicuous evidence in favor of the standard doctrine is debatable. There is a frequently encountered view, to be specific, that the vacillation of Myc. *-Ce-jo* and *-Ce-o* in “material” adjectives (< **eyo-*)—e.g., *e-re-pa-te-jo* vs. *e-re-pa-te-o* ‘of ivory’—demonstrates that the loss of intervocalic *y* was still in progress in the Mycenaean era (e.g., Lejeune 1972, 169 [§171]). But this is quite unsure. For there is the possibility that the subphonemic transitional glide */j/*, always written between an */i/* and a non-front vowel (*wi-ri-ni-jo* ‘leathern’, *ke-ra-i-ja-* ‘of horn’ [fem.]), was generated also in the sequences */ea/* and */eo/*, but was merely less robust there—which both explains its inconsistent notation and indicates that “real” phonemic *y* had simply been lost intervocalically by the end of Mycenaean period, as is shown anyway by the spelling *o-u* and never **o-ju* for *ou* ‘not’ (οὐ) < **h₂oyu* (Cowgill 1960, 347–50).

³⁰ See Bartoněk (2003), 139; Hajnal-Risch (2006), 232–7 (C. §82.B); García Ramón (2016), 213.

³¹ In fact, a close study of the evidence pertaining to the appearance of $e\check{d}$ for etymological $a\check{d}$ in Greek, which obviously cannot be presented here, indicates that the entire phenomenon, in no matter what dialect, is the product of analogies and not of a sound law at all—with one type of analogy producing secondary *-εε/o-* for *-αε/o-* inflection in Doric contract presents, and other types responsible for *-εε/o-* in place of “expected” *-αε/o-* in literary Ionic *compound* presents (e.g., φωνή beside προσεφώνεε etc. already in Hom.) and some decompositional simplexes (e.g., φωνέω Thgn.+)] as well, on which see Forssman (1966), 82–3.

In this particular case, the idea that nom.-acc. pl. γέρεα (beside Ion. γερα [= γέρα < **géraa*] SEG 17: 377.3) has its *-ε-* analogically from gen. sg. **-e-os* and/or gen. pl. *-e-ōn* is badly undermined by the distribution of forms: γέρεα is attested many times (20x in Hdt., nearly a dozen times in Ion. inscriptions [especially from Cos and Miletus]), while **γέρεος* is never found at all, and γερέων is vanishingly rare (once in a fragment of Menecrates [4.11], quoted later by D.H [Ant. Rom. 1.48.3.11], and on one inscription from Mytilene [IG XII,2: 484.2]). This will be discussed in detail in another place. For now, see again Méndez Dosuna (1985), 223–5. The explanation by way of Schmidt’s sound law is, however, maintained by Stüber (1996), 113–5.

The only dialect that satisfies these criteria is Ionic. In the other dialects from which Homeric forms can stem, what Schmidt regarded as an $a\ddot{o} > e\ddot{o}$ sound change cannot be shown to have operated, and the “contract” presents show athematic inflection. It may not be much progress, but now at least it can be specified that the question is whether Bechtel’s account will work in Homeric Ionic.

6.1.4 An answer may start by asking why there have to be two stages to the development ($*g\acute{o}aon > *g\acute{o}eon$ and then $*g\acute{o}eon > \gamma\acute{o}on$) at all, or why it could not have been $*g\acute{o}aon > \gamma\acute{o}on$ directly. For if a vowel is going to be lost by hyphaeresis in any case, it is not immediately clear why it should change first. Bechtel does not say anything explicit about this, but the reason seems to be that although there are post-Homeric Ionic parallels for what looks like the loss of / \acute{e} / between two / \acute{o} / vowels³²—

$*-o(iy)eont- > -o(iy)ont-$: $\pi\acute{o}\iota\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Chios *BCH* 1913, 194–202, no. 20, ca. 400); $*-oeont- > -oont-$: $\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Amorgos *SGDI* III.2: 5363, after 300), $*-oeont- > -oont- > -\acute{o}nt$ ($\nu\acute{o}\ddot{\upsilon}\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ [Democritus Frag. 129. 2 and 3])

—there are no such inscriptional and/or literary parallels for the loss of / \acute{a} / in the same position. In Homer in particular, no form would point to the loss of \acute{a} preceded by \acute{o} in a sequence of three consecutive vowels, unless it is claimed that $\gamma\acute{o}on$ itself is a unique example of it. It therefore looks as if Bechtel wanted to take advantage of forms like $\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ to get from a three-syllable imperfect $*g\acute{o}aon$ to the two-syllable $\gamma\acute{o}on$ that we have.

6.1.5 But it is difficult to believe very confidently in this vowel loss for $\gamma\acute{o}on$. First, there is room for some doubt that what would happen before medial $-nt-$ would also happen before final $-n$, though this is hard to judge for very many dialects because of the scarcity of evidence bearing on the treatment of $*-oeo-$ altogether, and especially in these two positions specifically. But to judge by the analogous hyphaeresis of simple $-eo-$ before $-nt-$ and $-n$, where preservation is the rule in most dialects, but which shows reduction to $-ont-$ and $-on$ in some ($\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ [*IC* III.iii: 5, *SEG* 36:811] and $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ [*IC* III.iii: 3 C.16] E. Cret. [Hierapytna]), the treatment is not always uniform in both environments (Delph. $\theta\epsilon\alpha\rho\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\nu$ [*FD* 3: 4.369] vs. $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omicron\nu$ [*SGDI* II: 2675]). One may note, possibly tellingly, that in the rather full treatment given to this $-eo- > -o-$ phenomenon in Schwyzer (1939), 252–3, the available examples of $-eoCC- > -oC-$ (including but by no means limited to $-eont- > -ont-$: Eub. $\Theta\omicron\kappa\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ [*IG* XII.9: 56, no.454 ca. 475], Meg. $\Theta\omicron\gamma\upsilon\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\varsigma$ [*SGDI* III.1: 3025.63] < $\theta\epsilon\omicron-$) far outnumber those attesting $-eoC > -oC$ (E. Cret. $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ [*IC* III.iii: 3 C.16], as above). There is consequently no guarantee that any variety of Ionic ever underwent hyphaeresis of $*-(o)eon > *(o)on$ even if there are traces of $*-(o)eont- > *(o)ont-$ there.

Beyond mistrust of an Ionic $*-(o)eon > *(o)on$ assumed on the basis of $*-(o)eont- > -(o)ont-$ ($\pi\acute{o}\iota\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ [Chios], $\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ [Amorgos]), however, there is the possibility of making a case that $-oe\ddot{o}$ - hyphaeresis itself was post-Homeric altogether in Ionic. Homer

³² See *SGDI* III.2: 555 sub no. 5363 and, in more detail (with more examples drawn from more dialects than just Ionic), Schwyzer (1939), 252–3. It should be noted, however, that many supposed examples of etymological $-eea-$ and $-eeo-$ surfacing in the end as $-\acute{e}a-$ and $-\acute{e}o-$ are probably to be explained in a different way: $*-eea/o- > -\acute{e}a/o- > -\acute{e}a/o-$ (Nussbaum 2018, 271–302).

has a decent number of *-oeō* and *-oeǎ-* forms of *voéō* (< **noheyo/e-* with two old hiatuses, one may note):

voéō 3x *Il.*, 5x *Od.*; *voéontι* 1x *Il.*, 1x (in a 3x repeated line) *Od.*; *voeóση* 1x *Il.*

In every case the etymological */oeǎ/* sequence is metrically guaranteed as still trisyllabic.³³ Homer does not have many other verbs in *-oeō* and *-oeǎ-*, but the forms that can be found also fail to show the vowel loss on which Bechtel's explanation has always depended:

*λόεον*³⁴ 'washed' 1x *Od.*; *οινοχοεῦντες*³⁵ 'pouring (wine)' 1x *Od.*; contrast *ποιέον* 2x *Il.* with *ποιοντος* (Chios), as above.

It therefore seems anything but obvious that *γóον* would be an already-Homeric hyphaeresized form of **góeon* (however that may itself have arisen³⁶).

6.1.6 The dispositive point in all this, however, is perhaps that the very verb under discussion here (*γοάω*) never shows any other form in Homer or even after Homer in which a vowel would seem to have been hyphaeresized between the two *o*-vowels, at least on the surface. The relevant Homeric forms are:

With unmolested *-oao-*: *γοάοιμεν* (1x *Il.*), *γοάοιεν* (1x *Il.*)

With *-oaǎ-* "distracted" to *-ooǎ-*: *γοόωντα* (1x *Od.*), *γοόωντες* (1x *Od.*), *γοόωντας* (1x *Od.*), *γοόωσα* (3x *Il.* [in 4 appearances], 5x *Od.*), *γοόωσαν* (2x *Od.*)

³³ So too *voéōν* (Hes. *Op.* 286). It would be arbitrary to insist that *voeῦντες* (Hes. *Op.* 261) stands in the place of an "original" *ῥνόοντες*, of course.

³⁴ It is not especially plausible that 3rd sg. impf. *λό'* (*λόε*) at κ 361 is analogical to a putative 1st sg. and 3rd pl. **lóon* that was produced by a hyphaeresis of impf. *λόεον* (δ 252) (: fut. *λοέσσομαι* [ζ 221], aor. *λοέσσαι* [τ 320] etc.) to a present **loweyo/e-* (> *λόούω* [Hom. *λούεσθαι*, fut. *-λούσομαι*, aor. *λοῦσαι* etc.]). The attestation in Homer of unhyphaeresized *λόεον* is itself a bit of an embarrassment to this account of this *λόε*, as is the existence of a *λόω* in, e.g., Attic (see LSJ 1062, col. 1), which is not otherwise much of a hyphaeresizing dialect. Hom.+ *λόω* can in any case be explained as a different, and inherited, simple thematic present formation, with Lat. *lavō*, *-ere* as an exact correspondent (by "Thurneysen-Havet's Law"; see, e.g., Weiss 2020, 152).

³⁵ It would again be arbitrary or even tendentious to contend that *οινοχοεῦντες* is "really" *ῥοινοχόοντες*, though it would be reasonable to wonder whether *-χοευ-* in this form, with "recent" Ionic but thoroughly Homeric *-ευ-* from *-eo-* (Chantraine 2013, 61–5, especially 63–4), might not have been triggered by the separate present *οινοχοεῦεν* (2x *Il.*, 2x *Od.*).

³⁶ The dubiousness of a putative **góeon* > *γóον* obviously undermines the plausibility of a **góeon* that arose in some way other than via Schmidt's *aǎ* > *eǎ* rule as well. Specifically, Leumann's idea (see §5.3 above) that the present *γοάω* represents a denominative in original **-e(y)o/e-* to the verbal abstract **gówo-* 'a groan' (> *γóος*) that was remade as an *-a(y)o/e-* present in assimilation to *βοάω*, leaving only **góeon* > *γóον* as a trace, would also be strongly disfavored if **-oeon* > *-oon* cannot be counted on. But Leumann's overall scenario has other problems too (on which see again §5.3 above)—to which it may be added that *γοάω*, as a virtual *praesens tantum*, is less likely than it might seem to have followed the lead of an *averbo* like *βοάω*: (ἐ)βόησα, in which the present is the marginal member (as observed above).

With *-oaǎ-* contracted to *-oō-*: γόων (1x *Od.*), γοῶντες (2x *Il.*, 1x *Od.*)³⁷

If fifteen times we have uncontracted forms that rule out hyphaeresis in the first place, and if three times we have contracted-looking forms that also rule it out at least as they stand, then invoking hyphaeresis to explain the last remaining form must inspire skepticism. Furthermore, the Homeric present stem forms of the rhyme-verb βόάω ‘shout’—as comparatively few as they are, and with no form occurring more than once—show exactly the same pattern as γόάω (except without cases of unmolested *-oaǎ-*):

With *-oaǎ-* “distracted” to *-oō-*: βοόωσι (1x *Il.*), βοόων (1x *Il.* [in 2 appearances]), βοόωντα (1x *Il.*), βοόωντες (1x *Il.*)

With *-oaǎ-* contracted to *-oō-*: βοῶν (1x *Il.*), -βοῶντε (1x *Il.*)

In other words, all the available evidence suggests that at least the second step in Bechtel’s phonological explanation of γόων is something that did perhaps happen in Ionic, but, if so, only after the formational period of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*—and may not have happened before final *-n* at all.³⁸

6.2 This brings us to the second way of explaining an imperfect that takes the transmitted shape γόων. If γόων in Z 500 is an imperfect, which remains the clearly superior parsing, but does not come from regular, expectable **góaon* by sound change(s), we could resort to a fairly obvious alternative way of still explaining the form as an imperfect. Nor is this alternative especially difficult to envision. In fact, it was envisioned *modo grosso* at least as long ago as Brandreth (1841), 102, followed by Fick (1886), 320 (both ad loc.), where the idea was to see γόων as a rearrangement of a 3. pl. impf. in the “Aeolic” inflection that is indeed found in Lesbian and Thessalian, but also in Arcadian, Cyprian, Mycenaean and—most importantly for present purposes—in Homeric language.³⁹ This is the well-known athematic inflection of present stems that would belong to the so-called “contract” type in Attic, Ionic and Doric—which is to say *-ē-* in place of *-eo/e-*, *-ā-* in place of *-ao/e-*, and *-ō-* in place of *-oo/e-*. Forms pointing to this kind of present inflection include: Lesb. αἰτηται (*IG XII.2*: 14), κάλημ<μ>ι (Sa. 60.4 *PMG*), ζαμῶσθω (*IG XII.2*: 1 etc.), καλησθαι (*IG XII.2*: 645 etc.), ευεργετεντεσσι (*IG XII*, 2 527), ποιημενος (*IG XII Suppl.*: 137); Thess. στραταγεντος (*SEG 31*: 577), διεσαφειμενα (*IG IX.2*: 1229 etc.); Arc. ποεντω (*IG*

³⁷ The suggestion (Bechtel 1908, 196) that γόων and γοῶντες are substitutions of contracted forms for forms that have undergone the hyphaeresis (**gó(e)on* and **go(é)ontes*) that the same author proposed (Bechtel 1906) for γόων < *gó(e)on* itself is both arbitrary and even self-defeating, implying as it does that in γόων and γοῶντες Ionic actually had unhyphaeresized and contracted forms (that had furthermore not undergone an **ao* > **eo* change either). And accounting for γόων and γοῶντες as Atticisms of the tradition is surely the counsel of despair.

³⁸ It is far from sure or even plausible that the widely transmitted forms σόη(ι)ς (I 681) and σόη(ι) (I 424), apparent pres. subjunctives (see Ludwich 1902–7; Allen 1931; West 1998–2000 etc. ad locc.), provide evidence of a **sa(w)óēi(s)* that hyphaeresized the *ā* in its first syllable after *w*-loss. It seems probable that these forms are of a piece with the 3 pl. pres. subj. (I 393) widely transmitted as σόωσι for σαῶσι. Cf. also Hesych. (1320) **σόεις*: σῶζεις? See also §6.3 below and the Appendix.

³⁹ See, e.g., Schwyzer (1939), 729–30; Buck (1955), 123–4; Blümel (1982), 167–77 (§§181–9); Scarborough (2023), 136–42 (§2.1.3); Dubois (1986), 142–52; Egetmeyer (2010), 465–73; Chantraine (2013), 294–5, 486.

V.2 6), ἀδικεντα (*IG* V.2 6), ἀδικημενος (*IG* V.2: 6), ζαμιοντω (*IG* V.2 6); Myc. *tere-ja-e* (PY Ep04, Eb40) = *teleyyāhen* (-*hen* infin. to pres. *teleyyā-* [= **teleyyao/e-*]).

6.2.1 As is already clear from the examples just given (Lesb. αιτηται etc.), the stem in this type of inflection ends in a long vowel that does not alternate with a short one (except where the underlying long vowel has been shortened by Osthoff’s Law [Thess. στραταγεντος etc.]). This is especially evident from a category like the -μεναι infinitive. In these forms, primary or “real” athematic presents (so-called “-μι presents”) show a zero-grade:

ἱ-μεναι (: εἶ-μι), ἰέ-μεναι (: ἴη-μι), ἰστά-μεναι (: ἴστη-μι < **hístā-*).

But verbs with “Aeolic” inflection show the same long vowel that they show everywhere else:

Hom. ἀλήμεναι (E 823+), πενθήμεναι (σ 174+), ποθήμεναι (μ 110), φιλήμεναι (X 265), φορήμεναι (O 310).

6.2.2 The imperfect of this kind of inflection of γόαω would have had in its original form:

**(e)gōān* **(e)gōāmen*
**(e)gōās* **(e)gōāte*
**(e)gōā⁴⁰* **égoān/ *gōān*

—with the 3rd plural expected to have a short *ā* as the stem-final before the ending -*n*, as an analogous paradigm like that of the Homeric “passive” aorist in invariant -(θ)η- would suggest:

$\left. \begin{array}{l} *γ\acute{o}\bar{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu \\ *γ\acute{o}\bar{\alpha}\tau\epsilon \\ *γ\acute{o}\bar{\alpha}\nu^{41} \end{array} \right\} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -(\theta)\eta\mu\epsilon\nu \\ -(\theta)\eta\tau\epsilon \\ -(\theta)\epsilon\nu \text{ (ἦγερθεν A 57 etc.)} \end{array} \right.$
--

6.2.3 Even if the metrical shape of γόον in Z 500 can be explained, however, by taking it to represent this kind of descriptively athematic 3rd pl. imperfect, that idea still does not exactly impose itself. For one thing, it is necessary to determine whether it is possible that the 3rd pl. **γόαν* finally gets represented by γόον. If this happened, it would have to have been a kind of diaktasis or distraction (see also §6.1.6 above).⁴² This is a phenomenon limited to epic language—in which an old, but metrically irreplaceable, uncontracted

⁴⁰ To 3. sg. imperf. act. **(e)gōā* cf. *σάω* (Π 363, Φ 238) to *(*)σάωμι* ‘save’, the “Aeolic” correspondent of Ion. *σαόω* (-*όω* factitive to *σάος* ‘safe and sound’).

⁴¹ As an evidence of this type of Aeolic 3rd pl. imperfect, Fick (see Leaf 1900, ad loc.) quoted a *γέλαν* (: **γέλαμι* = *γελάω* ‘laugh’) from a fragment of Sappho or Alcaeus (*PLF*: Incert. Frag. 8). To be sure, the quantity of the *a* in the final syllable cannot be determined in its context: *γέλαν δ’ ἀθάνατοι θεοί*. But the null hypothesis is that it is short—judging again from the indications of the 3rd pl. aor. “pass.” -(θ)εν, which is the closest available parallel, since that of, e.g. *ἔβημεν*, *ἔβητε*, *ἔβαν* is inexact because its stem does not end in an invariant -*ā* (or -η): cf. dual *βάτην*.

⁴² Chantraine (2013), 77–84 (Ch. V).

sequence, especially of \check{a} plus \check{o} , is represented by a two-syllable version of the vowel, namely \bar{o} (= ω), that would have been the eventual contraction product.

a. The commonest type, with $\check{a}\bar{o}$ by “nature” or position retained as $o\omega$, can be exemplified by:

$\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega \rightarrow \delta\rho\acute{o}\omega, \delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega\sigma\iota \rightarrow \delta\rho\acute{o}\omega\sigma\iota, \delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega\iota\tau\epsilon \rightarrow \delta\rho\acute{o}\omega\tau\epsilon, \delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \rightarrow \delta\rho\acute{o}\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$

b. The next most frequent is an $\bar{a}\bar{o}$ or $\bar{a}oCC$ sequence that is replaced by “distracted” $\bar{o}\bar{o}$ or $\bar{o}oCC$:

$\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu\tau\omicron \rightarrow \mu\nu\acute{o}\omega\nu\tau\omicron, -\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega\sigma\iota \rightarrow -\delta\rho\acute{o}\omega\sigma\iota, \mu\alpha\mu\acute{\alpha}\omega\sigma\iota \rightarrow \mu\alpha\mu\acute{o}\omega\sigma\iota, \eta\beta\acute{\alpha}\omega\sigma\alpha \rightarrow \eta\beta\acute{o}\omega\sigma\alpha$

c. But what is needed for $\gamma\acute{o}\omega\nu$ as a representative of $*\gamma\acute{o}\check{\alpha}\nu$ is the diektasis of two vowels in hiatus that are both the nuclei of metrically short syllables. This is rare, but not unexampled. For at least $\check{a}\bar{o}$ sequences are found that take the form $\bar{o}\bar{o}$ in Homer:

$\sigma\acute{\alpha}\omega\varsigma, \sigma\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu \rightarrow \sigma\acute{o}\omega\varsigma$ (τ 300), $\sigma\acute{o}\omega\nu$ (H 310 etc.) and cf. $\sigma\acute{o}\omega\iota$ (A 344 etc.)⁴³

Nom. $*\Pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\omega\varsigma \rightarrow \Pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega\varsigma$ (B 844, Δ 525)

Cf. nom. $*\Pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\omega\varsigma > \Pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega\varsigma$ (Δ 520)

gen. I $*\Pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega' \nu\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\nu\#$ represented as I $\Pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\omega \nu\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\nu\#$ (Y 484)

patronymic $\Pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\omicron$ (Δ 228)

If distracted renditions of these non-identical vowels in hiatus in fact take their cue from what would be the contracted outcome of such sequences, and since oa gives the same contraction product as ao in Ionic, it does seem possible that $\gamma\acute{o}\omega\nu$ is indeed a diektasized rendering of a $*\gamma\acute{o}\check{\alpha}\nu$. As an additional factor favoring this eventual representation of the form, it is unquestionably the case that $\gamma\acute{o}\omega\nu$ as we have it looks more like the normal Ionic $\gamma\acute{o}\omega\nu$ than a hypothetical Aeolic $*\gamma\acute{o}\check{\alpha}\nu$ could. In addition, the Homeric paradigm of $\gamma\acute{o}\acute{\alpha}\omega$ has a good number of more banal diektasis forms:

$\gamma\acute{o}\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu\tau\alpha, \gamma\acute{o}\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma, \gamma\acute{o}\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma, \gamma\acute{o}\acute{\alpha}\omega\sigma\alpha, \gamma\acute{o}\acute{\alpha}\omega\sigma\alpha\nu; v.ll. \gamma\acute{o}\acute{\alpha}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu, \gamma\acute{o}\acute{\alpha}\omega\epsilon\nu$

And these necessarily have three o -vowels in a row, and even two consecutive short ones, which might have something to do with this slightly unusual $\gamma\acute{o}\omega\nu$ as well.

d. All in all, then, it seems at least possible that an “Aeolic”-type athematic form could have gotten a diektatic treatment of $\check{a}\bar{o}$ and ended up as $\gamma\acute{o}\omega\nu$.

6.3 Nor would $\gamma\acute{o}\acute{\alpha}\omega$ ‘bewail’ be the only case in Homer of a present stem that very specifically shows “Aeolic” inflection in its imperfect indicative (+/- other forms) beside

⁴³ This despite Chantraine (2013), 83, since there is no particular reason to rule out an analogical explanation of fem. $\sigma\acute{o}\eta$ (O497) and neut. $\sigma\acute{o}\alpha$ (Ω 382 +). And the idea that the adjective had an o -grade root is hardly tenable against the evidence of $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\phi\rho\rho\omega\nu$ (δ 168) and related forms ($\sigma\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\phi\rho\rho\alpha$ [Φ 462, *H. Bacch.* 49], $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\phi\rho\rho\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$ [ψ 13], $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\phi\rho\rho\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\sigma\iota$ [ψ 30] and several more in Archil., Theogn., Pind., Simon., Bacchyl.) together with $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$ (A 32), $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\acute{o}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (A 83) etc., and $\sigma\acute{\omega}\varsigma, \sigma\acute{\omega}\nu$ in the epics themselves as well as in Attic (including, e.g., Thuc., Ar., Antiph.), together with indications like Cypr. PN *sa-wo-pi-o* /Sawobiō/ (ICS 255) or Boe. $\Sigma\alpha\upsilon\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$. (*IG VII* 1888 c, 8).

the “contract” forms that would be regular in Ionic. Another clear case is that of the verb meaning ‘save’.⁴⁴

The extra-presential forms of this verb in Homer include a fut. act. and midd., a very well represented aor. act., and a much less frequent aor. pass. The fut. forms are of the shape *σαώσω*, -εις, -ει etc. (*Il.*, *Od.*) and *σαώσεται* (*Od.*). The aor. act. forms are what would be expected to go with this future:

ἐσάωσα (*Od.*), *σάωσας* (*Il.*), (*ἐ*)*σάωσε* (*Il.*, *Od.*), *ἐσάωσαν* (*Il.*); subj. *σαώσης* (*Il.*), *σάωση* (*Il.*), *σαώσεται* (*Il.*), *σαώσομεν* (*Il.*, *Od.*); opt. *σαώσειας* (*Il.*), *σάωσαι* (*Il.*, *Od.*), *σαώσειαν* (*Il.*); inv. *σάωσον* (*Il.*, *Od.*), *σάωσατε* (*Il.*); infin. *σαώσεσθαι* (*Il.*), *σαώσεσθαι* (*Il.*); aor. pass. *ἐσάωθεν* (*Od.*); inv. *σαωθήτω* (*Il.*); inf. *σαωθήναι* (*Il.*, *Od.*).

These fut. and aor. forms guarantee that the present of this verb, if any, would be non-“Aeolic” *σαώω*, which would itself be unambiguously analyzable as the -*ώω* factitive to *σάος* ‘safe and sound’. This, in turn, is consistent with such forms as 3 pl. pres. indic. *σαούσι* (Tyrt. *IEG* 11.13), 2 sg. inv. *σάου* (*H. Dem.* 3), 3 sg. opt. *σαοῖ* (Thgn. *IEG* 1.868). In the epics themselves, this present is presupposed by the imperfect iterative *σώεσκον* (Θ363), representing **σαόεσκον*^{tr} ‘I often saved’. Beside this, however, strong traces of an -*ωμι* inflection for this present are found: 2. sg. pres. indic. *σάως/σάωις* (Alc. [*PLF*: 313]) and, crucial for the present point, the Homeric forms 3 sg. impf. *σάω* (Π 363, Φ 238) and 2 sg. inv. *σάω* (ν 230 [2x], ρ 595), which is already enough to establish an instance in which Homeric language (if the *Hymns* qualify as such) has both “Aeolic” and non-“Aeolic” present inflection side by side in one verb.

Other Homeric forms of this present are either interestingly ambiguous on this score or provide additional evidence of -*ωμι* beside -*ώω* inflection.⁴⁵

6.4 So far, consequently, there is nothing actually against this “Aeolic” athematic explanation of γόν. But it would obviously corroborate the case if something positive can be said for it. What is needed is some evidence that this particular verb did in reality inflect, at least in part, according to the athematic Aeolic pattern in the epic dialect. In fact, there are a couple of indications that it did.

6.4.1.a. The first such thing that comes to mind is the pres. infinitive γοήμεναι (Ξ 502).⁴⁶ Infinitives in -ήμεναι to -άω presents are not at all common in Homer. They are much less common, in any case, than -ήμεναι to -έω. There are only γοήμεναι itself (: γόν [κ 567], γοάσκειν [θ 92], γοόωσα [E 413+] etc.), ἀρήμεναι ‘pray’ at χ 322 (: ἀράται [I 240+], ἠρώμην [E 114+] etc.), and πεινήμεναι ‘starve’ at υ 137 (: πεινάων [Γ 25] etc.). Each occurs only once.

6.4.1.b. Furthermore, ἀρήμεναι is peculiar, since it is the only active form of this otherwise deponent verb (which occurs in the present, imperfect, future, aorist and perfect) that is found in Homer or elsewhere. But the explanation of ἀρήμεναι is obvious. The phrase at χ 322 that contains this uniquely active form is:

... ἀρήμεναι || ἐν μεγάροισιν#

⁴⁴ See also Forssman (2019), 41 (§2.2.1 II). On the supposed “Aeolic” pedigree of imperfect dual forms in -ήτην to -άω presents see, for now, note 51.

⁴⁵ See Appendix.

⁴⁶ See also Forssman (2019), 41 (§2.2.1 II).

And this may justly be suspected of having been modeled on the one at Ξ 502 in the *Iliad*, where γοήμεναι appears instead:

... γοήμεναι || έν μεγάροισιν#.

Active inflection in the present is, after all, the invariant rule for γοάω. One is entitled to suppose from this that γοήμεναι already belonged to the epic morphological inventory when the exceptional ἀρήμεναι was created.

6.4.1.c. Πεινήμεναι, for its part, is an infinitive not to a banal -ᾶo/e- present, but to an -āo/e- present with -ā- throughout. This is not unambiguously clear from the Homeric forms that happen to occur:

(πεινάων [Γ 25], πεινάοντα [Σ 162], πεινάοντε [Π 758]).

These forms, if made to an -ᾶo/e- present of the usual sort, would all present an unavoidable cretic sequence (†πεινάων etc. = ~ ~ ~), impossible to place anywhere in a hexameter. Consequently, the Homeric forms, in the absence of further information, could be suspected of showing a frequent type of metrical lengthening.⁴⁷ But residual Attic forms (though this present joined the ordinary -ᾶo/e- type later⁴⁸) confirm a real, etymological -āo/e- present stem (> Att.-Ion. *-ᾶo/e- > Ion. *-ἦω > -έω, -ήει > -ῆ) here:

infinitive πεινήν (Ar. *Ach.* 794+); indic. πεινής (Hdn. *Περὶ παθῶν* 3.2: 315.11), πεινή (Ar. *Eq.* 1271+); subj. πεινή (Pl. *Phaedo* 85a+).

The other relevant factor is that the segments making up υ 137 (# σίτου δ’ οὐκέτ’ ἔφη⁵ πεινήμεναι || εἶρετο γάρ μιν#) do not seem to suggest a secondary explanation of πεινήμεναι like the one that looked plausible for ἀρήμεναι above. Nevertheless, a secondary explanation based upon the very unusual coexistence of an older Att.-Ion. πεινηο/ε- with a newer πειναο/ε- may be considered. Since this verb for ‘starve’ is at least as well represented in the imperfect as elsewhere, we may perhaps conjecture that the 3 sg. of the older inflection, which would have been *(ἐ)πεινή (< *[ἐ]πεινήε), played a role in the creation of πεινήμεναι. This impf. *(ἐ)πεινή would have become more or less opaque as soon as the newer and less marked πεινάω inflection began to compete. It was then, in this scenario, that it became eligible to play a role in the analogical creation of a purely epic infinitive by a process like (ἐ)δάμη (B 860 = 874, I 545+) : δαμήμεναι (K 403 = P 77+) = *(ἐ)πεινή : x, which would reliably produce the infinitive πεινήμεναι, of course.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Chantraine (2013), 100–1 (§44 A. a).

⁴⁸ 3 pl. pres. indic. πεινώσιν (Ar. *Plut.* 504), impf. ἐπεινων (Ar. *Aves* 1282, *Ach.* 535+; Xen. *Hell.* VI, 2.15.2), pres. ptcl. m. dat. pl. πεινώσι (Ar. *Aves* 580+). For additional forms see Veitch (1887), 518.

⁴⁹ An equivalent solution—on an understanding that -ήμεναι to an -έω is more cogent, because more frequent, than -ήμεναι to an -άω—could start with recognizing that an -ηο/ε- present like πεινηο/ε-, in Ionic, would develop, e.g., an indic. 1st sg. *πεινέω (< *πεινήω) and 3rd pl. *πεινέουσι (< *πεινήουσι), with the latter analogically redone as *πεινέουσι to conform to the usual indicative rather than subjunctive pattern. This would have led to a pres. indic. inflectional pattern *πεινέω, πεινής, πεινή, *πεινέουσι and enabled *πεινέω : πεινήμεναι on the model of καλέω : καλήμεναι, πενθέω : πενθήμεναι, φιλέω : φιλήμεναι, and especially—

6.4.1.d. This leaves γοήμεναι as the one and only Homeric active infinitive in -ήμεναι that goes with an unremarkable active present in -ᾶο/e-. But, as suggested above, it also appears likely that γοήμεναι was actually the model for the unexpected active infinitive ἀρήμεναι, from which it was concluded that γοήμεναι must therefore have been around in epic language for at least a relatively long time. This means at the same time, however that γοᾶω is the only verb in Homer that displays the pattern -ᾶω, -ᾶεις, -ᾶει etc. : -ήμεναι. In other words, that pattern is completely unproductive in epic language, which, in turn, means that as far as can possibly be told, γοήμεναι was probably not itself analogically formed by an epic poet, since no model—or at least no exact model—seems to exist. But if γοήμεναι was not analogically formed, and is therefore not a creation of epic language, then the Homeric repertory presumably came by it honestly, so to speak. It may be considered, that is to say, an epic Aeolicism that has merely Ionicized *-ᾶμεναι to -ήμεναι.⁵⁰

This infinitive is therefore one indication that the epic dialect, to put it synchronically, inflected γοᾶω at least partly in the athematic-looking “Aeolic” fashion. If so, we would now have a small piece of positive support for the idea that γοόν in Z 500 represents a 3rd plural imperfect *γούων of just such a paradigm.⁵¹

6.4.2 There are, however, two other features of the Homeric *averbo* of γοᾶω that are relevant here. By themselves, neither would necessarily mean very much, but in light of what it seems possible to conclude from γοόν itself and from γοήμεναι, they at least deserve to be mentioned.

6.4.2.1. a. First there is the iterative imperfect in -σκο/ε- to this verb. As a rule in Homer,⁵² contract presents both in -έω and in -ᾶω make the -σκο/ε- imperfect from the full thematic stem in -εε- or -αε- (the latter regularly represented with distraction to -αα-), which is what would be expected of such present stems in the first place:

κομέουσι : κομέεσκον ἑκπεράα : περάασκε

ὀχέειν : ὀχέεσκον πεδάα : πεδάασκον

Contract presents with a heavy and metrically long root syllable, however, would systematically contain a cretic sequence if they were made in the same, expectable way (where O = syllable): Ὄεῖσκον etc., Ὄᾶεσκον etc. The Homeric solution to this problem

because of semantic relatedness to πεινήμεναι ‘starve’—ποθέω : ποθήμεναι ‘miss, long for’. In either case, πεινήμεναι cannot count as an -ήμεναι infinitive to an ordinary -ᾶω present.

⁵⁰ Chantraine (2013), 294–5.

⁵¹ Another set of Homeric forms that have been analyzed as “Aeolic” -ῆ presents corresponding to -ῆο/e- stems in Ionic etc. (Chantraine 2013, 295) are a number of duals. While these forms made to -εο/e- presents mostly show the -εήτην that would be banal as the outcome of ancient Ionic *-ee-ton or *-ee-tān (e.g., αινεῖτον [σ 64], κομείτην [Θ 113] etc.), those that go with -αο/e- presents, instead of expected -ᾶτην < *-ae-tān, regularly show -ήτην (φοιτήτην [M 266] etc.). This might seem to establish actual “Aeolic” inflection for an additional tranche of -αο/e- presents in epic language. But the fact that “Aeolic” -η- inflection in the -εο/e- cases is mostly missing argues against this, as does the circumstance that the stem-final -η- of these -ήτην duals to -αο/e- presents is always placed in the biceps and is thus consistently resolvable.

⁵² For more on this see Nussbaum (1998), 64–72 with reference to Kimball (1980), 44–6.

was to make the iterative imperfect of contract presents with a heavy root syllable in -εσκον and -ασκον rather than -έεσκον and -άεσκον/-άασκον:

ὠθεῖ : ὠθεσκον νικά : νικάσκομεν

πωλεῖται : πωλέσκετο τρωπᾶσθε : τρωπάσκετο etc.

To judge by the completely consistent evidence of the accent as transmitted in the forms that could disambiguate, in addition to the complete absence of graphic contraction products, iterative imperfects like those just exemplified are not the result of contraction: *οἰχνέεσκε, if it had existed, would have yielded an *οἰχνεῖσκε vs. actual οἰχνεσκε, just as *ὠθέεσκον would have developed to *ὠθεῖσκον vs. actual ὠθεσκον. Instead, these Ὀξω and Ὀξω presents act as if they were made, speaking purely descriptively, from athematic stems with a final short vowel. In any case, the distribution is clear and regular: in contract presents after a light syllable we find -έεσκ- and -άασκ-, while after a heavy syllable it is -εσκ- and -ασκ-. This pattern is followed by forms of 27 different contract presents that make iterative imperfects in Homer.

6.4.2.1.b. There are exactly three verbs that offer exceptional forms. The first of them, καλέω, does make a regular καλέεσκον, -ε (2x *Il.*, 1x *H. Pan.*, 1x *Hes. Th.*), but there is also anomalous καλέσκετο (O 338).⁵³ Similarly, εἶω makes an irregular-looking εἶασκες, -ε (4x *Il.*), while its by-form εἶασκον, -ε (3x *Il.*, 1x *Od.*, 1x *Hes. Frag.*) is a representation of regularly formed *εἶεσκον, -ε.⁵⁴ But the third present in this tiny group is precisely γοάω, which once makes the iterative imperfect that would be expected (γοάασκεν θ 92), but then, twice within eight lines of the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, offers two instances of the irregularly short form in what is essentially a repeated line segment:

τὸν δὴ ἔπειτα γόασκε|^{tr} (209), # οὐκέτ’ ἔπειτα γόασκε|^{tr} (216).

These abnormal short forms require an explanation, occurring as they do in only three of the twenty-eight contract presents that form an iterative in Homer—and appearing only in some such forms at that.

6.4.2.1.c. For καλέω : καλέσκετο, a rationale is not far to seek.⁵⁵ For it is guaranteed by κάλημ<μ>ι (Sappho *PLF* 60.4) and κ[άλ]η[μ]ι (Sappho *PLF* 1.16) that καλέω did in fact inflect as a descriptive athematic κάλημι in Lesbian and therefore, presumably, in other dialects showing “Aeolic” inflection as well.⁵⁶ This makes it possible to suppose that while καλέεσκον, -ε (*Il.* +) was the iterative imperfect to καλέω, καλέσκετο (*Il.*) was the version of the form made from Aeolic κάλημι. The model for its formation would have been provided by the -σκον imperfects derived from presents inherited as athematic, in which the weak stem of an ablauting present preceded the -σκο/ε-, as in ἴσταται (K 173, O 293,

⁵³ The form is passive: υἱὸς δὲ Σφήλιοι |^{tr} καλέσκετο Βουκολίδαο. It has dictional congeners in the naming construction |⁵ οἱ Τιτηνες καλέονται (Ξ 279) and |⁵ αἱ Νηϊάδες καλέονται (ν 104 = 348), cf. also |^{tr} καὶ ἀθάνατοι καλέονται (E 342) and |^{tr} καὶ ἀφνειοὶ καλέονται (ο 433, ρ 423 = τ 79). It also has versificational ones in |^{tr} τιέσκετο Ἴλιος ἱρή (A 490) and the like (H 140, λ 208).

⁵⁴ Nussbaum (1998), 66–70, 70–2.

⁵⁵ Nussbaum (1998), 68.

⁵⁶ So too possibly Thess. (Pelag.) προκαλεσθαι if this is a subjunctive in *kalē-ō-. See Scarborough (2023), 138–9.

X 318) : ἴστασκε (τ 574) or φάτο (A 188+) : φάσκε (Λ 306+),⁵⁷ and where the exact model for κάλημι : καλέσκετο would have been provided, in turn, by ἴστημι : ἴστασκε and φημί : φάσκε. The pres. infinitive καλήμεναι (K 125) could, of course, support the idea that epic language really did have a present κάλημι at its disposal, but a single occurrence in the tenth book of the *Iliad* is not an ideally sturdy basis for that belief. It is not quite worthless either, however, since it is not as if -έω presents make Homeric -ήμεναι infinitives without further ado.

6.4.2.1.d. In the case of ἔασκες and ἔασκε (*Il.*), the way is once again theoretically open to explaining the irregular short iterative as derived from “Aeolic” *ḗāmi rather than ἐάω, with *ḗāmi : ἔασκε parallel to ἴστᾱμι/ ἴστημι : ἴστασκε. For a present of the *ḗāmi type is plausibly attested both in the Thessalian pres. imv. εατου (*IG IX 2: 1229.26–7*) and the Arcadian pres. pass. εατοι (*IG V 2: 262, 1.23 [Mantineia]*).⁵⁸ If so, and if εἶασκον, εἶασκε (*Il.* +) is a replacement paradigm for *ἑάεσκον/-ε, it would be a second case in which an iterative imperfect has been derived both from a contract present and from its surface athematic “Aeolic” correspondent. This time, however, we lack any additional indication from Homeric language itself that the epic repertory included “Aeolic” present forms of this particular verb.

Furthermore, it is impossible to rule out a different way altogether of accounting for irregularly short ἔασκες, -ε.⁵⁹ For although there is reason to be skeptical of ὄο from ὄεο by hyphaeresis in Homer (§§6.1.4 – 6.1.6 above), that is not to say that epic language

⁵⁷ Nussbaum (1998), 69. It could be pointed out, however, that Hom. φάσκε is not exactly an Ionic iterative imperfect in the usual sense. First, forms of that class are never augmented, while ἔφασκον, -εσ, -ε(ν) are frequent in Homer. And while some of them may be “repaired” (e.g., by reading *ἄλλά με φάσκες for ἄλλά μ’ ἔφασκες in N100), this is far from the rule. Furthermore, non-imperfect forms simply pointing to a pres. φάσκω are not infrequent, although—notably—they are all post-Homeric: Aesch. φάσκοντες (*Suppl.* 388), φάσκω (*Choeph.* 91); Thuc. φασκόντων (1.136.1), φάσκοντες (2.54.2) and frequently, but always as pres. participle; Eur. φάσκουσα (*Alc.* 637); Soph. φάσκοιμ’ ἄν (*Aj.* 1037), φάσκειν (*El.* 9), φάσκων (*El.* 319) etc.

⁵⁸ For the Thessalian form see, e.g., Blümel (1982), 175 (§188). On the Arcadian form see especially Dubois (1986), 149. It is unlikely that either of these forms is a contracted continuator of *e(w)ae-. First, in both these dialects an -ā- present is the default expectation (note 39 above) as the correspondent of an -ao/e- present in Ionic (and elsewhere). In addition, there is some unclarity about the contraction of -ae- both in Arcadian and especially in Thessalian. To be sure, -awe- > -ā- in Arcadian (Dubois 1986, 30) appears to be supported by sixth-century [α]φεθλα (*IG V 2: 75 [Tegea]*) beside fourth-century επαθλα, putatively epā^hla (*IG V 2: 6.5 [Tegea]*), if indeed that is not a dialect borrowing from elsewhere (*HGD 2, 122*). But even so, the contraction seen in fourth-century επαθλα would seem to be a recent one, given that another fourth-century inscription from the very same town (*IG V 2: 560 [Tegea]*) offers uncontracted āe- in αελιοσ. And since *IG V 2: 262*, the inscription supplying εατοι, has been dated to the fifth century, it would appear to be too early for a contraction of *eaetoi > eātoi. In addition, the Arcadian crasis (Buck 1955, 80; *HGD 2, 122*) of ka(y) epi was evidently kēpi (κεπι twice on *IG V 2: 113*) and that of ta epionta was tēpionta (τεπιοντα *IG V 2: 75*), suggesting that *a(y)e (even in contrast to *a(w)e > ā?) might have contracted to ē. Furthermore, Arcadian inscriptions display forms in which a sequence of an a-vowel and an e-vowel appear as ae or aη (*HGD 2, 122*).

⁵⁹ Nussbaum (1998), 69–70.

shows no hyphaeresized forms at all. For a case can be made in favor of $-é(w)aa > -éā$ in $|\overset{5}{\text{κρέα}} \text{ ἔδμεναι}|$ (Δ 345, X 347), presumably representing elided κρέαα , beside κρέα πολλὰ (Θ 231, μ 19, ω 364 etc.) and many other such guaranteed dibrach κρέα forms.⁶⁰ Similarly, nominal s -stems in etymological $*-ē(w)-ē(h)-$ that end up as descriptive $-ε$ -stems in Neo-Ionic and already in Homer—i.e., $*kléweh-a > κλέα$ etc.—have also probably gotten this shape by way of a simple $é(w)eha > éā$ development, amounting to the loss of one, presumably the second, of the two e -vowels.⁶¹ And the consequence is that there are two ways of explaining the short ἔασκες , $-ε$ of the *Iliad*, neither of which can be decisively excluded.

6.4.2.1.e. As for irregularly short γόασκε (*H. Aphr.* 209, 216), the lack of support for hyphaeresis, Homeric or otherwise, in the sequences ῶᾶ and ῶᾶ (§§6.1.4 – 6.1.6 above) would seem to open the door to consideration of the idea that although γούασκεν (1x *Od.*) is the regular, predictable iterative to present γούω , this γόασκε might be a congener of καλέσκετο to κάλημι and, possibly, ἔασκες , $-ε$ to $(*)\text{ἔᾶμι}$ —which is to say that this γόασκε was derived from the “Aeolic” $*\text{γῶᾶμι}$ that may underlie infinitive γοήμεναι and, in the proposal being made here, imperfect γόν (= $*\text{γῶαν}$).

This account of the form is not at all sure but is not to be dismissed in every possible version either. The factor that demands attention in the evaluation of γόασκε as a potential artifact of an $-\alpha\mu$ inflection of γούω in epic language is that while καλέσκετο and ἔασκες , $-ε$ occur in the *Iliad* and never again, γόασκε does not appear until *H. Aphr.* and is found only once, in effect, even there. By the usual calculus, this would favor the view, as the default, that the form is an innovation *vis à vis* γούασκεν in the *Odyssey*.

But this is not itself a reason to rule out all possible connection between γόασκε and the “Aeolic” inflection of γούω in Homer that is suggested by γοήμεναι . After all, an “Ionic” iterative imperfect made to an “Aeolic” athematic present is an analogical creation in epic language by definition. And this means that a recently formed γόασκε might simply be a relatively late deployment of the very same analogical process—namely $\text{ἴστημι} : \text{ἴστασκε} = (*)\text{γῶημι} : \text{γόασκε}$ —as operated in the earlier-attested cases of $\text{κάλημι} : \text{καλέσκετο}$ and, possibly, $(*)\text{ἔᾶτοι} : \text{ἔασκε}$ (§6.4.2.1.c.).

A more concrete and specific version of this inner-epic analogical explanation of γόασκε , however, is possible—but only if Homeric language really did have the use of the imperfect $*\text{γῶαν}$ of which γόν in Z 500 would be the transmitted form. The idea would be an analogical

impf. iterative $\text{γόασκε} \leftarrow$ actual 3rd pl. impf. $*\text{γῶαν}$

on the model provided by such pairs as

impf. iterative $(\acute{\alpha}\nu)\text{ἴεσκε}$ (*Hes. Th.* 157) : 3rd pl. impf. $(\xi\acute{\upsilon}\nu)\text{ἴεν}$ (A 273)/($\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta$) ἴεν (χ 377)

impf. iterative τίθεσκεν (*Hes.*, frag. 67 [b] M-W) : 3rd pl. impf. $(\pi\rho\acute{o})\text{τίθεν}$ (α 112)

and less exactly by

⁶⁰ Metrically guaranteed dibrach κρέα also survives into Hesiod (probable in frag. 17a.9) and Theognis (1.293) as well as Euripides, Teleclides, and Aristophanes. See Sommer 1957.

⁶¹ Nussbaum (2018), 294–301 (§2.3.4).

impf. ἔφασκον, -εζ, -ε (N 100+)/ φάσκει⁶² (K 331, Λ 306+) : 3rd pl. impf. ἔφαν (Γ 161+).⁶³

An even larger set of models—though purely formal this time—resided in the tolerably frequent -σκο/ε- iterative imperfects made to -σα- aorists, where pairs like

impf. iterative ἐλάσασκεν (B 199) : 3rd pl. ἔλασαν (T 281+)/ ἤλασαν (A 154)

impf. iterative σπείσασκε (θ 89) : σπεῖσαν (I 177+)/ ἔσπεισαν (ν 55)

could also, of course, have encouraged an innovated

γόασκε ← 3rd pl. impf. *γόαν

The only obvious alternative to this explanation of putatively recent γόασκε, in fact, is to suppose that by the stage of the tradition represented by the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, the morphological rule for deriving Ionic iteratives that dictated -αεσκο/ε- after light syllables and -ασκο/ε- after heavy ones had simply been relaxed by generalization of -ασκο/ε- to any verb in which it would be convenient (with the opposite generalization of -αεσκο/ε-/-αασκο/ε- to stand after a heavy syllable remaining impossible, of course). Such a scenario would, of course, immediately allow for the γόασκε in question here—though it remains implausible without an explanation of why there is only one instance of a form that illustrates this supposed revision of the derivational rule in question.

6.4.2.2 The final piece of the *averbo* of γοάω that might, at least at first glance, support an explanation of γόον as representing an “Aeolic” athematic imperfect, is the pres. act. participle—or rather some forms of it. In §6.1.6 it was already argued that the Homeric forms of γοάω as transmitted do not support the vowel loss that Bechtel proposed in his explanation of γόον. But the evidence compiled in §6.1.6 also shows that there are only two forms of γοάω in Homer that look contracted at all.

One is the 3rd pl. imperfect of the *Odyssey* passage (κ 567) in §4. But the contracted form there is not metrically guaranteed (|^{tr} γόων τίλλοντό τε χ αίταζ) and could theoretically represent a substitution of the regular Ionic form—or, later on, even that of the Attic one during the written tradition—for an athematic form. As noted above, this is completely unsure and may even qualify as arbitrary. It remains the case, however, that continuators of uncontracted *goāō-* in this verb (cf. §6.1.6 again) are significantly more numerous than contracted ones.

But even if imperfect γόων at κ 567 is and always was the contracted Ionic form, it makes its first and only Homeric appearance in the *Odyssey*. And this leaves the contracted-looking forms of the pres. act. participle (γοῶντες Σ 315, 355; ι 467) as the only forms of pres. γοάω in the *Iliad* that do not continue the original uncontracted forms either directly or indirectly by way of *diektasis*.

In and of itself, this does not mean much. But it can be added that these participial forms occur in two expressions of a very common shape and position:

⁶² Necessarily analyzed as impf. to a pres. φάσκω because eligible for augment, though no form but the impf. occurs in Homer and Hesiod, or anywhere else, apparently, before Aeschylus.

⁶³ Of the 15 occurrences of this form in Homer, nine are in the expression #Ωζ ἄρ' ἔφαν, which may be the form taken by a *#Ωζ ἄρα φάν. Four others occur in #Ωζ ἔφαν, where the augmented form is guaranteed, and which could have been the expression from which ἔφαν was generalized everywhere.

|^{tr} ἀνεστενάχοντο γοῶντες (Σ 315 ≅ 355) |^s τοὺς δὲ στενάχοντο γοῶντες (ι 467)

It further emerges, moreover, that the template that produced the two expressions that feature irresolvable γοῶντες has other unmistakable outputs:

^{tr} ἐπεστενάχοντο δ’ ἑταῖροι (Δ 154)	^s μεγάλη στενάχοντο θέουσαι (Π 393)
	^s ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναικες (Τ 301 = Χ 515 = Ω 746, Ω 722)
	^s ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γέροντες (Τ 338)
	^s ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο πολῖται· (Χ 429)

Naturally, we could assume that the γοῶντες expressions appearing in Σ 315, 355 and ι 467 just above are simply of comparatively recent origin, that they were modeled on Δ 154 and on Π 393 etc., and that they made use of the contracted form of the participle that was available by then. This story of the Homeric form γοῶντες is not ruled out by anything.

It might seem, however, that it could be more compelling than it is. For the fact remains that no other contracted form of γοῶν has managed to work its way into the *Iliad* at all. In addition, the late-origin explanation of the γοῶντες expressions (Σ 315, 355 and ι 467) would be more conclusive, it might be argued, if at least one of the supposed models (Δ 154 and Π 393 etc.) was better represented than the γοῶντες expressions are. But that is really not the case. For |^{tr} ἀνεστενάχοντο γοῶντες (Σ 315 ≅ 355) and |^s τοὺς δὲ στενάχοντο γοῶντες (ι 467) are actually better represented—though the numbers as a whole are all too small to support really cogent inferences—than any one of the potential models. The situation might therefore be seen as leaving just enough room to consider the possibility that |^{tr} γοῶντες# and |^s γοῶντες# contain a modernization/ Ionicization of an “Aeolic” *γῶαντες# that would go together with the imperfect γόν (for *γῶαν) itself (§§6.2.2 – 6.2.3), and with the well-embedded infinitive γοήμεναι (§6.4.1), and possibly also with the very unusual short imperfect iterative γόασκε (§6.4.2.1.b and e). Finally, a small potential benefit obtained from supposing that γοῶντες is a recent Ionicization of *γῶαντες# is that it immediately explains a related little peculiarity. As things stand in the traditional text, the *Iliad* has only the contracted-looking form of the masc. participle of γοῶν (γοῶντες Σ 315 ≅ 355), while the *Odyssey* still has the uncontracted form three out of four times (γοῶντα τ 119, γοῶντες μ 234, γοῶντας κ 209 vs. γοῶντες ι 467). Though this is hardly a serious problem, the question would not arise at all if Homeric γοῶντες systematically conceals “Aeolic” *γῶαντες.

But arguing that |^{tr} ἀνεστενάχοντο γοῶντες and |^s τοὺς δὲ στενάχοντο γοῶντες—on the grounds that they are at least as well represented as any of the expressions produced by the same template (|^{tr} ἐπεστενάχοντο δ’ ἑταῖροι, |^s ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γέροντες etc.), and are therefore liable to be at least as old, and may consequently continue archaic expressions—cannot succeed in the end. For on the one hand, the γοῶντες# expressions could have been created comparatively late on the model of a congener that does not turn out to be more frequent than they are in the poems as we have them. Furthermore, the γοῶντες# expressions may even be conceived as having been modeled on all of the other |^{tr} στενάχοντο *# and |^s στενάχοντο *# expressions simultaneously, as it were.

Furthermore, the |^{tr} ~ ~ στενάχοντο ~ ~ *# and |^s ~ ~ στενάχοντο ~ ~ *# expressions are themselves only one fairly small group among the outputs of two epic dictional “templates” that have been far more productive. Other products of the templates that produced our (-)στενάχοντο expressions are:

<p>To ^s τοὺς δὲ στενάχοντο γοῶντες ι 467</p> <p> ^s ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γέροντες T 338</p> <p> ^s μεγάλη στενάχοντο θέουσαι Π 393</p>	<p>To ^{tr} ἀνεστενάχοντο γοῶντες Σ 315, 355</p>
<p>Cf. ^s τὸν δὲ λίσσοντο γέροντες I 574, Σ 448</p> <p> ^s τοὶ δ' ἐφθέγγοντο καλεῦντες κ 229, 255</p> <p> ^s ἐμὲ δὲ φθέγγοντο καλεῦντες μ 249</p> <p> ^s οἱ δ' ἠσπάζοντο ἰδόντες <i>H Aphr</i> 15</p> <p> ^s ἓνα ποίεον ἐξαγαγόντες H 435</p> <p> ^s τοὺς γὰρ μινύθεσκον ἔδοντες ξ 17</p> <p> ^s ἄρα θηήσαντο ἰδόντες θ 17</p> <p> ^s στίχας ἴστασαν ἀμφιέποντες B 525</p> <p> ^s ἵνα τε ξυνέχουσι τένοντες Y 478</p> <p> ^s τοὶ δὲ φθινύθουσιν ἔδοντες α 250, π 127</p> <p> ^s ἓνα χεύομεν ἐξαγαγόντες H 336</p> <p> ^s καὶ ἀλεξώμεσθα μένοντες Λ 348, X231</p> <p> ^s μενεαίνομεν ἀφρονέοντες O 104</p> <p> ^s κακὰ ῥάπτομεν ἀμφιέποντες γ 118</p> <p> ^s καὶ τέτλαμεν εἰσορόντες υ 311</p> <p> ^s ὅτι μ' ἦλθετε κηδήσοντες; Ω 240</p> <p> ^s κακὰ ῥέζετε δυσμενέοντες β 73</p>	<p>Cf ^{tr} ἐρητύοντο μένοντες, Θ 435, O 3, O 367</p> <p> ^{tr} καθήατο μητιόωντες Y 153</p> <p> ^{tr} ἐμητίσαντο μένοντες μ 273</p> <p> ^{tr} ἐσύλευον θεράποντες· E 48</p> <p> ^{tr} ὑποτρομέεσκον ὀρῶντες Y 28</p> <p> ^{tr} ἀνήϊξαν γελόωντες σ 40</p> <p> ^{tr} μάλ' ἀσχαλόωσι μένοντες α 304</p> <p> ^{tr} ἐριδμαίνωσιν ἔθοντες Π 260</p> <p> ^{tr} ἀγαζόμεθ' ἐξερέοντες κ 249</p> <p> ^{tr} καθεζώμεσθα κίοντες Y 136, α 372</p> <p> ^{tr} τὰ οἱ δίδομεν φιλέοντες θ 545</p> <p> ^{tr} εἴσκομεν εἰσορόντες ι 321, λ 363</p> <p> ^{tr} ἵνα φθείσωμεν ἐλόντες π 369</p> <p> ^{tr} κελεύετε κερτομέοντες θ 153</p>
<p>To: ^s ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες T 301, X 515, Ω 722</p> <p> ^s ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο πολῖται· X 429</p>	<p>To: ^{tr} ἐπεστενάχοντο δ' ἐταῖροι· Δ 154</p>
<p>Cf. ^s πυκιναὶ κλονέοντο φάλαγγες E 93</p> <p> ^s Τρώων εἶποντο φάλαγγες E 591, Λ 344</p> <p> ^s πλεῖσται κλονέοντο φάλαγγες Λ 148, O 448</p> <p> ^s δεύοντο δὲ δάκρυσι κόλποι I 570</p>	<p>Cf ^{tr} ἐπεσσεύοντο δὲ λαοί· B 86</p> <p> ^{tr} περὶ κτείνοντο καὶ ἄλλοι Δ 538</p> <p> ^{tr} μετεσσεύοντο γεραιαί Z 296</p> <p> ^{tr} δύο δ' ἄμ' ἔποντο νομῆες Σ 525, ρ 214, υ 175</p>

<p> \sup τανύοντο δὲ μώνυχες ἵπποι Π 375</p> <p> \sup κνήμαι ῥώοντο ἀραιαί Σ 411, Υ 37</p> <p> \sup κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί δ 344, ρ 135</p> <p> \sup ὄθεν ὑδρεύοντο πολῖται η 131, ρ 206, <i>H Dem</i> 99</p> <p> \sup κούρας ἀνέλοντο θύελλαι υ 66</p>	<p> \sup περισσεύοντο δ’ ἔθειραι Τ 382, Χ 315, <i>H Bac</i> 4</p> <p> \sup ἐπερρώοντο γυναῖκες υ 107</p>
--	--

In the context of all this, it seems a particularly vain endeavor to pursue the vindication of a scenario in which |\sup| ~ ~ -στενάχοντο γοῶντες# and |\sup| ~ ~ -στενάχοντο γοῶντες# are especially well embedded outputs of these templates, are therefore expressions of exceptionally long standing in the tradition, are consequently archaisms, and are accordingly likely to represent predecessors that featured “Aeolic” *γῶαντες.

7. A summary of the conclusions reached and the proposals made in this discussion is easily given.

a. The Homeric 3rd pl. γῶον is much more likely to be an imperfect than an aorist.

b. Once the case of pres. ptcl. γοῶντες is set aside as a plausible instance of the ordinary introduction of an irresolvably contracted form of a stem that otherwise appears in uncontracted form, the Homeric *averbo* of pres. γοῶω includes three oddities: impf. γῶον, infinitive γοήμεναι, iterative γοάσκει.

c. All three simultaneously cease to be odd if “Aeolic” inflection of this present, which is confirmed in any case by the infinitive, is assumed to have been a feature of the grammar of Homeric language.

d. Adopting Bechtel’s approach produces a doubtful explanation for impf. γῶον itself, and a rather *ad hoc* account of impf. γῶον and ptcl. γοῶντες, but does nothing to clarify the very unusual short iterative γοάσκει directly, and infin. γοήμεναι would have to be classed as a genuinely old epic Aeolism anyway.

APPENDIX: MORE ON ΣΑΩΜΙ BESIDE ΣΑΟΩ INFLECTION IN THE HOMERIC PRESENT OF ‘SAVE’

The 3 pl. pres. subj. at I 393 is mostly transmitted as σώωσι: ἦν γὰρ δὴ με σώωσι θεοῖ|⁷ (see, e.g., Ludwich 1902–7; Allen 1931; West 1998–2000 ad loc.). This is printed by Ludwich, while Allen and West, with some ancient authority, opt for σαῶσι. A non-“Aeolic” σαῶω should, of course, have made a subjunctive of the shape **sa(w)óōsi*, which would have regularly resulted in the σαῶσι that the latter editions offer. But it is perhaps worth noting that a σώωμι should theoretically have formed subj. **sā(w)óōnti* (short-vowel subjunctive to athematic ω-stem [cf. aor. ἔγνω : subj. γνῶ < **gnōēi*]), which could have given the same result.

At I 424 a 3 sg. modal form of this present, perhaps subj. and perhaps opt.,⁶⁴ is widely transmitted as σῶη(ι) (see Ludwich 1902–7; Allen 1931; West 1998–2000 ad loc.), which is printed by van Thiel (1996), e.g. But a form of a very different shape also has wide

⁶⁴ Chantraine (2013), 350–1.

support from variants and reported ancient readings (to mention only those that are metrical) like σοῶ (Ven. A), σοῦ (Herodian), σόω, σόοι, σοοῖ (see Ludwich 1902–7; Allen 1931; van Thiel 1996; West 1998–2000 ad loc.). This prompted the conjecture of a σαῶ (Christ, Rzach), which (while Ludwich stayed with σοῦ) is printed by Allen and West, evidently correctly:

ὄφρ' ἄλλην φράζωνται ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μῆτιν ἀμείνω,
ἢ κέ σφιν νῆάς τε σαῶ καὶ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν (I 424)

An only slightly modified version of the same language—with a second person modal form in place of the third—occurs at I 681, where, moreover, a rather similar farrago of *vv. ll.* is found. A well-represented variant here is a form consistent with the reading σόη at I 424—which is to say σόης. But in this passage too, the tradition offers a variety of variants such as σοῦς (Aristarch., Hdn.), σαῶς (also Aristarch.), σόως, σάως, σόοις, σοοῖς (see Ludwich 1902–7; Allen 1931; van Thiel 1996; West 1998–2000 ad loc.), which invite the reading σαῶς that is one of the two attributed to Aristarchus anyway,⁶⁵ and is the choice of Allen (1931) and West (1998–2000):

αὐτόν σε φράζεσθαι ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἄνωγεν
ὅπως κεν νῆάς τε σαῶς καὶ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν· (I 681)

Syntactically, the choice between a subjunctive and an optative is not entirely straightforward. At I 424 (... μῆτιν ... /ἢ κέ σφιν νῆάς τε σαῶ), a relative clause of purpose ('... a better plan to save the ships ...') with a subjunctive verb and κέ might be the unmarked choice (cf. ... κλητοὺς ὀτρύνομεν, οἳ κε τάχιστα/ ἔλθωσ' ἐς κλισίην... [I 165–6], and see Monro 1891, 257–8 [§282]; Chantraine 1963, 247 [§364]). But it is not as if optative plus modal particle is ruled out in such a situation: ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ τινα μάντιν ἐρείομεν ἢ ἱερῆα ... ὅς κ' εἴποι ... (Chantraine 1963, 248 [§365] and cf. A 62 and H 342, Φ 336, ε 166, κ 343), which, if need be, can be rationalized as a relative clause in which the verb is simply a potential optative ('... who could say ...').

The situation at I 681 is rather different. This is unlikely to be a purpose clause, since such clauses introduced by ὅπ(π)ως in Homer do not, as a rule, add a modal particle either to a subjunctive or to an optative, especially in the *Iliad* (Monro 1891, 261 [§264], 280 [§306]; Chantraine 1963, 268 [§395]). Rather, the unforced reading of ... φράζεσθαι ... ἄνωγεν/ ὅπως κεν νῆάς τε σαῶς ... is as an indirect question, in effect, in which the direct version would have had a potential optative (and see Chantraine 1963, 296 [§435], citing as a parallel, i.e., φραζώμεσθ' ὅς κέν μιν ... πεπιθόμεν [I 112] 'let us think of how we might persuade him' [πεπιθόμεν: Chantraine 1963; van Thiel 1996; West 1998–2000 vs. *lect. fac.* πεπιθόμεν: Ludwich 1902–7; Allen 1931]). To this example may be added, e.g., also τίς δ' οἶδ' εἴ κέν οἱ ... θυμὸν ὀρίνας (Λ 792). That a direct question can, by the way, show a potential optative as its verb is demonstrated by such instances as τῶν δ' ἄλλων

⁶⁵ I gratefully accept the suggestion of one of the anonymous readers of this submission that a footnote be added, in connection with the citation of readings proposed by ancient philologists and editors, in which mention is made of contemporary work exercising the question of whether these authorities were reporting on the received text of their time or were promoting conjectures of their own—a body of recent literature in which West (2001) and Schironi (2018) are conspicuous.

τίς κεν ... οὐνόματ’ εἴποι ... ; (P 260) and, especially relevant to I 681, πῶς κε σὺ χεῖρονα φῶτα σαώσεαις ... ; (P 149). In any case, however, a subjunctive cannot be ruled out in I 681. As pointed out to me by Hayden Pelliccia, P 144–5 attests an indirect question that is almost perfectly parallel to the one in I 681, but with an unambiguous subjunctive: φράζεο νῦν ὅπως κε πόλιν καὶ ἄστρῳ σαώσης (or ... σαώσεις, still subj.).

If, therefore, I 424 and 681 have the same mood, it could be either optative or subjunctive. The alternative possibility—i.e., a subjunctive in one but an optative in the other—might seem unnecessarily complicated at first glance, especially if the composition of one of these lines specifically involved recycling language from the other. But a special circumstance is that the 2nd and 3rd sg. subjunctives of pres. σαώω would be identical to the 2nd and 3rd sg. optatives—σαοῖς and σαοῖ being the forms in both moods. This itself, however, does not explain σαῶς and σαῶ. But if we exploit the fact, pointed out above, that Homeric language had both a σαώω and a σάωμι, and recall, also from above, that the subjunctive of the athematic “Aeolic” present would be expected to have had a starting point of the shape *sǎ(w)ǎeis, *sǎ(w)ǎei, which would become *sǎ(w)ǎis, *sǎ(w)ǎi, (cf. again aor. subj. γνῶ < *gnǎei), an explanation of σαῶς and σαῶ qua subjunctives of σάωμι is immediately provided—with the 3rd sg. *sǎ(w)ǎei > σαῶ very possibly attested as such at I 424, and 2nd sg. *sǎ(w)ǎeis > σαῶς at 681. And it is at this point that it becomes important to recur to the identity of subj. σαοῖς, σαοῖ with opt. σαοῖς, σαοῖ in Ionic. For if an Ionic-speaking poet in the Homeric tradition knew that his own subjunctive σαοῖ(ς) could take the form σαῶ(ς) in epic language, he would naturally assume that his own optative σαοῖ(ς) could likewise be converted to epic σαῶ(ς). But there is a different, epic-internal analogical process that could have produced subj. and/or opt. σαῶ(ς) at I 424 and 681 as well. This would take the 3 sg. impf. indic. as the starting point and operate with Ion. (ἐ)σάου : Ion. subj. and opt. σαοῖ(ς) = “Aeolic” σάω (Π 363, Φ 238; §6.3 above) : x, which would produce epic hybrid subj. and opt. σαῶ(ς).

Cornell University

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, T.W., ed. (1931). *Homeri Ilias* 1–3. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bartoněk, A. (2003). *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Bechtel, F. (1906). ‘GOON bei Homer’, *Hermes* 41.2, 319–20.
- (1908). *Die Vocalcontraction bei Homer*. Halle: Max Niemeyer.
- Bile, M. (1988). *Le dialecte cretois ancien: etude de la langue des inscriptions. Recueil des inscriptions posterieures aux IC*. Paris: Librarie Orientaliste Paul Genthner/Athenes: Ecole Française d’ Athenes.
- Blümel, W. (1982). *Die aiolischen Dialekte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Brandreth, T., ed. (1841). *Homeri Ilias Littera Digamma Restituta ad Metri Leges* 1–2. London: Pickering.
- Buck, C.D. (1955). *The Greek Dialects*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (repr. London: Bristol Classical Press. 1998 [2001]).
- Chantraine, P. (1958). *Grammaire homérique* 1: *Phonétique et morphologie*. Paris: Klincksieck.

- (2013). *Grammaire homérique 1: Phonétique et morphologie*; nouvelle édition revue et corrigé par Michel Casevitz. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Cowgill, Warren (1960). ‘Greek *ou* and Armenian *oč*,’ *Language* 36, 347–50.
- DELG²: Chantraine, P. (2009). *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*; achevé par Jean Taillardat, Olivier Masson et Jean-Louis Perpillou; avec, en supplément, les *Chroniques d’étymologie grecque* (1–10) rassemblées par Alain Blanc, Charles de Lamberterie et Jean-Louis Perpillou. Paris: Klincksieck. Nouvelle édition.
- Dubois, Laurent (1986). *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien* 1–3. Louvain-la-Neuve: Cabay.
- EDG: Beekes, R. with the assistance of Lucien van Beek (2012). *Etymological Dictionary of Greek. Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online*. Edited by Alexander Lubotsky. Leiden: Brill.
- Egetmeyer, Markus (2010). *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre, Tome I: Grammaire*. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Fick, A. (1886). *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer Entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen sprachform wiederhergestellt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht’s Verlag.
- Forssman, B. (1966). *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- (2019). *Die homerischen Verbalformen*. Unter Mitarbeit von Manfred Brust und Jürgen Habisreiter. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, Beiheft 29. München: Röll.
- García Ramón, José L. (2016). ‘Il greco miceneo’, in *Manuale di epigrafia micenea: Introduzione allo studio dei testi in lineare B*. Parte I – la scrittura, i documenti, la lingua, Capitolo 11. Padova: Libreriauniversitaria.it edizioni.
- GEW: Frisk H. (1955–72). *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vols. 1–2. Heidelberg: C. Winter..
- Hajnal, I. – Risch, E. (2006). *Grammatik des mykenischen Griechisch 1: Einleitung und Phonologie*.
https://www.academia.edu/62532264/Hajnal_and_Risch_Grammatik_des_mykenischen_Griechisch_Vol_1.
- HGD: Thumb, A. (1932 and 1959). *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte* 1 (rev. E. Kieckers) – 2 (rev. A. Scherer). Heidelberg: C. Winter..
- IEG: West, M.L. ed. (1989–92). *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. Ed. 2., aucta atque emendata. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press..
- IEW: Pokorny, J. (1959–69). *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern-München: A. Francke..
- Kimball, S.E. (1980). ‘A Homeric Note’, *Glotta* 58, 44–6.
- Leaf, W., ed. (1900). *The Iliad, edited, with apparatus criticus, prolegomena, notes, and appendices*. London: Macmillan.
- Lejeune, M. (1972). *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Leumann, M. (1950). *Homerische Wörter*. Basel: F. Reinhardt.
- LIV²: (2001). *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer. Bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel et al. Wiesbaden: L. Reichert..
- Ludwich, A., ed. (1889). *Homeri Odyssea*. Leipzig: Teubner.

- (1902–7). *Homeri Ilias* 1–2. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. (1985). *Los dialectos dorios del Noroeste. Gramática y estudio dialectal*. Salamanca (*Acta Salamantica, filosofía y letras* 161).
- Meister, K. (1921). *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*. Wiesbaden: Vieweg+Teubner (repr. Stuttgart: Teubner 1966).
- Nussbaum, A.J. (1998). *Two Studies in Greek and Homeric Linguistics*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (2018). 'The Homeric Formulary Template and a Linguistic Innovation in the Epics', in O. Hackstein and D. Gunkel (eds.), *Sprache und Metrik: Conference held September 2nd – 4th, 2013 at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich*. Leiden: Brill, 267–317.
- O'Neill Jr., E. (1942). 'The Localization of Metrical Word-Types in the Greek Hexameter', *Yale Classical Studies* 8, 105–78.
- Risch, E. (1974). *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. 2^{te}, völlig überarbeitete Auflage. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Monro, D.B. (David Binning) (1891). *Homeric Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (repr. London: Bristol Classical Press 1998).
- PLF: Lobel, E. and Page, D., eds. (1963). *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- PMG: Page, D.L., ed. (1962). *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rau, J. (2009). *Indo-European nominal morphology: the decads and the Caland system*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Scarborough, M. (2023). *The Aeolic dialects of Ancient Greek: A Study in Historical Dialectology and Linguistic Classification*. Leiden: Brill.
- Schironi, F. (2018). *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Schmidt, J. (1889). *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra*. Weimar: Böhlau.
- Schwyzler, E. (1939). *Griechische Grammatik* 1. 5^{te} unveränderte Auflage. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung (repr. 1977).
- Sommer, F. (1905). *Griechische Lautstudien*. Strassburg: J. Trübner.
- (1956). 'Homeric', in H. Kronasser (ed.), *MNHHMHE XAPIN. Gedenkschrift für Paul Kretschmer*, vol. 2. Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 142–151.
- Stüber, K. (1996). *Zur dialektalen Einheit des Ostionischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Weiss, M. (2020). *Outline of the historical and comparative grammar of Latin*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- van Thiel, H., ed. (1996). *Homeri Ilias*. Hildesheim/Zürich/New York: G. Olms.
- Veitch, W. (1887). *Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- West, M.L., ed. (1998–2000): *Homeri Ilias* 1–2. Stuttgart/Leipzig: Teubner
- (2001). *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*. München – Leipzig: K. G. Saur.
- (2017). *Homerus: Odyssea*. Berlin/Boston: W. de Gruyter.