

THE AUGMENT USE IN *ILIAD* 6: AN EVIDENTIAL MARKER? *

Résumé. – Cet article traite de l’emploi et de l’omission de l’augment dans le chant 6 de l’*Iliade*. Dans notre recherche, nous ne tiendrons compte que de formes assurées par la métrique. Nous commençons donc par préciser les critères utilisés pour déterminer quelles formes sont indubitables d’un point de vue métrique, et nous les appliquons au chant précité. Ensuite, nous discutons des formes douteuses. Pour trancher sur ces formes (simples ou composées), nous utilisons la méthode dite « de Barrett et Taida », qui veut que les formes douteuses du point de vue de l’augment peuvent être analysées en les comparant aux formes assurées par la métrique de même paradigme. Le corpus de formes ainsi obtenu servira de base à l’analyse, que nous divisons en trois parties: morphologique, syntaxique et sémantique. Pour terminer, nous tentons d’analyser les résultats avec la théorie de l’« évidentialité », c’est-à-dire du marquage linguistique de la source d’information.

Abstract. – This article discusses the augment use and absence in *Iliad* 6. In our research, we will only use forms that are confirmed by the metre. We therefore start by outlining which criteria are used to determine a metrically secure form and apply them to *Iliad* 6. Then we discuss the forms in which there are still doubts. To decide

* This article is part of an ongoing investigation into the meaning, origin and use of the augment in Early Greek prose and poetry. We would like to thank Professors Mark Janse and Giovanbattista Galdi (Universiteit Gent), Professors Eugen Hill and José Luís García Ramón (Universität zu Köln), Professors Andreas Willi (Oxford) and James Clackson (Cambridge), Dr. Michael Frotscher, Dr. Antje Casaretto, Dr. Daniel Kölligan (Universität zu Köln), Dr. Peter-Arnold Mumm (LMU München), Dr. Philomen Probert and Dr. Wolfgang de Melo (Oxford), Dr. Klaas Bentein and Dr. Joanne Stolk (Universiteit Gent) and all the participants of the 21st LIPP Symposium in Munich on July 2nd 2014, of the *More Hitches in Historical Linguistics* Conference in Ghent on March 16th 2015, of the *International Conference on Historical Linguistics* in Naples on July 27th 2015, of the DiaLING presentation held in Ghent on November 15th, 2016, of the research seminar in Cologne on December 15th, 2016 and of the Philological Seminar in Oxford on May 23rd, 2017 for their questions, input, criticism and feedback. Lastly, our thanks go to the anonymous reviewers who helped in improving and editing this article. The article was made possible by a fellowship BOF.PDO.2016.0006.19 of the research council of the Universiteit Gent (BOF, *Bijzonder Onderzoeksfonds*), by a travel grant V426317N for a research stay in Oxford and by a postdoctoral fellowship 12V1518N, both granted by the FWO Vlaanderen (*Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Vlaanderen*, Science Foundation Flanders).

on those forms (both simplex and compound forms), we use the “Barrett - Taida method”, which states that forms with doubtful augmentation can be analysed by comparing them to the metrically secure forms of the same paradigm. The corpus of forms that is thus obtained, will be the basis for the analysis. We divide the analysis in three parts: morphological, syntactic and semantic. At the end, we try to analyse the results with the theory of “evidentiality”, the linguistic marking of information source.

1. Why this chant / work?

Iliad 6 provides us with a representative corpus of 529 verses with both emotional and narrative passages: besides the omnipresent battle scenes, it is one of the most emotional ones in the entire *Iliad*, as it contains the Farewell between Hektor and Andromakhe and the little Astyanax who was scared by Hektor’s flashing helmet. The chant also contains the legendary encounter between Glaukos and Diomedes, who in spite of them being enemies find out that they share a common history of guest-friendship and decide to exchange their battle gear and agree not to engage in battle anymore. It thus offers a corpus of different passages and tenses that allows us to assess the previous theories on the augment (of which some were unfortunately sometimes rather “eclectic” in their choice of passages and examples), and will inevitable have some exceptions as well.

2. Metrically secure forms

The prototypical hexameter has the following structure:

— ˘˘ // — ˘˘ // — ˘˘ // — ˘˘ // — ˘˘ // — ˘

1a 1b 1c 2a 2b 2c 3a 3b 3c 4a 4b 4c 5a 5b 5c 6a 6b

In determining “word end”, we consider enclitics to be part of the word after which they appeared¹. The following criteria will be used to determine the metrical guarantee of a transmitted verb form with or without augment (the criteria are listed in order from validity and applicability, starting with the formal and then proceeding to the metrical ones).

1. See H. AHRENS (1852, p. 200), B. GISEKE (1864, p. 127), W. MEYER (1884, p. 980), P. MAAS (1923, p. 30-31), H. FRAENKEL (1960), M. WEST (1982, p. 37), B. SNELL (1982, p. 68), R. NÜNLIST (2000, p. 112), I. TAIDA (2007, p. 9), S. OSWALD (2014, p. 421); E. O’NEILL (1942) struggled with this problem, as he stated on page 109 that enclitics did not belong to the word, but on page 110 wrote that word and enclitic formed a bigger conglomerate.

1. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite creates an unmetrical verse: most metrically secure (un)augmented verbal forms are placed in a position in the verse where the augment cannot be added or removed without violating the metre.

2. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the elision of the dative plural ending of consonant stems in $-\sigma\iota/ -\psi\iota/ -\xi\iota$.²

3. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the elision of the dative singular ending in $-i$.³

4. As a word final $-v$ is *never* elided⁴, (un)augmented forms are secure, if the opposite requires such an elision.

5. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the elision of the unelidable short $-a$ ending in monosyllabic pronouns and articles, which cannot be elided⁵.

6. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the elision of the unelidable short $-o$ in monosyllabic articles and prepositions, which cannot be elided⁶.

7. The presence of the augment is also guaranteed, in those verb forms that would otherwise yield a short monosyllabic verb form, regardless of the fact whether the verb form appears before the caesura or at the end of the verse or not (cf. *infra*)⁷.

8. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the violation Hermann's Bridge: this bridge states that there cannot be a word end

2. J. LA ROCHE (1869, p. 76, 80), I. BEKKER (1872, p. 22-23), D. MONRO (1891, p. 349-350), P. MAAS (1923, p. 27), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 86), R. WACHTER (2000, p. 74).

3. C. GRASHOF (1852, p. 11), J. LA ROCHE (1869, p. 76, 80, but see p. 125-129), I. BEKKER (1872, p. 22-23), D. MONRO (1891, p. 349-350), P. MAAS (1923, p. 27), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 86), R. WACHTER (2000, p. 74); there are only 19 exceptions in the entire Homeric corpus, the list of which can be found in J. LA ROCHE (1869, p. 125-129)

4. F. SPITZNER (1816, p. 167), R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1890, p. 230-240), D. MONRO (1891, p. 349-350), P. MAAS (1923, p. 27), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 403), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 85-86), W. J. W. KOSTER (1966, p. 45), D. KORZENIEWSKI (1968, p. 24), R. WACHTER (2000, p. 74-75). The elision of $-v$ was not discussed in J. LA ROCHE (1869), which means that he had not found any instances in which it occurred.

5. R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1890, p. 239), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 403), W. J. W. KOSTER (1962, p. 45), M. WEST (1987, p. 13).

6. R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1890, p. 239), D. MONRO (1891, p. 349), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 403), W. J. W. KOSTER (1962, p. 45), M. WEST (1987, p. 13).

7. J. WACKERNAGEL (1906, p. 147-148), A. MEILLET (1903, p. 92-93; 1908, p. 97-104; 1913, p. 94, 104-105; 1937, p. 243), K. BRUGMANN (1916, p. 13), H. JACOBSON (1927, p. 263), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 651), G. BONFANTE (1942, p. 104-105), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 482), B. MARZULLO (1952, p. 41), K. STRUNK (1967, p. 275, 1987), I. HAJNAL (1990, p. 53), O. SZEMERÉNYI (1990, p. 322; 1996, p. 297) and recently also P. MUMM (2004, § 1, without reference to J. Wackernagel). J. Wackernagel showed that a similar evolution occurred in Armenian and Middle Indic.

between 4a and 4b, and is one of the strictest bridges in epic poetry, with very few exceptions (about 0,3 %) ⁸.

9. An augmented or unaugmented form is considered secure, if the opposite would create a caesura at the end of the third foot: bipartite hexameters were avoided; as this had been noted already at least as early as Varro, it is sometimes called “Varro’s Bridge” ⁹.

10. The presence or absence of an augment is secure, if the opposite would yield a spondaic fifth foot: only 2 to 3% of the verses have a spondee in the fifth foot (and spondaic fifth feet with a word end at the end of the foot are avoided) ¹⁰.

11. The presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the creation of monosyllabic verb forms (short and long) before the caesura ¹¹.

8. G. HERMANN (1805, p. 692-693; 1817, p. 213 [*caesura quarti trochaei rarissima est et studiose vitatur*]), F. SPITZNER (1816, p. 9-12), J. VAN LEEUWEN (1890, focusing on the exceptions), D. MONRO (1884, p. lxxv; 1891, p. 340), T. ALLEN & E. SIKES (1904, p. 15-16, mentioning the exceptions), S. BASSETT (1919, p. 372), E. O’NEILL (1942, p. 170-171), D. KORZENIEWSKI (1968, p. 30-34), R. BEEKES (1972), B. SNELL (1986, p. 13-16), M. WEST (1982, p. 36-38; 1997, p. 222-225), H. BARNES (1986), M. VAN RAALTE (1986, p. 97-98), C. SICKING (1993, p. 73-79), R. NÜNLIST (2000, p. 112), F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 40; 2017, p. 60-61).

9. E. GERHARD (1816, p. 127-128), J. VOSS (1826, p. 63 with some examples in epic Greek, such as *Iliad* 15, 18; *Odyssey* 10, 58 and *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* [HH 2], 202), H. AHRENS (1852, p. 199-200), K. LEHRS (1860, p. 513), W. VON CHRIST (1874, p. 182, 199), D. MONRO (1884, p. lxxiv-lxxv), P. MAAS (1923, p. 22), T. STIFLER (1924, p. 348), R. SJÖLUND (1938, p. 64), W. J. W. KOSTER (1962, p. 70-71), D. KORZENIEWSKI (1968, p. 34), W. INGALLS (1970, p. 1), M. CANTILENA (1995, p. 39-40, he also referred to an unpublished MA thesis discussing this topic: M. MARRA, *Il problema dell’esametro bipartito*, MA Thesis Università di Venezia, 1992-1993 – *non uidimus*), B. GENTILE & L. LOMIENTO (2003, p. 270, referring to Pseudo-Hephaestion [2nd century AD?] as the author of the metrical prohibition).

10. E. GERHARD (1816, p. 142-147), G. HERMANN (1817, p. 220), A. LUDWICH (1866, p. 1-23), J. LA ROCHE (1869, p. 84-85), P. MAAS (1923, p. 22), W. J. W. KOSTER (1962, p. 66-68), D. KORZENIEWSKI (1968, p. 30), M. WEST (1982, p. 37), B. SNELL (1986, p. 13-16), M. VAN RAALTE (1986, p. 37-38), C. SICKING (1993, p. 73-74). For a detailed treatment of spondaic verses in epic Greek, see A. LUDWICH (1866).

11. W. MEYER (1884, p. 983) noted that the combination of a dactylic word and a monosyllabic word before the caesura in the third foot was avoided; already C. HOFFMANN (1842, p. 20-21) pointed out that it was unusual to end the sentence in the foot before the actual pause. C. SICKING (1993, p. 81) argued that a monosyllabon at the end of a sentence, colon or verse was avoided. In F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 40-41), this rule was applied to a corpus of epic Greek, namely 7566 verses of the *Iliad* (chants 1, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 23 and 24), 5260 of the *Odyssey* (chants 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 13, 14, 19, 21 and 24) and the entire Hesiodic corpus. The analysis showed that only 9 instances of a monosyllabon at the end of a verse and 13 monosyllabics before a caesura could be found in the *Theogony*; in the *Works and Days*, there were 10 monosyllabics at the end of a verse and 11 before a caesura; in the *Iliad*, there were 126 monosyllabics at the end of a verse and 62 before a caesura; in the *Odyssey*, 78 monosyllabics at the end of the verse and 20 before a caesura were attested.

12. As a monosyllabic form is avoided at the end of the verse¹², an augment is secure if the opposite would create a monosyllabic verb form at 6b¹³.

13. What applies to the simplex verb form, applies to the compound as well¹⁴; as such, the transmitted augmented compound verb forms of monosyllabic simplex verb forms can count as secure, i.e. what applies to ἔσχε and ἔφη applies to ἐπέσχε and προσέφη as well.

14. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite leads to the violation of “Gerhard - Wernicke’s Law”¹⁵: this law states that if there is word end after spondaic fourth foot, the last syllable should have a long syllable by nature and not by position¹⁵.

15. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite creates an elision before caesura¹⁶.

16. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite leads to a violation of Meyer’s first law: this law states that word end is forbidden at 2b or 2c, when the word started in the first foot¹⁷. This are actually two different laws, which we will call Meyer 1a (prohibition of word end at 2b of a word starting in the first foot) and Meyer 1b (prohibition of word end at 2c of a word starting in the first foot). These laws survive under Meyer’s name, but the foundations had been laid (long) before him¹⁸. Regarding Meyer 1a, earlier scholars, such as Hoffmann and Grashof, had already observed the avoidance of word end at 2b (without restricting the constraint to words starting in the first foot)¹⁹, and, according to the ancient

12. We were unable to find out which scholar had first stated this bridge; G. HERMANN (1817, p. 216) already observed that a word end there was dispreferred, but not excluded, when special emphasis was needed. C. HOFFMANN (1842, p. 20-21) catalogued this caesura among the *caesurae minores*, but stated that a caesura in this position was possible, if something spectacular was announced or if the poet spoke about Zeus. See also A. WIFSTRAND (1933, p. 56), R. SJÖLUND (1938, p. 63), B. SNELL (1986, p. 16), H. BARNES (1986, p. 141), M. VAN RAALTE (1986, p. 90), C. SICKING (1993, p. 81), I. TAIDA (2010, p. 253).

13. I. TAIDA (2010, p. 253).

14. J. WACKERNAGEL (1916, p. 148).

15. E. GERHARD (1816, p. 147-157, especially page 147: *igitur vitabant spondeum externa vi, hoc est, positione effectum*), F. WERNICKE (1819, p. 172-173), B. GISEKE (1865, p. 145-147), T. STIFLER (1924), M. WEST (1997, p. 225). As T. STIFLER (1924, p. 342) and M. West noted, it was not F. Wernicke, but E. Gerhard who had made this observation first; the name “Wernicke’s law” does injustice to E. Gerhard, and therefore, we decided to use the term “Gerhard - Wernicke’s Law”.

16. J. LA ROCHE (1869, p. 86, 99), M. WEST (1982, p. 36); but P. MAAS (1923, p. 31), D. KORZENIEWSKI (1968, p. 26-27) and B. SNELL (1982, p. 12) allowed it.

17. W. MEYER (1884, p. 980).

18. See M. CANTILENA (1995) for a detailed history of this law.

19. C. HOFFMANN (1842, p. 22) noted that the caesura at 2b weakened the verse and catalogued this caesura among the *caesurae minores* in the subcategory (*caesurae*) *versum mollientes* and C. GRASHOF (1852, p. 11) noted that an incision after the trochee in the 2nd foot was avoided. In his overview of the different caesurae, G. HERMANN (1817, p. 212) did not discuss caesurae at 2b and 2c, which means that he did not consider word end at this position a possibility. See also M. CANTILENA (1995, p. 34).

skholia, already Nikanor (2nd century AD) mentioned that a caesura at 2b, ἡ τομὴ κατὰ τὸν ἑβδομὸν χρόνον, was avoided, hence the term “Nikanor’s Bridge”²⁰. B. Giseke had already stated that a word that started in the first foot should not end at the end of the second foot (be it in spondaic or in dactylic form)²¹, and was thus the “founding father” of Meyer 1b. The applicability of these laws to early epic is debated given the fact that there are between 4 and 6 % of exceptions and W. Meyer himself restricted his law to post-Homeric epic (but Hoffmann, Grashof and Giseke applied it to epic Greek as a whole)²². In an in-depth study, M. Cantilena addressed Meyer’s Law (which he restricted to the prohibition of word end at 2b) and the constraint against word end after the trochee in the 2nd foot. He noted that Meyer 1a (but not 1b)²³ was violated in about 7 % of the verses in the *Iliad* and in 6 % of the verses in the *Odyssey* and that the constraint against word end after the trochee of the second foot was violated in 11 % of the verses in the *Iliad* and in 10 % of the verses in the *Odyssey*²⁴. He admitted that 6 % of violations were not much, but nevertheless concluded that the definition “metrical law” was too strong, because some common formulae violated this rule and because the 6 % was very high, when compared with the 0,3 % violations of Hermann’s Bridge and 0,08 % of the prohibition of an bipartite hexameter²⁵. We, however, believe that 6 % is not that much (com-

20. Nikanor stated, according to a skholion, that a word end was rare at the ἑβδομὸν χρόνον (i.e. the first short of the second foot). See S. BASSETT (1919) for an analysis of the ancient grammarians and metricians, and their concepts of the caesurae (p. 362-365 on Nikanor’s Bridge).

21. B. GISEKE (1864, p. 128-135).

22. W. MEYER (1884, p. 980-981) himself limited the validity of his observations to Alexandrian and Imperial hexametric poetry only, as there were too many exceptions in Homer and Hesiod: he listed 5 violations in the first 100 lines of *Iliad* 1 and 20 in the 828 lines of the *Works and Days*. P. MAAS (1923, p. 22) listed Meyer’s Bridge under the post-Homeric appearances and B. GENTILI & L. LOMIENTO (2003, p. 277-278) listed “Giseke - Meyer” as post-Homeric (without noting that B. Giseke had applied his law to epic Greek as a whole, including Homer); also M. CANTILENA (1995) and S. OSWALD (2014) denied the validity of Meyer’s Laws for early hexameter Greek.

B. GISEKE (1864, p. 128-135) made the discovery. The applicability of the laws to epic Greek in its entirety was accepted by G. KIRK (1966, p. 77; 1985, p. 19), D. KORZENIEWSKI (1968, p. 33-34), M. WEST (1982, p. 36-38; 1997, p. 222-225), B. SNELL (1986, p. 15-16), C. SICKING (1993, p. 78-80), R. NÜNLIST (2000, p. 113), M. STEINRUCK (2010), I. TAIDA (2010, p. 252), F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 42-43; 2017, p. 62-66).

23. He only wanted to study the (alleged) word end prohibition and therefore did not address the issue of word end at 2c (M. CANTILENA [1995, p. 31]: *la mia analisi consente di riesaminare il problema dello zeugma al trocheo secondo sulla basi di dati concreti*).

24. M. CANTILENA (1995; the tables are found on pages 30-32); this had also been noted by N. PORTER (1951, p. 16), R. BEEKES (1972, p. 4-6, without mentioning either B. Giseke nor W. Meyer), H. BARNES (1986, p. 128-129), B. SNELL (1986, p. 14). Similar figures were given by C. SICKING (1993, p. 80).

25. M. CANTILENA (1995, p. 40-42). The difference in the percentages of observance between Meyer’s Law and Hermann’s Bridge was also noted by R. BECK (1972, p. 214). Before H. Fraenkel wrote the first version of his colometric analysis, T. STIFLER (1924, p. 337) had already noted that a trochaic caesura in the fourth was

pared to the 3 % of spondees and 15 % of exceptions to the digamma). The fact that these rules applied in later poetry is an indication that the tendency was already present in Homeric and Hesiodic epic: the Alexandrians and Imperial epicists fine-tuned and optimised the hexameter, so if they felt that this rule had to be adhered to, it must mean that they considered the rule already valid for Homer²⁶. Some scholars even argue that a word at 2b or 2c is forbidden *tout court*, even for words that started in the second foot²⁷, but we think that it is too broad a formulation, especially since the Imperial epicist Nonnos (5th century AD) had many word ends at 2b²⁸. In *Iliad* 6, we have 27 violations of Meyer 1a (5 %), 13 of Meyer 1b (2,5 %) and 7 in which it could be 1a or 1b (1,5 % – depending on whether one reads the augment or not).

17. The avoidance of word end at 2b had been noted before W. Meyer, and can be linked to Hermann's Bridge, which was the avoidance of word end at 4b²⁹. Based on Hermann's and Meyer's Laws, H. Fraenkel argued that the ideal verse had a caesura at at 1a/1b/1c/2a, one at 3a/3b, (possibly) one at 4a and finally one at 4c. H. Fraenkel's schema with caesurae would then be a positive reformulation of the two word-end inhibitions at 2b and 4b³⁰.

18. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite violates Hilberg's first principle, which states that if there is a word end at the end of the third foot, the foot should not be spondaic³¹ (this can be considered a consequence from the inhibition against bipartite hexameters).

3. Metrically insecure forms

The following instances are metrically insecure.

1. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the genitive singular ending in -oio is insecure, because -ov followed by ê- / ê'- is metrically equivalent to -oio followed by a consonant and -ov is not always shortened before another vowel³²; this only

avoided, but not in the second foot (i.e. that Hermann's Bridge was observed, but Meyer's Law not). The figures of the bipartite hexameter are found in M. MARRA, *op. cit.*, (n. 9), quoted in M. CANTILENA [1995, p. 40-42] – *non uidimus*.

26. E. O'NEILL (1942, p. 116: "in the inner metrics of the various poets the similarities *enormously outweigh* the differences" – emphasis is ours).

27. As was first stated explicitly (as far as we can tell) by C. GRASHOF (1852, p. 11). The inhibition was mentioned in R. BEEKES (1972, p. 4-6 without mentioning C. Grashof, B. Giseke nor W. Meyer), H. BARNES (1986, p. 127-129), B. SNELL (1986, p. 14).

28. A. WIFSTRAND (1933, p. 73-79).

29. G. KIRK (1966; 1985, p. 19), W. INGALLS (1970), M. CANTILENA (1995, p. 42).

30. H. FRAENKEL (1960), G. KIRK (1966, p. 76-77), H. BARNES (1986, p. 127-129), M. CANTILENA (1995, p. 38-40).

31. I. HILBERG (1879, p. 1-12).

32. In the *Iliad*, the diphthong -ov appears 412 times in hiatus (i.e. before another vowel or diphthong) and is shortened in 275 instances (67%), which means that is not shortened in 33 % of the cases; already D. MONRO (1891, p. 355-356) noted that the long vowel and long diphthongs were the least likely to be subject to shortening, followed by the diphthongs -ev and -ov, whereas the diphthongs with -i were shortened much more often than not. R. SJÖLUND (1938) did not distinguish between the -i and -v

applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above; inversely, an augmented verb form preceded by the genitive ending *-ou* is not secure either; sometimes, both are transmitted, as is the case in *Iliad* 6, 313 where both Ἀλεξάνδροιο βεβήκει and Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐβεβήκει can be found in the manuscripts.

2. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the dative plural ending in *-σι* of the *-ā-* or *-o-* stems is insecure, because PIE had an ending **-ōis* as well (the old Indo-European instrumental plural); this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above; it is not certain that the ending *-οισι* was the older one, as was formerly assumed³³. In the 2nd declension the ending *-οις* can continue the old Indo-European instrumental plural **-ōis*³⁴, so that a sequence *-οισι* followed by a consonant as in *συλήσειν*: Ἐκτώρ δὲ κασιγνήτοισι κέλευσε “[...] to rob [him of his armour]. Hektor ordered his brothers ...” (*Iliad* 15, 545) is metrically equivalent to *κασιγνήτοις ἐκέλευσε*, and, as the 1st and 2nd declension influenced each other, a Proto-Greek dative plural **-āis* was created after the *-o-* stems³⁵, thus rendering *-αισι* followed by a consonant metrically insecure. In addition, Mycenaean also has dative plural endings in *-o* and *-a* (standing for *-ois* and *-ais*) and *-o i* and *-a i* (standing for *-oīhi* and *-aīhi* from earlier *-oisī* and *-aisī* with the *s* having fallen out intervocally and being restored only later)³⁶.

3. An unaugmented verb form preceded by dative plural ending in *-εσσι* of the consonant stems is insecure, because this can be elided³⁷; this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above.

diphthongs, but only noted that the long vowels and diphthongs were shortened less often than the short diphthongs.

33. Almost from the beginning of Indo-European linguistics as a science, the Greek ending *-οις* was explained as false segmentation from *-οισι* with elision from the *ι* before a consonant, see F. BOPP (1835, p. 289, against his earlier opinion that *-οις* was the old instrumental and equal to Vedic *-ais*), G. GERLAND (1860), A. NAUCK (1874, p. 244-249), J. SCHMIDT (1905, p. 4), K. WITTE (1913b) and even P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 194-196, 201-202; 1964, p. 41) and C. RUIJGH (1958, p. 106-11). In several editions (especially in the 19th century), *-οις* is printed *-οισ'* when a vowel follows. K. WITTE (1913b) is the most detailed argument for this interpretation. In fairness, most of these scholars did not have the Mycenaean evidence at their disposal.

34. K. BRUGMANN (1904, p. 397-398), P. CHANTRAINE (1964, p. 40-41), H. RIX (1992, p. 140), B. FORTSON (2004, p. 116), M. WEISS (2009, p. 207).

35. K. BRUGMANN (1904, p. 398), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 201-202; 1964, p. 51), H. RIX (1992, p. 134), M. WEISS (2009, p. 234).

36. E. VILBORG (1960, p. 57), P. CHANTRAINE (1964, p. 40-41), O. PANAGL (1976, p. 88-89), A. BARTONĚK (2003, p. 167, 188), A. BERNABÉ & E. LUJÁN (2006, p. 147-148). C. RUIJGH (1958, p. 111-112; 1967, p. 76-79) interpreted both the endings *-o* and *-a* and *-o i* and *-a i* as *-ois* and *-ais*, because in his opinion it would not have been logical that the intervocalic *s* had been restored in the 3rd declension, as in *tī-ri-si* “three” (dative plural), but not in the 2nd declension. A. BARTONĚK (2003, p. 167) and A. BERNABÉ & E. LUJÁN (2006, p. 147) objected to this suggestion, by stating that no in other context the second element of a diphthong was written and that it therefore would be strange why it had happened in that specific inflectional form (although A. Bartoněk did not rule out C. Ruijgh’s interpretation altogether). Maybe Mycenaean was at a stage in which the intervocalic *s* in the dative plural of the 3rd declension had been restored already on the force of the datives in *-ksi*, *-psi* and *-ssi* whereas this had not yet happened in the *-ā-* and *-o-* stems?

4. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the final short $-α$ of adverbs, adjectives and nouns is insecure³⁸; this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above.

5. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the final $-ο$ of adverbs, verbal endings and pronouns is insecure³⁹; this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above.

6. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the final $-ε$ of adverbs, verbal endings, adjectives, nouns, pronouns is insecure⁴⁰; this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above; J. La Roche argued that the dual ending $-ε$ was never elided⁴¹, but this rule is not observed in all manuscripts; as such, we will have to discuss these instances on a case by case basis.

7. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the final $-ι$ of certain adverbs is insecure⁴²; this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above.

8. As a short diphthong, a long vowel and a long diphthong could be shortened, when they are not under the ictus, an unaugmented verb form preceded by a word ending in a diphthong, long vowel or long diphthong is not secure (unless by the shortening one of the above mentioned metrical rules would be violated); an example is $\tilde{\phi} \delta\tilde{\omega}\kappa\epsilon$: if $\tilde{\phi}$ does not stand under the ictus of the foot, the sequence $\tilde{\phi} \tilde{\epsilon}\delta\tilde{\omega}\kappa\epsilon$ would be metrically acceptable as well.

9. Similarly to the instance discussed above, are verb forms preceded by a short closed syllable: if the verb form has a syllabic augment that is followed by a single consonant, the augment is not secure: $\delta\tilde{\nu} \tilde{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon$ and $\delta\tilde{\nu} \theta\tilde{\eta}\kappa\epsilon$ are metrically equivalent, if $\delta\tilde{\nu}$ does not stand under the ictus.

10. F. Spohn argued that in case of a caesura at 3b (the so-called trochaic caesura in the third foot), a dactyl is preferred in the second foot, especially if the first foot had been a dactyl as well⁴³. J. La Roche went even further and argued that the preferred metrical structure before a caesura at 3b was \sim (a trochee) followed by $\sim\sim$ (an amphibrachys)⁴⁴. We believe that “Spohn’s Bridge” (as we would dub this rule) is related to the preference of a dactyl in the second foot⁴⁵, and the avoid-

37. For the possible elision of $-εσσι$, see J. LA ROCHE (1869, p. 125-129), where all the instances are listed, K. F. KRÜGER (1853, p. 20), D. MONRO (1891, p. 350). R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1890, p. 236) noted that the elision was possible in the dative plural without distinguishing between the different endings.

38. R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1890, p. 233-234), D. MONRO (1891, p. 349).

39. R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1890, p. 234-235), D. MONRO (1891, p. 349).

40. R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1890, p. 233-234), D. MONRO (1891, p. 349).

41. J. LA ROCHE (1869, p. 76-82, 113).

42. J. LA ROCHE (1867, p. 82), R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1890, p. 234), D. MONRO (1891, p. 349-350) listed the instances where it was forbidden; P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 85-86) and R. WACHTER (2000, p. 74-75) did not give any details (nor in any of the other cases of acceptable elision). They just stated that $-a$, $-e$, $-o$ and sometimes $-i$ were susceptible to elision.

43. F. SPOHN (1816, p. 57). See also K. AMEIS (1870, p. 103) and K. AMEIS & C. HENTZE (1900, p. 93).

44. J. LA ROCHE (1864, p. 100-105; 1869, p. 100-109).

45. J. BARNES (1711, p. 93; but on page 420 he argued exactly the opposite), J. VOSS (1826, p. 8-9), J. LA ROCHE (1869, p. 100-109).

ance of two spondees in the first two feet of the hexameter. On the other hand, verses starting with two spondees are attested in 11 to 17 % of the verses, depending on the work or chant⁴⁶, so that we cannot speak of a real metrical inhibition or bridge. All instances will thus have to be discussed on a case by case basis. In *Iliad* 6, there are 11 % of double spondees.

4. Application of these rules to *Iliad* 6

The verb forms that are secure by the rules under § 2 are called “type A”. In *Iliad* 6, the secure forms have their guarantee because of the following factors mentioned above⁴⁷:

1. no unmetrical verses: ῥῆξε (6), φιλέσκειν (15), ἐξενάριξε (20, 30, 36), βῆ (21), τέκ (22), ἐνήρατο (32), ναῖε (34), ἔλε (35), ἔλ’ (38), φοβέοντο (41), ἐξεκυλίσθη (42), ἐλλίσσετο (45), φάτο (51), ἔτραψεν (61), ἐξέσπασε (65), ἀπίθησεν (102), ἐλέλιχθησαν (106), ἔσταν (106), λῆξαν (107), ἐλέλιχθεν (109), συνίτην (120), ἦσαν (121), σεῦε (133), δύσεθ’ (136), ἔχε (137), οδύσαντο (138), ἦν (140), γένετ’ (153), τέκεθ’ (154), ὄπασαν (157), ἐδάμασσε (159), πεῖθ’ (162), ἔθειλεν (165), φάτο (166), λάβεν (166), ἄκουσε (166), ἀλέεινε (167), πέμπε (168), ἠνώγει (170), βῆ (171), ξεινίσσε (174), ἰέρουσεν (174), ἐφάνη (175), ἐρέεινε (176), ἐκέλευσε (179), φάτο (185), ὕφαινε (187), εἶσε (189), γίνωσκε (191), κατέρυκε (192), δῶκε (193), τάμον (194), ἀλᾶτο (201), ἔκτα (205 – cf. *infra*), πέμπε (207), ἐγένοντο (210), φάτο (212), ξεινίσ’ (217), κάλλιψ’ (223), ἀπώλετο (223), λαβέτην (233), ἐξέλετο (234), ἴκανεν (237, 242), ἔνεσαν (244), κοιμῶντο (246, 250), ἔσαν (248), ἠλυθε (251), φῦ (253), ὀνόμαζε (253), ἀνήκεν (256), ἡμείβετ’ (263), ἔτρωφε (282), κέκλετο (287), ἀόλλισσαν (287), ἦγαγε (291), ἀνήγαγεν (292), φέρε (293), βῆ (296), ἴκανον (297), ᾧῖξε (298), θῆκεν (303), ἠρᾶτο (304), ἔρατ’ (311), ἦσαν (315), ἔχ’ (319), θέε (320), νεῖκεσσαν (325), ἔθειλον (336), φάτο (342), ὄφελ’ (345), τέκε (345), ὄφελλον (350), θῆκε (357), ἡμείβετ’ (359), ἴκανε (370), ἔστη (371), ἄκουσε (386), ἦ (390), ἴκανε (392), ἔχεθ’ (398), κίεν (399), καλέεσκε (402), μείδησεν (404), φῦ (406), ὀνόμαζε (406), πέρσεν (415), ἐξενάριξε (417), ἐφύτευσαν (419), ἔσαν (421), κίον (422), βασιλευεν (425), ἦγαγ’ (426), ἐπλετο (434), ἄνωγεν (444), μάθον (444), ἀριστεύεσκε (460), ὀρέξατο (466), ἐκλίνθη (468), εἴλετο (472, 494), κύσε (474), εἶπεν (475), ἐλέησε (484), ὀνόμαζε (485), ἴκανε (497), δῆθουνεν (503), σεύατ’ (505), ἐβεβήκει (513), φέρον (514), ὀαρίζε (516), ἐκέλευες (519);

3. no elision of dative singular -i: εἶπε (75), δέξατο (483);

7. no short monosyllabic verb forms: ἔκτα (205), ἀνέσχον (301), ἦ (390), κατέδω (504);

46. In *Iliad* 6, a double spondee is found in 59 of the 529 verses (11 %); in *Iliad* 16 in 101 of the 867 verses (12 %); in *Iliad* 22 in 58 of the 515 verses (11 %) and in *Iliad* 24 in 105 of the 804 verses (13 %); in *Odyssey* 1 in 65 of the 444 verses (15 %); in *Odyssey* 9 in 86 of the 566 verses (15 %) and in *Odyssey* 23 in 59 of the 372 verses (16 %).

47. The text is quoted after H. VAN THIEL (1991, 1996 and 2011), because his edition is more conservative than M. WEST (1998, 2000) – see for this problem also R. FÜHRER & M. SCHMIDT (2001). For a complete apparatus, one has to consult A. LUDWICH (1902) and M. WEST (1998; 2000) (especially in cases when different readings involving the augment are attested, H. van Thiel did not mention all variants in the apparatus).

8. Hermann's Bridge: γείνατο (24, 26), ὄσατο (62), εἶπε (75), μήσατο (157), πιστώσαντο (233), ἔφατ' (253, 406, 485), λάμπετο (319), τεκμήραντο (349), τέτμεν (374), πῆλε (474), δέξατο (483);

9. no bipartite hexameter, "Varro's Bridge": ἐκέκλετο (66, 110), ἐδειδιμεν (69), ἔκειτο (295), ἐνείκεσας (333), ἐρύετο (403), ἐπειρήσανθ' (435);

10. no spondaic fifth foot: ἔθηκεν (8), ἐδύτην (19), ἐβήτην (40), ἔστη (43), ἐπειθε (51), ἔμεινας (126), ἔριζεν (131)⁴⁸, ἀνώγει (240)⁴⁹, ἔειπεν (375, 381), ἔθηκε (482);

11. no monosyllabic verb forms (short and long) before the caesura: ἀπέβη (116), προσέφη (342), ἀπέβη (369), ἔβη (377, 386), κατέδου (504), προσέφη (520);

12. no monosyllables in 6b: ἔστη (43), ἔκτα (205), ἀνέσχον (301);

13. what applies to the simplex verb form, applies to the compound as well: ἀπέβη (116), ἀνέσχον (301), προσέφη (342), ἀπέβη (369), κατέδου (504), προσέφη (520);

15. no elision before the caesura: πέρησε (10), μίγη (25), ἔγειρε (105), ἔλασεν (158), λάβεν (166), σεβάσσατο (167), πόρεν (168), δίδου (192), γήθησεν (212), δίδου (219), σεβάσσατο (417), πῆλε (474), δέξατο (483);

18. Hilberg's first principle: ἐκέκλετο (66, 110), ἔκειτο (295), ἐνείκεσας (333), ἐρύετο (403), ἐπειρήσανθ' (435).

5. Analysing the metrically insecure forms: the "Barrett - Taida method"

For the verb forms that are not secure (the ones as described in § 3) and/or for forms in which both augmented and unaugmented forms are transmitted, the method devised by W. S. Barrett and I. Taida will be used to determine if the (un)augmented form was the original. When only one form is transmitted, the starting point is the transmitted verb form, as we believe that that form should only be changed in extreme circumstances. When analysing cases in which both the augmented and the unaugmented verb forms were attested in Euripides, W. S. Barrett decided to look at the other instances of that specific verb in Euripides; he divided the attestations in three categories: metrically secure augmented forms, uncertain forms and metrically guaranteed unaugmented forms. Whichever of the guaranteed forms was more common, had to be adopted in the doubtful instances⁵⁰. I. Taida applied this method to the *Homeric Hymns* to Demeter and to Hermes (although not to all doubtful instances)⁵¹. He expanded W. S. Barrett's *modus operandi* and included as criterion the passage in which the form occurred

48. In verse 139 a spondaic fifth foot could be possible, if one read ἐπουρανίους ἤριζεν, but this verb is never attested in an augmented form.

49. If one wanted a spondaic fifth foot in verse 240, one would have to read εὔχεσθ' ἠνώγει with elision of the infinitive ending in -σθαι (which is attested).

50. W. S. BARRETT (1964, p. 361-362).

51. I. TAIDA (2007, 2010).

(e.g. if the verb form had a metrically insecure augment, but occurred in a simile or speech, the augment was in all likelihood correct; if a form had a metrically insecure augment absence but was an iterative verb form, the augment absence was probably correct)⁵². If the numbers itself did not yield a solution, I. Taida looked at the words preceding the verb form (is the elided or non-elided form more frequent?) and if that did not work, he looked at occurrences in later hexametric Greek. We follow his method and use the following criteria (in order of importance):

- a) the overall figures of metrically secure forms;
- b) the position in the verse of the attested verb forms;
- c) the type of passage in which the form is attested (a form with an augment in a gnome or simile is more likely to be correct);
- d) the type of form: in case of doubt, a pluperfect, dual and iterative in -σκ- are more likely to have been unaugmented (cf. *infra*)⁵³;
- e) if the verb forms themselves do not allow for a conclusion, we will see if the preceding noun can shed any light on it (e.g. is this word more often attested in its elided or unelided form?);
- f) if this is not possible, we look at the attestations in the entire epic corpus;
- g) if this is still not possible, we look at other poetic genres;
- h) if a decision is still not possible, the form is undecided.

The forms that can be determined by this method, will be called “type B”; the forms that remain unexplained, will be called “type C”. In our analysis, we will use forms of type A and B.

6. Application of the “Barrett - Taida method” to *Iliad* 6

In what follows, we will apply the method to *Iliad* 6. The form under discussion is put in bold characters.

1. Τρώων δ' **οιόθη** καὶ Ἀχαιῶν φύλοπις αἰνή (6, 1).

This instance is problematic and nothing can be said about it, because only the form *οιόθη* is attested (no **εοιόθη* exists) and because the unaugmented *οιόθη* is metrically equivalent to the unattested augmented **ῶόθη*.

2. πολλὰ δ' ἄρ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθ' **ἴθυσε** μάχη πεδίοιο (6, 2).

This instance is also problematic and nothing can be said about it, because the *ι* in *ἴθυσε* is long by nature; as such, we cannot state with certainty that the form is (un)augmented.

3. ἄνδρα βαλὼν ὃς ἄριστος ἐνὶ Θρήκεσσι **τέτυκτο** (6, 7).

In this instance, the form *τέτυκτο* is insecure: throughout the early epic Greek corpus, a metrically secure *τέτυκτο* is attested twice, while the augmented *έτέτυκτο* is used 9 times. In addition, the form *Θρήκεσσι* is only found here; as such, there is

52. I. TAIDA (2007, p. 4-5; 2010, p. 251).

53. In this, we follow I. TAIDA (2007, p. 4-5; 2010, p. 251) as well.

no metrical support for the transmitted reading (but this does not mean that we want to insert the augment into the text).

4. τὸν ῥ' ἔβαλε πρῶτος κόρυθος φάλον ἵπποδασειῆς (6, 9).

In this instance, the form ἔβαλε is insecure, because throughout the early epic Greek corpus, the augmented form ἔβαλε is only metrically secure 11 times, whereas the unaugmented βάλε appears 140 times. As such, there is no metrical support for the transmitted form here.

5. ἐν δὲ μετόπω πῆξε, πέρησε δ' ἄρ' ὄστέον εἴσω (6, 10).

In this instance, the augmented form would be expected if “Spohn’s Bridge” were valid, but the unaugmented πῆξε is attested throughout the early epic Greek corpus 8 times in a metrically secure form, whereas the augmented counterpart is never attested; as such, the form πῆξε can be considered secured by internal evidence.

6. αἰχμὴ χαλκείῃ: τὸν δὲ σκότος ὄσσε κάλυπεν (6, 11).

This instance is somewhat more complicated, because the unaugmented κάλυπεν is only attested 6 times, whereas the augmented ἐκάλυπεν is found 20 times; as such, one could state that there is no certainty about the transmitted form, but looking at ὄσσε can solve the problem: the unelided form ὄσσε is metrically secure 47 times throughout the early epic Greek corpus and 10 times in the 5th foot (as is the case here), but the elided ὄσσ' is never metrically secure. It thus seems that ὄσσε is preferred here and, by consequence, also κάλυπεν is preferred.

7. Ἄξυλον δ' ἄρ' ἔπεφνε βοῖν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης (6, 12).

Here, both ἄρ' ἔπεφνε and ἄρα πέφνε are possible. The augmented ἔπεφνε is attested 8 times throughout the early epic Greek corpus and the unaugmented πέφνε 5 times. Moreover, both forms violate Meyer’s first law: the augmented violates Meyer 1a and the unaugmented 1b. As Meyer 1a is violated more often than 1b (1a is violated 27 times in *Iliad* 6 and 1b only 13 times) and the augmented form is attested more frequently than the unaugmented one, ἔπεφνε has preference.

8. Τευθρανίδην, ὃς ἔναιεν εὐκτιμένη ἐν Ἀρίσβῃ (6, 13).

In this instance, the transmitted ἔναιεν would be preferred, if “Spohn’s Bridge” were valid, but the augmented ἔναιεν is only attested 8 times and the unaugmented ναῖεν 20 times. Most augmented forms are found at the end of the verse, whereas the unaugmented form is preferred at the beginning of the verse or after the bucolic caesura; there is only one instance in which a form is metrically secure in this position, namely the unaugmented ναῖον in *Odyssey* 9, 222 where the verb form also appears at the beginning of the sentence. The transmitted form is nevertheless to be preferred, because otherwise we would have a spondee in the 2nd foot. Overall, a spondee is already less common than a dactyl in the second foot⁵⁴, but a spondee with the second half being long by position and not by a naturally long vowel or diphthong is even less common⁵⁵: out of the 529 verses in *Iliad* 6, we counted only 171 with a spondee in the second foot (which is only 32 %) and of those 171, only 54 have a second half foot that is long by position (which is again 32 %). This makes that about 10 % of the verses in this chant have a spondaic second foot with a

54. See already E. O’NEILL (1942, p. 159).

55. This had been noted already by A. MEILLET (1910, p. 41-42).

second half foot that is long by position. Therefore, the augmented form is preferred here.

9. ἀφνειὸς βιότοις, φίλος δ' ἦν ἀνθρώποισι (6, 14).

In this instance, the form under discussion is ἦν. At first sight, it seems metrically secure, but since L. Meyer and A. Nauck⁵⁶, scholars have argued that in most instances, the form is equivalent to the unaugmented ἔεν. Moreover, as ἦν is a contracted form of the augment and the vowel of the stem, it would violate Gerhard - Wernicke's Law. When the form ἔην is followed by a noun starting with a consonant, a substitution with (the unattested) ἔεν is equally possible. The scholars advocating the change argue that ἦεν, ἔην and ἔεν would have been written EEN in the oldest alphabet, but using the pre-Euclidean alphabet as origin and justification for changing the Homeric text is in our opinion opening Pandora's box. Moreover, the problem with the substitution of ἦν and ἔην by ἔεν is that the latter form is never attested (not even in instances where it would be metrically necessary) and therefore some caution is needed⁵⁷. In this instance, ἦν is not equivalent to ἔσκ' (as ἦεν would be to ἔσκειν), because the latter form would require an elision before the caesura. It is also difficult to see how and why ἔσκ' would have been replaced by ἦν. In short, we believe that the transmitted form can be defended here and will discuss the (alleged?) difference between ἔην, ἦν and ἔσκ- later on.

10. ἀλλά οἱ οὐ τις τῶν γε τότε ἦρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον (6, 16).

The form ἦρκεσε is insecure, because there is no metrically secure way to distinguish this form from the unaugmented ἄρκεσε (although this form is never attested).

11. πρόσθεν ὑπαντίσασας, ἀλλ' ἄμφω θυμὸν ἀπηύρα (6, 17).

The form ἀπηύρα is insecure, because we cannot distinguish it from the unaugmented *ἀπαύρα.

12. ἔσκειν ὑφηνίχοις: τὸ δ' ἄμφω γαῖαν ἐδύτην (6, 19).

In this specific instance, ἔσκειν would be metrically equivalent to ἦεν, but as we stated above, we do not see how these forms could have been imposed on one another and therefore consider the form to be secure (the difference between the forms will be addressed later on).

13. Βουκολίων δ' ἦν υἱὸς ἀγαθοῦ Λαομέδοντος (6, 23).

This issue was addressed in 6, 14.

14. καὶ μὲν τῶν ὑπέλυσε μένος καὶ φαίδιμα γυῖα (6, 27).

This is a compound verb and in deciding whether a compound verb is augmented or not, we look at the simplex forms; in this instance, there are 5 metrically secure augmented forms in the aorist paradigm of λύω, against 24 unaugmented forms. As such, the transmitted form cannot count as secure here.

56. L. MEYER (1860a, p. 386-389; 1860b, p. 423-425), G. CURTIUS (1868; 1871, p. 478-479), A. NAUCK (1874, p. 249-255), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 677), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 319-321).

57. See already W. VON HARTEL (1873, p. 66-70), A. LUDWICH (1885, p. 262-268) and R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1892, p. 225).

15. Μηκιστηϊάδης καὶ ἀπ' ὤμων τεύχε' ἐσύλα (6, 28).

The instance here is insecure, because throughout the early epic Greek corpus, the augmented form is metrically secure once as is the unaugmented form. The elided τεύχε' is metrically secure 26 times in the fifth foot and the unelided τεύχεα 29 times. As such, no decision can be made.

16. Αστούαλον δ' ἄρ' ἔπεφνε μενεπτόλεμος Πολυποίτης (6, 29).

This was addressed in 6, 12.

17. καὶ δὴ μιν τάχ' ἔμελλε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν (6, 52).

In this instance, the augmented form is secure, because ἔμελλε is attested metrically secure in 21 instances (and 2 cases of ἡμελλε with long augment), whereas the unaugmented μέλλε is only found 5 times.

18. ἀντίος ἦλθε θεῶν, καὶ ὁμοκλήσας ἔπος ηῦδα (6, 54).

As ἦλθε is a syncopated form of ἦλυθε and ἔλυθε is never attested, the augment in ἦλθε can count as secure⁵⁸.

19. ἀντίος ἦλθε θεῶν, καὶ ὁμοκλήσας ἔπος ηῦδα (6, 54).

The form ηῦδα is insecure, because we cannot distinguish metrically between ηῦδα and αὔδα; given the fact that the verb twice has the unaugmented iterative ἀυδήσασκε and twice the unaugmented dual προσαυδήτην, we are inclined to think that the augment in this form could very well have been original, especially since this is a speech introduction, but as we have no independent metrical evidence, we have to consider this form to be insecure.

20. οὔτα κατὰ λαπάρην: ὃ δ' ἀνετράπετ', Ἀτρείδης δὲ (6, 64).

The form οὔτα is insecure, because we cannot say if the form is augmented or not.

21. οὔτα κατὰ λαπάρην: ὃ δ' ἀνετράπετ', Ἀτρείδης δὲ (6, 64).

The form ἀνετράπετ' is a compound and thus we look at the figures of the simplex; in this case, the simplex has 9 metrically secure 3rd person singular thematic middle aorist forms versus 2 unaugmented ones; as such, the augment in ἀνετράπετ' can count as secure here.

22. ὧς εἰπὼν ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου (6, 72).

The metre does not allow us to decide if ὄτρυνε was augmented or not; the unaugmented iterative ὀτρύνεσκον is attested and this seems to indicate that this verb conformed to the “normal” augment uses, but as we have no independent confirmation by the metre, the form has to count as insecure.

23. Ἴλιον εἰσανέβησαν ἀναλκείησι δαμέντες (6, 74).

The augment in the compound form εἰσανέβησαν is secure, because the simplex has 5 augmented third plural aorist forms with a secure augment against 2 unaugmented forms.

24. ὧς ἔφαθ', Ἐκτώρ δ' οὐ τι κασιγνήτω ἀπίθησεν (6, 102).

In this case, one could have had ὧς φάτο, Ἐκτώρ with hiatus or with the consonantic effects of the initial *h* still operative, but given the fact that ὧς ἔφαθ' or ὧς

58. H. JACOBSON (1909) disagreed.

ἔφατ' are more common than ὦς φάτο and that ὦς ἔφαθ', οἷ is preferred over ὦς φάτο, τοῖ in spite of τοῖ still being used in the epic language, make us think that the transmitted ὦς ἔφαθ', Ἔκτωρ can be considered secure here ⁵⁹.

25. αὐτίκα δ' ἐξ ὀχέων σὺν τεύχεσιν ἄλτο χαμᾶζε (6, 103).

It is impossible to know if ἄλτο was augmented or not, because it is metrically equivalent to (the unattested) ἤλτο.

26. πάλλων δ' ὀξέα δοῦρα κατὰ στρατὸν ὄχετο πάντη (6, 104).

The form ὄχετο is metrically insecure, because the metrical value of the augmented and unaugmented form is the same.

27. Ἀργεῖοι δ' ὑπεχώρησαν, λῆξαν δὲ φρόνοιο (6, 107).

The augment of the compound form ὑπεχώρησαν is insecure, because the simplex has only 5 metrically insecure aorist forms and no secure augmented forms. As such, there is no metrical back up for the augment in this case.

28. ἀμφὶ δέ μιν σφυρὰ τύπτε καὶ αὐχένα δέρμα κελαινὸν (6, 117).

The unaugmented form τύπτε is secure here, because throughout the early epic Greek corpus the verb has 11 metrically secure unaugmented forms and no metrically secure augmented forms.

29. ἄντυξ ἦ πυμάτη θένν ἀσπίδος ὀμφαλοέσσης (6, 118).

The unaugmented θένν is secure, because the verb has 7 metrically secure unaugmented forms and no augmented ones ⁶⁰.

30. τὸν πρότερος προσέειπε βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης (6, 122).

The augment in the compound form προσέειπε is secure, because the simplex has 102 secure augmented forms and only 33 unaugmented ones.

31. δὴν ἦν, ὃς ῥα θεοῖσιν ἐπουρανίοισιν ἔριζεν (6, 131).

This has been addressed before in 6, 14.

32. θύσθλα χαμαὶ κατέχευαν ὑπ' ἀνδροφόνοιο Λυκούργου (6, 134).

The augment in the compound κατέχευαν is secure, because the simplex has 27 augmented form and 21 unaugmented ones.

33. δύσεθ' ἄλως κατὰ κῦμα, Θέτις δ' ὑπεδέξατο κόλπῳ (6, 136).

There is no independent metrical confirmation for the augment in the compound form ὑπεδέξατο, because the simplex has 11 augmented forms and 10 unaugmented ones in early epic Greek and 42 augmented forms and 39 unaugmented ones throughout the entire hexametric corpus. These figures are too close to allow for a final decision.

34. καὶ μιν τυφλὸν ἔθηκε Κρόνου πάϊς: οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δὴν (6, 139).

The augment in ἔθηκε would be an illustration of what F. Spohn and J. La Roche argued for and would also confirm the dispreference for a verse starting with a double spondee, but there is no independent metrical confirmation for the augment in this form, because the augmented form is less common than the unaugmented one

59. See also F. DE DECKER (*forthcoming*) on *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, 39.

60. See also F. DE DECKER (2017, p. 109) on *Iliad* 1, 483.

(55 against 67) and the augmented one is largely preferred at the end of the verse; moreover, the only form that has been attested with metrical certainty in this position, is the unaugmented one.

35. ἦν, ἐπεὶ ἀθανάτοισιν **ἀπήχθετο** πᾶσι θεοῖσιν (6, 140).

As was argued before, it is impossible to decide if verbs starting with a short vowel followed by two or more consonants had an augment or not. The same applies to verbs starting with a diphthong.

36. τὸν δ' αὐθ' Ἰππολόχοιο **προσηύδα** φαίδιμος υἱός (6, 144).

This was discussed in 6, 54.

37. ἔνθα δὲ Σίσυφος **ἔσκειν**, ὃ κέρδιτος γένετ' ἀνδρῶν (6, 153).

This has been discussed before as well (6, 14). We have no reason to doubt the unaugmented nature of (as almost all iteratives are augmentless) and it would be difficult to explain why and how ἔσκειν would have replaced ἦεν.

38. αὐτὰρ Γλαῦκος **ἔτικτεν** ἀμύμονα Βελλεροφόντην (6, 155).

This would be another illustration for F. Spohn and J. La Roche, and in this instance there is some metrical evidence in favour of the augmented form ἔτικτεν: there are 8 metrically secure augmented forms against 5 unaugmented ones.

39. ὄπασαν: αὐτὰρ οἱ Προῖτος κακὰ **μήσατο** θυμῷ (6, 157).

In this instance, both κάκ' ἐμήσατο and κακὰ μήσατο have been transmitted, the former one being the reading of most manuscripts (and printed in H. van Thiel's edition). The unaugmented form (printed by M. West) has nevertheless preference, because it does not violate Hermann's Bridge and because there are 23 metrically secure unaugmented aorist and imperfect forms of this verb versus only 8 augmented ones.

40. ὃς ῥ' ἐκ δήμου ἔλασεν, ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτερος **ἦεν** (6, 158).

This has been discussed before (6, 14 and 6, 153).

41. τῷ δὲ γυνὴ Προΐτου **ἐπεμήνατο** δι' Ἄντεια (6, 160).

The augment in ἐπεμήνατο is insecure, because the form is only attested here and we therefore have no independent confirmation of the form.

42. ἡ δὲ ψευσαμένη Προΐτον βασιλῆα **προσηύδα** (6, 163).

This has been discussed before (6, 54).

43. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ Λυκίην **ἶξε** Ξάνθον τε ρέοντα (6, 172).

This problem has been addressed before (6, 140).

44. προφρονέως μιν **τίεν** ἄναξ Λυκίης εὐρείης (6, 173).

The absence of the augment in τίεν can count as secure here, because the verb has 24 metrically secure unaugmented forms and only 4 augmented forms.

45. καὶ τότε μιν ἐρέεινε καὶ **ἦτεε** σῆμα ιδέσθαι (6, 176).

This problem has been addressed before (cf. 6, 140).

46. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σῆμα κακὸν **παρεδέξατο** γαμβροῦ (6, 178).

This has been addressed before (6, 136).

47. πεφνέμεν: ἦ δ' ἄρ' ἔην θεῖον γένος οὐδ' ἀνθρώπων (6, 180).

This has been addressed before (6, 14).

48. καὶ τὴν μὲν **κατέπεφνε** θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας (6, 183).

As was shown in 6, 12 the augmented forms of the simplex are more common than the unaugmented ones and therefore, the augment in the compound form counts as secure as well.

49. δεύτερον αὖ Σολύμοισι **μαχέσσατο** κυδαλίμοισι (6, 184).

There is only one metrically secure attestation of the 3rd person unaugmented aorist singular form and no augmented form. This on itself would not be secure to determine the form, but the dative form Σολύμοισι is the only one that is attested and is therefore secure here as well; if that form is secure, so is the unaugmented **μαχέσσατο**.

50. τὸ τρίτον αὖ **κατέπεφεν** Ἀμαζόνας ἀντιανείρας (6, 186).

This has been addressed in 6, 183.

51. εἶσε λόχον: τοὶ δ' οὐ τι πάλιν οἰκόνδε **véοντο** (6, 189).

The form **véοντο** is difficult to analyse: in early epic Greek, there are 2 metrically secure augmented forms and 2 metrically secure unaugmented forms; the rest of the paradigm has only 3 unaugmented forms, making it more likely that the unaugmented form might have been preferred here as well. More importantly, οἰκόνδε without elision is metrically secure 30 times, of which 22 in the fifth foot, whereas οἰκόνδ' with elision is metrically secure 3 times and only once in the fifth foot. As such, οἰκόνδε has preference here and if οἰκόνδε has preference, so has the unaugmented form.

52. πάντας γὰρ **κατέπεφεν** ἀμύμων Βελλεροφόντης (6, 190).

This has been addressed in 6, 183.

53. ἦ δ' **ἔτεκε** τρία τέκνα δαίφρονι Βελλεροφόντη (6, 196).

In early epic Greek, there are 83 metrically secure unaugmented active aorist forms against only 7 augmented forms; as such, there is no metrical confirmation for the transmitted augment in this instance.

54. Λαοδαμείη μὲν **παρελέξατο** μητίετα Ζεύς (6, 198).

The simplex form has two metrically secure augmented and two unaugmented forms; in post-Homeric epic Greek, there is one metrically secure augment. There is therefore no metrical confirmation for the augment in **παρελέξατο**.

55. ἦ δ' **ἔτεκε** ἀντίθεον Σαρπηδόνα χαλκοκορυστήν (6, 199).

This has been discussed in 6, 196.

56. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κείνος **ἀπήχθετο** πᾶσι θεοῖσιν (6, 200).

This has been discussed before (6, 140).

57. μαρνάμενον Σολύμοισι **κατέκτανε** κυδαλίμοισι (6, 204).

The augment in **κατέκτανε** can be considered secure, because the simplex has 19 metrically secure augmented forms against 9 unaugmented forms.

58. Ἴππόλοχος δέ μ' ἔτικτε, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ φημι γενέσθαι (6, 206).

In this instance, both μ' ἔτικτε and με τίκτε would have been possible, but the augmented form has preference as was argued in 6, 155; moreover, μ' ἔτικτε would violate Meyer 1a whereas με τίκτε conflicts with Meyer 1b; as 1a is violated more often than 1b, this is an additional reason to consider the augment secure here.

59. πέμπε δέ μ' ἐς Τροίην, καί μοι μάλα πόλλ' ἐπέτελλεν (6, 207).

The augment in the compound form ἐπέτελλεν is secure, because the simplex has 5 metrically secure augmented forms and no unaugmented ones.

60. ἔγχος μὲν κατέπηξεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ (6, 213).

The augment in the compound κατέπηξεν cannot be confirmed, because the simplex has 8 unaugmented forms and no augmented forms (as was argued in 6, 10).

61. αὐτὰρ ὁ μειλιχίοισι προσήδα ποιμένα λαῶν (6, 214).

This was discussed in 6, 54.

62. οἷ δὲ καὶ ἀλλήλοισι πόρον ξεινήϊα καλά (6, 218).

The absence of the augment in πόρον can count as secure, because there are 38 unaugmented forms versus 2 augmented forms.

63. καὶ μιν ἐγὼ κατέλειπον ἰὼν ἐν δόμασ' ἐμοῖσι (6, 221).

The augment in this compound form is insecure, because the simplex has 10 augmented forms and 11 unaugmented ones.

64. πάσας ἐξείης; πολλῆσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφήπτο (6, 241).

This problem has been addressed before (6, 140).

65. ὧς ἔφαθ', ἧ δὲ μολοῦσα ποτὶ μέγαρ' ἀμφιπόλοισι (2, 286).

This instance has been addressed before (6, 102).

66. αὐτὴ δ' ἐς θάλαμον κατεβήσето κηῶντα (6, 288).

The augment in this compound form is secure, because the augmented simplex form ἐβήσето is attested 8 times and the unaugmented one βήσето 5 times.

67. ὃς κάλλιστος ἔην ποικίλμασιν ἠδὲ μέγιστος (6, 294).

This has been addressed before.

68. ἀστήρ δ' ὧς ἀπέλαμπεν: ἔκειτο δὲ νείατος ἄλλων (6, 295).

The reason why the augment in this form can be considered secure, is that the passage is a simile and in the Homeric *similia*, the augment is preferred (cf. *infra*).

69. βῆ δ' ἰέναι, πολλὰ δὲ μετεσσεύοντο γεραιαί (6, 296).

The augment in this compound verb is secure, because the simplex has 8 augmented forms and no unaugmented ones.

70. τὴν γὰρ Τρῶες ἔθηκαν Ἀθηναίης ἰέρειαν (6, 300).

This has been discussed before (6, 139).

71. ὧς ἔφατ' εὐχομένη, ἀνένευε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη (6, 311).

The augment in this compound form cannot be confirmed, because the simplex verb form has 5 metrically secure augments, but 14 unaugmented forms.

72. ὦς αἶ μὲν ῥ' εὔχοντο Διὸς κούρη μεγάληοιο (6, 312).

The problem of verbs starting with a diphthong has been discussed before (6, 140). In his Homer edition, West argued that all past tense forms of the verb starting with the diphthong εὐ- or εὔ- had to be changed into ἠῶ- or ἠῷ-, because the augment had been removed during the transmission⁶¹. As the verb starting with a short diphthong did not receive a long diphthong augment anymore as of the Koine period, the long diphthongs were no longer written in the manuscripts either. In doing so, M. West argued that he followed A. Fick⁶². This is only partly true, as A. Fick reintroduced the long diphthongs into the texts, not because he believed that they were removed, but because he believed that the poet used the augment whenever he could: as the augment was already firmly established in the prose writings of the poet's age, it necessarily meant that the poet knew the augment and used it accordingly, and only left it out when the metre forced him to do so.⁶³

73. Ἐκτωρ δὲ πρὸς δῶματ' Ἀλεξάνδροιο βεβήκει (6, 313).

In this specific instance, both Ἀλεξάνδροιο βεβήκει and Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐβεβήκει are transmitted. There are 8 metrically secure forms of Ἀλεξάνδροιο and 3 of Ἀλεξάνδρου. The former thus has preference; if Ἀλεξάνδροιο has preference, so does the unaugmented verb form. See also 6, 495.

74. καλά, τά ῥ' αὐτὸς ἔτευξε σὺν ἀνδράσιν οἱ τότε ἄριστοι (6, 314).

This could be an illustration of F. Spohn and J. La Roche, but there is no independent confirmation for it: there are 5 metrically secure augments against 16 unaugmented forms; in post-Homeric Greek, there are 22 augments and 23 unaugmented forms. The augment as transmitted here, can therefore not be considered secure.

75. οἱ οἱ ἐποίησαν θάλαμον καὶ δῶμα καὶ αὐλήν (6, 316).

This could be an illustration of the avoidance of a verse initial double spondee, but there is no independent confirmation for it: there are 5 metrically augmented forms and 34 unaugmented ones.

76. ἔνθ' Ἐκτωρ εἰσηλθε Διὶ φίλος, ἐν δ' ἄρα χειρὶ (6, 318).

This has been discussed before (6, 54).

77. τὸν δ' εὔρ' ἐν θαλάμῳ περικαλλέα τεύχε' ἔποντα (6, 321).

This has been discussed in 6, 312.

78. ἦστο καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι περικλυτὰ ἔργ' ἐκέλευε (6, 324).

As the verb ἦστο starts with a long vowel, it is impossible to know if the form is augmented or not.

79. ἦστο καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι περικλυτὰ ἔργ' ἐκέλευε (6, 324).

Both ἔργα κέλευε and ἔργ' ἐκέλευε have been transmitted, with the former being adopted by most editions. The Barrett - Taida method sheds a different light on the issue. There are 60 metrically secure augmented imperfect and aorist forms of

61. But he was not consistent, as he "forgot" to introduce the long diphthong in *Iliad* 1, 22, where he printed ἐπευφήμησαν (as all other editions).

62. M. WEST (1998, p. xxvii).

63. A. FICK (1883, p. 34).

ἐκέλευ(σ)- against only 9 unaugmented forms. This is a very clear distribution and requires us to adopt the augmented form.

80. τὸν δ' αὖτε **προσέειπεν** Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής (6, 332).

This has been discussed in 6, 122.

81. **ἦμην** ἐν θαλάμῳ, ἔθελον δ' ἄχει προτραπέσθαι (6, 336).

What was said about ἦστο, applies to ἦμην as well.

82. **ὄρμησ'** ἐς πόλεμον: δοκέει δέ μοι ὄδε καὶ αὐτῷ (6, 338).

This has been addressed before (6, 140).

83. ἐνθά με κῦμ' **ἀπόερσε** πάρος τάδε ἔργα γενέσθαι (6, 348).

The verse under discussion is the only instance in which the verb form is attested; it is therefore impossible to determine if the absence of the augment is secure or not.

84. οὐδ' **εὔρ'** Ἀνδρομάχην λευκώλενον ἐν μεγάροισιν (6, 371).

This has been discussed in 6, 312.

85. πύργῳ **ἐφεστήκει** γοώσά τε μυρομένη τε (6, 373).

This has been discussed before (6, 140).

86. ἦ ῥα γυνὴ ταμίη, ὃ δ' **ἀπέσσυτο** δώματος Ἴεκτωρ (6, 390).

The augment in the compound form is secure, because the simplex has 7 augmented forms and only one unaugmented form.

87. Σκαιάς, τῇ ἄρ' **ἐμελλε** διεξιμέναι πεδίονδε (6, 393).

This was addressed before (6, 52).

88. ἐνθ' ἄλοχος πολύδωρος ἐναντίη **ἦλθε** θέουσα (6, 394).

This was addressed before (6, 54).

89. Ἠετίων ὃς **ἔβαιεν** ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὕληέσση (6, 396).

This has been addressed in 6, 13.

90. ἦ οἱ ἔπειτ' **ἦντησ'**, ἅμα δ' ἀμφίπολος κίεν αὐτῇ (6, 399).

This problem has been addressed in 6, 140.

91. Ἀνδρομάχη δέ οἱ ἄγχι **παρίστατο** δάκρυ χέουσα (6, 405).

This problem has been addressed in 6, 140.

92. ἦτοι γὰρ πατέρ' ἀμὸν **ἀπέκτανε** δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (6, 414).

This has been addressed in 6, 204.

93. Θήβην ὑψίπυλον: κατὰ δ' **ἔκτανεν** Ἠετίωνα (6, 416).

As was stated in 6, 204, there are 19 verb forms with a metrically secure augment against 9 metrically secure unaugmented forms; this makes the presence of the augment in this instance more likely.

94. ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν **κατέκχη** σὺν ἔντεσι δαιδαλέοισιν (6, 418).

The transmitted augment in this compound form cannot be confirmed, because the simplex verb form has only one metrically secure form, and it is an unaugmented one ⁶⁴.

95. ἦδ' ἐπὶ σῆμ' **ἔχεεν**: περὶ δὲ πτελέας ἐφύτευσαν (6, 419).

This has been addressed before (6, 134).

96. πάντας γὰρ **κατέπεφνε** ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (6, 423).

This has been addressed before (6, 183).

97. ἄψ ὄ γε τὴν **ἀπέλυσε** λαβῶν ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα (6, 427).

This has also been addressed before (6, 27).

98. πατρὸς δ' ἐν μεγάροισι **βάλ'** Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα (6, 428).

As was argued in 6, 9, the unaugmented form is attested much more often and can therefore count secure here as well.

99. τὴν δ' αὖτε **προσέειπε** μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ (6, 440).

This has been addressed before (6, 122).

100. Τρώων ἵπποδάμων ὄτε Ἴλιον **ἀμφεμάχοντο** (6, 461).

The augment in this compound form can be considered secure, because the simplex has 12 secure augment forms and only one unaugmented form. ⁶⁵

101. ἐκ δ' **ἐγέλασσε** πατὴρ τε φίλος καὶ πότνια μήτηρ (6, 471).

The augmented form is less attested in early epic Greek than the unaugmented one (5 against 9). In the entire hexametric corpus, the augmented form is slightly more common than the unaugmented one (31 against 28), but is attested in certain metrical positions. There is a decided preference for the form to start in 2b, but this is the only instance in which the form appears in 1b. As ἐκ δ' ἐγέλασσε is the "tmesis-variant" of ἐξεγέλασσαν (which always has a secure augment), we hesitatingly consider the augment here to be secure as well.

102. καὶ τὴν μὲν **κατέθηκεν** ἐπὶ χθονὶ παμφανόωσαν (6, 473).

As was argued in 6, 139, nothing can be said about the simplex and, consequently, this applies to the compound as well.

103. χειρὶ τέ μιν **κατέρεξεν** ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (6, 485).

There are 6 metrically secure augmented simplex verb forms and no unaugmented forms, so the augment in *κατέρεξεν* is secure.

104. ἵππουριν: ἄλοχος δὲ φίλη οἰκόνδε **βεβήκει** (6, 495).

As was argued in 6, 189, οἰκόνδε has preference in the fifth foot; as such, also the unaugmented *βεβήκει* has preference here.

105. Ἔκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο, **κιχήσατο** δ' ἔνδοθι πολλὰς (6, 498).

The absence of the augment in *κιχήσατο* can be considered secure, because the verb form is attested 7 times with a metrically guaranteed absence of the augment and is never attested with an augment. Moreover, the verb form is followed by a 2nd

64. See F. DE DECKER (2017, p. 81-82) on *Iliad* 1, 40.

65. See F. DE DECKER (2017, p. 95-96) on *Iliad* 1, 267.

position clitic and in those instances, the augment is mostly absent (cf. *infra*). κινήσατο is a tetrasyllabic verb form and they tend to be unaugmented much more often as well (cf. *infra*).

106. ἀμφιπόλους, τῆσιν δὲ γόν πάσησιν ἐνώρσεν (6, 499).

The problem in analysing this form has been addressed in 6, 140. There is an unaugmented iterative form attested of this verb, namely ὄρσασκε, and this seems to indicate that the verb followed the accepted augment rules, but – as was argued in 6, 54 – we cannot consider this form to be secure, because we have no independent metrical evidence.

107. οὐ γάρ μιν ἔτ' ἔφαντο ὑπότροπον ἐκ πολέμοιο (6, 501).

The augment in this form is secure, because there are 3 metrically secure augmented instances of the middle third person plural imperfect form against 1 unaugmented.

108. Ἔκτορα δῖον ἔτεμεν ἀδελφεὸν εὗτ' ἄρ' ἔμελλε (6, 515).

The verb form itself does not allow for a decision: there are three metrically secure augmented forms attested and all of them appear at verse end, and there are four metrically secure unaugmented forms, of which two appear at the beginning of the verse and two after the bucolic caesura. The formula Ἔκτορα δῖον, on the other hand, is attested 6 times within the verse and always has the form $\text{—}^{\sim}\text{—}$, never $\text{—}^{\sim}\text{—}$ – , which makes it likely that it had that metrical form here as well; if that is the case, the augmented form is secure (the formula also appears 19 times at the end of the verse, but there no conclusion is possible on the final syllable).

109. Ἔκτορα δῖον ἔτεμεν ἀδελφεὸν εὗτ' ἄρ' ἔμελλε (6, 515).

This has been discussed in 6, 52.

110. τὸν πρότερος προσέειπεν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής (6, 517).

This has been addressed before (6, 122).

111. δηθύνων, οὐδ' ἦλθον ἐναΐσιμον ὡς ἐκέλευες (6, 519).

This form has been discussed in 6, 54.

7. Facts and figures of *Iliad* 6: A, B and C forms.

By this philological approach, we now have determined our corpus and obtained the following figures for *Iliad* 6 (the forms that have been confirmed in § 6 will be catalogued as type B forms):

	Augmented forms		Unaugmented forms		Percentages	
	A	A+B	A	A+B	A augments	A+B augments
Imperfect	22	41	50	56	31 %	42 %
Aorist	42	68	70	76	38 %	47 %
Pluperfect	3	3	2	4	60 %	43 %
Overall	67	112	122	136	35 %	45 %

A refers to forms that are “metrically secure”, B to “forms that are guaranteed by internal reconstruction and comparison”, and C to “forms that are metrically insecure and impossible to determine”. There are 45 forms of the type C.

8. Previous scholarship on the augment applied to *Iliad* 6: metre and morphology.

1. The augment is always used or absent, when the opposite would render the form unmetrical, but this does not mean that the augment is only metrically motivated. This does not mean that the use is facultative and that augment use and absence are solely metrically motivated, as is often argued⁶⁶. It is true that certain forms can only be used with or without augment, but that does not mean that the poet used them only out of metrical grounds. For several forms, synonyms or other forms in the paradigm existed. The *Paradebeispiel* is the form ὀνόμηνε “s/he called out”: the past tense forms of ὀνομαίνω can only be used without augment and thus seemed without evidentiary value in the discussion on use and absence of the augment, but there is the synonymous form ὀνομάζω, which can build forms with an augment (such as the attested ὀνόμασας “you called/named” in *Odyssey* 24, 339 besides the unaugmented synonym ὀνόμηνας “you called/named” in *Odyssey* 24, 341) and without an augment (such as ὀνομάζε “s/he called”, used mostly in speech introductions)⁶⁷.

66. G. CURTIUS (1873a, p. 134-135) stated *das Fehlen des syllabischen Augments bei Homer ist vollkommen facultativ [...] aber sie [sc. the use and absence of the augment] auf bestimmte Regeln zurückzuführen ist kaum möglich* (emphasis is ours). B. DELBRÜCK (1879, p. 68, note 1) stated *Die Versuche, eine solche [sc. a difference in meaning between augmented and non augmented forms] aufzufinden, scheinen mir misslungen zu sein*. See also G. MEYER (1891, p. 561): *bei Homer ist das Fehlen des syllabischen Augments vollständig facultativ; Gesetze hierüber lassen sich schwerlich finden*. See also D. MONRO & T. ALLEN (1908, p. vi-vii), K. HOFFMANN (1970, p. 36-37), M. WEST (1973, p. 179; 1998, p. xxvi-xxvii), H. PELLICCIA (1985, p. 15, 97-98, 108-109), R. JANKO (1992, p. 11), M. BECKWITH (1996, p. 5), R. WACHTER (2000, p. 97-98).

67. For these forms, see K. AMEIS & C. HENTZE (1895, p. 167), P. CHANTRAINE (1953, p. 483) and J. RUSSO, M. FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO & A. HEUBECK (1992, p. 399), all of them noted that the augmented ὀνόμασας was only found in this passage, but none of them discussed the use and absence of the augment in these synonyms. See F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 37-38, 2017, p. 124-125) for more examples and a more detailed analysis.

2. It has been argued that the aorist had more augmented forms than the imperfect⁶⁸. The figures quoted above indicate that in *Iliad* 6 this statement is true for our corpus of A and for the A+B forms.

3. H. Blumenthal argued that the sigmatic and thematic aorist were more often augmented than the root aorist and the imperfect and considered this an indication that the augment was more common in younger forms⁶⁹. The figures of the aorists in *Iliad* 6 do not confirm this:

Aorist type	Augmented		Unaugmented		Percentages	
	A	A+B	A	A+B	A augments	A+ B augments
Sigmatic	11	16	37	41	23 %	28 %
Thematic	13	31	21	23	38 %	57 %
Reduplicated	7	18	4	4	63 %	82 %
Root	11	14	5	5	69 %	74 %
k-aorist	2	2	4	4	33 %	33 %
Passive -θη-	2	2	2	2	50 %	50 %
Passive -η-	1	1	1	1	50 %	50 %

One could argue that for most types, the figures are too small to be significant, but it is noteworthy that the root aorists are so much more augmented and the sigmatic aorist has so few augmented forms; in addition, similar trends have been noted for *Iliad* 1, Hesiod and *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, indicating that the sigmatic aorist is not *per definitionem* the most augmented tense form⁷⁰.

4. Pluperfects tend to be much more unaugmented⁷¹, because 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” (cf. *supra*)⁷². *Iliad* 6 is an exception in that respect: we have 2

68. A. PLATT (1891), J. DREWITT (1912a, 1912b, 1913), H. BLUMENTHAL (1975, stating that the root aorist and imperfect were less augmented than thematic and sigmatic aorist).

69. H. BLUMENTHAL (1975).

70. See F. DE DECKER (2016) for Hesiod, F. DE DECKER (2017) for *Iliad* 1 and F. DE DECKER (*forthcoming*) for *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.

71. This had been noticed already by Aristarkhos, see J. LA ROCHE (1866, p. 423). See also P. BUTTMANN (1830, p. 318; 1858, p. 127-128), K. KOCH (1868, p. 20-21), J. LA ROCHE (1882, p. 32-39), A. PLATT (1891, p. 231), D. MONRO (1891, p. 61), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 481-482, with reference to both Aristarkhos and J. La Roche), L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 124-129, with a list of forms), F. DE DECKER (2015b: 245-246).

72. L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 124-125).

unaugmented A and 4 unaugmented A+B pluperfects versus 3 A pluperfects ⁷³. As this sample is very small, the aberrant results might be due to that.

5. It has been noted that dual forms tend to be augmented much less than the other persons ⁷⁴, and but in *Iliad* 6 there are 2 augmented duals and 2 unaugmented ones (all A forms) ⁷⁵. The small sample might be the reason for the unexpected data.

6. Verb forms are augmented when the unaugmented form would yield a form ending in a short open monosyllabic form (*horror monosyllabi*): this *Wortumfang* constraint is widely known and not limited to Greek alone ⁷⁶. In

73. The augmented instances are ἐδείδμεν (99), ἠνώγει (170) and ἐβεβήκει (513). The unaugmented instances are ἀνώγει (240) and ἀνώγεν (444) – both A forms, and βεβήκει (313, 495) – both B forms. We interpret ἀνώγεν, ἠνώγει and ἀνώγει as pluperfects of ἀνώγα and ἀνώγεν as a thematic pluperfect. 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 (G. MEKLER [1887, p. 46 and 49-57], B. DELBRÜCK [1897, p. 226], K. BRUGMANN [1900, p. 378-379; 1904, p. 547-548, 1916; p. 493-496], P. THIEME [1929], E. SCHWYZER [1939, p. 767, 777], H. RIX [1976, p. 257], Y. DUHOUX [1992, p. 436]). For an analysis of the Vedic pluperfect, see P. THIEME (1929) and M. KÜMMEL (2000). There is no agreement on the existence of an Indo-European pluperfect, but most scholars it already existed in PIE, see K. BRUGMANN (1904, p. 484), O. SZEMERÉNYI (1990, p. 323), M. KÜMMEL (2000, p. 82-86) and B. FORTSON (2010, p. 81). For another opinion, see J. WACKERNAGEL (1920, p. 185) and J. KATZ (2007, p. 14). These thematic pluperfect forms therefore belong to the oldest layers of the epic language (G. MEKLER [1887], E. SCHWYZER [1939, p. 777]). In a later stage, the pluperfects in εἰ replaced the older thematic forms in ε whenever metrically possible: G. MEKLER (1887, p. 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 N. BERG (1977, p. 228 with reference to Mekler), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 777), M. PETERS (1997, p. 212), M. BECKWITH (2004, p. 77-80), J. KATZ (2007, p. 9-10).

74. C. GRASHOF (1852, p. 29), J. LA ROCHE (1882, p. 19), A. PLATT (1891, p. 213-214), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 651), L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 94, with reference to Schwyzer), H. BLUMENTHAL (1974, p. 75), P. MUMM (2004, p. 148), F. DE DECKER (2015a, p. 54; 2015b, p. 247; 2016, p. 51; 2017, p. 127-128).

75. The augmented instances are ἐδούτην (19) and ἐβήτην (40); the unaugmented ones συνίτην (120) and λαβέτην (223).

76. J. WACKERNAGEL (1906, p. 147-148), K. BRUGMANN (1916, p. 13), H. JACOBSON (1927, p. 263), A. MEILLET (1937, p. 243), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 651), G. BONFANTE (1942, p. 104-105), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 482), B. MARZULLO (1952, p. 41), K. STRUNK (1967, p. 275; 1987), I. HAJNAL (1990, p. 53), O. SZEMERÉNYI (1990, p. 322; 1996, p. 297) and recently also P. MUMM (2004, § 1, without reference to J. Wackernagel) and C. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007, p. 31-32). J. Wackernagel showed that a similar evolution occurred in Armenian and Middle Indic. H. SASSE (1989) showed that this constraint operated in later Greek in the imperatives as well. See most recently the discussion in F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 53-56; 2017, p. 127-128).

Iliad 6, there are 3 instances ἔκτα (205) and ἀνέσχον (301 – this is an example of the fact that what applies to the simplex, also applies to the compound), ἦ (390).

7. In general, simplex forms with four or more syllables do not have a syllabic augment⁷⁷; this is also a *Wortumfang* constraint, but one in the opposite direction. The constraint works with verb forms that are already (at least) tetrasyllabic without the augment and not against verb forms that would be tetrasyllabic with an augment. R. Lazzeroni argued that augmented forms of tri- and tetrasyllabic forms were common⁷⁸, but did not note that most tetrasyllabic forms do not have an augment. There are 10 tetrasyllabic simplex verb forms in *Iliad* 6 and all of them are unaugmented (8 are of type A and 2 of type B)⁷⁹. This could be one of the contributing factors to the absence of the augment in the iterative forms⁸⁰, but is certainly not the only reason.

9. Previous scholarship on the augment applied to *Iliad* 6: syntax.

This subchapter discusses the syntactic factors influencing the use and absence of the augment.

1. A verb form remains generally unaugmented, when it is followed by a 2nd position clitic or postpositive⁸¹. This was first noted by J. Drewitt and expanded to all “Wackernagel-clitics” by W. Beck; we therefore call this rule “Drewitt - Beck”. The reason for the absence of the augment is that in a sequence γνῶ δὲ ... the verb is the first accented word of the sentence or colon, and the particle is thus linked to it; if the form were augmented, i.e. ἔγνω δὲ ..., we would have a sequence *(h₁)é-ǵneh₃-de in which the enclitic verb form would precede the enclitic particle, but this is violation of the clitic chain rules: in a sequence of enclitic or postpositive words, the connective particles come first, then the other particles, then the pronouns and

77. F. DE DECKER (2015b, p. 245 and 310-311, with a list of forms).

78. R. LAZZERONI (2017, p. 50-51).

79. The instances are φιλέεσκεν (15), φοβέοντο (41), σεβάσσατο (167, 417), μαχέσσατο (184), πιστώσαντο (233), τεκμήραντο (349), καλέεσκε (402), βασιλεύεν (425), κινήσατο (498).

80. G. CURTIUS (1880, p. 408-409), A. GIACALONE RAMAT (1967, p. 122), F. DE DECKER (2015b, p. 310-311, with a list of all tetrasyllabic iterative forms in Homer).

81. This was first noticed by J. DREWITT (1912b, p. 104; 1913, p. 350) and was expanded by W. BECK (1919). The rule is therefore best called ‘Drewitt - Beck’s Rule’. W. Beck specifically linked this phenomenon and the placement of the ‘Wackernagel clitics’. See also B. MARZULLO (1952, p. 415), L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 99-102), H. ROSÉN (1973, p. 316-320), E. BAKKER (1999a, p. 53-54), C. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007, p. 53), J. GARCÍA RAMÓN (2012, § B.2.3), F. DE DECKER (2015a, p. 56; 2015b, p. 249-250, 312; 2016, p. 56-58; 2017, p. 128-129), I. HAJNAL (2016a, p. 13; 2016b, p. 446-447).

the verb forms are only put at the end of the chain⁸² (even if one does not assume that the verb in PIE was enclitic, the sequence augmented verb form followed by clitic would still violate Wackernagel's Law, because in that case, the Wackernagel clitic would only appear in the 3rd position). This applies to *Iliad* 6 as well: there are 19 verb forms with reference to past that are followed by a clitic and 17 of them are unaugmented⁸³; of the 2 augmented verb forms, both are of type A⁸⁴. We give one example (the verb is put in bold face and the clitic is underlined):

βῆ δὲ μετ' Αἴσηπον καὶ Πήδασον, οὓς ποτε νόμφη [...] (*Iliad* 6, 21.)

He went with Aisepos and Pedasos, whom once a nymph [...]

2. Kiparsky argued that in PIE in a sequence of marked forms only the first one was marked and the others appeared in the neutral form⁸⁵: in a sequence of past tense forms only the first one was put in the indicative (with augment in Indo-Iranian and Greek) and the others following it in the injunctive, as this form was both tenseless and moodless. In epic Greek, an unaugmented verb form often appears when it is coordinated with a preceding augmented verb form by the connecting particles καί, ἰδέ, τε, ἅμα τε, τε καί, and δέ. We give one example (the augmented verb form is underlined, whereas the unaugmented or "reduced" form is put in bold face):

ὧς ἄρα φωνήσας κόρυθ' ἔλλετο φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ
ἵπουριν ἄλοχος δὲ φίλη οἴκόνδε **βεβήκει**. (*Iliad* 6, 494-495.)

So famous Hektor spoke and put on his helmet with horse-hairs; his beloved wife went home [again].

P. Kiparsky himself argued that the rule was absolute, but that many examples of it were obscured by the transmission; for Vedic, he explicitly

82. This had been noticed already by D. MONRO (1891, p. 335–338), before J. WACKERNAGEL posited his famous Law. For the clitic chain, see J. WACKERNAGEL (1892, p. 336), B. DELBRÜCK (1900, p. 51–53, with reference to D. Monro), K. BRUGMANN (1904, p. 682–683), T. KRISCH (1990, p. 73–74), C. RUIJGH (1990), J. WILLS (1993), C. WATKINS (1998, p. 70).

83. The instances are πέρησε (10), βῆ (21, 296), ναῖε (34), ἔγειρε (105), λῆξαν (107), φᾶν (108), σεβάσσατο (107, 417), πέμπε (168, 207), πόρεν (168), δίδου (192), δῶκε (193), γήθησεν (212), ἔθειλον (336), κτήσατο (498).

84. The instances are ἔκειτο (295), ἦ (390).

85. P. KIPARSKY (1968); he expanded this in 2005 (discussing K. HOFFMANN [1967]), but the basic ideas of 1968 remained the same. See I. HAJNAL (1990, p. 54–55; 2016a, p. 13; 2016b, p. 447–448), O. SZEMERÉNYI (1990, p. 282–284; 1996, p. 265–266), F. PAGNIELLO (2002, p. 8–17), C. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007, p. 39, 45, 52), J. GARCÍA RAMÓN (2012, § B.2), S. LURAGHI (2014) and F. DE DECKER (2015a, p. 57–59; 2015b, p. 250–254; 2016, p. 59–72; 2017, p. 129–134). The rule has received P. Kiparsky's name, but the first to observe this was A. MEILLET (1913, p. 115–116) for Armenian, see also C. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007, p. 39, 45).

ruled out that the injunctive could be used to mention events, as K. Hoffmann had argued⁸⁶, because such a “memorative” was typologically rare, if not non-existent⁸⁷. S. Levin, who agreed with P. Kiparsky, noted that in many instances either the reduction did not occur or the augmented form was preceded by an unaugmented one; in addition, there were several passages in which only unaugmented forms were found⁸⁸. In his analysis of the Vedic injunctive, R. Lazzeroni observed that the reduction often did not occur and that there were passages with only augmented indicatives, only injunctives or injunctives preceding the indicative⁸⁹. He concluded from that augmented indicative and injunctive were simple and mutually interchangeable variants⁹⁰. A similar argument can be found in H. Pelliccia’s study of Greek epic: he argued that the earliest Greek epic did not have speeches, that the injunctive was a valid category referring to timeless (*Hymnal*) events and that the reduction was still a valid rule; then the rule was no longer understood and the poet(s) felt that the augmented and unaugmented forms could be used without distinction. In a later stage – in which the augment had become more common – speeches were added; as a consequence, more augmented forms were introduced into the poems. As formulae could now appear with an augment in a speech and without it in narrative passages, the forms with and without an augment were even more considered to be equivalent, leading to a complete loss of the original distinction⁹¹. The question can only be answered by looking at the data:

Unaugmented forms following an augmented form (“examples”)		Augmented forms following an augmented form (“exceptions”)		Unaugmented forms preceding an augmented form (“reverse reductions”)	
A	A+B	A	A+B	A	A+B
79	91	34	67	28	30

This yields the following percentages:

Percentages of rule observation		Percentages of rule observation, including the reverse reductions	
A	A+B	A	A+B
70 %	58 %	56 %	48 %

86. K. HOFFMANN (1967) used the term *Memorativ*; for his theory, cf. *infra*.

87. P. KIPARSKY (2005, § 1): *There seem to be no languages with a mood whose function is “mentioning” or “reminding”*.

88. S. LEVIN (1969).

89. R. LAZZERONI (1977, p. 12-15).

90. R. LAZZERONI (1977, p. 15): *in larga misura [l’ingiuntivo] già è un doppione dell’indicativo*.

91. H. PELLICCIA (1985, especially p. 31-35).

That the reduction was a strict rule in epic Greek, is clearly contradicted by the facts, as the rule only “operated” in less than 60 % of the cases (and even in less than 50 % if one counts the unaugmented forms preceding an augmented verb form as exceptions as well) and a vast majority of them have augments that cannot easily be removed (even if one wanted to go that far to make the rule work). We believe that the reduction was a tendency to avoid too many augmented forms in one single passage and not a strict rule governing an entire chant or work. If the rule were strict, we would expect the chants or books of the Greek and Indic epics to start with an augmented form and to have almost no other augmented forms anymore. This is clearly not the case. Moreover, we also think that there were semantic elements that could “overrule” the reduction (an example will be discussed later on). An example of a passage where not too many augmented forms were allowed, is the battle description in *Iliad* 6, 1-44 where we have 9 augmented forms and 19 unaugmented forms (of which 1 precedes the first augmented verb form).

On the other hand, we do not believe that this reduction did not exist, as there are examples of other reductions as well⁹²: in a sequence of forms referring to the dual, only the first appeared in the dual, whereas the others could appear in the plural, because the idea of duality is already present in the first verb form and therefore there is no need for the subsequent forms to express this idea again⁹³. There is one example of this reduction in *Iliad* 6 (the dual form is underlined and the plural form is put in boldface):

χεῖράς τ' ἀλλήλων λαβέτην καὶ **πιστώσαντο**. (*Iliad* 6, 233.)

They took each other's hand and swore friendship.

In this instance, the dual form λαβέτην is followed by the plural form πιστώσαντο. This passage described how Glaukos and Diomedes exchanged gifts and swore not to engage in battle again, after they found out that their ancestors were guest-friends of each other.

10. Previous scholarship on the augment applied to *Iliad* 6: semantics

This subchapter treats the semantics of the use and absence of the augment. As was the case in the previous subchapters, we will first list the ob-

92. As was noted by P. KIPARSKY (1968) and S. LURAGHI (2014).

93. This analysis goes back to Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1827, quoted in K. STRUNK (1975, p. 237). K. STRUNK (1975, p. 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. See K. STRUNK (1975, p. 234-239), C. VITI (2011, p. 600-601) and M. FRITZ (2011, p. 50-51, with reference to P. KIPARSKY [1968] and K. STRUNK [1975]). See also F. DE DECKER (2015b, p. 157, 252, for examples in speech introductions; 2017, p. 142-144, for instances in *Iliad* 1).

servations from previous scholars and check to what extent the data from *Iliad* 6 confirm this.

1. The augment is used, when actions in a recent past are described or when a past action still has relevance for the present⁹⁴. This explains why the augment is used in sentences with the adverb νῦν, as this refers to an action in the immediate past⁹⁵. In *Iliad* 6, there are no instances of a past tense form with νῦν, but there are instances of past actions still being present at the moment of speaking. One example is (the augmented form is underlined):

Ἀστυάνακτ': οἷός γάρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἑκτώρ. (*Iliad* 6, 403.)

[They called him] Astyanax; on his own, Hektor was [still] keeping the city safe.

In this passage, Homer explained why Hektor's son was called "Astyanax" ("city-ruler"), namely because Hektor was still keeping Troy safe and warding off the attacks of the Greek army. As this describes a past action that continues until the present day and is still valid, the augment is used⁹⁶.

2. When actions in a remote or mythical past are described, the augment is absent⁹⁷. *Iliad* 6 contains two remote passages, namely the speeches by Glaukos (154-211) and Diomedes (215-231), in which they described their genealogies and common remote past as guest friends, and these passages have very few augmented forms.

3. Another important distinction is that between speeches and narrative descriptions. The latter has much less augmented forms than the former⁹⁸. There are two explanations for this: the first one argues that the speeches belong to the younger linguistic stratum and therefore have much more augments⁹⁹, the other argues that speeches involve more interaction between speaker and audience and make more reference to recent events, whereas

94. A. PLATT (1891) used the term "perfect aorist" to describe these forms. See also J. DREWITT (1912a; 1912b; 1913), E. BAKKER (1999a; 2002; 2005).

95. A. PLATT (1891), J. DREWITT (1912a, p. 44), L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 87-89, 135-136), E. BAKKER (1999a, p. 53, 60-62), J. GARCÍA RAMÓN (2012, § F1b).

96. That is why we added "still" to the translation.

97. For Homer, see already A. PLATT (1891) and J. DREWITT (1912a, 1912b). K. HOFFMANN (1967, p. 160-213) noted the use of the injunctive in contexts that he described as *fernere, nicht historische Vergangenheit*. See also K. STRUNK (1968) and W. EULER (1995).

98. K. KOCH (1868), A. PLATT (1891, p. 223), D. MONRO (1891, p. 62), J. DREWITT (1912a), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 484), L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 110-128), L. BASSET (1989), M. WEST (1989), E. BAKKER (2005, p. 114-153), P. MUMM (2004).

99. This theory was taken furthest by H. PELLICCIA (1985), cf. *supra*, p. 287 and footnote 91.

narrative descriptions are by definition more remote and less linked to the present ¹⁰⁰. The speeches in *Iliad* 6 can be divided into two categories, with or without the speeches by Glaukos and Diomedes ¹⁰¹; the narratives can be divided into narrative with those speeches or narrative without, and also narrative with or without speech introductions and conclusions. As speech introductions and conclusions are actually the transition between speeches and narrative and vice versa, they are a category on their own and will be discussed separately ¹⁰². The figures are ¹⁰³:

	Augmented		Unaugmented		Percentage of augments	
	A	A+B	A	A+B	A	A+B
Speeches						
With the speeches of Glaukos and Diomedes	24	37	52	58	32 %	39 %
Without these speeches	13	19	23	24	36 %	44 %
Narrative						
Without these speeches	32	55	65	72	33 %	43 %
With these speeches	41	69	90	102	31 %	40 %
Overall figures in <i>Iliad</i> 6	67	112	122	136	35 %	45 %

We note that the speeches referring to the present situation have a higher percentage of augmented verb forms than the narrative passages ¹⁰⁴. We give one example from the speech of Glaukos (the augmented forms are put in bold face):

100. This viewpoint was already adopted by A. PLATT (1891) and J. DREWITT (1912a), and was expanded by E. BAKKER (1999a; 2005, p. 114-153) and P. MUMM (2004).

101. Already K. KOCH (1868, p. 27-28) noted that speeches could have narrative elements, and he pointed at Nestor's speech in *Iliad* 1 specifically; see also D. MONRO (1891, p. 62), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 484), L. BASSET (1989, p. 14) and F. DE DECKER (2017, p. 136-138) for *Iliad* 1.

102. They are not included in the figures, which is the reason why the figures of speeches and narratives do not add up to the totals of the chant.

103. A refers to metrically secure forms, B to forms that could be determined by internal reconstruction within the epic language and C to forms that could not be determined are therefore metrically insecure.

104. The reason why the overall percentages are higher than both speeches and narratives, is that the overall figures also contain the speech introductions and conclusions.

ὥς φάτο, τὸν δὲ ἄνακτα χόλος λάβεν οἶον ἄκουσε. (*Iliad* 6, 166.)

So she spoke; anger took hold of the king, when he heard [that story].

In this passage, Glaukos related how king Proitos became angry after he had heard the (lying) tale by his wife Anteia, who claimed that Bellerophon had tried to rape her. As this is a remote and genealogical story (almost mythical) and thus belongs to the distant past, no augments are used.

4. The augment is used in verb forms that emphasise an event and/or communicate something surprising or new¹⁰⁵. This can be combined with the previous point: as speeches often communicate something that is important for the speaker and sometimes unknown to the hearer, the use of the augment in speeches is expected; also in narrative, certain actions can be highlighted (although there are many instances in which the augment appears without a clear reason). Besides the meeting between Glaukos and Diomedes, the most important person of this chant is Hektor. His goodbyes to his mother Hekabe and especially to his wife Andromakhe and son Astyanax belong to the most emotional of the entire epic. It is thus no coincidence that when Hekabe and Andromakhe meet Hektor, their arrival is related with an augmented verb form and that Hektor's taking off of his helmet and putting it back on his head is also described with augmented forms. We give two examples (the augmented forms are underlined):

ἔθθα οἱ ἠπιόδωρος ἐναντίη ἤλυθε μήτηρ. (*Iliad* 6, 251.)

There, his [sc. Hektor's] mother, carrying many gifts, came to meet him.

This verse described how Hekabe came to meet Hektor hoping to convince him not to go and face Akhilleus in battle.

αὐτίκ' ἀπὸ κρατὸς κόρυθ' εἴλετο φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ (*Iliad* 6, 472).

Immediately, shining Hektor took the helmet from his head.

In this passage, Homer described how Astyanax became scared by seeing Hektor's flashing helmet, how he and Andromakhe starting laughing and how he then eventually took off the helmet.

5. When a repeated or habitual action in the past is described, the augment is often absent. As a repeated action usually does not communicate something new, the absence of the augment is expected (cf. the previous point). This is especially clear in the verb forms combined with αἰέν / αἰεί "always". This adverb indicates a repetition of the verbal action and of the 49 metrically secure past tense forms that are attested with this adverb in epic Greek, 40 are unaugmented¹⁰⁶. There are no examples of αἰέν / αἰεί in

105. P. MUMM (2004), F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 81-84; 2017, p. 138-139).

106. The unaugmented instances are *Iliad* 1, 52; 3, 272; 9, 451; 10, 188; 11, 168; 11, 565; 13, 357; 13, 386; 13, 557; 15, 227 (repeated in *Iliad* 17, 730); 15, 594; 15, 730 in

Iliad 6, but there are descriptions of habitual actions, as in the following description of Priam's house(hold) in 6, 242-250 (we take one sentence from the passage which has 4 unaugmented verbs):

κοιμῶντο Πριάμοιο παρὰ μνηστῆς ἀλόχοισι. (*Iliad* 6, 246.)

There the sons of Priam used to sleep with their wedded wives.

This sentence in the passage described the bedrooms of the palace where Priam's sons slept with their wives; as this is a habitual action, an unaugmented imperfect verb form is used.

6. A special case of the augment absence in past tense forms that describe a repeated action, are the iteratives in *-sk-*: with one exception¹⁰⁷, all these forms are unaugmented¹⁰⁸. This absence is mostly explained from a semantic point of view (besides the morphological argument that was mentioned before): they describe repeated actions in the past or a single action that was repeated by several characters and mostly appear in narrative parts; as such, they usually do not refer to single and unexpected events (contexts in which the augment was used more often)¹⁰⁹. These verb forms are often combined by an optative of the repeated action in the past¹¹⁰, or with αἰεὶ¹¹¹. Sometimes, the subject is an indefinite character. There are 3 iteratives in *Iliad* 6 and all of them are unaugmented¹¹². One of the best examples is the following sentence:

16, 105; 16, 109; 16, 641; 16, 646; 17, 364; 17, 412; 19, 132; 19, 253; 21, 362; 21, 543; 22, 198; 23, 379; 23, 500; 23, 821; *Odyssey* 2, 22; 4, 353; 7, 259; 8, 334; 9, 74; 10, 330; 16, 191; 16, 241; 21, 155; 22, 117; 22, 357; *Works and Days*, 114; Hesiod, *Fragmentum* 198, 7. The augmented instances are *Iliad* 10, 232; 22, 146; 23, 502; 24, 548; *Odyssey* 9, 513; 10, 32; 14, 224; 22, 228; 23, 38.

107. In *Odyssey* 20, 7 (ἐμισγέσκοντο), the augment is guaranteed by the caesura. C. GRASHOF (1852, p. 14) tried to remove the augment by conjecturing ἦϊσαν, αἱ μνηστῆρσιν μιγέσκοντο τὸ πάρος περ, but that would require the -το in μιγέσκοντο to be read with lengthening under the ictus.

108. P. BUTTMANN (1830, p. 382), C. GRASHOF (1852, p. 14), D. MONRO (1884, p. xlvi; 1891, p. 62), H. SMYTH (1894, p. 464), R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1892, p. 81), J. DREWITT (1912a, p. 44), C. MOHRMANN (1933, p. 90), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 481-482), B. MARZULLO (1952, p. 416), L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 116-125), F. PAGNIELLO (2002, p. 84-108, 2007), E. BAKKER (2005, p. 127). H. POEHLMANN (1858, p. 10) pointed out that this has been observed already by the *Etymologicum Magnum*.

109. L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 116-125), F. PAGNIELLO (2002, p. 84-108; 2007), E. BAKKER (2005, p. 126-127), F. DE DECKER (2015b, p. 275-276; 2015a, p. 64-65; 2016, p. 101-102; 2017, p. 139-140).

110. F. PAGNIELLO (2007).

111. F. DE DECKER (2015b, p. 270).

112. The instances are φιλέεσκεν (15), καλέεσκε (402) and ἀριστεύεσκε (460).

Ἔκτορος ἦδε γυνὴ ὃς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι. (*Iliad* 6, 460.)

This is the wife of Hektor, who used to excel in fighting [among those who fought in Troy].

This verse belongs to a speech-within-a-speech in Hektor's Farewell to Andromakhe; in it, he described how she will end up in slavery after the Trojans have lost the war and how an unknown bypasser will see her weeping, recognise her and make the following statement.

Besides those three iteratives, there are also two instances of ἔσκεν¹¹³. It is argued that they have iterative value as well, contrary to the other past tense forms of εἰμί¹¹⁴. This is only partly true: ἔσκεν often has iterative value and can in most instances be translated by "used to be", but there are passages in which the difference between ἔσκεν and ἦεν / ἦν / ἔην / ἦην is hardly noticeable:

Ἄξυλον δ' ἄρ' ἔπεφνε βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης
 Τευθρανίδην, ὃς ἔβαιεν εὐκτιμένη ἐν Ἀρίσβῃ
 ἀφνειὸς βιότιοι, φίλος δ' ἦν ἀνθρώποισι
 πάντας γὰρ φιλέεσκεν ὁδῶ ἐπι οἰκία ναίων.
 ἀλλὰ οἱ οὐ τις τῶν γε τότε ἤρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον
 πρόσθεν ὑπαντίσας, ἀλλ' ἄμφω θυμὸν ἀπήυρα
 αὐτὸν καὶ θεράποντα Καλήσιον, ὃς ῥα τότε ἕππων
 ἔσκεν ὑφηνίοχος· τῷ δ' ἄμφω γαῖαν ἐδύτην. (*Iliad* 6, 12-19.)

Diomedes, good in shouting, killed Axylos, son of Teuthras, who lived in well-built Arisbe, who was rich in living and loved to all people, because living in his house next to the road, he welcomed all [travellers]. Yet, none of them stood next to him and warded off the painful death, but both of them [Diomedes] stripped of their lives, him and his servant Kalesios, who was his charioteer. Both men were covered with earth [i.e. died and were buried].

In this passage, Homer described how Diomedes killed Axylos and his servant Kalesios. Both past tense forms of εἰμί refer to habitual actions in the past and can be translated by "used to be"; the difference cannot have been metrical, as ἔσκεν is equivalent to ἦεν; ἦν, on the other hand, is secured by the metre here (as ἔσκ' would create an elision before the caesura).

7. Closely related to the use of the augment in actions close to the speaker, is the Homeric use of the augment in general truths and proverbs: they describe a general truth the knowledge of which is based on past experiences and refer to past actions of which the correctness is still valid at the moment of speaking or to actions that occurred in the past, but could

113. The instances are 19 and 153.

114. E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 677), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 319-321), A. GIACALONE RAMAT (1967, p. 120-121), R. LAZZERONI (2017) did not address this aspect.

(re)occur at any time in the present ¹¹⁵. There are no gnomic aorists in *Iliad* 6, but there is one example with a gnomic or a statement of general validity:

τῷ δὲ θεοὶ κάλλος τε καὶ ἡνορέην ἐρατεινὴν
 ὤπασαν· αὐτὰρ οἱ Προΐτος κακὰ μῆσατο θυμῷ. (*Iliad* 6, 156-157.)

Him the gods granted beauty and lovely strength; but against him Proitos plotted evil in his mind.

In this passage, Glaukos related how Bellerophon's valour and beauty were given to him by the gods. This is not a gnomic aorist *sensu stricto*, but the Greeks believed that excellence was in most instances a divine gift. To stress this general statement, the verb form is augmented. Proitos's evil actions do not belong to general knowledge and are therefore related with an unaugmented aorist form.

8. Closely related to the use of the augment in the gnomic aorist, is its use in the *similia*, the Homeric comparisons in which Homer compared a battle scene or another event to a scene from everyday life (mostly in the agricultural sphere) ¹¹⁶. As the similes compare an action in the recent past with occurrences in the past, and they are "close" to the audience, in evoking a domestic rather than heroic, reality ¹¹⁷, their link with the present and the audience is evident and the use of the augment therefore does not sur-

115. L. Döderlein was the first to use this term: *Da nun dieser Aorist in allgemeinen Sätzen und Denkprüchen seinen eigentlichen Platz findet, so dürfte er in den Grammatiken zweckmässig der gnomische Aorist genannt werden* (L. DÖDERLEIN [1847], p. 316, emphasis taken from the original text). The literature on the gnomic aorist is large, some examples (the list is obviously not exhaustive): E. MÖLLER (1853 and 1854), F. FRANKE (1854), B. VAN GRONINGEN (1948), A. SALMON (1960), A. PERISTERAKIS (1962), C. J. RUIJGH (1971, one of the most detailed treatments), A. FAULKNER (2005). That the gnomic aorist was almost always augmented in Homer, had been noticed very early on: A. PLATT (1891), G. HERBIG (1896, p. 250-270), B. DELBRÜCK (1897, p. 302), J. WACKERNAGEL (1904, p. 5; 1920, p. 181), K. BRUGMANN (1916, p. 11, who noted that there was no explanation for this fact), J. DREWITT (1912a; 1912b and 1913), H. HIRT (1928, p. 171-173). It has been accepted since. See most recently F. PAGNIELLO (2002, p. 74-84), E. BAKKER (2005, p. 131-135), A. FAULKNER (2005, p. 68-69) and BERTRAND (2006b, p. 241).

The use of the augment in the gnomic aorists was also used as additional criterion by I. Taida himself (cf. *supra*, p. 270).

The augment use in the gnomic aorist is not nevertheless not absolute, as can be seen in *Iliad* 4, 320; 9, 320; *Odyssey* 8, 481; *Theogony* 447 (the absence of the augment is not secured by the metre in that specific instance), *Works and Days*, 17-20 (if the aorists in this passage are indeed gnomic), 345, 702-705, 740-741 (cf. F. DE DECKER [2016], p. 55-67).

116. A. PLATT (1891), J. DREWITT (1912a, 1912b, 1913), P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 484), G. SHIPP (1972, p. 120), E. BAKKER (2002, p. 75-77; 2005, p. 114, 121 and 131-134).

117. E. BAKKER (2005, p. 114).

prise¹¹⁸. In *Iliad* 6 there are 3 examples of something that could be considered a simile and they all have an augment¹¹⁹. We give one example:

ὥς υἱὸς Πριάμοιο Πάρις κατὰ Περγάμου ἄκρης
τεύχεσι παμφαίνων ὥς τ' ἠλέκτωρ ἐβεβήκει. (*Iliad* 6, 512-513.)

So Priam's son, Paris, ran down the top of [the fortification of] Pergamon, glowing in his armour like the beaming sun.

This passage compares the attack by Paris in his shining armour to that of the gleaming sun.

9. Whereas gnomic aorists and similes describe realities that are close to everyday life and therefore have more augmented verb forms, eternal and timeless habits of the gods are described with augmentless forms¹²⁰. In these contexts, the injunctive was used in Vedic Sanskrit and Avestan¹²¹. Of this, there are no examples in *Iliad* 6.

118. E. BAKKER (2005, p. 114, 121 and 131-134), G. SHIPP (1972, p. 120) stated that “[the augment use] illustrates the linguistic similarity of proverbial comments and similes”.

119. The instances are ἀπέλαμπεν (295), ἔκειτο (295), ἐβεβήκει (513).

120. See M. WEST (1989) for Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns and F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 102-107) for Hesiod.

121. For Vedic, see J. AVERY (1880, p. 330), B. DELBRÜCK (1888, p. 354-355: *so habe ich mich doch überzeugt, dass der Injunctiv nicht selten (die Stellen s. bei Avery) in dem Sinne des Indicativ Praesentis gebraucht wird, doch so, dass die Beziehung auf die Gegenwart des Sprechenden nicht hervortritt, vielmehr nur in dem Sinne, dass eine Verbalaussage ausgedrückt werden soll, welche sich weder auf die Zukunft, noch auf die Vergangenheit bezieht.* – emphasis is ours), L. RENO (1928, p. 71-73), J. GONDA (1956, p. 33-46), K. HOFFMANN (1967, *passim*, but especially p. 119), K. STRUNK (1968, p. 290-294), R. LAZZERONI (1977), M. WEST (1989), W. EULER (1995), P. MUMM (1995); an analysis of the Iranian augment and injunctive use is missing. The situation in Iranian is further complicated by the fact that Avestan has very little augments, whereas Old Persian almost never omits it. For Avestan, see A. WILLIAMS JACKSON (1892, p. 136: “in Av. the augment is comparably rare, the instances of its omission far exceed in proportion those of the Vedic Sanskrit”, and on page 177), H. REICHEL (1909, p. 93-94), J. KELLENS (1984, p. 245-249), R. BEEKES (1988, p. 150) and F. MARTÍNEZ GONZÁLEZ & M. DE VAAN (2001, p. 84-85); for Old Persian, see F. MARTÍNEZ GONZÁLEZ & M. DE VAAN (2001, p. 84: *el aumento se encuentra empleado sistemáticamente en griego clásico, en antiguo indio y en persio antiguo*), K. HOFFMANN & B. FORSSMAN (2004, p. 181-182). For Old Persian and Avestan, see already A. MEILLET (1915, p. 115: *Précédées de l'augment, ces formes expriment le passé; en ce sens, l'emploi de l'augment est constant en perse, par opposition à l'Avesta où l'augment n'est à peu près pas employé et au Véda où il est facultatif*). This difference is difficult to explain, but might – in our opinion – be due to the different nature of the texts: whereas the Old Persian texts are mostly inscriptions referring to acts in a somewhat recent past, the Avestan texts are mainly mythical stories. As such, the difference in augment use would fit the distinction recent versus remote past, as in Homer; an in-depth study needs to shed light on this problem.

10. Speech introductions mark the transition from narrative to speeches and deserve special attention by the audience, as the audience is almost “drawn into the dialogue”¹²²; the poet highlights them by using an augmented verb form much more often than not¹²³. The data from *Iliad* 6 confirm this: there are 27 introductions, of which 5 are undefinable¹²⁴, 16 augmented (12 of type A)¹²⁵ and 6 unaugmented (all type A)¹²⁶. We give one example:

Νέστωρ δ' Ἀργείοισιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν ἄσας. (*Iliad* 6, 66.)

Nestor shouted out loudly and called out to the Argives.

In three instances, the unaugmented speech introduction has a syntactic explanation: in the introduction ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε¹²⁷, the first *verbum dicendi* is augmented, but the second is not because of the above mentioned reduction rule.

11. The same applies, to a lesser extent, to speech conclusions; they mark the transition from speech to narrative and are more augmented than the narrative verbs themselves. There are 8 speech conclusions, of which 4 are augmented (2 of type A)¹²⁸ and 4 are not (all of type A)¹²⁹. One augmented example is:

ὣς ἔφατ' εὐχομένη, ἀνένευε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη. (*Iliad* 6, 311.)

So she spoke praying, but Pallas Athene nodded in disapproval.

This conclusion concluded the prayer to Athene made by Hekabe; Homer also already included that the goddess would not grant the prayer.

12. In his analysis of the augment in the aorist forms in the speeches of the *Iliad*, E. Bakker argued that the augment was less common in negative sentences¹³⁰, unless the negation was linked to the speaker's deixis¹³¹. This analysis has two shortcomings: it leaves out the narrative parts and is re-

122. This was pointed out by P. MUMM *apud* DE DECKER (2015a, p. 60), who used the term *Verlebendigung*.

123. J. DREWITT (1912a, p. 44), E. BAKKER (2005, p. 122–123), F. DE DECKER (2015a; 2015b, p. 241–290; 2016, p. 84–86; 2017, p. 142–143).

124. The instances are ηῦδα (54), προσηῦδα (144, 163, 214, 343).

125. The instances are ἐλλίσσετο (45), ἐκέκλετο (66, 110), προσέειπε (112, 332, 440, 517), ἔφατ' (253, 406, 485), ἡμείβετ' (263, 359), ἦράτο (304), μετὰ δὲ δμῶϊσιν ἔειπεν (375), πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (381), προσέφη (520).

126. The instances are εἶπε (75, 475), ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (253, 406, 485), νείκεσεν (325).

127. This is attested in lines 253, 406, 485.

128. The instances are ὣς ἔφαθ' (122, 286), ὣς ἔφατ' (311), ἦ ῥα (390).

129. The instances are ὣς φάτο (51, 166, 212, 342).

130. E. BAKKER (2005, p. 126), C. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007, p. 45, 51–52).

131. E. BAKKER (2005, p. 128–130), C. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007, p. 45, 51).

stricted to the aorist. Nevertheless, the data of *Iliad* 6 (all tenses and passages) seem to confirm E. Bakker's hypothesis to a certain extent (although the sample is very small)¹³². The figures are :

	Augmented		Unaugmented		Augment percentages	
	A	A+B	A	A+B	A	A+B
Negation: speeches	2	4	3	4	40 %	50 %
Negation: narratives	1	2	3	3	25 %	40 %
Negation: speeches without Glaukos and Diomedes	2	4	2	2	50 %	67 %
Overall: speeches without Glaukos and Diomedes	13	19	23	24	36 %	44 %
Negation: narratives with Glaukos and Diomedes	1	2	4	5	20 %	29 %
Overall: narratives with Glaukos and Diomedes	41	69	90	102	31 %	40 %
Speech introductions	0	0	1	1	0 %	0 %
Overall negation	3	6	7	8	30 %	43 %
Overall	67	111	123	136	35 %	45 %

The figures indicate that negation *per se* is not a factor influencing the augment use, but in narrative and in the speeches that have narrative or remote mythical character (Glaukos and Diomedes), the percentage of augments in negated sentences is even lower than in positive sentences (in the speeches by Glaukos and Diomedes no single augmented form in a negative sentence can be found)¹³³. Most augmented forms in a negative sentence are found in speeches¹³⁴, where the link with the speaker's deixis, as posited by E. Bakker, is indeed present. This is not surprising, as narrative passages are already less augmented, and a negation removes the action even more

132. A similar trend was found in *Iliad* 1, see F. DE DECKER (2017, p. 144-146).

133. The augmented forms in negative sentences in narrative are προσέφη (342), ἔφαντο (501).

134. The augmented forms in negative sentences in speeches are ἐδείδιμεν (99), ἦν (131, 140), ἦλθον (519). The unaugmented forms in speeches are ἐξενάρτιξε (417), ἄνωγεν (444).

from the deixis, hence the predominance of unaugmented verb forms in negative sentences ¹³⁵. An example from a narrative passage is

οὐδὲ Πάρις δῆθουνεν ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι δόμοισιν. (*Iliad* 6, 503.)

And Paris did not linger in his high home any longer.

13. We now address the subordinate clauses (complement clauses, relative, temporal, causal and conditional clauses). For the so-called ἐπεὶ-clauses, it had been noted already that they were usually unaugmented in narrative and also in speeches, if ἐπεὶ had a temporal (and not causal meaning) ¹³⁶. We expand this to all subordinate clauses and find the following figures (as was the case with the negative sentences, the sample is very small):

	Augmented		Unaugmented		Percentages	
	A	A+B	A	A+B	A	A+B
Speeches with Glaukos's and Diomedes speeches	6	8	13	13	32 %	38 %
Speeches without Glaukos's and Diomedes's speeches	3	4	8	8	27 %	33 %
Narratives without Glaukos's and Diomedes's speeches	6	9	12	12	33 %	43 %
Narratives with Glaukos's and Diomedes's speeches	9	13	17	17	35 %	43 %
Overall figures of subordination	12	17	25	25	32 %	40 %
Compared to the overall figures:						
Speeches with Glaukos's and Diomedes	24	37	52	58	32 %	39 %
Speeches without Glaukos's and Diomedes's speeches	13	19	23	24	36 %	44 %
Narratives without Glaukos's and Diomedes's speeches	32	55	65	72	33 %	43 %
Narratives with Glaukos's and Diomedes's speeches	41	69	90	102	31 %	40 %
Overall figures in <i>Iliad</i> 6	67	112	122	136	35 %	45 %

135. The unaugmented forms in narrative passages are ἀπίθησεν (102), τέτμεν (374), δῆθουνεν (503). In Glaukos's speech, the following two forms can be found: πεῖθ' (162), νέοντο (189).

136. A. PLATT (1891, p. 220), E. BAKKER (2005, p. 125-127).

The absence of the augment in subordinate clauses can be explained by the fact that they describe actions that constitute the background for the main action and are situated in a (slightly) more remote past than the main action. What is remarkable and unexpected is that, contrary to the negative sentences, the distinction speeches//narrative with Glaukos and Diomedes is not valid here and that subordinate clauses in speeches are even less augmented than the narrative subordinate clauses. To determine the relationship between the use and absence of the augment in narrative and negative sentences, a larger corpus of several chants might be needed.

14. Lastly, we also have to mention that the rules mentioned above are only tendencies and that there are obviously exceptions as well. We give two examples:

ἔνθ' αὖτε Γλαύκῳ Κρονίδης φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς. (*Iliad* 6, 243.)

But then Kronos's son, Zeus, took away the wits of Glaukos.

In this sentence, Homer states that Zeus will make Glaukos lose his mind, as he will agree to change his golden armour for the bronze one of Diomedes; as the Greeks thought that madness was often god-sent, this divine intervention could be interpreted as somewhat gnomic, but yet the augment is missing.

τὸν δ' Ἴκτωρ **βεΐκεσεν** ἰδὼν αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσι. (*Iliad* 6, 325.)

Hektor saw him and scolded him with ugly words.

This example is even more problematic: it is a speech introduction and will introduce a scathing speech by Hektor addressed to Paris, in which Hektor reproached Paris that the war that was raging on, had been started because of *him* and that therefore some more valour of his side could well be expected, but the verb introducing this speech is nevertheless unaugmented.

11. Analysis of a passage

In this subchapter, we will apply the rules and trends described above to the following passage. As will become clear, we are dealing with tendencies and trends, not with catch-all rules (as was stated above, the augmented forms are underlined, the unaugmented ones are put in bold face and the insecure forms are expanded):

- 414 ἦτοι γὰρ πατέρ' ἀμὸν ἀπέκτανε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,
 415 ἐκ δὲ πόλιν πέρσεν Κιλικῶν εὖ ναιετάωσαν
 416 Θήβην ὑψίπυλον· κατὰ δ' έκτανεν Ἡετίωνα,
 417 οὐδέ μιν έξενάριξε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τό γε θυμῷ,
 418 ἀλλ' ἄρα μιν κατέκρηε σὺν ἔντεσι δαιδαλέοισιν
 419 ἦδ' ἐπὶ σῆμ' έχεν· περὶ δὲ πτελέας έφύτευσαν
 420 νόμφαι ὄρεστιάδες κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγίοχοιο.
 421 οἱ δέ μοι ἐπτὰ κασίγνητοι έσαν ἐν μεγάροισιν
 422 οἱ μὲν πάντες ἰθὺς κίον ἤματι Ἄϊδος εἶσω:
 423 πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς
 424 βουσὶν ἐπ' εἰλιπόδεσσι καὶ ἀργεννῆς ὄϊεσσι. (*Iliad* 6, 414-424.)

Then, godly Akhilleus indeed killed our father, destroyed the city of the Kikilians, Thebes with the high walls, a city good to live in, he then killed Eetion, but did not rob him of his armour as he restrained himself in his mind from doing this, but he burnt him in his well-wrought battle gear and threw a gravemound over him; and the Nymphs living in the mountains, daughter of aegis-bearing Zeus planted elm trees (on the grave). In the palace there were seven brothers of mine, all of them went down into the Hades on that single day. For Akhilleus, swift of foot, hew all of them down, as they were pasturing their cattle rolling in their gait and their white sheep.

We now discuss the individual verb forms.

– ἀπέκτανε (414): this form is augmented (as was established by internal reconstruction and comparison above), because it starts enumerating Akhilleus's murderous habits by relating how he slaughtered the Thebans and destroyed their city.

– πέρσεν (415): this verb form is unaugmented, because it belongs to the same process of killing and destroying Thebes.

– κατὰ δ' έκτανεν (416): this verb is augmented (as was established above), because it relates a new killing performed by Akhilleus, namely that of Eetion.

– έξενάριξε (417): this verb is unaugmented, because it belongs to the same process of killing Eetion.

– σεβάσσατο (417): this verb is unaugmented, because it belongs to the same process of killing Eetion and because the verb is followed by a 2nd position clitic, γάρ.

– κατέκρηε (418): the presence or absence of the augment in this form cannot be established with certainty.

– έχεν (419): the augment in this form was established by internal comparison, but the presence of it is somewhat surprising, especially since it shows a more restrained and respectful sight of Akhilleus (namely burying a slain opponent).

– έφύτευσαν (419): unless one sees the augment in this form as aetiological (explaining the presence of elm trees on that grave mound), the presence of the augment is surprising (again).

– έσαν (421): this form belongs to the background, as Andromakhe is describing her family (they both know she had seven brothers).

– κίον (422): this form is unaugmented, because the emphasis is not on their death, but on the fact that they met their death at the hands of Akhilleus (which is mentioned in the next verse).

– κατέπεφνε (423): this is the last and final statement: “Akhilleus killed them all”. This needs emphasis (in the sense of Mumm’s analysis) and is therefore augmented. As was the case with κατὰ δ’ ἔκτανεν and ἀπέκτανε, the presence of the augment was determined by internal reconstruction.

In this part of her speech, Andromakhe tried to convince Hektor not to face Akhilleus in a man-to-man battle, because Akhilleus would most certainly kill him as well. As evidence for that she related how he killed her relatives. The verbs referring to the actual killing are augmented, whereas most other verbs are not. If P. Kiparsky’s reduction rule were correct, we would have expected to only have one single augmented form, but this is not the case.

12. The augment as an evidential marker?

We have now determined the use and absence of the augment in *Iliad* 6, but how can these facts be explained? As was noted earlier, the acts and speeches which were closely related to what was happening on the battle ground had more augmented verb forms than the stories about genealogies and guest-friendships in a more remote past. The same can be said about the speech by Andromakhe in which she related how Akhilleus murdered her entire family. The use of the augment in stories involving actions the speakers performed themselves or had to endure first-hand, can be explained as an indication of the eyewitness account, or more precisely as an “evidential marker”. Evidentiality is used here in the narrow sense as *grammatical marking of information source*¹³⁷. Languages can have up to 6 evidential

137. The first in-depth treatment was the volume of W. CHAFE & J. NICHOLLS (1986), but no uniform definition was given there. For a historical overview of “evidentiality” as a term and concept, see W. JACOBSEN (1986). One of the first to describe the mandatory indication of one’s source of information, was F. BOAS (1911b, p. 43 and 1911c, p. 443). In his work on Amero-Indian languages, he did not use the term “evidentiality”, nor did he treat the issue in detail, but he did mention that in several languages it was necessary for speakers to indicate on which grounds or by which observation, they came to the statement they had just made. For the concept, see also E. SAPIR (1921, p. 108-109). W. JACOBSEN (1986, p. 3) limited evidential marking to instances in which the speaker had no direct evidence for the statement, but already F. Boas and E. Sapir included eyewitness accounts as well (but they did not use the term “evidentiality”). For the definition, see M. FALLER (2002, p. 2: “the grammatical encoding of the speaker’s (type of) *grounds* for making a speech act”), A. AIKHENVALD (2003a, p. 3; 2004, p. 1; 2015, p. 239), C. BRUGMAN & M. MACAULEY (2015, p. 201-202), E. VISSER (2015, p. 179). See also B. JOSEPH (2003b, p. 97): “evidentiality can be defined as the indication of the source of a speaker’s information, of the modality by which that information was gained, and/or *the speaker’s stance* (i.e., *the attitude*) towards the truth of the information” (emphasis is ours). A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (2017b, p. 7) used the slightly different “grammaticalized marking of information source”.

categories¹³⁸, but the basic distinction is that of direct / visual versus indirect / non visual¹³⁹, although it might be better to use (as was first done by M. Faller) “best evidence available” (or *best possible grounds* in her words) instead of “visual / direct”¹⁴⁰. It can occur with verbs in the present, past and future, but is most common in the past¹⁴¹. We believe that the augment in *Iliad* 6 (and in epic Greek in general) was part of an evidential system distinguishing visual/direct versus non-visual/indirect evidence¹⁴². In this system, the augmented verb forms were the marked ones, describing past actions still valid for the present and actions in the immediate past that occurred in the presence of the speaker, indicating that the speaker witnessed or participated in the action. We are aware that scholars on evidentiality almost never mention the oldest Indo-European languages, let alone discuss examples from them¹⁴³, but, with the exception of Drewitt - Beck’s clitic rule, which might be a syntactic constraint known only in Greek (as neither Vedic, Avestan nor Armenian have any remnants of it), all the other observations can be explained in the evidential framework¹⁴⁴.

In spite of the absence of examples of Indo-European languages in the above mentioned works, the concept has been suggested for Greek before, albeit without overt morphological marking¹⁴⁵. For the augment, it has been briefly mentioned as possible explanation by E. Bakker, P. Mumm and J. García Ramón, but only J. García Ramón used the term “evidentiality”

138. See A. AIKHENVALD (2003a; 2004, *passim*) and the contributions in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (2003).

139. T. WILLETT (1988, p. 57), J. BYBEE, R. PERKINS & W. PAGLIUCA (1994, p. 95), V. PLUNGIAN (2001, p. 351-352), S. GIPPER (2014, p. 799).

140. M. FALLER (2002, *passim*, but especially § 4.3) used the term *best possible grounds*; W. ADELAAR (2017, p. 673).

141. A. AIKHENVALD (2003a, p. 15; 2004, p. 25; 2015, p. 245), D. HINTZ (2007, p. 67), F. DE HAAN (2013, § 1), A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (2017b, p. 8).

142. A1 in the terminology of A. AIKHENVALD (2004, p. 25-28; 2015, p. 241), but she did not discuss neither Greek nor any other Indo-European language.

143. The reference works and collections by W. CHAFE & J. NICHOLS (1986), J. NUYS & P. DENDALE (1994), L. JOHANSON & B. UTAS (2000) and A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (2003) do not contain articles on the oldest Indo-European languages.

144. According to W. ADELAAR (2017, p. 674), in Quechua and Aymaran languages, some evidential markers have to yield their place to clitics as well. If this could be confirmed in other evidential languages, the Greek situation would become less problematic.

145. E. BAKKER (1993) on ἄρα; R. VAN ROOY (2016) on evidential strategies in Plato (the first paper that exclusively focuses on evidentiality in Ancient Greek); A. BARTOLOTTA, M. BUIJS & D. KÖLLIGAN (2017).

expressis verbis ¹⁴⁶. The constraints and rules on the use of evidential markers are similar to those for the augment, as can be seen below:

1. The use of visual evidentials explains why the events that directly concerned Andromakhe were related with augmented verb forms, whereas the verbs in the speeches by Glaukos and Diomedes were not. Neither Glaukos nor Diomedes had been a witness to Bellerophon enduring his hardships and being welcomed at the court of Oineus, whereas Andromakhe had to live through the murder of her family since the day it happened.
2. The reduction of augmented forms into one augmented form followed by different unaugmented forms is paralleled in evidential languages: when the evidential marker has been expressed already and is clear from the context, it does not have to be repeated on each form ¹⁴⁷.
3. In stories in the remote or more distant past, the augment is missing: the absence of visual evidentials in remote and mythical stories has many parallels in evidential languages ¹⁴⁸.
4. The use of the augment in general truths and *similia* can be explained by visual evidentiality, as visual evidentials can be used to state general truths within the speaker's realm ¹⁴⁹.
5. Evidential marking is less common in negative sentences ¹⁵⁰, but is not excluded ¹⁵¹. Even in languages without grammatical evidential marking, neg-

146. E. BAKKER (2002, p. 73-75 – he explained the augment use in descriptions as “an acute perception of the god that is made possible by the poet”); P. MUMM (2004, § 10, personal communication by e-mail on July 15th 2016, without using the term “evidentiality”): *Diese [sc. die Augmentfunktion, the function of the augment] gehört ihrer kategoriellen Systematik nach in den Bereich der subjektiven Modalität, d.h. der vom Sprecher bezeichneten Quellen für die Gültigkeit seiner Aussage. Das Augment wird gesetzt, wenn der Sprecher (Erzähler oder Redner) die Gültigkeit oder Wichtigkeit seiner Aussage nicht nur präsupponiert, sondern forciert oder für sie einsteht. Da dahinter grundsätzlich ein besonderes Äußerungsinteresse steht, folgt automatisch ein besonderer Bezug auf die Gegenwart (der redenden Figur oder der Erzählzeit)* (emphasis is ours); J. GARCÍA RAMÓN (2012, § A).

147. A. SCHLICHTER (1986, p. 50), M. FALLER (2002, p. 148), P. VALENZUELA (2003, p. 39), D. HINTZ (2007, p. 80-83), S. GIPPER (2011, p. 50, 64).

148. J. BARNES (1984, p. 261), L. ANDERSON (1986, p. 293), T. WILLETT (1988, p. 60, 88), I. MUSHIN (2001, p. 76-79), M. FALLER (2002, p. 22-23), E. MASLOVA (2003, p. 230-232), R. DIXON (2003, p. 168), P. VALENZUELA (2003, p. 50), A. AIKHENVALD (2004, p. 310-315), D. HINTZ (2007, p. 64), S. GIPPER (2014, p. 807), E. VISSER (2015, p. 299).

149. J. BARNES (1984, p. 259), R. OSWALT (1986, p. 30), F. DE HAAN (1998, § 5), M. FALLER (2003, p. 20), A. AIKHENVALD (2004, p. 172-173), W. ADELAAR (2017, p. 673).

150. A. AIKHENVALD (2003; 2004, p. 256-257; 2015, p. 242-243), A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (2017b, p. 7).

151. Contrary to what was assumed by L. ANDERSON (1986, p. 277) and F. DE HAAN (1998, § 3).

ative sentences can have less distinctions in past tense marking than affirmative sentences¹⁵².

We therefore believe that the augment was in origin an evidential marker that indicated that the speaker and / or hearer were closely involved in the action and were witness to it (or at least claimed to be). The evidential value of the augment also explains why the *Odyssey* has more augmented verb forms than the *Iliad*: as Odysseus is relating his own adventures, it is almost self-evident that these stories will be related with augmented (“evidential”) forms. The same value for the augment can also be established for Hesiod: the *Theogony* refers to a mythical past and therefore has fewer augmented forms; the *Works and Days*, on the other hand, 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 and are an eyewitness account *par excellence*¹⁵³.

Conclusion

In this article, we discussed the augment use in *Iliad* 6. This chant is one of the most emotional and famous in the poem, because of the story of the exchange between Glaukos and Diomedes, but especially because of the Farewell between Hektor and Andromakhe and the little Astyanax who was scared of Hektor’s helmet. Our analysis was performed in four stages. First, we determined the metrical and morphological criteria to establish if the attested forms were metrically secure. These criteria were mostly metrical bridges and caesurae. In a second step, we investigated the forms that were not metrically secure and asked if internal evidence from the entire epic corpus could be used to determine if the form was secure. This was done via the so-called “Barrett - Taida” method, which analyses metrically insecure forms by looking at their distribution in the entire epic corpus. We also briefly looked at problematic instances. These first two steps enabled us to catalogue the forms into three categories: the ones secured by the metre (type A), the ones secured by internal reconstruction (type B) and the ones that were problematic and/or could not be determined (type C). In a third step, we applied the previous scholarship on the Homeric augment to our established corpus of A and B forms. In the last stage, we tried to explain the augment use and compared the augment use to the visual evidential systems that exist in many languages of the world and found that the augment use and absence could be explained by a system with two evidential forms, the augmented form being the one that pointed at past actions that were wit-

152. M. MIESTAMO (2017, p. 312-316).

153. F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 75-76, 111-112).

nessed (or considered as such) and the unaugmented one being the one that was used in all other situations.

For future research, the use of evidentiality as framework could also shed a new light on the augment use in the Indo-Iranian branch: as was stated above, there is no comprehensive study yet on the presence and absence of the augment in the different Old Iranian languages. An evidential system “eyewitness” - “non-eyewitness” with the augment indicating the “eyewitness” would be able to account for the differences between Old Persian texts, in which mostly events from a recent past are described, and Avestan poetic texts, which describe stories in a remote and sometimes even mythical past. This framework could also be the basis for a study of the augment in Vedic Sanskrit: contrary to the unaugmented verb forms (which Avery and Hoffmann described as being timeless), no study has been performed on the augmented forms in the Rig Veda. It would be interesting to see if the Vedic augment appears in contexts that refer to a recent past and/or to actions that have been witnessed by the speakers and audience.

Filip DE DECKER
Postdoctoral researcher
FWO Vlaanderen - UGent & KULeuven
filipdedecker9@gmail.com

Bibliography

Online resources

Chicago Homer: <http://homer.library.northwestern.edu/html/application.html>
 Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>

Studies

- W. ADELAAR (2017): “A Typological Overview of the Aymaran and Quechuan Language Structure”, in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2017a), p. 651-682.
- H. AHRENS (1852): *Griechische Formenlehre des Homerischen und Attischen Dialektes*, Göttingen.
- A. AIKHENVALD (2003a): “Evidentiality in Typological Perspective”, in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2003), p. 1-31.
- A. AIKHENVALD (2003b): “Evidentiality in Tariana”, in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2003), p. 131-163.
- A. AIKHENVALD (2004): *Evidentiality*, Oxford.
- A. AIKHENVALD (2015): “Evidentials: Their Links with Other Categories”, *LT* 19, p. 239-277.
- A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2003): *Studies in Evidentiality*, Amsterdam.
- A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2017a): *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology*, Cambridge.
- A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (2017b): “Linguistic Typology: Setting the Scene”, in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2017a), p. 1-35.
- T. ALLEN (1912): *Homeri Opera. Tomus V*, Oxford.
- T. ALLEN (1931): *Homeri Ilias*, Oxford.
- T. ALLEN & E. SIKES (1904): *The Homeric Hymns*, London.
- L. ANDERSON (1986): “Evidentials, Paths of Change, and Mental Maps: Typologically Regular Asymmetries”, in W. CHAFE & J. NICHOLS (eds.) (1986), p. 273-311.
- K. AMEIS (1870): *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band. Zweites Heft. Gesang 4-6*, Leipzig.
- K. AMEIS & C. HENTZE (1895): *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang 13-24*, Leipzig.
- K. AMEIS & C. HENTZE (1900): *Anhang zu Homers Odyssee Schulausgabe 4. Gesang 19-24*, Leipzig.
- J. AVERY (1880): “The Unaugmented Verb Forms of the Rig and Atharva Vedas”, *JAOS* 11, p. 326-365.
- E. BAKKER (1993): “Discourse and Performance in Homeric Poetry”, *CA* 16, p. 1-29.
- E. BAKKER (1997a): “The Study of Homeric Discourse”, in I. MORRIS & B. POWELL (eds.) (1995), p. 283-304.

- E. BAKKER (1997b): *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*, Ithaca.
- E. BAKKER (1999): "Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer", in J. KAZAZIS & A. RENGAKOS (eds.). *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris. N. Maronitis*, Stuttgart, p. 50-65.
- E. BAKKER (2002): "Remembering the God's Arrival", *Arethusa* 35, p. 63-81.
- E. BAKKER (2005): *Pointing at the Past: from formula to performance in Homeric poetics*, Cambridge, MA.
- H. BARNES (1986): "The Colometric Structure of the Homeric Hexameter", *GRBS* 27, p. 125-150.
- J(anet) BARNES (1984): "Evidentials in the Tuyuca Verb", *IJAL* 50, p. 255-270.
- J(oshua) BARNES (1711): *Homeri Ilias & Odyssea, et in easdem scholia, sive interpretatio, veterum*, Cambridge.
- W. S. BARRETT (1964): *Euripides Hippolytos. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford.
- A. BARTOLOTTA, M. BUIJS & D. KÖLLIGAN (2017): "Modality and Injunctive in Ancient Greek", presentation during the Conference 'Charting the Semantic Space of Ancient Greek Modality', on May 6th, 2017 in Paris.
- A. BARTONĚK (2003): *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*, Heidelberg.
- L. BASSET (1989): "L'augment et la distinction discours/récit dans l'*Illiade* et l'*Odyssée*", in M. CASEVITZ (ed.), *Études homériques*, Lyon, p. 9-16.
- S. BASSETT (1919): "The Theory of the Homeric Caesura According to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine", *AJP* 40, p. 343-372.
- D. BECK (2017): "The Typology of Morphological Processes: Form and Function", in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2017a), p. 325-360.
- R. BECK (1972): "A Principle of Composition in Homeric Verse", *Phoenix* 26, p. 213-231.
- W. BECK (1914): *De augmenti apud Homerum usu*, Giessen.
- M. BECKWITH (1996): *The Greek Reduplicated Aorist*, PhD Thesis Yale.
- M. BECKWITH (2004): "Homeric ἠνώγεον (H 394), ἐπρίγει (ψ 216) and the Imperfect Origins of the Greek Pluperfect", *KZ* 117, p. 76-85.
- R. BEEKES (1972): "On the Structure of the Greek Hexameter: O'Neill Reinterpreted", *Glotta* 6, p. 1-10.
- R. BEEKES (1988): *A Grammar of Gatha Avestan*, Leiden
- I. BEKKER (1858): *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Prius. Ilias*, Bonn.
- I. BEKKER (1863): *Homericische Blätter. Erster Band. Beilage zu dessen Carmina Homerica*, Bonn.
- I. BEKKER (1872): *Homericische Blätter. Zweiter Band. Beilage zu dessen Carmina Homerica*, Bonn.
- N. BERG (1977): "Der Ursprung des altgriechischen Plusquamperfekts und die Entwicklung der alphathematischen Flexion", *NTS* 31, p. 205-263.
- A. BERNABÉ & E. LUJÁN (2006): *Introducción al griego micénico: gramática, selección de textos, glosario*, Zaragoza.
- N. BERTRAND (2006a): "La localisation des formes intransitives d'ἴστημι. Le rôle de ἴστη et στάς dans le récit homérique", *GALIA* 10, p. 47-96.

- N. BERTRAND (2006b): "Présence du passé dans l'épopée homérique. À propos de *Pointing to the Past* de E. J. Bakker", *GAIA* 10, p. 237-243.
- H. BLUMENTHAL (1975): "Some Homeric Evidence for the History of the Augment", *IF* 79, p. 67-77.
- F. BOAS (ed.) (1911a): *A Handbook of American Indian Languages*, Washington.
- F. BOAS (1911b): "Introduction", in F. BOAS (ed.) (1911a), p. 1-84.
- F. BOAS (1911c): "Kwakiutl", in F. BOAS (ed.) (1911a), p. 423-558.
- G. BONFANTE (1942): "The Armenian Aorist", *JAOS* 62, p. 102-105.
- F. BOPP (1835): *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen*, Berlin.
- F. BOPP (1842): *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen*, Berlin.
- L. BOTTIN (1969): "Studio dell'aumento in Omero", *SMEA* 10, p. 69-145.
- C. BRÜGGER (2009): *Basel Kommentar. Band VIII: 24. Gesang. Faszikel 2: Kommentar*, Berlin.
- K. BRUGMANN (1892): *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II, 2, Strassburg.
- K. BRUGMANN (1900): *Griechische Grammatik*, München.
- K. BRUGMANN (1902): "Die ionischen Iterativpräterita auf σκον", *IF* 13, p. 267-277.
- K. BRUGMANN (1904): *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg.
- K. BRUGMANN (1916): *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II, 3, Strassburg.
- C. BRUGMAN & M. MACAULEY (2015): "Characterizing Evidentiality", *LT* 19 (2), p. 201-237.
- P. BUTTMANN (1830): *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre. Erster Band*, Berlin.
- P. BUTTMANN (1858): *Griechische Grammatik*, Berlin.
- J. BYBEE, R. PERKINS & W. PAGLIUCA (1994): *The Evolution of Grammar*, Chicago.
- M. CANTILENA (1995): "Il ponte di Nicanore", in M. FANTUZZI & R. PRETAGOSTINI (eds.), *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*, Roma, p. 9-68.
- W. CHAFE & J. NICHOLS (eds.) (1986): *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Knowledge*, Norwood.
- P. CHANTRAINE (1948): *Grammaire homérique*, Paris.
- P. CHANTRAINE (1953): *Grammaire homérique. Tome II: Syntaxe*, Paris.
- P. CHANTRAINE (1964): *Morphologie historique du grec*, Paris (deuxième édition revue et augmentée).
- J. CLACKSON (2007): *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*, Cambridge.
- G. CURTIUS (1868): "Verschiedenes. 2. εἰ ποτ' ἔην γε", *CS* 1, 2, p. 286-294.
- G. CURTIUS (1871): "Homerisches", *CS* 4, p. 473-491.
- G. CURTIUS (1873a): *Das Verbum der griechischen Sprache seinem Baue nach dargestellt*. Erster Band, Leipzig.
- G. CURTIUS (1873b): *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*, Leipzig.
- G. CURTIUS (1880): *Das Verbum der griechischen Sprache, seinem Baue nach dargestellt*. Zweiter Band, Leipzig.

- F. DE DECKER (2015a): "The Augment in Homer, with Special Attention to Speech Introductions and Conclusions", in F. DE DECKER *et al.* (eds.), *JournaLIPP* 4, Proceedings of the 21st LIPP Symposium, p. 53-71. Online publication: <https://lipp.ub.lmu.de/index.php/lipp/article/view/4841/2723>
- F. DE DECKER (2015b): *A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Speech Introductions and Conclusions in Homer*, PhD Thesis LMU München. Online publication: <https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17995/>
- F. DE DECKER (2016): "A Contrastive Analysis of the Homeric and Hesiodic Augment, with Special Focus on Hesiod", *IJDL* 13, p. 33-128.
- F. DE DECKER (2017): "Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν: an Analysis of the Augment use in Iliad 1", *JIES* 45, p. 58-171.
- F. DE DECKER (*forthcoming*): "The Augment Use in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (HH 2)" [to appear in *Glotta*].
- F. DE HAAN (1998): "The Category of Evidentiality", Unpublished manuscript, accessible via www.academia.edu
- F. DE HAAN (2001): "The Cognitive Basis of Visual Evidentials", in A. CIENKI *et al.* (eds.), *Conceptual and Discourse Factors in Linguistic Discourse*, Stanford, p. 91-106.
- F. DE HAAN (2013): "Chapter 78: The Coding of Evidentiality", in *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, Leipzig. Online publication: <http://wals.info/chapter/78>
- B. DELBRÜCK (1879): *Syntaktische Forschungen IV. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, Halle.
- B. DELBRÜCK (1888): *Syntaktische Forschungen V. Altindische Syntax*, Halle
- B. DELBRÜCK (1893): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. I, Strassburg.
- B. DELBRÜCK (1897): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II, Strassburg.
- B. DELBRÜCK (1900): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. III, Strassburg.
- R. DIXON (2003): "Evidentiality in Jarawara", in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2003), p. 165-187.
- L. DÖDERLEIN (1847): *Reden und Aufsätze*, Erlangen.
- W. DRESSLER (1969): "Eine textsyntaktische Regel der idg. Wortstellung", *KZ* 83, p. 1-25.
- W. DRESSLER (1972): "Über die Rekonstruktion der indogermanischen Syntax", *KZ* 85, p. 5-22.
- J. DREWITT (1912a): "The Augment in Homer", *CQ* 6, p. 44-59.
- J. DREWITT (1912b): "The Augment in Homer (continued)", *CQ* 6, p. 104-120.
- J. DREWITT (1913): "A Note on the Augment", *CP* 8, p. 349-353.
- Y. DUHOUX (1987): "Les débuts de l'augment grec: le facteur sociolinguistique", *Minos* 20-22, p. 163-172.
- Y. DUHOUX (1992): *Le verbe grec ancien*, Louvain-la-Neuve.
- W. EULER (1995): "Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen", in W. SMOCZYŃSKI (ed.), *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume*, Part One, Cracow, p. 137-142.

- M. FALLER (2002): *Semantics and Pragmatics of Evidentials in Cuzco Quechua*, PhD thesis, Stanford.
- M. FALLER (2003): "The Evidential and Validational Licensing Conditions for the Cusco Quechua Enclitic *mi*", *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 16, p. 7-21.
- A. FAULKNER (2005): "Aphrodite's Aorists: Attributive Sections in the Homeric Hymns", *Glotta* 81, p. 60-79.
- A. FICK (1883): *Die homerische Odyssee in der ursprünglichen Sprachform wiederhergestellt*, Göttingen.
- A. FICK (1885): *Die homerische Ilias nach ihrer entstehung betrachtet und in der ursprünglichen sprachform wiederhergestellt*, Göttingen.
- B. FORTSON (2004): *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*, Oxford.
- B. FORTSON (2010): *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*, 2nd Edition, Oxford.
- H. FRAENKEL (1960): "Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter", in H. FRAENKEL, *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, München, p. 100-156.
- F. FRANKE (1854): *Ueber den gnomischen Aorist*, Leipzig.
- M. FRITZ (2011): *Der Dual im Indogermanischen*, Heidelberg.
- R. FÜHRER & M. SCHMIDT (2001): Review of M. WEST (1998), *GGA* 253, p. 1-32.
- J. GARCÍA RAMÓN (2012): "TAM, Augment and Evidentiality in Indo-European", Handout from the Workshop *Grammatische und lexikalische Strukturen im Wandel* held in Cologne, March 21st -23rd 2012.
- B. GENTILE & L. LOMIENTO (2003): *Metrica e ritmica. Storia delle forme poetiche nella Grecia antica*, Mondadori.
- E. GERHARD (1816): *Lectiones Apollonianae*, Leipzig.
- G. GERLAND (1860): "Ueber den dativ pluralis des griechischen", *KZ* 9, p. 36-68
- A. GIACALONE RAMAT (1967): "La funzione del suffisso -ΣΚ- nel sistema verbale greco", *AGI* 52, p. 105-123
- G. GIANNAKIS (ed.) (2014): *The Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, Leiden .
- S. GIPPER (2011): *Evidentiality and Intersubjectivity in Yurakaré*, PhD thesis, Nijmegen.
- S. GIPPER (2014): "Intersubjective Evidentials in Yurakaré", *SL* 38, p. 792-835.
- B. GISEKE (1864): *homerische Forschungen*, Leipzig.
- J. GONDA (1956): *The Character of the Indo-European Moods*, Wiesbaden.
- W. GOODWIN (1900): *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, Cambridge, MA.
- C. GRASHOF (1852): *Abhandlung zur Kritik des homerischen Textes in Bezug auf die Abwerfung des Augments*, Düsseldorf.
- I. HAJNAL (1990): "Die mykenische Verbalform *e-e-to*", *MSS* 51, p. 21-75.
- I. HAJNAL (2016a): "Induktive versus abduktive Rekonstruktion: das Beispiel des griechischen Augments", Handout from the Workshop in Honour of Michael Job, held on March 2, 2016 in Göttingen.

- I. HAJNAL (2016b): “Induktive versus abduktive Rekonstruktion: das Beispiel des griechischen Augments”, *IF* 121, p. 435-453.
- M. HALE (1987): “Notes on Wackernagel’s Law in the Language of the Rig Veda”, in C. WATKINS (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*, Berlin, p. 38-50.
- W. VON HARTEL (1873): *Homerische Studien*, Berlin.
- G. HERBIG (1896): “Aktionsart und Zeitstufe”, *IF* 6, p. 157-270.
- G. HERMANN (1805): *Orphica*, Leipzig.
- G. HERMANN (1817): *Elementa doctrinae metricae*, London.
- I. HILBERG (1879): *Das Princip der Silbenwägung in der griechischen Poesie*, Wien.
- D. HINTZ (2007): *Past Tense Forms and Their Functions in South Conchucos Quechua*, PhD thesis, UCSB.
- H. HIRT (1928): *Indogermanische Grammatik IV. Doppelung, Zusammensetzung, Verbum*, Heidelberg.
- C. HOFFMANN (1842): *Quaestiones Homericae*, Clausthal.
- K. HOFFMANN (1967): *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg.
- K. HOFFMANN (1970): “Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbums”, *MSS* 28, p. 19-41.
- K. HOFFMANN & B. FORSSMAN (2004): *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*, Innsbruck.
- W. INGALLS (1970): “The Structure of the Homeric Hexameter: A Review”, *Phoenix* 24, p.1-12.
- W. JACOBSEN (1986): “The Heterogeneity of Evidentials in Makah”, in W. CHAFE & J. NICHOLS (eds.) (1986), p. 3-28.
- H. JACOBSON (1909): “episch ἤλυθον”, *KZ* 43, p. 170-172.
- H. JACOBSON (1927): “Σκυθικά”, *KZ* 54, p. 254-286.
- R. JANKO (1982): *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*, Cambridge.
- R. JANKO (1992): *The Iliad: a commentary. Volume 13-16*, Cambridge.
- M. JANSE (2003): “The Metrical Schemas of the Hexameter”, *Mnemosyne* NS 56, p. 343-348.
- M. JANSE (2014): *Inleiding tot de Homerische taal en metriek*, Gent.
- L. JOHANSON & B. UTAS (eds.) (2000): *Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, Berlin.
- B. JOSEPH (2003a): “Evidentials. Summation, Questions, Prospects”, in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2003), p. 307-327.
- B. JOSEPH (2003b): “Evidentiality in Indo-European? Building a Case”, in K. JONES-BLEY *et al.* (eds.) *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual UCLA Conference on Indo-European Linguistics*, Washington, DC, p. 96-111.
- J. KATZ (2007): *The Origins of the Greek Pluperfect* (accessed online : <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1426973>).
- J. KELLENS (1984): *Le verbe avestique*, Wiesbaden.
- P. KIPARSKY (1968): “Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax”, *FL* 4, p. 30-57.

- P. KIPARSKY (2005): "The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications", in *The Yearbook of South East Asian Studies* 2005, accessed online: <http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/injunctive.article.pdf>.
- G. KIRK (1966): "Studies in Some Technical Aspects of Homeric Style", *YCS* 20, p. 75-152.
- G. KIRK (1985): *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 1-4*, Cambridge.
- G. KIRK (1990): *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 5-8*, Cambridge.
- K. KOCH (1868): *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*, Braunschweig.
- D. KORZENIEWSKI (1968): *Griechische Metrik*, Darmstadt.
- W. J. W. KOSTER (1962): *Traité de métrique grecque suivi d'un précis de métrique latine*, Leyde.
- W. J. W. KOSTER (1966): *Traité de métrique grecque suivi d'un précis de métrique latine*, Leyde.
- T. KRISCH (1990): "Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht", in H. RIX & H. EICHNER (eds.) (1990), p. 64-81.
- K. F. KRÜGER (1853): *Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen. Zweiter Theil: Ueber die Dialekte, vorzugsweise den epischen und ionischen. Erstes Heft: Formenlehre*, Berlin.
- R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1890): *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre. Erster Band*, Hannover.
- R. KÜHNER & F. BLASS (1892): *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre. Zweiter Band*, Hannover.
- R. KÜHNER & B. GERTH (1898): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre. Erster Band*, Hannover.
- R. KÜHNER, B. GERTH (1904): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre. Zweiter Band*, Hannover.
- M. KÜMMEL (2000): *Das Perfekt im Indo-Iranischen*, Wiesbaden.
- M. KÜMMEL (2015): *Liste vedischer Verbstämme und -formen* (accessed online :, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273448547_Liste_vedischer_Verbstämme_und_-Formen).
- C. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007): "L'augment dans le texte arménien de l'Évangile", *REArm* 30, p. 31-57.
- J. LA ROCHE (1866): *Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum nebst einem Anhang über die Homerhandschriften*, Leipzig.
- J. LA ROCHE (1869): *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Leipzig.
- J. LA ROCHE (1882): *Das Augment des griechischen Verbums*, Linz.
- J. LA ROCHE (1893): *Homerische Untersuchungen. Zweiter Theil*, Leipzig.
- J. LATACZ (ed.) (2000): *Homer Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*, Berlin.
- R. LAZZERONI (1977): "Fra glottogonia e storia: ingiuntivo, aumento e lingua poetica indoeuropeo", *SSL* 17, p. 1-30.
- R. LAZZERONI (2017): "Divagazioni sull'aumento in Omero", in G. MAROTTA & F. STRIK LIEVERS (eds.), *Strutture linguistiche e dati empirici in diacronia e sincronia*, Pisa, p. 33-56.
- K. LEHRS (1860): "Enige bemerkungen zur caesur des hexameters", *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 6, p. 513-531.

- S. LEVIN (1969): "Remarks on the 'Historical' Present and Comparable Phenomena of Syntax", *FL* 5, p. 386-390.
- LSJ= H. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, H. JONES & R. MCKENZIE (1996): *Greek-English Lexicon*, with a Revised Supplement. With the Help of Many Scholars, Oxford.
- A. LUDWICH (1866): *Quaestionis de hexametris poetarum Graecorum spondaicis capita duo*, Halle.
- A. LUDWICH (1885): *Aristarch Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurteilt von Arthur Ludwich*. Zweiter Theil, Leipzig.
- A. LUDWICH (1902): *Homeri Ilias. Volumen prius*, Leipzig.
- S. LURAGHI (2014): "Conjunction Reduction", in G. GIANNAKIS (ed.) (2014), p. 362-363.
- P. MAAS (1923): *Griechische Metrik*, Leipzig
- F. MARTÍNEZ GONZÁLEZ & M. DE VAAN (2001): *Introducción al avéstico*, Madrid.
- B. MARZULLO (1952): *Il problema omerico*, Firenze.
- E. MASLOVA (2003): "Evidentiality in Yukaghir", in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2003), p. 219-235.
- M. MEIER-BRÜGGER (1992a): *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. I, Berlin.
- M. MEIER-BRÜGGER (1992b): *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. II', Berlin.
- M. MEIER-BRÜGGER (2010): *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*, Berlin.
- A. MEILLET (1903): *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*, Vienne.
- A. MEILLET (1908): *Les dialectes indo-européens*, Paris
- A. MEILLET (1910): "Sur la valeur du f chez Homère", *MSL* 16, p. 29-45
- A. MEILLET (1913): *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg.
- A. MEILLET (1915): *Grammaire du vieux perse*, Paris.
- A. MEILLET (1937): *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, Paris.
- K. MEISTER (1921): *Die homerische Kunstsprache*, Leipzig.
- G. MEKLER (1887): *Beiträge zur Bildung des griechischen Verbums*, Dorpat.
- G. MEYER (1891): *Griechische Grammatik*, Leipzig.
- L. MEYER (1860a): "Die homerischen formen des zeitworts εἶναι", *KZ* 9, p. 373-389.
- L. MEYER (1860b): "Die homerischen formen des zeitworts εἶναι (schluss)", *KZ* 9, p. 423-431.
- W. MEYER (1884): "Zur Geschichte des griechischen und des lateinischen Hexameters", *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse* 4, p. 979-1089.
- M. MIESTAMO (2017): "Negation", in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2017a), p. 405-439.
- C. MOHRMANN (1933): *Homerische Sprachleer*, Nijmegen.
- E. MOLLER (1853): "Ueber den gnomischen aorist", *Philologus* 8, p. 113-129.
- E. MOLLER (1854): "Ueber den gnomischen aorist. Zweiter artikel", *Philologus* 9, p. 346-366.
- D. MONRO (1884): *Homer. Iliad Books I - XII*, Oxford.

- D. MONRO (1891): *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*, Oxford.
- D. MONRO & T. ALLEN (1908): *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros I - XII continens*, Oxford.
- I. MORRIS & B. POWELL (eds.) (1995): *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden.
- P. MUMM (1995): "Verbale Definitheit und der vedische Injunktiv", in H. HETTRICH & W. HOCK (eds.), *Verba et Structurae. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk*, Innsbruck, p. 169-193.
- P. MUMM (2004): "Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments", in T. KRISCH (ed.), *Analecta homini universali dicata. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl*, Stuttgart, p. 148-158.
- A. MURRAY & W. WYATT (1999a): *Homer Iliad. Books 1-12*, Cambridge, MA.
- A. MURRAY & W. WYATT (1999b): *Homer Iliad. Books 13-24*, Cambridge, MA.
- I. MUSHIN (2001): *Evidentiality and Epistemic Stance. Narrative Retelling*, Amsterdam.
- A. NAUCK (1874): "Kritische Bemerkungen VI", *Mélanges gréco-romains de l'Académie de Saint-Petersbourg* III, p. 207-444.
- M. NEGRI (1976): "Studi sul verbo greco II", *Acme* 29, p. 233-250.
- R. NÜNLIST (2000): "Homerische Metrik", in J. LATACZ (ed.) (2000), p. 109-113.
- J. NUYTS & P. DENDALE (1994): "Bibliographie sélective de l'évidentialité", *Langue française* 102, p. 121-125.
- E. O'NEILL (1942): "The Localization of Metrical Word Types in the Greek Hexameter", *YCS* 8, p. 105-178.
- R. OSWALT (1986): "The Evidential System of Kashaya", in W. CHAFE & J. NICHOLS (eds.) (1986), p. 29-45.
- S. OSWALD (2014): "Metrical Laws", in G. GIANNAKIS (ed.) (2014), p. 419-423.
- F. PAGNIELLO (2002): *The Augment in Homer*, PhD thesis, University of Georgia at Atlanta.
- F. PAGNIELLO (2007): "The Past-Iterative and the Augment in Homer", *IF* 112, p. 105-123.
- O. PANAGL (1976): "Die mykenische Sprache", in O. PANAGL & S. HILLER (eds.), *Die frühgriechischen Texte aus mykenischer Zeit*, Darmstadt, p. 78-100.
- H. PELLICCIA (1985): *The Structure of the Archaic Greek Hymns*, PhD thesis, Yale.
- A. PERISTERAKIS (1962): *Essai sur l'aoriste intemporel en grec*, Athens.
- M. PETERS (1997): "Das armenische Flexionstyp *gitem*, *gitac'i* und das ion-att. Plusquamperfekt", in A. LUBOTSKY (ed.), *Sound Law and Analogy. Papers in Honor of Robert Beekes on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, Leiden, p. 211-217.
- A. PLATT (1891): "The Augment in Homer", *JPh* 19, p. 211-237.
- V. PLUNGIAN (2001): "The Place of Evidentiality within the Universal Grammatical Space", *JPr* 33, p. 349-357.
- H. POEHLMANN (1858): *Quomodo poetae epici augmento temporali usi sint*, Tilsit.
- N. PORTER (1951): "The Early Greek Hexameter", *YCS* 12, p. 1-64.
- G. RAUSCHER (1886): *De scholiis Homericis ad rem metricam pertinentibus scripsit Georgius Rauscher*, Strassburg.
- H. REICHELDT (1909): *Altawestisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg.

- L. RENOU (1928): "Les formes dites d'injonctif dans le RgVeda", in *Étrennes linguistiques offertes par quelques amis à Émile Benveniste*, Paris, p. 63-80.
- L. RENOU (1932): "À propos du subjonctif védique", *BSL* 33, p. 5-30.
- N. RICHARDSON (1993): *The Iliad: A Commentary. 6: 22-24*, Cambridge.
- E. RISCH (1974): *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin.
- H. RIX (1976): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*, Darmstadt.
- H. RIX (1992): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*, Darmstadt. 2. erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage.
- H. RIX & H. EICHNER (eds.) (1990): *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, Wiesbaden.
- H. ROSÉN (1973): "Satzbau und augmentloses Tempus im homerischen Tatsachenbericht", *FoL* 6, p. 315-330.
- C. RUIJGH (1958): "Les datifs pluriels dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien", *Mnemosyne IV* 11, p. 97-116.
- C. RUIJGH (1967): *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam.
- C. RUIJGH (1971): *Autour de "te épique"*, Amsterdam.
- C. RUIJGH (1990): "La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel", in H. RIX & H. EICHNER (eds.) (1990), p. 213-233.
- J. RUSSO, M. FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO & A. HEUBECK (1992): *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume III: Books XVII – XXIV*, Oxford.
- A. SALMON (1960): "L'aoriste dit gnomique", *LEC* 28, p. 402-423.
- E. SAPIR (1921): *Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech*, New York.
- H. SASSE (1989): "Wortumfang und Wortform. Zur Weiterentwicklung einsilbiger Imperative im nachklassischen Griechisch", *KZ* 102, p. 212-215.
- A. SCHLICHTER (1986): "The Origins and Deictic Nature of the Wintu Evidentials", in W. CHAFE & J. NICHOLS (eds.) (1986), p. 46-59.
- J. SCHMIDT (1905): "Zur geschichte der langdiphthongen im Griechischen", *KZ* 38, p. 1-52.
- M. SCHMIDT (1854a): "Aristarch-Homerische excursus 1: Augment", *Philologus* 9, p. 426-434.
- M. SCHMIDT (1854b): "Nachträgliche bemerkungen", *Philologus* 9, p. 752-756.
- E. SCHWYZER (1939): *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*, München.
- E. SCHWYZER & A. DEBRUNNER (1950): *Griechische Grammatik. Teil II. Syntax*, München.
- A. SHEWAN (1912): "The Homeric Augment", *CP* 7, p. 397-411.
- A. SHEWAN (1914): "The Homeric Augment Again", *CP* 9, p. 189-191.
- G. SHIPP (1972): *Studies in the Language of Homer*, Cambridge.
- C. SICKING (1993): *Griechische Verslehre*, München.
- R. SJÖLUND (1938): *Metrische Kürzung im Griechischen*, Uppsala.
- H. SMYTH (1894): *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects. I. Ionic*, Oxford.

- B. SNELL (1982): *Griechische Metrik*, Göttingen.
- F. SPITZNER (1816): *De versu Graecorum heroico maxime Homeric*, Leipzig.
- F. SPITZNER (1832): *Homeri Iliadis Vol. I*, Gotha.
- F. SPOHN (1816): *De extrema Odysseae parte, inde a rhapsodiae Ψ versu CCXCVII aevo recentiore orta quam Homeric*, Leipzig.
- M. STEINRÜCK (2010): “Remarques sur la loi de Meyer-Fraenkel”, *IFC* 10, p. 273-278.
- T. STIFLER (1924): “Das Wernicksche Gesetz und die bukolische Diärese”, *Philologus* 79, p. 323-354.
- K. STRUNK (1967): “Wortstruktur und Pronomen im Altpersischen”, *KZ* 81, p. 265-275.
- K. STRUNK (1968): “Zeit und Tempus in den altindogermanischen Sprachen”, *IF* 73, p. 279-311.
- K. STRUNK (1975): “Zum Verhältnis von Wort und Satz in der Syntax des Lateinischen und Griechischen”, *Gymnasium* 82, p. 225-239.
- K. STRUNK (1987): “Ergänzende Beobachtungen zu Wortumfang und Wortform”, *KZ* 100, p. 323-338.
- K. STRUNK (1994): “Der Ursprung des verbalen Augments – Ein Problem Franz Bopps in heutiger Sicht”, in R. STERNEMANN (ed.), *Bopp-Symposium 1992 der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*, Heidelberg, p. 270-284.
- O. SZEMERÉNYI (1990): *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. 4. erweiterte Ausgabe, Darmstadt.
- O. SZEMERÉNYI (1996): *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, Oxford.
- I. TAIDA (2007): “Elision and Augment in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter”, *Exemplaria Classica* 11, p. 3-12.
- I. TAIDA (2010): “Augment in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes”, *Hermes* 138, p. 250-258.
- P. THIEME (1929): *Das Plusquamperfektum im Veda*, Göttingen.
- P. VALENZUELA (2003): “Evidentiality in Shipibo-Konibo”, in A. AIKHENVALD & R. DIXON (eds.) (2003), p. 33-61.
- B. VAN GRONINGEN (1948): “Quelques observations sur l’aoriste gnominique”, in *Studia Varia Carolo Guilielmo Vollgraf*, Amsterdam, p. 49-61.
- J. VAN LEEUWEN (1890): “Homeric IV”, *Mnemosyne* 18, p. 265-299.
- J. VAN LEEUWEN (1918): *Enchiridium dictionis epicae*, Leiden.
- M. VAN RAALTE (1986): *Rhythm and Metre. Towards a Systematic Description of Greek Stichic Verse*, Assen.
- R. VAN ROOY (2016): “The Relevance of Evidentiality for Ancient Greek: Some Explorative Steps through Plato”, *JGL* 16, 3-46.
- H. VAN THIEL (1991): *Homeri Odyssea*, Hildesheim.
- H. VAN THIEL (1996): *Homeri Ilias*, Hildesheim.
- H. VAN THIEL (2011): *Homeri Ilias*, Second edition, Hildesheim.
- W. VEITCH (1879): *Greek Verbs. Defective and Irregular*, Oxford.
- E. VILBORG (1960): *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*, Göteborg.
- E. VISSER (2015): “Tensed Evidentials: A Typological Study”, *LT* 19, p. 279-325.

- C. VITI (2011): "The Use of the Dual Number in Homer", in T. Krisch and T. Lindner (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog. Akten der XIII Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 28. September 2008 in Salzburg*, Wiesbaden, p. 595-604.
- W. VON CHRIST (1874): *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig.
- J. VOSS (1826): *Hymne an Demeter. Übersetzt und erläutert*, Heidelberg.
- J. WACKERNAGEL (1877): "Der griechische verbalaccent", *KZ* 23, p. 457-470.
- J. WACKERNAGEL (1892): "Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung", *IF* 1, p. 333-437.
- J. WACKERNAGEL (1904): *Studien zum griechischen Perfektum*, Göttingen.
- J. WACKERNAGEL (1906): "Wortumfang und Wortform", *GGN* 168, p. 147-184.
- J. WACKERNAGEL (1920): *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I, Basel.
- R. WACHTER (2000): "Grammatik der homerischen Sprache", in J. LATACZ (ed.) (2000), p. 61-108.
- C. WATKINS (1998): "Proto-Indo-European: Comparison and Reconstruction", in A. GIACALONE RAMAT & P. RAMAT (eds.), *The Indo-European Languages*, London, p. 25-73.
- D. WEBER (1986): "Information Perspective, Profile, and Patterns in Quechua", in W. CHAFE & J. NICHOLS (eds.) (1986), p. 137-155.
- M. WEISS (2009): *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor.
- F. WERNICKE (1819): *Tryphiodorou Alosis Iliou*, Leipzig.
- M. WEST (1973): "Greek Poetry 2000 - 700 BC", *CQ NS* 23, p. 179-193.
- M. WEST (1982): *Greek Meter*, Oxford.
- M. WEST (1987): *Introduction to Greek Metre*, Oxford.
- M. WEST (1989): "An Unrecognized Injunctive Usage in Greek", *Glotta* 67, p. 135-138.
- M. WEST (1997): "Greek Meter", in I. MORRIS & B. POWELL (eds.) (1997), p. 217-238.
- M. WEST (1998): *Homerus Ilias. Volumen I: Rhapsodiae I - XII*, Berlin.
- M. WEST (2000): *Homerus Ilias. Volumen II: Rhapsodiae XIII - XXIV*, Berlin.
- A. WIFSTRAND (1933): *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos. Metrisch-stilistische Untersuchungen zur späteren griechischen Epik und zu verwandten Gedichtgattungen*, Lund
- T. WILLETT (1988): "A Cross Linguistic Survey of the Grammaticization of Evidentiality", *SL* 12, p. 51-97.
- A. WILLI (2007): "Of Aspects, Augments, Aorists – or How To Say To Have Killed a Dragon", in C. GEORGE *et al.* (eds.), *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*, Cambridge, p. 34-48.
- A. WILLIAMS JACKSON (1892): *An Avesta Grammar in Comparison with Sanskrit*, Stuttgart.
- J. WILLS (1993): "Homeric Particle Order", *KZ* 106, p. 61-81.
- K. WITTE (1913a): "Über die Entstehung der ionischen Langzeile", *Glotta* 4, 1-21.
- K. WITTE (1913b): "Über die Kasusausgänge -οιο und -ου, -οισι und -οις, und -ησι und -ης im griechischen Epos", *Glotta* 5, p. 8-47.
- W. WYATT (1969): *Metrical Lengthening in Homer*, Roma.