

A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Speech Introductions and
Conclusions in Homer.

Inaugural-Dissertation

zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades

der Philosophie an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität

München

vorgelegt von

Filip De Decker

aus

Zeile, Belgien

München, 2015

Erstgutachter: Professor Doctor Olav Hackstein

Zweitgutachter: Professor Doctor Martin Hose

Tag der mündlichen Prüfung: 23. Januar 2015

Acknowledgements.

I would like to thank everybody who helped me before and during the completion of my PhD thesis. In the first place, all my colleagues who shared an office with me in the *Schellingstraße* 10 deserve a thank-you (alphabetical order): Elena, Hanna, Katharina, Martina, Nicholas, Ozan, Paul, Taja.

I also want to express my gratefulness to everybody with whom I was able to discuss the topic, take and attend classes: Adam, Albert, Andreas, Benedikt, Conny, Christoph, Dieter, Eduard, Felicitas, Michael, Paolo, Peter-Arnold and Steffi.

A special thanks goes out to my colleagues and professors in the LIPP programme, thanks to whom I was able to present my ideas to non-specialists and who gave many valuable insights as to methodology and presentation.

I would also like to mention my co-organisers of the 21st LIPP colloquium, Isabell, Katharina, Markus, Matthias and Taja; Thanks to them, the conference was a success and I was able to present my ideas on the augment to a broader audience.

I thank Kathleen Rabl for improving my English.

I am very thankful to Frau Dr. Caroline Trautmann, head of the *Prüfungsamt* and previously coordinator of the Graduate School of Language and Literature, and Herr Dr. Daniel Holl, the current coordinator of the Graduate School of Language and Literature, who provided me with help and support in difficult times and with administrative and other issues involving the promotion track.

Most important in the process of the completion and deserving of the warmest thanks are my supervisors, Herr Professor Dr. Olav Hackstein and Herr Professor Dr. Martin Hose without whose help I would never have been able to come to Munich and this thesis would never have been completed. Thanks to frequent discussions with them many issues became clearer and were formulated much more accurately.

Finally, I would like to thank my brothers, Ivo and Joris, and the persons to whom I owe everything, my parents, Theo De Decker and Lieve Peeters, and my late grand-parents, Jean Peeters and Gabrielle Mercken. To all of them, this thesis is dedicated.

Filip De Decker, Munich, February 20th 2015.

Table of Contents.

Chapter 1. Introduction.	1.
1.1. Speech introductions and conclusions in Homer.	1
1.2. The problem of historical syntax and Homeric syntax: <i>Status Quaestionis</i> .	2
1.3. Methodology and <i>modus operandi</i> .	4
1.4. Division and overview of the dissertation.	6
Chapter 2. A brief overview of previous work on speech introductions and conclusions.	7
2.0. Preliminary remarks.	7
2.1. Metrical observations on speech introductions.	7
2.2. The morphological and semantic analyses of speech introductions.	11
2.3. The so-called <i>tis speeches</i> .	13
2.4. Speech introductions, conclusions and Homeric conversation.	15
2.5. Speech introductions, conclusions and verbal suppletion.	15
2.6. Conclusions on previous work on speech introductions.	17
Chapter 3: The <i>verba dicendi sensu stricto</i>.	18
3.0. Preliminary remarks.	18
3.1. The verb αὐδάω.	18
3.2. The verb ἔειπον and its compounds.	39
3.3. The verb φημί.	68
3.4. The verb ἦ.	107
3.5. The verb μυθέομαι.	113
3.6. The verbal root * μ erh ₁ .	116
3.7. The verbs derived from the root *sek ^w .	120
3.8. The <i>verba dicendi</i> derived from the root *h ₂ ge/or.	131
3.9. The verb φωνέω.	147
Chapter 4. “Answer”.	172
4.1. The etymology of ἀμείβομαι.	172
4.2. The meaning of ἀμείβομαι and its compounds in speech introductions and conclusions.	172
4.3. The difference between the simplex ἀμείβομαι and the compound ἀπαμείβομαι.	174
4.4. Verbal inflection of ἀμείβομαι and its compounds.	179
4.5. The diatheses of ἀμείβομαι and its compounds.	180
4.6. Metrical position of the simplex ἀμείβομαι.	180

4.7. The syntactic constructions (case usage) of ἀμείβομαι	183
4.8. Word order in the formulae of ἀμείβομαι.	185
4.9. Connection between the formulae of ἀμείβομαι and the rest of the verse.	187
4.10. The compound ἀπαμείβομαι.	188
4.11. Conclusion.	191
Chapter 5. Verbal distribution, suppletion, tense and modal usage in speech introductions and conclusions.	193
5.1. Distribution of verbs and tenses in speech introductions and conclusions.	193
5.2. Reference to the past in speech introductions and conclusions.	195
5.3. Speech introductions and conclusions referring to the future.	211
5.4. Reference to the apparent unreal in speech introductions: the Greek counterfactual.	221
Chapter 6. The augment in Homer, with a special focus on speech introductions and conclusions.	241
6.1. Introduction.	241
6.2. Morphometric observations on the augment use.	242
6.3. Syntactic observations.	249
6.4. Semantic observations.	256
6.5. Formulaic expansion and the use of the augment.	277
6.6. The augment in compounds.	283
6.7. Willi's theory on the augment.	284
6.8. Conclusion.	287
Chapter 7. Conclusion. The semantics and the grammar of speech introduction and conclusion verbs in Homer.	291
7.1. The semantics of speech introduction and conclusion verbs in Homer.	291
7.2. "Morpho-semanto-syntactic" observations on speech introductions and conclusions.	296
APPENDICES: Figures and forms.	305
Appendix A: General data on speech introductions and conclusions.	305
Appendix B: Data on the augment.	310
Appendix C: Data relating to tense usage.	316
Appendix D: The use of the subjunctives and optatives of the root * <i>uek</i> ^w .	318
Appendix E: Optatives and modal indicatives in past potentials and counterfactuals.	323
Bibliography.	333

Chapter 1. Introduction.

1.1. Speech introductions and conclusions in Homer.

This thesis provides a morpho-syntactic analysis of the Homeric speech introduction and conclusion formulae. 45% of the verses in the *Iliad* and 67% of those of the *Odyssey* belong to direct speech.¹ Transitions between narrative and speeches and between speeches belong to the oldest stratum of the poems.² Regardless of the age of the epic and/or mythical stories, the transition between narrative and speech needed to be made.

The term “speech introductions” is used for the verses introducing direct speech. If a verse is followed by indirect speech or is not followed by a speech at all, it is not discussed. In general every speech is concluded, unless one speech is immediately followed by another speech.³ In such cases, my analysis will also take into account the immediate reaction of the audience (if there is one). The instances of the *verba dicendi* that do not introduce direct speech will therefore not be discussed. This means that many instances of ἔειπον and φημί will remain unanalysed.

Speeches can be introduced by many different verbs,⁴ but in this dissertation the speeches introductions and conclusions containing the verbs of “speaking”, “addressing” and “answering” will be discussed.⁵ I will leave out the *verba clamandi* (such as καλέω), the *verba clamandi vel sonandi* (such as ἄύω and βοάω), the *verba rogandi* (such as εἶρομαι), the *verba orandi* (such as εὔχομαι), *verba invehendi* (such as νεικέω), the *verba hortandi* (such as κελεύω and ὀτρύνω) and the *verba iurandi* (such as ὀμνυμι). They will be addressed in future research. The reason for this is twofold. First, the verbs discussed in the thesis are the actual verbs of speaking in the strict sense,⁶ and therefore provide a formally and semantically complete corpus. The introductions by the *verba dicendi* compounded with προσ- and ἀμείβομαι make up more than half of all speech introductions in Homer.⁷ The conclusions with φημί consist more than half of all attested conclusions in Homer.⁸ In total, these categories account for about 2300 introductions and conclusions. Secondly, the verbs omitted are semantically more diverse and produce a more intensified meaning of speaking.

¹ Fingerle 1939:67-68.

² Grimm 1962:6.

³ Fingerle 1939:373; Fränkel 1950:118; Führer 1967:44. See Combellack 1939 for this problem.

⁴ See especially Fingerle 1939; Führer 1967:9,16-17,37 and Edwards 1970:1-16. A complete list of all introductions and conclusions can be found in Fingerle 1939:308-324 and 349-355.

⁵ Compilations of speech introductions have been made by Fingerle 1939, Führer 1967, Edwards 1969 and 1970, Riggsby 1992; Machacek 1994 and most importantly Kelly 2007. I refer to Chapter 2 for a more detailed discussion of the scholarship on the issue.

⁶ Bolling 1922:214; Riggsby 1992:102; Kelly 2007 did the same in his analysis of speech introductions.

⁷ Fingerle 1939:337.

⁸ Führer 1967:36.

1.2. The problem of historical syntax and Homeric syntax: *Status Quaestionis*.

The investigation will focus on the morpho-syntactic elements, because morphology and syntax cannot be separated.⁹ Historical syntax remains a stepchild in the field of comparative linguistics: it is still under-investigated when compared to historical phonology or morphology.¹⁰ One of the main reasons for this is that it is much more difficult to reconstruct sentences or texts for a reconstructed language than it is to reconstruct case endings or individual forms.¹¹ For Indo-European the standard works are still those by Delbrück,¹² Wackernagel,¹³ and Brugmann.¹⁴ Only very recently, have Indo-European handbooks started to include treatments of syntax: even Beekes 1995 and Szemerényi 1996 did not address syntax, and only Fortson 2004, Clackson 2007 and Tichy 2009 included discussions of mood, tense and case usage. A new Indo-European syntax is being prepared, but a publication date has not yet been set.¹⁵ For Greek, the picture is no different: the historical grammars by Chantraine and Rix only discussed phonology and morphology,¹⁶ but did not address syntax. The only extensive historical Greek syntax is that of Stahl, but its value is debated.¹⁷ The large Greek grammars provide only a limited treatment of the historical evolution.¹⁸ In addition, there is no recent historical grammar of Greek in English. The same applies to the grammars of the Greek dialects: in the grammars of Bechtel, Buck, Blümel, Duhoux and Dubois the syntactic discussions are always much less prominent than the morphological

⁹ See already Hermann 1901:61-64; Campbell – Mithun 1980:24; Hock – Joseph 1997:189 *because of these multiple interactions it is not always easy to determine where syntax begins and where morphology or phonology ends*.

¹⁰ Lehmann 1979:66: *syntax has been investigated far less in historical linguistics than has phonology*; Campbell – Mithun 1980:19; Clackson 2007:157, quoting Campbell-Mithun 1980.

¹¹ Campbell – Mithun 1980, especially on page 22: *our limited knowledge of directionality in syntactic changes is a severe handicap in reconstruction*. Campbell himself seemed less pessimistic: *In short, while syntactic reconstruction can be very difficult, it is clearly possible* (1998:251). See Euler 2011:33 and Rieken 2012:410 *Die Rekonstruktion von Syntax stellt in der historischen Sprachwissenschaft notorisch ein Problem dar*.

¹² Delbrück 1871, 1876, 1878, 1879, 1888, 1893, 1897 and 1900.

¹³ Wackernagel 1920 and 1924.

¹⁴ Brugmann 1925; Brugmann 1904 discussed morphology and syntax without distinction: he explained the formation of the tenses and their uses in the same chapter.

¹⁵ The new grammar will be published by the Winter Verlag. Their website (http://www.winter-verlag.de/de/news/nicdc4268024158a9d89f39f/Editionsplan_Indogermanische_Grammatik/) states that the case syntax will not be completed before 2015 and verbal syntax not before 2016. In 2012 a special issue of *KZ* was dedicated to syntax in honour of Heinrich Hettrich and the 2013 issue of *JHL* was also dedicated to syntax.

¹⁶ Chantraine 1964, Rix 1992.

¹⁷ See the critical reviews by Gildersleeve 1908a, 1908b and 1909. There are the smaller works by Kieckers (1926b and c) and Meier-Brügger 1992a, but they are not as thorough as Stahl's. Meier-Brügger 1992 has an updated bibliography (until 1992).

¹⁸ Kühner-Gerth 1898, 1904. More historical observations can be found in Brugmann 1900; Schwyzer 1939; Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950.

parts,¹⁹ although Buck stated that the syntactic differences between the dialects were much more obvious than the morpho-phonological ones.²⁰ The only exclusively syntactic treatment of the dialects was Slotty 1915.²¹ Slowly, this is changing, as the influence of poetry on Greek prose has been investigated,²² the syntax of Pindar and Sappho have been discussed,²³ and the case system in Mycenaean has been researched.²⁴ For Homer, one can use the grammars of Monro and Chantraine, but the different commentaries rarely discuss syntax, and consequently, Homeric syntax remains under-investigated in comparison to morphology.²⁵ Individual aspects such as the word order with clitics (the so-called Wackernagel's Law),²⁶ the particles,²⁷ use of the moods,²⁸ the tense usage,²⁹ the conditional³⁰ or final clauses³¹ were studied in the 19th and beginning of the 20th century. In recent times, the word order of the different clitics,³² use of the Homeric moods,³³ the "irrealis" construction,³⁴ the ἐπεὶ clauses,³⁵ and the prepositions have been discussed,³⁶ but the basic works remain those by Brugmann, Delbrück, Wackernagel, Monro and Chantraine, and a morpho-syntactic analysis of a well-defined corpus is still missing. In spite of the wide variety of studies of formulae and their appearance, there has been very little research on the entire corpus of formulae. Edwards noted that only Chantraine had undertaken such an endeavour for Book I of the *Iliad*.³⁷ Besides comparative studies on Homeric and Mycenaean formulae,³⁸ and in-depth analyses of

¹⁹ The syntax is hardly addressed in Blümel 1982 and in Duhoux 1983. In Dubois 1986a there are 35 pages of the 236 devoted to syntax (pages 201-234).

²⁰ Buck 1955:136. He therefore concluded that the dialectal syntax should be investigated more thoroughly.

²¹ This is visible in the large works by Ahrens 1839 and 1843b; Hoffmann 1891, 1893 and 1897; Smyth 1894 and Bechtel 1921 and 1924.

²² Bers 1984.

²³ Hummel 1993; Tzamali 1996.

²⁴ Hajnal 1990, Bichlmeyer 2012, 2014.

²⁵ Wachter 2000:102 *die Syntax der hom. Sprache ist noch weniger genau und vollständig erforscht als die Laut- und Formenlehre und die Wortbildung*.

²⁶ Wackernagel 1892.

²⁷ Hartung 1832, 1833; Denniston 1959.

²⁸ Delbrück 1871, 1879; Masius 1885; Mutzbauer 1908; Methner 1908; Walter 1923.

²⁹ Mutzbauer 1893.

³⁰ Lange 1872, 1873; Tabachovitz 1953; Gonda 1956; Koppers 1959.

³¹ Weber 1884; for final clauses in Indo-European, see Hettrich 1987.

³² Hale 1987; Ruijgh 1990; Wills 1993.

³³ Willmott 2007.

³⁴ Krisch 1986; Ruijgh 1992; Hettrich 1992, 1996, 1998 (the foundations had been laid already by Gerth 1878). For the term "irrealis", see later on.

³⁵ Muchnová 2011.

³⁶ Fritz 2005.

³⁷ Edwards 1986:197 *the first application of Milman Parry's insights, (...) was Chantraine 1932, an article on the "play of formulae" in Iliad 1. It remains the only work of its kind, an excellent source for observing how formulae are used. Chantraine deals with repeated verses, verses repeated with slight modifications, the combining of formulae which fall between the various caesurae, and modifications and changes of position of formulae (underlining is mine).*

³⁸ Three much discussed examples of such formulae are ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἦβην, Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος and Ἐνυαλίῳ ἀνδρεφόντῃ, and the literature on these formulae is large.

individual formulae,³⁹ there is no morphosyntactic analysis on a specific corpus of formulae, not even in the commentaries and *Companions to Homers* that have appeared: the updated version of Ameis-Hentze-Cauer, the Oxford and Cambridge editions obviously addressed the oral and formulaic nature of the poems, but do not discuss the corpus of formulae, nor are there articles in the *Companions* that specifically treat a corpus of formulae. Kelly 2007 has an appendix in which most speech introductions were analysed from a morphological and semantic standpoint, but not from a syntactic point of view. An additional problem is that the Homeric language was clearly a *Kunstsprache* but that it was subject to influences of the spoken language of the different bards:⁴⁰ archaic features coexisted with innovations and with pseudo-archaisms, and this applies to the syntax as well.⁴¹

1.3. Methodology and *modus operandi*.

The research will be performed as follows. In a first stage, I compile the corpus of speech introduction and conclusion formulae. As stated above, two categories of verbs will be analysed (“speak, address” and “answer”). Speech introductions and conclusions belonging to those categories will be dealt with. After the compilation, the verbs are listed in etymologically related sections, in which simplex and compounds are considered. Then I proceed to the actual analysis. First, the meaning and the etymology are discussed. In many instances, it is important to determine the exact meaning and etymology in order to understand the inherited nature and to allow for possible comparisons in other languages. Secondly, I investigate the use of the verb in introductions and conclusions. Most verbs are either confined to introductions or to conclusions. Some verbs have simplex forms that appear in conclusions but compounds that are used in introductions. I then discuss the verbal morphology. As was argued before, morphology and syntax cannot be separated, and therefore I list and catalogue all attested forms per verb, distinguishing between simplex and compound. The third step is the analysis of the tenses used. Here I pay attention to the difference between introduction and conclusion, between compound and simplex and between the different categories of verbs: do they use different tenses to refer to past, present and future? The fourth step includes a discussion of the use of the augment among the different verbs. That the augment is more common in speech introductions has only recently been

³⁹ Nussbaum 1998 is a classic example of such an in-depth analysis.

⁴⁰ The standard work is still Meister 1921, whose term *Kunstsprache* has become the term to describe the Homeric language.

⁴¹ Risch 1954:73; Forssman 1991. I thank Professors Hackstein and Hose for discussing these issues with me.

noticed,⁴² but a more specific investigation as to how, why and when the augment is (not) used, has not been performed. Tense and augment use are discussed in more detail in chapters 5 and 6 respectively. The fifth step concerns the use of verbal gender. Most verbs are only attested in one diathesis (active or middle), but some verbs use both diatheses and in that case, an attempt is made to distinguish between them. The sixth step includes the distribution of moods and converbs. Special attention will be paid to the participle, because the participle is often used as extension in speech introductions but is also used to conclude speeches. I try to determine what is specific for which verbs/class of verbs. I also discuss what moods are used. This is related to the question of the tenses, because in the oldest Greek the future could be expressed by two (or even three, if one assumes that the optative could refer to the future as well) different moods. Another issue that is addressed is the difference between the moods: is it visible and does it apply equally to all verbs? The seventh step is the examination of case usage and the use of preverbs and prepositions. More specifically, I attempt to determine in what case form the addressee and the words spoken are put, and if the preverb of the compounds influences the case usage, and –if so- how this can be explained. The eighth step is the analysis of the word order. I investigate what the predominant position of subject, object, verb, apposition is, and if the metre plays a role in this. I also check if certain stylistic and/or emphatic uses influence the default positioning. Metrical peculiarities are briefly discussed, but the emphasis lies on the syntactic features. The ninth and final issue that I investigate is the use of tmesis. Is it poetically motivated or inherited? It obviously goes without saying that the metre can never be ignored, because certain forms and/or constructions were excluded by their metrical form.

In Chapter 5 the tense and modal use are discussed, with special attention to verbal distribution, suppletion and tense usage in introductions and conclusions. Four elements are investigated:

Are there differences in the use of certain verbs between introductions and conclusions, and is there a preference for a certain verb in an introduction or a conclusion?

Are certain moods and tenses restricted to introductions or conclusions?

How are introductions and conclusions referring to the past expressed?

How are introductions and conclusions referring to the future expressed?

This chapter provides an investigation of the tense use of all introduction and conclusion verbs, and –more specifically- addresses the difference between imperfect and aorist and the

⁴² Bakker 2005:122 (but Drewitt 1912a:44-46 had already hinted at it).

(complementary) distribution between subjunctive and future indicative. In this respect I briefly consider the value of the modal particle as well (although a more thorough investigation will have to be performed at another occasion).

A more thorough look at the augment use in Homer in general is undertaken in chapter 6. I included a special chapter on it, because the augment analysis formed a larger part of the investigation. Particular attention is paid to *verba dicendi*, but other examples are treated as well. The augment is analysed from a metrical-morphological, syntactic and semantic perspective. Willi's theory on the origin of the augment as an original laryngeal reduplication is also addressed.

The thesis concludes with a “grammar of speech introductions and conclusions”, in which the main morpho-syntactic observations are listed per verb and a general overview of recurring features in introductions and conclusions is provided.

At the end of the dissertation, I added 5 appendices: Appendix A contains forms and figures on introductions and conclusions. Appendix B provides the data on the augmentation. In Appendix C the data on mood and tense usage are listed. In Appendix D the instances of ἔειπον with and without modal particle are discussed, and in Appendix E the relationship between modal indicative and optative is investigated.

1.4. Division and overview of the dissertation.

The thesis starts with an overview of previous work on speech introductions and conclusions (**Chapter 2**). The two categories of word families are two bigger chapters of the dissertation and form its “core”: “speaking” and “addressing” (**Chapter 3**), and “answering” (**Chapter 4**). The division of the verbs among the different chapters is the following.

Chapter 3: The *verba dicendi sensu stricto*.

- 3.1. αὐδάω.
- 3.2. ἔειπον.
- 3.3. φημί.
- 3.4. ἦ.
- 3.5. μυθέομαι.
- 3.6. ἔρέω.
- 3.7. ἐννέπω - ἐνίπτω.
- 3.8. ἀγορεύω - ἀγοράομαι.
- 3.9. φωνέω.

Chapter 4: “answer”: ἀμείβομαι.

In **Chapter 5** the tenses and moods in the introductions and conclusions are discussed. In **Chapter 6** the augment use in the Homeric poems is analysed, with focussing on the verbs of speaking. **Chapter 7** is the conclusion, followed by the Appendices and the bibliography.

Chapter 2. A brief overview of previous work on speech introductions and conclusions.

2.0. Preliminary remarks.

In this chapter an overview of the work that has been performed on speech introductions and conclusions will be given. As will become clear, speech introductions have been studied more often than conclusions. Speech introductions in general have been considered from a metrical point of view and from a formal-semantic one. In addition, one particular category of introductions has been investigated in more detail, namely the so-called *tis speeches*, the speeches by undefined characters. Speech introductions and conclusions have only been very briefly discussed in the works on Homeric conversation. They were mentioned in works on verbal suppletion, but only as part of the verbs of speaking and not as a separate category. My overview starts with the metrical aspects, then proceeds to discuss the formal-semantic aspects, then the *tis speeches*, then the Homeric conversation and at the end the studies on verbal suppletion.

2.1. Metrical observations on speech introductions.

1. Parry.

The first work that requires a discussion, is that by Milman Parry (however, an in-depth assessment of Parryism and oral poetry in general remains beyond the scope of this thesis).⁴³ He argued that noun epithet formulae were nothing more than metrical fillers in the verse: a formula “swift-footed Akhilleus” only meant “Akhilleus” and had nothing to do with his running capacities.⁴⁴ Depending on the metrical needs and the position in the verse, the poet used another noun epithet formula for the same idea/hero,⁴⁵ and for every specific position in the verse and for every idea there was one formula available, and only one. This is known as the principle of *thrift* or *economy*.⁴⁶ In his ground-breaking works on the oral and formulaic nature of the Homeric poems, Parry also addressed the speech introductions. He argued that the basic idea of every speech introduction was “X spoke to Y”,⁴⁷ that the metrical form of the noun-epithet formula decided the use of the verb of speaking, and that the addition of a participle only added the nuance of the participle to the introduction, but did not change the

⁴³ In Parry 1971 all the works by Milman Parry were collected by his son, Adam Parry.

A good overview of the literature on Homeric formulaic language can be found in Edwards 1986 and 1988. For speech introductions, see Edwards 1988:19-20 and 32-35.

⁴⁴ Parry 1930, 1932.

⁴⁵ Parry 1930:80, 1932:6-7.

⁴⁶ Parry 1930:86-89, 1932:7-9.

⁴⁷ Parry 1930:80 *the essential idea in τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε is “he said to him”*.

introduction itself.⁴⁸ What is famous is his analysis of the formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, which he considered to be synonymous with “he spoke”.⁴⁹ In this specific case, the formula was used if the name of the speaker had been mentioned already in the preceding verse. The value of his works for Homeric scholarship cannot be overestimated.⁵⁰ First of all, it explained many metrical anomalies, such as μέροπες ἄνθρωποι with an irregular lengthening of the syllable πες as it can be interpreted as a formulaic inflection of μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.⁵¹ Secondly, it also showed that certain formulae could be inflected when the language changed. This was the case with the speech introduction formula καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, which could be used in its feminine form καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα after the digamma ceased to “exist” (cf. infra).⁵² The flexibility and inflection of the formulae were studied in more detail by Hainsworth and Hoekstra.⁵³ In its extreme form, however, Parryism reduces the Homeric poems and language to a container of ready-made formulae void of any meaning or context. It also has an inherent contradiction: if the use of a certain verb (this can be a speech introduction verb, but the argument is valid for other actions as well) is determined by a noun-epithet and if a noun epithet is only used to describe a certain hero without any additional meaning, why then do we find different verbs used with different noun-epithets?⁵⁴ If *thrift* were the most important motivating factor, we would not expect so many different speech introduction and conclusion formulae:⁵⁵ the speech conclusions ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη and ὥς ἔφατο are metrically equivalent, when they are followed by a name or noun that starts by two consonants, and yet one finds ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, Τρῶες δὲ μάλα σχεδὸν ἦλυθον αὐτῶν (*Iliad* 5,607) and ὥς ἔφατο, Τρῶας δὲ κατὰ κρήθεν λάβε πένθος (*Iliad* 16,548). The same applies to the answering formulae: ἀπαμείβετο and ἡμείβετο are metrically equivalent, but appear in different contexts (cf. infra). If Parryism in its rigid form were correct, these formulae could not have coexisted. This is an indication that context and meaning were important after all. An additional observation also worth considering is that,

⁴⁸ A. Parry 1971:10-16 (the original dates from 1928).

⁴⁹ Parry 1937.

⁵⁰ I would like to point out that the bases of his work were laid by German scholars such as Wolf 1795, Düntzer, Ellendt and Witte (especially 1913a:2241). Parry himself admitted this (Parry 1971:4-5), but it has been mostly forgotten since.

⁵¹ A. Parry 1971:198 (the original dates from 1928). This had been noticed already by Monro 1891:355.

⁵² Parry 1934:166-167; Parry 1934 addressed the issue of the digamma in the different “layers” of the language. This specific example was later mentioned in Chantraine 1948:146; Hoekstra 1969:70; Garvie 1994:9; Hackstein 2010a:415, 2011b:39-40.

⁵³ Hainsworth 1968; Hoekstra 1969, 1981.

⁵⁴ This was addressed by Austin 1975:1-80 (speech introductions were discussed on page 62); Machacek 1994 and Friedrich 2007 with regard to speech introductions (cf. infra). Hainsworth 1968:115-116 had already noticed this problem in the case of “he answered him”, but did not draw any conclusions from it.

⁵⁵ Speech conclusions were discussed in A. Parry 1971:216-217 (=Parry 1928:35-37).

while the metre is indeed very important, the meaning and syntax cannot be excluded: there is a syntactic and semantic difference between the speech verbs compounded with *pros* and with *meta*, as there is between the aorist ἀμείψατο and the imperfect ἀμείβετο, which were metrically equivalent (cf. infra). Parry's analyses for speech introductions were refined by Edwards, Riggsby and Machacek.

2. Edwards 1969, 1970.

Edwards continued Parry's work and agreed with it, stating that the formulae ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε and ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα were used by the poet because the meter made him do so.⁵⁶ At the same, he showed that depending on the context a new formula could be coined by the poet's creative mind.⁵⁷ He analysed the verbs of "answering" very briefly and the speech introductions in more detail. In his analysis of the speech introductions, he distinguished between "speak" in the normal sense and "speak" in a stronger sense. He also analysed anomalous introductions chant per chant, which he considered to be context-induced, and catalogued verbs with noun-epithets and expansions (such as participles). His conclusion was that the place in the verse was more important than the exact meaning, and that the emotional value was often not transmitted by the introduction verb, but by the context and/or content of the speech.⁵⁸ Speech conclusions were not treated in his articles, nor were tense usage or word order.

3. Patzer 1972.

In this work Patzer analysed the speech conclusions from a metrical and semantic point of view.⁵⁹ He noticed that there were many constructions and formulae that were metrically equivalent, but that the context decided on which formula was used, as was the case for ὦς εἰπὼν, which is metrically equivalent to ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη.⁶⁰ He pointed out that speech conclusions with φημί were either followed by the subject of the next sentence or by the verb of the next sentence, in which case the connection was made by δέ.⁶¹

4. Riggsby 1992.

In discussing the speech introductions in the *Odyssey* Riggsby only treated the "normal" speech introductions, and catalogued them into 4 classes: "speak a speech", "speak to

⁵⁶ Edwards 1970:2.

⁵⁷ Edwards 1969:81 *exceptional phrasing draws attention to the exceptional circumstances*; 1970:1 *the varied use made of the standard expressions displays the wide range of the poet's skill within the formulaic diction*.

⁵⁸ I refer to his remarks on the formula "he addressed him", where Edwards argued that the differences in meaning did not play a role in determining which formula was used (Edwards 1970:12). One can also check the conclusion (Edwards 1970:36-37).

⁵⁹ Patzer 1972:14-26.

⁶⁰ Patzer 1972:18.

⁶¹ Patzer 1972:18-20.

someone”, speak to a large group” and “answer”.⁶² He excluded the so-called *tis speeches* (cf. infra) and the verbs of “insulting”, because they represented an action that was more than just “speaking”.⁶³ Riggsby showed that there was a difference between “speak to” and “answer”: the *pros-* compounds are therefore not synonymous with the verbs of answering (contrary to what Parry had argued).⁶⁴ Starting from the line as a whole, Riggsby observed that not all verbs were put in the position where they would be expected based on their metrical form.⁶⁵ This is in my opinion an important observation because it proves that the metre was not the only determining factor after all. His work is also valuable, because it provided an overview of all speech introduction verb forms in their metrical form and a comparison between the Odyssean data and those of the Alexandrian and Imperial epic poets.⁶⁶

5. Machacek 1994

Machacek expanded Parry’s theory to the entire line and remarked that the *economy* principle that one idea was expressed by one and only one formula was not correct, if one looked at the level of the verse: the idea of “Odysseus answered him” could be expressed by 3 different formula, namely τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολυμήτις Ὀδυσσεύς, τὸν δ' αὖ διογενὴς Ὀδυσσεὺς ἡμείβετο μύθῳ and τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.⁶⁷ The same applied to “Agamemnon answered” and “Akhilleus answered”, but Machacek showed that the context in which the formula was used, determined the line and not just the metrical requirements.

6. Friedrich 2007.

In this book Friedrich analysed all formulae for a certain idea and showed that for many essential ideas the poet used more than one metrically equivalent formula.⁶⁸ This is a violation of the Parryian principle of economy (hence the subtitle of his book *The Poetics of the Breaches*). He argued that the existence of more than one formula was due to the will of the poet to vary his lexicon, but also because of the context. He applied this to speech introductions as well,⁶⁹ and showed that the context could play a role after all: τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 1,172) the formula ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων was used to describe Agamemnon, because he was going to use his authoritative power to settle his

⁶² Riggsby 1992:103.

⁶³ Riggsby 1992:103.

⁶⁴ Riggsby 1992:110-112.

⁶⁵ Riggsby 1992:103.

⁶⁶ Riggsby 1992:104-105.

⁶⁷ Machacek 1994:323-326.

⁶⁸ Friedrich 2007:48-65.

⁶⁹ Friedrich 2007:40-45, 68-77.

quarrel with Akhilleus. As such, Homer wanted to stress Agamemnon's hierarchic superiority.⁷⁰

2.2. The morphological and semantic analyses of speech introductions.

This subchapter discusses those works that addressed formal and morphological elements of the verbs of speaking besides the metrical requirements.

7. Fingerle 1939.

The first work that intensively studied the speech introductions and conclusions was that of Fingerle 1939.⁷¹ In this work all instances of speech introductions and conclusions were listed and catalogued per verb.⁷² The different formulae were then analysed metrically and semantically. Especially important was the observation that different compounds were used, when a few persons were addressed or when an entire group was spoken to.⁷³ He also observed that several introductions comprised of two *verba dicendi*,⁷⁴ and that many introductions were expanded by a participle of another verb of speaking.⁷⁵ He also observed the case usage with different verbs,⁷⁶ and discussed the different metrical positions of the verb, object and subject.⁷⁷ He noticed the differences in tense usage, but did not offer an explanation for them. Word order, case usage (except with *meta* and *pros* compounds) and augment were not addressed. All speeches were catalogued in different categories, such as “answering formulae”, “army speeches”, “assembly speeches”, “soliloquies”, etc. depending on the person addressed and the content of the speeches.⁷⁸ Fingerle dedicated a special chapter the so-called *tis speeches*,⁷⁹ but did not distinguish between speeches that were actually pronounced and speeches within a speech which only occurred in the mind of a specific speaker.⁸⁰ He also addressed the speech conclusions and pointed out that many speech conclusions with a verb form of φημί in the singular were followed by a sentence in which the subject was in the plural.⁸¹ In addition, he also analysed the similes, the formulae used in

⁷⁰ Friedrich 2007:98-99.

⁷¹ See Führer 1967:v and *passim*; Schneider 1995:1.

⁷² The introductions were listed on pp. 305-325 and the conclusions on pp. 347-377.

⁷³ See especially Fingerle 1939:325 and 335.

⁷⁴ Fingerle 1939:345.

⁷⁵ Fingerle 1939:87, 327-334; Fournier 1946b:32.

⁷⁶ Fingerle 1939:341.

⁷⁷ Fingerle 1939:325-345.

⁷⁸ Fingerle 1939:8-304.

⁷⁹ Fingerle 1939:282-292.

⁸⁰ This is one of the main criticisms by Schneider 1995 (cf. *infra*).

⁸¹ Fingerle 1939:360.

speech to greet and say goodbye, and the *Typik des Schweigens*.⁸² Unfortunately he was not quoted in Riggsby 1992, Machacek 1994, Beck 2005, nor in Kelly 2007, but became the starting point for Führer 1967 and Schneider 1995. Fingerle's work was the only one that provided a list of all introductions and conclusions, and discussed speech introductions and conclusions.

8. Führer 1967.⁸³

Führer summarised Fingerle's work in his first chapter, provided an overview of all introduction and conclusion verbs and expanded it to the other epic and lyric poets.⁸⁴ He started by discussing the introduction verbs,⁸⁵ proceeded to the speech conclusions,⁸⁶ then he analysed speeches without a conclusion and investigating the speeches themselves and cataloguing them in a way to that of Fingerle.⁸⁷ The focus was on the content and construction of the actual speeches, and compared lyric poetry with epic, such as the use of the Homeric formula φώνησέν τε by Pindar under the form φώνᾱσεν δέ.⁸⁸ He did not focus on syntax as such, but addressed individual remarkable instances of change in diathesis (the middle of φημί is hardly ever used in lyric poetry and post-classical epic poetry),⁸⁹ tense usage (such as the issue of the historical present)⁹⁰ and the position of the verb in the sentence.⁹¹

9. Kelly 2007.

This book is by far the most important and detailed investigation of speech introductions in Homer. The title refers to Book 8 of the *Iliad* and addresses the textual problems in this book,⁹² but it goes further than that chant: it discusses all verbs of speaking, and had an appendix with all the speech introductions that occurred more than once.⁹³ Syntax as such is not treated (although the tense usage is occasionally mentioned), but the context of each introduction is discussed in detail. Although I once or twice disagree with his analysis (such as the difference between ἡμείβετο and ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη or that between ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα and ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον, cf. *infra*), his work shows that the context and the meaning of each formula were important for the poet when he was determining which

⁸² Fingerle 1939:448-474

⁸³ I owe this reference to professors Martin West and Martin Hose.

⁸⁴ Führer 1967:9-21, the verbs and figures can be found on page 9.

⁸⁵ Führer 1967:23-35.

⁸⁶ Führer 1967: 36-44, with the figures on page 36.

⁸⁷ Führer 1967:107-111.

⁸⁸ Führer 1967:21.

⁸⁹ Führer 1967:37.

⁹⁰ Führer 1967:93-105.

⁹¹ Führer 1967:144.

⁹² Kelly 2007:378-409.

⁹³ Kelly 2007: 411-421.

formula to use (as had been noticed already by Riggsby and Machacek). Some speech conclusions are discussed, when the reaction of the audience is described.⁹⁴ An important observation is that the formula ὁ σφιν ἐν φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν was always followed by a positive reaction of the audience (either they obeyed or cheered at the proposal).⁹⁵ The only “negative” point is that he did not reference Fingerle 1939, Fournier 1946a and b nor Führer 1967.

Kelly and Friedrich showed that the context could not be neglected either, although Friedrich only confined himself to the metrical aspects.

2.3. The so-called *tis* speeches.⁹⁶

The term *tis* speeches is used to describe the speech of an undetermined character and are introduced by a sentence with *tis* as subject. These speeches are generally used to indicate the speech of an entire group, which is then referred to as “someone from group Y”. There are two categories: the *actual* *tis* speeches and the *potential* *tis* speeches. The former was used for actual speeches by large groups and was combined with a verb in the past with the iterative suffix *sk*, mostly εἶπεςκε. The latter refers to speeches within the speech of an important protagonist: the speaker imagines that some unknown person in the future might/could/would say something about him and/or the current situation. These speeches are expressed by a verbal form with future reference (future indicative or aorist subjunctive).

10. Hentze 1905.

Hentze listed all instances of the *tis* speeches, compared them with the chorus in tragedy and called them *Chorreden*.⁹⁷ He distinguished between the speeches in the past and the future, which he called *fingierte Aussprüche*.⁹⁸ These speeches were inserted in the speech of a speaker, when s/he expected or feared someone from the common people to say something about him/her in praise or in reproach.⁹⁹ Although Hentze distinguished between the two categories, he still discussed them as one entity. Fingerle did not discuss the speeches in detail, but followed Hentze and considered these speeches to be one group.¹⁰⁰ Fingerle stated that the speeches were used to give a voice to the otherwise anonymous masses.¹⁰¹

11. Wilson 1979.

⁹⁴ Kelly 2007:272.

⁹⁵ Kelly 2007:375-376.

⁹⁶ The term *tis Reden* was coined by Fingerle 1939:283-293.

⁹⁷ Hentze 1905:255.

⁹⁸ Hentze 1905:260.

⁹⁹ Hentze 1905:260-262.

¹⁰⁰ Fingerle 1939:283-293.

¹⁰¹ Fingerle 1939:288.

Wilson started with the work of Hentze and Fingerle, listed the instances of the *tis speeches* and summarised their use. He distinguished between the speeches that had been spoken and the ones that were used as a speech-within-a-speech.¹⁰² Wilson called former ones *actual tis speeches* and created the term *potential tis Reden* to refer to the speeches that had not been spoken yet. He pointed out that these two categories were distinct in their formal build-up and stressed that the *potential* ones were used within the social framework of the Greek hero, who wanted to be highly esteemed in public opinion.¹⁰³ These speeches reflect the psychology of the speaker who inserted them in his speech, while the *actual tis speeches* were morally neutral.¹⁰⁴ Wilson then continued to compare the Homeric use with that of later writers, especially among the tragedians.¹⁰⁵

12. De Jong 1987a.

De Jong began by listing and discussing all the instances. She showed that the two categories were indeed distinct: the *actual tis speeches* were used to give the masses a voice,¹⁰⁶ while the potential speeches were only imagined by the speaker¹⁰⁷ and were used to describe the opinion and psychology of the person in whose speeches they appeared.¹⁰⁸

13. Schneider 1995.

Schneider listed all the speech introductions and conclusions by undetermined characters,¹⁰⁹ and focussed the passages in which they occurred. He did not address the use of diathesis, tense, augment or mood. Although he started with Homer, Schneider also compared the use of these speeches in Apollonios of Rhodes and Quintus of Smyrna, and demonstrated that the use of introductions and conclusions became more extended in these later writers, and that certain introductions that were confined to well-defined subjects in Homer could be expanded to unspecified characters.¹¹⁰ He rejected the arguments by Wilson and De Jong, and argued that the context of the *actual* and *potential tis speeches* was the same, namely that both types described an action in which the public had not participated.¹¹¹ As a consequence, he approached them as one entity.

¹⁰² Wilson 1979:2.

¹⁰³ Wilson 1979:1.

¹⁰⁴ Wilson 1979:2.

¹⁰⁵ Wilson 1979:5-15.

¹⁰⁶ De Jong 1987a:82, with reference to Fingerle 1939:288.

¹⁰⁷ De Jong 1987a:76 *these speeches within speeches are no quotation by the narrator of words actually said by a character, but they are imaginary speeches, constructed by the speaking character itself.* (underlining is mine, in her text the word was italicised).

¹⁰⁸ De Jong 1987a:83.

¹⁰⁹ Schneider 1995:13-14.

¹¹⁰ Schneider 1995:150-173.

¹¹¹ Schneider 1995:1-11.

Although Hentze and Fingerle had treated them as one entity and Schneider had argued that there was no difference in the content,¹¹² Wilson and De Jong were right in distinguishing between them: the εἶπεσθε speeches provide an insight into what the bigger groups say/think, while the *potential tis speeches* actually contain the opinion and the fear of the public opinion of the speaker in whose speech these verses occur.¹¹³ A second distinction is that the actual *tis speeches* have already taken place, while the potential ones are only imagined (hence the difference in mood, cf. *infra*).

2.4. Speech introductions, conclusions and Homeric conversation.

In the following three works the content of the speeches has been discussed. Speech introductions are only rarely included. Lohmann 1970 and Larrain 1987 analysed the structure and content of the speeches (Lohmann addressed the speeches in the *Iliad* while Larrain discussed the first 8 chants of the *Odyssey*), but did not consider introductions or conclusions. Larrain mentioned previous work on introductions and *tis* speeches,¹¹⁴ but limited his investigation to the content of the speeches and let the introductions and conclusions out.

14. Beck 2005.

This is the most thorough investigation of verbs of speaking and indirect speech. Beck did not investigate verbs of speaking alone, but also speech acts. In addition, she discussed some instances of speech introduction verses that did not introduce direct speech immediately, but were first followed by some other verses, after which the introduction was repeated leading to the direct speech.¹¹⁵ The only speech introductions she discussed in more detail, were the *tis speeches*,¹¹⁶ in which she agreed with De Jong's analysis (but did not mention Hentze, Fingerle, Wilson or Schneider).¹¹⁷ She briefly discussed the speech conclusions that were followed by a "negative introduction": "X spoke, but Y did not speak back", which occurred mostly in heated exchanges.¹¹⁸

2.5. Speech introductions, conclusions and verbal suppletion.

The following works did not address speech introductions as such, but discussed the suppletive nature of the *verba dicendi*.

¹¹² Fingerle 1939:289-293, Schneider 1995:8-11.

¹¹³ Wilson 1979:1-3, De Jong 1987a:82-83; Beck 2005:47-56; Kelly 2007:183-184.

¹¹⁴ Larrain 1987:28-30.

¹¹⁵ Beck 2005:118-123.

¹¹⁶ Beck 2005:47-56.

¹¹⁷ She (Beck 2005:52) used the term *hypothetical* instead of *potential*.

¹¹⁸ Beck 2005:110-112

15. Osthoff 1899.

Osthoff discussed suppletion in both nominal and verbal morphology. He only addressed the verbs of speaking very briefly, and only stated that the root **uek*¹¹⁹ was suppletive in both Greek as Indo-Iranian, but did not analyse any passages.¹¹⁹

16. Fournier 1946 and b.

Fournier 1946a analysed all verbs of speaking in Greek literature starting from Homer until the Classical period. He did not distinguish between speech introductions and other contexts, but paid more attention to the suppletive schemata between the different verbs and the tense usage of the verbs of speaking. The different meanings of the *verba dicendi* were analysed: an example is the use of φημί in the meaning “say” and in the meaning “think”. Fournier divided his work in chapters that corresponded to different verbs, mentioned the forms attested and briefly mentioned the etymology. An important finding was that φημί did not belong to the suppletive schema of ἔειπον and ἐρέω.¹²⁰ The value of this work lies in the fact that it is one of the few treatments of the *verba dicendi* and it provided an overview of the evolution from Homer into later Greek. Fournier 1946b limited himself to the speech introductions: he analysed the case usage,¹²¹ word order,¹²² double introductions,¹²³ and tense usage.¹²⁴

17. Kölligan 2007.

Contrary to previous works (cf. supra), Kölligan addressed all the suppletive verbal roots and discussed the evolution in meaning and usage in Greek from Homer until the Hellenistic age. He distinguished between strong and weak suppletion, and defective verbs.¹²⁵ The *Verbalverzeichnis* in Kühner-Blass and Veitch 1879 commented on the different verbal forms attested, but did not treat suppletion in detail. Kölligan presented the different forms, their meaning, uses and etymology. One chapter was devoted to the verbs of speaking.¹²⁶ The work provided an overview of most speech verbs in Homer and described their use. As his work did not focus on Homer nor on speech introductions in particular, he did not distinguish between verbs used in introductions and conclusions, but the work is very useful because it shows which verbs survived, which meanings changed and which verbs are used in what tense.

¹¹⁹ Osthoff 1899:11-12.

¹²⁰ Fournier 1946:1-47.

¹²¹ Fournier 1946b:31,49.

¹²² Fournier 1946b:37.

¹²³ Fournier 1946b:35, 41.

¹²⁴ Fournier 1946b:60-65.

¹²⁵ Kölligan 2007:46-345 for strong suppletion, 346-405 for weak suppletion and 405-531 for defective verbs.

¹²⁶ Kölligan 2007:218-246.

2.6. Conclusions on previous work on speech introductions.

As can be noted from the overview, a detailed investigation of tense usage, augmentation, word order and case uses is still lacking. The only aspect that has received attention are the metrical constraints, but I think that too much weight has been attributed to the metre. Parryism and oral poetry in general have become indispensable for any Homeric analysis, including speech introductions and conclusions, but its basic tenet that the metre is the most important motivating factor (let alone the sole factor) is in my opinion problematic, because it reduces the Homeric poems to a mechanical “copy paste” of formulae and cannot account for certain syntactic differences (e.g. in tense or case usage) which were not motivated by the metre.¹²⁷ If all verbs of speaking only communicated the idea of “speak” and the sole motivating factor of speech introductions were to state an idea “X spoke” without any additional meaning, it would be difficult to explain why “Odysseus answered X” could be expressed by more than one verse,¹²⁸ nor why equivalent formulae such as καὶ φάτο μῦθον, φώνησέν τε, εἶπέ τε μῦθον and καὶ προσέειπε coexisted (cf. *infra*). On the other hand, it cannot be denied that certain formulae which initially might have had an emotional value, were expanded and eventually lost their meaning, as was the case with the formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα. This does not mean, however, that this applies to all speech introduction formulae. Parry has nevertheless convincingly shown that formulae could be inflected and expanded from one context to another. This is important in morphology and phonology, and -as I will show- also in syntax: especially in the case of word order and augment use, certain formulae could be expanded from “grammatically correct” contexts into others. This is in my opinion an indication that the poet(s) actively composed the poems, used, reused and updated the orally transmitted formulae.¹²⁹

¹²⁷ For a more moderate analysis that combines poetic artistry and formulaicity, see Bowra 1972:1-32. He argued that the Homeric poems were formulaic, but that the poet chose them because of their worth and meaning.

¹²⁸ As was correctly observed by Machacek 1994:326-327.

¹²⁹ This was stated simultaneously and independently by Lohmann 1970:283-288 and Edwards 1970:1.

Chapter 3: The *verba dicendi sensu stricto*.

3.0. Preliminary remarks.

In this chapter I treat the speech introductions and conclusions that are constructed with the verbs of speaking. They distinguish themselves from the verb “answer” by the fact that the finite verb forms can be used to introduce and conclude speeches, and that the participle is used to conclude speeches.

3.1. The verb αὐδάω.

3.1.1. Etymology and meaning of αὐδάω.

The verb αὐδάω is a denominative verb of αὐδή “voice”.¹³⁰ Indo-European cognates include Sanskrit *vadati* and a *seṭ* root *vadita*,¹³¹ and therefore a reconstruction **h₂uedH* can be maintained.¹³² The link with the Greek verb ὑδέω (found in Apollonios of Rhodes) cannot be substantiated, because of the initial ὑ. Greek αἰίδω “sing” is not related and belongs to a separate **h₂ueid*.¹³³ An etymological connection with Tocharian AB *wätk* “order, command” (from **h₂uedH* –*ske/o* “say repeatedly, say intensely”) is possible, because the meaning “order, command” accords with the iterative and intensive meaning of the suffix.¹³⁴ The Hittite *watarnahh* “order, command” can be added here as well,¹³⁵ but Hittite *uttar*, which is sometimes added in the etymological equation,¹³⁶ is better explained as **h₁eut₁/h₁utn*.¹³⁷

3.1.2. Verbal inflection of αὐδάω and compounds in speech introductions and conclusions.

The verbs αὐδάω, μεταυδάω and προσαυδάω occur in speech introduction formulae.

Verb	Used in speech introductions.	Used in speech conclusions.
αὐδάω	87 instances.	No examples.
μεταυδάω	25 instances.	No examples.
προσαυδάω	179 instances.	3 instances.

¹³⁰ Tucker 1990:234.

¹³¹ Frisk 1960:184, Chantraine 1968-1974:137-138, Mayrhofer 1996:496 (*sub voce VAD*ⁱ), Kümmel 2001a:286 (=LIV²), and also Beekes 2010. The link between the Greek and Sanskrit words had been suggested already in Seiler-Capelle 1889:13 and 100.

¹³² Rix 1976:69, adopted in Peters 1980:66, Mayrhofer 1996:496, Kümmel 2001a:286 (=LIV²).

¹³³ Vine 1981:142-147, Kümmel 2001a and b (LIV²); the connection was first made by Wackernagel 1888:151-152 and then by Harðarsson 1993b:163.

¹³⁴ Olav Hackstein (personal communication, September 18th 2013). Other etymological explanations are mentioned in Malzahn 2010:343 and 910 and Adams 1999:570-571, 2013:641-642. For the evolution of CH.CC into C.CC, see Hackstein 2002a.

¹³⁵ Mayrhofer 1996:496, Kümmel 2001a:286 (=LIV²).

¹³⁶ Eichner 1978:126 and 146, followed by Pinault 1994:134 and Mayrhofer 1996:496.

¹³⁷ Kümmel 2001a :286 (=LIV²).

The verb προσαυδάω also occurs 3 times in a conclusion:¹³⁸

ὥς ἄρα μιν Πριάμοιο προσήυδα φαίδιμος υἱὸς (*Iliad* 21,97).

ὥς τὼ γε κλαίοντε προσαυδήτην βασιλῆα (*Iliad* 11,136).

ὥς τὼ γε κλαίοντε προσαυδήτην φίλον υἱὸν (*Iliad* 22,90).

The most remarkable feature is that the speech conclusions with forms of αὐδάω have a person addressed, which is unusual and does not occur with φημί, ἔειπον, φωνέω or ἦ.

The forms of αὐδάω, προσαυδάω and μεταυδάω are schematised in the tables below.

Tense.	Form.	Number of attestations.
Imperfect	3 rd p. sg.: ἥυδα.	85 occurrences.
Aorist	3 rd p. sg.: αὐδήσασκεν.	2 occurrences.

προσαυδάω

Tense.	Form.	Occurrences.
Imperfect	1 st p. sg.: προσήυδων	13 instances.
	3 rd p. sg.: προσήυδα	166 instances.
	3 rd p. pl.: προσήυδων	1 instance.
	Dual 3 rd p.: προσαυδήτην	2 instances.

μεταυδάω

Tense.	Form.	Occurrences.
Imperfect	1 st p. sg.: μετηύδων	2 instances.
	3 rd p. sg.: μετηύδα	23 instances.

The verb αὐδάω belongs to the contracted άω verbs, but originally had an athematic (Aeolic) ᾱμι inflection. A morphological and metrical discussion of the imperfect forms μετηύδα and προσήυδα (both 3rd person singular), and προσήυδων (used in the 1st person singular and 3rd person plural) and μετηύδων (1st person singular) and the dual προσαυδήτην will make this clear. As can be seen in the tables above, the most common form is the 3rd person singular (ἥυδα, προσήυδα and μετηύδα). This form has the same ending as the regular contracted imperfect forms of the άω contract verbs, and the original thematic inflection *αὐδᾱμι was attracted to the άω contract verbs by a false reinterpretation of the 3rd singular form as a

¹³⁸ Differently Kölligan 2007:231, who stated that the verb was only used in introductions. Beck 2005:174 mentioned that προσήυδα was the only verbal form of προσαυδάω that was used in a conclusion and did not mention προσαυδήτην.

contracted imperfect form.¹³⁹ This evolution can be illustrated with the following verses. The oldest speech introduction verses occupied an entire verse and had the verb at the verse final position, as was the case in:

καί σφεας φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 5 times).¹⁴⁰

In this verse, the verb could not be analysed as a contracted form, because the verse final position “secured” the long vowel: it is impossible to analyse προσηύδα as an older προσηύδαε. This does not mean that this verse was younger because it had an irresolvable contraction in it,¹⁴¹ but rather points to the Aeolic original form ποταύδᾱ.¹⁴² In a later stage, the poet created speech introductions where the verb was followed by a noun-epithet formula. Examples are:

τὸν δὲ δολοφρονέουσα προσηύδα πότνια Ἥρη (*Iliad* 14,300; 14,329; 19,106),

αὐτὰρ Πηλεΐωνα προσηύδα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 22,7).

In these instances, the verb form προσηύδα is metrically equivalent to προσηύδαε. This is proved by the fact that the current verse with word end after a fourth spondaic foot violates the so-called bucolic bridge and contains an older –υυ.¹⁴³ The poet knew the contracted verb forms from his own dialect, but he was also aware that he could use non-contracted verb forms. Starting from contexts where a non-contracted form could be used, the poet reinterpreted προσηύδα as a *verbum contractum* and also created 1st singular and 3rd person plural forms in ων, such as προσηύδων and μετηύδων. The relatively recent date of the creation and reinterpretation is proved by the fact that these forms in ων are only attested in the *Odyssey*. Examples are:

καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδων (occurring 7 times),¹⁴⁴

δὴ τότ' ἐγὼν ἐτάροισι μετηύδων ἀχνύμενος κῆρ (*Odyssey* 12,153; 12,270).

This evolution is a strong indication that the poets constantly reused and expanded even the oldest speech introductions, and illustrates that older and younger elements do not only coexist in one verse, but sometimes even within the same word.¹⁴⁵

This evolution is not without parallels, as a similar event occurred with the root aorist ἀπηύρα: this form was no longer recognised as a root aorist, but was interpreted as an

¹³⁹ Bechtel 1908:186-187. Bechtel's observation was followed by Chantraine 1948:306, Wathelet 1970:298-299 and Risch 1975:320.

¹⁴⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 4,284; 4,337; 10,191 and *Odyssey* 4,77 and 10,430.

¹⁴¹ Chantraine 1948:77-78; Shipp 1972:158; Horrocks 1987:288.

¹⁴² Usener 1887:24-27; West 1987:22.

¹⁴³ Olav Hackstein, personal communication February 25th 2014.

¹⁴⁴ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,550; 10,482; 10,500; 11,56; 11,209; 11,396 and 12,296.

¹⁴⁵ See especially Forssman 1991.

imperfect of the $\acute{\alpha}\omega$ contracted verbs, and consequently a form $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ arose.¹⁴⁶ Wackernagel's suggestion that the 1st person singular $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ was an old aorist $*\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\bar{\alpha}\nu$ that was Ionicised while the 3rd person plural was Ionic from the start seems less likely:¹⁴⁷ it is better to assume with Chantraine that both forms were later Ionic creation based on a false interpretation of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\bar{\alpha}$.¹⁴⁸ The verb $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\bar{\alpha}$ is used 19 times, and appears 18 times in verse final position:¹⁴⁹

Ἑκτορ', ἀτὰρ Τεῦκρον Τελαμώνιον εὖχος ἀπηύρα (*Iliad* 15,462),
τεύχεα Σαρπήδοντος, ἃ μιν Πάτροκλος ἀπηύρα (*Iliad* 23,800).

The only instance where $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\bar{\alpha}$ is used in verse internal position, is:

ἦ σε βίη ἀέκοντος ἀπηύρα νῆα μέλαιναν (*Odyssey* 4,464).

In this specific instance, the form is metrically equivalent to $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\epsilon$ and was reinterpreted as a contracted imperfect form of a verb $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega$, and a 1st person singular form $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ was created:¹⁵⁰

δώσω οἱ θώρηκα, τὸν Ἀστεροπαῖον ἀπηύρων (*Iliad* 23,560).

Contrary to $\pi\rho\sigma\eta\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ and $\mu\epsilon\tau\eta\acute{\upsilon}\delta\omega\upsilon\upsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ was already attested in the *Iliad* and appeared there more than in the *Odyssey*. These passages are considered to be young,¹⁵¹ but as younger and older elements coexist in the same verse, it is better to interpret this (and older so-called “younger” elements) as an indication for the fact that the Homeric language was an artificial language with influences of the poets' (plural!) contemporary speech, rather than dissecting it into younger and older passages.¹⁵²

Another form of Aeolic origin is the dual form $\pi\rho\sigma\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\eta}\tau\eta\nu$. The use of the form is already very special, as it is used with an accusative of the addressed person in a speech conclusion (cf. supra). Wackernagel assumed that this was indeed an Aeolic form but suspected that the change of the ending $\tau\bar{\alpha}\nu$ into $\tau\eta\nu$ happened during the stage of the Attification of the poems.¹⁵³ This assumption is not necessary: if the dual had disappeared in

¹⁴⁶ Wackernagel 1914:99-100 (=KS II:1156-1157); Meister 1921:101; Schwyzer 1939:740; Chantraine 1948:356; Strunk 1957:118 and 124; Durante 1969:86; Matthiesen 1969:1020-1021; Hoekstra 1981:16; Coray 2009:52.

¹⁴⁷ Wackernagel 1914:99-100 (=1969:1156-1157).

¹⁴⁸ Chantraine 1948:356, Strunk 1958.

¹⁴⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 6,17; 9,273; 10,495; 11,115; 11,334; 15,462; 16,828; 17,125; 17,236; 20,290; 21,179; 21,201; 23,291; 23,800; 24,50 and *Odyssey* 3,192; 4,464; 11,203 and 18,273.

¹⁵⁰ This form appears 5 times: *Iliad* 9,131; 19,89; 23,560; 23,808 and *Odyssey* 13,132.

¹⁵¹ Meister 1921:101.

¹⁵² Oral communication by Professors Olav Hackstein and Martin Hose.

¹⁵³ Wackernagel 1916b:214.

Ionic,¹⁵⁴ already the Ionic bards might have given this form a more Ionic look. If the form is interpreted as an athematic form (which is more likely given the fact that the verbs that had a contracted inflection in Ionic-Attic, were conjugated athematically in Aeolic), the Aeolic version would have been *προσαυδάτᾱν*. Chantraine explained the form as an Ionification of a form the bards did not understand anymore: they noticed the form *προσαυδάτᾱν*, but did no longer know what tense or person it represented, as they had already lost the dual, and therefore decided to give it a more Ionic veneer by changing the *ᾱ* into *η*.¹⁵⁵ Hock, however, argued that at the time of the poems Ionic still knew the dual, albeit as a rare and poetic trait, and suggested that the forms in *ἦτην* of the contracted verbs in *ᾰω* were neither genuine Aeolic nor Ionified Aeolicisms, but the result of a specific Ionic(-Attic) sound law: the normal result of a contraction *a+e* was *ᾱ* in Ionic, unless the following syllable contained an *η*, in which case the contraction result was *η*. He assumed that this sound law was leveled out in Attic, or never occurred there in the first place.¹⁵⁶ Recently, however, it has been argued that the dual verbal forms in Homer originated during the Ionic phase of the epic diction.¹⁵⁷ There are problems with this assumption. First, there is the form *ἄπειλήτην*, which preserved the Aeolic long vowel *η* of the athematic conjugation of the contracted verbs (the *η* is not the result of the *urgriechische* contraction of *ε+ε*, as Wackernagel initially assumed¹⁵⁸). In addition, there is also the form *προσαυδήτην*, which is problematic if one assumes that Ionic still had the dual at the time of the composition of (Ionic phase of) the poems. The contraction result of *α+ε* is *ᾱ* in Ionic,¹⁵⁹ and not *η*, as is transmitted in these forms. If Ionic had known the dual at the time of the creation of the epics, the form would have been *προσαυδάτην*. The Aeolic forms would have been **ἄπειλήτᾱν* and **ποταυδάτᾱν*, which looked too exotic for the Ionic bards, so that they gave them a more Ionic veneer by replacing the long *ᾱ* by *η*.¹⁶⁰ In favour of the Aeolic interpretation of both *προσηύδα* and *προσαυδήτην*, speaks the fact that the vowel before *προσ-* always needs to be read with a short one (the so-called *correptio*

¹⁵⁴ The dual was on the decline in almost all Indo-European languages. In Greek it died out in Attic in 360^a in the verbal morphology and in 320^a in the nominal morphology (Meisterhans 1885:93-95; Kühner-Gerth 1898:20; Hackstein 1993:49). Brugmann 1900:371 stated that Attic was the dialect where the dual survived the longest. The most detailed treatments of the Attic dual is Cuny 1906:78-87. See also Chantraine 1953:22 and Hackstein 1993:48-49. In other dialects this happened earlier. Some languages such as Gothic preserved it, while others lost it but preserved endings in the plural system (such as Slavic). Recent discussions of the dual are Euler 2010 and Fritz 2011.

¹⁵⁵ Chantraine 1948: 306. This idea was followed by Ruijgh 1979:76.

¹⁵⁶ Hock 1971:38-42.

¹⁵⁷ Tichy 1990:185, Fritz 2011:45 with reference to Tichy. Viti 2011 argued that the dual was not used randomly in Homer, but did not make any statements on the origins. The Homeric situation was not discussed in Euler 2010. The most recent study is Melazzo 2012.

¹⁵⁸ Wackernagel 1885:85.

¹⁵⁹ Kühner-Blass 1890:206; Smyth 1894:526.

¹⁶⁰ For a similar explanation see Nussbaum 2002:181, which was repeated in Tate 2013:293.

attica), as in κασίγνητον δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 15,466), ἡδὲ προσηύδα (*Odyssey* 24,320) and in the famous formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα. This scansion can be explained, if one reconstructs the Aeolic form of the preverb, namely ποτι,¹⁶¹ with the *i* being elided before the initial vowel of -ηύδα. This correction is a metrical device that occurs often in post-caesural position,¹⁶² but there are some arguments to consider this specific form to be a genuine Aeolism. The Aeolic hypothesis receives more weight by the fact that the digamma is observed in the formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (except when the formula is preceded by the participle φωνήσας'). Janko showed that the *correptio* occurred very often before πρὸς, but much less before πρό, and therefore concluded that an older ποτί had to be reconstructed in these instances.¹⁶³ The verbal forms προσέειπε and προσέφη can only be reconstructed as *poté(w)eipe and *potéphā, when they are preceded by a long vowel or a word ending in a consonant. An additional argument in support of the Aeolic origin of this formula, is the verse Ἴριον δὲ προτέρην ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 15,157), where the real proto-Greek cluster *pro-* of προτέρην is counted as two consonants, but the Ionified *pr* of προσηύδα is not. Hackstein's explanation of a post-caesural correction cannot be ruled out and a metrically motivated absence of *muta cum liquida* lengthening is visible in words such as Ἀφροδίτη.¹⁶⁴ It is worth noting that the preposition ποτί occurs in Homer with the roots *b^heh₂ and *uek^w, but never with *h₂ud-. It is, however, remarkable that in many instances προσέειπε and προσέφη do not allow for a reconstruction as *poti*: as these forms have two short vowels, it is imperative that the vowel preceding the verb is long, and if the word before προσέειπε or προσέφη ends in a short vowel, both *p* and *r* are needed to provide for a long vowel. In the formula πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε the cluster *pr* is never preceded by a vowel that counts as short in the metre. In the formula ἦκα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον (*Iliad* 3,155) and in the formula πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον (occurring 24 times) *pr* does not make position. Nevertheless, the Aeolic origin is more likely: the original verb was the compound *ποταύδāμι. It originally had an athematic inflection, and became a thematic ᾠω-verb under influence of the third person singular. The fact that *pr* in προσαυδάω never built position, is due to the fact that the verb προσαυδάω was not felt as part of the normal Ionic language and

¹⁶¹ Meillet 1918:304-314; the origin of πρὸς as *p(r)otj from *proti* was made by Schmidt and discussed in Jacobsohn 1934. See Günther 1906/7:141-147 for a discussion of the forms in the inscriptions of the Greek dialects. See also Chantraine 1968-1974:941. The prepositions *poti and *proti are probably not related (Chantraine 1968-1974:932 and 941).

¹⁶² Hackstein 2011a:28-29, personal communication on September 18th 2013.

¹⁶³ Janko 1979; he pointed to the non-assibilated form of ποτί, and concluded from that the form was created during the Aeolic phase of the Greek epos, as this form could not belong to the Achaeian stratum, because Mycenaean underwent assibilation (he reiterated this in 1981:90).

¹⁶⁴ Hackstein 2011a:29 discussed this specific example.

therefore never was extended in formulae, while the roots $*b^h eh_2$ and $*mek^w$ were so common that they were used in contemporary formulae as well, and used the prefix $\pi\rho\sigma\text{-}$ with position-building anlaut.

3.1.3. The forms of $\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\omega$ and its compounds.

I give a brief overview of the forms and tenses used. A detailed analysis on the use of the tenses and augment is provided for in the respective chapters (chapters 5 and 6).

Verb.	Augmented forms.	Unaugmented forms.
$\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\omega$	$\eta\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}$ (85 instances). ¹⁶⁵	$\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon\nu$ (1 instance), ¹⁶⁶ $\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\sigma\chi'$ (1 instance). ¹⁶⁷
$\pi\rho\sigma\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\omega$	$\pi\rho\sigma\eta\delta\acute{\alpha}$ (166 times), ¹⁶⁸ $\pi\rho\sigma\eta\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$ (14 instances). ¹⁶⁹	2 instances: $\pi\rho\sigma\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\eta}\tau\eta\nu$ (2 instances). ¹⁷⁰
$\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\omega$	$\mu\epsilon\tau\eta\delta\acute{\alpha}$ (23 instances), ¹⁷¹ $\mu\epsilon\tau\eta\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$ (2 instances). ¹⁷²	None.

3.1.4. The simplex $\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\omega$.

3.1.4.1. Metrical position of $\alpha\upsilon\delta\acute{\alpha}\omega$ within the verse.

¹⁶⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 1,92; 3,203; 4,265; 5,170; 5,217; 5,647; 6,54; 8,200; 10,377; 10,461; 11,379; 11,822; 12,163; 13,221; 13,254; 13,259; 13,266; 13,274; 13,311; 13,619; 14,500; 16,619; 17,119; 17,537; 20,424; 21,183; 23,482; 23,586; 24,307; 24,333 and *Odyssey* 1,213; 1,230; 1,306; 1,345; 1,388; 1,399; 1,412; 2,129; 2,177; 2,208; 2,242; 2,309; 2,371; 3,21; 3,75; 3,201; 3,225; 3,239; 4,155; 4,290; 4,315; 4,593; 4,468; 5,28; 6,186; 15,48; 15,86; 15,154; 15,179; 15,265; 15,279; 15,512; 15,535; 15,544; 16,30; 16,68; 16,112; 16,146; 16,240; 16,262; 16,434; 17,45; 17,77; 17,107; 17,392; 17,598; 18,226; 19,26; 20,338; 21,320; 21,343; 22,153; 23,123; 24,375; 24,510.

¹⁶⁶ The instance is *Iliad* 17,420.

¹⁶⁷ The instances is *Iliad* 5,786.

¹⁶⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 1,201; 1,539; 2,7; 4,24; 4,69; 4,92; 4,192; 4,203; 4,256; 4,284; 4,312; 4,337; 4,369; 5,30; 5,123; 5,242; 5,454; 5,713; 5,871; 6,144; 6,163; 6,214; 7,225; 7,356; 8,101; 8,351; 8,461; 10,163; 10,191; 11,815; 12,353; 12,365; 13,94; 13,462; 13,480; 13,750; 14,2; 14,138; 14,197; 14,270; 14,300; 14,329; 14,356; 15,35; 15,48; 15,89; 15,114; 15,145; 15,157; 15,398; 15,436; 15,466; 16,6; 16,537; 16,706; 16,829; 16,858; 17,33; 17,74; 17,219; 17,431; 17,468; 17,500; 17,553; 17,621; 17,707; 18,72; 18,169; 19,20; 19,106; 19,120; 19,341; 20,331; 20,448; 21,73; 21,97; 21,368; 21,409; 21,419; 22,7; 22,37; 22,81; 22,215; 22,228; 22,364; 23,557; 23,601; 23,625; 24,169; 24,517 and *Odyssey* 1,122; 1,252; 2,269; 2,362; 3,41; 4,25; 4,77; 4,550; 4,680; 5,117; 5,172; 7,236; 8,346; 8,407; 8,442; 8,460; 10,265; 10,324; 10,377; 10,400; 10,418; 10,430; 10,455; 10,482; 10,500; 11,56; 11,99; 11,154; 11,209; 11,396; 11,472; 11,616; 12,36; 12,296; 13,58; 13,227; 13,253; 13,290; 14,114; 15,62; 15,150; 15,208; 15,259; 16,7; 16,22; 16,180; 17,40; 17,396; 17,459; 17,507; 17,543; 17,552; 17,575; 17,591; 18,9; 18,104; 18,258; 18,388; 19,3; 20,165; 20,177; 20,198; 21,192; 22,100; 22,150; 22,286; 22,311; 22,343; 22,366; 22,410; 22,436; 23,34; 23,112; 23,208; 24,320; 24,372; 24,399; 24,472; 24,494.

¹⁶⁹ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,550; 9,345; 9,363; 9,474; 9,492; 10,418; 10,482; 10,500; 11,56; 11,209; 11,396; 11,552; 12,296; 14,484.

¹⁷⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 11,136 and 22,90.

¹⁷¹ The instances are *Iliad* 2,109; 8,496; 9,16; 15,103; 18,139; 19,269; 24,32; 24,715 and *Odyssey* 1,31; 4,721; 6,217; 6,238; 8,96; 8,386; 8,535; 12,20; 12,376; 13,36; 20,291; 21,67.

¹⁷² The instances are *Odyssey* 12,153 and 12,270.

The verb is usually placed at the end of the verse. This is the case in 85 of the 87 instances of the simplex. The end of the verse is mostly made up of either ἔπος ἡῦδα or ἀντίον ἡῦδα. Examples are:

Rest of the verse.	Speech construction.	Passage.
χειρῶν δ' ἀψάσθην· ὃ δὲ δακρύσας	ἔπος ἡῦδα	<i>Iliad</i> 10,377
τὸν δ' αὖ Νεστορίδης Πεισίστρατος	ἀντίον ἡῦδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,48

The two exceptions are:

καὶ τότε δὴ θάρσησε καὶ ἡῦδα μάντις ἀμύμων (*Iliad* 1,92).

In this instance the poet put a noun-epithet formula after the verb, which is a common trait in speech introductions, even with verbal forms that could metrically be put at the end of the verse (this is especially clear in the case of προσέειπον).

ὃς τόσον αὐδῆσασχ' ὅσον ἄλλοι πεντήκοντα (*Iliad* 5,786).

In this verse, the verb is positioned at the end of the sentence.

In most cases, the speech introduction with the simplex occupies the entire verse and has the following structure: accusative of person addressed, mostly a pronoun – particle(s) – subject – adverb – verb.¹⁷³ Examples are:

Object.	Particle(s).	Subject.	Adverb.	Verb.	Passage.
τὴν	δ' αὖτ'	Ἀντήνωρ πεπνυμένος	ἀντίον	ἡῦδα	<i>Iliad</i> 3,203
τὸν	δ' αὖτ'	Ἰδομενεὺς Κρητῶν ἀγὼς	ἀντίον	ἡῦδα	<i>Iliad</i> 13,221
τὸν	δ'	Εὐηνορίδης Λειώκριτος	ἀντίον	ἡῦδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,242
τὴν,	δ' αὖτ'	Εὐρύμαχος, Πολύβου παῖς	ἀντίον	ἡῦδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,434; 21,320
τὸν	δ' αὖ	Λαέρτης πεπνυμένος	ἀντίον	ἡῦδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,375

In the other instances, the speech introduction only occupies part of the verse (this only occurs in the *Iliad*):

στῆ δὲ πρόσθ' αὐτοῖο ἔπος τέ μιν ἀντίον ἡῦδα (*Iliad* 5,170),

ὕψος' ἀνέσχεθε χειρὶ καὶ εὐχόμενος ἔπος ἡῦδα (*Iliad* 10,461).

3.1.4.2. The syntactic constructions of αὐδάω.¹⁷⁴

The following constructions are attested.

1. It appears without any object:

¹⁷³ For the particles in this speech introductions, see Klein 1988:267-269.

¹⁷⁴ The most extensive treatments listing the constructions of both simplex and compounds are La Roche 1861: 204-205, Fingerle 1939:309-345 and Nordheider 1978a. Other (more brief) treatments are Fournier 1946a:229 and Kölligan 2007:231.

καὶ τότε δὴ θάρσησε καὶ ἤῤα μάντις ἀμύμων (*Iliad* 1,92),
 ὃς τόσον αὐδῆσασχ' ὅσον ἄλλοι πεντήκοντα (*Iliad* 5,786),
 ὧς δέ τις αὖ Τρώων μεγαθύμων αὐδῆσασκεν (*Iliad* 17, 420).

2. The verb is constructed with the accusative of the words spoken. Sometimes, a participle appears before the verb, describing the state of mind or the intentions of the character speaking the words. Examples are (participle is underlined):

ἀντίος ἦλθε θεῶν, καὶ ὁμοκλήσας ἔπος ἤῤα (*Iliad* 6,54),
 χειρῶν δ' ἀψάσθην· ὃ δὲ δακρύσας ἔπος ἤῤα (*Iliad* 10,377),
 ὡς εἶδ', ὧς ἀνεπᾶλτο, καὶ εὐχόμενος ἔπος ἤῤα (*Iliad* 20,424- καὶ εὐχόμενος ἔπος ἤῤα occurs 7 times),¹⁷⁵
 οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδὼν, καὶ φωνήσας ἔπος ἤῤα (*Iliad* 24,307),
 τὴν δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἤῤα (πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἤῤα occurs 48 times,¹⁷⁶ and is predominantly but not exclusively used to describe Telemakhos).¹⁷⁷

3. In most cases, the simplex is used in the formula ἀντίον ἤῤα, which stands at the end of the verse. In this formula, the verb ἤῤα has a direct object, namely the person addressed:

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνείας Τρώων ἀγὼς ἀντίον ἤῤα (*Iliad* 5,217),
 καὶ ῥα Ποσειδάωνα μέγαν θεὸν ἀντίον ἤῤα (*Iliad* 8,200),
 τὸν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρύμαχος Πολύβου πάϊς ἀντίον ἤῤα (*Odyssey* 1,399; 2,177),
 ἦ ῥα καὶ Ἑρμεῖαν υἱὸν φίλον ἀντίον ἤῤα (*Odyssey* 5,28).

4. The verb αὐδάω is also constructed with a double accusative, namely both the words spoken and the person addressed. This construction also occurs with the compound προσαυδάω, and with πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε. The example is (the accusatives are put in bold face):

στῆ δὲ πρόσθ' αὐτοῖο **ἔπος** τέ **μιν** ἀντίον ἤῤα (*Iliad* 5,170).

This is the only instance where the simplex is constructed with an accusative of the person and one of the words spoken.¹⁷⁸ This verse has the typical combination of **steh*₂ and a *verbum dicendi* (cf. supra).¹⁷⁹ ἀντίον means “directed at” and can be either an adjective or adverb. It cannot be a preposition, as ἀντί takes the genitive (and its compound ἐναντίον takes the genitive or the dative, but never the accusative). In *Iliad* 5,170 ἀντίον is best considered an adjective in the meaning “he spoke a word, directed at”. I believe that this formula is the

¹⁷⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 10,461; 11,397; 13,619; 14,500; 17,537; 20,424 and 21,183.

¹⁷⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 23,586 and *Odyssey* 1,213; 1,230; 1,306; 1,345; 1,388; 1,412; 2,129; 2,208; 2,309; 2,371; 3,21; 3,75; 3,201; 3,225; 3,239; 4,290; 4,315; 4,593; 15,86; 15,154; 15,179; 15,265; 15,279; 15,512; 15,535; 16,30; 16,68; 16,112; 16,146; 16,240; 16,262; 17,45; 17,77; 17,107; 17,392; 17,598; 18,226; 19,26; 20,338; 21,343; 22,153; 23,123; 24,375 and 24,510.

¹⁷⁷ La Roche 1861:205; Fingerle 1939:343; Beck 2005:64.

¹⁷⁸ Ameis – Hentze 1882:54; Leaf 1902:206; Kirk 1990:76.

¹⁷⁹ Bertrand 2006a; for more examples, see Appendix A.7.

starting point for the creation of a formula ἀντίον ηὔδα, in which ἀντίον was used as an adverbial accusative. This formula had the advantage that it could be put after the bucolic caesura. The use of a single **k^we* to connect two sentences (cf. *infra*), the combination of the root **steh₂* and a *verbum dicendi*, the word order and the old construction of a double accusative are archaisms that point in that direction. The double accusative is rare with simplex verbs of “speaking to someone”.¹⁸⁰ In Indo-European with verbs of speaking, asking, giving and taking away could be constructed with the double accusative,¹⁸¹ but already within Indo-European there was a tendency to replace the double accusative constructions with a construction of accusative – dative or accusative – genitive ablative.¹⁸² These constructions were not synonymous, however. In the construction with the double accusative both accusatives were equivalent, whereas in the construction with accusative and dative or accusative and genitive/ablative, the accusative was more important than the other case.¹⁸³ This applies to the example quoted above as well: the addressee is at least as important as the word spoken and therefore the construction of the double accusative is used.

5. The simplex αὐδάω is never constructed with the dative of the person addressed, nor with the dative of the words spoken. This is remarkable, as the Vedic *vadati* can be constructed with the accusative of the words spoken and the dative of the person addressed.¹⁸⁴ The root **uek^w* (εἰπ-) occurs in the simplex with a dative of the person addressed, as in ὥς τότε Τυδείδης ἀνεχάζετο, εἶπέ τε λαῶ (Iliad 5,600), or in εἰ μὴ ἄρ' Αἰνεία τε καὶ Ἑκτορι εἶπε παραστὰς (Iliad 6,75).

3.1.4.3. Word order in the formulae with αὐδάω.

The word order is always OV,¹⁸⁵ except in the three instances where the verb has no object.

There are many examples:

Object.	Rest of the verse.	Verbal construction.	Passage.
τὸν	δ' αὖτ' Ἴδομενεὺς Κρητῶν ἀγὸς	ἀντίον ηὔδα	Iliad 13,221

¹⁸⁰ Delbrück 1893:382 and Hettrich 1994:130, footnote 28 pointed out that most examples occurred with verbs compounded with *pros* in which the accusative of the person depended on the preverb (cf. *infra*).

¹⁸¹ The double accusative was treated in Gaedicke 1880:249-252, Delbrück 1893:380-387 (especially 382 deals with the verbs of speaking), Brugmann 1904:442-443, De Boel 1988a, Jacquino 1989, Hettrich 1994 and Hock 2012.

¹⁸² Hettrich 1994.

¹⁸³ Hettrich 1994:131.

¹⁸⁴ Grassmann 1877:1199.

¹⁸⁵ This dissertation follows the treatments of Watkins 1976, Houben 1977 and Comrie 1998 (and many others after them, such as Fortson 2010:157; Keydana 2008:§3.1; Hackstein 2010b; Hock 2013) that the basic word order for PIE was OV. Watkins and Comrie pointed out that the analysis of Indo-European word order should be based on the comparison of those formulae and forms, which are attested in the different languages and which can safely be assumed to be archaic. One of the first to argue for OV word order was Delbrück 1888:149-150.

τὸν	δὲ χολωσάμενος Κρητῶν ἀγὸς	ἀντίον ἤῤα	<i>Iliad</i> 23,482
τὸν	δ' Εὐηνορίδης Λειώκριτος	ἀντίον ἤῤα	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,242
τὴν	δ' αὖ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος	ἀντίον ἤῤα	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,371

The appositions usually follow the nouns they determine:

	Noun.	Apposition.	Verbal construction.	Passage.
τὸν δ' αὖ	Σαρπηδῶν	Λυκίων ἀγὸς	ἀντίον ἤῤα	<i>Iliad</i> 5,647
καὶ ῥα	Ποσειδάωνα	μέγαν θεὸν	ἀντίον ἤῤα	<i>Iliad</i> 8,200
τὸν δ' αὖτ'	Εὐρύμαχος	Πολύβου πάϊς	ἀντίον ἤῤα	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,177
ἦ ῥα καὶ	Ἑρμείαν,	υἱὸν φίλον,	ἀντίον ἤῤα	<i>Odyssey</i> 5,28

In two instances, the apposition precedes the noun it determines:

	Apposition.	Noun.	Verbal construction.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	Εὐηνορίδης	Λειώκριτος	ἀντίον ἤῤα	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,242
τὸν δ' αὖ	Νεστορίδης	Πεισίστρατος	ἀντίον ἤῤα	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,155

στῇ δὲ πρόσθ' αὐτοῖο ἔπος τέ μιν ἀντίον ἤῤα (*Iliad* 5,170).

This verse illustrates the placement of clitics: as it expected by Wackernagel's Law,¹⁸⁶ the clitics are put in the 2nd position of the sentence, after the 1st accented word (ἔπος). Within the chain of clitics, there is a hierarchy as well: connecting particles precede other particles, which in turn precede pronouns, which again precede the enclitic verb forms.¹⁸⁷

3.1.4.4. Connection between αὐδάω and the rest of the verse.

In 71 of the 87 instances, a speech introduction with αὐδάω occupied the entire verse (by this I mean that the verb of the introduction is the only finite verb form in the verse). In several instances, however, the formula with αὐδάω only occupies part of the verse. In those instances where it does not extend over the entire verse, the formula is connected to the rest of the verse by connective particles, such as καὶ, δέ, τε, ἥδέ or contrastive particles such as δέ, ἀλλά. In the case of δέ it is often difficult to decide what the exact function is, as it is one of

¹⁸⁶ It should be added that Wackernagel's Law can operate at sentence or at word group level: if an enclitic determines a specific word, it appears immediately after that word and not after the 1st word of the sentence. See especially Hale 1987, Ruijgh 1990 and Wills 1993. I would like to thank Ivo Hajnal (Innsbruck) for pointing this out to me (oral communication during the 21st LIPP Symposium in Munich on July 3rd 2014).

Wackernagel's Law also operates in non-Indo-European languages, see e.g. Mushin 2006.

¹⁸⁷ This had been noticed already by Monro 1891:335-338, before Wackernagel posited his famous Law. For the clitic chain see Wackernagel 1892:336; Delbrück 1900:51-53 (with reference to Monro); Brugmann 1904:682-683; Krisch 1990:73-74; Ruijgh 1990; Wills 1993; Watkins 1998:70.

the most common particles: often it only means “and”,¹⁸⁸ can be superfluous,¹⁸⁹ or is used as a metrical lengthening device.¹⁹⁰ Klein distinguished between a contrastive use and a mere connecting use. In the latter case it could be used as a lengthening device, as was the case in:

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἴδομενεὺς Κρητῶν ἀγὸς ἀντίον ἦῤδα (occurring 5 times).¹⁹¹

In many instances, however, the use of δέ is not superfluous at all, and indicates indeed a contrast between the first half of the verse and the speech introduction.¹⁹² This is the case in instances such as:

χειρῶν δ' ἀψάσθην: ὃ δὲ δακρύσας ἔπος ἦῤδα (*Iliad* 10,377).

The following verse needs to be discussed as well:

στῆ δὲ πρόσθ' αὐτοῖο ἔπος τέ μιν ἀντίον ἦῤδα (*Iliad* 5,170).

The use of a simple **k^we* to connect two different sentences continues an old usage.¹⁹³ In general, τε is used to connect two sentences with the same subject.¹⁹⁴

3.1.5. The compound προσανδάω.

3.1.5.1. Metrical observations on the formulae with the compound προσανδάω.

The verbal forms of προσανδάω very often occupy the verse final position (in 131 of the 166 instances), which is due to the formulaic nature of ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (this formula occurs 107 times), and also to the fact that almost all verbal forms of have a long penultimate syllable, which makes it possible to put the form at the end of the verse (some examples):

καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 30 times),¹⁹⁵

ἦ δὲ ψευσαμένη Προΐτον βασιλῆα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 6,163),

καί σφεας φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 5 times),¹⁹⁶

τοὺς ὃ γ' ἐποτρύνων ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring three times).¹⁹⁷

¹⁸⁸ Denniston 1954:162.

¹⁸⁹ Denniston 1954:171; Klein 1992:28-29 stated that the particle δέ was the common Homeric device to avoid an asyndeton.

¹⁹⁰ Klein 1992:30, with the observation that this would only function for the masculine pronoun.

¹⁹¹ The instances are *Iliad* 4,265; 13,221; 13,259; 13,274; 13,311.

¹⁹² Bakker 1997b:62-82; Hajnal 2003b:228-229.

¹⁹³ Kühner-Gerth 1904:241; Brugmann 1900:530; Meillet 1937:372 (albeit with some skepticism); Denniston 1959:496; Ruijgh 1971:12-13; Dunkel 1982, 2014b:689-702; Mayrhofer 1992:520-521. The most important works on this particle are Ruijgh 1971 for Greek, Watkins 1985 (=1994:300-306) for Hittite and Dunkel 1982, 2014b:689-706; Szemerényi 1985 and Migron 1990 for PIE. I cannot address the issue whether this particle was the same as the subordinating one (this had been suggested already by Wackernagel 1940). For a more detailed discussion I refer the reader to Eichner 1971 and Dunkel 1982, 2014b:702-706.

¹⁹⁴ Ruijgh 1971:7

¹⁹⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 1,201; 2,7; 4,312; 4,369; 8,101; 10,163; 13,750; 14,138; 16,6; 17,74; 20,331; 21,73; 23,601; 23,625 and 24,517, and *Odyssey* 1,122; 5,172; 8,346; 8,407; 13,58; 13,227; 13,253; 14,114; 15,259; 16,180; 18,104; 20,198; 22,410; 24,372 and 24,399.

¹⁹⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 4,284; 4,337; 10,191 and *Odyssey* 4,77 and 10,430.

¹⁹⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 13,94; 13,480 and 17,219.

The only verbal form that cannot be put at the end of the verse because of metrical constraints, is προσαιδήτην. When another verb form of προσαιδάω is not in verse final position, it is in most cases due to the fact that the subject, usually a noun-epithet formula, follows the verb:¹⁹⁸

	Verb.	Noun Epithet.	Passage.
τήν δὲ δολοφρονέουσα	προσηύδα	πότνια Ἥρη	attested 4 times ¹⁹⁹
τὸν δ' ἐπαλαστήσασα	προσηύδα	Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη	<i>Odyssey</i> 1,252

The issue of the initial *pr* will be discussed later on. The issue of the digamma in ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (always observed, except when the formula is preceded by the participle φωνήσας') has been treated already. Another peculiarity is the inflection of Ζεὺς. Depending on its position in the verse, the accusative is either Ζῆνα or Δία:²⁰⁰

αὐτίκα κερτομίοισι Δία Κρονίωνα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 1,539),
αὐτὴ δ' ἀγγελέουσα Δία Κρονίωνα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 19,120),
αὐτὰρ Ἀθηναίη Ζῆνα Κρονίωνα προσηύδα (*Odyssey* 24,472).

In all instances the syllable before the *kr* of Κρονίωνα is scanned as long.

3.1.5.2. The syntactic constructions of προσαιδάω.

The compound προσαιδάω is used without any (overt) arguments in the following instances:

στῇ ῥα μάλ' Ἑκτορος ἐγγύς, ἀπειλήσας δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 7,225),
Ἥρῃ δ' οὐκ ἔχαδε στῆθος χόλον, ἀλλὰ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 8,461),
στῇ δὲ παρ' Αἰάντεσσι κιών, εἴθαρ δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 12,353),
χερσὶ καταπρηγέσσει, ὀλοφυρόμενος δὲ προσηύδα (occurring three times).²⁰¹

It often occurs with the words spoken in the accusative. These words always appear as ἔπεα πτερόεντα.

Another construction is the person addressed in the accusative (which is underlined):

δὴ τότε θοῦρον Ἄρηα προσηύδα Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 5,454),
τὸν δ' αὖθ' Ἱππολόχοιο προσηύδα φαίδιμος υἱός (*Iliad* 6,144),
Αἴας δ' ἐρρίγησε, κασίγνητον δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 15,436),
τὸν δὲ κατ' οὐδοῦ βάντα προσηύδα Πηνελόπεια (*Odyssey* 4,680).

¹⁹⁸ All the instances in which there is no verb final position are *Iliad* 4,256; 5,30; 5,454; 6,144; 6,214; 6,343; 14,197; 14,300; 14,329; 16,858; 17,500; 19,106; 21,97; 22,7; 22,37; 22,364 and *Odyssey* 1,252; 1,336; 4,680; 10,400; 10,455; 11,99; 12,36; 17,507; 17,575; 18,244; 20,165; 20,177 and 21,192.

¹⁹⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 14,197, 300, 329; 19,106.

²⁰⁰ Hackstein 2011b:34

²⁰¹ The instances are *Iliad* 15,114; 15,398 and *Odyssey* 13,199.

It also occurs with the dative of the words spoken, and the person addressed in the accusative. In that case the meaning is “X addressed Y with ... words” (some examples):

Object	Subject.	Noun.	Verb.	Adjective.	Passage.
τὸν	δ' Ἑλένη	μύθοισι	προσηύδα	μειλιχίοισι	<i>Iliad</i> 6,343
τὸν	μὲν ἐγὼν	ἐπέεσσι	προσηύδων	μειλιχίοισιν	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,552

Sometimes, only the adjective appears and the word for “words” itself is left out:

	Object.	Verb.	Adjective.	Passage.
αὐτίκα δ'	Ἴδομενῆα	προσηύδα	μειλιχίοισιν	<i>Iliad</i> 4,256
αὐτὸς δ' αὖτ'	Ὀδυσῆα	προσηύδα	μειλιχίοισι	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,165

The verb is also (often) constructed with two accusatives, namely the words spoken and the person addressed. There are numerous examples of this construction, which always occurs with the formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (some examples):

	Person.	Words spoken.	Verb.	Passage.
αἶψα δὲ	Τυδείδην	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 5,242
αὐτίκ'	Ἀθηναίην	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 5,713
αἶψα δ' ἄρ'	Εὐμαίον	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,7
αἶψα δὲ	Τηλέμαχον	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,3

In some cases, the verb appears with an accusative of the person and an adjective without the word for “words”:

Object.	Subject.	Adjective.	Verb.	(extension)	Passage.
τὸν	δ' ὁ γέρον	ἐλεεινὰ	προσηύδα	χεῖρας ὀρεγνύς	<i>Iliad</i> 22,37

The above mentioned constructions may also occur with a participle added to the main verb. In that case, it becomes more complicated to determine to which verbal form the accusatives and/or the datives belong.²⁰² If the participle has no direct object, or rules another case than the cases in the sentence, there is little doubt to which verbal form the accusative(s) should be linked. This is the case (among others) in:

καί μιν δάκρυ χέουσ' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 22,81),
 δακρύσασα δ' ἔπειτα προσηύδα θεῖον ἀοιδόν (*Odyssey* 1,336),
 καί μ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Odyssey* 10,324).

If the participle can take an accusative as well, it is less clear if one should link the accusative of the person to the participle or to the main verb. This is the case in:

²⁰² One can refer for these problems to the preliminary remarks of Jacquinod 1989:11.

τοὺς ὃ γ' ἐποτρύνων **ἔπεα πτερόεντα** προσηύδα (*Iliad* 13,480).

Particularly interesting are cases in which there are two accusatives and the participle is also a *verbum dicendi*. In many instances, προσηύδα is combined with the participle φωνήσας or φωνήσας'; the feminine participle form is an adaptation of the formula with the masculine form, as it neglects the digamma:²⁰³

Connector.	Pronoun.	Participle.	Words spoken.	Verb.	Passage.
καί	σφεας	φωνήσας'	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 15,145
καί	μιν	φωνήσας	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 24,517
καί	μιν	φωνήσας	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδων	<i>Odyssey</i> 12,296

The participle φωνήσας means “raising the voice”. The position of the object is due to the fact that it has to be put in the 2nd position of the verse, because it is a clitic.

The speech introductions with προσαυδάω can also be expanded by the participle ἀμειβόμενος:

Connector.	Pronoun.	Participle.	Words spoken.	Verb.	Passage.
καί	μιν	ἀμειβόμενος	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 15,48; 23,557

The origin of the double accusative construction with this verb can be explained in two ways. It is most likely that the accusative of the words spoken was an internal object and the accusative of the person was due to the preposition πρός.²⁰⁴ It is also possible that the accusative depended on ἔπεα πτερόεντα. The meaning of this formula is debated: Parry considered it to be just a metrical variant “he spoke” which was used if the name of the speaker had been mentioned already in the preceding verse.²⁰⁵ Others argue that the formula was not used as verse filler, but had a “genuine meaning”.²⁰⁶ If this is the case, one could interpret the accusative of the person addressed as an original accusative of goal: the words would be flying towards the addressee.

²⁰³ This has been studied in detail by Hoekstra 1965 and Janko 1981. I refer for more details to the subchapter on φωνέω.

²⁰⁴ Horrocks 1981:41; Jacquiod 1989:137-155; Hettrich 1994:130; this observation had been made already by Delbrück 1893:382 and Renou 1952:345, who suggested that if there was a preverb, one of the accusatives depended on it, and by Lagercrantz 1895:388, but he did not try to explain the double accusative. For the double accusative cf. supra.

²⁰⁵ Parry 1933:39, 1937.

²⁰⁶ This was first argued for by Wackernagel 1860. Calhoun 1933, 1935 and Vivante 1935 responded to Parry's criticism (see previous note).

The dative of the addressed person does not occur with προσευδάω. If the dative of a person occurs, it belongs to the participle, as the verb ἐπεύχομαι “speak defiantly, arrogantly” regularly takes the dative.²⁰⁷ This is the case in:

Connector.	Pronoun.	Participle.	Words spoken.	Verb.	Passage.
καί	οἱ	ἐπευχόμενος	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 16,829

3.1.5.3. Word order with προσευδάω.

The basic word order in the formulae with προσευδάω is OV. Examples are (the accusative is put in bold face and the verb is underlined):

Τεῦκρος δ' ἐρρίγησε **κασίγνητον** δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 15,466),
 δεινὰ δ' ὁμοκλήσας **ἔπεα πτερόεντα** προσηύδα (*Iliad* 16,706),
τὸν καὶ τεθνηῶτα προσηύδα φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ (*Iliad* 16,858),
 καὶ τότε ἐγὼ **Κύκλωπα** προσηύδων ἄγχι παραστάς (*Odyssey* 9,345),
τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἐπέεσσι προσηύδων μελιχίοισιν (*Odyssey* 11,552),
 καὶ τότε δὴ **μ'** ἐπέεσσι προσηύδα πότνια Κίρκη (*Odyssey* 12,36).

There are some exceptions (the verb and object have been isolated):

	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
χειρὸς ἐλοῦσ' ἐπέεσσι	προσηύδα	θοῦρον Ἴαρη	<i>Iliad</i> 5,30
αὐτὰρ ὁ μελιχίοισι	προσηύδα	ποιμένα λαῶν	<i>Iliad</i> 6,214
ὥς τώ γε κλαίοντε	προσασπείη	βασιλῆα	<i>Iliad</i> 11,136
ὥς τώ γε κλαίοντε	προσασπείη	φίλον υἱὸν	<i>Iliad</i> 22,90
δακρύσασα δ' ἔπειτα	προσηύδα	θεῖον ἀοιδόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 1,336
ἦ δ' ἐπὶ οἷ καλέσασα	προσηύδα	δίον ὑφορβόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,507
Εὐρύμαχος δ' ἐπέεσσι	προσηύδα	Πηνελόπειαν	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,244

The instances of exceptional word order with προσασπείη are metrically driven, because the verb form cannot appear at the end of the verse. The other exceptions are formulaic inflections of verses where the subject occupied the metrical slot at the end of the verse. Parry explained that verses meaning “X speaks” or “Y started to speak” had a specific metrical make up, in which the final slot of the verse could be reserved for the noun-epithet description

²⁰⁷ LSJ:619.

of a hero or god.²⁰⁸ This is especially clear in those verses, where the verb cannot be put at the end of the verse.

A verse with the subject at the end and OV word order, such as

	Object.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
δὴ τότε	θοῦρον Ἄρηα	προσηύδα	Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων	<i>Iliad</i> 5,454
	τὸν δ' ὑπὲρ οὐδοῦ βάντα	προσηύδα	Πηνελόπεια	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,575

was reformed to have the object in the position of the subject, and yielded verses as

	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
χειρὸς ἐλοῦσ' ἐπέεσσι	προσηύδα	θοῦρον Ἄρηα	<i>Iliad</i> 5,30
αὐτὰρ ὁ μελιχίοισι	προσηύδα	ποιμένα λαῶν	<i>Iliad</i> 6,214
ἦ δ' ἐπὶ οἷ καλέσασα	προσηύδα	δῖον ὑφορβόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,507
Εὐρύμαχος δ' ἐπέεσσι	προσηύδα	Πηνελόπειαν	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,244

They are adaptations of verses in which the accusative appeared in sentence initial position and the nominative was put at the end. They are therefore not an indication of an original VO structure in PIE.

The apposition usually follows the noun that it determines:²⁰⁹

Subject.	Object/Noun.	Apposition.	Verb.	Passage.
ἦ δὲ ψευσαμένη	Προΐτον	βασιλῆα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 6,163
αὐτὰρ Ἀθηναίη	Ζῆνα	Κρονίωνα	προσηύδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,472

In one instance the apposition to the direct object appears after the verbal form:

	Object.	Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
αὐτίκα δ'	Ἀλκιμέδοντα	προσηύδα	πιστὸν ἐταῖρον	<i>Iliad</i> 17,500

3.1.5.4. The connection of προσαυδάω to the rest of the verse.

In 150 out of 179 speech introductions the introduction occupies the entire verse:

καί μιν φωνήσας' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 9 times),²¹⁰

αἶψα δὲ Τηλέμαχον ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring four times).²¹¹

²⁰⁸ Parry 1930:86-90. On pages 87-88 he gave an overview of noun epithet descriptions with the same metrical value. See also Edwards 1966, 1969 and 1970, and Beck 2005:11-12.

²⁰⁹ Delbrück 1888:19, 1900:198; Hackstein 2010b.

²¹⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 15,35; 15,89 and *Odyssey* 2,269; 5,117; 7,236; 8,442; 8,460; 13,290 and 23,34.

If the introduction does not occupy the entire verse,²¹² the speech introduction can be linked to the rest of the verse by a particle such as ἀλλά, δέ, καί or ἤδέ:

Ἦρῃ δ' οὐκ ἔχαδε στήθος χόλον, **ἀλλὰ** προσήυδα (*Iliad* 4,24),
 ἧ **καὶ** Ταλθύβιον θεῖον κήρυκα προσήυδα (*Iliad* 4,192),
 στῆ ῥα μάλ' Ἑκτορος ἐγγύς, ἀπειλήσας **δὲ** προσήυδα (*Iliad* 7,225),
 δειρῇ βάλλ' Ὀδυσῆϊ, κάρη δ' ἔκυσ' **ἠδὲ** προσήυδα (*Odyssey* 23,208).

The distinction between the different connecting particles has been addressed above.

3.1.9. The compound μεταυδάω.

3.1.9.1. The metrical position of μεταυδάω.

The speech introductions with μεταυδάω occupy the entire verse in 22 out of 25 instances. In one instance, there is a “double introduction”:²¹³

αὐτίκα δὲ μνηστῆρσι μετηύδα καὶ φάτο μῦθον (*Odyssey* 21,67).

Witte argued that this specific formula was the result of a contamination between two more common formulae, namely μετηύδα with a dative of the person (occurring 24 times) and φάτο μῦθον (occurring 7 times).²¹⁴ This explanation is not necessary, however: this instance marks an important moment in the *Odyssey*, as Penelope announces the bow contest, which will pave the way for Odysseus to reveal himself and slaughter the suitors. To mark this dramatic turning point, the poet used this explicit and double formula. Moreover, double formulae in speech introductions are not uncommon in Homer, and one *verbum dicendi* can sometimes be determined by a participle of another (usually φωνήσας or ἀμειβόμενος). Examples of other speech introductions made up of two (or more) *verba dicendi* are:

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε γυνὴ καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 15,434).

ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (*Odyssey* 21,258).

The verb form μετηύδα appears in 16 instances (out of 23 instances) in verse final position. When the verb is not in final position, the verse final position is occupied by the subject:

	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
--	-------	----------	----------

²¹¹ The instances are *Odyssey* 17,591; 19,3; 22,150 and 23,112.

²¹² The instances are *Iliad* 4,24; 4,192; 7,225; 8,461; 12,353; 14,270; 15,114; 15,398; 15,436; 15,466; 17,33; 17,431; 17,468; 17,707; 24,169 and *Odyssey* 3,41; 13,199; 14,79; 15,62; 15,150; 17,396; 22,286; 23,208 and 24,320.

²¹³ The term “double introduction” is used to refer to those introductions, in which a finite form of a verb of speaking is combined with a finite verb form of another verb of speaking, answering or shouting. In most cases, there was initially a semantic difference, but gradually it disappeared and in many introductions the distinction was no longer discernible. For the concept of the double introduction, see Classen 1873:113-125; Mutzbauer 1909:131; Kieckers 1912; Jacobsohn 1934:132; Fingerle 1939:307; Fournier 1946b:35,41; O’Nolan 1978:28, 30-31; Kirk 1985:288; Hoekstra 1989:162; Riggsby 1992; Hackstein 2010a:423. See Appendix A.4.

²¹⁴ Witte 1909a:140-141.

Ἀργείους. ὃ δ' ἔπειτα	μετηύδα	ἰσόθεος φῶς	<i>Iliad</i> 23,569
καὶ τότε ἄρ' ἀθανάτοισι	μετηύδα	Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων	<i>Iliad</i> 24,32
τῆς δ' ἀδινὸν γοόωσα	μετηύδα	Πηνελόπεια	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,721
δὴ ῥα τότε ἀμφιπόλοισι	μετηύδα	δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς	<i>Odyssey</i> 6,217
ἢ δ' ἐν μέσσω σταῖσα	μετηύδα	δῖα θεάων	<i>Odyssey</i> 12,20

The verb form μετηύδων is always extended by a participle:

	Verb.	Participle.	Passage.
δὴ τότε ἐγὼν ἐτάροισι	μετηύδων	ἀχνύμενος κῆρ	<i>Odyssey</i> 12,153; 12,270

3.1.9.2. The syntactic constructions of μεταυδάω.

The compound μεταυδάω appears in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It is a compound of αὐδάω and the preposition μετά “among”. The following constructions are attested.

1. The verb can be used without overt arguments:

Ἀργείους: ὃ δ' ἔπειτα μετηύδα ἰσόθεος φῶς (*Iliad* 23,569),

ἢ δ' ἐν μέσσω σταῖσα μετηύδα δῖα θεάων (*Odyssey* 12,20).

2. The verb can be constructed with the dative of the person addressed (datives are underlined):

ἰάνθη: πᾶσιν δὲ νεμεσσηθεῖσα μετηύδα (*Iliad* 15,103),

δὴ τότε ἐγὼν ἐτάροισι μετηύδων ἀχνύμενος κῆρ (*Odyssey* 12,153; 12,270),

ὅς ῥα τότε μνηστῆρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισι μετηύδα (*Odyssey* 20,291).

3. The verb can also be constructed with the accusative of the words spoken and the dative of the person addressed:

	Words spoken.	Person.	Verb.	Passage.
τῷ ὃ γ' ἐρεισάμενος	ἔπε'	Ἀργείοισι	μετηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 2,109
τῷ ὃ γ' ἐρεισάμενος	ἔπεα	Τρώεσσι	μετηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 8,496
τοῦ ὃ γ' ἐπιμνησθεῖς	ἔπε'	ἀθανάτοισι	μετηύδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 1,31

The dative of the person is attested with all μετά compounds. The preposition μετά is used when the speaker addressed a multitude of speakers,²¹⁵ and was physically present among the persons or gods (always plural),²¹⁶ whom he addressed. The preverb πρὸς is used when only a

²¹⁵ The use of *meta* was described in La Roche 1861:209; Delbrück 1879:132-133, 1888:132; ; Monro 1891:177-178; Mommsen 1895:40; Kühner-Gerth 1898:507; Brugmann 1900:445, Ameis-Hentze 1900b:102; Mutzbauer 1909:152; Chantraine 1953:81, 116; Leumann 1950:93-94; Beck 2005:36; Fritz 2005:197-204, O'Sullivan 2010a:898.

²¹⁶ La Roche 1861:209, Mommsen 1895:44, Fritz 2005:197.

few people are addressed.²¹⁷ In all instances of μεταυδάω, the speaker is physically present in the audience, so that the original locative meaning of “speaking among” can be kept and a locative interpretation for this dative is better suited.²¹⁸ Another remarkable feature of μεταυδάω is that it can be used as compound with an accusative of the words spoken and a dative of the person addressed. The other compounds with μετά, such as μετέειπον, μετάφημι or μεταφωνέω, do not employ this construction. This could be an indication that the other μετά-compounds had been grammaticalised already into a verb with a single dative, namely “speak to” with dative, while μεταυδάω was still used in the older meaning “speaking words among people”. The usage of μετά with the dative was already on the decline and died out by the time of Classical Greek.²¹⁹

3.1.9.3. Word order with the compound μεταυδάω.

The word order is always OV: both the direct object and the dative of the person addressed are placed before the verb. Some examples are:

	Dative of person.	Verb.	Passage.
ἀλλ' ὃ γε	οἷς ἐτάροισι φιλοπτολέμοισι	μετηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 23,5
δὴ ῥα τότε	ἀμφιπόλοισιν ἐυπλοκάμοισι	μετηύδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 6,238

	Accusative.	Dative of person.	Verb.	Passage.
τοῦ ὃ γ' ἐπιμνησθεῖς	ἔπε'	ἀθανάτοισι	μετηύδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 1,31

In one specific case, there is an apposition to a demonstrative pronoun in sentence initial position:

	Pronoun.		Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
Ἀργείους:	ὃ	δ' ἔπειτα	μετηύδα	ἰσόθεος φῶς	<i>Iliad</i> 23,569

3.1.9.4. Connection between the formulae with μεταυδάω and the rest of the verse.

When the speech introduction does not occupy the entire verse (which only occurs twice), it is linked to the rest of the verse by δέ or καί:

Ἀργείους: ὃ δ' ἔπειτα μετηύδα ἰσόθεος φῶς (*Iliad* 23,569),

²¹⁷ Chantraine 1953:116; Riggsby 1992:107; Beck 2005:40 (cf. infra).

²¹⁸ The use of *meta* as indication for locative sense was described in La Roche 1861:209; Delbrück 1879:132-133, 1888:132; Seiler-Capelle 1889:385; Monro 1891:177-178; Mommsen 1895:39-41; Kühner-Gerth 1898:507; Brugmann 1900:445; Ameis-Hentze 1900b:102; Mutzbauer 1909:152; Leumann 1950:93-95; Chantraine 1953:81, 116; Fritz 2005:197-204; O'Sullivan 2010a:898.

²¹⁹ Monro 1891:178 in the main *Homeric*; Mommsen 1895 *passim* but especially on page 654; Kühner-Gerth 1898:507; Brugmann 1900:444; Günther 1906/7:128; Chantraine 1953:117; Humbert 1960:313; Luraghi 2005:145, Bortone 2010:158-159.

αὐτίκα δὲ μνηστῆρσι μετηύδα καὶ φάτο μῦθον (*Odyssey* 21,67).

3.1.10. Conclusion for αὐδάω and its compounds.

In this chapter, the etymology, the forms and syntactic constructions of the verb αὐδάω and its compounds in speech introduction and conclusion formulae were discussed. There is only one certain cognate, Sanskrit *vadati* “he speaks”, and one very likely cognate Tocharian *wätk* “order, command”. The oldest verbal forms in Homer indicate that the original inflection was athematic, and was attracted to the contracted conjugation during the Ionic stage of epic diction. The chapter also showed that the compound προσαυδάω was originally *ποταυδάμ and that it was an Aeolic athematic verb. The following elements seem to support this assumption. First, the scansion obliges us to read a short vowel before *pr* in every instance, which is not the case with the προσ- compounds of the other *verba dicendi*. Second, the fact that the old formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα only occurs with προσαυδάω (and with the metrically equivalent but younger ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον), but not with the simplex αὐδάω, could be another indication for the fact that the compound verb was the oldest. A third element in favour is the occurrence of the dual form προσαυδήτην: the aberrant vocalism can only be explained if one assumes the form to be Aeolic.

One of the remarkable semantic elements is the use of a speech conclusion with a person addressed. This is rare, as it only occurs with ἀγορεύω, but not with ἔειπον, φημί, nor φωνέω, and only once with πρόσφημι. The conclusions that have this construction have the dual verb form προσαυδήτην. These verses therefore seem to preserve old elements.

Syntactically, the compound μεταυδάω still preserved the older use of the simplex and the preposition μετά, as it could have both accusative of the words spoken and a dative of the persons to whom/in the midst of whom the words were spoken. Other compounds with μετά do not have this construction anymore. The construction with the double accusative is more common with the compound προσαυδάω than with the simplex, where it mostly occurs with the adjective ἀντίον (if this is indeed an adjective), which is not used with the other *verba dicendi*. The double accusatives after προσαυδάω are also remarkable, because no other compound in πρός has preserved this construction, except where it is only used with a neutre pronoun and a person addressed.

The general word order used with αὐδάω and its compounds is OV. The instances where the object follows the verb are either metrically determined or formulaic inflections of formulae where the order was OV. The formulaic inflection and adaptation of OV formulae into VO is not uncommon, and will be observed in other speech introductions as well.

3.2. The verb ἔειπον and its compounds.

3.2.0. Preliminary remarks.

This chapter discusses the speech introduction formulae of the root **uek^w*. The etymology, derivatives, forms, moods and syntactic constructions of the simplex ἔειπον and the compounds προσέειπον and μετέειπον, and the construction ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν will be examined. As the emphasis of this investigation lies on the morphological and syntactic features of the speech introduction formulae, only the instances of the simplex ἔειπον and the compounds that appear in introductions and conclusions will be discussed.²²⁰

3.2.1. Etymology and meaning of the root **uek^w*.

The verbal root εἶπ- belongs to the root **uek^w*. The meaning of this root is “speak, address, mention” and it was used in prose but also in poetry. From **uek^w* a reduplicated thematic aorist **ueyk^w* was built, as can be seen in Sanskrit *avocam* and Avestan *vaocam*. In Greek the reduplication **ueyk^w* was dissimilated into **ueik^we*.²²¹ There are two other certain parallels for such a dissimilation in Greek: εἴρηται from **φέρρητοι*,²²² and εἴρῃται from **ueyrū-* “guard, direct one’s attention towards”,²²³ and besides the above mentioned examples, the Ionic ἐνεῖκαι from ἐνέγκαι is very likely a case of dissimilation.²²⁴ As was usual in PIE, the thematic aorist was built on the zero grade.²²⁵ In addition, Greek ἔειπον and Vedic *avocam* share the same etymologically identical collocation **uek^wos uek^w-*.²²⁶ Such a *figura etymologica* is a characteristic of the Indo-European poetic language. Homeric examples are (the *figura* is underlined):²²⁷

ἐσθλὸν δ' οὐδέ τί πω εἶπες ἔπος οὐδ' ἐτέλεσσας (*Iliad* 1,108),

²²⁰ This word family has been treated by La Roche 1861:205-207 and 1901; Mutzbauer 1893:325-327; Fournier 1946:3, 211-212, 228 and *passim*; Beck 1984 (=LfgrE); Kölligan 2007:218-246.

²²¹ The reduplication was first noticed by Bopp 1842:825-826, and later expanded by Ebel 1853:46-47, 1855a:163. The dissimilation was first noticed by Brugmann 1881:305-306. The key in discovering this was the fact that the Attic inscriptions that still distinguished between spurious and genuine diphthongs (before the alphabet change of 403^a) always wrote EI and never E, which rules out that the εἰ in ἔειπον was the result of a contraction. For this one is referred to Meisterhans 1885:79. The dissimilation is now generally accepted, as can be seen in Solmsen 1901:237; Lautensach 1911:107; Chantraine 1968-1974:362; Frisk 1960:464; Morpurgo-Davies 1970:205-206 with other parallels; Rix 1976:215-216; Meier-Brügger 1987:314, 2010:305; Beckwith 1996:7-12; Fortson 2004:93; Casaretto 2006:145; Beekes 2010:389. The most recent treatments of reduplicated aorists are Bendahman 1993 and Beckwith 1996.

²²² Fournier 1946:4; this parallel was also pointed out by Harðarsson 1993b:163.

²²³ Hackstein 2012b:97-98.

²²⁴ Meier-Brügger 1987; Kölligan 2007:246 with reference to Meier-Brügger and García-Ramón. One is also referred to Grammont 1948:164-166 and Lejeune 1972:151-152 for detailed treatments of other dissimilations in Greek.

²²⁵ Chantraine 1948:387, 1964:171; Rix 1976:215-216; Szemerényi 1990:303-304; Fortson 2004:93.

²²⁶ Schmitt 1967b:264-265; the Indo-European heritage is also accepted by Mayrhofer 1996:490-491, Latacz – Nünlist – Stoevesandt 2000:67 and Stüber 2002:169, all with reference to Schmitt.

²²⁷ Schmitt 1967:264-265; Clary 2012:7.

πρόφρων τέτληκας εἰπεῖν ἔπος ὅττι νοήσης (*Iliad* 1,543),
 Σαρπηδὼν Διὸς υἱός, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυνδὸν ἔειπε (*Iliad* 5,683),
 καὶ δὲ τόδ' ἠνώγεον εἰπεῖν ἔπος αἶ κ' ἐθέλητε (*Iliad* 7,394),
 ὀπποῖόν κ' εἴπησθα ἔπος, τοῖόν κ' ἐπακούσας (*Iliad* 20,250),
 χερσὶ τε συμπλατάγησεν, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυνδὸν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,102),
 παιδὶ δέ κεν εἴποιμι ἔπος, τό κε κέρδιον εἴη (*Odyssey* 18,166),
 ὣς εἰπὼν ἐπέεσσι διεπτοίησε γυναῖκας (*Odyssey* 18,340),
 ὄφρα καθεζόμενος εἴπη ἔπος ἡδ' ἐπακούσῃ (*Odyssey* 19,98),
 δάκρυα δ' ἔκβαλε θερμά, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυνδὸν ἔειπεν (*Odyssey* 19,362),
 ὄφρα ἔπος εἴπωμι τό μοι καταθύμιόν ἐστιν (*Odyssey* 22,392),
 τοῦτ' ἄρα δεύτατον εἶπεν ἔπος, ὅτε οἱ γλυκὺς ὕπνος (*Odyssey* 23,342).

Vedic examples are:²²⁸

āvocāma rāhūgaṇā agnāye mādhumad vācaḥ

“we, the *Rāhūgaṇā*, have spoken to Agni a word full of honey” (*RgVeda* 1,78,5ab).²²⁹

idām pitré marútām ucyate vacas

“this speech is spoken to the father, the *Marut*.” (RV 1,1.114.6a).

tād vāṃ narā nāsatiyā ānu syād yād vām mātāsa ucātham āvocan

“This hymn of praises that the *Manas* have sung to you today, be welcome to you, O *Nāsatiyas*, Heroes!” (RV 1,182,8b).²³⁰

āvocāma kavāye médhyāya vāco vandāru vṛṣabhāya vṛṣṇe

“To him adorable, sage, strong and mighty we have sung forth our song of praise and homage.” (RV 5,1,12ab).

mā vo vācāṃsi paricákṣyāṇi vocam

“let I not speak words that remain unnoticed.” (RV 6,52,14c).

In Avestan one finds only the passive form of the *figura*:²³¹

imā āt uxδā vacā “these spoken words” (*Yašt* 35,9).

hūxtəm vacō “well spoken word” (*Yašt* 12,8).

3.2.2. The use of *uek^w/ εἰπ in speech introductions and conclusions.

²²⁸ Schmitt 1967:264-265. The translations are taken from Geldner 1951a,b and c and Griffith 1889. The text is taken from Aufrecht 1877a and b, and Holland-Van Nooten 1994. The text quoted is the metrically restored one by Holland-Van Nooten.

²²⁹ As of now, I abbreviate *RgVeda* by RV.

²³⁰ Here I preferred Geldner’s translation over that of Griffith’s, because Geldner was closer to the syntactic construction of the Vedic. I nevertheless used Griffith’s “Heroes” and did not take Geldner’s “Herren” for *narā*.

²³¹ Schmitt 1967:265.

There are many compounds of **mek^w*/ εἶπ, but only the simplex ἔειπον and the compounds προσέειπον and μετέειπον are used in speech introductions and conclusions. The compounds only occur in speech introductions. The simplex is used both in speech introductions as in conclusions. In speech conclusions the verb is mostly used in the participle, but there are also 6 instances of the finite verb form, namely the formula ὥς ἄρα τις εἶπεςκε. A special case is the conclusion ὥς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ἐαδόντα μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 9,173; *Odyssey* 18,422), where the actual conclusion is ὥς φάτο, and the phrase τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ἐαδόντα μῦθον ἔειπεν is an extension to the conclusion.

3.2.3. Verbal forms, compounds and inflection of **mek^w*/ εἶπ.

In this specific subchapter the formal aspects of ἔειπον will be discussed: first the forms will be listed, and then the *nu ephelkustikon* and the digamma will be briefly discussed. The tense usage and augmentation will be treated in a separate chapter (chapter 5 and 6).

Both the simplex ἔειπον and the compounds προσέειπον and μετέειπον are very common. The simplex ἔειπον and the compounds προσέειπον and μετέειπον occur in speech introduction and conclusion formulae. The table lists the forms that are used, and all forms are aorists.

Verb	Form	Number of attestations
ἔειπον	Indicative	ἔειπον: 4 instances, ²³² ἔειπε: 67 instances, ²³³ εἶπε: 43 instances, ²³⁴ εἶπεςκε: 28 instances. ²³⁵
	Participle	Nom. m. sg.: 114 instances, nom. f. sg.: 24 instances, ²³⁶ acc. m. sg.: 5 instances, ²³⁷

²³² The instances are *Odyssey* 9,171; 10,188; 10,561 and 12,319.

²³³ The instances are *Iliad* 2,59; 2,156; 3,85; 3,303; 5,632; 5,683; 6,375; 6,381; 7,46; 7,66; 8,280; 8,426; 9,173; 9,623; 10,140; 10,318; 11,429; 11,440; 11,522; 13,306; 14,189; 15,13; 20,114; 20,292; 22,476; 23,68; 23,102; 23,235; 23,271; 23,456; 23,617; 23,657; 23,706; 23,752; 23,781; 23,786; 23,801; 23,830; 24,485; 24,682; 24,777 and *Odyssey* 4,803; 5,338; 6,21; 8,433; 14,492; 15,45; 16,336; 16,460; 17,74; 17,414; 17,467; 17,493; 17,495; 18,169; 18,422; 19,96; 19,362; 20,32; 20,128; 20,261; 21,151; 22,4; 22,207; 23,4; 23,165; 24,213; 24,513.

²³⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 5,600; 6,75; 6,475; 7,277; 11,403; 11,647; 12,60; 12,210; 13,725; 16,513; 17,90; 17,237; 17,334; 17,651; 18,5; 18,391; 19,257; 19,286; 20,343; 20,375; 21,53; 21,552; 22,98; 23,143; 23,155; 23,204 and *Odyssey* 5,298; 5,355; 5,407; 5,464; 7,330; 8,302; 14,494; 21,428.

²³⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 2,271; 3,297; 3,319; 4,81; 4,85; 7,178; 7,201; 17,414; 17,423; 22,372; 22,375 and *Odyssey* 2,324; 2,331; 4,769; 4,772; 8,328; 10,37; 13,167; 13,170; 17,428; 18,72; 18,400; 20,375; 21,365; 21,396; 21,401; 23,148; 23,152.

²³⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 3,139; 5,35; 5,133; 5,792; 8,425; 11,210; 15,100; 15,142; 15,149; 18,202; 23,212; 24,188 and *Odyssey* 1,96; 1,319; 4,425; 4,767; 6,41; 8,15; 13,352; 13,366; 15,43; 15,130; 15,545; 19,600.

²³⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 15,405; 16,502; 16,855; 22,361 and *Odyssey* 5,313.

		nom. ntr. sg.: once, ²³⁸ dat. m. sg.: 3 instances, ²³⁹ nom. m. du.: once. ²⁴⁰
	Subjunctive	3 rd p. sg.: 8 instances. ²⁴¹
	Optative	3 rd p. sg.: once. ²⁴²
προσέειπον	Indicative	προσέειπον: 17 instances, ²⁴³ προσέειπε: 171 instances. ²⁴⁴
μετέειπον	Indicative	μετέειπον: once, ²⁴⁵ μετέειπε: 59 instances, ²⁴⁶ μετέειφ': 5 instances. ²⁴⁷

Of the augmented forms, 60 occur in the following tmesis or tmesis-influenced constructions:

- πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (33 instances),²⁴⁸
- μετὰ (DATIVE) ἔειπε (13 instances),²⁴⁹
- μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπε (5 instances),²⁵⁰
- πρὸς δ' Εὐρύκλειαν ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 20,128),

²³⁸ It occurs in *Odyssey* 4,838.

²³⁹ The occurrences are *Iliad* 13,821 and *Odyssey* 15,160; 15,525.

²⁴⁰ It occurs in *Iliad* 21,298.

²⁴¹ The instances are *Iliad* 6,459; 7,87; 7,300; 12,317; 22,106; 23,575 and *Odyssey* 6,275; 21,324.

²⁴² It occurs in *Iliad* 6,479.

²⁴³ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,375; 4,394; 4,464; 4,484; 9,258; 9,522; 10,270; 10,366; 10,382; 11,79; 11,138; 11,163; 11,435; 11,462; 11,477; 11,504; 12,111.

²⁴⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 1,105; 1,206; 1,224; 1,320; 1,441; 1,502; 1,585; 3,58; 3,386; 3,437; 5,179; 5,229; 5,276; 5,756; 6,122; 6,332; 6,440; 6,517; 7,23; 7,33; 7,37; 7,233; 7,287; 8,138; 8,357; 9,114; 9,676; 10,36; 10,64; 10,81; 10,119; 10,168; 10,248; 10,340; 10,412; 11,602; 11,605; 11,837; 13,774; 14,64; 14,211; 14,263; 15,205; 15,253; 16,125; 16,432; 17,11; 17,560; 18,94; 18,183; 18,196; 18,356; 19,184; 20,86; 20,103; 20,177; 21,149; 21,461; 21,497; 21,511; 22,177; 22,232; 22,238; 22,249; 22,278; 23,722; 23,794; 24,217; 24,361; 24,378; 24,389; 24,410; 24,432; 24,634; 24,668 and *Odyssey* 1,178; 1,221; 2,39; 2,84; 3,13; 3,25; 3,229; 3,356; 4,234; 4,461; 4,471; 4,491; 4,442; 4,454; 4,631; 4,696; 4,706; 4,742; 4,830; 5,96; 5,145; 6,56; 7,27; 8,144; 8,253; 8,334; 8,334; 8,349; 8,354; 11,91; 11,145; 11,404; 11,440; 11,487; 13,326; 13,361; 14,36; 14,148; 15,271; 15,351; 15,389; 15,430; 15,434; 15,508; 16,36; 16,90; 16,166; 16,193; 16,225; 16,258; 16,266; 17,5; 17,123; 17,342; 17,405; 17,498; 17,528; 17,560; 17,585; 18,177; 18,356; 19,21; 19,214; 19,252; 19,308; 19,349; 19,473; 19,491; 19,559; 19,588; 20,44; 20,134; 20,235; 20,363; 21,199; 21,206; 21,311; 21,330; 21,423; 22,44; 22,135; 22,419; 22,480; 22,485; 23,10; 23,25; 23,39; 23,58; 23,104; 23,173; 23,256; 23,285; 24,350; 24,393.

²⁴⁵ It occurs in *Odyssey* 19,140.

²⁴⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,73; 1,253; 2,78; 2,283; 2,336; 3,96; 3,455; 7,94; 7,170; 7,326; 7,367; 7,399; 8,30; 9,31; 9,95; 9,432; 9,696; 10,219; 10,233; 10,241; 14,109; 15,285; 18,253; 19,76; 23,889 and *Odyssey* 2,24; 2,95; 2,157; 2,228; 3,330; 4,773; 7,155; 7,158; 8,25; 11,342; 13,171; 14,459; 15,304; 15,439; 16,394; 16,399; 17,151; 17,369; 18,412; 20,244; 20,321; 20,350; 22,131; 22,247; 24,53; 24,130; 24,422; 24,425; 24,442; 24,451; 24,453.

²⁴⁷ The instances are *Odyssey* 2,409; 18,60; 18,405; 21,101; 21,130.

²⁴⁸ The instances are in the *Iliad* : 2,59; 2,156; 5,632; 6,381; 7,46; 8,280; 8,426; 10,140; 11,429; 11,440; 11,522; 13,306; 14,189; 15,13; 23,68; 23,235; 24,485 and 24,682; in the *Odyssey*: 4,803; 5,338; 6,21; 14,492; 15,45; 16,460; 17,74; 17,414; 17,495; 18,169; 19,96; 20,32; 20,261; 23,4 and 23,165.

²⁴⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 3,85; 6,375; 7,66; 22,476 and 23,781 and *Odyssey* 9,171; 10,188; 12,319; 16,336; 17,467; 17,493; 21,151 and 22,4.

²⁵⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 3,303; 9,263; 20,114; 20,292 and 24,777.

- μῦθον ἐν (Ἀργείοισιν) ἔειπεν (8 instances).²⁵¹

Of the non-augmented forms, 11 appear with a preposition, namely in εἶπε πρὸς ὄν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν.

3.2.4. The digamma and *nu ephelkustikon* in the verbal inflection.

A common but at the same time remarkable usage of the *nu ephelkustikon* is its use at the end of the iterative εἶπεσκεν, as in:

ὥδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον (occurring 9 times).²⁵²

This verse is noteworthy, because it observes the initial digamma of εἶπεσκεν but neglects the initial digamma of ἰδὼν. This use is not confined to speech introductions with ἔειπον. My colleague Eduard Meusel pointed out that forms that can use a *nu* to resolve an hiatus caused by the digamma, almost always do so.²⁵³ That a *nu* is used to “cure” a digamma hiatus, had been observed before.²⁵⁴ This *Hiatustilgung* cannot be explained by assuming younger influences.²⁵⁵ First, the use is predominant in precesural position and *in pausa*,²⁵⁶ and when the digamma falls outside formulae.²⁵⁷ This is visible in the following instances, where a neglected digamma appears after the trochaic caesura:

ὥδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον (occurring 9 times),
 τὴν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 7,37),
 τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 9,114),
 τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 10,233),
 τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 15,253),
 εὐχόμενος δ' ἄρα εἶπεν ἐκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι (*Iliad* 16,513)
 χειρὶ τε συμπλατάγησεν, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυνδὸν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,102),
 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπεν ἰδὼν ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον (*Iliad* 23,143),
 εὐχόμενος δ' ἄρα εἶπεν, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (*Odyssey* 7,330),
 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (*Odyssey* 21,248).

²⁵¹ The instances are *Iliad* 23,271; 23,456; 23,657; 23,706; 23,752; 23, 786; 23,801 and 23,830.

²⁵² The instances are *Iliad* 2,271; 4,81; 22,372 and *Odyssey* 8,328; 10,37; 13,167; 18,72; 18,400 and 21,396.

²⁵³ He made this observation first for Pindar (Meusel 2013:103-104), and later expanded it to Homer (p.c.).

²⁵⁴ Meister 1921:247; Chantraine 1948:92. Already in the editions by Bekker and Fick, the *nu ephelkustikon* was removed when it was used to remedy a digamma hiatus. For criticism of this method see Leskien 1866. For an overview on the previous scholarship on the *nu ephelkustikon* see Willi 2014.

²⁵⁵ Hoekstra 1969:72-75; Tichy 2012:351; Hämmig 2013:134 considered most of the instances to be secondary and referred to the studies of Isler 1908 (*non uidi*) and Janko 1982. Neither Hoekstra nor Hämmig mentioned the almost exceptionless occurrence of the *nu* before digammated words, nor did they mention the Pindaric occurrences.

²⁵⁶ The *in pausa* use of the *nu ephelkustikon* was established by Maasse 1881 for Attic inscriptions and extended to Attic prose and Ionic inscriptions by Sommer 1907. See also Willi 2014:202.

²⁵⁷ Olav Hackstein, personal communication January 23rd 2015.

In the following instances the digamma was neglected before the bucolic caesura:

μέσσω δ' ἀμφοτέρων σκῆπτρα σχέθον, εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Iliad* 7,277),

Ἥελιος γάρ οἱ σκοπιὴν ἔχεν εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Odyssey* 8,302),

ἦ καὶ ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος κεφαλὴν σχέθεν εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Odyssey* 14,494).

A second element that indicates that the *nu* was not simply a feature from the transmission is the fact that the use of a *nu* to solve a digamma-hiatus is also attested in Pindar.²⁵⁸

3.2.5. The finite and non-finite verb forms and moods of *uek^w/εἰπ- and its compounds.

3.2.5.1. The participle.

The participle is used in the speech conclusion formulae, if the subject of the participle is the same as that of the main verb of the verse or if the subject of the participle has a function in the sentence. Examples of the subject of the participle and the subject of the verb of the main sentence being the same, are (this list is not exhaustive):

ὥς εἰπὼν ἐν χερσὶ τίθει, ὃ δὲ δέξατο χαίρων (several occasions),²⁵⁹

ἦτοι ὃ γ' ὥς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετο: τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη (several occasions),²⁶⁰

ὥς εἰποῦσα θεὰ γλυκὺν ἴμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ (*Iliad* 3,139),

ἦ μὲν ἄρ' ὥς εἰποῦσ' ἀπέβη πρὸς δώματα καλά (*Odyssey* 15,454).

Examples of the subject of the participle having a function (but not the subject) in the sentence are:

ὥς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι ἐπέτατο δεξιὸς ὄρνις (*Iliad* 13,821).

“When he was speaking this way, a favourable bird flew over him.”

τὸν μὲν ἄρ' ὥς εἰπόντα πόδες φέρον: αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ (*Iliad* 15,405).

“His feet carried him after he had then spoken in this way.”

ὥς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυπεν (*Iliad* 16,502; 16,855).

“After he had thus spoken, the final death (lit. end of death) covered him.”

In the three examples quoted above, the underlined pronouns are not the object of εἶπον, but of the main verb of the verse.

3.2.5.2. The indicative.

The indicative is “the mood of reality”,²⁶¹ or is at least modally neutral, i.e. it does not have the nuance of fear, hope, expectation or wish.²⁶² This is linked to the fact that the Greek

²⁵⁸ Meusel 2013:103-104.

²⁵⁹ The instances are (with differences in augmentation): *Iliad* 1,446; 23,624 and 23,797. In the feminine form the formula appears in *Odyssey* 15,130.

²⁶⁰ The instances are: *Iliad* 1,68; 1,101; 2,76, 7,354; 7, 365 and *Odyssey* 2,224.

indicative continues both the Indo-European indicative as the injunctive. It occurs very often in speech introductions and conclusions, is mostly used to state that a person has said something, and refers to the real world. Examples are:

δεινὰ δ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν Ἥρην πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 15,13),
καὶ τότε ἄρ' Αἴας εἶπε βοῆν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον (*Iliad* 17,651),
δάκρυα δ' ἔκβαλε θερμά, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυνδὸν ἔειπεν (*Odyssey* 19,362),
τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε περίφρων Πηνελόπεια (*Odyssey* 23,285).

The use of the indicative in the conditionals, introduced by εἰ μή, will be discussed in the chapter on verbal distribution, tense usage and use of the moods. An example is:

εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρην πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 2,156),

3.2.5.3. The subjunctive and optative.

The verb ἔειπον appears in 8 instances in the subjunctive in a speech introduction formula, and once in the optative. First the instances in the subjunctive will be discussed, and then the one in the optative. As the context of the introductions is important, it will be discussed.

καὶ ποτέ τις εἴπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσας (*Iliad* 6,459).

This is a speech introduction occurring in Hektor's goodbye to Andromakhe and Astyanax. He depicted a gloomy picture of what awaited Andromakhe, if he were not perform his duties, and described how someone would see her weeping while she was performing manual labour as a slave and would say that she used to be the wife of Hektor.

καὶ ποτέ τις εἴπησι καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων (*Iliad* 7,87).

This is a speech introduction that occurs in the speech, pronounced by Hektor when he was addressing the Trojans and Greeks. The introduction here describes how an unknown traveller might pass Aias's grave mound and read the grave inscription that stated that buried warrior was killed by Hektor in battle.

ὄφρα τις ὧδ' εἴπησιν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε (*Iliad* 7,300).

This verse is a speech introduction, pronounced by Hektor in response to Aias, after Idaios suggested Hektor and Aias cease their duel. Hektor described how an undefined Greek or Trojan later might say that Hektor and Aias treated each other with respect.

ὄφρα τις ὧδ' εἴπη Λυκίων πύκα θωρηκτάων (*Iliad* 12,317).

This verse is a speech introduction within the speech of Sarpedon to Glaukos to incite him and excel in fighting, so that they may win glory and renown among the Lycians.

²⁶¹ Kühner-Gerth 1898:202; Brugmann 1900:513; Rijksbaron 2002:6 *the speaker represents the state of affairs as a fact.*

²⁶² Chantraine 1953:205; Strunk 1975:233, 1992:29-30.

μή ποτέ τις εἴπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος ἐμεῖο (*Iliad* 22,106).

In this instance, Hektor speaks to himself and fears that some lower ranked and less courageous Trojan might say about him that he brought downfall on Troy by believing too much in his own strength.

μή ποτέ τις εἴπησιν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων (*Iliad* 23,575).

This is a speech introduction in the speech by Menelaos, who complained that Antilokhos had used foul play in the horse race, and suggested that amends be made to avoid that some unknown Greek might say in the future that the contest had been unfair.

καί νύ τις ὧδ' εἴπησι κακώτερος ἀντιβολήσας (*Odyssey* 6,275).

This verse is a speech introduction, belonging to Nausikaa's speech to Odysseus. She asked him not to follow her too closely into the city of the Phaiakians, because someone from a lower class might scoff at her for walking around in company of a foreign man.

μή ποτέ τις εἴπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν (*Odyssey* 21,324).

This is a speech introduction formula which occurs in the speech of the suitor Eurymakhos. After the suitors failed to string the bow, Penelope suggested the beggar be given a chance to shoot as well. Eurymakhos responded that it would be a cause of great shame for all the suitors, if the beggar were to succeed.

All of the above mentioned introductions share the following:²⁶³

- they all introduce a speech within a speech
- they all have an indetermined subject (τις),
- they are expanded by a partitive genitive or a participle construction,
- they all express the expectation/ fear of the speaker that someone from the normal people or later generations will say something about the speakers or their actions,
- the speaker assumes it likely that the words will be spoken, but the words have not been spoken yet,
- they are all expressed by a subjunctive without modal particle,
- two instances occur in a subordinate final clause introduced by ὅρα,
- two instances are introduced by μή: they can be a negative purpose clause, a subordinate clause indicating fear,²⁶⁴ or a negative command in the 3rd person,²⁶⁵ (but the difference is not

²⁶³ See Hentze 1905; Fingerle 1939:283-293; Wilson 1979; De Jong 1987a; Schneider 1995; Beck 2005:47-56; Kelly 2007:183-184; Strauss-Clay 2013.

²⁶⁴ Ameis-Hentze 1901:87, Chantraine 1953:208, Fernández Galiano 1992:186.

²⁶⁵ Monro 1891:254.

always clear)²⁶⁶ and have both the idea of fear and the notion that something should be avoided,²⁶⁷

- 5 instances occur in a main clause without modal particle or negation,
- 5 of the 8 speech introductions quoted above have a conclusion as well: the conclusion is always a future indicative form of ἐρέω, either ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει or ὥς ἐρέουσ(ι).²⁶⁸ The two final clauses with ὄφρα are not concluded, nor is μή ποτέ τις εἶπῃσιν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων (*Iliad* 23,575).

In many aspects, the introductions seem comparable to the iterative εἶπεσκε introductions. The main difference, however, between the *tis* speeches in the εἶπεσκε sentences and the *tis* speeches here is that they refer to future events and thus refer to something somebody *might* or *is expected to* say, but has not said yet. In this context, the term *potential tis speeches* is used.²⁶⁹ Although Fingerle discussed them as one entity and Schneider argued that there was no difference in the content,²⁷⁰ Wilson and De Jong were right in distinguishing between them: the εἶπεσκε speeches provide an insight into what the bigger groups say/think, while the *potential tis speeches* actually contain the opinion and the fear for the public opinion of the speaker in whose speech these verses occur.²⁷¹ The actual *tis* speeches were really pronounced, while the potential ones only existed in the mind of the speaker, and could be used to depict a situation the speaker wanted to avoid.²⁷²

- καὶ κέ τις ὧδ' ἐρέει Τρώων ὑπερηνορέοντων (*Iliad* 4,176):

Agamemnon did not want the Trojans to rejoice in Menelaos's death.

- καὶ ποτέ τις εἶπῃσιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσας (*Iliad* 6,459):

Hektor wanted to avoid that Andromakhe became a slave.

- μή ποτέ τις εἶπῃσι κακώτερος ἄλλος ἐμεῖο (*Iliad* 22,106):

Hektor did not want a Trojan to say that his overconfidence caused the city to collapse.

- μή ποτέ τις εἶπῃσιν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων (*Iliad* 23,575):

Menelaos did not want the future Greeks to be upset about the unfair contest.

- καὶ νύ τις ὧδ' εἶπῃσι κακώτερος ἀντιβολήσας (*Odyssey* 6,275):

Nausikaa wanted to avoid that a certain Phaiakian would chastise her for her behaviour.

- μή ποτέ τις εἶπῃσι κακώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν (*Odyssey* 21,324):

²⁶⁶ Chantraine 1953:208-209.

²⁶⁷ Chantraine 1953:208.

²⁶⁸ Schneider 1995:13-14.

²⁶⁹ Wilson 1979:1-2, De Jong 1987a:76, Strauss Clay 2013.

²⁷⁰ Fingerle 1939:289-293, Schneider 1995:8-11.

²⁷¹ Wilson 1979:1-3, De Jong 1987a:82-83; Beck 2005:52-56; Kelly 2007:183-184.

²⁷² Wilson 1979:1-3.

the suitors wanted to avoid that later Greeks would say that they were incapable of shooting the arrow but that the beggar succeeded.

Alternatively, the potential *tis* speeches something the speaker wanted himself to obtain:²⁷³

- καί ποτέ τις εἶπῃσι καὶ ὀπιγόνων ἀνθρώπων (*Iliad* 7,87):

Hektor wants to be remembered as the best of the Trojans who was responsible for the death of many Greeks.

- ὄφρα τις ᾧδ' εἶπῃσιν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε (*Iliad* 7,300):

Idaios wants the battle between Hektor and Aias to be remembered for its chivalry.

- ὄφρα τις ᾧδ' εἶπῃ Λυκίων πύκα θωρηκτάων (*Iliad* 12,317):

Glaukos really wants Sarpedon and him to be remembered by the Lykians as brave fighters.

The use of the subjunctive can be explained by the fact that the speakers really expect the anonymous *tis* characters to make the statements. This agrees with the meaning of the subjunctive in PIE to express the will and/or the expectation of the speaker.²⁷⁴

One speech introduction is expressed in the optative, and is not concluded. The formula is transmitted in the optative and in the subjunctive:

καί ποτέ τις εἴποι 'πατρός δ' ὃ γε πολλὸν ἀμείνων' (*Iliad* 6,479).

This speech introduction is also pronounced by Hektor in his goodbye to Andromakhe and Astyanax. He prayed to the gods that his son would become an even better fighter than he was. The subjunctive καί ποτέ τις εἶπῃσι was also transmitted,²⁷⁵ and was adopted by several editions, among others that by Van Thiel and Graziosi-Haubold.²⁷⁶ The argument in favour of the subjunctive is that Hektor used it, because he was certain that his son would exceed him in bravery.²⁷⁷ The optative has the preference, because it appears in a prayer with other optatives and the clearer certainty expressed by subjunctive would be out of place.²⁷⁸ Hektor was certainly not self-assured about his fighting capacities, given his doubts and depiction of the gloomy future of Andromakhe. The subjunctive reading is probably influenced by *Iliad* 6,459. In addition to the semantic arguments there are formal objections against the subjunctive

²⁷³ Wilson 1979:3.

²⁷⁴ Delbrück 1871 *passim*, see the conclusion on page 90, he discussed the examples quoted here on pp. 124-126; Brugmann 1904:579-583; Krahe 1972:128-129; Tichy 2006:304-305, 2009:105-106; Weiss 2009:383; Fritz 2010:393.

²⁷⁵ Only the *Marcianus Graecus* 822 in superscript, the *archetypus b* (of the manuscripts *Marcianus Graecus* 821, the *Laurentianus* 32.3 and the *Scorialensis* Y.I.1), the *Vaticanus Graecus* 1319 and the *Oxoniensis Bodleianus New College* 298 have the optative. The optative is also quoted by the grammarian Nikanor (West 1999:201).

²⁷⁶ Faesi 1858a:254; Ludwich 1885:351-354; Witte 1913a:2242; Van Thiel 1996:120; Graziosi-Haubold 2000:218, with reference to Ludwich; the online *Chicago Homer* also printed the subjunctive.

²⁷⁷ Faesi 1858a:254, Ludwich 1885:351-354, Graziosi-Haubold 2000:218, with reference to Ludwich.

²⁷⁸ Leaf 1900:292 (with reference to Dawes), Latacz 2000b:152; the optative was also defended by Ameis-Hentze 1884:133.

reading as well: the subjunctive would require the *a* in πατρός to be read with *correptio attica*, which never happens elsewhere in this word.²⁷⁹ Ludwig argued that the occurrence of *correptio* was not conclusive against the subjunctive, as it occurred in other words and that the optative εἴποι was never found elsewhere.²⁸⁰ Magnien suggested to read εἴπη, as that reading avoided the problem of the *correptio*.²⁸¹ These suggestions might address the formal problems but do not explain why Hektor would first be so certain that Andromakhe would be enslaved and at the same time would be convinced that his son would surpass him in bravery. The optative is therefore to be preferred. Schwyzer-Debrunner interpreted this optative as a potential without modal particle,²⁸² which cannot be ruled out, but the uncertainty of Hektor about the future makes it more likely that this was a wish. Fritz used these two examples to show that there was an *inhaltliche Nähe* between subjunctive and optative,²⁸³ but the difference in moods in the two examples shows the difference in expectation by Hektor: while he is certain that Andromakhe will cry in slavery, he is not certain that his son will surpass him (which is the reason why he prayed to the gods). As such, the optative is not close to the subjunctive here.

3.2.8. The simplex εἶπον.²⁸⁴

3.2.8.1. Metrical position of εἶπον in the verse.

The augmented form εἶπον occurs 71 times and is put at the end of the verse in 70 instances:

	Verse final position.	Passage.
στῆ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ με πρὸς μῦθον	εἶπεν	<i>Iliad</i> 2,59
ὅς ῥα τότε Τρῳσὶν τε καὶ Ἑκτορι μῦθον	εἶπεν	<i>Iliad</i> 10,318
χερσὶ τε συμπλατάγησεν, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυνδὸν	εἶπεν	<i>Iliad</i> 23,102

The non-augmented εἶπον only appears in verse final position in 2 instances out of 37:

	Caesura	5 th foot.	Final foot.	Passage.
--	---------	-----------------------	-------------	----------

²⁷⁹ Leaf 1900:292 (with reference to Dawes), Latacz 2000b:152.

²⁸⁰ Ludwig 1885:351-354.

²⁸¹ Magnien 1922b:134; according to West, this was already suggested earlier, but his apparatus only stated „t“ (1999:201), which meant *testimonium auctoris unius* (1999:lix). The correction had in fact already been suggested by Heyne 1821a:327.

²⁸² Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:324; Basset 1984:55 (=2004:13).

²⁸³ Fritz 2010:395. Along similar lines, Bergaigne 1877 had already argued that the oldest PIE did not distinguish between subjunctive and optative; Hahn 1953 also assumed that the meaning of subjunctive and optative was initially the same, namely that of a future.

²⁸⁴ Previous discussions on εἶπον have been made by La Roche 1861:205-207; Mutzbauer 1893:325-327; Fournier 1946:3, 211-212, 228; Beck 1984; Kölligan 2007:218-247. See also the notes at the beginning of the chapter.

ἦτοι Ἀθηναίη ἀκέων ἦν	//	οὐδέ τι	εἶπε	<i>Iliad</i> 4,22; <i>Iliad</i> 8,459
-----------------------	----	---------	------	---------------------------------------

In 20 instances the verb form is put in the 3rd foot:²⁸⁵

1 st – 2 nd foot.	3 rd foot.	Rest.	Passage.
ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα	εἶπε	πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν	(occurs 11 times)
καὶ τότε ἄρ' Αἴας	εἶπε	βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον	<i>Iliad</i> 17,237

In 2 instances it occupies the verse initial position:

Verb initial.		Passage.
εἶπεν	ἐπευξάμενος Δίτ' ἅλλοισιν τε θεοῖσι	<i>Iliad</i> 6,475
εἶπε	δ' ἄρα κλαίουσα γυνὴ εἰκυῖα θεῇσι	<i>Iliad</i> 19,286

In 13 times it is put after the bucolic caesura:²⁸⁶

	Caesura	Verb.	Passage.
ὥς τότε Τυδεΐδης ἀνεχάζετο,	//	εἶπέ τε λαῶ	<i>Iliad</i> 5,600
ἔγνω ἐσάντα ἰδὼν, μέγα δ' Ἔκτορα	//	εἶπε βοήσας	<i>Iliad</i> 17,334
Ἥελιος γάρ οἱ σκοπιὴν ἔχεν	//	εἶπέ τε μῦθον	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,302

The iterative εἶπεσκεν occurs 28 times and always appears after the ictus of the second foot, and never occupies verse final position:

1 st foot and 2a.	2b and 3 rd foot.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὥδε δέ τις	εἶπεσκεν	ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον	<i>Iliad</i> 2,271
ὥδε δέ τις	εἶπεσκεν	Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε	<i>Iliad</i> 3,297

The conclusions do not occupy the entire verse in 5 εἶπεσκε conclusions:²⁸⁷

ὥς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε, μένος δ' ὄρσασκεν ἐκάστου (*Iliad* 17,423).

The conclusions with finite verb forms occupy the entire verse in:

ὥς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε (*Iliad* 4,85).

There is one instance of a double formula of two introductions in one verse:²⁸⁸

Participle.	1 st introduction.	2 nd introduction.	Passage.
ὀχθήσας	δ' ἄρα εἶπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 21,258

²⁸⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 11,403; 16,513; 17,90; 17,237; 17,651; 18,5; 19,257; 20,343; 20,375; 21,53; 21,552; 22,98; 23,143 and *Odyssey* 5,298; 5,355; 5,407; 5,464; 7,330; 21,248.

²⁸⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 5,600; 6,75; 7,277; 11,647; 12,60; 12,210; 13,725; 17,334; 18,391; 23,155; 23,204 and *Odyssey* 8,302; 14,494.

²⁸⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 17,423; 22,375 and *Odyssey* 4,772; 13,170; 23,152.

²⁸⁸ This use of the participle is not confined to the poetic language. See Kieckers 1913:151-153.

Sometimes, the speech introduction is extended by another participle construction.²⁸⁹

Introduction.	Participle construction.	Passage.
ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν	ιδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν	<i>Iliad</i> 7,178; 7,201
ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκε	δόμων ἔκτοσθεν ἀκούων	<i>Odyssey</i> 23,148

In one instance, the speech introduction is extended by more than one participle:

Participle.	Introduction.	Participle construction.	Passage.
εὐξάμενος	δ' ἄρα εἶπεν	ιδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν	<i>Iliad</i> 19,257

3.2.8.2. The constructions with the simplex ἔειπον in speech introductions and conclusions.

When ἔειπον is used in speech introductions and conclusions, it means “address (someone), speak (a word), say (a word)”, and is followed by direct speech. It is attested with the following constructions.

1. It can be used without overt arguments, and then it means only “speak”. This construction is found in:

- speech conclusions;
- the iterative εἶπεσκε(ν);
- the 8 formulae in the subjunctive (cf. supra);
- the indicative when the verb is determined by a participle construction as is the case in

εἶπεν ἐπευξάμενος Διὶ τ' ἄλλοισιν τε θεοῖσι (*Iliad* 6,475),

εὐξάμενος δ' ἄρα εἶπεν ιδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν (*Iliad* 19,257),

εἶπε δ' ἄρα κλαίουσα γυνὴ εἰκυῖα θεῇσι (*Iliad* 19,286).

2. When ἔειπον is not used without arguments, it can govern the person addressed in the accusative:

ἔγνω ἐσάντα ιδὼν, μέγα δ' Ἑκτορα εἶπε βοήσας (*Iliad* 17,334).

3. ἔειπον can also be constructed with the addressee in the dative. The dative is used in 7 instances, and the accusative in 7 instances. Sometimes the same formula appears on one occasion with an accusative and on another with a dative. An example of the accusative is:

An example of the dative is:

ὥς τότε Τυδείδης ἀνεχάζετο, εἶπέ τε λαῷ (*Iliad* 5,600).

Sometimes, the same name is used in the accusative on one occasion, and in the dative in another:

²⁸⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 2,271; 4,81; 6,459; 6,475; 7,178; 7,201; 20,375 and 22,372 and *Odyssey* 8,328; 10,37; 13,167; 18,72; 18,400; 21,396; 23,148.

δὴ τότε Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἴκτορα εἶπε παραστάς,
καὶ τότε ἄρ' Ἴκτορα εἶπε παραστάς Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 20,374-375),
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' Αἰνεία τε καὶ Ἴκτορι εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 6,75),
εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεὺς αἰψ' Ἀγαμέμνονι εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 23,155).

The use of the accusative might be an archaism, but can also have originated under the influence of the compound προσέειπον.²⁹⁰

4. In two instances, the simplex is used to mean “speak a word to”. In those instances, an accusative of the word spoken and a dative of the person addressed are found:

ὅς ῥα τότε Τρῳσὶν τε καὶ Ἴκτορι μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 10,318),
ἐνθ' Ὀδυσσεὺς δμῳέσσι καὶ νιέϊ μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Odyssey* 24,213).

5. When ἔειπον is used in the formula πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε, it is used with the accusative of the person addressed (and is often but not always used when the simplex προσέειπον cannot be used, cf. *infra*).

ἐκ δ' ἦλθε κλισίης καὶ σφεας πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 10,140).

6. When ἔειπον is used in the formula μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπε, it is used with the accusative of the person addressed (and is often but not always used when the simplex μετέειπον cannot be used, cf. *infra*).

λαοῖσιν δ' ὁ γέρον Πρίαμος μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 24,777).

7. It can be used with the preposition πρὸς followed by the person addressed in the accusative.

ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν (attested 11 times).

8. It can be used with the preposition μετὰ followed by the person addressed in the dative.

ἔστη ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἰών, μετὰ δὲ δμῳῇσιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 6,375).

9. It can be used with the accusative of the word spoken and the preposition ἐν followed by the person addressed in the dative (cf. *infra*).

στῇ δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (attested 7 times).

3.2.8.3. Word order in speech introductions and conclusions with the simplex ἔειπον.

The metrical form of the indicative ἔειπον allows it to be placed in almost any position in the verse (contrary to e.g. προσέφη, which can never be placed at the end of the verse).

Generally speaking, the word order is OV. Examples are:

Rest of the verse.	Object.	Verb.	Passage.
Σαρπηδὼν Διὸς υἱός,	ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυνδόν	ἔειπε	<i>Iliad</i> 5,683

²⁹⁰ Edwards 1991:85.

εἰ μὴ ἄρ'	Αἰνεΐα τε καὶ Ἴκτορι	εἶπε παραστὰς	<i>Iliad</i> 6,75
ὧς φάτο, Λαέρτης δ' ἐχάρη καὶ	μῦθον	ἔειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,513

There are several instances, where the word order is VO. Some of them can be explained by formulaic inflection of a verse that originally had OV. This is the case for:

καὶ τότε ἄρ' Αἴας εἶπε βοῆν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον (*Iliad* 17,237; 17,507; 17, 651).

This is an adaptation of a verse with the nominative βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος at the end.

In the following instances, the VO order is the only possible word order because of metrical constraints:

εὐχόμενος δ' ἄρα εἶπεν ἐκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι (*Iliad* 16,513).

A sequence ἐκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι εἶπεν would not fit the metre, and therefore the poet had to use εἶπεν ἐκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι instead. This verse is linguistically remarkable, as it used the *nu ephelkustikon* before a word starting with a digamma (εἶπεν ἐκηβόλῳ), it has *correptio epica* of φ in ἐκηβόλῳ (a long diphthong, which is usually not shortened) and shows a metrically lengthened the first syllable in Ἀπόλλωνι.

ὧς τότε Τυδεΐδης ἀνεχάζετο, εἶπέ τε λαῶ (*Iliad* 5,600).

3.2.8.4. Connection of ἔειπον with the rest of the verse.

The connection between the forms of ἔειπον and the rest of the sentence is made by the connecting particles τε, δέ and καί, but as was argued before, they are not interchangeable. Ruijgh argued that the connecting particle τε linked verbal forms with the same subject, while verbal forms with a different subject were generally connected by δέ.²⁹¹ The 5 instances of εἶπέ τε μῦθον confirm this, although in μέσσω δ' ἀμφοτέρων σκῆπτρα σχέθον, εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Iliad* 7,277) the subject is not entirely the same, as the verb εἶπε only has Idaios as subject, while σχέθον has both Talthybios and Idaios as subject.²⁹² A correction was suggested, but is not advisory. Ruijgh considered the connection made by τε in a sentence with a verb followed by a *verbum dicendi* to be normal, because it underlined the close link between the action and the speaking that was about to follow.²⁹³ In one instance, the connection is not made with τε, but with δέ:

ἦ δ' αὖθ' ἔξεσθαι μὲν ἀνήνατο, εἶπε δὲ μῦθον (*Iliad* 23,204).

In this verse, it is related how the goddess Iris went to summon the winds to set fire to Patroklos's pyre. She found the winds at a feast and upon arriving she was invited to join the

²⁹¹ Ruijgh 1971: *passim* but especially 175-179.

²⁹² Ruijgh 1971:175-177

²⁹³ Ruijgh 1971:179 *la particule souligne, pour ainsi dire, le lien stable qui existe entre la parole et le procès qui la prépare.*

banquet, but Iris did not want to join, addressed them and asked to ignite the fire. As such, there is a contrast between the two verbs. The particle τε is also transmitted in some manuscripts, but a connection μὲν ... δέ... is much more common to indicate a contrast than μὲν ... τε As was shown earlier on, the particle δέ always carries some contrast in it, and is therefore more suited in this instance.

There is one instance with ἔειπον where Homer used the old pronoun **sos* to start a new sentence (underlining and putting in bold face are mine):

ἦν δέ τις ἐν Τρώεσσι Δόλων Εὐμήδεος υἱὸς
κήρυκος θείοιο πολύχρυσος πολύχαλκος,
ὃς δὴ τοι εἶδος μὲν ἦν κακός, ἀλλὰ ποδώκης:
αὐτὰρ ὁ μόνος ἦν μετὰ πέντε κασιγνήτησιν.
ὃς ῥα τότε Τρωσὶν τε καὶ Ἑκτορι μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 10,314-318).

3.2.9. The compound προσέειπον.

In this subchapter the compound προσέειπον will be discussed. First there is a short overview of the formal elements, and then the constructions and case usage are discussed. Afterwards, the word order, the position in the verse and the connection of προσέειπον to the rest of the verse are discussed.

3.2.9.1. Metrical observations on the verses with of προσέειπον.

The preverb/prefix/preposition προσ-/πρός never undergoes *correptio attica* in the compound, and always builds position, unless it preceded by a word that has a long vowel or ends in a consonant. In that case, it cannot be determined whether or not πρ- in προσ- really counted as two consonants. There are about 20 unclear cases, and about 40 cases of position making.

The formulae with προσέειπον can occupy the entire verse. The most common construction is Object – Verb – Noun Epithet: the verse starts with the object (mostly a demonstrative pronoun), followed by the verb and the subject, which is put at the end of the verse. Examples are:

Pronoun.		Verb.	Noun Epithet.	Passage.
τὸν	πρότερος	προσέειπε	ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς	<i>Iliad</i> 20,177; 21,149
τὴν	δ' αὖτε	προσέειπε	περίφρων Πηνελόπεια	occurring 5 times. ²⁹⁴
τὸ/ἦν	δ' αὖτε	προσέειπε	μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἑκτώρ	occurring 5 times. ²⁹⁵

²⁹⁴ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,830; 17,498; 18,177; 23,10 and 23,58.

²⁹⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 6,440; 7,233; 7,287; 22,232 and 22,249.

If the subject is not expressed, or if it is a person without an epithet or a pronoun, the verb is often put at the end of the verse. In that case, the subject can appear at the beginning and the object can stand between the subject and the verb. Examples are:

ἀλλ' ὃ γε Ταλθύβιον τε καὶ Εὐρυβάτην προσέειπε (*Iliad* 1,320),

Ἀντίνοος δέ μιν οἶος ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε (*Odyssey* 2,84).

The introductions with προσέειπον can be expanded by a participle construction, which mostly belongs to the subject. Examples of such participle extensions are:

	Participle construction.	Verb.	Passage.
Κάλχαντα πρότιστα	κάκ' ὀσσόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Iliad</i> 1,105
πρῶτον ἔπειτα γέροντα	καθαπτόμενος	προσέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,39
Ἀλκίνοος δέ μιν οἶος	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,235

Special cases are those verses where one person stops speaking, and the other starts. In those verses, a speech conclusion and an introduction appear side by side. Examples are (this occurs mostly in the *Odyssey*, because there are more dialogues there):

Conclusion.		Participle.	Verb.	Passage.
ὥς ἔφατ',	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπον	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,138
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὃ δέ μ' αὐτίκ'	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,145

In some instances, there is no participle in the introduction:

Conclusion.	Introduction verb.		Passage.
ἦ ῥ',	ἅμα τε προσέειπεν	Ὀδυσσεῖα πολίπορθον	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,356

When προσέειπον occupies only a part of the verse, it is sometimes part of a “double introduction”:²⁹⁶

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε γυνὴ καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 15,434).

3.2.9.2. Constructions of προσέειπον.

The compound προσέειπον is attested in the following constructions.

1. In only five instances, the person addressed is not explicitly mentioned in the verse:

χεῖρα γέροντος ἔλὼν ἐξείρετο καὶ προσέειπε (*Iliad* 24,361),

ἐξαῦτις μύθοισιν ἀμειβομένη προσέειπεν (*Odyssey* 4,234),

ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς μύθοισιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπον (*Odyssey* 4,484),

²⁹⁶ Mutzbauer 1909:131; Kieckers 1912; Fingerle 1939:307; Fournier 1946b:35,41; O’Nolan 1978:28, 30-31; Hoekstra 1989:162; Riggsby 1992; Hackstein 2010a:423. See Appendix A.4.

ἐξαῦτις μύθοισιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε (*Odyssey* 24,350),

μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσι καθαπτόμενος προσέειπεν (*Odyssey* 24,393).

2. The verb is constructed with the accusative, as are all compounds with προσ-. The exclusive use of the accusative is remarkable, because the *prati* compounds with the meaning “answer” in Sanskrit can use the dative of the person.²⁹⁷ The use of the accusative in Homer is an archaism, because it maintains the oldest use of the accusative: the direction (speaking towards) or the direct object (addressing someone).

3. In some instances, the words spoken are put in the dative. This is the case, when the verb is “enlarged” by a participle. The words are not object of προσέειπε, but an instrumental of ἀμειβόμενος, “answering with words”. Examples are (the list is not exhaustive):

Rest of the verse.	Dative.	Participle.	<i>Verbum dicendi</i> .	Passage.
τὴν δὲ Πάρις	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Iliad</i> 3,347
ἐξαῦτις	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβομένη	προσέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,234; 19,214
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὧς	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπον	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,484
καὶ τότε μιν	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβομένη	προσέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,252

3.2.9.3. Word order with προσέειπον.

The normal word order of the compound προσέειπον is OV. There are many examples:

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (occurring 8 times),²⁹⁸

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε διάκτορος ἀργεῖφόντης (occurring 4 times),²⁹⁹

The verses that have the object at the end of the verse after the verb can either be explained as formulaic reuse of a formula where the object was subject and appeared at the verse end, or by metrical grounds, if the object could not be (easily) put before the verb:

λίσσομένη προσέειπε Δία Κρονίωνα ἄνακτα (*Iliad* 1,502),

πυκνήσιν λιθάδεσσιν: ὃ δὲ προσέειπεν ἄνακτα (*Odyssey* 14,36).

In these two instances, the word order is metrically determined: Δία Κρονίωνα ἄνακτα cannot be put before the verb without violating the metre. The formula Δία Κρονίωνα ἄνακτα appears once in the accusative and 4 times in the dative,³⁰⁰ and is always used in verse final position. If Δία Κρονίωνα is used without ἄνακτα, it can be used in OV structure, as in αὐτίκα κερτομίοισι Δία Κρονίωνα προσήυδα (*Iliad* 1,539).

The same applies to the next instance of VO word order:

²⁹⁷ Delbrück 1888:141, Haudry 1977:329.

²⁹⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 9,676 and 10,248, and *Odyssey* 14,148; 16,90; 16,225; 16,258; 16,266 and 17,560.

²⁹⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 21,497; 24,378; 24,389; 24,310 and 24,432 and *Odyssey* 5,145.

³⁰⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 2,202; 7,194; 7,200 and 18,118.

ἔσθη, καὶ προσέειπεν ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον (*Iliad* 17,11).

This verse is a formulaic inflection of those verses where ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος stood at the end of the verse in the nominative. The formula ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος in the nominative occurs 9 times and is always placed in verse final position.³⁰¹ Examples are:

Rest of the verse.	Verb.	Noun epithet – SUBJECT.	Passage.
τὸν δ' ὥς οὖν	ἐνόησεν	ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος	<i>Iliad</i> 3,21
πολλάκι μιν	ξείνισσεν	ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος	<i>Iliad</i> 3,232
ὥς φάτο,	μερμήριξε δ'	ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,169

These verses in the nominative were then inflected into the accusative, but the noun-epithet formula continued to occupy the same metrical position: the formula ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον (in the accusative) appears 6 times, and is also put at the end of the verse.³⁰² This yields verses with VO word order. Examples of this verse final position are:

Rest of the verse.	Verb.	Noun epithet – OBJECT.	Passage.
οὐκ ἂν δῆ	μείνεια	ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον	<i>Iliad</i> 3,52
ἔσθη, καὶ	προσέειπεν	ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον	<i>Iliad</i> 17,11

The next verse with VO word order is

Ἔκτωρ δὲ προσέειπεν ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα (*Iliad* 22,278).

In this specific instance, the VO structure is also metrically motivated, as the formula ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα occurs ten times, and is always put in the verse final position.³⁰³

Examples are:

Rest of the verse.	Verb.	Noun epithet – OBJECT.	Passage.
ἵπποι θ' οἷ	φορέεσκον	ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα	<i>Iliad</i> 2,770
πειρᾶν ὥς	πεπύθοιεν	ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα	<i>Iliad</i> 9,181
Ἔκτωρ δὲ	προσέειπεν	ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα	<i>Iliad</i> 22,278

The formulaic inflection and substitution also explain the VO word order in the following instances:

Rest of the verse.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
ἄστυδε ἰέμενος, καὶ ἔδν	προσέειπε	συβώτην	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,5

³⁰¹ The instances are *Iliad* 3,21; 3,136; 3,232; 3,253; 4,150; 5,161; 11,463 and 17,138, and *Odyssey* 15,169.

³⁰² The instances are *Iliad* 3,52; 3,69; 3,90; 3,432; 17,1 and 17,11.

³⁰³ The instances are *Iliad* 2,674; 2,770; 9,181; 9,698; 10,323; 17,280 and 22,278, and *Odyssey* 11,470; 11,551 and 24,18.

Φήμιος: αὐτὰρ ὁ χειρὸς ἔλων	προσέειπε	συβώτην	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,263
Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐπὶ οἷ καλέσας	προσέειπε	συβώτην	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,342

These 3 verses are a rework of formulae where συβώτης was used in the nominative and had OV word order:

Object.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸν δ' αὖτε	προσέειπε	συβώτης, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν	occurring three times ³⁰⁴

The formulaic inflection and substitution cannot explain the VO word order in the following instance:

ἦ ῥ', ἅμα τε προσέειπεν Ὀδυσσῆα πολίπορθον (*Odyssey* 18,356).

This specific instance is remarkable, because a sequence ἦ ῥ', ἅμα τε πολίπορθον Ὀδυσσῆα προσέειπεν would have fit the metre as well. The adjective πολίπορθος is only put before the name Ὀδυσσεύς, when the formula is used in the nominative.³⁰⁵ In the accusative, however, the adjective πολίπορθον is always put after the name, although πολίπορθον Ὀδυσσῆα would be possible as well. The formula Ὀδυσσῆα πολίπορθον is only used at the end of the verse.³⁰⁶ In other positions in the verse, it is adapted into Ὀδυσσῆα πολιπόρθιον.³⁰⁷

The following instance of VO order is also clearly an inflection of an OV formula:

Rest of the verse.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
αὐτὰρ ὃ γε	προσέειπε	φίλην τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,480

is a clear case of formulaic inflection of

Object.	Particles.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸν	δ' αὖτε	προσέειπε	φίλη τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,419

3.2.9.4. Connection of προσέειπον with the rest of the verse.

If the clause with προσέειπον does not occupy the entire verse, but is linked with another main clause with a finite verb, there is a connecting particle to link both clauses. These particles are: καί, δέ; αὐτάρ (mostly these three); ἅμα τε, but as was shown before, the context determines which particle or adverb was used. Examples are:

δεῖσε δ' ὃ γ' ἐν θυμῷ, Διομήδεα δὲ προσέειπε (*Iliad* 8,138),

ἔστη, καὶ προσέειπεν ἄρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον (*Iliad* 17,11).

³⁰⁴ The instances are *Odyssey* 15,351; 15,389 and 16,36.

³⁰⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 2,278 and 10,363, and *Odyssey* 8,3; 16,442 and 22,283.

³⁰⁶ The instances are *Odyssey* 18,356 and 24,119.

³⁰⁷ The instances are *Odyssey* 9,504 and 9,530.

In these two verses the difference in particle use is clear: in the first one, there is a contrast between the internal fear felt by Nestor and his shouting to Diomedes, while in the second the example the “usual” combination of standing next to someone and speaking to him is described. As standing and speaking are often combined, there is no contrast felt.

ὥς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπον (*Odyssey* 11,435),

ἦ ῥ', ἅμα τε προσέειπεν Ὀδυσσεύῃα πολίπορθον (*Odyssey* 18,356).

3.2.10. The compound μετέειπον.

3.2.10.1. The metrical position of μετέειπον within the rest of the verse.

The verses with the compound often occupy the entire verse. In most cases, the metrical structure is Object – Verb – Noun-Epithet or Object – Subject – Verb. In several instances, there is an apposition or a participle construction linked to the subject. Examples of this are:

Object.	Verb	Subject.	Apposition.	Passage.
τοῖσι δὲ καὶ	μετέειπε	γέρον	ἥρως Ἑχένης	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,342
τοῖσι δὲ καὶ	μετέειπε	Μελάνθιος,	αἰπόλος αἰγῶν	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,369

In several instances the subject does not have an apposition but is expanded by a participle construction:

Object.	Subject.	Verb.	Participle.	Passage.
τοῖς δ'	Ὀδυσσεὺς	μετέειπε,	συβώτεω πειρητίζων	<i>Odyssey</i> 14,459; 15,304
τοῖς δ'	Ἀγέλεως	μετέειπεν,	ἔπος πάντεσσι πιφαύσκων	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,131; 22,147

Shipp interpreted these examples as innovations, because the construction Object - verb – noun epithet would have been expected.³⁰⁸

Object.	Verb.	Subject.	Participle.	Passage.
τοῖσι δὲ καὶ	μετέειπε	Μέδων	πεπνυμένα εἰδώς	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,442

In several instances, there are two main verbs in the verse, which are both linked to the act of speaking and/or addressing.³⁰⁹

τοῖσιν δ' Ἀντίνοος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε (ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε occurs 24 times),³¹⁰

τοῖς δ' αὖτις μετέειπε γυνὴ καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 15,439).

³⁰⁸ Shipp 1972:52

³⁰⁹ See Appendix A.4.

³¹⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 1,73; 1,253; 2,78; 2,283; 7,326; 7,367; 9,95; 15,285; 18,253 and *Odyssey* 2,24; 2,160; 2,228; 4,773; 7,158; 7,185; 8,25; 13,171; 16,394; 16,399; 18,412; 20,244; 24,53; 24,425 and 24,453.

A specific case is the participle extension of the first formula mentioned above: ὁ σφιν ἐὺ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε.

Sometimes, the verb μετέειπον appears in the verse together with another finite verb in the main clause:

ὁψὲ δὲ δὴ Μενέλαος ἀνίστατο καὶ μετέειπε (*Iliad* 7,94),

τοῖσιν δ' Εὐπείθης ἀνά θ' ἴστατο καὶ μετέειπε (*Odyssey* 24,422).

In other instances, the clause of μετέειπον only occupies half of the verse. In that case, it is always put in the second half of the verse. Examples are:

λεπτὸν καὶ περίμετρον: ἄφαρ δ' ἡμῖν μετέειπε (*Odyssey* 2,95 and 24,130),

λεπτὸν καὶ περίμετρον: ἄφαρ δ' αὐτοῖς μετέειπον (*Odyssey* 19,140).

3.2.10.2. Constructions of μετέειπον.

The following constructions are attested.

1. The first one is that there is no person addressed expressed with the compound verb: this occurs in 10 instances. Examples are:

ὁψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε γέρων ἱππηλάτα Φοῖνιξ (*Iliad* 9,432).

ὁψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε γέρων ἥρως Ἐχένης (*Odyssey* 7,155).

2. The second construction is the dative of the person addressed. In most instances, this is a personal pronoun and appears in the beginning of the verse. An example is the formula τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε (NOUN EPITHET), which occurs 19 times with a different subject.³¹¹

3. The third construction is the verse ὁ σφιν ἐὺ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν (occurring 15 times).³¹² The dative in that verse can belong to any of the three verbal forms in the verse, and probably belongs to all three. A variant is the construction τοῖσιν δ' (NOM) ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε (occurring 8 times with different subject),³¹³ where there is no participle. In that construction, the dative can belong to both verbs, and in all likelihood belongs to both, as the meanings of both verbs are very close.³¹⁴

The person addressed always appears in the dative. The dative is explained as belonging to the preposition μετά. When more than one or two persons are addressed, the poet did not use πρὸς but μετά, as the speaking is interpreted in a locative sense, “speaking among” (as was noted before).³¹⁵ The compound verb is never constructed with an accusative.

³¹¹ The instances are *Iliad* 2,336; 3,96; 3,455; 10,219; 10,233; 14,109; 19,76 and 23,889, and *Odyssey* 2,157; 2,409; 3,330; 11,342; 17,151; 17,369; 18,405; 20,350; 21,101; 24,442 and 24,451.

³¹² The instances are *Iliad* 1,73; 1,253; 2,78; 2,283; 7,326; 7,367; 9,95; 15,285 and 18,253 and *Odyssey* 2,160; 2,228; 7,158; 16,399; 24,53 and 24,453.

³¹³ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,773; 7,185; 8,25; 13,171; 16,394; 18,412 and 20,244.

³¹⁴ Ameis-Hentze 1884:7; Delbrück 1897:421.

³¹⁵ See footnotes 210 and 213.

3.2.10.3. Word order in the verses with μετέειπον.

The word order is always OV, except in those instances where there is no object. When the object is a personal pronoun, it is put at the beginning of the verse or colon:

τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε Γερήνιος ἱππότης Νέστωρ (*Iliad* 2,336),

τοῖσιν δ' Ἀλκίνοος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν (*Odyssey* 13,171),

If the subject of the compound is a noun epithet formula, the subject appears at the end of the verse, as can be seen in:

ὄψε δὲ δὴ μετέειπε Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος (*Odyssey* 20,321).

This also applies to μετέειπε ἱερὴ ἱς Τηλεμάχῳ, which occurs five times.³¹⁶

If the subject is expanded by an apposition, subject and apposition appear at the end of the verse, as in:

τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε Μελάνθιος, αἰπόλος αἰγῶν (*Odyssey* 17,369).

If the subject is not expressed, if it is a pronoun or a name without epithet, the verb occupies the final position in the verse. Examples are ὄψε δὲ δὴ Μενέλαος ἀνίστατο καὶ μετέειπε (*Iliad* 7,94) and ὃ σφιν ἐὺ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν.

3.2.11. The formulae with ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν.

A special case is the formula ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν, which is attested 8 times in *Iliad* 23 and only there.³¹⁷

στῇ δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (7 instances),³¹⁸

μειδιόων, καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,786).

The use of the preposition ἐν with a dative of the persons addressed in a speech introduction is rare, as in the vast majority of cases the preposition/preverb μετὰ is used. In addition, there are no forms attested of a verb ἐνέειπον nor of ἐνλέγω.³¹⁹ The use of ἐν Ἀργείοισιν as locative description is metrically motivated: μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν is a metrical variant for μετὰ, because μῦθον μετ' Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν would not fit the metre. When μετὰ is metrically possible, it is used as in

ὄνθον ἀποπτύων, μετὰ δ' Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,781).

A similar metrically motivated use of ἐν Ἀργείοισιν is found with the verb ἀγορεύω:

στὰς δ' ἄρ' ἐν Ἀργείοις ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε (*Iliad* 23,535)

³¹⁶ The instances are *Odyssey* 2,409; 18,60; 18,405; 21,101 and 21,130.

³¹⁷ See most recently Beck 2005:234-238.

³¹⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 23,271; 23,456; 23,657; 23,706; 23,752; 23,801 and 23,830.

³¹⁹ The forms are not found in LSJ nor in Beck 1984 (=LfgrE).

In this instance μετ' Ἀργείοις would have been metrically impossible. The locative sense is indicated by the fact that the verb ἀγορεύω is combined with a form of the root **steh*₂: “standing among the Argives, he spoke winged words”.

The distinction between μετ' Ἀργείοισιν and ἐν Ἀργείοισιν is also metrically determined outside speech introductions and conclusions, as can be seen in the following examples:

τοσσοῖδ' ὅσοισιν σὺ μετ' Ἀργείοισιν ἀνάσσεις (*Iliad* 14,94),

ὀμνύεω δέ τοι ὄρκον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἀναστὰς (*Iliad* 19,175).

There is therefore no need to interpret ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν as an instance of a verb ἐνέειπον in tmesis.

3.2.12. Tmesis with ἔειπον.

The first question is if one should distinguish between preverbs and prepositions. Hajnal argued that the distinction was not clear,³²⁰ but as Homer had instances such as ἐν δώματα ναίει and ἐν δώμασι ναίει it might be better to make the distinction. As such, ἐν δώματα ναίει is a case of tmesis, because ἐν cannot govern an accusative, while ἐν δώμασι ναίει is not tmesis, because the dative can belong to ἐν.³²¹ Consequently, μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἔειπε, πρὸς δ' Εὐρύκλειαν ἔειπε and εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν are not considered cases of tmesis, because the respective preverbs already function as prepositions.

In what follows, I will discuss the instances of ἔειπον in which preverb and verb were separated. This is called “tmesis” and is generally believed to be the older stage of the language, when there were no compounds yet. It is very remarkable that this phenomenon is absent in Mycenaean, which is 500 years older than Homeric Greek.³²² Although a detailed analysis has to remain outside the scope of this thesis, I would like to briefly touch upon the subject. This absence has been explained in four different ways:³²³

a) the Homeric language represents a linguistic stage that is older than Mycenaean.³²⁴ This was argued for by Horrocks.³²⁵

³²⁰ Hajnal 2004:§3.

³²¹ Haug 2012:101-103.

³²² See Horrocks 1980 and Duhoux 1994/5 and 1998 for a convincing argumentation that tmesis is absent in Mycenaean. Sánchez Ruipérez 1997:530-531 was more skeptical and believes that there might have been some instances of tmesis after all.

³²³ See the overview in Hajnal 2004:§1 and §2 and Hettrich 2012b.

³²⁴ Horrocks 1980.

³²⁵ Horrocks 1980; West 1988:156; Latacz 1998:14; Plath 2002. The current edition of *Der Neue Pauly* considers this to be the *communis opinio*, judging from the contributions in it by Latacz 1998:14 and Plath 2002, who both referred to Horrocks and West. Hajnal's assessment of the scholarship on the issue (Hajnal 2004:§2) gives a more nuanced view.

b) The Homeric language belonged to a dialectal branch that was different from the Mycenaean one and preserved tmesis until the 1st Millennium BC.³²⁶

c) Tmesis is nothing more than a purely poetic phenomenon, used by the poet to give his language a less contemporaneous and more poetic outlook. In its extreme this theory was argued for by Haug, who stated that the differences in tmesis use between *Iliad* and *Odyssey* could be used to prove that these poems were written by different authors.³²⁷

d) Morpurgo Davies argued that while tmesis in Homer certainly contained relics of the oldest language state, it also had a “poetic flavour” (my term).³²⁸ For this she referred to the use of tmesis in later poets.³²⁹ As tmesis was closely linked with the poetic language, its absence in Mycenaean is most likely not linguistically motivated, but stylistically: as these documents were supposed to state objective facts, poetic features were deliberately avoided. As such, no far reaching conclusions should be drawn from the absence in Mycenaean. This was further expanded by Hajnal.³³⁰

It is not straightforward to decide which of the four explanations is correct, but I believe that the existence of tmesis in Anatolian³³¹ and Indo-Iranian³³² argues against Haug’s statement that tmesis was only a poetic tool and not inherited, and I find it even more unlikely to conclude that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* had different authors only because the use of tmesis differed (especially since these two poems agree in many other linguistic traits³³³). It can nevertheless not be denied that tmesis was indeed a poetic tool, but its inherited nature is in my opinion undisputed as well. As such, I consider the suggestion by Morpurgo Davies and Hajnal to be the most likely. In what follows I intend to show that

- certain speech introductions had inherited tmesis,
- in other instances the difference between compound and tmesis was due to a complementary distribution,
- there were also formulaic expansions of these tmesis-constructions.

³²⁶ This option was suggested by Duhoux 1998, although he argued that it was unverifiable. In order to (dis)prove this, Duhoux suggested an in-depth linguistic analysis of all formulae involving tmesis.

³²⁷ See Haug 2012 for this (in my opinion very blunt) statement. He had already argued for the poetic nature of tmesis in 2002:42-44 and 2010:97.

³²⁸ Morpurgo Davies 1985, also accepted by Hajnal 2004. I would like to thank Benedikt Peschl for discussing this issue with me and for providing me with additional information on tmesis in Indo-Iranians.

³²⁹ Morpurgo Davies 1985; this had been noticed already by Wackernagel 1926:171-174 (without reference to Mycenaean, obviously).

³³⁰ Hajnal 2004.

³³¹ Fortson 2004:139-140.

³³² Delbrück 1888:44-46; 1900:103-104; Brugmann 1904:288, 457-459; Hale 1993; Fortson 2004:139-140; I thank Benedikt Peschl for pointing out Hale 1993 to me.

³³³ Janko 1982, 2012.

Contrary to Hajnal (and also Haug³³⁴), I believe that several speech introductions are not instances of secondary tmesis based on the compound, but rather archaic formulae. This is especially the case in the following formulae:

- σῑῑ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ με πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 2,59),
σῑῑ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (attested 5 times),³³⁵
σῑῑ δὲ παρ' Ἑκτορ' ἰὼν καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 7,46),
σῑῑ δὲ παρ' αὐτὸν ἰὼν καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 8,280),
σῑῑ δὲ μάλ' ἐγγὺς ἰὼν καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 11,429),
σῑῑ δὲ παρ' Ἀντίνοον, καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 17,414).

Hajnal argued that these verses were a poetic innovation after the double accusative construction of ὄφρα τί μιν προτεῖποι ἀμειβόμενος ἐπέεσσιν (*Iliad* 22,329),³³⁶ but in my opinion the archaic nature of the formulae quoted above speaks against this. Archaic are the following elements:

- it combined a speech introduction with the root **steh₂*.³³⁷ there are 8 instances of this combination with πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν whereas the compound προσέειπον is only combined thrice with a finite form of **steh₂*.
- it has no augment in σῑῑ because of it is followed by a 2nd position clitic,³³⁸
- it has the double accusative of words spoken and person addressed,
- it has a clitic pronoun in the inherited 2nd position.

There are only three such formulae attested with the compound προσέειπον:

- ἔσῑῑ, καὶ προσέειπεν ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον (*Iliad* 17,11),
σῑῑ ῑ' ἐς μέσσον ἰὼν καὶ Ὀδυσσῑῑα προσέειπε (*Odyssey* 8,144),
σῑῑ δὲ πάροιθ' αὐτῑῑ: τὸν δὲ προσέειπεν Ἀθήνη (*Odyssey* 16,166).

I therefore believe that the formula καὶ (clitic pronoun) πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε was an inherited formula, but from this contexts the formulae πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε and μῦθον ἔειπε were expanded. The formula πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε and the compound προσέειπον were used in different contexts (and the same applies to the formula μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπε and the compound μετέειπον).³³⁹

Compound προσέειπον.	The construction (πρὸς) μῦθον ἔειπε.
----------------------	--------------------------------------

³³⁴ Haug 2012:96-98.

³³⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 23,68; 24,682 and *Odyssey* 6,21; 20,32; 23,4.

³³⁶ Hajnal 2004:§4:E.

³³⁷ Bertrand 2006a; Appendix A.4.

³³⁸ Chapter 6.3; Appendix B.2.

³³⁹ In this respect I agree with Haug 2012, but I do not follow his line of argument that this proves that tmesis was only a poetic tool.

Mostly not in verse final position.	Verse final position.
Used in the structure PN – (Particles –) Noun Epithet.	Used when no noun epithet is attested for the subject.
Attested with noun – epithet formula, if the formula can be put at the end of the verse.	Used when the noun epithet of the subject cannot be put at the end of the verse.
Combined with the participle of ἀμείβομαι.	Generally not combined with a participle.

Some examples will make this clear. In the following verses the “tmesis” construction is used, because the noun epithet formula could not be put at the end of the verse or because there is no noun epithet attested for the subject:

τοῖσι δὲ Δαρδανίδης Πρίαμος μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 3,303),
τὸν καὶ Τληπόλεμος πρότερος πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 5,632),
τὸν δ' αὖτ' ὀτρηνή ταμὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 6,381),
ἀντίθεος Τελαμωνιάδης μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 9,623),
τὸν καὶ Πείραιος πρότερος πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 17,74),
τὴν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρυνόμη ταμὶ πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 17,141;18,169).

In the following verses the use of the compound was metrically excluded, although noun epithets were attested for both object and subject:

εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναῖν Ἥρην πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 2,156),
δεῖν δ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν Ἥρην πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 15,13).

In the following instances the compound is used, because there is a noun epithet formula for the subject:

τοῖς δ' αὖτις μετέειπε Γερήνιος ἱππότης Νέστωρ (*Iliad* 7,170),
τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής (*Iliad* 13,774),
Ἑρμῆν δὲ προσέειπεν ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων (*Odyssey* 8,334).

In the following instances, we see a combination of the participle of ἀμείβομαι and the compound:

Ἀλκίνοος δέ μιν οἶος ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε (*Odyssey* 8,235),
ἐξαυτὶς μιν ἔπεσιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπεν (*Odyssey* 16,193).

The observations above explain the difference in construction between

τὸν καὶ Τληπόλεμος πρότερος πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 5,632),

and

τὸν προτέρη προσέειπε θεά, γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη (*Odyssey* 3,13).

As Athena had many noun epithet formulae that could be put at the end of the verse, the verse could be constructed with the compound προσέειπον, whereas Tlepolemos did not have such noun epithet formulae, and therefore the formula πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε had to be used.

In one instance a “tnesis formula” was inflected itself and expanded. The formula

τὴν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρυνόμη ταμίη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 17,141;18,169)

has the nominative Εὐρυνόμη ταμίη and used the tnesis construction because the noun epithet Εὐρυνόμη ταμίη formula could not be put at the end of the verse. It is inflected into an accusative of Εὐρυνόμη ταμίη in the following verse:

ἧ ῥα καὶ Εὐρυνόμην ταμίην πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Odyssey* 19,96).

In a final stage even a formula μῦθον ἔειπε was extracted, and this was then used as speech introduction, either with a dative of the person addressed or without person addressed.

Examples of this formula with person addressed are:

ὅς ῥα τότε Τρῳσὶν τε καὶ Ἑκτορι μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 10,318),

ἐνθ' Ὀδυσσεὺς δμῳέεσσι καὶ νιέϊ μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Odyssey* 24,213).

Examples of this formula without person addressed are:

τὴν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς γήθησεν ἰδὼν καὶ μῦθον ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 22,207),

ὣς φάτο, Λαέρτης δ' ἐχάρη καὶ μῦθον ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 24,513).

I believe that the examples quoted and analysed above show that Morpurgo Davies and Hajnal were right in stating that tnesis in Homer was a syntactic archaism and a poetic tool at the same time.

3.2.13. Conclusion.

In this chapter the speech introduction and conclusion formulae of ἔειπον and its compounds were analysed. The analysis focused on the use of the moods, word order, constructions and tnesis (the augment will be discussed in chapter 6).

The word order in speech introductions was OV. In a few instances, the order was VO because the metre required it, and in other instances the VO order was a formulaic adaptation of a verse in OV order.

The next aspect of the investigation involved the case usage and the tnesis. The simplex ἔειπον used both the dative and the accusative of the person addressed in speech introduction formulae, or an accusative of the word and a dative of the person. The compounds of ἔειπον in tnesis preserved the older construction of the words spoken in the accusative, and the

person addressed in the case of the preposition. In some instances, the preposition was still an adposition/adverb and did not govern a case yet. As a “genuine” compound, however, the verbs only governed one case, namely that of the person addressed. The case then depended on the preverb: *πρός* was used with the accusative when few people were addressed, and *μετά* was used with the dative/locative when many people were spoken to. This indicates that compound verbs had been grammaticalised as verbs with one object already during the creation of the epics. This happened most likely during the Ionic phase of the epic diction, as *προσαυδάω* (which belongs to the Aeolic phase) could still be used with 2 accusatives.

The next step was to analyse the moods and finite and non-finite verb forms of *ἔειπον*. The participle was used in speech conclusion formulae when the subject of the speaking and that of the main verb was the same, or when the subject of the participle had a function in the main clause. The participle is almost the only verb form used to express a speech conclusion with *ἔειπον*. In some instances, the aorist participle indicated an action that occurred almost simultaneously as the verb, and the anteriority of the aorist was less present. The indicative always describes actions without any modal nuance. In eight instances, a speech introduction of *ἔειπον* was used in the subjunctive and in one instance in the optative. The study of the moods has shown that Homer used the subjunctive and the optative of *ἔειπον* to a large extent in their original meanings. The subjunctive indicates the expectation, will or negative will and fear of the person involved, and is very close to a future indicative. The optative was used to express a wish, and the context made it clear that the speaker (Hektor) was uncertain that the wish w/could be fulfilled.

3.3. The verb φημί.

3.3.1. Etymology and meaning of φημί.

The verb φημί is an athematic verb built on the root $*b^he_2$. In the meaning “speak”, this root has cognates in other Indo-European languages, such as Latin *fārī*, Russian *bajati* “speak”, and maybe Old English *bō(i)an* “brag”.³⁴⁰ The Armenian verb *bam* “I say” is also related, and is only used to introduce direct speech. This verb forms fossilised into a quotative particle *bay* “that”.³⁴¹ The basic meaning of $*b^he_2$ is “shine, make visible”, as is seen in Vedic *bhāti* “it/he shines” and Homeric φάε “(Dawn) appeared, shone”.³⁴² From “shine” the root evolved into “speak”.³⁴³ It is thus not necessary to assume two different roots $*b^he_2$ -.³⁴⁴ As such, the Greek φαίνω (from $*b^he_2-n-ie/o$) “show, make visible” is related to φημί,³⁴⁵ and the link between the two meanings was still felt in Homer. This can be seen in the following two examples:

μῦθον ἀτιμήσατε πεφασμένον ὃν κ' εἶπω (*Iliad* 14,127)

“(but you could not) dishonour the word *spoken/brought forward*, that I will speak well”.

The participle πεφασμένον is in later Greek used for φαίνω, but here word has both the meaning “speak” and “show, bring forward”.³⁴⁶

ὥς φάθ', ὃ δ' ὀρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἤρχετο, φαῖνε δ' αἰοιδήν (*Odyssey* 8,499).

This verse described how Demodokos started to sing about the Trojan Horse. Homer stated that Demodokos showed/brought forward the song.³⁴⁷

Both meanings are also attested in the verb πιφαύσκω “speak, address, show”, which a reduplicated present built on the root with *u* epenthesis.³⁴⁸ The verb is used as a participle extension to the subject in speech introductions:

³⁴⁰ Walde-Hofmann 1938:525-526; Buck 1949:1254; Ernout-Meillet 1967:245-246; Frisk 1970:1009-1010; Chantraine 1968-1974:1195-1196; Lühr 1976:92; Hackstein 1995:174, Schirmer 2001a:69 (=LIV²); Kölligan 2007:229; De Vaan 2008: 231; Beekes 2010:1566-1567.

³⁴¹ Hübschmann 1897:427-428; Schwyzler 1930:243; Pokorny 1959:105; Chantraine 1968-1974:1196; Bader 1976:88-91; Schirmer 2001b:55; Martirosyan 2010:164-165.

³⁴² Buck 1949:1254; Strunk 1994b:421; Mayrhofer 1996:259-260; Kölligan 2007:229; Irslinger 2008a:8 (=NIL).

³⁴³ The link was already made by Doederlein 1858:161-174; Curtius 1873:297-298, Kühner-Blass 1892:561, Mutzbauer 1909:147. See also Fournier 1946:12; Frisk 1970:1009-1010; Mayrhofer 1963:469; Chantraine 1968-1974:1195-1196; Coleman 1985:328; Meier-Brügger 2000:34, 2005:440; Schirmer 2001a, 2001b; Irslinger 2008:8; O'Sullivan 2010a:870 (LfgrE); Beekes 2010:1566-1567.

³⁴⁴ Pokorny 1959:104-106 mentioned two different roots.

³⁴⁵ Doederlein 1858:161-174; Meier-Brügger 2000:34, 2005:440; Markwald 2008:806 (=LfgrE). A further evolution is displayed by Alabian *běj* „work“: the root originally meant „show“, then „show the deeds“ and then evolved into „work“ (Meyer 1892:33, Demiraj 1997:97-98).

³⁴⁶ Already Buttmann 1830:542 and Veitch 1879:675 linked the participle with φημί. Janko 1992:164 linked it with φαίνω and stated that one showed forth a word by saying it. See most recently Markwald 2008:806, who translated *das dargelegte Wort*.

³⁴⁷ Kölligan 2007:506.

τοῖς δ' Ἀγέλεως μετέειπεν, ἔπος πάντεσσι πιφαύσκων (*Odyssey* 22,131; 22,247).

This instance clearly shows both meanings: the word is shown to all and thus spoken to all.

The derived nouns are φάτις and φάσις with zero grade, φήμη with *e* grade and φωνή with *o* grade. There also is a verb derived in *sk*, namely φάσκω: in Homer, this verb occurs only in the imperfect in Homer, but it developed a full paradigm in later Greek (which is uncommon for the *sk* iteratives).³⁴⁹ From the noun φωνή, the verb φωνέω was derived, which also had compounds and occurred in speech introduction and conclusion formulae. This verb and its compounds will be discussed in the next subchapter. In two instances, φημί and φωνέω are combined in one speech introduction:

Ἑρμείαν, ποτὶ δὲ Πρίαμον φάτο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 24,353),

ἦ δέ μεν ἄγχι σῆσθα ἔπος φάτο φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 4,370).

3.3.2. Meaning and use in speech introductions/ conclusions of φημί and compounds.

The simplex φημί has two rather different meanings, namely “speak” and “think”.³⁵⁰ As the investigation is restricted to the speech introductions and conclusions, the instances where φημί means “think” will not be discussed. The simplex φημί appears much more in speech conclusions (510 instances) than in speech introductions (58 instances). 57% of all speech conclusions in Homer are constructed with a form of φημί.³⁵¹

In the introductions, it is mostly used in the formulae ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε and φάτο μῦθον. In conclusions it is almost always preceded by the adverb ὥς “so, thus, in that way”. There are many compounds,³⁵² but only πρόσφημι and μετάφημι appear in speech introduction and conclusion formulae, and are almost exclusively used in introductions. In 18 instances, the speech introductions of φημί and its compounds are combined with a verb form of the root **steh₂*, which is a typical combination in speech introductions.³⁵³ Examples are:

ἔστη, καὶ Σθένελον προσέφη Καπανηΐον υἱόν (*Iliad* 5,108),

ἦ δέ μεν ἄγχι σῆσθα ἔπος φάτο φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 4,370),

³⁴⁸ Chantraine 1968-1974:1168-1170; Risch 1975:276; Meier-Brügger 1992c; Markwald 2001 (LfgrE); Kölligan 2007:506.

³⁴⁹ Fournier 1946a:37; Chantraine 1948:319; Hackstein 1995:174; Schirmer 2001b:70; Kölligan 2007:228.

³⁵⁰ Fournier 1946a:12-39; O'Sullivan 2010a.

³⁵¹ Führer 1967:36. A complete list of all introductions and conclusions can be found in Fingerle 1939:308-324 and 349-355.

³⁵² See O'Sullivan 2010a for a list of all the instances, forms and meanings of both the simplex and all the compounds.

³⁵³ Bertrand 2006a; Appendix A.7, A.8, A.9 and A.10.

3.3.3. Verbal forms, compounds and inflection of φημί and its compounds.

3.3.3.1. The verbal forms and inflection of φημί.

The simplex φημί and the compounds πρόσφημι and μετάφημι appear in speech introduction and conclusion formulae. The forms can be found in the tables below.

φημί

Diathesis.	Tense.	Form.	Augment?	Occurrences.
Active	Imperfect.	3 rd p. sg.	Augmented.	ἔφη: 18 instances. ³⁵⁴
			Unaugmented.	φη: once. ³⁵⁵
		3 rd p. pl.	Augmented.	ἔφαν: 15 instances, ³⁵⁶ ἔφασαν: twice. ³⁵⁷
			Unaugmented.	φάν: twice, ³⁵⁸ φάσαν: 4 instances. ³⁵⁹
	Future	3 rd p. sg.		φήσει: once. ³⁶⁰
Middle	Imperfect	1 st p. sg.	Augmented.	ἐφάμην: 38 instances. ³⁶¹
		3 rd p. sg.	Augmented.	ἔφατ': 179 instances, ³⁶² ἔφαθ': 108 instances, ³⁶³ ἔφατο: 11 instances. ³⁶⁴

³⁵⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 1,584; 5,111; 5,607; 21,136; 21,502 and *Odyssey* 2,377; 8,482; 17,409; 19,462; 18,185; 19,361; 19,386; 19,503; 20,120; 22,433; 22,465; 23,181 and 24,397.

³⁵⁵ The instance is *Iliad* 21,361.

³⁵⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 3,161; 3,302; 3,324; 7,181; 7,206; 10,295 and *Odyssey* 9,413; 10,67; 10,422; 10,471; 10,475; 17,488; 18,75; 18,117 and 21,404.

³⁵⁷ The instances are *Odyssey* 10,46 and 20,384.

³⁵⁸ The instances are *Odyssey* 2,337 and 7,343.

³⁵⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 2,278 and *Odyssey* 9,500; 12,192; 21,366.

³⁶⁰ The instance is *Iliad* 8,148.

³⁶¹ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,382; 4,398; 4,471; 4,491; 4,554; 9,272; 9,287; 9,353; 9,368; 9,480; 9,506; 9,526; 10,70; 10,178; 10,198; 10,345; 10,388; 10,428; 10,487; 10,503; 10,550; 10,566; 11,59; 11,145; 11,180; 11,215; 11,404; 11,440; 11,487; 11,538; 11,563; 12,115; 12,222; 12,277; 12,303; 12,324; 14,490 and 19,148.

³⁶² The instances are *Iliad* 1,33; 1,43; 1,361; 1,457; 1,568; 2,333; 2,394; 2,419; 2,441; 3,398; 3,418; 3,461; 4,68; 4,198; 4,272; 4,326; 5,106; 5,121; 5,372; 5,719; 5,767; 6,253; 6,311; 6,406; 6,485; 7,43; 7,108; 8,97; 8,112; 8,198; 8,381; 8,409; 9,688; 10,240; 11,195; 11,516; 11,592; 12,173; 12,329; 12,351; 12,364; 13,417; 14,218; 14,232; 14,277; 14,297; 14,458; 14,486; 15,78; 15,113; 15,168; 15,236; 15,377; 15,552; 16,249; 16,458; 16,527; 16,676; 17,123; 17,246; 17,256; 17,333; 17,481; 17,491; 17,624; 17,656; 17,694; 18,384; 18,423; 19,7; 20,393; 21,356; 23,429; 23,488; 23,664; 23,708; 23,754; 23,771; 23,811; 23,836; 23,859; 23,895; 24,77; 24,120; 24,127; 24,159; 24,286; 24,314; 24,339; 24,571; 24,689; 24,707 and *Odyssey* 2,267; 2,302; 3,329; 3,374; 3,385; 4,216; 4,296; 4,311; 4,375; 4,394; 4,464; 4,481; 4,538; 4,458; 4,610; 5,43; 5,181; 5,225; 6,66; 6,254; 6,328; 7,330; 8,194; 8,256; 8,343; 8,433; 9,360; 9,522; 9,536; 10,261; 10,270; 10,280; 10,319; 10,336; 10,382; 10,406; 10,438; 10,496; 10,541; 11,79; 11,138; 11,163; 11,204; 11,247; 11,435; 11,462; 11,477; 11,504; 12,111; 12,142; 12,294; 12,352; 13,16; 14,52; 14,499; 15,56; 15,124; 15,530; 16,406; 16,417; 17,147; 17,215; 17,374; 17,458; 18,50; 18,78; 18,163; 18,290; 18,387; 19,90; 19,402; 19,551; 20,22; 20,91; 20,102; 20,247; 20,275; 21,84; 21,143; 21,167; 21,248; 21,269; 21,287; 22,492; 23,96; 24,492.

³⁶³ The instances are *Iliad* 2,807; 3,76; 3,84; 3,95; 3,111; 4,20; 5,352; 6,102; 6,286; 7,54; 7,92; 7,175; 7,200; 7,344; 7,379; 7,403; 8,28; 8,457; 9,29; 9,50; 9,79; 9,430; 9,656; 9,693; 9,710; 10,218; 10,227; 10,313; 11,280; 12,413; 13,487; 14,133; 14,378; 15,300; 15,565; 15,726; 16,562; 17,233; 17,722; 18,145; 19,74; 20,379;

			Unaugmented.	φάτο: 150 instances, ³⁶⁵ φάτ': 16 instances, ³⁶⁶ φάθ': 15 instances. ³⁶⁷
	Present	Nom. m. sg.		φάμενος: once. ³⁶⁸
	Participle	Nom. f. sg.		φαμένη: 7 instances. ³⁶⁹
		Nom. m. pl.		φάμενοι: once. ³⁷⁰

πρόσφημι

Diathesis	Tense	Form	Occurrences
Active	Imperfect	1 st p. sg.	προσέφην: 3 instances. ³⁷¹
		2 nd p. sg.	προσέφης: 18 instances. ³⁷²
		3 rd p. sg.	προσέφη: 214 instances. ³⁷³

21,342; 21,381; 21,434; 21,537; 23,12; 23,54; 23,249; 23,417; 23,446; 23,539; 23,676; 23,738; 23,784; 24,265; 24,718 and *Odyssey* 1,42; 1,381; 2,103; 3,430; 3,477; 4,638; 4,673; 6,211; 6,223; 6,247; 7,226; 8,234; 8,321; 8,398; 9,256; 10,466; 11,333; 12,28; 13,1; 13,47; 13,184; 15,220; 15,437; 16,358; 16,393; 17,177; 17,481; 18,40; 18,58; 18,66; 18,320; 18,410; 19,100; 20,157; 20,268; 20,320; 20,358; 21,358; 21,376; 22,178; 22,255; 22,265; 22,446; 23,32; 23,141; 24,57; 24,138; 24,463; 24,496.

³⁶⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 16,548; 19,112; 19,301; 19,338; 20,31; 22,429; 22,437; 22,515; 24,746; 24,760 and 24,776.

³⁶⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 1,188; 1,245; 1,345; 1,511; 1,595; 2,16; 2,142; 3,181; 3,243; 3,259; 3,395; 4,208; 4,401; 5,363; 5,426; 5,443; 5,493; 5,655; 5,689; 5,889; 6,51; 6,166; 6,212; 6,342; 8,167; 8,245; 8,484; 9,173; 9,205; 10,332; 10,482; 11,396; 11,616; 11,804; 12,80; 13,295; 13,298; 13,455; 13,468; 13,748; 14,222; 14,270; 14,506; 15,34; 15,47; 15,199; 16,46; 16,130; 13,626; 16,710; 17,33; 17,342; 17,567; 17,591; 17,648; 18,17; 18,22; 19,125; 21,114; 21,284; 21,393; 21,471; 21,478; 23,108; 23,287; 23,491; 23,499; 23,555; 23,651; 23,793; 24,200; 24,353; 24,358; 24,424; 24,507; 24,598 and *Odyssey* 1,420; 2,35; 2,80; 2,146; 2,361; 2,384; 4,65; 4,113; 4,183; 4,370; 4,609; 4,703; 4,758; 5,116; 5,171; 5,180; 6,148; 7,182; 7,329; 8,10; 8,199; 8,295; 8,385; 9,281; 13,37; 13,53; 13,250; 13,287; 15,169; 15,171; 15,202; 16,448; 16,476; 17,26; 17,150; 17,233; 17,348; 17,541; 17,551; 17,574; 18,88; 18,151; 18,281; 18,422; 19,14; 19,47; 19,89; 19,249; 20,54; 20,111; 20,144; 20,183; 20,345; 21,67; 21,80; 21,96; 21,175; 22,42; 22,68; 22,108; 22,354; 22,361; 22,378; 22,393; 23,111; 23,205; 23,231; 24,315; 24,345; 24,450; 24,513; 24,520.

³⁶⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 4,104; 4,514; 12,442; 20,364; 20,373; 21,161; 21,423; 22,224; 23,184 and *Odyssey* 2,296; 10,321; 11,97; 22,210; 22,224; 24,533; 24,545.

³⁶⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 10,148; 10,162; 10,177; 10,328; 10,512; 15,442; 15,478 and *Odyssey* 4,37; 5,451; 8,499; 14,109; 16,46; 17,602; 21,181 and 24,408.

³⁶⁸ The instance is *Iliad* 5,290.

³⁶⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 5,835; 22,247; 22,460 and *Odyssey* 11,150; 13,429; 18,206 and 23,85.

³⁷⁰ The instance is *Odyssey* 10,446.

³⁷¹ The instances are *Odyssey* 9,282; 9,501 and 10,422.

³⁷² The instances are *Iliad* 16,20; 16,744; 16,843 and *Odyssey* 14,55; 14,165; 14,360; 14,442; 14,507; 15,325; 16,60; 16,135; 16,464; 17,272; 17,311; 17,380; 17,512; 17,579 and 22,194.

³⁷³ The instances are *Iliad* ; 1,84; 1,130; 1,148; 1,215; 1,285; 1,364; 1,511; 1,517; 1,560; 2,172; 2,369; 2,790; 2,795; 3,129; 4,30; 4,183; 4,188; 4,349; 4,356; 4,401; 4,411; 5,108; 5,251; 5,286; 5,427; 5,439; 5,689; 5,764; 5,814; 5,888; 6,342; 6,520; 7,283; 7,405; 8,454; 9,196; 9,307; 9,606; 9,643; 10,42; 10,369; 10,382; 10,400; 40,423; 10,446; 10,508; 10,554; 11,199; 11,316; 11,361; 11,384; 11,607; 12,230; 12,309; 13,46; 13,67; 13,76; 13,215; 13,248; 13,768; 14,41; 14,82; 14,312; 14,341; 15,173; 15,184; 15,220; 15,243; 15,246; 16,48; 16,555; 16,720; 16,842; 17,18; 17,169; 17,326; 17,464; 17,585; 17,684; 18,78; 18,97; 18,187; 18,284; 19,145; 19,154; 19,198; 19,215; 19,404; 19,419; 20,19; 20,82; 20,430; 21,212; 21,222; 21,228; 21,435; 21,478; 22,14; 22,182; 22,260; 22,337; 22,344; 22,355; 23,93; 23,438; 24,55; 24,64; 24,87; 24,138; 24,299; 24,559; 24,649 and *Odyssey* 1,63; 1,156; 1,383; 2,348; 2,399; 4,30; 4,59; 4,147; 4,168; 4,203; 4,265; 4,332; 4,461; 4,824; 4,835; 5,21; 5,214; 6,24; 7,178; 7,207; 7,240; 7,302; 8,152; 8,165; 8,412; 8,423; 8,463; 8,474; 8,486; 9,1; 9,407; 9,446; 11,354; 11,377; 11,565; 12,384; 13,49; 13,139; 13,153; 13,311; 13,382; 13,416; 14,191; 14,390; 14,439; 15,9; 15,110;

μετάφημι

Diathesis	Tense	Forms	Occurrence
Active	Imperfect	3 rd p. sg.	μετέφη: 14 instances. ³⁷⁴

3.3.3.2 Metrical irregularities in the verbal inflection of φημί.

φῆ πυρὶ καιόμενος, ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλυε καλὰ ῥέεθρα (*Iliad* 21,361).

In this verse, the last syllable of the participle καιόμενος needs to be read with a long syllable, although the nominative ending *os* counts as short. This is a case of lengthening under the ictus.³⁷⁵

Another metrically remarkable observation involves the long scansion of the final syllable of the 3rd person plural form ἔφον, when a word followed that started with a vowel. This is a case of lengthening under the ictus- especially when a caesura followed- as is the case in the following examples:

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφον, Αἴας δὲ κορύσσετο νόροπι χαλκῷ (*Iliad* 7,206),

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφον ἀπιόντες, ἐμὸν δ' ἐγέλασσε φίλον κῆρ (*Odyssey* 9,413),

καὶ τότε μ' ἐκκαλέσαντες ἔφον ἐρήρηες ἑταῖροι (*Odyssey* 10,471),

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφον, Ἴρω δὲ κακῶς ὠρίνετο θυμός (*Odyssey* 18,75).

In the last example, it is possible that the name Iros started with a digamma, or was thought to start with a digamma.

There are other verbal instances of such a scansion occurring before a caesura (the verb form with the irregular scansion) is underlined):³⁷⁶

οἳ τ' Ἐλεῶν' εἶχον ἦδ' Ὑλην καὶ Πετεῶνα (*Iliad* 2,500),

οἳ τε Πλάταιαν ἔχον ἦδ' οἳ Γλισᾶντ' ἐνέμοντο, (*Iliad* 2,504),

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἳ δ' ἀνστάντες ἔβαν ἐπὶ θῖνα θαλάσσης (*Odyssey* 16,358).

An alternative explanation is that the irregular scansion was due to a double *nn* pronunciation in hiatus,³⁷⁷ or due to lengthening under the ictus. It is also possible that the long scansion was

15,380; 16,201; 17,16; 17,192; 17,353; 17,453; 17,477; 18,14; 18,124; 18,284; 18,337; 18,365; 19,15; 19,41; 19,70; 19,106; 19,164; 19,220; 19,261; 19,335; 19,382; 19,499; 19,554; 19,582; 20,36; 20,168; 20,183; 20,226; 21,256; 21,380; 22,34; 22,60; 22,105; 22,170; 22,194; 22,320; 22,371; 22,390; 22,394; 22,430; 22,490; 23,129; 23,247; 23,263; 24,302; 24,330; 24,356; 24,406; 24,447; 24,516; 24,541.

³⁷⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 1,58; 2,411; 4,153; 19,55; 19,100 and *Odyssey* 4,660; 8,132; 16,636; 18,42; 18,51; 18,312; 20,270; 21,140 and 21,740.

³⁷⁵ West 1987:22; such lengthening occurred often with participles in *μενος*, as had been observed already by Brandreth 1844:134.

³⁷⁶ The examples are taken from Von Hartel 1873:112 (see following note).

caused by verses where ὦς ἄρ' ἔφην was followed by a consonant. There are also instances outside the verbal inflection where a final *t* seems to have continued in the scansion. One example is the vocative Αἴαν Ἰδομενεῦ τε κακοῖς, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ ἔοικε (*Iliad* 23,493). In this instance the second syllable of Αἴαν has to be read long, but there is no long vowel. This is irregular,³⁷⁸ and might mean that the *t* from the stem continued to work in the metre. An alternative explanation is that a pause followed after the vocative Αἴαν and that this pause supplied the missing mora in the foot.³⁷⁹

3.3.4. The verbal morphology of φημί and its compounds.

1. A thorough discussion of the augment and tense use is given in the augment chapter.
2. The figures are the following:

Verb.	Augmented forms.	Unaugmented forms.
φημί	371 instances: ἐφάμην (38 instances), ἔφη (18 instances), ἔφατ' (179 instances), ἔφαθ' (108 instances), ἔφατο (11 instances), ἔφην (15 instances), ἔφασαν (twice).	188 instances: φῆ (once), φάτο (150 instances), φάτ' (16 instances), φάθ' (15 instances), φάν (twice), φάσαν (4 instances).
πρόσφημι	235 instances.	None.
μετάφημι	14 instances.	None.

I now address the issue whether ἔφη and φάτο are aorists, imperfects with an aoristic meaning or imperfects with “genuine” imperfect meaning. The forms ἔφη and/or φάτο seem to have a punctual meaning “he spoke”, but are normally interpreted as imperfects. Many attempts have been made to solve this apparent contradiction:

³⁷⁷ This explanation had already been suggested in the 19th century: Curtius 1869:166 with reference to Misteli 1868a:109-112 (incorrectly quoted as *KZ* 12, as it was written in *KZ* 17) and Ahrens 1843 (although he disagreed with the latter); Von Hartel 1873:111-114, with reference to Curtius 1869:166-167; see also Ameis-Hentze 1887:50 who referred to Von Hartel. In many instances the apparent irregularity was “fixed” by inserting a particle δ' (as in *Odyssey* 7,341). West 1982:16 and 38 argued that final *r*, *s* and *n* could be read and interpreted as double consonants and mentioned parallels in Pindar and Bakkhylides. For the double scansion of liquids and nasals, see also Hackstein 2011a:29.

³⁷⁸ Richardson 1993:224 with reference to Chantraine 1948:103-104.

³⁷⁹ Hackstein 2011a:29; Dieter Gunkel, personal communication. West (1982:36-38, 1987:18, 1997:230-232) and Korzeniewski (1968:20-27) mentioned the exceptions and linked it with the precaesural position of these words, but not with the vocative as such.

- In the 19th and in the beginning of the 20th century scholars doubted that the forms ἔφη and φάτο were imperfects, and argued that ἔφη and φάτο were aorists because of the formal parallels with ἔβην and ἔστην,³⁸⁰ and because of the supposed punctual meaning “he spoke”.
- Debrunner argued that the active ἔφη was an imperfect but that the middle φάτο was an aorist.³⁸¹ He used three arguments for this:
 - there were no present forms of the middle φημί;³⁸²
 - the participle formula ὧς φάμενος had an exact parallel in the aorist participle ὧς εἰπών;
 - the root ἄγορ- had the same tense-diathesis distinction: the active verb ἄγορεύω appeared 139 times in the present and only 14 in the aorist, while the middle verb ἄγοράομαι appeared 3 times in the present and 24 times in the aorist.³⁸³

Debrunner’s analysis was accepted by Schwyzer, who pointed to the middle aorist ἔφθιτο of the active verb φθίνω,³⁸⁴ and by Szemerényi.³⁸⁵

- Several scholars explained the forms as imperfects, but interpreted the meaning as aoristic.³⁸⁶ Delbrück argued that φημί could not build an aorist and that it therefore used the imperfect with the meaning of the aorist.³⁸⁷ In his analysis of the *verba dicendi*, Fournier pointed out that an imperfect could not have been used in the speech conclusions, because as soon as the direct speech had finished, the speaking was over and therefore no duration could be expected anymore. Consequently, the meaning of the speech conclusion verbs had to be aoristic,³⁸⁸ and this aoristic meaning was then extended to other speech introduction verbs in the imperfect, such as προσεφώνεε and μετηύδα.³⁸⁹

Against the interpretation of ἔφη and/or φάτο as aorists the following observations can be adduced:

³⁸⁰ Buttmann 1839:11-12 described these forms as imperfects, and stated that the present forms *βῆμι and *στῆμι had disappeared in Greek, while Curtius 1873:181 stated that ἔβην was considered an aorist in Greek, because *βῆμι did not exist, but ἔφην was interpreted as an imperfect, because φημί did exist. Mutzbauer 1909:149 stated that the forms ἔφην and ἐφάμην *sind unstreitig ihrer Bildung nach Aoriste*. See also Kölligan 2007:224 on this issue.

³⁸¹ Debrunner 1928 criticising Chantraine 1927b; Debrunner 1930:312-313, and 1936a. This had been suggested already by Stahl 1907:59 but without further arguments.

³⁸² The assumption that a form was an aorist, if no present existed, was already made by Buttmann and Curtius.

³⁸³ Debrunner 1936a:77.

³⁸⁴ Schwyzer 1939:673.

³⁸⁵ Szemerényi 1990:271.

³⁸⁶ The first to notice this were Madvig 1847:112 and Buttmann 1858:222, followed by Gildersleeve 1883:161, Stahl 1907:123-124, Wackernagel 1920:173, Kieckers 1926c:24 and Fournier 1946a:18-21, 1946b:60-65.

³⁸⁷ Delbrück 1879:112, 1897:73-74.

³⁸⁸ Fournier 1946a:18-21, 1946b:60-65.

³⁸⁹ Fournier 1946a:18-21, 1946b:60-65.

- Debrunner's observation that the anterior meaning of φάμενος meant that it had to be an aorist, is not conclusive. The active participle φάντες (which does not occur in a speech conclusion) can be used in an anterior sense,³⁹⁰ and aorist participles in general can express an action simultaneous to the main verb, as is visible in εἰπών and φωνήσας (cf. infra).³⁹¹
- Why would the absence of a middle present form mean that the past form was an aorist?
- Why would ἔφατο be an aorist and ἔφη an imperfect?
- If one interprets ἔφη and ἔφατο as aorists, it would mean that the root $*b^heh_2$ had a root present and aorist at the same time, but it is very unusual for a root present and root aorist to occur within the same root.³⁹² It is therefore better to interpret ἔφη and ἔφατο as imperfects and not as aorists.
- Schwyzer's comparison between the coexistence of ἔφατο and φημί and that of ἔφθιτο and φθίνω is not convincing, because the present formations are different: φθίνω is not a root present, contrary to φημί.
- The apparent aoristic meaning is not problematic. There are many instances in Greek where an imperfect is used when an aorist would be expected.³⁹³ This is particularly true for many *verba dicendi* and verbs of convincing, ordering and sending,³⁹⁴ and is not confined to poetry alone: ἔλεγε and ἐκέλευε were often used in prose and inscriptions when one would in fact expect ἔλεξε and ἐκέλευσε.³⁹⁵ The use of the imperfect in speech introductions and conclusions can be explained by the fact that the action of speaking implied a durative aspect, because it expected a reaction from the person addressed: the interpretation and reaction to the words that were spoken implied the durative action of the speaking.³⁹⁶ Chantraine observed that in many instances of speaking the imperfect of "speaking" was combined with the aorist, and that the latter indicated the sudden reaction to the speaking, while the speaking itself was

³⁹⁰ Monro 1891:64.

³⁹¹ Monro 1891:66.

³⁹² Already Hartmann 1918:7 had pointed this out: in his opinion, root aorist and root present could only co-occur, if the present was an *eintretende Handlung*. The most extensive treatment of the Indo-European root aorist is Harðarsson 1993a: he did not list φημί among the verbs that had a root aorist, nor did he discuss the coexistence of root presents and root aorists (Harðarsson 1993a:176-178 for the Homeric aorists and 178-213 for an analysis of the individual root aorists in Greek). On the coexistence of root presents and root aorists, see Kümmel 1998.

³⁹³ Blass 1889:406, Kühner-Gerth 1898:143-144, Rodenbusch 1907:116.

³⁹⁴ Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:277-278, Chantraine 1953:192.

³⁹⁵ Veitch 1879:675-676.

³⁹⁶ I refer for this to the chapter of the tense usage. The first to notice this were Naegelsbach 1834:249-252 for Homer, Blass 1889 for Attic and Svensson 1930 for all Greek dialects. See also Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:277-278; Chantraine 1953:192; Hettrich 1976:59-60 states that *Der PSt (Präsensstamm, FDD) bezeichnet a) den Akt des Sagens unter Einschluß des fortwirkenden Zustandes, der durch diesen Akt hervorgerufen wird, bis zur Reaktion des Angesprochenen; b) den Akt des Sagens allein in seiner Erstreckung*; Braswell 1988:107; Hummel 1993:240; Rijksbaron 2002:18-19.

describing the situation when the action occurred.³⁹⁷ It is therefore not necessary to assume with Delbrück and Fournier that the meaning was purely aoristic. This will be discussed in more detail in the chapter on the tense usage

To conclude, it is better to interpret ἔφη and ἔφατο as imperfects, because the coexistence of a root aorist and a root present within the same root is very rare and because the use of the imperfect instead of an aorist in speech introduction and conclusion formulae can be explained as a durative effect of the speaking on the audience.

3.3.5. The diatheses used with φημί and its compounds.

For the analysis of the diatheses, a distinction has to be made between simplex and compounds. It is important to stress that the arguments only apply to the speech introduction and conclusion formulae, and that they are confined to the simplex verb. The simplex verb φημί is found both in the active as in the middle diathesis. The active forms appear in about 40 instances, whereas the middle ones appear in almost 520 instances. The table below lists the active and middle forms/ conclusions that are metrically equivalent. As the middle forms are much more common, they are listed first:

Middle form (is equivalent to)	Active form.
ὥς ἔφατο	ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη (in 9 specific instances). ³⁹⁸
ἔφατ', ἔφαθ', φάτο	φη
φάθ', φάτ'	φη (with <i>correptio epica</i>)
ἔφατ', ἔφαθ'	ἔφη (with <i>correptio epica</i>)

The following formulae do not have an alternative attested, but could have had one (the unattested form is italicised):

Middle form	Active form
ὥς ἐφάμην	ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην
ὥς φάτ'	ὥς φη
ὥς φάντ' / ὥς φάνθ'	ὥς φάσαν
ὥς φάντ'	ὥς ἔφαν

From the tables, it is clear that the 3rd person singular middle forms are always metrically equivalent to the active (unaugmented) form φη, and the augmented instances could also have

³⁹⁷ Chantraine 1953:192-193.

³⁹⁸ The forms are listed and discussed later in this subchapter.

been replaced by the augmented form ἔφη (with *correptio epica*). In 9 instances the formula ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη is metrically certain, but in 9 other verses it could have been replaced by ὦς ἔφατο (as will be discussed later on). This means that the poet could have used the middle in the 3rd person plural if he wanted to. The only form that is metrically “secure” is the active form φάν and this only occurs twice. The variation between active and middle diathesis is therefore not metrically motivated.

The following differences between active and middle are remarkable:

Active.	Middle.
The active is only attested in about 40 instances.	The middle is much more common: there about 520 attestations.
It is used in only one speech introduction.	It is used in about 50 introductions.
It is never attested in the 1 st person singular in introductions nor in conclusions.	The form ὦς ἐφάμην is attested 38 times.
The active 3 rd person plural forms are attested 21 times.	The middle is never attested in the 3 rd person plural in introductions nor in conclusions.
The active is never constructed with a direct object.	The use of the words spoken is very common in speech introductions with the middle.
The subject of an active form can refer to a hero, but also to a group of unknown people.	The subject of a middle form is never an undefined character or group.
In 35 instances the speech conclusions with the active verb are preceded by the particle ἄρα.	In speech conclusions the middle verb is never preceded by a particle.

The absence of active transitive forms is remarkable, because a formula μῦθον ἔφη would have perfectly fit the metre. In the speech introduction καὶ τότε μ' ἐκκαλέσαντες ἔφαν ἐρίηρες ἐταῖροι (*Odyssey* 10,471), the object μ' belongs to the participle ἐκκαλέσαντες and not to ἔφαν, the main verb, and this is therefore no example of a transitive active verb form.

The following agreements are noteworthy:

1. Both active and middle forms occur in conclusions.
2. The same rules for absence and presence of augmentation apply to active and middle: there are no instances where a rule applied only to the middle and not to the active, or vice versa.
3. Both active and middle can be expanded by a participle.

The agreements between active and middle can be illustrated by the following examples. In the verses quoted below, Homer related how the speaking of one person angered another. In both verses, the conclusion was augmented, but in one instance, the active is used while in the other the middle is used:

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, ποταμὸς δὲ χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον (*Iliad* 21,136),

ὥς ἔφατ', Εὐρύμαχος δὲ χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον (*Odyssey* 18,387).

The same applies to the extension of the speech conclusion by a participle:

ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 1,43),

ὥς ἔφαν εὐχόμενοι, τῶν δ' ἔκλυε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη (*Iliad* 10,295).

In both instances, the conclusion of a prayer and the positive answer of a god are described.

In the examples quoted above, it also becomes clear that the augmentation does not differ between active and middle forms. The following examples confirm this:

ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἄρα πῶ οἱ ἐπεκράϊαινε Κρονίων (*Iliad* 2,419),

ὥς ἔφαν, οὐδ' ἄρα πῶ σφιν ἐπεκράϊαινε Κρονίων (*Iliad* 3,302).

In both these instances, Homer described how Zeus did not grant the fulfillment of a prayer.

At first sight, these instances seem to prove conclusively that there is no semantic difference between the two diatheses,³⁹⁹ as was most recently stated by the new *Basel Kommentar*.⁴⁰⁰ In what follows, I will try to determine if there is a distinction after all.

The basic distinction between active and middle is the following: the active denoted the action on itself, while the middle was used when the subject was more involved, or when the object acted upon the subject as well.⁴⁰¹ This distinction is not always clear, however. First, some roots are middle in one daughter language but active in another. Second, some roots change the diathesis within the paradigm in one language.⁴⁰² Third, often the distinction is not semantic but only formal and an active meaning is not confined to active verbs.⁴⁰³

A comparison of the cognates of **b^heh₂* reveals the following: Latin *fārī* is only attested in the middle and Vedic *bhanati* appears both in the middle and in the active without any apparent distinction in meaning. In one passage the active and middle forms appear besides one another:

³⁹⁹ Brugmann 1900:465-466 noted that many Homeric forms showed no difference in meaning between the active and the middle; Stahl 1907:59; Witte 1913a:2240-2241; Meillet 1923:64, 1937:246; Chantraine 1927a:165, 1953:173-174, 1964:288; Latacz 2000b:6 (Regel 23), 38 (commentary on *Iliad* 1,33 and 58).

⁴⁰⁰ Latacz 2000b:6 (Regel 23), 38 (comment on *Iliad* 1,33 and 58).

⁴⁰¹ Brugmann 1900:459-460, 1904:598-600; Wackernagel 1920:125-127; Szemerényi 1990:270; Tichy 2009:87-89; Fortson 2010:82.

⁴⁰² Brugmann 1904:599; Fortson 2010:82-83.

⁴⁰³ Brugmann 1904:598-599; Fortson 2010:83. For Greek, see also Bekker 1858:3-4; Kühner-Gerth 1898:109-110; Brugmann 1900:465-466; Stahl 1907:59; Humbert 1960:106.

etāvi pṛcha kīm bhanati kam āpo ádrim pasidhīm rujanti //

*kīm u ṣvidasmai nivído bhananta indrasyāvadyaṁ (RV 4,18,6-7).*⁴⁰⁴

Frage sie aus, was sie da reden, welchem Felswall die Gewässer durchbrechen. //

*“Reden sie ihm einladende Worte nach, (oder) beabsichtigen die Gewässer Indra’s Schande?”*⁴⁰⁵

As such, there are parallels in other Indo-European languages for the use of both diatheses in the root **b^heh₂*: Greek and Vedic use both diatheses, while in Latin only the middle was attested, *fārī* being a deponent verb. The question is how the use of both diatheses can be explained. Meillet, Renou and Chantraine argued that an active present could be combined with a middle form in the preterite without difference in meaning.⁴⁰⁶ Their arguments were:

- there was often no difference in meaning between middle and active forms in the RV,⁴⁰⁷
- the causatives in *aya* often used the middle ending *anta* in the 3rd person plural imperfect (without augment),
- metrical reasons might have played a role as well,⁴⁰⁸
- φθίνω had an active present, but a middle aorist ἔφθιτο and a middle aorist participle φθίμενος,⁴⁰⁹
- the active present φθάνω used the middle participle φθάμενος in the root aorist,⁴¹⁰
- the active perfect form ἔουκα had a middle pluperfect forms ἐίκτην.⁴¹¹

Chantraine admitted that metrical reasons played a role, but argued that Greek preserved the archaism that the past tense of an active verb could be expressed by a middle form.⁴¹²

The arguments used to prove a tense-based *Diathesenwechsel* are not conclusive. Jamison argued that the change in diathesis in the RV was not inherited but the result of an inner Indic evolution. If the change in diathesis had been an archaism, it would have occurred in forms outside the causatives and the 3rd person plural forms as well.⁴¹³ In her opinion, the use of the ending *anta* in the active paradigm was a tool to clarify the active 3rd person plural endings in

⁴⁰⁴ Aufrecht 1877:292, the removal of the sandhi was found in Van Nooten – Holland 1994:180.

⁴⁰⁵ Geldner 1951a:442.

⁴⁰⁶ Meillet 1922a:64, 1924a:110, 1935:218; Renou 1925:108; Chantraine 1927b:54, 1953:173-175; Haudry 1979:181-182.

⁴⁰⁷ Renou 1925:105.

⁴⁰⁸ Renou 1925:73-80, 105-115.

⁴⁰⁹ Meillet 1924a:110-111.

⁴¹⁰ Meillet 1924a:111.

⁴¹¹ Meillet 1924a, Chantraine 1927b:49.

⁴¹² Chantraine 1953:173-175; the use of active and middle forms in the perfect participles was thoroughly investigated in Hackstein 1997.

⁴¹³ Jamison 1979b:152.

an, which were not clear because the final *t* was never written.⁴¹⁴ The *anta* endings were never used with an augment, because in that case, confusion could arise with the genuine middle ending.⁴¹⁵ As such, it was a language internal disambiguation rather than an inherited archaism.⁴¹⁶ She noticed that the change in diathesis in Greek occurred mostly in the 3rd person plural forms, and suggested that the active 3rd person plural endings were replaced by middle ones, *when semantic and/or metrical conditions encourage it*.⁴¹⁷ As most of the forms where a change in diathesis occurred referred to a mental activity (verbs referring to a mental activity could use the middle more often, because they had a closer involvement of the subject),⁴¹⁸ Jamison argued that the use of the middle in Homer and the RV was better explained by metrical and semantic reasons than by assuming an inherited neutralisation in the past tenses. It is in my opinion also difficult to explain why the diatheses in PIE would have had different endings in the primary tenses but not in the secondary tenses.

The reasons for the difference in diathesis (if there is one) must therefore be sought in the Greek examples themselves. In his study on the differences in diathesis between ὀρᾶν and ὀρᾶσθαι, and between ἰδεῖν and ἰδέσθαι, Bechert showed the following distinction between active and middle forms.⁴¹⁹ The middle forms were used, when

- the (involvement of the) subject was stressed,
- the influence of the object on the subject was emphasised,
- the object was stressed.

The active was used when

- the subject was not important, and/or
- only the action deserved attention.

Bechert's findings can be applied to φημί as well. In the imperfect, the active forms are only attested in the 3rd person singular and the 3rd person plural. The fact that the active assigns less value to the subject explains why the first person singular is never used in the active in a speech introduction or conclusion (although it would have been metrically possible, cf. *supra*). The person speaking always puts some emphasis on himself, and therefore the middle form is more suited than the active one (this applies only to the simplex and only to the speech

⁴¹⁴ Jamison 1979b:152.

⁴¹⁵ Jamison 1979b:160; Meillet and Renou had observed this themselves already, as can be seen in Renou 1928:73-80 and Meillet-Benveniste 1931:130.

⁴¹⁶ Jamison 1979b:164-165.

⁴¹⁷ Jamison 1979b:164.

⁴¹⁸ This had been observed already by Delbrück 1897:422-423.

⁴¹⁹ Bechert 1964:406-407, 419, 425-427; Clackson 2007:142-143; Cotticelli Kurras – Rizza 2013:9-10. For a broader study on the middle in general, see Klaiman 1991, who confirmed that the middle was used when the subject was more involved or affected by the action. See most recently also Cotticelli Kurras – Rizza 2013.

introduction and conclusion formulae). As was stated above the active forms are never found with a direct or internal object. This indicates that in no instance the object was considered important. The 3rd person plural never appears in the middle but is used 23 times in the active form: in 21 instances the 3rd person plural form refers to the speaking of an indeterminate and unnamed subject (someone of the army, someone from the suitors, a commoner, the soldiers, the suitors without specification, Odysseus's men without specification), in one instance the 3rd plural form refers to two specified heroes and in one case it refers to Aiolos and his (unnamed) children.⁴²⁰ In contrast, no middle form of φημί refers to the speaking of an unnamed and undetermined person. The use of the active in these instances thus removes the emphasis from the subject, as it is not important or even unknown. This agrees with Bechert's findings that the active was used when the subject was not important. As the middle is the most common form and the active seems the exception, I will address the use of the active. I will first discuss the instances of the 3rd person plural. I start by the conclusion ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην (attested 9 times), then I discuss the form ἔφην without ὥς ἄρ', then ἔφασαν, φάσαν and φάν. I then proceed to the 3rd singular formula ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη (attested 18 times) and φῆ.

In all 9 instances of ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην the subject is undetermined.⁴²¹

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην, πάλλιν δὲ μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ (*Iliad* 3,324).

This speech conclusion described how unknown soldiers of the Greek and Trojan armies finished speaking and praying that the duel between Paris and Menelaos would end the war. The speech was introduced by ὣδε δέ τις εἶπεσεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε (*Iliad* 3,319).⁴²²

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην, πάλλιν δὲ Γερήνιος ἱππότης Νέστωρ (*Iliad* 7,181).

This verse is similar in context to the instance described above. In this verse, Homer related how Nestor was about to draw lots to see which Greek warrior would engage in battle with Hektor, and how an anonymous Greek soldier spoke and hoped that Aias, Diomedes or Agamemnon would be chosen.⁴²³ The speech introduction leading up to this verse was ὣδε δέ τις εἶπεσεν ἰδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν (*Iliad* 7,178).⁴²⁴

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην, Αἴας δὲ κορύσσετο νόροπι χαλκῷ (*Iliad* 7,206).

⁴²⁰ Schneider 1995.

⁴²¹ Fingerle 1939:363. A list of introductions and conclusions by undetermined characters can be found in Schneider 1995:13-14.

⁴²² Schneider 1995:13.

⁴²³ Schneider 1995:57-60.

⁴²⁴ Schneider 1995:13.

This verse occurs in the same context as above. Aias was chosen as warrior to face Hektor. The Greek army prayed that Aias be given victory. The speech introduction was ὣδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν (*Iliad* 7,201).⁴²⁵

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην ἀπιόντες, ἐμὸν δ' ἐγέλασσε φίλον κῆρ (*Odyssey* 9,413).

In this verse, the persons speaking are the other Kyklopes. When Polyphemos cried out for help, they responded by asking who caused him harm. He answered that “Nobody” was killing him. They reacted to that by saying that if n/Nobody harmed him, the pain must have come from Zeus and they could not help him. Then they went away, and Odysseus stealthily took pleasure in the fact that he outwitted the Kyklops. The speech introduction was οἱ δ' ἀπαμειβόμενοι ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον (*Odyssey* 9,409). The third person plural is used, because the group of Kyklopes is an anonymous entity.⁴²⁶

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην μνηστῆρες, ὃ δ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο μύθων (*Odyssey* 17,488).

In this instance, an undetermined suitor finished admonishing Antinoos that he should not dishonour the beggar by throwing a stool at him, but he (A) did not listen. The introduction to this speech was ὣδε δέ τις εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερηγορούντων (*Odyssey* 17,482). The subject of the introduction was a singular undetermined person, but the speech is concluded as if the entire group of suitors spoke these words.⁴²⁷ The active verb is used here because the subject refers to an entire group.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην, χαῖρεν δὲ κληιδόνη δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς (*Odyssey* 18,117).

In this verse, an undetermined suitor finished speaking and congratulating Odysseus for his victory over the beggar Iros. The suitors wished Odysseus the best, and stated that they would ship off Iros to King Ekhetos, known for his inhuman brutality. The introduction to this speech was made by ὣδε δέ τις εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερηγορούντων (*Odyssey* 18,111a).⁴²⁸ The undetermined *tis* is repeated by the 3rd person plural in the conclusion.⁴²⁹

A special instance is the following verse:

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην, Πρίαμος δ' Ἑλένην ἐκαλέσσατο φωνῇ (*Iliad* 3,161).

In this instance, the subject is not an unknown commoner, but the ensemble of Trojan leaders. They have been named before, but in the speech introduction they appear without names, are

⁴²⁵ Schneider 1995:60-63.

⁴²⁶ Schneider 1995:149.

⁴²⁷ Schneider 1995:77-78.

⁴²⁸ This verse was removed by the editors of the Loeb (Murray – Dimock 1998b:208-209) and by Ameis-Hentze 1900b:102, and was printed in smaller font by Ludwig 1891:159 and considered an interpolation by Russo 1990:53, but adopted by Allen (OCT) and Van Thiel 1991:250. As Stanford (1958:304) argued, the verse is needed to introduce the speech. See Schneider 1995:73-76 for a detailed defence of the transmitted verse. The main argument is that the verb δεικνύωντ' of 18,111 does not introduce direct speech on other occasions.

⁴²⁹ Fingerle 1939:292; Schneider 1995:73-76.

referred to as “the leaders of the Trojans” in the 3rd person plural.⁴³⁰ The introduction was ἦκα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον (*Iliad* 3,155). The use of the active 3rd person plural in this case conforms to the other usages, as it refers to a speech introduction by an unspecified and/or unnamed group.

I now proceed to the other active 3rd plural forms. The instances of ἔφην without ὥς ἄρ' and those of ἔφασαν, φάσαν and φάν can be analysed in a similar way. They are all used in a speech conclusion after an unnamed person or group had spoken.⁴³¹

ὥς ἔφην, οὐδ' ἄρα πῶ σφιν ἐπεκράϊαινε Κρονίων (*Iliad* 3,302).

In this specific instance, Homer described how Greek and Trojan soldiers alike had prayed for a peaceful conclusion of the war, but that Zeus was unwilling to grant it.⁴³² The speech introduction was ὧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε (*Iliad* 3,297). This verse (3,302) resembles ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἄρα πῶ οἱ ἐπεκράϊαινε Κρονίων (*Iliad* 2,419), and thus seemed to indicate that there was no difference in the meaning of the diatheses, but in the verse with the middle verb, Agamemnon was the person who had spoken. In that verse the subject was important and therefore the active verb form was less suited, and the middle was used.

ὥς φάν, ὃ δ' ὑψόροφον θάλαμον κατεβήσατο πατὴρ (*Odyssey* 2,337).

In this instance, an anonymous suitor finished saying that Telemakhos's journey might cause them (the suitors) even more problems, because, if he died on his trip, they would have to divide the estate and property. The introduction of this speech was made by ἄλλος δ' αὖτ' εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερηγορόντων (*Odyssey* 2,331).⁴³³ The undetermined ἄλλος is repeated by a verb in the plural. The active verb is used because the subject is anonymous.

ὥς ἔφασαν, βουλὴ δὲ κακὴ νίκησεν ἐταίρων (*Odyssey* 10,46).

In this verse, the poet described how Odysseus's men, who were notorious for their lack of common sense,⁴³⁴ considered looking into the bags with winds that Odysseus had received from Aiolos. They thought that Odysseus had received gold and silver and was unwilling to share it with them. The speech introduction that was used to introduce the speech was ὧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον (*Odyssey* 10,37).⁴³⁵ This is another instance, where an undetermined subject was repeated by a subject in the 3rd person plural.

ὥς ἔφην, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ προσέφην μαλακοῖς ἐπέεσσι (*Odyssey* 10,422).

⁴³⁰ Schneider 1995:146-147.

⁴³¹ The list of speech introductions and conclusions of the speeches by undefined persons can be found in Schneider 1995:13-14.

⁴³² Schneider 1995:48-52.

⁴³³ Schneider 1995:141-145.

⁴³⁴ Schneider 1995:96 described their intellectual capacities with the term *Dummheit*.

⁴³⁵ Schneider 1995:14, 94-98.

This verse is the speech conclusion of the crying of Odysseus's men when they saw returning from Kirke's cave. The 3rd plural form is used to describe the undetermined number of Odysseus's men.

ὥς φάσαν ἰεῖσαι ὅπα κάλλιμον: αὐτὰρ ἐμὸν κῆρ (*Odyssey* 12,192).

In this verse Homer described how the Sirens finished speaking and enticing Odysseus to sail nearer and listen to their songs. The Sirens are an undetermined group and are therefore described in the 3rd person plural, as was seen in the speech introduction ἐγγύθεν ὀρνυμένη, λιγυρὴν δ' ἔντυνον ἀοιδὴν “(the ship) drawing near, and they raised their clear-toned song”⁴³⁶ (*Odyssey* 12,183).

ὥς ἔφασαν μνηστῆρες: ὃ δ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο μύθων (*Odyssey* 20,384).

This verse described the speech of an anonymous suitor, who ridiculed Telemakhos for only having miserable guests such as a beggar and a swineherd.⁴³⁷ The introduction to this verse was made by by ἄλλος δ' αὖτ' εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερηγορόντων (*Odyssey* 20,375).⁴³⁸

In the following speech conclusion, the speakers are made up of a group of anonymous persons and one person named by name:

ὥς ἔφαν, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μετεφώνεον ἀχνύμενος κῆρ (*Odyssey* 10,67).

In this instance, the verse described how Aiolos and his children finished speaking to Odysseus after he went to Aiolos's home for a second time. The speakers are Aiolos and his children: while Aiolos is named by name, his children are only referred to as his children. This example is a crossing between the speaking of an entirely anonymous group and a clearly defined one.

The only instance of the 3rd person plural where the subject was not anonymous but named in the introduction and, is:

ὥς ἔφαν εὐχόμενοι, τῶν δ' ἔκλυε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη (*Iliad* 10,295).

In this instance the speakers are known. The conclusion formula occurs after both Odysseus and Diomedes had prayed separately to Athena.

In what follows the 3rd person singular forms will be analysed. I start with the form φῆ. The active verb is once put at the beginning of the verse, and received strong emphasis by that use:

φῆ πυρὶ καίόμενος, ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλυε καλὰ ῥέεθρα (*Iliad* 21,361).

The stress is clearly put on Skamandros's angry speaking and much less on the fact that it is Skamandros who is speaking. The unusual form and position (it is the only speech conclusion

⁴³⁶ Murray-Dimock 1998a:461. Similar translations can be found in Ameis –Hentze 1900b:180 *sie stimmten an* and in Heubeck 1989:127 *they broke into clear song*.

⁴³⁷ Russo 1992:125.

⁴³⁸ Schneider 1995:81-82.

with $\phi\eta$ and also the only conclusion with a verb initial position) put the stress on the verb and not on the subject. The sentence initial position of a verbal form is a very marked one and was not the default position.⁴³⁹

The other 18 singular forms occur in the formula $\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$, which is metrically equivalent to to the middle $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\phi\alpha\tau\omicron$ if it was followed by a word that started with 2 consonants. Reversely, $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\phi\alpha\tau\omicron$ is always equivalent to $\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$. As such, the distinction between them cannot have been purely metrical. The formula $\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$ is attested 18 times, but is used only 5 times in the *Iliad*. Normally, however, the formula $\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$ is used after a determined hero or god has spoken. It indicates a strong contrast or an unexpected action between the speaking and the action that will follow.⁴⁴⁰ As such, the emphasis is put on the action, more than on the subject (which does not mean that the subject is completely invisible). Another difference between $\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$ and $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\phi\alpha\tau\omicron$ is that the former can be followed by the subject of the next sentence, while this only happened once with $\omega\varsigma \epsilon\phi\alpha\tau\omicron$. The reason for this that $\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$ put more action on the speaking than on the speaker, and therefore the effect of the speaking on the addressee was expressed by a sudden reaction of the addressee.

$\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$ καὶ ἀναΐξας δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον (*Iliad* 1,584).

This verse describes how Hephaistos finished speaking to Here. In the verse after it, he offered a cup to his mother and addressed her again. His second speech is rather unexpected. The formula $\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$ was used to contrast Hephaistos's first and his second speech.

$\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$, σκῆπτρῳ δὲ μετάφρενον ἠδὲ καὶ ὄμῳ (*Iliad* 2,265).

In this instance, the poet described how Odysseus finished speaking and took his sceptre and beat Thersites so badly, that he started bleeding from his shoulders and from his back. The stark contrast between the speaking and the beating itself is more important than the person who performed the action. It is therefore clear that the poet wanted to highlight this unparalleled use of physical force by the use of $\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$.

$\omega\varsigma \alpha\rho' \epsilon\phi\eta$, Σθένης δὲ καθ' ἵππων ἄλτο χαμᾶζε (*Iliad* 5,111).

⁴³⁹ This will be argued in more detail in the chapter on the augment, but for the default position of the verb at the end of the sentence, see Bergaigne 1879; Delbrück 1878:17, 1888:17; Kühner-Gerth 1904:595; Watkins 1963:48, 1998:68; Fortson 2010:142-144; Fritz 2010:384; Hock 2013. For the marked position in the beginning of the sentence, one can refer to Delbrück 1878:19; Watkins 1963:48; Fortson 2010:142-144; Fritz 2010:384. See Bertrand 2006a for Greek, and De Lamberterie 2007 for Greek and Armenian: they argued that verb initial forms were already marked and therefore did not need an augment. This distinction is most clearly seen in Hittite: Dressler 1969:6-8; McCone 1979:468-469; Disterheft 1984:221 *of all the languages with OV word order, Hittite is the most invariant*; Luraghi 1990:18; Clackson 2007:166-167; Hoffner-Melchert 2008:406; Fortson 2010:142; Hock 2013. As Watkins 1997 pointed out, Delbrück's observations were confirmed by the Anatolian languages. The verb initial position in Anatolian is mostly emphatic, see Friedrich 1960:146, Luraghi 1990:96-97 and Bauer 2011.

Hoffner-Melchert were more cautious and added that further research was needed in this field.

⁴⁴⁰ This is addressed in more detail in the augment chapter, see pages 271-272.

In this verse Homer described how Diomedes finished speaking, and how Sthenelos jumped from his chariot in order to attend to Diomedes. He had asked Sthenelos for help, after he had been hit by an arrow. Sthenelos immediately heard him and attempted to cure the wound. In this instance, the middle form ὥς ἔφατο could have been used as well and would have been more expected, because the action after the phrase ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη is not what is unexpected, but what Diomedes expected.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, Τρῶες δὲ μάλα σχεδὸν ἦλυθον αὐτῶν (*Iliad* 5,607).

In this instance, the poet described how Diomedes finished speaking to the Greeks inciting them to face the Trojans and not resist fighting with the gods. The reaction to those words is surprising, because Homer did not state that the Greeks pushed the Trojans back, but rather that the Trojans came exceedingly close. As such, ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη announced an unexpected turn of events, and is therefore better suited than ὥς ἔφατο.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, ποταμὸς δὲ χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον (*Iliad* 21,136).

In this verse, Akhilleus finished speaking boastfully that he would kill every Trojan and throw the bodies into the river Skamandros. Skamandros reacted very angrily to this, although he was not directly addressed by Akhilleus. The formula δὲ χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον occurs four times in the *Odyssey* and is always preceded by a middle verb form. The question is why this is the case. As was stated above, this seemed to indicate that there was no real semantic difference between the active and middle diathesis.

ὥς ἐφάμην, ὁ δ' ἔπειτα χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον (*Odyssey* 9,480),

ὥς ἔφατ', Ἀντίνοος δὲ χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον (*Odyssey* 17,458).

ὥς ἔφατ', Εὐρύμαχος δὲ χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον (*Odyssey* 18,387),

ὥς φάτ', Ἀθηναίη δὲ χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον (*Odyssey* 22,224).

The difference between the Iliadic instance and the ones mentioned above is that the actions of the river Skamandros are very unexpected, as he was not involved in the story so far. Skamandros was not angry because Akhilleus was speaking, but because Akhilleus was saying that he would overflow the river with corpses. The person who made the statement was less relevant for Skamandros than the actual actions.

In *Odyssey* 9,480 the subject of the verb φημί stood in the first person, and therefore the subject was accented, as it the speaker referred to himself. Consequently, an active form was less suited. In the three other instances, the conclusion belongs to an action between individuals that had been mentioned already.

In *Odyssey* 17,458 and 18,387 the suitors Antinoos and Eurymakhos became exceedingly angry not only because of what the beggar (Odysseus in disguise) was saying, but also

because of who was saying it: they were annoyed because a beggar was making them reproaches and was provoking them. In those instances, the middle was used to emphasise the subject as well: a beggar had been speaking bluntly, not a noble guest. In *Odyssey* 22,224 the suitor Agelaos finished speaking, and he had also been mentioned already. As he addressed Mentor (Athena in disguise), her anger was expected. As a consequence, no strong contrast existed between his speaking and Athena's anger.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, Λητώ δὲ συναίνυτο καμπύλα τόξα (*Iliad* 21,502).

In this verse Homer described how Hermes finished speaking to Leto, saying that he did not want to engage in battle with her, and how Leto picked up the bow and arrows that Artemis had dropped after being beaten in battle by Here. Leto's reaction to Hermes's words is surprising, as one would not expect her to pick up the bow, but rather to respond to Hermes's words. The surprising reaction by Leto to Hermes's words is announced by ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, which indicates a contrast here. In this instance, the subject of the next sentence follows the conclusion, and therefore ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη is used.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρη῏ς δὲ θεῶν μέγαν ὄρκον ἀπώμνυ (*Odyssey* 2,377).

In this verse, Telemakhos finished his request to Eurykleia that she would not inform Penelope about his trip to Pylos and Sparta. Eurykleia reacted positively to this, and swore that she would do as he asked. In this instance, the subject of the next sentence follows the conclusion, and therefore ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη is used. Eurykleia obeyed Telemakhos, Penelope and Odysseus. As such, it is not so important who addressed her, because as soon as she is spoken to, she would obey anyway. This explains the use of the active diathesis.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ θρη῏νον ἐλὼν ὑπέφηνε τραπέζης (*Odyssey* 17,409),

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ θρη῏νον ἐλὼν βάλε δεξιὸν ὄμνον (*Odyssey* 17,462).

In these two examples, Homer related how the suitor Antinoos became so annoyed that he picked up a stool after his speech and threw it in Odysseus's direction. The use of the active is surprising, because the subject is an important character, Antinoos being one of the worst suitors. The active is used here, as there is a contrast between the speaking and the throwing of the chair: there is nothing in Antinoos's words that indicated that he was about to throw something in Odysseus's direction.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρη῏ς δὲ διὲκ μεγάροιο βεβήκει (*Odyssey* 18,185).

Penelope finished speaking to Eurynome, saying that she (P) did not need to make herself beautiful, because her beauty had gone away the day that Odysseus left for Troy. She asked Eurynome to go and summon the maidens. Eurynome did as was asked: as she was a maid, she would obey if Telemakhos or Penelope spoke to her, and therefore the act speaking was

more important than the speaker. In this instance, the subject of the next sentence follows the conclusion, and therefore ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη is used.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρηῦς δὲ κατέσχετο χερσὶ πρόσωπα (*Odyssey* 19,361).

In this verse Penelope finished speaking to Eurykleia and asked her to wash the stranger's feet. Eurykleia put her hands before her face, started crying and addressed the absent Odysseus first, and then spoke to the stranger (who was in fact Odysseus). This reaction is completely unexpected, and therefore ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη is suited here. In addition, Eurykleia was a maid and would obey if Telemakhos, Penelope or Odysseus spoke to her, and therefore the act speaking was more important than the speaker.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρηῦς δὲ λάβηθ' ἔλε παμφανόωντα (*Odyssey* 19,386).

In this verse, Odysseus finished speaking to Eurykleia. She took a bowl with water, and added warm water to the cold water to wash his feet. In this instance, the subject of the next sentence follows the conclusion, and therefore ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη is used. As Eurykleia was a maid, she would obey if Telemakhos, Odysseus or Penelope spoke to her, and therefore the act speaking was more important than the speaker.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρηῦς δὲ διέκ μέγαροιο βεβήκει (*Odyssey* 19,503).

In this verse, Odysseus finished urging and threatening Eurykleia to keep quiet about his real identity and she went away. As Eurykleia was a maid, she would obey if Telemakhos, Penelope or Odysseus spoke to her, and therefore the act speaking was more important than the speaker. In this instance, the subject of the next sentence follows the conclusion, and therefore ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη is used.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, χαῖρεν δὲ κληιδόνη διὸς Ὀδυσσεὺς (*Odyssey* 20,120).

This instance is the only example of a speech conclusion that is introduced by ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη and that refers to an unnamed subject.⁴⁴¹ This verse described how a female servant of Odysseus who was working at the mill, heard the thundering by Zeus and interpreted the omen in a for Odysseus favourable way. Her interpretation caused Odysseus to feel joy. The formula is an adaptation of *Odyssey* 18,117 (cf. supra). The introduction was ἥ ῥα μύλην στήσασα ἔπος φάτο, σῆμα ἄνακτι (*Odyssey* 20,111- cf. supra).

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρηῦς δὲ διέκ μέγαροιο βεβήκει (*Odyssey* 22,433).

Odysseus finished asking Eurykleia to call the maidens, and she did as he asked: she went outside and called the maidens. In this verse, there is no contrast either.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ πεῖσμα νεὸς κυανοπρώροιο (*Odyssey* 22,465).

⁴⁴¹ Schneider 1995:156

This verse gruesomely described how Odysseus finished speaking and started building a multiperson gallows for the unfaithful maidens. In this instance, the speaking is clearly contrasted with the act of building the gallows.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη πόσιος πειρωμένη: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς (*Odyssey* 23,181).

In this verse, Homer described how Penelope just said that Odysseus could sleep in his bed, which was put it outside their bedroom. This is a trick, as the bed is attached to a tree and could not be moved. The formula ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη was used here to emphasise the contrast between the (unreal) suggestion and Odysseus's (angry) response.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, Δολίος δ' ἰθὺς κίε χεῖρε πετάσας (*Odyssey* 24,397).

In this instance, Homer described how Odysseus finished telling to Dolios to remain seated and start eating, as they had been waiting for a long time. Dolios, however, immediately jumped up, ran to Odysseus and kissed him. Dolios's reaction is unexpected, and therefore the formula ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη was used.

There was only one instance in the *Iliad* where the active diathesis was unexpected. The situation in the *Odyssey* is different: when a speech conclusion is followed by the word γρη῏ς, the conclusion is expressed by ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, although ὥς ἔφατο would have been metrically possible. The use of the active form ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη to conclude a speech that had been spoken to Eurynome or Eurykleia could be surprising, because they are not unimportant characters, but I believe that in those contexts it was not important who spoke, as both were nurses and obeyed their masters. What was important, was the fact that they were asked to do something, not who asked it. An alternative explanation could be that the use of the active the paradigm of φημί was increasing in the *Odyssey*: the formula ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη is used 5 times in the *Iliad* and 13 times in the *Odyssey*, while ὥς ἔφατο is used 11 times in the *Iliad* but never in the *Odyssey*.

Finally, the participle has to be discussed. The participle is attested 7 times in a speech conclusion, and is always middle. The active participle φάς does not occur in the Homeric poems, but outside speech conclusions, one finds the form φάντες.⁴⁴² The metre can only be a partial explanation, because sequences such as *ὥς ἄρα φάς, *ὥς ἄρα φάντες or *ὥς ἄρα φᾶσα “so speaking, ...” could have been used as well, but they do not occur. The absence of the active participle is in all likelihood due to the fact that it is used when the subject of the participle is the same as that of the main verb. In such instances, the subject is not unimportant and an active form is therefore less suited. The middle puts the subject more on the foreground.

⁴⁴² The instances are *Iliad* 3,44 and 14,126.

To conclude, the active of the simplex φημί was originally used to stress the action of the verb and to name speaking by unimportant characters. The middle was never used to refer to unknown or unmentioned characters. As such, only the active 3rd person plural is found in speech conclusions of an undetermined or anonymous subject. The active was also used when the need was felt to stress the contrast between the action of the speaking and the subsequent action more than the mention of the subject. In order to do so, the poet used the formula ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη. In the *Odyssey* the formula ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη was used when Eurykleia or Eurynome received an order: this formula was used because the order was more important than the person who gave it. Therefore ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη was used, because it stressed the action of the verb. Among later writers such as Apollonios of Rhodes and Quintus Smyrnaeus, the formula ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη will even be used to refer to speech conclusions after an introduction of the *tis* type.⁴⁴³ These elements indicate that originally the distinction between active and middle was related to the degree of subject involvement and in a few instances metrical necessities played a role as well, but later this distinction became less outspoken, and the active forms were also used when the subject was known or when there was no strong contrast.

3.3.6. The simplex φημί.

3.3.6.1. Word order.

In the speech conclusions, there is no distinction between VO and OV, as φημί is used without arguments in almost all instances.

In the speech introductions, the basic word order is OV, as can be seen in the instances of ἔπος φάτο and ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'.

θάμβησέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (*Iliad* 3,398),

ἦ δέ μεν ἄγχι στήσασα ἔπος φάτο φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 4,370).

The word order is VO in the 10 instances of φάτο μῦθον. As the formula φάτο μῦθον always appeared at the end of the verse, the word order might be metrically determined, because μῦθον φάτο would not have been possible at verse end:

καί ῥα ἐκάστω φωτὶ παρασταμένη φάτο μῦθον (*Odyssey* 2,384),

In speech conclusions, the participles are always put after the verb they determine, as can be seen in instances such as

Speech conclusion.	Participle.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
--------------------	-------------	--------------------	----------

⁴⁴³ Apollonios Rhodios, *Argonautika* 2,154; Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomerica* 4,32; 13,19 and 13,478. These passages were discussed in Schneider 1995:153-169.

ὥς ἔφατ'	εὐχόμενος,	τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων	<i>Iliad</i> 1,43
ὥς φάτο	λίσσόμενος	μέγα νήπιος: ἦ γὰρ ἔμελλεν	<i>Iliad</i> 16,46
ὥς ἔφατο	κλαίουσ',	ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες	<i>Iliad</i> 19,301
ὥς φάτ'	ἐποτρύνων:	Τρῶεσσι δὲ φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ	<i>Iliad</i> 20,364
φῆ	πυρὶ καιόμενος,	ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλυε καλὰ ῥέεθρα	<i>Iliad</i> 21,361

In the last example, the speech conclusion is not introduced by ὥς, as was the case in all other conclusions. The participles describe how the speech was “performed”, and therefore belong to the actual conclusion.

In speech introductions, the participles usually precede the verb they determine:

Beginning of verse.	Participle.	Speech intro.		Passage.
καὶ ῥα ἐκάστω φωτὶ	παρισταμένη	φάτο μῦθον		<i>Odyssey</i> 2,384; 8,10
ἦ ῥα μύλην	στήσασα	ἔπος φάτο,	σῆμα ἄνακτι	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,111

The apposition follows the subject or object to which it belongs.⁴⁴⁴ Examples of apposition to the subject are:

Speech conclusion.	Subject.	Apposition.	Rest of verse.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο λίσσόμενος		μέγα νήπιος:	ἦ γὰρ ἔμελλεν	<i>Iliad</i> 16,46
ὥς φάτ'	Ἀθηναίη	κούρη Διός:	οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δὴν	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,296

In the first example, μέγα νήπιος is the apposition to the subject of φάτο.

Remarkable are those instances, where the first word of the subject is a form of what later would become the article. In those cases, the article is not an article but a genuine pronoun, and is the subject. The apposition is in these cases put after the subject, and even after the verb:

Speech conclusion	Subject.	Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
ὥς ἔφαθ',	οἱ	δ' ἐχάρησαν	Ἀχαιοὶ τε Τρῶές τε	<i>Iliad</i> 3,111
ὥς ἔφαθ'	αἱ	δ' ἐπέμυζαν	Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη	<i>Iliad</i> 4,20
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἦ	δ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο	δῖα θεάων	occurring 5 times. ⁴⁴⁵

The nouns are only appositions, and the meaning of the first example is “and they rejoiced, the Trojans and the Greeks”,⁴⁴⁶ and that of the second is “and they murmured, Athene and Here”.⁴⁴⁷ In those cases the pronoun is accented.⁴⁴⁸

⁴⁴⁴ Delbrück 1879:150-151; Hackstein 2010b.

⁴⁴⁵ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,382; 4,398; 10,487; 10,503 and 12,115.

⁴⁴⁶ Monro 1891:226, Chantraine 1953:160-161.

⁴⁴⁷ Monro 1891:226, Chantraine 1953:161 *et elles, elles murmurent Athéné et Héré.*

An example of an apposition to the object is

Beginning of the verse.	Object.	Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
ἦ ῥα μύλην στήσασα	ἔπος	φάτο,	σῆμα ἄνακτι	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,111

It is noteworthy that the digamma is observed in (w)ἔπος and in (w)ἄνακτι.

The verb form of φημί only appears in one instance in verse initial position. Wachter explained this fact as an illustration of verbal enclisis and used the conclusion formula ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων as key example for the Wackernagel position of the verb. In both phrases, the verb appeared after the first word of the sentence in a clitic chain.⁴⁴⁹ If the verb was put in the first position, it was focused and not enclitic.⁴⁵⁰ The verb φημί is put in verse initial position in φῆ πυρὶ καιόμενος, ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλυε καλὰ ῥέεθρα (*Iliad* 21,361), where there is a strong emphasis on the verb.

3.3.6.2. Case usage.

The use of a person addressed is very rare with the simplex. This has to do with the fact that most instances of the simplex are speech conclusions of the type “so s/he spoke” without object. The simplex mostly uses the word spoken or the message delivered as object in the accusative (this could be called an internal object). Examples are ἔπος φάτο, φάτο μῦθον and ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἕκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν.

In the verse τὸν δ' Ἑλένη τανύπεπλος ὑποφθαμένη φάτο μῦθον (*Odyssey* 15,171), the accusative τὸν belongs to the verb ὑποφθαμένη “be quicker than him” and not to φάτο. The meaning is that Helen is quicker than Menelaos and addresses everybody, and not that she only addresses Menelaos.

The finite verb might have a person addressed in καὶ τότε μ' ἐκκαλέσαντες ἔφην ἐρίηρες ἐταῖροι (*Odyssey* 10,471), but the position of the pronoun makes it much more likely that the accusative belongs to the participle ἐκκαλέσαντες.

In the following verse, the accusative does not belong to the participle, but to the finite verb:

ὥς ἄρα μιν φαμένη ῥάβδῳ ἐπεμάσσατ' Ἀθήνη (*Odyssey* 13,429).

⁴⁴⁸ The forms are accented in some manuscripts but not in all. Van Thiel (1991:50) and West (1998:94) accented the pronouns, but Leaf did not. The commentaries did not discuss the use of the article as pronoun in the above mentioned instances. West stated (1998:xxi) *ὁ pronomēn demonstrativum accentu non privandum esse monui*.

⁴⁴⁹ Wachter 2000:106.

⁴⁵⁰ Wachter 2000:106.

The pronoun is put in the 2nd position of the sentence, as it is object of the main verb and is preceded by a clitic particle: in the clitic chain, particles precede the pronouns.⁴⁵¹ As such, μιν is the subject of ἐπεμάσσας, although it appears immediately before φαμένη.

3.3.6.3. Metrical position in the verse.

The verbal forms in the speech conclusions are put in the beginning of the verse, and the first word is always ὦς, except in the following instance:

φῆ πυρὶ καιόμενος, ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλυε καλὰ ῥέεθρα (*Iliad* 21,361).

The conclusions ὦς ἔφατ', ὦς ἔφαθ' and its non-augmented counterpart ὦς φάτο always occupy the first foot. The former can only be followed by a word starting with a word starting with a long vowel (either by position or by nature), while the latter can only be followed by a word starting with one consonant and with a long vowel.⁴⁵² Examples of ὦς ἔφατ' are

Speech conclusion.	First word with long initial vowel.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὦς ἔφατ'	εὐχόμενος,	τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων	<i>Iliad</i> 1,43
ὦς ἔφατ',	οὐδ'	ἄρα οἱ κῆρυξ ἀπίθησεν ἀκούσας	<i>Iliad</i> 4,198

Examples of ὦς φάτο are

Speech conclusion.	First word starting with single consonant and long vowel.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὦς φάτο:	Πηλεΐωνι	δ' ἄχος γένετ', ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ	<i>Iliad</i> 1,188
ὦς φάτο,	Πάτροκλος	δὲ φίλῳ ἐπεπείθεθ' ἑταίρῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 1,345

Examples of ὦς ἔφαθ' are

Speech conclusion.	First word with long initial aspirated vowel.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὦς ἔφαθ',	Ἔκτωρ	δ' οὐ τι θεᾶς ἔπος ἠγνοίησεν	<i>Iliad</i> 2,807
ὦς ἔφαθ',	οἷ	δ' ἔσχοντο μάχης ἄνεώ τ' ἐγένοντο	<i>Iliad</i> 3,84

The conclusion ὦς φάτ' was used when the word following the conclusion started with a short unaspirated vowel:

Speech conclusion.	First word with short initial unaspirated vowel.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὦς φάτ'	ἐποτρύνων,	οἱ δ' ἀντίοι ἔγχε' ἄειραν	<i>Iliad</i> 20,373

⁴⁵¹ This had been noticed already by Monro 1891:335-338, before Wackernagel posited his famous Law. For the clitic chain see Wackernagel 1892:336; Delbrück 1900:51-53 (with reference to Monro); Brugmann 1904:682-683; Krisch 1990:73-74; Ruijgh 1990; Wills 1993; Watkins 1998:70.

⁴⁵² This is based on Fingerle 1939 and O'Neill 1942.

ὥς φάτ',	ἐγὼ	δ' ἄορ ὀξὺ ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ	<i>Odyssey</i> 10,321
----------	-----	-----------------------------------	-----------------------

The conclusion ὥς φάθ' was used when the word following the conclusion started with a short unaspirated vowel:

Speech conclusion.	First word with short initial aspirated vowel.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὥς φάθ',	ὃ	δὲ τόξον μὲν ἐνὶ κλισίῃσιν ἔθηκεν	<i>Iliad</i> 15,478
ὥς φάθ',	ὃ	δ' αὐτίκα παῦσεν ἐὼν ῥόον, ἔσχε δὲ κῦμα	<i>Odyssey</i> 5,451

The conclusion ὥς ἔφατο can only be used if the word following the conclusion starts with two consonants:

Speech conclusion.	First word with 2 consonants.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὥς ἔφατο,	Τρῶας	δὲ κατὰ κρήθην λάβε πένθος	<i>Iliad</i> 16,548
ὥς ἔφατο:	Ζεὺς	δ' οὐ τι δολοφροσύνην ἐνόησεν	<i>Iliad</i> 19,112

The conclusions of the types ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη and ὥς ἐφάμην offered more leeway to the poet, because they could be followed by any syllable, regardless whether the syllable was open, closed, long or short or started with a consonant or vowel:

Speech conclusion.	First word.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη,	ποταμὸς	δὲ χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον	<i>Iliad</i> 21,136
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη,	χαῖρεν	δὲ κληδόνι δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,120
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὃ	δὲ δέκτο καὶ ἔκπιεν: ἦσατο δ' αἰνῶς	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,353
ὥς ἐφάμην,	τοῖσιν	δ' ἐπεπείθετο θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ.	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,148

The conclusion ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην can only be followed by a word starting with a consonant:

Speech conclusion.	First word with initial consonant(s).	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην,	Πρίαμος	δ' Ἑλένην ἐκαλέσσατο φωνῇ	<i>Iliad</i> 3,161
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην	μνηστῆρες,	ὃ δ' οὐκ ἐμπάζετο μύθων	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,488

In several instances, the last vowel of ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην underwent lengthening under the ictus (or dated from a period when Osthoff's Law had not operated yet and the ending was still *nt*):

Speech conclusion.	First word without initial consonant.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην,	Αἴας	δὲ κορύσσετο νόροπι χαλκῷ	<i>Iliad</i> 7,206

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην	ἀπιόντες,	ἐμὸν δ' ἐγέλασσε φίλον κῆρ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,413
-------------	-----------	----------------------------	----------------------

Whether this lengthening is purely metrical or a remnant from the period when the final *t* was still present in the verbal inflection is unclear. It is likely that the poet expanded ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην from contexts where it was metrically “correct” into other contexts as well. The interaction probably started from contexts where ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη and ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην were metrically equivalent, because the following word started with a consonant:

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην,	χαῖρεν	δὲ κληδόνι δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,117
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη,	χαῖρεν	δὲ κληδόνι δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,120

From those verses, the poet thought that he could use both conclusions interchangeably. Speech conclusions in the active diathesis were rare because they were initially only used when the subject was unknown or when the speaking was more important than the subject. The active conclusions increased in use during the creation of the epics. This makes the hypothesis of a poetic extension of ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην more likely than the inherited form ὥς ἄρ' *ἔφην(*t*).

These data could give the impression that the verb forms in the speech conclusions were only metrically determined, but as was argued before, this is not the case: the conclusions ὥς ἔφαθ', οἶ and ὥς ἔφαθ', αἶ are metrically equivalent to ὥς φάτο τοί and ὥς φάτο ταί.⁴⁵³ This will be addressed in more detail in the chapter of the augment.

In general, the conclusion does not occupy the entire verse. This is only the case in:

ὥς ἔφατ' Ἀτρεΐδης, δουρικλειτὸς Μενέλαος (*Odyssey* 17,417).

ὥς ἐφάμην μαλακοῖσι καθαπτόμενος ἐπέεσσιν (*Odyssey* 10,70),

ὥς ἔφατ', ἐν στήθεσσι καθαπτόμενος φίλον ἦτορ (*Odyssey* 20,22),

ὥς φάτ', οἰόμενος λαοσσόον ἔμμεν Ἀθήνην (*Odyssey* 22,210).

The conclusions with a participle form of φημί occupy the first foot and the second half foot of the second foot. One speech conclusion with a participle occupies two complete feet and one half of the third foot: ὥς ἄρα μιν φαμένη ράβδῳ ἐπεμάσσατ' Ἀθήνη (*Odyssey* 13,429).

The verb forms of φημί in the imperfect (the ones used the most in speech introductions and conclusions) cannot conclude the verse, because sequences ◡— or ◡— cannot appear at verse end. The speech introduction formulae ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε, φάτο μῦθον and φάτο φώνησέν τε always appear at the end of the verse.

⁴⁵³ This had been noticed already by Grashof 1852:6.

In 7 instances, the subject of φημί is extended by a participle construction (cf. supra):⁴⁵⁴

Beginning of verse.	Participle.	Speech intro.		Passage.
καί ῥα ἐκάστω φωτὶ	παρισταμένη	φάτο μῦθον		<i>Odyssey</i> 2,384; 8,10
Ἀλκινόω δὲ μάλιστα	πιφασκόμενος,	φάτο μῦθον		<i>Odyssey</i> 13,37
ἦ ῥα μύλην	στήσασα	ἔπος φάτο,	σῆμα ἄνακτι	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,111

At the end the formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε needs a brief discussion. This formula always appears at the end of the verse. Parry and his followers argued that this formula, just as ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, was a simple speech introduction formula with the meaning “s/he spoke”.⁴⁵⁵ While this is true for ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, it is not the case for ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε. This formula has an emotional value and indicated that a person was going to state something important.⁴⁵⁶ The original meaning was “he spoke a word and called by name”,⁴⁵⁷ but this later evolved into “he spoke and addressed”.⁴⁵⁸ The emotional and intense value is seen in the use of the formula. It is often combined with a verb meaning “touch” or “being touched” or “insult”:

ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῶ χειρὶ ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (7 instances),⁴⁵⁹

χειρὶ τέ μιν κατέρεξεῖν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (5 instances),⁴⁶⁰

τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν νεΐκεσσεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (*Odyssey* 17,215),

(...) ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (8 instances).⁴⁶¹

3.3.6.4. Connection of the speech introduction/conclusion to the rest of the verse.

When φημί is used in the entire verse, there is no connection to the rest of the verse, but this is very rare (only once in a conclusion and 19 times in an introduction). In most cases, the conclusion is linked to the rest of the verse by a particle, usually καί, δέ or οὐδέ. The distinction between these particles was described above. In cases of sharp contrasts, αὐτάρ is used to connect the conclusion and the new sentence. In most cases, the connection between the speech conclusions and the rest of the verse is made by δέ. The speech introduction

⁴⁵⁴ The instances are *Odyssey* 2,384; 4,370; 8,10; 10,471; 13,37; 15,171; 20,111.

⁴⁵⁵ Parry 1937; Edwards 1970:2, 1988:24-25.

⁴⁵⁶ Couch 1937:140, see also D'Avino 1969:23. For the emotional value see also Kelly 2007:388.

⁴⁵⁷ Classen 1879:202; Autenrieth 1891 *s.u.*: is always followed either by the name of the person addressed or by some substantial equivalent for the name (accessed online via <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>); Ameis-Hentze-Cauer 1913:29; Spitzer 1933:235; Calhoun 1933:8, 1935; Jacobsohn 1934; Chantraine 1953:193; D'Avino 1969; Muñoz Valle 1971; LSJ *s.u.* .

⁴⁵⁸ D'Avino 1969; Edwards 1970:10-11; O'Sullivan 1999a:714-715; Latacz-Nünlist-Stoevesandt 2009:131.

⁴⁵⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 6,253; 6,406; 14,232; 18,384; 18,423; 19,7 and *Odyssey* 15,530.

⁴⁶⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 1,361; 6,485; 24,127 and *Odyssey* 4,610; 5,181.

⁴⁶¹ The instances are *Iliad* 15,552 and *Odyssey* 16,417; 18,78; 19,90; 21,84; 21,167; 21,287; 23,96.

formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε is connected to the rest of the verse by the particle τε. The other speech introduction formulae with φημί are connected to the rest of the verse by δέ in:

τοίχου τοῦ ἑτέρου, ποτὶ δὲ Πρίαμον φάτο μῦθον (*Iliad* 24,598),

and by καί in:

χάλκεον ἔγχος ἔχων, καὶ ὀνειδέειον φάτο μῦθον (*Iliad* 21,393),

Ἄρτεμις ἀγροτέρη, καὶ ὀνειδέειον φάτο μῦθον (*Iliad* 21,471).

3.3.6.5. Agreement between verb and subject.

Generally, the verb accords with the subject, but in one instance, there is a so-called *constructio ad sensum*, where the verb does not take the grammatical number, but the number of the meaning:

ὥς φάσαν ἡ πληθὺς: ἀνὰ δ' ὁ πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεὺς (*Iliad* 2,278)

Here the grammatical number of πληθὺς is singular, but it refers to a multitude and therefore the verb φάσαν is therefore put in the plural.⁴⁶² Etymologically, however, the word is an original collective **pleh₁-d^h-uh₂*,⁴⁶³ in which the **h₂* was the collective marker. The noun was then later recharacterised with a nominative *s*.⁴⁶⁴ The full grade **pleh₁-d^h-uēh₂s* can be found in Latin *plēbēs*.⁴⁶⁵ Metrical necessities cannot have played a role, as both the augmented singular ἔφη and the non-augmented form φῆ would have been metrically possible. The speech introduction to this conclusion was ὧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον (*Iliad* 2,271).⁴⁶⁶ Related to this observation, is the (remarkable) fact is that speeches introduced by an unknown or unspecified person, are concluded by a form of φημί in the third person plural, never in the third person singular nor in the middle (cf. supra).⁴⁶⁷ Schneider explained this by the fact that the undeterminate subject was used to state the opinion of a large group.⁴⁶⁸ Therefore the conclusions could be put in the plural, as the speaking was made by a large group. It is important to note that the conclusion of an undetermined subject could be put in the singular (and only in the singular) with ἔειπον, while the speaking of an undetermined

⁴⁶² Delbrück 1879:10-11, Monro 1891:158; Ameis-Hentze-Cauer 1913:67; Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:608-609; Brügger-Stoevesandt-Visser 2003:88.

⁴⁶³ Mayrhofer 1986a:134.

⁴⁶⁴ Olav Hackstein, personal communication.

⁴⁶⁵ For the connection between Greek πληθὺς and Latin *plēbēs*, see Brugmann 1906:220, Pedersen 1926:62-63, 70-71, Pokorny 1959:799. The reconstruction **pleh₁-d^h-uēh₂s* for Latin *plēbēs* goes back to Steinbauer *apud* Mayrhofer 1986a:133. Schrijver 1991:381, Kortlandt 1997:160, De Vaan 2008:471 and Beekes 2010:1192 reconstructed **pleh₁-d^h-ueh₁s*.

⁴⁶⁶ Schneider 1995:13; Brügger-Stoevesandt-Visser 2003:88.

⁴⁶⁷ Schneider 1995:13-14, and *passim*.

⁴⁶⁸ Schneider 1995 *passim*.

subject could only be expressed by a plural form in conclusions with φημί: there is no conclusion with φημί in the singular in which is stated “and so someone spoke”.⁴⁶⁹

3.3.7. The compound πρόσφημι.

3.3.7.1. Meaning and forms.

The verb πρόσφημι occurs only in the active diathesis. The forms are προσέφην (3 instances), προσέφης (18 instances) and προσέφη (214 instances).

3.3.7.2. Use of πρόσφημι in speech introductions and conclusions.

The compound πρόσφημι appears 234 times in speech introductions and it is used only once in a speech conclusion:

ὥς πού σε προσέφη, σοὶ δὲ φρένας ἄφρονι πεῖθε (*Iliad* 16,842).

This verse was pronounced by Hektor after he had slain Patroklos. He taunted him by saying that Akhilleus must have told him to assail Troy and to kill Hektor. Hektor boastfully added that he was foolish to obey that order and that this caused his downfall. Patroklos was indeed too overconfident and did attempt to conquer Troy, but he did so in defiance of Akhilleus's warnings rather than following his order, as Hektor suggested. The clitic πού “somehow, somewhat like this” indicates that Hektor only guessed what Akhilleus had said.

The verb also occurs in “negative introductions”, by which is meant that the speaker does not address the person addressed. This occurs predominantly in phrases as “so s/he spoke, but X did not respond”:⁴⁷⁰

ὥς φάτο, τὸν δ' οὐ τι προσέφη κορυθαίολος Ἴεκτωρ (*Iliad* 5,689; 6,342),

ὥς φάτο, τὸν δ' οὐ τι προσέφη λευκώλενος Ἥρη (*Iliad* 8,484),

ὥς φάτο, τὸν δ' οὐ τι προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (*Odyssey* 20,183).

In 18 instances, the poet addressed the speaker, and put the verb in the 2nd person singular:

τὸν δὲ βαρὺ στενάχων προσέφη Πατρόκλεις ἱππεῦ (occurring three times),⁴⁷¹

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη, Εὐμαιε συβῶτα (occurring 15 times).⁴⁷²

After the addressing by the poet to the speaker, the direct speech of the addressed person starts. This might be metrically motivated,⁴⁷³ but in the case of Patroklos it also highlights the emotional nature of the passage, as his death is imminent.⁴⁷⁴

⁴⁶⁹ Schneider 1995: 13-14 and 31-35.

⁴⁷⁰ For the combination of speech conclusion and negative introduction, see Appendix A.5.

⁴⁷¹ The instances are *Iliad* 16,20; 16,744 and 16,843.

⁴⁷² The instances are *Odyssey* 14,55; 14,165; 14,360; 14,442; 14,507; 15,325; 16,60; 16,135; 16,464; 17,272; 17,311; 17,380; 17,512; 17,579 and 22,194.

⁴⁷³ Combellack 1976:45 was more skeptical: *I should say it is more prudent, however, to conclude that we really do not know why Homer did this.*

As was argued before, the difference between πρόσφημι and μετάφημι is that the former is used to address a few people while the latter is used to speak to a large group. There are two deliberate exceptions:⁴⁷⁵

τοὺς δ' αὖτ' ἐξ ἄντρου προσέφη κρατερὸς Πολύφημος (*Odyssey* 9,407).

In this passage Polyphemos who had been blinded already, responded to a remark by the Kyklopes. He could not see his audience anymore and therefore no difference was made between μετάφημι and πρόσφημι.⁴⁷⁶

τοὺς δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (*Odyssey* 22,34).

This line is used by Homer to describe how Odysseus addressed all the suitors as one entity just before he was about to kill them all. By using πρόσφημι the poet depicted the group as one person.⁴⁷⁷ In this case one would have expected the verb μετάφημι.

3.3.7.3. Word order.

The predominant word order is OV. Examples of this are (the list is not exhaustive):

Particles.	Object.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
αὐτὰρ	Ἀπόλλωνα	προσέφη	κρείων ἐνοσίχθων	<i>Iliad</i> 21,435
δὴ τότε	Τηλέμαχον	προσέφη	πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,390
δὴ τότε	Ὀδυσσῆα	προσέφη	γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,541

In the following instances, the accusative cannot belong to the participle:

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὴν δὲ	βαρὺ στενάχων	προσέφη	πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς	<i>Iliad</i> 1,364
τὸν δὲ	παρισταμένη	προσέφη	γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,516

The VO word order is attested in the following instances. These instances can be explained as formulaic inflection of formulae where a nominative stood at the end of the verse instead of the accusative. The verse

Particles.	Participle.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
καί ῥα	καλεσσάμενος	προσέφη	χρυσὴν Ἀφροδίτην	<i>Iliad</i> 5,427

is a rework of a verse with the nominative at the end:

⁴⁷⁴ Ameis-Hentze 1894:4; Willcock 1984:244; Janko 1992:317-318. Beck 2005:181-182 agreed with the emotional nature of the passage, but assumed that it was not the vocative but the participles which contributed to the emotions. This is less likely, because usually Homer did not address characters when they were about to speak.

⁴⁷⁵ Riggsby 1992:107-108.

⁴⁷⁶ Riggsby 1992:107-108.

⁴⁷⁷ Riggsby 1992:107-108.

	Direct object.	Indirect object.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
κρήδεμνόν θ',	ὃ ρά	οἱ	δῶκε	χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ	<i>Iliad</i> 22,470

The verse

Participle.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη	προσέφη	κλυτὸν ἐννοσίγαιον	<i>Iliad</i> 15,173

is an adaptation of

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὴν δὲ	μέγ' ὀχθήσας	προσέφη	κλυτὸς ἐννοσίγαιος	<i>Iliad</i> 15,184

The verse

Particles.	Subject.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
αὐτὰρ	Τηλέμαχος	προσέφη	γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην	<i>Odyssey</i> 1,156

is a formulaic inflection of

Particles.	Object.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
δὴ τότ'	Ὀδυσσεῖα	προσέφη	γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,541

The verses

Participle.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
ἐκ δὲ καλεσσάμενος	προσέφη	τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,15; 21,380
κινήσας δὲ θύρην	προσέφη	τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,394

are an adaptation of

Conclusion.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο	κώκυσεν δὲ	φίλη τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,361

and

Object.	Particle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	αὖτε	προσέειπε	φίλη τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,21

The sequence προσέφη τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν appears 5 times in the accusative and is always put at the end of the verse,⁴⁷⁸ but it is in all likelihood a rework of the ten instances,⁴⁷⁹ where

⁴⁷⁸ The instances are *Odyssey* 19,15; 21,380; 22,391; 22,394 and 22,480.

⁴⁷⁹ The instances are *Odyssey* 2,361; 4,472; 17,31; 19,21; 22,419; 22,485; 22,492; 23,25; 23,39 and 23,69.

τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια appeared at the end of the verse as subject (as was argued in the case of ἔειπον as well).

The vocatives that occur in the 18 instances of προσέφης, are always put at the end of the verse. In the verses with a vocative at the end, the nominative and a 3rd person verbal form would not have been metrical possible:

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Vocative.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφης,	Εὖμαιε συβῶτα	occurring 15 times. ⁴⁸⁰

In this verse, the 3rd person form in the nominative would have given προσέφη Εὖμαιος συβώτης at the end of the verse, but that is unmetrical. Therefore the vocative was a better solution and added some vividness to the situation.

The following verse posed additional problems:⁴⁸¹

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Vocative.	Passage.
τὸν δὲ	βαρὺ στενάχων	προσέφης	Πατρόκλεις ἱπεῦ	occurring three times. ⁴⁸²

Both nominative and vocative of Πάτροκλος would have metrically been impossible:⁴⁸³

Πάτροκλος would have given the metrical shape – ∪ for the fifth foot and that would not fit the metre, while Πάτροκλε also would also have the metrical form – ∪, and would have caused an hiatus. Therefore the poet needed to use the vocative form Πατρόκλεις from Πατροκλῆς. Homer could have used the 3rd person formula with the nominative Πατροκλῆς as well. The nominative is also transmitted in some codices, but the 2nd person and the addressing by the poet added an emotional value to the passage, and therefore have preference.⁴⁸⁴

3.3.9.4. Case usage.

The verb πρόσφημι is used with the accusative of the person addressed, but also occurs with a double accusative, namely the person addressed and what is (not) spoken, as is the case in the formula τὸ/ῆν δ' οὐ τι προσέφη. A dative of the person addressed is not found. In

τῷ μιν ἐεισάμενος/ τῇ μιν ἐεισαμένη προσέφη (occurring six times),⁴⁸⁵

the dative τῷ / τῇ belongs to the participle ἐεισάμενος/ ἐεισαμένη “resemble”, while the accusative μιν belongs to προσέφη.

⁴⁸⁰ The instances are *Odyssey* 14,55; 14,165; 14,360; 14,442; 14,507; 15,325; 16,60; 16,135; 16,464; 17,272; 17,311; 17,380; 17,512; 17,579 and 22,194.

⁴⁸¹ See Janko 1992:317-318 for an analysis of the passage.

⁴⁸² The instances are *Iliad* 16,20; 16,744 and 16,843.

⁴⁸³ For the forms and the paradigm, see Monro 1891:87-88 and Janko 1992:317-318. Meister 1921:52 only discussed the accusative, as did Chantraine 1948:95.

⁴⁸⁴ See also Fingerle 1939:328 who stated that the vocative was metrically needed, but served a semantic (i.e. emotional) purpose as well.

⁴⁸⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 2,795; 16,720; 17,326; 17,585; 20,82 and *Odyssey* 6,24.

The accusative at the beginning of the verse belongs to both verbal forms in the following instances:

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸν/τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	NOUN EPITHET	106 instances.
τὼ καὶ	δεικνύμενος	προσέφη	πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς	<i>Iliad</i> 9,196
τὸν/τὴν δ'	ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν	προσέφη	NOUN EPITHET	20 instances. ⁴⁸⁶

The speech introductions with πρόσφημι are sometimes used without syntactic arguments. This is especially the case, when the verse starts with ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη or ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος, as is the case in 9 out of the 10 instances where this formula occurs.⁴⁸⁷ Examples are:

Participle construction.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη	προσέφη	γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη	<i>Iliad</i> 2,172; <i>Odyssey</i> 15,9
ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος	προσέφη	ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων	<i>Iliad</i> 15,243
ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη	προσέφη	πόδας ὠκέα Ἴρις	occurs four times. ⁴⁸⁸

3.3.7.5. Metrical position of the verb in the verse.

The metrical form of the imperfect προσέφη/ν/ς does not allow for the verb to be in absolute verse final position, because a sequence of υ– cannot be put at the end of the verse. As such, the structure is usually the following: Pronoun (– Participle Extension) – Verb – Noun/Name Epithet. This structure allows the poet to extend the formula to use it for many different names and situations (as is seen by the fact that πρόσφημι occurs 234 times in an introduction). This verb is one of the *Paradebeispiele* for the oral poetry and formulaic nature of the Homeric poems.⁴⁸⁹ The speech introductions with πρόσφημι are almost always extended with a participle construction:

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸ/τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	NOUN EPITHET	occurring 106 times
τὴν δὲ	μέγ' ὀχθήσας	προσέφη	νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς	<i>Iliad</i> 1,517

⁴⁸⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,148; 4,439; 4,411; 5,251; 5,888; 10,446; 12,230; 14,82; 17,169; 18,284; 22,260; 22,344; 24,559 and *Odyssey* 8,165; 18,14; 18,337; 19,70; 22,34; 22,60; 22,320.

⁴⁸⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 2,172; 2,790; 3,129; 11,199; 13,768; 15,243; 17,648; 24,87 and *Odyssey* 15,9. The only instance where an accusative of the addressed person does occur is *Iliad* 15,173.

⁴⁸⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 2,790; 3,129; 11,199 and 24,87.

⁴⁸⁹ Parry 1928 (=A.Parry 1971:1-191, for πρόσέφη see pages 15-16), see also A. Parry 1971:328-329; Beck 2005:11-12.

τῷ μιν	ἔεισαμένη	προσέφη	πόδας ὠκέα Ἴρις	<i>Iliad</i> 2,795
τὴν δ'	ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν	προσέφη	πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,70

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Vocative.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	ἐπικερτομέων	προσέφη	Πατρόκλεις ἱππεῦ	<i>Iliad</i> 16,744

Participle.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
ἐκ δὲ καλεσσάμενος	προσέφη	τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,15
κινήσας δὲ θύρην	προσέφη	τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,394)

3.3.7.6. Connection to the rest of the verse.

When the speech introduction with *πρόσφημι* occupies the entire verse (which is the case in most instances), there is no connection to the rest of the verse. In the other cases, the connection is often made by the particle *δέ*. Examples are:

ἀντιάαν: τὸν δὲ προσέφη κρείων ἐνοσίχθων (*Iliad* 13,215),

οἰσόμενος: τὸν δὲ προσέφη σθένης Ἰδομενῆος (*Iliad* 13,248),

ὧς πού σε προσέφη, σοὶ δὲ φρένας ἄφρονι πεῖθε (*Iliad* 16,842).

A connection can also be made by *καί*. In many instances, *καί* connects the verse with the preceding verse or two different words in the same verse. In one instance, it connects *προσέφη* with the rest of the verse: ἔσση, καὶ Σθένελον προσέφη Καπανηΐον υἱόν (*Iliad* 5,108). The difference with the particle *δέ* in connecting different sentences has been mentioned before.

3.3.8. The compound *μετάφημι*.

The verb *μετάφημι* has the same usages as the other verbs compounded with *μετά*.

3.3.8.1. Meaning and forms.

The verb occurs 14 times in the 3rd person singular *μετέφη*. It is used when a speaker addresses a multitude of people.⁴⁹⁰ The verb *μετάφημι* is only used in speech introductions.

3.3.8.2. Word order.

The word order is OV in 13 out of the 14 instances:

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τοῖς δέ	βαρὺν στενάχων	μετέφη	κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων	<i>Iliad</i> 4,153

⁴⁹⁰ See footnotes 210 and 213.

τοῖς δὲ	δολοφρονέων	μετέφη	πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,51; 21,274
---------	-------------	--------	--------------------	------------------------------

The word order is VO in

Rest of the verse.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
ἦτοι ὃ γ' εὐχόμενος	μετέφη	πάντεσσι θεοῖσι	<i>Iliad</i> 19,100

If the subject is determined by an apposition, the subject appears before the verb, while the apposition is put after the verb. Examples are:

Object.	Subject.	Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
τοῖσιν δ'	Ἀντίνοος	μετέφη,	Εὐπείθεος υἱός	occurring 5 times ⁴⁹¹
τοῖς ἄρα	Λαοδάμας	μετέφη,	πάϊς Ἀλκινόοιο	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,132

3.3.8.3. Case usage.

The persons addressed are always expressed and always occur in the dative, and is to be interpreted in a locative sense, namely “speaking among people” (as was stated before).⁴⁹² In τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 1,58; 19,55) the dative belongs both to the participle and to μετέφη.

3.3.8.4. Metrical position in the verse.

The verses with μετάρημι always occupy the entire verse. In 7 instances the verb is expanded by a participle. Examples of this extension are:

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τοῖσι δ'	ἀνιστάμενος	μετέφη	πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς	<i>Iliad</i> 1,58; 19,55
τοῖσιν δ'	εὐχόμενος	μετέφη	κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων	<i>Iliad</i> 2,411
τοῖς δὲ	δολοφρονέων	μετέφη	πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,51; 21,274

In 6 instances the subject is determined by an apposition, which always appears after the verb (cf. supra). In one specific instance there are only nominatives linked to the verb:

αὐτὸς διογενὴς μετέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (*Odyssey* 18,312).

The subject of the verse is πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς.

3.3.9. Conclusion.

In this chapter, the verb φημί and those compounds that appear in speech introductions and conclusions were analysed. The simplex was used much more in speech conclusions than in introductions.

⁴⁹¹ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,660; 16,363; 18,42; 20,270 and 21,140.

⁴⁹² See footnotes 210 and 213.

The diathesis use in the speech introductions and conclusions differs significantly between the simplex and the compounds. Among the compounds, a middle form is never found in the introductions or conclusions, while the middle forms are found 520 times in the simplex in contrast to only 40 active forms. At first sight, there does not seem to be a difference, as both of them are subject to the same augmentation rules and can both be expanded by a participle. Almost all middle forms are metrically equivalent to an active construction, which proves that the diathesis choice was not only metrically motivated. Although the difference between active and middle is not always clear in PIE, the main difference is that the active diathesis describes the action without any specific attention to the subject, while the middle is used when the subject is more involved and/or when the action of the verb has an effect on the subject. In his study on the diathesis use in ὁρᾶν and ὁρᾶσθαι, and ἰδεῖν and ἰδέσθαι, Bechert found that the middle was used when the subject or the object were important, or when the subject underwent influence from the object, and that the active was used when the action was important or when the subject had no importance. His conclusions apply to φημί as well. The active is never transitive, never occurs in the 1st person singular, is only used once in a speech introduction and only appears in the 3rd person singular and plural. The 3rd person singular only occurs in ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη. The formulae in the 3rd person plural always (with one exception) refer to an undefined group or to an undetermined character. As such, the active is used when the action is important, or when the subject is irrelevant, while the middle is never used to refer to the speech of an undetermined character. The middle is always used when the speaker is known or has some importance for the action. The use of the formula ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη in the singular is used in the *Iliad* when there is a strong contrast between the speaking and the subsequent actions. In the *Odyssey* this use is continued, but it is also used when the nurses Eurykleia and Eurynome were addressed: in those instances, they received orders and the orders were more important than the person who gave them, hence the use of the active diathesis. The formula ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη was expanded in later Greek, and in post-Homeric epic this formula could be used for undetermined characters as well. The middle forms were the oldest and that they preserved the old use of the middle when the subject was involved in the action. As it was almost always important who spoke, the active was initially rarely used and was confined to undetermined characters or to instances where the consequences of the speaking were considered more important than the speaker himself. Gradually, the active forms were used more often. Future research will have to show if the distinctions observed for the speech introductions and conclusions are also valid for the other uses of φημί.

In the speech conclusions, it is sometimes difficult to establish the word order, because the verbs are mostly used without syntactic arguments. The word order is generally OV in the speech introductions, and the exceptions can in most cases be explained as formulaic rework of instances where the accusative was a nominative (and subject).

Speech introductions are often expanded by a participle and mostly occupy the entire verse, while speech conclusions can also be expanded by a participle, but this is less common rare (44 instances out of 510). The simplex is used mostly in conclusions, while the compounds occur almost exclusively in introductions (1 conclusion versus 250 introductions).

The cases used are the dative and the accusative. The compound *μετάφημι* used the dative, because it is compounded with *μετά*, and the compound *πρόσφημι* is constructed with the accusative. This is in line with the other speech introduction verbs. The compounds can have a personal object, while the simplex *φημί* is only constructed with an object of the word(s) spoken.

The participle is used 7 times in speech conclusions, when the subject of the speaking and the verb in the next sentence are the same. The only mood used is the indicative. This refers to the fact that the speaking is depicted as a real fact.

It might seem surprising that the tenses used in the introductions and conclusions are imperfects, but this can be explained by the fact that the speaking was not only punctual, but also had a durative effect on the persons addressed. This also explains why most verbs introducing speeches were put in the imperfect rather than in the aorist. For a detailed analysis of tense usage and augmentation, I refer to chapters 5 and 6.

3.4. The verb ἤ.

3.4.1. Etymology of ἤ.⁴⁹³

The Homeric verb ἤ appears 88 times in speech conclusions and means “s/he spoke”. In Homer, it only occurs in the 3rd person singular of the indicative. It is related to the Greek verb ἄνωγα “speak, order” (also attested in Homer),⁴⁹⁴ which is a reduplicated perfect **h₂eh₂oǵh₂e* with a prefix *an*.⁴⁹⁵ The Greek form was originally **ēgt* which became **ēkt*, in which the final *kt* was dropped.⁴⁹⁶ The attestations of this verb in later Greek are:

Writer.	Attested form.
Alkman	ἤτί “he speaks” ⁴⁹⁷
Sappho	ἤσι “he speaks” ⁴⁹⁸
Attic prose (mostly Plato and Aristophanes) ⁴⁹⁹	ἤν δ’ ἐγώ “and I said”
	ἤ δ’ ὅς “and he said”
	ἤμί “I speak”

The present ἤμί is a Greek innovation and is reformed after φημί, based on the parallel between ἤ and ἔφη/ φη.⁵⁰⁰

The cognates in other languages are:

- Latin *aiō/aiiō* and *axamenta* “carmina saliaria”,
- the Armenian noun *arac* “proverb” and the verb *asem* “speak”,⁵⁰¹
- Tocharian AB *āks* “speak”.

⁴⁹³ The etymology was discussed in Frisk 1960:115, 636; Chantraine 1968-1974:94; Van Windekens 1976:159; Levet 1998; Hackstein 1995:332-335; Kümmel 2001d; De Vaan 2008:31-32; Beekes 2010:110-111, 519. The most detailed treatment is Hackstein 1995, followed by Kümmel 2001d. A semantic analysis was made in Goossens 1987 and Levet 1988.

⁴⁹⁴ Curtius 1873:400-401, Chantraine 1968-1974:94, Frisk 1960:115, 636; Beekes 2010:110, against his views of 1972:94.

⁴⁹⁵ The interpretation of a perfect was already made by Solmsen 1906:221. See also Chantraine 1968-1974:94; Goossens 1987:885.

⁴⁹⁶ This was first noticed by Wackernagel 1875:467; Meyer 1896:570; Brugmann 1900:275, 1916:103 (with reference to Solmsen) and Solmsen 1906:225. It has been accepted in LSJ:762, 771; Frisk 1960:115,636; Chantraine 1968-1974:94, 412; Beekes 2010:110-111, 519. See also Kümmel 2001d.

⁴⁹⁷ Alkman 136 Page (=194 Calame); see Curtius 1873:149-150; Veitch 1879:301; Page 1951:147; Calame 1983:603; Hackstein 1995:333.

⁴⁹⁸ Sappho 109 Lobel-Page (= 97Bergk=122 Diehl, see Lobel-Page 1955:xiv and 87). The forms were mentioned in Curtius 1873:149-150; Veitch 1879:301; Hackstein 1995:333.

⁴⁹⁹ Curtius 1873:149-150; Veitch 1879:301, Kühner – Blass 1892:212. Levet 1988:155 stated that Plato used the verb 1207 times.

⁵⁰⁰ Osthoff 1884:175-176; Brugmann 1916:103; Hamm 1957:123, 161-162; Solta 1960:368; Levet 1988:155.

⁵⁰¹ The Armenian form was added by Pott 1871:726, Hübschmann 1875b:25, Meillet 1892:194. An explanation for the apparent irregularity of the *s* in Armenian *asem* is given in Brugmann 1916:103 and Rix *apud* Hackstein 1995:334: the PIE cluster **ǵt* (from the aorist) evolved into **kt* and then into **st*; from this form the *s* was extended throughout the entire paradigm. The explanation of Klingenschmitt 1982:137-138 is less likely. For a detailed discussion, one is referred to Hackstein 1995:333-334.

The PIE form can be reconstructed as **h₁eǵ* or **h₂eǵ*. Initially, it was argued that the laryngeal had to be **h₁*, because of the Greek forms ἦτί and ἦσι, as those forms were found in dialects that distinguished between Proto-Greek **ā* and **ē*.⁵⁰² The Tocharian form *āks* excludes a reconstruction **h₁eǵ*: if the initial laryngeal were **h₁*, the Tocharian form would have to be based on a zero grade **h₁ǵ*, but initial preconsonantic laryngeals were dropped in Tocharian.⁵⁰³ As such, it is built on a full grade. As **h₁e* cannot yield *ā* in Tocharian, the initial laryngeal has to be **h₂*.⁵⁰⁴ If Greek ἄζω is related and is reconstructed as **h₂ǵyo*, it would be another element in favour of **h₂*,⁵⁰⁵ but it can also be derived from the interjection ἄ.⁵⁰⁶ Latin *aiio* is best explained by reconstructing **h₂ǵyo*, in which the initial *a* originated from a *schwa secundum* in the cluster **h₂ǵy* rather than **h₂eǵye/o* (as Weiss reconstructed),⁵⁰⁷ as *ye/o* presents are normally built on the zero grade.⁵⁰⁸ If **h₂* is accepted, the Greek forms ἦτί and ἦσι are problematic, but as these appear in authors who wrote in their own dialect but were at the same time profoundly influenced by the epic diction, it is possible that the present forms were rebuilt after the Homeric (aorist) form ἦ and not directly on **h₂eǵ* and therefore had η instead of ᾱ.⁵⁰⁹ The reconstruction **h₂eǵ* by Jasanoff and Hackstein is now generally accepted.⁵¹⁰

3.4.2. Meaning(s) of ἦ in speech introductions and conclusions.

The verb form ἦ only occurs in speech conclusions, and means “s/he spoke”.⁵¹¹ It is used predominantly in the formulae ἦ ῥα, ἦ καί and ἦ δ’ ὅς. The first two formulae are confined to epic Greek, while the last one survived into Classical Greek, and was used by Aristophanes and Plato.⁵¹² In that formula the form ὅς is not a relative pronoun, but continued the old pronominal stem *sos*,⁵¹³ which was also used as subject in the speech introduction ὅς ῥα τότε Τρωσὶν τε καὶ Ἑκτορι μῦθον ἔειπεν in *Iliad* 10,318 (cf. supra). The use of ὅς with *s* in this

⁵⁰² Rix 1969:181, 1992:204 (but see Rix *apud* Hackstein 1995:334); Beekes 1972:94, 2010:110; Lindeman 1974; Klingenschmitt 1982:138; Levet 1988:165-166; Adams 1988:33, 1999:38-39; Schrijver 1991:26; Hilmarsson 1996:11-12; Meiser 1998:106 (but see 2003:196-197); De Vaan 2008:31-32.

⁵⁰³ Adams 1988:33, Hackstein 1995:333, Ringe 1996:13-17.

⁵⁰⁴ The first one to use **h₂* was Jasanoff 1988:229. See also Hackstein 1995:333-335, Malzahn 2010:522.

⁵⁰⁵ Meier-Brügger 1992b:249. See also Hackstein 1995:333.

⁵⁰⁶ Frisk 1960:26; Chantraine 1968-1974:26; Beekes 2010:27.

⁵⁰⁷ Weiss 2009:159.

⁵⁰⁸ Hackstein 2012a:112 (this is his review of Weiss 2009). It is better to assume *schwa secundum*, because initial preconsonantal laryngeals generally do not vocalise in Latin, see Schrijver 1991:15-31 (with doubts on the counterexamples); Weiss 2009:159, although Weiss never explicitly stated that **#HCC* became *CC* in Latin.

⁵⁰⁹ Hackstein 1995:334.

⁵¹⁰ See Kümmel 2001d; Meiser 2003:196-197; Pinault 2008:584; Weiss 2009:159, 469.

⁵¹¹ This was already noticed by Buttmann 1830:543, 1858:222; LSJ: 762, 771; Hackstein 1995:334. See Goossens 1987 for the most recent in-depth analysis.

⁵¹² Curtius 1873:149-150; Veitch 1879:301, Kühner – Blass 1892b:212; Gossens 1987; Levet 1988:155.

⁵¹³ Brugmann 1904:659; Rix 1992:183-184.

contexts is due to the fact that the pronoun is used with full emphasis (verse initially) or *in pausa*.⁵¹⁴

The form ἤ is used 88 times, of which 62 occur in the *Iliad* and 26 in the *Odyssey*. It is often combined with the particle ῥα and/or καί, and marks the transition from direct speech to another action. The subject is rarely expressed:⁵¹⁵ this is the case in only 4 instances (cf. *infra*).⁵¹⁶ In 8 instances the verb ἤ is combined with another introduction:⁵¹⁷

ἤ καὶ Ταλθύβιον θεῖον κήρυκα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 4,192),

ἤ ῥα καὶ Ἑρμεῖαν, υἷὸν φίλον, ἀντίον ἦῶδα (*Odyssey* 5,28),

ἤ ῥα καὶ Εὐρυνόμην ταμῖν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Odyssey* 19,96).

The conclusions with ἤ ῥα are normally followed by a sentence in which the subject of ἤ is also the subject.⁵¹⁸

The verb ἤ generally concludes speeches by characters who have been named and not by anonymous persons. In only one instance, a speech by an anonymous character is concluded by ἤ:

ἤ ῥα γυνὴ ταμῖν, ὃ δ' ἀπέσσυτο δώματος Ἑκτωρ (*Iliad* 6,390).

The subject of the introduction is repeated in the conclusion. It is unusual for conclusions with ἤ to have an expressed subject.

The perfect form ἄνωγα is only used with indirect speech,⁵¹⁹ and *accusativus cum infinitivo* but never introduces or concludes a speech. Its use and morphology therefore remain outside the scope of this thesis.

3.4.3. Verbal forms, compounds and verbal inflection.

The only form attested in Homer is ἤ, and there are no compounds attested in speech conclusions. This is an active form of the indicative, but the exact tense is debated. In the past, the form was interpreted as imperfect.⁵²⁰ If one assumes with Weiss that the root **h₂eǵ* could be of the Narten type **h₂eǵ* / **h₂ēǵ*,⁵²¹ one could argue for a Narten imperfect **h₂ēǵt* which

⁵¹⁴ Wackernagel 1906:174-176 *eine Nebenform* sos war in *Pausa* üblich; Sommer 1907:29.

⁵¹⁵ Veitch 1879:301.

⁵¹⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 6,390 and 22,77 and *Odyssey* 3,337 and 22,292.

⁵¹⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 4,192; 20,428 and *Odyssey* 5,28; 6,198;14,494;17,396;18,356;19,96. See also Appendix A.2.

⁵¹⁸ Fingerle 1939:365-366.

⁵¹⁹ Grimm 1967:962.

⁵²⁰ Buttmann 1830:543, 1858:222; Veitch 1879:301; Meyer 1896:570; Brugmann 1900:275; Chantraine 1968-1974:412; Rix 1976:208, 1992:204; Goossens 1987:885; LSJ: 762, 771; Schrijver 1991:26.

⁵²¹ Weiss 2009:469. The term “Narten type” refers to the ablaut pattern ē/e in the verbal inflectional system: the singular active forms had an **ē* grade, while the plural and the middle forms had a **e* grade. It was discovered by Narten 1969. See Isebaert 1992 and Weiss 2009:47.

would also explain the long *e* vowel in Greek in those dialects that distinguish original **ā* and **ē*. In that case, the forms ἦτί and ἦσι were not created based on epic influence, but created directly on ἦ. The problem with this scenario is the meaning of the verb form. The form ἦ is always used in aoristic meaning. The first to interpret the form as an aorist was Klingenschmitt,⁵²² and this interpretation is now accepted by most scholars.⁵²³ Rix and Hackstein argued that the meaning “and he spoke” pointed to an aorist, rather than an imperfect.⁵²⁴ The form ἦ is best considered an aorist, not only because of the meaning but especially because of the use. It (almost) always appears in those speech conclusions in which the subject of ἦ and that of the following verb are the same. As such, the action of speaking can be considered complete, because the subject proceeds to another action. This is also the reason why the speech conclusions with φωνέω appear in the aorist, as there the subject of φωνέω and the following verb are also the same. This also explains why φάτο and ἔφη were not aorists in the speech conclusions: in most cases the subjects of the conclusion and the following verb were not the same, and the speaking had a continuous effect on the audience, and caused the reaction of the public. It is therefore better to consider ἦ to be an aorist and not a Narten imperfect.

3.4.4. Metrical position of ἦ.

The form ἦ always appears as first word of the sentence. The formula ἦ ῥα καὶ occupies the entire first foot (this occurs 24 times),⁵²⁵ as does ἦ ῥα, καὶ (occurring 20 times).⁵²⁶ In those two formulae, there is always correptio in καί, because otherwise the formula does not fit the metre. In the formula ἦ καὶ (occurring 22 times),⁵²⁷ there is correptio in καί on 11 occasions.⁵²⁸ In ἦ, καὶ (occurring 15 times),⁵²⁹ there is correptio in καί in 11 occasions.⁵³⁰ In two instances of ἦ ῥ' the conclusion occupies the first foot of the first verse:

ἦ ῥ', Ἀχιλλεύς δ' ἐτάροισιν ἰδὲ δμῳῇσι κέλευσε (*Iliad* 24,643),

⁵²² Actually already Kühner-Blass 1892: 212 argued that the form was more likely an aorist than an imperfect.

⁵²³ Klingenschmitt 1982:137, Hackstein 1995:334, Kümmel 2001d:256; De Vaan 2008:31.

⁵²⁴ Rix *apud* Hackstein 1995:334.

⁵²⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 3,310; 3,355; 4,419; 5,280; 5,416; 8,300; 10,372; 14,346; 20,259; 23,24; 23,596 and 24,302 and *Odyssey* 5,28; 6,198; 8,186; 8,416; 8,469; 14,446; 17,197; 17,356; 18,108; 19,96 and 23,366.

⁵²⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 3,447; 7,244; 11,349; 13,754; 16,426; 17,516; 19,424; 20,438; 21,200; 21,489; 21,590; 22,273; 22,289; 22,367; 22,395; 23,563; 23,612; 24,596 and *Odyssey* 2,321 and 22,236.

⁵²⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 1,219; 1,528; 3,369; 4,192; 5,533; 9,620; 11,320; 13,59; 17,209; 24,228; 24,247; 24,440; 24,621 and *Odyssey* 9,371; 14,494; 15,182; 16,172; 19,476; 20,197; 21,118; 21,431 and 22,8.

⁵²⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 1,219; 3,369; 5,533; 24,440; 24,621 and *Odyssey* 9,371; 14,494; 15,182; 21,118; 21,431 and 22,8.

⁵²⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 3,292; 10,454; 11,143; 11,368; 11,446; 11,842; 14,214; 15,742; 18,410; 19,238; 19,266; 20,353; 20,428; 21,233 and 21,324.

⁵³⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 3,292; 10,454; 11,446; 11,842; 14,214; 18,410; 19,266; 20,353; 20,428; 21,233 and 21,324.

ἦ ρ', ἅμα τε προσέειπεν Ὀδυσσεύῃα πολίπορθον (*Odyssey* 18,356).

In the two other instances, ἦ ρ' belongs to a larger construction, either with a participle extension as in:

ἦ ρ' εὖ γινώσκων, Τρῶας δ' ἄχος ἔλλαβε θυμόν (*Iliad* 14,475),

or with the subject that is expressed, as in:

ἦ ρ' ὁ γέρων, πολιάς δ' ἄρ' ἀνὰ τρίχας εἴλκετο χερσὶ (*Iliad* 22,77).

3.4.5. The syntactic constructions (case usage) of ἦ.

The verb ἦ is never used with a direct or indirect object, but was extended by a participle construction on one occasion (cf. *supra*). In 9 instances, the subject of ἦ is not the same as that of the sentence that follows:⁵³¹

ἦ ῥα γυνὴ ταμίη, ὃ δ' ἀπέσσυτο δώματος Ἑκτώρ (*Iliad* 6,390),

ἦ ρ', Ἀχιλλεύς δ' ἐτάροισιν ἰδὲ δμοῦ ἦσι κέλευσε (*Iliad* 24,643),

ἦ ῥα βοῶν ἐλίκων ἐπιβουκόλος: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς (*Odyssey* 22,292).

The subject is rarely expressed:⁵³² there are four instances, where ἦ was followed by its subject. In those instances, the subject in the next sentence was different from that of ἦ (they belong to the 9 instances quoted above):⁵³³

ἦ ῥα γυνὴ ταμίη, ὃ δ' ἀπέσσυτο δώματος Ἑκτώρ (*Iliad* 6,390),

ἦ ῥα βοῶν ἐλίκων ἐπιβουκόλος: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς (*Odyssey* 22,292).

In 9 instances the subject of ἦ is expressed after the verb that follows ἦ (the subject is underlined):⁵³⁴

ἦ καὶ κυανέησιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων (*Iliad* 1,528; 17,209),

ἦ καὶ χρυσείῃ ῥάβδῳ ἐπεμάσσατ' Ἀθήνῃ (*Odyssey* 16,172).

3.4.6. Agreement between verb and subject.

The verb ἦ only occurs in the 3rd person singular and agrees with the subject in every case. The singular verb refers always to an introduction that was made by a person in the singular, even if the subject was anonymous (this is in contrast to the *tis speeches*, which can be introduced by a verb in the singular but concluded by a verb in the plural).

3.4.7. Connection between ἦ and the rest of the verse.

⁵³¹ The instances are *Iliad* 6,390; 10,454; 11,446; 14,475; 21,233; 22,77; 24,643 and *Odyssey* 3,337; 22,292.

⁵³² LSJ:771.

⁵³³ The instances are *Iliad* 6,390; 22,77 and *Odyssey* 3,337; 22,292.

⁵³⁴ The instances are (*Iliad* 1,528; 3,310; 13,59-60; 14,346; 17,209; 23,596; 24,302; 24,596 and *Odyssey* 16,172).

The verb ἤ is either followed by the particle ῥα (in 51 instances) or by καί (on 37 occasions). The connection with the next sentence is made by καί in 79 instances. In 5 instances, the particle δέ is used to connect the conclusion with the next sentence:⁵³⁵

ἤ ῥα γυνή ταμῖη, ὃ δ' ἀπέσσυτο δώματος Ἴκτωρ (*Iliad* 6,390),

ἤ ῥα Διὸς θυγάτηρ, οἱ δ' ἔκλυον αὐδησάσης (*Odyssey* 3,337).

In both instances, there is a contrast between the speech conclusion and what follows. As such, the particle used is not καί, but δέ (as was argued for before).

In one instance, the contrast between the two sentences is made by αὐτάρ:

ἤ ῥα βοῶν ἐλίκων ἐπιβουκόλος: αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς (*Odyssey* 22,292).

In one instance, the particle cluster ἄμα τε connects the two sentences:

ἤ ῥ', ἄμα τε προσέειπεν Ὀδυσσεῖα πτολίπορθον (*Odyssey* 18,356).

Ruijgh argued that the particle τε could only connect sentences, if they had the same subject.⁵³⁶ This is the case here. In this verse, it best to consider ἄμα as an adverb “at the same time”, and the particle τε as the connector.

3.4.8. Conclusion.

This chapter discussed the verb ἤ. This verb is exclusively used in speech conclusions. First, the etymological links with Latin *aio*, Armenian *asem* and Tocharian *āks-* were mentioned: Hackstein's reconstruction **h₂eǵ* (with **h₂*) is the only one that could explain the Greek, Latin, Armenian and Tocharian data. The fact that the verb ἤ means “s/he spoke” and that it is mostly used when the subject of the conclusion is the same as that of the next verb, proves that Rix and Hackstein were correct to analyse the form as an aorist: the subject (which is not expressed in the most cases) has finished speaking and proceeds to another action. The verb is almost always followed by ῥα or ῥα καί. The verb is augmented, because the non-augmented verb form would be too short.

⁵³⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 6,390; 14,475; 22,77; 24,643 and *Odyssey* 3,337.

⁵³⁶ Ruijgh 1971:175-179.

3.5. The verb μυθέομαι.

3.5.1. Etymology and meaning of μυθέομαι.

The etymology of μυθέομαι is unclear. It is a denominative verb of μῦθος.⁵³⁷ It has been interpreted as a compound of *mû* and *tho-* (from **d^hh₁-*) and would mean “making the *mu* sound”,⁵³⁸ but there are no cognates in other Indo-European languages. The verb has two meanings: “speak, utter a word, address” but also “advise, speak the truth”.⁵³⁹ The etymology was doubted by some,⁵⁴⁰ but the evolution from “raise the voice, make a piercing sound” into “shout” and finally into a speech introduction verb is not uncommon: a similar evolution occurred with φωνέω/ φώνᾱμι (cf. infra). The only problem is that the intermediary stages of “shouting” are not attested for μυθέομαι.⁵⁴¹

The Greek word μῦθος lives on in the modern word *myth* and has this notion already in later Greek, but in the oldest Greek it did not have the notion of something untrue or “mythical”.⁵⁴² In none of the passages discussed below, μυθέομαι has the notion of “fantasy” or “mythical story”. This is most clearly seen in its use by the historian Hekataios of Milete who used the word to state that he only described true facts in contrast to the fantastic stories which the other Greek believed (too easily, in his opinion).⁵⁴³

Ἑκαταῖος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται· τάδε γράφω, ὥς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι.⁵⁴⁴

“Hekataios of Milete speaks as such: I write down, that what I deem to be true”.

3.5.2. The use and meaning of μυθέομαι in speech introductions and conclusions.

The verb is attested in 5 speech introductions but not in a conclusion.⁵⁴⁵ In speech introductions and conclusions, μυθέομαι is only attested in the simplex. The meaning is “speak, address”. In four instances, the speaker spoke to his own mind and the meaning is “address”:

⁵³⁷ This word has been treated in Fournier 1946a:215-216; Edwards 1970:19; Beck 1993a, b and c (LfgrE), but not in Kelly 2007.

⁵³⁸ Curtius 1869:314, Walde-Pokorny 1927:309-311 and Pokorny 1959:751-752 explained the root **mû* as the onomatopoeic sound of the lips. This was accepted by Frisk 1972:264-265. Chantraine 1968-1974:718-719 and Beck 1993c:271 considered the link to be possible.

⁵³⁹ For the meaning *avis* see Fournier 1946a:215-216. Beck 1993a listed all meanings.

⁵⁴⁰ Beekes 2010:976; he interpreted the word as pre-Greek.

⁵⁴¹ Chantraine 1968:719 had some questions about the etymology “making the *mu* sound”, because the evolution and meaning of the word seemed to contradict that etymology: *mais le sens du mot, dès les plus anciens textes, n'est pas en faveur de cette hypothèse.*

⁵⁴² See Beck 1993a, b and c.

⁵⁴³ I owe this reference to Professor Martin Hose (LMU Munich).

⁵⁴⁴ The text is quoted after Jacoby and the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

Jacoby 1923:317-375; Meister 1998:263-267, especially 266; S.West 2012b:649. It is nevertheless debated whether the phrase ὧδε μυθεῖται already belongs to Hekataios's own words, or is the introduction to his words. I am inclined to accept the first hypothesis. I thank Professor Hose for discussing this issue with me.

⁵⁴⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 17,200; 17,442; 23,305 and *Odyssey* 5,285; 5,376.

κινήσας ῥά κάρη προτὶ ὄν μῡθήσατο θυμόν (*Iliad* 17,200),

κινήσας δὲ κάρη προτὶ ὄν μῡθήσατο θυμόν (*Iliad* 17,442; *Odyssey* 5,285; 5,376).

In only one instance, the speaker addressed another person:

μυθεῖτ' εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων νοέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ (*Iliad* 23,305).

This verse described how Nestor advised his son Antilokhos to use trickery in the chariot race. This speech introduction in this verse is expanded over two verses, with the verb in emphatic enjambement. The entire speech introduction is

ὠκύποδες φέρον ἄρμα: πατὴρ δέ οἱ ἄγχι παραστάς

μυθεῖτ' εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων νοέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ (*Iliad* 23,304-305).

Fournier suggested that a meaning “advise” for μυθεῖτ' was better suited here than simply “address”.⁵⁴⁶ As εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων means “thinking about (how to obtain) good things”, both translations “his father, standing next to him, spoke to him” and “his father, standing next to him, advised him thinking on how to obtain a good result” are possible.⁵⁴⁷

3.5.3. Verbal inflection, tense use and augmentation of μῡθέομαι.

The verb is attested 4 times in the aorist μῡθήσατο and once in the imperfect μυθεῖτ'. The imperfect appeared in a speech introduction with a person addressed, while the aorist was used when the speaker addressed himself. This was also the case in ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὄν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν. The difference in tense can be explained by the fact that the imperfect had a lasting impact on the audience, while the speaking to one's own mind only affected the speaker himself. The augment is missing in the four instances of μῡθήσατο because the person is speaking to himself (cf. infra). The augment is missing in μυθεῖτ' because it is already marked by its verse initial position (cf. infra).

3.5.4. Metrical observations on the speech formulae with μῡθέομαι.

One speech introduction is expanded over two verses. The verb is put as first word in the second verse in an emphatic enjambement:

ὠκύποδες φέρον ἄρμα: πατὴρ δέ οἱ ἄγχι παραστάς

μυθεῖτ' εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων νοέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ (*Iliad* 23,304-305).

⁵⁴⁶ Fournier 1946a:215-216. The meaning “advise” was not mentioned in Autenrieth-Kaegi nor in LSJ.

⁵⁴⁷ Richardson 1993:209. It is better to take εἰς ἀγαθὰ both with φρονέων and with μυθεῖτ'. The grammarian Nikanor interpreted εἰς ἀγαθὰ as extension to μυθεῖτ' “advised (him) in order to get good things”. This suggestion was mentioned and accepted in Ameis-Hentze 1886:74-75 and Leaf 1902:493. Richardson on the other hand considered μυθεῖτ' εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων to be a whole. As εἰς ἀγαθὰ means “eyeing good things, with the intention of obtaining goods things”, it is more likely that Nestor was both thinking about getting a good result and was advising his son how to obtain it.

In the other instances, the formula *πρὸς ὃν μῦθήσατο θυμόν* is put at the end of the verse and is preceded by a participle construction *κινήσας ῥα κάρη*. As *μῦθήσατο* cannot be put at the end of the verse, it is therefore put between *ὃν* and *θυμόν*.

Janko stated that *πρὸς* or *πρὸς* were used before a word that started with an observed digamma, while *πρὸς* was only used when the digamma had been neglected already. He concluded from that *πρὸς* or *πρὸς* were replaced by *πρὸς* after the initial digamma had disappeared.⁵⁴⁸ Evidence for this distinction are the speech introduction formulae *κινήσας ῥα κάρη πρὸς ὃν μῦθήσατο θυμόν* and *ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν*: in the first one, the digamma is still observed in *ὃν* while in the second it is no longer the case.⁵⁴⁹ In the second example, the *pr* of *πρὸς* is neglected, while it is impossible to determine whether this was the case in the first instance as well. It has to be noted though that the prepositional phrase *πρὸς ὃν* does not belong to the oldest layers of epic, as only the *w* is observed in the metre and the double consonantic anlaut **sw* is does not make position.

3.5.5. The syntactic constructions in speech formulae with *μυθέομαι*.

In four formulae the person addressed is expressed with a prepositional phrase. As only one person (or better “entity”, as the addressee is the mind) is addressed, the preposition used is a form of *πρὸς*. The dative participle *νοέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ* in *μυθεῖτ' εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων νοέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ* (*Iliad* 23,305) belongs to the dative object *οἱ* of the preceding verse, and does not depend on *μυθεῖτ'*:

*ὠκύποδες φέρον ἄρμα: πατήρ δέ οἱ ἄγχι παραστάς
μυθεῖτ' εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων νοέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ* (*Iliad* 23,304-305).

3.5.6. Conclusion.

The verb *μυθέομαι* is only attested in the middle form and is used 5 times in speech introductions. The imperfect is attested when the speaker is speaking to a genuine person, while the aorist is used when the speaker speaks to himself. The formula *πρὸς ὃν μῦθήσατο θυμόν* is better interpreted as a prepositional clause, rather than a case of tmesis, as the adposition is used in its later prepositional meaning “towards”.

⁵⁴⁸ Janko 1979:25-29.

⁵⁴⁹ Janko 1979:25.

3.6. The verbal root **uerh₁*.

3.6.1. Etymology.⁵⁵⁰

The root **uerh₁* means “speak solemnly” and is attested in speech introductions and conclusions in the future ἐρέω and in the perfect εἶρημαι. The future form ἐρέω is the regular Greek outcome of the desiderative built on this root **uerh₁* – *s* and the perfect is built on the reduplication **ueurh₁* – with dissimilation of *ueu* into *uei* (as was the case in ἔειπον).⁵⁵¹ There is also a present εἶρω, but that is not attested in speech introductions nor in conclusions. That present is either a rare (and Greek-internal) backformation **uer-ie/o* on the future ἐρέω,⁵⁵² or a present **uerh₁ ie/o*.⁵⁵³ Cognates in other Indo-European languages are the Hittite quotative particle *war* (literally “he spoke”), the verb *weriyezzi* “he calls”, Sanskrit *vrata* “wish, prescription” and Avestan *uruuāta* “order”.

3.6.2. Meaning, tenses and forms of **uerh₁* in speech introductions and conclusions.

The verb **uerh₁* means “to speak” and survives into later Greek.⁵⁵⁴ In Homer it is already used in a suppletive relation with **uek^w*, and this will continue into later Greek as well.⁵⁵⁵ It is relatively rarely used in speech introductions and conclusions, and is mostly used to state that the speaker will say something important or truthful.⁵⁵⁶ In Homer, the division between introductions and conclusions is the following:

Verb	Speech introduction	Speech conclusion
<i>*uerh₁</i>	1 instance. ⁵⁵⁷	9 instances. ⁵⁵⁸

The tenses and forms used are:

Description	Form and attestation
Pluperfect	εἶρητο (occurring 3 times). ⁵⁵⁹
Future indicative	ἐρέει (occurring 4 times). ⁵⁶⁰

⁵⁵⁰ The etymology was discussed in Fournier 1946a:5, 11, 94-99; Frisk 1960:469-471; Chantraine 1948:136, 1968-1974:326-327; O’Sullivan 1987b (LfgrE); Schrijver 1991:198; Vine 1996:36-37; Mayrhofer 1996:594-595; Kümmel 2001e:689-690 (LIV); Kölligan 2007:223-225, 246; Beekes 1969:238, 2010:392-393.

Besides the etymology, the meaning was discussed in Fournier 1946a:5, 94-99 O’Sullivan 1987b; Kölligan 2007:218-247, but not in Kelly 2007.

⁵⁵¹ Chantraine 1948:208; Rix 1976:202.

⁵⁵² Chantraine 1948:267, 1968-1974:325-326; Frisk 1960:470; Kümmel 2001e:689-690

⁵⁵³ Oettinger 1979:344; Kloekhorst 2008:1002-1003; Beekes 2010:393; Barber 2013:363.

⁵⁵⁴ Fournier 1946a:5-8, 53-59, 146-208; O’Sullivan 1987b.

⁵⁵⁵ Osthoff 1899:11-12; Fournier 1946a:5-8, 53-59, 146-208; Kölligan 2007:223-225, 246.

⁵⁵⁶ Fournier 1946a:5-8; O’Sullivan 1987b.

⁵⁵⁷ This occurs in *Iliad* 4,176.

⁵⁵⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 4,182; 6,462; 7,91; 10,540; 22,108 and *Odyssey* 6,285; 16,11; 16,351; 21,329.

⁵⁵⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 10,540 and *Odyssey* 16,11 and 16,351.

	ἐρέουσ(ιν) (appearing 3 times). ⁵⁶¹
--	--

**uerh_I* is used in 3 speech conclusions in the pluperfect εἶρητο. These conclusions indicated that a sudden action interrupted the speaker while speaking. The pluperfect described the completed state of speaking and was not used to indicate anteriority to the other verb in the verse.⁵⁶²

οὗ πω πᾶν εἶρητο ἔπος ὅτ' ἄρ' ἦλυθον αὐτοί (*Iliad* 10,540).

In this instance, Nestor was interrupted by an attack while inciting the Greeks to fight against the Trojans.

οὗ πω πᾶν εἶρητο ἔπος, ὅτε οἱ φίλος υἱὸς (*Odyssey* 16,11).

In this verse, Odysseus was speaking to the swineherd Eumaios and observed that the dogs did not bar at Telemakhos, when he (T) suddenly appeared.

οὗ πω πᾶν εἶρηθ', ὅτ' ἄρ' Ἀμφινόμος ἶδε νῆα (*Odyssey* 16,351).

In this verse, the suitor Eurymakhos was interrupted by Amphinomos who noticed the ship of the other suitors and started speaking himself.

In future meaning, the verb ἐρέω appeared in 6 conclusions and one introduction. The introduction is καὶ κέ τις ὧδ' ἐρέει Τρώων ὑπερηγορούντων (*Iliad* 4,176). The conclusions are ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει (occurring three times) and in ὧς ἐρέουσ(ιν) (appearing three times). As was argued elsewhere, the conclusions with a future always appear after a short speech by an undetermined character. The speeches are always inserted within the speech of an important person who is afraid that an undetermined character might say something negative about him/her in the future. As such, the speeches refer to a speech that *might* be spoken and not to an actual speech by an undetermined character.⁵⁶³

The main difference between the conclusions in the pluperfect and those in the future is that the ones in the pluperfect refer to spoken speeches by actual characters while the conclusions in the future refer to a speech-within-a-speech that is only imagined by the speaker and has not taken place (yet). This explains the difference in tense usage: as the actual speeches have occurred, a past tense is used, while the future is used to indicate that the speeches will be spoken but have not been spoken yet. For more details, I refer to chapter 5, where the tense usage will be discussed.

⁵⁶⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 4,176; 4,182; 6,462 and 7,91.

⁵⁶¹ The instances are *Iliad* 22,108 and *Odyssey* 6,285; 21,329.

⁵⁶² Delbrück 1897:228; Brugmann 1904:569-571, 578; Thieme 1927:1-5; Duhoux 1992:437; Kümmel 2000:82-83; Tichy 2009:86.

⁵⁶³ This issue was discussed in the chapter on εἵπτον.

3.6.3. Metrical observations on speech introductions and conclusions with ἐρέω/*uerh₁.

The initial *w* of ἐρέω/*uerh₁ is observed in the conclusion ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει, because τις is scanned long. The conclusion formulae ὥς ἐρέουσιν, οὗ πω πᾶν εἴρητο ἔπος and οὗ πω πᾶν εἴρηθ' are ambiguous, because the syllables before the *w* are long by nature. The initial digamma is neglected in the introduction καί κέ τις ὥδ' ἐρέει Τρώων ὑπερηγορούντων (*Iliad* 4,176). The conclusions always appear in the first half of the verse, while the speech introduction occupied the entire verse.

3.6.4. Diathesis in the speech introductions and conclusions with ἐρέω/*uerh₁.

The speech introductions and conclusions with ἐρέω/*uerh₁ are used both in the active as in the passive diathesis. The root ἐρέω/*uerh₁ is the only verb of speaking that is attested in the passive in speech introductions or conclusions. The passive pluperfect refers to a completed state of speaking,⁵⁶⁴ and in the negated speech conclusions it therefore indicates that the speech had not yet been completed. It is a personal passive with the subject explicitly expressed, namely ἔπος.

3.6.5. Word order in the speech introductions and conclusions with ἐρέω/*uerh₁.

The speech introductions and conclusions with *uerh₁ have no objects, and it can therefore not be decided if the word order is VO or OV. There are nevertheless some observations to make about the speech introduction καί κέ τις ὥδ' ἐρέει Τρώων ὑπερηγορούντων (*Iliad* 4,176). In this verse, the partitive genitive belonging to the subject is placed after the verb. The particle chain is put in the second position of the verse, and the modal particle is put before the enclitic pronoun τις. In the clitic chain the connecting particles precede the other clitics, the 2nd position clitics that are not enclitic precede the enclitics and particles precede pronouns, and an enclitic verb form is put at the end of the chain.⁵⁶⁵

3.6.6. Conclusion.

Although the root ἐρέω/*uerh₁ is very common in later Greek, it is relatively rare in speech conclusions and is used only once in a speech introduction. It is the only speech verb that is attested in the future indicative and the pluperfect. The conclusions in the pluperfect refer to actual speeches by specified persons, while the conclusions in the future refer to a speech

⁵⁶⁴ Fournier 1946a:6 described it as *l'aspect de l'achèvement du parfait*.

⁵⁶⁵ This had been noticed already by Monro 1891:335-338, before Wackernagel posited his famous Law. For the clitic chain see Wackernagel 1892:336; Delbrück 1900:51-53 (with reference to Monro); Brugmann 1904:682-683; Krisch 1990:73-74; Ruijgh 1990; Wills 1993; Watkins 1998:70.

within a speech that is imagined by an existing character and in which that character fears or hopes that an unknown person/group of people will say something about him/her. It is the only verb in a speech conclusion that is used in the passive diathesis. The conclusions in the pluperfect are all from the type “the word had not yet been spoken”. As will be argued later on, the verb ἐπέω/**uerh*₁ is used in suppletion with the other verbs of speaking: its use is confined to refer to conclusions in the future and (interrupted) conclusions in the past.

3.7. The verbs derived from the root *sek^w.

3.7.0. Preliminary remarks.

In this subchapter the verbal forms ἔννεπε, ἐνένιπε and ἡνίπατε are treated. They all introduce direct speech, but the question is if they belong to the same paradigm. I will analyse ἔννεπε first and ἐνένιπε and ἡνίπατε afterwards. In this specific instance, I will also discuss examples and verb forms that did not appear in speech introduction or conclusions, because determining the exact etymology and meaning is the most important element of the discussion. I first discuss the meaning and etymology of ἐν(ν)έπω, followed by that of ἐνίπτω, ἡνίπατε and ἐνένιπε. After that, the metrical and syntactic aspects of the speech introductions and conclusions with these verbs are discussed.

3.7.1. The etymology and meaning of ἔννεπε.

The form ἔννεπε is the imperfect of ἐν(ν)έπω.⁵⁶⁶ Chantraine explained the prefix *en* as an old epic and archaic form, dating from the time when **en* could still govern both dative and accusative, and concluded from that fact that the verbs with this prefix were archaic and important.⁵⁶⁷ Initially, ἐν(ν)έπω was linked with **mek^w*,⁵⁶⁸ but the treatment of *-*VnwV* into *VnnV* is unusual for both Ionic and for Aeolic. The Aeolic treatment of *-*VnwV* is -*VnV* (with disappearance of the postconsonantal **w*),⁵⁶⁹ -*VNwV* as in ξένφος and κάλφος (attested in Boeotian inscriptions)⁵⁷⁰ or -*VwwV* as in Homeric αὔερώ from **ἄνφερώ*.⁵⁷¹ The evolution *-*VnwV* into *VnnV*, as suggested by Wackernagel and Bechtel,⁵⁷² is attested in ξέννος but as this occurred in later inscriptions and among grammarians, the writing *nn* might represent an “hyperaolic” writing.⁵⁷³ In the Ionic dialects **enw* either became εἰν or ἐν, but not ἐνν.⁵⁷⁴

⁵⁶⁶ This verb was treated in Buttmann 1825:279-290; Bechtel 1914:125; Fournier 1946a:47-48; Chantraine 1968-1974:349-350; Pokorny 1959:897-898; Frisk 1960:520; Edwards 1970:17; Harder 1984a, 1984b, 1984c (=LfgrE); Risch 1985a; Hackstein 1997; Zehnder-Kümmel 2001a, 2001b (=LIV); Kölligan 2007:231-232; Beekes 2010:428 (without reference to Hackstein 1997).

⁵⁶⁷ Chantraine 1942:115-117, also quoted in Frisk 1960:520.

⁵⁶⁸ Buttmann 1825:249-258; Stadelmann 148:33; Savelsberg 1868:41; Brugmann 1881:305. Recently, the online Chicago Homer database interpreted the instances of this verb as a compound of εἶπον, but also had a lemma ἐνέπω.

⁵⁶⁹ This had been observed already by Bechtel 1921:14-15. See also Blümel 1984:85-86 and Rix 1992:63.

⁵⁷⁰ Blümel 1984:85-86; Rix 1992:63.

⁵⁷¹ Brugmann 1900:143; Schwyzler 1939:106 and 224; Mazon 1942:98; Chantraine 1948:158-159.

⁵⁷² Wackernagel 1880:260-265, 1916a:280-281; Bechtel 1921:14-15.

⁵⁷³ Buck 1955:49-50; Thumb-Scherer 1959:93; Lejeune 1972:158-159; Blümel 1984:85. See Lejeune 1972:158-159 for a critical assessment (and negative appraisal) of the evidence. See most recently Méndez Dosuna 1994.

⁵⁷⁴ See already Wackernagel 1880:260-265; Monro 1891:361-382; Bechtel 1924:71-75; Chantraine 1948:158-164; Buck 1955:49-52; Thumb-Scherer 1959:262; Rix 1976:63; Wathélet 1981; Wachter 2000:72-73.

If one starts from **en-sek^w*,⁵⁷⁵ the form with *enn* displays the expected Aeolic outcome of **ens-V-*,⁵⁷⁶ while the Ionic treatment would have been *εν-* or *ειν* (as in *εἰνάλιος* from **en-sal-ios*).⁵⁷⁷ It is therefore not necessary to interpret the *vv* as metrical lengthening.⁵⁷⁸ An important element in this discussion is the Doric form *ἐνεφέποντι*.⁵⁷⁹ Risch showed that this verb was a compound of *ἐπί* and *ἐνέπω*.⁵⁸⁰ The initial aspiration of *ἐνέπω* was due to an “aspiration hop” from **en-hep-*.⁵⁸¹ The aspiration in the Doric form is impossible to explain if one starts from **en-uek^w*. As such, the etymology *en-sek^w* can be considered certain. Cognates in other languages are Latin *insece* and *inquit*, Celtic *insce* “discourse” and German *sagen*.⁵⁸² Apart from the phonological arguments, there are three additional arguments that make a connection with **uek^w* less likely. First, the root *uek^w* is not attested in a present formation in Greek, contrary to Latin *invoco* and Sanskrit *vivakti* (cf. *infra*). Secondly, the root **uek^w* is not combined with the preverb *en(i)*.⁵⁸³ Thirdly, the meaning of the verb *ἐνέπω* is “speak solemnly, announce”,⁵⁸⁴ and this meaning is not found in **uek^w*.

The verb is used once in a speech introduction and has the meaning “solemnly announce, make known”.

ἀντομένη κατέρυκε, Διὸς δέ σφ' ἔννεπε μῦθον (*Iliad* 8,412).

In this instance, Iris is bringing a message to those gods who are fighting on the battlefield in defiance of Zeus’s order. As the verb does not simply mean “tell, say” and Iris is not speaking her own words, a special *verbum dicendi* is used and not a common verb such as *ἔειπον* or *φημί*.

⁵⁷⁵ The first to suggest this was Ebel 1853:47.

⁵⁷⁶ Bechtel 1921:37-38; Schwyzler 1939:300; Buck 1955:69; Chantraine 1964:178; Lejeune 1972:128; Rix 1976:55; Schmitt 1977:81; Risch 1985a:1.

⁵⁷⁷ I follow here Ruijgh (1967:53-54, 1978:301) and Janko (1992:11), and do not think that *εἰνάλιος* is simply a case of metrical lengthening as Wyatt (1969:92) suggested.

⁵⁷⁸ Chantraine 1948:100, also suggested in 1968-1974:349 (but he did not exclude the suggestion that *nn* was the Aeolic treatment of **ns*); Pokorny 1959:897; Frisk 1960:520 (who –contrary to Chantraine– ruled out that there was an Aeolic treatment of **ns*); Wyatt 1969:94-96.

⁵⁷⁹ Risch 1985a, also mentioned in Hackstein 1997.

⁵⁸⁰ Risch 1985a.

⁵⁸¹ Risch 1985a:4-5; Hackstein 1997:27.

⁵⁸² For the analysis of Latin *inquit* I refer to Hackstein 1997. For the cognates, see Frisk 1960:520; Chantraine 1968-1974:349-350; Kümmel-Zehnder 2001; Beekes 2010:428.

⁵⁸³ Hackstein 1997:30. I also refer to the discussion on *ἐν* ... *ἔειπον* in the subchapter on *ἔειπον*.

⁵⁸⁴ Buttman 1825:279-290; Strunk 1957:23; Harder 1984c:599 *almost always of things that are of more than ordinary importance to the speaker and/or audience and may imply a certain solemnity*; Brügger – Stoevesandt – Visser 2003:142.

3.7.2. The etymology of ἐνίπτω, ἐνένιπε and ἡνίπαπε.

The forms ἐνένιπε and ἡνίπαπε are reduplicated aorists and are generally linked with ἐνίπτω,⁵⁸⁵ but there is no agreement on the etymology, formation and meaning.⁵⁸⁶ In what follows, the four etymologies that have been suggested for ἐνίπτω (and also ἡνίπαπε and ἐνένιπε), will be discussed.

1. The verb ἐνίπτω was explained by Brugmann and Bendahman as a reduplicated present with *ye/o* suffix built on **uek^w*.⁵⁸⁷ The evolution was **eni- ui-uk^w -ye/o* > **eni- ui-ik^w -ye/o* with dissimilation⁵⁸⁸ > **eni- uīk^w -ye/o* > **eni- īk^w ye/o* with disappearance of the intervocalic digamma > **eniīk^w -ye/o* with contraction > ἐνίπτω/ ἐνίσσω. The reduplicated aorists ἡνίπαπε and ἐνένιπε were explained as secondary inner-Greek creations.⁵⁸⁹

There are nevertheless some issues with this reconstruction.

a) It supposed a contraction after the intervocalic digamma had fallen out, but if this verb was an old inherited formation, one would expect the digamma to have remained.

b) The root **uek^w* is not attested in the present in Greek until very late.⁵⁹⁰ There is no Greek parallel for Sanskrit *vivakti* and Latin *invocare*: the former is an athematic reduplicated form based on the full grade (and could be late)⁵⁹¹, while the latter is based on the *o* grade. In addition, the coexistence of a reduplicated present and aorist is very rare.⁵⁹²

c) The supposed dissimilation **eni-ui-uk^w* into **eni-iiik^w* seems to be contradicted by the so-called *boukolos* rule.⁵⁹³ An analogical restoration of the **u* can only be assumed if the connection with **uek^w* was still active, but given the fact that the root **uek^w* was not used in the present in Greek, such a connection is unlikely. Beckwith is in my opinion right in

⁵⁸⁵ Monro 1891:397 and Leaf 1902:139 doubted that this was an aorist and considered it a pluperfect, but there is no reason to do so.

⁵⁸⁶ Buttmann 1825:283; Brugmann 1900:260, 1916:145, 366-367; Schwyzler 1939:648; Chantraine 1948:398; Beekes 1969:129-130; Kirk 1985:142; Bendahman 1991:17, 58-60; Janko 1992:289; Fernández Galiano 1992:258; Beckwith 1996:144-146; Kümmel 2001d; Krieter-Spiro 2009:149.

⁵⁸⁷ Brugmann 1881:306; Bendahman 1991:58-60; Harðarsson 1993b:164 (with reference to Bendahman); Kümmel 2001d. According to Seiler 1872:214 this link had been made already by Savelsberg (1841:15, 1868:42).

⁵⁸⁸ The first to notice this dissimilation was Brugmann 1881:306.

⁵⁸⁹ Brugmann 1881:306-307; Bendahman 1991:60: *sekundäre innergriechische Neubildungen*.

⁵⁹⁰ As Bendahman 1991:40 noted herself as well.

⁵⁹¹ Beckwith 1996:145; Casaretto 2006:145. Mayrhofer 1996:490 was more cautious: *Ererbt viell. das redupl. Präsens *ui-ū(e)k^w*. Bendahman 1991:59 admitted that *vivakti* was unparalleled in the other Indo-European languages.

⁵⁹² Casaretto 2006:145-146.

⁵⁹³ Beckwith 1996:145. Weiss 1993:153-160 and 1994 showed that the *boukolos* rule was of Indo-European date. De Saussure is the inventor of this sound law (De Saussure 1889); it had been posited already by Brugmann 1881:307 for some Indo-European languages but not for Greek.

assuming that this link was no longer felt by the speakers, contrary to the reduplicated aorist **ueuk^w*- in which the **u* was restored by the parallel with **uek^wos*.⁵⁹⁴

d) The univerbation of the root **uek^w* and the preverb **eni* is otherwise not attested in Greek. The verb form ἐνέειπε which is transmitted in several instances, is a *lectio facilior* for ἐνένιπε (cf. infra). When the preverb *eni* is combined with the root **uek^w*, it refers to speaking to a large group without the notion of “speaking strongly” or “insulting” (cf. supra).

e) This etymology leaves the aorists ἐνένιπε and (especially) ἡνίπαπε without an explanation. The former can be explained as a younger creation on ἐνίπτω, but the latter cannot be linked with **uek^w*, as the *a* remains unexplained.⁵⁹⁵

In light of the above observations the link between ἐνίπτω and **uek^w* should be given up.

2. Hackstein started from the assumption that the original meaning of ἐνίπτω was not “insult, rebuke” but “speak”.⁵⁹⁶ he linked ἐνίπτω with **sek^w* and interpreted it as a reduplicated present with *ye/o* suffix: **en- si-sk^w ye/o* > **en- hi-sk^w ye/o* > **en- hi-k^w ye/o* with loss of the *s* before the labiovelar > ἐνίπτω/ ἐνίσσω.⁵⁹⁷ The long ι in ἡνίπαπε and ἐνένιπε was due to secondary ablaut *ĩ/ī* as was visible in ῥιφῆναι/ ῥιφή.⁵⁹⁸ In his opinion the following elements argued against the original meaning “insult” for ἐνίπτω:

- The future ἐνίψω is never used in the meaning “insult”. As it can only be the future of ἐνίπτω and not of ἐνέπω,⁵⁹⁹ this means that “insult” cannot have been the original meaning of ἐνίπτω.⁶⁰⁰

- There is one passage in Homer where the aorist of ἐνίπτω cannot mean “insult”.⁶⁰¹

στῆθος δὲ πλήξας κραδίην ἡνίπαπε μύθοι (Odyssey 20,17).

- The root ἐνιπ- was used in names for which a meaning “insult, rebuke” could not easily be explained, such as the river Ἐνιπεύς, a female name Ἐνιπαγόρεια (from Thera), the name

⁵⁹⁴ Weiss 1993:157-158; Beckwith 1996:7-8 and 145.

⁵⁹⁵ One explanation for the *a* is that by Ruijgh. He did not address the etymology of ἐνίπτω and ἐνένιπε, but argued that the form ἡνίπαπε (and also ἡρύκακε) had originated under the influence of the reduplicated aorist ἡγαγον (Ruijgh 1972:228-229). As that aorist was very common, its structure influenced the reduplication of the other reduplicated aorists. This explained the presence of the *a* in both forms. This is rather unlikely (Bendahman 1991:60), because it would mean that a very common aorist would have influenced two relatively rare and epic aorists, but would not have exerted any other influence.

⁵⁹⁶ Hackstein 1997:24.

⁵⁹⁷ Hackstein 1997:29-32, also Kölligan 2007:232.

⁵⁹⁸ Hackstein 1997:34-35.

⁵⁹⁹ Against suggestions that ἐνίψω was the future of ἐν(ν)έπω (cf. supra).

⁶⁰⁰ Hackstein 1997:19-24.

⁶⁰¹ Hackstein 1997:24. This had been observed already by Buttmann 1825:280-281; Seiler 1872:214 *milder in Od 20,17 “mahnte sein Herz”*; Harder 1984b:597.

Συνήνιτος for a Cretan warrior,⁶⁰² and Ἐνιπώ, the name transmitted for the mother of Arkhilokhos.⁶⁰³ Neumann suggested the meaning “shout” for the warrior name.

- Pindar used the verb ἐνίπτω in the meaning “speak” as well.⁶⁰⁴

κάρυξε δ’ αὐτοῖς

ἐμβαλεῖν κώπαισι τερασκόπος ἀδείσας ἐνίπτων ἐλπίδας (Pindar, *Pythian Ode* IV, 200-201).⁶⁰⁵

“the seer bade them to throw themselves to the oars as he pronounced joyful expectations.”⁶⁰⁶

3. Brugmann suggested that the verb ἐνίπτω was a univerbation of the prefix *eni* and the zero grade of **h₃ek^w* “see”.⁶⁰⁷ The initial meaning was “having an angry look”, and this evolved into “insult”.⁶⁰⁸ The evolution **eni-h₃k^w* *ye/o* into ἐνίπτω would be phonologically regular.

The problem is that while the link with **h₃ek^w* is semantically possible and the aorist ἐνένιπε could be explained as **en-eni-h₃k^w* (with reduplication of the preverb instead of the root), the aorist ἡνίπαπε cannot be accounted for, because the expected form would have been †ἡνίποπε (from **eni-h₃k^w-h₃k^w-e*).⁶⁰⁹ This etymology is therefore excluded.⁶¹⁰

4. Barber stated that because the ι in ἐνιπή was long, it was reasonable to assume that the ι in ἐνίπτω was long as well.⁶¹¹ Building on a reconstruction by Beekes (and in fact already Pott),⁶¹² he explained ἐνίπτω as a zero grade present of the root **h₂ek^w* “oppress, squeeze, attack” and reconstructed it as **(h₁)eni-h₂k^w-ye/o*.⁶¹³ In that scenario, the aorist ἡνίπαπε could be reconstructed as **(h₁)eni-h₂k^w-h₂k^w-e* (with secondary augmentation),⁶¹⁴ and the aorist ἐνένιπε as a later creation built on ἐνίπτω with reduplication of the preverb. Barber did not

⁶⁰² Neumann 1974:35-36; Hackstein 1997:24-25. Neumann explained the η in the name as *Kompositionsdehnung* and the τ for ττ as double consonants were not written in the oldest Cretan texts; ττ was the Cretan assimilation of -πτ- (Neumann 1974:35). For further names built on ἐνιπή, see Fick 1874:29 and Bechtel 1917:154. The female names were not treated in Stüber 2008 (the most recent work on personal names in Greek).

⁶⁰³ Hackstein 1997:24-25.

⁶⁰⁴ Slater 1969:177; Hackstein 1997:24.

⁶⁰⁵ Snell-Maehler 1997:74.

⁶⁰⁶ This translation is based on that of Dornseiff (quoted in Neumann 1974:35-36) and that of Race 1997:285. The translation used on the *Perseus* website is “announcing his sweet hopes”.

⁶⁰⁷ In his notation it was **ək^w*.

⁶⁰⁸ Brugmann 1901:32 (against his opinion of 1881:305-307). This was accepted by Boisacq 1938:254, Porzig 1942:228-229 and Hamp 1973:84-87. Chantraine (1968-1974:349) did not exclude this, but remained skeptical: *L'hypothèse n'est pas absurde, mais dans l'usage épique, rien ne confirme cette vue*. Harder 1984a and 1984b is skeptical. This hypothesis is quoted in Irslinger 2008b:380, but she also mentioned the skepticism of Chantraine and Frisk.

⁶⁰⁹ Beekes 1969:130.

⁶¹⁰ This was already doubted by Beekes 1969:130 and Bendahman 1991:58.

⁶¹¹ Barber 2013:369.

⁶¹² Pott 1833:181; Ebel 1853:48; Curtius 1854:407; Beekes 1969:129-130, 2010:427; Barber 2013:369-370.

⁶¹³ Beekes also included the present ἰάπτω into the equation and explained it as a reduplicated present with **ye/o* suffix, but the present can only be secondary, as *ye/o* presents are built on the zero grade (Barber 2013:370).

⁶¹⁴ Beekes 1969:130; Barber 2013:370.

exclude Hackstein's etymology, however.⁶¹⁵ Beekes explained the aorist ἐνένιπε as a later creation on ἐνίπτω after ἡνίπαπε was no longer understood.⁶¹⁶ Bendahman objected to this etymology (and that by Brugmann) by arguing that the difference between “attack” and “insult” was too large and that neither ἐνίπτω, nor ἐνένιπε nor ἡνίπαπε ever had the notion of attack.⁶¹⁷

Phonologically, only two suggested etymologies are possible: the one by Hackstein, and the one by (Pott-)Beekes-Barber, but the one by Hackstein is more likely, given the non-aggressive meaning of the word in Pindar and in the *Odyssey*.

3.7.3. Textual problems in the speech introductions with ἐνένιπε and ἡνίπαπε.

In some introductions with ἐνένιπε other variants are transmitted as well: ἐνένισπε, ἐνένιπτε and ἐνέειπε.⁶¹⁸ The last suggestion is excluded because the use of the prefix *en(i)* and a form of ἔειπον is only used when a large group is addressed, it is never unverbated and only has a neutral meaning “speak to” but is not used to indicate “speak strongly, insult”. The form ἐνένιπτε would be a reduplicated imperfect besides a non-reduplicated present. This is not attested anywhere else and is unlikely.⁶¹⁹ The form was inserted during the transmission because ἐνένιπε was no longer understood: ἐνένιπτε is clearly the *lectio faciliior*. The same applies to ἐνένισπε: this is a creation on the aorist ἐνισπε motivated by the fact that ἐνένιπε was no longer understood.

3.7.4. The augment use in the speech introductions with ἔννεπε, ἐνένιπε and ἡνίπαπε.

The form ἡνίπαπε is augmented, while the forms ἔννεπε and ἐνένιπε are not. Only in the case of ἐνένιπε the metre played a role, because the augmented *ἡνένιπε would have been impossible to use in the metre, while the unaugmented form *ἐνίπαπε could have been used. The form ἡνίπαπε is augmented, because it indicates a strong contrast between the speaker and the addressee.

3.7.5. The tense usage in the speech introductions with ἔννεπε, ἐνένιπε and ἡνίπαπε.

⁶¹⁵ Barber 2013:370-371.

⁶¹⁶ Beekes 1969:130.

⁶¹⁷ Bendahman 1991:58.

⁶¹⁸ Buttmann 1825:282-283; Bendahman 1991:57; Hackstein 1997:20. See the apparatus of Leaf 1902:140 on *Iliad* 15,442, that of West 2000:314 on *Iliad* 23,473 and that of Van Thiel 1991:255 on *Odyssey* 18,326 and Van Thiel 1991:291 on *Odyssey* 21,167.

⁶¹⁹ This had already been noted by Buttmann 1825:282-283 .

The verb ἐνέπω is durative and therefore the form ἐννεπε is used in the imperfect. This agrees with what was argued before, namely that genuine speech introduction verbs are predominantly used in the imperfect. The forms ἐνένιπε and ἠνίπαπε are used in the meaning “insult”, are more punctual or terminative and are therefore used in the aorist.⁶²⁰

3.7.8. Speech introductions with ἠνίπαπε.

3.7.8.1. Constructions in speech introductions with ἠνίπαπε.

The form ἠνίπαπε is attested 5 times and always used with a dative of the word and an accusative of the insulted.⁶²¹ In 4 of the 5 instances, the verb is expanded by a participle construction:

Participle construction.	Accusative.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
ὅσσε πάλιν κλίνασα	πόσιν δ'	ἠνίπαπε	μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 3,427
στῆθος δὲ πλήξας	κραδίην	ἠνίπαπε	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,17

Accusative.	Participle construction.	Dative (adjective).	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
καί μιν	ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν	χαλεπῶ	ἠνίπαπε	μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 2,245
Ἑκτορ'	ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν	χαλεπῶ	ἠνίπαπε	μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 17,141

3.7.8.2. Word order in speech introductions with ἠνίπαπε.

The word order is always OV:

Object.	Particles.	Subject.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
Κτήσιππον	δ' ἄρα	Τηλέμαχος	ἠνίπαπε	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,303

Clitics occupy the 2nd position in the verse:

Particle.	Clitic.	Participle construction.	Dative.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
καί	μιν	ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν	χαλεπῶ	ἠνίπαπε	μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 2,245

When there are more than one clitic, the hierarchy is observed: connective particles precede other particles and particles precede pronouns:

Object.	Clitics.		Subject.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
	Connective.	Other clitic.				
Κτήσιππον	δ'	ἄρα	Τηλέμαχος	ἠνίπαπε	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,303

⁶²⁰ The aspectual distinction was noticed by Hackstein 1997:36-37.

⁶²¹ The instances are *Iliad* 2,245; 3,427; 17,141 and *Odyssey* 20,17; 20,303.

3.7.8.3. Metrical observations on speech introductions with ἡνίπαπε.

The formula ἡνίπαπε μύθῳ is always put at the end of the verse. In two instances the formula ἡνίπαπε μύθῳ is preceded by an adjective in the dative, χαλεπῷ (cf. supra).

In the formula ὑπόδρα ἰδών the digamma is observed in ἰδών and the *o* of ὑπόδρα is scanned as long.

3.7.9. Speech introductions with ἐνένιπε.

3.7.9.1. Constructions in speech introductions with ἐνένιπε.

The verb ἐνένιπε is attested 13 times in a speech introduction and never in a conclusion.⁶²² It is used without overt arguments in the following instances:

Ἀντίνοος δ' ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (4 instances),⁶²³

Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (*Odyssey* 23,96).

In these constructions ἐνένιπε extended the speech introduction ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε by describing how the speaking occurred.

The formula ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε was later reworked by the poet and could be constructed with the accusative of a person:

τόν ῥ' Ἐκτώρ ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (*Iliad* 15,552),

ἀμφίπολον δ' ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (*Odyssey* 19,90).

The transition between these two constructions occurred in those instances where accusative and nominative had the same metrical form, as was the case in the following pair:

Ἀντίνοον δ' ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (*Odyssey* 16,417),

Ἀντίνοος δ' ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (attested 4 times).

In a final stage, ἐνένιπε could introduce direct speech without ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε. In that case the verb is used with a person addressed:⁶²⁴

τόν δ' αἰσχυρῶς ἐνένιπεν Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας (*Iliad* 23,473),

ἦ ῥ' Ὀδυσῆ' ἐνένιπεν ὀνειδείοις ἐπέεσσι (*Odyssey* 18,326).

3.7.9.2. Word order in speech introductions with ἐνένιπε.

In the formulae with ἐνένιπε the word order is always OV. Examples are:

τόν δ' αἰσχυρῶς ἐνένιπεν Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας (*Iliad* 23,473),

Ἀντίνοον δ' ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (*Odyssey* 16,417).

⁶²² The instances are *Iliad* 15,552; 16,626; 23,473 and *Odyssey* 16,417; 18,78; 18,326; 19,65; 19,90; 21,84; 21,167; 21,287; 23,96. See Fingerle 1939:319 and Edwards 1970:17.

⁶²³ The instances are *Odyssey* 18,78; 21,84; 21,167; 21,287.

⁶²⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 16,626; 23,473 and *Odyssey* 18,326; 19,65; 22,212.

The apposition follows the word it determines: In the following instance, the word is an original demonstrative pronoun.

ἧ δ' Ὀδυσῆ' ἐνένιπε Μελανθῷ δεῦτερον αὖτις (*Odyssey* 19,65).

The word ἧ is an original demonstrative pronoun and the apposition by which it is determined, is Μελανθῷ. The meaning is “and that one, Melantho, scoffed a second time at Odysseus”. In later Greek, ἧ will be used as an article.

The speech introductions with ἐνένιπε observe Wackernagel’s Law, as can be seen in the following examples:

Accusative.	Clitic.	Adverb.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸν	δ'	αἰσχροῶς	ἐνένιπεν	Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας	<i>Iliad</i> 23,473

Accusative.	Clitic.	Verb.	Rest of introduction.	Passage.
Ἀντίνοον	δ'	ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,417

Subject.	Clitic.	Accusative.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
ἧ	ρ'	Ὀδυσῆ'	ἐνένιπεν	ὀνειδείοις ἐπέεσσι	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,326

3.7.9.3. Metrical observations on speech introductions with ἐνένιπε.

The form ἐνένιπε always occupies the 2nd half of the 2nd foot and never appears at the end of the verse, although it would have been perfectly possible.

1 – 2a.	2b- 3b1.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
τόν ρ' Ἔκτωρ	ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν	<i>Iliad</i> 15,552
ὥς φάτο, τὸν δ'	ἐνένιπε	Μενoitίου ἄλκιμος υἱός	<i>Iliad</i> 16,626
τὸν δ' αἰσχροῶς	ἐνένιπεν	Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας	<i>Iliad</i> 23,473

As was stated above, ἐνένιπε was initially combined with another introduction verb and described the fashion in which the speech was performed. In a later stage the verb introduced direct speech itself: the poet reinterpreted the verb as a speech introduction verb and replaced the formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν by a noun epithet, a dative object or an apposition to the subject.

The original construction was the following:

Subject.	Verb.	Actual speech introduction.	Passage.
Ἀντίνοος δ'	ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	Attested 4 times.

Τηλέμαχος δ'	ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 23,96
--------------	----------	-----------------------------	----------------------

The subject was then substituted by an object, if it had the same metrical shape:

Object.	Verb.	Actual speech introduction.	Passage.
Ἀντίνοον δ'	ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,417

This was reformed into the following pattern:

	Object.	Verb.	Name epithet.	Passage.
πρῶτος	τὴν γ'	ἐνένιπε	Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,212

Subject.	Object.	Verb.	Dative object.	Passage.
ἦ ῥ'	Ὀδυσῆ'	ἐνένιπεν	ὀνειδείοις ἐπέεσσι	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,326

On one occasion, the introduction is combined with conclusion:

Conclusion.	Object.	Verb.	Name epithet.	Passage.
ὦς φάτο,	τὸν δ'	ἐνένιπε	Μενoitίου ἄλκιμος υἱός	<i>Iliad</i> 16,626

The verb ἐνένιπεν is always written with a *nu ephelkustikon* when it is followed by a word starting with an original digamma, as in ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν. It was mentioned before that the use of the *nu* in these contexts cannot simply be explained as a later intrusion into the text, because the same phenomenon occurred in Pindar.⁶²⁵

3.7.10. Speech introductions with ἔννεπε.

3.7.10.1. Constructions in the speech introductions with ἔννεπε.

The verb form ἔννεπε is only used once in a speech introduction.⁶²⁶ It is constructed with the dative of the person and the accusative of the word spoken:

Rest of the verse.	Genitive	Dative.	Verb.	Accusative.	Passage.
ἀντομένη κατέρυκε	Διὸς δέ	σφ'	ἔννεπε	μῦθον	<i>Iliad</i> 8,412

The only remarkable element is the elision of the *i* in σφ'. This is uncommon, but had parallels in the speech introductions of ἀγορεύω. The pronoun σφ' is used here without the

⁶²⁵ This was observed by my colleague Eduard Meusel (cf. supra), after whom I would call this phenomenon "Meusel's principle".

⁶²⁶ Führer 1967:23.

notion of reflexivity, which is not uncommon in Homer.⁶²⁷ A parallel can be found in the following verse:

αὐτὸς δέ σφ' ἀγόρευε, θεοὶ δ' ὑπὸ πάντες ἄκουον (*Iliad* 8,4).

3.7.10.2. Word order in speech introductions with ἔννεπε.

ἀντομένη κατέρυκε, Διὸς δέ σφ' ἔννεπε μῦθον (*Iliad* 8,412).

This verse has VO word order, but metrical constraints cannot be ruled out here, because μῦθον ἔννεπε cannot be put at the end of the verse, while ἔννεπε μῦθον is perfect to conclude a hexameter. In δέ σφ' the expected clitic hierarchy can be found (as was argued before): a connective clitic is put before the pronominal clitic and a 2nd position clitic with its own accent appears before an enclitic.

3.7.11. Conclusion.

The root **sek^w* means “speak (emphatically) and appears in three different verbal forms ἔννεπε, ἐνένηπεν and ἠνίπαπε. The discussion of the etymology was longer than the ones in other subchapters, but this was necessary to determine the exact meaning. It was shown that the forms ἐνένηπεν and ἠνίπαπε were best linked with **sek^w* as well, and that the basic meaning was “speak emphatically”. They are only attested in speech introductions, and agree with what was stated in the other (sub)chapters: when metrically possible, the word order is OV and the person addressed is expressed in the accusative. The only remarkable element is that ἐνένηπεν is never used in verse final position, although that would have been metrically possible.

⁶²⁷ Monro 1891:219-220; Ameis-Hentze 1900a:38; Chantraine 1948:267-268; S.West 1988:130.

3.8. The *verba dicendi* derived from the root **h₂ge/or*.

3.8.1. Etymology and meaning of ἀγορεύω and ἀγοράομαι.

The verbs ἀγορεύω and ἀγοράομαι are both derived from the root **h₂ger* “gather”, as are the verb ἀγείρω and the noun ἀγορά.⁶²⁸ ἀγοράομαι is a denominative verb to ἀγορά.⁶²⁹ The verb ἀγορεύω appears to be a derivation of ἀγορεύς, but this noun is not attested.⁶³⁰ It is in all likelihood a creation with the productive -εύω suffix as in παιδεύω.⁶³¹ The coexistence of both ἀγορεύω and ἀγοράομαι is not surprising, because it is common in Homeric Greek that one root has a derived verb in -εύω and one in ἐ/άω.⁶³² The original meaning “gather” remained the one used with ἀγείρω,⁶³³ while the meaning of ἀγορεύω and ἀγοράομαι evolved from “gather” into “gather people, organise an assembly” and eventually into “speak in the assembly”.⁶³⁴ Already in Homer ἀγορεύω predominantly had the meaning “speak” (with or without the notion of an assembly) and “speak” (in general) is the only meaning that survives in later Greek.⁶³⁵ The original meaning “gather, organise an assembly” can be seen in the following *figura etymologica*,⁶³⁶ but the meaning “speak speeches” cannot be excluded either:⁶³⁷

οἱ δ' ἀγορὰς ἀγόρευον ἐπὶ Πριάμοιο θύρῃσι (*Iliad* 2,788).

“(and) they held an assembly close to Priam’s gates.”⁶³⁸

Examples of ἀγοράομαι in the the meaning “gather, hold assembly” are:⁶³⁹

ὦ πόποι ἦ δὴ παισὶν ἐοικότες ἀγοράσθε (*Iliad* 2,337).

“Oh, dear! You hold assembly, behaving like children.”

οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἡγορόωντο (*Iliad* 4,1).

“And sitting beside Zeus the gods gathered in council.”

When ἀγοράομαι was used in the meaning “speak”, it always had the notion of “speaking in a group, in the assembly”. The following example shows this:

⁶²⁸ Beekes 1969:49, 2010:11,14; Frisk 1972:8-9, 13-14. Older etymologies are found in Chantraine 1968-1974:9. The semantics are discussed in Fournier 1946a:41-46; Seiler 1955a, b, c and d (LfgrE); Kirk 1985:331; Kölligan 2007:221-223; Kelly 2007:143-148 (especially 144), 226-228.

⁶²⁹ Mutzbauer 1909:95; Tucker 1990:233.

⁶³⁰ It is not found in LSJ, the *LfgrE* nor in Aura Jorro 1985.

⁶³¹ For the analogical extensions of the productive -εύω suffix, see Chantraine 1948:367-369 and Shipp 1972:99-105.

⁶³² Chantraine 1948:367-369; Shipp 1972:99-105; Risch 1975:332-335.

⁶³³ Seiler 1955a:55-57 (LfgrE).

⁶³⁴ Chantraine 1968-1974:12-13; Seiler 1955a, 1955b. For the typical scene of “assembly speeches”, see Arend 1933:116-121.

⁶³⁵ LSJ *sub uoce*; Kirk 1985:331.

⁶³⁶ Ameis-Hentze-Cauer 1927:102; Kirk 1985:224; Brügger – Stoevesandt – Visser 2003:256-257

⁶³⁷ Kirk 1985:224 and 331.

⁶³⁸ The translations are based on those by the *Loeb* series and of the online *Chicago Homer* but have been adapted.

⁶³⁹ Kirk 1985:244, 331.

ὅς ὁπότ' ἐν Λήμνῳ κενεαυχέες ἡγοράασθε (*Iliad* 8,230).

“(the empty boasting) you spoke openly in hollow vaunting at Lemnos”.⁶⁴⁰

Contrary to ἀγοράομαι, the verb ἀγορεύω was also used in environments where the notion of “assemble”, “gather” or “speak to a large group” was not present.⁶⁴¹

οἴσθα: τίη τοι ταῦτα εἰδυῖη πάντ' ἀγορεύω (*Iliad* 1,365).

Akhilleus was speaking to his mother here. The notion of “speaking to an assembly/large group” or “gathering” is absent, because Akhilleus and Thetis are the only persons present.

οὔτω πη τάδε γ' ἐστὶ φίλον τέκος ὥς ἀγορεύεις (*Iliad* 24,373).

In this verse, Priam was speaking to Hermes. As in the previous example, there is no notion of an assembly, because Priam and Hermes are the only two persons involved in the conversation.

3.8.2. The use of ἀγορεύω in speech introductions and conclusions.

The verb ἀγορεύω is only attested as a simplex and is used 52 times in speech introductions and conclusions: 19 introductions and 33 conclusions. There are no compounds in Homer:⁶⁴²

ἀπαγορεύω and προσαγορεύω are only attested in Attic and later prose, because the succession of short syllables renders the words unfit for the metre. The only compound that would fit the metre is ἀνταγορεύω, but that is attested only in Pindar and Aristophanes.⁶⁴³

Examples of speech introductions are:⁶⁴⁴

Κάλχας δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα θεοπροπέων ἀγόρευε (*Iliad* 2,322),

(...) ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον/ ἀγόρευεν (8 instances).⁶⁴⁵

Examples of speech conclusions are:⁶⁴⁶

κεῖνος τὼς ἀγόρευε: τὰ δὲ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται (*Iliad* 2,330; *Odyssey* 18,271),

ὧς Ἴκτωρ ἀγόρευ', ἐπὶ δὲ Τρῶες κελάδησαν (*Iliad* 8,542; 18,310),

ὧς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον (occurring 24 times).⁶⁴⁷

⁶⁴⁰ I used “openly” to render the public meaning in ἡγοράασθε. The *Loeb Classical Library* translated *uttered*.

⁶⁴¹ Fournier 1946a:41-42, 1946b:45; Buck 1949:1254.

⁶⁴² Seiler 1955c; LSJ *sub uoce* ἀγορεύω.

⁶⁴³ LSJ *sub uocibus*.

⁶⁴⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 1,571; 2,322; 3,155; 4,6; 7,347; 8,4; 8,148; 21,121; 21,427; 22,377; 23,535 and *Odyssey* 2,15; 4,189; 9,409; 16,345; 17,439; 18,349; 20,359; 22,461.

⁶⁴⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 3,155; 21,121; 21,427; 22,377; 23,535 and *Odyssey* 4,189; 9,409; 17,439.

⁶⁴⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 2,330; 5,274; 5,431; 7,464; 8,212; 8,542; 13,81; 16,101; 18,310; 18,368; 21,514; 24,142 and *Odyssey* 4,620; 7,334; 8,333; 8,570; 13,178; 14,409; 15,493; 16,321; 17,166; 17,290; 17,589; 18,243; 18,271; 20,172; 20,240; 22,160; 23,288; 24,203 and 24,383.

⁶⁴⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 5,274; 5,431; 7,464; 8,212; 13,81; 16,101; 18,368; 21,514 and *Odyssey* 4,620; 7,334; 8,333; 14,409; 15,493; 16,321; 17,166; 17,290; 18,243; 20,172; 20,240; 22,160; 23,288; 24,98; 24,203 and 24,383.

The last verse is the only instance in Homer where a form of the pronoun τοιοῦτος is used in a speech conclusion.⁶⁴⁸

In the conclusions, the adverb is mostly ὥς “so”, but in two conclusions the form τῶς used:

κεῖνος τῶς ἀγόρευε: τὰ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται (*Iliad* 2,330; 18,271).

The *t* stem of the pronominal stem is demonstrative and means “thus”,⁶⁴⁹ but in most instances the adverb ὥς is used, as τῶς appears only 5 times in the entire Homeric epics.⁶⁵⁰

3.8.3. The verbal forms, compounds and verbal inflection of ἀγορεύω.

The verb ἀγορεύω has the following forms in speech introductions and conclusions:

Description	Forms
Infinitive	ἀγορεύειν (7 instances). ⁶⁵¹
Participle	Nom. m. sg.: ἀγορεύων (2 instances). ⁶⁵²
Imperfect	3 rd p. sg.: ἀγόρευε (11 instances), ⁶⁵³ ἀγόρευεν (4 instances), ⁶⁵⁴ ἀγόρευ’ (4 instances), ⁶⁵⁵ 3 rd p. pl.: ἀγόρευον (27 instances). ⁶⁵⁶

3.8.4. The use of the augment with ἀγορεύω.

There are neither speech introductions nor conclusions with an augmented verb form. An augmented form ἡγόρευον can only be used in the metre if the diphthong ευ undergoes metrical shortening, but there are no instances of this shortening.⁶⁵⁷

3.8.5. The finite and non-finite verb forms, and the moods of ἀγορεύω.

The indicative is used in most introductions and in all (but one) conclusions with ἀγορεύω.

⁶⁴⁸ Führer 1967:38-39. In later lyric and epic writers, such as Pindar and Apollonios of Rhodes, τοιοῦτος was used more regularly in speech conclusions.

⁶⁴⁹ Brugmann 1900:567, Beekes 2010:1683.

⁶⁵⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 2,330; 3,415; 14,48 and *Odyssey* 18,271; 19,234.

Leaf 1900:74 assumed that it was initially used much more often, but that the forms were removed from the tradition by corruption.

⁶⁵¹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,571; 7,347 and *Odyssey* 2,15; 16,345; 18,349; 20,359 and 22,461.

⁶⁵² The instances are *Iliad* 4,6 and 8,148.

⁶⁵³ The instances are *Iliad* 2,322; 2,330; 8,4; 21,427; 23,535 and *Odyssey* 17,349; 18,271

⁶⁵⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 21,121; 22,377; and *Odyssey* 4,189; 17,589.

⁶⁵⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 8,542; 18,310 and *Odyssey* 8,570; 13,178.

⁶⁵⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 3,155; 5,274; 5,431; 7,464; 8,212; 13,81; 16,101; 18,368; 21,514; 24,142 and *Odyssey* 4,620; 7,334; 8,333; 9,409; 14,409; 15,493; 16,321; 17,166; 17,290; 18,243; 20,172; 20,240; 22,160; 23,288; 24,98; 24,203; 24,383.

⁶⁵⁷ The grammars of Chantraine 1948 and Wachter 2000 did not address this shortening. It was also overlooked in Sjölund 1937 (which is the standard work on metrical shortening) and in Kelly 1990.

The infinitive is used in the formula ἤρχ' ἀγορεύειν (occurring 7 times),⁶⁵⁸ and introduces direct speech when a large group is addressed.

The participle is used twice to introduce direct speech.

- In one instance, a speech is introduced by a participle as extension to a verb expressing a mental action:

αὐτίκ' ἐπειρᾶτο Κρονίδης ἐρεθιζέμεν Ἥρην
κερτομίους ἐπέεσσι παραβλήδην ἀγορεύων (*Iliad* 4,5-6).

- In one other instance, direct speech is introduced by the participle ἀγορεύων and another *verbum dicendi*:

Ἐκτωρ γάρ ποτε φήσει ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ' ἀγορεύων (*Iliad* 8,148).

3.8.6. The diatheses of ἀγορεύω.

The verb ἀγορεύω is used in the active diathesis in Homer, while ἀγοράομαι is only attested in the middle.

3.8.7. Metrical observations on speech formulae with ἀγορεύω.

In introductions, the finite verb forms of ἀγορεύω are always put at the end of the verse, and the same applies for the participle and the infinitive, as they only differ metrically in the last syllable.

Finite verb form:

Rest of the verse.	Finite verb form.	Passage.
ἦκα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	ἀγόρευον	<i>Iliad</i> 3,155

Participle:

Rest of the verse.	Participle.	Passage.
Ἐκτωρ γάρ ποτε φήσει ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ'	ἀγορεύων	<i>Iliad</i> 8,148

Infinitive:

	Infinitive	Passage.
τοῖσιν δ' Ἥφαιστος κλυτοτέχνης ἤρχ'	ἀγορεύειν	<i>Iliad</i> 1,571

Speech introductions with ἀγορεύω are often expanded by a *participium coniunctum* to the subject of the verb. The participle construction is put before the formula ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε:

⁶⁵⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 1,571; 7,347 and *Odyssey* 2,15; 16,345; 18,349; 20,359 and 22,461.

Rest of the verse.	Participle construction.	ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	Verb.	Passage.
καί	οἱ ἐπευχόμενος	ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	ἀγόρευεν	<i>Iliad</i> 21,121
	στάς δ' ἄρ' ἐν Ἀργείοις	ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	ἀγόρευε	<i>Iliad</i> 23,535
οἱ δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενοι	ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	ἀγόρευον	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,409
	ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος	ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	ἀγόρευε	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,349

In the formula ὥς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον, the *a* of τοιαῦτα is always preceded by a short vowel and *pr* never makes position. This verse does not have any obvious Aeolic elements. One can interpret πρὸς ἀλλήλους as an Ionification of ποτ' ἀλλήλους, but it can also be explained by the fact that the position building can fail to operate after the caesura.⁶⁵⁹

Contrary to the normal usage, the dative plural ending SI is elided in the participle construction ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ' ἀγορεύων:

Ἔκτωρ γάρ ποτε φήσει ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ' ἀγορεύων (*Iliad* 8,148).

3.8.8. The syntactic constructions of ἀγορεύω.

In speech introductions and conclusions ἀγορεύω is constructed:

a) without words spoken nor person addressed. This is the case in:⁶⁶⁰

ὥς Ἔκτωρ ἀγόρευ', ἐπὶ δὲ Τρῶες κελάδησαν (*Iliad* 8,542; 18,310),

ἦ μὲν ἄρ' ὥς ἀγόρευεν, ὃ δ' ὄχετο δῖος ὕφορβος (*Odyssey* 17,589).

b) with the dative of the person (without preposition) addressed.⁶⁶¹ This is the case in the instances of ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν:

Dative.	Subject.	Verb.	Passage.
τοῖσιν δ'	Ἥφαιστος κλυτοτέχνης	ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν	<i>Iliad</i> 1,571
τοῖσιν δ'	Εὐρύμαχος, Πολύβου παῖς,	ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,345; 18,349; 20,359

and in one instance of the finite verb form ἀγόρευε:

Dative.	Adverb.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τοῖσι δ'	ἔπειτ'	ἀγόρευε	Θόας Ἀνδραίμονος υἱός	<i>Iliad</i> 15,281

The dative is always a demonstrative pronoun put at the beginning of the verse.

⁶⁵⁹ Hackstein 2011a:28 with reference to these specific instances.

⁶⁶⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 2,322; 2,330; 4,6; 8,542; 18,310 and *Odyssey* 8,570; 13,178; 18,271.

⁶⁶¹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,571; 7,347 and *Odyssey* 2,15; 16,345; 18,349; 20,359; 22,461.

c) with the accusative of the words spoken. This is the case in:

Subject.	Particles.	Participle construction.	Words spoken.	Verb.	Passage.
ἦ	δ' ἄρ'	ἐπευχομένη	ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	ἀγόρευε	<i>Iliad</i> 21,427
οἱ	δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενοι	ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	ἀγόρευον	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,409

d) with the accusative of the words spoken and the preposition πρὸς followed by the accusative of the person addressed, ἀλλήλους. The object spoken is either expressed by ἔπεα πτερόεντ' or by τοιαῦτα. The specificity of the verb ἀγορεύω is that the person addressed and/or the words spoken can be expressed in the conclusion as well, contrary to other verbs in speech conclusions such as εἶπον and φημί. The prepositional phrase πρὸς ἀλλήλους is only used once in an introduction, and 25 times in a conclusion. The introduction is:

ἦκα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον (*Iliad* 3,155).

The conclusions are:

ὥς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον (occurring 24 times),

πολλὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον (*Iliad* 24,142).

e) The verb ἀγορεύω is followed by the preposition ἐν with the dative, when it is used in the participle:

Rest of the verse.	Prepositional construction.	Participle.	Passage.
Ἔκτωρ γάρ ποτε φήσσει	ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ'	ἀγορεύων	<i>Iliad</i> 8,148

f) In the following instance, the dative of the person belongs to the participle and not to the finite verb form:

καὶ οἱ ἐπευχόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν (*Iliad* 21,121).

g) It is unclear whether ἀγορεύω is constructed with an accusative or a dative of the person in the following verse:

αὐτὸς δέ σφ' ἀγόρευε, θεοὶ δ' ὑπὸ πάντες ἄκουον (*Iliad* 8,4).⁶⁶²

As ἀγορεύω is never constructed with the accusative of the person, it is better to interpret σφ' as a dative,⁶⁶³ but the elision of the dative ending –ι is unusual.⁶⁶⁴ The pronoun is not used in a reflexive meaning. Chantraine interpreted σφ' as the accusative σφε,⁶⁶⁵ but there are other instances where this form is used in the dative:

χρύσεια δέ σφ' ὑπὸ κύκλῳ ἐκάστω πυθμένι θῆκεν (*Iliad* 18,375),

⁶⁶² See Edwards 1970:24.

⁶⁶³ The interpretation as dative can be found in Ameis-Hentze-Cauer 1930:39 and in Wilson 1996:50.

⁶⁶⁴ Buttmann 1830:126; La Roche 1869:110-128; Chantraine 1948:86; Wachter 2000:74.

⁶⁶⁵ Chantraine 1948:267.

ἀγχίμολον δέ σφ' ἦλθ' Ἑκάβη τετιηότι θυμῷ (*Iliad* 24,283),
σῖτον δέ σφ' ἐπένειμε Φιλοίτιος, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν (*Odyssey* 20,254).

The constructions of ἀγορεύω described above confirm the clear distinction in addressing small and large groups in introductions and conclusions that was observed already in the other *verba dicendi*:

1. The infinitive formula ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν is always constructed with the dative and is used when a large group is addressed. This is another example of the use of the dative to speak to a group and the accusative for a few people.
2. The same applies to the use of the preposition ἐν with the dative: in those instances, the verb ἀγορεύω has the meaning “speaking openly, speaking in a large group”. As the entire population of Troy is addressed, a preposition with a dative/ locative is used and not πρὸς with the accusative. In two other instances, the verb ἀγορεύω is combined with “standing among the Argives”, in which ἐν also indicates the locative sense and in which the construction belongs both to the verb of “standing” as to that of “speaking”:

σῆς ἐν Ἀχαιοῖσιν ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν (*Iliad* 22,377),
σῆς δ' ἄρ' ἐν Ἀργείοις ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε (*Iliad* 23,535).

The combination of a form of **steh*₂ and a *verbum dicendi* is common in Homer and is attested 3 times with ἀγορεύω.⁶⁶⁶

3. The prepositional clause πρὸς ἀλλήλους is used 26 times and refers in 24 of the 26 instances to only 2 persons. The phrase refers to a larger group in the following instances:

ἦκα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον (*Iliad* 3,155).

This verse described how the Trojan elders spoke to one another about Helen's beauty.

ὥς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον (*Odyssey* 8,333).

This concluded the speech of the gods speaking about Hephaistos caught Aphrodite and Ares. These examples confirm the distinction between the use of πρὸς with the accusative when a few persons are addressed and ἐν or μετά with the dative/ locative when an entire group is addressed.

3.8.9. Word order in the speech formulae of ἀγορεύω.

The word order is always OV, as the accusative of the words spoken, the prepositional object and the dative of the person addressed are put before the verb. The finite verb form of

⁶⁶⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 22,377; 23,535 and *Odyssey* 17,349. See Appendix A.6.

ἀγορεύω always occupies the verse final position in introductions and conclusions. Examples are:

	Prepositional object.	Words spoken.	Verb.	Passage.
ἦκα	πρὸς ἀλλήλους	ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	ἀγόρευον	<i>Iliad</i> 3,155

	Words spoken.	Prepositional object.	Verb.	Passage.
ὥς οἱ μὲν	τοιαῦτα	πρὸς ἀλλήλους	ἀγόρευον	24 instances

Dative.	Subject.	Apposition.	Verb.	Passage.
τοῖσιν δ'	Εὐρύμαχος,	Πολύβου πάϊς,	ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,345

The appositions to the subject of ἀγορεύω follow the noun they determine:

Dative.	Subject.	Apposition.	Verb.	Passage.
τοῖσιν δ'	Ἥφαιστος	κλυτοτέχνης	ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν	<i>Iliad</i> 1,571
τοῖσιν δ'	Εὐρύμαχος,	Πολύβου πάϊς,	ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,345

If the speech conclusion does not occupy the entire verse, the conclusion is introduced by the adverb ὥς and the verb is put at the end of the conclusion:

ὥς Ἴκτωρ ἀγόρευ', ἐπὶ δὲ Τρῶες κελάδησαν (*Iliad* 8,542; 18,310).

The following speech conclusions have a remarkable word order. In the following conclusion, the subject follows the verb:

ὥς ἀγόρευ' ὁ γέρων· τὰ δὲ κεν θεὸς ἦ τελέσειεν (*Odyssey* 8,570).

In general, the adverb ὥς is put at the beginning of a speech conclusion (be it in a conclusion with a participle or a finite verb form) and the demonstrative pronouns are used to introduce introductions. The following two conclusions differ from that schema:

ἦ μὲν ἄρ' ὥς ἀγόρευεν, ὃ δ' ὤχετο δῖος ὕφορβος (*Odyssey* 17,589).

This verse described how Penelope finished speaking to Eumaios and how he went away while she remained to speak to Odysseus alone. The adverb ὥς is not put at the beginning of the verse, because Homer wanted to create a contrast between the speaking of Penelope and the leaving of Eumaios. The poet used the pronominal construction ἦ μὲν ... ὃ δ'... to create this contrast. As the first word of the sentence was a pronoun, the clitic chain μὲν ἄρ' followed immediately after it. As μὲν is a connective particle, it was put before ἄρ' in the clitic chain. The clitic chain occupied the 2nd position and ὥς could therefore only be put after it.

κεῖνος τὼς ἀγόρευε: τὰ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται (*Iliad* 2,330; *Odyssey* 18,271).

In this conclusion, the pronoun started the verse and the adverb τὼς is only put in the 2nd position and does not start the conclusion.

3.8.10. Agreement between verb and subject with ἀγορεύω.

The speech introductions that refer to a single person speaking are put in the 3rd person singular. The speech conclusion ὥς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον refers in 20 of the 24 attested instances to only two persons.⁶⁶⁷ As such, one would expect the dual in subject and verb, and while the dual form ἀγορευέτην cannot be used in the hexametre, the dual form of the pronoun τῷ would have fit the metre. This could be another indication that the poet did no longer know the dual at the time when this formula was created.

3.8.11. Connection of formulae with ἀγορεύω to the rest of the verse.

The conclusions that do not occupy the entire verse are linked to the rest of the verse by the particles δέ or δὴ. When ἀγορεύω is used in the participle, it is connected to the subject of the verse. In one instance, a participle introduction occupies the entire verse:

κερτομίοις ἐπέεσσι παραβλήδην ἀγορεύων (*Iliad* 4,6).

In one introduction, the introductory part is put in the first part of the verse, and the reaction of the audience is already put in the second half:

αὐτὸς δέ σφ' ἀγόρευε, θεοὶ δ' ὑπὸ πάντες ἄκουον (*Iliad* 8,4).

The connection between the introduction and the rest of the verse is made by δέ. This verse has the form of a conclusion, because it describes the speaking and the effect of the speaking on the audience (which was very common in the conclusions with φημί). This verse is made up of formulaic elements, but the combination in one single verse is unique.⁶⁶⁸ The reason for this is that Zeus is about to pronounce an order with far reaching consequences: he will forbid the gods to intervene in the battle until Akhilleus is rehabilitated. As it can be expected that this order will not be accepted by the gods and will cause uproar and discontent, the poet already stated in the introduction that they would nevertheless obey the order. As this verse is unique and combines an introduction and the reaction of the audience before the words were spoken, the connection could not be made by καί, because that only makes a “normal”

⁶⁶⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 5,274; 5,431; 7,464; 8,212; 13,81; 16,101; 18,368; 21,514; 24,142 and *Odyssey* 4,620; 7,334; 17,166; 17,290; 20,172; 20,240; 22,160; 23,288; 24,98; 24,203; 24,383.

⁶⁶⁸ Kirk 1990:295.

connection. As was argued before, the particle δέ is more suited, because it indicates a contrast.

3.8.12. ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα versus ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε/ον.⁶⁶⁹

In speech introductions, ἀγορεύω is metrically equivalent to προσαυδάω when used in combination with ἔπεα πτερόεντα:

καί οἱ ἐπευχόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 16,829),

καί οἱ ἐπευχόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν (*Iliad* 21,121).

The agreements between both formulae are the following:

ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε/ον	ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα
Digamma in ἔπεα observed: ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε (<i>Odyssey</i> 17,349).	Digamma in ἔπεα mostly observed: πολλὰ λισσόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (<i>Iliad</i> 21,368).
Combined with the root *steh ₂ “stand”: ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε (<i>Odyssey</i> 17,349).	Combined with the root *steh ₂ “stand”: ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 7 times). ⁶⁷⁰
Linguistic innovation: digamma and <i>nu ephelkustikon</i> to make position: στὰς ἐν Ἀχαιοῖσιν ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν (<i>Iliad</i> 22,377).	Linguistic innovation: digamma neglected in extension of masculine formula into feminine subject: καί μιν δάκρυ χέουσ' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (<i>Iliad</i> 22,81); καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 9 times). ⁶⁷¹

The differences between the formulae are:

ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε/ον	ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα
3 rd person plural attested 3 times out of 8 formulae: οἱ δ' ἀπαμειβόμενοι ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον (<i>Odyssey</i> 9,409). ⁶⁷²	3 rd person plural attested only once out of 115 instances: καί μ' ὀλοφύρομενοι ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδων (<i>Odyssey</i> 10,418).
Combined with the accusative of the person addressed with the preposition πρὸς in the	Combined with the accusative of the person addressed without preposition.

⁶⁶⁹ Kelly 2007:144.

⁶⁷⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 4,203; 13,462; 14,356; 16,537 and *Odyssey* 4,25; 17,552; 22,100.

⁶⁷¹ The instances are *Iliad* 15,35; 15,89 and *Odyssey* 2,269; 5,117; 7,236; 8,442; 8,460; 13,290 and 23,34.

⁶⁷² The instances are *Iliad* 3,155; 24,142 and *Odyssey* 9,409.

word group πρὸς ἀλλήλους.	
Combined with locative constructions indicating a large group, as in στὰς ἐν Ἀχαιοῖσιν ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν (<i>Iliad</i> 22,477); στὰς δ' ἄρ' ἐν Ἀργείοις ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε (<i>Iliad</i> 23,535).	Never combined with a locative construction indicating a large group.
Used in a speech conclusion: πολλὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον (<i>Iliad</i> 24,142).	Never used in a speech conclusion. ⁶⁷³

From the data discussed above, it is clear that ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα is restricted to speech introductions with a subject in the singular. Kelly argued that ἀγορεύω was used when the subject was plural or when a large group was addressed,⁶⁷⁴ but a singular subject addressing one single person is attested in two of the five attestations of ἀγόρευε:

καὶ οἱ ἐπευχόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν (*Iliad* 21,121).

In this instance, Akhilleus addressed the Trojan Lykaon, after he (L) had supplicated to spare him. His supplication was introduced by καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 21,73). In this instance both formulae are used interchangeably.

ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε (*Odyssey* 17,349).

In this instance, the swineherd Eumaios addressed Odysseus.

In addition to the observations made above, the following needs to be mentioned as well.

- The fact that ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα is rarely used for a large group (only twice on 115 instances),⁶⁷⁵ can be explained by the fact that compounds with the preverb προσ- can only refer to small groups (as was argued on several occasions already).
- It is very noteworthy is that the poet created ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε as variant for ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα and not ἔπεα πτερόεντα μετηύδα, although μετηύδα could be used to indicate speaking to a large group as well.
- The only element that indicates that ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα is older than ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε is the fact that the construction with ἀγορεύω used a preposition with the person addressed, while προσηύδα was used with an accusative of the person without preposition.

⁶⁷³ See also Kelly 2007:144.

⁶⁷⁴ Kelly 2007:144.

⁶⁷⁵ In *Iliad* 10,191 it refers to the sentinels and their chiefs, and in *Odyssey* 10,430 Odysseus's men are addressed.

3.8.13. Meaning and use of ἀγοράομαι in speech introductions and conclusions.

The verb appears 24 times in a speech introduction and never in a conclusion.⁶⁷⁶ It always refers to speaking to a larger group, and means both “spoke to, addressed” as “assembled”.⁶⁷⁷ The notion of “gathering a large group” explains why it is combined with μετέειπεν, which is a μετά-compound and refers to speaking to a larger group (cf. supra).⁶⁷⁸ Mutzbauer argued that ἀγοράομαι did not have the notion of speaking in it and only referred to the gathering of the people, and that the actual speaking was expressed by μετέειπε,⁶⁷⁹ but this is not conclusive, because speech introductions with two *verba dicendi* are attested elsewhere as well. It is therefore better to assume that ἀγοράομαι had the notion of “gather” and “address” at the same time.

3.8.14. Verbal forms, inflection and augmentation in speech formulae with ἀγοράομαι.

The only form attested is the middle aorist ἀγορήσατο. There are no compounds attested in Homer. The augment is metrically excluded, but in other forms the verb ἀγοράομαι can be augmented, as is seen the following examples (which do not appear in speech introductions or conclusions):

οἱ δὲ θεοὶ παρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἡγορόωντο (*Iliad* 4,1),
ᾧς ὁπότ' ἐν Λήμνῳ κενεαυχέες ἡγοράασθε (*Iliad* 8,230).

3.8.15. The diatheses used in speech formulae with ἀγοράομαι.

The use of the middle can be explained by the fact that the verb refers to one's own interests and stresses the personal involvement, but as ἀγοράομαι is only attested in the middle throughout the entire Greek literature, it is possible that this verb never existed in the active and was restricted to the middle, while ἀγορεύω was only used in the active. As was argued elsewhere, the distinction between active and middle is not always clear: some roots are middle in one daughter language, but active in another, some roots change the diathesis in the paradigm within the same language, and often the distinction is not semantic but only formal and an active meaning is not confined to active verbs.⁶⁸⁰

⁶⁷⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,73; 1,253; 2,78; 2,283; 7,236; 7,367; 9,95; 15,285; 18,253 and *Odyssey* 2,24; 2,160; 2,228; 4,773; 7,158; 7,185; 8,25; 13,171; 16,394; 18,412; 20,244; 24,53; 24,425; 24,453.

⁶⁷⁷ Ameis-Hentze 1884:7 translated *nahm das Wort*. Delbrück 1897:421 translated *sich mit andern beraten*; Heubeck 1992:365 *he spoke in the assembly*; Kölligan 2007:231.

⁶⁷⁸ Ameis-Hentze 1884:7; Delbrück 1897:421; Seiler 1955b.

⁶⁷⁹ Mutzbauer 1909:95.

⁶⁸⁰ Brugmann 1904:598-599; Fortson 2010:83.

3.8.16. Metrical observations on speech formulae with ἀγοράομαι.

There are three metrical types of formulae. In the first one the subject of the speech introduction is expanded by a participle construction, and the verse starts with the formula ὃ σφιν ἐὺ φρονέων:

Subject.	Dative.	Participle extension.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
ὃ	σφιν	ἐὺ φρονέων	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε	13 times. ⁶⁸¹

The second one is a small adaptation of the first one, as the subject is expanded by a participle as well:

	Subject.	Participle extension.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
τοῦ	ὃ γε	δάκρυ χέων	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,24; 24,425

The third construction is different: the dative of the person addressed is put at the beginning of the verse, and is then followed by the name of the subject:

Dative.	Subject.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
τοῖσιν δ'	Ἀντίνοος	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,773
τοῖσιν δ'	Ἀλκίνοος	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 7,185; 8,25; 13,171
τοῖσιν δ'	Ἀμφίνομος	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,394; 18,412; 20,244

The formula ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν always occupies the end of the verse: ἀγορήσατο itself cannot be put in verse final position, because of metrical constraints, and therefore it is followed by καὶ μετέειπεν. In the participle construction ἐὺ φρονέων the diphthong ἐὺ must be read with 2 syllables, and the *u* must be counted as long.⁶⁸²

In the formulae of the 3rd construction, the final syllable of the names Ἀντίνοος, Ἀλκίνοος and Ἀμφίνομος has to be scanned as long. This metrical irregularity is of the same nature as that of ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε, which occurs with the same names (cf. infra).

3.8.17. The syntactic constructions (case usage) in speech formulae with ἀγοράομαι.

The formula ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν is only constructed with the dative of the person. The dative refers to the large group among which the speaker is standing when he addresses the

⁶⁸¹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,73; 1,253; 2,78; 2,283; 7,326; 7,367; 9,95; 15,285; 18,253 and *Odyssey* 7,158; 16,399; 24,53; 24,453.

⁶⁸² Wachter 2000:81.

audience.⁶⁸³ In the following formula, it is unclear to which verb(s) the dative belongs, as it can be linked with all three of them:

Subject.	Dative.	Participle extension.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
ὁ	σφιν	ἐὺ φρονέων	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε	13 times.

The pronoun σφιν is used without reflexive meaning and this is not unusual in Homer.⁶⁸⁴

There is no object belonging to the finite verb forms in the following instances:

τοῦ ὃ γε δάκρυ χέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν (*Odyssey* 2,24; 24,425).

The object is not contained in the genitive τοῦ, because it is a *genitivus causae* (“shedding tears for him”) and does not belong to the group of people addressed.⁶⁸⁵ In these instances there are *variae lectiones* τοῖς and τούς, but they are clearly the *lectio faciliior*, and have not been adopted in any of the editions (OCT, Van Thiel, Budé).

3.8.18. Word order in the speech formulae with ἀγοράομαι.

The word order in the formulae is OV, as the dative object is always put before the verb:

Subject.	Object.	Participle extension.	Finite verb form.	Passage.
ὁ	σφιν	ἐὺ φρονέων	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε	13 times. ⁶⁸⁶

Object.	Subject.	Finite verb form.	Passage.
τοῖσιν δ'	Ἀλκίνοος	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 7,185; 8,25; 13,171

The enclitic pronoun σφιν is put in the 2nd position of the verse:

Subject.	Enclitic.	Participle extension.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
ὁ	σφιν	ἐὺ φρονέων	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε	13 times.

The demonstrative pronoun τοῖσιν is always put in verse initial position (this is the case for all introductions in which a demonstrative pronoun is used):

Pronoun.	Subject.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
τοῖσιν δ'	Ἀντίνοος	ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,773

⁶⁸³ Seiler 1955b.

⁶⁸⁴ Chantraine 1953:152.

⁶⁸⁵ Monro 1891:145; Ameis-Hentze 1900a:38; Chantraine 1953:65; S.West 1988:130

⁶⁸⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,73; 1,253; 2,78; 2,283; 7,326; 7,367; 9,95; 15,285; 18,253 and *Odyssey* 7,158; 16,399; 24,53; 24,453.

3.8.20. Conclusion.

The root **h₂gor* is used in two speech introduction verbs, namely ἀγοράομαι and ἀγορεύω, neither of which is attested in compounds. The verb ἀγορεύω is used more often in speech conclusions than in introductions. It is constructed with the accusative of the words spoken (either ἔπεα πτερόεντα or τοιαῦτα). The verb is remarkable in that it used a person addressed preceded by a preposition (πρὸς ἀλλήλους), which is rare among the other speech introduction verbs. When a large group was addressed, the poet either used the formula ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν constructed with the dative of the person, or extended the subject with the participle construction στὰς ἐν followed by a dative. When only a few people were addressed, the construction πρὸς ἀλλήλους was used. This confirms the distinction between the use of the dative/locative for speaking to/among a large group and πρὸς with the accusative for speaking to a few people.

Although the formula ὧς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον referred to a group of two persons in 20 out of the 24 instances, the dual is not used. The metre excluded the use of the dual form of the verb, but the pronoun could have been used in the dual, if the poet had still known that form.

The following table lists the agreements and differences between ἀγορεύω and ἀγοράομαι.

ἀγορεύω	ἀγοράομαι
OV word order.	OV word order.
Used in introductions and more often in conclusions.	Only used in introductions.
Used with dative of the person addressed, without person addressed or with prepositional construction indicating the person addressed.	Only used with the dative of the person addressed.
The notion of speaking to a large group is more often absent than present.	Always has the notion of speaking to a large group.
Often constructed with the words spoken.	Never constructed with the words spoken.
Only used in the active diathesis.	Only used in the middle diathesis.
Attested in the 3 rd person singular and plural, and can refer to large groups, but also to two persons. The dual is not used.	Only attested in the 3 rd person singular and only refers to one specific person.
As finite verb always used as sole <i>verbum</i>	Always combined with the verb form

<i>dicendi</i> in the verse.	μετέειπε.
Attested in the present infinitive, present participle and the imperfect indicative.	Used in the aorist indicative.

The observations below are specific to the verb ἀγορεύω:

- The formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα can be used in introductions and conclusions, and can be used for small groups and large audiences. The formulae ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευο/εν and ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσήυδα/ων are metrically equivalent, but the former could be constructed with a plural subject and could be used to address a large group. The element proving that ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσήυδα was the older formula is that it used the accusative of the person addressed without preposition.
- Even speech conclusions with ἀγορεύω could be constructed with the words spoken and the person addressed with a preposition. The use of both words spoken and person addressed in a conclusion is unparalleled among other *verba dicendi*.
- In one speech introduction, the reaction of the audience is already mentioned, before the direct speech has been quoted. This is also unparalleled in other introductions.

3.9. The verb φωνέω.

3.9.0. Preliminary remarks.

In this chapter, the verb φωνέω is treated. As the initial meaning of φωνέω was “to raise one’s voice”, it was in origin a *verbum clamandi*. In a first stage, it only existed as a simplex and was used in this specific meaning to extend existing speech introductions “so he spoke and he raised his voice” or “raising his voice, he thus spoke”. In a second stage the finite verb forms were used to introduce direct speech without another *verbum dicendi*. In this chapter, the etymology is only treated at the end, because the syntactic analysis provides important insights on the etymology and the oldest Greek form. As was stated before, the tense usage and augment will be discussed in detail in chapters 5 and 6.

3.9.1. Meaning of φωνέω and its compounds in speech introductions and conclusions.

The meaning of the simplex is “raise one’s voice, speak; speak to, address”.⁶⁸⁷ As I argued above, the verb evolved into a genuine speech introduction verb in different stages.

1. It was originally used as an extension to a speech introduction, either as a participle or in the formula φώνησέν τε.⁶⁸⁸ Some examples are:

καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 30 times),⁶⁸⁹

καί μιν φωνήσας' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 9 times),⁶⁹⁰

καί σφεας φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 5 times),⁶⁹¹

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνείας ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 20199),

Ἑρμείαν, ποτὶ δὲ Πρίαμον φάτο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 24,353).

2. In a second stage, the use of φωνέω was then extended: φώνησέν τε could also introduce direct speech without another verb of speaking, and ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν and ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας/σ' were used as speech conclusions.

3. In a third stage compounds were created and were used in introductions as well. This is a significant innovation in comparison to the other *verba clamandi*.

⁶⁸⁷ Classen 1867:120; Seiler-Capelle 1889:586 *die Stimme ertönen lassen*; Mutzbauer 1909:130-131 *sich aussprechen*; Fournier 1946a:46, 1946b:47 *faire entendre la voix*; Kölligan 2007:232; O'Sullivan 2010b (LfgrE).

⁶⁸⁸ For this use of φώνησέν τε see Fingerle 1939:345; Führer 1967:16-17.

⁶⁸⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,201; 2,7; 4,312; 4,369; 8,101; 10,163; 13,750; 14,138; 16,6; 17,74; 20,331; 21,73; 23,601; 23,625; 24,517 and *Odyssey* 1,122; 5,172; 8,346; 8,407; 13,58; 13,227; 13,253; 14,114; 15,259; 16,180; 18,104; 20,198; 22,410; 24,372; 24,399.

⁶⁹⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 15,35; 15,89 and *Odyssey* 2,269; 5,117; 7,236; 8,442; 8,460; 13,290 and 23,34.

⁶⁹¹ The instances are *Iliad* 4,284; 4,337; 10,91 and *Odyssey* 4,77; 10,430.

3.9.2. Verbal forms, compounds and verbal inflection of φωνέω.

The simplex is highly formulaic: there is only one introduction formula in a finite verb form, namely φώνησέν τε, and only one conclusion formula in a finite form, namely ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν; when a conclusion is expressed by a participle, the formula is ὥς ἄρα followed by a form of the participle φωνήσας.

These are the numbers of forms attested for φωνέω:⁶⁹²

φωνέω	Introduction.	Conclusion.
Overall.	91 instances.	69 instances.
Participle.	57 instances.	60 instances.
Finite verb forms.	34 instances.	9 instances.

The compounds that are used in introductions, are προσφωνέω and μεταφωνέω. The difference in meaning is the same as with the compounds of the other verbs: προσφωνέω means “to speak to (a few) people”, while μεταφωνέω means “to speak among a (large) group of people”. Neither compound appears in a speech conclusion. The figures for the compounds are the following:

Verb	Introduction	Conclusion
προσφωνέω	38 times.	None.
μεταφωνέω	8 instances.	None.

The most important difference between the simplex φωνέω and the compounds μεταφωνέω and προσφωνέω is that the simplex is only used in the aorist, while the compounds are only used in the imperfect. The figures and forms are the following:

Verb	Tense	Form	Occurrences
φωνέω	Aorist indicative	3 rd p. sg.	ἐφώνησεν: 9 instances, ⁶⁹³ φώνησεν: 34 instances. ⁶⁹⁴
	Aorist participle	Nom. m. sg.	φωνήσας: 84 instances. ⁶⁹⁵

⁶⁹² The instances of each every form will be given below.

⁶⁹³ The instances are *Iliad* 10,465; 19,276 and *Odyssey* 2,257; 10,229; 17,57; 19,29; 21,163; 21,386; 22,398.

⁶⁹⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 1,333; 3,181; 5,799; 7,190; 8,184; 8,466; 10,532; 13,373; 16,616; 19,314; 20,199; 22,296; 23,442; 23,666; 24,193; 24,353; 24,459 and *Odyssey* 4,370; 7,298; 7,308; 8,140; 8,400; 11,347; 13,3; 16,43; 17,445; 18,121; 18,200; 19,405; 19,481; 19,545; 21,227; 24,327.

⁶⁹⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 1,201; 2,7; 2,35; 2,84; 4,284; 4,312; 4,337; 4,369; 6,116; 6,369; 6,494; 7,103; 7,303; 8,101; 8,157; 9,199; 10,163; 10,191; 11,531; 12,251; 12,370; 13,750; 13,883; 14,41; 14,138; 16,6; 16,682; 17,74; 17,188; 17,673; 20,144; 20,331; 21,73; 21,468; 22,306; 23,99; 23,601; 23,625; 24,307; 24,468; 24,517; 24,671 and *Odyssey* 1,122; 2,413; 4,77; 4,550; 4,657; 4,715; 5,148; 5,172; 5,380; 8,46; 8,104; 8,346; 8,407; 10,302; 10,430; 10,482; 10,500; 11,56; 11,209; 11,396; 12,296; 13,58; 13,227; 13,253; 14,114; 14,418; 14,439; 15,215; 15,259; 15,282; 16,40; 16,180; 16,190; 16,213; 18,104; 18,394; 20,198; 22,79; 22,236; 22,410; 24,372; 24,399.

		Nom. f. sg.	φωνήσας': 18 instances. ⁶⁹⁶
		Gen. m. sg.	φωνήσαντος: 1 instance. ⁶⁹⁷
		Nom. m. pl.	φωνήσαντες: 1 instance. ⁶⁹⁸
		Nom. m. du.	φωνήσαντε: 3 instances. ⁶⁹⁹
προσφωνέω	Imperfect	3 rd p. sg.	προσεφώνεε: 18 instances, ⁷⁰⁰ προσεφώνεεν: 18 instances. ⁷⁰¹
		3 rd p. pl.	προσεφώνεον: 2 instances. ⁷⁰²
μεταφωνέω	Imperfect	1 st p. sg.	μετεφώνεον: 1 instance. ⁷⁰³
		3 rd p. sg.	μετεφώνει: 1 instance, ⁷⁰⁴ μετεφώνεε: 3 instances, ⁷⁰⁵ μετεφώνεεν: 3 instances. ⁷⁰⁶

The feminine participle can be used in the same metrical contexts as the masculine, but the substitution/ inflection occurred in a period when the digamma no longer operated, as can be seen in the following two formulae:

καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα

καί μιν φωνήσας' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα.

In the second formula the ending α in the feminine participle is elided, and this proves that the initial w of ἔπεα was no longer known by the poet.⁷⁰⁷ This shows that speech introduction formulae were also reinterpreted, reused and inflected. This is further illustrated by the following formulae, in which the masculine form was replaced by the feminine one:

ὦς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπεβήσετο, τὸν δ' ἔλιπ' αὐτοῦ (*Iliad* 2,35),

ὦς ἄρα φωνήσας' ἀπεβήσετο, τὸν δ' ἔλιπ' αὐτοῦ (*Iliad* 1,428).

⁶⁹⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,428; 15,35; 15,89; 15,145 and *Odyssey* 2,269; 2,405; 3,29; 3,371; 5,117; 5,192; 6,316; 7,37; 7,78; 7,236; 8,442; 8,460; 13,290; 23,34.

⁶⁹⁷ *Iliad* 19,418.

⁶⁹⁸ *Iliad* 5,239.

⁶⁹⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 6,232; 10,349 and *Odyssey* 24,361.

⁷⁰⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 2,22; 3,389; 3,413; 8,292; 11,510; 14,242; 21,152 and *Odyssey* 4,69; 5,159; 8,381; 14,401; 15,194; 15,539; 16,56; 16,308; 23,182; 24,23; 24,243.

⁷⁰¹ The instances are *Iliad* 9,201; 11,346; 11,464; 17,484; 20,428; 21,330; 21,378 and *Odyssey* 16,221; 18,25; 18,214; 19,35; 22,163; 22,355; 24,35; 24,105; 24,120; 24,191; 24,505.

⁷⁰² The instances are *Iliad* 1,332; 8,445.

⁷⁰³ The instance is *Odyssey* 10,67.

⁷⁰⁴ The instance is *Odyssey* 18,35.

⁷⁰⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 18,323 and *Odyssey* 8,201; 22,69.

⁷⁰⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 7,384; 9,52 and *Odyssey* 16,354.

⁷⁰⁷ Parry 1934:166-167; Chantraine 1948:146; Hoekstra 1969:70; Garvie 1994:9; Hackstein 2010a:415, 2011b:39-40.

The finite verb forms of the simplex are only attested in the 3rd person singular aorist, both in the augmented ἐφώνησεν as in the non-augmented form φώνησεν. The augmented form ἐφώνησεν appears in conclusions and the unaugmented one in introductions. Noteworthy is that all forms have the *nu ephelkustikon* to make the formula fit the verse.

The compounds are only used in the imperfect: προσφώνέω is used in the 3rd person singular forms προσεφώνεε (without *nu ephelkustikon*) and προσεφώνεεν (with *nu*), and the third person plural προσεφώνεον (which appears 2 times in “negative” introductions). The compound μεταφώνέω is used in the 1st person singular μετεφώνεον, and in the 3rd person singular forms μετεφώνεεν and μετεφώνεε (with and without *nu ephelkustikon*), and in the contracted form μετεφώνει. The contracted form can be found in:

ἡδὺ δ' ἄρ' ἐκγελάσας μετεφώνει μνηστήρεσσιν (*Odyssey* 18,35).

The contracted form μετεφώνει is used here, because it is the only one that could be used in this specific verse.⁷⁰⁸ The other forms of the compounds are never contracted.

The use of the *nu ephelkustikon* deserves a brief discussion as well. It removes hiatus with the compounds in the following instances:

αὐτίκα δ' Αἰνείαν προσεφώνεεν ἐγγυὺς ἐόντα (*Iliad* 17,484),

ἦ, καὶ ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσεφώνεεν Ἴκτορα δῖον (*Iliad* 20,428),

στὰς ἐν μέσσοισιν μετεφώνεεν ἡπύτα κῆρυξ (*Iliad* 7,384).

It is remarkable, however, that the *nu* is always used when a word starting with a digamma follows. This is not just the case for the compounds of φωνέω, but in almost all instances in Homer (one of the few exceptions being the formula ἴφι ἀνάσσειν). This phenomenon was observed for Pindar and later tentatively expanded to Homer by Eduard Meusel (cf. supra).⁷⁰⁹

This can be observed in the following instances, where the words start with *sw:

αὐτίκα δ' Ἥφαιστον προσεφώνεεν ὃν φίλον υἱόν (*Iliad* 21,330; 21,378),⁷¹⁰

ἡδὺ δ' ἄρ' ἐκγελάσας μετεφώνεεν οἷς ἐτάροισι (*Odyssey* 16,354).

A similar phenomenon occurred with ὤδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον, where the digamma was neglected when the hiatus could be resolved by the *nu* (cf. supra).

3.9.3. The formula φώνησέν τε.

⁷⁰⁸ La Roche 1869:19, Hackstein 2011b:40. Monro 1891:55 and Chantraine 1948:39-40 discussed the metrical necessity to use contracted forms, but did not discuss this specific instance. The contracted form was not mentioned in Russo 1993 nor in Steiner 2010.

⁷⁰⁹ Meusel 2013:103-104 for Pindar. This phenomenon was discussed in detail in the subchapter on ἔπειον. This issue was not treated in Hämmig 2013. I would like to thank Eduard Meusel for discussing this issue with me in more detail.

⁷¹⁰ The formula προσεφώνεεν ὃν is attested 5 times: *Iliad* 21,330 and 21,378, *Odyssey* 16,221; 19,35 and 24,505.

As was stated above, the formula φώνησέν τε is attested 34 times. Janko argued that the formula φώνησέν τε was a younger creation for εἶπέ τε μῦθον, created at the time that the initial digamma ceased to be observed.⁷¹¹ In 24 of the 34 attested instances of φώνησέν τε, a digammaless εἶπέ τε μῦθον would have created a hiatus. This seems to confirm Janko's observation, but I believe that there are some arguments against a purely mechanical substitution. First of all, both formulae have the syntactic archaism that a past tense form remained unaugmented, because it was followed by a 2nd position clitic.⁷¹² Secondly, the formal arguments are not entirely correct. The formula εἶπέ τε μῦθον occurs 5 times:

μέσσω δ' ἀμφοτέρων σκῆπτρα σχέθον, εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Iliad* 7,277),
 Πάτροκλος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἀναίνετο εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Iliad* 11,647),
 κέκλετο δ' Ἥφαιστον κλυτοτέχνην εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Iliad* 18,391),
 Ἥελιος γάρ οἱ σκοπιὴν ἔχεν εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Odyssey* 8,302),
 ἦ καὶ ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος κεφαλὴν σχέθον εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Odyssey* 14,494).

In 11,647 the digamma was observed; in 18, 391 it is uncertain if it had been observed; in 7,277 it was not observed and in 8,302 and 14,494 the hiatus by the digamma had been remedied by adding a *nu* to the preceding verbal form:

Ἥελιος γάρ οἱ σκοπιὴν ἔχεν (Ϝ)εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Odyssey* 8,302),
 ἦ καὶ ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος κεφαλὴν σχέθον (Ϝ)εἶπέ τε μῦθον (*Odyssey* 14,494).

If Janko's theory were correct, one would have expected the formula to be substituted by φώνησέν τε in these two instances.

Reversely, there are 8 instances of φώνησέν τε in which a "digammaless" εἶπέ τε μῦθον could have been used, if the preceding word had had a *nu ephelkustikon*:

αὐτὰρ ὃ ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 1,333; 8,446).

This formula could be constructed with (Ϝ)εἶπέ τε μῦθον in the following form:

*αὐτὰρ ὃ ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν (Ϝ)εἶπέ τε μῦθον
 τὸν μὲν παρ πόδ' ἐὼν χαμάδις βάλε φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 7,190).

This formula can be constructed with (Ϝ)εἶπέ τε μῦθον in the following form:

*τὸν μὲν παρ πόδ' ἐὼν χαμάδις βάλεν (Ϝ)εἶπέ τε μῦθον
 Νέστωρ δὲ πρῶτος κτύπον ἄϊε φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 10,532).

This formula can be constructed with (Ϝ)εἶπέ τε μῦθον in the following form:

*Νέστωρ δὲ πρῶτος κτύπον ἄϊεν (Ϝ)εἶπέ τε μῦθον
 Ἔκτωρ δ' ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 22,296).

⁷¹¹ Janko 1992:13, see also Kölligan 2007:232.

⁷¹² See chapter 6.3.

This formula can be constructed with (w)εἰπέ τε μῦθον in the following form:

*Ἐκτωρ δ' ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν (w)εἰπέ τε μῦθον

Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἐρήτυε φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 16,43).

This formula can be constructed with (w)εἰπέ τε μῦθον in the following form:

* Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἐρήτυεν (w)εἰπέ τε μῦθον

φωνῇ δὲ βροτῇ κατερήτυε φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 19,545).

This formula can be constructed with (w)εἰπέ τε μῦθον in the following form:

* φωνῇ δὲ βροτῇ κατερήτυεν (w)εἰπέ τε μῦθον

There are two instances in which φώνησέν τε was used and in which εἰπέ τε μῦθον could have been used without any problem:

ἄψατο δ' ἡμιόνου ταλαεργοῦ φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 23,666)

is metrically equivalent to

*ἄψατο δ' ἡμιόνου ταλαεργοῦ (w)εἰπέ τε μῦθον

καὶ ῥ' ἀπομόρξατο χερσὶ παρειᾶς φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 18,200)

is metrically equivalent to

*καὶ ῥ' ἀπομόρξατο χερσὶ παρειᾶς (w)εἰπέ τε μῦθον.

Thirdly, there are several speech formulae that could be used after the bucolic caesura:⁷¹³

ἡδὲ προσηύδα

ἀλλὰ προσηύδα

καὶ προσέειπε

καὶ μετέειπε

καὶ φάτο μῦθον

If a purely mechanical substitution to cure the hiatus were the reason, the poet could have used καὶ προσέειπε, προσέειπε, καὶ μετέειπε (depending on the context) or καὶ φάτο μῦθον as well. The digamma-caused hiatus can therefore not have been the only reason for the substitution of εἰπέ τε μῦθον by φώνησέν τε.

Fourthly, there are semantic differences between the two formulae. The introduction εἰπέ τε μῦθον is attested 5 times, but is only combined once with another *verbum dicendi*:

κέκλετο δ' Ἥφαιστον κλυτοτέχνην εἰπέ τε μῦθον (*Iliad* 18,391).

The formula φώνησέν τε, on the other hand, is combined with another *verbum dicendi* in 17 of the 34 attested instances.⁷¹⁴ As such, φωνέω was combined with another verb and the entire formula meant “X spoke and raised his voice”.

⁷¹³ Führer 1967:16-17; Edwards 1970:12; Riggsby 1992:103-105.

⁷¹⁴ For this use of φώνησέν τε see Fingerle 1939:345; Führer 1967:16-17; Riggsby 1992:104.

Some examples are of φώνησέν τε with another *verbum dicendi* are:

ἐς δ' ἄλοχον Ἑκάβην ἐκαλέσσατο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 24,193),

τὸν δ' αὖτ'(NAME) ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε (occurring 11 times).⁷¹⁵

In 13 cases, the other verb of speaking is put in the imperfect, and indicates the durative effect of the speaking.⁷¹⁶ As such, φώνησέν τε is not the main introduction and can best be translated with “and he let his voice be heard”.⁷¹⁷ A phrase as ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε would then mean “s/he answered and let her/his voice be heard”. In a later stage φώνησέν τε could be used in introductions without another *verbum dicendi*. Examples where φώνησέν τε is not followed by a *verbum dicendi* are:

ἰππείου δὲ θεὰ ζυγοῦ ἦψατο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 5,799),

ἐξ ἵππων δ' ἀπέβαινεν ἐπὶ χθόνα φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 24,459),

καὶ δέπαϊ χρυσέῳ δειδίσκετο, φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 18,121).

If a mere substitution had been the reason, it would have been much easier for the poet to just use καὶ φάτο μῦθον as replacement instead of φώνησέν τε.

I therefore believe that εἶπέ τε μῦθον was a genuine speech introduction, while φώνησέν τε was in origin an addition to an existing speech introduction and was only later “upgraded” to a speech introduction. Therefore, I do not think that it is necessary to assume that one formula replaced the other.

3.9.4. The participle usage of φωνέω and its compounds.

The verb φωνέω and its compounds are used in the indicative and in the participle. The participle is only used with the simplex, and appears when the subject of φωνέω was the same as the verb of the verse. It is used to enforce an introduction, but also to conclude speeches. The participle is only attested in the aorist, is used with the simplex and appears in two distinct contexts with different meanings.⁷¹⁸

- First, it appears in the speech conclusions and is used when the subject of the speaking and that of the other verb in the verse are the same. The aorist refers to the speaking as an accomplished action, and indicates that the subject is proceeding to something else. The

⁷¹⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 20,199 and *Odyssey* 7,298; 7,308; 8,140; 8,400; 11,347; 11,362; 13,3; 17,445; 19,405 and 24,327.

⁷¹⁶ The verbs of speaking in the introduction were durative, because the speaking had an effect on the audience beyond the speaking of the words itself, while the raising of the voice is only punctual. This was argued by Blass 1889. A detailed discussion will be given in the chapter on tense usage (chapter 5).

⁷¹⁷ Seiler-Capelle 1889:586 *die Stimme ertönen lassen*; Mutzbauer 1909:130-131 *sich aussprechen*; Fournier 1946a:46, 1946b:47 *faire entendre la voix*; Kölligan 2007:232; O'Sullivan 2010b.

⁷¹⁸ Chantraine 1953:188-189.

participles always occur in the formula ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας (the case and number can differ).

Examples are:

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας' ἀπεβήσετο, τὸν δ' ἔλιπ' αὐτοῦ (*Iliad* 1,428),

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπεβήσετο, τὸν δ' ἔλιπ' αὐτοῦ (*Iliad* 2,35),

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας ἔλασεν καλλίτριχας ἵππους (*Odyssey* 15,215).

The particle ἄρα marked the transition from the subject's speaking into his actions.⁷¹⁹

- The participle also occurs in speech introductions. In those instances, the participle is combined with other *verba dicendi* and does not have an anterior meaning because the raising of the voice and the speaking are simultaneous.⁷²⁰ Examples are:

οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδὼν, καὶ φωνήσας ἔπος ἠΐδα (*Iliad* 24,307),

καὶ μιν φωνήσας προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (*Odyssey* 14,439),

καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 30 times).

In one instance the participle is used when the subject of the participle is not the same as that of the main verb. The construction in which the participle appears, could be interpreted as a genitive absolute:

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσαντος Ἐρινύες ἔσχεθον αὐδὴν (*Iliad* 19,418).

When Akhilleus readied his chariot and was about to assail Troy, his horses Xanthos and Balios started speaking to him and prophecied him that he would die soon and that they were not to blame for it. In this verse, Homer described how the Erinyes removed the power of speech from Xanthos, after he finished speaking. There are two different interpretations for the genitive φωνήσαντος in this verse: it can be interpreted as a genitive absolute (GA) “after he had thus spoken”, but can also be a *participium coniunctum* to the suppressed genitive object of ἔσχεθον.⁷²¹ The meaning would then be “then the Erinyes removed the power of speech from him, who had just spoken in this fashion”. It is likely that this interpretation was the original one and that the verse was later reinterpreted as “after he had spoken, the Erinyes removed his power of speech”. As such, the example quoted above played a pivotal role in the creation of the GA: it originated in all likelihood from constructions where the genitive had a

⁷¹⁹ Grimm – Nordheider – Brandt 1979:1132, 1144 and 1151.

⁷²⁰ It is not uncommon for the aorist to have a simultaneous meaning, see Monro 1891:66; Kühner-Gerth 1898:154; Chantraine 1953:188-189; Oguse 1962:46. Platt 1919 listed several instances where an anterior meaning was excluded.

⁷²¹ The use and explanation of the genitive φωνήσαντος were not addressed in Ameis-Hentze 1896:29; Leaf 1902:347; Edwards 1991:285, Coray 2009:177. This verse was not discussed in Kunst 1922, Keydana 1997 nor in Ruppel 2013:233-234 (where she listed all GAs in Homer).

function in the sentence and was determined by a participle. In a later stage of the language the genitive and its participle were reinterpreted as a separate syntagm, and the GA arose.⁷²²

As *Paradebeispiel* for the creation of the GA, the following instance is often quoted:⁷²³

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἳ δ' ἐχάρησαν ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ

μῆνιν ἀπειπόντος μεγαθύμου Πηλεΐωνος (*Iliad* 19,74-75).

In these verses, Homer described how the Greeks exulted with joy after Akhilleus renounced his anger. The original meaning was “the Greeks were happy about Akhilleus, after/because he had renounced his anger” with a genitive after verbs of sentiment. Later, the construction was reinterpreted as “the Greeks were happy, because/after Akhilleus had renounced his anger”. It is the second meaning that gave rise to the genitive absolute. The fact that in these verses the genitive and the participle and the genitive μῆνιν ἀπειπόντος μεγαθύμου Πηλεΐωνος are in the verse following the verb also contributed to the fact that the participle construction μῆνιν ἀπειπόντος μεγαθύμου Πηλεΐωνος was felt as a separate and independent syntactic unity rather than a *genitivus causae* depending on ἐχάρησαν. The use of the genitive in this instance is remarkable because χαίρω normally governs the dative of cause.⁷²⁴ Kunst argued that the genitive in this instance was not against the Greek language,⁷²⁵ but -as Ruppel pointed out- there are several problems with this specific example:⁷²⁶

- the verb χαίρω normally governs the dative and not the genitive,
- it neglected the *w* in ἀπο(ω)ειπόντος,
- a genitive absolute is usually intransitive.

In light of what was mentioned before, I think that the example with φωνέω is better suited to explain the evolution from a genitive with a function in the sentence into a genitive absolute, but of course there is no single instance that can explain the rise/transition of a genitive construction into the genitive absolute.

3.9.5. The simplex φωνέω.

3.9.5.1. Metrical position of the simplex φωνέω.

⁷²² Gildersleeve *apud* Spieker 1885:312; Brugmann 1900:523-524, 1904:609-610; Kunst 1922 (especially on page 40); Schwyzer 1942; Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:398; Chantraine 1953:324-325; Ruppel 2013.

⁷²³ Kunst 1922:40; Edwards 1991:243; Keydana 1997:231.

This was not discussed in Ameis-Hentze 1896:7; Leaf 1902:323.

⁷²⁴ Seiler 1872:620; Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:393; Chantraine 1953:77; Langholf 2010:1097; Ruppel 2013:48-52.

⁷²⁵ Kunst 1922:40.

⁷²⁶ Ruppel 2013:48-51.

The formula φώνησέν τε always appears after the bucolic caesura, regardless whether it extends an existing speech introduction or not. Examples of a speech introduction extended by φώνησέν τε, are:

Speech introduction.	Bucolic caesura.	φωνέω formula.	Passage.
Ἑρμείαν, ποτὶ δὲ Πρίαμον φάτο	//	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 24,353
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρύαλος ἀπαμείβετο	//	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,140; 8,400
τὴν δ' αὖτ' Αὐτόλυκος ἀπαμείβετο	//	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,405
τὸν δ' αὖ Λαέρτης ἀπαμείβετο	//	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,327

In one instance, φώνησέν τε extended another speech introduction that was preceded by a speech conclusion:

Speech conclusion.	Speech introduction.	Bucolic caesura.	φωνέω formula.	Passage.
ὥς εἰπὼν	ἵπποισιν ἐκέκλετο	//	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 8,148

Other examples of φώνησέν τε are:

	Bucolic caesura.	φωνέω formula.	Passage.
αὐτὰρ ὃ ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ	//	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 1,333; 8,446
τὸν μὲν πὰρ πόδ' ἐὼν χαμάδις βάλε	//	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 7,190
καὶ δέπαϊ χρυσέῳ δειδίσκετο,	//	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,121

In introductions, the participle was always put in the 2nd foot and in the first half of the 3rd foot. When used in an introduction, it preceded the introduction:

1 st foot.	2 nd foot.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
καὶ σφεας	φωνήσας	ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα	occurring 5 times
καὶ σφεας	φωνήσας'	ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 15,145
καὶ μιν	φωνήσας	ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα	occurring 30 times

In the formulae quoted above the word σφεας is to be read with synizesis.

In conclusions, the participle is also put in the 2nd foot of the verse. In the nominative singular, it occupies the 2nd foot and the first half of the 3rd foot:

1 st foot.	2- 3a: participle.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὥς ἄρα	φωνήσας'	ἀπεβήσετο, τὸν δ' ἔλιπ' αὐτοῦ	<i>Iliad</i> 1,428
ὥς ἄρα	φωνήσας	προτέρω ἄγε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς	<i>Iliad</i> 9,199

When the participle is used in another case (gen. sg.) or in the plural, it occupies the 2nd foot, the first half of the 3rd foot and the first half of the second half foot of the 3rd foot (3b1).

1 st foot.	2 – 3b1: participle.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὦς ἄρα	φωνήσαντες	ἐς ἄρματα ποικίλα βάντες	<i>Iliad</i> 5,239
ὦς ἄρα	φωνήσαντος	Ἑρινύες ἔσχεθον αὐδήν	<i>Iliad</i> 19,418
ὦς ἄρα	φωνήσαντε	βάτην πρὸς δώματα καλά	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,361

The conclusion formula ὦς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν occupies the same position as the participle construction in the singular, but the participle conclusion can only be used in conclusions when the subject of the speaking is the same as that of the main verb of the sentence or serves a function in the next sentence, while ὦς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν can be used when the subject of the speech is not the same as that of the next sentence, but also when the subject is the same.

1- 3a: speech conclusion.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὦς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν	καὶ ἀπὸ ἔθεν ὑπόσ' αἰείρας	<i>Iliad</i> 10,465
ὦς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν	λῦσεν δ' ἀγορὴν αἰψηρήν	<i>Iliad</i> 19,276; <i>Odyssey</i> 2,257
ὦς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν	τοὶ δ' ἐφθέγγοντο καλεῦντες	<i>Odyssey</i> 10,229

3.9.5.2. The syntactic constructions of the simplex φωνέω.

The simplex φωνέω is used without overt arguments, as was seen in formulae such as φώνησέν τε and ὦς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν. In the following instances, it appears that the verb has a direct object, but the accusatives belong in all likelihood to the main verb.⁷²⁷

καὶ σφεας φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 5 times),

καὶ σφεας φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 15,145),

καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 30 times).

The accusatives are put before the participle because they are enclitic pronouns and have to appear in the 2nd position, even if this means that the enclitic is placed before a verb form to which it does not belong.⁷²⁸

3.9.5.3. Word order in the formulae of the simplex φωνέω.

As φωνέω is used without arguments, there is no OV or VO word order. The clitics are put in the expected 2nd position (the clitic is put in bold face and the verb is underlined):

ἱππείου δὲ θεὰ ζυγοῦ ἦψατο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 5,799),

ὦς **ἄρ'** ἐφώνησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ ἔθεν ὑπόσ' αἰείρας (*Iliad* 10,465).

3.9.5.4. The agreement between subject and verbal forms with the simplex φωνέω.

⁷²⁷ This had already been noticed by Doederlein 1858:164.

⁷²⁸ Wackernagel 1892:335.

In most instances, there is normal agreement between the subject and the verb form of the simplex φωνέω. In three instances, the participle appears in the dual, and in one instance, the dual and the plural are transmitted. The instances are discussed below.

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσαντε καθ' ἵππων αἵξαντε

χεῖρας τ' ἀλλήλων λαβέτην καὶ πιστώσαντο (*Iliad* 6,232-233).

These verses appear after Glaukos and Diomedes found out that they were guest friends because Bellerophon was a mutual acquaintance to both families. After that, they agreed not to fight each other anymore. As Glaukos and Diomedes are two persons, the use of the participles in the dual φωνήσαντε and αἵξαντε is syntactically justified. In the next verse, there are two finite verbs: the first one, λαβέτην, is a 3rd person dual form, but the second, πιστώσαντο, is a 3rd person plural form.

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσαντε παρέξ ὁδοῦ ἐν νεκύεσσι

κλινθήτην: ὃ δ' ἄρ' ὦκα παρέδραμεν ἀφραδίησιν (*Iliad* 10,349-350).

In this instance, Homer described how Odysseus and Diomedes finished speaking to each other, after they discovered the Trojan spy Dolon during their exploration mission in Trojan territory. The participle φωνήσαντε and the finite verb form κλινθήτην are both put in the dual.

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσαντε βάτην πρὸς δώματα καλά

οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἵκοντο δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας

εὔρον Τηλέμαχον καὶ βουκόλον ἠδὲ συβώτην

ταμνομένους κρέα πολλὰ κερῶντάς τ' αἶθοπα οἶνον. (*Odyssey* 24,361-364).

In this instance, Homer described how Odysseus and his father Laertes finished speaking to each other. After that, they went to their home and found Telemakhos and the swineherd Eumaios. The participle φωνήσαντε and the first finite verb form, βάτην, are in the 3rd person dual, while the other finite verbs (ἵκοντο and εὔρον) are in the 3rd person plural. In addition, the pronoun οἱ is also plural, although the dual form τῶ would have been possible.

In all the instances, the dual participle is grammatically justified. In two of the three instances, the first of a series of finite verb forms appears in the dual, while the others are in the third person plural. It is important to note that the dual finite forms that are combined with plural finite forms are not metrically necessary:

- χεῖρας τ' ἀλλήλων λαβέτην καὶ πιστώσαντο (*Iliad* 6,233) could have been replaced by χεῖρας τ' ἀλλήλων ἔλαβον καὶ πιστώσαντο.
- ὥς ἄρα φωνήσαντε βάτην πρὸς δώματα καλά (*Odyssey* 24,361) could have been replaced by ὥς ἄρα φωνήσαντες ἔβαν πρὸς δώματα καλά.

Therefore the use of the dual was a deliberate choice made by the poet and not something he had to do because of the metre. The absence of the augment in the dual forms also points to an archaism. It is true that duals and plurals are often used besides one another,⁷²⁹ that the dual had already become obsolete in Homer's contemporary Ionic (in contrast to Attic where it remained in use for a much longer time),⁷³⁰ as can be seen in certain hyperionised dual forms (cf. supra). The combination of nominal dual forms and participles in the dual with verbal forms in the plural or the dual and the plural does not indicate that the dual had become obsolete already,⁷³¹ but can be explained by the fact that the dual form is clearly marked, and the plural form is unmarked. If the dual is already expressed by the nominal and/or participle forms there is no need to repeat this feature again in the verbal form. If one verbal form is a dual form, the idea of duality is already present, and there is no need for the subsequent forms to express this idea again.⁷³² This is a form of *conjunction reduction* or *markedness reduction* in the number,⁷³³ as the dual form would be the marked form, while the third person plural forms were less clearly marked.

In the following instance, there are textual problems.

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσαντες ἐξ ἄρματα ποικίλα βάντες (*Iliad* 5,239).

In this specific instance, the participles appear in the plural, but in some manuscripts they are transmitted in the dual forms φωνήσαντε and βάντε. Most editors and commentaries quote the form in the plural,⁷³⁴ and only Leaf used the dual form.⁷³⁵ None of them discussed the problem, however. At first sight, the dual participles seem the *lectio difficilior*. Strunk pointed out that most manuscripts only agreed in the dual participle ἐμμεμαῶτ' in the next verse, although he quoted the verse in the dual.⁷³⁶ It is therefore possible that there was only one dual participle in the original text and that the two other participles were put in the plural. The

⁷²⁹ Chantraine 1953:25-26, Wachter 2000:102.

⁷³⁰ Meisterhans 1885:93-95; Kühner-Gerth 1898:20. Brugmann 1900:371 stated that Attic was the dialect where the dual survived the longest. The most detailed treatments of the Attic dual is Cuny 1906:78-87. See also Chantraine 1953:22 and Hackstein 1993:48-49.

⁷³¹ That the dual was already dead in the Homeric poems as well, was argued for by Monroe (1891:161-162), who stated that the dual was never mandatory and that the plural could always be used instead of it and by Cuny (1906:491-500) who argued that the dual only used as an artificial literary device. Wachter (2000:92) argued that the dual was still alive ("echt lebendig").

⁷³² This analysis goes back to Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1827, quoted in Strunk 1975:237. Strunk (1975:234-239) provided an analysis of Homeric and Attic (Xenophontic) instances to show that Greek did not need to mark the dual more than once.

⁷³³ Strunk 1975:234-239 (without using the phrase "conjunction reduction"); Fritz 2011:50-51, with reference to Kiparsky 1968 and Strunk 1975, used the term "conjunction reduction". I would personally prefer to use the term "markedness reduction", but this does not influence the argument.

⁷³⁴ Ameis-Hentze 1884:59, Kirk 1990:84; the editions by Ludwich, Allen and West all adopted the plural reading. The same reading was also chosen by Murray-Wyatt in the *Loeb Classical Library*.

⁷³⁵ Leaf 1900:210.

⁷³⁶ Strunk 1975:235-236.

use of only one dual form agrees with the explanation that the dual was marked and needed to be expressed only once.

3.9.5.5. Connection of the forms of the simplex φωνέω with the rest of the verse.

When the simplex φωνέω appears in the participle, there is no need to connect it to the rest of the verse, because it is connected already by the case from (except maybe in the case of the participle in the genitive). In the case of the finite verb forms, the formula φώνησέν τε is connected to the rest of the verse by the connecting particle τε. In the case of the speech conclusion formula ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, the connection to the rest of the verse is made by καί in two instances, and by δέ in the others. Examples are:

ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ ἔθεν ὑψόσ' ἀείρας (*Iliad* 10,465),

ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, λῦσεν δ' ἀγορὴν αἰψηρήν (*Odyssey* 2,257).

Both instances illustrate the difference in connection between καί and δέ (as was noted before on several occasions). In the first instance, the speaker finished speaking and proceeded to another action. In the second instance, the speaker is a suitor who finished speaking as well, but dissolved the Ithakan assembly after his speech. This is unexpected, because one would have expected Telemakhos to dissolve the assembly as he was (supposed to be) the one in command in Ithaka.

3.9.6. The compound προσφωνέω.

3.9.6.1. The use of the compound προσφωνέω in speech introductions and conclusions.

The verb προσφωνέω is attested 38 times, and occurs only in speech introductions. In two of those 38 verses, it is used in a negative introduction “they did not speak to him nor did they ask him anything”:

στήτην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 1,332),

ἦσθην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 8,445).

3.9.6.2. Metrical position of προσφωνέω.

The verb forms are always put before the bucolic caesura. The verb cannot be put at the beginning of the verse, and could only have been put at the end, if the form were contracted, but only the uncontracted forms προσεφώνεε and προσεφώνεον are attested and they cannot appear in the beginning or the end of the verse. Examples are:

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσεφώνεε Τεῦκρος ἀμύμων (*Iliad* 8,292).

αἶψα δὲ Πάτροκλον προσεφώνεεν ἐγγὺς ἐόντα (*Iliad* 9,201).

Many verses have the schema Pronoun – (Participle Extension) – Verb – Noun Epithet:

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὴν δὲ	χολωσαμένη	προσεφώνεε	δῖ' Ἀφροδίτη	<i>Iliad</i> 3,413
τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσεφώνεε	Τεῦκρος ἀμύμων	<i>Iliad</i> 8,292
τὸν δὲ	χολωσάμενος	προσεφώνεεν	Ἴριος ἀλήτης	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,25
τὸν δὲ	παριστάμενος	προσεφώνεε	φαίδιμος υἱός	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,243

3.9.6.3. The syntactic constructions of προσφωνέω.

The following constructions are attested.

1. The absolute construction (without person addressed) appears in

ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσεφώνεε δῖα θεάων (*Odyssey* 5,159).

2. The verb προσφωνέω is a compound with προσ- and is therefore constructed with the accusative of the person addressed. This occurs in 35 instances, in 1 instance the verb is used without arguments and in two instances, the verb appears with a double accusative. Examples of a single accusative are:

αὐτίκ' ἄρ' Ἥφαιστον προσεφώνεεν ὃν φίλον υἱόν (*Iliad* 21,378),

ἧ καὶ Πείραιον προσεφώνεε, πιστὸν ἐταῖρον (*Odyssey* 15,539).

3. When the subject of προσφωνέω is determined by a participle, the accusative can belong to both the participle as to προσφωνέω. This is the case in:

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσεφώνεε Τεῦκρος ἀμύμων (*Iliad* 8,292),

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσεφώνεε νήδυμος Ὕπνος (*Iliad* 14,242),

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσεφώνεε φαίδιμος υἱός (*Odyssey* 16,308).

In the following instance, accusative only belongs to προσφωνέω, because the verb παριστάμενος is usually constructed with the dative:

τὸν δὲ παριστάμενος προσεφώνεε φαίδιμος υἱός (*Odyssey* 24,243).

4. The double accusative appears in:

στήτην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 1,332),

ἦσθην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 8,445).

The double accusative can be explained by influence of the verb “they did not ask him anything” in the same verse, or can be an older construction “they did not say anything to him”. Both προσαυδάω and πρόσφημι could also be constructed with an accusative of the person and a neutral pronoun in the accusative. It is therefore also possible that this construction was expanded to προσφωνέω as well.

5. The verb προσφωνέω is never constructed with the dative of the person addressed nor with the dative/instrumental of the words spoken. In two verses the subject of προσφωνέω is expanded with the participle ἐεισάμενος or ἐεισαμένη “resembling, in the guise of”:

τῷ μιν ἐεισάμενος προσεφώνεε θεῖος ὄνειρος (*Iliad* 2,22),

τῇ μιν ἐεισαμένη προσεφώνεε δῖ' Ἀφροδίτη (*Iliad* 3,389).

In these cases, a dative and accusative appears besides one another: the dative τῷ belongs to the participle and the accusative μιν belongs to προσεφώνεε. As the accusative is the enclitic pronoun μιν, it is put in the second position of the verse, even if this means that the enclitic is placed before a verb form to which it does not belong.⁷³⁷

3.9.6.4. Word order in the formulae of προσφωνέω.

In the 37 instances where προσφωνέω is used with an object, the construction OV is used in 30 instances. Examples are:

Object.	Adjective.	Subject.	Verb.	Genitive.	Passage.
τὸν	προτέρη	ψυχῇ	προσεφώνεε	Πηλείωνος	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,23
Object.	Particles.	Subject.	Verb.	Genitive.	
τὸν	δ' αὖτε	ψυχῇ	προσεφώνεεν	Ἀμφιμέδοντος	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,120

Particles/adverbs.	Object.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
δὴ τότ' ἄρ'	Ἀλκίνοον	προσεφώνεε	δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,381

A special case are the introductions with a participle extension. The participle is put after the object, but before the verb.

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὴν δὲ	χολωσαμένη	προσεφώνεε	δῖ' Ἀφροδίτη	<i>Iliad</i> 3,413
τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσεφώνεε	Τεῦκρος ἀμύμων	<i>Iliad</i> 8,292
τὸν δὲ	χολωσάμενος	προσεφώνεεν	Ἴρος ἀλήτης	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,25
τὸν δὲ	παριστάμενος	προσεφώνεε	φαίδιμος υἱός	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,243

In several instances, the object is determined by an apposition following the verb. The word order is OV as well.

Adverbs/particles.	Object.	Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
αἶψα δ' ἄρ'	Αἴαντα	προσεφώνεεν	ἐγγὺς ἐόντα	<i>Iliad</i> 11,464
αὐτίκα δ'	Αἰνείαν	προσεφώνεεν	ἐγγὺς ἐόντα	<i>Iliad</i> 17,484
αὐτίκ' ἄρ'	Ἥφαιστον	προσεφώνεεν	ὄν φίλον υἱόν	<i>Iliad</i> 21,330; 21,378,

⁷³⁷ Wackernagel 1892:335; Kieckers 1926c:139.

αἶψα δ'	ἔδον πατέρα	προσεφώνεεν	ἐγγὺς ἔοντα	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,355
---------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-----------------------

In the instances with the double accusative, two enclitics are used as accusative objects. They appear in the second position of the sentence. First, the inanimate object *τι* appears and then the animate personal pronoun *μιν*.⁷³⁸

Verb.	Connector.	Inanimate object.	Animate object.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
στήτην,	οὐδέ	τί	μιν	προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο	<i>Iliad</i> 1,332
ἦσθην,	οὐδέ	τί	μιν	προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο	<i>Iliad</i> 8,445

In 7 instances the word order is VO:

	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
αὐτίκα δ' Ἰδομενεὺς	προσεφώνεε	Νέστορα δῖον	<i>Iliad</i> 11,510
ἦ, καὶ ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν	προσεφώνεεν	Ἔκτορα δῖον	<i>Iliad</i> 20,428
δὴ τότε Τηλέμαχος	προσεφώνεε	Νέστορος υἱόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,69
καὶ τότε Τηλέμαχος	προσεφώνεε	Νέστορος υἱόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,194
δὴ τότε Τηλέμαχος	προσεφώνεε	δῖον ὑφορβόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,56
εἰ μὴ Τηλέμαχος	προσεφώνεεν	δὼν πατέρ' αἶψα	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,221
δὴ τότε Τηλέμαχος	προσεφώνεεν	δὼν πατέρ' αἶψα	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,35

In these instances, the word order can be explained as formulaic inflection of the instances where the order was OV.

The VO order of

Subject.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
δὴ τότε Τηλέμαχος	προσεφώνεε	Νέστορος υἱόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,69
καὶ τότε Τηλέμαχος	προσεφώνεε	Νέστορος υἱόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,194

is a formulaic rework of those instances, where Νέστορος υἱὸς appeared at the end of the verse in the nominative, as in the following three examples:

Rest of the verse.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
ἤθελε Μηριόνης, μάλα δ'	ἤθελε	Νέστορος υἱός	<i>Iliad</i> 10,229

Rest of the verse.	Connector.	Subject.	Passage.
--------------------	------------	----------	----------

⁷³⁸ This had been noticed already by Monro 1891:335-338, before Wackernagel posited his famous Law. For the clitic chain see Wackernagel 1892:336; Delbrück 1900:51-53 (with reference to Monro); Brugmann 1904:682-683; Krisch 1990:73-74; Ruijgh 1990; Wills 1993; Watkins 1998:70.

ἄν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς πολύμητις,	ἔπειτα δὲ	Νέστορος υἱὸς	<i>Iliad</i> 23,755
---------------------------	-----------	---------------	---------------------

Verb.	Participle construction.	Subject.	Passage.
ἦ ῥα	καὶ ἵππον ἄγων	μεγαθύμου Νέστορος υἱὸς	<i>Iliad</i> 23,596

The VO order of

Subject.	Verb.	Object.	Passage.
δὴ τότε Τηλέμαχος	προσεφώνεε	δῖον ὑφορβόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,56

is a formulaic rework of a verse with δῖος ὑφορβός as subject at the end of the verse:

Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσεφώνεε	δῖος ὑφορβός	<i>Odyssey</i> 14,401

In the following two verses, the VO order was metrically motivated: the object could only be put in the position after the verse, because the subject ended in a short and a long vowel, and the verb ended in two short vowels:

αὐτίκα δ' Ἰδομενεὺς προσεφώνεε Νέστορα δῖον (*Iliad* 11,510),

ἦ, καὶ ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσεφώνεεν Ἴκτορα δῖον (*Iliad* 20,428).

In the formula προσεφώνεεν ὃν πατέρ' αἶψα (*Odyssey* 16,221; 19,35) the word order is highly remarkable:⁷³⁹ the adverb αἶψα “quick, in a hurry” appears 112 times in Homer, and in only three verses it is put at the absolute end of the verse. This indicates that the word order in this verse is highly marked. As such, the VO order can be interpreted in that sense as well: the emphasis lies on the quick speaking to his father.

In many instances, the object is put before the verb, but is determined by an apposition in the accusative, which is put after the verb. Examples are the participle construction ἐγγὺς ἐόντα is used 6 times, and is always put after the verb:⁷⁴⁰

	Object.	Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
αἶψα δ' ἄρ'	Αἴαντα	προσεφώνεεν	ἐγγὺς ἐόντα	<i>Iliad</i> 11,464
αἶψα δὲ	Πάτροκλον	προσεφώνεεν	ἐγγὺς ἐόντα	<i>Iliad</i> 9,201
αὐτίκα δ'	Ἥφαιστον	προσεφώνεεν	ὃν φίλον υἱόν	<i>Iliad</i> 21,330
αἶψα δ'	ἐὼν πατέρα	προσεφώνεεν	ἐγγὺς ἐόντα	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,355
αἶψα δὲ	Τηλέμαχον	προσεφώνεεν	ὃν φίλον υἱόν	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,505

⁷³⁹ Ameis – Hentze 1900b:109, Hoekstra 1989:276.

⁷⁴⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 9,201; 11,346; 11,464 and 17,484, and *Odyssey* 22,163 and 22,355.

In one instance there is a feminine participle construction as apposition after the verb:

	Object.	Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
	ὀχθήσας	ἄλοχον	προσεφώνεε	κέδν' εἰδυῖαν
				<i>Odyssey</i> 23,182

A genitive belonging to the subject of προσφώνέω is often put after the verb. This is especially the case in the description of the ghosts in the Underworld. Examples are:

Object.		Verb.	Genitive.	Passage.
τὸν	προτέρη ψυχῇ	προσεφώνεε	Πηλεΐωνος	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,23
τὸν	δ' αὖτε ψυχῇ	προσεφώνεεν	Ἀμφιμέδοντος	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,120

3.9.6.5. Agreement between verb and subject with προσφώνέω.

In 36 instances, the number of the verb form agrees with the number of the subject. In two instances, however, the 3rd plural form προσεφώνεον is used with a dual. In the two instances the first verbal form is put in the dual, as are the participles, but the verbs following the first dual form are put in the plural (as was observed with the simplex as well).

τὼ μὲν ταρβήσαντε καὶ αἰδομένω βασιλῆα

στήτην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 1,331-332).

In these verses, Homer described how the two heralds reluctantly went to Akhilleus's tent to inform him that they had to take away Briseis from him. The pronoun and participles appear in the dual, as does the first finite verb form, στήτην. The two following finite verbs are put in the plural.

αἱ δ' οἶαι Διὸς ἀμφὶς Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη

ἦσθην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 8,444-445).

In this verse, Homer described how Athene and Here sat down and did not speak back to Zeus, after he had decreed again that no god should help the Greeks and that the Trojans would get the upper hand until Akhilleus received the treatment he deserved. The first finite verbal form, ἦσθην, appears in the dual, but the two others are in the plural. Meillet explained the use of the plural in these two instances by the formulaic nature of οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο: this was an old formula in the 3rd person plural, and was used here because more than one person was referred to.⁷⁴¹ This is possible, but it is more likely that the difference in number can be explained by the conjunction reduction as argued for by

⁷⁴¹ Meillet 1922b:158-160.

Strunk and Fritz (cf. *supra*): the first finite verb form expresses the duality and is marked, while the others are no longer marked for duality and therefore appear in the plural.

3.9.6.6. Connection of προσφώνέω to the rest of the verse.

The verb προσφώνέω is mostly the only finite verb form in the verse. In that case, there is no connection needed with the rest of the verse. In only three instances, there are other finite verbs in the verse. In two instances, προσφώνέω is linked by οὐδέ to the other finite verbs:

Verb 1.	Connector 1.	Objects.	Verb 2.	Connector 2.	Verb 3.	Passage.
στήτην,	οὐδέ	τί μιν	προσεφώνεον	οὐδ'	ἔρέοντο	<i>Iliad</i> 1,332
ἦσθην,	οὐδέ	τί μιν	προσεφώνεον	οὐδ'	ἔρέοντο	<i>Iliad</i> 8,445

In the other instance, the link between προσφώνέω and the other verb is made by καί:

Verb 1.	Connector.	Participle.	Verb 2	Object.	Passage.
ἦ,	καί	ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν	προσεφώνεεν	Ἕκτορα δῖον	<i>Iliad</i> 20,428

3.9.7. The compound μεταφώνέω.

3.9.7.1. Metrical position of the μεταφώνέω.

The attested forms are μετεφώνεον, μετεφώνεε, μετεφώνεεν and in one instance μετεφώνει.

The verbal forms are always put in the 3b1-4 and appear before the bucolic caesura:

Participle construction.	3b1: verb form.	Bucolic caesura.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
στάς ἐν μέσσοισιν	μετεφώνεεν	//	ἡπύτα κῆρυξ	<i>Iliad</i> 7,384
τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος	μετεφώνεεν	//	ἱππότη Νέστωρ	<i>Iliad</i> 9,52
ἡδὺ δ' ἄρ' ἐκγελάσας	μετεφώνει	//	μνηστήρεσσιν	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,35

A conclusion and an introduction with μεταφώνέω are combined in the same verse in:

Speech conclusion.		3b1: verb form.	Bucolic caesura.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
ὧς ἔφην,	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ	μετεφώνεον	//	ἀχνύμενος κῆρ	<i>Odyssey</i> 10,67

The forms μετεφώνεον, μετεφώνεε and μετεφώνεεν cannot be put at the end of the verse. The form μετεφώνει, on the other hand, could have been put at the verse final position, because ἡδὺ δ' ἄρ' ἐκγελάσας μνηστήρεσσιν μετεφώνει would have fit the verse as well.

3.9.7.2. The syntactic constructions of μεταφώνέω.

The compound μεταφώνέω is used without arguments in one instance:

ὧς ἔφην, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μετεφώνεον ἀχνύμενος κῆρ (*Odyssey* 10,67).

Even in this instance, the use of the verb μεταφωνέω is justified, because Odysseus is speaking towards his comrades and they form a large group. This explains why μετα- compounds are used when he speaks to his men, and προσ- compounds when he engages in a dialogue with only one or two persons.

In all other instances the reference to a (large) group is present in the verse. In one instance, it is combined with a verb that has a prepositional construction alongside it:

στὰς ἐν μέσσοισιν μετεφώνεεν ἡπύτα κῆρυξ (*Iliad* 7,384).

In this case, the dative has locative sense for both verbs: “standing among them, the loud-voiced herald spoke (to them)”. The prepositional phrase ἐν μέσσοισιν implies that a larger group is present. A similar construction with a locative dative that belongs both to the participle as to the main verb, can be found in:

τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετεφώνεεν ἱππότης Νέστωρ (*Iliad* 9,52).

In this verse, the dative belongs both to ἀνιστάμενος “standing up before/to/among them” as to μετεφώνεεν “speaking among them”. This is the original locative use of the dative in compounds with μετά.

In the other instances, there is only one verb in the verse, and the dative belongs to the compound and more specifically to the preposition μετά. Examples are:

ὥς ὁ βαρὺ στενάχων μετεφώνεε Μυρμιδόνεσσιν (*Iliad* 18,323),

τοῖσιν δ' Εὐρύμαχος μετεφώνεε δεύτερον αὖτις (*Odyssey* 22,69).

3.9.7.3. The word order with μεταφωνέω.

There are only 8 instances of the compound μεταφωνέω attested. In 1 instance, the verb is used without arguments, in 3 instances there is OV word order and in 4 cases the word order is VO. This can be explained by the fact that the persons addressed with the compound μεταφωνέω are the names of people or groups such as Μυρμιδόνεσσιν, Φαιήκεσσι, μνηστήρεσσιν of which the metrical structure that can only be put at the beginning of a foot, and by the fact that the verbal forms μετεφώνεον, μετεφώνεε and μετεφώνεεν could not be put at the end of the verse. In one instance, the verse with VO could have had OV without any metrical problem. This is the case in ἡδὺ δ' ἄρ' ἐκγελάσας μετεφώνει μνηστήρεσσιν (*Odyssey* 18,35), where the verb and the object could have easily switched places.

3.9.7.4. Connection of μεταφωνέω with the rest of the verse.

The compound μεταφώνέω always occupies the entire verse, but is extended by a participle in 5 of the 8 occurrences.⁷⁴² There is therefore no need to connect the verb to the rest of the verse. Examples of the participle extension are:

ὥς ὁ βαρὺ στενάχων μετεφώνεε Μυρμιδόνεσσιν (*Iliad* 18,323),
 ἦδὺ δ' ἄρ' ἐκγελάσας μετεφώνει μνηστήρεσσιν (*Odyssey* 18,35).

3.9.11. The etymology of φωνέω: is the oldest form φωνέω or φώνᾱμι?

The verb φωνέω is related to the root $*b^heh_2$,⁷⁴³ and represents the *o* grade of this root. The verb is a derivation from the noun φωνή, made with the old suffix $*-neh_2$ and the *o* grade of the root. Recently, the inherited nature of this word was (indirectly) doubted by Tichy, who replaced it by ὥψ in the second chant of her *Uriliad*.⁷⁴⁴ There is, however, no reason for this replacement, because the root is old and attested in almost many different daughter languages, and also because the building type is old as well.⁷⁴⁵ In addition, φωνή and ὥψ are not synonyms: the former is only used for humans, while the latter can be used for animals, gods and gods alike.⁷⁴⁶ The derivation in έω from an original ᾱ stem, is remarkable. Two explanations have been given:

- The first explanation is that the verb was initially an -άω derivative, φωνάω or φώνᾱμι in the Aeolic form, and that the Ionic aorist φώνησε contained an older $*φώνᾱσε$.⁷⁴⁷ As evidence for this evolution Forssman pointed to the Pindaric aorist φώνᾱσε δ'.⁷⁴⁸ During the transition of the Aeolic epic phase into the Ionic phase, this form became φώνησε and was reinterpreted as the aorist of an έω verb. A factor that could have accelerated the transition of the form in in άω into έω is that έω derivatives were much more common.⁷⁴⁹ Forssman concluded that the original meaning of the simplex was “raise one’s voice”, and that the simplex and compounds acquired the meaning “speak, address” only later.⁷⁵⁰

⁷⁴² The instances are *Iliad* 7,384; 9,52 and 18,323, and *Odyssey* 16,354 and 18,35.

⁷⁴³ According to Chantraine (1968-1974:1237), Curtius was the first to state this (Curtius 1873:297-298), but already Doederlein 1858:164 had noticed this. For a discussion on $*b^heh_2$, one is referred to the subchapter on φημί. Pedersen 1905:403 and Frisk 1970:1058-1059 denied the link between φωνέω and φημί, but this is difficult to maintain.

⁷⁴⁴ Tichy 2010:23.

⁷⁴⁵ Olav Hackstein, lecture at the LMU Munich, June 11th 2013.

⁷⁴⁶ Doederlein 1858:164; Seiler 1872:619; Ebeling 1885b:479; Krapp 1966:23; LSJ *sub uoce*.

⁷⁴⁷ Forssman 1966:79-83. See also Frisk 1970:1058-1059 and Chantraine 1968-1974:1237. Forssman’s analysis was recently followed by O’Sullivan 2010b:1073. That φώνᾱσε was the older form, had been suggested already by Schmidt 1889:334.

⁷⁴⁸ Forssman 1966:79-83, Führer 1967:21-22.

⁷⁴⁹ Beekes 2010:1601-1602.

⁷⁵⁰ Forssman 1966:82-83.

- Another explanation is that the derivation in *έω* was based on the adjectives in *-φωνος* and not on the noun *φωνή* directly.⁷⁵¹

Important in this discussion are the forms of *φωνέω* attested in Pindar. In what follows, the Pindaric evidence will be briefly analysed. The Pindaric formula *φώνᾱσε δ'* (*Nemean* 10,76; *Olympian* 13,67) is the exact equivalent of the Homeric *φώνησέν τε*.⁷⁵² Several scholars doubted the inherited nature of the vocalism in Pindar: already Ahrens considered the Pindaric form a backformation on *φωνά*.⁷⁵³ Leumann pointed to forms such as *πονῶθῃ* and concluded therefore that *φώνᾱσε δ'* had to be a Hyperdorism as well.⁷⁵⁴ Strunk, on the other hand, did not consider this form an Hyperdorism, but interpreted it as a genuine creation of Pindar's dialect, besides the "correct" and inherited forms such as *ἀφωνήτω* in *Pythian* 4,237 and the participle *φωνήσας* in *Isthmian* 6,51.⁷⁵⁵ I believe that the "correct" forms are not conclusive enough to rule out that the original verb was an **eh₂* derivation. The Pindaric passages with the vocalism in *η* are the following:

ἔϋξεν δ' ἀφωνήτω περ ἔμπας ἄχει (Pindar, *Pythian* 4, 237).

The adjective *ἀφώνητος* is rare, as it is only used in Pindar here and in Sophokles, *Oedipus in Colonus* 1283.⁷⁵⁶ The vocalism in *η* is not necessarily an indication against the inherited nature of the **eh₂* derivation. It is possible that Pindar was influenced by the Homeric vocalism when creating this neologism. Such influences could be observed in Sappho and Alkaios as well (cf. *supra*).

εἶπέν τε φωνήσας ἄτε μάντις ἀνήρ (Pindar, *Isthmian* 6,51).

The speech introduction in this form is not found in Homer, as *ἔειπον* is not combined with *φωνήσας* in speech introductions nor in conclusions. Pindar extended the introduction,⁷⁵⁷ and combined two Homeric features, namely the sequence *εἶπέ τε* and the participle *φωνήσας*. It is therefore likely to be a Pindaric imitation and adaptation of the Homeric formula *εἶπέ τε μῦθον* and the use of *φωνήσας* in speech introductions. In order to do, Pindar adapted the vocalism of the Homeric participle *φωνήσας* into the one of his Aeolic dialect.⁷⁵⁸

⁷⁵¹ Beekes 1969:167-168; this possibility was also mentioned in Chantraine 1968-1974:1237. Tucker 1990:167-168 agreed with this explanation.

⁷⁵² Führer 1967:21-22.

⁷⁵³ Ahrens 1843b:148; Schwyzer 1939:720.

⁷⁵⁴ Leumann 1950:66.

⁷⁵⁵ Strunk 1964:169.

⁷⁵⁶ Braswell 1988:324.

⁷⁵⁷ Führer 1967:21.

⁷⁵⁸ This was not discussed in Nagy 1994, nor in the other commentaries on Pindar, namely Fennell 1889; Schröder 1922; Bundy 1962; Burton 1962; Bowra 1964; Verdenius 1987 and 1988.

Returning to Homer, there are several elements that indicate that the simplex was an old verb and that it was indeed a derivation from φωνή. As simplex, the verb φωνέω is attested much more in the aorist than in the present.⁷⁵⁹ This is the case for Homer as well: the oldest use of the simplex was the formula φώνησέν τε. In half of the instances it occurred with another *verbum dicendi* and meant “raise the voice”. The inherited nature of this formula is in my opinion proved by the fact that both Homer and Pindar used this formula in their old and (syntactically motivated) unaugmented form. It is only later that φωνέω was reinterpreted as a *verbum dicendi* in Homer. The reinterpretation as -έω verb possibly occurred because έω verbs were much more common than άω verbs and because the formula φώνησέν τε could be the aorist of an έω or an άω verb. The transition happened during the transition of an Aeolic into an Ionic stage and was facilitated by the fact that there were no present indicative forms attested, contrary to e.g. βοάω or τιμάω. An evolution from “raise the voice” into “speak, address” is not uncommon. In a later stage the verb was used as verb in introductions and conclusions, and in another stage the verb was compounded. The following chronology can thus be given:⁷⁶⁰

1. The original verb was *φώνāμι, an athematic derivation of an *eh₂ noun and was used only in the formula *φώνāσέν τε “and raised his voice”. The augment use was still determined by syntactic and semantic rules, and this prevented the formula from being augmented. In this stage, the aorist forms of φωνέω were used as extension to existing speech introductions.
2. The formula φώνησέν τε was reinterpreted as meaning “he spoke” and the verb was used in speech introductions and conclusions.
3. The epic tradition “switched” from Aeolic into Ionic.
4. The form φώνāσε was reformed into φώνησε. Since athematic inflections of denominative verbs did not exist in Ionic, the inflection became thematic. As έω denominatives were more common than άω verbs and there were no present forms attested, the form φώνησε was interpreted as an aorist from φωνέω. This transition was facilitated by the fact that there were no present indicative forms attested, contrary to e.g. βοάω or τιμάω. In addition, it was an Ionic peculiarity that many άω verbs switched their conjugation (even in the present) to the έω type.⁷⁶¹ As such, the evolution of φωνέω is not uncommon.

⁷⁵⁹ Tucker 1990:106 and 190.

⁷⁶⁰ See already Forssman 1966:79-83.

⁷⁶¹ Kühner-Blass 1892:149.

5. The meaning of φώνησέν τε and φωνήσας was reinterpreted as “and he spoke” and “having spoken”. As a result, φωνέω was considered a speech introduction verb as well. Consequently, conclusions such as ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας and ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν were created.

6. As many of the other verbs used in speech introductions were compounded with προσ or μετα, the same compounds were created for φωνέω, namely προσφωνέω and μεταφωνέω. Since speech introductions verbs were used more often in the imperfect than in the aorist, the newly created verbs προσφωνέω and μεταφωνέω were used in the imperfect as well.

3.9.12. Conclusion.

This chapter discussed the use of φωνέω and its compounds in speech introductions and conclusions. The simplex is used in both introductions and conclusions, while the compounds only occur in introductions: as the compounds are compounded with προσ- and μετα-, they can only occur in the introductions, because the preverbs point at the persons addressed. In the introductions, the finite verb is used in the formula φώνησέν τε, while the participle appears in introductions with another finite verb form of a *verbum dicendi*. In the conclusions the participle and the finite verb form are used: in all instances, the subject of the speaking is also the subject of the other verb form in the verse. The aorist is used with the simplex, because the original meaning was “raise the voice”. The compounds are used in the imperfect, because they are used in the meaning “address” and have durative meaning. the use of the tenses and the augment in discussed in chapter 5 and 6 respectively. The dual is used with φωνέω when two persons have spoken. The word order is OV, and in the cases where VO occurs, it is either metrically required or a formulaic inflection of an original OV formula. The dual is combined with other verbal forms in the plural. This is not a sign that the dual was regressing, but can be explained by the markedness of the dual: if one verbal form is already marked for duality, the others do not need to indicate it anymore.

Chapter 4. “Answer”.

4.1. The etymology of ἀμείβομαι.⁷⁶²

The Greek verb ἀμείβομαι appears both in the active as well in the middle, and is derived from the root **h₂mei-* “exchange”. This root is attested in many languages, and this can be explained by the importance of exchanging goods and gifts in the Indo-European society.⁷⁶³ The Greek word is related to Latin *migrare* “exchange (the road), exchange place”, hence “go, move”,⁷⁶⁴ and this meaning can also be found in the Greek word.⁷⁶⁵ Both verbs are constructed with a **g^w* suffix, which is rare and therefore the link is doubted by some.⁷⁶⁶ Chantraine stated that labial suffixes were not used in nominal nor verbal derivation.⁷⁶⁷ As a **g^w* suffix is very uncommon, one could theoretically also argue for a *b* suffix,⁷⁶⁸ but that is at least equally rare.

Assuming two different suffixes, as was done in Ernout-Meillet, cannot be ruled out,⁷⁶⁹ but in that case the link between Latin *migrare* and Greek ἀμείβομαι would have to be given up.

4.2. The meaning of ἀμείβομαι and its compounds in speech introductions and conclusions.

The verb ἀμείβομαι and the compound ἀπαμείβομαι are only used in the middle forms in speech introductions and conclusions. The meaning of the active ἀμείβω was “exchange something with someone”, as is the meaning of most of the compounds. In the middle, the exchanging was considered to be in one’s own interest. The original meaning can be seen in the following examples, where actual objects had been exchanged:

ὃς πρὸς Τυδείδην Διομήδεα τεύχε' ἄμειβε (*Iliad* 6,235- active),

τῷ κέν σ' εὖ δώροισιν ἀμειψάμενος ἀπέπεμψε (*Odyssey* 24,285 - middle).

The middle verb was also used in combination with words. The meaning “exchanging words” became then “answer, speak back”. Viechnicki explained the meaning “answer” by assuming that words were a commodity like everything else, and thus could be exchanged.⁷⁷⁰ The only problem with that explanation is the construction: in the meaning “exchange” the verb is

⁷⁶² The word has been studied by Fingerle 1939:335-337; Fournier 1946b (but not in 1946a); Edwards 1966 and 1969; Erbse 1979a; Kelly 2007:176 -180 and 281-285.

⁷⁶³ Benveniste 1969:96-101, 186-187; Viechnicki 1994:117-122, 125-131.

⁷⁶⁴ Walter 1862:430; Prellwitz 1892:19; Frisk 1960:90; Chantraine 1968-1974:73-74; Erbse 1979a:619; Schrijver 1991:20; Viechnicki 1994:129-130; de Vaan 2008:379; Beekes 2010:85-86.

⁷⁶⁵ Erbse 1979a:622.

⁷⁶⁶ Beekes 1969:43 is skeptical, but does not exclude the link. Chantraine 1968-1974:73-74 pointed out that the link was difficult. Similar skepticism was found in Viechnicki 1994:131, de Vaan 2008:379, and Beekes 2010:86, but none of them rejected the link.

⁷⁶⁷ Chantraine 1933:260, but he did not specifically discuss ἀμείβω nor ἀμειβή.

⁷⁶⁸ Beekes 1969:43, Viechnicki 1994:129

⁷⁶⁹ Ernout-Meillet 1967:402.

⁷⁷⁰ Viechnicki 1994:121, see also Beck 2005:19-20.

constructed with a dative of the person and an accusative of the object, while “answer” has the accusative of the person and the dative of the words.⁷⁷¹ This seems to indicate that the verb ἀμείβομαι had already acquired the meaning “answer” before Homer and that the verb had become transitive in that meaning.⁷⁷² As Viechnicki pointed out, the meaning “answer” became the one that was used the most in Classical times.⁷⁷³ Examples where the words are mentioned, are:

τὸν δ' Ἑλένη μύθοισιν ἀμείβετο δῖα γυναικῶν (*Iliad* 3,171),
 νῶϊ μὲν ὥς ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβομένῳ στυγεροῖσιν (*Odyssey* 11,81),
 καὶ τότε δὴ μ' ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπεν (*Odyssey* 17,123).

In the last stage, the words were left out and the verb just meant “answer”.⁷⁷⁴ The meaning “answer, speak back” is also attested outside speech introductions. Examples of a meaning “answer” outside speech introductions and conclusions are:

ὄφρα τί μιν προτιείποι ἀμειβόμενος ἐπέεσσιν (*Iliad* 22,329),
 Τηλέμαχον μύθοισιν ἀμείψασθαι χαλεποῖσιν (*Odyssey* 2,83),
 ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ θῆν μοι καὶ ἀμείψασθαι θέμις ἐστίν (*Odyssey* 16,91),
 Μοῦσαι δ' ἐννέα πᾶσαι ἀμειβόμεναι ὅπῃ καλῇ (*Odyssey* 24,60).

The verb ἀμείβομαι is not the only verb that can be used in the meaning “answer, reply”, as also προσέφη, προσεφώνεε and ἀντίον ἤῤα can so be used, but these verbs can also be used in other meanings, while the only meaning of ἀμείβομαι in speech introductions is “answer”.⁷⁷⁵

The simplex is used in 142 speech introductions and in 1 conclusion, and the compound ἀπαμείβομαι in 123 introductions. Both verbs are used in finite verb forms and in the participle, and have the same meaning “answer, speak back”. The participles ἀμειβόμενος and ἀπαμειβόμενος indicate that the speaking was an answer to something that was said before and are therefore used in dialogues, especially when one person answers or reacts to the words or action of another character. The participle of the simplex ἀμείβομαι is used 42 times in speech introductions,⁷⁷⁶ and that of the compound ἀπαμείβομαι appears 111 times.⁷⁷⁷

⁷⁷¹ Erbse 1979a:620-622.

⁷⁷² Erbse 1979a:621-622.

⁷⁷³ Viechnicki 1994:124.

⁷⁷⁴ Erbse 1979a.

⁷⁷⁵ Beck 2005:19-20.

⁷⁷⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 3,437; 7,356; 15,48; 17,33; 23,557; 23,794 and *Odyssey* 2,84; 4,234; 4,375; 4,394; 4,464; 4,471; 4,484; 4,491; 4,554; 4,706; 5,96; 8,235; 9,258; 9,522; 10,270; 10,336; 10,382; 11,79; 11,138; 11,145; 11,163; 11,404; 11,435; 11,440; 11,462; 11,477; 11,487; 11,504; 16,193; 17,123; 19,214; 19,252; 21,206; 22,44; 24,350.

⁷⁷⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 1,84; 1,130; 1,215; 1,285; 1,560; 2,369; 4,188; 5,764; 5,814; 6,520; 7,283; 8,292; 8,469; 9,307; 9,606; 9,643; 10,42; 10,382; 10,423; 10,554; 11,316; 11,607; 13,72; 14,242; 14,312; 14,341;

The participle of the simplex can be combined with προσέειπον or προσήυδα:

ἐξαὔτις μύθοισιν ἀμειβομένη προσέειπεν (*Odyssey* 4,234),

καί μιν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 15,48; 23,557).

The participle of the compound ἀπαμειβομαι is usually, but not exclusively, combined with προσέφη:

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (3 instances),⁷⁷⁸

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσεφώνεε νήδυμος Ὕπνος (*Iliad* 14,242),

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνείας ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέειπε (*Iliad* 20,86).

The finite verb forms are always used in the meaning “answer”. The compound ἀπαμειβομαι is always combined with another verb of speaking, while the simplex is used on its own. In the following instance, the finite verb form is expanded by a participle construction:

ὣς ἐφάμην, ὃ δέ μ' οἰμώξας ἡμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 9,506; 11,59).

This verse shows that ἀμειβομαι, which was initially used as a participle extension to other speech introductions, could be expanded itself by a participle construction as soon as it was used in the finite forms. Such an expansion could also be seen with ἐκέκλετο and αὖω.

4.3. The difference between the simplex ἀμειβομαι and the compound ἀπαμειβομαι.

The question is whether there are differences between the simplex and compound in meaning and use. The participle of both verbs is used in combination with other *verba dicendi*. In almost all cases, the finite verb of the introduction is a compound with προσ-.⁷⁷⁹ Two differences between simplex and compound have been suggested.

1. Drewitt observed that the simplex was used more often in the *Iliad*, while the compound was used predominantly in the *Odyssey*, and stated that that was the difference between the verbs.⁷⁸⁰

2. Kelly noted that ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη and ἡμείβετο were not equivalent: the former indicated a disagreement between speaker and audience, which was not found in ἀμειβομαι,⁷⁸¹ while the latter indicated emotional perturbation and/or the remembrance of past injury, but

18,187; 19,145; 19,154; 19,198; 19,215; 20,19; 20,86; 20,199; 21,222; 22,182; 23,93; 24,64; 24,138; 24,299 and *Odyssey* 1,63; 4,147; 4,168; 4,203; 4,265; 4,824; 4,835; 5,21; 5,214; 7,207; 7,240; 7,302; 8,152; 8,412; 8,463; 9,1; 9,409; 11,354; 11,377; 12,384; 13,139; 13,153; 13,311; 13,382; 13,416; 14,55; 14,165; 14,191; 14,360; 14,390; 14,401; 14,442; 14,507; 15,380; 16,60; 16,135; 16,201; 16,308; 16,464; 17,16; 17,192; 17,272; 17,311; 17,353; 17,380; 17,405; 17,512; 17,579; 18,124; 18,365; 19,41; 19,106; 19,164; 19,220; 19,261; 19,335; 19,382; 19,499; 19,554; 19,582; 20,36; 20,168; 20,226; 22,105; 22,170; 22,430; 22,490; 23,129; 23,263; 24,302; 24,330 and 24,356.

⁷⁷⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 1,215; 18,187 and 24,138.

⁷⁷⁹ The only exception is *Odyssey* 9,409.

⁷⁸⁰ Drewitt 1912a:57.

⁷⁸¹ Kelly 2007:281-285.

did not necessarily indicate that the addressee would disagree with what was going to be said.⁷⁸²

Kelly's arguments will be addressed first. His distinction is not correct in my opinion because both formulae are used interchangeably in contexts with or without disagreement and hostility:

a) first of all, both formulae (i.e. ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη and ἡμείβετο) are used in the heated and angry exchanges between Akhilleus and Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1.

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 1,130),

τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 1,172),

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 1,285),

τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑποβλήδην ἡμείβετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 1,292).

As can be seen, the poet seems to vary between them without a clear semantic difference.

b) Secondly, both formulae are also used in the (very unfriendly) discussion between Here and Zeus about Thetis's request to Zeus:

τὴν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*Iliad* 1,544)

τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη (*Iliad* 1,551),

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς (*Iliad* 1,560).

As was the case with the other formulae, it is difficult to distinguish between the formulae in this context, as both Here and Zeus are angry with one another. The discussion between them is concluded by the following verses, which can only indicate a strong disagreement and a hostile atmosphere:

ὣς ἔφατ' ἔδδεισεν δὲ βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη,

καί ῥ' ἀκέουσα καθῆστο ἐπιγνάμψασα φίλον κῆρ (*Iliad* 1,568-569).

c) Thirdly, both formulae are used in the conversation between Laertes and Odysseus at the end of *Odyssey* 24. There is no disagreement nor is there injury inflicted by one of the two characters. Examples are:

τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα πατὴρ κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβων (*Odyssey* 24,280),

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (*Odyssey* 24,302).

d) Moreover, in the following instances of ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη there is no disagreement between speaker and addressee either:

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 1,84).

⁷⁸² Kelly 2007:176-180.

After Kalkhas asked for protection against “a strong ruler”, Akhilleus did not disagree but responded positively to his request for protection. As such, there is no conflict nor disagreement between the two characters.

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 2,369).

In this instance Agamemnon stated that he agreed with Nestor and complimented him for his wise and useful advice.

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 24,138).

This instance introduced the speech in which Akhilleus agreed with his mother to release Hektor's body.

e) In the following instances of ἡμείβετο a clear disagreement between speaker and addressee can be discerned:

αὐτίκα δ' Εὐρύλοχος στυγερῶ μ' ἡμείβετο μῦθῳ (*Odyssey* 12,278)

This verse is pronounced by Eurylokhos, one of Odysseus's men. He was angry and disagreed with Odysseus's order not to eat the cattle of the Sun God.

f) Edwards showed that the use of ἡμείβετο and ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη was also determined by the character: for Zeus, Akhilleus, Eumaios and Odysseus the formula ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη was used much more often than ἡμείβετο, while for Priam ἡμείβετο was used.⁷⁸³ As such, it seems that the metre played a role as well.

Thus, it is clear that Kelly's distinction is not valid.

I now turn to Drewitt's suggestion that the difference between simplex and compound was a difference between *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. First, the figures for the simplex will be given:

Finite verb form.	Total instances.	Attestations in the <i>Iliad</i> .	Attestation in the <i>Odyssey</i> .
ἡμείβετ(ο)	78 times.	49 times.	29 times.
ἀμείβετ(ο)	19 times.	5 times.	14 times.
ἡμείψατο	1 instance.	1 instance.	None.
ἀμείψατο	1 instance.	1 instance.	None.
Simplex total.	99 instances.	56 instances.	43 instances.

The figures for the compound ἀπαμείβομαι are:

Finite verb form.	Total instances.	Attestations in the <i>Iliad</i> .	Attestation in the <i>Odyssey</i> .
ἀπαμείβετο	12 instances.	1 instance.	11 attestations.

⁷⁸³ Edwards 1969, especially 83-84.

At first, this seems to confirm Drewitt's hypothesis, but the biggest difference is not the number of attestations in the *Iliad* versus the *Odyssey*, but the way they are used in the introductions. The following differences can be observed.

1. The simplex is used much more often as a finite verb and is mostly used in introductions without being linked to other verbs of speaking (the verb is underlined):

τὸν δ' Ἑλένη τανύπεπλος ἀμείβετο δῖα γυναικῶν (*Iliad* 3,228),

τὴν δ' ἡμείβειτ' ἔπειτα θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη (*Iliad* 15,92),

τὸν δ' ἡμείβειτ' ἔπειτα περίφρων Πηνελόπεια (*Odyssey* 18,250; 19,123).

In only three instances, the simplex is combined with another verb of speaking (the *verba dicendi* are put in bold face):

ὣς φάτο, **κώκυσεν** δὲ γυνή καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ (*Iliad* 24,200),

τὸν δ' αὖτε **προσέειπε** γυνή καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 15,434),

τοῖς δ' αὖτις **μετέειπε** γυνή καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 15,439).

The finite verb forms of compound ἀπαμείβομαι never introduce a speech introduction by themselves, and are always combined with another verb of speaking:

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνείας **ἀπαμείβετο** φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 20,199- ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε occurs 11 times),⁷⁸⁴

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρύαλος **ἀπαμείβετο** νείκεσέ τ' ἄντην (*Odyssey* 8,158).

The verb ἀπαμείβομαι is never used as the only *verbum dicendi* in speech introductions. This can be seen in the following examples, where introductions with another *verbum dicendi* and the participle of ἀπαμείβομαι appear as a formulaic variation of a construction of two finite verbs. The verse

Rest of verse.	Participle.	Finite verb form.	Passage.
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνείας	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Iliad</i> 20,86

is reworked into an introduction with two finite verb forms in

Rest of verse.	Finite verb 1.	Finite verb 2.	Passage.
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνείας	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 20,199

The verse

Rest of verse.	Participle.	Finite verb form.	Passage.
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀντίνοος	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,405

is reworked into an introduction with two finite verb forms in

⁷⁸⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 20,199 and *Odyssey* 7,298; 7,308; 8,140; 8,400; 11,347; 11,362; 13,3; 17,445; 19,405 and 24,327.

Rest of verse.	Finite verb 1.	Finite verb 2.	Passage.
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀντίνοος	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,445

2. The simplex was originally used as a participle extension, but once the finite verb forms became established as introduction verbs, they could be expanded by a participle as well (although this was rare with verbs of answering⁷⁸⁵):

ὥς ἐφάμην, ὃ δέ μ' οἰμώξας ἡμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 9,506; 11,59).

3. The simplex can be used to conclude speeches, but the compound can never do this. The conclusion is:

νῶϊ μὲν ὥς ἐπέεσσιν ἀμειβομένῳ στυγεροῖσιν (*Odyssey* 11,81).

4. The simplex can be used in the aorist or imperfect, while the compound is only used in the imperfect.

5. The participle of the simplex can be combined with προσέειπον or προσηύδα:

ἔξαυτίς μύθοισιν ἀμειβομένη προσέειπεν (*Odyssey* 4,234),

καί μιν ἀμειβόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 15,48; 23,557).

The participle of the compound ἀπαμείβομαι is mostly combined with προσέφη(ς) (attested 104 times out of 111 instances), and much less with other verbs:

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (3 instances),⁷⁸⁶

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (29 instances).⁷⁸⁷

The differences and agreements can be summarised as follows:

Simplex ἀμείβομαι.	Compound ἀπαμείβομαι.
Finite verb mostly only <i>verbum dicendi</i> in introduction.	Finite verb form always combined with other finite <i>verbum dicendi</i> .
Finite verb can be expanded by participle of <i>verbum clamandi</i> .	Finite verb form is only combined with another finite verb form.
More often attested as finite verb form than as participle.	Much more often attested as participle than as finite verb form.
Participle only combined with προσ-compounds.	Participle only combined with προσ-compounds.
Participle combined with προσέειπον or προσηύδα, and never with προσέφη(ς).	Participle almost exclusively combined with προσέφη(ς).

⁷⁸⁵ Edwards 1969:81.

⁷⁸⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,215; 18,187 and 24,138.

⁷⁸⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 10,382; 10,423; 10,554; 19,154; 19,215 and *Odyssey* 7,207; 7,302; 8,152; 8,412; 9,1; 11,354; 11,377; 14,191; 14,390; 15,380; 16,201; 17,16; 17,192; 17,353; 18,124; 18,356; 19,41; 20,226; 22,105; 22,170; 23,129; 24,302; 24,330 and 24,356.

The participle can conclude speeches.	Never used in conclusions.
---------------------------------------	----------------------------

4.4. Verbal inflection of ἀμείβομαι and its compounds.

The figures for simplex and compound are the following:

Verb.	Finite verb forms.	Participle.
ἀμείβομαι	99 attestations.	43 attestations.
ἀπαμείβομαι	12 attestations.	111 attestations.

The simplex ἀμείβομαι is attested in introductions and conclusions in the following forms:

Form.	Description.	Attestations.
Aorist	Augmented.	ἡμείψατο ⁷⁸⁸
	Unaugmented.	ἀμείψατο ⁷⁸⁹
Imperfect	Augmented.	ἡμείβετο (78 instances). ⁷⁹⁰
	Unaugmented.	ἀμείβετο (19 instances). ⁷⁹¹
Participle.	Nom. masculine singular.	ἀμειβόμενος (occurring 38 times). ⁷⁹²
	Nom. feminine singular.	ἀμειβομένη (4 instances). ⁷⁹³
	Nom. masculine dual.	ἀμειβομένω ⁷⁹⁴

The figures for the compound ἀπαμείβομαι are:

Form.	Description.	Attestations.
Imperfect.	Unaugmented.	ἀπαμείβετο (12 instances). ⁷⁹⁵
Participle.	Nom. masculine singular.	ἀπαμειβόμενος (108 instances). ⁷⁹⁶

⁷⁸⁸ *Iliad* 23,542.

⁷⁸⁹ *Iliad* 4,403.

⁷⁹⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 1,121; 1,172; 1,292; 1,413; 1,544; 1,551; 3,199; 4,50; 4,317; 5,375; 5,381; 5,825; 6,263; 6,359; 8,145; 8,151; 9,162; 10,60; 10,86; 10,102; 10,128; 10,143; 10,390; 10,426; 11,655; 13,231; 14,52; 14,103; 14,193; 15,92; 15,200; 15,471; 16,439; 17,715; 18,127; 18,181; 18,360; 18,393; 18,428; 18,462; 19,28; 20,132; 20,309; 24,89; 24,372; 24,386; 24,405; 24,552; 24,659 and *Odyssey* 1,44; 1,80; 1,314; 3,102; 3,210; 3,253; 4,711; 4,808; 8,338; 8,357; 9,506; 10,71; 11,59; 12,278; 13,146; 13,329; 13,392; 13,420; 14,121; 15,67; 15,340; 15,485; 16,186; 17,280; 18,250; 19,213; 23,69; 23,80 and 24,280.

⁷⁹¹ The instances are *Iliad* 3,171; 3,228; 13,823; 24,200; 24,424 and *Odyssey* 4,382; 4,398; 6,67; 9,272; 9,287; 9,368; 10,487; 10,503; 11,180; 11,215; 11,563; 12,115; 15,434 and 15,439.

⁷⁹² The instances are *Iliad* 3,437; 7,356; 15,48; 17,33; 23,557; 23,794 and *Odyssey* 2,84; 4,375; 4,394; 4,464; 4,471; 4,484; 4,491; 4,554; 5,96; 8,235; 9,258; 9,522; 10,270; 10,336; 10,382; 11,79; 11,138; 11,145; 11,163; 11,404; 11,435; 11,440; 11,462; 11,477; 11,487; 11,504; 16,193; 17,123; 21,206; 22,44; 24,350.

⁷⁹³ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,234; 4,706; 19,214 and 19,252.

⁷⁹⁴ *Odyssey* 11,81.

⁷⁹⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 20,199 and *Odyssey* 7,298; 7,308; 8,140; 8,158; 8,400; 11,347; 11,362; 13,3; 17,445; 19,405 and 24,327.

⁷⁹⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,84; 1,130; 1,215; 1,285; 1,560; 2,369; 4,188; 5,764; 5,814; 6,520; 7,283; 8,292; 8,469; 9,307; 9,606; 9,643; 10,42; 10,382; 10,423; 10,554; 11,316; 11,607; 13,72; 14,242; 14,312; 14,341; 18,187; 19,145; 19,154; 19,198; 19,215; 20,19; 20,86; 20,199; 21,222; 22,182; 23,93; 24,64; 24,138; 24,299 and *Odyssey* 1,63; 4,147; 4,168; 4,203; 4,265; 5,21; 5,214; 7,207; 7,240; 7,302; 8,152; 8,412; 8,463; 9,1; 11,354; 11,377; 12,384; 13,139; 13,153; 13,311; 13,382; 13,416; 14,55; 14,165; 14,191; 14,360; 14,390; 14,401; 14,442;

	Nom. neuter singular.	ἀπαμειβόμενον (twice). ⁷⁹⁷
	Nom. masculine plural.	ἀπαμειβόμενοι (once). ⁷⁹⁸

The participle is always used in the present, because it describes an action that occurs at the same time as the action of the main verb. In almost all instances the participle is used with a verb of speaking and indicates that the speaking is in fact an answer and/or a reaction to what the addressed person said or did before.

4.5. The diatheses of ἀμείβομαι and its compounds.

There are no speech introductions or conclusions with an undetermined subject. The subject always exchanges something from himself with someone else, namely his words and/or opinions. Because of the involvement of the subject, the middle is used in speech introductions and conclusions.

4.6. Metrical position of the simplex ἀμείβομαι.

The metrical form of the finite verb forms and the participle make it impossible for the verb to be placed at the end of the verse.

1. The participle is used 43 times. In 3 instances it is put in the second half of the second half of the first foot (1b2). This is the case when the participle of the simplex ἀμείβομαι is combined with ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα:

	Object pronoun.	Participle.	Words spoken.	Verb.	Passage.
ὅς	μιν	ἀμειβόμενος	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 7,356
καί	μιν	ἀμειβόμενος	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 15,48; 23,557

2. In all the other instances, the participle occupies the 2nd half of the second half of the third foot (3b2).⁷⁹⁹ In most instances, the participle is put immediately before the finite verb:

Rest of the verse.	Dative.	Participle.	<i>Verbum dicendi.</i>	Passage.
τὴν δὲ Πάρις	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Iliad</i> 3,437

14,507; 15,380; 16,60; 16,135; 16,201; 16,308; 16,464; 17,16; 17,192; 17,272; 17,311; 17,353; 17,380; 17,405; 17,512; 17,579; 18,124; 18,365; 19,41; 19,106; 19,164; 19,220; 19,261; 19,335; 19,382; 19,499; 19,554; 19,582; 20,36; 20,168; 20,226; 22,105; 22,170; 22,430; 22,490; 23,129; 23,263; 24,302; 24,330 and 24,356.

⁷⁹⁷ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,824 and 4,835.

⁷⁹⁸ The instance is *Odyssey* 9,409.

⁷⁹⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 3,437; 17,33; 23,794 and *Odyssey* 2,84; 4,234; 4,375; 4,394; 4,464; 4,471; 4,484; 4,491; 4,554; 4,706; 5,96; 8,235; 9,258; 9,522; 10,270; 10,336; 10,382; 11,79; 11,138; 11,145; 11,163; 11,404; 11,435; 11,440; 11,462; 11,477; 11,487; 11,504; 16,193; 17,123; 19,214; 19,252; 21,206; 22,44; 24,350.

ἐξαῦτις	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβομένη	προσέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,234
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὧς	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπον	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,484

In two instances, the participle is used in a very specific schema: speech conclusion – reaction to the speaking – participle – particle – verb (but the participle is still put in the 2nd half of the 2nd half foot of the 3rd foot, 3b2):

Conclusion.	Reaction.	Participle.	Particle.	Verb.	Passage.
ὧς φάτο,	χῆρατο δ' Ὑπνος,	ἀμειβόμενος	δὲ	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 14,270
ὧς φάτο,	τὸν δ' οὐ πείθεν:	ἀμειβόμενος	δὲ	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 17,33

In one instance, the participle is used in a conclusion in the same metrical position, but is not combined with another verb of speaking:

	Dative (noun).	Participle.	Dative (adjective).	Passage.
νόϊ μὲν ὧς	ἐπέεσσιν	ἀμειβομένω	στυγεροῖσιν	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,81

The finite verb forms are ἀμείψατο, ἡμείψατ', ἀμείβετο and ἡμείβετ' (cf. supra).

3. The finite verb form ἡμείβετ' is put in the second half of the first foot (71 instances).⁸⁰⁰

Examples are:

Pronoun (1a).	Verb (1b).	ἔπειτα.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων	<i>Iliad</i> 1,172
τὸν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	Θέτις κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσα	<i>Iliad</i> 1,413
τὸν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειθ'	Ἑλένη Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα	<i>Iliad</i> 3,199
τὸν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	περίφρων Πηνελόπεια	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,250; 19,123
τὸν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	πατήρ κατὰ δάκρυον εἴβων	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,280

4. The form ἡμείβετο is put 5 times in the second half of the fourth foot (4b) in the formula ἡμείβετο μύθῳ.⁸⁰¹ In two instances the formula belongs to a speech introduction that occupies the entire verse:

Object.	Particles.	Subject.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
τὸν	δ' αὖ	διογενὴς Ὀδυσσεύς	ἡμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,485

⁸⁰⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 1,121; 1,172; 1,413; 1,544; 1,551; 3,199; 4,50; 4,317; 5,375; 5,381; 5,825; 6,263; 6,359; 8,145; 8,151; 9,162; 10,60; 10,86; 10,102; 10,128; 10,143; 10,390; 10,426; 11,655; 13,231; 14,52; 14,103; 14,193; 15,92; 15,200; 15,471; 16,439; 17,715; 18,127; 18,181; 18,360; 18,393; 18,428; 18,462; 19,28; 20,132; 20,309; 24,89; 24,372; 24,386; 24,405; 24,552; 24,659 and *Odyssey* 1,44; 1,80; 1,314; 3,102; 3,210; 3,253; 4,711; 4,808; 8,338; 8,357; 13,146; 13,329; 13,392; 13,420; 14,121; 15,67; 15,340; 16,186; 17,280; 18,250; 19,213; 23,69; 23,80 and 24,280.

⁸⁰¹ The instances are *Odyssey* 9,506; 10,71; 11,59; 12,278 and 15,485.

Adverb.	Subject.	Dative (adj.).	Object.	Verb.	Dative (noun).	Passage.
αὐτίκα δ'	Εὐρύλοχος	στυγερῷ	μ'	ἡμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 12,278

In two instances the formula introduces direct speech, but only occupies part of the verse. In one instance, it is combined with a conclusion:

Conclusion.	Subject.	Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ δέ	μ'	οἰμώξας	ἡμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,506; 11,59

The other instance is:

Rest of the verse.	Subject.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
οἱ δ' ἄνεω ἐγένοντο:	πατήρ δ'	ἡμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 10,71

5. When ἡμείβετο is combined with μύθῳ, it is also put at the end of the verse in the formula καὶ ἡμείβετο μύθῳ.⁸⁰²

Rest of the verse.	Connector.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο, κώκυσεν δὲ γυνή	καὶ	ἡμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 24,200
τοῖς δ' αὖτις μετέειπε γυνή	καὶ	ἡμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,439

6. The other instances of ἡμείβετο are always put before the bucolic caesura and before a noun epithet formula.⁸⁰³

Rest of the verse.	Verb.	Caesura.	Noun epithet.	Passage.
τὸν δ' Ἑλένη μύθοισιν	ἡμείβετο	//	δῖα γυναικῶν	<i>Iliad</i> 3,171
θάρσυνος οἰωνῷ: ὁ δ'	ἡμείβετο	//	φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ	<i>Iliad</i> 13,823
ὥς ἐφάμην, ἥ δ' αὐτίκ'	ἡμείβετο	//	πότνια μήτηρ	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,180; 11,215

7. The aorist ἡμείψατο is also put before the bucolic caesura, not before a noun epithet formula, but between noun and epithet.

Rest of the verse.	Noun.	Verb.	Caesura.	Epithet	Passage.
τὸν δ' υἱὸς	Καπανῆος	ἡμείψατο	//	κυδαλίμοιο	<i>Iliad</i> 4,403

8. The aorist ἡμείψατ is put after the caesura of the 7th half foot.

⁸⁰² The instances are *Iliad* 24,200; 24,424 and *Odyssey* 6,67; 15,434 and 15,439.

⁸⁰³ The instances are *Iliad* 3,171; 3,228; 13,823; and *Odyssey* 4,382; 4,398; 9,272; 9,287; 9,368; 10,487; 10,503; 11,180; 11,215; 11,563; 12,115.

Rest of the verse.	Caesura. (7 th half foot)	Verb.	Rest of the verse.	Passage.
Πηλείδην Ἀχιλλῆα δίκη	//	ἡμείψατ'	ἀναστάς	<i>Iliad</i> 23,542

4.7. The syntactic constructions (case usage) of ἀμείβομαι.

1. The verb can be used without accusative or dative objects, but this use is rare. The examples of the finite verb are:

θάρσυνος οἰωνῶ: ὃ δ' ἀμείβετο φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ (*Iliad* 13,823),

ὥς ἐφάμην, ἦ δ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο πότνια μήτηρ (*Odyssey* 11,180; 11,215),

ὥς ἐφάμην, ἦ δ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο διὰ θεάων (occurring 5 times).

The examples of the participle without an argument are:

Conclusion.	Reaction.	Participle.	Particle.	Verb.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο,	χήρατο δ' Ὑπνος,	ἀμειβόμενος	δὲ	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 14,270
ὥς φάτο,	τὸν δ' οὐ πεῖθεν:	ἀμειβόμενος	δὲ	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 17,33

2. The verb is mostly used with the accusative of the person addressed. In the verses with a finite verb form of ἀμείβομαι, there is an accusative in 87 instances (out of 99) and the accusative belongs to the finite verb form:

Object (pronoun).	Verb.	ἔπειτα.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων	<i>Iliad</i> 1,172
τὴν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	Μέδων πεπνυμένα εἰδώς	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,711
τὸν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	Γερήνιος ἱππότης Νέστωρ	11 attestations. ⁸⁰⁴

3. The simplex ἀμείβομαι can be constructed with a dative and the accusative of the person addressed. The dative can be used in the singular or the plural: the singular is only used with μῦθος, the plural with μῦθος and ἔπος. The use of the dative is largely attested with the participle and much less with the finite verb: of the 99 finite verb forms, there are only 10 instances in which the dative μύθῳ is used,⁸⁰⁵ and 3 in which the verb is expanded by νηλεῖ θυμῷ. There are 43 instances with the participle and in 15 instances the participle is used with a dative.⁸⁰⁶ Examples of this construction are:

⁸⁰⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 4,317; 8,151; 9,162; 10,102; 10,128; 10,143; 11,655; 14,52 and *Odyssey* 3,102; 3,210 and 3,253.

⁸⁰⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 24,200; 24,424 and *Odyssey* 6,67; 9,506; 10,71; 11,59; 12,278; 15,485; 15,439; 15,434.

⁸⁰⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 3,437; 23,794 and *Odyssey* 2,84; 4,234; 4,484; 4,706; 5,96; 9,258; 11,81; 16,193; 19,214; 19,252; 21,206; 24,350.

Conclusion.	Subject.	Accusative.	Participle.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ δέ	μ'	οἰμώξας	ἡμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,506; 11,59

Conclusion.	Subject.	Object.		Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ δέ	μ'	αὐτίκ'	ἀμείβετο	νηλεῖ θυμῷ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,272; 9,368

4. When the simplex is used in the participle, it is more difficult to determine whether the accusatives belong to the participle or to the finite verb. Examples are:

Object.	Subject.	Dative.	Participle.	Verb.	Passage.
τὴν δὲ	Πάρις	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Iliad</i> 3,437

	Accusative.	Dative.	Participle.	Verb.	Passage.
ὄψε δὲ δῆ	μιν	ἔπεσιν	ἀμειβομένη	προσέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,706
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς	μιν	ἔπεσιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπον	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,258
καὶ τότε	μιν	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβομένη	προσέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,252
ἐξαυτίς	σφ'	ἐπέεσιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 21,206

Conclusion.	Particle.	Subject.	Object.	Participle.	Verb.	Passage.
ὥς ἔφατ',	αὐτὰρ	ἐγώ	μιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπον	14 times. ⁸⁰⁷

	Object pronoun.	Participle.	Words spoken.	Verb.	Passage.
ὅς	μιν	ἀμειβόμενος	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 7,356
καί	μιν	ἀμειβόμενος	ἔπεα πτερόεντα	προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 15,48; 23,557

In all the examples mentioned above, the accusative might have belonged to both verbs, in spite of Erbse's statement that it only belonged to the main verb.⁸⁰⁸ The participle might have been used in its original meaning "in return", but it might also have the meaning "answer", and in that meaning ἀμείβομαι is constructed with an accusative.

5. The simplex ἀμείβομαι can be constructed with a dative without an accusative of the person addressed. Examples of the finite verb forms of ἀμείβομαι with only a dative construction are:

⁸⁰⁷ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,375; 4,394; 4,464; 9,522; 10,270; 10,336; 10,382; 11,79; 11,138; 11,163; 11,435; 11,462; 11,477 and 11,504.

⁸⁰⁸ Erbse 1979a:621.

Conclusion.	Verb 1.	Subject.	Speech verb.	Dative.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο,	κώκυσεν δὲ	γυνή	καὶ ἀμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 24,200
ὥς φάτο,	γῆθησεν δ'	ὁ γέρων	καὶ ἀμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 24,424

Examples of the participle of ἀμείβομαι with only a dative construction are:

	Dative.	Participle.	Verb.	Passage.
ἐξαὔτις	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβομένη	προσέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,234
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς	μύθοισιν	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπον	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,484

In the following two instances, there is a person addressed in the verse, but it belongs to the first verb (and the case form of the person addressed is determined by the first verb):

Object.		Speech verb 1.	Subject.	Speech verb 2.	Dative.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	αὐτε	προσέειπε	γυνή	καὶ ἀμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,434
τοῖς δ'	αὐτις	μετέειπε	γυνή	καὶ ἀμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,439

6. In one instance, the verb is only combined with an accusative and not with a dative.

	Accusative.	Pronoun.	Participle.	Verb.	Passage.
Εὐρύμαχος δέ	μιν	οἷος	ἀμειβόμενος	προσέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,44

This instance refers to the audacious reply by Eurymakhos to Odysseus when the latter had started to kill the suitors. The dative is replaced by the pronoun οἷος “alone, as only person”. In this case, I suspect that the participle was used without objects, namely “Eurymakhos spoke to him, being the only one to answer”, but even in this scenario, it cannot be ruled out that the accusative belongs to both verb forms.

7. The verb ἀμείβομαι is also constructed with a double accusative, but this occurs only twice and both cases are so-called negative:

Conclusion.	Subject.	Person.	Object.	Verb.		Passage.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ δέ	μ'	οὐδέν	ἀμείβετο	νηλεΐ θυμῷ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,287
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ δέ	μ'	οὐδέν	ἀμείβετο,	βῆ δὲ μετ' ἄλλας	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,563

This has parallels with other verbs of speaking, such as πρόσφημι and ποσφονέω.

4.8. Word order in the formulae of ἀμείβομαι.

The word order is always OV. If the simplex ἀμείβομαι has a direct object, it is always put before the verb. The demonstrative pronouns τόν and τήν are put in verse initial position, and refer to a person who was previously mentioned. The subject of the verb is usually put after

the finite verb form of ἀμείβομαι, because the finite verb form (augmented or not) cannot be put in verse final position. This provides a typical formulaic construction of the verse: Accuative (mostly a pronoun) – (Particles)- *verbum dicendi* – NOUN EPITHET.⁸⁰⁹ Examples are:

Object (pronoun).	Verb.	ἔπειτα.	Subject.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων	3 attestations. ⁸¹⁰
τὴν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 1,544
τὸν δ'	ἡμείβετ'	ἔπειτα	βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη	5 attestations. ⁸¹¹

In a few cases, the subject is put before the verb:

Conclusion.	Subject.	Object person.	Object.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὃ δέ	μ'	οὐδέν	ἀμείβετο	νηλεΐ θυμῷ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,287
Conclusion.	Subject.	Object person.	Participle.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὃ δέ	μ'	οἰμώξας	ἡμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,506

Adverb.	Subject.	Dative.	Object.	Verb.	Dative.	Passage.
αὐτίκα δ'	Εὐρύλοχος	στυγερῷ	μ'	ἡμείβετο	μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 12,278

Sometimes, the subject appears before the verb, but the apposition to the subject is put after the verb:

Object.	Subject.	Dative.	Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	Ἑλένη	μύθοισιν	ἀμείβετο	δῖα γυναικῶν	<i>Iliad</i> 3,171

A special case are the instances where the subject is a demonstrative pronoun with an apposition after the verb (the subject is put in bold face, the apposition is underlined):

	Subject.		Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
θάρσυνος οἰωνῷ:	ὃ δ'		ἀμείβετο	φαίδιμος Ἑκτώρ	<i>Iliad</i> 13,823
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἥ δ'	αὐτίκ'	ἀμείβετο	δῖα θεάων	Attested 5 times.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἥ δ'	αὐτίκ'	ἀμείβετο	πότνια μήτηρ	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,180; 11,215

⁸⁰⁹ A.Parry 1971:10-16, 306.

⁸¹⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 1,172; 10,86 and 14,103.

⁸¹¹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,551; 4,50; 16,439; 18,360 and 20,309.

4.9. Connection between the formulae of ἀμείβομαι and the rest of the verse.

The connection between a speech introduction with ἀμείβομαι and the next sentence can be made by two particles, namely δέ or καί. The difference is the same as was noticed before. When καί is used, the introduction belongs together with the previous verbal action. This is the case in the following introductions:

Conclusion.	Verb.	Connector.	Subject.	Connector.	Introduction.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο,	κώκυσεν	δέ	γυνή	καί	ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 24,200
ὥς φάτο,	γῆθησεν	δ'	ὁ γέρων,	καί	ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 24,424

The particle καί is used to connect two actions that are performed by the speaker. In the two speech conclusions, the difference is clear. The contrast between the speech of person A and the reaction of person B is expressed by δέ, while the connection between the two actions of person B is described by καί. In the two instances below, the verbs connected by καί are both performed by the speaker and are not contrasted. In the second example, both verbs are used in one introduction formula and form a unity.

Rest of the verse.	Connector.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
πατρὶ φίλῳ. ὁ δὲ πάντα νόει	καί	ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 6,67

Speech introduction 1.	Connector.	Speech introduction 2.	Passage.
τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε γυνή	καί	ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,434; 15,439

In the instances mentioned below, δέ points to a contrast between the speaking of one person (in the conclusion) and the reaction of another speaker:

Conclusion.	Subject.	Connector.	Introduction.	Passage.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ	δέ	μ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο νηλεῖ θυμῷ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,272; 9,368
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ	δέ	μ' οὐδὲν ἀμείβετο νηλεῖ θυμῷ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,287
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἡ	δ'	αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο πότνια μήτηρ	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,180; 11,215

Conclusion.	Subject.	Connector.	Introduction.	Next sentence.	Passage.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ	δέ	μ' οὐδὲν ἀμείβετο,	βῆ δὲ μετ' ἄλλας	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,563

Other sentence.	Subject.	Connector.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
οἱ δ' ἄνεω ἐγένοντο:	πατήρ	δ'	ἡμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 10,71

4.10. The compound ἀπαμείβομαι.

4.10.1. Metrical observations on the verses with ἀπαμείβομαι.

The finite verb forms of ἀπαμείβομαι only occur 12 times (of which 11 are times in the formula ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε), and are always put in the first half of the second half of the third foot (3b1).

Pronoun.	Particle.	Subject.	Finite verb.	2 nd finite verb.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	αὖτ'	Ἀλκίνοος	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	5 attestations. ⁸¹²
τὸν δ'	αὖτ'	Αἰνείας	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 20,199
τὸν δ'	αὖτ'	Εὐρύαλος	ἀπαμείβετο	νεῖκεσέ τ' ἄντην	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,158

The participle forms ἀπαμειβόμενος, ἀπαμειβόμενον and ἀπαμειβόμενοι appear in 109 instances in the second half of the first foot (1b1):

Pronoun.	Participle.	Verb.	Noun-Epithet.	Passage.
τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσεφώνεε	νήδυμος Ὕπνος	<i>Iliad</i> 14,242
τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	Πρίαμος θεοειδής	<i>Iliad</i> 24,299
τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς	19 attestations. ⁸¹³

Pronoun.	Participle.	Verb.	Vocative.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφης,	Εὖμαιε συβῶτα	11 instances. ⁸¹⁴
τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφης,	Εὖμαιε συβῶτα	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,512; 17,579

In only two instances, the participle appears in the second half of the third foot (3b1). This is the case when the participle is combined with προσέειπε, and not with the usual προσέφη:

Object.	Particle.	Subject.	Participle.	Verb.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	αὖτ'	Αἰνείας	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Iliad</i> 20,86
τὸν δ'	αὖτ'	Ἀντίνοος	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,405

The metre requires the syllable before the verbal forms of ἀπαμείβομαι to be long by nature, but this is not always the case. In 10 of the 12 instances of ἀπαμείβετο the verbal form is preceded by a personal name ending in short –ος (the irregular syllable is put in bold face):⁸¹⁵

⁸¹² The instances are *Odyssey* 7,281; 7,308; 11,347; 11,362 and 13,3.

⁸¹³ The instances are *Odyssey* 5,214; 7,240; 8,463; 13,311; 13,382; 13,416; 19,106; 19,164; 19,220; 19,261; 19,335; 19,382; 19,499; 19,554; 19,582; 20,36; 22,430; 22,490 and 23,263.

⁸¹⁴ The instances are *Odyssey* 14,55; 14,165; 14,360; 14,442; 14,507; 16,60; 16,135; 16,464; 17,272; 17,311 and 17,380.

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀλκίνοος ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε (occurring 5 times),⁸¹⁶
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρύαλος ἀπαμείβετο νείκεσέ τ' ἄντην (*Odyssey* 8,158),
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρύαλος ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 8,140; 8,400),
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀντίνοος ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 17,445),
τὴν δ' αὖτ' Αὐτόλυκος ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 19,405).

In those instances, there is a case of *brevis pro longo*. It is possible that the verse was originally used when the name ended in a long vowel (long vowel is put in bold face):⁸¹⁷

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνεΐας ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 20,199),
τὸν δ' αὖ Λαέρτης ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 24,327).

In some of the instances, the *varia lectio* προσαμείβετο is transmitted, but this is in my opinion the *lectio facilior* and an attempt to correct the metrical irregularity that originated from a formulaic inflection.

In one instance, a personal name ending in short ος precedes the participle, and the short ος undergoes lengthening:

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀντίνοος ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέειπε (*Odyssey* 17,405).

This is in all likelihood caused by parallel verses, where the participle was preceded by a personal name ending in a long vowel, such as:

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνεΐας ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέειπε (*Iliad* 20,86).

4.10.2. The constructions of ἀπαμείβομαι.

1. The finite verb form ἀπαμείβετο is always constructed with an accusative of the person addressed:

Pronoun/object.	Particle.	Subject.	Finite verb.	2 nd finite verb.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	αὖτ'	Αἰνεΐας	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 20,199
τὸν δ'	αὖτ'	Εὐρύαλος	ἀπαμείβετο	νείκεσέ τ' ἄντην	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,158
τὸν δ'	αὖ	Λαέρτης	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,327

⁸¹⁵ Hainsworth 1988:332 noted that this formula was suited for names with a scansion – ◡ ◡ –, but did not address the lengthening, Garvie 1994:201,224.

⁸¹⁶ The instances are *Odyssey* 7,298; 7,308; 11,347; 11,362; 13,3.

⁸¹⁷ This concept was first established by Parry 1971:197-201 (the French original dates from 1928). See also Chantraine 1948:105, Edwards 1970:9, Crespo 1977:37-38. Hoekstra 1969:137-139 mentioned the irregularity, but stated that the origin of the substitution could not be reconstructed. I believe that the evolution described by Chantraine (which goes back to Parry) provides the explanation: the formula was used with a name in ης and was then extended to names ending in ος, hence the metrical irregularity.

2. The participle is always combined with another *verbum dicendi* and it is therefore difficult to determine whether the accusative belongs to the participle or to the finite verb form. As was observed with the simplex, the accusative might belong to both verb forms:

Pronoun (object).	Participle.	Verb.	Noun-Epithet.	Passage.
τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσεφώνεε	Τεῦκρος ἀμύμων	<i>Iliad</i> 8,292
τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς	9 attestations. ⁸¹⁸
τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς	9 attestations. ⁸¹⁹

3. In one verse, the participle is not combined with an accusative of the person addressed:

Subject.	Participle.	Words spoken.	Verb.	Passage.
οἱ δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενοι	ἔπεα πτερόεντ'	ἀγόρευον	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,409

4. The compound ἀπαμείβομαι is never constructed with the dative of the words spoken.⁸²⁰

4.10.3. Word order in the verses with ἀπαμείβομαι.

As was the case with the simplex ἀμείβομαι, the word order is always OV. The accusative of the person addressed always occupies the verse initial position, and is always a form of the pronominal stem **so/to* which is still used as a demonstrative pronoun. In most cases with the compound ἀπαμείβομαι, the word order is pronoun – particle – participle – finite verb – NOUN EPITHET:⁸²¹

Pronoun.	Participle.	Verb.	Noun-Epithet.	Passage.
τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	κρατερὸς Διομήδης	<i>Iliad</i> 5,814
τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	κορυθαίολος Ἴκτωρ	<i>Iliad</i> 6,520
τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσεφώνεε	νήδυμος Ὕπνος	<i>Iliad</i> 14,242
τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς	3 instances. ⁸²²
τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη	πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς	29 instances. ⁸²³

Another construction is pronoun – participle – verb – vocative of person speaking:

Pronoun.	Participle.	Verb.	Vocative.	Passage.
----------	-------------	-------	-----------	----------

⁸¹⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 1,84; 9,307; 9,606; 9,643; 11,607; 19,145; 19,198; 21,222 and 23,93.

⁸¹⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,560; 5,764; 8,469; 14,312; 14,341; 22,182; 24,64 and *Odyssey* 1,63 and 5,21.

⁸²⁰ Erbse 1979a:622.

⁸²¹ Erbse 1979a:622.

⁸²² The instances are *Iliad* 1,215; 18,187 and 24,138.

⁸²³ The instances are *Iliad* 10,382; 10,423; 10,554; 19,154; 19,215 and *Odyssey* 7,207; 7,302; 8,152; 8,412; 9,1; 11,354; 11,377; 14,191; 14,390; 15,380; 16,201; 17,16; 17,192; 17,353; 18,124; 18,356; 19,41; 20,226; 22,105; 22,170; 23,129; 24,302; 24,330 and 24,356.

τὸν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη,	Εὖμαιε συβῶτα	11 instances. ⁸²⁴
τὴν δ'	ἀπαμειβόμενος	προσέφη,	Εὖμαιε συβῶτα	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,512; 17,579

4.10.4. Connection between the formulae with ἀπαμείβομαι and the rest of the verse.

The link between the finite verbal form of ἀπαμείβομαι and the rest of the verse is made by the particle τε:

Speech introduction 1.	Introduction 2.	Connector.		Passage.
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρύαλος ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν	τε		<i>Odyssey</i> 8,140; 8,400
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρύαλος ἀπαμείβετο	νεΐκεσέ	τ'	ἄντην	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,158
τὸν δ' αὖ Λαέρτης ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν	τε		<i>Odyssey</i> 24,327

4.11. Conclusion.

The simplex ἀμείβομαι and the compound ἀπαμείβομαι are very common in speech introductions. The basic meaning was “exchange, return”. Objects could be exchanged (such as gifts or cloths), but also words. From “exchanging words” the meaning of the verb evolved into “address”, and from “returning words” the meaning became “answer”. In speech introductions, both meanings are found simultaneously. In that meaning, the verb became transitive and took the person who was answered in the accusative. Because “answering” always involves a high level of personal participation and involvement, only the middle diathesis is attested, when ἀμείβομαι and ἀπαμείβομαι have the meaning “answer”.

The simplex is used more often in finite verb forms and less as a participle, while ἀπαμείβομαι is used much more frequently in the participle. The participle is always combined with another verb of speaking. The simplex ἀμείβομαι can be used on its own to introduce a direct speech, but the compound ἀπαμείβομαι (which is used much less frequently in finite verb forms) is always combined with another verb of speaking when used in an introduction.

The word order is OV. The person addressed is always expressed in the accusative, and the words spoken appear in the dative. In many instances, the person addressed is expressed by a demonstrative pronoun of the stem *so/to and is put at the beginning of the verse.

The case usage differs between the simplex ἀμείβομαι and the compound ἀπαμείβομαι: ἀμείβομαι can be used without objects, with the accusative of the person addressed, the dative

⁸²⁴ The instances are *Odyssey* 14,55; 14,165; 14,360; 14,442; 14,507; 16,60; 16,135; 16,464; 17,272; 17,311 and 17,380.

of the word(s) spoken, or with both. The compound ἀπαμείβομαι is only used with the accusative of the person addressed.

As the Homeric poems have a high percentage of direct speech, many speech introductions are used. The introduction formulae were therefore used on many different occasions. This explains the metrical irregularities of several formulae, because a given formula could be extended from a context where it was metrically regular into a context where it would not “fit”.

Chapter 5. Verbal distribution, suppletion, tense and modal usage in speech introductions and conclusions.

In this chapter I discuss the distribution of verbs in introductions and conclusions, the differences between introductions and conclusions, the tense usage and the use of moods and converbs. The chapter is divided in four subchapters: the first one lists the differences in verbal distribution between introductions and conclusions, the second subchapter discusses the use of the past tenses in introductions and conclusions, the third one describes how speech introductions and conclusions referring to the future are expressed and the fourth subchapter treats those speech introductions that belong to counterfactual constructions.

5.1. Distribution of verbs and tenses in speech introductions and conclusions.

The situation of the speech introductions and conclusions is suppletive:⁸²⁵ certain *verba dicendi* are predominantly used in the introductions, while others are mostly used in conclusions. The differences between introductions and conclusions can be presented as follows:

Issues.	Introductions.	Conclusions.
Attestations. ⁸²⁶	There are more introductions than conclusions.	There are more introductions than conclusions.
“Double formulae”. ⁸²⁷	An introduction with more than one finite verb of speaking is not uncommon.	A conclusion with more than one verb of speaking is extremely rare.
Use of the participle.	The participle is never used on itself to introduce a direct speech, but always expands an existing speech introduction with another finite verb form.	A participle can be used to conclude a speech without the presence of another verb of speaking.
Verbs.	The following verbs are used in speech introductions:	The following verbs are used in speech conclusions:

⁸²⁵ The suppletion of the Greek verbs of speaking has been discussed in Osthoff 1899:11-12, Fournier 1946a *passim* and in Kölligan 2007:218-246. In his chapter on the *verba dicendi*, Kölligan 2007:218-246 did not distinguish between forms used in speech introductions and conclusions. The figures are quoted in the Appendices A1, A2, A3, A4 C1 until C 6 at the end of the thesis.

⁸²⁶ Appendix A.1.

⁸²⁷ Appendix A.4.

	<p>ἀγοράομαι; ἀγορεύω in 19 out of 52 instances; αὐδάω; the finite verbs of ἔειπον; virtually all compounds; the verbs of answering; the forms of *<i>uerh</i>₁ in the future; about 50 instances of the 550 attested instances of the simplex φημί; φωνέω in the participle φωνήσας/σ’ and in the formula φώνησέν τε.</p>	<p>ἀγορεύω in 33 out of 52 instances the participle forms of ἔειπον; the verb ἦ; the forms of *<i>uerh</i>₁ in the pluperfect; the forms of the simplex φημί in about 500 of the 550 instances attested; φωνέω in the formulae ὥς ἄρ’ ἐφώνησεν and ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας/σ’.</p>
Compounds.	Compounds are used almost exclusively in introductions.	There are only 4 instances of a compound in a conclusion.
Past reference.	Reference to the past can be made by the aorist, the imperfect and the pluperfect.	Reference to the past can be made by the aorist, the imperfect and the pluperfect.
Future reference.	The future indicative and the aorist subjunctive are attested, but the subjunctive is much more common.	Only the future indicative is attested.

I now briefly discuss the findings.

1. In general, the rule is that every speech that is introduced, is also concluded, unless one speech is immediately followed by another speech, in which case the new introduction concludes the preceding speech.⁸²⁸ One example is the heated exchange between Akhilleus and Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1.⁸²⁹ The angry speeches between the two heroes were not concluded, because as soon as one person finished speaking, the speech of the other was already introduced. The speech introduced by

τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 1,121)

was not concluded but was followed by the following introduction:

⁸²⁸ Fingerle 1939:373; Fränkel 1950:118; Führer 1967:44; Patzer 1972:14. See Combellack 1939 for a discussion on the issue.

⁸²⁹ See Lohmann 1970:131-138 for an analysis of the passage and Kelly 2007:411 for an analysis of the speeches and the introductions.

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 1,130).

2. The combination of a conclusion followed by an introduction (and sometimes also combined with the reaction of the audience) is a normal schema in Homer.⁸³⁰ In 9 instances the introduction following the conclusion is negative and indicates that the audience was too angry and/or disappointed to react.⁸³¹

3. The combination of two verbs of speaking, answer and shouting in a single introduction has been noticed before.⁸³² In many of these double introductions the verbs had originally a different meaning, but were later interpreted as a single introduction with two verbs of speaking.

4. Very rarely, a speech conclusion is expanded by another verb of speaking, as is the case in:

ὥς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ἐαδόντα μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 9,173; *Odyssey* 18,422).

The sentence after the actual conclusion describes the reaction of the audience to the speaking, and is a variation to the theme “X spoke and Y was pleased”.

ὥς ἔφατ' (NAME), τοῖσιν δ' ἐπὶ ἡνδανε μῦθος (occurring 6 times).⁸³³

5. The participles are used in conclusions when the subject of the participle serves a function in the sentence following the conclusion. In most cases, the subject of the conclusion is the same as that of the verb of the next sentence. The opposite is not necessarily true: when the subject of the speech conclusion serves a function in the next sentence, the verb in the speech conclusion can still be expressed by a finite verb form, but this is comparably rare.

6. The compounds are almost exclusively used in speech introductions, even if the simplex of the verb was mostly used in conclusions: although φημί was much more common in conclusions than in introductions, its compounds πρόσφημι and μετάφημι only occur in introductions.

5.2. Reference to the past in speech introductions and conclusions.

The tense usage in speech introductions and conclusions is summarised in the table below:

Category.	Imperfect.	Aorist.	Pluperfect.
<i>Verba dicendi</i> . ⁸³⁴	616 instances: ἀγορεύω; αὐδάω and compounds;	435 instances, mostly: ἀγοράομαι;	* <i>uerh₁</i> in conclusions.

⁸³⁰ Lord 1991:122-125; Brügger – Stoevesandt – Visser 2003:100; see Appendix A.2.

⁸³¹ Kelly 2007:348

⁸³² Mutzbauer 1909:131; Kieckers 1912; Fingerle 1939:307; O’Nolan 1978:28, 30-31; Hoekstra 1989:162; Riggsby 1992; Hackstein 2010a:423. See Appendix A.4.

⁸³³ The instances are *Odyssey* 16,406; 18,50; 18,290; 20,247; 21,143 and 21,269.

⁸³⁴ Appendix C.1 and C.4.

	1 instance of μυθέομαι; 1 instance of ἐννέπω; φημί and compounds.	ἔειπον and compounds; ἐνένιπε and ἠνίπαπε; 2 instances of αὐδάω; 4 instances of μυθέομαι; ῥῆ.	
φωνέω. ⁸³⁵	The forms of the compound only appear in the imperfect.	The forms of the simplex are only attested in the aorist.	-
“answer”. ⁸³⁶	The imperfect is used in 109 out of 111 instances.	In 2 instances an aorist form of ἀμείβομαι is used.	-

As can be seen in the table above (and also in Appendices C1 to C5) certain verbs are expressed in the aorist, while others predominantly occur in the imperfect. The pluperfect, the aorist and the imperfect are used to refer to the past and their use is based on aspectual value and not on relative chronology: the aorist does not indicate anteriority, but only refers to the punctual meaning of the action or a completed action,⁸³⁷ the imperfect is used for durative actions in the past, conative actions and depictions of past actions,⁸³⁸ and the pluperfect describes a completed state in the past and it can express simultaneity to actions in the past and is not used to state anteriority in the past.⁸³⁹

These observations can be applied to speech introductions and conclusions.

1. The *verba dicendi* use the imperfect more than the aorist and the verbs meaning “answer” almost exclusively use the imperfect in introductions. Many scholars considered this to be unexpected, because the speaking is punctual:⁸⁴⁰ as soon as the words are spoken, the speaking is completed.⁸⁴¹ This apparent contradiction lead scholars to believe that the forms of φημί were aorists, or had an aoristic meaning.⁸⁴² In his analysis of the *verba dicendi*,

⁸³⁵ Appendix C.3 and C.5.

⁸³⁶ Appendix C.2.

⁸³⁷ Kühner-Gerth 1898:154; Chantraine 1953:187-189.

⁸³⁸ Kühner-Gerth 1898:142-146.

⁸³⁹ Delbrück 1897:228; Brugmann 1904:569-571, 578; Kieckers 1926c:27; Thieme 1927:1-5; Duhoux 1992:437; Kümmel 2000:82-83; Tichy 2009:86.

⁸⁴⁰ Kühner-Gerth 1898:153 *Häufig wird das Imperfekt gebraucht, wo man eine abgeschlossene, nicht eine noch in der Entwicklung begriffene Handlung ausgedrückt erwarten sollte, wo also das Imperfekt statt des Aoristes zu stehen scheint.*

⁸⁴¹ This apparent contradiction had been noticed already by Naegelsbach 1834:249-252 for Homer, followed by Erdmann 1867:57 for Pindar. See also the following footnotes.

⁸⁴² Buttmann 1839:11-12 described these forms as imperfections, and stated that the present forms *βῆμι and *στῆμι had disappeared in Greek, while Curtius 1873:181 stated that ἔβην was considered an aorist in Greek, because

Fournier pointed out that an imperfect could not have been used in the speech conclusions: as the direct speech was finished, no duration could be expected anymore. Fournier therefore argued that the meaning of φημί in speech conclusions had to be aoristic,⁸⁴³ and that this aoristic meaning was then extended to the forms of φημί in speech introductions, and to other speech introduction verbs, such as προσεφώνεε and μετηύδα.⁸⁴⁴ This assumption is not necessary, however. First of all, these imperfect forms can be explained in three different ways: it either refers to a *de conatu* meaning “he tried to say”, a descriptive action “he was speaking thus” or to a durative action “he spoke repeatedly”.⁸⁴⁵ Second, the use of the imperfect with verbs of speaking, ordering and sending has parallels in Attic prose⁸⁴⁶ and in inscriptions.⁸⁴⁷ Blass argued that the speaking was not depicted in its punctual pronouncing of the words, but in its durative process of speaking and subsequent influence on the audience.⁸⁴⁸ He assumed that this was an Attic peculiarity,⁸⁴⁹ but scholars after him showed that this was common in all Greek dialects.⁸⁵⁰ In addition, nor Indo-Iranian nor Greek have an inherited aorist of **b^heh₂* “speak”.⁸⁵¹ The imperfect is also used to describe the speech introduction verbs in dialogues. This is especially the case with the verbs of answering, such as ἀ(πα)μείβομαι and the formula ἀντίον ηὔδα: they are used when a character reacted to the speech of somebody else and do not describe a single action but a longer process. Some examples make this clear:

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 1,84).

καὶ τότε δὴ θάρσησε καὶ ηὔδα μάντις ἀμύμων (*Iliad* 1,92).

*βῆμι did not exist, but ἔφην was interpreted as an imperfect, because φημί did exist. Mutzbauer 1909:149 stated that the forms ἔφην and ἐφάμην *sind unstreitig ihrer Bildung nach Aoriste*.

The first scholars to suggest that the meaning of φημί might have been aoristic, were Madvig 1847:112 and Buttmann 1858:222, followed by Stahl 1907:123-124, Wackernagel 1920:173, Kieckers 1926c:24 and Fournier 1946a:18-21, 1946b:60-65.

See also Kölligan 2007:224 on this issue.

⁸⁴³ Fournier 1946:18-21, 1946b:60-65.

⁸⁴⁴ Fournier 1946:18-21, 1946b:60-65.

⁸⁴⁵ Kühner-Gerth 1898:142-146.

⁸⁴⁶ Blass 1889.

⁸⁴⁷ Delbrück 1879:103-106; Veitch 1879:675-676. This use of the imperfect was not addressed in Meisterhans 1885 nor in Threutte 1980, 1996. For Attic prose, see also Blass 1889.

⁸⁴⁸ Blass 1889, Stahl 1907:97-99.

⁸⁴⁹ Blass 1889, his title was *Demosthenische Studien* which clearly referred to the Attic nature of the phenomenon. He discussed Demosthenes and Attic inscriptions, but did not address other sources.

⁸⁵⁰ Jacobsthal 1907:6-17 for the Cretan inscriptions (although he noted that the aorist tended to replace the imperfect in later Cretan inscriptions); Svensson 1930 *passim* with the conclusion on page 77. Blass and Svensson were followed by Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:277-278; Chantraine 1953:192, 1966:40-43; Braswell 1988:107; Hummel 1993:240; and Rijksbaron 2002:18-19. This was also observed by Hettrich 1976:59-60 for Herodotos. His explanation was the following: *Der PSt (Präsensstamm, FDD) bezeichnet a) den Akt des Sagens unter Einschluß des fortwirkenden Zustandes, der durch diesen Akt hervorgerufen wird, bis zur Reaktion des Angesprochenen; b) den Akt des Sagens allein in seiner Erstreckung*.

⁸⁵¹ For Vedic, see Grassmann 1877:927, Whitney 1885:109, and Werba 1997:445; for Greek and Indo-Iranian see Schirmer 2001a (LIV).

In the verses mentioned above, the speech introduction verb is expressed in the imperfect, because it provoked a reaction by the addressee or by someone from the audience. In the first verse, Akhilleus guaranteed the safety of Kalkhas, and as a result of this, Kalkhas started to speak. In the second instance, Kalkhas reacted to Akhilleus's protection, took courage and started to speak. His encouragement was expressed in the aorist,⁸⁵² but his speaking in the imperfect, because it caused a reaction by Agamemnon

The following introductions are used to introduce the speeches in the angry confrontation between Agamemnon and Akhilleus. As each speech causes a reaction, the introductions are put in the imperfect and not in the aorist:

τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 1,121).

τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 1,130).

τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 1,148).

τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 1,172).

The use of the imperfect in speech introductions is paralleled in Avestan (the verb is underlined):⁸⁵³

adauuata anrō mainiiuš pouru.mahrkō (*Yašt* 3,14).

« *Anra Mainiiu aux nombreuses destructions dit* ».

paiti ahmāi auuašata spitāmō Zaraθuštrō (*Videvdad* 19,7).

« *Spitāma Zaraθuštra lui répondit* ».

In the RV, the root *VADⁱ* is used in the imperfect to introduce a speech in the following instance:⁸⁵⁴

avapātantīr avadan divá óṣadhayas pári yám jīvám aśnāvāmahai ná sá riṣyāti pūruṣaḥ
vom Himmel herabfliegend sprachen die Kräuter: Wen wir am Leben antreffen werden,
der Mann soll nicht zur Schade werden. (RV 10.97,17)⁸⁵⁵

2. In introductions ἔειπον is used in the aorist. The root **uek^w* can be used to introduce and conclude direct speech in Greek and Indo-Iranian,⁸⁵⁶ and is only attested in the aorist in Greek. As such, the difference in tense usage between the aorist **uek^w* and the imperfects **h₂uedH* and **b^heh₂* is not a Greek innovation but an inherited feature.

3. ἀγορεύω and ἀγοράομαι are both derived from **h₂gor* “speak, gather”, but are used in different tenses in introductions: the former appears in the imperfect, while the latter is used

⁸⁵² Chantraine 1953:193.

⁸⁵³ Kellens 1984:247; the translations are taken from Kellens as well.

⁸⁵⁴ Lubotsky 1997:1223; the text is the one by Van Nooten-Holland 1994:537.

⁸⁵⁵ Geldner 1951c:307.

⁸⁵⁶ For Vedic, see Delbrück 1876:66 and Grassmann 1877:1191. For Greek and Vedic, see Mutzbauer 1893:325; Bendahman 1991:40.

in the aorist.⁸⁵⁷ The verb ἀγορεύω means “speak (in a group)”, and is used in the imperfect when it is used in speech introductions and conclusions. This “follows” the rules of the other speech introduction verbs:⁸⁵⁸ the imperfect use indicates that the speaking had a durative effect on the audience, even after it was finished.⁸⁵⁹ The verb is used in the aorist in the meaning “having revealed one’s opinion”, and does not refer to the actual speaking itself and its consequences but to a completed action,⁸⁶⁰ and is therefore expressed in the aorist (but in general the aorist of ἀγορεύω is rare⁸⁶¹):

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ

μῦθον ἀγασσάμενοι: μάλα γὰρ κρατερῶς ἀγόρευσεν. (*Iliad* 8,28-29).

This conclusion appears after Zeus’s prohibition to help the Greek army in any way possible. The actual speech conclusion appeared in the imperfect, while μάλα γὰρ κρατερῶς ἀγόρευσεν resumed the speech a second time.

ἀγοράομαι is used in the imperfect when it means “organise an assembly, hold an assembly”, while it is used in the aorist when it is combined with a verb of speaking and when the verb means “speak in the assembly”. The imperfect is used, because the organising and holding of the assembly is considered to be more durative than the actual speaking in the assembly itself.

Two examples show this difference:

οἱ δὲ θεοὶ πὰρ Ζηνὶ καθήμενοι ἡγορόωντο (*Iliad* 4,1)

“and sitting beside Zeus, the gods gathered in assembly”.⁸⁶²

This verse described how the gods were holding assembly and refers to an activity that lasted for a longer period than just the speaking itself. This is contrasted by the use of ἀγοράομαι in speech introductions, in which it refers to the speaking alone:

ὃ σφιν ἐὺ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν (*Iliad* 1,73).

This verse described how Kalkhas responded to Akhilleus’s request to explain the cause of the plague, how he stood up and spoke to the Greek army.

4. In conclusions the verbs ἦ and ἔειπον are used in the aorist.

5. In conclusions φημί and ἀγορεύω are used in the imperfect.

⁸⁵⁷ Seiler 1955b and c.

⁸⁵⁸ I refer for more details to the subchapter of **h₂gor*.

⁸⁵⁹ Seiler 1955c:85 described the use of the imperfect in this verb as *ohne Anfangs- oder Endpunkt*.

⁸⁶⁰ The use of the aorist for ἀγορεύω in the meaning “reveal one’s opinion” is also visible in the subjunctive and the imperative, but this has to remain outside the scope of this dissertation.

⁸⁶¹ Wackernagel 1916a:221; Seiler 1955c; Shipp 1972:265.

⁸⁶² Kirk 1985:331.

In Greek ἔειπον was used as aorist to λέγω and ἀγορεύω (but both verbs had their own principal parts as well, even in the Homeric poems⁸⁶³),⁸⁶⁴ and never built its own paradigm with present, future and perfect.

The differences in tense usage is aspectual and related to the reaction of the audience. The imperfect is used when the subject of the speaking is not the same as that of the next sentence and/or when the reaction of the audience is mentioned. This is best illustrated by the verb φημί: it is used more than 500 times in a conclusion, but only in 46 instances the subject of the conclusion is also subject of the verb of the next sentence.⁸⁶⁵ This use of the imperfect is the same as the one discussed in speech introductions: as the speaking has a durative effect on the audience, it is expressed in the imperfect. As was stated above, it is not necessary to interpret the forms of φημί as aorists or as imperfects with aorist meaning.⁸⁶⁶ Examples of a speech conclusion in which the reaction of the audience is expressed are:⁸⁶⁷

ὥς ἔφατ', ἔδδειςεν δ' ὁ γέρον καὶ ἐπείθετο μύθῳ (*Iliad* 1,33).

This verse described how Khryses was struck with fear after Agamemnon told him to go away lest he be harmed in spite of his priesthood. As Agamemnon's rude speaking caused a reaction in his addressee, the speaking was expressed in the imperfect.

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἢ δ' ἐπίθοντο (7 instances).⁸⁶⁸

This verse describes how the speaking by one person is immediately obeyed by the audience.

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ (this verse occurs 7 times).⁸⁶⁹

In this specific verse, it is related how the speaking of one person causes an unwanted silence and disappointment among the audience.

The aorist, on the other hand, is used when the reaction of the audience is not mentioned or when the speaker immediately proceeds to something else. In those instances, the speaking is not durative but punctual and has no lasting effect on the audience (therefore no reaction of the audience is mentioned either). The two verbs that use the aorist in conclusions are ἦ and ἔειπον. Some examples make this clear:

⁸⁶³ The aorist ἀγορεῦσαι occurs (among others) in *Iliad* 12,176. The future indicative (or aorist subjunctive?) ἀγορεύσω occurs in (among others) in αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Τρώεσσι μεθ' ἱπποδάμοις ἀγορεύσω (*Iliad* 7,361). See Veitch 1879:10-12 and Kühner-Blass 1892:346-347.

⁸⁶⁴ Osthoff 1899:11-12; Fournier 1946a *passim*; Kölligan 2007:218-246.

⁸⁶⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 1,245; 1,584; 2,142; 3,395; 4,104; 4,208; 5,899; 6,51; 9,173; 10,332; 11,804; 13,468; 15,119; 16,46; 17,33; 17,123; 17,342; 20,31; 23,108; 23,793; 24,507; 24,760 and *Odyssey* 1,42; 1,420; 2,80; 4,65; 4,113; 4,183; 4,758; 6,66; 9,500; 16,448; 17,150; 17,233; 17,409; 17,462; 18,151; 18,422; 19,249; 20,54; 21,80; 21,175; 21,181; 22,465; 23,231 and 24,520.

⁸⁶⁶ This was discussed in more detail in the chapter on φημί.

⁸⁶⁷ More instances have been discussed in the chapter on φημί.

⁸⁶⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 7,379; 9,79; 14,133; 14,378; 15,300; 23,54; 23,738.

⁸⁶⁹ The instances are: *Iliad* 7,92; 8,28 (the lines 8,28-40 are contested), and *Odyssey* 8,234; 11,333; 13,1; 16,393 and 20,320.

ἦ ῥα, καὶ Ἑκτορα δῖον ἀεικέα μήδετο ἔργα (*Iliad* 22,395; 23,24).

These verses describe how Akhilleus finished speaking and started thinking about how he could further defile Hektor's body. The reaction of his audience is not mentioned. As Akhilleus proceeded from speaking to doing something else, his speaking was only punctual and therefore expressed in the aorist.

ἦ μὲν ἄρ' ὥς εἰποῦσ' ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη (*Iliad* 5,133).

This verse described how Athena had spoken and went away afterwards. There is no mention of the reaction of the audience in the sentence following the conclusion.

ὥς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε καὶ οὐτήσασκε παραστάς (*Iliad* 22,375).

In this verse Homer described how the Greek soldiers finished speaking mockingly about the dead Hektor and started stabbing his corpse. As the subject of the speaking is the same as that of the next action, the aorist is used.

The aorist does not necessarily indicate anteriority but only the completion of the action, as there are several instances where an anterior meaning for an aorist participle would have been impossible.⁸⁷⁰ In some verses, the participle εἰπών/ εἰποῦσα indicates an action starting before that of the main verb, but continuing along with it.⁸⁷¹ This use of the aorist participle is continued in Classical Greek.⁸⁷² Examples are:

ὥς εἰποῦσα θεὰ γλυκὺν ἥμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ (*Iliad* 3,139),

ὥς εἰποῦσ' ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου (*Iliad* 5,792).

The use of the aorist of **uek*^w to indicate the conclusion of a spoken word was also used in the RV.⁸⁷³ Examples of aorists concluding a prayer or offering in the RV, besides the ones quoted among the *figurae etymologicae* in the subchapter on *ἔειπον*, are (the verb is underlined):⁸⁷⁴

āvocāma nivācani asmin mā:nasya sūnuḥ sahasāne agnaú (RV 1,189,8).

*wir haben vertrauliche Worte vor ihm gesprochen, ich, der Sohn des Māna, vor dem mächtigen Agni.*⁸⁷⁵

āvocāma kavāye médhiyāya vāco vandá:ru vr̥ṣabhāya vr̥ṣṇe (RV 5,1,12).

⁸⁷⁰ Platt 1919 listed the most striking examples of aorist participles, for which an anterior meaning was excluded. None of his examples was one of *ἔειπον*.

⁸⁷¹ Delbrück 1897:483; Kühner-Gerth 1898:156; Brugmann 1900:493; Ameis – Hentze – Cauer 1913:119; Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:300-301; Chantraine 1953:188-189; Krieter-Spiro 2009:60. This use of the aorist participle was observed for Attic prose by Kieckers 1913:152.

⁸⁷² Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:300-301; Rijksbaron 2002:125.

⁸⁷³ Delbrück 1876:66; the examples are taken from Delbrück, but the translations from Geldner (see the following notes). The punctual meaning was also mentioned by Mutzbauer 1893:325; Bendahman 1991:40.

⁸⁷⁴ The text is taken from Van Nooten – Holland 1994, the translations from Geldner 1951a, b and c.

⁸⁷⁵ Geldner 1951a:270.

*Wir haben dem opferwürdigen Seher ein lobendes Wort gesagt, dem männlichen Bullen.*⁸⁷⁶

Examples of speech conclusions with the root **uek*^w are:

ítīmám agnīm amṛtā avocan (RV 5,2,12c).⁸⁷⁷

*Also haben die unsterblichen zu diesem Agni gesagt.*⁸⁷⁸

evá: mahán bṛháddivo átharvā ávocat svá:m tanúvam índram evá (RV 10,120,9).

*Also hat der große Bṛhaddiva Atharvan zu ihm selbst, zu Indra, gesprochen.*⁸⁷⁹

6. The aspectual distinction is also visible with the verb *μυθέομαι*. When the speaker speaks to himself, the effect of the speaking has no effect on the audience, and therefore those speech introductions are expressed in the aorist:

κινήσας ῥα κάρη προτὶ ὄν μυθήσατο θυμόν (*Iliad* 17,200),

κινήσας δὲ κάρη προτὶ ὄν μυθήσατο θυμόν (*Iliad* 17,442; *Odyssey* 5,285; 5,376).

When the speaker addressed somebody else, the verb was put in the imperfect, because the words were intended to obtain something for the speaker and addressee:

ὠκύποδες φέρον ἄρμα: πατήρ δέ οἱ ἄγχι παραστάς

μυθεῖτ' εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων νοέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ (*Iliad* 23,304-305).

This verse described how Nestor advised his son Antilokhos to use trickery in the chariot race. This speech introduction in this verse is expanded over two verses, with the verb in emphatic enjambement.

7. A similar aspectual difference can be discerned in the forms of *ἐννέπω*. The verb *ἐννέπω* is durative and therefore the form *ἐννεπε* is used in the imperfect. This agrees with what was argued before, namely that genuine speech introduction verbs are predominantly used in the imperfect. The forms *ἐνένιπε* and *ἠνίπαπε* are used in the meaning “insult”, are more punctual or terminative and are therefore used in the aorist.⁸⁸⁰

8. The verb *φωνέω* is used in the aorist as simplex verb, but in the imperfect in the compounds.⁸⁸¹ Its initial meaning was “raise the voice” and therefore it was used in the aorist as a participle extension to existing introductions.⁸⁸² In most instances, the aorist is used in a

⁸⁷⁶ Geldner 1951b:3.

⁸⁷⁷ The text is taken from Van Nooten-Holland 1994:203.

⁸⁷⁸ Geldner 1953a:5.

⁸⁷⁹ Geldner 1953c:347.

⁸⁸⁰ The aspectual distinction was noticed by Hackstein 1997:36-37.

⁸⁸¹ The original meaning and detailed transition were discussed in the subchapter on *φωνέω*.

⁸⁸² Mutzbauer 1909:131; O’Sullivan 2010b:1074.

participle extension to an existing introduction and does not indicate anteriority, but only refers to the punctual meaning of the action.⁸⁸³ Examples of this extension are:

καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 7 times),⁸⁸⁴

καί σφεας φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring 5 times),⁸⁸⁵

οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδὼν, καὶ φωνήσας ἔπος ηὔδα (*Iliad* 24,307).

In these instances the meaning was still “raise one’s voice”.

In a second stage the verb was used as extension to introductions in the formula φώνησέν τε with a finite verb form. Initially, φώνησέν τε was used with another *verbum dicendi* and indicated the fashion in which the speaking occurred. As “raising the voice” was a punctual action, the aorist was used (cf. *supra*):

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνείας ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 20,199),

ὣς εἰπὼν ἵπποισιν ἐκέκλετο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 23,442),

Ἑρμείαν, ποτὶ δὲ Πρίαμον φάτο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 24,353).

Afterwards, φώνησέν τε was also used without another *verbum dicendi* and could introduce direct speech by itself:

αὐτὰρ ὃ ἔγνω ἦσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 1,333),

ὣς φάτο, τὸν δ' ὁ γέρον ἠγάσσατο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 3,181),

ἔξ ἵππων δ' ἀπέβαινεν ἐπὶ χθόνα φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 24,459).

This led to the reinterpretation of φωνέω as a *verbum dicendi*. As a result, it could also be used in speech conclusions. Used in conclusions, the tense usage of φωνέω was the same as that of the other verbs of speaking: when the subject of the speaking was the same of that of the next verb or when it had a function in the next sentence, the aorist was used.

ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπέβη πρὸς μακρὸν Ὀλύμπου (*Iliad* 24,468).

In this verse Homer described how Hermes finished speaking to Priam. As Priam’s reaction is not described and as Hermes proceeded to something else, the aorist is used in the participle.

ὣς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, λῦσεν δ' ἀγορὴν αἰνητήν (*Iliad* 19,276).

In this verse Homer described how Nestor finished speaking and dissolved the assembly. As there is no reaction mentioned and Nestor proceeds to another action, the aorist is used.

ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας πόρε φάρμακον ἀργεῖφόντης (*Odyssey* 10,302).

⁸⁸³ Kühner-Gerth 1898:154; Chantraine 1953:187-189.

⁸⁸⁴ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,550; 10,482; 10,500; 11,56; 11,209; 11,396 and 12,296.

⁸⁸⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 4,284; 4,337; 10,191 and *Odyssey* 4,77 and 10,430.

This verse described how Hermes finished speaking to Odysseus and offered him the antidote against Kirke's spell. The subject of the speaking and the verb of the next action are the same, and therefore the speaking is expressed in the aorist.

ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῇ δ' ἄπερος ἔπλετο μῦθος (*Odyssey* 17,57; 19,29; 21,386; 22,398)

This formula is a special case, because it indicates that the spoken words did not even reach the audience and therefore, a reaction by the audience is impossible. As such, the action is almost immediately completed and the use of the aorist is expected.

What distinguished φωνέω from the other *verba clamandi* is that it became used as a genuine speech introduction verb and “created” compounds as well. As soon as the compounds were created, they were used in the same meaning as the other verbs. As these other verbs were used in the imperfect, the compounds of φωνέω were also used in the imperfect.⁸⁸⁶

9. The pluperfect is used with **uerh₁*. The pluperfect is not used in Greek to state anteriority in the past, but only describes a completed state in the past and it can express simultaneity to actions in the past.⁸⁸⁷ The root **uerh₁* is used in 3 speech conclusions in the pluperfect εἶρητο. These conclusions indicated that a sudden action interrupted the speaker while he was speaking.

οὐ πω πᾶν εἶρητο ἔπος ὅτ' ἄρ' ἦλυθον αὐτοί (*Iliad* 10,540).

“The word had not even been completely spoken, when they suddenly came (fighting).”

In this instance, Nestor was interrupted by an attack while inciting the Greeks to fight against the Trojans.

10. I now discuss the instances of ἀμείβομαι and αὐδάω that are attested in the aorist.

10.1. The verb ἀμείβομαι is used twice in the aorist. In both cases, the speaker is immediately rebuked and there is no long-lasting conversation. As such, the answering is only a punctual action. In addition, the words are pronounced by characters, who are not known for their rhetorical skills and whose speeches have no durative effect:

τὸν δ' υἱὸς Καπανῆος ἀμείψατο κυδαλίμοιο (*Iliad* 4,403).

In this specific instance, Aias reacted to an insult that Agamemnon directed at Diomedes. Diomedes did not want to react to Agamemnon's words, so Aias intervened. Diomedes, however, was not pleased with Aias's answer and told him to keep quiet. Aias was a man of actions and did not accomplish great deeds by his speaking. Therefore, the aorist is used in the introduction to his speech, because his words have no lasting effect and are immediately

⁸⁸⁶ For more details on this evolution, I refer to the subchapter on φωνέω.

⁸⁸⁷ Delbrück 1897:228; Brugmann 1904:569-571, 578; Kieckers 1926c:27; Thieme 1927:1-5; Duhoux 1992:437; Kümmel 2000:82-83; Tichy 2009:86.

rebuked by Diomedes. Riggsby noticed the rareness of the aorist ἀμείψατο and suggested correcting it into the imperfect ἀμείβετο,⁸⁸⁸ but in light of the temporal distinction, I do not think that this correction is necessary.

Πηλείδην Ἀχιλλῆα δίκη ἡμείψατ' ἀναστάς (*Iliad* 23,542).

In this verse, Antilokhos (Nestor's son) protested against stripping him of his prize in the chariot racing. Nestor had told how he could use trickery to win the race, and as a result, Antilokhos effectively won the race. After the race, Menelaos complained to Akhilleus about his (Ant) unfair game. Akhilleus was moved by Menelaos's arguments and was about to offer the prize to Menelaos instead of Antilokhos, when he reacted. As Antilokhos's reaction will have no long lasting effect and will fail, the speaking is expressed in the aorist.

10.2. The verb αὐδάω is used twice in the aorist. Both instances refer to speakers who speak in an unusual fashion.

ὅς τόσον αὐδήσασχ' ὅσον ἄλλοι πεντήκοντα (*Iliad* 5,786).

This verse compared Here's speaking to the speech capacities of Stentor, who was renowned for his legendary strong voice. In this instance the aorist is used, because this is a single comparison and Here is normally not depicted as Stentor.

ὥς δέ τις αὖ Τρώων μεγαθύμων αὐδήσασκεν (*Iliad* 17,420).

This speech introduction appeared in a *tis speech* and described how an unknown and unspecified Trojan stood over Patroklos's body and foretold that his death would cause the destruction of Troy. This is linked to a specific situation and not a repeated action that occurred on many occasions. There is no reply nor reaction to this speech. As such, an aorist is more suitable than an imperfect.

11. This aspectual difference is also observed in the postposed negative conditional sentences introduced by εἰ μή, which are used in past counterfactual sequences.⁸⁸⁹ Many

⁸⁸⁸ Riggsby 1992:107.

⁸⁸⁹ In Classical Philology and in Indo-European scholarship, the term "irrealis" is often used to refer to statement contrary-to-fact, as is the case in the French *irréel* and German *irrealis*: for the French term, see Lazard 1998:235 and for the use of the German term, one can refer to Hettrich's works.

In general linguistics, on the other hand, the term "irrealis" is normally used to refer to everything that is not realis, i.e. not belonging to the actual world, but being potential, past potential, present and past counterfactual. The first to use the term *irrealis* in this meaning was Sapir 1930:165. In general linguistics after Sapir, the term has been used to refer to everything that does not belong to the world of reality, but in this causes problems, because how can one then address the issue of negation? For negation and irrealis, see Kinkade 1998:234. As Bendix (1998:253) correctly stated *not everything that is not realis is irrealis*.

Consequently, there no universally accepted definition for the term, see Steele 1975; James 1982 and 1991; Givón 1994:268; Fleischman 1989:5; Robert 1990:366; Elliott 2000; Verstraete 2005:250; Van linden – Verstraete 2008; De Haan 2012; Cristofaro 2012; Michael 2014 (this is only a selection, as the literature on counterfactuals and irrealis constructions is very large). Bybee (1998:269) goes even further and argued that *it appears that the term "irrealis" is simply too broad to be useful*, but this might be too agnostic. One can refer to the special issue of *AnthrL* in 1998 and the one of *LS* in 2012 which was dedicated to the notion of "irrealis". In

grammars argue that the present counterfactual is always expressed by the imperfect of the indicative, while the aorist indicative was used for the past counterfactual.⁸⁹⁰ Although the exact relationship between past tense and counterfactual constructions is debated,⁸⁹¹ there is a tendency for counterfactuals to be expressed by a past tense, and for the most past tense to express the most past counterfactual construction.⁸⁹² This explains why the strict Classical Latin rules require the subjunctive pluperfect for the past counterfactual, while the subjunctive imperfect is used for the present counterfactual.⁸⁹³ As imperfect and aorist (and also the pluperfect) can all refer to the past and have no relative chronology towards each other but are only distinguished by their aspectual value (cf. *supra*), this rigid distinction would be surprising.⁸⁹⁴ In fact, these three tenses can be used in the past counterfactual, depending on the aspect that is expressed.⁸⁹⁵ This is clear from the speech introductions. Some examples:

καὶ νῦ κέν οἱ πόρεν ἵππον, ἐπήνησαν γὰρ Ἀχαιοί,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' Ἀντίλοχος μεγαθύμου Νέστορος υἱὸς
Πηλεΐδην Ἀχιλῆα δίκη ἡμείψατ' ἀναστάς: (*Iliad* 23,540-542).

that issue, Cristofaro applied the term *irrealis* to the Greek optative (2012:133 and 143), but did not distinguish between present potential, past potential and *optativus obliquus*.

In order to avoid confusion, I will continue to use the terms “potential”, “past potential”, “present counterfactual” and “past counterfactual”.

⁸⁹⁰ Krüger 1845:190-191; Madvig 1847:116-117; Gildersleeve 1900:169; Kühner-Gerth 1904:468-472; Goodwin 1900:93-94; Bizos 1961:158-161 (but see also below). This was recently stated by Greenberg 1986:249 and Rijksbaron 2002:73.

⁸⁹¹ Many scholars assume that there is an inherent relationship between past tense and counterfactual because both of them are removed from the present (Nutting 1901 for Greek and Latin; Kendrick Pritchett 1955:8-9 and Seiler 1971 for Greek; Steele 1975; Langacker 1978; James 1982, 1991:285; Fleischman 1989; Hofling 1998). Others argue that the past tense alone is not enough to mark the contrafactivity (Givón 1994; Dahl 1997; Verstraete 2005:230-231; Lazard 2006; Van linden – Verstraete 2008:1867; Gerö 2001 stated this for Greek). In addition, there are indeed languages where future-based tenses are used for the counterfactual constructions, see Robert 1990, Verstraete 2005 and Michael 2014.

⁸⁹² Fleischman 1989:6-7.

⁸⁹³ The Latin counterfactual constructions followed a strict schema, but in Older Latin this schema had not been grammaticalised (cf. *infra*).

⁸⁹⁴ As Martin Hose pointed out to me, there has always been a tendency to apply the strict grammatical rules of Latin to Greek as well. This might be another instance of this.

⁸⁹⁵ Krüger 1845:190-191; Madvig 1847:116-119; Gildersleeve 1900:169; Nutting 1901:298; Kühner-Gerth 1904:468-472; Goodwin 1900:93-94; Bizos 1961:158-161 mentioned both options: they argued that the traditional distinction was the rule, but that the aspectual meaning could sometimes put an imperfect in a past counterfactual. For the aspectual difference, see Kieckers 1926c:54; Bornemann – Risch 1978:229-230; Delaunois 1975:5-7, 1988:96-106; McKay 1981; Krisch 1986:22; Hettrich 1992:267, 1998; Gerö 2001:188. Schwyzler-Debrunner 1950:345-350 pointed out that the aspectual difference was the original one, and that the use of the imperfect for the present counterfactual and the aorist for the past counterfactual was only grammaticalised in Attic. Fanning noted that while the pluperfect maintained its past state meaning in the counterfactuals in the New Testament, the imperfect took over most of the other instances and the aorist was not used that often anymore (1990:252, 282-290, 309).

Time reference in unreal conditions is often problematic, I refer to the editors' note before Harris 1986: *however, the boundary between potential and unreal conditionals is less clear-cut than between real and either of them, and the time parameter is less clear-cut in potential and unreal conditions than in real conditions*. (underlining is mine)

In this instance, the aorist was used, because the act of answering was a single and unsuccessful action of a minor character. The use of the aorist is therefore not related to the fact that it is a past counterfactual, but to the fact that the responding was a single action. It is noteworthy that the aspectual difference also applies to the main clause: *πόρεν* is an aorist, because the giving of a gift is a completed action.

καί νύ κε δὴ πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα
 Ἕκτορα δάκρυ χέοντες ὀδύροντο πρὸ πυλάων,
 εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ἐκ δίφροιο γέρων λαοῖσι μετηύδα (*Iliad* 24,713-715).

In this instance, the imperfect is used, because *verba dicendi* appear in the imperfect to indicate a lasting effect on the audience. The imperfect is used, although there is a clear reference to the past.⁸⁹⁶ The aspectual difference also applies to the main clause: *ὀδύροντο* is an imperfect, because it refers to the durative wailing and mourning by the Trojans.

The clearest illustration for this aspectual difference comes from the following two introductions with *φωνέω*:

καί νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδν φάος ἡελίοιο,
 εἰ μὴ Τηλέμαχος προσεφώνεεν ὃν πατέρ' αἶψα (*Odyssey* 16,220-221).

This verse described how the sun would have set for both Telemakhos and Odysseus when they were crying, if Telemakhos had not spoken to his father first.

καί νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδν φάος ἡελίοιο,
 εἰ μὴ Ὀδυσσεὺς αὐτὸς ἐρύκακε φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 21,226-227).

In this instance the poet related that Odysseus and Eumaios started crying, and that the sun would have set, if Odysseus had not restrained him and spoken to him to keep quiet.

The aspectual difference also applies to the main clause: *ἔδν* is an aorist, because the setting of the sun is a punctual and completed action. The form *φώνησέν τε* is put in the aorist because it refers to a punctual action of “raising one’s voice” while *προσεφώνεεν* is an imperfect because it is a compound verb of speaking used in a speech introduction. Those verbs are mostly put in the imperfect to stress the durative effect of the speaking on the audience.

This aspectual difference applies to all instances of the potential and counterfactual constructions⁸⁹⁷, be in the indicative or optative.⁸⁹⁸ Some examples (the verbs are put in bold face):

⁸⁹⁶ Hettrich 1992:267.

⁸⁹⁷ As will be argued later on, it is better to assume that Greek only had a past potential. The distinction between past potential and counterfactual depended on the context.

ἦ γὰρ ἂν Ἀτρεΐδῃ νῦν ὕστατα **λωβήσαιο** (*Iliad* 1,232).

“indeed, son of Atreus, you would have committed your last outrage.”⁸⁹⁹

In this sentence Akhilleus scoffed at Agamemnon saying that he was very close to having said his last insulting words, as he (Akh) almost killed him (Ag). The aorist is used here while it refers to a single action.

An example of a counterfactual in the optative in the present stem is:⁹⁰⁰

εἰ μὲν γὰρ μὴ δῶρα **φέροι** τὰ δ' ὅπισθ' **ὀνομάζοι**

Ἀτρεΐδης, ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἐπιζαφελῶς **χαλεπαῖνοι**,

οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγέ σε μῆνιν ἀπορρίψαντα **κελοίμην** (*Iliad* 9,515-517).

“If Atreus’s son were not bringing you gifts, but still called you names and forever carried a heavy grudge (against you), I would not advise you to give up your wrath.”

In this instance, Odysseus tried to persuade Akhilleus to let go of his anger, by arguing that Agamemnon was not angry with him but was even offering him rich gifts. The present stem is used, because the offering, scolding and advising are durative actions (as is confirmed by the presence of αἰὲν “always” and ὅπισθ’ “further on”).

An example of a counterfactual in the optative an aorist and perfect stem combined is:

(...) τάχα κεν φεύγοντες ἐναύλους

πλήσειαν νεκύων, εἴ μοι κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων

ἦπια **εἰδείη**: νῦν δὲ στρατὸν ἀμφιμάχονται (*Iliad* 16,71-73).

“soon they would have filled the rivers beds in their flight with their corpses, if (only) rules Agamemnon had known (to act) appropriately towards me, but now, they (sc. the Trojans) are pressing on the (Greek) army.”

Akhilleus complained here that he was mistreated by Agamemnon; if he had received respect, the Trojans would have been dying in large numbers, but now they are destroying the Greeks. The perfect stem is used because the verb “know” in Greek is resultative, and the filling of the river is described in the aorist, because one can only fill a river with his corpse once.

οὐκ ἂν δὴ **μείνειας** ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον;

γνοίης χ' οἴου φωτὸς ἔχεις θαλερὴν παράκοιτιν (*Iliad* 3,52-53).

“Would you now not face Menelaos, loved by Ares? You would soon find out/you would soon have found out of what human being you are holding the beautiful wife.”

⁸⁹⁸ I agree with Chantraine 1953, Van Emde Boas – Huitink 2010 and García Ramón 2012b that the tense division in all moods was aspect based and not random, as Fournier 1946b:60-65, Chantraine 1966 and Basset 2000a and 2000b argued.

⁸⁹⁹ The translation is based on the *Loeb* and the *Chicago Homer*. Unless noted otherwise, translations are mine.

⁹⁰⁰ Hettrich 1992:267.

In this instance, Hektor suggested that Paris would engage in battle with Menelaos, as he would then find himself confronted with a strong fighter. Both verbs are put in the aorist stem, because the meeting of Menelaos and the finding out of Menelaos's strength are single actions.

οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότῃ γ' ἐκεύθανον εἴ τις ἴδοιτο (*Iliad* 3,453).

“They would not have hidden him out of love, if someone had seen him.”

This verse described how the Trojans did not like Paris, and would not have hidden him but have willingly delivered him to the Greeks, if it meant that their city would be spared. The hiding is expressed in the imperfect, because it involves a durative action, while the seeing is a punctual action.

εἰ δὲ σύ γ' εἰσελθοῦσα πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρὰ

ὦμόν **βεβρώθεις** Πρίαμον Πριάμοιό τε παῖδας

ἄλλους τε Τρῶας, τότε κεν χόλον **ἐξακέσαιο** (*Iliad* 4,34-36).

“If you had gone through the gates and high walls and completely devoured Priam, his children and the other Trojans raw, only then you would have satisfied your hatred.”

In this verse, Zeus stated that Hera was so enraged with the Trojans that only eating them would satisfy her anger. The perfect stem is used to describe the completed action of the eating alive of the Trojans, and the aorist is used to describe the single action of the satisfying of the hatred.

This aspectual distinction applied to the “modal indicatives”⁹⁰¹ as well.

ἔγχος ἐμόν **κατέπαυσε** διαμπερές, εἴ σ' **ἔβαλόν** περ (*Iliad* 16,618).

“My sword would have immediately stopped you, if I had hit you.”

This aspectual distinction was still valid in Classical Greek as well, and it is therefore not necessary to assume “mixed constructions” with past and present counterfactuals when imperfect and aorist are used besides one another.⁹⁰² Some Attic examples make this clear:⁹⁰³

⁹⁰¹ The term is taken from Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:344 and Chantraine 1953:225. See also Seiler 1997:310.

⁹⁰² Krüger 1845:190-191; Madvig 1847:116-119; Gildersleeve 1900:169; Kühner-Gerth 1904:468-472; Goodwin 1900:93-94; Bizon 1961:158-161 mentioned both options: they argued that the traditional distinction was the rule, but that the aspectual meaning could sometimes put an imperfect in a past counterfactual. For the aspectual difference, see Kieckers 1926c:54; Smyth 1956:516-520; Bornemann – Risch 1978:229-230; Delaunoy 1975:5-7, 1988:96-106; McKay 1981; Krisch 1986:22; Hettrich 1992:267, 1998.

Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:345-350 pointed out that the aspectual difference was the original one, and that the use of the imperfect for the present counterfactual and the aorist for the past counterfactual was only grammaticalised in Attic.

Greenberg 1986:249 and Rijksbaron 2002:73 stated that the tense distinction was the basis for the difference past – present counterfactual and did not address the aspect.

Time reference in unreal conditions is often problematic, I refer to the editors' note before Harris 1986: *however, the boundary between potential and unreal conditionals is less clear-cut than between real and either of them,*

οἶκος δ' αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν **λάβοι**, σαφέστατ' ἂν **λέξειεν**.

“The house itself would have told (the story) very clearly, if it had taken a voice.”

(Aiskhylos, *Agamemnon* 37-38).⁹⁰⁴

In these verses Aiskhylos stated that the house Agamemnon would have started to relate the dreadful story of Agamemnon's murder as soon as it had acquired a voice: the speaking is ingressive and the acquiring of a voice is punctual, hence the aorists.

οὐκ ἂν οὖν νήσων ἔξω τῶν περιοικίδων, αὐται δὲ οὐκ ἂν πολλαὶ **εἶεν**, ἡπειρώτης ὦν **ἐκράτει**, εἰ μὴ τι καὶ ναυτικὸν **εἶχεν** (Thucydides 1.9,4)

“As he lived on the mainland, he could not have ruled (for so long) over the islands in the vicinity, and there could not have been many of them, if he had not also had some kind of fleet.”⁹⁰⁵

In this instance, Thucydides combined an optative for the past potential with an imperfect for the counterfactual of the past.⁹⁰⁶ In this instance the present stem is used because it involved actions that were referred to durative actions.⁹⁰⁷

εἰ μὴ ὑμεῖς **ἦλθετε**, **ἐπορευόμεθα** ἂν ἐπὶ βασιλέα (Xenophon, *Anabasis* 2,1,4).⁹⁰⁸

“If you had not come, we would have been marching against the king (of Persia).”

The coming is considered complete and is expressed in the aorist, while the marching is durative and therefore appears in the aorist.

εἴ τι **πάθοι** (...) καὶ τοῦτ' **ἐξεργάσαιτο** (Demosthenes 4,12).

“If something suddenly happened to him and he had nevertheless accomplished this.”

The aorists are used because the actions of something happening to Philip of Macedon and his subsequent action were considered punctual and single events.

ἀξιόπιστος δ' ἂν εἰκότως **φαίνοιτο** (Demosthenes 1,3).

“He would seem truly trustworthy.”

The present stem was used here because Demosthenes was talking about Philip's actions in the past which gave the false impression that he could be trusted.

and the time parameter is less clear-cut in potential and unreal conditions than in real conditions. (underlining is mine)

⁹⁰³ The examples of Xenophon and Thucydides were found in Hettrich 1996:134; I compiled the examples from Demosthenes myself.

⁹⁰⁴ The commentaries by Fraenkel (1950:24) and Page – Denniston (1957:70) did not discuss the use of the tense.

⁹⁰⁵ This translation is based on the one of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

⁹⁰⁶ The tense and mood usage in this passage was not discussed in Gomme's Commentary.

⁹⁰⁷ Hettrich 1996:134.

⁹⁰⁸ Hettrich 1996:134.

It is therefore clear that the distinction in tense use in the potential constructions is not related to present or pastness, but to the aspect.

5.3. Speech introductions and conclusions referring to the future.

There are 10 speech introductions and 7 speech conclusions referring to a speech in the future: the verbs in the conclusions are always expressed in the future indicative, while the verbs in the introductions are used 8 times in the aorist subjunctive, once in the future indicative and once in the future indicative with modal particle. The following elements are common to all the speech introductions referring to the future:⁹⁰⁹

- They are all part of a speech within a speech: a character is speaking and inserts a speech in his/her speech.
- They all express the expectation/ fear of the speaker that someone from the normal people or later generations will say something about the speakers or their actions.
- They are constructed without a person addressed and without words spoken.
- The speaker assumes it likely that the words will be spoken, but the words have not been spoken yet.
- The speeches that are concluded, have a conclusion in the future indicative.

The introductions and conclusions with future reference are listed below:⁹¹⁰

Speech introduction	Speech conclusion
καί κέ τις ὧδ' ἐρέει Τρώων ὑπερηνορεόντων (<i>Iliad</i> 4,176).	ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει: τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθών (<i>Iliad</i> 4,182).
καί ποτέ τις εἴπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσιν (<i>Iliad</i> 6,459).	ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει: σοὶ δ' αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος (<i>Iliad</i> 6,462).
καί ποτέ τις εἶποι 'πατρός δ' ὃ γε πολλὸν ἀμείνων' (<i>Iliad</i> 6,479).	No conclusion.
καί ποτέ τις εἴπησι καὶ ὀπιγόνων ἀνθρώπων (<i>Iliad</i> 7,87).	ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει: τὸ δ' ἐμὸν κλέος οὐ ποτ' ὀλεῖται. (<i>Iliad</i> 7,91).
ὄφρα τις ὧδ' εἴπησιν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε (<i>Iliad</i> 7,300).	No conclusion.
Ἐκτωρ γάρ ποτε φήσει ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ'	ὥς ποτ' ἀπειλήσει: τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα

⁹⁰⁹ Hentze 1905; Fingerle 1939:283-293; Wilson 1979; De Jong 1987a; O'Sullivan 1987b:486-487; Schneider 1995 *passim*; Kelly 2007:183-184; Strauss-Clay 2013. They were not discussed in Edwards 1970 nor in Beck 2005.

⁹¹⁰ Fingerle 1939:283-293; Führer 1967:48-50; Wilson 1979:1-2; Schneider 1995:13-14.

ἀγορεύων (<i>Iliad</i> 8,148).	χθών (<i>Iliad</i> 8,150).
ὄφρα τις ᾧδ' εἴπη Λυκίων πύκα θωρηκτάων (<i>Iliad</i> 12,317).	No conclusion.
μή ποτέ τις εἴπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος ἐμεῖο (<i>Iliad</i> 22,106).	ὥς ἐρέουσιν: ἐμοὶ δὲ τότε ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη (<i>Iliad</i> 22,108).
μή ποτέ τις εἴπησιν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων (<i>Iliad</i> 23,575).	No conclusion.
καὶ νύ τις ᾧδ' εἴπησι κακώτερος ἀντιβολήσας (<i>Odyssey</i> 6,275).	ὥς ἐρέουσιν, ἐμοὶ δέ κ' ὀνείδεα ταῦτα γένοιτο. (<i>Odyssey</i> 6,285).
μή ποτέ τις εἴπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν (<i>Odyssey</i> 21,324).	ὥς ἐρέουσ', ἡμῖν δ' ἂν ἐλέγχεα ταῦτα γένοιτο (<i>Odyssey</i> 21,329).

From the table above, the following 4 elements can be deduced:

- future reference in introductions is expressed in four different ways: optative aorist, aorist subjunctive, future indicative and future indicative with a modal particle;
- not every introduction is concluded (as was the case with the introductions referring to the past);
- most introductions referring to the future use the aorist subjunctive;
- the conclusions referring to the future are put in the future indicative.

I start by discussing c) and d). From the above mentioned data, it is clear that for an introduction in the future a subjunctive form of μek^w has to be used, while the conclusions in the future are expressed by forms of $*\mu erh_1$. The question is if there is a difference between the introductions in the aorist subjunctive and the conclusions in the future indicative. I believe that there is no distinction. The subjunctive in PIE expressed the will and/or the expectation of the speaker.⁹¹¹ In Homer, subjunctive and future indicative cannot be distinguished,⁹¹² and in Vedic the future is expressed much more often by the subjunctive than

⁹¹¹ Delbrück 1871 *passim*, see the conclusion on page 90, he discussed the examples quoted here on pp. 124-126; Brugmann 1904:579-583 (especially 581); Krahe 1972:128-129; Greenberg 1986:248; Tichy 2006:304-305, 2009:105-106; Weiss 2009:383; Fritz 2010:393; Fortson 2010:96 *the subjunctive was probably a future tense*. Whether PIE already had a future, is doubtful, see Krahe 1972:132, Fortson 2010:91). Recent scholars such as Tichy 2009:105-106 and Fritz 2010:390 assumed it had not. For a recent discussion of the PIE subjunctive see Bozzone 2012.

⁹¹² Monro 1891:252 *A Subj. of the Second and Third Person in an Affirmative sentence is usually an emphatic Future*; Kühner-Gerth 1898:217-218; Leaf 1900:291; Brugmann 1904:568-569 (with reference to this specific passage); Walter 1923:10; Schwyzler-Debrunner 1950:310; Hahn 1953; Chantraine 1953:209-210, 1964:245; Ruijgh 1971:287-288, 1992:75-77; Greenberg 1986:248; Latacz 2000b:147; Willmott 2007:64, 111, 194-195; Wachter 2009:104; Fritz 2010:393; Fortson 2010:106; Bozzone 2012:10.

by the future itself.⁹¹³ As the roots **uerh₁* and **uek^w* are not attested in all moods and tenses, the distinction is formally motivated:⁹¹⁴ **uek^w* could only appear in the aorist, while **uerh₁* was used in the future indicative and the pluperfect. The root **uek^w* can therefore only be used with future meaning if it was used in the subjunctive. There are parallels for this in the RV:

indrasya nú vīrīyāṇi prā vocaṃ (RV 1.32,1a).⁹¹⁵

*Des Indra Heldentaten will ich nun verkünden.*⁹¹⁶

prā sú va āpo mahimā nam uttamāṃ kārūr vocāti sādane vivásvataḥ (RV 10.75,1ab).⁹¹⁷

*Eure höchste Größe, ihr Gewässer, wird jetzt der Dichter fein verkünden an des Vivasvat Platze.*⁹¹⁸

In my opinion, the verbal distribution between introductions and conclusions is suppletive: the subjunctive aorist is used in the introductions, and the future indicative in the conclusions. This division is not metrically motivated, because the future indicative forms of ἐρέω are always metrically equivalent to the subjunctive forms of ἔειπον: ἐρέουσι can be substituted by εἴπωσι and ἐρέει can appear instead of εἴπη. The future indicative φήσει is equivalent to the aorist subjunctive εἴπη.⁹¹⁹ Theoretically, a conclusion with a subjunctive would have been possible as well. The reverse is not true, as the subjunctive aorist forms of ἔειπον cannot be substituted by a future indicative of **uerh₁* or φημί. This “suppletive division” explains the difference between introductions and conclusions better than assuming that the future was more objective⁹²⁰ or more emphatic⁹²¹ than the subjunctive.

In one instance, the optative is used to refer to the future:

καί ποτέ τις εἴποι ‘πατρός δ’ ὃ γε πολλὸν ἀμείνων’ (*Iliad* 6,479).

The most important nuance is not the future meaning, but the uncertainty about the actual fulfilment of the statement: the reason why the optative was used, was that this speech introduction did not state what Hektor expected someone to say, but what he hoped someone

⁹¹³ Delbrück 1874:183; Speijer 1896:54; Macdonell 1910:386; Renou 1952:369-370. For a recent study on the future in Vedic, see Bozzzone 2009.

⁹¹⁴ Osthoff 1899:11-12; Kölligan 2007:218-246.

⁹¹⁵ The tekst is taken from Van Nooten-Holland 1994:20.

⁹¹⁶ Geldner 1951a:36.

⁹¹⁷ The text is the one by Van Nooten-Holland 1994:520.

⁹¹⁸ Geldner 1951c:255.

⁹¹⁹ It could also have been equivalent to the sigmatic aorist subjunctive φήσῃ, but the sigmatic aorist of φημί is only attested as of Pindar (see Veitch 1871:675, Kühner-Blass 1892:210-211, LSJ *sub uoce*).

⁹²⁰ Kühner-Gerth 1898:217-218; Hentze 1907:357; 1909:131-132. This is also the opinion of Ameis-Hentze in their Homer commentary.

⁹²¹ Gonda 1956:75-76.

would say (underlining is mine). In this instance, the optative has the meaning of a wish and the speech is less “future-linked” than the others.⁹²²

In two introductions, the future indicative is used to refer to the future:

Ἐκτὼρ γάρ ποτε φήσει ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ' ἀγορεύων (*Iliad* 8,148).

In this verse, the poet could not distinguish between aorist subjunctive of one root and future indicative of another, because $*b^heh_2$ “speak” does not belong to the suppletive schema $*\mu ek^w$ - $*\mu erh_1$, nor is there another schema in which it is used.⁹²³ The verse is special in that it does not belong to the *tis* speeches, but has a determined subject.⁹²⁴ The sigmatic aorist of $*b^heh_2$ is not attested in Homer yet,⁹²⁵ and the form φήσει is better interpreted as an inherited “desiderative”.⁹²⁶

καὶ κέ τις ὧδ' ἐρέει Τρώων ὑπερηνορέοντων (*Iliad* 4,176).

In this instance the future indicative is used and is accompanied by the modal particle *κεν*.

All the *tis* speeches (including this instance) express something the speaker wants to obtain or avoid,⁹²⁷ but the main difference is that the subjunctive speeches refer to an action in the future that has not yet occurred, while the instance with modal particle is a reaction to an event that had already happened. A brief discussion of all these introductions with future reference makes this clear. I start by the introductions in the subjunctive:

- καὶ ποτέ τις εἴπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσας (*Iliad* 6,459).

Hektor depicted a gloomy picture of what awaited Andromakhe, if Troy were to be conquered: she would become a house slave, and someone would say that she used to be the wife of Hektor. At the time of speaking, however, Hektor had not died yet nor had Troy been taken.

- καὶ ποτέ τις εἴπησι καὶ ὀπιγόνων ἀνθρώπων (*Iliad* 7,87).

When Hektor announced the conditions for the duel between him and Aias, he stated that the victor would obtain the weaponry of his victim, but that the body would be returned for burial. He stated that Aias's grave mound would have the funeral inscription that he was killed by Hektor, who had slain many Greek warriors. At the time of speaking, however, the duel had not started yet.

- ὄφρα τις ὧδ' εἴπησιν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε (*Iliad* 7,300).

⁹²² Delbrück 1871:24-26; Greenberg 1986; Crespo 1997; Tichy 2002.

⁹²³ Fournier 1946:3-39; Kölligan 2007:227.

⁹²⁴ This is the reason why it was not discussed in detail in Schneider 1995 (as he stated himself on page 17).

⁹²⁵ Veitch 1871:675; Kühner-Blass 1892:210-211; LSJ *sub uoce*.

⁹²⁶ Schirmer 2001b (LIV).

⁹²⁷ Wilson 1979:1-3; De Jong 1987a:82-83; see also the chapter on *ἔειπον*.

This verse is a speech introduction, pronounced by Hektor in response to Aias, after Idaios suggested Hektor and Aias cease their duel. Hektor described how an undefined Greek or Trojan later might say that Hektor and Aias treated each other with respect. At the time of speaking the duel had not been stopped yet.

- ὄφρα τις ὧδ' εἶπη Λυκίων πύκα θωρηκτάων (*Iliad* 12,317).

This verse is a speech introduction within the speech of Sarpedon to Glaukos to incite him and excel in fighting, so that they may win glory and renown among the Lycians. At the time of speaking, the fighting had not started and Sarpedon and Glaukos had not excelled yet.

- μή ποτέ τις εἶπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος ἐμεῖο (*Iliad* 22,106).

In this instance, Hektor speaks to himself and fears that some lower ranked and less courageous Trojan might say that he brought downfall on Troy by believing too much in his own strength. At the time of speaking, Troy was still standing and Hektor had not made his fatal decision yet.

- μή ποτέ τις εἶπησιν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων (*Iliad* 23,575).

This is a speech introduction in the speech by Menelaos, who complained that Antilokhos had used foul play in the horse race, and suggested that amends be made to avoid that some unknown Greek might say in the future that the contest had been unfair. At the time of speaking Antilokhos had not apologised yet. Menelaos referred to what would happen if the conflict were not resolved. He used this speech to convince Antilokhos to accept his guilt and to apologise.

- καί νύ τις ὧδ' εἶπησι κακώτερος ἀντιβολήσας (*Odyssey* 6,275).

This verse is a speech introduction, belonging to Nausikaa's speech to Odysseus. She asked him not to follow her too closely into the city of the Phaiakians, because someone from a lower class might scoff at her for walking around in company of a foreign man. At the time of speaking, however, she had not yet been noticed by anyone nor had she and Odysseus gone to the city already.

- μή ποτέ τις εἶπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν (*Odyssey* 21,324).

This is a speech introduction formula which occurs in the speech of the suitor Eurymakhos. After the suitors failed to string the bow, Penelope suggested the beggar (Odysseus in disguise) be given a chance to shoot as well. Eurymakhos responded that it would be a cause of great shame for all the suitors, if the beggar were to succeed. When Eurymakhos spoke, the beggar had not tried the bow.

The context of the speech introduction in the future indicative is different, because it is a reaction to a specific event that had already occurred.

καὶ κέ τις ὧδ' ἔρξει Τρώων ὑπερηνορέοντων (*Iliad* 4,176).

This verse was pronounced by Agamemnon when he saw Menelaos lying on the ground after being hit by Pandaros's arrow. He thought that Menelaos would die and therefore exclaimed in despair that a Trojan would be dancing on Menelaos's grave and would ridicule him (A) for not being able to conquer Troy. At the time of speaking Agamemnon did not yet know that Menelaos's wounds were not mortal and he sincerely feared his brother would die.⁹²⁸ What distinguishes this introduction from the other introductions and conclusions is the use of the modal particle. Contrary to later Greek, a future indicative and a subjunctive in the main clause can also be used with a modal particle. The particle was first used with the optative and subjunctive, and its use was then extended to the future indicative as well, because future indicative and subjunctive were semantically close.⁹²⁹ The exact meaning of the particle is debated:⁹³⁰ it has been suggested that it described the conditions under which the action occurred and that it was used in sentences with a conditional meaning,⁹³¹ that it was used with the optative and subjunctive to indicate that the action expressed by the verbal form occurred in a specific instance and was not general (as first stated by Delbrück).⁹³² Basset modified the rule to state that the modal particle did not indicate the specific instance, but that it limited the verb to the current situation.⁹³³ Recently, Gerö explained its use as “intensifying”.⁹³⁴ The validity of this assumption has been doubted, because there were too many exceptions to the rule,⁹³⁵ and the use was then considered to be “poetic” or “metrically motivated”.

The “conditional” and “intensive” explanation can in my opinion not explain why the particle occurred in only one of the introductions above: all *potential tis speeches* are used by the

⁹²⁸ See already Faesi 1858:163.

⁹²⁹ Kühner-Gerth 1898:208; Stahl 1907:251; Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:351 (and not 251 as Chantraine printed); Chantraine 1953:225.

⁹³⁰ The most recent survey is Gerö 2000. It was not addressed in the Oxford, Cambridge or Basel Commentaries.

⁹³¹ That the modal particle was used with a subjunctive to describe the conditions under which the verbal action took place, had been noticed already in 1832 in the *Philological Museum* on page 102 (the author is only known by his initials H.M.) and by Hermann 1832 and Hartung 1832:216-334, especially 294.

⁹³² Delbrück 1871:83-86; Monro 1891:250, 259, 266, 327-335; Kühner-Gerth 1898:208; Leaf 1900:17; Brugmann 1900:499; Chantraine 1948:279, 1953:210-211; Valgiglio 1955:50; Ruijgh 1971 *passim* but especially 275 and 286-302, 1992:80-82; Dunkel 1990, 2014b:33-35, 397, 430.

⁹³³ Basset 1988a:32, 1989b:204.

⁹³⁴ Gerö 2000.

⁹³⁵ Basset 1988a:29, 1989b:205 (see the next footnote); Willmott 2007:199-210. Monro himself already admitted that there were many exceptions, but tried to correct many of the “problematic cases” (Monro 1891:259, 266-267). This rule is not even mentioned in the recent commentaries, such as the Oxford, Cambridge and Basel ones. Many exceptions involve the use of the so-called *te épique*. Chantraine (1953:349) had already voiced concerns on the “particularising” meaning (in spite of his own analyses).

speakers to present their view/fear for the future and are thus “intense”. The “conditional” explanation cannot explain why the particle is not used in generic relative clauses (cf. *infra*).

I believe that the most likely explanation is a combination of Delbrück’s and Basset’s observations, which can be summarised as follows: the modal particle was used in specific instances with a link to the present situation, and was omitted when a generic instance or an instance referring to the more remote future was referred to. This distinction seems to work well for the introductions quoted above, as only the introduction in the instance of Menelaos and Agamemnon refers to an instance that has already occurred, but two important questions remain:

a) why is the modal particle not used in the following introductions and conclusions that refer to the future and describe a specific instance as well:

ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει: τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθών (*Iliad* 4,182).

This is the conclusion of the introduction with a modal particle and refers therefore to the same specific instance in which the modal particle was used (namely Agamemnon’s fear for Menelaos’s life). The presence of the modal particle is expected, but is absent.

Ἐκτωρ γάρ ποτε φήσει ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ' ἀγορεύων (*Iliad* 8,148).

ὥς ποτ' ἀπειλήσει: τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθών (*Iliad* 8,150).

These two verses were pronounced by Diomedes when he expressed his fears that Hektor would ridicule him for retreating from him. As Diomedes had already backed out of combat, the instance refers to an actual event. We would therefore expect the modal particle.

b) Can the distinction between presence and absence be confirmed by other instances, and can the exceptions be explained?

Concerning question a), I believe that the modal particle was not used in the three instances quoted above, because the future tense was accompanied by the word ποτέ. This word means “someday, some time” and is unspecified. It is therefore less frequently combined with the specific value of the modal particle κε/ ἄν: ποτέ is combined 46 times with a future, subjunctive or optative,⁹³⁶ and in 39 instances there is no modal particle.⁹³⁷ An additional example makes this clear:

καὶ ποτέ τοι τρις τόσσα παρέσσεται ἀγλαὰ δῶρα (*Iliad* 1,213).

⁹³⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,166; 1,205; 1,213; 1,234; 1,240; 1,340; 2,97; 2,325; 2,379; 4,164; 4,182; 6,448; 6,459; 6,462; 6,479; 7,87; 7,91; 7,343; 8,148; 8,150; 9,495; 10,453; 13,625; 14,481; 15,40; 18,283; 22,106; 23,575 and *Odyssey* 1,308; 2,76; 2,137; 2,203; 2,256; 2,342; 3,216; 8,461; 17,249; 18,141; 19,22; 19,81; 21,324; 21,403; 24,196.

⁹³⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 1,213; 1,234; 1,240; 1,340; 2,97; 2,325; 2,379; 4,182; 6,459; 6,462; 6,479; 7,87; 7,91; 7,343; 8,148; 8,150; 9,495; 10,453; 13,625; 14,481; 15,40; 18,283; 22,106; 23,575 and *Odyssey* 1,308; 2,137; 2,203; 2,256; 2,342; 8,461; 17,249; 18,141; 19,22; 19,81; 21,324; 21,403; 24,196.

This instance was pronounced by Athena who told Akhilleus that one day he would be rewarded for not killing Agamemnon. As Athena did not refer to a specific instance but to an undetermined moment in the future, no modal particle was used.

Question b) is more difficult to answer. As was stated above, the Delbrück-Basset hypothesis seems the most promising. In order to confirm or deny it, I analysed the 98 instances of εἶπον and its compounds in the subjunctive and optative (most of them did not occur in speech introductions or conclusions), as they provided me with a representative sample from *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The results were the following (but they need to be confirmed by further investigations):

1. The analysis confirmed that the modal particle was used in specific instances with a link to the present situation, and was omitted when a generic instance was referred to.

ὅς κ' εἴποι ὃ τι τόσσον ἐχώσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 1,64).

This instance is probably one of the best examples for the use of κε as a particle in a specific context. After the Greek army was hit by the plague, Akhilleus suggested that somebody should tell them why Apollo was so enraged. In a relative clause with final or consecutive meaning, the optative is very often accompanied by the modal particle κε, and indicates the likely consequence of the action.⁹³⁸ The augment in ἐχώσατο also refers to the specific situation,⁹³⁹ and might have perfect meaning “(has become angry and) is now so enraged”.⁹⁴⁰ Bentley suggested to remove the particle to restore the digamma,⁹⁴¹ but this is not necessary, as not all instances of digamma are observed. Moreover, Danielsson showed that the digamma was used more often to avoid a hiatus than it was to cause lengthening by position.⁹⁴²

In the two examples quoted below, one refers to a specific instance of speaking by a defined subject and one to a generic *tis speech*.⁹⁴³

καὶ δέ κέ τοι εἴπησι, διοτρεφές, αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα (*Odyssey* 4,391).

καὶ νύ τις ὧδ' εἴπησι κακώτερος ἀντιβόλησας (*Odyssey* 6,275).

In the first instance Eidothea pointed out that her father Proteus would answer any question that was asked. As she referred to a specific person, the modal particle was used.⁹⁴⁴ In the second instance, Nausikaa feared that an undefined Phaiakian might see her in company of Odysseus and would chastise her for choosing a foreign husband. The second instance refers

⁹³⁸ Chantraine 1953:249, Latacz 2000b:53 with reference to Chantraine.

⁹³⁹ Bakker 2005:118.

⁹⁴⁰ Lejnieks 1964:46-47.

⁹⁴¹ Benteiana 1884:124.

⁹⁴² Danielsson 1909.

⁹⁴³ Chantraine 1953:211.

⁹⁴⁴ Chantraine 1953:211.

to an undefined character who could say something while the first one refers to a well-defined person, namely Proteus. The difference in definiteness explains the use and absence of the modal particle.⁹⁴⁵

When a speaker asked the audience to obey the words he was about to pronounce, he used the following formula:

ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἄν ἐγὼ εἶπω πειθώμεθα πάντες (attested 10 times),⁹⁴⁶

κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, Ἰθακήσιοι, ὅτι κεν εἶπω (attested 4 times).⁹⁴⁷

The modal particle referred to the specific words that were about to be spoken.

2. When a repeated action was described, the modal particle was much more absent than present.⁹⁴⁸ This is clear in the following instance:

δῶρ' ἀποαιρεῖσθαι ὅς τις σέθεν ἀντίον εἶπη (*Iliad* 1,230).

In this case, one would expect a modal particle to occur, because Akhilleus is referring to his specific situation, but he makes the situation more generic, and states that Agamemnon always takes the gifts from people who dare to stand up to him.⁹⁴⁹ This is seen in the (iterative) present form ἀποαιρεῖσθαι⁹⁵⁰ instead of the expected aorist, in the use of the generic ὅς τις,⁹⁵¹ and in the subjunctive εἶπη without modal particle. As such, Agamemnon's behaviour is not interpreted as an individual *faux pas* but an illustration of his systemic abuse of power. Ruijgh noted that the modal particle was used with the relative ὅς, but much less often with the indefinite relative and generic ὅς τις.⁹⁵² This agrees with the specifying value of the modal particle: when a specific person is referred to, the modal particle is used, but not when a generic situation is described.

3. When an action in the remote past was described, the modal particle was not used.

τῷ δόμεν ὅς μετὰ τοῖσι δίκην ἰθύντατα εἶποι (*Iliad* 18,508).

This verse occurs in the description of Akhilleus's new shield made by Hephaistos: as these verses describe an event in a remote mythical world, the link with the present is missing, and consequently no modal particle is used.

⁹⁴⁵ Chantraine 1953:211.

⁹⁴⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 2,139; 9,26; 9,704; 12,75; 14,74; 14,370; 15,294; 18,297 and *Odyssey* 12,213; 13,179. See also Appendix D.

⁹⁴⁷ The instances are *Odyssey* 2,25; 2,161; 2,229; 24,454. See also Appendix D.

⁹⁴⁸ Delbrück 1871:172-176; Hentze 1907; Howorth 1955; Hettrich 1992:266-267; 1996:136.

⁹⁴⁹ Ameis-Hentze 1884:19, Latacz 2000b:98

⁹⁵⁰ Ameis-Hentze 1884:19, Kirk 1985:77. I agree here with Chantraine's analyse in his *Grammaire homérique* and with Van Emde Boas – Huitink 2010 and García Ramón 2012b that the difference in tenses in subjunctive, imperative, optative and infinitive was aspect-based and not random, as Fournier 1946b:60-65, Chantraine 1966 and Basset 2000a and 2000b argued.

⁹⁵¹ Kirk 1985:77, Latacz 2000b:98.

⁹⁵² Ruijgh 1971:448-449; Basset 1989b:204-205.

4. The particle is missing in exhortative clauses, purpose clauses,⁹⁵³ wishes and after *verba timendi* (which may have been an original wish construction after all⁹⁵⁴).

νῦν δ' αἰνῶς δείδουκα κατὰ φρένα μή σε παρείπη (*Iliad* 1,555).

μή ποτέ τις εἴπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν (*Odyssey* 21,324).

This is a speech introduction formula which occurs in the speech of the suitor Eurymakhos. After the suitors failed to string the bow and shoot arrows through the axes, Penelope suggested the beggar be given a chance to shoot as well. Eurymakhos then responded that it would be a cause of great shame for all the suitors, if the beggar were to succeed. The clause is a negative wish but also has the idea of fear in it.⁹⁵⁵

ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (attested 9 times).⁹⁵⁶

The absence of the modal particle in the purpose and exhortative clauses is in my opinion an important argument against the “intensive” theory, because especially exhortative sentences have an intensified meaning, and one would therefore expect the modal particle to appear in these contexts, if its meaning were to intensify the verbal action. The same applies to negative purpose clauses, because this is something the speaker really does not want to happen, and therefore the “intensive” particle would have been expected.

5. The particle is missing if the preceding verb form has already been constructed with a modal particle.⁹⁵⁷ This is a sort of *conjunction reduction*: if one verb is already marked for particularity, it is not necessary to mark it with the following verb forms. The following examples make this clear (the marked verb and the particle are put in bold face, while the “reduced” verb is underlined):

ὅς **χ'** ἕτερον μὲν **κεῦθι** ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴπη (*Iliad* 9,313),

ὅς δέ **κ'** **ἀνήνηται** καὶ τε στερεῶς ἀποείπη (*Iliad* 9,510),

ταῦτα δ' ἄ μ' εἰρωτᾷς καὶ λίσσσαι, οὐκ **ἂν** ἔγωγε

ἄλλα παρὲς **εἵπομι** παρακλιδὸν οὐδ' ἀπατήσω (*Odyssey* 17,138-139),

ὃ φίλοι, οὐκ **ἂν** δὴ τις ἀν' ὀρσοθύρην **ἀναβαίη**

καὶ εἵποι λαοῖσι, βοή δ' ὥκιστα γένοιτο (*Odyssey* 22,132-133).

In the instances mentioned above, the first verb was determined by a modal particle, and therefore the second verb did not need an additional modal marking.

⁹⁵³ Weber 1884:32-38; Monro 1891:262; Chantraine 1953:266-273. The only ind-depth investigation of the Homeric purpose clauses is Weber 1884.

⁹⁵⁴ Delbrück 1871:23; Kühner-Gerth 1904:390-391; Hentze 1907:368; Chantraine 1953:208-209, 288; Brunel 1980:251.

⁹⁵⁵ Ameis-Hentze 1901:87, Chantraine 1953:208, Fernández Galiano 1992:186.

⁹⁵⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 7,68; 7,349; 7,369; 8,6 and *Odyssey* 7,187; 8,27; 17,469; 18,352; 21,276.

⁹⁵⁷ This had been noticed already by Madvig 1847:152, Frohberger 1863, Kühner-Gerth 1898:248-249. See most recently Gerö 2001:193.

6. When a subjunctive, optative or future indicative is negated, the modal particle is not used: in the first 6 chants of the *Iliad* there are 59 instances of a future indicative, subjunctive or optative with a negation,⁹⁵⁸ and in 44 cases there was no modal particle.⁹⁵⁹ The absence of the particle can be explained by the fact that the negation removes the link with the current situation (just as was the case with the augment).

7. It is not always clear to distinguish an exhortative subjunctive from a subjunctive with modal particle, nor is it always easy to explain why the modal particle was (not) used.

ἀλλ' ἄγ' ἐγών, ὃς σεῖο γεραίτερος εὖχομαι εἶναι,
ἐξείπω καὶ πάντα δίδωμαι: οὐδέ κέ τίς μοι
μῦθον ἀτιμήσει', οὐδέ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 9,60-62).

In the following instance the subjunctive ἐξείπω and the future indicative δίδωμαι are explained as exhortative, because of the presence of ἀλλ' ἄγ', but a difference with a “normal” future is not lightly made.⁹⁶⁰ At the same time, the form ἀτιμήσει' is used with modal particle, although it is negated. In this specific instance, one could argue that we are dealing with a litotes and that the sentence is therefore highly affirmative.

As such, I believe that the modal particle has indeed specifying value and that this specifying value confirms the distinction between introductions referring to the future with and without modal particle.

It is thus clear that the distinction between future indicative and aorist subjunctive is a suppletive one in introductions and conclusions, and that there is no semantic difference. The difference between presence and absence of modal particle can be explained by the connection to a concrete situation: when the speaker refers to an event that is very close to him, the modal particle is used, but when the event is only imagined in a distant future, the modal particle is absent. This is confirmed by examples outside speech introductions as well.

5.4. Reference to the apparent unreal in speech introductions: the Greek counterfactual.

⁹⁵⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 1,29; 1,89; 1,97; 1,132; 1,132; 1,137; 1,236; 1,241; 1,262; 1,298; 1,301; 1,324; 1,548; 1,563; 1,576; 1,598; 2,141; 2,203; 2,235-236; 2,250; 2,262; 2,263; 2,276; 2,325; 2,347; 2,361; 2,367; 2,380; 2,386; 2,387; 2,392-393; 2,485; 2,485; 2,489; 2,490; 2,491-492; 3,52; 3,54; 3,66; 3,225; 3,288-289; 3,206; 3,391; 4,235; 4,539; 5,33; 5,138; 5,215; 5,217; 5,303; 5,816; 5,895; 6,129; 6,141; 6,353; 6,360; 6,367; 6,412; 6,521-522.

⁹⁵⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,29; 1,89; 1,97; 1,132; 1,132; 1,236; 1,241; 1,262; 1,298; 1,301; 1,548; 1,563; 1,576; 1,598; 2,141; 2,203; 2,235-236; 2,262; 2,263; 2,276; 2,325; 2,347; 2,361; 2,367; 2,380; 2,386; 2,387; 2,392-393; 2,485; 2,489; 2,490; 2,491-492; 3,206; 4,235; 5,138; 5,215; 5,217; 5,303; 5,816; 5,895; 6,353; 6,360; 6,367; 6,412.

⁹⁶⁰ Chantraine 1953:209 *A la première personne, en particulier, il est malaisé de tracer une frontière entre le sens de volonté et le futur emphatique.*

The last issue that needs to be addressed are the counterfactual constructions in Greek, more specifically how the modal and tense use could be explained. There are 12 speech introduction formulae that are used in a construction that could be described as “counterfactual”. The verbs in all these instances are put in the indicative and all appear in a postposed conditional clause introduced by εἰ μή. The following questions will be addressed:

- a) what was the original construction in PIE;
- b) what is the /is there a difference between “past potential” and “counterfactual”;
- c) what was the situation in Homer;
- d) how can the differences between the Indo-European and Homeric situation be explained;
- e) how can the mood and tense usage in the speech introductions in the counterfactuals be explained?

a) In many Indo-European languages, the counterfactual was originally expressed by the optative or by constructions that could be traced back to an original optative, such as Germanic (originally the perfect optative),⁹⁶¹ Tocharian,⁹⁶² Indo-Iranian (originally the perfect optative),⁹⁶³ Celtic,⁹⁶⁴ and Italic (even in Old Latin).⁹⁶⁵ Hettrich observed that all these languages use different constructions and concluded that the PIE verbal system used the optative for both present and past potential without distinguishing between past potential and present counterfactual and without having a past counterfactual.⁹⁶⁶ He suggested the term *fiktiv*, which referred to something unreal but did not indicate the degree of “un-reality”.⁹⁶⁷ In

⁹⁶¹ Delbrück 1897:405-409, 1904:201, 262-264; Sloty 1915:86-87; Krisch 1986:10; Euler 1994; Dahl 1997:104-107.

⁹⁶² This was observed by Thomas 1952:43-46, 1970:466-469; Krause-Thomas 1960:192 and by Pinault 1997:475-477, who pointed out that the present counterfactual was expressed by remnants of the optative and the past counterfactual by the gerund and the optative of copula „be“.

⁹⁶³ Renou 1952:372; Hoffmann 1967:47; Brunel 1980:258-259; Krisch 1986:11-12; Hettrich 1988:365, 1992:270-274, 1996:133, 1998:264; Euler 1994:35-38; Lazard 1998:240; Kümmel 2000:89-90; Tichy 2002:194; Mumm 2008:§2.3; Knobl 2007:110; Dahl 2010:393 for the potential of the past, and 2010:399-401 for counterfactuals; Rieken 2012:411-417. For Avestan, see Jolly 1871:34; Reichelt 1909:323-324; Lazard 1975, 1998:240 (limiting it to the past counterfactual); Kellens 1984:423 (limiting it to the past counterfactual); Rieken 2012:415. For Old Persian see Kellens 1985:121.

Jamison 2009:39-40 was very skeptical about the Indo-Iranian evidence.

⁹⁶⁴ Krisch 1986:11, Hettrich 1998:264; Rieken 2012a is the most thorough investigation of conditionals in Old Irish.

⁹⁶⁵ Dräger 1874:280-284, 1878:692-704; Delbrück 1897:401; Nutting 1901; Bennett 1901a:190-207; Brunel 1980:259; Harris 1986:265-269; Hettrich 1992; Meiser 1993:183; a discussion of the Latin history of the potentials and counterfactuals has to remain outside the scope of this thesis. One can refer to Hettrich and Meiser for a possible explanation, but there is no agreement on the issue.

⁹⁶⁶ Delbrück 1871:28-29, 1897:371, 401; Brugmann 1916:861-863, 1925:215; Greenberg 1986:248; Hettrich 1988:365, 1992, 1998; Tichy 2002:194, 2009:98; Mumm 2008:§2.3.

⁹⁶⁷ Hettrich 1988:365, adopted by Tichy 2002:194 and Mumm 2008:§2.3.

I refer to the (already quoted) editors' note before Harris 1986: *however, the boundary between potential and unreal conditionals is less clear-cut than between real and either of them, and the time parameter is less clear-*

short, the optative expressed a wish and a possibility in all nuances (likely, possible, unlikely).⁹⁶⁸

b) As was stated above, PIE did not distinguish between past potential and counterfactual. The question is if one can draw a sharp line between past potential and counterfactual.⁹⁶⁹ The former is mostly used in instances such as “X/you could have ...” while the latter is mostly used in conditional constructions. Both instances refer to a situation that is contrary to fact. A sentence such as “you could have seen Agamemnon fighting” implies “if you had been present, you could have seen him fighting”, but in most cases the addressee was not there. A counterfactual is a past potential, that had been proved to be non-realised:⁹⁷⁰ a sentence as “you could have noticed” is considered past potential, while “you could have noticed it, if you had been there” is counterfactual, because you were not there. This distinction is not full proof: Akhilleus’s statement “you would have committed your last outrage” is known to be false, and is yet considered a past potential. It might therefore be better to assume that Greek only possessed a past potential with different degrees of realisation and different aspectual values.⁹⁷¹ To avoid confusion, I will continue to use the terms “counterfactual” and “past potential”.

In addition, it is not always easy to distinguish between present and past potential either, because it is often difficult to decide whether the action was considered likely or only remotely possible.

οὐκ ἂν δὴ μείνειας ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον;
γνοίης χ' οἴου φωτὸς ἔχεις θαλερὴν παράκοιτιν (*Iliad* 3,52-53).

In this instance, Hektor suggested that Paris would engage in battle with Menelaos, as he would then find himself confronted with a strong fighter. The optative is used, but it is unclear whether Hektor considered it likely that Paris would indeed go and face Menelaos. It is only Paris’s subsequent reaction that made it clear that Hektor’s suggestion would be realised.

cut in potential and unreal conditions than in real conditions. (underlining is mine). Already Delbrück 1871:28-29 had shown that the optative could be used for all nuances of (un)likelihood.

⁹⁶⁸ Delbrück 1871:28-29, 1897:371.

⁹⁶⁹ The first to equal both was Sapir 1930:165.

⁹⁷⁰ Athanasiadou – Dirven 1997b:74; Verstraete 2005:230-243.

⁹⁷¹ Schwyzler-Debrunner 1950:346-347.

Delaunoy 1975; 1988:96-106 and Basset 1988b, 1989b:224-226 argued that there was only a past potential, while Wakker 2006 argued that there was only a counterfactual in Greek. This is only a terminological discussion.

c) As was the case in Indo-European, the Homeric optative could also be used to express wishes and potentials, even when the fulfilment was uncertain or unlikely.⁹⁷² As was argued earlier on, the tense distinction was only aspect-based.

An example of an optative in an event that is likely to happen is (the optatives are put in bold face):⁹⁷³

ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίγνωτ' ἐστί, καὶ ἂν πᾶϊς **ἡγήσαιτο** (*Odyssey* 6,300).

“it is easily recognisable, and even a child could lead you there.”

In this sentence Nausikaa told Odysseus that the house of king Alkinoos was so easily found and recognisable, that even a little child could lead him to it.

An example of a past potential in the aorist stem is:⁹⁷⁴

ἦ γὰρ ἂν Ἀτρεΐδῃ νῦν ὕστατα **λωβήσαιο** (*Iliad* 1,232).⁹⁷⁵

An example of a counterfactual in the optative with present stem is:⁹⁷⁶

εἰ μὲν γὰρ μὴ δῶρα **φέροι** τὰ δ' ὀπισθ' **ὀνομάζοι**

Ἀτρεΐδῃς, ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἐπιζαφελῶς **χαλεπαίνοι**,

οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγέ σε μῆνιν ἀπορρίψαντα **κελοίμην** (*Iliad* 9,515-517).

An example of a counterfactual in the optative in the aorist stem is:

τόν γε ἰδοῦσ' **ὀνόσαιτ'**, οὐδ' εἰ μάλα μιν χόλος **ἔκοι** (*Iliad* 17,399).

“Seeing this battle, she (Athena) would not have scorned it, not even if strong anger had come to her.”

An example of a counterfactual in the optative with an aorist and perfect stem combined is:

(...) τάχα κεν φεύγοντες ἐναύλους

πλήσειαν νεκύων, εἴ μοι κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων

ἦπια **εἶδεῖν**: νῦν δὲ στρατὸν ἀμφιμάχονται (*Iliad* 16,71-73).

Even in Ionic prose, mostly in Herodotos, and in Attic drama and prose there are still instances of this old use, but the Attic prose examples are often corrected into indicatives.⁹⁷⁷

Two examples for a past potential taken from Herodotos are:⁹⁷⁸

εἴησαν δ' ἂν οὗτοι Κρηῖτες (Herodotos 1,2).

“That could have have been Cretans.”

⁹⁷² Gerth 1878; Van Pottelbergh 1939:8; Chantraine 1953:218; Brunel 1980:240. See also Willmott 2008.

⁹⁷³ The examples are taken from Gerth 1878, Chantraine 1953:218-225; Hettrich 1992, 1998; Willmott 2008.

⁹⁷⁴ The instances have been discussed above in 5.2.

⁹⁷⁵ This example was discussed in Chantraine 1953:219-220.

⁹⁷⁶ Hettrich 1992:267.

⁹⁷⁷ The examples are taken from Gerth 1878 (accepting the corrections); Gildersleeve 1900:173-175 (accepting the corrections as well); Kieckers 1926c:35-36, 53-58; Chantraine 1953:213.

⁹⁷⁸ Other Herodotean examples can be found in 1,70; 2,98; 5,59; 7,180; 7,184; 7,214; 8,136; 9,71. See Gerth 1878 and Gildersleeve 1900:173-175 for a discussion of these passages.

ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν καὶ φθόνῳ ἂν εἴποιεν (Herodotos 9,71).

“But they might also have said that also out of envy.”

Two *Paradebeispiele* from Attic drama are:⁹⁷⁹

οἶκος δ’ αὐτός, εἰ φθογγὴν **λάβοι**, σαφέστατ’ ἂν **λέξειεν** (Aiskhylos, *Agamemnon* 37-38).⁹⁸⁰

φαίη δ’ ἂν ἡ θανοῦσά γ’, εἰ φωνὴν **λάβοι**. (Sophokles, *Elektra* 548).

“The dead woman would have said it (herself), if she (still) had a voice.”

Two examples from Attic prose are:⁹⁸¹

οὐκ ἂν οὖν νήσων ἔξω τῶν περιουκίδων, αὐταὶ δὲ οὐκ ἂν πολλὰ **εἶεν**, ἡπειρώτης ὦν ἐκράτει, εἰ μὴ τι καὶ ναυτικὸν εἶχεν (Thucydides 1.9,4).

In this instance, Thucydides combined an optative for the past potential with an imperfect for the counterfactual of the past.⁹⁸²

εἶ γὰρ ἂν **εἰδείην** ὅτι ἐπ’ ἐκείνοις ἦν καὶ ἐμὲ τιμωρήσασθαι καὶ αὐτοῖς μηνύσασιν ἐλευθέρους γενέσθαι. (Lysias 7,16).

“I should have known that it was in their power to enact vengeance on me and obtain their freedom by denouncing me”.⁹⁸³

The optative εἰδείην was transmitted, but was changed into ἦδεν by Emperius, and into ἦδη by Hude.⁹⁸⁴

While the use of the optative in the Ionic and dialectal examples are generally accepted,⁹⁸⁵ the Attic examples are corrected in most editions, but by doing so, one removes a syntactic peculiarity and archaism from the text in order to make the text fit into the Procrustean bed of the prescriptive grammar.⁹⁸⁶

Gradually, however, Greek replaced the optative by the indicative in the past potential, present counterfactual and past counterfactual,⁹⁸⁷ and in most cases Homer already used the

⁹⁷⁹ The text is taken from the Perseus project and the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

⁹⁸⁰ The commentaries by Fraenkel (1950:24) and Page – Denniston (1957:70) printed the optatives, but did not discuss the use of this mood.

⁹⁸¹ For more examples from Attic prose, see Gerth 1878, Gildersleeve 1900:173-175 and Gerö 2001.

⁹⁸² The tense and mood usage in this passage was not discussed in Gomme’s Commentary.

⁹⁸³ This translation is based on that by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

⁹⁸⁴ Carey 2007 on this passage.

⁹⁸⁵ Delbrück 1871:201; Monro 1891:301-302; Mutzbauer 1908:172; Sloty 1915:73-74, 132; Stahl 1909:264-267; Dubois 1986a:222-223; Crespo 1997:56 (for Homer and Herodotos); Rijksbaron 2002:71 (for Herodotos).

⁹⁸⁶ Gerö 2000, 2001; Martin Hose, personal communication. The term *Procrustean* was used by Gerö 2001:183.

⁹⁸⁷ Gerth 1878; Monro 1891:293-294; Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950:344-345; Chantraine 1953:229 *nous observons dans ces faits le développement de l’emploi irréal qui prend la place de l’optatif*; Brunel 1980:240-245; see also Horrocks 1995:161-162 and Wathelet 1997:260-262 but none of the scholars offered an explanation of how the substitution could have happened.

indicative in these instances. This transition started already before the creation of the Homeric poems, but had not yet been completed at the time when the poems were written down.

An example of a “past potential” in the indicative is:

ἔνθα κ' ἄυπνος ἀνὴρ δοιοῦς **ἐξήρατο** μισθοῦς (*Odyssey* 10,84).

“A man who would not need sleep, could have earned there two wages.”

An example of a counterfactual construction in the indicative is:

Ἑκτορα: καὶ νῦ κεν ἔνθ' ὁ γέρων ἀπὸ θυμὸν **ᾔλεσσε**

εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὄξυ **νόησε** βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης: (*Iliad* 8,90-91).

“and now the old man would have lost his life, if strong-voiced Diomedes had not quickly noticed (it).”

d) The use of the indicative in a sequence that is presented as contrary-to-fact is surprising, because the indicative is “the mood of reality”,⁹⁸⁸ or is at least modally neutral, i.e. it does not have the nuance of fear, hope, expectation or wish.⁹⁸⁹ How can this situation be explained? Five different suggestions have been given. I mention them first and discuss them afterwards.

1. Brugmann-Thumb argued that the optative initially expressed the potential and counterfactual nuance, but that it was replaced by the indicative of the past in those instances that referred to a past event.⁹⁹⁰ As the optative could refer to past, present and future,⁹⁹¹ it did not allow for a clear temporal distinction. The indicative, however, allowed a distinction to be made between “this could happen (in the present or future)” and “this could have happened (in the past)”.⁹⁹² Debrunner added that a parallel evolution occurred in later (post-Classical) Greek with the iterative optative of the past: a past iterative action in a subordinate clause could be expressed by the optative, but in later Greek the optative was replaced by a past indicative when the action was clearly situated in the past. The past indicative was used to stress the pastness of the action.⁹⁹³

2. Krisch argued that the Greek indicative went back to an older injunctive that had replaced the Indo-European optative.⁹⁹⁴ In his opinion almost all modal indicatives the augment could be removed, and as such, they were original injunctives. He started from the postposed

⁹⁸⁸ Kühner-Gerth 1898:202; Brugmann 1900:513, Rijksbaron 2002:6 *the speaker represents the state of affairs as a fact.*

⁹⁸⁹ Chantraine 1953:205; Strunk 1975:233, 1992:29-30.

⁹⁹⁰ Brunel 1980:236 agreed, but did not mention any of these scholars. This suggestion was not addressed in Krisch 1986, Ruijgh 1992 nor in Hettrich 1998. Willmott 2007 only discussed Ruijgh, but did not mention the others.

⁹⁹¹ Kühner-Gerth 1898:225. Neisser 1927:283 and Benveniste 1951 argued that the optative could be used as a past tense in Indo-Iranian.

⁹⁹² Brugmann – Thumb 1913:590-591; Debrunner 1921; Brunel 1980:236.

⁹⁹³ Debrunner 1921.

⁹⁹⁴ Krisch 1986.

conditional clause introduced by εἰ μή, and considered the verbal form in the εἰ μή clause to be an original injunctive. The original meaning of these sentences was “Y should have done something, or else X would have happened”, from which the conditional sequence “X would have happened if Y had not done this” was extracted.⁹⁹⁵ The injunctive was then reinterpreted as unaugmented indicative and the indicative was subsequently extended to the entire construction to distinguish the potential optative from the counterfactual constructions.⁹⁹⁶

3. Dunkel distinguished between potential, prospective and counterfactual sentences, and argued that each of them was originally expressed by a different particle of Indo-European origin. Later, all three were confused and could be used in all three functions. He argued that the counterfactual in Greek had always been expressed by the indicative with the particle ἄν.⁹⁹⁷ This particle had a parallel in the Hittite particle *man* which is used to introduce wishes, potential and counterfactual sentences, as in *man kuennir* “they would have killed”. Dunkel interpreted *man* as a merger of *ma* and *an*.⁹⁹⁸

4. The next scenario is that based on suggestions by Gerth, Ruijgh and Hettrich. They noticed that there were 69 counterfactual constructions with at least one indicative (either in the protasis or/and in the apodosis) in Homer.⁹⁹⁹ Of these 69, 57 constructions had a postposed conditional clause and in 46 instances the postposed conditional clause was introduced by εἰ μή. As such, they considered the εἰ μή to be the starting point for the substitution.¹⁰⁰⁰ Gerth noticed the parallel between a counterfactual sentence followed by another main clause introduced by ἀλλά and a counterfactual sentence followed by a negative conditional introduced by εἰ μή, and suggested that they influenced each other, but did not elaborate any

⁹⁹⁵ Krisch 1986:17-19.

⁹⁹⁶ Krisch 1986:29.

⁹⁹⁷ Dunkel 1990:129.

⁹⁹⁸ Dunkel 1990:128.

⁹⁹⁹ The counterfactual instances are *Iliad* 2,80-81; 2,155-156; 3,373-374; 3,453; 5,311-312; 5,388-390; 5,679-680; 5,897-898; 6,73-75; 7,104-106; 7,273-275; 8,90-91; 8,130-132; 8,217-218; 8,366-369; 11,310-312; 11,504-506; 11,750-752; 12,290-293; 13,723-725; 14,258-259; 15,121-126; 15,459-460; 16,617-618; 16,686-687; 16,698-701; 16,847-848; 17,70-71; 17,530-531; 17,613-614; 18,165-167; 18,397-398; 18,454-456; 20,288-291; 21,211-212; 21,544-545; 22,202-203; 23,154-155; 23,382-383; 23,490-491; 23,526-527; 23,540-542; 23,733-734; 24,220-222; 24,713-715 and *Odyssey* 1,237-240; 3,255-256; 4,171-173; 4,292-293; 4,363-364; 4,502-503; 4,732-734; 5,39-40; 5,426-427; 5,436-437; 9,497-499; 11,317; 13,137-138; 13,384-385; 14,67; 16,220-221; 21,226-227; 23,21-23; 23,218-220; 23,241-242; 24,41-42; 24,50-51; 24,284-285 and 24,528-530.

The εἰ μή clauses are *Iliad* 2,155-156; 3,373-374; 5,311-312; 5,388-390; 5,679-680; 6,73-75; 7,104-106; 7,273-275; 8,90-91; 8,130-132; 8,217-218; 8,366-369; 11,310-312; 11,504-506; 11,750-752; 12,290-293; 13,723-725; 14,258-259; 15,121-126; 16,698-701; 17,70-71; 17,530-531; 17,613-614; 18,165-167; 18,397-398; 18,454-456; 20,288-291; 21,211-212; 21,544-545; 22,202-203; 23,154-155; 23,382-383; 23,490-491; 23,540-542; 23,733-734; 24,713-715 and *Odyssey* 4,363-364; 4,502-503; 5,426-427; 5,436-437; 13,384-385; 16,220-221; 21,226-227; 23,241-242; 24,41-42; 24,50-51; 24,284-285 and 24,528-530. See Basset 1989b:16.

¹⁰⁰⁰ This suggestion was first made by Gerth 1878. That it was the basis for the substitution, was noticed by Chantraine 1953:226-227 and Brunel 1980:242, but they did not elaborate on it..

further.¹⁰⁰¹ Ruijgh started from an original paratactic construction,¹⁰⁰² in which the clauses were separated by ἀλλά and in which the action of one clause was prevented by the action in the second clause,¹⁰⁰³ and suggested that the action of the first sentence was expressed in the subjunctive and meant “I expect X to happen/ this can happen”, and the second meant “but Y had done and prevented it”. If this was related by a person who did not witness the actual action, the subjunctive was replaced by an optative, and meant “X could have happened, but Y had done and prevented it”. In a second stage, ἀλλά was replaced by εἰ μή and the indicative appeared thus in a conditional clause.¹⁰⁰⁴ From the negative conditional, the indicative was first expanded to the positive conditional and then to the protasis. The extension to the protasis was triggered by the Greek preference to have the same mood in apodosis in protasis for the different constructions: as potentialis and realis used the same mood in both clauses, the irrealis would have followed this parallelism as well.¹⁰⁰⁵ Hettrich also observed that most counterfactuals of the past had the apodosis put after the main clause.¹⁰⁰⁶ He agreed with Ruijgh’s chronology, but suggested that the first clause was expressed in the optative as it was only a possibility (past potential),¹⁰⁰⁷ and the second one in the indicative, as that action did occur. As such, he did not need to operate with a subjunctive that was replaced by the optative, and needed one substitution less. Once it had been expanded to the main clause of the counterfactual, it was also expanded to the modal indicatives that were not used in a conditional construction.

5. The last explanation is that there was no substitution: Basset (implicitly) and Willmott argued that the modal indicatives distinguished themselves from the optative in that they were in situations that could have occurred, while the optatives could not be used in such contexts.

¹⁰⁰¹ Gerth 1878.

¹⁰⁰² This does not mean that Homeric Greek in its proto-form (or even PIE) could not have known subordinate clauses. Initially, the opinion was that there were no subordinate clauses in PIE (Windisch 1869:205; Hermann 1895), but this is no longer accepted (Lehmann 1980, Lühr 2008:122). See Fykias – Katzikadeli 2013 for a recent survey. For this discussion, the (non-)existence of subordinate clauses is irrelevant.

¹⁰⁰³ Ruijgh 1992, Hettrich 1998.

¹⁰⁰⁴ The issue whether the εἰ sentences were original independent and paratactic wish clauses, as Lange 1872 and 1873 argued for (and was accepted by Kühner-Gerth and Chantraine), or that they had always been subordinated (as Tabachovitz 1953 argued, and was accepted by Hettrich), is irrelevant for this discussion. for a critical survey of both theories, see Risch 1953 and 1954.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Ruijgh 1992:81-82

¹⁰⁰⁶ Hettrich 1998:267; see also Wakker 1994:206-214, who stated that in 47 out of 70 instances, the εἰ μή clause followed the main clause.

¹⁰⁰⁷ The interpretation of the optative as past potential in such sentences was already made by Kühner-Gerth 1898:232, Brugmann 1900:505 and Schwyzler-Debrunner 1950:328.

¹⁰⁰⁸ They referred for this to Seiler's analysis of the optative as *dissociative*.¹⁰⁰⁹ Willmott used the following two examples to prove the difference:¹⁰¹⁰

ἐνθά κεν Ἀργεῖοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη

εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 2,155-156).

καὶ νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,

εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὅξυ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη (*Iliad* 5,311-312).

The first example described how the Greeks would have returned home before Troy was conquered, if Here had not told Athene to intervene. The second example referred to the salvation of Aineias by Aphrodite during battle. Willmott stated that the indicatives in the first example showed that the return was a genuine possibility, while the optative was used to indicate that the event of Aineias's death was very unlikely, given his divine lineage.¹⁰¹¹

I now discuss the different suggestions.

1. This scenario is the simplest one and has the advantage that it can point at a similar evolution in later Greek. It would also explain the use of the past tense as past tense maker and not just as counterfactual marker,¹⁰¹² but the problem are the εἰ μή sentences. There is no instance attested in which a counterfactual optative was preserved in these sentences (contrary to positive εἰ conditionals, past potentials and counterfactuals in the main clause). This seems to indicate that the εἰ μή sentences are somehow the starting point for the innovation.

2. Dunkel's scenario would have the advantage that the Greek indicative was a syntactic archaism shared with Hittite and would thus be dating from Indo-Hittite. There are some problems with it, however. While it cannot be ruled out that there would have been three different modal particles, Forbes's explanation of ἄν, κε and κεν as originating from the particle **kem* in a context with negation still seems more economical: in a negative context, this particle would have been οὐ κεν and in the zero grade **οὐ km*, which lead to οὐ καν, which was then falsely segmented into οὐκ ἄν. Another problem is that Dunkel needed to distinguish between potential and counterfactual, which seems to be contradicted by the evidence of the other Indo-European languages.¹⁰¹³ A third problem is that there are several modal indicatives that can be reconstructed as older optatives, but that there are no optatives in counterfactual/past potential contexts that can be reconstructed as indicatives. This seems

¹⁰⁰⁸ Basset 1989b:220-230 noticed the differences between the constructions, but did not state that the indicative replaced the optative. Willmott 2007:48-52; in 2008 she discussed the potential optatives but did not address the issue of the substitution nor the counterfactuality.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Seiler 1971, 1993, 1997. See also Basset 1984 and 1986.

¹⁰¹⁰ Willmott 2007:48-52, 120-122.

¹⁰¹¹ Willmott 2007:49, 120-122.

¹⁰¹² See the discussion in footnote 876.

¹⁰¹³ Hettrich 1998:264.

to indicate that the optative in this context was older than the indicative. Fourthly, Dunkel's scenario cannot explain how the optative would have intruded into the field of the indicative, if the counterfactual and potential were as sharply distinguished as he argued. At the same time the optative did not replace/ "compete with" the indicative in the εἰ μή clauses. If both coexisted and intruded in each other's domain, one would have expected to find examples of that as well. This is an indication that the εἰ μή clauses must have played an important role in the substitution. Fifthly, the reconstruction of Hittite *man* as *ma an* is possible but not conclusive.¹⁰¹⁴

3. Krisch's explanation is rather complicated, and is problematic because Greek did not have a productive injunctive category anymore¹⁰¹⁵ and because the modal injunctive referred to the present or future and was not used in counterfactual contexts.¹⁰¹⁶ It also assumes that all augmented verbal forms in Greek were once unaugmented, which I do not believe to be true (see chapter 6).

4. There are three problems with the (Gerth-) Ruijgh-Hettrich scenario. The first one is that it requires many steps, but there are examples for the intermediary stages. Only the starting point optative followed by ἀλλά is not attested.

Stage 1. The optative was used to express present and also past potentials. These sentences could be "contradicted" by an adversative sentence introduced by ἀλλά.¹⁰¹⁷ The meaning was "X could have happened, but Y did so (to thwart it)". The verb in the sentence introduced by ἀλλά was put in the indicative, because it referred to actions that did occur in real life.

Stage 2. The particles ἀλλά were replaced by εἰ μή.¹⁰¹⁸ The meaning of the sentence was "X would have happened, if Y had not acted (to prevent it)". As of this moment, the construction had an indicative in the postposed negative conditional, while the main clause still had an

¹⁰¹⁴ Hettrich 1998:264 was even more doubtful: *Die vorgeschlagene Segmentierung von man in ma plus an ist bestenfalls eine sehr hypothetische Möglichkeit.* (my underlining)

¹⁰¹⁵ Ruijgh 1992:81; Hettrich 1998:262.

¹⁰¹⁶ Lazard 1975, 1998; Kellens 1985; Hettrich 1998:262-263.

The modal injunctive seemed to have survived in one or two relic forms in Middle Iranian (Tedesco 1923:289-290). Yoshida 2009 (for Sogdian) and Kunamoto 2009 (for Khotanese) seem to imply that the injunctive could be used in counterfactual contexts in Iranian, but the remnants of Sogdian and Khotanese are so fragmentary and late, that a conclusive judgement is not possible.

¹⁰¹⁷ This suggestion was first made by Gerth 1878. See especially Ruijgh 1992:81-83 and Hettrich 1998.

Basset 1989b:220-222 noticed the connection between ἀλλά and εἰ μή, but did not address the issue of the substitution, because he did not believe that it occurred. See also Hettrich 1998.

The instances are *Iliad* 5,22-23; 5,885-887; 16,847-849; 17,319-323; 19,271-274; 23,606-607 and *Odyssey* 4,174-181; 4,441-444; 7,278-280; 9,79-81; 11,565-566; 11,630-632; 12,71-73; 14,32-34; 19,282-283 and 21,128-129. Basset 1989b:220 only listed 12 instances.

¹⁰¹⁸ The issue whether the εἰ sentences were original independent and paratactic wish clauses, as Lange 1872 and 1873 argued for (and was accepted by Kühner-Gerth and Chantraine), or that they had always been subordinated (as Tabachovitz 1953 argued, and was accepted by Hettrich), is irrelevant for this discussion. for a critical survey of both theories, see Risch 1953 and 1954.

optative. Examples of this construction are (the optative is put in bold face, the indicative is underlined)

καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' **ἀπόλοιτο** Ἄρης ἄτος πολέμοιο,
εἰ μὴ μητρυνὴ περικαλλῆς Ἡερίβοια
Ἑρμέα ἐξήγγειλεν: ὃ δ' ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα (*Iliad* 5,388-390).

In this passage Homer related how Ares would have died, if Eeriboia had not called on Hermes to save him, which he did by removing him from the battle scene. In this example ἄλλά and εἰ μὴ are metrically equivalent.

ἐνθά κε ῥεῖα **φέροι** κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πανθοΐδαο
Ἀτρεΐδης, εἰ μὴ οἱ ἀγάσσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 17,70-71).

In this passage Homer stated that Menelaos would have won the spoils of Panthoos's son, if Apollon had not prevented it.

Stage 3. In this stage, the indicative of the postposed negative conditional clause was expanded to the postposed positive conditional clause.

Stage 4. The indicative of the postposed positive conditional clause was expanded to the preposed conditional clause. The main clause was still in the optative. An example is:

εἰ μὲν τις τὸν ὄνειρον Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἔνισπε
ψεῦδός κεν **φαῖμεν** καὶ **νοσφιζοίμεθα** μᾶλλον (*Iliad* 2,80-81).

"If another Greek had related this dream, we would have called it a lie and would have rebuked him."

In this verse Nestor told Agamemnon that he would not have believed his (A) dream, if someone else had told him about it.

Stage 5. The indicative of the preposed conditional clause was expanded to the main clause. Examples are (the indicatives are underlined):

εἰ δὲ ἔπος Πηληϊάδαο φύλαξεν
ἦ τ' ἂν ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα κακὴν μέλανος θανάτοιο (*Iliad* 16,686-687).

"If he had heeded the word of the son of Peleus, he w/could have avoided the baneful fate of the black death."

This sentence refers to Patroklos's death and stated that he would not have died if he had listened to Akhilleus's words.

Stage 6. In this stage, the indicative of the conditional construction was expanded to the main clauses with a past potential that did not have a conditional clause. An example is:

ἐνθα κ' ἄυπνος ἀνὴρ δοιοῦς ἐξήρατο μισθοῦς (*Odyssey* 10,84).

The second issue was raised by Hettrich himself: why would a syntactic change have occurred/started in Homer and expanded into later Greek.¹⁰¹⁹ Hettrich stated that the influence of Homer could not be overestimated. This is true, as can be seen by his profound influence on prose writers such as Herodotos. In addition, also in later times poetry could influence prose, as can be seen in Attic prose.¹⁰²⁰ As possible parallel I could refer to the influence of the Bible translations on the vernaculars: many sayings and syntactic turns that are found in the Bible have made their way into the spoken and written language. I therefore do not think that it is a problem that a syntactic change would have occurred in Homer. Moreover, it is not certain that the evolution started in Homer. It might have been ongoing already and Homer's use might have accelerated the process.

The third question is why a postposed conditional could influence the construction of the main sentence. There are three elements that played a role. First of all, there is the metrical commodity:¹⁰²¹ εἰ μή could be used before a long vowel, a short vowel, a word starting with one consonant or a word starting with more than one consonant (provided that the first syllable of this word was long); ἀλλά could not be used when a word starting with a vowel followed or when it was followed by a word with one consonant and an initial long syllable. A second factor involves the marked position of the conditional clause. As was stated above, 57 of the 69 counterfactual constructions had a postposed conditional. While postposed conditionals are not impossible, they are less common,¹⁰²² as even languages that have postposed subordinate clauses prefer to put their conditional clause before the main clause.¹⁰²³ As such, the Greek conditional schema of the type “p, if not q” with postposed εἰ μή clause was very marked and might have exerted influence on the other constructions. In the *Odyssey* postposed conditionals are much less common,¹⁰²⁴ and in Classical Greek, more than 2/3 of the protases precede the apodosis.¹⁰²⁵ A third factor is that the substitution of the optative into an indicative in the conditional clause created a difference in construction between protasis and apodosis. By extending the mood of the conditional clause to the main clause this disequilibrium was resolved.¹⁰²⁶

As such, there are no convincing arguments that exclude the Gerth-Ruijgh-Hettrich hypothesis.

¹⁰¹⁹ Hettrich 1998:267.

¹⁰²⁰ The standard work on this issue is Bers 1984.

¹⁰²¹ Ruijgh 1992:81-83.

¹⁰²² Greenberg 1963:68; Comrie 1986:83-84; Hettrich 1998:268.

¹⁰²³ Comrie 1986:83-84.

¹⁰²⁴ Lang 1989.

¹⁰²⁵ Seiler 1997:309.

¹⁰²⁶ Ruijgh 1992:83.

5. That both indicative and optative coexisted and were semantically distinct, is in my opinion problematic. First of all, a substantial part of the modal indicatives in conditional constructions occurred in instances that could never have occurred.¹⁰²⁷ Secondly, her distinction is not correct: it is not true that Aineias could not have died because he was the son of a goddess: divine descent is by no means a guarantee against death, as is proved by the deaths of Akhilleus and Sarpedon, who were children of a god(dess) and nevertheless both died. In addition, the return of the Greeks cannot have been considered a real possibility, because everybody knows that Troy will eventually fall (my underlining). Thirdly, Seiler attributed the notion of dissociation to both to the optative and to the modal indicative. As such, I think that this scenario is less likely and that we have to accept a substitution.

Now that a substitution has been accepted, the main question is: can it be proved?

The best example that the transition was in progress is the description of the battle between Meriones and Aineias, in which both men claim that they could have taken out the adversary, if only they had hit him. In Aineias's speech the indicative was used, while in Meriones's speech the optative was used.

Μηριόνη τάχα κέν σε καὶ ὀρχηστήν περ ἔοντα

ἔγχος ἐμὸν κατέπαυσε διαμπερές, εἴ σ' ἔβαλόν περ. (*Iliad* 16,617-618).

Meriones, my spear would have stopped you, although you are a good dancer, if only I had hit you."

εἰ καὶ ἐγὼ σε βάλοιμι τυχὼν μέσον ὁξέϊ χαλκῷ

αἰψά κε καὶ κρατερός περ ἔων καὶ χερσὶ πεποιθώς

εὔχος ἐμοὶ δοίης (...) (*Iliad* 16,623-625).

"If (only) I could throw and hit you in the middle with my sharp spear, then you would have given/ would give me battle honour, although you are stronger and can rely on your fighting prowess."

Both can be interpreted as contrary-to-fact, but at the same time they can be possible or even likely as well. It is in my opinion unlikely that only Aineias would have considered his victory possible,¹⁰²⁸ while Meriones would have thought that he was going to lose. I think that both fighters expressed their disappointment about their own misses by a remote potential/ counterfactual construction.

¹⁰²⁷ The instances were analysed in De Jong 1987b:67-81 and Lang 1989.

¹⁰²⁸ Willmott 2007:48 argued that it would make no sense that the sentence pronounced by Aineias had counterfactual meaning, because Aineias was in her opinion convinced of his ability to win.

In addition, several instances of the modal indicative can contain an older optative:¹⁰²⁹ there are 18 modal indicatives that describe an action that was avoided by a main clause introduced by *ἀλλά*. Of those 18, 7 are metrically equivalent to an optative, 3 can be substituted by an optative if the optative morpheme is metrically shortened (which is attested)¹⁰³⁰ and 8 cannot be substituted.¹⁰³¹ I give one example of such a possible substitution (the indicative that can be replaced is underlined):

πάντες κ' αὐτόθ' ὄλοντο ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ δαμέντες

ἀλλὰ με μοῖρ' ὀλοή καὶ Λητοῦς ἔκτανεν υἱός (*Iliad* 16,848-849).

“they would have died in that place tamed by my spear, but my baneful fate and Leto’s son killed me.”

The indicative *ὄλοντο* can contain an older optative *ὀλοίατ'* which does not require the hiatus in *ὄλοντο ἐμῷ*.

There are 98 modal indicatives in conditional constructions (I do not count the indicatives in the *εἰ μή* clauses, because they continued the indicative of the *ἀλλά* sentence, as was shown above). Of these 98 indicatives, 24 can be substituted into an optative, 14 can be substituted if one assumes shortening or word order change, 8 are injunctives caused by an older modal *markedness reduction*,¹⁰³² and 52 cannot be changed.¹⁰³³ I give two examples of a possible substitution:¹⁰³⁴

εἰ μὲν τις τὸν ὄνειρον Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἔνισπε

ψεῦδος κεν φαῖμεν καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μάλλον (*Iliad* 2,80-81).

The indicative *ἔνισπε* is equivalent to the optative *ένίσποι*.

Ἴκτορα: καὶ νύ κεν ἔνθ' ὁ γέρων ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὄλεσσε

εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὅζῃ νόησε βοήν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης: (*Iliad* 8,90-91).

In this instance the indicative *ὄλεσσε* is equivalent to the optative *ὀλέσσαι*.

The last category is the modal indicative. Of the 59 modal indicatives in a sentence without conditional, 20 can be reconstructed into an optative, 6 can be reconstructed if one assumes

¹⁰²⁹ This does not mean that I argue that these indicatives should be removed from the text, I only want to show that syntactic change might have occurred during the creation of the poems

¹⁰³⁰ The shortening of the optative *οἰ* in epic is not ruled out by Sjölund 1937 (the only detailed work so far on epic shortening). One example of such shortening is *δοῦρ' ἔχεν: οὐκ ἂν τις μιν ἐρυκάκοι ἀντιβολήσας* (*Iliad* 12,465).

¹⁰³¹ Appendix E.1 and E.4.

¹⁰³² Kiparsky 1968:37 argued that a sequence of optative – optative could be reduced into optative – injunctive. This is visible even in Attic prose: there are instances in which an optative is followed by an indicative (this was not addressed by Kiparsky). A list can be found in Gildersleeve 1900:§444. Cf. *infra*.

¹⁰³³ Appendix E2 and E.4.

¹⁰³⁴ See Appendix E.2.

metrical shortening, one if the word order is changed, 2 are injunctives and 31 cannot be changed.¹⁰³⁵ I give 2 examples:

καί κε τὸ βουλοίμην, καὶ κεν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν (*Iliad* 3,41).

“I would have wanted it to be like this, and it would have been much better.”

The indicative ἦεν is equivalent to the optative εἶη.

ὥφελες, οὐκ ἂν τόσσα θεοπροπέων ἀγόρευες (*Odyssey* 2,184).

“You would not have been speaking like a seer making such prophecies.”

In this instance the indicative ἀγόρευες is equivalent to the optative ἀγορεύοις.

There is one instance where the optative of the main clause was replaced by a metrically equivalent indicative, but in which the optative of the conditional remained (the indicative is underlined and the optative is put in bold face):

οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότῃ γ' ἐκεύθανον εἴ τις **ἴδοιτο** (*Iliad* 3,453).

As was stated above, this verse described that the Trojans would not have hidden Paris, if they had seen him. Both the seeing and the hiding of Paris are equally (un)likely.

This proves in my opinion that the transition was ungoing during the Homeric poems.

e) I now apply the findings made above to the 12 speech introductions that occurred in a contrary-to-fact construction. I will discuss the tense usage of apodosis and protasis and the use of the mood in the main clause (the verbs have been underlined).

1. ἔνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη

εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 2,155-156).

The postposed conditional εἰ μὴ clause prevented the action of the main clause: the Greeks would have gone home, if Here had not spoken to Athene. Since the εἰ μὴ clause was in origin a paratactic clause referring to an actual event, the indicative was used; therefore ἔειπεν is put in the indicative. As the Greeks can only obtain a homecoming once, the aorist ἐτύχθη is used in the main clause. The verb ἔειπεν is only attested in the aorist.

The indicative of the main clause, ἐτύχθη, cannot be reconstructed into an optative.

2. ἔνθά κεν αὖτε Τρῶες ἀρηϊφίλων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν

Ἴλιον εἰσανέβησαν ἀναλκείησι δαμέντες,

εἰ μὴ ἄρ' Αἰνεία τε καὶ Ἑκτορι εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 6,73-75).

The postposed conditional εἰ μὴ clause prevented the action of the main clause: the Trojans would have fled into their citadel while being pursued by the Greeks, if Apollo had not

¹⁰³⁵ See Appendix E.3.

spoken to Aineias and Hektor. Since the εἰ μή clause was in origin a paratactic clause referring to an actual event, the indicative was used; therefore εἶπε is put in the indicative.

The indicative εἰσανέβησαν is metrically equivalent to the optative εἰσαναβαῖεν.

The aorist is used, because the return is considered a single action.

3. ἔνθά κε λοιγὸς ἔην καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα γένοντο,
καὶ νύ κεν ἐν νήεσσι πέσον φεύγοντες Ἀχαιοί,
εἰ μὴ Τυδείδῃ Διομήδῃ κέκλετ' Ὀδυσσεύς (*Iliad* 11,310-312).

The postposed conditional εἰ μή clause prevented the action of the main clause: the Greeks would have fled to their ships and would have suffered death, destruction and defeat, if Odysseus had not shouted to Diomedes. Since the εἰ μή clause was in origin a paratactic clause referring to an actual event, the indicative was used; therefore κέκλετ is put in the indicative. The indicative ἔην is metrically equivalent to the optative εἴη, with metrical shortening. The unaugmented forms γένοντο and πέσον are inherited injunctives, which were used as a result of modal *markedness reduction*: as there was already one form marked as optative, the others no longer needed to be marked as such.¹⁰³⁶ Even in Classical Greek there are instances where an optative is followed by an indicative.¹⁰³⁷

The form ἔην is put in the present, because it described a durative action; the other verbs are put in the aorist, because they describe completed actions; κέκλετ' is an aorist, because “shouting” is considered to be punctual.

4. ἔνθά κε λευγαλέως νηῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων
Τρῶες ἐχώρησαν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν,
εἰ μὴ Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἑκτορα εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 13,723-725).

The postposed conditional εἰ μή clause prevented the action of the main clause: the Trojans would have fled into their citadel away from the ships of the Greeks, if Poulydamas had not spoken to Hektor. Since the εἰ μή clause was in origin a paratactic clause referring to an actual event, the indicative was used; therefore εἶπε is put in the indicative. The verb of the main clause cannot be reconstructed into an optative. The verbs are put in the aorist, because the return to Troy is depicted a single action and εἶπε is an inherited aorist to describe punctual speaking.

5. καὶ νύ κ' ἔτι πλέονας κτάνε Παίονας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς,
εἰ μὴ χωσάμενος προσέφη ποταμὸς βαθυδίνης (*Iliad* 21,211-212).

¹⁰³⁶ Kiparsky 1968:37 (but he only addressed the reduction of the optative into the injunctive in Indo-Iranian, not in Greek).

¹⁰³⁷ Gildersleeve 1900:§444

The postposed conditional εἰ μή clause prevented the action of the main clause: Akhilleus would have killed much more Paionians, if the river Skamandros had not angrily spoken to him. Since the εἰ μή clause was in origin a paratactic clause referring to an actual event, the indicative was used; therefore προσέφη is put in the indicative.

The killing is described as a completed action without lasting consequences, while the imperfect is used because the compound προσέφη describes a speaking that has durative effect on the audience. It is a *verbum dicendi* that describes a durative effect on the audience, and therefore the imperfect is needed.

6. καί νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδῃ φάος ἡελίοιο
εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεὺς αἴψ' Ἀγαμέμνονι εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 23,154-155).

The postposed conditional εἰ μή clause prevented the action of the main clause: the Greeks would have continued to wail and mourn Patroklos, if Akhilleus had not spoken to Agamemnon. Since the εἰ μή clause was in origin a paratactic clause referring to an actual event, the indicative was used; therefore εἶπε is put in the indicative. The verb of the main clause can be reconstructed into an optative if one assumes that the older construction was ὀδυρομένοις δῦν.¹⁰³⁸

The setting of the sun is a single action, and is therefore expressed in the aorist; εἶπε is an inherited aorist and is used to describe punctual speaking.

7. καί νύ κε δὴ προτέρω ἔτ' ἔρις γένητ' ἀμφοτέροισιν,
εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεὺς αὐτὸς ἀνίστατο καὶ φάτο μῦθον (*Iliad* 23,490-491).

The postposed conditional εἰ μή clause prevented the action of the main clause: Aias and Odysseus would have continued their wrestling contest if Akhilleus had not stood up and told them to stop. Since the εἰ μή clause was in origin a paratactic clause referring to an actual event, the indicative was used; therefore ἀνίστατο and φάτο are put in the indicative.

The verb of the main sentence cannot be reconstructed into an optative, unless one changes the order of the verse: *καί νύ κε δὴ προτέρω ἔρις ἀμφοτέροισι γένοιτο.

In this instance, the imperfect is used because the verb φημί is a *verbum dicendi* that indicates a durative action. The use of the imperfect in ἀνίστατο is remarkable, because “standing up” is a completed action and we would therefore have expected an aorist. In addition, ἀνέστη would have fit the metre as well.

8. καί νύ κέν οἱ πόρεν ἵππον, ἐπήνησαν γὰρ Ἀχαιοί,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' Ἀντίλοχος μεγαθύμου Νέστορος υἱὸς

¹⁰³⁸ For this form, see Monro 1891:72.

Πηλείδην Ἀχιλλῆα δίκη ἡμείψατ' ἀναστάς: (*Iliad* 23,540-542).

The postposed conditional εἰ μή clause prevented the action of the main clause: the Greeks would have agreed with Menelaos's complaint and had given him the prize in the chariot race, if Antilokhos had not protested about it.

The indicative πόρεν can contain an older πόροι with epic shortening.¹⁰³⁹ The tense usage has been discussed before.

9. καί νύ κε δὴ πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα
Ἔκτορα δάκρυ χέοντες ὀδύροντο πρὸ πυλάων,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ἐκ δίφροιο γέρων λαοῖσι μετηύδα (*Iliad* 24,713-715).

In these verses, Homer described how the entire city of Troy would have wept for Hektor during day and night, if Priam had not addressed his people. As Priam did speak to the Trojans, the continuous wailing did not occur and remained contrary-to-fact.

The verb of the main clause can contain an older optative ὀδυροῖατο (with shortening) or ὀδύροιντο.¹⁰⁴⁰ The tense usage has been discussed before.

10. καί νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδῃ φάος ἡέλιοιο,
εἰ μὴ Τηλέμαχος προσεφώνεεν ὃν πατέρ' αἶψα (*Odyssey* 16,220-221).

In these verses, Homer described how Odysseus and Telemakhos would have wept until sunrise, if Telemakhos had not spoken to his father.

11. καί νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδῃ φάος ἡέλιοιο,
εἰ μὴ Ὀδυσσεὺς αὐτὸς ἐρύκακε φώνησέν τε: (*Odyssey* 21,226-227).

In these verses, Homer described how Odysseus and Eumaios would have wept until sunrise, if Odysseus had not spoken to him.

The tense usage of instances 10 and 11 has been discussed before. Since the εἰ μή clause was in origin a paratactic clause referring to an actual event, the indicative was used; therefore προσεφώνεεν, ἐρύκακε and φώνησέν were put in the indicative.

The verb of the main clause can be reconstructed into an optative if one assumes that the older construction was ὀδυρομένοις δῆ.

12. καί νύ κε δὴ πάντας ὄλεσαν καὶ ἔθηκαν ἀνόστους
εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίη, κόρυη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,
ἦϋσεν φωνῇ, κατὰ δ' ἔσχεθε λαὸν ἅπαντα (*Odyssey* 24,529-530).

¹⁰³⁹ The shortening of the optative *oi* in epic is not ruled out by Sjölund 1937 (the only detailed work so far on epic shortening). One example of such shortening is δοῦρ' ἔχεν: οὐκ ἄν τις μιν ἐρυκάκοι ἀντιβολήσας (*Iliad* 12,465).

¹⁰⁴⁰ The use and existence of the ending *ointo* in the optative are debated. Homer seemed to have preferred *oiato*, see Monro 1891:72 and Chantraine 1948:476-477.

In this verse, Homer described how Athene intervened to stop Telemakhos and Odysseus from killing all the relatives of the suitors. Since the εἰ μή clause was in origin a paratactic clause referring to an actual event, the indicative was used; therefore ἦϋσεν and ἔσχεθε are put in the indicative.

All verbs are put in the aorist, because the killing is considered a single and completed action, and the verb ἦϋσεν means “making a piercing sound”, which is a punctual action.

In this instance, the second indicative is a result of modal conjunction reduction. The construction could contain an older optative construction *καί νύ κε πάντας ὀλέσσειαν καὶ (ἔ)θηκαν ἀνόστους.

5.5. Conclusion.

In this chapter the distribution of verbs in introductions and conclusions, and the use of mood and tense in introductions and conclusions were discussed. The division between introductions and conclusions was suppletive: in many cases, a verb was either used in introductions or in conclusions. Introductions referring to the future were expressed in the aorist subjunctive, while the conclusions were expressed by the future indicative.

Tense use in Homeric Greek was aspectual: aorist imperfect and pluperfect all refer to the past, but do not indicate a relative chronology but refer to the completion of the action, the duration of the action or the completed state as a result of a past action. This distinction applies to the indicative, but also to the optative, subjunctive and participle, and is also valid in the contrary-to-fact constructions. Homer (and Classical) Greek do not have a strict schema with present and past counterfactual, but only differ in aspect. The aorist was used in speech conclusions when the speaker immediately proceeded to something else, and/or when the effect of the speech on the audience was not mentioned and/or when the reaction of the audience was not mentioned, and with **uek*^w, because it is not attested in any other tenses; in introductions the aorist was used when a unique speaking was related, when an unimportant character was speaking (the *tis* speeches) or when someone’s speaking had no effect on the audience. The imperfect was used in speech conclusions, when the effect of the speaking was mentioned: in these cases the speaking had a longer effect than the pronunciation of the words. It is also used in introductions when there was a dialogue or when the speaking influenced the audience. This use is also attested in non-Attic inscriptions, Herodotos, Attic inscriptions and Attic prose.

In Indo-European there was only a past potential, expressed in the optative and this was also the initial situation in Homer, with the aspect indicating the tense. During the creation of the

Homeric poems a substitution of the optative by the so-called “modal indicative” occurred (but might have started earlier already). There are different reasons for this substitution, but the prime factor contributing to this change was the postposed conditional clause introduced by εἰ μή with an indicative. The indicative in this type of sentences was taken over from a paratactic sentence with ἀλλά followed by an indicative, as the εἰ μή and ἀλλά sentences were metrically and semantically equivalent. From the εἰ μή conditionals the indicative spread to the positive postposed and preposed conditionals and eventually to the main clause.

Chapter 6.

The augment in Homer, with a special focus on speech introductions and conclusions.

6.1. Introduction.

In Indo-European linguistics the augment is usually described as a prefix added to a verbal form in the indicative to indicate a past tense.¹⁰⁴¹ It is in origin an Indo-European deictic particle or an independent temporal adverb **(h₁)e*, “then, there”. In what follows, the use (and the absence) of the augment in Homer will be discussed, and I will focus predominantly but not exclusively on speech introductions and conclusions.¹⁰⁴² The augment in Mycenaean or in other Indo-European languages will remain outside the scope of this chapter. The augment use cannot be explained by one single reason or explanation. There is a conglomerate of different reasons that can be used to explain the absence/presence of the augment. These explanations are sometimes contradictory, and only indicate tendencies.¹⁰⁴³ Moreover, the Homeric language was an artificial language but at the same time continuously innovated and underwent influences from everyday speech.¹⁰⁴⁴ In the first three subchapters I analyse the augment from metrical-morphological, syntactic and semantic standpoints. In the fourth subchapter I discuss the expansion of certain (un)augmented formulae into contexts where the use/absence of the augment was no longer justified. I then briefly mention the compounds, and at the end I address Willi’s theory that the augment was in origin a reduplication syllable

¹⁰⁴¹ Brugmann 1904:288, 484-485; Macdonnell 1910:315; Clackson 2007:217; Weiss 2009:384.

¹⁰⁴² The augment has been treated extensively, and was even debated among Alexandrian scholars. Studies of the Homeric augment have been made by Grashof 1852; Poehlmann 1858; Koch 1868; La Roche 1867:76-80, 99-102; 1882; Platt 1891; Drewitt 1912a, 1912b and 1913; Shewan 1912 and 1914 (in response to Drewitt); Chantraine 1948:479-484; Bottin 1969; Blumenthal 1974; West 1989; Basset 1989a; Strunk 1994a; Bakker 1999a and 2005; Mumm 2004; Lehnert 2005 (an analysis of the augmentation in the first two books of the *Iliad* based on Mumm 2004 and with a short overview of previous scholarship on pages 1-8; unfortunately, he neglected all the other explanations) and 2012 (a very brief discussion); Willi 2007 (cf. *infra*); Pagniello 2007; García-Ramón 2012a and De Decker 2014. The most detailed analysis of verbal forms in tmesis and compounds is Dottin *L’augment des verbes composés dans l’Iliade et l’Odyssée*, but I was unable to consult it myself (it was quoted in Chantraine and Bottin). For a brief summary of the augment use/absence in Homer, see Hackstein 2011b:32-33. For a thorough analysis of previous scholars (especially from the 19th century), one can consult Bottin 1969. As Bakker 2005:115 pointed out, Bottin 1969 is the only thorough overview of scholarship from 1850 until 1969, but he did not address Franz Bopp’s theories on the origin of the augment. Bopp explained the augment either as a negative suffix denying the present state (Bopp 1842:781) or as a relic from the demonstrative *a* (in Bopp’s notation, Bopp 1833:786-787). This was repeated by Bréal 1900 explained it as a shorter form of the emphatic particle *ñ*. For an analysis of Bopp’s theories, see Strunk 1994a.

The augment in Mycenaean has been treated by Ruijgh (1979:84 and posthumously in 2011), Hoenigswald 1964, Luria 1960, Duhoux 1987, Mumm 2004 and García-Ramón 2012a. The use/absence of the augment in Mycenaean cannot be addressed here.

Rijksbaron 2006 argued that there were much more unaugmented forms in Attic drama than generally assumed, as many forms had been erroneously considered to be historical presents. The issue of the historical presents and the absence of the augment in drama cannot be addressed here either.

¹⁰⁴³ De Lamberterie 2007:53.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Bakker 2005:131.

that was grammaticalised as a marker of perfect state and extended into contexts where it did not belong.

6.2. Metrical-morphological observations on the augment use.

1. The absence of the augment is an archaism and can be a relic from the period in PIE when the augment had not yet been established as a verbal marker (provided that it already existed in Indo-European verbal morphology), or it can be a remnant from the Indo-European *Dichtersprache*.¹⁰⁴⁵

2. The augment is always used/left out, if the metre requires it. The following observations apply to verbs used in speech introductions and conclusions:¹⁰⁴⁶

- The verb form ἀπαμείβετο can only be used if it is not augmented and it is metrically equivalent to ἡμείβετο.¹⁰⁴⁷
- The form κέλευσε can only be used, when preceded by a word ending in a short vowel. Therefore, the conclusion ὥς ἐκέλευσε is always augmented.
- The conclusions ὥς ἔφατο Κρονίδης and ὥς ἔφατο Ζεύς can only be used when the verb form is augmented.
- In speech conclusions, the middle and augmented ὥς ἔφατ' is equivalent to the active and unaugmented ὥς φῆ, and ὥς ἔφαθ', οἷ is equivalent to ὥς φάτο, τοί.¹⁰⁴⁸
- The form ἐφάμην is preferred over φάμην, and ὥς φάμην is impossible. Therefore, the conclusion always appears in the form ὥς ἐφάμην.
- The verb form ἀγόρευον is preferred,¹⁰⁴⁹ because the augmented form ἡγόρευον can only be used if the diphthong ευ is shortened but shortening of ευ is very rare:¹⁰⁵⁰ the formula ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον/ ἀγόρευεν, which occurs in 8 instances,¹⁰⁵¹ is therefore always unaugmented.
- The verb forms ὀνόμαζε and ἀγορήσατο can only be used without an augment:¹⁰⁵²

ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (occurring 43 times),¹⁰⁵³

¹⁰⁴⁵ Delbrück 1879:68, Wackernagel 1942:1-4.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Chantraine 1948:483.

¹⁰⁴⁷ Drewitt 1912b:110-111.

¹⁰⁴⁸ This had been observed already by Grashof 1852:6.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Chantraine 1948:483.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Neither Sjölund 1937, Chantraine 1948 nor Kelly 1990 discussed any examples of this specific shortening.

¹⁰⁵¹ The instances are *Iliad* 3,155; 21,121; 21,427; 22,377; 23,535 and *Odyssey* 4,189; 9,409; 17,439.

¹⁰⁵² La Roche 1882:18.

¹⁰⁵³ The instances are *Iliad* 1,361; 3,398; 5,372; 6,253; 6,406; 6,485; 7,108; 14,218; 14,232; 14,297; 15,552; 18,384; 18,423; 19,7; 21,356; 24,127 and 24,286 and *Odyssey* 2,302; 3,374; 4,311; 4,610; 5,181; 6,254; 7,330; 8,194; 8,291; 10,280; 10,319; 11,247; 14,52; 15,124; 15,530; 16,417; 17,215; 18,78; 18,163; 19,90; 19,402; 21,84; 21,167; 21,248; 21,287 and 23,96.

ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε (occurring 24 times).¹⁰⁵⁴

- The metrical form of the word following a speech conclusion with φημί determines in many instances whether or not the verb will be augmented:

a) Words of the metrical type –υ– are almost always put in the first half of the first foot or the first half of the second foot of the verse.¹⁰⁵⁵ If a word of this metrical type occurs after the conclusion and starts with a single consonant, the conclusion can only be non-augmented.

b) Words of the type υ– – are usually put in the second half of the second half foot of first (1b) or second foot (2b),¹⁰⁵⁶ which means that the speech conclusion before words of that type has to have the form –υ, which only allows ὦς φάτ' or ὦς φῆ (with *correptio epica*). Augmented forms are therefore excluded. This means that participles of compounds such as ἐποτρύνων or ἀπειλήσας can only be preceded by a non-augmented verb form.

The consequences of these observations are that the non-augmented form always occurs in the following formulae (the list is not exhaustive):

ὦς φάθ', ὃ .. (this sequence appears 7 times),¹⁰⁵⁷

ὦς φάτ' ἐποτρύνων, ... (*Iliad* 12,442; 20,364; 20,373),

ὦς φάτ', Ἀθηναίη (occurring 2 times)¹⁰⁵⁸ or ὦς φάτ' Ἀθηναίη (occurring 5 times)¹⁰⁵⁹,

ὦς φάτο, Πάτροκλος (occurring five times),¹⁰⁶⁰

ὦς φάτο Τηλέμαχος and ὦς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος (occurring ten times),¹⁰⁶¹

This shows that the metre played an important role, but it would nevertheless be false to state that the metre was the sole factor, because if the poet wanted to use an augmented form, he could have made use of the formula ὦς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ ... (in which case he had one foot less to fill his verse).

The following exceptions are not caused by the metre.

ὦς φάσαν ἢ πληθύς: ἀνὰ δὲ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεὺς (*Iliad* 2,278),

ὦς φάσαν, ἀλλ' οὐ πεῖθον ἐμὸν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν (*Odyssey* 9,500),

¹⁰⁵⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 1,73; 1,253; 2,78; 2,283; 7,236; 7,367; 9,95; 15,285; 18,253 and *Odyssey* 2,24; 2,160; 2,228; 4,773; 7,158; 7,185; 8,25; 13,171; 16,394; 18,412; 20,244; 24,53; 24,425; 24,453.

¹⁰⁵⁵ O'Neill 1942:144.

¹⁰⁵⁶ O'Neill 1942:146.

¹⁰⁵⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 1,345; 9,205; 11,616; 16,130 and 16,710.

¹⁰⁵⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 21,423 and *Odyssey* 22,224.

¹⁰⁵⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 4,104 and 22,224, and *Odyssey* 2,296; 24,533 and 24,545.

¹⁰⁶⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 1,345; 9,205; 11,616; 16,130 and 16,710.

¹⁰⁶¹ The formula ὦς φάτο Τηλέμαχος appears in *Odyssey* 1,420; 2,146 and 20,345. The formula ὦς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος appears in *Odyssey* 17,26; 17,541; 19,14; 19,47; 20, 144; 22,108 and 22,393.

ὥς φάσαν ἰεῖσαι ὅπα κάλλιμον: αὐτὰρ ἐμὸν κῆρ (*Odyssey* 12,192),

ὥς φάσαν, αὐτὰρ, ὃ θῆκε φέρων αὐτῇ ἐνὶ χώρῃ (*Odyssey* 21,366).

These four instances all have an undetermined nameless subject (the masses in *Iliad* 2,278; Odysseus's men in *Odyssey* 9,500; the Sirens in *Odyssey* 12,192 and the suitors in *Odyssey* 23,366),¹⁰⁶² and are metrically equivalent to the augmented conclusion ὥς ἔφαν (occurring 6 times), which also has an undetermined subject in 5 of the 6 instances. The absence of the augment seems to be an archaism, but the form has a relatively young element in the ending -σαν, which was created on the active 3rd person plural indicative of the sigmatic aorist and was then extended to all third person plural endings, even outside the aorist and the indicative.¹⁰⁶³ The form ἔφαν is in all likelihood older than φάσαν. The change from ἔφαν into φάσαν and the generalisation of the 3rd person plural ending -σαν was still continuing in VIII^a but the ending -σαν had already become more widespread than the other 3rd person plural endings.¹⁰⁶⁴ At the time when the epos was being written down, both endings still coexisted. The absence of the augment in these verses is therefore not a genuine archaism, but a pseudo-archaism.

3. Augmented forms are less common than the unaugmented ones in Homer.¹⁰⁶⁵ This is remarkable, because the data for the Indo-Iranian are significantly different: Vedic has more augmented forms,¹⁰⁶⁶ Old-Persian has more augmented forms as well,¹⁰⁶⁷ and only Avestan has fewer augmented forms than unaugmented forms.¹⁰⁶⁸ These differences in usage, however, remain outside the scope of this thesis.

4. The augment is more common in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad*.¹⁰⁶⁹ This is closely related to the fact that there are more speeches in the *Odyssey* than in the *Iliad* and to the difference in thematic. I refer to point 19 (below).

¹⁰⁶² The speeches by undetermined masses and anonymous characters were thoroughly discussed in Schneider 1995.

¹⁰⁶³ Brugmann 1900:316, 352; Rix 1976:245. Whether the extension happened from the 3rd person plural form ἔδειξαν (Schmidt 1885:319-327) or from ἔλυσαν (Meyer 1896:545-546), is irrelevant for this discussion.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Hackstein 2002a:132

¹⁰⁶⁵ Koch 1868:27; Platt 1891:229-230 (doubting the accuracy of Koch's figures); Monro 1891:402; Drewitt 1912a:44-47, 1912b; Chantraine 1948:484 (also doubting Koch's figures); Basset 1989a; Bakker 1997b:52 (noting that Koch's observations were intrinsically right), 2005:115.

¹⁰⁶⁶ Avery 1880:329; Macdonell 1910:315, 1916:122. I owe this observation to Benedikt Peschl. See also the discussion in Hoffmann 1967:27-42 (figures on page 36).

¹⁰⁶⁷ Martínez – De Vaan 2001:84 *el aumento se encuentra empleado sistemáticamente en griego clásico, en antiguo indio y en perso antiguo*; Forssman – Hoffmann 2004:181. The augment was mentioned in Lazard 1963 and in Brandenstein-Mayrhofer 1964, but they did not state that the augmented forms were more common than the unaugmented ones.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Williams Jackson 1892:136 *in Av. the augment is comparably rare, the instances of its omission far exceed in proportion those of the Vedic Sanskrit*, 177; Reichelt 1909:93-94; Kellens 1984:245-249; Beekes 1988:150; Martínez – De Vaan 2001:84-85; Forssman – Hoffmann 2004:181-182.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Drewitt 1912a, especially 44-47; Chantraine 1948:484.

5. It is often missing in verbal forms of four or more syllables. See Appendix B.1.

Examples are:

τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ἀγορήνδε καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 1,54),

δὴ τότε κοιμήσαντο παρὰ πρυμνήσια νηός (*Iliad* 1,476; *Odyssey* 12,32),

τρὶς μὲν μερμήριξε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν (*Iliad* 8,169).

In many instances, the metre played a role, but in the examples quoted above, the augmented form could have been used without any problems.

6. It is very often omitted in pluperfect forms.¹⁰⁷⁰ The reason for this is that the reduplication and the secondary endings were already enough to mark the form as pluperfect.¹⁰⁷¹ In addition, the *Wortumfang* also played a role: most pluperfect forms already had four syllables or more, and that adding a syllabic augment would make the verb form even longer. The only pluperfect attested in speech introductions (γέγωνα) is augmented, when the speech introduction verb is accompanied by a person addressed and when the form is not followed by a 2nd position clitic (cf. *infra*):

Ἀτρεΐδης δ' ἔδδισε καὶ Ἀντιλόχῳ ἐγεγώνει (*Iliad* 23,425).¹⁰⁷²

¹⁰⁷⁰ This had been noticed already by Aristarkhos, see La Roche 1866:423. See also Buttmann 1830:318, 1858:127-128; Koch 1868:20-21; La Roche 1882:32-39; Platt 1891:231; Monro 1891:61; Chantraine 1948:481-482 (with reference to both Aristarkhos and La Roche), Bottin 1969:124-129 (with a list of forms).

¹⁰⁷¹ La Roche 1882:35

¹⁰⁷² I interpret γέγωνα as a perfect. Together with its augmented counterpart ἐγέγωνεν, γέγωνε has been interpreted as a pluperfect of γέγωνα (Schwyzer 1939:777; Chantraine 1948:439, 1968-1974:213; Nussbaum 1987:250; Heubeck 1992:193-194; Beckwith 2004:77; Brügger 2009:243.), an imperfect of a present γεγώνω (Kühner-Blass 1892:389; Ameis-Hentze 1896:83, 1900b:45; Cunliffe 1924:75-76; Smyth 1956:691. Monro 1891:30 mentioned both possibilities, but categorised the forms under the thematic inflection of the perfect.), or even an imperfect built on the pluperfect ἐγεγώνει (Janko 1992:219). Even ἐγεγώνει, which has all the formal characteristics of a pluperfect, has been interpreted as an imperfect of a present γεγωνέω (Veitch 1879:149; Kühner-Blass 1892:389; Chantraine 1948:206-207; Smyth 1956:691). The forms ἐγέγωνεν and γέγωνε are thematic pluperfect forms. The oldest pluperfects had the same endings as the perfect and distinguished themselves from the perfect only by the augment, as is confirmed by Vedic (Mekler 1887:46 and 49-57; Delbrück 1897:226; Brugmann 1900:378-379, 1904:547-548, 1916:493-496; Thieme 1929; Schwyzer 1939:767, 777; Rix 1976:257; Duhoux 1992:436. For an analysis of the Vedic pluperfect, see Thieme 1929 and Kümmel 2000. There is no agreement on the existence of an Indo-European pluperfect, but in all likelihood it already existed. See Brugmann 1904: 484; Szemerényi 1990:323; Kümmel 2000:82-86 and Fortson 2010:81. For another opinion, see Wackernagel 1920:185 and Katz 2007:14.). These thematic pluperfect forms therefore belong to the oldest layers of the epic language (Schwyzer 1939:777). In a later stage, the pluperfects in ει replaced the older thematic forms in ε whenever metrically possible (Mekler (1887:63-64 and 73) pointed out that 127 of the 190 attested pluperfects are found at the end of the verse, where they could cover an older thematic perfect form. See also Berg 1977:228 (with reference to Mekler); Schwyzer 1939:777; Peters 1997:212; Beckwith 2004:77-80; Katz 2007:9-10.). In the case of γέγωνα, this could only be done at the end of the verse (Beckwith 2004:77):

Ἀτρεΐδης δ' ἔδδισε καὶ Ἀντιλόχῳ ἐγεγώνει (*Iliad* 23,425).

Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἀπειλήσας ἐγεγώνει (*Odyssey* 21,368).

The thematic forms that were not replaced, were no longer clearly understood as pluperfects but reinterpreted as imperfects. As such, the forms ἐγέγωνεν, γέγωνε and ἐγεγώνει were pluperfects in origin, but they were synchronically interpreted as imperfects (Mekler 1887:47-63; Beckwith 2004:82. This evolution is more likely than the one suggested by Janko, who argued that the imperfect (ἐ)γέγωνε(v) was built on the pluperfect ἐγεγώνει.). This interpretation was facilitated by the fact that the verb γέγωνα had present meaning and that a form ἐγεγώνει could therefore be interpreted as an imperfect, especially since speech introductions often had

In most cases, a pluperfect form described the result of a completed action in a more remote past, and therefore the absence of the augment is more or less “expected”.¹⁰⁷³ Examples are (the pluperfect is underlined):

ἦ ρά νύ τοι πολλοὶ δεδμήατο κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν (*Iliad* 3,183),

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρηῦς δὲ διέκ μεγάροιο βεβήκει (*Odyssey* 18,185; 19,503; 22,433).¹⁰⁷⁴

On the other hand, there are also exceptions:¹⁰⁷⁵

οἴχνεσκον· κείνου γὰρ ἐδείδισαν ὄβριμον ἔγχος (*Iliad* 5,790).

7. Verb forms are usually augmented when the unaugmented form would yield a form ending in a short open monosyllabic form (*horror monosyllabi*).¹⁰⁷⁶ This explains the difference in augmentation between the following two formulae:

Αἴγισθος δολόμητις, ἐπεὶ κτάνε πολλὸν ἀρείω (*Odyssey* 3,250),

Αἴγισθον δολόμητιν, ὅς οἱ πατέρα κλυτὸν **ἔκτα** (*Odyssey* 3,308).

It is important to note that the constraint applies to short closed monosyllabic verb forms as well.¹⁰⁷⁷ If short closed syllables were exempt from this constraint, we would find forms such as *σχέν as well, but such forms are not attested neither in Homer nor in Hesiod. The forms φάν and βάν were created after the unaugmented singular forms φῆ and βῆ.¹⁰⁷⁸ An example of such a monosyllabic form in a speech conclusion is:

ὥς φάν, τῷ δ' ἀσπαστὸν ἐείσατο κοιμηθῆναι (*Odyssey* 7,343).

8. It is important to stress that most semantic and syntactic restriction do not apply to compound verbs (cf. *infra*). All compounded verb forms are augmented. Recently, Tichy argued that speech introductions were not so archaic as generally assumed, and suggested that the augment needed to be removed in all introductions and that the form προσέφη should be

verbal forms in the imperfect. As a result, present paradigms, such as γεγώνεω and (possibly) γεγώνω were created (As Nussbaum (1987:248-250) pointed out, the present γεγώνεω survived in later Greek, while the form γεγώνεμεν is the only form that pointed to the present γεγώνω, and this might not be sufficient to posit this present).

¹⁰⁷³ Bottin explained the pluperfect as belonging to the narrative style, and assumed that the forms were therefore unaugmented (1969:124-125).

¹⁰⁷⁴ Chantraine 1948:481 stated that the unaugmented form βεβήκει appeared 22 times while the augmented one ἐβεβήκει was found only 5 times.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Chantraine 1948:481.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Wackernagel 1906:147-148 (=1951:148-149); Brugmann 1916:13; Renou 1928:80; Meillet 1937:243; Schwyzler 1939:651; Chantraine 1948:482; Strunk 1967:275, 1987; Szemerényi 1990:322 and recently also Mumm 2004:§1.1 (without reference to Wackernagel). Wackernagel showed that a similar evolution occurred in Armenian and Middle Indic. Sasse 1989 showed that this constraint operated in later Greek in the imperatives as well. For an analysis of the phonological problems relating to the constraint in Armenian see Schirru 2007 (with reference to B. Vaux. 1998. *Phonology of Armenian*. Oxford – *non uidi*).

¹⁰⁷⁷ Contrary to what Wackernagel 1906: 147-148; Brugmann 1916:13 and Strunk 1967:275 assumed.

¹⁰⁷⁸ This had already been suggested by Wackernagel (1906) 147-148 himself, although he did not rule out the fact that closed syllables were not subject to this rule (see previous note).

replaced by ποτίφᾱ.¹⁰⁷⁹ The following arguments can be adduced against this assumption. First of all, almost all compound verbs in speech introductions are augmented. Secondly, the form ποτίφᾱ cannot be used in the hexameter, because the syllable preceding the verbal form has to be scanned as long. Thirdly (and more generally), the mechanical removal of all augments neglects the semantic and syntactic circumstances under which the augment appeared and/or remained absent. Such an intervention is tantamount to removing all augmented verb forms from the RV.

9. Older forms such as duals and root aorists do not have an augment.¹⁰⁸⁰ Compounded verbs in the dual do not have the augment.¹⁰⁸¹ Examples of unaugmented root aorists are:

ἐκ δὲ Χρυσήϊς νηὸς **βῆ** ποντοπόροιο (*Iliad* 1,439),
κάππεσεν, ἀμφὶ δέ μιν θάνατος **χύτο** θυμοραϊστής. (*Iliad* 16,414; 16,580).

Examples of unaugmented duals are:

Μυρμιδόνων δ' ἐπὶ τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας **ἰκέσθην** (*Iliad* 1,328),
χεῖράς τ' ἀλλήλων **λαβέτην** καὶ πιστώσαντο (*Iliad* 6,232-233)
τὼ δ' εἰς ἀμφοτέρω Διομήδεος ἄρματα **βήτην** (*Iliad* 8,115).
ὥς ἄρα φωνήσαντε παρῆξ ὁδοῦ ἐν νεκύεσσι
κλινθήτην: ὁ δ' ἄρ' ὦκα παρέδραμεν ἀφραδίησιν (*Iliad* 10,349-350)

Examples of unaugmented dual compounds are:

τὼ δ' ἵππῳ δείσαντε **καταπτήτην** ὑπ' ὄχεσφι (*Iliad* 8,136),
ὥς τὼ γε κλαίοντε **προσαυδήτην** βασιλῆα (*Iliad* 11,136),
ὥς τὼ γε κλαίοντε **προσαυδήτην** φίλον υἱὸν (*Iliad* 22,90).

In the last two instances mentioned above, one could also argue that the absence is only apparent. The original form would have been ποταυδᾱτᾱν, but was not understood any longer by the bards during the Ionic phase of epic diction, who therefore gave it a more Ionic look (cf. supra). It is therefore possible that it was in fact augmented, namely ποτᾱυδᾱτᾱν, but that the bards did not know this and “forgot” to “Ionicise” the verbal form entirely. As the augmented forms of προσαυδάω were well attested, the first explanation that the form is not augmented is much more likely.¹⁰⁸² The combination of the pronominal stem **so/to* in a demonstrative meaning in the dual, with the presence of a person addressed in a speech

¹⁰⁷⁹ Tichy 2006:82-85. In Tichy 2012 she argued that every augment should be removed whenever possible, unless it was metrically required or when the verb form was a gnomic aorist. In 2012:360 she even went as far as replacing the augmented προσηύδα by the unaugmented ἀμείβετο.

¹⁰⁸⁰ For the dual see Grashof 1852:29; La Roche 1882:19; Platt 1891:213-214; Schwyzer 1939:651, Bottin 1969:94 (with reference to Schwyzer), Blumenthal 1974:75, Mumm 2004:148. For the root aorists and dual forms without augment see Blumenthal 1974.

¹⁰⁸¹ Bottin 1969:92-96.

¹⁰⁸² Leaf 1900:478 *otherwise this imperfect always has the augment*.

conclusion and the use of a dual verbal form without an augment very likely represent linguistic archaisms.

10. Younger forms such as the sigmatic aorist and the *θη* aorist have it more often.¹⁰⁸³

Examples are:

Ἀτρείδης δ' ἐβόησεν ἰδὲ ζώννυσθαι ἄνωγεν (*Iliad* 11,15),
καὶ τότε δὴ περὶ κῆρι Ποσειδάων ἐχολώθη (*Iliad* 13,206).

The above mentioned rules (9 and 10) explain the difference in augmentation between the verbs in the two verses mentioned below:

ὥς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ ἐμοί γε κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἦτορ (*Odyssey* 4,481; 9,256; 10,496),
ὥς φάτο, τῆς/τοῦ / τῶν δ' αὐτοῦ λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ (occurring 5 times).¹⁰⁸⁴

11. Forms that require the elision of case forms such as the dual in E or the dative singular in I or plural in SI are not augmented, because these endings cannot be elided.¹⁰⁸⁵ The dative in SIN can be followed by an augmented form. Examples are:

αὐτὰρ ὃ κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγγοισι κέλευσε (*Iliad* 2,50),
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' Αἰνεία τε καὶ Ἴκτορι εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 6,75).

When the dative plural ending is SIN, the augment can be used:

ὥς εἰπὼν Τρώεσσιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν αὔσας (*Iliad* 17,183).

12. A genitive ending in OIO is never elided into OI' and subsequently, the augment is not used after such a genitive.

ὥς ἄρα μιν εἰπόντα τέλος θανάτοιο κάλυπεν (*Iliad* 16,502; 16,855; 22,361).

13. An important observation is that the augment is not used, when it would require the elision of a rare case ending (such as a dual in E).¹⁰⁸⁶ This occurs in speech introductions with *εἶπε* and *καλέσσατο*.

Νεστορέας μὲν ἔπειθ' ἵππους θεράποντε κομείτην (*Iliad* 8,113),
πανσυδίη: μετὰ δέ σφι Μολίωνε θωρήσσοντο (*Iliad* 11,709).
ὥς εἰπὼν Αἴαντε καλέσσατο καὶ Μενέλαον (*Iliad* 17,507).

In this instance, the verb *καλέσσατο* had to remain unaugmented, because the sequence *Αἴαντ' ἐκαλέσσατο* would be ambiguous: it could mean “he called on Aias” and “he called on both Aiantes”.¹⁰⁸⁷

¹⁰⁸³ Blumenthal 1974, but his study was criticised because of his limited corpus.

¹⁰⁸⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 21,114 and *Odyssey* 4,703; 22,68; 23,205 and 24,345.

¹⁰⁸⁵ For the rare elision of SI, see La Roche 1869:76, 80; Bekker 1872:22-23; Monro 1891:349-350; Chantraine 1948:86; Wachter 2000:74.

For the elision of I, see La Roche 1869:76, 80; Monro 1891:349-350; Chantraine 1948:86; Wachter 2000:74.

¹⁰⁸⁶ La Roche 1869:76-82, 113.

¹⁰⁸⁷ La Roche 1866:426.

6.3. Syntactic observations.

1. A verb form usually remains unaugmented, when it is followed by a 2nd position clitic. By this term, I mean an enclitic word such as *τε* or *ῥα*, or a word that cannot be put in the first position of the sentence such as *δέ*, *μέν* or *γάρ*. This was first observed by Drewitt and was expanded and investigated more in detail by Beck and Bottin.¹⁰⁸⁸ For the particle *δέ* this absence of augmentation has been accepted,¹⁰⁸⁹ but it has not been investigated in detail for the other clitics.¹⁰⁹⁰ How can the absence in these instances be explained? The augmented form is in a compound of a preverb and a verbal form.¹⁰⁹¹ The Vedic accentuation bears witness to this: when an augmented form is accented, the accent is always put on the augment, just as the accent of a preposition that immediately precedes the verb form.¹⁰⁹² The Greek accentuation preserves the old compound status as well:¹⁰⁹³ although the general rule in Greek verbal accentuation states that the accent should be protracted as far as possible, the accent can never be placed further than the augment, as it could also never be placed further than the last preverb. As such, one has to accentuate the imperative *παρέκδος* and not *†πάρεκδος*, and also *παρέσχον*, and not *†πάρεσχον*.¹⁰⁹⁴ If an enclitic or a word that cannot be put at the beginning of the verse is used in the verse, it has to be put in the second position.¹⁰⁹⁵ In that case, the verb cannot be augmented, because it would mean that the enclitic would come after two words, and clitics such as *τε* and *δέ* are always put first in the clitic chain.¹⁰⁹⁶ The verb is therefore not augmented in such instances. If the verb had been augmented and a 2nd position clitic had been used in the sentence, the expected word order would be:

* *e* = *de* = *wek^we*

Augment – Clitic – Verb form

This is not the case, because in Greek the augment cannot be dissolved from the verb form. Consequently, the verb form has to come first, and the clitic has to follow the verb:

¹⁰⁸⁸ Drewitt 1912b:104, 1913:350; Beck 1919; Bottin 1969:99-102; I called this the “Drewitt-Bottin rule”, because Drewitt’s observation was extended and investigated by Bottin in much more detail.

¹⁰⁸⁹ Drewitt 1912b:104, 1913:350; Beck 1919; Bottin 1969:99-102; Rosén 1973:316-320; Bakker 1999a:53-54; De Lamberterie 2007:53; García-Ramón 2012a:B.2.3.

¹⁰⁹⁰ For a list of verses with the sequence VERB followed by *δέ*, see Bottin 1969:105-115. The figures per chant can be found on pages 112-115. The only attempt to expand this to other clitics was Beck 1919.

¹⁰⁹¹ Brugmann 1904:288.

¹⁰⁹² Macdonell 1910:315.

¹⁰⁹³ Wackernagel 1877b:469-470; Monro 1891:77.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Meillet 1939:243; Bally 1947:100; Probert 2007:47.

¹⁰⁹⁵ This is based on the observations by Bergaigne 1878:91-93 (for Latin, Greek, Indo-Iranian and Germanic) and Delbrück 1878:47-48 (for Vedic prose) and Wackernagel (for all Indo-European languages known at the time of publication, 1892), who stated that enclitic words had to come second in a sentence.

¹⁰⁹⁶ For the clitic chain see Wackernagel 1892:336; Delbrück 1900:51-53 (with reference to Monro); Brugmann 1904:682-683; Krisch 1990:73-74; Ruijgh 1990; Wills 1993; Watkins 1998:70.

*wék^we = de

Verb Clitic

Examples are (the list is obviously not exhaustive- Appendix B.2):

αἶδεσθην μὲν ἀνήνασθαι, δεῖσαν δ' ὑποδέχθαι (*Iliad* 7,93),

μέσσω δ' ἀμφοτέρων σκῆπτρα σχέθον, εἰπέ τε μῦθον (*Iliad* 7,277).

ὣς φάτο, χῆρατο δ' Ὑπνος, ἀμειβόμενος δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 14,270),

κέκλετο δ' Ἥφαιστον κλυτοτέχνην εἰπέ τε μῦθον (*Iliad* 18,391).

ὣς ἔφατ': αἶδετο γὰρ θαλερὸν γάμον ἐξονομῆναι (*Odyssey* 6,66),

σμερδαλέον δ' ἐβόησε, γέγωνέ τε πᾶσι θεοῖσι (*Odyssey* 8,305).

Drewitt-Bottin's rule also explains why the formula στή δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (occurring 7 times)¹⁰⁹⁷ has a non-augmented verb form στή, but an augmented ἔειπεν. Bertrand showed that the verb στή did not need an augment, because it was already focused by its sentence initial position. If the verb occurred in non-sentence initial positions, the form was ἔστη.¹⁰⁹⁸ The difference between στή and ἔστη cannot be metrical, because ἔστη could be put at the beginning of a sentence or verse. In addition, in all instances στή was followed by a 2nd position clitic, so that the absence of the augment could also be syntactically motivated.¹⁰⁹⁹

2. A verb form was often not augmented, when it was coordinated with a preceding augmented verb form by the connecting particles KAI (καί), τε, ἄμα τε, τε καί or ἰδέ. This is due to the fact that an augmented form is marked and that in a series of several elements only the first one needed to be marked. This is called *conjunction reduction* and was first noticed by Kiparsky,¹¹⁰⁰ although *markedness reduction* might be a better term. He observed that in Indo-Iranian and Greek a sequence of marked forms such as augmented indicatives or imperatives, the first form was marked, but the next one(s) were replaced by the injunctive.¹¹⁰¹ Starting from the idea that the injunctive was neutral as to time,¹¹⁰² Kiparsky stated that the absence of the augment in these verbal forms, was due to “conjunction

¹⁰⁹⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 23,271; 23,456; 23,657; 23,706; 23,725; 23,801 and 23,830.

¹⁰⁹⁸ Bertrand 2006a.

¹⁰⁹⁹ De Lamberterie 2007:53.

¹¹⁰⁰ Kiparsky 1968. He expanded this in 2005 (discussing Hoffmann 1967), but the basic ideas of 1968 remain the same.

¹¹⁰¹ For Greek, the injunctive was replaced with the infinitive in the case of a sequence of more than one imperative. Kiparsky expanded this idea to the Indo-Iranian (and maybe also Indo-European) *vāyav indraś ca* construction, in which the vocative was the marked form and the nominative the unmarked one (Kiparsky 1968:54-55).

¹¹⁰² Kiparsky 1968:36.

reduction”: the first form was marked and the others were left unmarked and neutral. A sequence

Verb +PAST Verb +PAST

evolved into

Verb + PAST ... Verb –PAST.¹¹⁰³

Kiparsky’s suggestion offers an explanation for many instances where augmented and non-augmented forms co-occur without (hardly) any semantic difference visible. This rule explains why the speech conclusions with ἦ are followed by a verb that is often not augmented. The 88 speech conclusion formulae with ἦ are always part of a sentence in which other verb forms occur as well, and in 82 instances the connection is made with καί or ἄμα τε. In 55 instances, the verbal form following ἦ was not augmented.

Examples of this reduction are:

ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἄρχε λέχουσδὲ κιών: ἄμα δ' εἶπετ' ἄκοιτις (*Iliad* 3,447),

ἦστο καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι περικλυτὰ ἔργα κέλευε (*Iliad* 6,324),

Ἀτρεΐδης δ' ἐβόησεν ἰδὲ ζώννυσθαι ἄνωγεν (*Iliad* 11,15),

ἦ ῥα, καὶ Ἑκτορα δῖον ἀεικέα μῆδετο ἔργα (*Iliad* 22,395).

ὣς ἄρ' ἔπειτ' ἦρᾶτο καὶ αὐτὴ πάντα τελεύτα (*Odyssey* 3,62),

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε γυνή καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 15,434),

αὐτίκα δὲ μνηστῆρσι μετηύδα καὶ φάτο μῦθον (*Odyssey* 21,67).

It also explains the combination of an augmented and unaugmented form in the formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (attested 43 times):¹¹⁰⁴

ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῶ χειρὶ ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (7 instances),¹¹⁰⁵

χειρὶ τέ μιν κατέρεξεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (5 instances),¹¹⁰⁶

τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν νείκεσσαν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (*Odyssey* 17,215),

(...) ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (8 instances).¹¹⁰⁷

The reduction only operates if the first verbal form is augmented. If it is not, the second one can be augmented without any problems (but does not have to be augmented). This is well illustrated by the formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε, which is usually preceded by an

¹¹⁰³ Kiparsky 1968.

¹¹⁰⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 1,361; 3,398; 5,372; 6,253; 6,406; 6,485; 7,108; 14,218; 14,232; 14,297; 15,552; 18,384; 18,423; 19,7; 21,356; 24,127 and 24,286 and *Odyssey* 2,302; 3,374; 4,311; 4,610; 5,181; 6,254; 7,330; 8,194; 8,291; 10,280; 10,319; 11,247; 14,52; 15,124; 15,530; 16,417; 17,215; 18,78; 18,163; 19,90; 19,402; 21,84; 21,167; 21,248; 21,287 and 23,96.

¹¹⁰⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 6,253; 6,406; 14,232; 18,384; 18,423; 19,7 and *Odyssey* 15,530.

¹¹⁰⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,361; 6,485; 24,127 and *Odyssey* 4,610; 5,181.

¹¹⁰⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 15,552 and *Odyssey* 16,417; 18,78; 19,90; 21,84; 21,167; 21,287; 23,96.

unaugmented verb. Therefore the form ἔφατ' can be augmented, because there is no constraints blocking it.

Kiparsky's theory has been challenged by Bakker, who used the following three arguments:¹¹⁰⁸

- a) the augment is not marker of past tense,
- b) there are many exceptions,
- c) the augment is not subject to syntax.

These arguments are not entirely convincing, however. While Bakker is right in stating that the augment is not a marker of past tense, this does not mean that the concept of the *markedness reduction* is wrong per se. The augmented form is a marked form (even if the augment is not a past marker, it is still a deictic marker), and the reduction of the marker in the following verbal forms is therefore not excluded. In addition to the examples adduced by Kiparsky, the following one is also important and in my opinion strengthens the concept of *markedness reduction*.¹¹⁰⁹ In a sequence of several forms in the dual, the first one is often put in the dual, while the following ones are not.¹¹¹⁰ Examples are:

στήτην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 1,332),

ἦσθην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 8,445).

In addition, a substantial amount of exceptions can be explained. It is important to observe that the *markedness reduction* does not occur to the same extent with all connecting particles. It is more common with καί than with δέ (as could be seen in the table of the clitics: if δέ preceded the verb, the verb is more often augmented than not, see Appendices B.2 and B.4). Kiparsky tried to explain this by stating that the augmentation of many verbs was a later regularisation during the transmission.¹¹¹¹ There is another explanation, however. The particle δέ does not mark a mere transition, but adds new information, while καί connects two (or more) aspects of the same action/event.¹¹¹² As such, when δέ is not used as a simple

¹¹⁰⁸ Bakker 1997b:60-62, 2005:116.

¹¹⁰⁹ Clackson's additional example of reduction between the indicative and the injunctive as proved by Hesiod, *Theogony* 4-11 (Clackson 2007:132) is better explained as a description of timeless activities by deities. They are generally described in the indicative present and injunctive present, as was argued for by Avery 1880:330, Renou 1928:71-73, Hoffmann 1967:119, Strunk 1968:290-294; West 1989 and Euler 1985. As Mumm 1995 pointed out, the injunctive can also refer to the present, as long as the phrase does not have a clearly defined temporal indication in it. I would therefore not include the sequence indicative present – injunctive in the list of possible reductions.

¹¹¹⁰ This analysis goes back to Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1827, quoted in Strunk 1975:237. Strunk (1975:234-239) provided an analysis of Homeric and Attic (Xenophontic) instances to show that Greek did not need to mark the dual more than once. Strunk 1975:234-239 (without using the phrase "conjunction reduction"); Fritz 2011:50-51, with reference to Kiparsky 1968 and Strunk 1975, used the term "conjunction reduction".

¹¹¹¹ Kiparsky 1968:41-42; Rosén 1973 tried to do the same.

¹¹¹² Klein 1992; Bakker 1997b:62-82; Hajnal 2003b:227-228.

connective but contrasts action, it is not subject to the *markedness reduction*.¹¹¹³ When δέ connects actions that are closely linked, the verbs linked are subject to the reduction. This is well-illustrated in the following examples:

τοὺς δ' ἐγὼ ἐξείνισσα καὶ ἐν μεγάροισι **φίλησα**,
ἀμφοτέρων δὲ φυὴν **ἐδάην** καὶ μήδεα πυκνά (*Iliad* 3,207-208).

The verbs linked by καί are subject to the *markedness reduction* while those by δέ are not: in these verses Antenor described that he had entertained Odysseus and Menelaos during the Embassy before the Trojan war, and confirmed that Odysseus was indeed very shrewd. In the first line, the verbs are closely connected because they describe how Antenor welcomed Odysseus as a guest. The verb in the second verse adds new information and marks a contrast with the preceding verses, and is therefore augmented.

ἦ ῥα καὶ ἐς δίφρον ἄρνας **θέτο** ἰσόθεος φῶς,
ἄν δ' ἄρ' ἔβαιν' αὐτός, κατὰ δ' ἡνία **τεῖνεν** ὀπίσσω:
παρ δέ οἱ Ἀντήνωρ περικαλλέα **βήσετο** δίφρον. (*Iliad* 3,310-312).

In these verses, Homer described how Priam finished speaking and prepared his chariot to watch the duel between Menelaos and Paris from the walls of Troy together with Antenor. The verb ἦ is augmented, while θέτο is not because it is connected by καί. The verb ἔβαιν' is augmented, because it described how Priam readied his chariot and mentions a new action. The two other verbs, τεῖνεν and βήσετο, are connected by δέ, but are nevertheless not augmented because they belong to the same process of preparing the chariot.

ἦ καὶ ἀναΐξας ἐριούνιος ἄρμα καὶ ἵππους
καρπαλίμως μάστιγα καὶ ἡνία **λάζετο** χερσίν,
ἐν δ' **ἔπνευσ'** ἵπποισι καὶ ἡμιόνοις μένος ἠΰ. (*Iliad* 24,444-442).

The verbs that are linked by καί are subject to the *markedness reduction* while those by δέ are not: therefore, λάζετο is not augmented, while ἔπνευσ' is augmented. In these verses Homer described how Hermes finished speaking, jumped onto his chariot and took the bridle and reins in his hand. The unexpected action is that he also incited his horses and mules: therefore λάζετο is not augmented, but ἔπνευσ' is.

Τηλεμάχῳ εἰκυῖα κατὰ πτόλιν ῥάχετο πάντη,
καὶ ῥα ἐκάστῳ φωτὶ παρισταμένη **φάτο** μῦθον,
ἐσπερίους δ' ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν ἀγέρεσθαι **ἀνώγει**. (*Odyssey* 2,383-385).

¹¹¹³ Bakker 1997b:52.

In these verses Homer described how Athena went away, disguised herself as Telemakhos and ordered his men to ready a ship, so that he could sail off to Sparta. The first verb ὄχρετο is augmented, and the two others are not. Although the second and the third verb (φάτο and ἀνῶγει) are linked by δέ, they are both unaugmented because they belong to the same action and are not contrasted with each other.

Lastly, we need to address Bakker's statement that the augment is never influenced by the syntax. I believe this is wrong. As is proved by the accentuation, the augmented form is in origin a compound of a deictic accentuated particle and an enclitic verb form. This in itself makes the augmented verb form subject to Wackernagel's Law (as Bakker himself admitted). Secondly, compounds are subject to certain syntactic rules. When compounds are combined in a series, the first compound remains a compound, but the others are used in the simplex form (as long as this does not obscure the sense).¹¹¹⁴ This is a case of *markedness reduction* as well. As it is attested in Greek, Latin and Hittite, it can be posited for Indo-European as well.¹¹¹⁵ I therefore believe that the augmented forms were subject to syntactic rules. If one accepts that the augmented forms were subject to different syntactic rules, many forms for which a purely semantic explanation could not be given, could be explained. The evidence is clear that the reduction of marked forms was a feature of Indo-European syntax.

3. Verb forms in the beginning of a verse or sentence were usually (but not exclusively) unaugmented.¹¹¹⁶ When the verb is put at the beginning of the sentence (which is not the usual position),¹¹¹⁷ it received emphasis by its position and in those instances the augment is not needed to add additional foregrounding. As was stated above, the augmented one was the marked one. If the verb in the sentence was already marked by another feature (such as *Verberststellung*), there was less necessity to augment the verb. The vast majority of these non-augmented instances of a verse initial verb form could also be explained by the fact that the verb forms are followed by a 2nd position clitic, but not all of them. Forms such as ἔγνων

¹¹¹⁴ Wackernagel 1924:177; Clausen 1955:49-51 *a Greek or Latin author sometimes reiterates a compound verb, either immediately or at a brief interval, in its simple form with the same meaning*; Watkins 1967.

¹¹¹⁵ Watkins 1967

¹¹¹⁶ Chantraine 1948:482; Bertrand 2006a; De Lamberterie 2007:37, 56-57. Van Thiel 1991:xxvi pointed out that this had been observed already by the Byzantine scholars.

¹¹¹⁷ For the default position of the verb at the end of the sentence, see Bergaigne 1879; Delbrück 1878:17, 1888:17; Kühner-Gerth 1904:595; Watkins 1963:48, 1998:68; Fortson 2010:142-144; Fritz 2010:384. For the marked position in the beginning of the sentence, one can refer to Delbrück 1878:19; Watkins 1963:48; Fortson 2010:142-144; Fritz 2010:384. This distinction is most clearly seen in Hittite: Dressler 1969:6-8; McCone 1979:468-469; Disterheft 1984:221 *of all the languages with OV word order, Hittite is the most invariant*; Luraghi 1990:18; Clackson 2007:166-167; Hoffner-Melchert 2008:406; Fortson 2010:142. As Watkins 1997 pointed out, Delbrück's observations were confirmed by the Anatolian languages. The verb initial position in Anatolian is mostly emphatic, see Friedrich 1960:146, Luraghi 1990:96-97 and Bauer 2011. Hoffner-Melchert were more cautious and added that further research was needed in this field.

and ἔσθη can be augmented and non-augmented at the beginning of the verse or sentence. Some examples:

εἶπεν ἐπευξάμενος Δίί τ' ἄλλοισίν τε θεοῖσι (*Iliad* 6,475).¹¹¹⁸

κέκλεθ' ὁμοκλήσας, φάτο δ' ἴμεναι ἄντ' Ἀχιλλῆος (*Iliad* 20,365).

φῆ πυρὶ καιόμενος, ἀνὰ δ' ἔφλυε καλὰ ῥέεθρα (*Iliad* 21,361).

This is the only instance where the non-augmented form φῆ has been used in a speech introduction or conclusion.¹¹¹⁹

μυθεῖτ' εἰς ἀγαθὰ φρονέων νοέοντι καὶ αὐτῷ (*Iliad* 23,305).

θρήνεον: ἔνθα κεν οὔ τιν' ἀδάκρυτόν γ' ἐνόησας (*Odyssey* 24,61),

κλαίμεν ἀθάνατοί τε θεοὶ θνητοὶ τ' ἄνθρωποι (*Odyssey* 24,64).

There are exceptions to the observations made above:

4. A verb followed by a 2nd position is clitic is in general not augmented, but nevertheless both ἔδδαισεν δέ (attested 7 times)¹¹²⁰ and δεῖσεν δέ (attested 4 times)¹¹²¹ are transmitted, and in the case of ἔδδαισεν δέ the unaugmented variant is possible in 6 out of the 7 instances.¹¹²²

There are semantic reasons for this, and they will be addressed later on.

5. Most conclusions with ῆ are combined with the particle ῥα (51 instances out of 88), which follows the verbal form. One would therefore expect the verb to be unaugmented by Drewitt-Bottin's rule. The reason why the verb was nevertheless augmented, was the *Wortumfang*: the non-augmented form **h₂eǵt* would have become **akt* and eventually Greek **ἄ*. Such a form would not have survived, and therefore the form had to be augmented.¹¹²³ As such, the augmentation was metrical-morphologically motivated.

6. The augmentation of the verb αὔω is irregular: the augment appears in ἥυσεν δέ and is absent in μακρὸν αὔσε. This will be addressed later on.

7. The verb οἰμώζω is also augmented when it is followed by a 2nd position clitic and is put in verse initial position. In this context, verbs are normally not augmented in Homer (cf. *supra*).

Examples are:

οἰμώξεν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα, φίλον δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἑταῖρον (*Iliad* 23,178; 24,591).

¹¹¹⁸ In this verse the variant εἶπε δ' was suggested by Aristarkhos and was preferred by Kirk (1990:223), but Van Thiel and West printed εἶπεν. The absence of the augment in both readings can be explained.

¹¹¹⁹ Leaf 1902:410, Richardson 1993:83

¹¹²⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 1,33; 1,568; 3,418; 10,240; 20,61; 24,571; 24,689.

¹¹²¹ The instances are *Iliad* 5,623; 7,93; 8,138; 13,163.

¹¹²² The instances are *Iliad* 1,33; 1,568; 3,418; 10,240; 24,571; 24,689.

¹¹²³ Wackernagel 1906:149-150.

8. As was noticed above, a verb followed by a 2nd position clitic is not augmented, but the opposite is not necessarily the case: a verb preceded by a clitic is not automatically augmented, as in those cases the “normal” constraints apply.¹¹²⁴

6.4. Semantic observations.

1. Although there is no agreement on a special meaning of the augment,¹¹²⁵ the semantic explanation of the augment can be summarised as follows. The augment is used when the past action is linked to and/or valid for the present situation. It indicates an interaction and/or contrast between defined characters present in the real world, it emphasises what was newly added or communicated, and marks the transition from narration into direct speech. The augment is *a deictic suffix that marked the completion of the action in the presence of the speaker*,¹¹²⁶ and puts the past action into the foreground.¹¹²⁷ The augment is used more often in speeches than in narrative,¹¹²⁸ because augmented forms indicate a relation with the speaker.¹¹²⁹

2. The imperfect is less augmented than the aorist:¹¹³⁰ according to Chantraine, 36% of the imperfects were augmented against 43% of the aorists.¹¹³¹ The explanation is related to that of the previous instance: the imperfect was the tense for narration,¹¹³² occurred more often in background and narrative descriptions and was used when there was a large time interval

¹¹²⁴ Appendix B.3.

¹¹²⁵ Curtius 1873:134-135 stated *das Fehlen des syllabischen Augments bei Homer ist vollkommen facultativ* (...) *aber sie* (sc. the use and absence of the augment, FDD) *auf bestimmte Regeln zurückzuführen ist kaum möglich* (underlining is mine). Delbrück (1879:68, note 1) stated *Die Versuchen einen* (sc. a difference in meaning between augmented and non augmented forms, FDD) *zu finden scheinen mir misslungen zu sein*. See also Meyer 1896:561 *bei Homer ist das Fehlen des syllabischen Augments vollständig facultativ; Gesetze hierüber lassen sich schwerlich finden*. Allen 1917:vi-vii also pointed out that the augment was sometimes metrically determined, but in many instances it was not, and considered explaining why a certain variant was chosen by the author, when the metre was not a factor, to be impossible: *scilicet ut in aliis rebus ita in augmentis sermo Homericus non constans fuit: iubente metro augmenta exiit, eodem iubente reposuit. Cur autem ubi et hoc et illud licuit alia auxerit vocabula alia nuda extulerit ne nunc quidem nobis compertum est*. Hoffmann 1970:36-37 considered the Homeric use of the augment to be so unclear that the augment could only be explained as facultative. Recently, Martin West reiterated this in the *praefatio* of his *Iliad* edition (West 1998:xxvi-xxvii): *saepissime manet in incerto, utrum poeta augmentum syllabicum apposuerit an omiserit* (...) *Veri est simile, poetas rhapsodosque alios aliter in hac re fecisse parum curiose, ut insipientis sit credere, auctoris voluntatem sive consuetudinem sincere per saecula esse conservatam*. (underlining is mine)

¹¹²⁶ Bakker 2005:147; this had already been observed by Platt 1891:227 –almost with the same words.

¹¹²⁷ Mumm 2004, Bakker 1999a:59, 2005:123-124, Hackstein 2010a:405.

¹¹²⁸ Koch 1868; Platt 1891:223; Drewitt 1912a; West 1989, Bakker 2005:114-153.

¹¹²⁹ Basset 1899a:15 used the term *situation de discours*. It is noteworthy that deictic pronouns are used almost exclusively in speeches, as was shown by Bakker 1999b and De Jong 2012b.

¹¹³⁰ Platt 1891:229-231, Monro 1891:402, Brugmann 1900:559, Chantraine 1948:484.

¹¹³¹ Chantraine 1948:484.

¹¹³² Delbrück 1879:105-106, 1897:302-306; Hoffmann 1967:151.

between the action in the past and the present.¹¹³³ Consequently, the imperfect appeared more often in instances that did not have a link to the present situation, and therefore the augment was not used. The aorist, on the other hand, was used to indicate that something had just been completed,¹¹³⁴ and is therefore more closely linked to the current situation. As a result the augment appears more in the aorist than in the imperfect.¹¹³⁵ In those instances when the action had just started or had been completed a short while ago, the augment was used because it added new information and/or because it described an event that was still valid and/or linked to the present situation.¹¹³⁶ Examples of a descriptive imperfect are (the imperfects are underlined):

τῷ δ' ἄμα τεσσαράκοντα μέλαιναι νῆες ἔποντο (occurs 9 times).¹¹³⁷

This verse is used 9 times in the Catalogue of Ships at the end of the description of a tribe to indicate that a specific people or tribe came to Troy with a contingent of 40 ships. As this referred to an action in a remote past (the Greek mobilisation for Troy occurred 10 years before), it is expressed by an unaugmented indicative.

τῇσι παρ' εἰνάετετς χάλκευον δαίδαλα πολλά (*Iliad* 18,400).

This verse was pronounced by Hephaistos. He described how he worked nine years in his smithy, hidden in a cave without anyone knowing that he existed. As the description referred to an action that had long passed, it was described in the augmentless imperfect.

3. The augment is used to stress new information or to indicate a contrast between persons in the real world. This is the main reason why speech introductions are generally augmented when there are no metrical-morphological or syntactic constraints.¹¹³⁸ In general, the rule would be that a verb of speaking is augmented, when it is constructed with a person addressed, but that the augment is missing when there is no person addressed or when the person is speaking to himself (see Appendix B.4- the person addressed is put in bold face and the verb is underlined).

τὴν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*Iliad* 1,544),

ὧς ἄρ' ἔφην, Πρίαμος δ' **Ἐλένην** ἐκαλέσσατο φωνῇ (*Iliad* 3,161),

¹¹³³ Delbrück 1897:302-306; Hoffmann 1967:151-153 used the term *fernere nicht historische Vergangenheit*; Szemerényi 1990:334; Fortson 2010:81,83,93; Dahl 2010:186.

¹¹³⁴ Delbrück 1876:6 *Durch den Aorist bezeichnet der Redende etwas als eben geschehen*; Kieckers 1926c:23; Hoffmann 1967:153-154.

¹¹³⁵ Bakker 2005:147; this had already been observed by Platt 1891:227 –almost with the same words.

¹¹³⁶ Platt 1891:227; Bakker 2005:147.

¹¹³⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 2,524; 2,534; 2,545; 2,630; 2,644; 2,710; 2,737; 2,747 and 2,759.

¹¹³⁸ That speech introductions were more often augmented than not, had been suggested implicitly by Drewitt 1912a:44 and by Bakker 2005:122-123.

ὥς εἰπὼν ἵπποισιν ἐκέκλετο φώνησέν τε (*Iliad* 8,184),¹¹³⁹

Αἴας δ' αὖτ' ἐγέγωνεν ἀμύμονι Πουλυδάμαντι (*Iliad* 14,469),

ὥς ὁ βαρὺ στενάχων μετεφώνεε **Μυρμιδόνεσσιν** (*Iliad* 18,323),

αὐτὰρ **Τηλέμαχον** προσέφη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη (*Odyssey* 2,399),

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων (*Odyssey* 8,354),

τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα συβώτης, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν (*Odyssey* 14,121),

In the formula ἀντίον ηὔδα (which occurs 72 times), the augment indicates contrast and interaction between two or more characters, as this formula is used when one person reveals his perturbation and his justification for an undertaking that will eventually fail.¹¹⁴⁰ The formula means “spoke (a word) in return” and that indicates an interaction. Some examples illustrate this (person addressed is underlined, and ἀντίον ηὔδα is given in bold face):

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἴδομενεὺς Κρητῶν ἀγὸς **ἀντίον ηὔδα** (*Iliad* 13,221).

τὸν δ' αὖ Νηυσικάα λευκώλενος **ἀντίον ηὔδα** (*Odyssey* 6,186).

Examples of the lack of augmentation when the speaker addresses his own mind are (the verb is underlined, the words referring someone's own mind are put in bold face):

κινήσας δὲ κάρη **προτὶ ὄν** μυθήσατο **θυμόν** (*Iliad* 17,442; *Odyssey* 5,285; 5,376).

ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε **πρὸς ὄν** **μεγαλήτορα** **θυμόν** (occurring 11 times).¹¹⁴¹

In the following verses there is no person addressed, and the verb is therefore unaugmented.

ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπεν ἰδὼν ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον (*Iliad* 23,143).

Now exceptions to the observations made above will be discussed.

a) In many instances, the augmented speech introduction formulae without a person are introductions that are extended by a participle. The participle adds new information, as it describes under which circumstances the speaking occurs. Since the augment is used to emphasise new information, its presence is expected:

ἀντίος ἦλθε θεῶν, καὶ ὁμοκλήσας ἔπος ηὔδα (*Iliad* 6,54),

ἐκ λόχου ἀμπήδησε καὶ εὐχόμενος ἔπος ηὔδα (*Iliad* 11,379 -εὐχόμενος ἔπος ηὔδα occurs 7 times).¹¹⁴²

This also explains why formulae such as ἀμειβόμενος δὲ προσηύδα and ἀμειβομένη προσέειπεν have the augment, although they have no person addressed:¹¹⁴³ ἀμειβόμενος “in

¹¹³⁹ See Kelly 2007:208 for an analysis of this passage.

¹¹⁴⁰ Kelly 2007:217-220.

¹¹⁴¹ The instances are *Iliad* 11,403; 17,90; 18,5; 20,343; 21,53; 21,552; 22,98 and *Odyssey* 5,298; 5,355; 5,407 and 5,464.

¹¹⁴² The instances are *Iliad* 10,461; 11,379; 13,619; 14,500; 17,537; 20,424 and 21,183.

¹¹⁴³ One finds ἀμειβομένη προσέειπεν or ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε in the following instances of the *Odyssey*: 4,234; 4,484 and 24,350.

return, as answer” indicates that the speech introduction formula is a direct answer to something that was said before, indicates an interaction and a contrast between persons,¹¹⁴⁴ introduces something new and is linked with the present situation.

In the following introductions there is no person addressed either:

ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 14,356)

ἦ δ' ἐν μέσῳ στήσῃ μετήνυδα δῖα θεάων (*Odyssey* 12,20).

The participle construction ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος indicated that the speaker was standing near (an)other character(s) when he was speaking, and therefore an interaction was implied. There are 12 instances of ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος/ ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη and they all have an augmented verb form.¹¹⁴⁵

καὶ ῥ' ὀλοφυρομένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (occurring four times).¹¹⁴⁶

This verse described how a female character spoke with pity to someone else. This speech introduction adds new information, because it mentions that a character starts to speak and that s/he feels pity at the same time. The participle ὀλοφυρομένη or ὀλοφυρόμενος is used 15 times in combination with a speech introduction with προσηύδα.¹¹⁴⁷

In the following instances of βοάω there is a person addressed in the verse, although the person is not directly syntactically linked to ἐβόησε(v),¹¹⁴⁸ but the interaction is nevertheless present:

σμερδαλέον δ' ἐβόησεν ἐποτρύνων Ὀδυσῆα (*Iliad* 8,92),

σμερδαλέον δ' ἐβόησε, γέγωνέ τε πᾶσι θεοῖσι (*Odyssey* 8,305).

The participle extension also explains the augment in the following verse:

Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἀπειλήσας ἐγγώνει (*Odyssey* 21,368).

The presence of the participle ἀπειλήσας points to an interaction between Telemakhos and the person he threateningly addressed (i.e. Odysseus). The augment is used here to indicate an interaction between different characters.

b) A second exception is the following verse:

καὶ τότε δὴ θάρσθησε καὶ ἦν δα μάντις ἀμύμων (*Iliad* 1,92).

¹¹⁴⁴ Kelly 2007:387, 411, 419.

¹¹⁴⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 4,92; 4,203; 5,123; 13,462; 14,356; 16,537; 18,169; 22,215; 22,228 and *Odyssey* 4,25; 17,552 and 22,100.

¹¹⁴⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 18,72 and *Odyssey* 2,362; 11,472 and 17,40.

¹¹⁴⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 5,871; 11,815; 15,114; 15,398; 18,72 and *Odyssey* 2,362; 10,265; 10,324; 10,418; 11,514; 11,472; 11,616; 13,199; 16,22 and 17,40.

¹¹⁴⁸ Schmidt 1982a:70

This verse occurs immediately after Akhilleus promised Kalkhas that he would ensure his safety. The augment is used here to emphasise that Kalkhas would speak after all, in spite of his initial fears. The speaking is unexpected, and therefore the verb is augmented.

c) The verb μετέειπε/ον is used with an augment but without a person addressed in 10 instances:

ὄψε δὲ δὴ Μενέλαος ἀνίστατο καὶ μετέειπε (*Iliad* 7,94),

ὄψε δὲ δὴ μετέειπε (NOUN EPITHET) (7 times).¹¹⁴⁹

In all these instances, the formula is introduced by ὄψε δὲ δὴ, which is used to indicate a nervous response to an embarrassing and/or difficult situation.¹¹⁵⁰ The vividness that this reply implies and the difficulty of the preceding situation are the explanation for the appearance of the augment: as the situation is peculiar, the audience's attention has to be attracted, hence the presence of the augment. In addition, the preposition/preverb μετά is always used in its original meaning "among", and therefore always implies the presence of people one is speaking among. Therefore, the augment always appears in the other μετά compounds of the *verba dicendi* as well, such as μετέφη, μετεφώνεε and μετηύδα.

d) The augmentation of the verb αὖω is remarkable. The verb is used in speech introductions with a person addressed. In such cases one would expect an augmented verb form, but this is not always the case. The formula ἐπὶ μακρὸν αὖσε is constructed with a person addressed, but is nevertheless used with the unaugmented form:

τῷ δ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν αὖσε Λυκάονος ἀγλαὸς υἱός (*Iliad* 5,101; 5,283),

τῇ δ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν αὖσε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης (*Iliad* 5,347).

The formula ἦϋσεν δὲ on the other hand has the augmented form, but is put at the beginning of the verse and is followed by a 2nd position clitic, and this would normally cause the verb to be unaugmented, as was the case in most other speech introduction verbs:

ἦϋσεν δὲ διαπρύσιον Δαναοῖσι γεγωνώς (*Iliad* 8,227; 11,275; 11,586; 17,247).

There are two possible explanations for the use of the augment in ἦϋσεν δὲ. The first one is that the form ἦϋσεν contains an older αὖσεν with a long alpha caused by metrical lengthening. As the α in αὖω is short, and as such, αὖσε cannot be used at the beginning of the verse. It is possible that the long α was later "replaced" by an η. A functional distinction in augmentation between ἦϋσεν and αὖσεν is also possible, however. The formula ἦϋσεν δὲ διαπρύσιον is used in a context where both the speaker as well as the audience are in a precarious situation and when the troops are in great danger, while ἐπὶ μακρὸν αὖσε is used when the troops are

¹¹⁴⁹ *Iliad*: 7,94; 7,399; 8,30; 9,31; 9,432; 9,696; *Odyssey*: 7,155; 20,321.

¹¹⁵⁰ Kirk 1990:246, Hainsworth 1993:64

victorious.¹¹⁵¹ There is also another explanation for the absence of the augment in the formula ἐπὶ μακρὸν ἄϋσε. The absence of the augment can be explained if one assumes that this formula is a formulaic substitution for another formula. ἄϋω is a *verbum clamandi* and was initially used as a participle extension to an existing speech introduction and appeared at the end of the verse. Examples of this extension are:

Subject.	Person addressed.	<i>Verbum dicendi.</i>	Participle extension.	Passage.
Νέστωρ	δ' Ἀργείοισιν	ἐκέκλετο	μακρὸν ἄϋσας	<i>Iliad</i> 6,66
Ἕκτωρ	δὲ Τρώεσσιν	ἐκέκλετο	μακρὸν ἄϋσας	<i>Iliad</i> 6,110; 8,172; 15,346

The expression μακρὸν ἄϋσας was then inflected and was used in the finite form. When inflecting this form, the poet “changed” the participle formula into the indicative μακρὸν ἄϋσε but could not augment it, because that would have violated the metre. This led to the following verse:

	Subject.	Adverbial accusative.	Verb.	Apposition.	Passage.
αὐτὰρ	ὁ	μακρὸν	ἄϋσεν	ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων	<i>Iliad</i> 3,81

In this verse, the verb was not augmented, because there was no person addressed. Later μακρὸν ἄϋσε was used with a prepositional construction ἐπὶ μακρὸν. In that context, the verb was constructed with a person addressed, but was not augmented, because it was an expansion of μακρὸν ἄϋσε.

Addressee.	Prepositional construction.	Finite verb.	Noun epithet.	Passage.
τῇ	δ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν	ἄϋσε	βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης	<i>Iliad</i> 5,347
τῷ	δ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν	ἄϋσε	μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ	<i>Iliad</i> 8,160

The absence of an augment in these verses could not be explained from a semantic perspective, because the presence of a person addressed generally favoured the use of the augment, but here the absence is due to the formulaic expansion. I personally prefer this explanation over the distinction between victorious and losing armies.

4. The use of the augment to stress new information, explains why speech conclusions with φημί are more augmented when they are extended by a participle: the participle provided additional information on how the speaking occurred. There are 44 instances of such an

¹¹⁵¹ Kaimio 1977:28-30, 238-239 (*urgent shouts in a crisis*), also quoted in Kelly 2007:242-243; see further Kelly 2007:186-187 and 242-243.

extension,¹¹⁵² and in 31 cases the verbal form is augmented.¹¹⁵³ This can be explained by the fact that the participle adds more information and it is in agreement with the nature of the augment to emphasise extra information or to suggest some contrast or interaction. Examples are:

ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη (*Odyssey* 3,385- ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος occurs 16 times),¹¹⁵⁴

ὥς ἔφατο κλαίουσ', ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες (occurring three times,¹¹⁵⁵ ὥς ἔφατο κλαίουσ'-κλαίων occurs 8 times).¹¹⁵⁶

There are also exceptions:

ὥς φάτ', οἰόμενος λαοσσόον ἔμμεν Ἀθήνην (*Odyssey* 22,210).

In this verse, the absence of the augment is metrical, as the augmented form ὥς ἔφατ', οἰόμενος λαοσσόον ἔμμεν Ἀθήνην could have fit the verse if the participle οἰόμενος had undergone a contraction into οἰόμενος. The contracted form οἰ- of οἶω/ οἶομαι does occur in μή τι φόβονδ' ἀγόρευ', ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ σὲ πεισέμεν οἶω (*Iliad* 5,252) and in εἴ τις ἔτ' ἔσται μῆτις, ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ οἶομαι εἶναι. (*Odyssey* 8,193),¹¹⁵⁷ but as contractions belong to a younger linguistic stratum, the absence of the augment in this formula is therefore an archaism.

5. That the augment stresses new information explains why it is used in the following instances (the augmented verbs are underlined):

τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;

Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός: ὃ γὰρ βασιλῆϊ χολωθεῖς

νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὥρσε κακὴν, ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί (*Iliad* 1,8-10).

In this passage, Homer revealed that the feud between Agamemnon and Akhilleus was created by a god, and that the god was Apollon. Therefore, ξυνέηκε and ὥρσε are augmented. The verb form ὀλέκοντο is not augmented, because it is followed by a 2nd position clitic, but also because it does not contain new information: that many people died, had been announced already in μῆνιν ... οὐλομένην (*Iliad* 1,1-2).

¹¹⁵² The instances are *Iliad* 1,43; 1,357; 1,457; 5,106; 5,121; 6,311; 8,198; 10,295; 11,592; 12,442; 15,337; 16,46; 16,249; 16,527; 19,301; 19,338; 20,364; 20,373; 20,393; 21,161; 21,361; 22,429; 22,437; 22,515; 23,184; 23,771; 24,314; 24,746; 24,760; 24,776 and *Odyssey* 2,80; 2,267; 3,385; 6,328; 9,413; 9,536; 16,448; 20,22; 20,102; 22,210; 23,181 and 24,438.

¹¹⁵³ The instances are *Iliad* 1,43; 1,457; 5,106; 5,121; 6,311; 8,198; 10,295; 11,592; 15,337; 16,249; 16,527; 19,301; 19,338; 20,393; 22,429; 22,437; 22,515; 23,771; 24,314; 24,746; 24,760; 24,776 and *Odyssey* 2,267; 3,385; 6,328; 9,413; 9,536; 20,22; 20,102 and 23,181.

¹¹⁵⁴ The formula ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος occurs in *Iliad* 1,43; 1,457; 5,106; 5,121; 8,198; 15,377; 16,249; 16,527; 20,393; 23,771 and 24,314 and in *Odyssey* 2,267; 3,385; 6,328; 9,536 and 20,102.

¹¹⁵⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 19,301; 22,515; 24,746.

¹¹⁵⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 19,301; 19,338; 22,429; 22,437; 22,515; 24,746; 24,760 and 24,776.

¹¹⁵⁷ Magnien 1922b:114.

ἦτοι ὃ γ' ὥς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἔζετο: τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη

Κάλχας Θεστορίδης οἰωνοπόλων ὅχ' ἄριστος (*Iliad* 1,68-69).

In this speech Homer described how Akhilleus finished speaking and sat down, while Kalkhas stood up and started speaking. The sudden appearance of Kalkhas, who had not yet been named, is new and therefore the augment is used.

6. The augment is also used when the verbal form describes a past action that is still valid in the present. The augment is used in general truths and proverbs, because they describe an action in the past that is still valid (the so-called *gnomic aorist*):¹¹⁵⁸ this looks contradictory because the verb seems to act as a present and have no link with the past,¹¹⁵⁹ but these verbal forms describe a general truth of which the knowledge is based on past experiences, and they refer to past actions of which the correctness is still valid at the moment of speaking.¹¹⁶⁰ In addition, the past actions that are related could occur at the current moment and would yield the same result as described in the proverbs. Two famous examples are:

πρίν τι κακὸν παθέειν: ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνων (*Iliad* 17,32; 20,198).¹¹⁶¹

It is knowledge from the past that a fool only understands the consequences of his actions after their completion,¹¹⁶² but this observation is still valid at the moment of speaking. As the past action is therefore still relevant and valid, it is linked to the present and therefore the augment is used.

ξυνὸς Ἐνυάλιος, καὶ τε κτανέοντα κατέκτα (*Iliad* 18,309).

In this verse, Hektor stated that Ares as god of warfare killed even those who had killed before and that every warrior would eventually be killed. This is a general truth, and therefore the verb is augmented.

There are only a few exceptions to this rule:

ὅσσα δὲ μερμήριξε λέων ἀνδρῶν ἐν ὀμίλῳ (*Odyssey* 4,791).

In this instance, the absence of the augment is in all likelihood due to the fact that the poet avoided adding an augment to verbal forms of four syllables and longer (cf. *supra*). The correction δ' ἐμερμήριξε is therefore unnecessary.¹¹⁶³

οἶμας Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε, φίλησε δὲ φῦλον ἀοιδῶν (*Odyssey* 8,481).

¹¹⁵⁸ This explanation goes back to Hermann 1801:187-188; the term was coined by Doederlein.

¹¹⁵⁹ Strunk 1968:299.

¹¹⁶⁰ This was first noticed by Platt 1891, then by Delbrück 1897:302, Wackernagel 1904:5 and later also by Drewitt 1912 a, 1912 b and 1913. It has been accepted since. See most recently Bakker 2005:114-135, Faulkner 2005:68-69 and Bertrand 2006b:241.

¹¹⁶¹ Willi 2007:45 stated that this verse only occurred in Hesiod, *Works and Days* 218, but it was already attested in Homer.

¹¹⁶² Bakker 2005:131-134.

¹¹⁶³ It was suggested by Platt 1891:218, Wackernagel 1904:6 and Chantraine 1948:484.

In this specific instance, the gnomic aorist is not augmented, because it is followed by a second-position clitic (cf. supra). Platt's correction ἐδίδαξ', ἐφίλησε is therefore unnecessary.¹¹⁶⁴ There are no gnomic aorists in speech introductions.

7. The augment is also common in the similes,¹¹⁶⁵ because they compare a current situation to an action in the past. The very nature of the similes almost "requires" the augment, because they compare a present action with occurrences in the past, and *they are "close" to the audience, in evoking a domestic rather than heroic, reality.*¹¹⁶⁶ As such, the link with the present is clear.¹¹⁶⁷ It has often been observed that the similes display a younger form of language,¹¹⁶⁸ but the augment use is not necessarily an indication of a less archaic stage (cf. supra). A classic example is the following passage (the augmented forms are underlined):

τὸν δ' ὥς οὖν ἐνόησεν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδῆς
ἐν προμάχοισι φανέντα, κατεπλήγη φίλον ἦτορ,
ἄψ δ' ἐτάρων εἰς ἔθνος ἐχάζετο κῆρ' ἀλεείνων.
ὥς δ' ὅτε τίς τε δράκοντα ἰδὼν παλίνορσος ἀπέστη
οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης, ὑπὸ τε τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα,
ἄψ δ' ἀνεχώρησεν, ὥχρός τέ μιν εἶλε παρειάς,
ὥς αὖτις καθ' ὅμιλον ἔδυν Τρώων ἀγερώχων
δείσας Ἀτρεὺς υἱὸν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδῆς. (*Iliad* 3,30-37)

These verses describe how Paris became incredibly scared when he noticed Menelaos on the battlefield. He is compared to a man who suddenly notices a snake on the field and who turns pale and starts to panic. Paris's sudden panic is a new narrative element and the verbs are therefore augmented, as are the verbs in the simile.

8. The augment is not used in speech conclusions with φημί when the subject of the conclusion and that of the verb of the next sentence are the same: as the subjects are the same, a contrast is less likely. There are 46 instances where the subject of φημί in the speech

¹¹⁶⁴ Platt 1891:218, Wackernagel 1904:6.

¹¹⁶⁵ Platt 1891; Drewitt 1912a, 1912b, 1913; Chantraine 1948:484; Shipp 1972:120; Bakker 2005:131-134.

¹¹⁶⁶ Bakker 2005:114.

¹¹⁶⁷ Bakker 2005:114, 121 and 131-134; Shipp 1972:120 stated that (*the augment use*) illustrates the linguistic similarity of proverbial comments and similes.

¹¹⁶⁸ Shipp 1972 *passim*. He discussed the augment very briefly on page 120, and was also quoted in Bakker 2005:114.

conclusion is the same as the next verb,¹¹⁶⁹ and in 37 examples the form of φημί is not augmented.¹¹⁷⁰ Two examples are:

ὥς φάτο Πηλεΐδης, ποτὶ δὲ σκῆπτρον βάλε γαίῃ (*Iliad* 1,245),

ὥς φάτο, καὶ ῥ' ἔμπνευσε μένος μέγα Παλλὰς Ἀθήνῃ (*Odyssey* 24,520).

There are exceptions. The five¹¹⁷¹ instances with ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη with the same subject are formulaic extensions of the formula from the context where the subject was different (for the augmentation with the particle ἄρα, cf. infra):¹¹⁷²

ὥς ἔφατο Κρονίδης, πόλεμον δ' ἀλίσσων ἔγειρε (*Iliad* 20,31),

ὥς ἔφατο κλαίουσα, γόνυ δ' ἀλίσσων ὄρινε (*Iliad* 24,760).

In these verses, only an augmented conclusion, either ὥς ἔφατο or ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη was metrically possible.

9. The augment is mostly missing in negative clauses, because the negation removes the link with the actual situation.¹¹⁷³ This also applies to negative speech introductions of the type “X did not speak to Y”. Examples are (the negation is put in bold face and the verb is underlined):

Ἀτρεΐδην προσέειπε, καὶ οὐ πῶ λῆγε χόλοιο (*Iliad* 1,224),

οὐ γάρ πῶ τοίους ἶδον ἀνέρας οὐδὲ ἶδωμαι (*Iliad* 1,262),

ἦτοι Ἀθηναίῃ ἀκέων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπε (*Iliad* 4,22; 8,459),

ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*Iliad* 4,68),

ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδὲ Διὸς πεῖθε φρένα ταῦτ' ἀγορεύων (*Iliad* 12,173),

ὥς φάσαν, ἀλλ' οὐ πεῖθον ἐμὸν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν (*Odyssey* 9,500),

ῥρμαινε φρεσὶν ἦσιν, ἅ ῥ' οὐκ ἀτέλεστα γένοντο (*Odyssey* 18,345).

10. The augment as deictic marker of a completed action in the immediate past explains why the augment is used with the adverbs AIPSA (αἶψα) “suddenly” (Appendix B.6). This word was mostly combined with an aorist and described an action that had just been completed.¹¹⁷⁴ As such, the use of the augment is expected. Examples are:

¹¹⁶⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,245; 1,584; 2,142; 3,395; 4,104; 4,208; 5,899; 6,51; 9,173; 10,322; 11,804; 13,468; 15,119; 16,46; 17,123; 17,342; 20,31; 23,793; 24,507; 24,760 and *Odyssey* 1,42; 1,420; 2,80; 4,65; 4,113; 4,,183; 4,758; 6,66; 9,500; 16,448; 17,150; 17,233; 17,409; 17,462; 18,151; 18,422; 19,429; 20,54; 21,80; 21,175; 21,181; 22,465; 23,231; 24,520.

¹¹⁷⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 1,245; 2,142; 3,395; 4,104; 4,208; 5,899; 6,51; 9,173; 10,322; 11,804; 13,468; 15,119; 16,46; 17,123; 23,793; 24,507 and *Odyssey* 1,420; 2,80; 4,65; 4,113; 4,,183; 4,758; 9,500; 16,448; 17,150; 17,233; 18,151; 18,422; 19,429; 20,54; 21,80; 21,175; 21,181; 23,231; 24,520.

¹¹⁷¹ The *Basel Kommentar* stated that *Iliad* 1,584 was the only instance where this occurred, but this is not true (Latacz 2000b:179, with reference to Fingerle 1939).

¹¹⁷² The instances are *Iliad* 1,584 and 2,265, and *Odyssey* 17,409; 17,462 and 22,465.

¹¹⁷³ Bakker 1997a:56,64, 2005:126-130; Mumm 2004:§5.4; De Lamberterie 2007:51.

¹¹⁷⁴ Erbse 1959:395

αἶψα δ' ἔλυσ' ἀγορήν: ἐπὶ τεύχεα δ' ἐσσεύοντο (*Iliad* 2,208),
αἶψα δ' Ἀθηναίην ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 8,351),
αἶψα δ' ἑμοῖς ἐτάροισιν ἐποτρύνας ἐκέλευσα (*Odyssey* 10,128),
αἶψα δὲ Φαιήκεσσι φιληρέτμοισι μετηύδα (occurring 4 times).¹¹⁷⁵

11. Similarly, the augment is used when a preterite verb form is combined with AUTIKA (αὐτίκα) “immediately” (see Appendix B.6).¹¹⁷⁶ This word indicates a sudden new action and therefore the augment is expected. Examples are:

θάμβησεν δ' Ἀχιλεὺς, μετὰ δ' ἐτράπετ', αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνων (*Iliad* 1,199).
αὐτίκα δ' ἐβρόντησεν ἀπ' αἰγλήεντος Ὀλύμπου (*Odyssey* 20,103).

In speech conclusions, the verb φημί is augmented when the next sentence has αὐτίκα in it. There are 27 instances of a speech conclusion with φημί followed by a sentence with αὐτίκα,¹¹⁷⁷ and in only one case is the verbal form not augmented. The augment thus indicates that the speaking initiated an immediate action by the audience, and therefore both the speaking and the reaction needed to be stressed. Examples are:

ὥς ἔφαθ', αἶ δ' ὑπὸ κῦμα θαλάσσης αὐτίκ' ἔδυσαν (*Iliad* 18,145),
ὥς ἐφάμην, ἦ δ' αὐτίκ' ἀπώμνυνεν, ὥς ἐκέλευον (*Odyssey* 10,345).

The augmentation of the verb is also the rule in speech introductions with αὐτίκα: there are 39 speech introductions, in which αὐτίκα appears and in 27 the verb form is augmented. Examples are (verb is underlined):

αὐτίκ' Ἀθηναίην ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 4,69; 5,713; 21,419),
αὐτίκα δ' ἐν πρώτοισι μέγα προθορῶν ἐκέλευσεν (*Iliad* 14,363),
αὐτίκ' ἄρ' Ἥφαιστον προσεφώνεεν ὃν φίλον υἱόν (*Iliad* 21,378),
ὥς ἐφάμην, ὃ δέ μ' αὐτίκ' ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε (occurring 7 times),¹¹⁷⁸
αὐτίκα δ' Εὐρύλοχος στυγερῶ μ' ἠμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 12,278),

In these instances, αὐτίκα indicates a contrast with what happened before, but also the presence of a person addressed contributed to the use of the augment. There are nevertheless 12 instances, where the augment is not used despite the fact that the speech introduction is combined with αὐτίκα. In three instances, the metre played an important role in the non-augmentation, because an augmented form would have been difficult to use in the verse (verbs are underlined):

¹¹⁷⁵ The instances are *Odyssey* 8,96; 8,386; 8,535 and 13,36.

¹¹⁷⁶ For the meaning and use of αὐτίκα see Erren 1970 and Führer 1978.

¹¹⁷⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 18,145; 23,488; 23,664; 23,754 and *Odyssey* 4,382; 4,398; 4,471; 4,491; 4,554; 5,451; 6,148; 9,272; 9,368; 10,345; 10,487; 10,503; 10,541; 11,145; 11,180; 11,215; 11,404; 11,440; 11,487; 12,115; 12,142; 12,303; 15,56 and 20,91.

¹¹⁷⁸ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,471; 4,491; 4,554; 11,145; 11,404; 11,440 and 11,487.

Κάλχας δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα θεοπροπέων ἀγόρευε (*Iliad* 2,322).

The form ἡγόρευε cannot be used in the hexametre.

αὐτίκα δ' ἢ γ' ἐπέεσσι πόσιν ἐρέεινεν ἕκαστα (*Odyssey* 4,137).

The augmented ἐρέεινεν cannot be used in the hexametre.

αὐτίκα μείλιχιον καὶ κερδαλέον ῥάτο μῦθον (*Odyssey* 6,148).

The form ῥάτο can only be used if it is followed by a word starting with consonants.

The absence of the augment in the speech introductions with αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο (occurring 9 times)¹¹⁷⁹ is a problem and is not easily explained, because the augmented form of ἀμείβομαι is attested much more often than the unaugmented one. Looking at the instances where these unaugmented formulae are used, it becomes clear that they are only used in combination with the speech conclusion ὥς ἐφάμην and appear in the same schema:

Conclusion.	PN	Particle.	(PN)	Adverb.	Verb.	(...)
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ	δέ	μ'	αὐτίκ'	ἀμείβετο	νηλεΐ θυμῷ
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἦ	δ'		αὐτίκ'	ἀμείβετο	διὰ γυναικῶν
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἦ	δ'		αὐτίκ'	ἀμείβετο	πότνια μήτηρ

The starting point was the following formulae in which a negative word caused the verb form to be unaugmented:

Conclusion.	PN	Particle	PN	Negation.	Verb.	(...)
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ	δέ	μ'	οὐδέν	ἀμείβετο	νηλεΐ θυμῷ
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ	δέ	μ'	οὐδέν	ἀμείβετο	βῆ δὲ μετ' ἄλλας

In both instances quoted in the table above, Odysseus attempted to speak to Aias when he saw him in Hades, but the latter refused to answer. As the interaction between Odysseus and Aias did not occur, the verb form was not augmented.

If the poet wanted to say that the interaction occurred right away, he could use the same formula and only had to replace οὐδέν by αὐτίκα.

The verse

Conclusion.	PN	Particle	PN	Negation.	Verb.	(...)
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ	δέ	μ'	οὐδέν	ἀμείβετο	νηλεΐ θυμῷ

was reformed into

Conclusion.	PN	particle	(PN)	Adverb.	Verb.	(...)
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὁ	δέ	μ'	αὐτίκ'	ἀμείβετο	νηλεΐ θυμῷ

¹¹⁷⁹ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,382; 4,398; 9,272; 9,368; 10,487; 10,503; 11,180; 11,215 and 12,115.

As such, he had a formula ὥς ἐφάμην, ὃ δέ μ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο (νηλεΐ θυμῷ). If he wanted to use a female subject, he only had to replace the masculine pronoun by a feminine one and remove the accusative, yielding the formula ὥς ἐφάμην, ἥ δ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο (...). The formula with female subject could then be expanded with an epithet formula, depending on the circumstances, leading to formulae such as

Conclusion.	PN	particle	(PN)	Adverb.	Verb.	Noun epithet.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἦ	δ'		αὐτίκ'	ἀμείβετο	δίᾳ γυναικῶν
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἦ	δ'		αὐτίκ'	ἀμείβετο	πότνια μήτηρ

12. That the augment stresses actions in the past with a link to the present explains why an action in the past that is still valid in the present, is described by a verbal form with an augment. This is the reason why an aorist accompanied by NUN (νῦν/ νυ- Appendix B.6) is more often augmented, as this refers to an action that was completed only recently,¹¹⁸⁰ and/or because it is used to add new information.¹¹⁸¹ Examples of the past action still valid in the present are (the augmented form is underlined):

ὅς κ' εἴποι ὃ τι τόσσον ἐχώσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 1,64).

In this verse Akhilleus suggested to Agamemnon to find someone who could explain why Phoibos Apollon was at the current time so enraged with them. As the rage started in the past but was still relevant for the current situation, the augment was used.¹¹⁸²

τοῦνεκ' ἄρ' ἄλγε' ἔδωκεν ἐκηβόλος ἡδ' ἔτι δώσει (*Iliad* 1,96).

In this verse, Kalkhas explained that Apollon had been sending the plague, and that he would continue to do so. The augment in ἔδωκεν clearly links the past actions with the present and the future.

εἰ μάλα καρτερός ἐσσι, θεός που σοὶ τό γ' ἔδωκεν (*Iliad* 1,178).

In this verse, Agamemnon downplayed Akhilleus's physical strength and prowess in battle by ascribing it to a gift he received from the gods. As the gift is a past action with relevance in the present day, the augment is used.

An example of an augmented form with νῦν is:

ὥς ἐμὲ νῦν ἐχόλωσεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (*Iliad* 18,111).

¹¹⁸⁰ Platt 1891; Drewitt 1912a:44; Bottin 1969:87-89, 135-136; Bakker 1999a:53, 60-62; García Ramón 2012a:F1b.

¹¹⁸¹ Ruiz Yamuza 2014.

¹¹⁸² Bakker 2005:118.

This verse was pronounced by Akhilleus when he described how Agamemnon became angry with him. As Akhilleus thought that Agamemnon was still enraged with him at the moment of speaking, the augment was used.

13. The use of the augment when an interaction between different persons is related, also explains why *verba dicendi* have the augment when they are constructed with a vocative or when the verse has a phrase stating “what a word have you spoken”, “you have spoken (correctly, falsely)” or “you have spoken (such) a ... word”. These situations are not speech introductions and already belong to the actual speech.¹¹⁸³ They refer to interaction (often with disagreement or reluctant agreement) between persons,¹¹⁸⁴ and put extra emphasis on what has been communicated: the vocative and/or the phrase “what have you said/spoken” link the act of speaking to the current situation. This is shown by the verb ἔειπον: there are 52 augmented instances,¹¹⁸⁵ and 10 unaugmented instances (4 of which are negative sentences).¹¹⁸⁶ Examples are:

	Vocative.	“Truthfully”	Verb.	Passage.
ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα	γέρον	κατὰ μοῖραν	ἔειπες	<i>Iliad</i> 1,286
ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα	φίλος	κατὰ μοῖραν	ἔειπες	<i>Iliad</i> 10,169
ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε,	τέκνον ἐμόν,	κατὰ μοῖραν	ἔειπες	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,486

Vocative.	“What a word”	Verb.	Passage.
αἰνότατε Κρονίδη	ποῖον τὸν μῦθον	ἔειπες	occurs 6 times ¹¹⁸⁷

Vocative.	“(What) a word”	“Truthfully”	Verb.	Passage.
Λαοδάμα,	μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος	κατὰ μοῖραν	ἔειπες	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,141

There are exceptions as well:

Vocative.	Negation.	Dative.	Positive (word).	Verb.	Passage.
μάντι κακῶν,	οὐ πώ ποτέ	μοι	τὸ κρήγυον	εἶπες	<i>Iliad</i> 1,106

¹¹⁸³ As was stated before, speeches have more augmented forms than narrative parts.

¹¹⁸⁴ Kelly 2007:180-182.

¹¹⁸⁵ The augmented instances are *Iliad* 1,286; 1,552; 2,59; 2,156; 2,194; 3,204; 4,25; 7,455; 8,146; 8,152; 8,209; 8,462; 9,59; 10,169; 10,445; 13,824; 14,95; 14,330; 15,185; 15,206; 16,49; 16,440; 17,170; 17,173; 17,410; 17,716; 18,361; 22,178; 23,350; 23,626; 24,379 and *Odyssey* 2,85; 2,243; 2,251; 3,211; 4,266; 4,349; 7,227; 8,141; 8,166; 8,397; 13,140; 13,385; 13,417; 14,509; 16,69; 17,140; 17,248; 17,406; 18,170; 19,334; 19,362; 20,37; 21,278; 22,486; 23,183; 23,273; 24,339.

¹¹⁸⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,106; 1,108; 24,744 and *Odyssey* 3,227; 4,204; 5,300; 7,331; 13,254; 16,243; 22,46.

¹¹⁸⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 1,552; 4,25; 8,462; 14,330; 16,440 and 18,361.

Positive.	Negation.	Verb.	Word.	Rest of verse.	Passage.
ἐσθλὸν	δ' οὐδέ τί πω	εἶπες	ἔπος	οὐδ' ἐτέλεσσας	<i>Iliad</i> 1,108

The verb forms were not augmented in the two instances quoted above, because they appeared in a negative sentence.

14. Unaugmented forms are preferred in narrative descriptions, in mythical stories and in subordinate clauses that describe actions anterior to others. This is especially clear in clauses that are introduced by EPEI (ἐπεὶ –Appendix B.6)¹¹⁸⁸ and ÊMOS (ἤμος “when, after”-Appendix B.6). Examples of a sentence introduced by these conjunctions are (the verb form is underlined):

ὥς φάτο, βῆ δ' ἄρ' ὄνειρος ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσε (*Iliad* 2,16),

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε (*Iliad* 18,609),

ἤμος δ' ἠριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως (attested 22 times).¹¹⁸⁹

15. The augment is used to emphasise new information and/or indicate a contrast. This explains why it is not used with the adverb AIEI (αἰεὶ- Appendix B.6), as this points to an habitual action and does not communicate something new. Examples are:

νύσσοντες ξυστοῖσι μέσον σάκος αἰὲν ἔποντο (*Iliad* 11,565),

αἰεὶ δὲ σμερδὸν βοόων Δαναοῖσι κέλευε (*Iliad* 15,687;15,732),

In several instances αἰεὶ is combined with a *sk* iterative,¹¹⁹⁰ and those verb forms also indicated a repeated action in the past. Examples are:

μητέρ' ἐμήν: ἦ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ λισσέσκετο γούνων (*Iliad* 9,451),

τὴν αἰεὶ στενάχεσχε' ὄθ' ἐὼν φίλον υἱὸν ὀρῶτο (*Iliad* 19,132).

16. When a speech conclusion is followed by a verse that indicates a reaction of the audience to the speaking, the verb in the conclusion is augmented. This reaction can be indicated by three factors: the sentence following the conclusion starts with the word αὐτάρ, the sentence starts with the subject or the number of the subject in the conclusion is different from the number of the subject in the next sentence.

In 194 verses, the subject of the next sentence differs in number from the speech conclusion with φημί (see Appendix B.5). In 176 instances, the form of φημί is augmented, and in 18 instances it is not.¹¹⁹¹ This is a high number of augmentations and can be explained by the contrasting value of the augment. In those instances where a change in subject number

¹¹⁸⁸ Bakker 2005:125-126.

¹¹⁸⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,477; 24,788 and *Odyssey* 2,1; 3,404; 3,491; 4,306; 4,431; 4,576; 5,228; 8,1; 9,152; 9,170; 9,307; 9,437; 9,560; 10,187; 12,8; 12,316; 13,18; 15,189; 17,1; 19,428.

¹¹⁹⁰ Seiler 1956:283

¹¹⁹¹ The instances are *Iliad* 2,278; 12,442; 20,373; 21,114; 21,284; 23,184 and 23,287 and *Odyssey* 2,337; 4,703; 7,434; 10,321; 11,97; 12,192; 21,366; 22,68; 23,205 and 24,345.

occurred, there was a contrast between the person(s) who spoke and the person(s) addressed. Such a contrast is often found in dialogues, in direct speech parts and in reactions to speeches in an assembly. The formula ὥς ἔφαθ' is almost always followed by a sentence with the subject in the plural and describes the reaction of the audience to the speech,¹¹⁹² and the metre cannot have been the reason for the augmentation, because ὥς ἔφαθ', οἷ is equivalent to ὥς φάτο, τοί.¹¹⁹³

In 219 instances, the speech conclusion is followed by a sentence which starts with the subject. In 171 of those instances, the verb used in the speech conclusion is augmented. The position of the subject as first word of the next verse indicates that (part of) the audience will react to what has been said and points at the interaction or contrast between the speaker and the audience, and therefore the speaking is augmented.

ὥς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπον (14 times):¹¹⁹⁴ 3rd sg. vs 1st sg.

This verse is used in dialogues between mortals and goddesses, or in dialogues between mortals and semi-gods (such as the Kyklops) or between mortals alone. The dialogue involves frequent contrast and interaction, hence the augmentation of the conclusion. While ἐφάμην is a metrically convenient form (cf. supra), the choice of ἔφατ' is more deliberate and not metrical, as there was an unaugmented alternative, namely φῆ or φάτο with hiatus.

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἷ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ (occurs 7 times)¹¹⁹⁵: 3rd sg. vs 3rd pl.

In this verse, the poet describes the reluctance of the audience to respond after something remarkable or embarrassing has been said. As the speaking of one person evoked a mental reaction in a large audience, it needs to be put in focus, and is therefore augmented.

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἷ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἢ δ' ἐπίθοντο (occurs 7 times): 3rd sg. vs 3rd pl.¹¹⁹⁶

This verse indicates the reaction of several people on the speaking of one person. The fact that the subject is mentioned immediately after the conclusion creates a direct link between the speaking and the subsequent reaction. Therefore the speaking is put in focus by the augment.

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἷ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἠδὲ γέλασαν (occurs 3 times): 3rd sg. vs 3rd pl.¹¹⁹⁷

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἷ δὲ ἄνακτος ὑποδδείσαντες ὁμοκλήν (occurs 3 times): 3rd sg. vs 3rd pl..¹¹⁹⁸

¹¹⁹² Fingerle 1939:360, Führer 1967:147-148

¹¹⁹³ This had been observed already by Grashof 1852:6.

¹¹⁹⁴ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,375; 4,394; 4,464; 9,522; 10,270; 10,336; 10,382; 11,79; 11,138; 11,163; 11,435; 11,462; 11,477 and 11,504.

¹¹⁹⁵ The instances are: *Iliad* 7,92, 8,28 (the lines 8,28-40 are contested), and *Odyssey* 8,234, 11,333, 13,1, 16,393 and 20,320.

¹¹⁹⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 7,379; 9,79; 14,133; 14,378; 15,300; 23,54; 23,738.

¹¹⁹⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 23,784; *Odyssey* 20,358; 21,376.

¹¹⁹⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 12,413; 23,417; 23,446.

In both cases, the speaking creates a reaction in the audience, and the subject is mentioned as the first word of the next sentence. The verb form of the conclusion is augmented to emphasise the effect of the speaking on the audience. As was stated before, the metre was not a deciding factor here.

This also explains the use of the augment in the following conclusions, as they are followed by a sentence that indicates the reaction of the audience.

ὥς ἔφατ', ὅρτο δὲ Ἴρις ἀελλόπος ἀγγελέουσα (occurring three times),¹¹⁹⁹

ὥς ἔφατ', ὅρτο δ' ἔπειτα μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας (*Iliad* 23,708 and 23, 811 -ὥς ἔφατ', ὅρτο δ' ἔπειτα occurs 5 times).¹²⁰⁰

In these instances, the speaking of one person causes the immediate reaction of another character. Therefore the speech conclusion is augmented, and also the verb that describes the reaction.

ὥς ἔφατ' (NAME), τοῖσιν δ' ἐπὶ ἡνδανε μῦθος (occurring 6 times).¹²⁰¹

In this instance, both the speaking and the fact that it had a positive effect on the audience, were stressed by the use of the augment.

ὥς ἔφαθ', ἡμῖν δ' αὖτ' ἐπεπείθετο θυμὸς ἀγῆνωρ (occurring 4 times).¹²⁰²

The poet described in this verse how the speaker and his companions obeyed the words that are spoken to them. Both the speaking and the obeying were expressed with an augmented verb form.

In the following verse a conclusion is combined with a reaction, and both verbs are augmented:

ὥς εἰπὼν δμῶεσσιν ἐκέκλετο, τοὶ δ' ἐπὶ θοντο (*Odyssey* 6,71).

The presence of a person addressed explains the augment in ἐκέκλετο, while ἐπὶ θοντο is augmented because it described the effect of the speaking on the audience and contains new information.

This can also explain the difference in augmentation between ἔδδαισεν δέ and δαῖσεν δέ. As was stated above, a verb followed by a 2nd position is clitic, is in general not augmented, but nevertheless both ἔδδαισεν δέ (attested 7 times)¹²⁰³ and δαῖσεν δέ (attested 4 times)¹²⁰⁴ are transmitted, and in the case of ἔδδαισεν δέ the unaugmented variant is possible in 6 out of the

¹¹⁹⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 8,409; 24,77 and 24,159.

¹²⁰⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 23,708; 23,811; 23,836 and 23,859, and *Odyssey* 14,499.

¹²⁰¹ The instances are *Odyssey* 16,406; 18,50; 18,290; 20,247; 21,143 and 21,269.

¹²⁰² The instances are *Odyssey* 2,103; 10,466; 12,28 and 24,138.

¹²⁰³ The instances are *Iliad* 1,33; 1,568; 3,418; 10,240; 20,61; 24,571; 24,689.

¹²⁰⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 5,623; 7,93; 8,138; 13,163.

7 instances.¹²⁰⁵ The difference between ἔδδεισεν δέ and δεῖσεν δέ is that the former is used when the reaction of a character to the words of another character is described. As the person reacts with great fear, this needs to be stressed and therefore the augment is used:

ὥς ἔφατ', ἔδδεισεν δ' ὃ γέρων καὶ ἐπείθετο μύθῳ (*Iliad* 1,33),
 ὥς ἔφατ', ἔδδεισεν δ' Ἑλένη Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα (*Iliad* 3,418),
 ὥς ἔφατ', ἔδδεισεν δ' ὃ γέρων, κήρυκα δ' ἀνίστη (*Iliad* 24,689).

In all these instances an unaugmented ὥς ἔφατο δ(w)εῖσεν δ' would have been metrically possible as well, but the fear was important to stress and was the direct result of the speaking, and as a consequence, the augment was used.

The fact that the reaction of the audience is augmented as well, can also provide an explanation for the difference between (δ') ἐδέξατο and (δὲ) δέξατο (although there are only a few instances).¹²⁰⁶ As was noticed above, a verb followed by a 2nd position clitic is generally not augmented, but the opposite is not necessarily the case: a verb preceded by a clitic is not automatically augmented (appendix B.3). In those cases the “normal” constraints apply. There are instances where the same form is preceded by a clitic and is sometimes augmented and sometimes not. The difference between the forms (δ') ἐδέξατο and (δὲ) δέξατο is in my opinion not simply the result of irregular transmission,¹²⁰⁷ but has the same explanation as the distinction between ἔδδεισεν δέ and δεῖσεν δέ: the augmented forms are used when the action is the result of someone's speaking or when it is combined with an emotional action, such as weeping or smiling. The augmented verb form ἐδέξατο is attested 15 times,¹²⁰⁸ and is used 8 times with an emotional action:

μειδήσασα δὲ παιδὸς ἐδέξατο χειρὶ κύπελλον (*Iliad* 1,596),
 ὥς εἰπὼν ἐν χερσὶ τίθει, ὃ δ' ἐδέξατο χαίρων (*Iliad* 23,624; 23,797),
 ὥς εἰποῦς' ἐν χερσὶ τίθει, ὃ δ' ἐδέξατο χαίρων (*Odyssey* 15,130),
 ὥς ἄρα φωνήσας οἱ ἐδέξατο χάλκεον ἔγχος (*Odyssey* 15,282; 16,40).
 ἦ ῥα καὶ ἀμφοτέρησιν ἐδέξατο καὶ κατέθηκεν (*Odyssey* 17,356),
 δακρύσας δ' Εὐμαιοὺς ἐδέξατο καὶ κατέθηκε (*Odyssey* 21,82).

There are only two exceptions:

ὥς εἰπὼν ἐν χερσὶ τίθει, ὃ δὲ δέξατο χαίρων (*Iliad* 1,446),
 Εὐμήλῳ δ' ἐν χερσὶ τίθει: ὃ δὲ δέξατο χαίρων (*Iliad* 23,565).

¹²⁰⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 1,33; 1,568; 3,418; 10,240; 24,571; 24,689.

¹²⁰⁶ Bottin 1969:105-107 briefly discussed it, but did not analyse individual instances.

¹²⁰⁷ Bottin 1969:104-107 argued that the forms were uncertain and could not be distinguished.

¹²⁰⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 1,596; 9,633; 18,238; 23,624; 23,797; 24,305 and *Odyssey* 1,121; 8,483; 11,327; 14,113; 15,130; 15,282; 16,40; 17,356; 21,82.

The unaugmented form δέξατο is used 7 times,¹²⁰⁹ and appears more often when neither speaking nor emotional actions are involved. In two instances it is used in verse initial position, and in one instance it is followed by a 2nd position clitic:

δέξατό οἱ σκῆπτρον πατρώϊον ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ (*Iliad* 2,186),

δέξατο: χηρωσται δὲ διὰ κτῆσιν δατέοντο (*Iliad* 5,158),

δέξατο χερσὶ φίλησιν: ὁ δ' ἐκ ποταμοῖο λιασθεὶς (*Odyssey* 5,462).

17. That the augment provides a link between the action in the past and the present, and is used to stress surprise and/or contrasts, explains why all speech conclusions are augmented when the verb form is preceded by the particle ἄρα (Appendix B.6). The exact meaning of ἄρα is debated, as it has been analysed both as indicating a strong contrast or surprise,¹²¹⁰ or as merely transitional,¹²¹¹ or both,¹²¹² but there is agreement on the fact that the particle provides a link between the action in the past and the current situation, and stresses the general knowledge or importance of what was said before.¹²¹³ The speech conclusions ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην, ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη and ἦ ῥ(α) were used to stress the value of the speaking and emphasise the contrast with the subsequent actions.¹²¹⁴ As such, the presence of the augment in the conclusion is not unexpected.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην, πάλλιν δὲ μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἴεκτωρ (*Iliad* 3,324).

This verse describes the contrast between the armies that have just prayed to Zeus, asking for a victor in the duel between Paris and Menelaos, and Hektor's drawing of the lots for this man-to-man battle.

ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη, γρηῖς δὲ θεῶν μέγαν ὄρκον ἀπώμνυ (*Odyssey* 2,377).

This verse describes how Telemakhos finished speaking and urging Eurykleia not to mention anything to Penelope about his journey. She answered by swearing a great oath that she would keep silent about his trip to Sparta. Both Telemakhos's speaking and Eurykleia's swearing are augmented, because they provide important new information.

¹²⁰⁹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,446; 2,186; 5,158; 6,483; 23,565 and *Odyssey* 5,462; 24,176.

¹²¹⁰ Hartung 1832:422 ἄρα bezeichnet (...) das Unvermuthende, und Befremdende, kurz die Ueberraschung, and ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη findet man dann gebraucht, wenn der Inhalt überrascht oder befremdet; Stadelmann 1840:131 ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη findet man da, wo der Inhalt der Rede überrascht oder befremdet; Chantraine 1968-1974:100.

¹²¹¹ Buttmann 1854:476; von Bäumlein 1861:29-34; Kühner-Gerth 1904:318-320; Brugmann 1900:539; see also Grimm – Nordheider – Brandt 1979:1132, 1144 and 1151 and recently Beekes 2010:121.

¹²¹² Denniston 1959:38 stated that the particle indicated apprehension of an idea not before envisaged or actual scepticism of the idea quoted.

¹²¹³ Mutzbauer 1909:149; Fingerle 1939:362; Grimm 1962:24; Bakker 1993a:18-22; Latacz 2000b:179.

¹²¹⁴ Grimm 1962:24; Bakker 1993a:18-22, 2005:98.

The contrasting value of ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη and ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην had been noticed before, see Hartung 1832:422; Stadelmann 1840:131; Mutzbauer 1909:149; Fingerle 1939:362 and Latacz 2000b:179.

18. The iterative forms with the suffix *-SK-*, which can appear in the imperfect or aorist of verbs that did not have it in other tenses, are almost always unaugmented (Appendix B.7).¹²¹⁵ Most iteratives appeared in narrative parts, and did not refer to specific actions, but described an action that occurred repeatedly in the past. As such, there is no new information added and no link between the action of the undefined subject and the present situation. Some examples prove this.

Ἕκτορος ἦδε γυνὴ ὅς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι (*Iliad* 6,460).

This verse appeared in Hektor's goodbye to Andromakhe. He put this verse in the mouth of an imaginary bypasser who would pronounce it when he noticed Andromakhe in slavery. The verse described Hektor as the ever-valiant fighter before Troy. As this verse did not refer to a specific action but to something that was true for a long time in the past, an augmentless iterative form was used to describe the action.

οἷος ποιμαίνεσκεν ἀπόπροθεν: οὐδὲ μετ' ἄλλους (*Odyssey* 9,188).

In this instance, the poet described how Polyphemos usually pastured his cattle far away from the other Kyklopes. As this is a description of a timeless situation, the augment is not used.

Starting from Bakker's observations on the use of the augment as *closeness to the speaker*, Pagniello argued that the *sk* iteratives did not refer to specific or focal actions, but to actions in the past that were less specifically defined and did not necessarily have a link with the present.¹²¹⁶ He also argued that the iteratives could also be used to describe a single action that was repeated by different characters. This is especially visible in speech introductions and conclusions: in speech introductions and conclusions the *sk* forms are used to describe how a group of different people made the same statement one after another. These speech introductions are never constructed with a person addressed, and therefore do not indicate interaction between different persons. As they all had an indefinite subject, they were less clearly linked with the present situation or with the audience, and as a consequence, the verbal forms were not augmented. The *sk* iteratives also appear in speech conclusions,¹²¹⁷ and are unaugmented for the same reasons as the introductions.

ὧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον (*Iliad* 2,271).

¹²¹⁵ Buttmann 1830:382; Grashof 1852:14; Monro 1891:62; Smyth 1894:464; Kühner-Blass 1892:81; Drewitt 1912a:44; Mohrmann 1933:90; Chantraine 1948:481-482; Bakker 2005:127. Poehlmann 1858:10 pointed out that this had already been observed by the *Etymologicum Magnum*.

For a detailed analysis see Bottin 1969:116-125; Pagniello 2007.

¹²¹⁶ Pagniello 2007.

¹²¹⁷ For a list of speech introductions and conclusions with *sk* verbs, see Fingerle 1939:285-294 and Schneider 1995:13-14.

In this verse, Homer described how the soldiers reacted to Thersites's punishment at the hands of Odysseus. The soldier is not specified, but the meaning is not that one soldier would be talking to his neighbour the whole time, but that many soldiers talked to their neighbour.

ὅς τόσον αὐδῆσασχ' ὅσον ἄλλοι πεντήκοντα (*Iliad* 5,786).

“who would speak with such a force as 50 others (would do)”

This verse described Here when she was about to incite the Greek army in the guise of Stentor, whose strong voice was proverbial. In this instance, one could argue that Stentor always speaks strongly, and that the iterative meaning is therefore present, but the one speaking is not Stentor, but Here. As Here does normally not take the form of Stentor, the comparison with Stentor seems to remove the *presentness* of the action, especially since the “real” Stentor is not present. This explains the absence of the augment, as the formula refers to a mythical person who is not present: ὅς refers to Stentor, and not to Here (although there is the *varia lectio* ἦ).

ὥς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε καὶ οὐτήσασκε παραστάς (*Iliad* 22,375).

This verse described how the Greek soldiers spoke to each other when they saw Hektor's dead body and how they stabbed the corpse. The soldiers are not defined, and the meaning is not that a given soldier would stab Hektor repeatedly, but that many soldiers would do so in passing by his dead body.

ᾧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκε νέων ὑπερηγορέοντων (*Odyssey* 2,324).

This verse refers to the arrogant suitors and their speaking. Although several suitors are mentioned by name in the *Odyssey*, Homer refers here to one remark that is repeated by several undefined suitors. The subject is not determined, nor is there a person addressed. The meaning is not that one suitor was constantly talking, but that many suitors were speaking after each other (or at the same time).

19. These observations explain the difference in augment use between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Often, the greater frequency of the augment in the *Odyssey* compared to that of the *Iliad* is interpreted as one of the younger features of the *Odyssey*, but there is no need to do so. As Bakker had already pointed out, the use of the augment is not evidence for a younger language stage.¹²¹⁸ As the themes of both poems are different, it is logical that the use of the augment is different. The *Iliad* describes the wrath of Akhilleus against the background of the Trojan war. As a consequence, it contains many battle descriptions and often refers to remote and mythical events. There are dialogues, but not that many. The *Odyssey* on the other hand

¹²¹⁸ Bakker 2005:115.

describes the travels of Odysseus and the troubles in his household during his absence. Everywhere Odysseus arrives, he is asked to relate his travels. As these refer to the immediate past, the augment is used more often. In addition, there are many more speeches and dialogues in the *Odyssey* and fewer descriptions of mythical stories. As such, the augment is more common in the *Odyssey*.

20. A last (important) point that needs to be mentioned, is that the observations made above can also explain the use/absence of the augment in the different works by Hesiod. The augment is much more common in the *Works and Days* than in the *Theogony*,¹²¹⁹ and it is generally used with the gnomic aorist and absent with the *sk* iteratives.¹²²⁰ The division between *Theogony* and *Works and Days* has generally been explained as the result of a difference in language age (as was the case with *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as well), but it is more likely that the different nature of the works is the reason for this: as the *Theogony* refers to a mythical past, it is logical that the augment is less frequently used; the *Works and Days* provide advice for every day life and are situated against the background of the conflict between Hesiod and his brother Perses, and therefore provide a much closer link to the present and the audience.

6.5. Formulaic expansion and the use of the augment.

There are many instances in which an augmented form occurs where an unaugmented form would be expected, and vice versa. Formulaic expansion and substitution of formulae can explain some of the appearances of (un)augmented forms in contexts where they would not be expected, or can account for apparent metrical irregularities in the verbal morphology. In what follows, several such irregularities in speech introductions will be analysed. There are several examples of which some have been discussed already. We will now discuss some further examples.

1. The first example is the absence of the augment in the speech introductions with αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο (occurring 9 times). This has been discussed before.
2. A second example is the unaugmented formula ἀμείβετο μύθῳ. Initially it was used in verses that were described earlier as “double introductions”:¹²²¹

Object.	Particles.	Speech verb 1.	Subject.	Particle.	Speech formula 2.	Passage.
τὸν	δ' αὐτε	προσέειπε	γυνή	καὶ	ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,434

¹²¹⁹ Rzach 1876:433-435; Troxler 1964:81. The augment use was not addressed in Edwards 1971.

¹²²⁰ Platt 1891; West 1966:214,289; 1978:345.

¹²²¹ Fingerle 1939:336.

τοῖς	δ' αὖτις	μετέειπε	γυνή	καὶ	ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,439
------	----------	----------	------	-----	---------------	-----------------------

In those two instances, the formula was unaugmented because of the *markedness reduction*. Later, it was then expanded to contexts where the syntactic constraint against the augment was no longer present:

Speech conclusion.	Verb 1.	Clitic.	Subject.	Connector.	Speech verb.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο,	κώκυσεν	δέ	γυνή	καὶ	ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 24,200
ὥς φάτο,	γῆθησεν	δ'	ὁ γέρων,	καὶ	ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 24,424

At the same time, ἀμείβετο μύθῳ is not constructed with a person addressed, so that the absence of the augment is both formulaically as well as semantically motivated.

3. A third example is the unaugmented speech introduction θρασὺν Ἴκτορα εἶπε παραστάς, which occurs 6 times.¹²²² Often an (un)augmented form occurred in a context where the other form would be expected. In three instances it appears in the postposed apodosis of a past counterfactual:¹²²³

Conditional conjunction.	Subject.	Object.	Speech formula.	Passage.
εἰ μὴ	Πουλυδάμας	θρασὺν Ἴκτορα	εἶπε παραστάς	<i>Iliad</i> 13,725

From the instances above, the formula θρασὺν Ἴκτορα εἶπε παραστάς was extended to contexts which did not belong to counterfactuals, because it could be conveniently put in the verse after the bucolic caesura:

	Subject.	Object.	Speech formula.	Passage.
δὴ τότε	Πουλυδάμας	θρασὺν Ἴκτορα	εἶπε παραστάς	<i>Iliad</i> 12,60, 12,210

In one instance, the formula was used with an augmented verb form:

ἀμφίθετος φιάλῃ: τὴν Νέστορι δῶκεν Ἀχιλλεύς

Ἀργείων ἀν' ἀγῶνα φέρων, καὶ ἔειπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 23,616-617).

This verse described how Akhilleus honoured Nestor with a prize and addressed him, explaining why he had deserved the honour. The unaugmented form would have fit the metre as well, and would not have required the *correptio* in καί. The augmentation in this instance marks the transition from the offering of the prize (with the non-augmented δῶκεν) to the

¹²²² The instances are *Iliad* 6,75; 12,60; 12,210; 13,275; 20,375 and 23,155.

¹²²³ The instances are *Iliad* 6,73-75; 13,723-725 and 23,154-155.

speaking (with the augmented *ἔειπε*), i.e. from narrative to direct speech. The fact that there was no possible confusion about the case ending might also have contributed to the augmentation.

4. Fourthly, some metrical anomalies in the conclusions with *φημί* can be explained by an inflection of an unaugmented speech conclusion. In 22 conclusions with unaugmented forms of *φημί*, the emotional effect of the speaking on the audience was expressed by the forms *γήθησεν*,¹²²⁴ *ρίγησεν*¹²²⁵ or *μείδησεν*.¹²²⁶

ὥς φάτο, μείδησεν δὲ θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη (*Iliad* 1,595),

ὥς φάτο, γήθησεν δὲ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης (*Iliad* 6,212),

ὥς φάτο, ρίγησεν δὲ Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων (*Odyssey* 5,116).

The formulae *ὥς φάτο, μείδησεν δὲ* and *ὥς φάτο, ρίγησεν δὲ* have a metrical anomaly. *ρίγησεν* and *μείδησεν* originally started with *sC- and one would therefore have expected that the end *o* of *φάτο* would have been scanned long. This is not the case, however. Another irregularity is the fact that the verb *φάτο* in the conclusion is unaugmented, although the reaction of the audience viz. addressee is mentioned. If the verb forms *ρίγησεν* and *μείδησεν* had been original in the conclusion, an augmented conclusion would have been expected, as both verbs started with *sC- and could therefore have been used in formulae such as *ὥς ἔφατο (s)ρίγησε or *ὥς ἔφατο (s)μείδησε. Examples of this double consonant are visible in the adjective *φιλομειδής* and in the following aorists of *ρίγέω*:

Τρῶες δ' ἐρρίγησαν ὅπως ἴδον αἰόλον ὄφιν (*Iliad* 12,208),

Αἴας δ' ἐρρίγησε, κασίγνητον δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 15,436).

The metrical anomaly and the absence of the augment can be explained, if one assumes that the following formula was the original one:

Conclusion.	Verb of emotion.	2 nd position clitic.	Noun epithet.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο,	γήθησεν	δὲ	βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης	<i>Iliad</i> 6,212

In this formula metrical constraints prevented the augment from appearing in *φάτο*, because *ὥς ἔφατο, γήθησεν* would have been unmetrical. The sequence *ὥς φάτ', ἐγήθησεν δέ* was metrically possible but syntactically less preferred, because it created an augmented verb form, when the verb was followed by the particle *δέ*. The verb *γήθησεν* was then replaced by

¹²²⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 6,212; 17,567; 24,424 and *Odyssey* 7,329; 8,199; 8,385; 13,250 and 18,281.

¹²²⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 3,259; 15,34 and *Odyssey* 5,116 and 5,171.

¹²²⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,595; 5,426; 14,222; 15,47; 23,555 and *Odyssey* 4,609; 5,180; 13,287; 16,476 and 23,111.

μείδησεν,¹²²⁷ which belongs to the same semantic field. The substitution yielded the following formula:

Conclusion.	Verb of emotion.	2 nd position clitic.	Noun epithet.	Passage.
ὦς φάτο,	μείδησεν	δὲ	θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη	<i>Iliad</i> 1,595

Afterwards (or at the same time) γήθησεν was replaced by ῥίγησεν,¹²²⁸ which has the exact opposite meaning:

Conclusion.	Verb of emotion.	2 nd position clitic.	Noun epithet.	Passage.
ὦς φάτο,	ῥίγησεν	δὲ	Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων	<i>Odyssey</i> 5,116

As such, formulae with an apparent metrical anomaly (the neglect of the initial *s*) were created.

5. A fifth case of formulaic extension is the word group (PARTICIPLE) ἄρα εἶπε, which first occurred in instances where there was no person addressed or when the person was speaking to himself. In such instances, the verb was unaugmented, as was argued before:

Participle.	Particle-Verb.	Rest of verse.	Passage.
εὐξάμενος	δ' ἄρα εἶπεν	ιδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν	<i>Iliad</i> 19,257
εὐχόμενος	δ' ἄρα εἶπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 7,330

In a second stage, it was then extended to instances where there was a person addressed:

Participle.	Particle-Verb.	Person addressed.	Passage.
εὐχόμενος	δ' ἄρα εἶπεν	ἐκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι	<i>Iliad</i> 16,513

The formula was extended in its unaugmented version, although the presence of a person addressed generally favoured the use of the augment.

6. A sixth example is the formula ἡμείβετο μύθῳ. In the following instance there is no person addressed, but the speech introduction is nevertheless augmented:

οἳ δ' ἄνεω ἐγένοντο: πατὴρ δ' ἡμείβετο μύθῳ (*Odyssey* 10,71).

The augment in this verse can be explained by the fact that the formula ἡμείβετο μύθῳ, which was used 4 times with a person addressed,¹²²⁹ was extended by the poet from those contexts with a person addressed into this verse, where no person addressed was present.

7. A seventh instance of formulaic extension can be found in the formula μῦθον εἶπον/ε. In speech introductions it was originally used in “tnesis-constructions” such as:

	Person addressed.	Adposition.	“Word”.	Verb.	Passage.
αὐτίκα δ'	ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς	μετὰ	μῦθον	εἶπεν	<i>Iliad</i> 20,292

¹²²⁷ This had been observed by Milman Parry. See A.Parry 1971:11-12.

¹²²⁸ This had been observed by Milman Parry. See A.Parry 1971:11-12.

¹²²⁹ The instances are *Odyssey* 9,506; 11,59; 12,278 and 15,458.

ἔζετο δ' ὀρθωθείς καί	σφεας	πρὸς	μῦθον	ἔειπεν	<i>Iliad</i> 23,235
ἀντίον ἧς ἀλόχου, καί	μιν	πρὸς	μῦθον	ἔειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 23,165

From these instances, a speech introduction formula μῦθον ἔειπεν with augmented verb was created without a person addressed and was used in 2 speech introductions:

	Connector.	Speech introduction.	Passage.
τὴν δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς γήθησεν ἰδὼν	καὶ	μῦθον ἔειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,207
ὥς φάτο, Λαέρτης δ' ἐχάρη	καὶ	μῦθον ἔειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,513

The extension of the formula explains why in the last instance the verb is augmented, although it is the second in a series of augmented verbs and is not constructed with a person addressed.

8. An eighth instance of formulaic inflection of an existing formula can be observed with the verb ἄύω and more specifically in the formulae μακρὸν ἄύσε and ἐπὶ μακρὸν ἄύσε. This was discussed before in point 3 d) of subchapter 6.4.

9. A ninth formulaic expansion can be observed in the use of the formula κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες/ε, which occurs 18 times.¹²³⁰ Examples of “justified” augment use are:

Words spoken.	Vocative.	Speech formula.	Passage.
ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα	γέρον	κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες	<i>Iliad</i> 1,286; 8,146; 24,379
ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα	φίλος	κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες	<i>Iliad</i> 10,169
ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα,	γύναι,	κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,266

Vocative.	Word spoken.	Speech formula.	Passage.
Ἴρι θεὰ	μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος	κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες	<i>Iliad</i> 15,206
Λαοδάμα,	μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος	κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,141.

As was argued above, the augmented forms were less common in subordinate clauses introduced by ἐπεὶ and in phrases with a negation, but the metrical usefulness of κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπον/εξ/ε (especially at the end of the verse) caused the formula to be extended to contexts where it would not be expected:

	Word “contradicting” augment use.	Speech formula.	Passage.
Αργείων βασιλῆας,	ἐπεὶ	κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες	<i>Iliad</i> 9,59
εἰ πλεόνεσσι μάχοιτο: σὺ δ'	οὐ	κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,251

¹²³⁰ The instances are *Iliad* 1,286; 8,146; 9,59; 10,169; 15,206; 23,626; 24,379 and *Odyssey* 2,251; 4,266; 7,227; 8,141; 8,397; 13,48; 13,385; 18,170; 20,37; 21,278 and 22,486.

10. A tenth and last example involves the formula VERB κηρόθι μᾶλλον. As was argued above, Homer preferred the non-augmented verb form when the simplex form already had four syllables. The verb form χολώσατο only occurs in the formula χολώσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον (occurring five times).¹²³¹ As χολώσατο is a simplex verb form of more than four syllables, the augment is normally avoided, but the verb χολόω is attested with the augment, even if the verb form already has four syllables.

στήτην: οὐδέ σφωῖν ἰδὼν ἐχολώσατο θυμῷ (*Iliad* 15,155),

δεῦρ' ἄγε πειρηθήτω, ἐπεὶ μ' ἐχολώσατε λήην (*Odyssey* 8,205).

As such, the tetrasyllabic constraint alone cannot have been the reason for the unaugmented verb form. κηρόθι μᾶλλον occurs 9 times in Homer,¹²³² and in 8 instances this formula is preceded by a verbal form of four syllables:¹²³³

	Verb of anger, hate.	“in the heart”	Passage.
εἰ δέ τοι Ἀτρεΐδης μὲν	ἀπήχθετο	κηρόθι μᾶλλον	(<i>Iliad</i> 9,300)
ὣς ἄρ' ἔφη, ποταμὸς δὲ	χολώσατο	κηρόθι μᾶλλον	(<i>Iliad</i> 21,136)
πόντον ἐπιπλείων. ὃ δ'	ἐχώσατο	κηρόθι μᾶλλον	(<i>Odyssey</i> 5,284)
ὣς ἐφάμην, ὃ δ' ἔπειτα,	χολώσατο	κηρόθι μᾶλλον	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,480
ἔπατ'. ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος ὅζῃ	γενέσκετο	κηρόθι μᾶλλον	(<i>Odyssey</i> 11,208)
ὣς ἔφατ', Ἀντίνοος δέ,	χολώσατο	κηρόθι μᾶλλον	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,458
ὣς ἔφατ', Εὐρύμαχος δέ	χολώσατο	κηρόθι μᾶλλον	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,387
ὣς φάτ', Ἀθηναίη δέ	χολώσατο	κηρόθι μᾶλλον	<i>Odyssey</i> 22,224

While the above mentioned formulae all contain the idea of “hate in the heart”, they are not synonymous and therefore do not violate the *economy* principle: the formula ἐμοὶ δ' ἄχος ὅζῃ γενέσκετο κηρόθι μᾶλλον was used when the poet wanted to say “I became angry”, because the 1st person singular middle aorist form of the above mentioned verbal forms (ἀπηχθόμην, ἐχωσάμην and ἐχολωσάμην) could not be used in the metre; the formula ἀπήχθετο κηρόθι μᾶλλον, on the other hand, was used with a *dativus incommodi* indicating who was hated/ the object of anger. The difference between δ' ἐχώσατο and δὲ χολώσατο can in my opinion best be explained by the fact that the verb form “he hated, he was angry” had to fill four syllables in the schema.

¹²³¹ The instances are *Iliad* 21,136 and *Odyssey* 9,480; 17,458; 18,387 and 22,224.

¹²³² The instances are *Iliad* 9,300; 21,136 and *Odyssey* 5,284; 9,480; 11,208; 15,370; 17,458; 18,387; 22,224.

¹²³³ The only instance where this is not the case is ἀγρόνδε προΐαλλε: φίλει δέ με κηρόθι μᾶλλον (*Odyssey* 15,370).

6.6. The augment in compounds.

A final remark involves the compounds. They are almost always augmented:¹²³⁴

ἦ μὲν ἄρ' ὧς εἰποῦσ' ἀπέβη πόδας ὠκέα Ἴρις (*Iliad* 8,425),
νευρὴν δ' ἐξέρρηξε νεόστροφον, ἦν ἐνέδησα (*Iliad* 15,469),
ὦνον ὑπισχόμεναι: ὁ δὲ τῇ κατένευσε σιωπῇ (*Odyssey* 15,463).

There are some exceptions as well. In some instances, the metre played a role:

αὐτίκα δούλιον ἦμαρ ἐμοὶ περιμηχανόωντο (*Odyssey* 14,340).

The absence of the augment here is metrical: as the *i* of *περί* is never elided,¹²³⁵ the augmented form *περιμηχανόωντο* cannot be used.

If the compounds are used in the “Aeolic” forms, they are never augmented.¹²³⁶

ἀλγήσας ὀδύνησι, μέσῳ δ' ἐνὶ κάββαλ' ὀμίλῳ (*Iliad* 12,206).

Compounds are also augmented, even if there are syntactic and/or semantic reasons that would favour the absence: they do not lose their augment, when the simplex verb has already four syllables, when they appear in negative sentences or in sentences introduced by *ἐπεί*, when they appear at the beginning of a sentence, when they are followed by a 2nd position clitic, when they are preceded by another augmented verb form or when they appear in a construction where there was already another augmented form. The only exceptions are the dual forms, where the unaugmented form is more common than the augmented one (cf. *supra*).¹²³⁷ Examples of a compound with a tetrasyllabic augmented verb form are (the verbs are underlined):

γαῖα δ' ὑπεστενάχιζε Διὶ ὧς τερπικεραύνῳ (*Iliad* 2,781),
τῷ δ' ἐπετοξάζοντο κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ (*Iliad* 3,79),
χειρὸς ἔχων Μενέλαον, ἐπεστενάχοντο δ' ἑταῖροι (*Iliad* 4,154).

Examples of a compound being augmented when followed by a 2nd position clitic are:

τὸν δὲ θεοὶ μὲν τεῦξαν, ἐπεκλώσαντο δ' ὄλεθρον (*Odyssey* 8,579).

Examples of a compound being augmented in spite of the *markedness reduction* are (the compounds are put in bold face):

ἔσσομαι, ὧς τὸ πρῶτον ὑπέστην καὶ **κατένευσα**: (*Iliad* 4,267),
χρύσειον σκῆπτρον ἔχων, ἐμὲ δ' ἔγνω καὶ **προσέειπε** (*Odyssey* 11,91),

¹²³⁴ Schmidt 1854a:427, Bottin 1969:87-89; I was unable to consult Dottin *L'augment des verbes composés dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée*. Curtius 1873:136-137 stated that an analysis of the compound verbs would be too extensive for a general study on the Greek verb.

¹²³⁵ Monro 1891:349; Chantraine 1948:86; Wachter 2000:74.

¹²³⁶ Bottin 1969:97-99, with a list of instances of all the Aeolic *apokopated* forms. I do not think that forms such as *κάββαλ'* derived from an earlier *κατέβαλε* which underwent syncope and assimilation, as was suggested by Schulze 1892:532, Wackernagel 1904:5, Schmidt 1905:6; Brugmann 1916:13.

¹²³⁷ Bottin 1967:92-96.

ἧ ῥα καὶ ἀμφοτέρησιν ἐδέξατο καὶ **κατέθηκεν** (*Odyssey* 17,356).

Examples of a compound being augmented in a negative sentence are (the negative word is put in bold face, while the verbs are underlined):

οὐδ' ἀπέλυσε θύγατρα καὶ **οὐκ** ἀπεδέξατ' ἄποινα (*Iliad* 1,95),

στήτην, **οὐδέ** τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 1,332),

τὸν δ' **οὐκ** εἰδότη' ὄλεθρον ἀνήγαγε καὶ κατέπεφνε (*Odyssey* 4,534),

ὥς φάτο, τὸν δ' **οὔ** τι προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (*Odyssey* 20;183).

6.7. Willi's theory on the augment.

Beckwith and Willi doubted that the semantic explanation could sufficiently explain the use of the augment, and looked for a relationship between the augment and reduplicated aorist. While Beckwith argued that the different suggestions for the augment use *did not inspire confidence* and lead him to believe that the usage was purely metrical,¹²³⁸ Willi argued that the origin of the augment had to be linked with the reduplication.¹²³⁹ He admitted that the use of the augment in the gnomic aorist was a problem, but argued that the explanation of the augment as a prefixed particle and the semantic explanations for the use of the augment (for which he only referred to Bakker) were problematic. As an alternative suggestion, Willi connected the use of the reduplicated aorist and that of the thematic augmented aorist (as Beckwith had suggested before him), and suspected a complementary distribution. Willi used the following arguments:

- a) the supposed meaning of the augment in Greek could not be found in other augment-languages,¹²⁴⁰
- b) all verbal suffixes were “postfixed” in Indo-European and not prefixed, and therefore the augment could never have been a particle,¹²⁴¹
- c) Bakker's explanation was unable to explain why the aorist was augmented more often in narrative than the imperfect,¹²⁴²
- d) all augmented forms referred to a completed action.¹²⁴³

Willi considered the solution for the augment issue to be easy, however:¹²⁴⁴ in his opinion, the augment was in origin the reduplication of a root starting with **h₁*.¹²⁴⁵ Starting from the

¹²³⁸ Beckwith 1996:5.

¹²³⁹ Willi 2007:46, the idea that the augment and the reduplication were linked had already been suggested by Pott 1833:73 (quoted in Bopp 1842:781) and Buttmann 1854:119-120.

¹²⁴⁰ Willi 2007:46.

¹²⁴¹ Willi 2007:46.

¹²⁴² Willi 2007:46.

¹²⁴³ Willi 2007:46-48.

similarities between the reduplicated and thematic (unreduplicated) aorists, Willi suggested that the augment was in origin the reduplication syllable of verbal roots starting with $*h_1C$. He did not state which verb(s) could have been the trigger, but listed the root $*h_1leud^h$ as one of the likely candidates. The reduplication syllable $*h_1e$ was then reanalysed as a past marker and extended from the reduplicated aorist to the other aorists and the other past tenses. As the reduplication indicated a completed action, it was not used in the pluperfects (as they already had a reduplication) and in the *sk* iteratives (which pointed to repeated and not completed actions).¹²⁴⁶ The gnomic aorist described a completed action in the past that could be repeated at any time and was therefore augmented (i.e. originally reduplicated). The reduplication also explained why the augment appeared at the beginning of the verb form.¹²⁴⁷ That the augment was used instead of the reduplication, also explained (according to Willi) why the reduplicated aorist disappeared in preference of the (unreduplicated) thematic aorist.¹²⁴⁸ The remaining reduplicated aorists then specialised as factitive or causative forms in Sanskrit and Greek.¹²⁴⁹

Even though there are many roots starting with $*h_1C$ or $*h_1R$,¹²⁵⁰ Willi's scenario is in my opinion unlikely. First of all, the use of both preposed and postposed particles is not unparalleled. The particles in question, word initial $*(h_1)e$ and final $*-i$, are also used outside the verbal system to stress adverbs and pronouns. Their placement is exactly like that in the verbal morphology: $*e-$ is placed at the beginning of the words, while $*-i$ is positioned at the end of the word.¹²⁵¹ One can compare the doublets οὗτος and οὗτοσί, of which the latter is stronger, and the pronouns κείνος and ἐκείνος and the adverbs χθές and ἐχθές, in which the latter is characterised by the deictic particle $e-$.¹²⁵² Secondly, it is difficult to see how a reduplication syllable would have been generalised and expanded to other verb forms. In this scenario, one would have to assume that the prefix was no longer felt as a reduplication but had nevertheless not lost its reduplication and perfective meaning. I personally find that unlikely. Thirdly, if the remaining reduplicated aorists specialised into factitive and/or causative aorists, the question is why the two inherited reduplicated aorists, $*g^{wh}en$ and $*uek^w$,

¹²⁴⁴ Willi 2007:46 *Now this Gordian knot can be cut rather easily*. (underlining is mine)

¹²⁴⁵ Willi 2007:46-48.

¹²⁴⁶ Willi 2007:46-48.

¹²⁴⁷ Willi 2007:46-48.

¹²⁴⁸ Willi 2007.

¹²⁴⁹ Willi 2007:47.

¹²⁵⁰ I refer to the list in LIV: 245-254.

¹²⁵¹ Strunk 1968:291-292.

¹²⁵² Strunk 1994a:278-279; Tichy 2009:126. This comparison had already been made in Platt 1891:229.

were neither causative nor factitive (underlining is mine).¹²⁵³ A fourth element is the syntactic constraints on the augment. As I argued above, it cannot be denied that certain syntactic features influence the use of the augment. It is difficult to see how they would have influenced a reduplication. Especially Drewitt-Bottin's rule linking the position of the 2nd position clitic with the (absence) of the augment is difficult to reconcile with the suggested origin of the augment as a reduplication. Fifthly, reduplicated aorists can be augmented as well (both in Greek as in Indo-Iranian),¹²⁵⁴ which would be difficult if the augment was in origin a reduplication. In Greek the augmentation of the reduplicated aorists follows the rules that could be found for the other verbs as well, which was shown in the analysis of the speech introductions: they were augmented when they were constructed with a person addressed, and were not augmented when they were followed by a 2nd position clitic. The following examples of ἐκέκλετο confirm this (as was discussed before):

ὥς εἰπὼν Τρώεσσιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν αὖσας (*Iliad* 17,183).

In this instance the verb is augmented because it is constructed with a person addressed and is not followed by a 2nd position clitic.

κέκλετο δ' Ἥφαιστον κλυτοτέχνην εἰπέ τε μῦθον (*Iliad* 18,391).

In this instance, the verb is not augmented, because it is followed by a 2nd position clitic.

This applied to the pluperfects as well. When a pluperfect is used in a speech introduction it is subject to the same augmentation rules as an imperfect or an aorist. Sixthly, the origin of the augment as reduplication does not explain why it is missing when the verb is used in a negative sentence. Seventhly, it is not certain that the reduplicated and causative aorist already existed in PIE, as it might well be a late dialectal feature,¹²⁵⁵ or an *einzelsprachliche* innovation.¹²⁵⁶ As such, the fact that there are more thematic aorists than reduplicated aorists is not probative. In addition, it is a circular argument: it assumes that the default category was the reduplicated aorist in PIE, but that it disappeared because the reduplication was reinterpreted as an augment. This can neither be proved nor falsified.¹²⁵⁷ Eighthly and lastly, Willi's statement that Bakker's observations on the augment had no parallels in the other "augment-languages" is not entirely true,¹²⁵⁸ as can be seen from the following facts:

¹²⁵³ Weiss 2010:115; Olav Hackstein, personal communication.

¹²⁵⁴ See the list in Macdonell 1916:173-175.

¹²⁵⁵ This is the meaning of Bendahman 1991.

¹²⁵⁶ As Olav Hackstein pointed out to me, the Tocharian evidence for the reduplicated aorist is not conclusive and is likely to be a language internal innovation.

¹²⁵⁷ I thank Olav Hackstein for pointing this out to me.

¹²⁵⁸ See especially García-Ramón 2012a.

1. In Vedic, the augment is used when actions in the immediate past are described, but not when timeless events are mentioned.¹²⁵⁹ The following example illustrates this:¹²⁶⁰

índreṇa yujā nīḥ srjanta vāgháto

vrajám gómantam aśvína

sahásram me dádato aṣṭakarṇíyaḥ

śrávo devéṣu akrata (RV 10.62,7)

*"Mit Indra als Verbündetem entleerten die Sänger den Rinder- und Roßpferch. Sie, die mir tausend Kühe mit gezeichneten Ohren schenken, haben sich Ruhm vor den Göttern erworben."*¹²⁶¹

In this passage, the remote mythical deeds done under supervision of Indra are described in the injunctive (the augmentless *srjanta* "they emptied"), while the action in the past that was linked to the singer (*me* in the passage), is described by an augmented tense *akrata* "they have made" (indicative aorist). The distinction between the injunctive to describe timeless mythical actions and the use of augmented forms to refer to actions linked to the audience is paralleled in Greek.

2. Delbrück argued that the gnomic aorist was augmented in Vedic as well,¹²⁶² which makes the present-linking value of the augment more than only a Greek specificity.

3. In Armenian the verb is not augmented when it has already received emphasis via another feature, such as verb initial position or VO word order.¹²⁶³

4. Greek and Vedic Sanskrit share the interpretation of the augmented form as a compound (as their accentuation proves).

5. Greek, Indo-Iranian and Armenian also share the *Wortumfang* constraint,¹²⁶⁴ which stated that short monosyllabic verbal forms were augmented to avoid the *horror monosyllabi*. I therefore believe that the explanation of the augment as a specific aorist reduplication that was extended throughout the entire verbal paradigm of the past cannot be sustained.

6.8. Conclusion.

The use of the augment in the verbal inflection can be summarised in the following 20 morphological-metrical, syntactic and semantic observations:

¹²⁵⁹ Hoffmann 1967:160-213 described the use of the injunctive in what he called *fernere Vergangenheit*. See also Strunk 1968 and Euler 1995.

¹²⁶⁰ I would like to thank Eduard Meusel, Albert Zasada and Benedikt Peschl for discussing this passage with me.

¹²⁶¹ Geldner 1951c:233.

¹²⁶² Delbrück 1897:302.

¹²⁶³ De Lamberterie 2007.

¹²⁶⁴ Wackernagel 1906:150-154; Brugmann 1916:13; Strunk 1967.

- Metrical-morphological explanations:
 1. The augment is always used/left out, if the metre requires it.
 2. It is almost always missing in verbal forms of four or more syllables.
 3. It is very often omitted in pluperfect forms.
 4. Compounded verb forms are augmented much more often than not.
 5. Older forms such as duals and root aorists do not have an augment.
 6. Younger forms such as the sigmatic aorist and the *THE*: aorist have it more often.
 7. Forms that require the elision of case forms such as the dual in E or the dative singular in I or plural in SI are not augmented, because the elision would render the case endings unclear.
- Syntactically motivated are the following uses of the augment:
 1. A verb form usually remains unaugmented, when it is followed by a 2nd position clitic: an enclitic word such as τε or ῥα, or a word that cannot be put at the first position of the sentence such as δέ, μέν or γάρ. These clitics are normally put in the second position of the sentence. An augmented verb is a compound of an accented temporal particle and an enclitic verbal form. If this form preceded the clitic, it would be put in the 3rd position of the sentence and not in the 2nd. Therefore, the clitic needed to be preceded by the accented unaugmented verb form. When the verb form is preceded by a 2nd position clitic, it can often be augmented, but the augmentation is subject to other (semantic) rules as well.
 2. A verb form that appeared in a series of past forms and that was preceded already by an augmented verb form, is often not augmented. This is due to the fact that an augmented form is marked and that in a series of several elements only the first one needed to be marked. This *conjunction reduction*, or *markedness reduction* as I prefer to call it, also applied in Indo-Iranian, and in sequences in the dual: the first form appeared as a marked form (dual) and others appeared in the unmarked form (normal plural form).
 3. Verb forms in the beginning of a verse or sentence are usually (but not exclusively) unaugmented. When the verb is put at the beginning of the sentence (which is not the usual position), it receives emphasis by its position and in those instances the augment is not needed to add additional foregrounding. As was stated above, the augmented one is the marked one. If the verb in the sentence is already marked by another feature, there was less necessity to augment the verb. The vast majority of these non-augmented

instances of verse initial verb forms can also be explained by the fact that the verb forms are followed by a 2nd position clitic, but not all of them.

○ Semantic reasons: the augment is used when the past action is linked to and/or valid for the present situation. It indicates an interaction and/or contrast between defined characters present in the real world, it emphasises what was newly added or communicated, and marks the transition from narration into direct speech. The augment puts the past action into the foreground,¹²⁶⁵ and is *a deictic suffix that marked the completion of the action in the presence of the speaker*.¹²⁶⁶ Applied to speech introductions and conclusions, this means the following:

1. The augment is used to stress new information or to indicate a contrast between persons in the real world. This is the main reason why speech introductions are generally augmented when there are no metrical-morphological or syntactic constraints.
2. In speech conclusions, the verb of speaking is augmented, when the speaking of one person influences a large group. This explains why most speech introductions have an augmented verb form when the reaction of the audience to the speaking is related, and is why the mental/physical reaction of the audience to the speaking is also expressed with an augmented verb form.
3. In speech conclusions the verb is augmented when the conclusion is expanded by a participle construction. The participle adds new information, because it describes under which conditions the speaking had occurred (as an act of weeping, complaining, shouting, joy or anger).
4. It is not used if the speaker addresses his own mind or speaks to himself, because there is no interaction between different characters. In most cases, the speaker withdraws himself from the real world by speaking to his own mind.
5. It is also used when the verbal form describes a past action that is still valid in the present. This explains why the augment is used in general truths and proverbs, because they describe an action in the past that is still valid. This also explains why the augment is used in sentences with *vŭv* “now”, because those sentences refer to an action that lies in the immediate past.

¹²⁶⁵ Mumm 2004, Bakker 1999a:59, 2005:123-124, Hackstein 2010a:405; the term “foregrounding device” was found in Hackstein 2010a:405.

¹²⁶⁶ Bakker 2005:147; this had already been observed by Platt 1891:227 –almost with the same words.

6. It is not used in speech conclusions when the subject of the conclusion and that of the verb of the next sentence are the same: as the subjects are the same, a contrast is less likely. This is the case in speech conclusions with $\phi\eta\mu\acute{\iota}$.
7. The augment is missing in sentences that describe repeated actions in the past. As such, it is not used in sentences with $\alpha\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ “always” and in sentences with the *SK* iteratives. The speech introductions with the *SK* forms are not augmented, because they describe the speaking of a larger and undefined group. As the group is anonymous and not linked to the audience, the augment is missing.
8. The augment is usually missing in negative clauses, because they do not have a direct link with the current situation.
9. Unaugmented forms are preferred in narrative descriptions, in mythical stories and in subordinate clauses that describe actions anterior to others (such as the $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ “because, after” clauses).
10. The use of unaugmented forms in remote and mythical stories is paralleled in Vedic Sanskrit. Stories in the RV that relate the immediate past or have a link to the speaker/narrator, are described in the augmented indicative and not in the injunctive. As such, there are semantic parallels between the use/absence of the augment in Greek and Vedic Sanskrit.

Chapter 7. Conclusion.

The semantics and the grammar of speech introduction and conclusion verbs in Homer.

This thesis analysed the speech introductions and conclusions in Homer from a morphological and syntactic standpoint. Previous research focused on the formal, semantic and metrical aspects of the speech introductions and conclusions, but the syntax (such as augmentation, usage of case, tense and mood) has not been discussed. Historical syntax has not been treated in as much detail as phonology and morphology, and this applies to Homer as well. The only treatment is the still unequalled Chantraine 1953. This dissertation therefore focused on the syntax and discussed metrical phenomena and morphology as far as they shed additional light on the syntactic features. I restricted myself to the verbs of “speaking (to)” and “answering”, because they were the verbs of speaking in the strict and “neutral” sense. The analysis was performed as follows. First, I compiled the formulae, listed them under the different verbs and divided them in categories: verbs of speaking and verbs of answering. Then I analysed the different verbs. First the etymology was treated, then the different forms, the use of moods and converbs, the constructions of the verb (cases and/or prepositional constructions), word order, metrical conditioning, and compounds and tmesis (when attested). I then investigated if there was a suppletive division between the different verbs in introductions and conclusions and how past and future reference were expressed in the speech introductions and conclusions. The last chapter was a thorough study on the Homeric augment, which focused on the verbs of speaking, but was not limited to them.

7.1. The semantics of speech introduction and conclusion verbs in Homer.

AUDAO and its compounds *προσαυδάω* and *μεταυδάω*. This verb is an old inherited and poetic verb and is related to Vedic *vadati* “he speaks”. Almost all the attested verbs forms were imperfects. It is almost exclusively used in speech introductions, was already considered poetic at the time of Homer and did not survive in later Greek. The formula *ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα* contains the poetic concept of the “winged words” and has a (mostly) observed digamma in *ἔπεα πτερόεντα*. The verbal inflection indicates that the verb belongs to the Aeolic layer of the Greek epic. The most common form is *προσηύδα* which appears often at the end of the verse: it cannot be replaced by its uncontracted counterpart and the *pr* always scans as short. This forms therefore represents an older Aeolic athematic imperfect form *ποτᾱύδα*. The same applies to the unaugmented dual form *προσαυδήτην*: the hybrid vocalism proves that the dual form dates from a period when the dual was still in use and that the dual was no longer known by the Ionic bards. The verb *αὐδάω* agrees with the other verbs of

speaking in that the compounds with μετα- refer to speaking to a large group and are constructed with a dative-locative and those in προς- to a small group and are constructed with an accusative. The word order is OV; the instances where this was not the case can either be explained by formulaic inflection of an OV formula or because of metrical constraints as the OV construction would have been unmetrical. From a metrical point of view, it is noteworthy that the end of the verse with the simplex is mostly made up of either ἔπος ἦῶδα or ἅντιον ἦῶδα, and that it has the schema accusative of person addressed – particle(s) – NAME/NOUN EPITHET – adjective/ adverb-verb/ verb alone. The verb forms of the simplex and the compounds are always put in verse final position, when it is metrically possible.

EEIPON and the compounds μετέειπον and προσέειπον: this verb is an inherited reduplicated aorist, means “speak to, address”. It is related to Sanskrit *avocam* “I spoke”; in Greek it is only attested in the aorist. The finite verb forms are used in introductions and conclusions, but the participle is exclusively used to conclude speeches. It is used when the subject of the participle is the same as that of the verb of the main clause or if the subject of the participle serves a function in the main clause (direct or indirect object). The indicative always describes actions without any modal nuance. The simplex is used in introduction referring to the past (as any other verb) but also in introductions that refer to the future. In eight instances, a speech introduction of εἶπον was used in the subjunctive and in one instance in the optative. None of the instances was constructed with a modal particle. These occur in “speeches within a speech” and indicate that the speaker imagines that someone will say something about him/her. The subjunctive indicates the expectation, will or negative will and fear of the person involved, and is very close to a future indicative. The optative was used to express a wish and/or a possibility.

The simplex can be constructed with the dative or with the accusative of the person addressed, while the compounds with μετα- refer to speaking to a large group and are constructed with a dative-locative and those in προς- to a small group and are constructed with an accusative. The dominant word order is OV in the following structure: Object – Verb – NOUN EPITHET (this is the most common with the compounds) or Object – Subject – (words spoken) – Verb. In several instances, there is an apposition or a participle construction linked to the subject.

PHE:MI and its compounds. This verb means “speak”, is an athematic present built on the root **b^heh₂* “show, bring forward; speak” and is attested in other languages, such as Latin *fārī*, Sanskrit *bhanati* “he speaks” and Armenian *bay* “he speaks”. It is in origin the same verb as φαίνω “to show”. The simplex is used mostly in conclusions: more than half of all speech

conclusions in Homer (57%) are constructed with a form of φημί, but the compounds are only used in introductions. It is common in Homer and in later Greek.

The verb is attested in the imperfect. The use of the imperfect in the conclusions is at first sight problematic, because the speech conclusions depict the act of speaking as a completed action. As such, one would expect the aorist. The forms in the conclusion have been interpreted as aorists, but there are formal and semantic arguments against this analysis: formally, it would be unusual for a root aorist and a root present to co-occur in the same paradigm, and semantically, the imperfect was used to indicate that the speaking had an effect on the audience that lasted longer than the mere pronunciation of the words. This use of the imperfect is found in most speech introductions as well and occurred in Ionic and Attic prose and inscriptions in all dialects as well. The verb is attested in both active as middle diathesis. The distinction lies in the involvement of the subject and object: the active verb form emphasises the verbal action and is used to conclude speeches with an undetermined subject, while the middle form is used when the verb has an object or when the subject is known. The participle is only used to conclude speeches.

The compounds with μετα- refer to speaking to a large group and are constructed with a dative-locative and those in προσ- to a small group and are constructed with an accusative. The word order is OV, whenever it metrically possible. The speech introductions with the compounds of φημί follow a certain metrical schema, as was noted by Parry already: the usual introduction has the structure Pronoun – Verb – Noun Epithet. This was needed, because the imperfect forms could not be put at the end of the verse. The speech introductions with the simplex φημί are mostly used in the formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε.

Ê: this verb is only used in speech conclusions, and was already fossilised in Homer. The meaning is “he spoke”. It is related to Latin *aiio* and Armenian *asem*. In later Greek, it survives in only two fixed expressions ἦν δ' ἐγὼ “and I spoke” and ἦ δ' ὅς “and he spoke”. Contrary to the speech conclusions with φημί, the subject of the conclusion with ἦ was in most cases the same as that of the verb of the next sentence. The form ἦ is an aorist and not an imperfect. This agrees with the fact that it is used when its subject is the same as that of the next verb: the aorist indicates that the action is completed and that the subject is proceeding to something else.

MU:THEOMAI: this verb is used in only 5 instances. It appears 4 times in the aorist and once in the imperfect. It is always unaugmented: the aorist appears in a formula where the speaker speaks to himself and the imperfect is used in the other instance. The aorist is used while the speaker only shortly speaks to himself. There is no compound attested, but 4

instances are constructed with a prepositional object. Contrary to the contemporary English word *myth* this verb does not have the notion of fairy tale or fantasy in Homer.

EREO: The root **uerh₁* means “speak solemnly”, is attested in Latin *verbum*, Hittite *war* “he spoke” and Sanskrit *vrata* “wish, prescription”. Since Homer this root is used to form the future and perfect forms of “speaking” and forms a suppletive paradigm with ἔειπον. In later Greek it was used as future and perfect forms of the verbs ἀγορεύω and λέγω. It is used in a few instances in speech conclusions in the future indicative and in the pluperfect. The conclusions in the future always conclude a speech by an undefined character, and the conclusions in the pluperfect indicate that a speech was not yet finished when the speaker was interrupted.

ENNEPO:/ ENIPTO: this verb means “speak (emphatically)” and is related to Latin *insece* and *inquit*, and to Germanic *sagen*. It is relatively rare in introductions and is not attested in conclusions. It is attested in the (reduplicated) aorists ἐνένιπε and ἠνίπαπε, and in the imperfect ἔννεπε. The meaning “speak emphatically” evolved in some instances into “insult”. When the meaning “insult” was used, the verb appeared in the aorist, when the verb meant “speaking”, the imperfect was used.

AGOREUO: This verb initially meant “gather”, but was used very soon in the meaning “speak in the assembly” and was then also used without the notion of an assembly or a bigger group. The meaning “speak” was already very common in Homer and is the one that survives in later Greek. The verb ἀγορεύω is used more often in conclusions than in introductions but is remarkable in many ways: it is the only verb that used the same formulae to introduce and to conclude direct speech. It is one of the very few verbs that can have a person addressed in the speech conclusion as well. The verb is never augmented, because the augmented form cannot be used in the metre. The verb often refers to two persons who are speaking but nor the verbal form nor the pronoun are ever used in the dual. The verb can refer to speaking to a large group or to a small group. In the latter case, it is used in the formula ἤρχ' ἀγορεύειν with the dative or with the preposition ἐν with the dative. In the former case, the formula prepositional clause πρὸς ἀλλήλους is used, which refers in 24 of the 26 instances to a group of only two people. The verb is combined with the formula ἔπεα πτερόεντα, as was the case with προσηύδα. The differences between the use of ἔπεα πτερόεντα with προσηύδα and ἀγορεύω are the following: ἔπεα πτερόεντα is mostly used with ἀγορεύω in speech conclusions and much less in introductions: ἀγορεύω can be combined with ἔπεα πτερόεντα when the subject is put in the plural, whereas ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδων only occurs once

versus 114 instances of ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα; ἔπεα πτερόεντα can be used with ἀγορεύω to refer to a large group, which can never be done with προσανδάω.

AGORAOMAI: the verb originally meant “gather”, then “gather people for an assembly” and then also “speak”. It is a derivation of *agora* “market place” (= place where people gather). This verb is always used in the expression ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν “he spoke and addressed the assembly” and this formula is always put at the end of the verse. There are two different metrical schemas: τοῖσιν δ' (NOM) ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε or ὁ σφιν ἐὺ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν. It is constructed with the dative of the person, and the person is always a pronoun that is put at the beginning of the verse.

There are several agreements and differences between these two verbs. The word order with both verbs is always OV.

ἀγορεύω is only attested in the active diathesis, it is used in the imperfect, infinitive and participle and is always the only finite verb form in introductions or conclusions. It can address both small groups (one or two persons) and large audiences and can be constructed with the dative of the person addressed, without person addressed or with prepositional construction indicating the person addressed.

ἀγοράομαι is only used in the aorist indicative and is confined to introductions to large groups, it is never constructed with the words spoken, only attested in the middle and always combined with μετέειπε.

PHO:NEO: and its compounds προσφωνέω and μεταφωνέω. This verb is related to φημί, and originally meant “raise one’s voice”. This verb is interesting in several respects, most importantly because it was in origin a *verbum clamandi* but became a full-fledged speech introduction and conclusion verb. The transition started when the formula φώνησέν τε, which was initially used as extension to existing speech introductions, was reinterpreted as meaning “and he spoke”. This formula is interesting because it shows that a verb form was not augmented when a 2nd position clitic followed the verb form. Based on that change, the verb φωνέω was also used in conclusions, and later created compounds as well. The compounds agree with what was observed for the other speech introduction verbs: they were augmented, the word order was predominantly OV and the preverb μετα- was used when a large group was addressed and the preverb προσ- when only a few people were spoken to. The verb form φωνέω in εω is remarkable, because the verb is denominative verb built on φωνά. The Pindaric formula φώνᾱσε δ’ indicates that the oldest form might have been *φώνᾱμι, and that the transition into an -εω verb occurred during the transition from the Aeolic into the Ionic phase in epic diction: *φώνᾱσέν τε was Ionified into φώνησέν τε and that was reinterpreted as

an aorist of an εω verb. The reasons for this reinterpretation are the fact that there were no present forms in άω attested and that and denominative verbs in εω were much more common.

AMEIBOMAI and its compounds. The verb originally meant “exchange” and then evolved into “exchange words, speak, answer”. In later Greek, άμείβομαι is only used in the meaning “answer, speak”. It is used almost exclusively in speech introductions. The simplex is used as a finite verb, but the compound άπαμείβομαι “answer” appears much more often in the participle. Both verbs are used in finite verb forms and in the participle, and have the same meaning “answer”. The participle of both verbs is used in combination with other *verba dicendi*. In almost all cases, the finite verb of the introduction is a compound with προσ-. These compounds are used when only one or very few persons are addressed. The participles άμειβόμενος and άπαμειβόμενος indicate that the speaking was answer to something that was said before and are therefore used in dialogues, especially when one person answers or reacts to the words or action of another character. The compound can never be augmented because of the metre, but the simplex can. It shows that the verb was augmented when it occurred in a positive introduction with a person addressed: in 78 out of the 99 augmented instances, the verb was constructed with a person addressed. The verb also confirms the use of the imperfect in speech introductions: as the process of answering involves a continuous action between speaker and addressee, the finite verb forms are largely attested in the imperfect. The two exceptions involve short reactions of characters who are quickly rebuked and do not react to that rebuke anymore. The person addressed is expressed in the accusative and the word order is OV. The simplex is mostly used in the following schem: ACC – (Particles) – *verbum dicendi* – NOUN EPITHET, while the compound is mostly used in this schema: Pronoun – particle – participle – finite verb – NOUN EPITHET.

7.2. “Morpho-semanto-syntactic” observations on speech introductions and conclusions.

1. The word order used in the speech introductions and conclusions is very largely OV. The instances where this is not the case, can either be explained by metrical reasons: the verb could not be put at the end of the verse and therefore the object had to follow the verb; or the formula with VO order can be explained by formulaic inflection of a formula with OV order. The following example makes this clear:

αὐτὰρ ὃ γε προσέειπε φίλην τροφὸν Εὐρύκλειαν (*Odyssey* 22,480)

is a formulaic inflection of

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε φίλη τροφὸς Εὐρύκλεια (*Odyssey* 22,419),

with the noun-epithet in the nominative at the end of the verse.

2. The demonstrative pronouns are always put verse initially if they refer to the person(s) addressed (this prototype of speech introduction had been noted already by Parry). Most examples can be found in the introductions with ἀμείβομαι, αὐδάω, προσέφη/ν/ς, προσέειπον, προσφωνέω.

3. The poet preferred a prototypical construction, either PN- VERB - Noun Epithet when the speaker had a noun-epithet formula that could be put at the end of the verse. If no noun-epithet was available for the speaker or if no noun-epithet could be used in a specific verse, the poet preferred to put the verb at the end of the verse, if it was metrically possible. This observation is an important element in favour of the theory of oral poetry, but I would not go as far as to say that all speech introduction formulae are basically the same and mean “X answered”, “Y spoke”, “Z spoke (with a certain nuance)”. In this respect, I refer to the works of Fingerle 1939, Edwards 1970, Riggsby 1992, Machacek 1994, and Kelly 2007, which showed that the context was important in determining which verb to use.

4. The augment in the verbal inflection have been summarised in 20 morphological-metrical, syntactic and semantic observations. The metrical and morphological observations are that the augment is used or left out when the metre requires it. The augment is mostly absent in old forms such as root aorists, pluperfect and dual forms; is dispreferred in tetrasyllabic simplex verb forms; is required in short monosyllabic verb forms and is preferred in younger forms such as the sigmatic aorist and the θη aorist. The augment remains absent, when its appearance would require the elision of a dative or dual ending. A syntactically motivated absence is observed, when a verb form is followed by a 2nd position clitic, an enclitic word such as τε or ῥα, or a word that cannot be put at the first position of the sentence such as δέ, μέν or γάρ; when the verb form appeared in a series of past forms and that was preceded already by an augmented verb form, or when the verb form is put at the beginning of the sentence: as this is not the usual position, it received emphasis by its position and in those instances the augment is not needed to add additional foregrounding. The use and absence of the augment can also be semantically motivated. The augment is used when the past action is linked to and/or valid for the present situation. As the augment is used to indicate a contrast or stresses new information, it appears in the following contexts: in speech introductions, when there is a person addressed and there are no metrical-morphological or syntactic constraints; in speech conclusions, when the speaking of one person influences a large group; in speech conclusions, when the conclusion is expanded by a participle construction. As the augment emphasises a past action valid for the present, it is used in gnomic aorists, general truths and

proverbs. The augment remains absent, when the speaker addresses his own mind or speaks to himself, because there is no interaction between different characters. The augment is not used in speech conclusions when the subject of the conclusion and that of the verb of the next sentence are the same: as the subjects are the same, a contrast is less likely. Past verb forms in negative clauses also remain unaugmented, because they do not have a direct link with the current situation. Unaugmented forms are preferred in narrative descriptions, in mythical stories and in subordinate clauses that describe actions anterior to others (such as the ἐπεὶ “because, after” clauses. Lastly, the augment is missing in sentences that describe repeated actions in the past. As such, it is not used in sentences with αἰεὶ “always” and in sentences with the *SK* iteratives. The speech introductions with the *SK* forms are not augmented, because they describe the speaking of a larger and undefined group. As the group is anonymous and not linked to the audience, the augment is missing.

The use of unaugmented forms in remote and mythical stories is paralleled in Hesiod, Pindar and Vedic Sanskrit. The *Theogony* which relates the mythical creation of the divine hierarchy has less augmented forms than the *Works and Days*, which is a “handbook for agriculture” and is linked to every-day life. Stories in the RV that relate the immediate past or have a link to the speaker/narrator, are described in the augmented indicative and not in the injunctive. As such, there are semantic parallels between the use/absence of the augment in Greek and Vedic Sanskrit.

5. Diathesis usage: most speech introduction and conclusion verbs are only attested in one diathesis. Two etymologically related verbs have a “diathesis division”: one verb is used in the active, while the other is used in the middle. This is the case for ἀγοράομαι and ἀγορεύω, where a clear distinction in meaning is not easily discernible. There are also verbs that are attested in both diatheses, and in those cases there is a distinction. This is the case with the simplex φημί. In case of φημί, more than 500 instances of the middle simplex were attested against less than 30 active forms. The distinction is clear: the middle is used when the subject is known and/or when there is an object, while the active was never used with a direct object, and was used as conclusion of the *tis speeches* or in the conclusion ὥς ἄρ’ ἔφη/ ἔφην which put the emphasis on the verbal action. As such, this agrees with the investigation by Bechert 1964, according to which the active diathesis was used when the subject was not important and/or the verbal action was emphasised and that the middle was used when the subject and/or object were put into the foreground.

6. Tense usage: In the speech introductions and conclusions that refer to the past, three tenses are used: aorist, imperfect and pluperfect. All three refer to the past, and are not used in

relative chronology to each other: neither the aorist nor the pluperfect indicate anteriority to another action in the past. The differences between them are aspectual. The pluperfect is used to indicate that the action of speaking was a completed state of affairs in the past. The aorist is used to describe a completed single action or a punctual action, while the imperfect was used for durative and/or repeated actions. The use of the imperfect in introductions and conclusions might therefore be surprising, but the use of the imperfect with the verbs of speaking can be explained by the fact that the speaking had an effect that lasted longer than the simple pronunciation of the words. This use is continued in later prose and in inscriptions. The same applies to ἀμείβομαι: it is mostly used in dialogues and refers to a repeated action. The aorist is used in conclusions when the speaker finishes speaking and immediately proceeds to something else without the reaction of the audience being mentioned: in almost all speech conclusions with ἦ and ἔειπον, all in the aorist, the reaction of the audience is absent while it is described how the speaker proceeds to something else. The aorist is used in introductions when an unimportant character is speaking (the *tis* speeches, Antilokhos) or when an unusual speech is described (Here acting as Stentor, Aias criticising Agamemnon). Speech introductions with ἔειπον are put in the aorist, because the root **uek*^w is not attested in the present stem in Greek. The use of the tenses in speech introductions and conclusions is therefore not a metrical tool, but is motivated by the aspectual distinction. This is confirmed by the verb φωνέω: the speech introductions with the compounds have the meaning “speak, address” and are put in the imperfect, while the simplex originally had the meaning “raise one’s voice” which is a punctual action and was therefore put in the aorist.

7. Suppletion for future reference: in speech introductions and conclusions, there is a division of tenses and roots for future reference. Introductions with reference to the future are expressed by the subjunctive of ἔειπον without modal particle, while conclusions referring to the future use a form of ἐρέω without modal particle. The speaker used the subjunctive in speeches-within-a-speech to indicate that s/he expected that an unknown character would definitely say something about him or the situation. In one instance, an optative is used. The optative appeared in Hektor’s speech in which he hoped that someone would say that his son was more courageous than he used to be. As Hektor was certain that Troy would eventually be destroyed, he used the optative to indicate that this was only a possibility in the future.

8. Use of the moods: in almost all cases, the finite verb in speech introductions or conclusions appears in the indicative because the speaking is depicted as real. In 8 instances, the speech introduction appears in the subjunctive and in one instance in the optative. The subjunctive instances occur in a “speech within a speech” and indicate the expectation by the

speaker that an unknown person will make a statement. The speaker is fairly certain that the words will be spoken, but is not entirely certain. The instance in the optative appears in the same context, but in that case, the speaker only hopes that another person might say something and is not certain at all that this speaking will indeed occur. As was stated above, the conclusions to these speeches are put in the future indicative, and this distribution is complementary.

9. Another feature that was investigated, was the modal particle: from a sample study, it appeared that it was used in future instances that were linked to the current situation or referred to specific instances, while it was missing in negative sentences, mythical stories, general descriptions, repeated actions and when the preceding verb form had already been marked by the particle. The sample study needs to be expanded to the entire Homeric corpus.

10. Judging from other Indo-European languages such as Indo-Iranian, Italic, Germanic, and Tocharian, the distinction between present potential, past potential, present counterfactual and past counterfactual was not made in PIE and the optative was used to express all these nuances (Hettrich's term *fiktiv* is a suitable description for all these nuances). This use of the optative can still be found in Homeric Greek and Ionic prose (and in some isolated passages in Attic drama and prose). In Homer, the indicative had already largely replaced the optative in these contexts. The starting point for the transition from optative into indicative were the postposed negative conditional clauses in εἰ μή, which -occurring in 46 of the 69 counterfactuals or *fiktiv* contexts- mostly referred to a real life action that prevented the action of the main clause, and were put in the indicative. This indicative was then extended to the postposed positive εἰ conditionals (which occurred in 11 instances), then to the preposed conditionals and eventually to the main clause (as was argued by Hettrich 1998, based on a scenario by Ruijgh 1992). In several instances, the indicative was still metrically equivalent to the older optative.

11. Homeric Greek, and probably Greek in its totality (as argued by Smyth, Delaunoy and Bornemann-Risch), did not distinguish between past and present counterfactual, but only in aspect. There are 12 speech introductions in such sentences, and they show that the difference between aorist and imperfect was still aspectual. This explains why the following two counterfactuals have different tenses, although they both refer to the past:

καί νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδν φάος ἡελίοιο,
εἰ μὴ Τηλέμαχος προσεφώνεεν ὃν πατέρ' αἶψα (*Odyssey* 16,220-221).
καί νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδν φάος ἡελίοιο,
εἰ μὴ Ὀδυσσεὺς αὐτὸς ἐρύκακε φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 21,226-227).

The imperfect προσεφώνεεν is used, because the verbs of speaking are mostly put in the imperfect and refer to durative actions, while the aorist φώνησέν refers to the 1 punctual action of “raising one’s voice”.

12. The participle is used in introductions and conclusions, but is attested more often in conclusions than in introductions. In conclusions it is used when the subject of the conclusion is the same as that of the verb of the next sentence or when the subject of speaking has a function in the next sentence. Exceptions to this rule are ἦ which has no participle and φημί which has about 50 conclusions in which the subject of the conclusion is the same as that of the next verb, but which nevertheless used the participle only 7 times. The use of participles in introductions is relatively rare among the verbs of speaking, as it is only attested once with ἀγορεύω and 40 times with φωνέω (which was in origin a *verbum clamandi*). The participles of φωνέω and ἀμείβομαι are used much more in introductions, but in those instances they expand an existing introduction.

13. Certain verbs are only used in introductions, while others are used in conclusions. The compounds are very rarely used in conclusions: there are only 4 conclusions with a compound verb versus more than 750 introductions with a compound verb. The figures can be found in Appendix A. It is worth noting that compounds also appear only in conclusions, even if the simplex was predominantly used in conclusions.

The following simplex verbs are used in conclusions in finite verb forms:

1. φημί (about 500 conclusions versus about 60 introductions),
2. *μερῆ₁ (9 conclusions and 1 introduction),
3. ἦ (88 conclusions),
4. ἀγορεύω (33 conclusions versus 12 introductions).

The following verbs are used in introductions in finite verb forms:

1. αὐδάω (87 introductions),
2. ἔειπον (138 introductions versus 6 conclusions),
3. φωνέω (34 introductions versus 9 conclusions),
4. ἀγοράομαι (24 introductions),
5. ἀμείβομαι (99 introductions).

14. Agreement: in general the subject agrees with the verb, but there are some exceptions. In one instance, the noun πληθύς was combined with a plural verb form because it referred to a plural entity. When the subject refers to only two persons, the dual is sometimes used, but only in old inherited formulae, such as προσσυνάω, which dates from the Aeolic period of epic diction when the dual was still used in every-day speech. A remarkable feature is the fact

that in a series of several dual forms only one is marked for duality, while the others are put in the plural. This applied to finite verb forms as well as participles. This is another instance of *conjunction reduction* or *markedness reduction*.

15. Genitive absolute: in one case, a speech conclusion used a construction that could easily be (re)interpreted as a genitive absolute and that might have contributed to its genesis.

ὥς ἄρα φωνήσαντος Ἐρινύες ἔσχεθον αὐδὴν (*Iliad* 19,418).

The instance originally meant “the Erinyes removed the power of speech from him who had just spoken in this manner”, but it was later reinterpreted as “after he had thus spoken, the Erinyes removed the power of speech” and from constructions such as these, Greek created the genitive absolute construction.

16. Case usage: the verb αὐδάω is used with the person addressed in the accusative. This is an archaism, as the related Vedic *vadati* is already constructed with the accusative of the words spoken and the dative of the person addressed. The simplex ἔειπον can be used with the accusative or with the dative of the person addressed and can even be constructed with the dative of the person and the accusative of the words spoken. The verb φημί is not attested with a person addressed, but with the accusative of the words spoken. All the compounds agree in the following (even those with an intransitive simplex): if one or a few persons are addressed, the verb is compounded with προσ- “towards” and the case used is the accusative; if a group of persons is addressed, the verb is compounded with μετα- “among, in the middle of” and the case used is the dative (old locative). Verbs of speaking can also be combined with prepositional constructions introduced by ἐν “in the presence of, in the group of”. These constructions also indicate a locative sense and imply the presence of a large group. The compound προσαυδάω is remarkable, because it can be constructed with two accusatives, one of the words spoken and one of the person addressed. Such a double accusative is rare. It has a parallel in constructions such as καί μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε and καί με πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν, in which the adposition πρὸς was still used in its original meaning “towards” and was neither preposition nor adverb. It is remarkable that the compound προσέειπον is only attested with one accusative, namely that of the person addressed.

The verb ἀμείβομαι and the compound ἀπαμείβομαι are only used with the accusative of the person, and can be constructed with the dative/instrumental of the word(s) spoken.

17. The combination of a form of the root **steh₂* and a verb of speaking is a recurring poetic description in speech introductions: the speaker is standing among a group and addresses that group or certain person in that group (Bertrand 2006a).

18. The last issue was the use of *tnesis*. It is only attested in speech introductions and not in conclusions. I used the term *tnesis* only when there was a separation of preverb and verb, when the compound verb was attested and when the preverb could not be interpreted as a preposition. From a historical point of view this is not entirely correct, because the instances in which preverb and verb had not yet merged, are the original ones and compounds are only a later creation, but the division was made out of practical reasons. The phenomenon is an inherited archaism, but is at the same time a poetic tool (as was argued for by Morpurgo Davies 1985 and Hajnal 2004). This is clearly seen in the instances of ἔειπον and its compounds. There are instances in which the formula πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν is an archaic construction, such as the examples below in which it is combined with the root **steh₂* and a clitic:

στῇ δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καί με πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 2,59).

On the other hand, there is also a complementary distribution between the compound προσέειπε and the formula πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε, and between the compound μετέειπε and the formula μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπε. The latter was used when the subject did not have a noun-epithet formula at its disposal or when the noun-epithet formula could not be placed at the end of the verse, while the former was the rule when a hero with a noun-epithet that could be put at the end of the verse, was speaking. This explains the difference in construction in the following instances:

τοῖσι δὲ Δαρδανίδης Πρίαμος μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 3,303)

and

τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε γέρων ἥρως Ἀλιθέρσης (*Odyssey* 2,157),

and between

τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε Γερήνιος ἱππότα Νέστωρ (*Iliad* 10,168),

and

δεινὰ δ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν Ἥρην πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 15,13).

This thesis investigated syntax of speech introductions and conclusions among the verbs of “speaking, addressing” and “answering”. As next step I plan to compare the findings of the “normal” verbs of speaking with the introductions and conclusions of the other verbs, such as “shout”, “call”, “order”, “swear” and “insult”, and to the instances of the *verba dicendi* that did not appear in speech introductions and conclusions. The results of that investigation would have to be confronted with speech introductions and conclusions in epic and lyric poetry outside Homer.

I hope to have laid the foundations for further research in Homeric syntax. Further research should expand the investigation of the augment use and compare it with Indo-Iranian and Armenian, and to investigate the modal particle in the entire *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

APPENDICES: Figures and forms.

Appendix A: general data on speech introductions and conclusions.

Appendix A.1. Number of introductions and conclusions per category.

Verb.	Introductions.	Conclusions.
<i>Verba dicendi</i>	1051 instances.	769 instances.
φωνέω and compounds.	137 instances.	69 instances.
ἀμείβομαι and compounds.	265 instances.	None.
Totals.	1453 instances.	838 instances.

Appendix A.2. Introductions and conclusions combined in the same verse.

Conclusion.	Introduction.	Passage.
ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην,	Πρίαμος δ' Ἑλένην ἐκαλέσσατο φωνῇ	<i>Iliad</i> 3,161
ὥς φάτο,	τὸν δ' ἐνένιπε Μενoitίου ἄλκιμος υἱός	<i>Iliad</i> 16,626
ὥς ἔφατ',	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπον	attested 14 times. ¹²⁶⁷
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἦ δ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο διὰ θεῶων	attested 5 times. ¹²⁶⁸
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὃ δέ μ' αὐτίκ' ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπε	attested 7 times. ¹²⁶⁹
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὃ δέ μ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο νηλεῖ θυμῷ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,272; 9,368
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὃ δέ μ' οἰμώξας ἡμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,506; 11,59
ὥς ἔφην,	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μετεφώνεον ἀχνύμενος κῆρ	<i>Odyssey</i> 10,67
ὥς ἔφην,	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ προσέφην μαλακοῖς ἐπέεσσι	<i>Odyssey</i> 10,422
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ἦ δ' αὐτίκ' ἀμείβετο πότνια μήτηρ	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,180; 11,215
ὥς ἔφατ',	αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ μιν ἀνυζόμενος προσέειπον	<i>Odyssey</i> 12,111
ἦ	καὶ ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσεφώνεεν Ἑκτορα δῖον	<i>Iliad</i> 20,428
ἦ ῥα	καὶ Ἑρμείαν, υἱὸν φίλον, ἀντίον ἦῦδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 5,28
ἦ ῥα	καὶ Ἀντίνοον ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,396
ἦ ῥ',	ἅμα τε προσέειπεν Ὀδυσσεῖα πτολίπορθον	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,356
ἦ ῥα	καὶ Εὐρυνόμην ταμίην πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,96
ὥς εἰπὼν	ἵπποισιν ἐκέκλετο φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 8,184; 23,442
ὥς εἰπὼν	Τρώεσσιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν αὖσας	<i>Iliad</i> 17,183
ὥς εἰπὼν	Αἴαντε καλέσσατο καὶ Μενέλαον	<i>Iliad</i> 17,507
ὥς εἰπὼν	ἐτάροισιν ἐκέκλετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς	<i>Iliad</i> 18,343

Appendix A.3. Speech conclusion followed by a reaction and by another speech introduction.

This is a variation from the schema above: the conclusion is followed by a reaction of (someone from) the audience and by a new speech introduction. This is a common pattern.¹²⁷⁰

Conclusion.	Reaction.	Introduction.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο,	τὸν δ' ὁ γέρων ἠγάσσατο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 3,181
ὥς φάτο,	χῆρατο δ' Ὑπνος,	ἀμειβόμενος δὲ προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 14,270

¹²⁶⁷ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,375; 4,394; 4,464; 9,522; 10,270; 10,336; 10,382; 11,79; 11,138; 11,163; 11,435; 11,462; 11,477 and 11,504.

¹²⁶⁸ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,382; 4,398; 10,487; 10,503; 11,180; 11,215 and 12,115.

¹²⁶⁹ The instances are *Odyssey* 4,471; 4,491; 4,554; 11,145; 11,404; 11,440; 11,487.

¹²⁷⁰ Lord 1991:122-125; Brügger – Stoevesandt – Visser 2003:100

ὥς φάτο,	τὸν δ' οὐ πείθεν:	ἀμειβόμενος δὲ προσηύδα	<i>Iliad</i> 17,33
ὥς φάτο,	κώκυσεν δὲ γυνή	καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 24,200
ὥς φάτο,	γῆθησεν δ' ὁ γέρων,	καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Iliad</i> 24,424
ὥς φάτο,	Λαέρτης δ' ἐχάρη	καὶ μῦθον ἔειπε	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,513
ἦ	καὶ ἐπὶ στίχας ἄλτο,	κέλευε δὲ φωτὶ ἐκάστω	<i>Iliad</i> 20,353
ἦ	καὶ ἐπ' ἀγκῶνος κεφαλὴν σχέθεν	εἶπέ τε μῦθον	<i>Odyssey</i> 14,494

Appendix A.4. The so-called “double introductions”.

Rest of the verse.	<i>Verbum dicendi</i> 1.	<i>Verbum dicendi</i> 2.	Passage.
ὥς εἰπὼν ἵπποισιν	ἐκέκλετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 8,148; 23,442
	κέκλετο δ' Ἥφαιστον κλυτοτέχνην	εἶπέ τε μῦθον	<i>Iliad</i> 18,391
ἐς δ' ἄλοχον Ἑκάβην	ἐκαλέσσατο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 24,193
Ἑρμείαν, ποτὶ δὲ Πρίαμον	φάτο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 24,353
ἦ δέ μευ ἄγχι στᾶσα ἔπος	φάτο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,370
χειρὶ τέ μιν κατέρεξεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	6 instances ¹²⁷¹
ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῶ χειρὶ	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	11 instances ¹²⁷²
θάμβησέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Iliad</i> 3,398
δεξιτερῆς ἔλε χειρὸς	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Iliad</i> 7,108
τόν ῥα οἱ ἔμβαλε χερσὶν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Iliad</i> 14,218
στίῃ δ' αὐτῆς προπάροιθεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Iliad</i> 14,297
τόν ῥ' Ἑκτώρ ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Iliad</i> 15,552
καίετο δ' ἴς ποταμοῖο	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Iliad</i> 23,356
στίῃ δ' ἵππων προπάροιθεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Iliad</i> 24,286
Τηλεμάχου δ' ἔλε χεῖρα,	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 3,374
Τηλεμάχῳ δὲ παρίζεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,311
ᾧ τρυνεν δ' Ὀδυσῆα	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 6,254
εὐχόμενος δ' ἄρα εἶπεν,	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 7,330
ἀνδρὶ δέμας ἐῖκυῖα,	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,194
ράβδῳ πεπληγυῖα	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 10,319
ὅττι μιν ὥς ὑπέδεκτο,	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 14,52
πέπλον ἔχουσ' ἐν χερσίν,	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,124
Ἀντίνοος δ' ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	4 instances ¹²⁷³
Ἀντίνοον δ' ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,417
ἀμφίπολον δ' ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,90
Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐνένιπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 23,96
τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν νείκεσσαν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,215
ἀχρεῖον δ' ἐγέλασσαν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 18,263
παυομένῳ δόρποιο,	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,402
ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπεν	ἔπος τ' ἔφατ'	ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε	<i>Odyssey</i> 21,248

¹²⁷¹ The instances are *Iliad* 1,361; 5,372; 6,485; 24,127 and *Odyssey* 4,610; 5,181.

¹²⁷² The instances are *Iliad* 6,253; 6,406; 14,232; 18,384; 18,423; 19,7 and *Odyssey* 2,302; 8,291; 10,280; 11,247; 15,530.

¹²⁷³ The instances are *Odyssey* 18,78; 21,84; 21,167; 21,287.

τὸν δ' αὖτ' Αἰνείας	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Iliad</i> 20,199
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀλκίνοος	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	5 instances ¹²⁷⁴
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Εὐρύαλος	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 8,140; 8,400
τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀντίνοος	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 17,445
τὴν δ' αὖτ' Αὐτόλυκος	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 19,405
τὸν δ' αὖ Λαέρτης	ἀπαμείβετο	φώνησέν τε	<i>Odyssey</i> 24,327
αὐτίκα δὲ μνηστῆρσι	μετηύδα	καὶ φάτο μῦθον	<i>Odyssey</i> 21,67
τὸν δ' αὖτε	προσέειπε γυνή	καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,434
τοῖς δ' αὖτις	μετέειπε γυνή	καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ	<i>Odyssey</i> 15,439
ὃ σφιν εὖ φρονέων	ἀγορήσατο	καὶ μετέειπεν	15 instances ¹²⁷⁵
τοῖσιν δ' Ἀλκίνοος	ἀγορήσατο	καὶ μετέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 7,185; 8,28; 13,171
τοῖσιν δ' Ἀμφίνομος	ἀγορήσατο	καὶ μετέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 16,394 18,412; 20,244
τοῦ ὃ γε δάκρυ χέων	ἀγορήσατο	καὶ μετέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 2,24; 24,425
τοῖσιν δ' Ἀντίνοος	ἀγορήσατο	καὶ μετέειπεν	<i>Odyssey</i> 4,773

Appendix A.5. Combination of a conclusion and a “negative introduction”.

Conclusion.	Addressee.	Negation.	Introduction.	Noun epithet.	Passage.
ὥς φάτο:	τὴν δ'	οὐ τι	προσέφη	νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς	<i>Iliad</i> 1,511
ὥς φάτο,	τὸν δ'	οὐ τι	προσέφη	κρατερὸς Διομήδης	<i>Iliad</i> 4,401
ὥς φάτο,	τὸν δ'	οὐ τι	προσέφη	κορυθαίολος Ἴκτωρ	<i>Iliad</i> 5,689; 6,342
ὥς φάτο,	τὸν δ'	οὐ τι	προσέφη	λευκώλενος Ἥρη	<i>Iliad</i> 8,484
ὥς φάτο,	τὴν δ'	οὐ τι	προσέφη	ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων	<i>Iliad</i> 21,478
ὥς φάτο,	τὸν δ'	οὐ τι	προσέφη	πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς	<i>Odyssey</i> 20,183

Conclusion.	Subject-Object.	Negation.	Introduction.	Rest of verse.	Passage.
ὥς ἐφάμην,	ὃ δέ μ'	οὐδέν	ἀμείβετο	νηλεῖ θυμῷ	<i>Odyssey</i> 9,287
ὥς ἐφάμην	ὃ δέ μ'	οὐδέν	ἀμείβετο	βῆ δέ μετ' ἄλλας	<i>Odyssey</i> 11,563

Appendix A.6. Combinations of the root **steh*₂ and ἀγορεύω.

1. στὰς ἐν Ἀχαιοῖσιν ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν (*Iliad* 22,377),
2. στὰς δ' ἄρ' ἐν Ἀργείοις ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε (*Iliad* 23,535),
3. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε (*Odyssey* 17,349).

Appendix A.7. Combination of the root **steh*₂ and αὐδάω and its compounds.

1. στῆ δὲ πρόσθ' αὐτοῖο ἔπος τέ μιν ἀντίον ηὔδα (*Iliad* 5,170),
2. βῆ δὲ θέειν, εἶθαρ δὲ παριστάμενος ἔπος ηὔδα (*Iliad* 17,119),
3. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 4,92),
4. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 4,203),
5. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 5,123),
6. στῆ ῥα μάλ' Ἴκτορος ἐγγύς, ἀπειλήσας δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 7,225),
7. στῆ δὲ παρ' Αἰάντεσσι κιών, εἶθαρ δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 12,353),

¹²⁷⁴ The instances are *Odyssey* 7,298; 7,308; 11,347; 11,362; 13,3.

¹²⁷⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 1,73; 1,253; 2,78; 2,283; 7,326; 7,367; 9,95; 15,285; 18,253 and *Odyssey* 2,160; 2,228; 7,158; 16,399; 24,53; 24,453.

8. ἄγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 13,462),
9. ἄγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 14,356),
10. ἄγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 16,537),
11. στή δ' ὀπιθεν δίφροιο καὶ Αὐτομέδοντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 17,468),
12. στή δὲ παρ' Αἰάντεσσι θεῶν, εἴθαρ δὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 17,707),
13. ἄγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 18,169),
14. ἄγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 22,215),
15. ἄγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Iliad* 22,228),
16. στή δὲ παρὰ Πρίαμον Διὸς ἄγγελος, ἡδὲ προσηύδα (*Iliad* 24,169),
17. ἄγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Odyssey* 4,25),
18. καὶ τότε ἔγὼ Κύκλωπα προσηύδων ἄγχι παραστάς (*Odyssey* 9,345),
19. ἄγχι παρισταμένη ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Odyssey* 10,377),
20. ἡ δὲ μευ ἄγχι στᾶσα προσηύδα δῖα θεάων (*Odyssey* 10,400),
21. ἡ δὲ μευ ἄγχι στᾶσα προσηύδα δῖα θεάων (*Odyssey* 10,455),
22. ἥρως, βῆ δὲ θύραζε, παριστάμενος δὲ προσηύδα (*Odyssey* 15,62),
23. στή δ' ἵππων προπάροιθε, δεδισκόμενος δὲ προσηύδα (*Odyssey* 15,150),
24. ἄγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Odyssey* 17,552),
25. ἄγχοῦ δ' ἰστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα (*Odyssey* 22,100),
26. ἀνστάς Ἀργείοισι φιλοπτολέμοισι μετηύδα (*Iliad* 19,269),
27. ἡ δ' ἐν μέσσω στᾶσα μετηύδα δῖα θεάων (*Odyssey* 12,20).

Appendix A.8. Combination of the root **steh*₂ and ἔειπον and its compounds.

1. στή δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ με πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 2,59),
2. εἰ μὴ ἄρ' Αἰνεία τε καὶ Ἴκτορι εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 6,75),
3. ἔστη ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἰών, μετὰ δὲ δμῳῇσιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 6,375),
4. στή δὲ παρ' Ἴκτορι ἰών καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 7,46),
5. στή δὲ παρ' αὐτὸν ἰών καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Iliad* 8,280),
6. στή δὲ μάλ' ἐγγὺς ἰών καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 11,429),
7. δὴ τότε Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἴκτορα εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 12,60),
8. δὴ τότε Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἴκτορα εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 12,210),
9. εἰ μὴ Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἴκτορα εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 13,725),
10. καὶ τότε ἄρ' Ἴκτορα εἶπε παραστάς Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 20,375),
11. ὣς ἄρα τις εἶπεν καὶ οὐτήσασκε παραστάς (*Iliad* 22,375),
12. στή δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,68),
13. εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεὺς αἶψ' Ἀγαμέμνονι εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 23,155),
14. στή δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,271),
15. στή δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,456),
16. Ἀργείων ἀν' ἀγῶνα φέρων, καὶ ἔειπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 23,617),
17. στή δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,657),
18. στή δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,706),
19. στή δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,752),
20. στή δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,801),
21. στή δ' ὀρθὸς καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 23,830),
22. στή δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 24,682),
23. στή δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς, καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Odyssey* 4,803),
24. στή δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς, καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Odyssey* 6,21),
25. στή δὲ παρ' Ἀντίνοον, καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 17,414),
26. στή δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 20,32),
27. στή δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἰών, πρὸς δ' Εὐρύκλειαν ἔειπε (*Odyssey* 20,128),
28. στή δ' ἄρ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς καὶ μιν πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν: (*Odyssey* 23,4),

29. ἔσθη, καὶ προσέειπεν ἀρηΐφιλον Μενέλαον (*Iliad* 17,11),
30. ἡ δὲ μάλ' ἄγχι στᾶσα φίλον πατέρα προσέειπε (*Odyssey* 6,56),
31. στή ῥ' ἐς μέσσον ἰὼν καὶ Ὀδυσσῆα προσέειπε (*Odyssey* 8,144),
32. στή δὲ πάροιθ' αὐτῆς· τὸν δὲ προσέειπεν Ἀθήνη (*Odyssey* 16,166),
33. ὁπρὲ δὲ δὴ Μενέλαος ἀνίστατο καὶ μετέειπε (*Iliad* 7,94),
34. Νέστωρ δ' Ἀργείοισιν ἀνίστατο καὶ μετέειπεν (*Iliad* 7,123);
35. τοῖσιν δ' Εὐπείθης ἀνά θ' ἵστατο καὶ μετέειπε (*Odyssey* 24,422).

Appendix A.9. Combination of the root **steh₂* and φημί and its compounds.

1. στή δ' αὐτῆς προπάροιθεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἕκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (*Iliad* 14,297),
2. εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεὺς αὐτὸς ἀνίστατο καὶ φάτο μῦθον (*Iliad* 23,491),
3. στή δ' ἵππων προπάροιθεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἕκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (*Iliad* 24,286),
4. καὶ ῥα ἐκάστω φωτὶ παρισταμένη φάτο μῦθον (*Odyssey* 2,384),
5. ἡ δέ μευ ἄγχι στᾶσα ἔπος φάτο φώνησέν τε (*Odyssey* 4,370)
6. καὶ ῥα ἐκάστω φωτὶ παρισταμένη φάτο μῦθον (*Odyssey* 8,10),
7. ἡ ῥα μύλην στήσασα ἔπος φάτο, σῆμα ἄνακτι (*Odyssey* 20,111),
8. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσέφη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη (*Iliad* 2,172),
9. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσέφη πόδας ὠκέα Ἴρις (*Iliad* 2,790),
10. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσέφη πόδας ὠκέα Ἴρις (*Iliad* 3,129),
11. ἔσθη, καὶ Σθένελον προσέφη Καπανήϊον υἱόν (*Iliad* 5,108),
12. ἐγγύθεν ἵσταμένη προσέφη Διομήδεα δῖον (*Iliad* 10,508),
13. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσέφη πόδας ὠκέα Ἴρις (*Iliad* 11,199),
14. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἱστάμενος προσέφη αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσι (*Iliad* 13,768)
15. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσέφη κλυτὸν ἐννοσίγαιον (*Iliad* 15,173),
16. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἱστάμενος προσέφη ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 15,243),
17. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἱστάμενος προσέφη ξανθὸς Μενέλαος (*Iliad* 17,684),
18. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσέφη πόδας ὠκέα Ἴρις (*Iliad* 24,87)
19. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσέφη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη (*Odyssey* 15,9),
20. τὸν δὲ παρισταμένη προσέφη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη (*Odyssey* 25,516),
21. τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 1,58),
22. τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (*Iliad* 19,55)

Appendix A.10. Combination of the root **steh₂* and φωνέω and its compounds.

φωνέω and its compounds: 5 instances.

1. στήτην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο (*Iliad* 1,332),
2. ἀγχοῦ δ' ἵσταμένη προσεφώνεε δῖα θεάων (*Odyssey* 5,159),
3. τὸν δὲ παριστάμενος προσεφώνεε φαίδιμος υἱός (*Odyssey* 24,243),
4. στὰς ἐν μέσσοισιν μετεφώνεεν ἡπύτα κῆρυξ (*Iliad* 7,384),
5. τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετεφώνεεν ἱππότα Νέστωρ (*Iliad* 9,52)

Appendix A.11. Combination of the root **steh₂* and ἀμείβομαι.

1. Πηλεΐδην Ἀχιλλῆα δίκη ἡμείψατ' ἀναστάς (*Iliad* 23,542).

Appendix B: Data on the augment.

Appendix B.1. List of tetrasyllabic forms.

Verb form.	Unaugmented tetrasyllabic forms.	Augmented tetrasyllabic forms.
1 st p. act. sg.	6 instances. ¹²⁷⁶	1 instance. ¹²⁷⁷
1 st p. mid. sg.	4 instances. ¹²⁷⁸	3 instances. ¹²⁷⁹
2 nd p. act. sg.	None.	None.
2 nd p. mid. sg.	4 instances. ¹²⁸⁰	1 instance. ¹²⁸¹
3 rd p. act. sg.	78 instances. ¹²⁸²	5 instances. ¹²⁸³
3 rd p. mid. sg.	131 instances. ¹²⁸⁴	19 instances. ¹²⁸⁵
1 st p. act. pl.	13 instances. ¹²⁸⁶	None.
1 st p. mid. pl.	11 instances. ¹²⁸⁷	2 instances. ¹²⁸⁸
2 nd p. act. pl.	1 instance. ¹²⁸⁹	2 instances. ¹²⁹⁰
2 nd p. mid. pl.	2 instances. ¹²⁹¹	None.
3 rd p. act. pl.	18 instances. ¹²⁹²	2 instances. ¹²⁹³
3 rd p. mid. pl.	126 instances. ¹²⁹⁴	20 instances. ¹²⁹⁵

¹²⁷⁶ The forms are μερμήριζον, πειρήτιζον, πολέμιζον and μερμήριζα (occurring three times).

¹²⁷⁷ The form is ἐσκοπίαζον.

¹²⁷⁸ The forms are λανθανόμην, μυθεόμην, νοσφισάμην and πυνθανόμην.

¹²⁷⁹ The form is ἐμυθεόμην, which is used three times.

¹²⁸⁰ The forms are θηήσας, κεχόλωσο, πελέσκειο and χαρίζεο.

¹²⁸¹ The instance is ἐβίωσας.

¹²⁸² The forms are the aorists κανάχησε, κονάβησε (3 instances), νεμέσησε (2 instances), μερμήριξε (12 instances), μερμήριζεν (5 instances), πελέμιζεν (2 instances), στυφέλιξε (3 instances), γεφύρωσεν (2 instances), κτεάτισσεν, μενοίνησεν, πελέκκησεν, περόνησεν, τελευτήσεν (3 instances), τολύπευσεν and the imperfects κανάχιζε, κελάρυζε, κεράριζε, κιθάριζε, κονάβιζε (3 instances), μερμήριζε (3 instances), πειρήτιζε (2 instances), πολέμιζε (2 instances), κανάχιζε, μενέαινε (3 instances), χαλέπαινε, βασίλεινε (4 instances), λιτάνευε, βασίλεινε (2 instances), κελάρυζεν, κονάβιζεν, λιτάνευεν, μενέαινε (2 instances), μερμήριζεν (2 instances), πειρήτιζεν (2 instances) and πελέμιζεν.

¹²⁸³ The forms are the imperfects ἐλλιτάνευε and ἐλλιτάνευεν, and the aorists ἐστουφέλιζεν, and ἐστουφέλιξε (2 instances).

¹²⁸⁴ The forms are βιάζετο (2 instances), δειδίσσετο, διαίνετο, διώκετο (2 instances), θωρήσσετο (2 instances), κεκάλυπτο, κεκόνιτο, κεχάριστο, κεχόλωτο, κορύσσετο (3 instances), κυλίνδετο (2 instances), λιάζετο, λιλαίετο, μαντεύετο, μελαίνετο, νεμεσίζετο, παλάσσετο (4 instances), πεπάλακτο (6 instances), πεπλήγετο (4 instances), πεπόλιστο, πεπόνητο, στεναχίζετο (4 instances), τετάνυστο (3 instances), τετάρπετο (2 instances), τετέλεστο (4 instances), τινάσσετο, τιταίνετο, φορύνετο and χαρίζετο and the aorists: βιήσατο (2 instances), βουλεύσατο (2 instances), δαμάσσατο, δηλήσατο, δοάσσατο (10 instances), δυνήσατο (5 instances), θηήσατο (3 instances), καλέσσατο (3 instances), κεράσσατο (2 instances), κιχήσατο (7 instances), κοιμήσατο (2 instances), κομίσσατο (2 instances), κορέσσατο, κοτέσσατο, ληϊσσατο (2 instances), λοέσσατο, μαντεύσατο, μαχέσσατο, μυθήσατο (7 instances), νοήσατο, πειρήσατο, περονάτο, περονήσατο, ποιήσατο (7 instances), πονήσατο, σεβάσσατο (2 instances), τεκμήρατο, τεκτήνατο, τεχνήσατο and χολώσατο (5 instances).

¹²⁸⁵ The forms are ἐδαΐζετο (2 instances), ἐκυλίνδετο, ἐμαραίνετο, ἐμιαίνετο, ἐτελείετο (2 instances) and ἐτιταίνετο, and the aorists ἐβιήσατο (2 instances), ἐδαμάσσατο, ἐδυνήσατο (2 instances), ἐκαλέσσατο (2 instances), ἐκομίσσατο, ἐκορέσσατο (2 instances) and ἐχολώσατο (1 instance).

¹²⁸⁶ The forms are δινέομεν, δορπέομεν, θαυμάζομεν (2 instances), πολεμίζομεν (3 instances) and the aorists διδάξαμεν, θητεύσαμεν, μενεήναμεν (2 instances), περήσαμεν and πολίσσαμεν.

¹²⁸⁷ The forms are κορεσσάμεθα, παυσάμεθα, γενόμεσθα, δυνάμεσθα (2 instances), καμόμεσθα, τεκόμεσθα (3 instances) and τιθέμεσθα (2 instances).

¹²⁸⁸ The forms are ἐδινέομεσθα and ἐθηεύμεσθα.

¹²⁸⁹ The form is κοιμήσατε.

¹²⁹⁰ The forms are ἐκακώσατε and ἐχολώσατε.

¹²⁹¹ The forms are λωβήσασθε and φιλέεσθε.

¹²⁹² The forms are the aorists κελάδησαν (occurring three times), κόμισαν (3 instances), κονάβησαν (occurring twice), νεμέσησαν (occurring twice), τελευτήσαν (occurring three times), and the imperfects θεράπειον, κροτάλιζον, πολέμιζον (2 instances) and χρεμέτιζον.

¹²⁹³ The forms are ἐκερτόμεον and ἐστουφέλιζαν.

1 st p. aorists in θη	5 instances ¹²⁹⁶	None.
2 nd p. aorists in θη	2 instances ¹²⁹⁷	None.
3 rd p. aorists in θη	8 instances ¹²⁹⁸	None.
Totals	409 instances (88%).	55 instances (12%).

In the next table the figures for the *sk* iteratives are mentioned, but they were mostly unaugmented, even if the form had not had four syllables.

1 st p. act. sg. iteratives in –sk-	None.	None.
1 st p. mid. sg. iteratives in –sk-	None.	None.
2 nd p. act. sg. iteratives in –sk-	None.	None.
2 nd p. mid. sg. iteratives in –sk-	None.	None.
3 rd p. act. sg. iteratives in –sk-	29 instances. ¹²⁹⁹	None.
3 rd p. mid. sg. iteratives in –sk-	29 instances. ¹³⁰⁰	None.
1 st p. act. pl. iteratives in –sk-	1 instance. ¹³⁰¹	None.
1 st p. mid. pl. iteratives in –sk-	None.	None.
2 nd p. act. pl. iteratives in –sk-	None.	None.
2 nd p. mid. pl. iteratives in –sk-	None.	None.
3 rd p. act. pl. iteratives in –sk-	9 instances. ¹³⁰²	None.
3 rd p. mid. pl. iteratives in –sk-	3 instances. ¹³⁰³	1 instance. ¹³⁰⁴
Totals	71 instances (98,6%).	1 instance (1,4%).

The dual forms with four or more syllables are rare.

3 rd p. mid. du.	4 instances. ¹³⁰⁵	None.
3 rd p. du. aorists in θη	3 instances. ¹³⁰⁶	None.

¹²⁹⁴ The forms are βιόωντο, βουκολέοντο, δαμάσαντο (2 instances), δάσσαντο (2 instances), δατέοντο (2 instances), δεικανόωντο, δεικανόωντ' (2 instances), δηϊόωντο, δηλήσαντο (2 instances), δηριόωντο, δηρίσαντο, θηήσαντο (3 instances), θωρήσσαντο (10 instances), καλέσαντο, κεκάδοντο (2 instances), κεκράαντο, κερόωντο (2 instances), κεχάροντο (3 instances), κλονέοντο (6 instances), κοιμήσαντο (8 instances), κομίσαντο, κοτέοντο, λελάθοντο, μηρύσαντο, μητιόωντο, μηχανόωντο, μιμνήσκοντο, μιμνήσκοντο, νεμέθοντο, πειρήσαντο (2 instances), πεπλήγοντο (2 instances), πιστώσαντο, ποιήσαντο, ποιμαίνοντο, πονέοντο (7 instances), σκιόωντο (7 instances), στενάχοντο (10 instances), σφαραγεύντο (2 instances), τανύοντο (4 instances), τεκμήραντο, τετύκοντο (8 instances), τιμήσαντο (2 instances), τορνώσαντο, τρομέοντο, φοβέοντο (4 instances), χερνίψαντο, βεβλήατο (2 instances), βεβολήατο, δεδμήατο, κεκλήατο and κεχολώατο (2 instances).

¹²⁹⁵ The forms are ἐθηήσαντο, ἐθωρήσσαντο, ἐκαρτύναντο (3 instances), ἐμητίσαντο, ἐπειρήσαντο, ἐσημήναντο, ἐστιγρόωντο (9 instances), ἐστρατόωντο, ἐτειχίσσαντο and ἐτετεύχατο.

¹²⁹⁶ The form is κοιμήθημεν, which occurs 5 times

¹²⁹⁷ The form is νεμεσσήθητε (occurring in 2 instances).

¹²⁹⁸ The forms are νεμεσσήθη (3rd person singular) and κυκήθησαν (occurring twice), μάνθησαν (occurring twice), νεμέσσηθεν, μάνθησαν, πετάσθησαν and στρεφεδίνθηθεν.

¹²⁹⁹ The forms are γοάσκειν, κομέεσκεν, ποιμαίνεσκεν, ρυστάζεσκεν, φιλέεσκεν (3 instances), θαρσύνεσκε, καλέεσκε, ναιετάσκε (3 instances), νεικείεσκε (2 instances), περάασκε (2 instances), ποθέεσκε, φθινύθεσκε, φιλέεσκε (5 instances) and φορέεσκε (5 instances).

¹³⁰⁰ The forms are γενέσκειτο, δασάσκετο, δειδίσκειτο (2 instances), δερκέσκειτο (2 instances), δησάσκετο, ζωννύσκετο, καλέσκειτο, κηδέσκειτο, κυκλήσκειτο, λισσέσκειτο, μαχέσκειτο, μισγέσκειτο, μνησάσκετο, παυέσκειτο, πολέσκειτο (3 instances), τίεσκειτο, τιτύσκειτο (7 instances), τρωπάσκειτο and φαινέσκειτο (1 instance).

¹³⁰¹ The form is νικάσκομεν.

¹³⁰² The forms are καλέεσκον, μινύθεσκον, θαυμάζεσκον, ναιετάασκον (2 instances), νεικείεσκον, πεδάασκον and φορέεσκον (2 instances).

¹³⁰³ The forms are μυθέσκοντο, σινέσκοντο and σιτέσκοντο.

¹³⁰⁴ The form is ἐμισγέσκοντο.

¹³⁰⁵ The forms are γουναζέσθην, θωρήσσεσθον, κορυστέσθην and τιναζάσθην.

¹³⁰⁶ The forms are δηρινθήτην, δινηθήτην and κυκηθήτην.

Appendix B.2. List of postverbal clitics.

2 nd position clitic in postverbal position.	Unaugmented simplex instances.	Augmented simplex instances.	Augmented compound.	Unaugmented compound.
ἄρα ¹³⁰⁷	10 instances.	5 instances.	2 instances.	None.
γάρ	64 instances.	22 instances.	6 instances.	1 instance.
γε ¹³⁰⁸	7 instances.	4 instances.	None.	None.
δέ	969 instances.	279 instances.	31 instances.	9 instances.
με/μ'	3 instances.	2 instances.	None.	None.
μοι	1 instance.	3 instances.	None.	None.
μέν	13 instances.	9 instances.	None.	None.
μιν	1 instance.	2 instances.	None.	None.
οἱ	3 instances.	None.	None.	None.
περ	1 instance.	1 instance.	None.	None.
ποτέ	2 instances.	None.	None.	None.
που	1 instance.	None.	None.	None.
ῥα	44 instances.	51 instances.	None.	None.
σε/ σ'	1 instance.	None.	None.	None.
σφι(ν)	1 instance.	None.	None.	None.
τε	159 instances.	33 instances.	2 instances.	2 instances.
τις	1 instance.	None.	None.	None.
τοι	1 instance.	None.	None.	None.
Totals.	1282	411	41	12

Appendix B.3. List of preverbal clitics.

2 nd position clitic in preverbal position.	Augmented instances.	Unaugmented instances	Augmented compound.	Unaugmented compound.
ἄρα	90 instances.	52 instances.	16 instances.	4 instances.
αὖ	None.	6 instances.	2 instances.	2 instances.
γάρ	27 instances.	69 instances.	12 instances.	1 instance.
γε	34 instances.	33 instances.	13 instances.	5 instances.
δέ	498 instances.	441 instances.	216 instances.	113 instances.
έ	None.	4 instances.	None.	None.
με/μ'	57 instances.	21 instances.	14 instances.	None.
μεν	3 instances.	None.	None.	1 instance.
μοι	22 instances.	22 instances.	13 instances.	None.
μέν	63 instances.	102 instances.	43 instances.	6 instances.
μιν	31 instances.	51 instances.	23 instances.	9 instances.
οἱ	56 instances.	56 instances.	16 instances.	20 instances.
οὖν	20 instances.	13 instances.	None.	1 instance.
περ	8 instances.	3 instances.	8 instances.	None.
ποτέ	22 instances.	7 instances.	2 instances.	1 instance.
που	2 instances.	2 instances.	1 instance.	1 instance.
πω	3 instances.	13 instances.	None.	None.
πως	4 instances.	None.	None.	None.
ῥα	54 instances.	31 instances.	6 instances.	10 instances.

¹³⁰⁷ The particle ἄρα is rarely put immediately after the verb: it is mostly preceded by another clitic such as δέ or τε. In those instances, the instance was counted under the first clitic and not under ἄρα

¹³⁰⁸ The particle γε is used 7 times after a verbal form that is preceded by another clitic.

σε/ σ'	19 instances.	8 instances.	1 instance.	2 instances.
σευ	2 instances.	None.	None.	None.
σφ'	8 instances.	2 instances.	1 instance.	2 instances.
σφι(ν)	16 instances.	18 instances.	6 instances.	1 instance.
σφισι(ν)	7 instances.	12 instances.	None.	None.
σφωε	None.	1 instance.	None.	None.
τε	137 instances.	92 instances.	23 instances.	6 instances.
τις	24 instances.	46 instances. ¹³⁰⁹	9 instances.	2 instances.
τοι	5 instances.	7 instances.	1 instance.	None.
Totals	1212 instances.	1112 instances.	426 instances.	187 instances.

Appendix B.4. Speech introduction verbs with person addressed.

The figures for the compounds are the following:

Verb.	Augmented with person addressed.	Unaugmented with person addressed.	Augmented without person addressed.	Unaugmented without person addressed.	Total instances.
προσέειπον	185 forms.	None.	3 forms.	None.	188 forms.
μετέειπον	55 forms.	None.	10 forms.	None.	65 forms.
πρόσφημι	224 forms.	None.	10 forms.	None.	234 forms.
μετάφημι	14 forms.	None.	None.	None.	14 forms.
προσφωνέω	35 forms.	None.	1 form.	None.	36 forms.
μεταφωνέω	5 forms.	None.	3 forms.	None.	8 forms.
προσαυδάω	138 forms.	2 forms (in conclusion).	42 forms.	None.	182 forms.
μεταυδάω	23 forms.	None.	2 forms.	None.	25 forms.
Totals.	679 instances.	2 instances.	71 instances.	None.	752 forms.

The figures for the simplex verbs are the following:

Verb.	Augmented with person addressed.	Unaugmented with person addressed.	Augmented without person addressed.	Unaugmented without person addressed.	Total instances.
ἀγορεύω	None.	4 instances.	None.	4 instances.	8 instances.
ἀμείβομαι	78 forms.	9 form.	1 form.	1 form.	99 instances.
αὐδάω	72 instances.	None.	13 instances.	2 forms.	87 forms.
αὖω	None (or 6?). ¹³¹⁰	4 instances.	8 instances (or only 2?).	1 instances.	13 instances
καλέω	2 instances.	1 instance.	None.	None.	3 instances.
(ἐ)κέκλετο	16 instances.	7 instances.	None.	None.	23 instances.
φημί	1 form.	1 form.	43 forms.	13 forms.	58 forms.
φωνέω	None.	None.	None.	34 forms.	34 forms.
Totals.	169 instances.	26 instances.	65 instances.	55 instances.	325 instances.

The instances of verbs with a person addressing himself, are:

Construction.	Augmented.	Unaugmented.
---------------	------------	--------------

¹³⁰⁹ This number includes 29 *sk* iteratives.

¹³¹⁰ I assume here that the dative Δαναοῖσι in ἦϋσεν δὲ διαπρύσιον Δαναοῖσι γεγωνός belongs to γεγωνός and not to the main verb.

There is a person addressed.	65 instances.	12 instances.
The subject addressed his/her own mind.	None.	11 instances: εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν. ¹³¹¹
No person addressed in the verse.	6 instances.	42 instances: 14 times εἶπε and 28 instances of εἶπεσκε.

The figures for μυθόομαι are:

Construction.	Augmented.	Unaugmented.
There is a person addressed.	None.	None.
The subject addressed his/her own mind.	None.	4 instances: προτὶ ὃν μυθήσατο θυμόν. ¹³¹²
No person addressed in the verse.	None.	1 instance: μυθεῖτ'. ¹³¹³

Appendix B.5. Changes in person number between the speech conclusions with φημί and the next sentence.

Change in person number (first the conclusion, then the number of the next sentence).	Total instances.	The form of φημί is augmented.	The form of φημί is not augmented.
1 st p. sg. versus 3 rd p.sg.	36 instances.	36 instances	None.
1 st p. sg. versus 3 rd p. pl.	4 instances.	4 instances.	None.
3 rd p. sg. versus 1 st p. sg.	20 instances.	18 instances.	2 instances.
3 rd p. sg. versus 3 rd p. pl.	114 instances.	103 instances.	11 instances.
3 rd p. pl. versus 1 st p. sg.	2 instances.	2 instances.	None.
3 rd p. pl. versus 3 rd p. sg.	18 instances.	13 instances.	5 instances.

Appendix B.6. figures on augmentation with adverbs indicating completed/repeated actions.

In what follows, the figures will be given for the adverbs that point at a completed action in the immediate past or at repeated actions.

The figures for AIEI are:

Unaugmented verb form.	Augmented verb form.	Total.
41 instances.	15 instances.	56 instances.

The figures for AIPSA (αἶψα) are:

Augmented verb form;	Unaugmented verb form.	Total.
64 instances.	45 instances.	109 instances.

The figures for finite verb forms in the speech conclusions with ARA (ἄρα) are:

Verb.	Augmented conclusion.	Unaugmented conclusion.
ἔειπον	None.	ὥς ἄρα τις εἶπεσκε: attested 6 times. ¹³¹⁴
ἦ	ἦ ῥ(α): attested 51 times.	None.
φημί	ὥς ἄρ' ἔφην: attested 9 times ¹³¹⁵ , ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη: attested 18 times. ¹³¹⁶	None.

¹³¹¹ The instances are *Iliad* 11,403; 17,90; 18,5; 20,343; 21,53; 21,552; 22,98 and *Odyssey* 5,298; 5,355; 5,407 and 5,464.

¹³¹² The instances are *Iliad* 17,200; 17,442 and *Odyssey* 5,285; 5,376.

¹³¹³ *Iliad* 23,305.

¹³¹⁴ The instances are *Iliad* 4,85; 17,423; 22,375 and *Odyssey* 4,772; 13,170; 23,152.

¹³¹⁵ The instances are *Iliad* 3,161; 3,324; 7,181; 7,206 and *Odyssey* 9,413; 17,488; 18,75; 18,117 and 21,404.

¹³¹⁶ The instances are *Iliad* 1,584; 5,111; 5,607; 21,136; 21,502 and *Odyssey* 2,377; 8,482; 17,409; 17,462; 18,185; 19,361; 19,386; 19,503; 20,120; 22,433; 22,465; 23,181 and 24,397.

φωνέω	ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν: attested 9 times. ¹³¹⁷	None.
Totals.	87 instances.	6 instances.

These are the figures of preterite forms accompanied by αὐτίκα in the same verse:

Augmented instances.	Unaugmented.	Total.
92 instances.	42 instances.	134 instances.

The figures for the subordinate clauses in a past indicative introduced by ἐπεὶ are:

Augmented forms.	Unaugmented forms.
224 instances.	290 instances.

The figures for the subordinate clauses in a past indicative introduced by ἥμος are:

Augmented forms.	Unaugmented forms.
12 instances.	24 instances.

The figures for preterite forms with νῦν are:¹³¹⁸

Tense	Augmented.	Unaugmented.
Aorist.	87 instances.	45 instances.
Imperfect.	11 instances.	6 instances.
Pluperfect.	2 instances.	2 instances.
Totals.	100 instances.	53 instances.

Appendix B.7: the figures of the SK iteratives.¹³¹⁹

In what follows, I provide the figures of the SK iteratives (that do not have an indicative present attached to it). The forms of φάσκω have been included as a separate category, because this verb created a present paradigm in later Greek but not yet in Homer. It is therefore somewhat different from the other SK forms.

Forms.	Unaugmented.	Augmented.
SK forms.	307 instances.	5 instances.
φάσκω	4 instances.	13 instances.

¹³¹⁷ The instances are *Iliad* 10,465; 19,276 and *Odyssey* 2,257; 10,229; 17,57; 19,29; 21,163; 21,386 and 22,398.

¹³¹⁸ In Attic the aorist is also very common with νῦν, see Rijksbaron 2002:29.

¹³¹⁹ As was stated earlier, the forms can be found in Bottin 1969:116-124.

Appendix C: data relating to tense usage.

Appendix C.1. The tense use in introductions with the *verba dicendi*.

Finite forms in introductions.	Aorist.	Imperfect.	Pluperfect.
αὐδάω	2 instances.	85 instances.	None.
μεταυδάω	None.	25 instances.	None.
προσαυδάω	None.	179 instances.	None.
ἔειπον	134 instances.	None.	None.
μετέειπον	65 instances.	None.	None.
προσέειπον	188 instances.	None.	None.
ἐν(ν)έπω	None.	1 instance.	None.
ἐνένιπε	13 instances.	None.	None.
ἠνίπαπε	5 instances.	None.	None.
ἀγορεύω	None.	12 instances.	None.
ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν	None.	7 instances.	None.
ἀγοράομαι	24 instances.	None.	None.
μυθέομαι	4 instances.	1 instance.	None.
φημί	None.	58 instances.	None.
μετάφημι	None.	14 instances.	None.
πρόσφημι	None.	234 instances.	None.
Totals.	435 instances	616 instances.	None.
Participle in introductions.	Aorist participle.	Present participle.	Perfect participle.
ἀγορεύω	None.	2 instances.	None.

Appendix C.2. The verb “answer” in speech introductions.

Finite forms in introductions.	Aorist.	Imperfect.	Pluperfect.
ἀμείβομαι	2 instances.	97 instances.	None.
ἀπαμείβομαι	None.	12 instances.	None.
Participle in introductions.	Aorist participle.	Present participle.	
ἀμείβομαι	None.	43 instances.	
ἀπαμείβομαι	None	111 instances.	

Appendix C. 3. The figures for φωνέω in introductions.

	Aorist.	Imperfect.	Pluperfect.
φωνέω	34 instances.	None.	None.
μεταφωνέω	None.	8 instances.	None.
προσφωνέω	None.	38 instances.	None.
	Aorist participle.	Present participle.	Perfect participle.
φωνέω	57 instances.	None.	None.

Appendix C.4. *Verba dicendi* in speech conclusions.

Finite forms in conclusions.	Aorist.	Imperfect.	Pluperfect.
ἀγορεύω	None.	33 instances.	None.
ἔειπον	6 instances.	None.	None.
* <i>uerh</i> ₁	None.	None.	3 instances.
ἦ	88 instances.	None.	None.
προσαυδάω	None.	3 instances.	None.

φημί	None.	503 instances.	None.
πρόσφημι	None.	1 instance.	None.
Participle in conclusions.	Aorist participle.	Present participle.	
ἔειπον	149 instances.	None.	
φημί	None.	7 instances.	

Appendix C.5. The figures for φωνέω in conclusions.

Finite forms in conclusions.	Aorist.	Imperfect.	Pluperfect.
φωνέω	9 instances.	None.	None.
Participle in conclusions.	Aorist participle.	Present participle.	
φωνέω	60 instances.	None.	

Appendix D: The use of the subjunctives and optatives of the root *uekʷ.

In this appendix I discuss the use of the modal particle ἄν/ κε/ κεν with all the 98 occurrences of ἔειπον in the subjunctive and the optative. This should reveal if the assumptions made for the subjunctive and optative in speech introductions and conclusions hold true for a larger corpus as well.

Appendix D.1. Absence of the modal particle.

The modal particle is not used in the following wish clause:

1. (...) αἶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ὥς (...)
εἵπομι' ὥς παρὰ σεῖο τυχὼν φιλότητος ἀπάσης (*Odyssey* 15,156-158)

It is not used in the following purpose clauses:

2. ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (*Iliad* 7,68),
3. ὄφρ' αἶ τις ὦδ' εἴπησιν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε (*Iliad* 7,300),
4. ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (*Iliad* 7,349),
5. ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (*Iliad* 7,369),
6. ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (*Iliad* 8,6),
7. ὄφρ' αἶ τις ὦδ' εἴπη Λυκίων πύκα θωρηκτάων (*Iliad* 12,317),
8. ὄφρ' ἦ μὲν μετὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων
ἔλθῃ, καὶ εἴπησι Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι (*Iliad* 15,56-57)
9. ὄφρ' αἶ τί μιν προτιείποι ἀμειβόμενος ἐπέεσσιν (*Iliad* 22,329),
10. ὥς μεμνέωτο δρόμου καὶ ἀληθείην ἀποείποι (*Iliad* 23,361),
11. ὄφρ' αἶ οἱ εἴπω πυκινὸν ἔπος, ὥς κεν Ἀχιλλεὺς (*Iliad* 24,75),
12. ἄλκιμος ἔσσι', ἵνα τίς σε καὶ ὀπιγόνων ἐν εἴπῃ (*Odyssey* 1,302),
13. πάντες, ἦν' ὑμῖν μῦθον ἀπηλεγέως ἀποείπω (*Odyssey* 1,373),
14. ἄλκιμος ἔσσι', ἵνα τίς σε καὶ ὀπιγόνων ἐν εἴπῃ (*Odyssey* 3,200),
15. εἴμ', ἵνα θαρσύνω θ' ἐτάρους εἴπω τε ἕκαστα (*Odyssey* 3,361),
16. κλυτὲ μοι, ἀμφίπολοι λευκώλενοι, ὄφρα τι εἴπω (*Odyssey* 6,239),
17. ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (*Odyssey* 7,187),
18. ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (*Odyssey* 8,27),
19. (...) ὄφρα καὶ ἄλλω
εἴπῃς ἡρώων, ὅτε κεν σοῖς ἐν μεγάροισι (*Odyssey* 8,241- 242),
20. αἵματος ὄφρα πῖω καὶ τοι νημερτέα εἴπω (*Odyssey* 11,96),
21. ὄφρ' ὑμῖν εἴπω μαντήϊα Τειρεσίαο (*Odyssey* 12,272),
22. (...) ἵνα τοι σὺν μῆτιν ὑφῆνω (...)
εἴπω θ' ὅσσα τοι αἶσα δόμοις ἐνὶ ποιητοῖσι (*Odyssey* 13,303-306),
23. (...) ὄφρα καὶ αὐτός, (...)
εἴπῃς ὀπτόθεν ἐσσι καὶ ὀπτόσα κήδε' ἀνέτλης (*Odyssey* 14,45-47),
24. ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (*Odyssey* 17,469),
25. κέκλυτέ μευ, μνηστῆρες ἀγήνορες, ὄφρα τι εἴπω (*Odyssey* 18,43),
26. ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (*Odyssey* 18,352),
27. ὄφρα καθεζόμενος εἴπῃ ἔπος ἡδ' ἐπακούσῃ (*Odyssey* 19,98),
28. κέκλυτέ μευ, μνηστῆρες ἀγήνορες, ὄφρα τι εἴπω (*Odyssey* 20,292),
29. ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (*Odyssey* 21,276),
30. ὄφρα γνῶς κατὰ θυμόν, ἀτὰρ εἴπησθα καὶ ἄλλω (*Odyssey* 22,373),
31. ὄφρα ἔπος εἴπωμι τό μοι καταθύμιόν ἐστιν (*Odyssey* 22,392),
32. ἔρχεο: κικλήσκει σε πατὴρ ἐμός, ὄφρα τι εἴπῃ (*Odyssey* 22,397).

It is absent in the following purpose/ complement clause:

33. λίσσεσθαι δέ μιν αὐτόν, ὅπως νημερτέα εἶπη (*Odyssey* 3,19),
 ἦλθον Τειρεσίαιο κατὰ χρέος, εἴ τινα βουλὴν
 34. εἵποι, ὅπως Ἰθάκην ἐς παιπαλόεσσιν ἰκοίμην (*Odyssey* 11,479-480),
 35. ἦστο κάτω ὁρώων, ποτιδέγμενος εἴ τί μιν εἵποι (*Odyssey* 23,91).

In the last two sentences the indirect question has a purpose nuance in it (“to see if”), and hence the modal particle is missing.

It is not used in the following negative purpose clauses/ negative wishes:

36. μή ποτέ τις εἶπησιν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων (*Iliad* 23,575),
 37. (...) μή τις ποτὶ δῶμα γέροντι
 ἐλθὼν ἐξείπη, ὃ δ' οἰσάμενος καταδήσῃ (*Odyssey* 15,442-443),
 38. μή ποτέ τις εἶπησι κακώτερος ἄλλος Ἀχαιῶν (*Odyssey* 21,324),
 39. παύεσθον κλαυθμοῖο γόοιό τε μή τις ἴδῃται
 ἐξελθὼν μεγάροιο, ἀτὰρ εἶπησι καὶ εἴσω (*Odyssey* 21,228-229).

It is not found in the following exhortative clauses:

40. ἀλλ' ἄγ' ἐγὼν, ὃς σεῖο γεραίτερος εὖχομαι εἶναι,
 ἐξείπω καὶ πάντα διίξομαι (...) (*Iliad* 9,60-61)
 41. εἶπω σὴ ἀλόχῳ, τῇ τις θεὸς ὕπνον ἐπῶρσε (*Odyssey* 22,428-429),
 42. ἀλλ' ἄγε τοι καὶ σῆμα ἀριφραδὲς ἄλλο τι εἶπω (*Odyssey* 23,73).
 (in several instances the difference with a “normal” future is hardly visible).¹³²⁰

It is not used in the following complement clause after *verbum timendi* (which is an original negative wish):

43. νῦν δ' αἰνῶς δείδοικα κατὰ φρένα μή σε παρείπῃ (*Iliad* 1,555).

It is left out in the following instances referring to a generic instance:

44. δῶρ' ἀποαιρεῖσθαι ὅς τις σέθεν ἀντίον εἶπη (*Iliad* 1,230)

In this case, one would expect a modal particle to occur, because Akhilleus is referring to his specific situation, but he makes the situation more generic, and states that Agamemnon always takes the gifts from people who dare to stand up to him.¹³²¹ This is seen in the (iterative) present form ἀποαιρεῖσθαι¹³²² instead of the expected aorist, in the use of the generic ὅς τις,¹³²³ and in the subjunctive εἶπη without modal particle.

It is left out in the following instance that refer to a mythical past:

45. τῷ δόμεν ὃς μετὰ τοῖσι δίκην ἰθύντατα εἵποι (*Iliad* 18,508).

This verse occurs in the description of the mythical world as depicted on the Akhilleus's new shield. As this is situated in a remote mythical past, the modal particle is missing.

It is left out in the following instances referring to an undefined and remote future:¹³²⁴

46. καὶ ποτέ τις εἶπησιν ἰδὼν κατὰ δάκρυ χέουσιν (*Iliad* 6,459),
 47. καὶ ποτέ τις εἵποι ‘πατρός δ' ὃ γε πολλὸν ἀμείνων’ (*Iliad* 6,479),
 48. καὶ ποτέ τις εἶπησι καὶ ὀψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων (*Iliad* 7,87),
 49. καὶ νῦν τις ὥδ' εἶπησι κακώτερος ἀντιβολήσας (*Odyssey* 6,275).

¹³²⁰ Ameis-Hentze 1901:121 translated *ich will es sagen*. Chantraine 1953:209 *A la première personne, en particulier, il est malaisé de tracer une frontière entre le sens de volonté et le futur emphatique*.

¹³²¹ Ameis-Hentze 1884:19, Latacz 2000b:98

¹³²² Ameis-Hentze 1884:19, Kirk 1985:77

¹³²³ Kirk 1985:77, Latacz 2000b:98;

¹³²⁴ They have been discussed in subchapter 3.2.

It is left out in the following instances as result of *markedness reduction*:

50. ὄφρ' ἂν ἐγὼ βεῖω προτὶ Ἴλιον, ἡδὲ γέρουσιν
εἶπω βουλευτῇσι καὶ ἡμετέρης ἀλόχοισι (*Iliad* 6,113-114).
51. ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθη ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἶπη (*Iliad* 9,313)
52. ὅς δέ κ' ἀνήνηται καὶ τε στερεῶς ἀποείπη (*Iliad* 9,510),
53. ἀλλὰ μὲν εἰς ὃ κε δῶρα φέρων ἐπιδίφρια θείω
καλά, σὺ δ' ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδης, εἶπω δὲ γυναιξὶ (*Odyssey* 15,75-76),
54. ὦ φίλοι, οὐκ ἂν δὴ τις ἂν' ὀρσοθύρην ἀναβαίη
καὶ εἶποι λαοῖσι, βοῇ δ' ὥκιστα γένοιτο (*Odyssey* 22,132-133).

D.2. Use of the modal particle.

It is used in the following relative clauses referring to a specific instance of speaking:

55. ὅς κ' εἶποι ὃ τι τόσσον ἐχώσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 1,64),
56. εἰ δὴ σοὶ πᾶν ἔργον ὑπεῖξομαι ὅττι κεν εἶπης (*Iliad* 1,294),
57. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Iliad* 2,139),¹³²⁵
58. οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητον ἔπος ἔσσεται ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Iliad* 2,361),
59. Ζεῦ πάτερ ἦ ῥά τί μοι κεχολώσεται ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Iliad* 5,421),
60. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Iliad* 9,26),
61. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Iliad* 9,704),
62. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Iliad* 12,75)
63. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Iliad* 14,74)
64. μῦθον ἀτιμήσατε πεφασμένον ὃν κ' ἐὺ εἶπω (*Iliad* 14,127),
65. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Iliad* 14,370),
66. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Iliad* 15,294),
67. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Iliad* 18,297),
68. εἶμι μὲν, οὐδ' ἄλιον ἔπος ἔσσεται ὅττι κεν εἶπη. (*Iliad* 24,92),
69. ξεῖνε φίλ', εἰ καὶ μοι νεμεσήσεται ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Odyssey* 1,158),
70. Ἀντίνο', εἰ πέρ μοι νεμεσήσεται ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Odyssey* 1,389),
71. κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, Ἰθακήσιοι, ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Odyssey* 2,25),
72. ἦν χ' ἡμῖν σάφα εἶποι, ὅτε πρότερός γε πύθοιτο; (*Odyssey* 2,31).

This verse is pronounced by Aigyptios, the father of one of Odysseus's men. He was grieving for his son for a long time, because he had not received any information about him. When he heard that an assembly was called in Ithaka, he was surprised and wanted to know who the speaker would be and if that speaker had any news about Odysseus and his men. As such, the particle is used in this instance, because it links the future situation with the present.

73. ἦν χ' ὑμῖν σάφα εἶπω, ὅτε πρότερός γε πυθοίμην (*Odyssey* 2,43),
74. κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, Ἰθακήσιοι, ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Odyssey* 2,161),
75. κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, Ἰθακήσιοι, ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Odyssey* 2,229),
76. ὅς κέν τοι εἶπησιν ὁδὸν καὶ μέτρα κελεύθου (*Odyssey* 10,539),
77. νῦν δ' ἄγεθ', ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Odyssey* 12,213),
78. ἀλλ' ἄγεθ', ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω, πειθώμεθα πάντες (*Odyssey* 13,179),
79. κήδεσιν. ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ξυνίει ἔπος, ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Odyssey* 19,378),
80. γαμβρὸς ἐμὸς θύγατέρ τε, τίθεσθ' ὄνομ' ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Odyssey* 19,406),
81. κρῆνον νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ δειλῇ ἔπος, ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Odyssey* 20,115),
82. κέκλυτε δὴ νῦν μεν, Ἰθακήσιοι, ὅττι κεν εἶπω (*Odyssey* 24,454).

It is used in the following temporal clause referring to a specific instance:

¹³²⁵ The sentence ὥς ἂν ἐγὼ εἶπω was in origin a relative clause, see Chantraine 1953:251.

83. ἔσται μὰν ὅτ' ἂν αὐτε φίλην γλαυκώπιδα εἴπη (*Iliad* 8,373).

It is used in the main clause referring to a specific instance or an instance linked to the current situation:

84. τῶν δ' ἄλλων τίς κεν ἦσι φρεσὶν οὐνόματ' εἴποι (*Iliad* 17,260).

In this instance Homer stated that there were so many Greek warriors, that no man could possibly name them all in this instance: “who could now name the names of all these man by heart?”.

85. αὐτίκ' ἂν ἐξείποι Ἀγαμέμνονι ποιμένι λαῶν (*Iliad* 24,654)

The verse describes the warning by Akhilleus that Priam should make sure that nobody saw him now, because if somebody did see him, he might inform Agamemnon. If this were to happen, the return of Hektor's body would become impossible. The link with the present situation is expressed by αὐτίκα.

86. τὸν γ' εἴ πως σὺ δύναιο λοχησάμενος λελαβέσθαι,
ὅς κέν τοι εἴπησιν ὁδὸν καὶ μέτρα κελεύθου (*Odyssey* 4,388-389)

“And if you are somehow able to catch him in an ambush and lay your hands on him, he will then reveal you the road and the ways (to find your way home).”

87. καὶ δέ κέ τοι εἴπησι, διοτρεφές, αἶ κ' ἐθέλησθα (*Odyssey* 4,391).

In these two instances Eidothea confirmed to Menelaos that Proteus would not tell a lie. As this instance refers to Proteus specifically, the modal particle is used (cf. supra).

88. καί κ' ἐλθὼν πρὸς δώματ' Ὀδυσσεύος θείοιο
ἀγγελίην εἵπομι περίφρονι Πηνελοπείῃ (*Odyssey* 15,313-314),

89. παιδὶ δέ κεν εἵπομι ἔπος, τό κε κέρδιον εἶη (*Odyssey* 18,166),

90. ὦ φίλοι, ἦδη μὲν κεν ἐγὼν εἵπομι καὶ ἄμμι (*Odyssey* 22,262).

It is used in a conditional sentence referring to a specific instance:

91. συμπάντων Δαναῶν, οὐδ' ἦν Ἀγαμέμνονα εἴπης (*Iliad* 1,90),

92. ἦν τίς τοι εἴπησι βροτῶν, ἢ ὅσσαν ἀκούσης (*Odyssey* 1,282),

93. ἦν τίς μοι εἴπησι βροτῶν ἢ ὅσσαν ἀκούσω (*Odyssey* 2,216).

The modal particle is used in the 2 last instances, because the speaker is referring to an immediate action in the future: “I/you will now go and see if some mortal can tell me/you.” It is distinct from the *tis* speeches that refer to an imagined future.

The modal particle is used in the following instances with a negation:

94. (...) οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγε
ἄλλα παρὲξ εἵπομι παρακλιδόν, οὐδ' ἀπατήσω (*Odyssey* 4,347-348).

The particle is used, because the negative sentence is a litotes: it is an emphatic confirmation made by Menelaos who stated that he was most certainly telling the truth. As such, the particle is expected.

95. (...) οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγε
ἄλλα παρὲξ εἵπομι παρακλιδὸν οὐδ' ἀπατήσω (*Odyssey* 17,138-139).

D.3. Problematic use/absence of the modal particle.

The absence of the particle is unexpected in the following instances:

96. (...) ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν
ταῦτ' εἵποις Ἀχιλῆϊ δαΐφρονι αἶ κε πίθηται (*Iliad* 11,791)

In this verse, the optative can be interpreted as a potential without modal particle, which comes in this instance close to a gentle imperative.¹³²⁶ The absence of the modal particle is remarkable, as it clearly refers to a specific instance, as is visible by καὶ νῦν in the previous verse. One could also interpret this as a wish with the meaning of a polite demand.¹³²⁷ As the wish is usually not constructed with the modal particle,¹³²⁸ this would explain the absence. Leaf observed that the neglected digamma in εἴποις could not be restored. This is one of the instances, where wish and potential optative come very close.

It is used in the following instances which seem to be generic:

97. ὁποῖόν κ' εἴπησθα ἔπος, τοῖόν κ' ἐπακούσαις (*Iliad* 20,250).

This verse is echoed in Hesiod, *Works and Days* 721 εἰ δὲ κακὸν εἴποις, τάχα κ' αὐτὸς μείζον ἀκούσαις. The use of the modal particles in this verse is remarkable. Chantraine suspected that the particle κε in κ' εἴπησθα might have been inserted to fill the hiatus after the digamma had disappeared,¹³²⁹ but as Danielsson pointed out, the digamma was used more often to prevent hiatus than it was used to lengthen by position.¹³³⁰ Even if this were the case, the use of κ' with the main verb still needs to be explained. This verse is a general statement with a lasting truth in it, and is not the only instance where the modal particle appears in a generic context.¹³³¹

98. (..) ὅς' ἂν πεπνυμένος ἀνὴρ
εἴποι καὶ ῥέξειε, καὶ ὃς προγενέστερος εἴη (*Odyssey* 4,204-205).

This verse is pronounced by Menelaos in response to Telemakhos's explanation of why he has come to Sparta. Menelaos praises Telemakhos for his insights and stated that even a wiser and older man would not have acted this thoughtfully. The modal particle ἂν is metrically secure.¹³³² The use of the particle is somewhat remarkable, as we seem to have a generic situation here, but the particle is probably used, because Menelaos specifically wanted to stress Telemakhos's wisdom.

¹³²⁶ Leaf 1900:519-520; Van Pottelbergh 1939:19.

¹³²⁷ Chantraine 1953:216.

¹³²⁸ Delbrück 1871:86, Chantraine 1953:218 lists only two examples, one of which occurs in an εἰ clause.

¹³²⁹ Chantraine 1953:246. The removal had been suggested by Bentley and Bekker already.

¹³³⁰ Danielsson 1909.

¹³³¹ Monro 1891:259.

¹³³² Chantraine 1953:249.

Appendix E: Optatives and modal indicatives in past potentials and counterfactuals.

In this Appendix I attempt a reconstruction of the older optatives in order to check if there was evidence in the text itself for the substitution of the optative by the indicative. The modal indicatives (i.e. the indicatives containing an older optative) are underlined.

Appendix E.1. The modal indicative is followed by an *ἀλλά* clause.

In this category the structure of the sentence was “X could have happened, but Y did something to prevent it”.

The reconstruction is possible in:

1. πάντες κ' αὐτόθ' ὄλοντο ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ δαμέντες

ἀλλά με μοῖρ' ὅλοη καὶ Λητοῦς ἔκτανεν υἱός (*Iliad* 16,848-849).

The indicative ὄλοντο can contain an older optative ὀλοΐατ' which does not require the hiatus in ὄλοντο ἐμῷ.

2. ἔνθά κεν αὖτε Τρῶες ἀρηϊφίλων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν

Ἴλιον εἰσανέβησαν ἀναλκείησι δαμέντες,

Ἀργεῖοι δέ κε κῦδος ἔλον καὶ ὑπὲρ Διὸς αἴσαν

κάρτεϊ καὶ σθένει σφετέρῳ: ἀλλ' αὐτὸς Ἀπόλλων

Αἰνείαν ὄτρυνε δέμας Περίφαντι ἐοικῶς (*Iliad* 17,319-323).

In this instance, the indicative εἰσανέβησαν can contain an older optative εἰσαναβαῖεν. The indicative/injunctive ἔλον is due to modal *markedness reduction*.

3. καὶ κε θάμ' ἐνθάδ' ἐόντες ἐμισγόμεθ': οὐδέ κεν ἡμέας

ἄλλο διέκρινεν φιλέοντέ τε τερπομένῳ τε

πρὶν γ' ὅτε δὴ θανάτοιο μέλαν νέφος ἀμφεκάλυπεν

ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν που μέλλεν ἀγάσασθαι θεὸς αὐτός, (*Odyssey* 4,178-181).

The indicative ἐμισγόμεθ cannot contain an older optative, but the form διέκρινεν can be “reconstructed” as διακρίναι.

4. καὶ νύ κεν ἀσκηθῆς ἰκόμην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν:

ἀλλά με κῦμα ῥόος τε περιγνάμπτοντα Μάλειαν

καὶ Βορέης ἀπέωσε, (...) (*Odyssey* 7,79-81).

The indicative ἰκόμην is equivalent to the optative ἦκοιμ'.

5. καὶ νύ κε τὴν ἐνθ' ὧκα βάλεν μεγάλας ποτὶ πέτρας,

ἀλλ' Ἥρη παρέπεμψεν, ἐπεὶ φίλος ἦεν Ἰήσων (*Odyssey* 12,71-72).

In this instance, the indicative βάλεν is metrically equivalent to the older optative βάλοι.

6. (...). καὶ κεν πάλαι ἐνθάδ' Ὀδυσσεὺς

ἦην: ἀλλ' ἄρα οἱ τό γε κέρδιον εἴσατο θυμῷ (*Odyssey* 19,282-283).

The indicative ἦην is equivalent to the optative εἶη.

7. καὶ νύ κε δὴ ἐτάνυσσε βίη τὸ τέταρτον ἀνέλκων

ἀλλ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀνένευε καὶ ἔσχεθεν ἰέμενόν περ (*Odyssey* 21,128-129).

The indicative ἐτάνυσσε is equivalent to the optative τανύσειε.

The reconstruction was only possible if metrical shortening occurred in the verbal form:

1. ἀλλά μ' ὑπὴνειακὴν ταχέες πόδες ἦ τέ κε δηρὸν

αὐτοῦ πήματ' ἔπασχον ἐν αἰνῆσιν νεκάδεσσιν,

ἦ κεν ζῶς ἀμενηνὸς ἔα χαλκοῖο τυπῆσι. (*Iliad* 5,885-887).

2. οὐ γάρ κέν με τάχ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ παρέπεισεν Ἀχαιῶν
ἀλλὰ σὺ γὰρ δὴ πόλλ' ἔπαθες καὶ πόλλ' ἐμόγησας (*Iliad* 23,606-607).
The indicative παρέπεισεν is metrically equivalent to the optative παραπεῖσαι with shortening.

- In this instance, the indicative *πάθεν* is metrically equivalent to the older optative *πάθοι* (with metrical shortening, which is attested for the optative ending in *οι*¹³³³).

1. καὶ κεν δὴ πάλαι ἄλλον ὑπερμενέων βασιλῆων
ἐξικόμεν φεύγων, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτ' ἀνεκτὰ πέλονται:
ἀλλ' ἔτι τὸν δύστηνον οἶομαι, (...) (*Odyssey* 20,222-224).

The reconstruction was not possible in the following instances:

1. ἀλλὰ μάλα Τρῶες δειδήμονες: ἦ τέ κεν ἦδη
λαΐνον ἔσσο χιτῶνα κακῶν ἔνεχ' ὅσσα ἔοργας (*Iliad* 3,55-56).
In this instance the sentence with ἀλλὰ exceptionally preceded the m
2. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα μέλαιναν,
ἀλλ' Ἥφαιστος ἔρυτο, σάωσε δὲ νυκτὶ καλύψας (*Iliad* 5,22-23).
3. λαοὶ ὑπ' Ἀργείων. τάχα δ' ἂν καὶ κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν
ἔπλετο: (...)
ἀλλ' ἔχεν ἦ τὰ πρῶτα πύλας καὶ τεῖχος ἐσᾶλτο (*Iliad* 13,676-679).
4. οὐκ ἂν δὴ ποτε θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι ἐμοῖσιν
Ἄτρεΐδης ᾠρινε διαμπερές, οὐδέ κε κούρην
ἦγεν ἐμεῦ ἀέκοντος ἀμήχανος: ἀλλὰ ποθὶ Ζεὺς
ἦθελ' Ἀχαιοῖσιν θάνατον πολέεσσι γενέσθαι (*Iliad* 19,271-274).
5. καὶ νύ κ' ἔτι προτέρους ἶδον ἀνέρας, οὓς ἔθελόν περ,
Θησέα Πειρίθοόν τε, θεῶν ἐρικυδέα τέκνα:
ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἐπὶ ἔθνε' ἀγείρετο μυρία νεκρῶν (*Odyssey* 11,630-632)

¹³³³ The shortening of the optative *oi* in epic is not ruled out by Sjölund 1937 (the only detailed work so far on epic shortening). One example of such shortening is δοῦρ' ἔχεν: οὐκ ἄν τις μιν ἐρυκάκοι ἀντιβολήσας (*Iliad* 12.465).

Appendix E.2. Optative reconstructions in conditional constructions.

In what follows, the conditional constructions (protasis and apodosis) with counterfactual meaning are addressed. The indicative forms that are “modal” (i.e. possible replace an older optative) are underlined.

The reconstruction is possible in the following instances:

1. εἰ μὲν τις τὸν ὄνειρον Ἀχαιῶν ἄλλος ἐνίσπε
ψεῦδος κεν φαῖμεν καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μᾶλλον (*Iliad* 2,80-81).
In this instance, the indicative can be replaced by the optative ἐνίσποι.
2. καὶ νῦ κεν εἴρυσσέν τε καὶ ἄσπετον ἦρατο κῦδος,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὅζῳ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη (*Iliad* 3,373-374).
In this instance the indicative εἴρυσσέν can be replaced by the optative εἴρυσσαι.
3. οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότῃ γ' ἐκεύθανον εἴ τις ἴδοιτο (*Iliad* 3,453).
In this instance, the indicative ἐκεύθανον can be replaced by the optative κεύθοιεν
4. ἔνθά κεν αὖτε Τρῶες ἀρηϊφίλων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν
Ἴλιον εἰσανέβησαν ἀναλκείῃσι δαμέντες,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' Αἰνεία τε καὶ Ἑκτορι εἶπε παραστὰς (*Iliad* 6,73-75).
In this instance, the indicative εἰσανέβησαν can be replaced by the optative εἰσαναβαῖεν.
5. καὶ νῦ κε δὴ ξιφέεσσ' αὐτοσχεδὸν οὐτάζοντο,
εἰ μὴ κήρυκες Διὸς ἄγγελοι ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν
ἦλθον, ὃ μὲν Τρώων, ὃ δ' Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων, (*Iliad* 7,273-275).
In this instance, the indicative οὐτάζοντο can be replaced by the optative οὐτάζοιτο.
6. Ἑκτορα: καὶ νῦ κεν ἔνθ' ὁ γέρων ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὄλεσσε
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὅζῳ νόησε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης: (*Iliad* 8,90-91).
In this instance, the indicative ὄλεσσε can be replaced by the optative ὀλέσσαι.
7. καὶ νῦ κ' ἐνέπρησεν πυρὶ κηλέῳ νῆας εἵσας,
εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκ' Ἀγαμέμνονι πότνια Ἥρη (*Iliad* 8,217-218).
In this instance, the indicative ἐνέπρησεν can be replaced by the optative construction κεν ἐμπρήσαι or κ' ἐνιπρήσαι.
8. οὐδ' ἂν πῶ χάζοντο κελεύθου δῖοι Ἀχαιοὶ
εἰ μὴ Ἀλέξανδρος Ἑλένης πόσις ἠῦκόμοιο
παῦσεν ἀριστεύοντα Μαχάονα ποιμένα λαῶν (*Iliad* 11,504-506).
In this instance, the indicative χάζοντο can be replaced by the optative χάζοιτο.
9. εἰ δὲ ἔπος Πηληϊάδαο φύλαξεν
ἦ τ' ἂν ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα κακὴν μέλανος θανάτοιο. (*Iliad* 16,686-687).
In this instance, the indicative φύλαξεν can be replaced by the optative φυλάξαι.
10. τοιοῦτοι δ' εἴ πέρ μοι ἐείκοσιν ἄντεβόλησαν,
πάντῃς κ' αὐτόθ' ὄλοντο ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ δαμέντες. (*Iliad* 16,847-848).
In this instance, the indicative ὄλοντο can be replaced by the optative ὀλοίατ', which does not require the hiatus in ὄλοντο ἐμῷ.
11. καὶ νῦ κε δὴ ξιφέεσσ' αὐτοσχεδὸν ὠρμηθήτην
εἰ μὴ σφω' Αἴαντε διέκριναν μεμαῶτε, (*Iliad* 17,530-531).
In this instance, the indicative ὠρμηθήτην can be replaced by the optative ὀρμηθείτην.
12. ἦλυθε, καὶ κεν Τρωσὶ μέγα κράτος ἐγγυάλιξεν,
εἰ μὴ Κοίρανος ὦκα ποδώκεας ἦλασεν ἵππους: (*Iliad* 17,613-614).
In this instance, the indicative ἐγγυάλιξεν can be replaced by the optative ἐγγυαλίξαι.
13. καὶ νῦ κεν εἴρυσσέν τε καὶ ἄσπετον ἦρατο κῦδος,
εἰ μὴ Πηλεΐωνι ποδῆγεμος ὦκέα Ἴρις

ἄγγελος ἦλθε θεοῦσ' ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου θωρήσσεσθαι (*Iliad* 18,165-167).

In this instance the indicative εἵρυσσέν can be replaced by the optative εἵρυσσαι.

14. καὶ νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδῃ φάος ἡελίοιο
εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεὺς αἶψ' Ἀγαμέμνονι εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 23,154-155).

In this instance, the indicative ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδῃ can be replaced by the optative ὀδυρομένοις δύη.¹³³⁴

15. καὶ νύ κε δὴ πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἡέλιον καταδύντα
Ἔκτορα δάκρυ χέοντες ὀδύροντο πρὸ πυλάων,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ἐκ δίφοροιο γέρον λαοῖσι μετηύδα: (*Iliad* 24,713-715).

In this instance, the indicative ὀδύροντο can be replaced by the optative ὀδύροιντο or ὀδυροίατο.

16. ἦτοι μὲν τόδε καὐτὸς οἶεαι, ὥς κεν ἐτύχθη,
εἰ ζώνων' Αἴγισθον ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔτετμεν (*Odyssey* 3,255-256).

In this instance, the indicative ἔτετμεν can be replaced by the optative τέτμωι.

17. καὶ μιν ἔφην ἐλθόντα φιλησέμεν ἔξοχα πάντων
Ἀργείων, εἰ νῶιν ὑπεῖρ ἄλλα νόστον ἔδωκε (*Odyssey* 4,171-172).

In this instance, the indicative ἔδωκε can be replaced by the optative δοίη.

18. ἄλγιον: οὐ γάρ οἱ τι τό γ' ἦρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον,
οὐδ' εἰ οἱ κραδίη γε σιδηρὴ ἐνδοθεν ἦεν (*Odyssey* 4,292-293).

In this instance, the indicative ἦεν can be replaced by the optative εἴη.

19. εἰ γάρ μιν ζών γε κίχεις Ἰθάκης ἐνὶ δήμῳ,
τῷ κέν σ' εὖ δώροισιν ἀμεινάμενος ἀπέπεμψε (*Odyssey* 24,284-285).

In this instance, the indicatives κίχεις and ἀπέπεμψε can be replaced by the optatives κίχοις and ἀποπέμψαι.

20. εἰ δὲ φθεγξαμένου τευ ἢ αὐδῆσαντος ἄκουσε,
σύν κεν ἄραξ' ἡμέων κεφαλὰς καὶ νήϊα δοῦρα
μαρμάρῳ ὀκρίοντι βαλὼν: τόσσον γὰρ ἦσιν. (*Odyssey* 9,497-499)

In this instance, the indicative ἄκουσε can be replaced by the optative ἀκούσαι.

21. καὶ νύ κεν ἐξετέλεσσαν, εἰ ἦβης μέτρον ἵκοντο (*Odyssey* 11,317)

In this instance, the indicative ἵκοντο can be replaced by the optative ἵκοιντο.

22. καὶ νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδῃ φάος ἡελίοιο,
εἰ μὴ Τηλέμαχος προσεφώνεεν ὃν πατέρ' αἶψα: (*Odyssey* 16,220-221)

In this instance, the indicative ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδῃ can be replaced by the optative ὀδυρομένοις δύη.

23. καὶ νύ κ' ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδῃ φάος ἡελίοιο,
εἰ μὴ Ὀδυσσεὺς αὐτὸς ἐρύκακε φώνησέν τε: (*Odyssey* 21,226-227)

In this instance, the indicative ὀδυρομένοισιν ἔδῃ can be replaced by the optative ὀδυρομένοις δύη.

24. καὶ νύ κ' ἀναίξαντες ἔβαν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας,
εἰ μὴ ἀνὴρ κατέρυκε παλαιὰ τε πολλὰ τε εἰδώς (*Odyssey* 24,50-51).

In this instance, the indicative ἔβαν can be replaced by the optative βαῖεν.

The reconstruction is only possible if metrical shortening occurred in a verb form:

1. ἔνθα κε λοιγὸς ἔην καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα γέγοντο,
καὶ νύ κε σήκασθεν κατὰ Ἴλιον ἡῦτε ἄρνες,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὅζον νόησε πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*Iliad* 8,130-132).

The indicatives/injunctives γέγοντο and σήκασθεν are the result of modal *markedness reduction* as there was already one optative in the verse.

¹³³⁴ For this form, see *Monro* 1891:72.

In this instance, the indicative ἔην can be replaced by the optative εἴη (with shortening of the optative suffix, which is attested elsewhere).

2. ἔνθά κε λοιγὸς ἔην καὶ ἀμήχανα ἔργα γέγοντο,
καὶ νῦ κεν ἐν νήεσσι πέσον φεύγοντες Ἀχαιοί,
εἰ μὴ Τυδεΐδῃ Διομήδεϊ κέκλετ' Ὀδυσσεύς (*Iliad* 11,310-312).

The indicatives/injunctives γέγοντο and πέσον are the result of modal *markedness reduction* as there was already one optative in the verse.

In this instance, the indicative ἔην can be replaced by the optative εἴη (with shortening of the optative suffix, which is attested elsewhere).

3. καὶ νῦ κεν ἡ παρέλασσε' ἡ ἀμφήριστον ἔθηκεν,
εἰ μὴ Τυδεὸς υἱὶ κοτέσσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 23,382-383).

In this instance, the indicative παρέλασσε' can be replaced by the optative παρελάσσαι (with shortening). The indicative ἔθηκεν can be replaced by the optative θεΐη, or can be due to modal *markedness reduction*.

4. καὶ νῦ κεν οἱ πόρεν ἵππον, ἐπήνησαν γὰρ Ἀχαιοί,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' Ἀντίλοχος μεγαθύμου Νέστορος υἱὸς
Πηλεΐδην Ἀχιλῆα δίκη ἡμείψατ' ἀναστάς: (*Iliad* 23,540-542).

In this instance, the indicative πόρεν can be replaced by the optative πόροι (with shortening).

5. εἰ μετὰ οἷς ἐτάροισι δάμῃ Τρώων ἐνὶ δήμῳ,
ἡδὲ φίλων ἐν χερσίν, ἐπεὶ πόλεμον τολύπευσε.
τῷ κέν οἱ τύμβον μὲν ἐποίησαν Παναχαιοί
ἡδέ κε καὶ ὃ παιδὶ μέγα κλέος ἦρατ' ὀπίσσω (*Odyssey* 1,237-240).

In this instance, the indicative δάμῃ can be replaced by the optative δαμείη (with shortening).

6. οὐδέ κεν Ἀργεῖη Ἑλένη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,
ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἄλλοδαπῷ ἐμίγη φιλότῃ καὶ εὐνῇ,
εἰ ἥδῃ ὃ μιν αὖτις ἀρήϊοι νῆες Ἀχαιῶν (*Odyssey* 23,218-220)

In this instance, the indicative ἐμίγη can be replaced by the optative μιγείην (with shortening).

7. καὶ νῦ κ' ὄδυρομένοισι φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ἄλλ' ἐνόησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη. (*Odyssey* 23,241-242)

In this instance, the indicative ὄδυρομένοισιν φάνη can be replaced by the optative ὄδυρομένοις φανεΐη with shortening.

The reconstruction is only possible if the order of the words/verse is changed:

1. αἶνυτο, καὶ κεν ἔπαυσε μάχης ἐπὶ νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν,
εἴ μιν ἀριστεύοντα βαλὼν ἐξεΐλετο θυμόν. (*Iliad* 15,459-460).

In this instance, the indicative ἐξεΐλετο θυμόν can be replaced by the optative ἐκ θυμόν ἔλοιτο.

2. Μηριόνη τάχα κέν σε καὶ ὀρχηστήν περ ἐόντα
ἔγχος ἐμὸν κατέπαυσε διαμπερές, εἴ σ' ἔβαλόν περ. (*Iliad* 16,617-618).

In this instance, the indicative εἴ σ' ἔβαλόν περ can be replaced by the optative construction εἴ σε βάλοιμι (as is attested a few verses later).

3. καὶ νῦ κε δὴ προτέρω ἔτ' ἔρις γένετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν,
εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεὺς αὐτὸς ἀνίστατο καὶ φάτο μῦθον: (*Iliad* 23,490-491).

This verse could be reconstructed into the optative *καὶ νῦ κε δὴ προτέρω ἔρις ἀμφοτέροισι γένοιτο.

4. εἰ δέ κ' ἔτι προτέρω γένετο δρόμος ἀμφοτέροισι,
τῷ κέν μιν παρέλασσε' οὐδ' ἀμφήριστον ἔθηκεν. (*Iliad* 23,526-527).

This verse could be reconstructed into the optative *καὶ νῦ κε δὴ προτέρω ἔρις ἀμφοτέροισι γένοιτο. In this instance, the indicative παρέλασσε' can be replaced by the optative

παρελάσσει (with shortening). The indicative ἔθηκεν can be replaced by the optative θείη, or can be due to modal *markedness reduction*.

5. εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ πυθόμην ταύτην ὁδὸν ὀρμαίνοντα,
τῷ κε μάλ' ἢ κεν ἔμεινε καὶ ἐσσύμενός περ ὁδοῖο,
ἢ κέ με τεθνηκυῖαν ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔλειπεν. (*Odyssey* 4,732-734).

In this instance, verse can be reconstructed in the optative: *εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ ταύτην ὁδὸν ὀρμαίνοντα πυθοίμην, and the indicative ἔλειπεν can be replaced by the optative λείποι.

6. εἰ γὰρ τίς μ' ἄλλη γε γυναικῶν, αἶ μοι ἔασι,
ταῦτ' ἐλθοῦς' ἡγγεῖλε καὶ ἐξ ὕπνου ἀνέγειρε,
τῷ κε τάχα στυγερῶς μιν ἐγὼν ἀπέπεμψα νέεσθαι (*Odyssey* 23,21-23)

In this instance, the optative can be reconstructed in *ταῦτ' ἐλθοῦς' ἀγγεῖλαι ἐκ τ' ὕπνου ἀνέγειρε. The injunctive ἀνέγειρε is the result of modal *markedness reduction*.

7. καὶ νύ κε δὴ πάντας ὄλεσαν καὶ ἔθηκαν ἀνόστους,
εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίη, κούρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,
ἧῦσεν φωνῇ, κατὰ δ' ἔσχεθε λαὸν ἅπαντα. (*Odyssey* 24,528-530).

In this instance, the second indicative is a result of modal conjunction reduction. The construction could contain an older optative construction *καὶ νύ κε πάντας ὀλέσσειαν καὶ (ἐ)θηκαν ἀνόστους.

The reconstruction is not possible in the following instances:

1. ἔνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη
εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (*Iliad* 2,155-156).
2. καὶ νύ κ' ἔτι πλέονας Λυκίων κτάνε διὸς Ὀδυσσεὺς
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὅζῃ νόησε μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ (*Iliad* 5,679-680).
3. εἰ δέ τευ ἐξ ἄλλου γε θεῶν γένευσ' ὦδ' αἰδηλὸς
καὶ κεν δὴ πάλαι ἦσθα ἐνέρτερος Οὐρανίωνων. (*Iliad* 5,897-898).
4. ἔνθά κέ τοι Μενέλαε φάνη βιότοιο τελευτῇ
Ἕκτορος ἐν παλάμῃσιν, ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτερος ἦεν,
εἰ μὴ ἀναΐξαντες ἔλον βασιλῆες Ἀχαιῶν (*Iliad* 7,104-106).
5. εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ τάδε ἦδε' ἐνὶ φρεσὶ πευκαλίμῃσιν
εὐτέ μιν εἰς Αἶδαο πυλάρταο προὔπεμψεν
ἐξ Ἑρέβους ἄξοντα κύνα στυγεροῦ Αἶδαο,
οὐκ ἂν ὑπεξέφυγε Στυγὸς ὕδατος αἰτὰ ῥέεθρα. (*Iliad* 8,366-369).
6. καὶ νύ κεν Ἀκτορίωνε Μολίονε παῖδ' ἀλάπαξαι,
εἰ μὴ σφωε πατὴρ εὐρὺ κρείων ἐνοσίχθων
ἐκ πολέμου ἐσάωσε καλύψας ἡέρι πολλῇ. (*Iliad* 11,750-752).
7. οὐδ' ἂν πω τότε γε Τρῶες καὶ φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ
τείχεος ἐρρήξαντο πύλας καὶ μακρὸν ὀχῆα,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' υἱὸν ἐὼν Σαρπηδόνα μητίετα Ζεὺς
ᾤρσεν ἐπ' Ἀργείοισι λέονθ' ὥς βουσὶν ἔλιξιν. (*Iliad* 12,290-293).
8. ἔνθά κε λευγαλέως νηῶν ἅπο καὶ κλισιάων
Τρῶες ἐχώρησαν προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν,
εἰ μὴ Πουλυδάμας θρασὺν Ἕκτορα εἶπε παραστάς (*Iliad* 13,723-725).
9. ζήτει· καὶ κέ μ' αἶστον ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἔμβαλε πόντῳ,
εἰ μὴ Νηὶς δμητήρια θεῶν ἐσάωσε καὶ ἀνδρῶν: (*Iliad* 14,258-259).
10. ἔνθά κ' ἔτι μείζων τε καὶ ἀργαλεώτερος ἄλλος
παρ Διὸς ἀθανάτοισι χόλος καὶ μῆνις ἐτύχθη,
εἰ μὴ Ἀθήνη πᾶσι περιδδείσσα θεοῖσιν
ᾤρτο διέκ προθύρου, λίπε δὲ θρόνον ἐνθα θάασσε, (*Iliad* 15,121-124).
11. ἔνθά κεν ὑψίπυλον Τροίην ἔλον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν

- Πατρόκλου ὑπὸ χερσὶ, περιπρὸ γὰρ ἔγχεϊ θῦεν,
εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος ἐὺδμήτου ἐπὶ πύργου
ἔσθι τῷ ὅλοα φρονέων, Τρώεσσι δ' ἀρήγων. (*Iliad* 16,698-701).
12. κρύψαι χῶλὸν ἐόντα: τότε ἂν πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ,
εἰ μὴ μ' Εὐρυνόμη τε Θέτις θ' ὑπεδέξατο κόλπῳ (*Iliad* 18,397-398).
13. καὶ νῦ κεν αὐτῆμαρ πόλιν ἔπραθον, εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων
πολλὰ κακὰ ρέξαντα Μενoitίου ἄλκιμον υἱὸν
ἔκταν' ἐνὶ προμάχοισι καὶ Ἑκτορι κῦδος ἔδωκε. (*Iliad* 18,454-456).
14. ἔνθα κεν Αἰνείας μὲν ἐπεσσύμενον βάλε πέτρῳ
ἢ κόρυθ' ἥε σάκος, τό οἱ ἤρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον,
τὸν δέ κε Πηλεΐδης σχεδὸν ἄορι θυμὸν ἄπηύρα,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὅζῃ νόησε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων: (*Iliad* 20,288-291).
15. καὶ νῦ κ' ἔτι πλέονας κτάνε Παίονας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς,
εἰ μὴ χῳσάμενος προσέφη ποταμὸς βαθυδίνης (*Iliad* 21,211-212).
16. ἔνθα κεν ὑψίπυλον Τροίην ἔλον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν,
εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος Ἀγήνορα δῖον ἀνῆκε (*Iliad* 21,544-545).
17. πῶς δέ κεν Ἑκτωρ κῆρας ὑπεξέφυγεν θανάτοιο,
εἰ μὴ οἱ πύματόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἦντετ' Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 22,202-203).
18. καὶ νῦ κε τὸ τρίτον αὐτὶς ἀναΐξαντ' ἐπάλαιον,
εἰ μὴ Ἀχιλλεύς αὐτὸς ἀνίστατο καὶ κατέρυκε: (*Iliad* 23,733-734).
19. εἰ μὲν γάρ τις μ' ἄλλος ἐπιχθονίων ἐκέλευεν,
ἢ οἱ μάντιές εἰσι θυοσκοοὶ ἢ ἱερῆες,
ψευδὸς κεν φαῖμεν καὶ νοσφιζοίμεθα μᾶλλον (*Iliad* 24,220-222).
20. καὶ νῦ κεν ἦτα πάντα κατέφθιτο καὶ μένε' ἀνδρῶν,
εἰ μὴ τις με θεῶν ὀλοφύρατο καὶ μ' ἐλέησε (*Odyssey* 4,363-364).
21. καὶ νῦ κεν ἐκφυγε κῆρα καὶ ἐχθόμενός περ Ἀθήνη,
εἰ μὴ ὑπερφίαλον ἔπος ἔκβαλε καὶ μέγ' ἀάσθη: (*Odyssey* 4,502-503).
22. πόλλ', ὅς' ἂν οὐδέ ποτε Τροίης ἐξήρατ' Ὀδυσσεύς,
εἴ περ ἀπήμων ἦλθε, λαχὼν ἀπὸ ληΐδος αἶσαν. (*Odyssey* 5,39-40).
23. ἔνθα κ' ἀπὸ ρινοῦς δρύφθη, σὺν δ' ὅστέ' ἀράχθη,
εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεά, γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη: (*Odyssey* 5,426-427).
24. ἔνθα κε δὴ δύστηνος ὑπὲρ μόρον ῶλετ' Ὀδυσσεύς,
εἰ μὴ ἐπιφροσύνην δῶκε λαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη. (*Odyssey* 5,436-437).
25. πόλλ', ὅς' ἂν οὐδέ ποτε Τροίης ἐξήρατ' Ὀδυσσεύς,
εἴ περ ἀπήμων ἦλθε, λαχὼν ἀπὸ ληΐδος αἶσαν. (*Odyssey* 13,137-138).
26. φθίσεσθαι κακὸν οἶτον ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔμελλον,
εἰ μὴ μοι σὺ ἕκαστα, θεά, κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες. (*Odyssey* 13,384-385).
27. τῷ κέ με πόλλ' ῶνησεν ἄναξ, εἰ αὐτόθ' ἐγήρα (*Odyssey* 14,67).
28. ἡμεῖς δὲ πρόπαν ἡμαρ ἐμαρνάμεθ': οὐδέ κε πάμπαν
παυσάμεθα πτολέμου, εἰ μὴ Ζεὺς λαίλαπι παῦσεν. (*Odyssey* 24,41-42).

No reconstruction is needed, because the main clause was put in the optative:

1. καὶ νῦ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνείας,
εἰ μὴ ἄρ' ὅζῃ νόησε Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀφροδίτη (*Iliad* 5,311-312).
2. καὶ νῦ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης ἄτος πολέμοιο,
εἰ μὴ μητρυνὴ περικαλλῆς Ἡερίβοια
Ἑρμέα ἐξήγγειλεν: ὃ δ' ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα (*Iliad* 5,388-390).
3. ἔνθα κε ρεῖα φέροι κλυτὰ τεύχεα Πανθοῖδαο
Ἀτρεΐδης, εἰ μὴ οἱ ἀγάσσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 17,70-71).

Appendix E.3. The other modal indicatives.

The reconstruction is possible in:

1. καί κε τὸ βουλοίμην, καί κεν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν (*Iliad* 3,41).
The indicative ἦεν can be replaced by the optative εἴη.
2. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην: ἦ τ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν (*Iliad* 5,201).
The indicative ἦεν can be replaced by the optative εἴη.
3. ὧδε γὰρ ἐξερέω, τὸ δέ κεν τετελεσμένον ἦεν (*Iliad* 8,454).
The indicative ἦεν can be replaced by the optative εἴη.
4. οὐκ ἂν ἐφ' ὑμετέρων ὀχέων πληγέντε κεραυνῷ
 ἂψ ἐς Ὀλύμπου ἵκεσθον, ἵν' ἀθανάτων ἔδος ἐστίν (*Iliad* 8,455-456).
The indicative ἵκεσθον can be replaced by the optative ἵκοισθον
5. οὐδ' ἂν ἐτι φράδμων περ ἀνὴρ Σαρπηδόνα δῖον
ἔγνω, ἐπεὶ βελέεσσι καὶ αἵματι καὶ κονίησιν (*Iliad* 16,638-639).
The indicative ἔγνω can be replaced by the optative γνοίη.
6. οὐδέ κε Πάτροκλόν περ εὐκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ
 ἐκ βελέων ἐρύσαντο νέκυν θεράποντ' Ἀχιλλῆος (*Iliad* 18,151-152).
The indicative ἐρύσαντο can be replaced by the optative ἐρύσαιντο.
7. τὼ κ' ἀγαθὸς μὲν ἔπεφν', ἀγαθὸν δέ κεν ἐξενάριξε (*Iliad* 21,280).
The indicative ἐξενάριξε can be replaced by the optative ἐξεναρίζαι; the indicative ἔπεφν' cannot be changed.
8. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην: ἦ τ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν (*Iliad* 22,103).
The indicative ἦεν can be replaced by the optative εἴη.
9. ὠφέλες. οὐκ ἂν τόσσα θεοπροπέων ἀγόρευες (*Odyssey* 2,184).
The indicative ἀγόρευες can be replaced by the optative ἀγορεύοις.
10. θεσπεσίη: τότε ἂν οὐ τοι ἀποσχέσθαι φίλον ἦεν (*Odyssey* 9,211).
The indicative ἦεν can be replaced by the optative εἴη.
11. ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐ πιθόμην, ἦ τ' ἂν πολὺ κέρδιον ἦεν (*Odyssey* 9,228).
The indicative ἦεν can be replaced by the optative εἴη.
12. αὐτοῦ: ἐγὼ δέ κεν ἄλλον ὑπερμενέων βασιλῆων
 ἐξικόμην, ὅς κέν μ' ἐφίλει καὶ ἔπεμπε νέεσθαι (*Odyssey* 13,205-206).
The indicative ἐξικόμην can be replaced by the optative ἐξήκοιμ'. The indicative ἐφίλει can be replaced by the optative φιλοίη, with shortening. The indicative ἔπεμπε might contain an older injunctive as result of modal *markedness reduction*.
13. ἀσπασίως γάρ κ' ἄλλος ἀνὴρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθὼν
 ἔειπ' ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἰδέειν παῖδάς τ' ἄλοχόν τε (*Odyssey* 13,333-334).
The indicative ἔειπ' ἐνὶ can be replaced by the optative ἰοῖτ' ἐν.
14. ἐξαπίνης, καὶ κέν μοι ἐλεγχείην κατέχευας (*Odyssey* 14,38).
The indicative κατέχευας can be replaced by the optative καταχεύαις
15. ὅς κεν ἔμ' ἐνδυκέως ἐφίλει καὶ κτῆσιν ὄπασσεν (*Odyssey* 14,62).
The indicative ἐφίλει can be replaced by the optative φιλοίη, with shortening. The indicative ὄπασσεν is an older injunctive because of modal *markedness reduction*.
16. ἵππων τ' ὠκυπόδων ἐπιβήτορας, οἳ κε τάχιστα
 ἔκριναν μέγα νείκος ὁμοίου πτολέμοιο (*Odyssey* 18,263-264).
The indicative ἔκριναν can be replaced by the optative κρίναιεν.
17. πρὶν ἐλθεῖν: τῷ κ' οὐ τι τόσον κέλαδον μετέθηκε (*Odyssey* 18,402).
The indicative μετέθηκε can be replaced by the optative μεταθείη.
18. ἦ γάρ κέν σε μέσον βάλον ἔγχεϊ ὀξυόεντι (*Odyssey* 20,306).

καί κέ τοι ἀντί γάμοιο πατήρ τάφον ἀμφεπονεῖτο (*Odyssey* 20,306-307).
 The indicative ἀμφεπονεῖτο can be replaced by the optative ἀμφιπνοῖτο.
 19. θρήνεον: ἔνθα κεν οὐ τιν' ἀδάκρυτόν γ' ἐνόησας (*Odyssey* 24,61).
 The indicative ἐνόησας can be replaced by the optative νοήσαις.

The reconstruction is only possible if shortening occurred in the verb form:

1. καί κύνας: οὐ μὲν γάρ κε δάμη παύροισι βροτοῖσι (*Iliad* 9,454)
 The indicative δάμη can be replaced by the optative δαμείη, with shortening.
2. ἦ κ' ἐδάμην ὑπὸ χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος καὶ Ἀθήνης (*Iliad* 20,94).
 The indicative ἐδάμην can be replaced by the optative κε δαμείην (with shortening).
3. ἐνθάδε νῦν τρέψας ἀπὸ τείχεος: ἦ κ' ἔτι πολλοὶ
 γαῖαν ὁδὰξ εἶλον πρὶν Ἴλιον εἰσαφικέσθαι (*Iliad* 22,16-17).
 The indicative εἶλον can be replaced by the optative ἔλοιεν, with shortening.
4. κείμενον ἐν πεδίῳ ἐκὰς ἄσπετος, οὐδέ κέ τίς μιν
κλαῦσεν Ἀχαιῶδων: μάλα γάρ μέγα μήσατο ἔργον (*Odyssey* 3,260-261).
 The indicative κλαῦσεν can be replaced by the optative κλαύσαι with shortening.
5. ἦ γάρ μιν ζῶν γε κιχήσεται, ἦ κεν Ὀρέστης
κτεῖνεν ὑποφθάμενος, σὺ δέ κεν τάφου ἀντιβολήσας (*Odyssey* 4,546-547).
 The indicative κτεῖνεν can be replaced by the optative κτείνειν, with shortening.
6. ἀλλὰ κε κεῖνα μάλιστα ἰδὼν ὀλοφύραο θυμῷ (*Odyssey* 11,418).
 The indicative ὀλοφύραο can be replaced by the optative ὀλοφύραιο, with shortening.

The reconstruction is only possible if the word order is changed:

1. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κεν αὐτὸς ὑπέκφυγε κῆρα μέλαιναν (*Iliad* 5,22),
 The reconstruction into the optative is only possible, if the word order is: *οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ κ' ὑπεφύγοι αὐτὸς κῆρα μέλαιναν (with shortening).

The reconstruction is not possible:

2. ὀρνυμένου: ὑπὸ κεν ταλασίφρονά περ δέος εἶλεν (*Iliad* 4,421).
3. οὐκ ἂν ὑπεξέφυγε Στυγὸς ὕδατος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα (*Iliad* 8,369).
4. οὕτω κεν καὶ Τρῶες ἀνέπνευσαν κακότητος (*Iliad* 11,382).
5. χεῖρας ἐμάς, ἐπεὶ οὐ κεν ἀνιδρωτί γ' ἐτελέσθη (*Iliad* 15,228).
6. τὼ κ' οὐ τόσσοι Ἀχαιοὶ ὁδὰξ ἔλον ἄσπετον οὐδας (*Iliad* 19,61).
7. τὼ κεν δὴ πάλαι ἄμμες ἐπαυσάμεθα πτολέμοιο (*Iliad* 21,432).
8. τὼ κε κορεσσάμεθα κλαίοντέ τε μυρομένω τε (*Iliad* 22,427).
9. εὐχέσθαι: τό κεν οὐ τι πανύστατος ἦλθε διώκων (*Iliad* 23,547).
10. τῷ κέ οἱ οὐδὲ θανόντι χυτὴν ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἔχευαν (*Odyssey* 3,258).
11. καί κέ οἱ Ἀργεῖ νάσσα πόλιν καὶ δώματ' ἔτευξα (*Odyssey* 4,174).
12. ἔνθα κεν αἰνότατος λόχος ἔπλετο: τεῖρε γὰρ αἰνῶς (*Odyssey* 4,441).
13. τῷ κ' ἔλαχον κτερέων, καὶ μευ κλέος ἦγον Ἀχαιοί (*Odyssey* 5,311).
14. οἱ κέ σφιν καὶ νῆσον ἐυκτιμένην ἐκάμουντο (*Odyssey* 9,130).
15. αὐτοῦ γάρ κε καὶ ἄμμες ἀπωλόμεθ' αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον (*Odyssey* 9,303).
16. οὐ γὰρ κεν δυνάμεσθα θυράων ὑψηλάων
 χερσὶν ἀπώσασθαι λίθον ὄβριμον, ὃν προσέθηκεν (*Odyssey* 9,304-305)
17. ἔνθα κ' αὐπνος ἀνὴρ δοιοὺς ἐξήρατο μισθοῦς (*Odyssey* 10,84).
18. ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα κύνες δαίτηθεν ἰόντα (*Odyssey* 10,216).
19. ἔνθα χ' ὁμως προσέφη κεχολωμένους, ἦ κεν ἐγὼ τόν (*Odyssey* 11,565).

20. εἰσιδέειν: οὐ γάρ κεν ὑπέκφυγον αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον (*Odyssey* 12,446).
21. τῷ κέν οἱ τύμβον μὲν ἐποίησαν Παναχαιοὶ
ἡδέ κε καὶ ᾧ παιδί μέγα κλέος ἦρατ' ὀπίσσω (*Odyssey* 14,369-370).
22. δμοῦ δ' οὐκ εἷας προβλωσκέμεν, αἶ κεν ἔφαινον (*Odyssey* 19,25).
23. οὐ γάρ Ζεὺς εἷασε Κρονίων: τῷ κέ μιν ἤδη
παύσαμεν ἐν μεγάροισι, λιγύν περ ἐόντ' ἀγορητὴν (*Odyssey* 20,273-274).
24. κείατ' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν: ἰδοῦσά κε θυμὸν ἰάνθης (*Odyssey* 23,47).
25. τῷ κέν τοι τύμβον μὲν ἐποίησαν Παναχαιοὶ
ἡδέ κε καὶ σῶ παιδί μέγα κλέος ἦρα' ὀπίσσω (*Odyssey* 24,32-33).
26. ἄνδρας μνηστῆρας: τῷ κε σφέων γούνατ' ἔλυσα (*Odyssey* 24,381).

Appendix E.4. Overview of modal indicatives replaceable by optatives.

Form	Replaceable by an optative.	Replaceable by an optative, with metrical shortening.	Replaceable by an optative, with word order change.	Indicatives that are older injunctives as result of <i>markedness reduction</i> .	Not replaceable by an optative.
Modal indicatives outside conditionals, nor followed by an <i>ἀλλά</i> clause.	20 instances.	6 instances.	1 instance.	2 instances.	31 instances.
Modal indicatives, followed by an <i>ἀλλά</i> clause.	7 instances.	3 instances.	None.	None.	8 instances.
Modal indicatives in conditionals.	24 instances.	7 instances.	7 instances.	8 instances.	52 instances.
Totals.	41 instances.	16 instances.	8 instances.	10 instances.	91 instances.

Bibliography.

AC= *Antiquité Classique*.

Adams, D.

1985. A Change of *u to *i After a Labial in Late Proto-Indo-European. *MSS* 46. 1-12.

1988. *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology*. New Haven.

1999. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Leiden.

2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B. Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. Leiden.

AGI= *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*.

Ahrens, H.

1839. *Die Linguae Graecae Dialectis Aeolicis et Pseudo Aeolicis*. Göttingen.

1843a. Homerische Excurse. *RhM* 2.161-179.

1843b. *Die Linguae Graecae Dialectis. Liber Secundus. De Dialecto Dorica*. Göttingen.

1849. Homerische excursus. *Philologus* 4. 592-612.

Aikhenvald, A.

2003. Evidentiality in typological perspective. Aikhenvald – Dixon 2003. 1-32.

2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford.

Aikhenvald, A. – Dixon, R.

2003 (eds). *Studies in Evidentiality*. Amsterdam.

AION= *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*.

AJA= *American Journal of Archaeology*.

Ajello, R.

1998. Armenian. Giacalone Ramat – Ramat 1998. 197-227.

AJP= *American Journal of Philology*.

Akakutsa, N.

1997. Negative conditionals, subjectification and conditional reasoning. Athanasiadou – Dirven 1997a. 323-354.

Alberti, G.

1959. L'uso delle particelle nella formula di correlazione *πρῶτον μὲν ... ἔπειτα*. *Maia* 11. 44-66.

Ameis, C. – Hentze, C.

1880. *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang XIX-XXIV. Leipzig.

1882. *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang IV-VI. Leipzig

1883. *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang XIX-XXI*. Leipzig

1884. *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang I-III. Leipzig.

1886. *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang VII-IX. Leipzig.

1887. *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang VII-IX*. Leipzig.

1888. *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang X-XII. Leipzig.

1895. *Anhang zu Homers Odyssee Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang XIII-XVIII*. Leipzig

1896. *Anhang zu Homers Ilias Schulausgabe. Erläuterungen zu Gesang I - III*. Leipzig.

1898. *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang XIII-XVIII. Leipzig.

1900a. *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang I-VI. Leipzig.

1900b. *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang VII-XII. Leipzig.

1901. *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang XIX-XXIV. Leipzig.

1906. *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang 22-24. Leipzig.

Ameis, C. – Hentze, C. – Cauer, P.

1910-1911. *Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Leipzig.

1913. *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. 1-3. Leipzig.

1927. *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt*. Gesang I-III. Leipzig.

Ammann, H.

1922. *Untersuchungen zur homerischen Wortfolge und Satzstruktur*. Freiburg.

1923. Wortstellung und Stilentwicklung. *Glotta* 12. 107-112.

1927. Die ältesten Formen des Prohibitivsatzes im Griechischen und Lateinischen. *IF* 45. 328-344.

Andersen, Ø.

1990. The Making of the Past in the Iliad. *HSCP* 93. 25-45.

Andersen, Ø. – Haug, D.

2012a (eds). *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Cambridge.

2012b. Introduction. Andersen – Haug 2012a. 1-29.

Angier, C.

1964. Verbal Patterns in Hesiod's *Theogony*. *HSCP* 68. 329-344.

AnthrL= *Antropological Linguistics*.

- Arena, R.
1966. Gli aoristi “eolici” in ξα (= ion.-att. (σ)σα). *Helikon* 6. 125-173.
- Arend, W.
1933. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*. Berlin.
- Arntz, H.
1936(ed). *Germanen und Indogermanen*. Festschrift für Herman Hirt. Heidelberg.
- ArOr= *Archiv Orientalni*.
- Athanasiadou, A. – Dirven, R.
1997a. (eds) *On Conditionals Again*. Amsterdam.
1997b. Conditionality, hypotheticality, counterfactuality. Athanasiadou – Dirven 1997a. 61-97
- Aufrecht, T.
1852. Lateinische etymologieen. *KZ* 1. 190-191.
1855. ὕμνος. *KZ* 4. 274-282.
1877a. *Die Hymnen des RigVeda. Erster Theil: Maṇḍala I-VI*. Bonn.
1877b. *Die Hymnen des RigVeda. Zweiter Theil: Maṇḍala V – X, nebst Beigaben*. Bonn
- Aura Jorro, F.
1985. *Diccionario micénico*. I. Madrid.
1993. *Diccionario micénico*. II. Madrid.
- Austin, N.
1975. *Archery at the Dark of Moon*. Berkeley-Los Angeles.
- Austin, W.
1941. The Prothetic Vowel in Greek. *Language* 17. 83-92.
- Autenrieth, G.
1891. *A Homeric Dictionary for Schools and Colleges*. (accessible online via <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>).
- Autenrieth, G. – Kaegi, A.
1902. *Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten*. Leipzig.
- Avery, J.
1885. The Unaugmented Verb Forms of the Rig and Atharva Vedas. *JAOS* 11. 326-365.
- Babič, M.
2011. Enklitika in Korpusssprachen. *Krisch – Lindner* 2011. 29-38.
- Bach, K.
n.d. *Speech Acts*. Accessible via <http://online.sfsu.edu/~kbach/spchacts.html> .
- Back, M.
1991. Das Verhältnis von Aktionsarten und Tempus im Indogermanischen. *KZ* 104. 279-302.
- Bader, F.
1972. Parfait et moyen en grec ancien. *Mélanges de linguistique et philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine*. Paris. 1-26.
1975 (ed). *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*. Paris.
1976. Le présent du verbe „être“ en indo-européen. *BSL* 71. 27-111.
1980a. De lat. “arduus” à lat. “orior”. *RPh* 53 NS (=105). 37-61.
1980b. De lat. “arduus” à lat. “orior”. *RPh* 53 NS (=105). 261-275.
1982. Autour de Polyphème le Cyclope à l’oeil brillant: diathèse et vision. *Die Sprache* 30. 109-137.
1986. Structure de l’énoncé indo-européen. *BSL* 81. 71-120.
1987. Hittite duratives and the problem of IE present formations with infix and suffix. *JIES* 15. 121-156.
1990. Le liage, la peausserie et les poètes-chanteurs Homère et Hésiode: la racine *seh₂ ‘lier’. *BSL* 85. 1-59.
1994. (ed) *Les langues indo-européennes*. Paris.
- Bagot, P.
2002. λίσσομαι. *CEG* 7.127-128.
- Bakker, E.
1988a. *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer: scalarity and description of the particle per*. Leiden.
1988b. Restrictive Conditionals. *Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker* 1988. 5-25.
1991. Foregrounding and indirect discourse: Temporal subclauses in a Herodotean short story. *JPr* 16. 225-247.
1993a. Discourse and Performance in Homeric Poetry. *CA* 16. 1-29.
1993b. Activation and Preservation: The Interdependence of Textual Performance in an Oral Tradition. *OT* 8. 5-20.
1995. Noun Epithet Formulas, Milman Parry and the Grammar of Poetry. *Crielaard* 1995. 97-126.
1997a. The Study of Homeric Discourse. *Morris-Powell* 1997. 283-304.
1997b. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca.

- 1999a. Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer. In: Kazazis, J. – Rengakos, A. (eds). *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart. 50-65.
- 1999b. Homeric OYTOΣ and the Poetics of Deixis. *CP* 94. 1-19.
2005. *Pointing at the past: from formula to performance in Homeric poetics*. Cambridge, MA.
- 2010a. *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Malden, MA.
- 2010b. Pragmatics. Bakker 2010a. 150-167.
2011. Rhapsodes, Bards, and Bricoleurs: Homerizing Literary Theory. Available online via <http://chs.harvard.edu/wa/pageR?tn=ArticleWrapper&bdc=12&mn=1311>.
- Bakker, E. – Kahane, A.
1997. *Written voices, spoken signs: tradition, performance, and the epic text*. Cambridge.
- Balles, I.
2000. Die altindische cvi Konstruktion: Alte Deutungen und neue Wege. In: Forssman, B. – Plath, R. *Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik*. Wiesbaden. 25-36.
2006. *Die altindische cvi Konstruktion: Form, Funktion, Ursprung*. München.
- Bally, C.
1947. *Manuel d'accentuation grecque*. Bern.
- Bammesberger, A.
1986. *Der Aufbau des germanischen Verbalsystems*. Heidelberg.
1987. Index zu KZ 1-100. Accessible online: <http://www1.ku-eichstaett.de/SLF/EngluVglSW/HistSprF.htm>
- 1988 (ed). *Die Laryngalthorie und die Rekonstruktion des indogermanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Heidelberg.
- Barber, P.
2013. *Sievers' Law and the History of Semivowel Syllabicity in Indo-European and Ancient Greek*. Oxford.
- Bartholomae, C.
1878. *Das Verbum im Avesta*. München.
- Bartholomew, R.
1908. *Richard Bentley, A Bibliography*. Cambridge.
- Bartoněk, A.
1979. Greek Dialects between 1000 and 300 BC. *SMEA* 20. 113-140.
2003. *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*. Heidelberg.
2010. *A Comparative Graeco-Latin Syntax within the European Context*. München.
- Basset, L.
1979. *Les emplois périphrastiques du verbe grec MELLEIN*. Lyon.
1984. L'optatif grec et la dissociation énonciative. *LALIES* 4. 53-59.
1986. La représentation subjective d'un point de vue passée : l'optatif oblique dans les complétives déclaratives chez Thucydide. (=2004:19-39).
- 1988a. Valeurs et emplois de la particule dite modale en grec ancien. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 27-37
- 1988b. Qu'est-ce que l'irréel? *FS Taillardat*. 25-32.
- 1989a. L'augment et la distinction discours/récit dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée. Casevitz 1989. 9-16.
- 1989b. *La syntaxe de l'imaginaire: études des modes et des négations dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée*. Lyon.
1990. Le subjonctif du grec homérique permet-il d'envisager le passé ? (=2004:81-98).
- 2000a. L'opposition aspectuelle présent/aoriste chez Platon: une paire minimale „peux-tu le dire?“. (=2004:123-134).
- 2000b. Le prévisible et l'imprévu : oppositions de l'imparfait et de l'indicatif de l'aoriste dans Thucydide VI, 50-52. (=2004: 135-142).
2004. *L'imaginer et le dire. Scripta Minora*. Lyon.
- Bauer, A.
2011. Verberststellung im Hethitischen. *Krisch – Lindner* 2011. 39-48.
- Bauer, B.
2009. Strategies of Definiteness in Latin: Implications for early Indo-European. *Bubeník – Hewson – Rose* 2009. 71-87.
- Bauer, B. – Pinault, G.
2003. *Language in space and time*. A Festschrift for Werner Winter on the occasion of his 80th birthday. Berlin.
- BB= *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Also known as *Bezzenberger Beiträge*.
- Bechert, J.
1964. *Die Diathesen von ἰδῆν und ὀπᾶν bei Homer*. München.
- Bechtel, F.

1902. *Die attischen Frauennamen*. Göttingen.
 1908. *Die Vokalkontraktion bei Homer*. Halle.
 1914. *Lexilogus zu Homer*. Halle.
 1917. *Die griechischen Personennamen bis zur Kaiserzeit*. Halle.
 1921. *Die griechischen Dialekte*. Erster Band. Berlin.
 1924. *Die griechischen Dialekte*. Dritter Band. *Der ionische Dialekt*. Berlin.
- Bechtel, G.
 1936. *Hittite Verbs in –SK–*. Ann Arbor.
- Beck, D.
 2005. *Homeric Conversation*. Washington, DC.
 2012a. *Speech Representation in Homer*. Austin.
 2012b. The Presentation of Song in Homer's *Odyssey*. *Michin* 2012. 25-54.
- Beck, G.
 1919. *De augmenti apud Homerum usu*. Giessen.
- Beck, W.
 1984. εἰπεῖν. *LfggrE* 2,11. 470-481.
 1989. ἰάπτω. *LfggrE* 2,13. 1108.
 1989. καλέω. *LfggrE* 2,13. 1291-1296.
 1991a. κελεύω. *LfggrE* 2,14. 1373-1377.
 1991b. κέλομαι. *LfggrE* 2,14. 1377-1380.
 1993a. μυθόομαι. *LfggrE* 3,15. 268-270.
 1993b. μυθολογεύω. *LfggrE* 3,15. 270-271.
 1993c. μῦθος. *LfggrE* 3,15. 271-278.
- Beckwith, M.
 1994. Greek ἤρπον, Laryngeal Loss and the Reduplicated Aorist. *Glotta* 72.24-30.
 1996. *The Greek Reduplicated Aorist*. PhD Thesis Yale.
 1999. Homeric (ἐκ)λέλαθον. *KZ* 112.78-85.
 2004. Homeric ἠνώγεον (H 394), ἐπρίγει (ψ 216) and the Imperfect Origins of the Greek Pluperfect. *KZ* 117. 76-85.
- Beekes, R.
 1969. *The Development of the Proto Indo European Laryngeals in Greek*. The Hague.
 1972a. H₂O. *Die Sprache* 18. 117-131.
 1972b. On the Structure of the Greek Hexameter: 'O'Neill' Interpreted. *Glotta* 50. 1-10.
 1973. The proterodynamic perfect. *KZ* 87.86-98.
 1986. Homeric ἐμεῖο, Myc. *to e* and the Greek nominal and pronominal genitive singular. *Etter* 1986. 365-371.
 1988. *A Grammar of Gatha Avestan*. Leiden.
 1995. *Comparative Indo-European Linguistics*. Amsterdam.
 1996. Ancient European Loanwords. *KZ* 109. 215-236.
 1997. Review Hettrich – Hock 1995. *Kratylos* 45. 36-39.
 2010. *Greek Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden.
- Behaghel, O.
 1909. Beziehungen zwischen Umfang und Reihenfolge von Satzgliedern. *IF* 25. 110-142.
- Bekker, I.
 1863. *Homerische Blätter*. Beilage zu dessen *Carmina Homerica*. Bonn.
 1872. *Homerische Blätter*. Zweiter Band. Beilage zu dessen *Carmina Homerica*. Bonn.
- Bendahan, J.
 1991. *Der reduplizierte Aorist in den indogermanischen Sprachen*. Freiburg.
- Bendix, E.
 1998. Irrealis as Category, Meaning or Reference. *AnthrL* 40. 245-256.
- Bennett, C.
 1911. *The Syntax of Early Latin*. Boston.
 1914. *Syntax of Early Latin. II The Cases*. Boston.
- Bennett, E.
 1964 (ed.). *Mycenaean Studies*. Madison, WI.
- Bentleiana 1884= Notes on *Homer, Il.* I-VI. *JPh* 13. 122-145. (Homeric notes by Richard Bentley, edited posthumously).
- Benveniste, E.
 1935. *La formations des noms en indo-européen*. Paris.
 1936. Tokharien et indo-européen. *Arntz* 1936. 227-240.

1949. Euphémismes anciennes et modernes. *Die Sprache* 1. 116-122.
 1951. Prétérit et optative en indo-européen. *BSL* 47. 11-20.
 1969. *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. Paris.
- Berg, N.
 1977. Der Ursprung des altgriechischen Plusquamperfekts und die Entwicklung der alphathematischen Flexion. *NTS* 31.205-263.
- Bergaigne, A.
 1877. *Essai sur la construction grammaticale considérée dans son développement historique*. Paris
 1879. *Essai sur la construction grammaticale*. *MSL* 3. 1-51.
- Bergk, T.
 1843. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. Leipzig.
 1853. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. Leipzig.
- Berneker, E.
 1913. *Slavisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
- Bers, V.
 1984. *Greek Poetic Syntax in the Classical Age*. Yale.
- Bertrand, N.
 2006a. La localisation des formes intransitives d'ἴσθημι. Le rôle de ἔσθη et στάς dans le récit homérique. *GAIA* 10. 47-96.
 2006b. Présence du passé dans l'épopée homérique. À propos de *Pointing to the Past* de EJ Bakker. *GAIA* 10. 237-243.
- Bertolín-Cebrián, R.
 1996. *Die Verben des Denkens bei Homer*. Innsbruck.
- Bezzenger, A.
 1878. Homerische Etymologien. *BB* 4. 313-358.
 1902. Anzeig. *BB* 27. 137-185.
- Bichlmeier, H.
 2012. Zur Verwendung der Lokalpartikel im Mykenischen. *KZ* 125. 19-48.
 2014. *Studien zur Verwendung der Lokalpartikel im Mykenischen*. Wiesbaden.
- Birwé, R.
 1955. *Griechisch-Arische Sprachbeziehungen im Verbalssystem*. Walldorf.
- Bizos, M.
 1961. *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris.
- Blanc, A.
 2006. "Lancer du feu" en grec: étude de phraséologie. Pinault – Petit 2006. 23-36.
- Blass, F.
 1889. Demosthenische Studien III. *RhM* 44. 406-430.
- Blass, F. – Debrunner, A.
 1943. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen.
- Bloch, A.
 1944. Über die Entwicklung der Ausdrucksfähigkeit in den Sprachen des Altertums. *MH* 1. 234-257.
- Blümel, W.
 1982. *Die aiolischen Dialekte*. Göttingen.
- Blumenthal, H.
 1974. Some Homeric Evidence for the History of the Augment. *IF* 79. 67-77.
- BMCR= *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*.
- Boisacq, E.
 1938. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Heidelberg.
- Boley, J.
 2002. The Function of the Accusative in Hittite and its implications for PIE. *IF* 107. 124-151.
 2003. Historical basis of PIE syntax- Hittite Evidence and Beyond. Part One: Old Hittite and PIE syntax. *IF* 108. 127-166.
 2004a. Historical basis of PIE syntax. Hittite Evidence and Beyond. Part Two: The Particles. *IF* 109.140-182.
 2004b. *Tmesis and Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Innsbruck.
- Bolkestein, A.
 1976. AcI and ut-Clauses with Verba Dicendi in Latin. *Glotta* 54. 263-291.
 1977. Part II: The Difference between Free and Obligatory ut-Clauses. *Glotta* 55. 231-250.
- Bolling, G.
 1922. On the Interpolation of Certain Homeric Formulae. *CP* 17. 213-222.
 1951. Anta, Anten, Anti in the Homeric Poems. *Language* 51. 223-229.

- Bonomi, A.
1993. Le temps du récit. *CFS* 47. 7-22.
- Bopp, F.
1842. *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen*. Vierte Abteilung. Berlin.
- Bornemann, E. - Risch, E.
1978. *Griechische Grammatik*. Frankfurt.
- Bortone, P.
2010. *Greek Prepositions: From Antiquity to Present*. Oxford.
- Bosshardt, E.
1942. *Die Nomina auf -εῖς*. Zürich.
- Bottin, L.
1969. Studio dell'aumento in Omero. *SMEA* 10.69-145.
- Bowie, A.
1981. *The Poetic Dialect of Sappho and Alkaios*. Salem.
- Bowra, C.
1964. *Pindar*. Oxford.
1972. *Homer*. London.
- Bozzone, C.
2009. *Future Tense in the RgVeda*. MA Thesis Leiden.
2010. New perspectives on Formularity. Jamison – Melchert – Vine 2010. 27-44.
2012. The PIE Subjunctive: Function and Development. Melchert 2012. 7-18.
2014. How Do Epic Poets Construct Their Lines? A Study of the Verb προσέειπεν in Homer, Hesiod, the *Batrachomyomachia*, Appolonius Rhodius and Quintus Smyrnaeus. Handout accessible via www.academia.edu.
- Brandreth, T.
1844. *A Dissertation on the Metre of Homer*. London.
- Braswell, B.
1980. Three Linguistic Notes on Pindar. *Glotta* 58. 205-222.
1988. *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin.
1998. *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine*. Berlin.
- Bréal, M.
1889. Phonétique syntactique: de l'augment. *MSL* 6.333-334.
1900. Les commencements du verbe. *MSL* 11. 268-284.
- Brixhe, C.
1994. Le phrygien. Bader 1994. 165-178.
- Broger, A.
1996. *Das Epitheton bei Sappho und Alkaios. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*. Innsbruck.
- Broganyi, G.
1979 (ed). *Current Trends in Linguistic Theory 11. Festschrift for Oswald Szemerényi on his 65th Birthday*. Amsterdam.
- Brügger, C.
2009. *Homer Ilias. Gesamtkommentar. Band VIII. Vierundzwanzigster Gesang. Faszikel 2 : Kommentar*. Berlin.
- Brügger, C. – Stoevesandt, M. - Visser, E.
2003. *Homer: Ilias*. Band II, Faszikel 2: Kommentar. München.
- Brugmann, K.
1878a. Das verbale suffix *â* im indogermanischen, die griechische passivaoriste und die sogen. aeolische flexion der verba contracta. *MU* 1. 1-91.
1878b. Zur geschichte der personalendungen. *MU* 1. 133-186.
1880. Beiträge zur conjugationslehre: Der sogenannte unechte conjunctiv. *MU* 3. 1-16.
1881. Griechische Etymologien. *KZ* 25.298-307.
1888. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. I. Leipzig.
1892. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II. Leipzig.
1897. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. I. Leipzig. (reworked version from 1888).
1900. *Griechische Grammatik*. München.
1901. Griechisch ἄνθρωπος. *IF* 12. 25-32.
1902. Die ionischen Iterativpräterita auf σκον. *IF* 13. 267-277.
1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Leipzig.
1906. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II.1. Leipzig.

1916. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II.3. Strassburg.
 1925. *Die Syntax des einfachen Satzes im Indogermanischen*. Berlin.
- Brugmann, K. – Thumb, A.
 1913. *Griechische Grammatik*. München.
- Brunel, J.
 1980. Les periods conditionnelles du grec et le problème de l'optatif. *BSL* 75.227-261.
- Bruno, C.
 2011. When stylistics is a matter of syntax: cognate accusatives in Ancient Greek. *Krisch – Lindner* 2011. 100-109.
- BSL= *Bulletin de la Société linguistique de Paris*.
 BSOAS= *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*.
- Bubeník, V. – Hewson, J. – Rose, S.
 2009 (eds). *Grammatical Change in Indo-European Languages*. Amsterdam.
- Buck, C.
 1900. θήρ, Latin *fera*, and the Greek and Latin representatives of Indo-European palatals + ʎ. *AJP* 11.211-216.
 1933. *A Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford.
 1949. *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages*. Chicago.
 1955. *The Greek Dialects*. Chicago.
- BuJb= *Bursians Jahresberichte für Fortschritte der Altertumswissenschaft*.
- Bundy, E.
 1962. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley.
- Burguière, P.
 1960. *Histoire de l'infinitif en grec*. Paris.
- Burton, R.
 1962. *Pindar's Pythian Odes*. Oxford.
- Buttmann, P.
 1825a. *Lexilogus oder Beiträge zur griechischen Wort- Erklärung, hauptsächlich für Homer und Hesiod*. Berlin.
 1825b. *Lexilogus oder Beiträge zur griechischen Wort- Erklärung, hauptsächlich für Homer und Hesiod*. Zweiter Band. Berlin.
 1830. *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre*. Erster Band. Berlin.
 1839. *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre*. Zweiter Band. Berlin.
 1854. *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin.
- Bybee, J.
 1998. "Irrealis" as a Grammatical Category. *AnthrL* 40. 257-271.
- Byrd, A.
 2010. *Reconstructing Indo-European Syllabification*. PhD Thesis UCLA. (accessed online).
 2012. Predicting Indo-European Syllabification through Phonotactic Analysis. *Nielsen-Whitehead –Olander – Olsen – Rasmussen* 2012. 33-52.
- CA= *Classical Antiquity*.
- Calame, C.
 1983. *Alcman*. Rome.
- Caland, W.
 1890. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Avestâ. *KZ* 30.534-547.
 1895. Eine Übereinstimmung zwischen Vedischen und Awestischen Sprachgebrauch. *KZ* 34.456-457.
- Calhoun, G.
 1933. Homeric Repetitions. *UCPCP* 12,1. 1-26.
 1935. The Art of Formula in Homer: EPEA PTEROENTA. *CP* 30. 215-227.
- Campanile, E.
 1990. Ein Archaismus des Tocharischen. *TIES* 4. 55-60.
- Campbell, L.
 1998. *Historical Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge, MA.
- Campbell, L. – Mithun, M.
 1980. The Priorities and Pitfalls of Syntactic Reconstruction. *FoLH* 1. 19-40.
- Cancik, H. – Schneider, H.
 1997(eds). *Der neue Pauly*. Stuttgart.
 1998a(eds). *Der neue Pauly*. Band 4. Stuttgart.
 1998b(eds). *Der neue Pauly*. Band 5. Stuttgart.
 2002(eds). *Der neue Pauly*. Band 12,1. Stuttgart.

- Carey, C.
1989. *Lysias. Selected Speeches*. Cambridge.
2007. *Lysiae Orationes*. Oxford.
- Casaretto, A.
2006. Zur Suppletion von idg. **mleh*₂ und **uek*^h „sprechen“ im Indoiranischen. *KZ* 119. 133-152.
2012. Zum Verhältnis von Kasusfunktion und Lokalpartikel im RgVeda an Hand des Akkusativs. *KZ* 125.49-67.
- Casevitz, M.
1989 (ed). *Études homériques: Séminaire de recherche*. Lyon.
- Cauer, P.
1923. *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*. Leipzig.
- CEG= Blanc, A. e.a. *Chronique d'étymologie grecque*. (appears in *RPh*)
CFS= *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure*.
- Chanet, A.
1988. Objet propositionnel, prolepse et objet interne. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 67-97.
- Chantraine, P.
1927a. Le rôle des désinences moyennes en grec ancien. *RPh* 53 (NS 1). 153-165.
1927b. *L'histoire du parfait grec*. Paris.
1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.
1934. Sur l'archaïsme des parties récentes de l'Iliade (à propos de Θ 1-52). *REG* 47. 281-296.
1935. Les aoristes athématiques à voyelle longue. *MSL* 23. 135-140.
1942. Le rôle et la valeur de év dans la composition. *RPh* 68. 115-125.
1948. *Grammaire homérique*. Paris.
1953. *Grammaire homérique. Tome II : Syntaxe*. Paris.
1964. *Morphologie historique du grec*. Paris. (deuxième édition revue et augmentée).
1966. Questions de syntaxe grecque. *RPh* III, 40. 37-44.
1967. Le parfait mycénien. *SMEA* 3. 19-27.
1968-1974. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Paris.
1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Paris. (updated version of 1968-1974).
- Chantraine, P. – Goube, H.
1964. *Homère Iliade. Chant XXIII*. Paris.
- Cheung, J.
2007. *Etymological Dictionary of the Iranian Verb*. Leiden.
- Christol, A.
2006. Le voile de la nuit: de la poétique au lexique. Pinault – Petit 2006. 37-54.
- Clackson, J.
1994. *The Linguistic Relationship between Greek and Armenian*. London.
2007. *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge.
- Clary, T.
2013. Live Life and Die Death: Case Selection of Cognate Accusatives and Datives in Ancient Greek. Cooper – Rau – Weiss 2013. 1-20.
- Classen, J.
1879. *Beobachtungen über den homerischen Sprachgebrauch*. Frankfurt.
- Clausen, W.
1955. Silva Coniecturarum. *AJP* 76. 47-62.
- Closs Traugott, E. e.a.
1986 (eds). *On Conditionals*. Cambridge.
1997. *Unless and but conditionals: a historical perspective*. Athanasiadou – Dirven 1997a. 145-167.
- Coleman, R.
1985. The Indo-European origins and Latin development of the accusative with infinitive construction. Touratier 1985. 307-341.
- Collinge, N.
1970. *Collectanea Linguistica*. Amsterdam.
1985. *The Laws of Indo-European*. Amsterdam.
- Colvin, S.
2007. *A Historical Greek Reader*. Oxford.
- Combella, F.
1939. Omitted Speech Formulae in Homer. *UCPCP* 12,4.1-26.
1965. Some Formulaic Illogicalities in Homer. *TAPA* 96.41-65.

1976. Homer the Innovator. *CP* 71. 44-55.
- Comrie, B.
1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge.
1981. The theoretical significance of the Latin accusative and infinitive: a reply to Pillinger. *JL* 17. 345-349.
1985. *Tense*. Cambridge.
1986. Conditionals: a typology. Clos Traugott e.a. 1986. 77-99.
1998. The Indo-European Linguistic Family: Genetic and Typological Perspectives. Giacalone Ramat – Ramat 1998. 74-97.
- Conti[-Jiménez], L.
1994. Dativo homérico y locativo indoeuropeo para la expresión del punto final del movimiento. Macía Aparicio 1994. 25-32.
1996. Zur Verwendung von ἐπί+ Dativ und ἐπί+ Akkusativ neben Bewegungsverben bei Homer. *MSS* 56.17-36.
2002. Kasussyntax bei Homer: Überlegungen zum Adverbialen Akkusativ. Hettrich – Kim 2002. 1-20.
2012a. Los adverbios conjuntivos en griego antiguo. Análisis de ἄμα en Homero, Platón y Jenofonte. *Emerita* 80. 45-68.
2012b. Zu Konjunktionalabverbien im Altgriechischen: epeita in Homer. *KZ* 125. 68-80.
2014. El espectro funcional de οὐτω(ς) en los Poemas Homéricos. *Emerita* 82. 25-49.
- Contini – Morava, E.
2012. The message in the navel: (ir)realis and negation in Swahili. *LS* 34. 200-215.
- Cooper, A. – Rau, J. – Weiss, M.
2013 (eds). *Multi nominis grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan Nussbaum*. Ann Arbor.
- Cotticelli Kurras, P. – Rizza, A.
2013. Reconstructing Proto-Indo-European categories: The reflexive and the middle in Hittite and the Proto-language. *JHL* 3. 7-27.
- Couch, H.
1937. A Prelude to Speech in Homer. *TAPA* 68. 129-140.
- Cowgill, W.
1960. Gothic *iddja* and Old-English *ēode*. *Language* 36. 483-501.
- CP= *Classical Philology*.
CQ= *Classical Quarterly*.
- Crespo, E.
1977. *Elementos antiguos y modernos en la rapsodia homérica*. Salamanca.
1988. The Semantic and Syntactic Functions of the Accusative. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 99-120.
1997. Delbrück y la sintaxis de los modos. Crespo – García-Ramón 1997. 27-62.
2003. La sintaxis griega hoy. *Synthesis* 10. 31-53.
2012. Ordinal Adverbs as Markers of Discourse Cohesion. *KZ* 125. 81-89.
- Crespo, E. – García Ramón, J.
1997 (eds). *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*. Wiesbaden.
- Crielaard, J.
1995 (ed). *Homeric Questions, essays in philology, ancient history and archaeology*. Amsterdam.
- Cristofaro, S.
2012. Descriptive notions vs. grammatical categories: Unrealized states of affairs and 'irrealis'. *LS* 34. 131-146.
- CS= *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik*. Also known as *Curtius Studien*.
- Crusius, G.
1849. *Homeri Ilias. Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen*. Hannover.
- Cunliffe, R.
1924. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*. London.
- Cuny, A.
1907. *Le nombre duel en grec*. Paris.
1930. *La catégorie du duel dans les langues indo-européennes et chamito-sémitiques*. Brussels.
- Curtius, G.
1853. Die labiale tenuis als vertreterin einer gutturalen im griechischen. *KZ* 3. 401-418.
1862. *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*. Zweiter Theil. Leipzig.
1869. Zur Bildung des griechischen Nominativ Singularis. *CS* 2. 159-175.
1873. *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*. Leipzig.
1879. *Das Verbum der griechischen Sprache*. Leipzig.

- CW= *Classical Weekly*.
 CWo= *Classical World*.
 Dahl, E.
 2010. *Time, Tense and Aspect in Early Vedic Grammar*. Leiden.
 Dahl, O.
 1997. The relationship between past time reference and counterfactuality: a new look. Athanasiadou – Dirven 1997a. 97-113.
 Danek, G.
 2012. The Doloneia revisited. Andersen – Haug 2012. 106-121.
 Danielsson, O.
 1897. *Zur metrischen Dehnung im älteren griechischen Epos*. Stockholm.
 1909. Zur Lehre vom homerischen Digamma. *IF* 25. 264-284.
 D’Avino, R.
 1969. La funzionalità di ὀνομάζω e la formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε. *Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata*. II. Rome. 7-33.
 De Boel, G.
 1987a. Aspekt, Aktionsart und Transitivität. *IF* 92. 33-57.
 1987b. La syntaxe des verbes “voir” chez Homère. *Glotta* 65. 19-32.
 1988a. *Goal accusative and object accusative in Homer: a contribution to the study of transitivity*. Brussels.
 1988b. The Homeric accusative of limit of motion revisited. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 53-66.
 Debrunner, A.
 1921. Das hellenistische Nebensatziterativpräteritum mit ἄν. *Glotta* 11.1-28.
 1927. Alte Probleme der homerischen Sprache. *IF* 45.173-190.
 1928. Review Chantraine 1927b. *IF* 46. 287-290.
 1930. Review Meillet 1930. *IF* 48. 311-317.
 1936a. Der Aorist ἔφατο. *Glotta* 25.73-79.
 1936b. ἔφατο Aorist. *Glotta* 25. 276.
 1949. Vedisch mā ...śata “er soll nicht Macht haben”. *Die Sprache* 1. 130-135.
 De Decker, F.
 2014. The augment in Homer, with special attention to speech introductions and conclusions. Paper presented at the 21st LIPP Colloquium in Munich on July 3rd 2014. Handout accessible via www.academia.edu.
 De Haan, F.
 2012. Irrealis: fact or fiction? *LS* 34. 107-130.
 De Jong, I.
 1987a. The Voice of Anonymity: Tis Speeches in the *Iliad*. *Eranos* 85. 69-84.
 1987b. *Narrators and Focalizers*. Amsterdam.
 2012a. *Homer. Iliad Book XXII*. Cambridge.
 2012b. Double deixis in Homeric speech: on the interpretation of ODE and OUTOS. Meier-Brügger 2012a. 63-83.
 De Jong, I. – Rijksbaron, A.
 2006 (eds). *Sophocles and the Greek Language*. Leiden.
 De Lamberterie, C.
 1994. L’arménien. Bader 1994. 137-164.
 2006. Traces de la langue poétique indo-européenne dans le lexique arménien. Pinault – Petit 2006. 213-234.
 2007. L’augment dans le texte arménien de l’Évangile. *REArm* 30. 31-57.
 Delaunoy, M.
 1975. Contributions à l’étude de la notion du “possible du passé » en grec classique. *AC* 44. 5-19.
 1988. *Essai de syntaxe grecque classique*. Leuven.
 Demiraj, B.
 1997. *Albanische Etymologien*. Leiden.
 Denniston, J.
 1959. *The Greek Particles*. Oxford.
 De la Vila Polo, J.
 1994. Variantes textuales presente/aoristo en el *Edipo Rey* de Sófocles. Macía Aparicio 1994. 93-101.
 Delbrück, B.
 1869. Über den indogermanischen, speciell den vedischen dativ. *KZ* 18. 81-106.
 1871. *Syntaktische Forschungen I. Der Gebrauch des Conjunctivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen*. Halle.

1874. *Das altindische Verbum aus den Hymnen des RigVeda*. Halle.
 1876. *Syntaktische Forschungen II. Altindische Tempuslehre*. Halle.
 1878. *Syntaktische Forschungen III. Die Altindische Wortfolge aus der Çatapathabrâhmana*. Halle.
 1879. *Syntaktische Forschungen IV. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*. Halle.
 1888. *Syntaktische Forschungen V. Altindische Syntax*. Halle.
 1893. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. I. Leipzig.
 1897. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II. Leipzig.
 1900. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. III. Leipzig.
 1902. Die Grundbegriffe des Kasus und Modi. *NJb NF* 5. 317-336.
 1904. Der germanische optative in satzgefügen. *PBB* 29. 201-304.
- Derksen, R.
 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden.
- De Saussure, F.
 1889. βουκόλος. *MSL* 6.161-162.
- Deshpande, M.
 1992. Justification for Verb-Root Suppletion in Sanskrit. *KZ* 105. 18-49.
- De Vaan, M.
 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*. Leiden.
 2009. The derivational history of Greek ἵππος and ἵππεύς. *JIES* 37. 198-213.
- Diakonoff, I. – Neroznak, V.
 1985. *Phrygian*. Delmar.
- Diehl, E.
 1925. *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*. Leipzig.
- Dietz, R.
 1981. *Der Gebrauch der Partizipia Präsens im Tocharischen. Eine syntaktische Untersuchung*. Frankfurt.
- Dilts, M.
 2005. *Demosthenis Orationes*. Tomus II. Oxford.
- Disterheft, D.
 1984. Non final verbs in Hittite. *KZ* 97.221-227.
- Doederlein, L.
 1858. *Homerisches Glossarium* 3. Erlangen.
- Dressler, W.
 1969. Eine textsyntaktische Regel der idg. Wortstellung. *KZ* 83. 1-25.
 1972. Über die Rekonstruktion der indogermanischen Syntax. *KZ* 85. 5-22.
- Drewitt, J.
 1912a. The Augment in Homer. *CQ* 6. 44-59.
 1912b. The Augment in Homer (continued). *CQ* 6. 104-120.
 1913. A Note on The Augment. *CP* 8. 349-353.
- Drinka, B.
 2009. The *to/no construction of Indo-European. Verbal adjective or past passive participle? Bubeník – Hewson – Rose 2009. 141-158.
- Drummen, A.
 2013. A constructionist approach to the potential optative in Classical Greek drama. *Glotta* 89. 68-108.
- Dubois, L.
 1986a. *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien 1. Grammaire*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
 1986b. *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien 2. Corpus dialectal*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
 1986c. *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien 3. Notes, index, bibliographie*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Duhoux, Y.
 1975. L'ordre des mots en mycénien. *Minos* 13. 123-163.
 1983. *Introduction aux dialectes grecs anciens*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
 1987. Les débuts de l'augment grec: le facteur sociolinguistique. *Minos* 20-22.163-172.
 1988. Le système verbal grec: l'état mycénien. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 121-134.
 1992. *Le verbe grec ancien*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
 1994/5. Le mycénien, connaissait-il la tmèse? *Minos* 29/30. 187-202.
 1998. Autour de la tmèse grecque. Situation dialectale à l'époque; datation de l'épopée grecque. Isebaert – Lebrun 1998. 71-80.
- Duhoux, Y. – Morpurgo-Davies, A.
 1985 (eds). *Linear B: A Survey*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
 2011 (eds). *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek, Texts and their World*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Dum-Tragut, J.

2009. *Armenian*. Amsterdam.
- Dunkel, G.
 1978. Preverb Deletion in Indo-European? *KZ* 96. 14-26.
 1981a. Mycenaean and Central Greek. *Kadmos* 20.132-142.
 1981b. Further traces of preverbal *āmredita* in Greek and Latin. *KZ* 95. 226-231.
 1982. The original syntax of conjunctive **k^we*. *Die Sprache* 28. 129-143.
 1985. IE hortatory **ey*, **eyte* Vedic *eva stātāma*, Hitt. *ehu=wa*, Hom. εἰ δ' ἄγε. *MSS* 46.47-79.
 1990. Jakob Wackernagel und die idg. Partikeln **só*, **ke*, **kem* und **an*. Rix – Eichner 1990. 110-130.
 2014a. *Lexikon der indorermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. Band 1: Einleitung. Heidelberg
 2014b. *Lexikon der indorermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. Band 2: Lexikon. Heidelberg.
- Durante, M.
 1969. La fase eolica della poesia omerica. *Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata*. II. Rome. 85-129.
- Ebel, H.
 1853. Reduplicirte aoriste im griechischen. *KZ* 2. 46-48.
 1855a. Die scheinbaren unregelmässigkeiten des griechischen augments. *KZ* 4. 161-172.
 1855b. Review A. Fleckeisen, zur kritik der altlateinischen dichterfragmente bei Gellius. *KZ* 4.288-290.
- Ebeling, H.
 1885a. *Lexicon Homericum*. I. Α-Ξ. Leipzig.
 1885b. *Lexicon Homericum*. II. Ο-Ω. Leipzig.
- Ebner, A.
 1969. ἀπειλέω. *Lfgre* 1,6. 1007-1010.
- Edwards, A.
 1988. KLEOS APHTHITON and Oral Poetry. *CQ* 28 NS. 25-30.
- Edwards, G.
 1971. *The Language of Hesiod*. Oxford.
- Edwards, M.
 1966. Some Features of Homeric Craftmanship. *TAPA* 97. 115-179.
 1968. Some Stylistic Notes on *Iliad* XVIII. *AJP* 89. 257-283.
 1969. On Some 'Answering' Expressions in Homer. *CP* 64.81-87.
 1970. Homeric Speech Introductions. *HSCP* 74. 1-36.
 1980. Convention and individuality in *Iliad* 1. *HSCP* 84. 1-28.
 1982. Philology and the Oral Theory. *Pacific Coast Philology* 17.1-8.
 1986. Homer and Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part I. *OT* 1/2. 171-230.
 1988. Homer and Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part II. *OT* 3. 11-60.
- Eichner, H.
 1971. Urindogermanisch **k^we* 'wenn' im Hethitischen. *MSS* 29.27-46.
 1973. Hethittisch *mēḫhur*. *MSS* 31, 53-107.
 1975. Die Vorgeschichte des hethitischen Verbalsystems. Rix 1975. 71-102.
 1978. Phonetik und Lautgesetze des Hethitischen- ein Weg zu ihrer Entschlüsselung. Rix 1980. 120-165.
 1988. Anatolisch und Trilaryngalismus. Bammesberger 1988. 123-151.
- Elliott, J.
 2000. Realis and irrealis: Forms and concepts of the grammaticalisation of reality. *LT* 4. 55-90.
- Erbse, H.
 1959. αἶψα. *Lfgre* 1,3. 394-400.
 1965. ἀμείβομαι. *Lfgre* 1,4.
- Erdmann, O.
 1867. *De Pindari Syntactico Usu*. Halle.
- Ehrenfellner, V.
 2006. Nominative Infinitivphrasen in den homerischen Epen. *MSS* 62. 7-21.
- Erhart, A.
 1985. *Zur Entwicklung der Kategorien Tempus und Modus im Indogermanischen*. Innsbruck.
- Erren, M.
 1970. ἀντίκα "sogleich" als Signal der einsetzenden Handlung in Ilias und Odyssee. *Poetica* 3. 24-58.
- Ernout, A. – Meillet, A.
 1967. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris.
- Etter, A.
 1986 (ed). *O o p e r o s i*. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag. Berlin.
- Euler, W.

1979. *Indoiranisch-griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren indogermanischen Grundlagen*. Innsbruck.
1980. Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen. Rix 1980. 173-179.
1990. Präteritaltempora zur Bezeichnung der Vorvergangenheit in den älteren indogermanischen Sprachen. Rix – Eichner 1990. 131-149.
1994. Herkunft und ursprüngliche Funktion des Optativs Präteriti im Germanischen. In: Bense, G. (ed) *Diachronie – Kontinuität – Impulse*. Frankfurt. 25-49.
1995. Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen. In: Smoczyński, W. (ed). *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume, Part One*. Cracow. 137-142.
2010. Der Schwund des Duals in der Flexion indogermanischer Einzelsprachen. *SEC* 15. 77-110.
2011. Stilmittel im Indogermanischen: Überlegungen zu Besonderheiten der Wortstellung und Wortwahl. *IL* 34. 33-46.
- Faesi, J.
1858a. *Homers Iliade erklärt*. Erster Band Berlin.
1858b. *Homers Iliade erklärt*. Zweiter Band Berlin.
- Fajen, F.
1971. Tempus im Griechischen. *Glotta* 49. 34-41.
- Fanning, B.
1990. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford.
- Faulkner, A.
2005. Aphrodite's Aorists: Attributive Sections in the Homeric Hymns. *Glotta* 81. 60-79.
- Fennell, C.
1899. *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes*. Cambridge.
- Fernández Galiano, M.
1992. Books XXI-XXII. Russo – Fernández Galiano – Heubeck 1992. 131-311.
- Fick, A.
1874. *Die griechischen Personennamen*. Göttingen.
1890. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Göttingen.
- Fick, A. – Bechtel, F.
1894. *Die griechischen Personennamen*. Göttingen.
- Fillenbaum, S.
1986. The Use of Conditionals in Inducements and Detrments. Clos Traugott e.a. 1986. 179-185.
- Fingerle, A.
1939. *Typik der homerischen Reden*. München.
- Finglass, P.
2007. *Sophocles Elektra*. Cambridge.
2011. *Sophocles Ajax*. Cambridge.
- Finkelberg, M.
1987. Homer's View of the Epic Narrative: Some Formulaic Evidence. *CP* 22. 135-138.
1990. A Creative Oral Poet and the Muse. *AJP* 111. 293-303.
2004. Oral Theory and the Limits of Formulaic Diction. *OT* 19/2. 236-252.
2012. Late features in the speeches of the *Iliad*. Andersen – Haug 2012a. 80-95.
2013. Equivalent Formulae for Zeus in Their Traditional Context. Cooper – Rau- Weiss 2013. 44-49.
- FL= *Foundations of Language*.
- Fleischman, S.
1989. Temporal distance : a basic linguistic metaphor. *SL* 13. 1-50.
- Flobert, P.
1975. *Les verbes deponents latins des Origines à Charlemagne*. Paris.
- FoL= *Folia Linguistica*.
- FoLH= *Folia Linguistica Historica*.
- Forbes, K.
1958. The Relations of the Particle ἄν with κε(v), κα, καν. *Glotta* 37. 179-182.
- Forssman, B.
1966. *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars*. Wiesbaden.
1974. Zu homerisch ἀγγελίης 'Bote'. *MSS* 33.41-64.
1982. Zur altpersischer Syntax: DB I 50. *MSS* 41. 35-47.
1991. Schichten in der homerischen Sprache. Latacz 1991. 259-289.
- Fortson, B.
1998. Some New Observations on an Old Topic: *návam vácaḥ* in the Rigveda. Jasanoff – Melchert – Lisi 1998. 127-138.

2004. *Indo European language and culture: an introduction*. Oxford.
2010. *Indo European language and culture: an introduction*. 2nd Edition. Oxford.
- Fournier, H.
- 1946a. *Les verbes "dire" en grec ancien*. Paris.
- 1946b. Formules homériques de références. *RPh* 20. 29-68.
- Fraenkel, E.
1950. *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*. Oxford.
1962. *Litauisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
- Fraenkel, H. (Fränkel)
1950. Problems of Text and Interpretation in Apollonius' *Argonautica*. *AJP* 71. 113-133.
- Franke, F.
1854. *Über den gnomischen Aorist der Griechen*. Leipzig.
- Friedländer, P.
1929. Retractationes. *Hermes* 64. 376-384.
- Friedrich, J.
1960. *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg.
- Friedrich, P.
1975. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax. The Order of Meaningful Elements*. Butte.
- Friedrich, R.
2007. *Formular Economy in Homer. The Poetic of the Breaches*. Stuttgart.
- Frisk, H.
1960. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 1:A-Ko. Heidelberg.
1970. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Teil 2. Heidelberg.
1972. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Addenda. Heidelberg.
- Fritz, M.
2005. *Die trikasuellen Lokalpartikeln bei Homer: Syntax und Semantik*. Göttingen.
2010. *Indogermanische Syntax*. Meier-Brügger 2010. 374-412.
2011. *Der Dual im Indogermanischen*. Heidelberg.
- Froehde, F.
1893. Ἀπόλλων. *BB* 19. 230-244.
- Frohberger, H.
1863. Ueber die unterordnung mehrerer verba unter ein ἀπὸ κοινοῦ stehendes ἄν. *Philologus* 19.599-613.
- FS Taillardat= *Hediston Logodeipnon. Mélanges de philologie et de linguistique grecques offerts à Jean Taillardat*. Paris.
- Fugariu, F.
1962. „Personajul anonim“ în epopeă homerică. *Studii Clasice* 4.71-78.
- Führer, R.
1967. *Formproblemuntersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik*. München.
1978. αὐτίκα. LfgrE 1,9. 1598-1609.
1982. βιβάς, βιβάσθων, βιβάσκω, βιβάω. LfgrE 2,10. 56-57.
1993. μερμερίζω. LfgrE 3,15.152-153.
- Fykias, I. – Katsikadeli, C.
2013. The rise of “subordination features” in the history of Greek and their decline. *JHL* 3. 28-48.
- Gaedicke, C.
1880. *Der Accusativ im Veda*. Breslau.
- García-Ramón, J.
1975. *Les origines postmycéniennes du groupe dialectal éolien. Étude linguistique*. Salamanca.
1990. Proportionale Analogie und griechische Morphologie: Athematische Infinitive im Attischen und im Westionischen. Rix – Eichner 1990. 150-169.
1994. Correspondencias y ecuables en la reconstrucción indoeuropea: chip. *to-we-na-i /downai/* ved. *dāvāne*, IE. **dǵ₃-uén-*. Macía Aparicio 1994. 45-55.
2006. Homme comme force, force d'homme: un motif onomastique et l'étymologie du vieil irlandais *gus*. Pinault – Petit 2006. 79-94.
2009. Formal correspondences, different functions,. On the reconstruction of inflectional categories of Indo-European. Bubeník – Hewson – Rose 2009. 237-250.
- 2012a. TAM, Augment and Evidentiality in Indo-European. Handout from Workshop *Grammatische und lexikalische Strukturen im Wandel* held in Cologne, March 21st -23rd 2012.
- 2012b. Aspect and Mood in Indo-European Reconstruction. Melchert 2012a. 73-85.
- 2012c. Homerisch *kai essomenoisi puthesthai* und *dakein apetropon to leonton* :zur Kontinuität der Konstruktionen mit „doppeltem“ Dativ und Ablativ im Griechischen. *KZ* 125. 112-122.

- Garvie, A.
1994. *Homer Odyssey. Books VI-VIII*. Cambridge.
- Garzya, A.
1954. *Alcmane. I Frammenti*. Napoli.
- Geldner, K.
1953a. *Der RIGVEDA aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*. Erster bis vierter Liederkreis. Cambridge, MA.
1953b. *Der RIGVEDA aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*. Fünfter bis achter Liederkreis. Cambridge, MA.
1953c. *Der RIGVEDA aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*. Neunter bis zehnter Liederkreis. Cambridge, MA.
- Genesin, M.
2005. *Studio sulle formazioni di presente e aoristo del verbo albanese*. Rende.
- George, C.
2006. The spatial use of ἀνά and κατά with the accusative in Homer. *Glotta* 82.70-95.
George, C. – McCullagh, M. – Nielsen, B. – Ruppel, A. – Tribulato, O.
2007. *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*. Cambridge.
- Georgiev, V.
1958. *Die altgriechischen Flussnamen*. Sofia.
- Gerö, E.
2000. The Usage of ἄν and κε in Ancient Greek: Towards Unified Description. *Glotta* 76. 176-191
2001. Irrealis and Past tense in Ancient Greek. *Glotta* 77. 178-197.
- Gerth, B.
1878. *Grammatisch-Kritisches zur griechischen Moduslehre*. Dresden.
- Giacalone Ramat, A. – Ramat, P.
1998 (eds). *The Indo-European Languages*. London.
- Giannakis, G.
2009. (Historical) Linguistics and (Classical) Philology. *JIES* 37. 351-399.
- Gildersleeve, B.
1882. Studies in Pindaric Syntax. *AJP* 3. 434-455.
1883a. Studies in Pindaric Syntax III. *AJP* 4. 158-165.
1883b. On the Final Sentence in Greek. *AJP* 4. 416-444.
1886. The Consecutive Sentence in Greek. *AJP* 7. 161-175.
1888. On the Stylistic Effect of the Greek Participle. *AJP* 9. 137-157.
1900. *Syntax of Classical Greek*. Baltimore.
1902. Problems in Greek Syntax. *AJP* 23. 121-141.
1908a. Stahl's Syntax of the Greek Verb. First Article. *AJP* 8. 257-279.
1908b. Stahl's Syntax of the Greek Verb. Second Article. *AJP* 8. 389-409.
1909. Stahl's Syntax of the Greek Verb. Third Article. *AJP* 9.1-21.
- Gippert, J.
1984. Ein indo-iran. Infinitiv des Mediopassivs? *MSS* 43. 25-43.
1985. Verba dicendi: Infinitiv im Indoiranischen. *MSS* 44. 29-57.
- Givón, T.
1994. Irrealis and the Subjunctive. *SL* 18. 265-337.
- Godel, R.
1969. Les aoristes arméniens en -c'-. *Studia Classica et Orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata*. II. Rome. 253-258.
1975a. *An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden.
1975b. De quelques particularités du verbe arménien. *Bader* 1975. 225-232.
- Gonda, J.
1956. *The Character of the Indo-European Moods*. Wiesbaden.
1960a. Reflections on the Indo-European Medium I. *Lingua* 9. 30-67.
1960b. Reflections on the Indo-European Medium II. *Lingua* 9.175-193.
1979. *The Medium in the Rgveda*. Leiden.
- Goodwin, W.
1900. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge.
- Goossens, M.
1987. ἦ. *Lfgre* 2,12. 885.
- Gotō, T.

2002. Funktionen des Akkusativs und Rektionsarten des Verbums- anhand des Altindoarischen. Hettrich – Kim 2002. 21-42.
- Grammont, M.
1948. *Phonétique du grec ancien*. Lyon.
- Grashof, C.
1852. *Abhandlung zur Kritik des Homerischen Textes in Bezug auf die Abwerfung des Augments*. Düsseldorf.
- Grassmann, H.
1877. *Wörterbuch zu Rig-Veda*.
- GRBS= Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies.
- Greenberg, J.
1963a. *Universals of Language*. Cambridge.
1963b. Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. Greenberg 1963a. 73-113.
1986. The realis-irrealis continuum in the Classical Greek conditional. Closs Traugott e.a. 1986. 247-264.
- Griffin, J.
1995. *Homer, Iliad Book Nine*. Oxford.
- Griffith, R.
1889. *The Hymns of the RigVeda*. Translation accessed online.
- Grimm, J.
1962. Die Partikel ἄρα im frühen griechischen Epos. *Glotta* 40. 3-41.
1967. ἄνωγα. *Lfgre* 1,5. 960-970.
- Grimm, J. – Nordheider, H. – Brandt, H.
1973. ἄρα. *Lfgre* 1,7. 1126-1164.
- Güntert, H.
1914. *Über Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Altgriechischen*. Heidelberg.
- Günther, R.
1906/7. Die Präpositionen in den griechischen Dialektinschriften. *IF* 20.1-163.
- Hackstein, O.
1989. Zwei Bemerkungen zu kunstsprachlichen Perfektformen in Homer. *Glotta* 67. 47-59.
1993. On the Prehistory of the Dual Inflection in the Tocharian Verb. *Die Sprache* 35. 47-70.
1995. *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensstambildungen des Tocharischen*. Göttingen.
1997. Probleme der homerischen Formenlehre I: enipso β 137, enipsei H 447, λ 148 und die Etymologie von gr. ἐννεπε, ἐνίσσω / ἐνίπτω und (alt)lat. *insece, inquit*. *MSS* 57. 19-46.
1998. Sprachgeschichte und Kunstsprache: Der Perfekttyp βαβρηότες im frühgriechischen Hexameter (und bei späteren Daktylikern. *Glotta* 74. 21-53.
2000. Reflexe homerischer Lesarten bei den kaiserlichen Daktylikern. *Hermes* 128. 227-229.
2001. Studien zur Grammatikalisierung in älteren indogermanischen Sprachen. *KZ* 114. 15-42.
2002a. Uridg. *CH.CC > *C.CC. *KZ* 115. 1-22.
2002b. *Die Sprachform der homerischen Epen*. Wiesbaden.
2003a. Apposition and word order typology in Indo-European. Bauer – Pinault 2003. 131-152.
2003b. Reflexivpronomina, Präverbien und Lokalpartikel in indogermanischen Sprachen. *TIES* 10. 69-95.
2004. From Discourse to Syntax: The Case of Compound Interrogatives in Indo-European and Beyond. (accessed via <http://www.indogermanistik.uni-muenchen.de/index.html>)
2006. La langue poétique indo-européenne: archaïsme et innovation dans les théonymes. Pinault – Petit 2006. 95-108.
2010a. The Greek of Epic. Bakker 2010a. 401-423.
2010b. *Apposition and Nominal Classification in Indo-European and Beyond*. Vienna.
2011a. Homerische Metrik. Rengakos– Zimmermann 2011. 26-32.
2011b. Der sprachliche Hintergrund. Rengakos– Zimmermann 2011. 32-45.
2011c. *Homer: Einleitung und Übersicht*. Course notes from Homer classes at the LMU Munich.
2011d. Proklise und Subordination im Indogermanischen. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 192-202.
2012a. Review Weiss 2009. *Kratylos* 57. 101-115.
2012b. When words coalesce: Chunking and Morphophonemic Extension. Melchert 2012. 87-104.
2012c. Der negative Existentialsatz im Indogermanischen. *KZ* 125. 123-142.
2013. Polar Questions and Non Headed Conditionals in Cross Linguistic and Historical Perspective. In: Shu-Fen, C. and Benjamin Slade, B. (eds.). *Grammatica et verba: Glamor and verve. Studies in South Asian, historical, and Indo-European linguistics in honor of Hans Henrich Hock on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor. 99-115.

2014. Persistence phenomena in the evolution of constructions. Accessible online: http://www.indogermanistik.uni-muenchen.de/downloads/publikationen/publ_hackstein/persistence_phenomena1.pdf
- Hahn, A.
1953. *Subjunctive and Optative: Their Origins as Futures*. New York.
- Hainsworth, J.
1964. Structure and Content in Epic Formulae: The Question of the Unique Expression. *CQ* 14.155-64.
1968. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford.
1976. Phrase-clusters in Homer. In: Morpurgo-Davies, A. – Meid, W. (eds) *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to Leonard R. Palmer*. Innsbruck, 83-86.
1978. Good and Bad Formulae. In: B. Fenik (ed) *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Leiden. 41-50.
1988a. The Epic Dialect. Heubeck – Hainsworth – West 1988. 24-32.
1988b. Books V-VIII. Heubeck – Hainsworth – West 1988. 249-385.
- Hajnal, I.
1990. *Studien zum mykenischen Kasusystem*. Berlin.
1997. Definite nominale Determination im Indogermanischen. *IF* 102.38-73.
2000. Das Frühgriechische zwischen Balkan und Ägäis. Einheit oder Vielfalt. Accessible online: http://www.uibk.ac.at/sprachen-literaturen/sprawi/pdf/Hajnal/b39_fruehgriech.pdf
2003a. *Troja aus sprachwissenschaftlicher Sicht. Die Struktur einer Argumentation*. Innsbruck.
2003b. Der epische Hexameter im Rahmen der Homer-Troia Debate. In: Ulf, C. *Der neue Streit um Troja. Eine Bilanz*. München. 217-231. (accessible online via www.academia.edu)
2004. Die Tmesis bei Homer und auf den mykenischen Linear B-Tafeln: ein chronologischer Paradox? Penney 2004. 146-178.
- Hale, M.
1987. Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the language of the Rig Veda. Watkins 1987. 38-50.
1993. Tmesis and Movement in Avestan. *IIJ* 36. 29-43.
- Hamm, E.
1957. *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*. Berlin.
- Hammerschmidt, K.
1892. *Über die Grundbedeutung von Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihr Verhältnis zu den Temporibus*. Erlangen.
- Hämmig, A.
2013. *NY EPHELKYSTIKON. Untersuchung zur Verbreitung und Herkunft des beweglichen Nasals im Griechischen*. Hamburg.
- Hamp, E.
1973. Formations indo-européennes à second element $^{*}(H_o)k^{w}$ -. *BSL* 68. 77-92.
1976. The accentuation of Lithuanian compounds. *Baltistica* 12. 25-29.
1978. On Greek Prothetic Vowels. *MSS* 37. 59-68.
1990. Albanian *dhē* 'earth'. *KZ* 103.289-292.
- Harðarsson, J.
1993a. *Studien zum indogermanischen Wurzelaorist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen*. Innsbruck.
1993b. Griechisch ῥῆμα . Meiser 1993a. 159-163.
- Harder, M.
1984a. ἐνπιή . *LfgRE* 2,11. 596-597.
1984b. ἐνίπτω/ἐνίσσω . *LfgRE* 2,11. 597-598.
1984c. ἐν(v)έπω . *LfgRE* 2,11. 599-600.
- Harris, M.
1986. The historical development of SI-clauses in Romance. Closs Traugott ea 1986. 265-284.
- Hartmann, F.
1918. Aorist und Imperfektum. *KZ* 48. 1-47.
- Hartung, J.
1832. *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache. I*. Erlangen.
1833. *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache. II*. Erlangen.
- Haudry, J.
1977. *L'emploi des cas en védique*. Lyon.
1979. Une illusion de la reconstruction. *BSL* 74. 175-189.
1980. La « syntaxe des désinences » en indo-européen. *BSL* 75. 131-166.
1981. Review Klein, J. *The Particle u*. *Kratylos* 25. 122-125.
- Haug, D.

2002. *Les phases de l'évolution de la langue épique. Trois études de linguistique homérique*. Göttingen.
2009. Does Homeric Greek have prepositions? Or local adverbs? (And what's the difference anyway?) Bubeník – Hewson – Rose 2009. 103-120.
2010. The Language of Homer. In: Caragounis, C. (ed). *Greek. A Language in Evolution*. Hildesheim. 87-99.
2012. Tmesis in the epic tradition. Andersen – Haug 2012a. 96-105.
- Häusler, S.
2006. Der Beitrag des Adjektivs zur Organisationsstruktur poetischer Texte in den altindogermanischen Sprachen. Pinault – Petit 2006. 109-124.
- Held, W. – Schmalstieg, W. – Gertz, J.
1987. *Beginning Hittite*. Columbus, OH.
- Hentze, C.
1905. Die Chorreden in den homerischen Epen. *Philologus* 64. 254-268.
1906. Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der Finalsätze auf Grund der homerischen Epen. *Philologus* 65. 161-192.
1907. der homerische Gebrauch der Partikeln *εἰ*, *εἴ* *καὶ* und *ἤν* mit dem Konjunktiv. *KZ* 41. 356-378.
1909. Der homerische Gebrauch der *εἰ* Sätze mit dem Indikativ des Futurs. *KZ* 42. 131-146.
- Hermann, E.
1895. Gab es im Indogermanischen Nebensätze? *KZ* 33. 481-534.
1901. Über das Rekonstruieren. *KZ* 41. 1-64.
1914a. *Sprachwissenschaftlicher Kommentar zu ausgewählten Stücken aus Homer*. Heidelberg.
1914b. Über die Apokope der griechischen Präpositionen. *IF* 34. 338-365.
1914c. Die epische Zerdehnung. *KZ* 46. 241-256.
1917. Kleine Beiträge zur lateinischen Syntax. *KZ* 48. 111-119.
1948. Zusammengewachsene Präteritum und Futurum-Umschreibungen in mehreren indogermanischen Sprachen. *KZ* 69. 31-75.
- Hermann, G.
1801. *De emendanda ratione Graecae grammaticae*. Leipzig.
1805. *Orphica*. Leipzig.
1831. *De Particula AN Libri IV*. Leipzig.
- Hessinger, J.
1978. The Syntactic and Semantic Status of Prepositions in Greek. *CP* 73. 211-223.
- Hettrich, H.
1976. *Kontext und Aspekt in der altgriechischen Prosa Herodots*. Göttingen.
1984. Zur historischen Syntax der Nomina actionis im Rgveda: der doppelte Dativ. *MSS* 43. 55-106.
1985. Zum Kasussynekretismus im Mykenischen. *MSS* 46. 111-122.
1987. Zur Entwicklung der Finalsätze altindogermanischer Sprachen. *KZ* 100. 219-237.
1988. *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*. Berlin.
1990. Rektionaler und autonomer Kasusgebrauch. Rix – Hettrich 1990. 82-99.
1992. Lateinische Konditionalsätze in sprachvergleichender Sicht. Panagl – Krisch 1992. 263-284.
1994. Semantische und syntaktische Betrachtungen zum doppelten Akkusativ. Dunkel e.a. 1994. 111-134.
1996. Review Wakker 1994. *Kratylos* 41. 130-137.
1997. Syntaktische Rekonstruktion bei Delbrück und heute: Nochmals zum lateinischen und griechischen AcI. Crespo – García-Ramón 1997. 219-238.
1998. Die Entstehung des homerischen Irrealis der Vergangenheit. Jasanoff – Melchert – Lisi 1998. 261-270.
2002. Das Projekt einer Kasussyntax des Rgveda: Der Instrumental. Hettrich – Kim 2002. 43-63.
2006. Zum Dativ im Vedischen und anderen indogermanischen Sprachen (accessed online: http://www.vergl-sprachwissenschaft.phil1.uni-wuerzburg.de/fileadmin/04080400/temp/Beitrag_Tagungsakten_Jena_2006.pdf)
2007. *Materialien zu einer Kasussyntax der Rgveda*. Würzburg. (accessible online)
2011. Konkurrierender Gebrauch obliquen Kasus im Rgveda. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 223-231.
2012a. Konkurrenzen von Lokalkasus im RgVeda. *KZ* 125. 143-150.
2012b. Präpositionalausdrücke bei Homer. Meier-Brügger 2012a. 45-61.
- Hettrich, H. – Hock, W.
1995. *Verba et Structurae*. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk. Innsbruck.
- Hettrich, H. – Kim, J.
2002 (eds). *Indogermanische Syntax: Fragen und Perspektiven*. Wiesbaden.
- Heubeck, A.
1985. Zu einigen Problemen der pylischen Tafel An 607. *Minos* 19. 61-90.
1989. Books IX-XII. Heubeck- Hoekstra 1989. 3-145.

1992. Books XXIII-XXIV. Russo – Fernández Galiano – Heubeck 1992. 313-417.
 Heubeck, A. – Hainsworth, J. – West, S.
 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford.
 Heubeck, A. – Hoekstra, A.
 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume II: Books IX-XVI*. Oxford.
 Heyne, G.
 1802. *Homeri Carmina cum brevi Annotatione*. Tomus Primus. London-Dresden
 1821a. *Homeri Ilias cum brevi annotatione*. Volumen Primum. Oxford.
 1821b. *Homeri Ilias cum brevi annotatione*. Volumen Secundum. Oxford.
 1824. *Homeri Ilias*. London - Dresden.
 Hilmarsson, J.
 1996. *Materials for a Tocharian and Etymological Dictionary*. Reykjavík.
 Hinge, G.
 2006. *Die Sprache Alkmans. Textgeschichte und Sprachgeschichte*. Wiesbaden.
 Hintze, A. – Tichy, E.
 2000 (eds). *Anusantatyai. Festschrift für Johanna Narten*. München.
 Hirt, H.
 1912. *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Berlin.
 1913. Fragen des Vokalismus und der Stammbildung im Indogermanischen. *IF* 32. 209-318.
 H.M.
 1832. On Certain Construction of the Subjunctive Mood. *Philological Museum* 1. 96-106.
 Hock, H.
 1971. *The so-called Aeolic inflection of the Greek contract verbs*. PhD Thesis Yale.
 2012. Some notes on Indo-European double direct-object constructions. *KZ* 125. 151-164.
 2013. Proto-Indo-European verb finality. *JHL* 3. 47-76.
 Hock, H. – Joseph, B.
 1996. *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship. An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics*. Berlin.
 Hoekstra, A.
 1969. *Homeric Modifications of formulaic prototypes. Studies in the development of Greek epic diction*. London – Amsterdam.
 1981. *Epic Verse before Homer. Three Studies*. Amsterdam.
 1989. Books XIII-XVI. Heubeck- Hoekstra 1989. 147-287.
 Hoenigswald, H.
 1964. Mycenaean Augments and the Language of Poetry. Bennett 1964. 179-182.
 1986. Some Considerations of Relative Chronology: The Greek Thematic Present. Etter 1986. 372-375.
 1998. Greek. Giacalone Ramat – Ramat 1998. 228-260.
 Hofling, C.
 1998. Irrealis and Perfect in Itzaj Maya. *AnthrL* 40. 214-227.
 Hoffmann, K.
 1957. Zur vedischen Verbalflexion. *MSS* 2. 121-137.
 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg.
 1970. Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbums. *MSS* 28. 19-41.
 Hoffmann, K. – Forssman, B.
 2004. *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Innsbruck.
 Hoffmann, O.
 1891. *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange. 1. Band: der südachäische Dialekt*. Göttingen.
 1893. *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange. 2. Band: der nordachäische Dialekt*. Göttingen.
 1897. *Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhange. 3. Band: der ionische Dialekt*. Göttingen.
 Hoffner, H. – Melchert, C.
 2008. *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*. Winona Lakes.
 Hofmann, J.
 1924. Syntaktische Gliederungsverschiebungen im Lateinischen infolge Erstarrung ursprünglich appositioneller Verhältnisse. *IF* 42. 75-87.
 Holland, G.
 1987. Nominal Sentences and the Origin of Absolute Constructions in Indo-European. *KZ* 100. 163-193.
 Holzweißig, F.

1886. *Griechische Syntax in kurzer übersichtlicher Fassung*. Leipzig.
- Hooker, J.
1977. *The Language and the Text of the Lesbian Poets*. Innsbruck.
- Hornblower, S. – Spaworth, A.
2012 (eds.). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford.
- Horrocks, G.
1980. The Antiquity of the Greek Epic Tradition: Some New Evidence. *PCPS* 206 (NS 26). 1-12.
1981. *Space and Time in Homer*. New York.
1987. The Ionic Epic Tradition: Was There an Aeolic Phase in its Development? *Minos* 20-22. 269-294.
1995. On condition: aspect and modality in the history of Greek. *PCPS* 221 (NS 41). 153-174.
1997. Homer's Dialect. Morris-Powell 1997. 193-217.
- Houben, J.
1977. Word-order Change and Subordination in Homeric Greek. *JIES* 5.1-8.
- HSCP= *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.
- Hübschmann, H.
1875a. *Zur Casuslehre*. München.
1875b. Über die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen. *KZ* 23.5-49.
1894. Arisches und Armenisches. *IF* 4. 112-120.
- Humbert, J.
1960. *Syntaxe grecque*. Paris.
- Hummel, P.
1993. *La syntaxe de Pindare*. Leuven.
- Humphries, M.
1976. On negative Commands in Greek. *TAPA* 7. 46-49.
- ICS= *Illinois Classical Studies*.
- IJAL= *International Journal of American Linguistics*.
- IJDL= *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Historical Reconstruction*.
- IL= *Incontri Linguistici*.
- Irslinger, B.
2008a. *b^heh₂. NIL 7-11.
2008b. *d^heh₁. NIL 99-117.
2008c. *h₃ek^w. NIL 370-382.
- Irslinger, B. – Schneider, C. – Wodtko, D.
2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg.
- Isebaert, L.
1992. Spuren akrostatischer Präsensflexion im Lateinischen. Panagl – Krisch 1992. 193-205.
1993(ed.). *Miscellanea Linguistica Graeco-Latina*. Namur.
- Isebaert, L. – Lebrun, R.
1998 (eds). *Quaestiones Homericae: Acta Colloquii Namurcensis*. Leuven.
- Jackson, P.
2006. The poetics of myth in Pindar's *Olympian* 9,47-49. Pinault – Petit 2006. 125-132.
- Jacobsohn, H.
1908a. Der Aoristtypus ἄλτο und die Aspiration bei Homer. *Philologus* 67.325-365.
1908b. Der Aoristtypus ἄλτο und die Aspiration bei Homer. *Philologus* 67. 481-530.
1909a. Die Präposition πρὸς. *KZ* 42. 277-286.
1909b. Zur Geschichte des Diphthonges ηυ im Griechischen. *KZ* 43. 42-54.
1929. Zum homerischen ὅστερον πρότερον. *KZ* 56. 1-10.
1934. Zum homerischen ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν. *KZ* 62. 132-140.
- Jacobsthal, H.
1907. *Der Gebrauch der Tempora und Modi in den kretischen Dialektinschriften*. Strassburg.
- Jacoby, F.
1923. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Erster Teil. Berlin.
- Jacquiod, B.
1988. Analyse syntactique de la mise au meme cas du tout et du complement de la partie en grec ancien. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 135-145.
1989. *Le double accusatif en grec d'Homère à la fin du Ve siècle avant J.C.*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- James, D.
1982. Past tense and the hypothetical. A cross linguistic study. *SL* 6. 375-403.
1991. Preterit Forms in Moose Cree as Markers of Tense, Aspect, and Modality. *IJAL* 57. 281-297.
- Jamison, S.

- 1979a. The Case of the Agent in Indo-European. *Die Sprache* 25. 129-143.
- 1979b. Voice Fluctuation in the Rig Veda: Medial –*anta* in Active Paradigms. *IJJ* 21.149-169.
- 1983a. Two Problems in the Inflection of the Vedic Intensive. *MSS* 43. 41-73.
- 1983b. *Function and Form of the áya formations*. Göttingen.
1997. Delbrück, Vedic textual genres and syntactic change. Crespo- García-Ramón 1997.239-251.
2009. Where have all the optatives gone? Yoshida – Vine 2009. 27-45.
- Jamison, S. – Melchert, C. – Vine, B.
2010. *Proceedings of the 21st Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Bremen.
- Janko, R.
1979. The use of πρὸς, προτί and ποτί in Homer. *Glotta* 57.24-29.
1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: diachronic development in epic diction*. Cambridge.
1992. *The Iliad: a commentary. Volume 13-16*. Cambridge.
2012. πρῶτον τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀεῖδεν Relative chronology and the literary history of the early Greek epos. Andersen – Haug 2012a. 20-43.
- Jankuhn, H.
1969. *Die passive Bedeutung medialer Formen untersucht an der Sprache Homers*. Göttingen.
- JAOS= *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.
- Jasanoff, J.
- 1978a. Class III Presents in Tocharian. Watkins 1978. 101-115.
- 1978b. *Stative and Middle in Indo-European*. Innsbruck.
1988. PIE *ǵnē ‘recognize, know’. Bammesberger 1988. 227-239.
1997. Where does Sanskrit *bhavati* come from? In: Disterheft, D. (ed). *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel*. Part One. Washington. 173-186.
2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford.
- Jasanoff, J. – Melchert, C. – Lisi, O.
- 1998 (eds). *Mír Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck.
- Jennings Rose, H.
2012. Enipeus. Hornblower – Spaworth 2012.506.
- Jeffers, R.
1972. *The Infinitive of the Indo-European Languages*. PhD Thesis Cornell.
1975. Remarks on Indo-European Infinitives. *Language* 51. 133-148.
- JHL= *Journal of Historical Linguistics*.
- JHS= *Journal of Hellenic Studies*.
- JIES= *Journal of Indo-European Studies*.
- Jiménez Delgado, J.
2006. Los denominados “verbos contractos” en griego micénico. *SMEA* 48. 133-142.
- JL= *Journal of Linguistics*.
- Jokl, N.
1963. Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse des Albanischen zu den übrigen indogermanischen Sprachen. *Die Sprache* 9.113-156.
- Jolly, J.
1871. *Die Moduslehre in den altiranischen Dialekten in ihrer Bedeutung für die Classification des arischen Sprachzweigs*. München.
1873. *Geschichte des Infinitivs im Indogermanischen*. München.
- Jones, B.
2012. Relative chronology and an „Aeolic phase“ of epic. Andersen – Haug 2012a. 44-64.
- Jones-Bley, K. – Huld, M – Della Volpe, A. – Robbins Dexter, M.
- 2003 (eds). *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Washington.
- Joseph, B.
- 1999 (ed). *Historical Linguistics*. Columbus.
- 2003a. Evidentiality in Proto-Indo-European? Building a Case. Jones-Bley – Huld – Della Volpe – Robbins Dexter 2003. 96-111.
- 2003b. Evidentiality. Summation, questions, prospects. Aikhenvald – Dixon 2003. 307-327.
- Josephson, F.
2006. Début d’un emploi créatif de la langue hittite. Genre, style, discours, syntaxe, grammaire poétique. Pinault – Petit 2006. 141 – 156.
- JPh= *The Journal of Philology*.
- JPr= *Journal of Pragmatics*.
- JRS= *Journal of Roman Studies*.
- Kaimio, M.

1977. *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature*. Helsinki.
- Kammenhuber, A.
 1959. Zur hethitisch-luvischen Sprachgruppe. *KZ* 76. 1-26.
 1961. Zur Stellung des Hethitisch-Luvischen innerhalb der indogermanischen Gemeinsprache. *KZ* 77. 31-75.
- Kannicht, R.
 1997. Griechische Metrik. Nesselrath 1997. 343-362.
- Katz, J.
 2006. The riddles of the *sp(h)ij*: the Greek Sphinx and her Indic and Indo-European background. Pinault – Petit 2006. 157-194.
 2007a. The epic adventures of an unknown particle. George – McCullagh – Nielsen – Ruppel – Tribulato 2007. 65-79.
 2007b. The origins of the Greek pluperfect. (<https://www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/pdfs/katz/070702.pdf>)
- Kellens, J.
 1984. *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden.
 1985. Le système modal vieux perse. *MSS* 45. 105-125.
- Kelly, A.
 2007. *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to the Iliad*. Oxford.
- Kelly, S.
 1990. *Homeric Correlation and the Metrical Distinctions between Speeches and Narrative*. New York.
- Kemmer, S.
 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam.
- Kendrick Pritchett, W.
 1955. The conditional sentence in Attic Greek. *AJP* 76. 1-17.
- Kent, R.
 1950. *Old Persian*. New Haven.
- Kent Andersen, P.
 1993. Zur Diathese. *KZ* 106. 177-231.
- Keydana, G.
 1997. *Absolute Konstruktionen in altindogermanischen Sprachen*. Göttingen.
 2008. *Indo-European Syntax*. Accessible online via www.keydana.de
 2011. Wackernagel in the Language of the RigVeda. A Reassessment. *KZ* 124. 106-133.
- Kieckers, E.
 1912. Die Stellung der Verba des Sagen in den Schlatesätzen im Griechischen und den verwandten Sprachen. *IF* 30. 145-185.
 1913. Zu den Schlatesätzen im Lateinischen, Romanischen und Neuhochdeutschen. *IF* 31.7-22.
 1919. Zum „pleonastischen“ *inquit*. *Glotta* 10. 200-209.
 1921. Zu $\phi\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}$, *inquit* „heißt es“. *Glotta* 11. 184-185.
 1925. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen I Lautlehre*. Berlin.
 1926a. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen II Formenlehre*. Berlin.
 1926b. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen III Syntax Erster Teil*. Berlin.
 1926c. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen IV Syntax Zweiter Teil*. Berlin.
- Kim, R.
 2004. Greek Monosyllabic Imperatives in ς : The Endurance of a Morphological Pattern. *Glotta* 80. 95-157.
- Kimball, S.
 1988. *OH₂ in Common Greek. Bammesberger 1988.241-256.
 2014. Homeric $\kappa\rho\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon$, $\rho\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\epsilon$ and $\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\omicron$. *Glotta* 90. 163-173.
- Kinkade, M.
 1998. Is Irrealis a Grammatical Category in Upper Chehalis? *AnthrL* 40. 234-244.
- Kiparsky, P.
 1967a. Sonorant Clusters in Greek. *Language* 43.619-635.
 1967b. A phonological rule of Greek. *Glotta* 44. 109-134.
 1968. Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax. *FL* 4. 30-57.
 1976. Oral poetry: some linguistic and typological considerations. Stolz – Shannon 1976. 73-106.
 2005. The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications. *The Yearbook of South East Asian Studies*. Accessed online: <http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/injunctive.article.pdf> .
- Kirk, G.
 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 1-4*. Cambridge.
 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 5-8*. Cambridge.
- Klaiman, M.

1991. *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge.
- Klein, J.
 1977. The Indo-Iranian Prehistory of the Sanskrit *asáu/ amúm* Pronoun. *JIES* 5. 161-176.
 1981. The Origin of the RigVedic *vāyav indraś ca* Construction. *MSS* 40.73-91.
 1988. Homeric Greek αἶ: A Synchronic, Diachronic, and Comparative Study. *KZ* 100. 249-288.
 1991. Review Basset 1988b. *Language* 67. 863-864.
 1992. Some Indo-European Systems of Conjunction: RigVeda, Old Persian, Homer. *HSCP* 94. 1-51.
 1997. The Contribution of Rigvedic Sanskrit to the Reconstruction of Indo-European Syntax: Three Concrete Cases. Crespo- García-Ramón 1997. 253-281.
- Klingenschmitt, G.
 1972. Griechisch ἰλάσκεσθαι. *MSS* 28.75-88.
 1981. Albanisch und Urindogermanisch. *MSS* 40. 93-131.
 1982. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden.
- Klingner, F.
 1940. Über die Dolonie. *Hermes* 75. 337-368.
- Kloekhorst, A.
 2008. *The Hittite Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden.
- Kluge, F.
 1889. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Strassburg. (now 25th reprint)
- Knobl, W.
 2007. Mind-reading the Poet: Cases of Intended Metrical Irregularity in Vedic Poetry. *SII* 24. 105-139.
- Koch, K.
 1868. *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*. Braunschweig.
- Kocharov, P.
 2012. Perfect Reduplication in Late Indo-European. Melchert 2012. 160-165.
- Köhnken, A.
 1978. Noch einmal Phönix und die Duale. *Glotta* 56. 5-14.
- Koller, H.
 1951. Praesens Historicum und erzählendes Imperfekt. Beitrag zur Aktionsart der Präsensstammzeiten im Lateinischen und Griechischen. *MH* 8. 63-99.
- Kölligan, D.
 2007. *Suppletion und Defektivität im griechischen Verbum*. Bremen.
- König, E.
 1986. Conditionals, concessive conditionals and concessives: areas of contrast, overlap and neutralization. Clos Traugott e.a. 1986. 229-245.
- Kortlandt, F.
 1980. H₂O and oh₂. *LP* 23.127-128.
 1997. Baltic ē and ī/jā stems. *Baltistica* 32.157-164.
- Korzeniewski, D.
 1968. *Griechische Metrik*. Darmstadt.
- Kowaleck, H.
 1887. *Über Passiv und Medium*. Danzig.
- Krahe, H.
 1972. *Grundzüge der vergleichenden Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Herausgegeben von Wolfgang Meid und Hans Schmeja. Innsbruck.
- Krapp, H.
 1966. *Die akustischen Phänomene in de Ilias*. München.
- Krause, W. – Thomas, W.
 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Band I Grammatik. Heidelberg.
- Kretschmer, P.
 1892a. *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.
 1892b. Indogermanische accent- und lautstudien. *KZ* 31. 325-472.
- Krieter – Spiro, M.
 2009. *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar*. Band III. Faszikel 2: Kommentar. Berlin.
- Krisch, T.
 1986. *Überlegungen zur Herkunft und Entwicklung der irrealen Konditionalsätze des Altgriechischen*. Innsbruck.
 1990. Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht. Rix - Eichner 1990. 64-81.
 1997. B. Delbrücks Arbeiten zur Wortstellung aus heutiger Sicht. Crespo- García-Ramón 1997. 283-309.
 2002. Indogermanische Wortstellung. Hettrich – Kim 2002. 249-261.

2011. Some Remarks on the Position of Adverbials in Greek and Vedic Sentences. *Krisch – Lindner* 2011. 300-309.
- Krisch, T. – Lindner, T.
2011. (eds) *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog*. Wiesbaden.
- Krischer, T.
1979. Die Rolle der irrealen Bedingungssätzen in der Geschichte des griechischen Denkens. *Glotta* 57. 39-61.
- Kronasser, H.
1956. *Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen*. Heidelberg.
- Kroonen, G.
2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden.
- Krüger, K.
1845. *Griechische Grammatik für Schulen*. Berlin.
- Kuhn, A.
1853. Über die durch nasalen erweiterten verbalstämme. *KZ* 2. 455-471.
1864. Indische und germanische segensprüche. *KZ* 13. 49-157.
- Kühner, R. – Blass, F.
1890. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. Erster Band. Hannover.
1892. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. Zweiter Band. Hannover.
- Kühner, R. – Gerth, B.
1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre*. Erster Band. Hannover.
1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre*. Zweiter Band. Hannover.
- Kühner, R. – Stegmann, C.
1914. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil. Satzlehre. Erster Band*. Hannover.
- Kunamoto, H.
2009. The Injunctive in Khotanese. Yoshida – Vine 2009. 133-149.
- Kümmel, M.
1998. Wurzelpräsens neben Wurzelaorist im Indogermanischen. *KZ* 111.191-208.
2000. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen*. Wiesbaden.
2001a. **h₂uedH*. LIV 286.
2001b. **h₂ueid*. LIV 288.
2001c. **uek^w*. LIV 673-674.
2001d. **geuh₂* ‘rufen’. LIV 189.
- Kunst, K.
1922. Vom Wesen und Ursprung des absoluten Genitivs. *Glotta* 12. 29-50.
- Kuryłowicz, J.
1925/7. Injonctif et subjonctif dans les Gāthās de l’Avesta. *RO* 3. 164-179.
1935. *Études indo-européennes*. Wrocław.
1956. *L’apophonie en indo-européen*. Wrocław.
1964. *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg.
1967. Phonologie und Morphophonologie. (=1975:73-87).
1972. L’origine de ν ἐφελκυστικόν. *Mélanges de linguistique et philologie grecques offerts à Pierre Chantraine*. Paris. 75-81.
1973. *Esquisses Linguistiques I*.
1975. *Esquisses linguistiques II*. München.
- Kurzová, H.
1988. Morphological Semantics and Syntax in the Non-Formalized Sentence Structure of Greek. *Rijksbaron – Wakker – Mulder* 1988. 147-159.
- KZ= *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, also known as *Kuhns Zeitschrift*. As of 1988 the journal uses the name *Historische Sprachforschung*.
- Lagercrantz, O.
1895. Griechische etymologien: 1. ἀσπάζομαι ἐννέπω. *KZ* 34.382-392.
- Landgraf, G.
1903. *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Dritter Band: Syntax des einfachen Satzes*. Leipzig.
- Landreth, M.
1978. The Position of the Particles ἄν and κεν in Pindar. *Eranos* 76.13-18.
- Lane, G.
1953. Imperfect and preterite in Tocharian. *Language* 29.278-287.
1965. The Tocharian verbal stems in -tk-. *JAOS* 85.66-73.

- Lang, M.
1989. Unreal Conditions in Homeric Narrative. *GRBS* 30. 5-26.
- Langacker, R.
1978. The Form and Meaning of the English Auxiliary. *Language* 54. 853-882.
- Lange, L.
1872. *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel EI*. Leipzig.
1873. *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel EI II: EI KEN/ AN mit dem Optativ und EI ohne Verbum Finitum*. Leipzig.
- Langholf, V.
2008a. τελευτάω. *Lfgre* 4,22. 373-374.
2008b. τελευτή. *Lfgre* 4,22. 374-375.
2010. χαίρω. *Lfgre* 4,24.1091-1098.
- Larrain, C.
1987. *Die Struktur der Reden in der Odyssee 1 - 8*. Hildesheim.
- La Roche, J.
1861. *Homerische Studien: Der Accusativ im Homer*. Wien.
1866. *Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum nebst einem Anhang über die Homerhandschriften*. Leipzig.
1867. *Ilias ad fidem librorum optimorum*. Leipzig.
1869. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig.
1873. *Ilias ad fidem librorum optimorum*. Leipzig.
1882. *Das Augment des griechischen Verbum*. Linz.
1893. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Zweiter Theil. Leipzig.
1901. Die Formen von εἶπεῖν und ἐνεγκεῖν. *WS* 23. 300-311.
- Laser, S.
1958. Über das Verhältnis der Dolonie zur Odyssee. *Hermes* 86. 385-424.
- Lasso de la Vega, J.
1955. *La oración nominal en Homero*. Madrid
- Latacz, J.
1989. *Homer, der erste Dichter des Abendlands*. München.
1991 (ed). *Colloquium Rauricum: 200 Jahre Homer Forschung*. Stuttgart-Leipzig.
1998. Epos: Klassische Antike. Cancik – Schneider 1998a. 11-22.
2000a (ed). *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar*. Prolegomena. München.
2000b. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar*. Band I.1. Faszikel 1: Text: Gesang und Übersetzung. München.
2009 (ed). *Homer Gesamtkommentar (Basler Kommentar BK)*. Berlin.
- Latacz, J. – Nünlist, R. – Stoevesandt, M.
2000. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar*. Band I. 2. Faszikel 2: Kommentar. München.
2009. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar*. Band I. 2. Faszikel 2: Kommentar. München.
- Lattmann, H.
1903. Die Bedeutung der Modi im Griechischen und Latein. *NJb NF* 6. 410-418.
- Lautensach, O.
1899. *Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern und Komikern*. Hannover.
1911. *Die Aoriste bei den attischen Tragikern und Komikern*. Göttingen.
- Lazard, G.
1963. *La langue des plus anciens monuments de la langue persane*. Paris.
1975. La catégorie de l'éventuel. Bader 1975. 347-358.
1998. L'expression de l'irréel: essai de typologie. In : Kulikov, L. – Vater, H. (eds). *Typology of Verbal Categories*. Tübingen. 237-247.
2006. More on counterfactuality and on categories in general. *LT* 10. 61-66.
- Lazzeroni, R.
1998. Sanskrit. Giacalone Ramat – Ramat 1998. 98-124.
- Leaf, W.
1900. *Homer: The Iliad*. I: Books I-XII. London.
1902. *Homer: The Iliad*. II. Books XIII-XXIV. London.
- Leaf, W. – Bayfield, M.
1952. *The Iliad of Homer*. London.
- Lehnert, C.
2005. *Augmentierte und nicht-augmentierte Formen bei Homer. Eine Untersuchung der Verteilung anhand der zwei ersten Bücher der Ilias*. MA Thesis München.
2012. Anmerkungen zum homerischen Augment. Melchert 2012.209-212.
- Lehmann, W.

1974. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*. Austin.
1979. Internal Reconstruction and Historical Syntax. *SL* 3. 65-89.
1980. The Reconstruction of Non-Simple Sentences in Proto-Indo-European. In: Ramat, P. (ed.) *Linguistic Reconstruction and Indo-European Syntax*. Amsterdam. 113-144.
1984. Conditional Clauses in the Early Indo-European Dialects. In: Athlon. *Satura grammatica in honorem Francisci R. Adrados*. Madrid. 235-244.
1998. Explanation of Syntactic Changes in Late Indo-European by Use of Universals. Jasanoff – Melchert – Lisi 1998. 391-404.
2003. Realism in Indo-European Linguistics. Bauer – Pinault 2003. 245-275.
- Lehrmann, A.
1985. *Simple Thematic Imperfects in Anatolian and Indo-European*. PhD Thesis Yale.
- Lehrs, K.
1882. *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*. Leipzig.
- Lejeune, M.
1947. *Traité de phonétique grecque*. Paris.
1972. *Phonétique historique du mycénien et du grec ancien*. Paris.
- Lejnieks, V.
1964. *Morphosyntax of the Homeric Greek Verb*. The Hague.
- Leskien, A.
1866. *Rationem quam I. Bekker in restituendo digammo secutus est, investigavit DR. A. Leskien*. Leipzig.
- Létoublon, F.
1988. Ὑστατος ἐλθεῖν, ἄγγελος ἐλθεῖν. Prédication, attribut et apposition. *Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker* 1988. 161-175.
1992. (ed). *La langue et les textes en grec ancien*. Actes du Colloque Pierre Chantraine. Amsterdam.
- Leumann, M.
1950. *Homerische Wörter*. Basel.
1957. Aor. *ἔπιν und Tempusstämme von griech. πίνειν. *MH* 14. 75-80.
- Leumann, M. – Hofmann, J.
1928. *Stolz-Schmalz Lateinische Grammatik*. München.
- Leumann, M. – Hofmann, J. – Szantyr, A.
1965. *Lateinische Grammatik und Stilistik*. München.
- Levet, J.
1988. Recherches sur le verbe ἡμί. *FS Taillardat*. 155-169.
- LfgrE= Snell, B. – Mette, H. – Erbse, H. - Meier-Brügger, M. et alii (eds). 1955-2011. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen. 25 Lieferungen, 4 Bände.
- LfgrE 1,1= Mette, H. (ed.). 1955. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ᾗ - ἀεικής. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 1,2= Mette, H. (ed.). 1956. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ἀεικής - αἰρέω. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 1,3= Mette, H. (ed.). 1959. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. αἰρέω - ἄλλά. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 1,4= Knebel, G. (ed). 1965. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ἄλλά - ἄν. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 1,5= Voigt, E. 1967 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ἄν - ἄνθρωπος. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 1,6= Voigt, E. 1969 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ἄνθρωπος - ἀπό. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 1,7= Voigt, E. 1973 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ἀπό - Ἀρισταῖος. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 1,8= Voigt, E. 1976 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Ἀρισταῖος - Ἀτρείδης. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 1,9= Voigt, E. 1978 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Ἀτρείδης - ἄωτος. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 2,10= Voigt, E. 1982. (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. βάδην - Διώνη. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 2,11= Voigt, E. 1984 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Διοξίππη - ἐπαμύντωρ. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 2,12= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 1987 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ἐπαμύντωρ - θαῦμα. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 2,13= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 1989 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. θαῦμα - καπνός. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 2,14= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 1991 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. καπνός - λωφάω. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 3, 15= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 1993. (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. μά - νεῖνις. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 3,16= Beck, W. - Meier-Brügger, M. (eds). 1996 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. νενήνις - ὁδός. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 3,17= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 1999 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ὁδούς - ὁράω. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 3,18= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 2000 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ὀργή - πᾶς. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 3,19= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 2001 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Πασιδίκη - πλεῦμων. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 3,20= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 2004. (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. πλευραί - πῶν. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 4,21= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 2006 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. ῥα- τέκτων. Göttingen.

- LfgrE 4,22= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 2008 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Τέκτων - τρίπος . Göttingen.
- LfgrE 4,23= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 2008 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Τριπτόλεμος - φεύγω. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 4,24= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 2010 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. φή - χαλκός. Göttingen.
- LfgrE 4,25= Meier-Brügger, M. (ed). 2010 (ed). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. χαλκότυπος - ἦψ. Göttingen.
- LI= *Linguistic Inquiry*.
- Lienau, C.
1997. Enipeus. Cancik – Schneider 1997. 1034.
- Lindeman, F.
1970. *Einführung in die Laryngaltheorie*. Berlin.
1974. Note sur latin aio. *BSL* 69. 155-157.
1982. *The triple Representation of Schwa in Greek and some related Problems of Indo-European Phonology*. Oslo.
1987. *Introduction to the "laryngeal theory"*. Oslo.
- Lindner, T.
2002. Nominalkomposition und Syntax im Indogermanischen. Hettrich – Kim 2002. 263-279.
2011. *Indogermanische Grammatik. Band IV.1. Komposition*. Heidelberg.
- LIV= Rix, H. (ed). 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.
- Lobel, E. - Page, D.
1955. *Poetarum Lesborum Fragmenta*. Oxford.
- Lohmann, D.
1970. *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin.
- Lord, A.
1951. Composition by Theme in Homer and South Slavic Poetry. *TAPA* 82. 71-80.
1953. Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts. *TAPA* 84. 124-134.
1964. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA.
1968. Homer as Oral Poet. *HSCP* 72. 1-46.
- LP= *Lingua Posnaniensis*.
- LS= *Language Sciences*.
- LSCP= *Leipziger Studien zur Classischen Philologie*.
- LSJ= Liddell, H. – Scott, R. – Jones, H. – McKenzie, R. 1996. *Greek-English Lexicon*, with a revised Supplement. With the Help of Many Scholars. Oxford.
- LT= *Linguistic Typology*.
- Lubotsky, A.
1997a. *A RgVedic Word Concordance*. New Haven.
1997b. (ed). *Sound Law and Analogy*. Leiden.
- Ludwich, A.
1884. *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik, nach den Fragmenten des Didymos*. Erster Theil. Leipzig.
1885. *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik, nach den Fragmenten des Didymos*. Zweiter Theil. Leipzig.
1889. *Homeri Odyssea*. Volumen Prius. Leipzig.
1891. *Homeri Odyssea*. Volumen Alterum. Leipzig.
1902. *Homeri Ilias*. Pars Prior. Leipzig.
1907. *Homeri Ilias*. Pars Altera. Leipzig.
- Lühr, R.
1976. Germanische Resonantengemination durch Laryngal. *MSS* 35. 73-92.
1993. Zur Umstrukturierung von agenshaltigen Sachverhaltsbeschreibungen in Komplementfunktion: Dargestellt an altindogermanischen Sprachen. *KZ* 106. 232-261.
2000. Der Nebensatz und seine Konkurrenten in der Indogermania: Der altindische Relativsatz. *KZ* 113. 71-87.
2008. Competetive Indo-European Syntax. In: Ferraresi, G. – Goldbach, M. *Principles of Syntactic Reconstruction*. Amsterdam. 121-159.
2012. Komplementsätze im Indoiranischen. *KZ* 125. 227-241.
- Lujan, E.
2009. On the grammaticalisation of **k^wi/k^wo* relative clauses in Proto-Indo-European. Bubeník – Hewson – Rose 2009. 221-234.
- Luraghi, S.
1988. The Opposition Total: Partitive and the Use of Cases with Prepositions in Ancient Greek. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 177-192.

1990. *Old Hittite Sentence Structure*. London.
1997. *Hittite*. München.
1998. The Anatolian Languages. Giacalone Ramat – Ramat 1998. 169-196.
2003. Definite referential null objects in Ancient Greek. *IF* 108. 167-194.
2005. The History of the Greek Preposition μετά: From Polysemy to the Creation of Homonyms. *Glotta* 81. 130-159.
2011. Two theoretical approaches to cases in comparison. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 331-341.
- Luria, S.
1974. Zu den neugefundenen pylischen Inschriften. *PP* 15. 241-259.
- Maase, H.
1881. De Littera Nu Graecorum Paragoga Quaestiones Epigraphicae. *LSCP* 4. 1-64.
- Macdonell, A.
1910. *Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg.
1916. *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford.
1917. *A Vedic Reader for Students*. Oxford.
1927. *A Sanskrit Grammar for Students*. Oxford.
- Maddowell, D.
1999. *Demosthenes On the False Embassy*. Oxford.
- Machacek, G.
1994. The Occasional Contextual Appropriateness of Formulaic Diction in the Homeric Poems. *AJP* 115. 321-335.
- Macía Aparicio, L. e.a.
1994. *Quid Ultra Faciam. Trabajos de griego, latín y indoeuropeo en conmemoración de los 25 años de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid*. Madrid.
- MacLeod, C.
1982. *Homer. Iliad Book XXIV*. Cambridge.
- Mader, B.
1984. Ἐνιπεύς. *LfgRE* 2,11. 596.
1989. Ἰαπετός. *LfgRE* 2,13. 1107-1108.
- Madvig, J.
1847. *Syntax der griechischen Sprache, besonders der attischen Sprachform, für Schulen*. Braunschweig.
- Magnien, V.
1922a. L'alternance rythmique chez Homère. *MSL* 22. 70-96.
1922b. L'alternance rythmique chez Homère. *MSL* 22. 113-139.
- Maksoudiantz, M.
1911/2. Arménien ar. *MSL* 17.356.
- Malzahn, M.
2006. Kunstsprachliches und archaisches in der rigvedischen Metrik am Beispiel von distrahiert zu messendem e: neue Evidenz für alte Laryngalpräsenz. Pinault – Petit 2006. 265-290.
2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden.
- Mangold, B.
1873. De diecastasi Homerica imprimis verborum in αω. *CS* 6. 139-213.
- Margulíes, A.
1930. Verbale Stammbildung und Diathese. *KZ* 57. 201-241.
1931. Verbale Stammbildung und Diathese. *KZ* 58. 78-125.
- Markwald, G.
2001. πρᾶνσκω. *LfgRE* 3,19. 1268-1269.
2008. φαίνω. *LfgRE* 4,23. 804-811.
2010. φθάνω. *LfgRE* 4,24. 905-907.
- Martin, L.
1998. Irrealis Constructions in Mocho (Mayan). *AnthrL* 40. 198-213.
- Martínez, J. – De Vaan, M.
2001. *Introducción al avéstico*. Madrid.
- Marzullo, B.
1952. *Il problema omerico*. Firenze.
- Masius.
1885. *Über den Gebrauch des Konjunktiv in unabhängigen Sätzen bei Homer*. Glogau.
- Matasović, R.
2009. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden.
- Matthiesen, K.

1969. ἀπὸ ἡρώων. LfgrE 1,6. 1020-1022.
- Matzinger, J.
2004. Zur umbrischen Syntax: Die Anordnung der Erweiterungen der Determinans-Phrase. *KZ* 117. 269-291.
2005. Phrygisch und Armenisch. Meiser – Hackstein 2005. 375-394.
2012. Zwischensprachen. Areallinguistische Bemerkungen aus dem Bereich des Balkanindogermanischen. Sadovski– Stifter 2012. 137-160.
- Mauri, C. – Sansò, A.
2012. The reality status of directives and its coding across languages. *LS* 34. 147-170.
- Mayrhofer, M.,
1953. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen - A concise etymological Sanskrit dictionary*. Heidelberg.
1957. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen - A concise etymological Sanskrit dictionary*. Heidelberg.
1963. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen - A concise etymological Sanskrit dictionary*. Band II: D-M. Heidelberg.
1986a. *Indogermanische Grammatik*. Teil I. Lautlehre. Heidelberg.
1986b. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Band I. Heidelberg.
1992. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Band II. Heidelberg.
1996. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Band III. Heidelberg.
1997. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Band III. Lieferung 22. Heidelberg.
1998. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Band III. Lieferung 25. Heidelberg.
1999. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Band III. Lieferung 27. Heidelberg.
2001a. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Band III. Lieferung 31. Heidelberg.
2001b. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Band III. Lieferung 32. Heidelberg.
2004. *Die Hauptprobleme der indogermanischen Lautlehre seit Bechtel*. Wien.
- Mayrhofer, M. – Brandenstein, W.
1964. *Handbuch des Altpersischen*. Wiesbaden.
- Mazon, P.
1942. *Introduction à l'Iliade*. Paris.
- McCone, K.
1979. The diachronic possibilities of the Indo-European „amplified“ sentence: a case study from Anatolian. Brogyanyi 1979. 467-486.
1997. Delbrück's model of PIE word order and the Celtic evidence. Crespo- García-Ramón 1997. 363-394.
- McIntyre, L.
1992. *Classical Reduplication*. PhD Thesis University of North Carolina.
- McKay, K.
1981. Repeated Action, the Potential and Reality in Ancient Greek. *Antichthon* 15. 36-46.
1998. Aspectual Usage in Timeless Contexts in Ancient Greek. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 193-208.
- McLennan, G.
1974. Sur l'usage stylistique de l'augment chez Homère et les Alexandrins. *Mnemosyne* IV 27,3. 225-230.
- Meier-Brügger, M.
1986. Homerisch *μεν* oder *μοι*? Etter 1986. 346-354.
1987. Griech. *ἐνέικαι* und *ἐνέγκαι* : vereinigen oder trennen? *KZ* 100. 313-322.
1989. Griechisch *ὁμῆ*, *ἐάφθη*, *ἄαπτος* und *ἐψία*. *MSS* 50. 91-96.
1992a. *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. I. Berlin.
1992b. *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. II. Berlin.
1992c. Rund um griechisch *πιφαύσκω*. *Glotta* 70. 131-133.
2000. Das episch-homerische Wortfeld „singen“, „Sänger“ und seine Vorgeschichte. *ŽA* 50.31-36.
2003. *Indo-European Linguistics*. Berlin.
2005. Griechische Präsentien mit Suffixkonglomerat *nié κλίνω πλύνω κρίνω πίνω φαίνω*. Schweiger 2005. 435-442.
2010. *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin. (zweite erweiterte Auflage)
2012a.(ed). *Homer durch ein grosses Lexikon gedeutet*. Berlin.
2012b. Ein Paar Worte zum Abschnitt E (Etymologie) des LfgrE. Meier-Brügger 2012a. 118-121.
- Meillet, A.
1892. Notes de phonétique. *MSL* 7.161-167.
1900. Notes sur quelques faits de morphologie. *MSL* 11. 6-21.
1910. Remarques sur la langue de Corinne. *MSL* 16. 46-52.

1918. Sur une édition linguistique d'Homère. *REG* 31. 277-314.
- 1920a. L'accent quantitatif et les alternances des voyelles. *MSL* 21. 108-111.
- 1920b. Sur le rythme quantitatif de la langue védique. *MSL* 21. 193-207.
- 1922a. Remarques sur les désinences verbales de l'indo-européen. *BSL* 23. 64-75.
- 1922b. L'emploi du duel chez Homère et l'élimination du duel. *MSL* 22. 145-164.
- 1924a. A propos de hom. φεῖκτο . *BSL* 24. 110-112.
- 1924b. Sur gr. οἴκωχα . *BSL* 24. 113-116.
- 1924c. Sur le thème avestique yāsa- . *BSL* 24. 117.
- 1924d. Sur les désinences en r. *BSL* 24. 189-194.
1925. Remarques sur l'étymologie de quelques mots grecs. *BSL* 26. 1-22.
1927. Deux notes sur des formes grammaticales anciennes du grec. *RPh* 53. 193-198.
1928. Les noms du type *T'RĀUN*. *REArm* 8. 1-6.
1930. *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*. Paris.
1933. *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*. Paris.
1935. Sur les désinences secondaires de 3e personne du singulier. *MSL* 23. 215-224.
1936. *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*. Vienna.
1937. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Paris.
- Meillet, A. – Benveniste, E.
1931. *Grammaire du vieux perse*. Paris.
- Meillet, A. – Vendryès, J.
1948. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. Paris.
- Meiser, G.
1986. *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache*. Innsbruck.
1993a (ed). *Indogermanica et Italica*. Festschrift für Helmut Rix. Innsbruck.
1993b. Uralische Modussyntax: zur Genese des Konjunktiv Imperfekts. Rix 1993. 167-175.
1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt.
2003. *Veni Vidi Vici. Die Vorgeschichte des lateinischen Perfektsystems*. München.
- Meiser, G. - Hackstein, O.
2005 (eds.). *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel*. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden.
- Meister, K.
1921. *Die homerische Kunstsprache*. Leipzig.
- Meister, K(laus).
1998. Hekataios aus Milet. Cancik – Schneider 1998b. 263-267.
- Meisterhans, K.
1885. *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*. Berlin.
- Meisterhans, K. - Schwyzler, E.
1900. *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*. Berlin.
- Mekler, G.
1887. *Beiträge zur Bildung des griechischen Verbums*. Dorpat.
- Melazzo, R.
2012. The Dual in Ancient Greek. *IL* 35. 49-89.
- Melchert, C.
1978. Tocharian verb stems in -tk-. *KZ* 91. 93-130.
1994. *Anatolian Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam.
2012 (ed). *The Indo-European Verb*. Los Angeles.
- Meltzer, H.
1912. Griechische Syntax, Bedeutungslehre und Verwandtes. *BuJb* 159. 280-382.
- Méndez Dosuna, J.
1994. Contactos silábicos y procesos de geminación en griego antiguo. *Die Sprache* 36. 103-127.
- Menge, H.
1955. *Repetitorium der lateinischen Syntax und Stilistik*. Leverkusen.
- Methner, R.
1908. *Die Grundbedeutungen und Gebrauchstypen der Modi im Griechischen*. Bromberg.
- Meyer, G.
1891. *Griechische Grammatik*. Leipzig.
1892. *Albanesische Studien*. Wien.
- Meyer, L.
1861. Vocalvorschlag, vocalzerdehnung, distraction. *KZ* 10. 45-58.
- MH= *Museum Helveticum*.

- Michael, L.
2014. The Nanti reality status system: Implications for the typological validity of the realis/irrealis contrast. *LT* 18. 251-288.
- Migron, S.
1990. Notes on PIE **k^we*. *MSS* 51.129-145.
- Miller, G.
1982. *Homer and the Ionic epic tradition: some phonic and phonological evidence against an Aeolic 'phase'*. Innsbruck.
- Minchin, E.
2012(ed). *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World*. Leiden.
- Misteli, F.
1868a. Über die accentuation des griechischen. *KZ* 17. 81-134.
1868b. Über die accentuation des griechischen (vortsetzung). *KZ* 17. 161-194.
- Mohrmann, C.
1933. *Homerische Sprachleer*. Nijmegen.
- Moller, E.
1853. Ueber den gnomischen aorist. *Philologus* 8. 113-129.
- Mommsen, T(ycho).
1895. *Beiträge zu der Lehre von den griechischen Präpositionen*. Berlin.
- Monro, D.
1891. *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*. Oxford.
- Monro, D. – Allen, T.
1907. *Homeri Opera: Odysseae libros I-XII continens*. Oxford.
1908. *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros I - XII continens*. Oxford.
1910. *Homeri Opera: Odysseae libros XIII - XXIV continens*. Oxford.
1913. *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros XIII - XXIV continens*. Oxford.
- Monteil, P.
1963. *La phrase relative en grec ancien*. Paris.
- Moorhouse, A.
1988. The Role of the Accusative Case. *Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker* 1988. 209-218.
- Morpurgo-Davies, A.
1970. Review Bader, F. *Études de composition nominale en mycénien*. *CR* 20. 205-206.
1985. Mycenaean and Greek Language. *Duhoux- Morpurgo-Davies* 1985. 75-125.
- Morris, I. – Powell, B.
1997 (eds). *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden.
- MSL= *Mémoires de la société linguistique de Paris*.
MSS= *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*.
MU= Brugmann, K. – Osthoff, H. *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Leipzig.
- Muchnová, D.
2011. *Entre conjonction, connecteur et particule. Le cas de ἐπεὶ en grec ancien ; étude syntaxique, sémantique et pragmatique*. Prague.
- Mulder, H.
1988. Non Accusative Second Arguments of Two-Place Verbs in Ancient Greek. *Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker* 1988. 219-236.
- Mulvany, C.
1896. Some Forms of the Homeric Subjunctive. *CR* 10. 24-27.
- Mumm, P.
1995. Verbale Definitheit und der vedische Injunktiv. *Hettrich – Hock* 1995. 169-193.
2004. Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments. In: *Krisch, T. (ed). Analecta homini universali dicata*. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl. Stuttgart. 148-158.
2011. Optativ und verbale Infinitheit. *Krisch – Lindner* 2011. 411-420.
- Muñoz Valle, I.
1971. Interpretación de la formula homérica ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν. *Emerita* 39. 305-314.
- Murray, A. – Dimock, G.
1998a. *Homer Odyssey*. Books 1-12. Cambridge, MA.
1998b. *Homer Odyssey*. Books 13-24. Cambridge, MA.
- Murray, A. – Wyatt, W.
1999a. *Homer Iliad*. Books 1-12. Cambridge, MA.
1999b. *Homer Iliad*. Books 13-24. Cambridge, MA.

- Mushin, I.
2006. Motivations for second position. Evidence from North-Central Australia. *LT* 10. 287-326.
- Musić, A.
1927. *Beiträge zur griechischen Satzlehre (Bedingungs-, Relativ-, Fragesätze)*. Zagreb.
- Mutzbauer, C.
1893. *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Tempuslehre und der homerische Tempusgebrauch*. Strassburg.
1903a. Die Grundbedeutung des Conjunctivs und Optativs und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen. *Philologus* 62. 388-409.
1903b. Das Wesen des Optativs. *Philologus* 62. 626-638.
1908. *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihre Entwicklung im Griechischen*. Leipzig.
1909. *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Tempuslehre und der homerische Tempusgebrauch*. Strassburg.
1916. *Das Wesen des griechischen Infinitivs und die Entwicklung seines Gebrauches bei Homer*. Bonn.
- Naafs – Wilstra, M.
1987. Indo-European *Dichtersprache* in Sappho and Alcaeus. *JIES* 15. 273-283.
- Naegelsbach, C.
1834. *Bemerkungen zur Ilias (Buch I; II 1-483)*. Nürnberg.
- Nagy, G.
1976. Formula and Meter. Stolz- Shannon 1976. 239-260.
1990. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca.
1994. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.
1994/5. A Mycenaean Reflex in Homer: φορνῆα. *Minos* 29/30. 171-176.
1996. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge.
2006. Homer's name revisited. Pinault – Petit 2006. 317-330.
2008. *Greek: an Updating of a Survey of Recent Work*. Accessible via chs.harvard.edu.
- Nagler, M.
1967. Towards a Generative View of the Oral Formula. *TAPA* 98. 267-311.
- Nagy, G. – Householder, F.
1972. *Greek, A Survey of Recent Work*. The Hague.
- Narten, J.
1969. Zum "proterodynamischen" Wurzelpräsens. In: *Pratidānam. Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to F.B.J. Kuiper*. The Hague. 9-19.
1995. *Kleine Schriften*. Herausgegeben von M. Albino und M. Fritz. Wiesbaden.
- Negri, M.
1981. *Miceneo e lingua omerica*. Firenze.
- Neisser, W.
1883. Zur vedischen verballehre. *BB* 7. 211-241.
1927. *Vedica*. *ZII* 5. 281-292.
- Nesselrath, G.
1992. *Ungeschehenes Geschehen. Beinahe Episoden im griechischen und römischen Epos von Homer bis zum Spätantike*. Stuttgart.
1997. (ed). *Einleitung in die griechische Philologie*. Leipzig.
- Neu, G.
1968. *Das hethitische Mediopassiv und seine indogermanischen Grundlagen*. Wiesbaden.
- Neumann, G.
1974. Zu den kretischen Kriegernamen auf den Waffen von Afrati. *KZ* 88. 32-40.
1988. *Phrygisch und Griechisch*. Vienna.
- Niederreiter, S.
2011. Zum Wortfeld der Verba dicendi im Rgveda. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 421-430.
2013. Zum Gebrauch einer Verba dicendi im RigVeda. Handout 1. Grazer Kolloquium zur indogermanischen Altertumskunde. Graz 14.11.2013.
- Nielsen-Whitehead, B. – Olander, T. – Olsen, B. – Rasmussen, J.
2012. *The Sound of Indo-European*. Copenhagen.
- Niepukoj, M.
1997. *The Development of Verbal Reduplication in Indo-European*. Washington, DC.
- NIL= Irslinger, B. –Schneider, C. - Wodtko, D. 2008. *Nomina im indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg.
- NJb= *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur*.
- Nordheider, H.
1978a. αὐδάω. LfgrE 1,9 1534-1540.
1978b. αὐδή. LfgrE 1,9 1540-1543.
1978c. αὐδήεις. LfgrE 1,9 1543-1544.

NTS= *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*.

Nünlist, R.

2000. *Homerische Metrik*. Latacz 2000a. 109-114.

Nussbaum, A.

1986. *Head and Horn in Indo-European*. Berlin.

1987. Homeric ἐπελήκειον θ 379 and related forms. Watkins 1987. 229-253.

1997. The "Saussure Effect" in Latin and Italic. Lubotsky 1997b. 181-203.

1998. *Two Studies in Greek and Homeric Linguistics*. Göttingen.

2002. Homeric OPHAI (Od. 14.343) and OMEITAI (Il.9.274): Two of a Kind? *Colby Quarterly* 38. 175-196.

2007(ed). *Verba Docenti. Studies in historical and Indo-European linguistics presented to Jay Jasanoff*. Ann Arbor.

Nutting, H.

1901. The Unreal Conditional Sentence in Plautus. *AJP* 22. 297-316.

Oettinger, N.

1976. Der indogermanische Stativ. *MSS* 34. 109-149.

1979. *Die Stammbildung des Hethitischen Verbums*. Nürnberg.

1983. Altavestisch yas ... cišca 'jeder, der'. *MSS* 43. 177-189.

1986. „Indo-Hittite“-Hypothese und Wortbildung. Innsbruck.

1993. Zur Funktion des indogermanischen Stativs. Meiser 1993a. 347-361.

2006. Methodisches zur indogermanischen Dichtersprache: formale versus inhaltliche Rekonstruktion. Pinault – Petit 2006. 331-342.

2008. *Die Stammbildung des Hethitischen Verbums*. Dresden.

Ofitsch, M.

1998. Bemerkungen zum Regel idg. *#h₂wo > heth. #wa. *KZ* 111. 225-241.

Oguse, A.

1962. *Recherches sur le participe circonstanciel en grec ancien*. Wetteren.

O’Nolan, K.

1978. Doublets in the Odyssey. *CQ* NS 29. 23-37.

O’Neill, E.

1942. The localization of metrical word types in the Greek hexameter. *YCS* 8. 105-178.

Orel, V.

1997. *The Language of the Phrygians*. Delmar.

1998. *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden.

Osthoff, H.

1879. Die bildung des loc. plur. im indogermanischen und verwandtes. *MU* 2. 1-76.

1884. *Zur geschichte des Perfects im Indogermanischen, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Griechisch und Lateinisch*. Strassburg.

1899. *Vom Suppletivwesen der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Heidelberg.

O’Sullivan, J.

1987a. εἶρομαι, ἐρέω. *LfgrE* 2,11.483-485.

1987b. εἶρω I, ἐρέω. *LfgrE* 2,11.485-488.

1987c. εἰρωτάω. *LfgrE* 2,11. 488.

1987d. ἐρεείνω. *LfgrE* 2,11. 683-684.

1999a. ὀνομάζω. *LfgrE* 3,17. 714-716.

1999b. ὀνομῆναι. *LfgrE* 3,17. 718-719.

2000. ὀτρύνω. *LfgrE* 3,18. 846-853.

2010a. φημί. *LfgrE* 4,24. 870-903.

2010b. φωνέω. *LfgrE* 4,25. 1073-1076.

2010c. φωνή. *LfgrE* 4,251076-1080.

OT= *Oral Tradition*.

Page, D.

1951. *Alcman The Partheneion*. Oxford.

1955. *Sappho and Alcaeus*. Oxford.

Page, D. – Denniston, J.

1957. *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*. Oxford.

Pagniello, F.

2007. The past-iterative and the augment in Homer. *IF* 112. 105-123.

Palmer, L.

1963. The Language of Homer. Wace – Stubbings 1963. 75-178.

1965. Review Bennett 1961. *Language* 41, 312-329.
- Panagl, O.
 1990. Jacob Wackernagels Vorlesungen über Syntax aus heutiger Sicht. Rix - Eichner 1990. 54-63.
 1999. Beobachtungen zur Mykenischen Syntax. In: Deger-Jalkotzy, S. – Hiller, S. – Panagl, O. (eds). *Floerant Studia Mycenaea*. Salzburg. 487-494.
 2002. Zur indogermanischen Syntax und Stilistik. Hettrich – Kim 2002. 281-300.
- Panagl, O. - Krisch, T.
 1992.(eds) *Latein und Indogermanisch*. Innsbruck.
- Panhuis, D.
 1982. *The Communicative Perspective in the Sentence. A Study of Latin Word Order*. Amsterdam.
- Pappas, P.
 1999. The Development of counterfactuals with *thélo*: in Early Modern Greek. Joseph 1999. 15-40.
- Parry, A.
 1956. The Language of Achilles. *TAPA* 87.1-7.
 1971. *The making of Homeric Verse. Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, collected by Adam Parry. Oxford.
- Parry, M.
 1930. Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral verse making. I. Homer and the Homeric Style. *HSCP* 41. 73-147.
 1932. Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral verse making II. The Homeric Language as the Language of Oral Poetry. *HSCP* 43.1-50.
 1933. The Traditional Metaphor in Homer. *CP* 28. 30-43.
 1934. The Traces of the digamma in Ionic and Lesbian Greek. *Language* 10. 130-144.
 1937. On Winged Words. *CP* 32.59-63.
- Patzner, H.
 1970. *Dichterische Kunst und poetisches Handwerk im homerischen Epos*. Wiesbaden.
 1994. *Sprache und Dichtung im homerischen Epos*. Stuttgart.
- Pavese, C.
 1992. *Il grande Partenio di Alcmane*. Amsterdam.
- PBB= *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, also known as *Paul Braunes Beiträge*.
- PCPS= *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*.
- Pedersen, H.
 1905. Die nasalpräsentia und der slavische akzent. *KZ* 38. 297-421.
 1926. *La cinquième déclinaison latine*. Copenhagen.
- Penney, J.
 2004 (ed). *Indo-European Perspectives*. Festschrift for Anna Morpurgo Davies. Oxford.
- Persson,
 1912a. *Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung*. Teil I. Leipzig.
 1912b. *Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung*. Teil II. Leipzig.
- Peters, M.
 1976. Attisch *hīēmi*. *Die Sprache* 22.157-161.
 1980. *Die Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. Wien.
 1986a. Zur Frage einer achäischen Phase des griechischen Epos. Etter 1986. 303-319.
 1986b. Probleme mit anlautenden Laryngalen. *Die Sprache* 32. 365-383.
 1987. Review M. Negri *PU.RO Tre Lezioni di Micenologia*. *Die Sprache* 34. 269-273.
 1993. Beiträge zur griechischen Etymologie. Isebaert 1993. 85-113.
 1997. Das armenische Flexionstyp *gitem*, *gitac* 'i und das ion-att. Plusquamperfekt. Lubotsky 1997b. 211-217.
 1998. Homerisches und Unhomerisches bei Homer und auf dem Nestorbecher. Jasanoff – Melchert – Lisi 1998. 585-602.
 2006. Zur morphologischen Einordnung von Messapisch *klaohi*. In: M. Laporta (ed). *Studi di antichità linguistiche in memoria di Ciro Santoro*. Bari. 329-353.
- Petersmann, H.
 1979. Zur Entwicklung der motionslosen Partizipia im Griechischen. *Die Sprache* 25. 144-166.
- Petit, D.
 2000. Lituanien *stuomuō/ stomuō* et la théorie des laryngales. *KZ* 113. 259-275.
- Pietrandrea, P.
 2012. The conceptual structure of irreality: a focus on non-exclusion-of-factuality as a conceptual and a linguistic category. *LS* 34. 184-199.
- Pillinger, O.
 1980. The accusative and infinitive in Latin: a refractory complement clause. *JL* 16. 55-83.

- Pinault, G.
 1984. Benveniste et le tokharien. In: *E. Benveniste aujourd'hui*. Leuven. 109-124.
 1994. Formes verbales nouvelles dans des manuscrits inédits du Fonds Pelliot Koutchéen. *TIES* 4 Supplementary Series. 105-206.
 1997. Sur l'assemblage des phrases („Satzgefüge“) en tokharien. Crespo- García Ramón 1997. 449-500.
 2006. Compétition poétique et poétique de la composition. Pinault – Petit 2006. 367 – 412.
 2008. *Chrestomathie tokharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven.
- Pinault, G. – Petit, D.
 2006 (eds.). *La langue poétique indo-européenne*. Leuven.
- Pirart, E.
 1997. Subordinadas avésticas desconocidas. Crespo- García-Ramón 1997. 501-526.
- Pisani, V.
 1966. Lingua poetica indeuropea. *AGI* 51. 105-122.
- Piowarczyk, D.
 2011. A Short Note on Greek θήρ “Beast”. *SEC* 16. 119-123.
- Plath, R.
 2002. Tmesis. Cancik - Schneider 2002. 637-638.
- Platt, A.
 1891. The Augment in Homer. *JPh* 19. 211-237.
 1919. Some Homeric Aorist Participles. *JPh* 35. 128-132.
- Pokorny, J.
 1959. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern.
- Poehlmann.
 1858. *Quomodo poetae epici augmento temporalis usi sint*. Tilsit.
- Porter, N.
 1951. The Greek Hexameter. *YCS* 12. 1-64.
- Porzig, W.
 1927a. Review Ammann 1922. *IF* 44. 94-97.
 1927b. Zur Aktionsart in indogermanischen Präsensbildungen. *IF* 45. 152-167
 1942. *Die Namen für Satzinhalte im Griechischen und im Indogermanischen*. Berlin.
 1954. *Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets*. Heidelberg.
- Pott, A.
 1833. *Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Lemgo.
 1871. *Wurzel-Wörterbuch der Indogermanischen Sprachen. Dritter Band: Wurzeln auf stumme Konsonanten*. Detmold.
- PP= *La Parola del Passato*.
- Praust, K.
 2003. A Missing Link of PIE Reconstruction: the Injunctive of **H₁es* ,to be‘. Jones-Bley – Huld – Della Volpe – Robbins Dexter 2003. 112-143.
- Prellwitz, W.
 1892. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.
- Probert, P.
 2004. Review Cooper(-Krüger) 2002. *JHS* 124. 178-179.
 2007. *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Greek*. Bristol.
- Probert, P. – Willi, A.
 2012 (eds.). *Laws and Rules in Indo-European*. Oxford.
- Pronk, T.
 2011. The Saussure effect in Indo-European languages other than Greek. *JIES* 39. 177-193.
- Puhvel, J.
 1991. *Homer and Hittite*. Innsbruck.
- Pulley, S.
 2000. *Homer. Iliad Book I*. Oxford.
- QUCC= *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*.
- Race, W.
 1997a. *Pindar: Nemean Odes*. Cambridge.
 1997b. *Pindar: Olympian Odes*. Cambridge.
- Rasmussen, J.
 1989. *Studien zur morphophonemic der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck.
- Rau, J.

2009. Mycenaean *te re ja* and the Athematic Inflection of the Greek Contract Verbs. Yoshida – Vine 2009. 181-188.
- RE= Pauly, A. – Wissowa, G. – Kroll, W. – Mittelhaus, K. – Ziegler, K. – Gärtner, H. (eds). 1837-1980. *Pauly's RealienEncyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart.
- REA= *Revue des études anciennes*.
- REArm= *Revue des Études arméniennes*.
- REG= *Revue des études grecques*.
- Reichelt, H.
1909. *Altawestisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg.
- Rengakos, A. – Zimmermann, B.
2011. (eds) *Homer Handbuch: Leben – Werk – Wirkung*. Stuttgart.
- Renou, L.
1924. Védique *vāvr̥dhé*, *vāvr̥dhūh*. *BSL* 24. 185-188.
1925. *La valeur du parfait dans les hymnes védiques*. Paris.
1928. Les formes dites d'injonctif dans le RgVeda. In : *Étrennes linguistiques offertes par quelques amis à Émile Benveniste*. Paris. 63-80.
1932. A propos du subjonctif védique. *BSL* 33. 5-30.
1952a. *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris.
1952b. *Grammaire de la langue védique*. Paris.
- Revuelta Puigdollers, A.
1994. El significado del subjuntivo deliberativo en griego clásico. Macía Aparicio 1994. 75-85.
- RFIC= *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*.
- RhM= *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*.
- Rieken, E.
2011a. Verberststellungen in hethitischen Übersetzungstexten. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 498-507.
2011b. *Einführung in die hethitische Sprache und Schrift*. Münster.
2012. *Die Konditionalsätze, Irrelevanzkonditionalia und Konzessivsätze des Altirischen*. Münster.
- Rieken, E. – Widmer, P.
2009 (eds). *Pragmatische Kategorien. Form, Funktion und Diachronie*. Wiesbaden.
- Riggsby, A.
1992. Homeric Speech Introductions and the Theory of Homeric Composition. *TAPA* 122. 99-114.
- Rijksbaron, A.
1980. De semantiek van de Griekse hypothetische bijzinnen. *Lampas* 13. 130-145.
1988. The Discourse Function of the Imperfect. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 237-254.
1997 (ed). *New Approaches to Greek Particles*. Amsterdam.
2002. *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek. An Introduction*. Amsterdam.
2006. On false historic presents in Sophocles (and Euripides). De Jong – Rijksbaron 2006. 127-146.
- Rijksbaron, A. – Mulder, H. – Wakker, G.
1988 (eds). *In the footsteps of Raphael Kühner*. Amsterdam.
- Ringe, D.
1989. Doric ἰσαντι. *MSS* 50. 123-157.
1996. *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian*. New Haven, CT.
- Risch, E.
1953. Review Tabachovitz 1953. *Gnomon* 25. 138-140.
1954. Review Chantraine 1953. *Gnomon* 26. 70-74.
1955. Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte aus neuer Sicht. *MH* 12. 61-76.
1961. Review Gonda 1956. *Gnomon* 33. 174-178.
1965. Review Frisk 1960. *Gnomon* 37. 1-6.
1964. Avestan Mazdā Ašāicā. *MSS* 17. 51-66.
1974. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. Berlin-New York.
1979. Die griechischen Dialekte im 2. Vorchristlichen Jahrtausend. *SMEA* 20. 91-111.
1985a. Homerisch ENNEPO, Lakonisch EPHEPONTI und die alte Erzählprosa. *ZPE* 60. 1-9.
1985b. Zum griechischen Relativpronomen. *MSS* 46. 173-192.
- Risch, E. – Hajnal, I.
2006. Grammatik des mykenischen Griechisch. (built on E. Risch's manuscripts and extended by I. Hajnal)
Available online via <http://www.uibk.ac.at/sprachen-literaturen/sprawi/mykgr.html>
- Ritter, R.
1996. *Introducción al armeno antiguo*. Madrid.
- Rix, H.
1969. Review Beekes 1969. *Kratylos* 14.176-187.

1976. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. Darmstadt.
- 1980.(ed). *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie*. Wiesbaden.
1986. *Zur Entstehung des indogermanischen Modusystems*. Innsbruck.
1988. The Proto-Indo-European Middle: Contents, Form and Origin. *MSS* 49. 101-119.
1992. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. 2. Verbesserte Auflage. Darmstadt.
- 1993 (ed). *Oskisch-Umbrisch. Texte und Grammatik*. Wiesbaden.
1996. Review Schrijver 1991. *Kratylos* 41.153-163
2000. Oskisch *brateis*, *bratom*, Lateinisch *grates*. Hintze – Tichy 2000. 207-230.
2001. *Kleine Schriften*.
2003. The Latin imperfect in *-bā-*, the Proto-Indo-European root **b^hueh₂* and full grade I forms from set-roots with full grade II. Bauer – Pinault 2003. 363-384.
- Rix, H. (e.a.).
2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.
- Rix, H. – Eichner, H.
- 1990 (eds). *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*. Wiesbaden.
- Robert, J.
1990. Modality in Amele and Other Papuan Languages. *JL* 26. 363-401.
- Rodenbusch, E.
1907. Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Aktionsarten. *IF* 21. 116-145.
- Rodríguez-Adrados, F.
2000. Towards a Syntax of Proto-Indo-European. *IF* 105. 60-67.
- Rosén, H.
1973. Satzbau und augmentloses Tempus in Homerischen Tatsachenbericht. *FoL* 6. 315-330.
- RPh= *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes*.
- Rubenbauer, H. – Hofmann, J. – Heine, R.
1995. *Lateinische Grammatik*. München.
- Ruijgh, C.
1957. *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*. Assen.
1967. *Études sur le vocabulaire et la grammaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam.
1968. Observations sur la “métathèse de quantité”. *Lingua* 21. 382-399.
- 1971a. *Autour de “te épique”*. Amsterdam.
- 1971b. Review Beekes 1969. *Lingua* 26.181-196.
1972. Le redoublement dit attique dans l'évolution du système morphologique du verbe grec. In: *Mélanges offerts à Pierre Chantraine*. Paris: Klincksieck. 211-230.
1976. Observations sur l'emploi onomastique de *κεκλήσθαι* vis-à-vis de celui de *καλεῖσθαι*, notamment dans la tragédie grecque. In: *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J.C. Kamerbeek*. Amsterdam. 333-395. (=1996a:701-763).
1978. Review Rix 1976. *Mnemosyne* IV 31.298-307.
1979. La morphologie du grec. *SMEA* 20. 69-89.
1988. Les laryngales en grec préhistorique. Bammesberger 1988. 433-469.
1990. La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel. Rix – Eichner 1990. 213-233.
1992. L'emploi le plus ancien et les emplois plus récents de la particule *κε/ ᾗν*. Létoublon 1992. 75-84.
1995. Review Jacquino 1989. *Mnemosyne* IV 48. 582-591.
- 1996a. *Scripta minora ad Graecam Linguam pertinentia*. Volumen Primum. Assen.
- 1996b. *Scripta minora ad Graecam Linguam pertinentia*. Volumen Secundum. Assen.
2011. Mycenaean and Homeric Greek. Duhoux – Morpurgo-Davies 2011. 251-298.
- Ruiz Yamuza, E.
2000. Objective and Subjective Modality Satellites in Ancient Greek: *τάχα* and *ἴσως*. *Glotta* 76. 237-248.
2014. El adverbio *vūv* como marcador discursivo. *Emerita* 82. 1-23.
- Rumpel, I.
1883. *Lexicon Pindaricum*. Leipzig.
- Ruppel, A.
2013. *Absolute constructions in early Indo-European*. Cambridge.
- Russo, J.
1976. Is “Oral” or “Aural” Composition the Cause of Homer’s Formulaic Style? Stolz – Shannon 1976. 31-53.
1992. Books XVII-XX. Russo – Fernández Galiano – Heubeck 1992. 3-129.
1997. The Formula. Morris and Powell 1997. 238-60.

- Russo, J. – Fernández Galiano, M. – Heubeck, A.
1992. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume III: Books XVII - XXIV*. Oxford.
- Rüter, K.
1967. *ǃv*. LfgrE 1,5. 704-737.
- Rzach, A.
1876. *Der Dialekt des Hesiodos*. Leipzig.
- Sadovski, V.
2006. Epithetabildung und Götternamen-Kataloge. Stilistisches zur iranischen und indischen Dichtersprache. Pinault – Petit 2006. 419 – 448.
- Sadovski, V. – Stifter, D.
2012. *Iranistische und Indogermanistische Beiträge in Memoriam Jochem Schindler (1944-1994)*. Vienna.
- Saerens, C.
1976. Le syntagme ἀγγελίην ἐλθεῖν. *MSS* 34. 165-168.
- Saïd, S.
2012. Homer. Spawforth – Hornblower 2012. 695-700.
- Salone, S.
1983. The Pragmatic of Reality and Unreality Conditional Clauses in Swahili. *JPr* 7. 311-324.
- Sánchez-Ruipérez, M.
1979. *Structure du système des aspects et des temps du verbe en grec ancien*. Traduit de l'espagnol par M. Plenat et P. Serça. Paris.
1988. Sur le structure des oppositions de voix dans le verbe grec. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 255-263.
1997. Mycenaean Greek and its contribution to the reconstruction of Indo-European syntax. Crespo- García-Ramón 1997. 527-536.
- Sapir, E.
1930. Southern Paiute: A Shoshonean Language. *Proceedings of the American Association of Arts and Sciences* 65. 1-296.
- Sarauw, C.
1918. Syntaktisches. *KZ* 38. 145-193.
- Sasse, H.
1989. Wortumfang und Wortform. Zur Weiterentwicklung einsilbiger Imperative im nachklassischen Griechisch. *KZ* 102.212-215.
- Sauge, A.
2000. *Les degrés du verbe. Sens et formation du parfait en grec ancien*. Frankfurt.
- Savelsberg, J.
1841. *Quaestiones lexicales de radicibus Graecis*. Berlin.
1868. *De digammo eiusque immutationibus dissertatio*. Berlin.
- Schaeder, H.
1940. Ein indogermanischer Liedtypus in den Gathas. *ZDMG* 94. 399-408.
- Schirmer, B.
2001a. **b^heh₂¹*, 'glänzen, leuchten, scheinen'. *LIV* 68-69.
2001b. **b^heh₂²*, 'sprechen, sagen'. *LIV* 69.
2001c. **kleh₁*. *LIV* 321.
- Schirru, G.
2007. Parola minima e piede minimo in armeno. *AGI* 42. 179-202.
- Schlerath, B.
1985. Beobachtungen zum Wortfeld "singen, preisen, rufen, verkünden" im Rigveda. *MSS* 44. 191-214.
- Schmid, W.
1986. Bemerkungen zur äolischen Konjugation der Verba Contracta. *Etter* 1986. 245-252.
- Schmidt, G.
1973. Die iranischen Wörter für 'Tochter' und 'Vater' und die Reflexe des interkonsonantischen H (ə) in den idg. Sprachen. *KZ* 87. 36-83.
- Schmidt, J.
1876. *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*. Erster Band. Leipzig.
1885. Die personalendungen θα und σαι im griechischen. *KZ* 27. 315-328.
1889. *Die Pluralbildungen der indogermanischen Neutra*. Weimar.
1905. Zur geschichte der langdiphthonge im Griechischen. *KZ* 38. 1-52.
- Schmidt, K.
1969. *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. Göttingen.

1987. Zur semantischen Differenzierung des indogermanischen Kasussystems in Tocharischen. *TIES* 1. 139-151.
- Schmidt, M.
 1853. Ueber den gnomischen aorist. *Philologus* 8. 113-129.
 1854a. Aristarch- Homerische excursus 1: Augment. *Philologus* 9.426-434.
 1854b. Nachträgliche bemerkungen. *Philologus* 9.752-756.
- Schmidt, M.
 1978a. ἄντέω. LfgrE 1,9. 1590-1591.
 1978b. ἄντή. LfgrE 1,9. 1591-1598
 1978c. ἄνω. LfgrE 1,9. 1688-1693.
 1982a. βοάω. LfgrE 2,10. 69-70.
 1982b. γέγωνα, γεγώνω. LfgrE 2,10. 123.
- Schmidt, M. E.
 1930. Untersuchungen zur albanischen Sprachgeschichte. *KZ* 57. 1-42.
- Schmitt, R.
 1967a. Zwei Bemerkungen zum Augment. *KZ* 81. 63-67.
 1967b. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden.
 1968 (ed). *Indogermanische Dichtersprache*.
 1977. *Einführung in die griechischen Dialekte*. Darmstadt.
- Schneider, C.
 2012. Zusammen ist nicht gemeinsam. Zu einigen Partikeln mit assoziativer Bedeutung in der RgVeda. *KZ* 125. 295-309.
- Schneider, H.
 1995. *Der anonyme Publikumscommentar in Ilias und Odyssee*. Münster.
- Schneider, K.
 1942. Beiträge zur tocharischen Wortkunde und Grammatik. *IF* 58.37-50.
- Schrijver, P.
 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam.
 1999. Griechisch ἤδη ‚er wusste‘. *KZ* 112.264-272.
- Schulze, W.
 1892. *Quaestiones Epicae*. Gütersloh.
- Schumacher, S.
 2004. *Die keltischen Primärverben*. Innsbruck.
- Schwartz, M.
 2006. The Gathas and other Old Avestan poetry. Pinault – Petit 2006. 459-498.
- Schweiger, G.
 2005 (ed). *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt*. Traiering.
- Schwyzler, E.
 1923. *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora*. Leipzig.
 1930. Lesbisch φαι und altarmenisch bam bas bay. *KZ* 57.242-247.
 1939. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München.
 1942. Zum sog. Genitivus Absolutus statt Participium Coniunctum im Griechischen. *Emerita* 10. 98-104.
- Schwyzler, E. – Debrunner, A.
 1950. *Griechische Grammatik*. Teil II. München.
- SEC= *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia*.
- Seiler, E.
 1872. *Vollständiges griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch über die Gedichte des Homeros und der Homeriden*. Leipzig.
- Seiler, E. – Capelle, C.
 1889. *Vollständiges Wörterbuch über die Gedichte des Homeros und der Homeriden*. Leipzig.
- Seiler, H.
 1955a. ἀγείρω. LfgrE 1,1. 55-57.
 1955b. ἀγοράζομαι/ ἀγοράζω. LfgrE 1,1. 83-84.
 1955c. ἀγορεύω. LfgrE 1,1. 84-89.
 1955d. ἀγορή. LfgrE 1,1. 89-91.
 1956. αἰεί. LfgrE 1,2. 280-287.
 1971. Abstract Structures for Moods in Greek. *Language* 47. 79-89.
 1993. Satzverbindung in Konditionalgefüge (besonders im Altgriechischen). *CFS* 47. 143-158.
 1997. Conditionals in dimensional perspective. Athanasiadou – Dirven 1997a. 307-320.
- Severeyns, A.

1946. *Homère II. Le poète et son oeuvre*. Brussels.
- Shewan, A.
1912. The Homeric Augment. *CP* 7,4. 397-411.
1914. The Homeric Augment Again. *CP* 9,2. 189-191.
- Shipp, G.
1966. *The Language of Homer*. Amsterdam.
1972. *Studies in the Language of Homer*. Cambridge.
- Sicking, C.
1991. The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Forms, Especially in the Imperative. *Glotta* 69. 14-43.
- Sihler, A.
1995. *A Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford.
- SII= *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*.
- Sims-Williams, N.
1998. The Iranian Languages. Giacalone Ramat – Ramat 1998. 125-153.
- Sjölund, R.
1938. *Metrische Kürzung im Griechischen*. Uppsala.
- SL= *Studies in Language*.
- Slater, W.
1969. *Lexicon to Pindar*. Berlin.
- Slotty, J.
1915. *Der Gebrauch des Konjunktivs und Optativs in den griechischen Dialekten. I. Der Hauptsatz*. Göttingen.
- SMEA= *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici*.
- Smyth, H.
1894. *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects. I. Ionic*. Oxford.
1956. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, MA.
- Snell, B.
1986. *Griechische Metrik*. Göttingen.
- Snell, B. – Maehler, H.
1997. *Pindari Carmina. I. Epinicia*. Stuttgart-Leipzig.
- Spitzner, F.
1816. *De versu Graecorum heroico maxime Homeric*. Leipzig.
- Solmsen, F.
1901. *Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- und Verslehre*. Strassburg.
1906. Zur griechischen Verbalflexion. *KZ* 39. 205-231.
1911a. Zur Beurteilung der epischen Zerdehnung. *KZ* 44. 118-122.
1911b. Nachschrift zu S. 119. *KZ* 44. 160.
- Solta, G.
1960. *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Wien.
1970. Der hethitische Imperativ der 1. Person Singular und das idg. *l* Formans als quasi-desideratives Element. *IF* 75. 44-84.
- Sommer, F.
1902. *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Heidelberg.
1907. Zum inschriftlichen NU EPHELKUSTIKON. In: *Festschrift zur 49. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Basel im Jahre 1907*. Basel. 1-39.
1914a. *Kritische Erläuterungen zur lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Heidelberg.
1914b. *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Heidelberg. 3. Ausgabe.
- Specht, F.
1932. Beiträge zur griechischen Grammatik. *KZ* 59. 31-131.
1933. Wurzelinfigierungen. *KZ* 61. 142-144.
- Speijer, J.
1886. *Sanskrit Syntax*. Leiden.
- Spieker, E.
1885. On the So-Called genitive Absolute and its Use, Especially in the Attic Orators. *AJP* 6.310-343.
- Spitzer, L.
1933. Nochmals zum homerischen Hysteronproteron. *KZ* 60. 233-236.
- Stadelmann, C.
1840. *Grammatisch-kritische Anmerkungen zur Ilias des Homer*. Erster Band: 1-4 Buch. Leipzig.
- Stahl, J.
1907. *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit*. Heidelberg.

- Stanford, W.
 1958. *The Odyssey of Homer. Books XIII-XXIV*. London.
 1959. *The Odyssey of Homer. Books I-XII*. London.
- Stang, C.
 1932. Perfektum und Medium. *NTS* 6.29-39.
 1977. Indoeuropäische Adverbia auf *per, pr*. *NTS* 31. 1-16.
- Steele, S.
 1975. Past and Irrealis: Just what does it all mean? *IJAL* 41. 200-217.
- Stefański, W.
 1990. *The Diathesis in Indo-European*. Poznań.
- Steinbauer, D.
 1989. *Etymologische Untersuchungen zu den bei Plautus belegten Verben der ersten Konjugation. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Denominative*. Altendorf.
- Steiner, D.
 2010. *Homer Odyssey. Books XVII and XVIII*. Cambridge.
- Stephens, L.
 1983. The Origins of an Homeric Peculiarity: μή plus Aorist Imperative. *TAPA* 113. 69-78.
- Stoevesandt, M.
 2008. *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar. Band IV. 6. Gesang. Faszikel 2:Kommentar*. Berlin.
- Stolz, F.
 1903. Studien zur Doppelaugmentierung der griechischen Verba. *WS* 25. 127-142.
- Stolz, B. – Shannon, R. III (eds.).
 1976. *Oral Literature and the Formula*. Ann Arbor.
- Streitberg, W.
 1896. *Urgermanische Grammatik*. Heidelberg.
- Strunk, K.
 1957. *Die sogenannten Äolismen der homerischen Sprache*. Köln.
 1964. Dorisches und Hyperdorisches. *Glotta* 42.165-169.
 1967. Wortstruktur und Pronomen im Altpersischen. *KZ* 81. 265-275.
 1968. Zeit und Tempus in den altindogermanischen Sprachen. *IF* 73.279 -311.
 1975. Zum Verhältnis von Wort und Satz in der Syntax des Lateinischen und Griechischen. *Gymnasium* 82. 225-239.
 1977. Überlegungen zu Defektivität und Suppletion im Griechischen und Indogermanischen. *Glotta* 55, 2-34.
 1987. Ergänzende Beobachtungen zu “Wortumfang” und „Wortform“. *KZ* 100. 323-338.
 1988. Zur diachronischen Morphosyntax des Konjunktivs. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 291-312.
 1992. À propos de quelques catégories marquées et non-marquées dans la grammaire du grec et de l’indo-européen. *Léroublon* 1992. 29-42.
 1994a. Der Ursprung des verbalen Augments – Ein Problem Franz Bopps in heutiger Sicht. In: Sternemann, R. (ed.). *Bopp-Symposium 1992 der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*. Heidelberg 1994. 270-284.
 1994b. Relative Chronology and Indo-European Verb-System: The Case of the Present- and Aorist-Stems. *JIES* 22. 417-434.
 1997a. Nach einem Säkulum: Vermischtes aus und zu B. Delbrücks Arbeiten über Syntax. Crespo- García-Ramón 1997. 571-587.
 1997b. Vom Mykenischen bis zum klassischen Griechisch. Nesselrath 1997. 135-155.
 2005a. *Kleine Schriften I*. Innsbruck.
 2005b. *Kleine Schriften II*. Innsbruck.
- Stüber, K.
 1996. *Zur dialektalen Einheit des Ostionischen*. Innsbruck.
 2002. *Die primären s-Stämme des Indogermanischen*. Wiesbaden.
 2009. Griechisch. Stüber – Zehnder - Remmer 2009. 101-148.
- Stüber, K. – Zehnder, T. – Remmer, U.
 2009 (eds.). *Indogermanische Frauennamen*. Heidelberg.
- Svensson, A.
 1930. *Zum Gebrauch der erzählenden Tempora im Griechischen*. Lund.
- Sylburg, F.
 1816. *Etymologicum Magnum*. Leipzig (accessible online).
- Szemerényi, O.
 1979. Etyma Graeca IV: Homeric et Mycenaïca. *SMEA* 20. 207-226.
 1980. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt.

1985. Syntax, meaning and origin of the particle **k^we* (=Scripta Minora 365-395).
1990. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Vierte erweiterte Ausgabe. Darmstadt.
1987. *Scripta Minora*. Innsbruck.
1996. *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford.
- Tabachovitz, D.
1946. Phénomènes linguistiques du vieux grec dans le grec de basse époque. *MH* 3. 144-179.
1951. *Homerische ei Sätze. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung*. Lund.
- TAPA= *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*.
- Tate, A.
2013. Verse Segments and Syntactic Templates in Homeric Philology: Lessons and Applications. Cooper – Rau – Weiss 2013. 289-305.
- Tedesco, P.
1923. *a* Stämme und *aya* Stämme im Iranischen. *ZII* 2. 281-315.
- Thieme, P.
1929. *Das Plusquamperfektum im Veda*. Göttingen.
- Thomas, W.
1952. *Die tocharischen Verbaladjektive auf l*. Berlin.
1957. *Der Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen*. Wiesbaden.
1970. Zu einigen Besonderheiten der tocharischen Syntax. *Orbis* 19. 452-472.
1985. *Die Erforschung des Tocharischen*. Stuttgart.
1999. Zu einigen Besonderheiten des Tocharischen. In: *Florilegium Linguisticum: Festschrift für Wolfgang P. Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*. Frankfurt. 469-478.
- Thomson, R.
1975. *An Introduction to Classical Armenian*. Delmar.
- Threatte, L.
1980. *The Grammar of Attic inscriptions 1*. Berlin.
1996. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions 2*. Berlin.
- Thumb, A. – Hauschild, R.
1959. *Handbuch des Sanskrit*. II Formenlehre. Heidelberg.
- Thumb, A. – Scherer, A.
1959. *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. Heidelberg.
- Thurneysen, R.
1885. Der indogermanische imperativ. *KZ* 27. 172-180.
- Tichy, E.
1983. *Onomatopoetische Verbalbildungen des Griechischen*. Wien.
1990. Zum homerischen Dual. Rix – Eichner 1990. 170-187.
1997. Vom indogermanischen Tempus/ Aspektsystem zum vedischen Zeitstufensystem. Crespo- García-Ramón 1997. 589-609.
2006. *Der Konjunktiv und seine Nachbarkategorien*. Bremen.
2009. *Indogermanistisches Grundwissen für Studierende sprachwissenschaftlicher Disziplinen*. Bremen.
2010. *Älter als der Hexameter. Schiffskatalog, Troerkatalog und vier Einzelszenen der Ilias*. Bremen.
2012. *Ilias Diachronica: Zur sprach- und versgeschichtlichen Geschichte des Ilias* Ξ. Meier-Brügger 2012a. 335-372.
- TIES= *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies*.
- Touratier, C.
- 1985 (ed). *Syntaxe et latin*. Marseille.
- TPS= *Transactions of the Philological Society*.
- Tremblay, X.
1996. Etudes sur le verbe vieil-irlandais: les parfaits à longue en celtique et germanique. *EC* 32. 99-115.
1997. Etudes sur le verbe vieil-irlandais: III les parfaits à longue en celtique et germanique (suite et fin). *EC* 33. 109-142.
- Tronci, L.
2011. Taxonomie der Mediumkonstruktionen und Verbalmorphologie im Altgriechischen. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 585-594.
- Trost, K.
1972. *Perfekt und Konditional im Altkirchslavischen*. Wiesbaden.
- Troxler, H.
1964. *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*. Zürich.
- Tsagarakis, O.
1973. Phoenix and the Achaean Embassy. *RhM* 116. 193-205.

- Tsopanakis, A.
1966. *Problems in the Greek Hexameter*. Thessaloniki.
- Tucker, E.
1990. *The creation of morphological regularity: early Greek verbs in -ēō, -āō, -ōō, -ūō and -īō*. Göttingen.
- Tynan, J. – Delgado Lavín, E.
1997. Mood, tense and the interpretation of conditionals. Athanasiadou – Dirven 1997a. 115-142.
- Tzamali, E.
1996. *Syntax und Stil bei Sappho*. Dettelbach.
- UCPCP= *University of California Proceedings in Classical Philology*.
- Untermann, J.
2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg.
- Usener, H.
1887. *Altgriechischer Versbau*. Bonn.
- Vaillant, A.
1963. Une trace possible de l'augment en slave. *BSL* 58. xxvi-xxvii.
- Valgiglio, E.
1955. *Omero. Il IX Libro dell'Iliade*. Rome.
- Van Beek, L.
2011a. The Saussure effect in Greek: a reinterpretation of the evidence. *JIES* 39.129-175.
2011b. Vowel Assimilation in Greek: the Evidence Reconsidered. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 49-58.
- Van Bennekom, R.
1987a. ἐπεῖ. *Lfgre* 2,12. 626-627.
1987b. ἔπειτα. *Lfgre* 2,12. 629.
1987c. ἐτέος. *Lfgre* 2,12. 755.
- Van Bennekom, R. – Beck, W.
1978. αὐτάρ. *Lfgre* 1,9. 1564-1580.
- Van Caneghem-Ardijns, I. – Van Belle, W.
2008. Conditionals and types of conditional perfection. *JPr* 40. 349-376.
- Van den Hout, T.
2011. *The Elements of Hittite*. Cambridge.
- Van der Auwera, J.
1983a. Introduction: Taks for Conditionalists? *JPr* 7. 243-245.
1983b. Conditionals and Antecedent Possibilities. *JPr* 7. 297-309.
1986. Conditionals and speech acts. Clos Traugott e.a. 1986. 197-213.
1997. Conditional perfection. Athanasiadou – Dirven 1997a. 169-190.
- Van der Auwera, J. – Devos, M.
2012. Irrealis in positive imperatives and prohibitions. *LS* 34. 171-183.
- Van der Auwera, J. – Plungian, V.
1998. Modality's semantic map. *LT* 2.79-124.
- Van der Mije, S.
1996. οἰμῶζω. *Lfgre* 3,16. 581-583.
- Van Emde Boas, E. – Huitink, L.
2010. Syntax. Bakker 2010a. 134-150.
- Van Leeuwen, J.
1890. *Homerica IV. Mnemosyne* 18.265-299.
1918. *Enchiridium dictionis epicae*. Leiden.
- Van Leeuwen, J. – Mendes da Costa, M.
1930a. *Homeri Carmina. Ilias. Pars Prior Carm. I-XII*. Leiden.
1930b. *Homeri Carmina. Ilias. Pars Altera Carm. XIII-XXIV*. Leiden.
- Van linden, A. – Verstraete, J.
2008. The nature and origins of counterfactuality in simple clauses. Cross linguistic evidence. *JPr* 40. 1865-1895.
- Van Nooten, B. – Holland, G.
1994. *Rig Veda. A Metrically Restored Text with Introduction and Notes*. Cambridge, MA.
- Van Pottelbergh, R.
1939. *Over de Geschiedenis en de Beteekenis van den El Zin in het Grieksch*. Gent.
- Van Thiel, H.
1991. *Homeri Odyssea*. Hildesheim.
- Van Veen, P. – Van der Sijs, N. (eds.)
1997. *Etymologisch Woordenboek. De herkomst van onze woorden*. Utrecht-Antwerp.

- Van Windekens, A.
 1942. *Lexique étymologique des dialectes tokhariens*. Leuven.
 1976. *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. I: la phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Leuven.
- Veitch, W.
 1879. *Greek Verbs. Defective and Irregular*. Oxford.
- Verdenius, W.
 1987. *Commentaries on Pindar I*. Leiden.
 1988. *Commentaries on Pindar II*. Leiden.
- Verstraete, J.
 2005. The semantics and pragmatics of composite mood marking: The non-Pama-Nyungan languages of northern Australia. *LT* 9. 223-268.
- Vidal, A. – Manelis Klein, H.
 1998. Irrealis in Pilagá and Toba? Syntactic versus Pragmatic Coding. *AnthrL* 40. 175-197.
- Viechnicki, P.
 1994. *ameibo*: An Interdisciplinary Approach. *JIES* 22.113-132.
- Vilborg, E.
 1960. *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*. Göteborg.
- Vine, B.
 1982. *Indo-European Verbal Formations in -d*. PhD Thesis Harvard.
 1998. *Aeolic ὀπρετον and deverbative *-etó- in Greek and Indo-European*. Innsbruck.
 2006a. Review Hackstein 2002b and Haug 2002. *Kratylos* 51.144-149.
 2006b. Autour de sud-picénien *qolofitúr*: étymologie et poétique. Pinault – Petit 2006. 499 – 516.
 2007. Latin *gemō* ‘groan’, Greek γέγωνε ‘cry out’ and Tocharian *ken* ‘call’. Nussbaum 2007. 343-357.
- Visser, E.
 1987. *Homerische Versifikationstechnik. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*. Stuttgart.
 1997. Die Formel als Resultat frühepischer Versifikationstechnik. Generative Versbildung und die Gestaltung von Katalogversen. Létoublon 1997a. 159-172.
- Viti, C.
 2011. The use of the dual number in Homeric Greek. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 595-604.
- Vivante, P.
 1975. On Homer’s Winged Words. *CQ* NS 25. 1-12.
- Vlachodimitris, T.
 1989. ιδεῖν. *Lfgre* 2,13. 1116-1129.
- Voigt, E.
 1967. ἀντίος. *Lfgre* 1,6. 944-949.
- Von Bäumllein, W.
 1861. *Untersuchungen über griechische Partikeln*. Stuttgart.
- Von Christ, W.
 1884. *Homeri Iliadis Carmina*. Pars Prior. Leipzig.
- Von der Mühl, P.
 1956. *Homeri Odyssea*. Basel.
- Von Hartel, W.
 1873. *Homerische Studien*. Berlin.
- Von Kamptz, H.
 1982. *Die homerischen Personennamen*. Göttingen.
- Von Thiersch, F.
 1818. *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*. Leipzig.
 1826. *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*. Leipzig. (Dritte Auflage)
- Voyles, J.
 1970. The Infinitive and Participle in Indo-European. *Linguistics* 8. 68-91.
- Waack – Erdmann, K.
 1982. Das Futur des Verbums ἐννέπω. *MSS* 41. 199-204.
- Waanders, F.
 1988. Ancient Greek Periphrastic Expressions. Some Considerations. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 313-325.
- Wace, A. – Stubbings, F.
 1963 (eds). *A Companion to Homer*. London.
- Wackernagel, J.
 1877a. Zum homerischen Dual. *KZ* 23.302-310.

- 1877b. Der griechische verbalaccent. *KZ* 23. 457-470.
1878. Die epische Zerdehnung. *BB* 4. 259-312.
1880. Zum Zahlwort. *KZ* 25. 260-291.
1888. Miszellen. *KZ* 29. 124-152.
1892. Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *IF* 1. 333-437.
1897. *Vermischte Beiträge zur griechischen Sprachkunde*. Basel.
1904. *Studien zum griechischen Perfektum*. Göttingen.
1906. Wortumfang und Wortform (=KS I. 148-185).
1914. Akzentstudien III. (=KS II 1154-1188).
- 1916a. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*. Göttingen.
- 1916b. Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer. *Glotta* 7. 161-319.
1920. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*. I. Basel.
1924. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*. II. Basel.
1940. Indogermanisch –que als alte Nebensatzleitende Konjunktion. *KZ* 67.1-5.
1942. Indogermanische Dichtersprache. *Philologus* 95. 1-19.
1953. *Kleine Schriften I*. Herausgegeben von Kurt Latte. Göttingen.
1969. *Kleine Schriften II*. Göttingen.
- Wackernagel, W.
1860. *epēa pteroenta: Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Mythologie*. Basel.
- Wachter, R.
2000. Homer: Sprache. Latacz 2000a. 61-107.
2009. Grammatik der homerischen Sprache. Latacz 2009. 61-108.
2012. The other view. Focus on linguistic innovations in the Homeric epics. Andersen – Haug 2012a. 65-79.
- Wagner,
1905. Enipeus. *RE* V, 2. 2570.
- Wakker, G.
1988. Purpose Expressions in Ancient Greek. Rijksbaron – Mulder – Wakker 1988. 327-344.
1994. *Conditions and Conditionals: An Investigation of Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam.
2006. „you could have thought“: past potentials in Sophocles? De Jong – Rijksbaron 2006. 163-180.
- Walde, A. – Hofmann, J.
1938. *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Erster Band: A – L. Heidelberg.
- Walde, A. – Pokorny, J.
1927. *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Berlin.
- Walter, A.
1923. *Die Grundbedeutung des Konjunktivs im Griechischen*. Heidelberg.
- Wathelet, P.
1966. L coupe syllabique et les liquides voyelles dans la tradition formulaire de l'épopée grecque. In : Lebrun, Y. (ed). *Linguistic Research in Belgium*. Wetteren. 145-173.
1970. *Les traits éoliens dans la langue de l'épopée grecque*. Rome.
1981. La langue homérique et le rayonnement de l'Eubée. *AC* 50. 819-833.
1997. Les particules *κεν* et *ἄν* dans l'épopée grecque. Rijksbaron 1997. 247-268.
- Watkins, C.
1962. *The Indo-European Origins of the Celtic Verb*. Dublin.
1963. Preliminaries to a Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Syntax of the Old Irish Verb. *Celtica* 6. 1-49.
1967. An Indo-European Construction in Greek and Latin. *HSCP* 71. 115-119.
1975. Some Indo-European Verb Phrases and their Transformations. *MSS* 33. 89-109.
1976. Observations on the “Nestor’s Cup” Inscription. *HSCP* 80. 25-40.
1985. Indo-European **k^w*e “and” in Hittite. In: *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen. Festschrift für Johann Knobloch*. Innsbruck. 491-497.
- 1987 (ed). *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*. Berlin.
1994. *Selected Writings*. Innsbruck.
1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. Oxford.
1997. Delbrück and the syntax of Hittite and Luwian: predictive power. Crespo- García-Ramón 1997. 611-630.
1998. Proto-Indo-European: Comparison and Reconstruction. Giacalone Ramat – Ramat 1998. 25-73.
2002. ΕΠΕΩΝ ΘΕΣΙΣ. Poetic grammar: word order and metrical structure in the Odes of Pindar. Hettrich – Kim 2002. 319-337.
2006. The Erbesos blues and other tales on the semantics of case and the semantics of love among the Western Greeks. Pinault – Petit 2006. 517 – 522.

- Weber, P.
1884. *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze. I: Von Homer bis zur attischen Prosa*. Würzburg.
- Weiss, M.
1993. *Studies in Italic Nominal Morphology*. PhD Thesis Cornell.
1994. Life Everlasting. *MSS* 55.131-156.
2009. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor.
2010. Morphology and Word Formation. Bakker 2010a. 104-119.
- Weitenberg, J.
2003. Classical Armenian HAGAG ‘breath’ and OGEM ‘to speak’. Bauer – Pinault 2003. 419-428.
- Wenzel, E.
1811. *De genitivis et dativis linguae graecae, quos absolutos vocant*. Bratislava.
- Werba, C.
1997. *Verba Indoarica. Radices Primariae*. Wien.
- West, M.
1966. *Hesiod. Theogony*. Oxford.
1967. Epica. *Glotta* 44,3-4. 135-148.
1973a. Indo-European Metre. *Glotta* 51,3-4. 161-187.
1973b. Greek Poetry 2000 – 700 BC. *CQ NS* 23,2. 179-192.
1978. *Hesiod. Works and Days*. Oxford.
1987. *Introduction to Greek Metre*. Oxford.
1988. The Rise of the Greek Epic. *JHS* 108. 151-172.
1989. An Unrecognized Injunctive Usage in Greek. *Glotta* 67. 135-138.
1997. Homer’s Metre. Morris-Powell 1997.217-238.
1998. *Homerus Ilias. Volumen I: Rhapsodiae I - XII*. Berlin.
2000. *Homerus Ilias. Volumen II: Rhapsodiae XIII - XXIV*. Berlin.
2001. Some Homeric Words. *Glotta* 77.118-135.
2012. Towards a chronology of early Greek epic. Andersen – Haug 2012a. 224-241.
- West, M. – Latacz, J.
2009. *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar. 24. Gesang. Band VIII, Faszikel 1: Text und Übersetzung*. Berlin.
- West, S.
1988. Commentary I – IV. Heubeck – Hainsworth – West 1988. 51-248.
2012a. Odyssean Stratigraphy. Andersen – Haug 2012a. 122-137.
2012b. Hecataeus (1). Hornblower – Spawforth 2012. 649.
- Widmer, P.
2006. La métrique tokharienne: l’influence indienne et quelques développement tokhariens. Pinault – Petit 2006. 523-536.
- Wierzbicka, A.
1997. Conditionals and counterfactuals: conceptual primitives and linguistic universals. Athanasiadou – Dirven 1997a. 15-59.
- Willcock, M.
1970. *A Commentary on Homer’s Iliad*. London.
1978. *The Iliad of Homer: Books I - XII*. London.
1984. *The Iliad of Homer. XIII-XXIV*. London.
- Willi, A.
1994/5. *Do ra qe pe re na qe a ke*. An Indo-European Figure in Mycenaean? *Minos* 29/30. 177-185.
2003. *καί* mykenisch oder nachmykenisch? *Glotta* 79. 224-248.
2007. Of aspects, augments, aorists – or how to say to have killed a dragon. George – McCullagh – Nielsen – Ruppel – Tribulato 2007. 34-48.
2011. Morphosyntaktische Überlegungen zum Ursprung des griechischen Futurs. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 605-615.
2012. Kiparsky’s Rule, thematic nasal presents, and athematic *verba vocalia* in Greek. Probert – Willi 2012. 260-278.
2014. Review Hämmig 2013. *Kratylos* 59. 202-212.
- Williams Jackson, A.
1892. *An Avesta Grammar in Comparison with Sanskrit*. Stuttgart.
- Willmott, J.
2007. *The Moods of Homeric Greek*. Cambridge.
- Wills, J.
1993. Homeric Particle Order. *KZ* 106. 61-81.
- Wilson, C.

1996. *Homer. Iliad. Books VIII - IX*. Warminster.
- Windisch, E.
1868. Untersuchungen über den Ursprung des Relativpronomens in den indogermanischen Sprachen. *CS* 2. 201-420.
- Winter, W.
1950. On the origin of the Samprasaraṇa reduplication in Sanskrit. *Language* 26. 365-370.
1977. Internal Structure and External Relationship of Two Verbal paradigms: Tocharian B *weñ*, A *weñ* 'SAY'. *JIES* 5. 133-159.
- Witte, K.
1907. *Singular und Plural*. Leipzig.
1909a. Zur Entstehung homerischer Formeln. *Glotta* 1. 140-145.
1909b. Zur homerischen Sprache. *Glotta* 2. 8-22.
1911. Zur homerischen Sprache. *Glotta* 3. 105-153.
1913a. Homeros. *RE*. 2213-2248.
1913b. Wort- und Versrhythmus bei Homer. *RhM* 68. 217-238.
1913c. Über die Kasusausgänge -oto und -ov, -οισι und -οις, -ησι und -ης im griechischen Epos. *Glotta* 5. 8-47.
1913d. Zur Frage der Äolismen bei Homer: Der Dativ des Plurals der dritten Deklination. *Glotta* 5. 48-57.
1915. Wort- und Versrhythmus bei Homer. *RhM* 70. 481-523.
- WJA= Würzburger Jahresberichte für die Altertumswissenschaft.
- Wolf, F.
1795. *Prolegomena ad Homerum*. Halle.
- Wray, A.
2002. *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge.
- WS= *Wiener Studien*.
- Wyatt, W.
1969. *Metrical Lengthening in Homer*. Rome.
1978. Homeric πρός, προτί, ποτί. *SMEA* 19. 89-124.
1992. Homeric Hiatus. *Glotta* 70. 20-30.
- YCS= *Yale Classical Studies*.
- Yoshida, Y.
2009. Minor Moods in Sogdian. Yoshida – Vine 2009. 281-293.
- Yoshida, K. - Vine, B.
2009. (eds). *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*. Bremen.
- Younis, H.
2001. *Demosthenes. On the Crown*. Cambridge.
- ŽA= *Živa Antika*.
- Zachl, T.
1896. *De tmesi quae vulgo dicitur in Iliade et Odyssea Homeri*. Baden.
- Zair, N.
2012a. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Celtic*. Leiden.
2012b. A New Environment for Laryngeal Loss in Celtic. Nielsen-Whitehead – Olander – Olsen – Rasmussen 2012. 613-630.
- ZDMG= *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.
- Zehnder, T.
2011. Zur Funktion der Infinitive im Veda. Krisch – Lindner 2011. 622-631.
- Zehnder, T. – Kümmel, M.
2001a. *sek^w "sagen". *LIV* 526-527.
2001b. *sek^w „sich anschließen“. *LIV* 525-526.
- Zeilfelder, S.
2004. Topik, Fokus und Rechtssatzrand im Hethitischen. In: Groddek, D. – Rößle, S. *Šarnikzel-hethitologische Studine zum Gedenken an Emil Orgetorix Forrer*. Dresden. 655-666.
- ZII= *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik*.
- ZPE= *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphie*.