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ABSTRACT

In ancient Greek, past tenses of verbs starting with a consonant are prefixed with the vowel epsilon, but some verbs in Homer show an eta instead. These forms were linked to Vedic instances of long augments by part of the relevant literature. Other scholars preferred to explain the Greek instances as inner developments, while others denied any philological validity for the long augment as an actual morpheme, and rather explained its presence in some Homeric verbs as the product of analogical processes.

My thesis focusses on specific Homeric forms within the heterogeneous set of evidence offered by ancient Greek. I take these long-augmented verbs to be artificial creations of the Homeric language. This line of interpretation is supported not only by considerations of historical phonology and morphology, but also through an innovative formula-based method. Its aim is to describe, through an analysis of the Homeric traditional language, the possible reasons and dynamics for the creation in the Kunstsprache of artificial long-augmented forms. More specifically, it might be possible to explain them as part of analogical modifications of pre-existent formulaic patterns, so as to provide an accurate description of how (and why) their artificial structure was used as a metrical alternative to their counterparts in the spoken language.

The focus of my thesis is on ἠείδη ‘she/he knew’ (and ἠείδης ‘you knew’), ἠίκτο ‘she/he resembled’, ἀπήύρα ‘she/he took away’, and the trisyllabic forms of the imperfect of εἶμι, i.e. ἥια ‘I went’, ἥιε ‘she/he went’, ἥιαν/ἥιον ‘they went’. A detailed analysis of historical morphology shows that none of them can be assumed to be the result of linguistic processes in the ordinary language. This is also confirmed by their attestations limited to Homeric diction or later poetry imitating it. Furthermore, I show through the formula-based method how most of these long-augmented forms are part of analogical modifications derived from formulaic patterns, which contain forms of the same paradigm but without long augment (i.e. ἠδει ‘she/he knew’, ἐικυῖα/ἐικτό ‘resembling’/‘she/he resembled’, ἔσαν ‘they went’). This suggests that long-augmented forms are used primarily as metrically functional alternatives, which is a feature typical of artificial creations in Homer.

Since the results of the method confirm the artificial nature of these forms, they cannot be compared with the Vedic data, nor can their long augment be deemed a genuine morpheme of ancient Greek. It is rather the product of analogical processes within the Homeric Kunstsprache. In particular, I provide a possible narrative for the origin and analogical use of a Homeric long augment in the pluperfect of οἶδα and imperfect of εἶμι, while explaining the initial long vowels of ἠειδ- and ἠίκτο as analogical
temporal augments used by the Homeric poets for metrical purposes. As for ἀπηύρᾱ, this morphologically controversial form is best explained as another analogical use of temporal augmentation, applied by the Ionian bards to original *ἀπεύρᾱ despite its metrical irrelevance. My method shows how forms like ἀπηύρᾱ, which had become extraneous to the Ionian bards, could nonetheless undergo analogical reshaping through the influence of structural connections among formulaic patterns.
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**Most frequent abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>analogical modification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aor.</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att.</td>
<td>Attic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attr.</td>
<td>attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circ.</td>
<td>circumstantial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj.</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont.</td>
<td>continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contr.</td>
<td>contrastive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dor.</td>
<td>Doric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foc.</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>formulaic pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hdt.</td>
<td>Herodotus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hes.</td>
<td>Hesiod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>Homeric/Homer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impf.</td>
<td>imperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indic.</td>
<td>indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infin.</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ion.</td>
<td>Ionic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>long augment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS</td>
<td>Manuscripts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obj.</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf.</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ppl.</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ppf.</td>
<td>pluperfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr.</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep.</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres.</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pret.</td>
<td>preterit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QM</td>
<td>quantitative metathesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>shortening in hiatus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skt.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>starting-point (pattern/sub-pattern/formula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subj.</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top.</td>
<td>topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ved.</td>
<td>Vedic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1
Introduction to the long augment: instances, scholarship, and marginal case-studies

§1. Aims and focus of the thesis

In the Homeric poems, a few past-tense verbs seem to show a long syllabic augment (LA) η- instead of the regular short one. This has at least been the interpretation given by part of the relevant scholarship through an impressive number of different theories. The present thesis has two principal aims. The first is to show that specific Homeric instances of LA do not evidence a morpheme resulting from linguistic processes in the evolution of ancient Greek, but rather an artificial η- created and used by the Homeric poets, and resulting from several analogical processes within their Kunstsprache. Furthermore, the study of how these artificial creations worked will be based on an innovative method, which will be described in detail in Ch. 2 §2. It is based on a metrical-linguistic analysis of formulaic patterns (FP) and analogical modifications (AM) within the Homeric diction, with the purpose to uncover how the forms with a hypothetical long augment were used as metrical alternatives to their counterparts in the spoken language. Proving the efficacy of this method is the second aim of the thesis.

It needs to be pointed out that the label of ‘long augment’ (LA) will be used specifically for a long syllabic augment alternative to regular ἑ-, while the lengthening of initial vowels in past tenses (whether inherited from loss of laryngeal or analogical) will be referred to as ‘temporal augment’. The main area of investigation will be the Homeric poems. At the same time, ancient Greek stems showing a possible LA form a very heterogeneous group, both chronologically and morphologically. According to these two criteria, the instances of ancient Greek verbs which have been interpreted as long-augmented can be classified in the following groups:

- GROUP 1 Homeric forms with η- before the stem: ἡείδη/-ης; ἡμια, ἡμιε, ἡμιαν, ἡμιον; ἡμικτο; ἀπηύρα/-ας.

1 The reference to a section (§) will be preceded by the indication of its chapter (e.g. ‘cf. Ch. 1 §3.2.1’), unless the section belongs to the same chapter where the reference is. In this case, only the section will be indicated (e.g. ‘cf. §2.1’). The same will apply to footnotes (e.g. ‘cf. Ch. 1 n. 3’, or just ‘cf. n. 3’ if the note is in the same chapter containing the reference). When used alone, supra and infra will refer, respectively, to a previous or following point within the current section.

2 If considered non-reduplicated: cf. n. 6.
- GROUP 2 forms where ᾦ- may result from a contraction from *ηϝε-. Those attested already in the Homeric textual tradition are ᾦδη, ᾦϊκτο, ᾦλπετο and ᾦγάζετο, while the forms ᾦκειν, ᾦσκε and ᾦλαστο are found in later literature.

- GROUP 3 Post-Homeric forms with ᾦ- before the stem: ᾦμελλον, ᾦβουλόμην, ᾦδυνάμην.

- GROUP 4 Homeric forms with an earlier LA *η-, which has undergone quantitative metathesis (QM): ἐㄜκει, ἐㄜργει, ἐㄜλσει, ἐㄜγη, ἐㄜνδανε, ἐㄜνοχόει, ἀνέωγεν, ἀνέωξε.

- GROUP 5 Post-Homeric forms with the same QM described above: Att. ἐㄜρθων, ἐㄜλων, ἐㄜρταζον, ἐㄜγην, ἀνέωγη/ἀνέωξ.-

Groups 1-3, i.e. those having an actual ᾦ-, can be easily compared with the occurrences of long-augmented verbs in Vedic, as they all show ᾦ- where short a- would be expected:

1. aor. ᾦςα from ᾦςα- ‘to shine’
2. aor. ᾦτατ from ᾦσα- ‘to achieve’
3. impf. ᾦνηακ from νη-, ‘to turn’
4. impf. ᾦβιδθγατ from νβαδθ-, ‘to wound’
5. impf. ᾦβιδθατ from νβιθ-, ‘to share’
6. aor. ᾦαρ from να-, ‘to cover’.
7. impf. ᾦβγη from να-, ‘to choose’.
8. impf. ᾦγυνακ, aor. ᾦγυκτα, ᾦγυκσαθαμ from νυ- ‘to join’
9. impf. ᾦρινακ, aor. ᾦραικ from νει- ‘to leave’

Possible interpretations of the Vedic forms will be briefly presented in §2.3.

The main focus of the thesis will be on the Homeric past-tense instances showing unexpected ᾦ- before their stem, i.e. those labelled as ‘group 1’. Chapters 3-6 will centre on each of the four formations, which can be described in more details as follows:

- 2nd sg. ᾦειδης and 3rd sg. ᾦειδη of the ppf. of ὕδα.

- The augmented forms of the impf. of ᾦμι with a disyllabic stem, i.e. ᾦμι, ᾦε, ᾦσαν, ᾦον.

- 3rd sg. middle ᾦκτο of the ppf. of ὑικα.

- The morphologically opaque ᾦπηύρα/ᾱ-

I have chosen to concentrate on forms which in turn illustrate different scenarios for the creation of the LA, as follows:

---

3 If considered reduplicated: cf. n. 6.
5 The LA of this form is strongly defended by Lubotsky (1994: 201-2) through metrical considerations, as it is actually absent from the samhitā-pāṭha.
- They show an initial ᾱ- which has been interpreted as a separate LA⁶, and except for ἀπηύρᾱ all their LAs are required by the metre.
- They are part of the oldest occurrences in ancient Greek of a hypothetical LA, as they are all attested in Homer and peculiar to the epic language.
- Since they are artificial creations, the origin of their ᾱ- can be explained through the formula-based method.

The first reason represents a significant difference with the other verbs attested in Homer, namely those included in groups 2 and 4. More specifically, instances like ᾱλπετο from a hypothetical *ἠϝελπ- show a reconstructed LA, and the resulting ᾱλπ- is not required by the metre. Accordingly, variants can be found, or easily assumed as possible emendations for these forms. As for the instances of group 4, their QM also rests on the assumption of an original long-augmented form, and in §2.4.1 it will be proved that none of them can originate from QM in the Homeric language. Furthermore, most of the Homeric forms in groups 2 and 4 can be explained by alternative theories describing linguistic processes, rather than artificial creations⁸, so that the formula-based method cannot ultimately be applied in their case. It will therefore be possible to analyse these forms in separate sections, where alternative explanations of their morphology will also be provided. Similar conclusions will be reached for the verbs of groups 3 and 5, in addition to the fact that they are also post-Homeric.

As for the second reason adduced above, long-augmented forms in Homer have often been considered as archaisms. The group 1 verbs therefore offer the opportunity to reflect on a major issue in Homeric studies: the relationship between the conservative nature of the language and the constant tendency to create new analogical forms. I will show that the group 1 verbs are not archaisms, but

---

⁶ This applies to ᾱίκτο only partially, since this form may be derived from *ἠϝερκ-. According to this line of interpretation, ᾱίκτο should be compared to forms like ἠργάζετο (< *ἠϝερκ?) and labelled under ‘group 2’. At the same time, ᾱίκτο has also been taken to continue a non-reduplicated form (i.e. ᾱ-(ϝ)ικ-, so that it can also be included in group 1. At any rate, the initial ᾱ- of ᾱίκτο is required by the metre, and therefore consistently attested in the textual tradition. This represents an important difference from forms of group 2 like ἠργάζετο (with v.l. ἐργ-, εἱργ-), ἦδη (< *ϝειδ?) and ᾱλπετο (with v.l. ἐλπ-).

⁷ The classic long-augment theory for this verb (cf. §2.1) actually implies that ᾱ- is required by the metre, but in Ch. 6 I will suggest an alternative interpretation, according to which ᾱπηύρᾱ is an analogical reshaping of an original *ἀπεύρᾱ.

⁸ In this thesis, the forms that I will deem to be pure creations of the Homeric Kunstsprache will be referred to as ‘artificial’, or ‘artificially created’, as opposed to genuine linguistic forms spoken in the bards’ Ionic dialect. These two opposite categories are perfectly well expressed, respectively, by the German adjectives kunstsprachlich and sprachwirklich.
rather artificial creations. Accordingly, they cannot be diachronically related to the cases of LAs in Vedic – a possible parallel which has been invoked by part of the relevant scholarship.

A particular case will be offered by ἀπηῦρᾶ, whose controversial and much debated morphology deserves a whole chapter. The main difference from the other case-studies is that the apparent LA of ἀπηῦρᾶ will not be considered metrically necessary, but rather an analogical augmentation added to original *ἀπεῦρᾶ. Through the formula-based method, I will show how a form extraneous to Ionian bards could be affected by analogical processes even if not required by the metre.

On the one hand, the conclusions of this thesis will align with part of the existing scholarship in denying the existence of a sprachwirklich morpheme ἦ in Homer, and in considering the instances of Homeric LAs as artificial and analogical. At the same time, I will suggest an alternative narrative for the use of an artificial LA in ἡεῖδη- and ἦς and the forms in ἦη- of the impf. of ἐλθε, while providing separate explanations for ἤγκτο and ἀπηῦρᾶ. More specifically, except for the impf. of ἐλθε, Homeric LAs of group 1 will be all justified through the same type of process, namely an analogical use of temporal augmentation. The contribution of the formula-based method will be particularly stressed throughout the thesis, as it will allow for an original and detailed analysis of the mechanics behind Homeric AMs.

§2. Relevant scholarship, and explanations of marginal case-studies

As can be observed in the previous section, not only is an apparent LA attested both in Greek and Vedic, but also both languages show it mostly for stems with initial *ṷ-. Such correspondences have led some scholars to derive the LA from a morpheme present in the common ancestor of Greek and Vedic. Others have separated the origin of the LA in the two languages, taking the Greek forms to be inner developments, while individual Homeric cases have occasionally been described as artificial creations.

The following sections will discuss part of the relevant scholarship and possible interpretations of the case-studies which are marginal to the present research, namely the Greek verbs of groups 2-5 and the Vedic instances. The earliest approach in the scholarship will be presented in §2.1. It will also be shown that the verbs of group 3 were interpreted as an analogical and later result already in the 19th century. Section §2.2 will instead focus on one instance in the second line of interpretation seen above, namely Wyatt’s theory of a prothetic vowel. This will be the perfect opportunity to analyse the verbs of group 2, which will be explained as the result of an analogical application of temporal augmentation. Section §2.3 will then provide a brief overview of the Vedic cases and their possible interpretations, while in §2.4.1 it will be shown that the verbs of group 4
cannot be the result of QM in the Homeric language. Section §2.4.2 will then provide alternative explanations for all the forms with alleged QM (i.e. groups 4 and 5).

§2.1 Earliest scholarship: LA as an inherited morpheme, and the history of group 3
In the 19th century and the first half of the 20th, the LA was often interpreted as an inherited morpheme from the common ancestor of Greek and Vedic. More specifically, it was considered either as the original form of the augment, with the ‘short’ one being a later development⁹, or as a phonological variant in an original alternation with ἤ-¹⁰. A particularly detailed explanation was provided by Wackernagel (1885: 272–6), who observed that a LA is found in ancient Greek and Vedic for roots starting with *υ-. His examples included ἥειον, Attic past tenses beginning in ἧ- and ἤ-, as well as ἤργαζόμην, ἤδη and the forms in ἤκ- of ἤφικα and ἤεικάζω, which he derived from an original *η-ϝε- as opposed to ει- < ἤϝε-¹¹.

Later on, ἄσηρα was also derived from long-augmented *-η-ϝρα¹² by several scholars¹³, while ἤκτο was mentioned far less frequently. In particular, Schulze (1892: 265-6 n. 3) suggested an original *η-ϝε-ϝκ-το in Quaestiones epicae, but in a later contribution (1910: 185 n. 2) he preferred to derive ἤκτο from a reduplicated aorist *ἐ-ϝε-ϝκ- (cf. Ch. 5 §2.2). Wackernagel (1885: 275) did not include ἦσκε and ἤκτο among the examples of long-augmented verbs deriving from *η-ϝε- – unlike the related ἦκεν, ἦκαζον and ἦκασα (ibid.: 273)¹⁴ – and instead agreed with Nauck’s emendation to ἓσκεν and ἓκτο¹⁵. Chantraine (1973: 479), on the other hand, suggested that ἤκτο, if interpreted as having a LA, might not be reduplicated, i.e. ἕ-(ϝ)κτο.

---

⁹ Cf. Benfey 1855: 85; von Hartel 1873: 120.

¹⁰ This is the case for all the authors who have considered the alternation *ἐλέ as PIE, and compared it with the reduplication syllable *ἔ-ἔ-., and the adverbs *νέλνε and *προλπρό; cf. Brugmann 1913: 11; Schwyzer 1939: 653; Szemerényi 1996: 297 (Brugmann and Szemerényi, in particular, associate this phonological alternation with the augment’s origin as an independent word). Cf. also Wackernagel 1885: 276, who suggests that ἤ- might originally have alternated with ἦ- “nach bestimmten Gesetzen”, but also considers the possibility that the ‘short’ augment emerged later in verbs not starting with *υ-.

¹¹ Wackernagel (1885: 272) also mentions ἥγυννοντο, ἥοξε and ἥοιςαν, but these forms are conjectures not found in the Homeric textual tradition, which mostly shows ἥγυννοντα, ἥοξαν and ἥοισαν (cf. §2.4.2). Cf. West 1998: xxxiii.

¹² See Ch. 6 §1.1, §1.3 and §1.4 for the root and morphology of this past-tense form, and Ch. 6 §2.1 for the phonological outcome *-ε-υρα- < *-ε-ϝρα.

¹³ Cf. Schulze 1892: 265 n. 1; Sommer 1909: 64; Hirt 1912: 480; Brugmann 1913: 11; Schwyzer 1939: 653.

¹⁴ Similarly, Hirt (1912: 480) reports ἦκαν as a possible case of archaic LA without even mentioning ἤκτο.

¹⁵ Cf. also Meillet 1923: 110, who writes the formula containing ἤκτο (cf. Ch. 5 §2.1) as “δέμας δέ (ϝ)ἐ(ϝ)κτο γυναικί”. 
As for the ἡ- type of the impf. of ἐμψ, the presence of a LA is strongly supported by Meillet-Vendryes (1948: 318) for the plural forms, while they admit the possibility that ἡ- in the singular, e.g. ἡμω, was simply the temporal augment of an e-grade ει-. The presence of a LA to the zero grade, i.e. ἡ-σσων, ἡ-ςε, is suggested by Chantraine (1973: 285) for the whole Homeric impf. paradigm, while in the rest of the scholarship forms like ἡμω are often excluded from the instances of long-augmented verbs and explained differently.16

Several scholars mentioned only the Attic verbs as those showing a hypothetical QM17, while others more explicitly deemed the Homeric forms in εω-, ἡ- and ἀ- to be later corruptions, or more specifically Atticisms, which replaced originally unaugmented forms18, i.e. ἐδέοκεν, ἐδέλπει, (ἐ)δέργει, ἐδινοχόει, ἐκάνανε and ἐνέωτε/ἐνέοιξε. The hypothesis of QM has been supported for some of the Homeric verbs in the more recent scholarship, as will be seen in §2.4.1. In particular, supposing an original *ἡ- for the Homeric pluperfects leaves us with the same two possibilities observed for ἡμός: either they derive from *ἡμέραφο-19, or we must suppose a lack of reduplication. The latter view can be found in Chantraine’s (1973: 480) cautious remark that “il a pu exister un *ἡμουκεί sans redoublement”20.

As for the forms of group 3, i.e. ἡμέλλων, ἡδυνάμην and ἡβουλόμην, their LA was already judged to be a later analogy to ἡθέλων by most of the earliest scholarship21. More specifically, the existence of a preterite ἡθέλων next to the present with aphaeresis θέλω22 might have caused the use

---

16 In particular, scholars generally considered the plural and dual to be analagocical to the singular, whose ἡ- was interpreted as the expected temporal augmentation of the e-grade: cf. Meyer 1896: 555-6; Brugmann 1913: 14-5; Schwyzer 1939: 653 n. 12.
17 Cf. Wackernagel 1885: 272-3 (Att. ἐδήγη, ἐδάλλων, εὕρων, ἐδώρταζον, ἐδοκί; in particular, ἐνέωτε, though occurring in Homer already, is listed among the Attic examples); Hirt 1912: 480 (Att. ἐδώρων, ἐδήγη, ἐδάλλων, ἐνέφεξα); Brugmann 1913: 11 (Att. ἐδάλλων, ἐδώρων, and Hom.-Att. ἐνέφεξα); Schwyzer 1939: 653 (ἔδωρον, ἐδώρταζον, ἐδάλλων).
19 Cf. Schulze 1892: 266 n. 3 (*ἡμεράφει).
20 Chantraine (1973: 479-80) takes a lack of reduplication to be likely for ἐπιάκει of Od. 24.295 and for Att. ἐδέκει. He also considers the possibility that -ο- is an Atticism in Hom. ἐδέκει.
21 Cf. Meyer 1896: 555; Brugmann 1900: 265; Hirt 1912: 480; Buck 1933: 255; Schwyzer 1939: 654. On the other hand, Benfey (1855: 85) quoted only ἡμέλλων, ἡδυνάμην and ἡβουλόμην as the Greek correspondents of the Vedic long-augmented verbs, while von Hartel (1873: 120) included them among other Greek instances. Another exception in the scholarship can be found in Meillet-Vendryes 1948: 318, who included ἡμέλλον among the cases of the inherited LA before a resonant (cf. n. 29), while explaining ἡδυνάμην and ἡβουλόμην through a later use of the LA before stops.
22 The present ἐθέλω is certainly the older form, which explains both the impf. with augment ἡ- and the absence of θέλω in Homer, except for θέλουν in Od. 15.317 (cf. Debrunner 1954: 105; DELG: 300). Furthermore, the elision of ἐ- can easily be described as an aphaeresis after long vowel or diphthong in fixed expressions such as εἰ ἥθελες, εἰ μή ἥθελες.
of an analogical η-‐augment in the past tenses of verbs with semantic affinity. A very detailed study by Debrunner (1954) also confirmed that ἐθέλω is the main form in Homer and older Attic, while θέλω is mostly found as a development of Ionic and Aeolic. According to Debrunner (1954: 108), the alternation between ἐμελλόν and ἰμελλόν, which can already be found in Hesiod (e.g. Th. 478, 898), started in the poetic language based on the Homeric alternation between ἰθέλον and ἐθέλον, while the contrast between ἰμελλόν and μέλλω was a development of prose literature based on [ἴθελον : θέλω]. This contrast brought to the reanalysis of ἰμελλόν and ἰθέλον as long-‐augmented, so that an analogical η-‐ could be used in the impf. of the semantically related βούλομαι and δύναμαι.

The earliest line of interpretation, which wants to explain the LA as an inherited morpheme, has its grounds in what seem to be impressive coincidences between ancient Greek and Vedic, namely the presence of an apparent LA and the fact that it is attested mostly for verbs starting with *ṷ-‐. Yet, a deeper analysis easily shows that these are in fact mere coincidences. In particular, as argued by Rix (1976: 228), a comparison with Ved. a-‐ved-‐am shows that no Graeco-‐Aryan LA can be posited through ṣείνη. More generally, none of the Vedic instances is related to any of the cases of LA in Greek. In addition to this, many alternative explanations are possible for the Vedic phenomenon, as will be observed in §2.3.

Furthermore, if the LA were to be explained specifically through a following digamma, it would be hard to justify its occasional presence next to other types of augmentation for the roots beginning with *ṷ-‐, i.e. contracted forms in ει-‐ (representing [ɛi]): e.g. Att. εἴπων, εἰργαζόμην –, ἐθελον: ἐθέλω is not used in the Homeric language because it belonged to the Umgangsprache. However, as will be seen in Ch. 2 §2.4, priority was usually given to contemporary forms rather than archaisms when the metre allowed for it. This is not contradicted by the use of ἐθέλω/θέλω in Homer as opposed to the later Ionic literature. On the one hand, II. 1.277 clearly shows that the aphaeresis was already taking place after long vowel (cf. n. 2). On the other, the isolated use of ἰθελον in Od. 15.317 allows us to assume that an analogical θέλω had already developed in the bards’ tradition, but probably at a very late stage.

As pointed out by Debrunner (1954: 108), the idea of will and desire of θέλω and βούλομαι is paralleled by the meaning ‘to intend’, ‘to plan’ of μέλλω, while the semantic affinity with δύναμαι is described by Debrunner as a consequential relationship between wanting to do something and being able to do it (“wer will, der kann”).

An equivalence between Hom. ḫita and Ved. ḍyam has occasionally been suggested, but its shortcomings will be explained in Ch. 4 §2.1.
forms with ει- as a real diphthong (e.g. εἱὸν), or uncontracted forms, such as εκ-, ἀκ- ἤκο-26. The last two cases are the usual outcomes in the Homeric poems27. As I will show in §2.2, there are also cases of analogical temporal augments after loss of *y- in the Homeric textual tradition, since digamma was generally lost quite early in Ionic. Apart from these instances, which can be considered as later forms, we are still left with two possible types of augmentation in Homer for the roots beginning with *y-: a ‘regular’ ἐ-type and, far less frequently, a LA. This double development casts doubt on the idea that the LA is somehow due to the specific presence of y-28, especially considering that the Homeric impf. of είμι can be long-augmented and, most significantly, that the Vedic instances also include verbs starting in n- (ānat), y- (āyunak, āyukta, āyukṣātām) and r- (ārinak, āraik).

If anything, a more accurate description of the LA is that it seems to be attested before all resonants, rather than just *y29. As I will show in the next section, this phonological feature was used to explain the LA as a result of contraction with prothetic vowels, or (rather) compensatory lengthening after loss of laryngeal. However, this account seems to work only for some of the Vedic verbs, whereas the Greek examples – and in particular the Homeric cases – are harder to explain.

§2.2 Wyatt’s theory and the verbs of group 2
The dominant view since the second half of the 20th century has been to explain the LA as an inner-Greek development. The two most influential hypotheses on the ‘analogical’ LA were offered by Wyatt (1972) and Berg (1977). The latter saw the emergence of the LA from the impf. of είμι in ἤτ-, with analogical extension to the pff. of οἶδα. This theory will be analysed in depth in Ch. 4, where I will show that the ἤτ-type of the impf. of είμι is actually hard to explain through regular language change. The refutation of Wyatt’s theory, on the other hand, will allow me to provide an explanation specifically for group 2.

Wyatt started from the assumption that what seems to be a LA actually resulted from the contraction of syllabic augment ἐ- and the Greek prothetic vowel, which according to him developed as an ancient Greek innovation before resonants in the two following contexts: RVRC (> ϟRVRC)

26 Schwyzer (1939: 653) also quotes a few examples of preserved [ew]: Arg. ἔρεγονάστη ἔρανάσαντο, Lesb. εἰδον. Cf. also Ch. 6 §2.1 for the Aeolic preservation of ει- in augmented verbs starting with ϟp-.
27 More specifically, whereas in Homer contraction can take place for roots beginning with *s- and *i-, e.g. εἰχον, εἰπεινο, εἰπεις (cf. Schwyzer 1939: 653; Chantraine 1973: 42), it is never found for those beginning with *y-, except for variants not required by the metre (e.g. εἰπε-). Cf. n. 33).
28 Cf. Curtius’ (1877: 120-1) explanation of long-augmented forms through loss of digamma and subsequent compensatory lengthening.
29 This is clearly identified by Meillet-Vendryes (1948: 318): “Devant sonante, l’augment était parfois de la forme *ē- en indo-européen”. Cf. Szemerényi 1996: 297: “Beside e, especially before sonants, ἐ also occurs as syllabic augment”.
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and RVCR (\( \sigma \)-RVCR)\(^{30}\). Although this development, according to his theory, would occasionally fail before \(*_\mu\)-, Wyatt (1972: 75-6) finds sporadic preservation of the prothetic vowel before digamma in the following Greek verbs:

- ἐλδομαί and ἐπομαῖ, which also occur as ἐέλδ- and ἐέλπ- in Homer, so that ἠλπετο, transmitted in the Homeric textual tradition as a variant of ἠλπετο, is derived by Wyatt from \(*\epsilonψ\epsilonλπετο\).
- aorist ἡλσάμην (Semon. 17 West), from εἶλω ‘to enclose’, which is derived by Wyatt from \(*\epsilonψελ\).-.
- εῖδομαί, which seems to show a prothetic vowel both in the Homeric participle ἐσιάμενος (Wyatt 1972: 41) and in the etymologically related ppf. ἡειδη < \(*\epsilonψειδ\).-
- ἐργάζομαι, which might show the original prothesis in ἡργαζόμην < \(*\epsilonψεργ\)-, while the forms in ει- are considered by Wyatt as later.
- ἡκείν, (deemed by Wyatt as earlier than ἔφκεῖ) ἡκαζον, ἡκασα and possibly ἡκτο\(^{31}\), which might thus all be derived from \(*\epsilonψεικ\)-.

The main issue with this theory is pointed out by Wyatt (1972: 76) himself, when he explains that for these verbs “the long augment is our only evidence for the former presence of prothesis”. Obviously, if prothesis is considered as an inner Greek development, there is no need for external evidence to justify its original presence. This supposition is made all the more convenient by Wyatt’s assumption that prothesis would occasionally fail to develop before \(*_\mu\)-. Thus, we should just blindly accept that ἐέλδομαι and ἐλδομαι would randomly alternate, or that ἡργαζόμην might represent a relic of a prothetic vowel which is never found in the related noun ἔργον, as admitted by Wyatt himself (1972: 76). Finally, another glaring inconsistency is the preservation of ἡειδ-, from which Wyatt (1972: 75) derives ἡδη as a later contraction, alongside the complete lack of forms like \(*\ἡργάζετο\) or \(*\ἡέλπετο\), which should be the first outcomes from hypothetical \(*\epsilonψεργ\)- and \(*\epsilonψελπ\)-.

Alternative explanations should therefore be preferred if they can provide a more coherent picture. In particular, the presence of a seemingly prothetic vowel in the Homeric present forms of ἐλδομαι and ἐπομαι will be described in Ch. 3 §2.2 as an artificial feature found only in poetry, and which can perfectly be explained through our formula-based method. As for all the past tenses which Wyatt derives from \(*\ἡψε- \(< \*\epsilonψε\)-, it seems here more economical to see in them an analogical use of temporal augmentation. Cases of this type have been labelled as group 2 in §1, and most of them

\(^{30}\) See Wyatt 1972: 9. The prothetic vowel is always indicated with a generic \( \sigma \) because Wyatt considers it as a “vowel of undetermined timbre” (ibid.).

\(^{31}\) Wyatt (1972: 76) considers ἡκτο either as a reduplicated aorist – a line of interpretation which will be strongly rejected in Ch. 5 §2.2 – or as “an unrepeated pluperfect with long augment taken over from the active”, i.e. from ἡκείν.
can be considered as relatively later forms. In particular, ἡκεῖν is attested only in Arist. Av. 1298, while the variants ἡγνάζετο in Od. 3.435 and ἡγαζόντο in Od. 24.210 are isolated in the Homeric textual tradition. At the same time, an analogical temporal augmentation could perfectly well spread already at the time of the Ionian bards. First of all, there was wide availability of analogical models whose temporal augment was an inherited feature, such as ἡμ (cf. Skr. ām), ἡγε (cf. Skr. ājat), ἡδῶ (cf. *h₁e-h₂eg-), ἡλυθε (cf. *h₁e-h₁lud-), and ἡμερ (cf. *h₁e-h₂er-j-). Secondly, such analogy could perfectly be applied after loss of initial digamma, which happened quite early in Ionic (cf. §2.4.1). Therefore, the consistently attested ἡλπετ(ο) in Od. 9.419 and Hom. ἡδη are not necessarily later forms interpolated after the oral production. Although textual corruption remains a viable explanation for the inclusion of these LAs, which do not affect the metre, it is also entirely possible that they represent an archaic analogical process, which would be consistent with the overall lack of variants in the textual tradition. Furthermore, I take the analogical use of temporal augmentation in the group 2 verbs to be part of the spoken language, since forms like ἡγα and ἡδ- are also attested in post-Homeric prose. The opposite will be observed for ἡδαι-, ἡκτο and ἀπήρη, whose analogical temporal augment (Ch. 3 §2.2, Ch. 5 §2.4, Ch. 6 §2.2) were rather due to processes that originated within the Homeric Kunstsprache, and remained limited to poetic diction.

32 Cf. Dunbar 1998: 437, who also mentions the ancient comments on this form.

33 For Od. 3.435 only one papyrus contains the verb augmented in ἡμ (ηγαζετο), while the rest of the tradition has εἰρη- (West 2017: 59). The v.t. ἡγαζόντο for Od. 24.210 is found only in one papyrus, and in one manuscript ante correcturam (West 2017: 494). Despite the scarcity of its attestation, West prints ἡγα- for both forms, while Ludwich prints εἰρη- for Od. 3.435 and εἰρη- for Od. 24.210.

34 For the idea that the oldest examples of the so-called temporal augmentation are from roots beginning with a laryngeal, cf. Beekes-de Vaan 2011: 252-3.

35 ἡμερ was taken by von Hartel (1873: 120) and Curtius (1877: 121) to be the long-augmented impf. of a present εἰρη. Meyer (1896: 556) corrected this view by stating that ἡμερ is simply the temporally augmented impf. of ἀείρη.

36 Most critical editions have ἡλπετ(ο) in this passage, but ἡλπετο in all the other occurrences in the Homeric poems. In particular, this 3rd sg. occurs 12x times in the Iliad, while its second occurrence in the Odyssey, i.e. Od. 3.275, is transmitted unaugmented (West 2017: 52: “ἐλπετο (non ἡλπτ-) Ar t Ω”).

37 Cf. Ch. 3 §1.2 for the consistency of its attestation in the Homeric poems (as opposed to the rarely found εἰδ-) and a discussion of its morphology.

38 The augmented ἡδ- is the regular form in Attic-Ionic, just like Attic prose makes use of ἡγαζ- (Dem. In Neraeum 41.2, Od. 220), ἡκαζ- (e.g. Thuc. 2.54.5, 6.92.5) and ἡπαζ- (e.g. Thuc. 4.43.5, Isocr. Antidosis 7.4, Dem. De falsa legatione 54.5), which is clearly related to ἡλπετο (cf. DELG: 326).
§2.3 Possible interpretations of the LA in Vedic

As already mentioned, several Vedic forms might be explained through the effect of an original initial laryngeal following the syllabic augment. This was pointed out by Lubotsky (1994: 202) for all the Vedic forms listed in §1, except for ‘secondary’ ārinak and āraik. A more detailed analysis is offered by Ittzés (2005: 208-14), who finds confirmed instances of an initial laryngeal in three of the Vedic forms:

- Following LIV: 282-3, naś- ‘to achieve’ can be linked to a root *h₂nek-, whose initial laryngeal seems confirmed by Dor. δαιπικῆς; Hom. δαινεκὴς ‘continuous’, ‘unbroken’, and ποϊηνεκὴς ‘bis auf die Füße reichend’39.

- vas- ‘to shine’ is clearly from the root *h₂yes-, cf. Aeol. αὖως, Ion. ἡος ‘dawn’ < *h₂eyos-40.

- The initial laryngeal of the root of vṛj- ‘to turn’ finds strong confirmation in Hitt. ḫurki-us ‘wheel’41 and ḫurkił- ‘sin’, ‘perversion’42, so that *h₂yṛg-43 can be safely reconstructed.

According to this interpretation, ānat, āvas and āvṛṇak should be considered as relics of an original outcome, which was later analogically replaced by short ā-. The evidence for the other six roots, however, does not allow for a safe reconstruction of an initial laryngeal. In particular, while *H- is a debatable possibility for vṛ- ‘to cover’44 and vidh- ‘to share’45, it is ultimately impossible to

39 A derivation from h₂nek- (cf. Gr. ἐνεκεῖν) would not justify δαιπικῆς with long alpha, unless it is considered as an artificially created Atticism or Doricism (cf. Schwzyzer 1939: 190; Beekes 2010: 333). Cf. also LIV: 250 n. 1 for the identification of two distinct roots for ‘erreichen’ (*h₂nek-) and ‘nehmen’ (*h₁nek-).

40 Cf. LIV: 292-3.


43 Cf. LIV: 290-1.

44 Cf. Ittzés 2005: 212, who cautiously points to cases of lengthening in the Vedic compounds ἀπάγετα- ‘laid open’, ἀπιγέτα- ‘concealed’, and Hesychius’ Cypr. gloss ἀφόρος (< *h₂(m)or-?). At the same time, two more roots without an initial laryngeal might also underlie Ved. vṛ-, namely *ɣer- ‘to hinder’ (cf. LIV: 684-5) or *ɣel- ‘to enclose’ (cf. LIV: 674 n. 2).

45 The hypothesis of an initial laryngeal for the root *h₁uid⁵ has been suggested by Lubotsky (1994). However, the validity of this theory depends on the acceptance of two assumptions: the reconstruction of vidh- as a secondary formation combining the preverb vi- with the root aorist stem of dhā- (cf. Hoffmann 1969); and Lubotsky’s (1994: 203) suggestion, based on the glottalic theory, that in the passage from the original *ḏqi (cf. Gr. δύα Lat. dis, OHG zet(r)-) to Ved. vi- “the initial d-[...] was not simply lost, but merged with the reflex of the laryngeals” (cf. also Kortlandt 1983: 100 for a similar reconstruction of 덱운 < *ḏeqım < *h₁uidkmiti < *ḏiđkmiti). In addition to this, Lubotsky (1994: 204-5) also finds a possible cognate in ἡτοὺς ‘unmarried’, ‘young man’, following Beekes’ (1992: 176) reconstruction *h₁uid⁵eu-o- with metrical lengthening of the resulting initial vowel. He then proposes an original PIE adjective dɟi-dʰ₁-u- ‘single’, ‘bereft
reconstruct it for the remaining four roots, i.e. vyadh- ‘to wound’, vr- ‘to choose’, yuj- ‘to join’ and ric- ‘to leave’.

Consequently, the last four verbs may all be explained through an analogy to past tenses where ā- is justified, just as the Greek verbs of group 2 have here been explained as analogical to the inherited cases of temporal augmentation. At the same time, several other options are feasible. In particular, metrical lengthening is always a possibility in Vedic poetry, especially when it is necessary to avoid an excessively long sequence of short vowels. Furthermore, the preverb ā- might be the correct explanation for the verbs expressing a certain motion, as suggested by Cowgill (1965: 164) for the long-augmented forms of yuj-.

It can therefore be seen that there is no single explanation for all the long-augmented verbs in Vedic. What has been labelled as a ‘long augment’ is an excessively general term, which does not indicate an actual morpheme of Greek or Vedic. That it cannot be inherited has already been made clear in §2.1, where it has been observed that no etymological connection can be found between the Greek instances and the Vedic ones. Several cases of LA can therefore be explained as emerging separately in Greek and Vedic through independent processes, but not all the instances can be related to a common cause in Greek either. For example, an initial ķ- analogical to inherited temporal augmentation was clearly used both for the ancient Greek verbs of group 2, and for the post-Homeric of his half”, thus connecting the word ‘widow’ as well. LIV: 294, on the other hand, connects the adj. ṣeōς to the root *h2u̯i̭ed- ‘to harm’, thus reconstructing an initial laryngeal for Ved. vyadh- (cf. n. 46).

Contra LIV: 294, given that a connection between ṣeōς and a root meaning ‘to harm’, ‘to wound fatally’ is semantically less convincing (cf. Ittzés 2005: 212). Furthermore, the only evidence given by LIV for an initial laryngeal (apart from ṣeōς) is exactly the long-augmented ēvidhyat, which is obviously not enough to prove the existence of a laryngeal, and the hapax gen. sg. hṛdayāvidhas ‘heart-piercing’, whose long vowel “might be due to simple metrical lengthening in favour of the triṣṭubh pattern of the pāda” (Ittzés 2005: 211).

An initial laryngeal is often suggested for the Greek reflex ḫl, e.g. ἤμαρ < *Ḥj- (see Meier-Brügger 2003: 85-6 for overview of the debate and bibliography), while Rix’s (1976: 70) attempt to derive the Greek reflex ζ- from *Ḥj- is ultimately based only on the long-augmented ζvādhyat, which is obviously not enough to prove the existence of a laryngeal, and the hapax gen. sg. ξεδγυδίθασ ‘heart-piercing’, whose long vowel “might be due to simple metrical lengthening in favour of the triṣṭubh pattern of the pāda” (Ittzés 2005: 211).

Lubotsky (1994: 202) suggests this only for the long-augmented forms of ric-, while Ittzés (2005: 213) hypothesises an analogical influence of vr- ‘to cover’ (for which he considers an initial laryngeal as likely) onto vr- ‘to choose’, as well as of vrj- ‘to turn’ onto yuj- and ric-, given that all these three verbs construct their present stems with the infix -na/-n- and have forms with similar phonology and identical prosody, e.g. āyunak, ārinak.

instances of group 3, but their actual origins and usages are different, and the same explanation will not work for the Hom. ἡτ- type of the impf. of ἐλμ, as will be seen in Ch. 4. Similarly, some of the Vedic forms may even be considered as relics, but several other explanations are also possible for what is ultimately a very heterogeneous set.

§2.4 Groups 4 and 5: forms with QM?

§2.4.1 The Homeric forms

This section will focus on the Homeric instances of group 4, i.e. ἐῴκει, ἐώργει, ἐωλπει, ἀνεωργελανεωξε, ἐμδανε, ἐμοεχει and ἐάξη. I will show that it is ultimately impossible to explain them through QM of a long-augmented form, while alternative and more acceptable accounts will be briefly outlined for each Homeric form in §2.4.2. For the sake of methodological accuracy, shortening in hiatus (SH) and quantitative metathesis (QM) will be here treated as two separate phenomena, as they are not necessarily consequential – cf. Hom. νεός and Θήσεα, as opposed to νεώς and Θήσεά, which are never found in Homer. SH is represented by a simple shortening of the first vowel with the second unaffected and, most importantly, with the hiatus intact. This includes both cases like νεός, with a short second vowel, or instances like disyllabic νεῶν (i.e. gen. pl. of νηός ‘temple’), where the second vowel was long in the first place. At the same time, cases like ἔωσφόρος, with synizesis of εω in the first syllable, will be considered as equivalent to QM, given that this often results in a merger of the two vowels into one syllable, while instances like disyllabic νεῶν show only SH exactly because of their lack of synizesis. If only SH is attested both in Homer and in Ionic for a specific set of words, then it should be assumed that QM had not happened in the bards’ spoken language, nor could it be a linguistic feature at their disposal in hexametric composition. This assumption is corroborated by the clear tendency of the epic language to turn to spoken forms wherever the metre allowed for it (cf. Ch. 2 §2.4). Consequently, if only SH is attested in Homer for a specific type (e.g. gen. sg. of nouns in -εός), the conclusion will be that QM was not applied to it at the time of the Ionian bards.

Chantreine (1973: 479-80) suggested two possible interpretations for the ppf. ἐῴκει, ἐώργει and ἐωλπει: one is that they might be Attic interpolations replacing an older *ἐ(ϝ)ε(ϝ)ο-; alternatively, their original form would be a long-augmented and non-reduplicated *ἡ(ϝ)ο- if the hypothesis of QM were accepted. The long-augment hypothesis was actually dismissed by Chantreine himself in

52 Moreover, only shortening of the first vowel is possible when the second one is already long, e.g. in the gen. pl. -εων of the masc. 1st-declension nouns. However, the presence or lack of synizesis show that the merger of the two vowels, which is a typical consequence of QM, would not always happen.
subsequent editions of his *Grammaire homérique*\(^\text{53}\), but it has recently been revived by Jasanoff-Katz (2014: 257-8) to explain Greek cases of apparent LA with a specific sound law. In particular, they believe that ἃκτα and, through QM, ἐὼκεῖ, ἐὼργεῖ and ἐόλπεῖ can in fact be explained with a ‘long augment’ resulting from a contraction of the sequence \(*ευευ-\) into \(*էʉ.* They justify this peculiar outcome with “an early Greek sound law […] which must have been earlier than the standard rules governing the loss of digamma in Attic-Ionic”. The consequence of this sound change in the sequence \(*ευευ-\), according to Jasanoff-Katz, was for these ppf. to be perceived as non-reduplicated and long-augmented – which would be the expected synchronous re-intepretation of \(*ηικ-/ηιοκ-, *ηιρογγ-\) and \(*ηιολπ-\) – so that the newly-forged LA was analogically extended to the non-reduplicated ppf. *par excellence*, as shown by Hom. ἢιμιονή-ης.

Jasanoff-Katz do not really provide typological evidence for this earlier sound law\(^54\), although some support might be found in the tendency in Latin for intervocalic [w] to be dropped between like or similar vowels\(^55\). However, in Latin the labial glide is generally well preserved elsewhere, while its loss in intervocalic position can be observed in Attic-Ionic without any particular distinction between different phonetic contexts. More specifically, the loss of intervocalic digamma in Attic-Ionic, though later than that of *yod* and -σ-\(^56\), is nonetheless so early that an even earlier loss in \(*ευευ-\) is ultimately impossible to prove with certainty.

Most importantly, *էѲє-\) after loss of digamma is expected to contract into [ѳ:], whereas Jasanoff-Katz seem to imply the outcome [ѳ:] in their resulting \(*էŶ-\(^57\). After all, the QM hypothesised

\(^53\) See Chantraine 1973: 518, who seems to have been persuaded by Debrunner’s (1945: 199) review of his work.

\(^54\) Jasanoff-Katz (2014: 258 n. 18) observe that \([*ευευ- > *էʉ-\) might be due to a dissimilation between the two \(*-.υ-\), which caused loss of the first one (cf. Ch. 5 §2.4). This is nonetheless only mentioned as a possibility without sufficient details (see Ch. 5 §2.4 and n. 54), and the problem of the outcome [ѳ:] (see *infra*) is enough to refute the validity of this sound change.

\(^55\) E.g. lātrīna (attested beside lavārīna), altrōrsus (next to altrōvorsom), aetās (< aevīnas < *aiyu-itāt-) and sīs for sī vīs. Cf. Sihler 1995: 180; Weiss 2009: 165. In particular, Weiss (2009: 165) mentions gen. sg. dītis (< divītis < *deiqtētes) and praedis (< *prauidis < *prauiddis) to show that this loss could also happen after weakening of the second vowel. See also Weiss 2009: 243 for the early loss in the nom. pl. dī < *dē < *deyɛ < *deiyei < *deiwoi (the same evolution can be assumed for dat./abl. pl. dis as well).

\(^56\) Their weakening in intervocalic position must be placed in ancient Greek at a very earlier stage than the loss of intervocalic \(*-.υ-\), according both to the evidence in Linear B and to the diverse diachronic treatment of intervocalic digamma in the dialects. Although \(*-.υ-\) was lost very early in Attic-Ionic, it is fair to assume that even in this family its disappearance started after loss of intervocalic *yod* and the reduction to aspiration or total loss of intervocalic sigma. Cf. Lejeune 1955: 145, 152.

\(^57\) Accordingly, Chantraine suggested the long-augmented \(*η(ϝ)ο-\) as an alternative to an original \(*է(ϝ)α(ϝ)ο-\), not as a result from it. As for ἃκτα, it will be shown in Ch. 5 §2.4 that ἃ- might still be (and has been) explained as the result of
for δόκει, δόργει and δόλπε, would otherwise not work at all, since this phonological phenomenon is always observed in Homer with the sound [ɛ:] (usually represented by <η> in the Homeric text). This is not contradicted by the Homeric evidence adduced by Crespo (1977) and Peters (1980: 87-90 n. 40) to prove the existence of a QM of [ęo] into [eō] in Attic-Ionic. First of all, most of their examples do not show an actual QM, but rather a hypothetical shortening of [ɛ:] in hiatus. As for instances of actual QM, the only ones which offer a problematic picture are the Hom. gen. sg. δέιους and σπειόους. The first syllable of the former is interpreted by Peters (1980: 88 n. 40) as a metrical lengthening obscuring an original Ion. δέους < *d(y)ēos (< *dyeöos < *dyeöesos)60, attested in Hdt. 1.85.4. Similarly, Peters derives σπειόους from the QM of *spēos, while considering its first syllable as analogical to δέιους61.

On the one hand, both their initial syllables can be considered either as a product of metrical lengthening62, or as an actual contraction of *ee- in *speeos and *deeos. The former option seems the more likely for two reasons. First of all, contraction should have given *σπειός and *δείος, which would perfectly work in their occurrences given that in Homer they are always followed by a word starting with a consonant63. Secondly, lengthening of their first syllable is metrically required, since *σπείους and *δι(ε)έους would otherwise cause a cretic sequence with the preceding syllable

---

60 Some of Crespo’s (1977: 202 n. 49, 203 nn. 53, 54) examples are actually puzzling, since they do not have a first short vowel at all. Peters (1980: 87–90, n. 40), on the other hand, sees a shortening of [ɛ:] in ὑώθα < ὑιώθα and τέλεος < τέλειος. This idea is fascinating, given that [ɛ:] is the result of compensatory lengthening in εἶοθα < *se-syei.64 (cf. Lejeune 1955: 116) and, possibly, in τέλεος if derived from *telesmos. This interpretation also seems supported by Cret. τέλος, while the form τέλεος from Cos may even be a case of QM, possibly influenced by nearby Ionic speakers (cf. Ruijgh 1967: 201 n. 511).

61 Another instance of QM is suggested by Crespo (1977: 203) for [ἐγχώναξ] before [ὑπόξας] in Il. 18.347, but it should be explained with metrical lengthening, just like the case of [ἐχεώνις] ὑπόξας in exactly the same formula at Od. 8.436.

62 For the etymology of δείος, cf. DELG: 245-6; Beekes 2010: 317.

63 The exact etymology of this noun is ultimately unknown (cf. DELG: 1001; Beekes 2010: 1381), but both the nom. sg. σπείους and the dat. pl. σπείσσι confirm that the original gen. sg. of this noun was *speeos.

64 See the lengthening by position in [ἐπίξα δέος] at Il. 1.515 (cf. Chantraine 1973: 163).
lengthened by position\textsuperscript{65}. At the same time, their ending -ος is hard to justify through metrics, given that occurrences before a consonant would have made the use of an artificial or ‘Attic’ -ους unnecessary\textsuperscript{66}, and the occurrence of δέους in Hdt. 1.85.4 seems to show that the ending is actually Ionic, though difficult to explain through the phonology of this dialect. It might be argued, in agreement with Peters, that the two equivalent vowels, *-ee-, should have contracted first, as it may also be expected from Homeric phonology (cf. \textit{infra}), but the Homeric language also offers several instances of gen. sg. in -ως for the s-stem neuter nouns\textsuperscript{67}. Therefore, rather than assuming an Ionic special contraction of -εο- in the gen. sg. of δέος and σπέος\textsuperscript{68}, it may be easier to see in δέους and *σπέους a dissimilation of *δέους and *σπέους\textsuperscript{69}. This explanation seems much more satisfying from a phonological point of view than Peter’s theory, which would force us to see in δέους and *σπέους the only examples\textsuperscript{70} of an otherwise unparalleled QM.

In conclusion, it is here maintained that there is no Homeric evidence for an Att.-Ion. QM between [ε:] and a following short vowel. Jasanoff-Katz’ theory is therefore unable to explain the

\textsuperscript{65} For the same reason, dat. sg. *σπέει could never exist in the Homeric language.

\textsuperscript{66} Chantraine (1973: 7) considered δέους as a graphic adjustment of “le vieux génitif *δεος devant consonne”. This explanation takes into account the important fact that in both its Homeric occurrences [δειους\textsubscript{3a}] stands before a consonant (cf. n. 63), but the way in which this adjustment worked is not thoroughly explained. After all, the metrics does not require the use of -ους, although an Attic interpolation would be possible where the metre allows for it. However, the presence of δέους in Hdt. 1.85.4 suggests that -ους was Ionic, so that it seems more accurate to say that an original *δέους needed to be adjusted to the metre, and that such adjustment was achieved through the analogical use of -εο- in the first syllable.

\textsuperscript{67} E.g. γένεως (\textit{Od}. 15.533) θάμβευς (\textit{Od}. 24.394), θάρσεις (\textit{Il}. 17.573), θέρεις (\textit{Od}. 7.118), with their ending -εος usually found in arsis or in verse-final position. West usually emends them to -εος in his editions, but some of them are the only reading attested in the MSS (e.g. θάμβεις in \textit{Od}. 24.394).

\textsuperscript{68} For the idea of a special contraction, cf. Schulze 1966: 685; Wyatt 1969: 237 n. 3. Rosén (1962: 66-7), in particular, explained that in the original *deeos the Silbigkeit of the first vowel was preserved through a phonemic separation in *de-eos. He then suggested that in this particular sequence of three vowels the last two in hiatus (i.e. -εο-) underwent a contraction different from the usual Ionic one, namely -ους instead of -εο- or -εο-.

\textsuperscript{69} Cf. West 1998: xxx: “contractio vocuum εο fortasse dissimiluidinis causa post δε- ad δι abitii”.

\textsuperscript{70} Despite the lack of attestations of the gen. sg. of κλέος (*κλέους < *κλέος < *kleesos) in archaic poetry and Herodotus, a third example of this Ionic dissimilation might be the variant Ἡρακλέως (< *kleeos) next to Ἡρακλέους in the textual tradition of the \textit{Histories}. The former is actually accepted in critical editions only for the oracle in 7.220.4, probably because for this passage the v.l. Ἡρακλέος is attested in the older (and often more trusted) family α of the MSS A and B (cf. Legrand 1932-1954, book 7: 223; Rosén 1997: 291; Wilson 2015: 692; see also Ch. 4 §1.3 for the MSS genealogy of the \textit{Histories}). Considering the archaising patina of hexametric oracles, Hdt. 7.220.4 might confirm that Ἡρακλέους was the older gen. sg., while Ἡρακλέως, which is clearly not expected from *kleeos, should be interpreted as a later analogical levelling with the paradigm of the s-stem nouns.
morphology of ἑῳκει, ἑῷργει and ἑῴλπει\(^{71}\). Furthermore, an analysis of QM and SH in Homer will now show that a LA η- (i.e. [ɛː]) cannot be supposed either, not only for the three ppf. forms above, but also for any of the other Homeric verbs belonging to group 4. Following Miller (1982: 121-31), the Homeric evidence for QM and SH can be divided in four types of words\(^{72}\):

- Type I: words with a hiatus which does not derive from loss of intervocalic *-u-: ἔα ‘I was’ (Il. 4.321, 5.887); 1\(^{st}\) pl. aor. subj. in -ηομεν/-εωμεν; χρεώμενος; gen. sg. in -ᾱο/εω; gen. pl. in -ᾱων/-εον.
- Type II: words with *-u- as part of their stem and before inflectional suffixes: ἰός ‘dawn’\(^{73}\), forms of νηῆς ‘ship’, νηός ‘temple’, and nouns in -νέως.
- Type III: words with *-u- in a derivational affix: perf. ppl. (e.g. τεθνηότα/τεθνεότι), ἐως and τέως.
- Type IV: same as type II, but in compounds: ἐωσφόρος and proper names in -νέως and -λέως.

The presence of QM and/or SH for each type is outlined in Table I\(^{74}\). There it can be observed that QM is occasionally found in words which have an original hiatus (e.g. στέωμεν, θέωμεν, χρεώμενος\(^{75}\)), or a hiatus which came about earlier than the loss of intervocalic [w] (e.g. Ἀτρείδεος, ναυτέων)\(^{76}\). On the other hand, actual QM is not attested for words with an original digamma before

\(^{71}\) For the same reason, I disagree with Wyatt’s (1972: 78 n. 45) explanation of ἑῳρταζόν, ἑῴκει and ἑῷργει through QM, together with the perf. ἐκράκη (ibid.: 79). More precisely, he does not derive their original ‘long’ augment from the prothetic vowel (see §2.2), but instead he considers it as the ‘regular’ outcome from *eṷeṷo- through contraction (he also presents QM as a possibility for Att. ἀνέωξα: ibid.: 75).

\(^{72}\) For a thorough account of the data, cf. also Chantraine 1973: 68-73.

\(^{73}\) It should be noticed that the original morphology of this noun does not correspond perfectly to the description of type II (*h2ευς-ός). This might explain why the forms of ἰός do not even show SH in Homer (unlike e.g. gen. sg. νεός), but this noun has nonetheless been included for the QM in ἐωσφόρος (see infra).

\(^{74}\) All the tables I will reference in this thesis are found in Appendix I.

\(^{75}\) Miller’s (1982: 122) derivation of this form from *χρηόμενος is quite doubtful, as it can perfectly be explained from *χρηομενος; cf. DELG: 1228. See also n. 76 for the problem of QM after loss of yod.

\(^{76}\) Cf. n. 56 for the chronology of loss of intervocalic *-s- and *-i-. QM after loss of yod is actually quite hard to prove in Homer. The only possible example provided by Miller (1982: 122-3) is πόλεως, which is nonetheless a suspicious variant in the Homeric textual tradition (cf. Chantraine 1973: 218). The consideration of this v.l. as an Atticism is quite likely, especially since it is usually found as an alternative to πόλιος before consonant, thus showing no synizesis. Furthermore, the facts about nouns like πόλες might be particularly muddy due to the Ionic analogical extension of -το- to all cases, which can already be seen in Homer (e.g. πόλιας, and v.l. πόλιος).
inflectional suffixes, except for νέᾱ, which occurs with synizesis in Od. 9.283. At the same time, QM is found in two types of derivational words: those with a suffix starting with [w] (i.e. perf. ppl. like τεθνεῶτι, and the correlative ἐως and τεῶς), and tatpurusa (i.e. proper names in -νεῶς and -λεῶς) or bahuvrihi (ἐωσφόρος in Il. 23.226) compounds. This distribution brings Miller (1982: 137) to conclude that QM after loss of digamma was avoided in Ionic when “its effects would have been much more drastic paradigmatically.” Basically, the second application of QM, which followed the loss of digamma, took root in derived words, while in simplexes there was a certain paradigmatic resistance.

This should be accepted as a feature of the bards’ Ionic language, especially considering the strong tendency in Homer to use contemporary forms when they can fit into the hexameter (cf. Ch. 2 §2.4). The only question left now is to which group we should assign the long-augmented forms in *ἡ(π)ο- and ἡ(π)α-. They seem to show more affinity with Type II, given that the labial glide belongs to their verbal stem. Even though *-υ- does not precede an inflectional suffix, but rather follows a prefix, the purpose of paradigmatic clarity would still be crucial in the stem of these verbs. Consequently, after loss of intervocalic digamma, SH of a hypothetical LA should be expected, in accordance with non-compounded forms such as νεός. Furthermore, most forms with QM show synizesis in the Homeric language, including the isolated νέᾱ. Therefore, even if this word proved

---

77 This is actually a conjecture by Aristarchus, since νῆα is the only form attested in the textual tradition (cf. van der Valk 1949: 137). However, the necessity to scan this word as a monosyllable makes νέᾱ the only possible option, and the emendations offered in modern scholarship are ultimately unsatisfying (cf. Heubeck-Hoekstra 1989: 29 for bibliography). At the same time, it is tempting to see an Attic interpolation in this passage, especially considering the complete lack of QM for the paradigm of ναῦς in Herodotus as well.

78 ἦς and τῆς are never found in the textual tradition, although the original length of the first syllable can safely be assumed through comparison with Ved. yāvat and tāvat (cf. DELG: 377, 1073; Beekes 2010: 493, 1476). The Vedic evidence also confirms the presence of a suffix beginning with *y, while the ending -ς in Greek might be explained as a peculiarity of adverbs shared by ὅς as well (cf. Beekes 2010: 1683). After QM took place, spondaic *ης and *της before consonant were restored to εις and τεις, while different contexts show examples of metrical inconsistency, e.g. [ἐος ὅ ταῦθ' τα] in Il. 1.193 (cf. West 1966: 138; Chantraine 1973: 11). This is one of the passages where original ἦς can be restored, just as της in e.g. Il. 20.42. This is why I included ἦς and τῆς in Table I.

79 Cf. also Miller 2014: 67-8, 71.

80 Another solution suggested in the relevant scholarship is that QM applied in every context, and was later replaced in Ionic by paradigmatic levelling in specific cases, e.g. νεός analogical to νεῶν: cf. Hoffmann-Debrunner 1969: 37-8; Werner 1948: 71; Szemerényi 1956: 201 and n. 3; Ruijgh 1968: 391; Hackstein 2010: 407. However, as pointed out by Miller (1982: 134-5), this view forces us to see a gap in the absence of e.g. νιός in Homer, instead of simply considering the Homeric evidence as representative of the Ionic situation (cf. also Miller 2014: 68).
that QM was possible for Type II at a late stage of the Ionic oral composition, instances like ἐώλπει would still represent an oddity for two main reasons:

- They would form a broad category for a phenomenon which is not really found elsewhere, except possibly for νέα – if it is not interpreted as an Attic interpolation (cf. n. 77);
- They would not show any synizesis, unlike νέα.

The former point stresses the arbitrariness of creating a whole new category for QM based on an alleged LA. Furthermore, these hypothetically long-augmented verbs would thus never show a preservation of the original hiatus (e.g. *ήόλπει), unlike all the word-types in Table I. In conclusion, the Homeric language does not present QM of ἡ or ἠ in words with an intervocalic stem-final digamma, unless they are used in compounds or words where paradigmatic clarity becomes unnecessary. The only possible exception, i.e. νέα of Od. 9.283, is still incompatible with hypothetical long-augmented forms undergoing QM, since it shows synizesis.

§2.4.2 Alternative explanations for the forms of groups 4 and 5

The main aim of the previous section was to prove that the verbs in group 4 cannot derive from QM of a long-augmented form. In addition to this, alternative explanations of their morphology can be briefly provided. As already mentioned in §1, the morphology of some of these forms can be explained through processes belonging to the ordinary language. Others, however, might be artificial creations of the Kunstsprache, and as such they will represent a first encounter with artistic solutions devised by the epic poets.

As already seen, the ppf. ἐῴκει, ἐώργει and ἐώλπει cannot be derived either from the contraction of *ἐεο-, since QM is generally not found for [ε:], nor from a long-augmented *ήο-. At the same time, the unaugmented ἐοίκει and ἐόργει are never found as variants, while the v.l. ἐόλπει is attested only in a small portion of the textual tradition for Il. 19.32881. As already mentioned in §2.1, it has been suggested that ἐῴκει, ἐώργει and ἐώλπει are actually Attic interpolations. Following this interpretation, it might be concluded that the Homeric forms show the same Hypercharakterisierung with which the Att. ppf. in ἐο- have been explained by Debrunner (1945: 199). However, the consistent attestation in the Homeric textual tradition of ἐῴκει, ἐώργει and ἐώλπει would be impressive, if they were to be considered as a later corruption of the original text – although the insertion of their temporal augments would have been facilitated by their metrical irrelevance. At the same time, it is possible that the ‘hyper-characterisation’ mentioned above happened earlier than the historically-attested Attic verbs. The reasons behind it would be essentially two:

- Avoidance of syllabic augmentation after loss of intervocalic digamma, which would result in a sequence of three short vowels (i.e. \( \dot{e} \dot{e}o \)).

- Need for a clearer morphological distinction from the perfect indicative forms.

As for the former point, sequences of three short vowels are generally not found in the Homeric textual tradition\(^82\), although it might be argued that this simply obscures an older layer when the hiatus was kept. However, cases for which an archaic sequence of three short vowels can be reconstructed usually concern the internal morphology of inflected words, e.g. *Ἡρακλέεα in [Ἡρακλῆεα κρατερόφρονα] (II. 14.324), rather than a process of affixation such as the use of a syllabic augment. Therefore, the only instances standing against this tendency would be the reconstructed *ἐεοίκε (or *εἰοίκε), *ἐεόλπει (or *εἰόλπει) and *ἐεόργει (or *εἰόργει). These forms, however, probably never existed, given that a sequence of three short vowels was likely to be avoided in a process of affixation as late as the augmentation of ppf. forms\(^83\). The alternatives, therefore, were either a simple lack of augmentation, which would perfectly be in line with the several unaugmented pluperfects in Homer, or the ‘hyper-characterisation’ attested in Attic. The former solution can also be seen in ἐδρόγεε (not *ἐδρογγ-

The solution offered above would not perfectly explain ἔφροχει\(^86\), ἀνέωγε (II. 16.221, 24.228) and ἀνέωξε (Od. 10.389), since they are not ppf. forms. More specifically, they rather seem to show the simultaneous use of a syllabic augment and temporal augmentation, what might be called a double augmentation\(^87\). A possible explanation for ἔφροχει, which is the near-universal reading in

---

\(^{82}\) The only example I could find is ἀκλέες in II. 12.318, which is offered only by two manuscripts. The rest of the textual tradition consistently gives a final -ῆς or -είς (cf. West 1998: 365).

\(^{83}\) As further evidence of this Homeric avoidance, sequences like εεο, εεα, εει and εεε would often undergo aphaeresis, e.g. μυθὲα (Od. 2.202) next to μυθεα (Od. 8.180), θεοσέα (Od. 19.364) from *-δέα (cf. Chantraine 1973: 73-4).

\(^{84}\) Cf. Rosén 1987: 86. Herodotus does not use the ppf. of ἐξε or δικα, and for the latter perfect he rather shows many examples of the secondary stem οικ-.

\(^{85}\) Cf. Ruijgh 1971/2: 168: “comme la voyelle \( \dot{e} \)- de ces parfaits représentait le redoublement, on a apporté l’augment temporel à la voyelle suivante”. A clearer explanation is here found in the avoidance of a sequence of three short vowels, which might have been prevented by an analogical use of temporal augmentation.

\(^{86}\) Cf. Chantraine 1973: 479 and West 1998: xxvii for the suggestion that this verb might come from QM of a long-augmented form.

the textual tradition of its two Homeric occurrences (II. 4.3, Od. 20.255)\textsuperscript{88}, is that it was already used with a temporal augmentation in the Homeric poems. This analogical usage implies that the initial digamma was either no longer considered in the metre, or preserved analogically. Thus, in case of metrical neglect of initial digamma, the occurrences of *ὠνοχόει in II. 4.3 ([νέκταριβ ὠνοχόετσα]) and Od. 20.255 ([κανέωστινβ ὠνοχόετσα]) would have been unmetrical without the addition of a syllabic augment. The original temporal augment might simply have been kept together with the metrically required syllabic one\textsuperscript{89}.

As for ἀνέωγε and ἀνέωξε, the impressive consistency of the textual tradition in handing down ἀνέω(1).\textsuperscript{90} might suggest that this form was already used by the Ionian bards, as seen for the ppf. forms in ἐω- and ὠνοχόει. This conclusion, however, does not seem suitable for Hom. ἀνέω- for a number of reasons. First of all, it would be easy to see the forms in -ἐω- as an Attic replacement of original *ἀνάωγ- and *ἀνάωξ-, clearly represented by the unaugmented ἀναώγεσκον occurring in II. 24.455\textsuperscript{91}. Furthermore, although Herodotus’ text shows a 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg. ἀνέωγες in 1.187.5\textsuperscript{92}, the form ἀνωξα in 1.68.3\textsuperscript{93} is likelier to be the Ionic one (with ἀνέωγες as an Attic interpolation or an Atticism used by Herodotus), given that in non-past forms Herodotus has consistently ἀνοιγ- / ἀνωξ- (cf. οῖξασσα in II. 6.89). In Attic, on the other hand, only the compounded ἀνέω- is attested, and exclusively in the past tenses and in the perfect\textsuperscript{94}. Therefore, the idea of a replacement in Homer’s text of an original form seems more convincing in the case of ἀνεω-. More specifically, the stem *ἀνα-ογ- might have been the original metrical alternative to ἀνώγεσιν found in II. 14.168\textsuperscript{95}, and it might have been replaced by its Attic counterpart by inserting a syllabic augment which did not affect the metre.

\textsuperscript{88} Cf. West 1998: 112; 2017: 430. An alternative v.l. is ἐνοι-, while ὠνοχόει is never found. The former, which is scarcely attested, seems just an attempt to make sense of an apparently double-augmented (and mainly poetic) verb.

\textsuperscript{89} As noticed by Ittzés (2008: 172), who explains the ἐω- of ὠνοχόει as a misunderstanding of EOI in the metacharacterismos, the spelling ἐω- was also easily acceptable thanks to the several Attic instances of a seemingly double augmentation.

\textsuperscript{90} Cf. West 2000: 110, 343; Ludwich 1889: 243; West 2017: 217. Apart from the occasional lack of a diphthong (i.e. ἀνέωξος- / ἀνεώξε-), the only variant found in the textual tradition is ἀνώξε for Od. 10.389, used in only two manuscripts (and probably an erudite correction based on the Homeric forms in ἐογ-).

\textsuperscript{91} Cf. Verdejo Manchado 2014: 277.


\textsuperscript{93} Cf. Rosén 1987: 44.

\textsuperscript{94} Cf. Verdejo Manchado 2014: 269-70.

\textsuperscript{95} And possibly ἐξ-ἀγαρο in II. 12.340: cf. Forssman 2005: 113-4. The allomorph ἀνοιγ- might then represent a later stage when the original hiatus of ἀνωυγ- had been lost. However, it is hard to reconstruct an original sound between ἀνα- and -ογ-, especially considering the Aeolic evidence (see infra).
At the same time, the Homeric forms in ὤηγ- and Aeolic evidence complicate the picture significantly. In particular, an original root *h₅eig- > *oig-, which has been suggested by Forssman (2005: 112), would easily explain the Aeolic infinitive OEIΓÈN in an inscription from Mytilene96, while the Homeric forms in ὤηγ- would show the inherited temporal augmentation of *h₃iēg- or, as suggested by Forssman (2005: 112), of the original *h₂(y)eig-, concealed in the morphological reshaping of ὤηγνυντο and of the aorist forms in ὤης-. If *oig- is accepted as the original root, Hom. ἀναοῖγεσκον and ἀνέγεγ-ἀνέκξ- might conceal, respectively, the unaugmented *ἀνοεῖγεσκόν and *ἀνόειγ-.97 According to this interpretation, the Ionic stem was simply ἀνόηγ-, as seen in Herodotus, while Attic created augmented forms in ἀνέω-, possibly for analogy to the ‘hyper-characterised’ ppf. in ἔω- (see supra). The Homeric forms in ἀνέω- are therefore likely to be the replacement of an original form, so that the hypothesis of a QM in Homer, which has been shown to be phonologically impossible, can be replaced with a plausible alternative.

In general, the idea of an (Attic) interpolation can be suggested for all the forms seen so far, although alternative possibilities have also been found for the ppf. in ἐω- and ἔφοιξέτει. In particular, a linguistic process in the vernacular of the Ionian bards might be behind the morphology of the ppf. ὀκεῖ, ἔφογει and ἔφολπει. The creation suggested for ἔφοιξέτει, on the other hand, is a first taste of a type of interpretation which will be supported in chapters 3-6 for all the group 1 verbs. More specifically, the addition of a syllabic augment described above would represent an artificial creation, especially considering that ἔφοιξέτει is found only in poetry. The same line of interpretation might be the right answer for Hom. ἔηνδανε as well. Its syllabic augment should be considered as part of a wider usage in the Homeric diction, which will be explained in detail in Ch. 3 §2.2. There it will be

96 Cf. Forssman 2005: 108; Verdejo Manchado 2014: 272. To this piece of evidence might be added ὦ<s>τηγον in a fragment occasionally attributed to Alcaeus, though ultimately of uncertain authorship (cf. Voigt 1971: 364), and Myc. o-je-ke-te-to (Fq 130.1), which might be divided into o-je-ke and te-to, i.e. θέκο. The former member is interpreted by Aravantinos-Godart-Sacconi (2001:195-6) as *ὥητης, i.e. an s-stem built to ὦηγ-, and meaning ‘opening’ or ‘revelation’.

The latter sense is found in tragic authors for ἔνοφυμ (e.g. Aesch. Suppl. 322; Soph. Oed. Col. 515).

97 Cf. the emendation ἀνόηγ- by Fick (1883), and accepted by West in his editions of the Iliad and the Odyssey, where he also prints ὀωξ- instead of ὦξ- for the aorist forms. Forssman (2005: 110-1), however, thinks that ἀνέω- is already Homeric, and tries to derive it from an original temporally augmented *-οξ-, but the process of Lautumstellung suggested by him (*-οξ- > ὦωξ- ) is quite doubtful. He then considers ἔφοιξέτει and possibly ἔπνίδανε as analogical to ἀνέχετ- (Forssman 2005: 111). See Cohen-Hyllested (2012: 59) for criticism against the initial laryngeal in *h₅eig-, which according to them is not confirmed by any extra-Greek evidence – and which therefore is not taken to be acceptable counterevidence to the dissimilation rule [*h₅μ- > *h₅μ-] that they try to postulate for PIE.
proved with more examples that syllabic augments, or a prothetic ἐ- analogically used in non-past tenses, were often employed to avoid a bipartite hexameter, or a trochee before the fourth foot. The same process can be observed in the only two occurrences of Hom. ἐνδάνω as well:

ἐνθ' ἄλλοις μὲν πᾶσιν ἐγνδάνεν, οὐδέ ποι' Ἡρη

Il. 24.25

οὐδ’ Ἀγαμέμνονι πάμπαν ἐγνδάνεν: βούλετο γὰρ ῥα

Od. 3.143

In both cases, the absence of a syllabic augment, and the metrical consideration of the original cluster *su-, 99 would have created a bipartite hexameter, which is strenuously avoided in Homeric metrics – or an unmetrical trochaic third foot, in case of metrical neglect of *su- 100. The impf. ἐνδάνε, i.e. the starting-point form for the addition of a syllabic augment in ἐνδάνε, might represent a preservation of the e-grade *suḥ₂d-, which is also found in the Vedic hapax svādate ‘becomes tasteful’ 101, Lat. suādeo and Gr. ἢδομαι, ἢδος. 102 In this case, a syllabic augment would actually not be artificial, but rather the expected augmentation of an unaugmented ἐνδάνε < *suḥ₂-n-d-an-e/o-. Alternatively, given that Homer has also ἔνδανε in the present (Od. 2.114) 103, ἔνδανε seems rather analogical to ἢδομαι, possibly through the mediation of imperfects with a temporal augment. If ἔνδανε was perceived as augmented, as opposed to pres. ἔνδαναι, the addition of ἐ- represented an artificial use of the syllabic augment to avoid an unmetrical outcome after 3b, especially considering that the possibly double-augmented ἐγνδάν- occurs only in Homer.

The last Homeric form left to analyse is [ἐὕγη] 105 in Il. 11.559. All the other occurrences of this aorist passive are represented by [ἐὕγη] (Il. 13.162, 17.607, Od. 10.560, 11.65), which shows

98 The textual tradition alternates an aspirated ἐ- and ἐ- for ἐγνδάνε. The former might be original and analogical to the aspiration of the present ἔνδανος due to *su-.
99 This is clearly seen in ἄδεσ making position in Il. 12.80, 13.748, Od. 24.465.
100 Examples of this in the Homeric textual tradition are [οὐχὲ ἢδονες] in Od. 10.373, or the use of v-movable without lengthening by position in [σφισιν, ἢδονες3c] (e.g. Il. 18.510).
101 For an analysis of this form, cf. Lubotsky 1981: 133; LIV: 606. In particular, see Lubotsky 1981 for the theories describing the short vowel of Skt. svādati ‘to make savoury’ as secondary, while LIV (606) derives it from *suḥ₂-ŋ-d-, thus suggesting a parallel with ἔνδανος.
102 Cf. DELG: 389; Beekes 2010: 509-10.
103 Furthermore, verbs built like ἔνδανος usually show a zero grade, e.g. τυγχάνω, λανθάνω, λαμβάνω.
104 It is hard to say whether Ion. ἦδος, attested in Homer next to Aeol. ἦδος (or unaugmented ἦδος with pyrrhic scansion), is the aorist of ἔνδανος, or the impf. of ἦδος, an active which is found in the aorist ἦςε in Anacr. 131 Page. The latter option would confirm that the present stem ἦδ- was known to the Ionian bards.
105 The subjunctive ἐὕγη is an emendation by Grashof, and it is accepted by Allen and West. It is interesting to notice that such an interpretation would deny any assumption of a LA.
the expected syllabic augment added to the stem (ϝ)άγ- (< *ṷh₂ǵ-). A LA for ἐάγη would therefore represent an unexplainable inconsistency. Furthermore, the form might be interpreted as a metrical lengthening in the 6th foot106, or it might be analogical to the lengthening found in the compound [άγηϝζω] in Od. 11.575, although the other way around is also entirely possible107. Finally, ἐάγη might also underlie another Attic alteration, given that in this dialect the long vowel has been generalised in σάγνυμι through the re-syllabification of the compound *κατά(ϝ)άγνυμι as κατ-άγνυμι108.

The forms left to discuss are the Attic verbs belonging to group 5, i.e. ἔόρον, ἕωρταζον, ἕάλον and ἄνεωγγ-άνέοφξ-. What has been argued in §2.4.1 does not necessarily deny their derivation from a long-augmented form, given that QM is found in Attic after loss of [w] as well, as opposed to the Homeric data. Furthermore, ἕωρταζω could receive a temporal augment in its past tense (i.e. ἦρτ- with possible QM into ἔωρτ-109), although ἦρτ- is found only in late grammarians and scholia. As for ἔόρον and ἕάλον, they might be explained with a syllabic augment preserved as separate from the verbal stem, as expected in the original form (i.e. ἕορ- and ἕάλ- with analogical initial aspiration).

The long stem of ἔόρον might then be analogical to the ‘hyper-characterisation’ hypothesised for the pff. forms in ἓω-, while the long stem of ἕάλον might actually come from Att. ἀνάλισκομαι, which presents the same lengthening observed for κατάγνυμι (i.e. ἀν-άλλισκομαι < ἀνα-αλίσκομαι)110.

Alternatively, all four verbs might show a tendency in Attic to use what looks like a double augmentation. In the case of ὀράω, ἕωρταζο and ἄλλισκομαι, the aim might have been to characterise more clearly the past tenses of verbs which used to have a syllabic augment before their initial sounds were reduced to aspiration, while ἄνεωγγ-άνεοφξ- might simply be an insertion of a syllabic augment to characterise augmented ἄνωγ- more strongly, possibly through analogy to other forms in ἓω- such as the hyper-characterised pff. ἓόκει. In this scenario, Ionic would then simply present a preference

106 Cf. LfgE 80.
107 Cf. Wyatt 1969: 79, who also notices that the lines containing ἐάγη and ἀάγάς are quite similar.
109 A process of QM is also used by Verdejo Manchado (2014: 275-6) to explain Att. ἄνεωγγ-. In particular, he starts from a stem *Ϟοʔεύη, and considers Att. ἄνεωγγ- to derive from a secondary syllabic division of *ανά:μιογ(ε)ιγ- into *ανα:μίογ(ε)ιγ-, which then brought to the temporally augmented *αναε:μυογ(ε)ιγ- and subsequent QM of *(αν)ηνεγγ-. However, I find this process excessively convoluted, and the root *Ϟοʔεύη- problematic. It is described by Verdejo Manchado as a compounded *Ϟο-ʔεύη, with a hypothetical first member *Ϟο- with iterative value. This etymology had already been suggested by Brugmann (1912: 238-43), who considered the meaning of the original root *ʔεύη- to be ‘to give way’ (cf. Skt. vij- ‘erschreckt zurückweichen’ and OHG wihan ‘von der Stelle sich zurückziehen, weichen’), with the iterative *Ϟο- used for the action of ‘removing the bolt of a door or a lid’ (Verdejo Manchado 2014: 274). However, this prefix *Ϟο- is unparalleled in other IE languages, and the semantic evolution described above seems arbitrary.
for analogical temporal augmentation in ὤρ-, ἤλ-, ὤρταζ-. The initial lengthening of Ion. ἀνδρ-, on the other hand, might be inherited if a root *h₃h(e)i₃- is reconstructed.

§2.5 Final remarks

This introductory chapter has shown that the set of evidence for a LA in Greek and Vedic is so heterogeneous that a common explanation for all the forms is impossible. In particular, I mentioned three types of analogical process in the analysis of groups 2-5:

- A syllabic long augment, drawn from the contrast [ἠθλον : θελω] and used for the group 3 verbs;
- An analogical temporal augmentation applied to stems which had lost their initial consonant, and considered as a feature of the spoken language in the case of the group 2 verbs;
- A creation of the Kunstsprache due to metrical constraints and attested only in poetry, as suggested for ἐγνδανε and possibly for ἐφνρχσει.

Only the first of the three processes above consists in an actual LA, and I will suggest a similar type of formation for the ἤ- type of the impf. of εἰμι – though from a different analogical source. An analogical temporal augmentation will be suggested instead for ἡμι-, ἦκτο and ἄπηρᾶ, but I will not take their ἦ- to be a feature of the spoken language, since it is found only in poetry and can be justified through the formula-based method, just as I showed for ἐγνδανε in its two Homeric occurrences.

111 The impf. of ὦρα io is always unaugmented in Homer. As for Att. ἀορν, Dr Meissner has suggested to me an alternative and fascinating option. He has pointed out that there are examples of verbs in -αω with a lengthened grade since Homer, e.g. πορτίαμα (cf. Schwzyer 1939: 719 n. 3; DELG: 860), νομάω (cf. DELG: 716), στρωφάω (cf. DELG: 1027), τρωπάω (cf. DELG: 1094). Considering the attestation of o-ro-me-no in Linear B and Hesychius’ gloss ἔρται, which seem to suggest an archaic simplex *ὁρν, it is possible that the original form of its corresponding (frequentative? Cf. DELG: 1094) form in -αω was *ὁρα with lengthened grade. The seemingly double-augmented ἀορν might then simply be a relic, possibly preserved in the Att. impf. thanks to the ‘hyper-characterised’ past tenses in ἀρα-. Unfortunately, within my thesis this interpretation could find space only in a footnote, but I believe it has potential for future research.

112 This is the only augmentation of ἁλίσκομαι in Herodotus, but it can already be found in ἠλω of Od. 22.230.

113 In this case, Ion. also shows an aphaeresis of ἐοτ-, whose etymology is uncertain: cf. DELG: 339; Beekes 2010: 436.
Chapter 2
Methodological Prolegomena

§1. Brief notes on metrics, chronological layers, and tradition of the Homeric text

§1.1 Indication of metrical positions
As will be seen in §2.2, my formula-based method is based on the graphic representation of a template, which allows for a thorough metrical-linguistic analysis of formulaic patterns (FPs). This template will provide the position of words in the hexameter with a subscript indication, which has already been encountered in the first part of this introduction (e.g. [ἐάγη] in Ch. 1 §2.4.2). The following is the structure of the Homeric hexameter which will be employed in this thesis:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
1a & 1b & 1c & 2a & 2b & 2c & 3a & 3b & 3c & 4a & 4b & 4c & 5a & 5b & 5c & 6a & 6c \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

If a foot is spondaic, its second syllable will be indicated with the letter c, e.g. [πολλὰς] in verse-initial position (cf. II. 1.3), or [βουλή] for a verse-final word (cf. II. 1.5). This type of division, which has been suggested by Janse (2003), allows for a very straightforward description of metrical positions, while the complex debate on the structure (and proto-structure) of the Homeric hexameter\(^1\) would ultimately be irrelevant to the method presented in §2.

§1.2 Principles of oral diction and textual tradition
Some of the assumptions which will be presented here have already been followed in the analysis of Homeric forms in Ch. 1 §2.2, §2.4.1 and §2.4.2. The history of the Homeric text is too complex to allow me to provide a detailed discussion in this thesis, but it is possible to illustrate the basic principles (with essential bibliography given in footnote) which will be assumed in my analysis:

---

\(^1\) One way of representing the structure of the hexameter is to divide it into the two cola identified by the medial caesura (i.e. paroemiac and hemiepes), as suggested by West (1982: 35). The other major theory sees the Homeric hexameter as organised in four cola, as has been first proposed by Fränkel (1960: 103-26, from an original article published in 1926). Later re-elaborations include O’Neill’s (1942: 113) use of whole numbers after princeps and biceps, and of half numbers after the trochee (e.g. [− i 1/2] for a dactyl, and [− i −] for a spondee), or Hagel’s (1994/5: 78) numerical indication of morae rather than syllables (i.e. \(1− 2\) \(ω\) \(3− 4\) \(ω\) \(5− 6\) \(ω\) \(7− 8\) etc.). For a thorough range of the graphical divisions suggested for the hexameter, cf. Janse 2003: 343-7.
The Homeric poems are the result of an oral tradition, which later underwent rhapsodic re-elaboration and an open written transmission. The analysis of the language used by the Ionian bards, and the interpretation of the Aeolic elements contained in it, will not assume an older Aeolic phase. The identification of a passage as a rhapsodic elaboration should be kept in mind; problematic passages might also be explained through interpolations or alterations due to the Athenian redaction, the Alexandrian philologists, or transmission through papyri and manuscripts.

These guidelines do not in fact affect the basic principles of the formula-based method presented in §2. Whether an analogical modification (AM) is a direct remnant of the Ionic oral tradition, or a later rhapsodic re-elaboration, or even the result of a collating written work, the principles of epic diction are always followed. That is, the production of an AM will always work according to the dynamics of the Homeric diction, whose unit will be here identified with the formulaic pattern (FP). At the same time, considerations of textual criticism will come into play when different and significant variants are attested within the investigated patterns.

In general, the references to sprachwirklich elements will usually concern the possible linguistic situation of the Ionic dialect before 8th cent. BCE. Obviously, the chronological layers of the Homeric language will be taken into consideration, not only because the oral tradition itself spanned centuries, but also for the Homeric preservation of archaisms and the possible interpolation of later forms in the course of the textual tradition. As for the Homeric artificial creations, a distinction between bardic and rhapsodic will generally be avoided for those which are isolated or scarcely attested. It would ultimately be pointless to try to define the chronology of a kunstsprachlich word like 3rd sg. ἥειονη, attested only once in the Odyssey, as long as its artificial character can be confirmed


3 In other terms, it is here maintained that there is no ‘gap’ which may prove the existence of an Aeolic phase (cf. Horrocks 1987; Jones 2012), so that Aeolisms will not be considered as more archaic than their Ionic counterparts. A relatively recent defence of an Aeolic phase can be found in Janko 2012 – cf. also Jones 2012: 47 n. 7 for an overview of other authors for and against it.

4 The term ‘poet’ will often be used when a distinction between the oral tradition and later rhapsodic re-elaboration is not relevant. Cf. Haslam 2011: 849-50 for a discussion on the role and activity of the rhapsodes.


6 See West 2011: 10-4, 48-68 for an original formulation of this possibility for the text of the Iliad.

7 The most quoted critical editions will be West 1998, 2000 for the Iliad; Ludwich 1889, 1891 and West 2017 for the Odyssey. Other critical editions will be considered for particularly problematic passages. All translations are by Lattimore (1951) for the Iliad and by Verity (2016) for the Odyssey.
and explained within the dynamics of the Homeric formulaic language. On the other hand, a creation within the old bardic tradition will be implied for artificial elements which are well-attested and widespread throughout the Homeric *Kunstsprache*, such as the ἤ-type of the impf. of ἐμι.

§2. The formula-based method

The investigation of long-debated Homeric forms is an opportunity to test an innovative method. In most of the relevant scholarship, forms like ἤίκτο or ἀπηύρα are explained without consideration of the formulaic language in which they occur. More specifically, the complex organisation of the Homeric diction in formulaic systems is rarely\(^8\) adduced to explain *why* the Homeric singers opted for something like e.g. ἤἰσαν instead of ἤςαν, or ἤίκτο next to ἐκίκτο. What is rather found in most scholarship is a description of their odd morphology, followed by hypotheses on what specific linguistic phenomenon (e.g. phonological change, morphological analogy) is to be assumed as the cause of the oddity. Individual words are thus generally analysed as isolated entries without considering the formulaic context to which they belong. My research will rather focus on FPs and the AMs affecting them, in order to find the possible reasons for creating artificial long-augmented forms through an analysis of the Homeric traditional language.

It is here maintained that in specific cases – which can be defined through the criteria discussed further below – it is possible to identify both the original formulaic construction, and the modification deriving from it. The former will be here called starting point (SP), while the structure containing the long-augmented form will be defined as an AM. Since it is here believed that the long-augmented verbs of group 1 represent innovations of the Homeric *Kunstsprache*, they might be explained as the result of AMs of pre-existent formulaic structures containing corresponding related forms (e.g. ἤἰσαν in the AM and ἴσαν in the SP, as will be seen in Ch. 4). More specifically, an analysis of FPs can show how the long-augmented forms are used as metrically convenient alternatives to their non-artificial counterparts. It will thus be possible both to confirm that long-augmented forms are innovations within the Homeric language, and to provide an accurate description of how (and why) their creation resulted from the reshaping of existing forms.

The first step is to adopt a consistent type of description of formulaic structures. This will be the aim of §2.1, which will contain a discussion of the main theories revising Parry’s ground-breaking study. As a result, in §2.2 it will be shown that working with FPs, rather than overly rigid formulae,

\(^8\) As will be seen in Ch. 5 §3.2, a study by Hackstein (1989) seems to represent the closest example in the relevant scholarship to my formula-based method.
is an important step to understand AMs at a deeper level. Bozzone’s (2014) use of constructions will also be adopted to describe such patterns, as it allows for an accurate representation of different metrical-linguistic layers. This will be crucial to show the importance of a thorough metrical-linguistic analysis of FPs (§2.3), and essential criteria will be provided in order to define both the potential and the limits of the method. In §2.4, in particular, there will be a discussion on the use of the formula-based method for the specific contexts of interest for the present research, i.e. artificial creations starting from real forms in the spoken language.

§2.1 The formulaic pattern

A discussion of Homeric formulaic language should start from Parry’s (1930: 80) definition of a Homeric formula: “a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea”. Two elements of this definition can immediately be addressed: the consideration of a formula as a ‘group of words’, and the concept of repetition. The former represents a replacement of the more generic term ‘expression’ used by Parry in his French dissertation, and provides a more satisfying definition, given that the localisation of specific metrical word-types is a feature found in the whole history of Greek hexametric poetry, as first pointed out by O’Neill (1942: 115). Accordingly, in the present research single words will not be considered as formulae, but they will be studied as part of a formulaic structure, and on the basis of the positions where they most often occur.

As for the idea of repetition, Parry himself (1930: 81-3) made an important distinction between actual formulae and phrases repeated for particular reasons, such as figures of speech (e.g. refrains, anaphora, polyptoton), repetitions after pause effect, conscious quotations of other authors or re-elaborations of epic material. The repetition implied in Parry’s definition of formulae lies in their systemic nature: that is, formulae must be repeated within the frame of extension and economy.

---

9 Parry 1928: 16 : “une expression qui est régulièrement employée, dans les mêmes conditions métriques, pour exprimer une certaine idée essentielle”.
10 Cf. Hoekstra 1965: 14, who observed that defining single words as formulae would lead us to apply the label of ‘formulaic’ even to Callimachus’ or Apollonius’ style.
11 Cf. Minton 1965: 247, who prefers to speak of a “restriction to very frequent appearances of very common words”. As explained by Hainsworth (1968: 36), there is a certain ‘mutual expectancy’ between the constituents of a formula: the use of one word triggers the use of another, and there can be no clear definition of the Homeric formula without considering this semantic-syntactic relationship.
12 Cf. also Hainsworth’s (1968: 41) remark on the Homeric narrative convention of reporting a message or order verbatim, as well as ring-composition structures, which are quite frequent in similes.
13 Cf. Parry 1930: 86. In his French thesis, the terms extension and simplicité are used (cf. Parry 1928: 19).
The former refers to the number of formulae which the system consists of, while Parry’s thrift or economy is to what extent the system itself “is free of phrases which, having the same metrical value and expressing the same idea, could replace one another” (Parry 1930: 86). Parry was well aware that his theory might be seen as entailing a lack of freedom of expression for the epic bard, but he also acknowledged Homeric diction as stylistically and contextually typical of oral poetry. Indeed, the need of a formulaic system is clear evidence of a mnemo-technique, which a written tradition would make pointless.

At the same time, it should also be noted that a phrase occurring only once is not necessarily to be excluded from the formulaic repertoire. For example, as rightly observed by Hoekstra (1965: 13-4), the phrase [θεά δασπλήτας Ἕρινς], though being a *hapax*, clearly belongs to the same system as the one including [θεά γλαυκόπης Αθηνή] and [βοῶπις πότνια Ἡρη]. This assumption is made all the more acceptable by the fact that only a limited portion of Greek epic poetry is actually known to us, so that the formula [θεά δασπλήτας Ἕρινς] might have been used in other lines belonging to lost passages. As will be remarked further below, in the present thesis the term formula will be used even for one-time occurring constructions, as long as they can be inserted in the frame of a FP.

The creation and evolution of entire systems is regulated by the process of analogy. By this term, Parry (1928: 85) meant the modification of existent formulae by the Homeric bards to create new ones, with the aim “to make the expression of the ideas of heroic poetry as simple and as easy as possible”. For Parry, this is clear evidence that the Homeric bards would always operate within the boundaries of tradition. At the same time, the potential of AMs is quite restricted in Parry’s view, as it concerns only declension (e.g. θνητόν ἀνθρώπων / θνητοῖς ἄνθρωποις), conjugation (e.g. ἐγγύθεν ἐλθόν / ἐγγύθεν ἔλθος), and change or omission of enclitics (e.g. μου/σου) or particles (e.g. τε/δέ). Here lies the main problem with Parry’s definition of a formulaic system. While its boundaries may be correct for the highly formalised systems of noun-epithet formulae, they certainly

---

14 In particular, Parry based his research on the name-epithet formulae, by distinguishing two types of epithet: “particularisée, qui vise l’action momentanée” and “ornamentale” (Parry 1928: 25). The latter type was also called a ‘fixed’ epithet (cf. Parry 1930: 124).
17 That is, a system of formulae with two epithets and the name of a goddess, as well as the metrical structure [~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~] to create a suitable second hemistich.
19 Cf. Parry 1933: 181: “oral poetry is formulaic and traditional. The poet who habitually makes his poems without the aid of writing can do so only by putting together old verses and old parts of verses in an old way”.
20 Cf. Parry 1930: 85.
do not apply to the entirety of the Homeric material. In particular, according to Parry’s rigid idea of formula, many expressions would simply be excluded from the formulaic repertoire, either because not relatable to a specific system, or because completely anti-traditional or anomalous. An example of this is the essential equivalence observed for specific Homeric formulae, which seems to violate the principle of economy. More generally, Parry’s ‘essential idea’ increased the rigidity of what should be considered formulaic, while also assuming a blurred connotation. Paradoxically, this brought to two antithetical results: restricting the definition of formulae and formulaic systems and, on an opposite trend, creating systems which are excessively inclusive. The latter result can be seen in Parry’s (1930: 133) famous remark that the phrases [τεῦχε κόνσεσε] and [δωκε ἐταίρῳ] are ‘alike’.

A more flexible idea of Homeric formulae can broaden the extension of formulaic systems, and allow us to identify a significant number of modifications which do not break their unity. This is achieved by replacing the over-rigid definition of formulaic system with the idea of ‘pattern’, a term often used by Hainsworth (1968) to describe his theory of a ‘flexible formula’. This consists in replacing Parry’s idea of formula, where too little flexibility is allowed, with a more elastic structure, whose essential unity is not broken by several variations operating on a metrical, morphological or syntactic level. According to Hainsworth, the connection between the words of a formula does not disappear even when the metrical shape and position of the words are altered, so that even a strong modification like the splitting of a phrase between two lines (e.g. [ἔγχος ἔγχος] / [χάλκεον]) does not necessarily break the unity of a FP in Homeric oral composition.

A FP is here considered as a metrical-linguistic construction made of different layers (semantics, morphology, syntax, pragmatics and metrics), which is shared by two or more formulae in the epic diction without essential alterations to its structure. Alterations are nonetheless possible, and they can create sub-patterns (cf. §2.2), rather than breaking the unity of the FP. Parry’s ideas of

---

21 The issue of the anomaly of equivalence has been raised mostly for the systems of noun-epithet formulae studied by Parry: cf. Schmiel 1984; Edwards 1986: 194-7; Kahane 2018: 89.
22 E.g. short/long according to position (e.g. μέλι χλωρόν in II. 11.631, μύλι χλωρόν in Od. 10.234), correptio in hiatus, synizesis (γρειβ/γρείβ), elision, or metrical lengthening (e.g. Ὄλυμπος/Οδύμπος).
23 E.g. changes in declension or conjugation; suppletion (e.g. δέος αἰρέ/διλε); alternative dialect, diachronic or kunstsprachlich forms (e.g. gen. sg. -ου/-οο, πολλήν/πουλών, ημβροτε/ήμαρτε, νής/νές, μητρός/μητέρος); presence or absence of prefixes such as the augment.
24 E.g. rearrangement of the word order (e.g. χείρας ἄστατοι/ἄστατος χείρας); use of particles or prepositions; separation of the constituents (e.g. βροτός ἄνη/βροτος οὐτασεν ἄνη), which can even be found in enjambement (e.g. χάλκεον ἐγγός and ἐγγός | χάλκεον); expansion of a formula through additional words, e.g. ὀβριμός Ἄρης and βριήπος ὀβριμός Ἄρης.
25 See Hainsworth 1968: 36-9 for the full range of possible modifications.
extension and economy still apply, but the broader view of AMs implied by Hainsworth’s flexible formula is a crucial addition in defining constructions belonging to the same pattern. At the same time, Hainsworth’s theory needs to be integrated with a more thorough consideration of linguistic elements. As will be seen in §2.3, although his analysis offers a more significant insight into syntactic structures, the potential of his approach is not fully exploited, so that most conclusions remain within the domain of metrical constraints, and syntactic patterns are often described only partially.

§2.2 The template

It is necessary for the formula-based method to make use of a template which can take several linguistic layers into consideration. The words specified in this template are lexical items, which carry not only a specific meaning, but also a thematic contribution to the narrative. Therefore, the ‘essential idea’ will be here replaced with the concept of thematic connotation, which is the power of a formulaic expression – or even of a single word as part of that expression – to semantically colour the content of oral composition.

A semantic function, as explained by Bozzone (2014: 43), can be found only in constructions that are fully or partially lexically filled. A more abstract representation of formulae is however possible, although it also entails the risk of excessive genericness in the definition and coverage of a FP. As already seen, Parry (1930: 133) brings himself to state that the phrases \[\tau\varepsilon\nu\chi\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\sigma\iota\] and \[\delta\omicron\omicron\kappa\varepsilon\varepsilon\tau\omega\iota\rho\omicron\] are equivalent, thus basically ignoring semantics. As Hainsworth (1964: 156) notices, the juxtaposition above is actually based on the structure of the two phrases, rather than on their content, and the pattern should also be explained in more detail as ‘aor. 3\textsuperscript{rd} sing. \(\nu\) + ind. obj. \(\nu\) – \(\varepsilon\)’. This approach sees both elements of the phrase as variables, and introduces the important factor

\[\text{The study of poetic ‘themes’ can even bring to an Indo-European perspective of Homeric oral poetry, since a traditional theme is what never changes through time in a transmitted (and possibly re-elaborated) formula (cf. Nagy 1974: 229-61; Watkins 1995: 16-9). A famous example which might illustrate both the potential and the limit of this approach is [\χ\lambda\omega\varsigma \\alpha\rho\theta\omicron\tau\omicron\nu], whose status as IE formula has been much debated: cf. Edwards 1988; Volk 2002; Katz 2010: 361-2; Finkelberg 2019: 3-8.}\]

\[\text{As explained by Foley (1991: 7), the phraseology of oral traditions has “traditional referentiality”, which “entails the invoking of a context that is enormously larger and more echoic than the text or work itself”. I will focus on the thematic connotation carried by a phrase or word (i.e. the contextual and traditionally-charged semantics which can affect oral composition), without inquiring whether a specific episode or passage could be referred to in formulaic oral poetry – i.e. the possibility of textual referentiality in Homer, for which cf. Burgess 2012.}\]

\[\text{Cf also Hoekstra 1965: 12: “nor does it [scil. Parry’s idea that \(\tau\varepsilon\nu\chi\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\sigma\iota\) and \(\delta\omicron\omicron\kappa\varepsilon\varepsilon\tau\omega\iota\rho\omicron\) are alike] become more convincing by the introduction of the term “verse-pattern”, unless this term is more exactly defined”.}\]
of morpho-syntax into the picture. More precisely, structures like the one described by Hainsworth are lexically empty, and thus constitute “bare metrical/syntactic templates” (Bozzone 2014: 43).

Such consideration of the mere structure of formulae had already been introduced in 1963 by Russo. His analysis was based on O’Neill’s (1942) results on the localisation of word-types in Greek hexametric poetry (cf. §2.1), and on Porter’s (1951) study on how not only words, but also phrases tend to fill specific cola of the hexameter. Basically, as observed by Russo himself, Porter added a syntactic dimension to O’Neill’s study, noticing that combinations of word-types are preferred in certain positions. Russo (1963: 239) concludes that “these combinations themselves are formulaic”, and bases his analysis of the Homeric formulaic structures on grammatical-metrical patterns. For example, his interpretation of [ἄλγε’ ἔθηκε] in Il. 1.2 is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{N} & \text{V} \\
\sim & \sim \\
\sim & \sim & \sim
\end{array}
\]

Therefore, Russo’s research focusses on the frequent occurrences of metrical/syntactic word-types in specific parts of the hexameter, and considers this tendency as a generative force in the creation of FPs. This allowed him to use the label of ‘formulaic’ for phrases which had not been considered as such by Parry or Lord.

Russo’s ‘structural formula’ opened new possibilities for formulaic analysis, but it is ultimately a partial view. What is lacking in this case is a consideration of the semantics and context-based use of phrases – as well as inferences from discourse analysis which will be addressed further below. The structural formula finally takes syntax into consideration, but remains an empty template which Russo himself (1997: 246) later on considered “too loosely defined”. Accordingly, Parry’s equivalence of [τεῦχε κόνεσσι] and [δόκει ἐταίρῳ] still appears excessively generic. They both have a structure ‘aor. 3\(^{rd}\) sing. – \(\sim\) + ind. obj. \(\sim \sim \sim\)’, but they do not share any semantic link. Saying that [τεῦχε κόνεσσι] and [δόκει ἐταίρῳ] are ‘alike’ would then lead to an excessively inclusive system, where the economy of the single expressions would also be hard to define.

Syntactic patterns, however, were part of the formulaic composition mastered by Homeric bards and rhapsodes, just as they are used through speakers’ competence to generate new phrases.

---

29 The use of the term ‘pattern’ for a formulaic structure can therefore be found already in Russo 1963, who also addresses the existence of ‘sub-patterns’ (cf. ibid.: 240).

30 Parry himself (1930: 128) had already offered a description which included syntactic elements for [ἄλγε’ ἔθηκε]: “very common type of formula which is made up of a verb and its direct object and falls after the bucolic diaeresis”.

Accordingly, Kiparsky (1976) considered formulae just like the fixed or flexible bound expressions of ordinary language, and analysed them through the instruments of generative grammar. In particular, Kiparsky (ibid.: 82-3) re-interpreted Hainsworth’s flexible formulae as representing “co-occurrence restrictions (obligatory or variable) between lexical items”, while fixed formulae can be represented as “ready-made surface structures”. He also recovered the semantic value of formulae, which had ultimately been lost in Russo’s study, by specifying that the construction of a formula is not only based on syntactic relations, but also on the same semantic connections which are typical of the bound phrases of ordinary language as well. With relevance for my research, Kiparsky (ibid.: 89) considers the constituents of a flexible formula as ‘lexical items’, an expression which has already been used here for the specific words in a FP. What should be added to Kiparsky’s view is the importance of metrics, which necessarily affected the use of formulae. If anything, it was supposed to be a crucial part of the poet’s poetic-linguistic competence, thus participating in the generative process of creating and modifying phrases in the hexameter.

Finally, a thorough description of FPs may also need to consider discourse analysis, whose inclusion has been the major contribution in the most recent scholarship on the Homeric diction. In particular, Bozzone’s (2014) analysis of formulaic patterns takes into account the elements of information structure, and the identification and position of discourse topic (i.e. the background information) and focus (i.e. what is informationally salient in the sentence). Information structure is

---

32 Kiparsky (1976: 84) suggests representing the strong relation among the constituents of a formulae as a generated construction of grammatically related members dominated by the same node, e.g. πάθην ἄλγεα as a Verb-Phrase constituted by Verb and Object. Cf. also Nagler 1967 and 1974: 13-26 for a first approach to formulaic language through the tools of generative grammar – in particular, for the idea of Gestalt (associated by Nagler to the Sanskrit concept of sphaṭa), i.e. the preverbal template of formulae in an oral tradition.

33 An example offered by Kiparsky (1976: 75) is the phrase ‘fraught with’, which “requires something threatening”. Therefore the phrases *fraught with remorse or *fraught with joy do not work.

34 Kiparsky (1976: 87-8) seems to contradict himself in his attempt to rule out metrics completely from the picture. He claims that metrical criteria are excluded from his theory, but he admits further below that the language of oral literature differs from ordinary language “quantitatively in the extent and frequency of its use of bound phraseology, especially, but not exclusively, when the meter is strict” (ibid.: 88).

35 See for example Visser’s studies (1987; 1988) on the identification of a nucleus and a peripheral element in formulaic phrases. Peripheral elements are characterised by frequent and functional variability in their metrical shape, synonymity, and semantic bleaching, all features which Visser attributes to verbs of killing in Homeric killing scenes. This peripheral function can also be expressed by a whole phrase with respect to the sentence, as Bakker and Fabbricotti (1991) have shown for dative spear-phrases in the Iliad.
strongly intertwined with syntactic analysis and semantics, as perfectly exemplified by the lines introducing direct speech, which are the main object of Bozzone’s analysis.36

Finally, it is necessary to adopt a consistent way of describing FPs. As already explained, they need to be represented with a template which can be partially lexically filled or empty, and which can contain different layers of linguistic analysis. Our model for this type of template will be Bozzone’s (2014) use of the structural representations employed in construction grammar37 to describe FPs at different levels. To have an example38, let us consider the following lines:

τοίσι δ’ ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὦκύς ἁχίλλευς
tοσίν δ’ εὐχόμενος μετέφη κρείσον Αγαμέμνων
tοῖς δὲ βαρῶ στενάχων μετέφη κρείσον Αγαμέμνων

A common pattern can be identified for all these formulae, and will be referred to as ‘pattern x’. From a semantic point of view, all the formulae above have the thematic connotation of a line introducing direct speech – a particularly thematically-charged context in Homer. The only lexical item which is common to all the three lines (i.e. μετέφη) is a clear sign of this. At the same time, it is possible to describe a common syntactic structure: a pronoun in the dative is followed by a participle (or participial phrase) describing an action performed by the subject while he starts speaking; the participle is then followed by the main verb μετέφη, while the noun-epithet formula occupies the last cola of the hexameter and expresses the subject. Metrically speaking, word-boundaries mark specific caesurae and cola. As for discourse analysis, the dative pronoun represents a contrastive topic, namely the old speaker, while the noun-epithet phrase is the continued topic, i.e. the next speaker.

All these layers can be represented by making use of a constructional structure:

\[
[-\text{Contrastive Topic}] \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow [-\text{Focus}] \rightarrow \text{προσέφη} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow [-\text{Continued Topic}]
\]

The contrastive topic is the previous speaker, who is anaphorically resumed from the previous discourse through the article (τὸν/τὴν), while the continued topic is the speaker of the next discourse. The focus is represented by the ppl. referring to the subject (Ἀπαμειβόμενος), as the salient piece of information of this sentence is the new speaker’s action of replying.

36 In the present research, the left-fronted position for emphasis on the topic will be occasionally addressed. Cf. Bozzone 2014: 66, who provides the following description for the recurring [τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὦκύς ἁχίλλευς]:

37 Bozzone’s study is part of a thread of recent theories which have tried to explain the mechanics of the epic language through the principles of construction grammar and usage-based analysis: cf. in particular Antovic-Pagán Cánovas 2016; Kahane 2018. Bozzone’s constructions have been used here as models for the templates of my method simply because they allow for a more effective representation of the metrical-linguistic layers of FPs. It is not relevant for this thesis to side either with interpretations based on generative grammar (for which cf. n. 32) or with those following construction grammar, as neither of them ultimately denies the existence of SP patterns or AMs.

38 The following analysis is inspired by Bozzone 2014: 57-60.
Pattern \( x \)  
\( \left[ - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{Ind. Obj. Pr.}} \left[ \left( \right) \right. \left. - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{Nom. Ppl.}} \left[ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\eta_4a \right]_{\text{V. 3sg. pret.}} \left[ \left( \right) \right. \left. - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{X}}_{\text{Subj. NP}} \)

This template gives all the necessary information from a metrical, morphological and syntactic point of view. It is also possible to use the same type of template to describe its information structure:

Pattern \( x \) (pragmatics)  
\( \left[ - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{Contr. Top.}} \left[ \left( \right) \right. \left. - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{Nom. Ppl.}} \left[ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\eta_4a \right]_{\text{V. 3sg. pret.}} \left[ \left( \right) \right. \left. - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{X}}_{\text{Contr. Top.}} \)

What has just been described through Bozzone’s template is a pattern. Its structure is partially lexically filled, but it can also be turned into a lexicically empty template:

Pattern \( x \)

Apart from some minor alterations – namely the different case of the pronoun and the prosody of the participle – the lexically empty pattern above is reproduced in the following formulae, where \( \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\eta_4a \) is replaced by a different verb with the same prosody:

\[ \text{τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὡκός Ἀχιλλέως} \]

\[ \text{τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη Διός ἄλκιμος υἱός} \]

\[ \text{τὸν δ’ ἄρ’ ὑπόδρα ἰδὸν προσέφη πόδας ὡκός Ἀχιλλέως} \]

It is therefore possible to identify sub-patterns within the pattern at hand. They can be here represented with the following templates:

Sub-Patt. \( x.1 \)  
\( \left[ - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{Dat. Pr. Contr. Top.}} \left[ \left( \right) \right. \left. - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{Nom. Ppl.}} \left[ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\eta_4a \right]_{\text{V. 3sg. pret.}} \left[ \left( \right) \right. \left. - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{X}}_{\text{Nom. Cont. Top. NP}} \)

Sub-Patt. \( x.2 \)  
\( \left[ - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{Acc. Pr. Contr. Top.}} \left[ \left( \right) \right. \left. - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{Nom. Ppl. (P)}} \left[ \pi\rho\sigma\sigma\epsilon\phi_4a \right]_{\text{V. 3sg. pret.}} \left[ \left( \right) \right. \left. - \left( \right) \right]_{\text{X}}_{\text{Nom. Cont. Top. NP}} \)

Unlike Bozzone, who prefers to refer to formulae as ‘constructions’, I will keep on using the term ‘formula’, both for conventional purposes, and because I believe its connection to traditional poetry and orality is still meaningful in Homeric studies. Therefore, the definition of Parry’s

---

39 Although their higher level of abstraction calls for caution (see remarks above on Russo’s ‘structural’ formula), lexicically empty templates will be used for patterns showing an extremely regular structure, and producing what will be here called ‘sub-patterns’ (see infra).

40 Bozzone (2014: 57) usually gives two pieces of information: the syntactic role (e.g. Obj.) and, in construction-grammar terms, the surface realization (e.g. ‘NP’). Most often, I will indicate the case rather than the syntactic function, as in the template presented here for pattern \( x \). The reason lies in the fact that the same case could be used in a FP with different syntactic functions. For example, a dative which is usually in the function of indirect object might be employed with instrumental value in an AM. In cases like this, the syntactic function might be added to the indication of the case (e.g. ‘Dat.Instr.’), while the word class (e.g. ‘pr.’ for pronoun, ‘ppl.’ for participle, etc.), and, if significant, its parsing (e.g. 3sg.pret.téµavo) will usually be a secondary indication, just like for the type of phrase (e.g. ‘NP’, ‘PrP’, etc.) when a broader syntactic analysis is required.

41 Bozzone (2014: 35), by way of contrast, prefers to give it up because it “carries with it too many connotations”, including those of traditionality and orality. However, I believe these connotations should still be kept in mind when analysing the Homeric language. A comparison with the mechanisms of ordinary language can be useful in the analysis...
Homeric formula can now be modified with the integrations presented throughout the present section: a Homeric formula is a group of words, and part of a FP where it shares relatable metrical and linguistic features (i.e. prosody, syntactic structure, essential/thematic semantics, and discourse functions) with other formulae of the same pattern. In different terms, a formula is here considered as the concrete realisation of a FP (or sub-pattern), which graphically translates into a fully lexically-filled template. Therefore, a formula exemplifying part of the above-mentioned sub-pattern \(x.2\) can be represented as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Acc. Pr. Cont. Top.} & \quad \text{Nom. Ppl.} \\
\tau \delta \nu & \quad \delta' \alpha \pi \alpha \mu \beta \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \nu \sigma \eta \theta \zeta \omicron \alpha & \quad \text{V. 3sg. pret.}
\end{align*}
\]

The construction above is a formula not only because it is frequently repeated as part of the Homeric repertoire, but also because it can be linked to a productive FP. As can be inferred from the definition given above, repetition is not a necessary condition of a formula. Repetition is obviously a useful criterion when considering whether a formula is traditional, but I will use the term ‘formula’ even for phrases or sentences occurring just once in the Homeric corpus, as long as they can be shown to be generated from a specific FP. This conclusion is due both to the consideration of patterns as the true units of formulaic diction, and to the fact that a formula occurring once in the Homeric poems might still have been used elsewhere in the large portion of archaic epic poetry which is now lost (cf. §2.1).

\textbf{§2.3 Criteria and metrical-linguistic analysis}

The type of templates presented in the previous section will therefore be used to give a thorough description of FPs, sub-patterns and formulae. This will be crucial to identify AMs within FPs, and to describe them at every metrical-linguistic layer. As already illustrated, the structure from which an AM derives is here called starting point (SP). Most of the time, it will be possible to illustrate how an AM arose from a SP pattern or sub-pattern. The highest level of accuracy of my method consists in proving the derivation of a formula containing a long-augmented verb from another specific formula containing its vernacular counterpart. As can be expected, this is hard to achieve due to the nature of the Homeric oral tradition, in which authorship and textual referentiality are blurred concepts. It is ultimately impossible, and arguably pointless, to identify a single ‘moment of origin’ of a long-augmented form like \(\epsilon \iota \delta \iota \eta\) or \(\epsilon \iota \sigma \alpha \nu\). I will offer a plausible SP formula in Ch. 5 for the creation of \(\epsilon \iota \kappa \rho \omicron\), while the other case-studies will be shown to be part of AMs within broader patterns or sub-patterns.

\[^{noted} of epic diction as a ‘Saussurean’ langue (cf. Kahane 2018: 87-93), but there are still significant differences to consider due to its nature of Kunstsprache meant for performances in front of an audience.\]
Thanks to the concept of formulaic pattern, it is possible to explain in different terms why no SP can essentially be found in a formulaic system like the following:

\[ \theta\varepsilon\acute{a} \gamma\lambdaωκ\kappa\acute{o}π\acute{e}ς \Lambda\theta\acute{h}νη \]
\[ τ\dot{\o}ν \delta \acute{h}με\i\acute{e}βετ \acute{e}πε\i\acute{i}τα \]
\[ βο\i\acute{h}ν \acute{a}γα\i\acute{h}δ\acute{o}ς Με\i\acute{e}ν\i\acute{l}αος \]
\[ (\rho)\acute{a}να\acute{z} \acute{a}ν\d\acute{o}ρ\acute{o}ν \acute{A}γα\i\acute{m}\acute{e}μ\acute{v}νον \]

Which formula started the extremely productive and regular system of noun-epithet constructions in the nominative after 3b and starting with a consonant? The reason why no certain solution can be given lies in the fact that they share the same structure from a metrical, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic point of view\(^\text{42}\), while differing only for their reference to a specific hero or deity. All the three second-hemistich instances above can therefore be described with the same structural pattern:

\[
[[(-\mid\rightarrow\rightarrow\sim 5a)_{\text{Nom.Mod.}} \mid ((-\mid\rightarrow\rightarrow\times6c)_{\text{Nom.Cont.Top.}})]_{\text{Nom.NP}}
\]

Our template confirms Parry’s (1928: 85) conclusion that trying to find the original formula in systems as coherent as those of noun-epithet formulae is impossible and, ultimately, pointless.

Therefore, the question to answer now is in what cases a certain directionality can be described among formulae belonging to the same pattern. Although Hainsworth (1968) does not provide an exact methodology to identify the ‘primary’ form of an AM, several scattered observations in his study on the flexible formula seem to provide specific guidelines\(^\text{43}\). The criterion of frequency, for example, is clearly followed in certain cases\(^\text{44}\), while he explains some other modifications as forced upon the poet due to the demands of the metre\(^\text{45}\). The former criterion is likely to be the first one that comes to mind, as it is straightforward to presume that a frequent formula is traditional. An immediate conclusion would therefore be that high frequency and low frequency should characterise, respectively, a traditional SP and its AM. There are, however, two considerations which argue against such a conclusion:

\(^{42}\) Cf. Bakker 1997: 159-73 for an important addition of discourse elements to the semantic value of these noun-epithet formulae – in particular, the function of “staging” formulae, and the “epiphany” of the hero or deity.

\(^{43}\) Before Hainsworth’s flexible formula, Hoekstra’s study (1965) had already provided an analysis of AMs in Homer with a distinction between the ‘traditional’ structure (or position) and its ‘alteration’. The aim of his work, however, was to identify pre-Homeric prototypes, whereas the area of investigation of this thesis is mostly concerned with the diachrony of the Ionian bards’ oral composition, or its rhapsodic re-elaboration.

\(^{44}\) For instance, the position of words with shape \([-\mid\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim]\) between 4c and 6c is assumed as original by Hainsworth (1968: 59) because of the very low number of exceptions.

\(^{45}\) Cf. Hainsworth 1968: 61, who explains that a modification by the bard can either result from a personal choice “to ease the use of a formula”, or from a certain pressure due to compositional necessities. In the latter scenario, the modification forced upon the poet (e.g. by the use of a formula in an unusual case-form) is “a response to an emergency in composition and in no way part of the regular stock of formulae” \((i\acute{b}i\acute{d}.)\).
- AMs can also produce fairly frequent patterns of their own – e.g. the system comprising the frequent ἤϊ-forms of the imperfect of ἔμυ, which I take as the result of an AM in Ch. 4.

- Although the consideration of the relevant occurrences is quite useful for my research, a vast portion of epic poetry is now lost.

Despite these problems, it is fairly safe to assume that an isolated occurrence in the Homeric poems can be strong evidence for an AM, especially if it is part of a highly frequent SP pattern. This criterion, however, will be impossible to use in cases where the frequency of the alleged SP and that of its AM do not differ significantly. In general, as I will show, a metrical-linguistic analysis is always needed, while frequency will often serve to corroborate the results.

The criterion of frequency, at the same time, calls for the inclusion of another factor: memory. As noticed by Hainsworth (1976), specific constructions tend to be found only in a limited portion of the Homeric poems, such as a few continuous books, the same book, or even a short group of lines. This phenomenon, called ‘clustering’ by Hainsworth, seems to suggest that memory can play an important role in the frequency of usage of specific expressions. Although single authorship is extremely hard to define within the oral tradition of the Homeric poems, it is fair to assume that formulae concentrated within limited textual portions hint at least at a specific branch of the oral or rhapsodic tradition itself. I will follow this methodology for a few AMs, but limit its application to conclusions reached through philological investigation and the metrical-linguistic analysis of FPs.

As for the pressure of metrics, the structure of the hexameter clearly needs to be considered in the analysis of FPs, as already argued in the discussion on Kiparsky’s view (see §2.2). At the same time, metrics is only part of the competence of Homeric poets; explaining the origin of an AM solely

46 E.g. [γέρων Πρίαμος θεοειδῆς], used exclusively in book 24 of the Iliad, or [στρατὸν εὐρύν], whose usage is concentrated between Il. 1.229 and 4.436 (7x), except for two isolated occurrences in Il. 19.196 and 24.199.

47 Cf. Hainsworth 1976: 86: “An expression, once having come to the surface of the mind and been used, tends to remain there for some time and be used again before it sinks into oblivion”. Later on, Janko (1981) added more examples from the repertoire of noun-epithet formulae to explain the apparent anomaly of equivalence for some of them (cf. §2.1 and n. 21).

48 This assumption does not attempt to revive the approach of Neoanalysis to the Homeric text (for its history, cf. Willcock 1997; Edwards 2011). More generically, the history of the Homeric text implies that different oral branches and rhapsodic re-elaborations combined in the final result. It is ultimately irrelevant to the present research whether such branches should be identified with the tradition of multiple poets, or with the work of one alone, just as it is probably impossible, and often pointless, to delineate specific chronological layers of the Homeric composition. Cf. Janko 1981: 251, commenting on Hainsworth’s concept of ‘clustering’: “The discovery of such behaviour in the traditional poetry of Homer is not surprising, however that poetry was composed” (emphasis is mine).

49 Cf. Ch. 4 §3.2.1.2 on ἤῖα; Ch. 5 §2.4 on ἤῖκτο.
with the demands of the metre may give a partial view. The analysis of FPs aims to confirm the derivation of AMs from SP structures through an analysis of Homeric metrics, semantics, morphology, syntax, and pragmatics. These are the different layers described in the previous section, and included in the type of templates which will be used in the analysis of FPs.

The rigour of this type of research is sometimes missing in Hainsworth’s study, as can be shown from a few examples. For instance, Hainsworth’s (1968: 61) consideration of [ἀκροτάτης πόλιος] in II. 20.52 as a modification of the phrase [πόλει ἄκρη] is too limited. The reason for the change, according to Hainsworth, is twofold. The poet needs to shift the typically verse-final formula [πόλει ἄκρη] into a different position, and just as in the case of [πόλει ἄκρη] in II. 22.172 he opts for a superlative to fit the adjective before a certain caesura. In the case of [ἀκροτάτης πόλιος], however, the poet is also compelled to use the genitive because of the syntactic context (i.e. the preposition κατά). Since [*πόλος ἄκρητης] would be unmetrical, Hainsworth explains the inversion of the traditional word-order as a modification ‘forced upon’ the poet.

On the one hand, both frequency and morphology seem to favour Hainsworth’s hypothesis. The phrase [ἀκροτάτης πόλιος] occurs only once, as opposed to the highly frequent [πόλει ἄκρη], and it has exactly the same words inflected in a different case, while the adjective is also used in a different degree. According to Hainsworth, the modifications are therefore inflection and inversion, as well as change of position in the hexameter. A closer look, however, allows us to detect elements which escaped Hainsworth’s analysis. Let us first consider all the occurrences of [πόλει ἄκρη], i.e. the alleged SP:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{νηὸν Ἀθηναίης γλαυκώπιδος} & \text{ ἐν πόλει ἄκρη} \\
\text{II. 6.88} \\
\text{αἵ δ’ ὅτε νηὸν ἴκανον Ἀθηνη} & \text{ἐν πόλει ἄκρη} \\
\text{II. 6.297} \\
\text{ἐγγύθι τε Πριάμῳ καὶ Ἐκτορῳ ἐν πόλει ἄκρη} & \\
\text{II. 6.317} \\
\text{Τρώων αὐτ’ ἄγορη γένετ’ Ἰλίου ἐν πόλει ἄκρη} & \\
\text{II. 7.345}
\end{align*}
\]

One important factor which is missing from Hainsworth’s analysis is a full appreciation of the syntactic structure of the formula: [ἐν πόλει ἄκρη]. The presence of the preposition is crucial not only for the locative function of the phrase, but also to create a ‘perfect’ verse-end formula with the

---

50 As suggested to me by Dr Meissner, the superlative degree is also quite useful to justify the syntactic inversion, since the semantic emphasis is more strongly put on the adjective in this degree than on the positive one. This should therefore cause the fronting of the adjective, and it is probably at the origin of ‘pattern y’, which will be analysed further below.
metrical word [ἐν πόλει] covering the dactyl of the fifth foot. The metrical-linguistic description of this SP formula can be outlined by the following template:

\[ [ἐν πόλει ἀκρηη\text{loc}]_{\text{PrepP(Loc.)}} \]

The metrical and linguistic considerations outlined above will be necessary to fully understand how and why the analogical modification [ἀκροτάτης πόλιος] has taken place. Before this, let us look at the only occurrence of [πόλει ἀκροτάτη], in order to provide a more detailed description of the reasons behind its creation:

"Ἐκτωρός, δὲς μοι πολλὰ βοῶν ἐπί μηρί’ ἐκην
Τὸς ἐν κορυφήσι πολυπτύχοι, ἄλλοτε δ’ αὐτὲ
ἐν πόλει ἀκροτάτη· νῦν αὐτὲ ἐ δίος Λχαλλεύς
Ἴστυ πέρι Πριάμιοι ποσίν ταχέεσσι διώκει\text{51}"

Il. 22.170-3

Hainsworth (1968: 61) explains this modification with “some other expression that the poet wishes to use” in l. 171. More precisely, the poet prefers to employ [ἄλλοτε δ’ αὐτές] in verse-final position, thus also shifting [ἐν πόλει ἀκρηη] from its traditional verse-final position to the beginning of the next line. Hainsworth therefore concludes that this change requires the use of the superlative to fit the formula before the caesura. At the same time, this modification can be once again described with more accuracy from a linguistic point of view by making use of the following templates:

l. 171 [Τὸς ἐν κορυφήσι]_{\text{PrepP(Loc)}} [πολυπτύχου]_{\text{Gen.Mod.}} [ἄλλοτε δ’ αὐτές]_{\text{AdvP(Temp)}}

l. 172 [ἐν πόλει ἀκροτάτη]_{\text{PrepP(Loc)}} [νῦν δ’ αὐτές]_{\text{AdvP(Temp)}}

The constructions above give a more accurate idea of how the singer has structured the two lines. After Zeus’ statement about Hector’s frequent sacrifices, the specification of where they were performed, i.e. [Τὸς ἐν κορυφήσι], is syntactically circumstantial – and essentially peripheral to the content of l. 170. On the other hand, both the metrical position and the syntactic function of the adverbial phrase [ἄλλοτε δ’ αὐτές] are attested several times in the Homeric poems\text{52}. What the poet needs to introduce now is the contrastive locative phrase – i.e. where else Hector has performed the sacrifices. In a type of enjambment which is frequent with verse-final [ἄλλοτε δ’ αὐτές], the contrastive locative is expressed again with an [ἐν+dative] construction, i.e [ἐν πόλει ἀκροτάτη]. The traditional enjambment gives an account for the shift of [ἐν πόλει ἀκρηη] from its frequent verse-final position to the beginning of the next line. As for the use of the superlative, the safest assumption

\footnote{[my heart is mourning] for Hektor who has burned in my honour many thigh pieces of oxen on the peaks of Ida with all her folds, or again on the uttermost part of the citadel, but now the brilliant Achilleus drives him in speed of his feet around the city of Priam”}.

\footnote{Often with [ἄλλοτε (μὲν)] at the beginning of the same line: \text{Il.} 18.159, 18.472, 24.10; \text{Od.} 4.102, 11.303, 16.209.}
is Hainsworth’s consideration of metrics: the singer used it to fill up the space up to the medial caesura. At the same time, semantics and discourse might also help us explain [ἀκροτάτης]. On the one hand, given the contrastive force of [ἐν πόλει] to [(Ἴδης) ἐν κορυφήσις], the singer might have used a superlative to ‘match’ the high elevation of Mount Ida, thus also obtaining a ‘vertical’ correspondence of near-equivalent prosodical extensions. On the other hand, a certain thematic connotation might have been carried by the word κορυφή used in the first line, as shown for example by the occurrences of [ἀκροτάτη κορυφής πολυδειράδος Οὐλύμποι] in Il. 1.499, 5.754, 8.3. This might also have triggered the use of the superlative [ἀκροτάτης] in Il. 22.172.

So far, we have just contributed with a more accurate description of linguistic features in describing AMs. The only correction to Hainsworth’s exposition has been the important consideration of ἐν in the FP. For the rest, the AM starting from [πόλει ἀκρη] has been ultimately confirmed. The analysis of [ἀκροτάτης πόλιος], however, will offer an alternative conclusion to Hainsworth’s. Let us first look at its only occurrence:

οξὺ κατ’ ἀκροτάτης πόλιος Τρώεσσι κελεύων

Il. 20.52

Firstly, it is again necessary to integrate Hainsworth’s analysis with a complete syntactic structure: the whole modified formula is actually the prepositional phrase [κατ’ ἀκροτάτης πόλιος]. Moreover, Hainsworth failed to notice a FP to which the occurrence above can easily be linked – and in which it can be included with the label of passage d:

a. Il. 13.12

ὑψω ἐπ’ ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς Σάμου υλήσσης

b. Il. 14.157

Ζηνᾶ δ’ ἐπ’ ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς πολυπίδακος "Ἰδῆς"

c. Il. 6.470

δεινὸν ἅπ’ ἀκροτάτης κόρυθος νεύοντα νοήσας

d. Il. 20.52

ὁξὺ κατ’ ἀκροτάτης πόλιος Τρώεσσι κελεύων

---

53 “From the peak of the citadel urging the Trojans sharply on”.

54 Hainsworth (1968: 61) only hints at the syntax of the passage without describing it fully: “The context at another time might suggest the genitive singular for which the poet has no regular formula at hand to use or to modify”.

55 “Aloft on top of the highest summit of timbered Samos”.

56 “[She saw] Zeus, [sitting] along the loftiest summit on Ida of the springs”.

57 “[the crest with its horse-hair] nodding dreadfully, as he thought, from the peak of the helmet”.

58 See n. 53.
At its most inclusive and abstract level, the pattern underlying all the passages above can be represented as follows:

**Pattern y:**\[ \text{Prep. } \text{κατ' } \text{ἀκροτάτης } \text{πόλιος} \text{4a} \] \text{Gen.Mod.NP/Nom.PplP}

It is then possible to identify two sub-patterns thanks to the peripheral constituents following 4a: one with a phrase modifying the prepositional phrase in the genitive, and another one containing a participial phrase referring to the subject. The passage containing [κατ’ ἀκροτάτης πόλιος4a] obviously belongs to the latter sub-pattern, while in y.c\[59\] the preposition [ἀπ’1c] and the gen. κόρυθος4a clearly echo, respectively, [ἐπ’1c] and [κορυφῆς4a] of y.a and y.b.

**Sub-Pattern y.a-b**\[ [[ἐπ’1c]Prep. [ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς4a]] PrepP(Loc.) [[κόρυθος4a] Gen.Mod.NP/Nom.PplP]

**Sub-Pattern y.c-d**\[ [[κατ’1c]Prep. [ἀκροτάτης πόλιος4a]] PrepP(Loc.) [[κατ’ ἀκροτάτης πόλιος4a] Gen.Mod.NP/Nom.PplP]

In conclusion, the word order of [κατ’ ἀκροτάτης πόλιος4a] is not an ‘inversion’ of a primary [ἐν πόλει ἄκρη], but rather an analogical result within the FP described above. The consideration of ἀκροτάτης πόλιος as an AM is obviously due to its relatively isolated features within the FP, namely the use of the preposition [κατ’1c] and of the noun [πόλιος4a] – as opposed to the echoing features of passage y.c outlined above. This shows how frequency and metrical-linguistic analysis can be intricately related. At the same time, the connection between the adjective ἄκρος and the noun πόλις clearly plays an important role in the creation of this AM. More specifically, the use of a form of πόλις together with a form of ἄκρος was part of the traditional repertoire of the singer. Therefore, the bond of mutual expectancy of Hainsworth’s flexible formula is not to be discarded, but rather to be used as a possible analogical model of the modification within the FP. At the same time, in order to have a better understanding of the AM [κατ’ ἀκροτάτης πόλιος4a], it is necessary to look at the different layers of the actual structure in which it is used. This allows us to see that it did not directly originate from an inversion of [πόλει ἄκρη], nor does it seem to result from some metrical constriction forced upon the poet. It is instead an AM within what has been called ‘pattern y’.

**82.4 Artificial creations**

After describing how the metrical-linguistic analysis of FPs can help us identify AMs, we can now turn to the specific contexts which will be analysed in the present thesis. On the one hand, they offer a more solid ground for the application of the method, since the artificial nature of long-augmented

---

\[59\] In the analysis of FPs, I will always indicate the passages with the letter referring to the pattern (the one in this section, for example, is labelled ‘y’), and the letter identifying the specific passage itself (in this case: ‘c’). To avoid confusion, patterns will be indicated with Greek letters from Chapter 3 on. The FPs analysed in Ch. 3-6 and all their related passages are outlined in Appendix II.
forms might be spotted more easily thanks to plain oddities due to ‘later’ (and sometimes awkward) AMs. At the same time, the new criteria introduced here will call for further caution, due to the synchronic and diachronic complexity of the Homeric language.

The presence of artificially created forms can be a useful hint of a later AM, since they were functional to hexametric composition as metrical variants to their corresponding forms in the spoken language. This means that they were created to solve certain metrical exigencies, and it is logical to assume that the FPs which had counterparts in speech preceded ones that did not. For example, the addition of -ἐσσι to sigmatic stems (e.g. ἐπέσσι) provided a useful variant to be used in FPs, as shown by the following examples:

δώροισίν τ’ ἄγανοίσιν ἐπέσσι τε μελίχησι I. 9.113
αἴνως γὰρ μύθοισιν ἐπέσσι τε σοῖσιν ἀκόουσ Od. 4.597
εἰ δ’ ἂν ἐμοίς ἐπέκεσσι πιθώμεθα κηδόμενοι περ I. 18.273
σῆ τ’ ἄγανοφροσύνη καὶ σοῖς ἄγανοίς ἐπέκεσσι I. 24.772

These lines show a clear distribution between ἐπέσσι and ἐπέκεσσι: the former is used after datives in -οισι(ν), the latter after datives in -οις. The following sub-patterns can therefore be identified:

Sub-Pattern 1 [-οισι(ν) (ρ)ἐπεσσι]
Sub-Pattern 2 [-οις (ρ)ἐπεκεσσι]

As already pointed out, the latter is supposed to have originated from the former as the artificial solution to cases where the poet could not use the pre-existing spoken form.

Another important principle, already outlined by Parry (1932: 20), is that the current Ionic dialect is always preferred whenever the metre allows for it\(^{60}\). Not only is this useful to reconstruct the ordinary language of the Ionian bards\(^{61}\), but it also implies that an artificial form was used as a licence to fit the metre when the bards’ dialect could offer no solution. This obviously represents a considerable advantage for our formula-based method, but the identification of a form as kunstsprachlich is not always straightforward, as shown by the debate within the scholarship on the Homeric long-augmented forms. For this reason, in the following chapters the formula-based analysis

\(^{60}\) This is also strongly supported by Crespo (1997). He even provides a specific order of preference, according to which the vernacular forms are always the first choice if they can fit the hexameter. Otherwise, according to Crespo, artificial forms are created and generally preferred both to archaisms (cf. Hom. διεktasis and its interpretation in Ch. 3 §2.2) and foreign forms, both kept only as a last option. Crespo (1997: 133-5) also argues, though with more caution, that non-Ionic elements seem to be preferred to archaisms. At the same time, Crespo himself admits that the identification of certain forms as archaic or non-Ionic is not always easy, and the scholarship on the Homeric LA analysed in Ch. 1 §2.1 has shown that the same difficulty can be met in the distinction between archaisms and artificial forms.

\(^{61}\) Cf. Ch. 1 §2.4.1, where the lack of forms with QM, which could perfectly be used in the hexameter, has been interpreted as a feature of the Ionian bards’ ordinary language.
will always be preceded by a discussion of historical phonology and morphology, and a consideration of the attestations of the long-augmented forms. I will demonstrate that interpreting them as kunstsprachlich is more plausible on philological grounds, and their use limited to hexameter poetry (or poetry inspired by it) will corroborate this conclusion. The formula-based method will then show why and how these artificial forms were created and used as metrically functional alternatives in AMs. More specifically, it will be shown how an artificial long-augmented verb may derive from a corresponding verb without LA in the SP, and why the creation of such a variant was necessary for the structure of the AM.

A final question is whether the ‘chronology’ of certain linguistic features can be used to prove the derivation of an AM from a specific SP. This is clearly an area where caution is most necessary, given the complex diachrony and synchrony of the Homeric language. For example, the metrical consideration of digamma is not necessarily sufficient to identify an archaic formula, since the conservatism of Homeric diction allowed the poets to employ linguistic usages which were no longer productive in their ordinary language – mainly because anachronistic features would still be preserved in FPs, thus being also ‘reusable’. At the same time, however, the neglect of digamma can represent a strong hint for a later AM, especially if its presence is metrically relevant in the alleged SP. Nonetheless, the problem of the complex diachrony of the Homeric language remains, and the chronology of specific linguistic features is still open to debate. Problems relating to the layering of the Homeric language will be addressed when the analysis of a passage requires the consideration of specific linguistic features, namely metrical neglect/consideration of original consonants or clusters, and morphological and syntactic features which can be ascribed with certainty to a later stage of the Ionic tradition. If a passage $x$, considered as a possible AM, contains any feature which may be ascribed to a later stage of Homeric composition, while a passage $y$, considered as the hypothetical SP, does not contain such features, this will be taken as further evidence that $x$ may have derived from $y$.

In conclusion, the method described here aims to confirm the artificial character of Homeric long-augmented verbs by showing that they are used as metrically convenient alternatives to their counterparts in the vernacular. This implies that the formulaic structures containing the verbs with a LA will be shown to be AMs from pre-existing SPs, and that the metrical/morphological structure of long-augmented verbs is crucial to explaining the origin of the AMs in which they are contained. A thorough metrical-linguistic analysis of FPs will be corroborated by the distribution of occurrences

---

outside Homer, and by their frequency in the Homeric poems. An analysis of historical linguistics will always precede the investigation of FPs, so as to show the impossibility of long-augmented verbs in the vernacular, while the dynamics and reasons behind their creation will be illustrated through the templates exemplified in §2.3, which allow for an accurate description of the relationship between SPs and AMs.
Chapter 3
Hom. ἡείδη, ἡείδης

The Homeric language offers the anomalous 3rd sg. ἡείδη/-ει and 2nd sg. ἡείδης/-εις\(^1\) within the paradigm of the ppf. of οἶδα. Each of them is attested only once:

ἡδῶν ἀκηράσιον, θείων ποτόν: οὐδὲ τις αὐτὸν

ἡείδη διμῶν οὐδ’ ἀμφιπόλον ἐνί οἶκῳ\(^2\)

*Od. 9.205-6*

ἡμβροτες, οὐδ’ ἀρα πώ τι θεοὶ ἐπείκελ’ Ἀχιλλεύ

ἐκ Διὸς ἡείδης τὸν ἐμὸν μόρον, ἦ τοι ἐφής γε.\(^3\)

*II. 22.279-80*

As seen in Ch. 1 §2.1, §2.2, these forms were frequently quoted by the scholars who supported the existence of a LA before digamma. This chapter will include a brief description of the Homeric ppf. of οἶδα, followed by a discussion of the various hypotheses on ἡείδη/-ης. The consideration of these forms as artificial creations will be here preferred not only for reasons of phonology and morphology, but also through an analysis of the FPs to which the two passages above can be linked. This chapter will also offer a preliminary consideration of hypothetical relations between ἡείδη/-ης and other Homeric long-augmented forms.

§1. The Homeric pluperfect of οἶδα

§1.1 The paradigm

In the Homeric poems, the ppf. of οἶδα shows three types of formation:

1. The ‘alpha-thematic’ type\(^4\) (or ‘hiatus’ type) in the singular (ἡδεα, ἡδεε, ἡδει).

---

\(^1\) From here on, both forms will be reported as ἡείδη and ἡείδης (i.e. the most frequent variants in the editions of the Homeric poems) for conventional reasons, unless the alternation of the endings is important for the discussion at hand. The same will be done for the 3rd sg. form without LA, i.e. ἡδη.

\(^2\) “Sweet, unmixed [wine …]; it was a divine drink. Not a single servant in his house, man or woman knew of this wine”.

\(^3\) “You missed; and it was not, o Achilleus like the immortals, from Zeus that you knew my destiny; but you thought so”.

\(^4\) Several hypotheses have been proposed for the origin of this formation. Brugmann (1880: 16) reconstructed an original *-esα- and took it to be related to Lat. ppf. -ēra-, while also comparing ἡδα with Skt. avedīsam (but the original Greek *-es- seems incompatible with the suffix of Skt. aorists in -iṣ- and Lat. -ēr- < *-is-). Meillet-Vendryes (1948: 217), starting from the stem ἡείδη- which Wackernagel (1897: 45) had reconstructed for ἡδη and connected to Lat. vidēre, attributed the origin of the whole alpha-thematic type to the ppf. of οἶδα, specifically to the allomorph ἡείδε- resulting from the shortening of -η- before vocalic endings (e.g. ἡδεα < *geidē-a, cf. also Chantraine 1961: 202). Berg’s theory (1977: 233-
2. The ‘η-type’, which is found only for the 2nd and 3rd sg (η̃ονη/η̃ειονη, η̃ειονς, η̃ονηθα)⁵.

3. A zero-grade *γιο- in 3rd pl ἵσαν, which is the only form attested in Homer for the plural⁶.

The full range of the paradigm can be observed in Table II, which also provides a comparison with the oldest forms attested in Attic. Apart from the two occurrences with a seemingly LA, the stem ἴο- is the near-universal one for the Homeric ppf. of ὀλον (cf. §1.2). As for the endings, the peculiar 3rd sg. ἴον occurs 20 times (and in the compound περίηον once in Od. 17.317). The 2nd sg. ἴονθα(α)⁷ is attested only in Od. 19.93, but it is also found in older Attic (e.g. Plato Euthyphro 15d.4). As for the alpha-thematic type, the uncontracted forms in the singular are attested 6 times in 3 sg. ἴοεε(ν)⁸, and 4 times in 1st sg. ἴοε(α)⁹, so that an unattested 2 sg. *-εας can be reconstructed for the Homeric alpha-thematic paradigm. The same type is also represented by ἴετα, which is only found as a v.l. of ἴον in the manuscripts. The latter has been often the preferred variant in textual criticism, due to its

---

⁵ Chantraine (1961: 202) has considered this form as old, but the second eta might be analogical either to Hom. 3rd sg. -η or to the later contraction into -η of 1st and 2nd sg. forms of the ppf. Accordingly, ἴονθα occurs only once in the Odyssey, while it is attested later on in Classical Greek authors (cf. Katz 2006: 10 n. 25).

⁶ ἴοε (before consonant) in II. 2.409, 2.832, 11.330, 17.402, ἴοεν (before vowel) in II. 18.404, Od. 23.29. The form ἴοεε also occurs in a fragment attributed to Hesiod (198.5 Merkelbach-West).

---

⁷ Chantraine (1961: 202) has considered this form as old, but the second eta might be analogical either to Hom. 3rd sg. -η or to the later contraction into -η of 1st and 2nd sg. forms of the ppf. Accordingly, ἴονθα occurs only once in the Odyssey, while it is attested later on in Classical Greek authors (cf. Katz 2006: 10 n. 25).

⁸ ἴοε (before consonant) in II. 2.409, 2.832, 11.330, 17.402, ἴοεν (before vowel) in II. 18.404, Od. 23.29. The form ἴοεε also occurs in a fragment attributed to Hesiod (198.5 Merkelbach-West).
presence in the best MSS, and its status as *lectio difficile*10. This alternation between ἤδη and ἤδει in the textual tradition will have little relevance to the discussion on the LA, as will be seen below. For now it can be observed that the relevant scholarship generally agrees on interpreting ἤδει as the contraction of an older -ἐε11, continued unchanged by ἤδει in Homer and Herodotus12. Similarly, the only attestation of 1st sg. -εα in the *Iliad* once again belongs to the pff. of οἶδα (ἥδεα in *II. 8.366, 14.71), while the *Odyssey* also contains ἣνώγεα (3x), ἐκεθήπεα (1x) and πεποίθεα (2x). Finally, the pff. of οἶδα is also the only one showing 2nd sg. forms in Homer: ἣείδης and ἤδησθ(α)13.

§1.2 The peculiarities, and their relevance to the present research

The main points of debate on this pff. have been its stem and the Hom. 3rd sg ending -η. As for the first matter, the aim has generally been to justify the e-grade of the stem in the singular14. The scholars explaining the pff. of οἶδα as a stative form in *-εθερ* have mostly suggested an original zero grade *νιδε*.15 Berg (1977: 247-9) even proposed that the original text contained EIDE for *npos* (with the last syllable long by position before διμών in *Od. 9.206*), and that in the later *metakharacterismos* the possible variant ἤειδη was preferred. It is not clear, however, how an *Urtext* form EID- could yield the two long syllables ‘ηειδ’ as a possible misunderstanding. Considering this issue and the evidence in the Homeric textual tradition, the stem (p)εδα- should be considered as the Ionic synchronic ablaut for the Homeric pff. sg. of οἶδα. Even if a zero grade were accepted as original for the singular, no Homeric passage seems to suggest its earlier existence in the oral tradition16.

10 Cf. Schrijver 1999: 265. It should also be noticed that there is no attestation of ἤδη outside Homer (cf. Katz 2006: 10 n. 25), and that in the archaic Greek literature spanning from Homer to Hesiod a certain (i.e. with no variants) ἤδει is attested only in *Hymn Ven. 207* and *Hes. 43a.52 Merkelbach-West*.
12 Hdt. 1.45.3 (cf. n. 34); 2.100.3; 9.94.2.
14 In Homer the ablaut of the athematic (and non-kappatic) pluperfect is usually o-grade (e.g. γεγόνει, ἐπεκοίνισε) or lengthened grade (e.g. μεμήλει, τεθήπει) in the singular.
15 Cf. n. 5. Berg (1977: 240-56) also hypothesised a zero grade as the intermediate step in the evolution of the pff. of οἶδα from an original o-grade, e.g. *(e)goide > *(e)ide > *(e)idee* (cf. n. 4 for the evolution of the endings). Willi (2018: 225 n. 53) cautiously suggests that Berg’s theory might be valid if one accepted an analogy with the second aorist δόδον thanks to the presence of a zero grade *uid- in the pff. pl. as well. Among those who disagree with a reconstructed zero grade, Hackstein (2002: 256-9) stands out for his isolated interpretation of the pff. of οἶδα as an original root aorist built to *yeid-, and used as the past tense of οἶδα.
16 Cf. Ruijgh 2004: 54: “Already before Homer’s time the stem *pidoθ-* had been replaced by *pidoθ-*. It might be argued that verse-initial ήδειν before vowel might underlie an original ήδεις’ (cf. Katz 2006: 10 n. 25), but there are only two
Once the e-grade can be established for the singular of the Homeric ppf. of ὀἶδα, the only visible issues with its occurrences are the maintenance (or neglect) of initial digamma, and the consistent attestation of augmented ἱ- in the written tradition. On the one hand, it would be quite easy to posit an original ἑρεῖδη for all the instances of ἱδη¹⁷, since it occurs either after a vowel or after verse-initial ὅς – an original preservation of digamma would prevent hiatus in the former case and make position in the latter. At the same time, the near-unique attested form in papyri and manuscripts is ἱδη²⁻¹⁸, which seems to show an analogical temporal augmentation due to loss of initial digamma (cf. Ch. 1 §2.2). Hackstein (2002: 257-8), on the other hand, derives ἱδη from an original ἐ(ϝ)ειδη through Brugmann-Schwyzer’s dissimilation (cf. Ch. 1 n. 57, and Ch. 5 §2.2). However, the Homeric use of forms like ἢειδε clearly disproves the validity of ἱδη < ἐ(ϝ)είδη. More specifically, why was ἐ(ϝ)ειδε preserved, especially in verse-final position, while every hypothetical ἐ(ϝ)ειδη underwent contraction even if not required by the metre? The possibility of verse-final ἐ(ϝ)ειδη occurring instead of ἱδη after (elided) vowel is quite frequent in the Homeric text, and yet only ἱδη-ει is found in the textual tradition.

It seems therefore more plausible to see in ἱδη an analogical temporal augmentation. This process must have happened relatively early, given the near-complete absence of εἰδη in the textual tradition. An analogue ῥεῖδη could have arisen and be deployed in the FPs of the ppf. of ὀἶδα¹⁹, especially considering the persistence of linguistic usages in Homeric FPs even after their disappearance from the current ordinary language²⁰. Secondly, as already observed in Ch. 1 §2.2 for the group 2 verbs, several instances of inherited temporal augments (e.g. ἱα, ἱγον) could serve as early models for ἱδη. A possible addition is the augmented impf. of εἰμι, whose stem was identified with ἱ- in the Ionic dialect (see Ch. 4 §1.3), and whose paradigm shows intertwined connections with the ppf. of ὀἶδα (cf. §2.1). Finally, another factor which might have supported the spread of ἱδη was the usefulness of a temporal augment to distinguish the morphology of the ppf. of ὀἶδα more clearly.

¹⁸ The variant εἰδη is found only for two passages: in Vaticanus Palat. 6 (14th cent.) as a correction in rasura for ἱδη of II. 1.70 (cf. Allen 1931a: 4; West 1998: 8); in Monac. gr. 519 B (13th-14th cent.) instead of ἱδησθ’ of Od. 19.93 (cf. West 2017: 398).
¹⁹ Cf. Katz 2006: 27 n. 64.
²⁰ For the same reason, it would be pointless to correct every ἱδη with ἐ(ϝ)είδη, as consistently done by West in his edition of the Iliad (1998; 2000). In particular, West (1998: xxxiii), following Wackernagel (1878: 266), considers the unaugmented ἑρεῖδη as the original form not only in virtue of all the passages where initial digamma is considered, but also because he derives ἱδη from a contraction of ἱρεῖδη. This view will be rejected in §2.1.
from the numerous forms of the same paradigm showing εἰδ- (e.g. Hom. opt. εἰδεῖν, subj. εἶδή, εἰδέτε). 

As for Hom. ἡείδη, this 3rd sg. can be related either to the η-type or the alpha-thematic type seen above, depending on whether the variant showing -η (ἡείδη) or the one with -ει (ἡείδει) are accepted from the textual tradition. Similarly, it is possible both for ἡδη and ἡδεῖ to be the underlying form in all the Homeric occurrences of the 3rd sg without LA. Furthermore, that the ending -ει was no longer considered as a biceps (from contraction of -εε) in Homer, but rather as a single long syllable, is clearly shown by its frequent occurrences in the arsis of the second foot (e.g. βεβλήκει 7x, ἐστήκει 6x) or in verse-final position (e.g. (ἐ)βεβήκει 34x, ὄρωρει 26x, ἐφίκει 12x)21. Consequently, even if we accepted -η as the older ending in the Homeric language, the variant -ει could still have replaced it at a later time during the oral tradition in any of the occurrences of ἡδη. This also implies that Od. 9.205 could originally have had either ἡείδη or ἡείδει, as they were both part of the traditional repertoire.

As for the 2nd sg form in Il. 22.280, the variant ἡείδες, though much more widely attested, seems strikingly late. In particular, no 1st sg p pf. in -εν is attested in Homer, and the only other 2nd sg. p pf. form is ἡδηθ(α) in Od. 19.93. Although this could easily be replaced by ἡδης or ἡδεῖς, neither variant is attested in the textual tradition22. Consequently, the later analogy in the p pf. of 1st sg. -εν and 2nd sg. -ες from 3rd sg. -ει (cf. Appendix I n. 4) is attestat in Homer only by the v. l. ἡείδες of Il. 22.280. It therefore seems quite a late ending, and is consequently rejected by many editors23. The variant ἡείδης, however, poses additional problems. On the one hand, if one accepts that 3rd sg. ἡδη represents an old stative formation (cf. n. 5), then 2nd sg. -ης might be further evidence for the preservation of this original paradigm in the Homeric language. At the same time, an analogy to 3rd sg. ἡδη would have been possible at any stage24, and might also confirm that ἡείδης is an artificial

---

21 Cf. Shipp 1972: 170, who considered several metrical factors to show that -ει is a contraction of -εε. Berg (1977: 228-31), on the other hand, analysed the use in verse-final position of 3rd sg. p pf. with metrical shape (ω) ω — —, and took them to be clear evidence of an original 3rd sg. with ending -ε. According to Berg, this shows that at the time of the Homeric oral composition the endings of the p pf. were still undifferentiated from those of the perf. (cf. n. 4 for this stage in his theory). See Katz 2006: 14 n. 30 for arguments against this view.

22 Cf. Ludwich 1891: 183.


creation\textsuperscript{25}, given its strong isolation. Finally, a contraction from -\varepsilon\alphaς would also seem extremely late for the Homeric language, given that all its 1\textsuperscript{st} sg. forms are uncontracted in -\varepsilon\alpha\textsuperscript{26}. Therefore, while the peculiar LA of \varepsilon\iota\iota\iota/-\varepsilon\zeta plays no role in choosing between the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-sg. endings\textsuperscript{27}, its interpretation as kunstsprachlich or sprachwirklich might be linked to the original ending for 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg. \varepsilon\iota\iota\iota/-\varepsilon\zeta if this is also considered as artificial. This possibility will be further discussed in §3.1.

\section*{2. Hypotheses on \varepsilon\iota\iota\iota(-\varepsilon\zeta)}

The interpretations of \varepsilon\iota\iota\iota and \varepsilon\iota\iota\zeta can be ultimately divided in two groups: those considering them as having a LA, and those describing them as artificial Homeric forms. This simplification is just the starting point in the analysis of the relevant scholarship, as both types of interpretation actually show diverse solutions to explain the origin of \varepsilon\iota\iota\iota.-

\subsection*{2.1 A feature of the ordinary language?}

As already seen in Ch. 1 §2.1 and §2.2, within the scholarship asserting the presence of a LA in \varepsilon\iota\iota\iota/-\varepsilon\zeta two hypotheses can be identified: an earlier one, which connects the LA of \varepsilon\iota\iota\iota/-\varepsilon\zeta to the Vedic evidence; a more recent one, which explains the LA as an inner-Greek development. Within the latter line of interpretation, Ruijgh (1971/2) and Berg (1977) have both hypothesised an origin of the Greek LA from the impf. of \varepsilon\iota\mu with a subsequent use in the ppf. of \omicron\omicron\omicron. The two theories, however, differ in describing the specific development of the analogical use of this LA.

This section will focus on Ruijgh’s (1971/2: 167) suggestion, whereas the analysis of Berg’s hypothesis will be deferred to the discussion in Ch. 4 §2.1 on whether the \varepsilon\iota-type of the impf. of \varepsilon\iota\mu can be an outcome in the ordinary language. As for Ruijgh’s theory, the complex process suggested in it can be outlined in the following stages:

\textsuperscript{25} That is, if 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. \varepsilon\iota\iota\iota was just a relic in Homer of the original stative paradigm, next to the new and productive alpha-thematic type, then the analogical creation of a 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg. -\varepsilon\zeta should not be considered sprachwirklich, but simply an artificial solution – possibly due to the impossibility of using \varepsilon\iota\iota\iota in \textit{Iliad} 22.280 (cf. §3.1).

\textsuperscript{26} Cf. Rix’s (1976: 258) cautious remark: “hom. -\varepsilon\zeta (*-eas?)”.

\textsuperscript{27} That is, the alternation between -\varepsilon and -\varepsilon ultimately remains an issue of the textual tradition. Similarly, the presence of LA \varepsilon does not affect any hypothesised evolution of the stem of the ppf. of \omicron\omicron\omicron, which is why it is usually written or reconstructed as a separate morpheme (e.g. in Jasanoff-Katz 2014: 260).
1. The analogical creation of ᾖμεν\textsuperscript{28} causes the extension of ᾖ- to the whole paradigm – with restoration of [i] to 1\textsuperscript{st} sg. ᾖα\textsuperscript{29} – and an isolated contrast between forms like ᾖμεν and unaugmented ᾖμεν (\textltt{< *hii-men}).

2. This in turn leads to the reanalysis of ᾖ- as a LA.

3. Firstly, the new LA is extended to the ppf. of οἶδα, giving forms like *ἕ(φ)ισαν (> ἱσαν ‘they knew’).

4. Secondly, disyllabic ᾖ- whose first appearance is in the ppf. of οἶδα, is extended to the impf. of εἶμι before the time of the Ionian bards’ oral composition.

The main problem of Ruijgh’s hypothesis is the confused directionality of the to-and-fro analogical processes between the two paradigms. Ruijgh attributes the emergence of a LA to the contrast between ᾖμεν and ἱμεν, which implies a reanalysis of ᾖμεν as *ἵμεν. Yet, the extension of this pronunciation is actually applied by Ruijgh to the impf. of εἶμι only at the very last stage of the process above. Furthermore, it is even harder to explain why in Homer the disyllabic pronunciation is strongly attested for the impf. of εἶμι (cf. Ch. 4 §1.2), but completely absent in the ppf. of οἶδα, whose usual augmented form is ἱδ-\textsuperscript{30}. At the same time, Ruijgh’s theory points out a strong connection between the impf. of εἶμι and the ppf. of οἶδα, which will be a crucial factor in my hypothesis on the creation and use of the Homeric LA (cf. Ch. 4 §2.2). In particular, the mutual analogical processes in stages 3-4 above, according to Ruijgh, were facilitated by the near-perfect coincidence in Homer between ἱσαν ‘they went’ and (ϝ)ίσαν ‘they knew’, and the assumed similarity of the unaugmented dual forms\textsuperscript{31}. Further correspondences are the use of the ending -σθα in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} sg. of εἶμι\textsuperscript{32}, or the later use of the endings -ειν -εις -ει in the singular of both paradigms (cf. Ch. 4 §1.1 and n. 6).

At the same time, the hypothesis supported in the present thesis will suggest a directionality opposite to that of Ruijgh’s theory. That is, it is here believed that the LA first came about as an artificial morpheme in the ppf. of οἶδα, and was then extended to the impf. of εἶμι in order to obtain artificial alternative forms. One of the reasons why ἱδ- should be considered as an artificial form

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. Ch. 4 §1.1.
\textsuperscript{29} Cf. Ch. 4 §1.1, §2.1.
\textsuperscript{30} Ruijgh seems to justify this with an ‘older’ status for the use of a LA with the ppf. of οἶδα, but this clearly causes a circular way of reasoning, especially considering that, according to his theory, the ἱ- type was first created thanks to the impf. of εἶμι.
\textsuperscript{31} This similarity can just be assumed because in Homer only (συν)ἵτην ‘they both went’ is attested, but it is easy to reconstruct a 2\textsuperscript{nd} du. *ἵτον for the impf. of εἶμι, and the dual forms *ἵτον, *ἵτην for the ppf. of οἶδα.
lies in the distribution of its attestations. Outside Homer, the only occurrences in archaic literature are represented by two fragments of Archilochus:

57.8 West
\[\text{σάντα δ ἡείδ[ει] \ μι[γ] \ ἡειδει κακ[όν]}\]

For the rest, ἡείδ- is found three times in Apollonius Rhodius (1.984, 2.822, 4.1700), once in a fragment of Moero (fr. 1.2, quoted by Athen. Deipn. 11.80), and in l. 9 of Bion’s Epithalamium of Achilles and Deidameia.

The fact that ἡειδ- occurs only in Homer and in later poetry influenced by epic diction is already a strong hint of its artificial nature, although it could still be argued that ἡειδ- was an archaic relic already in the Homeric language. This view, however, is not supported by elements of historical morphology. In particular, as already shown in Ch. 1 §2.2, there is no coherent evidence for a prothetic vowel (let alone a PIE laryngeal) in the stem *ューid-, nor can a LA be supposed as a Proto-Greek (let alone a Proto-Graeco-Aryan) morpheme. Confirmation of the artificial nature of ἡειδ- will also come from the formula-based analysis, where I will show how ἡειδη-/ς could be used as a metrically functional alternative to the other forms of the ppf. of οἶδα.

It should also be noticed that the co-existence of ἡειδη, ἡδεε and ἡδη/-ει would not be economical in the ordinary language. If they did co-exist, it would then be necessary to suppose a diachronic relationship between them. As already seen, this is perfectly possible for ἡδε(ε) and ἡδη/-ει, given that ἡδει – largely attested as a variant of ἡδη already in the Homeric textual tradition – can be interpreted as a contraction of the earlier ἡδεε (cf. §1.1), while ἡδη, if interpreted as an original stative (cf. n. 5 and §1.2), might have preceded a later alpha-thematic restructuring of the ppf. of οἶδα. A form like ἡειδη, however, can be fitted into the historical development of ancient Greek only if the stem ἡδ- is derived from it through contraction, as has been suggested by part of the relevant scholarship. Although this would make more sense than Hackstein’s use of Brugmann-Schwyzer’s dissimilation (cf. §1.2) from a phonological point of view, it seems far-fetched to derive a form so consistently attested as ἡδ- from a verbal stem occurring only in one passage of the Odyssey, and with suspiciously late or analogical endings (cf. §1.2) in one line of the Iliad. Furthermore, in order to explain the success and wide attestation of ἡδ-, one would need to posit a very early contraction of ἡειδ- after loss of digamma, which is plainly at odds with Homeric evidence such as ἐξειπε or νῆς.

35 Or the presence of different dialect forms, which is nonetheless impossible to confirm through extra-Homeric evidence.
37 And, in particular, its use in metrical positions where a long-augmented form is not a possible variant.
§2.2 Artificial ἢςιῶ-: possible explanations

As already mentioned, ἢςιῶ has also been interpreted as an artificial creation resulting from different factors. This type of interpretation has already been touched upon in the previous section, since the use of an analogical LA could perfectly be an example of creation within the Kunstsprache to meet the requirements of the metre. However, as will be seen in Ch. 4 §2.1, the ἢ- type of the impf. of ἐμί does not seem to provide a persuasive model, so that a different explanation is needed. In particular, two options remain to account for the initial ἢ- of ἢςιῶ-ης: either a LA drawn from a different analogical source, or the product of one of the different metrical-phonological processes which can be observed in the Homeric diction.

The latter view can be found in Peters’ (1997: 211 n. 14) explanation of ἢςιῶ- as the result of Homeric diektasis from ἢδ– which is itself considered by Peters as an analogical replacement of *e- jpeg-. However, the reason and mechanism of the so-called Homeric diektasis are at odds with the phonological process described by Peters. This phenomenon is mostly found in Homer for the -άω verbs, e.g. ὀρῶ, ὀράς, plus specific cases like φάς, φάνθεν38. As first argued by Wackernagel (1878), the Homeric diektasis consists in restoring the metrical shape of the archaic uncontracted form (e.g. ὀράοντες), lost after contraction (*ὁρῶντες), by inserting an assimilated short vowel before the contracted syllable (i.e. ὀρόωντες)39. While Wackernagel interpreted this as a corruption of the literary tradition, diektasis could perfectly be an artificial solution already adopted by Ionian bards for forms which by their time had undergone contraction, thus becoming unmetrical40. Consequently, in order to be acceptable, Peters’ theory needs to imply that ἢδ- was the result of a contraction, which

38 Chantraine (1973: 76) mentions three types of occurrences: those with the first vowel short, e.g. ὀρῶ; those with the first vowel long, e.g. ὀβόωντες; forms like ὀβόωσι, ὀβόωσα, μαμίωσα, which belong to verbs with an original long alpha (cf. also Monro 1891: 50-1). For other isolated examples which do not belong to the -άω verbs, cf. Monro 1891: 51 and Chantraine 1973: 81-2. The Homeric language exceptionally offers uncontracted forms of -άω verbs as well (cf. Chantraine 1973: 78-9), which have been variously explained (cf. nn. 39, 40).

39 The theories describing diektasis as a sprachwirklich phenomenon are highly unlikely both because diektasis is found nowhere else outside Homer (cf. Monro 1891: 51; Chantraine 1973: 75-6; Haug 2011: 205), and because it always reproduces the metrical shape of the uncontracted form, “according to whether the first syllable was originally short (as in ὀρᾶω) or originally long, as in ὀρᾶον” (Haug 2011: 204). Accordingly, no diektasis is found for the contraction of two short syllables, since it is not metricaly required (cf. Chantraine 1973: 77-8). Cf. also Monro 1891: 52-3, who generally agrees with Wackernagel, but thinks that the corruption actually consisted in applying the timbre of the contracted forms of everyday language, e.g. ὀρᾶ, ὀρᾶς, to the uncontracted forms known from the epic performances, e.g. ὀρᾶο ὀρᾶς. According to Monro, this would explain the exceptions to diektasis (see n. 38) as belonging to verbal forms which did not exist in ordinary speech – so that there was no model to which a diektasis could be built.

40 Cf. Crespo 1997: 132, who explains exceptions like ναυτάςα and τηλεθάοντας as belonging to verbs which simply did not exist in Ionic (cf. also Chantraine 1973: 79).
has strongly been rejected in §1.2 and §2.1. If anything, the ppf. at hand for the singers was either the original unaugmented *(p)eiôς or the form *(p)eiôς, with an analogical temporal augmentation. Furthermore, even if *(η)δ̄- were actually perceived by the Ionic poets as a contracted form, Peter’s theory would still ignore the fact that diektasis was an artificial solution for forms which had become unmetrical. An original *(ορόντες) would disrupt the structure of the hexameter after becoming *(ορόντες), so that an artificial solution like *(ορόντες) was preferred by the bards. The same, however, cannot be assumed for *(η)δ̄-, since its occurrences never show metrical inconsistencies. In addition to this, *(ηείǿς) would also be the only example of diektasis at the beginning of a word and not resulting from a contraction contemporary to the Ionian bards, as well as the only case of a long vowel *(η)-abstracted from a diphthong.41 Therefore, the diektasis envisaged by Peters would require an unwarranted stretch of the notion of this Homeric artificial process.

Two different scenarios are suggested by Hackstein (2002: 257-8) as possible explanations for *(η)είǿς: either it is analogical to forms like *(η)ίκτο, where the initial *(η)- is explained by Hackstein with Brugmann-Schwyzer’s dissimilation (i.e. *(e)-μεύκτο > *(ε)κτο > *(ε)κτο), or it is a case of double augmentation from a stem *(ε)κτο-. The former option could still be related to the theories envisaging a LA, since an analogy with *(η)ίκτο implies the use of *(η)- as a reanalysed separate morpheme denoting augmentation. As for the origin of *(η)ίκτο, I will demonstrate in Ch. 5 §2.4 that Brugmann-Schwyzer’s dissimilation fails to explain the presence of initial *(η)-, just as in §1.2 it has not been considered suitable to justify *(η)δ̄- < *(ε)χείǿ-. At any rate, whatever origin may be posited for the initial *(η)- of *(η)ίκτο, could this vowel be morphologically reinterpreted as a LA and be applied to the ppf. of *(ο)δ̄α? If this were possible, *(η)ίκτο might then represent a valid analogical model for *(ηείǿς, providing an

41 An analogical use of diektasis for *(ηείǿς is also to be excluded. Chantraine (1973: 82-3) suggested this for Hom. *(ης, *(ερασθε, *(νηπιέ, *(νηπιές, *(νηπιάς and *(άσχετος. However, these forms do not present the development of a long vowel from a diphthong, unlike *(ηείǿ-, and some of them can be explained differently. Epic *(νηπιέ is probably a replacement of a previous *(νηπιές, i.e. the abstract noun from *(νήπος (cf. Wackernagel 1916: 69), and a possible ΝΙΠΙΑΣ for *(νηπιάς might have been misunderstood as *(νηπιάς before the metacharacterismos (cf. Schwyzer 1939: 104). As for *(ης, its apparent diektasis might actually be a simple analogy to the morphology of its Hom. masc./neut. counterpart *(οδ̄α – explained by Forssman (1991: 280) as a “Kompromiß zwischen einem altertümlichen *(hoo und dessen inzwischen üblichem, bei Homer gut bezeugtem Nachfolger *(ὁ”). As for Hom. *(άσχετος (I. 5.892, 24.708), this form is best explained as an artificial adjustment of *(σχετος to avoid an unmetrical result after 3b – an explanation which has already been given for *(εχοναι in Ch. 1 §2.4.2, and which will be similarly provided further below for *(ήλομαι and *(ήλομαι. The explanation of *(άσχετος from *(ά-χά-σχετος (cf. Schulze 1892: 495 n. 1; Mühlestein 1987: 235; Blanc 2012: 85-6; Ragot 2011: 366), where both the privative prefix *(η- and the copulative *(στ- would be used, seems unnecessary and, most importantly, devoid of any valid parallel in Greek. The adjective *(σχετος should therefore be derived from *(ηχο through privative alpha (cf. DELG: 375, Beekes 2010: 490), while the extra *(η- of *(άσχετος is a kunstsprachlich addition.
alternative to the analogy from the impf. of ἐἶμι suggested by Ruijgh and Berg, and here considered
doubtful (see §2.1 and Ch. 4 §2.1, §2.2). The main issue with this view, however, is that ἧκτο could
be reinterpreted as having a LA only if the reduplication of the perfect stem was ignored. This is
strongly at odds with the Homeric paradigm of ἔσκα, which consistently shows a distinct
reduplication syllable (see Ch. 5 §1.3).

Hackstein’s second scenario, on the other hand, might provide a more satisfying
interpretation. In particular, it is here believed that a stem ἔειδ- could be part of the linguistic
repertoire of the poets, and could therefore undergo a temporal augmentation to provide a metrically
functional artificial form. Hackstein (2002: 257-8) suggests that ἔειδ- could exist as the original form
of ἦδ-, thus embracing the possibility of explaining ἦδ- through Brugmann-Schwyzer’s dissimilation
(i.e. < *e-ui̭d). This option, however, has been discarded in §1.2, so that a different source needs to
be found than the one proposed by Hackstein. Many years before, Meyer (1896: 556) had suggested
a connection between ἔεισάμενος ‘resembling’ and ἥειδη, arguing that the former is evidence of a
prothetic vowel of the stem, and that ἥειδ- would be simply its temporally augmented form. As
already shown in the refutation of Wyatt’s theory (Ch. 1 §2.2), it is not here believed that the stem
contained a genuine prothetic vowel. Instead, the participle ἔεισαμεν-, together with the v.l. ἔειδομένη
found for a passage in the Odyssey, might belong to a set of evidence showing that an artificial stem
ἐειδ- was part of the poets’ repertoire, and could therefore receive a temporal augment for the artificial
ἡειδ-.

The middle verb ἔιδομαι is usually lexicalised separately from ὦδα or ὦδον due to its specific
(and intransitive) meaning ‘to resemble’, ‘to appear’, which is nonetheless expectable in the middle
formed to the root *u-eid- ‘to see’. Accordingly, the etymological connection of ἔιδομαι to the
paradigm of ὦδα was surely clear to the Homeric poets. In particular, as shown in §1.1, the synchronic
ablaut in the Homeric oral tradition for the ppf. of ὦδα was likely to be (u)eido-, which perfectly
corresponds to the morphology of ἔιδομαι. The stem ἔεισα- is obviously found in the aorist indicative
forms of ἔιδομαι with a syllabic augment. In particular, 3rd sg. ἔεισατο occurs 8 times in the Odyssey
(2.320, 5.398, 5.442, 7.281, 7.343, 8.295, 10.149, and 22.89), while the only instance in the Iliad is
2nd sg. ἔεισαο in 9.645. Except for Od. 10.149, its syllabic augment always prevents a bipartite
hexameter, as can be seen in the following examples:

43 More specifically, the absence of the syllabic augment would cause a bipartite hexameter if *ϝεισατο were to be
metrically considered (cf. n. 44). The avoidance of a bipartite hexameter is one of the strictest rules in Homeric metrics,
with very few exceptions – only 0.08% according to Cantilena (1995: 40), who speaks of 22 unjustifiable exceptions but
also includes ll. 15.18, although an emendation is possible for this line (cf. Maas 1962: 60; West 2000: 66). The rule is
The syllabic augment of ἐεῖσαμεν- is therefore metrically required, as well as morphologically justified. The same cannot be said, however, for the occurrences of its participle forms ἐεῖσάμενος/-η. They are found 8 times, always after [τῷ μιν] (6x) or [τῇ μιν] (2x) – except for [τῷ δ’ ἀρ’ ἐεῖσάμενος] in Od. 11.241 – and followed by [προσέφωνεα] or [προσεφώνεεεεε] (whose object is [μιν2b]) and a verse-final noun-epithet formula. The additional epsilon of ἐεῖσάμενος/-η clearly represents a morphological oddity, and it is not metrically required either. More specifically, if *ἐεῖσάμενος and *ἐεἰσάμενη were the forms metrically considered, [τῷ/τῇ μιν] would constitute a verse-initial spondean, thus producing a perfectly acceptable hexameter. Accordingly, the variant εἰσάμενος is attested in the textual tradition, though very sporadically. The form ἐεῖσάμενος should therefore be preferred both for its nearly total attestation, and because it is an unquestionable lectio difficilior.

It seems more reasonable to consider ἐεῖσαμεν- as an artificial form, since any consideration of an original prothetic vowel is ultimately denied by the philological evidence (cf. Ch. 1 §2.2). In
particular, its additional epsilon can perfectly well be derived from the aorist indicative ἐεἰσα-, possibly through the model of the forms in ἐε- of ἔλδομαι and ἔλπομαι, which will be analysed in depth further below. Since this vowel could not be interpreted as a syllabic augment, it was possible for an analogical present ἐεἰδομαι to be derived from ἐεἰσα- and arise in the Homeric tradition. Such a present is in fact attested for the Homeric text by the variant ἐεἰδομένη in Od. 6.24:

τῇ μιν ἐεἰδομένη προσέφη γλαυκόπις Αθήνη

All editors print [ἐεισαμένη], not only because this is the participle attested in every other occurrence of the formula above, but also because the variant [ἐειδομένη] has been judged as a corruption due to the proximity of ειδομένη at the beginning of Od. 6.22. At the same time, a significantly large part of the textual tradition offers this variant, while ἐεισαμένη is limited to a small number of manuscripts. If ἐειδομένη were the original form, it would represent the only attestation of a present stem ἐεἰδομαι in Homer, while later poetry shows a frequent use of it. In particular, the oldest instance is ἐειδόμενος in Pindar’s Nemean 10.15, while many other examples can be found since Hellenistic poetry.

The variant ἐειδομένη of Od. 6.24 consequently leaves us with two options. On the one hand, it might be a corruption which spread in most of the textual tradition after the oral and rhapsodic composition of the Homeric poems – leaving only a few testimonia with the original variant [ἐεισαμένη]3a. Such corruption was then probably created through the influence of the preceding [ἐιδομένη]2a in Od. 6.22, or it was based on an artificial present ἐεἰδομαι created in later poetry – at least since Pindar. In the second possible scenario, the original form was in fact [ἐειδομένη]3a, which would then show that the artificial creation of a present stem ἐεἰδομαι actually occurred already at the time of the Homeric epic tradition – while the three manuscripts showing [ἐεισαμένη]3a would restore the participle typical of the FP at hand. In this case, all the attestations of the present stem ἐεἰδο- in later poetry would simply build on an artificial creation of the epic diction.

As already mentioned, the creation of ἐεἰδο- could also be facilitated by several Homeric instances of stem doublets with the same morphological peculiarity. In particular, the present forms ἔελδομαι and ἔελπομαι are attested next to the expected ἔλδομαι and ἔλπομαι – e.g. ἔελπεται in Il.

the replacement of δέ with μέν seems arbitrary – Beekes himself reconstructs this step with caution – while μέν cannot be posited as original, since 3rd sg. acc. *(p)ε would have made position, as it usually does in Homer.

47 As for the occurrence of [τῷ μέν ἐεισασθηκάν] in Il. 15.544, it is more economical to interpret it as an AM of the frequent pattern [τῷ τῇ μῖν ἔεισαμεν] rather than the other way around, due to its strong isolation.


10.105, 13.813, ἐέλδεται in II. 13.63850. These two verbs, as already observed in Ch. 1 §2.2, were included by Wyatt (1972: 40, 75) among the roots in *ṷ-, i.e. having an original prothetic vowel before *ṷ-. The evidence for these two particular verbs, according to Wyatt, should be found in their Homeric present forms in ἐ-, and in the occasionally attested variant ἠλπετο. However, as already pointed out in Ch. 1 §2.2, the reading ἠλπετο seems to have an analogical temporal augment, while the other pieces of evidence for an original *ṷ- consist in present forms ἐέλπ-/ἐέλπ- which occur only in poetry51. Moreover, the formula-based method can provide an alternative explanation for the presence of forms in ἐ-, and confirm that they are in fact artificial creations of the epic tradition. In particular, it is possible to find a clear FP underlying the following passages:

II. 12.407

χάζετ’, ἐπεὶ οἴ θυμὸς ἐέλπετο κόδος ἀρέσθαι52

II. 13.813

ἤθην πού τοι θυμὸς ἐέλπεται ἐξαλαπάξειν53

Od. 15.66

ἤδη γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐέλδεται οίκαδ’ ἰκέσθαι54

The thematic connotation of all these passages concerns one’s heart being hopeful/longing to do something, as expressed by the recurring lexical items [θυμός3b] and [ἐ-4a]. The common structure of all the lines above can be outlined as follows:

Pattern ἐέλδ-/ἐέλπ-: [-2c]Dat.Pr. [θυμός3b]Nom.Subj. [ἐ- - - - 4c]V [- - - - x6c]V.Infin.(+ Compl.)

The verb stretching from 3c to 4c is a 3rd sg. present or imperfect, and it belongs either to (ἐ)έλπομαι or to (ἐ)έλδομαι. Furthermore, the second half of this pattern – i.e. [ἐ- - - - 4c]V [- - - - x6c]V.Infin.(+ Compl.) – can also be found in [ἐέλδεται4c ἐξ ἔρον εἶναι6c] in II. 13.638, and [ἐέλδετο4c γάρ σε ιδέσθαι6c]


51 For a possible etymology of these verbs, cf. DELG: 318, 326-7, where they are both derived from the same root * glyc of Lat. uelle, Germ. wollen. Beekes (2010: 375-6, 415), on the other hand, reconstructs two different roots: *werp- for ἐλπομαι (with ἐλπεται as analogical to ἐέλδεται), and *hylend- for ἠλδομαι, which however seems to have no correspondence outside ancient Greek. He therefore ascribes an original prothetic vowel (< *w) only to ἠλδομαι. In general, ἠλδ- is quite more frequent than ἐλδ-, while (ἐ)έλπ- shows the opposite trend.

52 “And yet [Teukros] not utterly gave way, since his heart was still hopeful of winning glory”.

53 “I suppose, then, your heart is hopeful utterly to break up”.

54 “For now my heart is full of longing to return to my home”.

64
in *Od*. 4.162.\(^{55}\) Finally, *Od*. 18.164 (Εὐρυνόμη, θυμός μοι ἐέλδεται, οὗ τί πάρος γε) contains slight changes to the pattern above, namely a syntactic inversion of [[-2x]Dat.Pr. [θυμός]Nom.Subj.], and no infinitive phrase in the second hemistich.\(^{56}\) Another important feature of this pattern is the constant presence of an additional ἐ- in the verb, which prevents the hexameter from being unmetrical (i.e. bipartite or with a trochee before 4a, cf. n. 44). In the case of past tenses (e.g. [ἐέλπετοται]), the vowel can easily be explained as a syllabic augment with a particular metrical usefulness – the same which has been observed in this section for the occurrences of [ἐέισαόταί] and [ἐέισαόταί], and in Ch. 1 §2.4.2 for [ἐέγνάνεταί]. All the instances in the present, however, are in stark contrast with the numerous occurrences of present forms without a seemingly prothetic vowel, i.e. ἔλδ-/ἐλπ-\(^{57}\). Furthermore, most occurrences of the forms in ἐέ- are exactly after third-foot trochaic caesura\(^{58}\), which suggests that this position became traditional for this peculiar morphological structure. The pattern above, in particular, shows how the present forms in ἐέ- were created in AMs, whose SP contained a corresponding imperfect form after 3b. More specifically, the metrically necessary ἐ- of the past tenses (e.g. ἐ-ἐλπέται, ἐ-ἐλδέται) was kept even after the main verb of the FP was replaced with a present (i.e. ἐ-ἐλπέται, ἐ-ἐλδέται), so as to avoid an unmetrical outcome. Consequently, the present ἐέλπομαι and ἐέλδομαι are best explained as kunstsprachlich forms.

It might be objected that the aor. ἐέισαο and ἐέισατο, although being consistently used after 3b, do not have any corresponding *ἐέιδεαυ/ἐείδεται in the Homeric poems. However, the creation of the participle ἐείσαμενος/-η shows the same analogical process observed for ἐέλδομαι and ἐέλπομαι, and the widespread attestation of the variant ἐειδομένη for *Od*. 6.122 seems to attest the presence of a stem ἐειδ- in the tradition of the Homeric text. Furthermore, the occurrence of [ἐέισαοταί] in the *Iliad* seen above can be compared to the pattern outlined for the forms ἐελδ- and ἐελπ-, as follows:

\[
πάντα τί μοι κατὰ θυμόν ἐέισαο μυθήσασθαι\]

*Il*. 9.645

\(^{55}\) I take this occurrence to contradict Wyatt’s statement (1972: 75) that there is no augmented form of ἐέλδομαι.

\(^{56}\) The pattern also seems echoed by the occurrence of [κατὰ θυμόνταί] at the end of *Od*. 23.345, where [ἐέλπετοταί] is used once again after trochaic caesura.

\(^{57}\) E.g. ἐέπαι 2x, ἐπέται 2x, ἐπομ(αί) 9x, ἐδοκαί 1x, ἐδομαί 1x. In this regard, it is interesting to notice how the unaugmented ἐλπέται is also used together with θυμός, but in FPs with a different structure (e.g. *Il*. 13.8, 15.288, 17.234) from the pattern with [ἐέλπετοταί] analysed here.

\(^{58}\) This is the case for all the forms in ἐέ- of ἐέλδομαι, except for [ἐέλδοσθομαί] in *Il*. 16.494. As for those of ἐέλπομαι, 5 out of 7 are found after 3b.

\(^{59}\) “All that you have said seems spoken after my own mind”.


As can be observed, the only differences from the pattern of ἐελδ-/ἐελπ- are the position of the dative pronoun – [−2a] instead of [−2c], which is occupied by [κατὰ 2c] – and the case of the lexical item [θυμόν3b]. The thematic connotation is also altered due to the use of the semantically different εἰδομαι, which can nonetheless govern an infinitive according to the pattern of ἐελδ-/ἐελπ-. The idea of ‘someone’s mind being hopeful/longing to do something’ is therefore shifted to the idea of ‘someone seeming to do something according to someone else’s mind’. For the rest, the main features of the pattern of ἐελδ-/ἐελπ- are consistently met in the AM containing [ἐείσαοι4c], including the metrical usefulness of ἐ- already observed for the augmented [ἐελδετοι4c], [ἐελπετοι4c], and for the artificial present forms [ἐελπεταται4c], [ἐελδεταται4c]. This strongly suggests that a stem ἐειδ- might have been artificially created on the model of the presents ἐελδ-/ἐελπ-, just like the artificial ἐεισάμενος/-η was abstracted from ἐεισαα-.

The newly-created stem ἐειδ- could then be associated to the stem (ϝ)ειδ- of the p pf. of οἰδα, since the etymological connection between the paradigms of εἰδομαι and οἰδα was supposedly plain to the Homeric poets. They consequently had the possibility of applying an analogical temporal augment to the stem ἐειδ-, in order to obtain a metrically alternative form for the preterite of οἰδα: ἐειδ- > ἡειδ-. A similar explanation has also been provided for Hom. ἦν ‘(s)he was’: this exclusively poetic form might consist in an artificial augmentation of ην, thus providing a metrically functional alternative to be used in verse-initial position, where [ην1c] consistently occurs (Il. 11.808, Od. 19.283, 23.316, 24.343)60. The artificial creation of ἡειδ- therefore seems to have parallels in the Homeric diction, as will also be seen in Ch. 5 §2.4 for ἦκτο (< ἢκτο), and it should now be confirmed by looking at the FPs of the occurrences of ἠειδή/-ης. In particular, it needs to be demonstrated that ἠειδ- could provide a metrical alternative to the other forms of the p pf. of οἰδα, which is a typical feature of artificial solutions in Homeric diction.

§3. Analysis of the occurrences through the formula-based method

§3.1 ἠειδής/-εις

The occurrence of ἠειδής is a valid example of the limits which the formula-based method may encounter. More specifically, Il. 22.279-80 can be linked only partially to specific FPs, and none of them contains counterparts to ἠειδής. At the same time, the method will show both the high degree

of originality of the passage, which might hint at a rhapsodic re-elaboration, and the usefulness of the metrical-morphological structure of ἥειδς to fill a specific metrical gap.

Let us first look at the occurrence again:

a.  II. 22.279-80
   1. ἡμβροτες, οὐδ’ ἄρα πῶ τι θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ’ Ἀχιλλεόδ
   2. ἐκ Διὸς ἥειδς τὸν ἐμὸν μόρον, ἦ τοι ἐφῆς γε.

Both lines offer a strong re-elaboration of pre-existent material, together with elements occurring only in few passages in the entirety of the Homeric poems. Verse-initial [ἡμβροτες οὐδ’], for example, occurs only here and in the following line:

b.  II. 5.287
   ημβροτες οὖδ’ ἔτυχες - ἀτάρ οὐ μὲν σφῶν γ’ ὀπό

The context in this passage is the same as that of a.1: a hero (Diomedes) has just started speaking, and is mocking his enemy for missing the shot. At the same time, in passage a the second verb – namely ἥειδς – is delayed until the next line, and covers the same metrical extension of [οὐδ’ ἔτυχες] in b. After [ἡμβροτες], the poet of a.1 opts instead for the phrase [οὐδ’ ἄρα πῶ], which is found only here and in three further passages:

c.  II. 17.401-2
   1. ἡματι τὸ ἐτάνυσσε κακὸν πόνον· οὐδ’ ἄρα πῶ τι
   2. ἡδέε Πάτροκλον τεθνηότα δίος Ἀχιλλεόδς

d.  II. 2.419
   ὦς ἔφατ’, οὐδὸ ἄρα πῶ οἱ ἐπεκραίαινε Κρονίων

e.  II. 3.302
   ὦς ἔφατ’, οὐδὸ ἄρα πῶ σφιν ἐπεκραίαινε Κρονίων

c.1 is the only instance sharing adverbial [τι] with a.1, whereas in d and e the phrase [οὐδὸ ἄρα πῶ] is followed by an enclitic dative. The presence of the ppf. of οἶδα in c.2 further confirms a certain connection between this passage and a, but the way the two pairs of lines have been constructed is quite different. In particular, as I will show in §3.2, the structure of c seems rather based on a different

61 “You did not hit me, you missed, but I do not think that you two”.
62 “[Zeus] strained tight above Patroklos that day. But the brilliant Achilleus did not yet know at all that Patroklos had fallen”.
63 “He spoke, but none of this would the son of Kronos accomplish”.
64 “They spoke, but none of this would the son of Kronos accomplish”.
pattern linked to the occurrence of ἡμιόη in the Odyssey. Passages d and e, on the other hand, show a pattern with interesting similarities to the structure of a.1:

\[ \text{d, e: } [\text{oίς ἐφατ}']_1\text{VP} \ [\text{oὔδ} ' ἀρα πώ_3\text{a}]_\text{Conj.+Adv} \ [\text{έπεκραίαινε} Κρονίων]}_\text{V+Subj.VP} \]

\[ \text{a.1 } [\text{ήμβροτες}_1\text{VP} \ [\text{oὔδ} ' ἀρα πώ_3\text{a}]_\text{Conj.+Adv} \ [\text{θεοῖς} \ [\text{ἐπιείκελ'} \ [\text{Ἀχιλλεῦδ}]}_\text{Voc.+Epith.NP} \]

The basic structure of their first hemistichs is overall identical, with differences concerning only the choice of lexical elements. In particular, in both cases an enclitic pronoun is used to stretch the adverbial phrase up to the trochaic caesura. While a dative of interest (οἱ, σφιν) is apt for the context of d and e, the same would not be suitable for the syntax of a.1. The poet then uses adverbial [τὶς], both for its emphatic sense of ‘at all’ and, probably more importantly, as a metrical filler, as can often be observed in Homeric diction with enclitic adverbs or particles. Adverbial [τὸς] has the same purpose at the end of c.1, where it is used to complete the hexameter. As for the second hemistich of d and e on the one hand, and of a.1 on the other, despite their strong syntactic differences, a certain connection can still be seen in the echoing prefix ἐπ(ι), used both as preverb in [ἐπεκραίαινες] and in the epithet [ἐπιείκελ', Σφιν]. At the same time, the poet of a.1 further delays the use of the coordinated verb by using the very frequent second-hemistich formula [θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ', Ἀχιλλεῦς]65.

Consequently, one of the differences between a.1 and the other passages analysed above lies in the absence of a second coordinated verb after the verse-initial one. Turning to a.2, we can first observe that the verb is not used at the beginning of this line either. It may be supposed that the Homeric forms at the poet’s disposal were essentially two for the 2nd sg. of the pff. of οἴδα: either ἡδησθ(α), found in Od. 19.93 (cf. §1.1), or θεός, which can perfectly be reconstructed based on Hom. ἢδησα. Although they could both be used at the beginning of the line a.266, the poet still delays the use of the second coordinated verb by employing the phrase [ἐκ Διὸς] in one of its most frequent positions in the hexameter. In particular, this phrase is always found in a specific pattern when used verse-initially, except for a.2:

"Ἡρη λισσομένη, Τρώεσσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφήπται
ἐκ Διὸς· ἀλλὰ σὺ σῆσαι ἐχε φρεσί, μηδὲ σε λήθη"67

II. 2.32-3

"Ἡρη λισσομένη, Τρώεσσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφήπται"

65 Also found in Il. 9.485, 9.494, 23.80, 24.486; Od. 24.36.

66 For this to happen, [θεός] needed to be followed by a vowel-beginning long syllable, while θδήσθα could be either elided before vowel-beginning arsis ([θδήσθα', Σφιν], or followed by a consonant cluster ([θδήσθας, CC-]).

67 “[Since] Hera [has forced them all over] by her supplication, and evils are in store for the Trojans from Zeus. Keep this thought in your heart then, let not forgetfulness”.

68
It is possible to observe more than one sub-pattern in the examples above – in particular, in the first two passages from the *Iliad* and in the two from the *Odyssey*. \[ \varepsilon \kappa \Delta \iota \omicron \varsigma \bar{o} \] seems to form two distinct sub-patterns with, respectively, \[ \varepsilon \phi \pi \tau \varsigma \tau \alpha \theta \] and \[ \alpha \kappa \omicron \upsilon - \] at the end of the previous line. At the same time, the essential elements shared by all the passages above can be outlined in the following pattern:

\[
[(\omega) \sim - X_6c] \nu
\]

The only exception to this structure is exactly *Il. 22.279-80*, where the vocative \[ \Lambda \chi \iota \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \delta \omega \] stands instead at the end of the first line. Overall, the only link between most of the passages above and \( a \), apart from the presence of \[ \varepsilon \kappa \Delta \iota \omicron \varsigma \bar{o} \], is the communicative situation of a speech addressed to a 2\(^{nd} \) sg. interlocutor, as stressed by the verbal forms \( \varepsilon \chi \varepsilon \) (*Il. 2.33, 2.70*), \( \varepsilon \upsilon \chi \varepsilon \) (*Il. 18.75*) and \( \alpha \kappa \omicron \upsilon \varsigma \varsigma \) (*Od. 1.282*).

---

68 “[Since] Hera [has forced them all over] by her supplication, and evils are in store for the Trojans by Zeus’s will. Keep this within your heart […].”

69 “And they settle there in triple division by tribes, beloved of Zeus himself, who is lord over all gods and all men”.

70 “Speak out, do not hide it. These things are brought to accomplishment through Zeus: in the way that you lifted your hands and prayed for”.

71 “Any mortal has word for you, or if you will hear a rumour from Zeus, which is above all how reports reach men”.

72 “To see if any mortal has word for me, or if I can hear a rumour coming from Zeus, which is above all how news reaches men”.
After [ἐκ Διόςεις] in a.2 the second coordinated verb finally comes in the form of [ἡεῖδηςεις].
The ppf. of οἶδα is then followed by the phrase [τὸν ἐμὸν μόρονές] at the same position in other Homeric passages, but the only connection between them and a.2 is precisely the occurrence of [τὸν ἐμὸνές] followed by a different consonant-beginning pyrrhic accusative in -ον. For the rest, both the syntactic structure and context of a.2 seem to be unique, as well as the occurrence of [μόρονές] after [τὸν ἐμὸνές]. The acc. sg. [μόρονές], at the same time, is found before bucolic caesura in other passages, where it is instead preceded by the attribute [κακόν] (whose ending is obviously echoed by the adjective [ἐμὸνές] of a.2). Again, the only element in common between a.2 and these occurrences is the same metrical position of a specific phrase, namely [-ονες μόρονές].

It therefore seems that the poet of passage a put together pieces of several FPs in a typical process of AM. In particular, the individual elements [ἐκ Διόςεις], [τὸν ἐμὸνές] and [-όν μόρονές] are drawn from different patterns in some sort of ‘collage’, while the gap between them is metrically filled by [ἡεῖδηςεις]. This verb replicates the prosody of [οὐδ’ ἔτοιχες] in II. 5.287 (i.e. passage b), but this phrase is used right after [ἡμπροτεζίς] in the same line, while in II. 22.279 [ἡμπροτεζίς] is followed only by [οὐδ’2α], and the second coordinated verb [ἡεῖδηςεις] is delayed up to the next line. This position is obviously important for the morphological structure of ἡεῖδηςζ, since neither *ἡδεάζ nor ἡδηζ(α) could be used in the second foot before [τὸν ἐμὸν μόρονές]. A stem ἡεῖδα- was therefore metrically required, and the endings -ης/-εις, regardless of their possible origin and reliability (cf. §1.2 and §3.3), clearly represent a necessary alternative to a hypothetical artificial *ἡείδηςζθ(α) or *ἡείδεαζ. Therefore, in II. 22.280 [ἡεῖδηςεις] was a perfect solution to the impossibility of using other forms of the ppf. of οἶδα in a certain metrical gap.

Furthermore, it is plausible that II. 22.280 is not only a particularly innovative piece of poetry, but also a relatively late creation within the Homeric tradition. As already observed in §1.2, this might be supported both by the largely attested variant [ἡείδεαζες], and by the interpretation of the v.l. [ἡείδηςεις] as the result of a contraction from *ἡείδεαζες, or as a form analogous to 3rd sg. ἡδηζ. In general, II. 22.279-80 does not strictly follow any FPs, but is rather a unique collage of fragments of different structures drawn from the poetic repertoire. Such features are often found in passages which may be 

---

74 i.e. II. 6.357, 21.133, Od. 11.618.
75 As for verse-final [ἡ τοι ἔρημος γε] of II. 22.280, a clear connection can be found only with Od. 11.430, where the phrase occurs identical except for the different verbal person: [κουριδίῳ τεῦξασα πόσα φόνον. ἡ τοι ἔρημη γε]. The accusative ending in [-ονες] at the bucolic caesura is another strong hint for the relation between the two passages.
interpreted as the product of rhapsodic activity. Furthermore, as already noticed, a major difference between ἥειδος and ἥείδη is that the artificial usefulness of the former may be shown also by its possible endings, while any alternation between -ει and -η is ultimately pointless for our analysis of ἥείδη in §3.2. More specifically, an analogical use of -ης ← 3rd sg. -η, or even of later endings which might have existed already in the current ordinary language (i.e. -εις, or -ης < *-εας), seems metrically required together with the artificial stem ἥειδ-, as observed above.

§3.2 ἥειδη/-ει

As already explained, a strong confirmation of ἥειδη as an artificial form might come from demonstrating its functional value, i.e. its use as a metrical alternative to genuine forms of the ppf. of οἶδα. This function of ἥειδη can be inferred from the pattern underlying the following passages:

a. Il. 18.403-4
   1. ἀφρῷ πορήμων ῥέεν ἄσπετος· οὐδὲ τις ἄλλος
   2. ἰδέεν οὔτε θεῶν οὔτε θητῶν ἀνθρώπων76

b. Od. 9.205-6
   1. ἥδην ἀκηράσιον, θεῖον ποτόν· οὐδὲ τις αὐτόν
   2. ἥειδη δυόων οὔδ’ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνί οἴκῳ77

c. Il. 24.697-8
   1. ἵππους, ἡμῖν οἱ δὲ νέκουν φέρον. οὐδὲ τις ἄλλος
   2. ἐγνω πρόσθ’ ἀνδρῶν καλλιζώνων τε γυναικῶν79

d. Od. 7.246-7
   1. ναίει ἐπιλόκαμος, δεινή θεός· οὐδὲ τις αὐτῆ

---

76 This gen. pl. is in clear violation of Meyer’s second law, but so is also [θοᾶς] in the very first line of the Iliad. In general, all three laws formulated by Meyer apply much more accurately to Alexandrian hexameter poetry, whereas Homer offers many exceptions (cf. West 1997: 225-6).

77 “[The stream of Ocean] went on forever with its foam and its murmur. No other among the gods or among mortal men knew about us”.

78 See n. 2.

79 “[And they drove their] horses […], while the mules drew the body. Nor was any other aware of them at the first, no man, no fair-girdled woman”.
2. μίσγεται οὔτε θεῶν οὔτε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων

The formulaic structure underlying passages a-d, which will be here called ‘pattern α’\(^{81}\), can be outlined as follows:

**Pattern α**  

1. [οὐδὲ τις\(^{5c}\)] \([- X_6c]\)Pr.

2. [\([- = 1c(-2a)]\)v \([(-2a) \equiv -ον\(_{3a}\)]\)Adv./Conj.+Part.Gen. \([- = = = 2a] - X_6c]\)Part.Gen.NP

The pronoun at the end of the first line changes according to the syntactic context. In a.d.1, [ωτί\(_{6c}\)] is required for the persistence of the topic – i.e. Calypso, with whom no one mingles. For the same reason a.b.1 has [ωτί\(_{6c}\)], so as to provide a reference to the divine drink – i.e. wine. On the other hand, the sentences of a.a and a.c are typical cases of zero anaphora, where the object/topic remains implied. Another consistent element of the pattern is that the ending [-ον\(_{3a}\)] of the partitive genitive governed by [τις\(^{5c}\) (ἄλλος\(^{6c}\)) always falls in penthemimeral caesura (i.e. [θε\(_{3a}\)], [δμώων\(_{3a}\)], [ἀνδρ\(_{3a}\)].) Furthermore, there are always two partitive genitives in the second line, although their coordination is realised in different ways. Finally, [ἡείδης\(^{2a}\)] in a.b.2 represents the only instance of the verb ending at 2a – thus showing a longer metrical extension. The partitive genitive [δμώον\(_{3a}\)] nonetheless ends at the medial caesura, in accordance with the main structure of pattern α.

Considering all the elements above, one more passage might be linked to the pattern at hand:

**e. II. 17.401-2**

1. ἡματι τῷ ἐτάνυσε κακὸν πόνον· οὐδ’ ἄρα πώ τι

2. ἡδεὶ Πάτροκλὸν τεθνηότα δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς\(^{82}\)

There are essential differences in a.e, which can nonetheless be explained with the different syntactic context. In particular, the subject of the verb is a specific person (Achilles), instead of an indefinite entity, and is also moved to the end of the second line – probably for an effect of suspense in the pathetic context of these lines. These elements clearly make the use of [τις\(^{5c}\) (ἄλλος\(^{6c}\))] impossible, so that the phrase [οὐδ’ ἄρα πώ τις\(^{6c}\)] ‘nor (did he) yet (know) at all’ is used instead at the end of the first line – a phrase which quite interestingly is also found in the passage containing ἡείδης\(_{3a}\), as seen in §3.1, and whose object is also a significant death or fate. As for the second line, the object

---

80 “[On it] lives [… Calypso] of the lovely hair, an awesome goddess. No one, either of the gods or of mortal men, has any dealings with her”.

81 As already explained in Ch. 2 n. 59, the FPs of Ch. 3-6 will be labelled with Greek letters, and their passages are all outlined in Appendix II with the same type of indication used here – i.e. Greek letter of the pattern and Latin letter of the passage itself, e.g. a.b.

82 “[Such was] the wicked work [Zeus] strained tight [above Patroklos] that day. But the brilliant Achilleus did not yet know at all that Patroklos had fallen”.

72
[Πάτροκλον3a] is used in the same position as that of the first partitive genitive of pattern α, while the verb is the same as the one in a.a.2 (i.e. [ηδεειc]), except for the lack of v-movable due to the following consonant-beginning word. Despite all these differences, it is the presence of [ηδεειc] that mostly allows for a relation among a.a, a.b and a.e, as well as the thematic connotation of their contexts, i.e. ‘nor did someone know’ (yet). In particular, passage a.a can be considered as the SP of a.e, given that it belongs to a well-attested and consistent pattern, whereas a.e is an isolated instance replicating the same position of [ηδεειc], while slightly changing the thematic connotation of pattern α from ‘nor did anyone know’ to ‘nor did someone specific know’. The three instances of the 3rd sg. ppf. of οἶδα seen in a.a, a.b and a.e also show a complementary distribution as metrical variants of the same verbal form, so that it can be used before simple consonant (ηδεε), before vowel (ηδεεν), or before a consonant cluster (ηειδη).

The last position in particular would be impossible for [ηδεειc]. It might be argued, however, that [ηδη1c] (or [ηδει1c]) would have perfectly worked before [δμωον3a] in a.b.2. The reason why ηδη could not be used lies once again in the analysis of pattern α. If the poet is following this specific FP in his AM, then the genitive plural needs to end at 3a for the penthemimeral caesura. The poet supposedly had two forms at his disposal: ηδεε and ηδη (or ηδει). The latter would cause a verse-initial [ηδη δμωον2c], which would not meet the requirement of the genitive plural ending at 3a. Like δμωον in a.b.2, passages a.a, a.c and a.d also show a disyllabic partitive genitive (θκων, ἄνδρον), which is pushed to the medial caesura thanks to the use of [οὑτε2c] in a.a.2 and a.d.2, and [προσθευ2a] in a.c.2. Both these words, however, would produce a bipartite hexameter in a.b.2 if followed by [δμωον3a] – i.e. [†ηδεεν οὑτε δμωον2c] and [†ηδη/ει προσθε(ν) δμωον2c]. Another possible alternative would have been to use [ηδεεν1c] followed by [ἀμφιπόλων3a] instead. If the same constituents are kept, this possible structure would lead to the following hypothetical line:

*ηδεεν3 άμφιπόλων οὑδε δμωον ἐνι οἶκο

The first partitive genitive would thus have ended at the medial caesura, according to the structure of pattern α. The word [άμφιπόλων3a] would also metrical match [οὑτε θκων3a] of a.a.2 and a.d.2, and [προσθε’ ἄνδρον2a] of a.c.2 – as well as [Πάτροκλον3a] of a.e.2. The main issue with the line above, however, is that it contains a combination of caesurae which is rare in the Homeric hexameter, namely 3a-4a-5a. A penthemimeral caesura often coexists with a break at 4a, but a caesura at 5a is usually found when the break in the fourth foot is prevented by a long word. The coexistence of these three

83 Although ηδη always undergoes correction when followed by a vowel (Il. 2.38, 11.741, 20.466, Od. 2.122, 3.146), there are nonetheless many cases in Homer where correptio in hiatus is not applied, so that the sequence [ηδη άμφιπόλων3a] would also be theoretically possible.
‘masculine’ caesurae would therefore make the line [ἡδὲν ὦμφωπόλων οὐδὲ δμῶον ἐνὶ οἶκῳ] metrically undesirable.

Therefore, the best option for the poet was to use δμῶον as the first genitive, but none of the variants of the 3rd sg of the plp. of οἴδα seems to fit properly in verse-initial position if he wants to follow pattern α – that is, if he wants to make the first partitive genitive end at 3a. A possible way of meeting this requirement was to stretch the verb up to 2a, thus allowing [δμῶον3a] to fall at the medial caesura. Consequently, an artificially created ἥειδ- represented the perfect solution, and worked as ametrical alternative to ἥδεε(ν) in α.α.2.

§3.3 Final remarks
The analysis of the Homeric use of ἥειδ- in §3.1 and §3.2 has shown how this artificial alternative for the plp. of οἴδα was part of the epic oral repertoire. In particular, Od. 9.206 can be explained as an AM within a specific pattern, where the use of ἥειδ- is both metrically functional and justified with specific constraints faced by the poet whilst following pattern α. Furthermore, the SP α.α contains [ἡδεε(ν)1c], i.e. a form which is relatable to ἥειδη, and to which the poet needed to find a metrical alternative. At the same time, an artificial ἥειδ- was also used in the AM of Il. 22.280 to fit a specific metrical gap, since the use of ἥδησθα/*ἥδεας would have been impossible. In this case, if the ending -ης is interpreted as analogical to -η, it can be considered as a further artificial element used to shape a metrically functional alternative to other possible forms in ἥειδ-, i.e. ἥειδησθ(α) or ἥειδεας. Alternatively, a very late -εις might have been drawn from the ordinary language, although its total absence in the other Homeric pluperfects suggests that ἥειδεας might simply be a later and isolated corruption.

The formula-based method has therefore shown the dynamics and reasons behind the use of artificial ἥειδ- in the Homeric formulaic language. The impossibility of its existence in the spoken language has been demonstrated in §2.1 and §2.2, especially in the failure of any attempt to reconstruct an original prothetic vowel. On the other hand, I showed how a stem ἕειδ- could come about in the Homeric Kunstsprache: its existence seems proved by a v.l. ἕειδομένη, and can be inferred through the existence of the artificial plp. ἕεισαμ- , and of a FP containing not only the artificial ἕελπ- and ἕελδ-, which might have functioned as analogical models, but also the aor. indic. ἕεισαο. The poets could then apply an analogical temporal augment to the stem ἕειδ- in order to obtain a metrically functional alternative to ἥδ-.
Chapter 4

The ἥί-type of the Homeric imperfect of εἶμι

This chapter will discuss the peculiar Homeric forms in ἥί- of the impf. of εἶμι. Its main aim is to confirm that the ἥί-type\(^1\) was not a feature of the ordinary language. In §1 there will be a preliminary discussion of the paradigm of εἶμι in Homer and older Attic, with considerations of PIE philology as well. In §1.3, a discussion of the Herodotean forms will show that the Ionic paradigm should be considered as having a diphthong. This will all be crucial in arguing why the creation of an ἥί-type would be out of place in the evolution of ancient Greek, and confirmation of this will come from the critical analysis of the theories on the ἥί-type in §2. This section will also provide a discussion of the relation between the ἥί-type and the other Homeric long-augmented forms, which has already been started in Ch. 3 §2.2. Finally, section §3 will contain a detailed analysis of the Homeric occurrences through the formula-based method, which will be particularly helpful to demonstrate how the artificial ἥσαν was used as a metrical and syntactic alternative to patterns containing ἴσαν, and how its position in enjambement became a traditional feature of the Homeric ἥί-type.

§1. The impf. of εἶμι: a philological study

Among the root presents that can be traced back to PIE, εἶμι is undoubtedly one of the best attested in the oldest IE languages. Ancient Greek, in particular, since Homer has perfectly preserved in the present indicative the alternation between e-grade in the singular (εἶμι, ἐι <*ei-si and εἰσι <*ei-ti) and zero grade in the plural and dual (ἴμεν, ἵτε, ἴσι<, ἴτον). The impf., on the other hand, offers a more complicated picture, as can be observed in Table III.

In §1.1 the evidence in older Attic – i.e. the only dialect offering a complete spectrum of the paradigm – will be analysed from a philological point of view. It will be shown what forms are expected from the PIE paradigm, and what analogical processes might underlie specific outcomes in ancient Greek. A comparison with Vedic will be helpful in this kind of analysis, which will also prove to be crucial for the discussion in §2.2 whether the ἥί-type is a kunstsprachlich creation of the Homeric diction or a dialectal development. As already mentioned, the former line of interpretation will here be preferred. A possible obstacle, however, is that the trisyllabic forms ἥία, ἥίε and ἥσαν

---

\(^1\) From here on, ‘ἥί-type’ will be the shorter and conventional way to refer to the forms ἥία, ἥί(ε)(ν), ἥσαν and ἥσον of the Hom. impf. of εἶμι.

are found not only in Homeric diction and later poetry inspired by it, but also in the textual tradition of Herodotus’ *Histories*. After a thorough analysis of the Homeric paradigm of the impf. of εἶμι in §1.2, the Herodotean forms will be discussed in §1.3, where it will be argued that a trisyllabic interpretation is ultimately unjustified. This conclusion will be linked to the evidence in older Attic, so that the ἥ- type will ultimately be considered as a specific feature of the Homeric *Kunstsprache*.

§1.1 The impf. of εἶμι in older Attic

The paradigm analysed in this section is attested in older-Attic authors, such as Aristophanes, Plato, Xenophon and Thucydides. Based on the data in Table III, an analysis of historical morphology for the impf. of εἰμι in older Attic can be summarised as follows:

- **1st sg.** From PIE *(h₁e-)*h₁éj-m, the resulting augmented *ējiyor* (cf. Skt. āyam) should have given *ēha*, through an early Greek *ējia* > *ēha*. The presence of a diphthong in Attic is usually explained with an analogical restitution of *-t-, based on the pre-consonantal allomorph.

- **2nd sg.** From PIE *(h₁e-)*h₁éj-s, the augmented outcome should be *eis* due to Osthoff’s law, but an analogically restored *ēis* can be expected, as in the case of 3rd sg. and 1st and 2nd pl. (see *infra*). At any rate, an original *eis*/*ēis* (cf. Skt. āiś) was replaced by a form using a perfect ending, just as in the impf. of εἰμι. The oldest form we have is Att. ἥσιοθα, which already seems to show analogy with the ppf. of ὄιδα (see *infra* on ἥσι).

- **3rd sg.** From PIE *(h₁e-)*h₁éj-t an unattested *I* (< *ējt < *ejt*, cf. Skt. áit) would be expected. Just like 2nd sg. ἥσιοθα, the form ἥσι also seems to show analogy with the ppf. of ὄιδα already in older Attic.

- **1st and 2nd pl.** From PIE *(h₁e-)*h₁i-, the expected augmented forms would be *ēiμεν* and *ēitė* due to loss of intervocalic laryngeal. As already seen for the 2nd and 3rd sg., where a short vowel is expected due to Osthoff’s law, an analogical extension of the same initial long vowel brought to Att. ἥμεν, ἥτε.

---

3 Cf. Kühner-Blass 1892: 217; Schwyzner 1939: 674. In Attic inscriptions, on the other hand, εἰμι is not frequently attested, and none of its impf. forms are reported in Threatte 1996: 591-2.
6 Cf. Ruijgh 1971/2: 167: “l’attique a créé ἥσι sur le modèle de ἥσα pour remplacer ἥμε”. Cf. also Rix 1976: 243. The analogy with ἥσα is supported by the intricate system of mutual connections between the paradigm of the impf. of εἰμι and the ppf. of ὄιδα, as already seen in Ch. 3 §2.1.
7 For this outcome of the intervocalic laryngeal in *(h₁e-)*h₁i-μέ and *(h₁e-)*h₁i-τέ, cf. Lindeman 1987: 44-8.
8 Cf. Ruijgh 1971/2: 167, who specifies that the whole process must have happened “après l’action de la loi d’Osthoff”. He also asserts that the extension was modelled on other paradigms where the long vowel is kept for the whole
3rd pl. From an original *(h₁e-)h₁i̭-ěnt, the expected augmented form would have been *ēen, which might have been avoided because of its lack of morphological clarity⁹. Through the restoration of -ι- (already seen for the 1st sg.) and the use of the secondary ending -σαν – widespread in the athematic conjugation already since Homer – a new and clearer 3rd pl. could be easily obtained.

Later Attic writers, such as Demosthenes, consistently use 1st sg. ἤειν, 2nd sg. ἤεις and 3rd pl. ἤεσαν (or ἤεισαν), which will also become the only forms in the koine together with post-Classical ἤειμεν and ἤειτε¹⁰. They all show analogy to the conjugation of the pluperfect, which is already visible in older Attic ἤεισθα and ἤει, and the pff. of ὄδα has often been invoked as the specific model of this analogy, due to the resemblances between the two paradigms¹¹. Finally, in §1.3 I argue that forms like ἄνα and ἄσαν were likely to belong not only to the older Attic paradigm, but also to the Ionic one.

§1.2 The impf. of εἰμι in Homer

The Homeric language, unlike older Attic, presents two striking features: on the one hand, it shows an alternative thematic inflection of the impf. of εἰμι; on the other, apart from an isolated ἐπὶσαν (Od. 19.445), the athematic forms have an odd contrast between augmented ἤι- and unaugmented ἰ-. At a closer look, the possible morphology of the Homeric impf. of εἰμι can be expressed by the combinations of the attributes ± AUGMENT, ± DIPHTHONG, ± THEMATIC. The second term here refers to the disyllabic (except for ἣομεν) forms with diphthong ἤι-, as opposed to the trisyllabic forms with hiatus ἰ-. Since there are two possible outcomes for each of the three elements, their theoretically possible combinations are 8 in total – although only 6 are morphologically feasible. They can all be observed in Table IV, which contain all the forms of the impf. of εἰμι attested in Homer.

The 1st sg. appears in Homer in the trisyllabic form ἤια (unlike disyllabic Attic ἦα¹²), and a thematic 1st sg. occurs twice only in book 10 of the Odyssey: ἄνηίον (Od. 10.146, 10.274). The 2nd sg. is not attested in Homer at all, whilst for the 3rd sg. the Homeric poems offer the thematic ἤτε(v), conjugation, such as the impf. of εἰμι, for which Chantraine (1961: 206) simply poses a stem *ēs- for the whole inflection. Sihler (1995: 550) more clearly explains the presence of *ēs- in the plural and dual as “the regular interaction of the augment with the following laryngeal in the expected shape *e-H₁s-”.

⁹ Cf. Ittzés 2008: 166. Theoretically speaking, it might also have been confused with the original 3rd pl. of the impf. of εἰμι, even though ἦνεγ as 3rd pl. (“they were”) does not survive in Homer.


¹² I use here the conventional writing with subscript iota to distinguish the forms with a diphthong from those with hiatus, while keeping the basic assumption that the diphthong was well pronounced up to 5th.-BCE Attic.
\( \text{ἠε(v)} \) and unaugmented \( \text{ἰε(v)} \). Ruijgh (1971/2: 167) takes \( \text{ἠε(v)} \) to be the product of a four-part analogy: e.g. \( \text{ἐδειξα} : \text{ἐδειξε} :: \text{ἠα} : \text{ἠε} \). This seems a very plausible origin for the ending -ει\(^{13}\), which might have caused the replacement of the original *\( \varepsilon \) (cf. §1.1) at a very early stage. If Ruijgh’s theory is accepted, \( \text{ἠε/ἰε} \) can also be assumed as the model for the whole Homeric thematic inflection\(^{14}\), which might have started from a simple analogy like (\( \varepsilon \))\( λιον \) : (\( \varepsilon \))\( λιον \) :: \( \text{ἠε/ἰε} \) : \( \text{ἰον} */\( \text{ἰον} \). If the seemingly thematic \( \text{ἠε} \) is considered as older than \( \text{ἠε} \), its occurrence in Herodotus (cf. §1.3) seems to show its preservation in Ionic, while Attic opted for the analogical -ει at an early stage. 3\(^{rd}\) sg. \( \text{ἠε} \), however, is already transmitted fairly consistently by the Homeric textual tradition for three lines: \( \text{Il.} \) 10.286, 13.247, \( \text{Od.} \) 8.290\(^{15}\). At the same time, in all these passage \( \text{ἠε} \) occurs in verse-final position, so that it can always be replaced by \( \text{ἠε(v)} \). Accordingly, Nauck suggested emending every \( \text{ἠε} \) to \( \text{ἠε(v)} \), but it is also entirely possible that \( \text{ἠε} \) already existed in the latest stage of the Homeric oral tradition, or at the time of the rhapsodic activity\(^{16}\). This also seems to be confirmed by the occurrence of \( \text{ἐξἠε} \) in \( \text{Hymn Ap.} \) 28 (cf. §1.3)\(^{17}\).

As for the plural, the 1\(^{st}\) pers. is only thematic and augmented, i.e. \( \text{ἠομεν} \), which occurs 3 times in the \( \text{Odyssey} \) (10.251, 10.570, 11.22), while the 2\(^{nd}\) pl. is never used. Although neither \( \text{ἠομεν} \) nor \( \text{ἠε} \) are attested in Homer, it is not far-fetched to assume that they were known to the Homeric bards, especially since a form starting with a long-vowel diphthong is likely to be the starting point for thematic \( \text{ἠομεν} \). The 3\(^{rd}\) pl., on the other hand, shows an impressive range of formations. Apart from the isolated \( \text{ἐπἠοσαν} \) in \( \text{Od.} \) 19.445, the thematic forms are represented by augmented \( \text{ἠοσαν} \) and unaugmented \( \text{οσαν} \). Moreover, the text of the \( \text{Odyssey} \) offers three instances of the thematic conjugation as well: \( \text{ἠον} \) in the identical 23.370 and 24.501, and \( \text{ἀνῄον} \) in 10.446 – i.e. in the only book where the thematic 1\(^{st}\) sg. forms occur.

\(^{13}\) Much less satisfying seems Peters’ (1980: 104 n. 49) theory, according to which \( \text{ἠε} \) continues an ancient middle (< *
\(^{*}(h1e-)h1e)).

\(^{14}\) Pace Chantraine 1973: 473, who considered 3\(^{rd}\) pl. \( \text{ἠον} \) as the starting point of all the other thematic formations in Homer. More specifically, Chantraine deemed *-ontil-ont – observable in the allegedly athematic aer. \( \text{ἐκλον} \) – as a PIE ending used for athematic verbs after consonant or resonant, although evidence shows that in such phonological contexts PIE athematic verbs typically employed -qtil-qt or, in a limited set of examples, -qntil-qnt (cf. Szemerényi 1996: 237 and 238 n. 13).

\(^{15}\) Cf. West 1998: 298 and 2017: 162 for the \( \text{apparatus criticus} \).

\(^{16}\) In this regard, we can mention Chantraine’s (1973: 286) observation that \( \text{ἠε} \) occurs in hypothetically ‘recent’ passages, namely the so-called \( \text{Dolomeia} \), and book 8 of the \( \text{Odyssey} \), which contains the love affairs between Aphrodite and Ares.

\(^{17}\) Based on this occurrence, Kühner-Blass (1892: 218) includes \( \text{ἠε} \) in the Old-Ion. and epic paradigm of the impf. of \( \text{ἦμ} \), although he gives some credit to Nauck’s emendation. For the \( \text{apparatus criticus} \), cf. Allen-Halliday-Sikes 1936: 21.
Finally, the Homeric language presents a 3rd du. form as well, always unaugmented. The simplex ἱτην is attested in II. 1.347 and Od. 9.430, 21.244, whereas the compound συνίτην belongs exclusively to the Iliad (6.120, 16.476, 20.159, 23.814). Both forms always end at the hephthemimeral caesura with their ending -την, except for II. 16.476. This passage is also the only case where συνίτην does not occur in the formula [ἐς μέσον ἀμφιτέρων/ ὀματιν μεμαδε μάρος ται].

§1.3 The Ionic impf. of εἶμι

The previous sections have described the differences between the older Attic paradigm, always showing a stem with a diphthong, and the diversity of forms in Homer. An accurate description of the impf. of εἶμι in Ionic would help us understand whether the ἤι- type was an artificial creation of the epic diction, or a genuine feature of the bards’ Ionic dialect. In the former case, it would be possible to consider the Ionic paradigm as identical to the older Attic one, except maybe for the 3rd-sg. ending -ε, which is likely to be older than ἤει and is clearly attested in Homer and Herodotus (cf. §1.2 and infra).

The ἤι- type is not attested only in Homer. For the reconstruction of a possible Ionic paradigm, we need to look at two sources: archaic poetry and Herodotus. The former shows once again the coexistence of different morphological forms with the same value, namely a disyllabic stem ἤι- as opposed to ἤ-, and a possibly older ending -ε alternating with -ει in the 3rd sg. In particular, the only certain occurrences of the ἤι-type are verse-initial [ἤια] in Hymn Ap. 420 and [ἤισαν] in Hymn Ven. 72. Another possible instance is ἤα τι / ἰθα μεν in Archil. 79.1-2 West, although due to the lack of context this ‘ἥα’ might also be neut. pl. ἥλια ‘provisions for a journey’, which is especially frequent in the Odyssey. As for the forms of the impf. of εἶμι with an initial diphthong, verse-initial ἤει in Hymn Ap. 28 has already been mentioned in §1.2, while another occurrence is in Archil. 185.3 West: ‘πιθηκος ἤει θηρίον άποκριθεις’. In this iambic trimeter, the first syllable of ‘ἥει’ needs to be scanned long, so that the initial ἤ is taken to be a diphthong. Alternatively, the verb might be replaced with ἤει, which is nonetheless absent from the textual tradition. Furthermore, as observed by Kühner-Blass (1892: 218), in this metrical context the form ἤε would also be possible.

Overall, the instances above, just like the Homeric ones, show a wide range of semantically equivalent alternatives, whose different prosodic structures facilitated metrical composition. According to this principle, the spondaic ἤει could both replace an older ἤε at the end of the hexameter.

18 A possible reason for this could be that the ἤι-type became basically the only (or at least the most traditional) augmented form of the impf. of εἶμι, thus making the augmentation of ἱτην impossible (†ἡίτην).
(as in Homer), or be used in metrical positions where ἓκ was not suitable (as in *Hymn Ap. 28*). At the same time, while the alternation between the ἓκ-type and a stem with a diphthong made a useful tool from a metrical point of view, it is certainly much harder to justify as an element of the ordinary Ionic language, since a coexistence of the two stems would not be economical (cf. §2.1). Alternatively, variant forms might belong to different dialects, thus showing the presence of non-Ionic elements in archaic poetry. However, this option cannot be confirmed because the ἓκ-type is found only in Homer, the poetry inspired by Homeric diction, and the textual tradition of Herodotus’ *Histories*. Finally, the consideration of the ἓκ-type as kunstsprachlich is not invalidated by any of the occurrences above, as they all belong to poetry using epic diction.

This coherent pattern of occurrences seems broken by the attestation of the ἓκ-type in the MSS tradition of Herodotus’ *Histories*, where the variants in ἓκ- represent the vast majority, as opposed to the far less frequent ἓκα and ἓκαν. Following this, most critical editions print ἓκα, ἓκε and ἓκαν for the impf. of ἐλμι in Herodotus. If these forms do belong in Herodotus’ prose, a consideration of the ἓκ-type as a real feature of Ionic becomes a very plausible option. On the other hand, Rosén’s edition (1987, 1997) stands out for his decision to print the forms of the impf. of ἐλμι consistently with initial ἓ-, thus preferring disyllabic ἓκα, ἓκε and ἓκαν. Long before this edition, Smyth (1920: 212) suggested that the ἓ handed down by the MSS should be interpreted as a diphthong.

Clearly, the acute accent in variants like ἓκα seems to indicate otherwise, so that agreeing with Smyth and Rosén consists in assuming a widespread corruption in the MSS tradition. If this is true for the spelling ἓκ-, its origin should then be located at the time of the two Byzantine archetypes of

---

19 It should be noted, however, that *[ἐξέγεν, χέρσον]* would be perfectly possible at the beginning of *Hymn Ap* 28, especially considering Homeric instances like [φώνησέν τε] or [δούπησεν δὲ πέσών] (for this use of ν-movable, cf. Hoekstra 1965: 74). This variant, however, is completely absent from the textual tradition – and the same will be seen in §3.2.1.2 for the Homeric instances of [ἡπιείς] followed by a consonant.

20 The same obviously goes for all the instances of the ἓκ-type found in later poetry imitating the epic language, such as Pseudo-Hes. Sc. 170 (ἡπιον), *Orphica Argon*. 236 (ἡπιν), 1287 (ἡπει), or hexameter poetry of the Hellenistic period (e.g. Apoll. Rhod. 1.141, 3.1331).

21 For a detailed overview of the most updated list of manuscripts, see Rosén 1987: xlv-llv (in particular, lxxiii for a possible *stemma codicum*). Cf. also Asheri 1988: lxxii-iii.

22 From now on, any information on the textual tradition variants is drawn from a comparison of critical editions of Herodotus’ *Histories*, with a particular focus on Legrand 1932-54, Rosén 1987, 1997, and Wilson 2015 – which is a revision of Hude 1927.

23 In particular, Hude 1927; Legrand 1932-54. Most recently, Wilson’s (2015) revision of Hude’s edition keeps the spellings ἓκα, ἓκε and ἓκαν.

24 Probably with the support of the Herodotean evidence, Kühner-Blass (1892: 218) included ἓκα, ἓκε and ἓκαν in the *neuionisch* paradigm of the impf. of ἐλμι, together with ἓκα (and possibly ἓκε).
the MSS families\(^{25}\). Interestingly, in some ancient grammar works spanning from the 9\(^{th}\) to the 13\(^{th}\) cent. CE, it is stated that “Ionians say ἡ̓ια and ἡ̓ισαν”. This identical comment is found in Photius\(^{26}\), *Suda*\(^{27}\), Plato’s scholia\(^{28}\), and as a later interpolation in the *Platonic Lexicon* by Timaeus the Sophist\(^{29}\). It is stated that, “Ἰονες ἡ̓ια λέγουσι και ἡ̓ισαν το ἡ̓ισαν”. The presence of the ἡ̓-type in Homer was certainly known to Aelius Dionysius, who therefore applied the label of ‘Ionic’ to a feature of the epic language as well\(^{31}\). Quite surprisingly, he omits Herodotus from his examples, although showing elsewhere to be aware that this author was Ionian\(^{32}\). Instead, he quotes two passages by the Attic Thucydides (1.1.1) and Aristophanes (fr. 417 K.-C.) as instances of, respectively, ἡ̓ισαν and ἡ̓ια. The Atticist Aelius Dionysius is probably using them to show two forms which he considered as non-Attic, namely ἡ̓ισαν instead of ἡ̓ισαν and ἡ̓ια instead of ἡ̓ια\(^{33}\). More specifically, the older-Attic ἡ̓ια and ἡ̓ισαν are marked by Aelius Dionysius with the generic label of ‘Ionic’, and then re-interpreted erroneously as ἡ̓ισαν and ἡ̓ια\(^{34}\). Aelius Dionysius’ misunderstanding might have been an isolated case in the 2\(^{nd}\) cent. CE\(^{35}\).

In the Late-Antique period, however, it seems to have spread extensively from the grammarians who

\(^{25}\) It is hard, however, to find a precise chronology for the split into the two canonical families α and β (or Florentine and Vatican). Cf. Asheri 1988: lxxxi.


\(^{27}\) *Lexicon* η.8, cf. Adler 1931: 546.

\(^{28}\) *Scholia in Platonem, ad R. Publ.* 449a., cf. Greene 1938: 226. The MSS of the *scholia vetere* date between 9\(^{th}\) and 13\(^{th}\) cent. CE (cf. Greene 1937: 185-7).

\(^{29}\) Accordingly, it is expunged from the η-section in Bonelli 2007: 150-1.


\(^{31}\) Several centuries later, the association between Homeric and Ionic is plain in Eustathius *Commentarii ad Homerī Iliadem* 50 (cf. van der Valk 1971: 81): “φασιν ἱονες […] το ἡ̓ισαν ἡ̓ια”, followed just by the quotation of *Od*. 4.433 (ἡ̓ια, πολλά θεοίς γουνόμους).


\(^{33}\) Cf. Defferrari 1969: 61, who illustrates the use of ἡ̓ιαν in Alciphron while also pointing out the preference by several Atticists for ἐρχομαι rather than εἰμι in the impf. This also explains the overall lack of discussion on the impf. of εἰμι in Schmid’s (1887-1897) work on the most important Atticists (cf. in particular 1887: 231; 1893: 40; 1896: 35), since ἐρχόμην is usually reported as the impf. paradigm used by them. On the other hand, cf. Defferrari 1969: 65 for Lucian’s exclusive use of ἡ̓ιαν and ἡ̓ισαν (except for one possible instance of ἡ̓ιαν).

\(^{34}\) Obviously, the two passages should have the spelling ἡ̓ι- or ἡ̓ι- to indicate a diphthong (cf. §1.1): Aristoph. fr. 417 “ἐπεὶ δ’ ἐγενόμην οὖσαν ἦ̓ι’ ἐπὶ ξύλα” (cf. Kassel-Austin 1984: 229); Thucyd. 1.1.1 “ὅτι ἀκμάζοντες τε ἡ̓ιαν ἐς αὐτόν” (cf. Alberti 1972: 25).

\(^{35}\) This assumption is corroborated by the fact that Aelius Herodianus, a grammarian contemporary to Aelius Dionysius, ascribes a form like ἡ̓ια solely to Homer in *Περὶ παθῶν* 3.2, without even mentioning Ionic: “κατά διάλοσιν τοῦ τ ἡ̓ια ὡς καρφα το ποιητή”, followed by two examples from *Od*. 4.433 and *Il*. 1.47.
used Aelius Dionysius as their source, so that the ἤἵ-type was by then considered as an ‘Ionic’ feature tout court.

If this confusion could affect the reception of Attic authors like Thucydides and Aristophanes, it is entirely possible that in the Byzantine archetypes of Herodotus’ Histories the ἤἵ-type was also attributed to the Ionian author considered as the ‘most Homeric’. The Byzantine editions might have therefore preserved the older spelling ηί— which is obviously found (unaccented) in the papyri of the first three centuries CE for the impf. of εἰμι, in order to reproduce the Homeric (and allegedly Ionic) ἤἵ-type in the text of Herodotus’ Histories. I therefore accept Rosén’s ἔ, ἔ, and ἔ as the original forms in Herodotus. This conclusion supports the existence of a stem with diphthong for the 5th-century BCE Ionic impf. of εἰμι, which would thus correspond to the older Attic paradigm. An interesting difference between them, however, might have been the preservation in Ionic of the possibly older 3rd sg. ἔ, as opposed to the consistent attestation of ἔια in older Attic. At the same time, the ending -ει might have been an option already in the latest stages of epic oral tradition, as possibly shown by the Homeric instances in verse-final position (though emendable), as well as by the occurrences in Hymn Ap. 28 and Archil. 185.3 West. In this case, Herodotus’ ἔ might be an archaism or a more literary variant.

§2. Hypotheses on the ἤἵ-type

In the relevant modern scholarship, there have been attempts to explain the odd morphology of the ἤἵ-type as an inner-Greek development—or even as an inherited form from PIE—containing a variously explained LA. This view clearly described the ἤἵ-type as a phenomenon of spoken Ionic, whereas a kunstsprachlich origin of it will be here supported instead.

§2.1 A feature of the ordinary language?

In the relevant scholarship, Hom. 1st sg. ἔια has occasionally been considered as perfectly corresponding to Ved. 1st sg. āyam, but this comparison is actually approximate. As can be seen in Table III, the augmented impf. of Ved. ya- ‘to go’ is regularly in the vrddhi ai-, as it is expected in

36 In this regard, it is also possible to mention a variant ἔ instead of ἔ in the textual tradition of Xen. Cyr. 5.4.10 and 5.4.11 (cf. Kühner-Blass 1892: 217).
37 De subl. 13.3: “μόνος Ἡρόδοτος Ὁμηρικώτατος ἔγένετο”.
38 E.g. ἔ for Hdt. 1.122.3. See Chambers 1981 for a publication of the papyri containing Herodotus’ Histories.
39 Cf. DELG: 307; Beekes 2010: 388.
Vedic for a verb whose guna-stem starts with a vowel[40]. Another typical outcome in Vedic is the internal sandhi ai- > āy- before vowel (e.g. rāye ‘for wealth’ < *rai-e)[41], which can perfectly explain the presence of a long diphthong āy- both in 1st sg. āyam and 3rd pl. āyan. Furthermore, while the Vedic paradigm has a consistent diphthong, Greek forms like ἅια present a hiatus between two vowels, which cannot be justified with any original consonantal sound between them. Therefore, Hom. ἅια, unlike Ved. āyam[42], cannot be explained as inherited from PIE *h₁e-h₁é-i through the normal phonological developments of ancient Greek.

As a consequence, the morphology of ἅια should be explained either as an inner-Greek development, or as an artificial form of epic diction. The former line of interpretation, as already mentioned in the previous chapter, was attempted by Ruijgh (1971/2) and Berg (1977). In particular, in Ch. 3 §2.1 Ruijgh’s theory was ultimately dismissed for an excessively convoluted process of analogical influences between the impf. of εἶμι and the ppf. of οἶδα. Berg’s (1977: 254) theory, on the other hand, provides a more coherent process, while still explaining the origin of the LA from the impf. of εἶμι. According to Berg, since the 1st sg. form from * h₁e-h₁é-i had given *ēa after loss of intervocalic yod, the Wurzelsilbe was restored as -i-, thus giving Hom. ἅια. Through analogy, the following paradigm was formed: 1st sg. ἅια, 2nd sg. ἅισθα, 3rd sg. ἅιε, 1st pl. ἅιμεν, 2nd pl. ἅιτε, 3rd pl. ἅίσαν[43]. This allowed for a reanalysis of ἅ- as a new morpheme, which was then applied to the (originally zero-grade[44]) ppf. of οἶδα.

The first issue with this view is that Berg (1977: 248 passim) seems to describe a real phenomenon of ancient Greek – or at least Ionic – since he derives ἅπεε, attested also in Herodotus, from his reconstructed *ηίδεε (cf. Ch. 3 §1.2). For this to happen, the LA needed to be an ordinary-language feature both in the impf. of εἶμι and in the ppf. of οἶδα. However, the creation of a form with hiatus is not expected in a phonological process ascribed to the natural development of ancient Greek[45]. At the same time, it might still be argued that the restoration of -i- brought such a morphological clarity – by making the forms of the paradigm more transparently from the root – to

---

[42] Cf. Mayrhofer 1972: 77, who considers āyam as equivalent to the Greek form with diphthong ᾱa.
[43] Sihler (1995: 525) similarly suggests that the -i- of the zero grade was ‘imported’ from the forms of the paradigm of εἶμι which presented it.
[44] As seen in Ch. 3 §1.2, Berg assumed an original *ηίδεε’ underlying Urtex EIDE. He therefore maintained that the LA was used with the ppf. of οἶδα when it still had a zero grade *ϝιδ-. Similarly, Rix (1976: 258) had already reconstructed *SPATH-a for Hom. ἅδον, based on a stative stem *SPATH-.
[45] See infra for Homeric examples of hiatus which can actually be explained with the loss of an intervocalic consonant and morphological boundaries.
be overall acceptable, despite the odd creation of a hiatus. If Berg’s reconstruction is accepted, both ἤι- and ἱ- should be supposed for the Ionic impf. of εἶμι at the time of the Homeric composition, according to the evidence seen for Homer (§1.2) and the rest of archaic poetry (§1.3). At the same time, the co-existence of ἤι- and ἱ- in the ordinary language as contemporary forms of the impf. of εἶμι would violate linguistic economy (cf. Ch. 3 §2.1), so that only two explanations are possible:

- If both stems are genuine spoken forms, the relationship between them should be diachronic.
- If only one of the two forms is genuine, then the other should be considered as an artificial creation of the epic Kunstsprache.

In the first scenario, it would be easier to assume that forms like ἤια are the older ones, while forms in ἱ- represent a later monophthongisation, since the opposite process would be harder to justify through Greek historical phonology. At the same time, if Berg’s hypothesis were accepted, it would be necessary to posit the analogical reintroduction of -ί- at a very early stage, namely right after the loss of intervocalic yod\(^{46}\). Before Berg’s analogical process could take place, the impf. of εἶμι might have been as follows (cf. §1.1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st. sg.</th>
<th>1st. pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>*ēa</td>
<td>*ēimen (- *ejmen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>*ējs (←*ejs)</td>
<td>2nd pl. *ēite (← *eite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>*ēi (← *eij)</td>
<td>3rd pl. *ēen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering this paradigm, it is simply unwarranted to suppose the restoration of a vowel -ί- creating hiatus, rather than of the intervocalic *-j- still preserved in 2nd sg., 3rd sg., 1st pl. and 2nd pl. If the aim was to highlight forms like *ἢα and *ῄεν as belonging to the impf. of εἴμι, then an analogical restoration of intervocalic -j- would easily have fulfilled the same purpose. Accordingly, the stem ἱ- is not only limited to poetry, but can also be found since the oldest instances of ancient Greek prose. It clearly belongs to older Attic, and in §1.3 I argued that it should also be restored for Herodotus’ Ionic, so that the ἤι-type seems ultimately exclusive of the epic diction – and of later poetry imitating it. A further confirmation that the stem ἱ- was the spoken form comes from the fact that an initial diphthong needed to be the starting point both for the analogical restoration of ἱ- in the 2nd sg., 3rd sg., 1st pl. and 2nd pl. (cf. §1.1), and for the creation of 3rd sg. ἱέ (cf. §1.2). It would therefore be more

---

\(^{46}\)This loss must have happened long before the first evidence in literature and inscriptions (cf. Sihler 1995: 188). As for Mycenaean, intervocalic -j- is attested in the material adjectives in -e-jo: cf. Ruijgh 1967: 65; Sihler 1995: 188; cf. also Bartoněk 2003: 139 for -wij- (e.g. *me-wi-jo or me-u-jo, cf. DMic I: 447-8), although a few examples in e-o seem to show that intervocalic yod was already disappearing, possibly through an intermediate stage in -h- (cf. Ruijgh 1967: 65; Lejeune 1972: 168). Neither the verb εἶμι nor its compounds are ever found in the impf. in the Linear B tablets (cf. Bartoněk 2003: 312-3).
logical to consider the ἰι-type not as a feature of the Ionic dialect, but rather as an artificial creation of Ionian poets within their oral tradition.

§2.2 Artificial ἰι: possible explanations

At this stage, a compelling question is why in Homer the artificial ἰι- was preferred to *Sprachwirklich ἰ- to such an extent that the latter is attested only in the isolated ἐπῆσαν and the few occurrences of ἵε(ν)/-ει and ἵομεν. The answer might lie in the essence of the Homeric artificial forms: their metrical functionality. As will be shown in §3.2.1.1 and §3.2.1.2, the trisyllabic structure of ἵσαν represented a perfect replacement for (mostly verse-initial) [οί ὁ’ ἱσαν], to the point that both its dactylic structure and position in enjambment were replicated in most of the other occurrences of the ἰι-type.

What process would then be at the origin of a form like ἰια, if it were to be considered as an artificial creation of the Homeric language? Berg’s theory might still be used to describe a product of the Homeric Kunstsprache. That is, the restoration of -ι- might have been an alternative solution to the loss of intervocalic yod, for the purpose of obtaining an artificial and metrically functional form. Such an origin, however, should still be posited at a very archaic stage. As already argued in §2.1, considering how early yod was lost intervocically in ancient Greek, it is more plausible to assume the sole existence of an analogically restored ἰι- by the time of the Homeric oral tradition already.

Consequently, if the stem with a diphthong was the Ionic bards’ starting point for an artificial creation, a process of diæresis might be considered. The main problem with this view, however, is that the Homeric instances of hiatus within a word can usually be explained with morphological boundaries, rather than an actual process of diæresis. Furthermore, such boundaries are usually preserved thanks to the original presence of *-r- or *-σ- — which indicates that in the oldest layer of the Homeric language an actual hiatus cannot even be assumed for these words47. The only possible cases of diæresis I could find are represented by the occurrences of Τρόια/Τρόιοι48, and by the hapax ἀοσταλέος49. However, the etymology of the latter is debated50, and its single occurrence can hardly

47 Frequent examples of this phaenomenon are forms of the nouns in -ος (e.g. ὄδος, ὀνήματος, δύοπλος, διάφωτος) and words like δύις διάφων (from the root *day- of διως < *day-ιδω). 

48 Il. 13.262: [Τρόια, τά κταμένον ἀποικίσαμεν αὐτῷ γὰρ ὄνω]; Il. 5.222 = 8.106: [ὁδοὶ Τρώϊων ἵπποι, ἑπιστάμενοι πεδίοι]; Il. 23.378: [Τρόιοι, οὐδέ τι πολλὸν ἀνευθείαν ἔσωσαν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλ’ ἐγγύς].

49 Od. 19.327: [ἐι κεν ἀοσταλέος, κατὰ εἰμίνον ἐν μεγάρους].

50 This form is usually connected with ἀδός ‘dry’, derived from PIE *sautso in IEW: 880-1, which contains one of the few attestations of a PIE vowel *a. Lubotsky (1985), on the other hand, derived the adjective from *h-sta-to- > *ahusos > *hauhos (non-Aeol. ἀδος), but his most convincing piece of evidence for an original *ahusos is just the hapax ἀοσταλέος. Berg-Lindeman (1991: 193-4) on the other hand, supported the traditional view (i.e. < *sautso) by describing ἀοσταλέος
be enough to prove the existence of diaeresis among the bards’ tools for the creation of artificial forms. As for Τρόια/Τρόιοι, it is tempting to consider their dactylic structure as an artificial creation to suit the metre wherever the forms *Τροιοί and *Τροφά were metrically unpreferable or impossible. However, it might also be argued that *Τροίος was the archaic variant, and that the creation of Τροφός was necessary to fit unmetrical forms into the hexameter, such as the acc. pl. (Τροφάς 3x instead of †Τροφάς, Τροφός 1x instead of †Τροφίους), or the dat. pl. (Τροφήσιον 7x instead of †Τροφήσιον). Furthermore, unlike in the case of the impf. of εἶμι, a philological analysis does not help decide which form might be kunstsprachlich, as the etymology of Τροιή/Τρόες is vividly debated and ultimately hard to establish51.

Consequently, neither a restoration of -ι- after loss of yod nor a process of diaeresis seem to be satisfying explanations for the artificial origin of the ᾅ- type. A third possibility, then, is that it was obtained simply by adding a LA to the zero-grade forms (ίσαν, ἰς), as implied in Chantraine’s (1973: 233) interpretation based on the contrast between ᾅ-ίσαν/illaume and ἰσαν/ίς. At the same time, this view leaves us with two issues that need to be resolved. First of all, which analogical model was followed to use a LA? That is, a LA needed to be abstracted from a specific source, or to exist already in the bards’ traditional diction as an artificial morpheme which they could use to obtain an ᾅ- type verb. Secondly, why did the bards need to create a form like ᾅ-ίσαν in the first place, instead of using the impf. of εἶμι with an initial diphthong? A solution to the latter problem will be found through the formula-based analysis in §3.2.1.1 and §3.2.2, where I will show how ᾅ-ίσαν was used as a metrical and syntactic alternative exactly thanks to its artificially created dactylic structure. As for the problem

as a metrical adjustment of an original στίχος λαγαρός (i.e. from εἰ κεν ἀσ- [−−] to εἰ κεν ἀσ- [−−]). This hypothesis strongly relies on Berg’s theory on the proto-hexameter (cf. Berg 1978; Tichy 1981; Haug-Welo 2001), and the controversial existence of στίχοι λαγαροί (cf. Chantraine 1973: 103-4). Finally, a third possible solution has been shown to me by Dr Torsten Meissner: if we accept *σαμο as the original root – which seems more likely – the initial σ- could have made position originally (i.e. εἰ κεν (η)ασ-), thus allowing a spondee in the first foot. The hiatus would then be a later metrical adjustment which need not be linked to an original existence of στίχοι λαγαροί.

51 A common root should be the basis for Hom. Τροιή and Τροις, the hero’s name Τρόις (from which the adjective Τρόηζ directly derives) and (Dor.?) Τροία (or Τροίη) found in Pindar (e.g Nem. 2.14, 3.60). This Greek family of nouns has been related to Hitt. Taruisa, whose interpretation is also controversial. For a thorough review of the relevant theories, cf. Fontaine 2016. In particular, a root *Troy- (cf. Kretschmer 1930: 167) would imply that the forms with hiatus are the older ones, whereas an original (Etruscan?) *Tri- > Gr. Τρόη- (cf. Beekes 2010: 1511; Kloekhorst 2012) might support the idea that there was no consonantal sound between Τρόη- and the adjectival suffix -ι-, and that therefore the forms with a diphthong might represent the original outcome.

52 A similar issue is encountered in the interpretation of ᾅ-ίσαν as a diaeresis of ᾅ-ίσαν. While -ι- can easily be interpreted as the Wurzelsilbe of εἶμι, thanks to zero-grade instances like ᾅ-ίσαν, it is harder to find an analogical parallel for initial ᾅ- if left on its own to form a separate syllable.
of an analogical LA, the answer might come from the ppf. of οἶδα. More specifically, if a form like ἠείον was created by applying a temporal augment to the artificial stem ἐειδ-, as argued in Ch. 3 §2.2, the initial ἠ- could then be reinterpreted as a LA and analogically added to the zero-grade forms of the impf. of εἶμι (e.g. ἡ-ἰσαν). As seen in Ch. 3 §2.1, the impf. of εἶμι and the ppf. of οἶδα share many analogical correspondences, so that the use of a newly-fledged LA would just be part of their intricate connection. In particular, their 3rd pl. forms are nearly identical (ἰσαν ‘they went’ and (ϝ)ἰσαν ‘they knew’), and quite interestingly the formula-based analysis will show that the origin of the ἠ-type lies specifically in the use of 3rd pl. ἠἰσαν as a dactylic substitute of ἵσαν, and as a metrical-syntactic alternative to constructions containing ἵσαν. I therefore conclude that the analogical LA abstracted from ἠείο- was first used in 3rd pl. ἠἰσαν, whose use in necessary enjambment will be considered as the origin of the Hom. ἠ-type (§3.2.1.1). This narrative allows us to explain how the stem ἠ- was created, since its emergence cannot be justified either as a phenomenon of the spoken language, or from the stem ἠ- through diaeresis. Furthermore, the stem ἠειο- offers a perfect analogical model for the fact that it could easily be re-interpreted as long-augmented by the Ionian bards – unlike ἠικτο, suggested by Hackstein (cf. Ch. 3 §2.2), given the consistent presence of a reduplicated stem in the paradigm of Hom. ἔοικα (cf. Ch. 5 §1.3).

§3. Analysis of the occurrences through the formula-based method

The analysis above, therefore, explains how the ἠ-type might have come into existence. What needs to be addressed now is why the Homeric singers opted for ἠτα, ἠτε and ἠἰσαν, instead of using the forms belonging to their ordinary language. The possible reason might come from an analysis of the Homeric traditional diction, and a consideration of the metrical constraints that come into play in AMs.

53 Strong morphological coincidences are here considered enough to trigger analogies between two paradigms, even if they are semantically different. That is, paradigms can affect each other just on morphological grounds: cf. the use of contract-verb endings in the impf. of τίθημι, ἱημι, δίδωμι (cf. Sihler 1995: 554), probably triggered by some forms in their paradigm which could be perceived as contracted, e.g. τίθεισι, ιείσιν, δίδοισι (cf. Chantraine 1961: 210 for this possible model, although he thinks that the impf. sg. of these verbs simply underwent thematisation). Furthermore, another possible correspondence between the past tense of οἶδα and the impf. of εἶμι is that the former was also likely to be regarded as some sort of imperfect, given the value of stative present of οἶδα.
§3.1 Two traditional patterns containing ἴσαν

The unaugmented 3rd pl. ἴσαν is the most frequent form of the Homeric impf. of εἰμι, with 31 occurrences in total. Unlike in the case of ἦντα or ἦσαν (cf. §2.1), the stem of ἴσαν might actually be inherited from the unaugmented PIE 3rd pl. of the impf. of *h₁ei₂*/h₁i₂– ‘to go’, according to the following process: *h₁i₂-én > *i-en → ἴσαν. In the last stage, through the use of -σαν – an athematic ending widespread already in Homer – there was an analogical replacement of the original form, which was likely to be *ἴεν (cf. Ved. yan)⁵⁴.

The high frequency of ἴσαν is not by itself evidence of its archaic origin, but its solid presence in traditional FPs is a confirmation of it. In particular, there are two patterns where ἴσαν is found in the same two positions which will be observed for the ἦτα-type in the next sections. Specific correspondences will allow me to demonstrate how ἦσαν was used as a metrical alternative to the whole syntactic structure [οἱ/αἱ δ’ ἴσαν], i.e. how it was employed in AMs derived from SP patterns containing ἴσαν.

§3.1.1 Pattern β: the occurrences of [ἴσαν]c

The first pattern of ἴσαν, here labelled with the Greek letter β, can be reconstructed as follows at its most basic level:

Pattern β  
\([-1a]\)Nom.Pl.Pr. \([-\sim 1c]\)Conj.+V.3pl.pret.

This structural representation is lexically filled with [οὶ/αί] or [αἱ/αί] in the first syllable, while the following past tenses – often unaugmented – can have prosodic structures expanding the metrical extension of the pattern, as exemplified in *Table V*. An important feature of pattern β is its use at the beginning of a new sentence, so that the personal pronoun is always followed by a particle or conjunction. The most frequent one is δ(ῆ) – as expected from epic coordination – but different ones are also found, such as τ(ῆ) or γ(ῇ). A further evolution of the system can bring not only to the use of a different nominative form, such as τοί, but also to a different case (e.g. [τὸν ρ’ ἔθελον] in *Od.* 16.428).

---

⁵⁴ See *Table III* for the loss of the original accent pattern in the impf. of ‘to go’ both in ancient Greek and in Vedic. While Hom. ἦν ‘(s)he was’ seems to underlie the original 3rd pl. of the impf. of εἰμί, the same cannot apply to Hom. ἴεν ‘(s)he went’. This is just the unaugmented 3rd sg. with n-movable, given the use of its final -ν as a euphonic consonant (e.g. *Il.* 3.383 [ἰεκ. τίν δὲ κίσανε], as opposed to *Il.* 2.872 [ἰεκ. ἥτε κούρη]), or for metrical usefulness (e.g. ἴεν in *Od.* 16.41, 17.30, 17.256, 24.221 before a word starting with just one consonant, as opposed to the occurrence of [ἴεκ] before [κλυτὰκ] in *Od.* 7.82). Accordingly, there is no Hom. *ἴεν next to ἴεν, which strongly suggests that the final -ν is actually an ending in this verbal form of εἰμί.
This section focuses on the instances of pattern \( \beta \) with the lexical item \( [\text{ἴσαν}_1] \), which are provided here below:

\( a \).

\textit{Il. 23.114}

\( \text{o̱i} \ \delta' \ \text{ἴσαν} \ \text{ὔλοτόμους πελέκεας ἐν χερσίν ἔχοντες}^{55} \)

\( b \).

\textit{Il. 24.647} = \textit{Od. 4.300, 7.339, 22.497}

\( \text{o̱i} \ \delta' \ \text{ἴσαν} \ \text{ἐκ μεγάροιο δάος μετὰ χερσίν ἔχουσαι}^{56} \)

\( c \).

\textit{Od. 10.103}

\( \text{o̱i} \ \delta' \ \text{ἴσαν} \ \text{ἐκβάντες λείην ὄ̀δόν, ἧ περ ἀμαξαὶ}^{57} \)

\( d \).

\textit{Il. 18.516}

\( \text{o̱i} \ \delta' \ \text{ἴσαν} \ \text{ reloadData λῃστὲς ἦρχας, ὣ ἔμαχαι}^{58} \)

\( e \).

\textit{Il. 13.795}

\( \text{o̱i} \ \delta' \ \text{ἴσαν} \ \text{ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἀπάλαντοι ἀέλλη}^{59} \)

Specific correspondences create sub-patterns. In particular, \( \beta.a \) and \( \beta.b \) share the following structure:

\[
[-] \text{Nom.Pl.} \ [\delta' \ \text{ἴσαν}_1]v \ [− − − (\text{)}] \text{Circum.} \ [(\text{)} − − − a] \text{Acc.Obj.} \ [\equiv \ \text{χερσίν}_3] \text{PrepP} \ [(− x)] \text{Nom.Pl.Ppl.ἔξω}
\]

At the same time, the preverb of \( [ἐκβάντες] \) in \( \beta.c \) seems to echo the preposition of \( [ἐκ \ μεγάροιοι] \) in \( \beta.b \), while \( \beta.d \) can be included in a pattern which will be analysed in depth in \S 3.2.2.

The structure of pattern \( \beta \) does not necessarily belong to the first foot, although the coincidence of its sentence-initial function with a verse-initial position is significantly frequent. The two following passages can also be included among the occurrences of \( [\text{ἴσαν}] \) in pattern \( \beta \), as they represent a simple shift of the same syntactic structure from the first foot to the fifth one:

\( f \).

\textit{Il. 24.247}

\( ἦ, \ \text{καὶ σκηνανῷ δῖεπ’ ἀνέρας; \ o̱i} \ \delta' \ \text{ἴσαν} \ \text{ἔξω}^{60} \)

\( 55 \) “These then went out and in their hand carried axes to cut wood”.

\( 56 \) “[The maid-servants] went forth from the main house, and in their hands held torches”.

\( 57 \) “They left the ships, and set off along a smooth road, on which wagons”.

\( 58 \) “But meanwhile the others went out. And Ares led them, and Pallas Athene”.

\( 59 \) “They went on, as out of the racking winds the stormblast”.

\( 60 \) “He spoke, and went after the men with a stick, and they fled outside”.

89
Finally, an isolated line of the Odyssey shows a slight change in the structure of pattern $\beta$, where the first foot contains a preverb in tmesis instead of the personal pronoun:

$h.$  
Od. 24.11

πάρ δ' ἵσαν Ὀκεανοῦ τε ῥόας καὶ Λευκάδα πέτρην

The peculiarities of this passage will be further described in §3.2.1.1. In particular, the presence of $[\hat{\eta}ίσαν1c]$ two lines below (Od. 24.13) will be further evidence of the connection between this form and $[ίσαν1c]$.

In §3.2.1.1, the instances of pattern $\beta$ will be linked to the occurrences of $[\hat{\eta}ίσαν1c]$ in enjambement. In particular, $[\hat{\eta}ίσαν1c]$ is found in passages where a new sentence cannot be started at the beginning of the hexameter, as the subjects have already been mentioned in the previous line. As a consequence, the context of enjambement makes it impossible to use pattern $\beta$ with $[ίσαν1c]$, since one of its main features is its function to start a new sentence, mostly in verse-initial position ($\beta.a-e$).

§3.1.2 Pattern $\gamma$: the occurrences of $[ίσαν4c]$  
Another frequent type of occurrence of ἵσαν is before bucolic caesura, and will be linked in §3.2.2. to the occurrences of $[\hat{\eta}ίσαν4c]$. Although the elements of this structure are less solid than those of pattern $\beta$, both the position of ἵσαν and the presence of a first-declension noun seem to be traditional features, which are replicated in the only occurrence of ἵσαν ‘they knew’ in the Iliad. The passages below are therefore grouped under the label of pattern $\gamma$.

$a.$  
Il. 3.2  
Τρῶες μὲν κλαγγῇ τ’ ἐνοπῇ τ’ ἵσαν ὄρνηθες ὅζ

$b.$  
Il. 17.266  
tόσσῃ ἄρα Τρῶες ίαχῇ ίσαν· αὐτάρ Αχαιοί

$c.$  
Il. 4.429  
ἡγεμόνων· οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι ἄκην ἵσαν, οὐδὲ κε φαίης

---

61 “Then he went back to his doorway and sat down; and the others went back inside”.  
62 “Past the waters of Oceanus they came, and the rock of Leucas”.  
63 “The Trojans came on with clamour and shouting, like wildfowl”.  
64 “With such a bellow the Trojans came on, but now the Achaians”.  
65 “[Each] of the lords commanding [his own men]; and these went silently, you would not think”.
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Passages γ.a and γ.b are clearly connected, as they both have the same subject (Τρῶες) and datives expressing the modality of the action, as well as a lexical item indicating the loud sound with which the Trojans advance ([κλαγγῇ] in γ.a, [ἐνοπῇ] in γ.b). Passages γ.c and γ.d share the ending [-ην] for the word preceding [ἰσαν]. As for γ.e, this is the only passage where [ἰσαν] is not preceded by a first-declension noun, but the presence of [αὐτὰρ Αχιλλεύς] suggests a connection with γ.b ([αὐτὰρ]) and γ.d ([Ἀχιλλεύς]).

As already explained, the common elements of this pattern are less solid than those observed for pattern β. This consideration can be drawn from the template below, which is meant to be inclusive of all the instances γ.a-e:

Pattern γ [(~) -ηNoun [ἰσαν] ]v

At the same time, more common features can be found at a closer look. In particular, in most occurrences the noun preceding [ἰσαν] belongs to the declension of the η-stems, either in the dat. sg. or in the acc. sg., with γ.e as the only exception. Therefore, both the presence of a first-declension noun and the position of [ἰσαν] seem to be traditional elements of pattern γ. Accordingly, not only is their presence consistent in γ.a-d, but it can also be found in the only occurrence in the Iliad of ἵσαν ‘they knew’ – a passage which has therefore been included within pattern γ:

f. Il. 18.405

ἀλλὰ Θέτις τε καὶ Εὐρυνόμη ἵσαν, αἳ μ’ ἐσάωσαν̄

Quite interestingly, the poet here uses a nom. sg. first-declension noun, which is unpreferable in the occurrences of ἵσαν ‘they went’ due to hiatus. This shows an important consideration of the initial digamma in (ϝ)ίσαν ‘they knew’, while the instances with ἵσαν ‘they went’ call for the use of a preceding consonant-ending noun (see γ.a and γ.c-e) to avoid hiatus. The only passage ignoring this is γ.b, where [ἰαχή] is immediately followed by [ἰσαν]. It should be noticed, however, that long

66 “Even these came then to assembly, since now Achilleus”.

67 “Thus gods went on to encounter gods; and meanwhile Achilleus”.

68 “Except Eurynome and Thetis. They knew, since they saved me”. The two previous lines (i.e. Il. 18.403-4) constitute the passage labelled as a.a in Ch. 3 §3.2.
diphthongs are particularly resistant to correction\textsuperscript{69}, so that \(\text{[ia}_\text{a} \text{chi}_{\text{a}} \text{is} \text{a}_\text{n}]\) was a perfectly acceptable solution for the bards, albeit containing hiatus. At the same time, \(\gamma.b\) inconsistently shows a correptio in hiatu of \(\text{[t} \text{o}_\text{s} \text{a}_\text{s} \text{i} \text{b]}\) before \(\text{[i} \text{a}_\text{na}_\text{a}a]\) at the beginning of the hexameter. The presence of two opposite treatments in the same line is not at all odd in Homeric poetry, but in the case of \(\gamma.b\) it might be a hint of some difficulty encountered by the poet while composing the line. In particular, the main difference between \(\gamma.a\) and \(\gamma.b\) is that the former contains two coordinated datives (\(\text{k} \text{l} \alpha \gamma \gamma \text{ti} \text{t}' \text{e} \nu \text{o} \pi \text{pi} \text{t}' \text{t}')\), so that the poet can avoid hiatus by using \(\text{t}'\) before \(\text{i} \text{s} \text{a}_\text{n}\), whereas in \(\gamma.b\) such coordination is not possible because \(\text{[t} \text{o}_\text{s} \text{a}_\text{s} \text{i} \text{b]}\) – which is expected at the beginning of the line right after the vehicle of a simile – is an attribute of the second dative \(\text{[ia}_\text{a} \text{chi}_{\text{a}} 4a]\).

Consequently, if we exclude \(\gamma.b\) for the presence of hiatus, and \(\gamma.e\) for the absence of a first-declension noun, pattern \(\gamma\) may be redefined as follows:

\[
\text{Sub-Pattern } \gamma.a, c, d, f \quad [(\text{C}) \text{Masc} \text{Noun} \text{[i} \text{a}_\text{a} \text{chi}_{\text{a}} \text{s} \text{a}_\text{n} 4c)]
\]

An important element which can be drawn from the pattern above is that the traditional presence of \(\eta\)-stem nouns might have played a role in the analogical correspondences between \(\text{[i} \text{a}_\text{a} \text{chi}_{\text{a}} \text{s} \text{a}_\text{n} 4c]\) and \(\text{[i} \text{a}_\text{a} \text{chi}_{\text{a}} \text{s} \text{a}_\text{n} 4c]\). More specifically, as will be observed in §3.2.2, there seems to be some phonetic echoing between the occurrences of \(\text{[i} \text{a}_\text{a} \text{chi}_{\text{a}} \text{s} \text{a}_\text{n} 4c]\) and the phrases \(\text{[i} \text{a}_\text{a} \text{chi}_{\text{a}} \text{s} \text{a}_\text{n} 4c]\) and \(\text{[E} \text{u} \text{r} \text{u} \text{n} \text{o} \text{m} \text{i} \text{t} \text{i} \text{s} \text{a}_\text{n} 4c]\). The same echoing can be found in the structure \(\text{[i} \text{a}_\text{a} \text{chi}_{\text{a}} \text{s} \text{a}_\text{n} 4c]\) of \(\gamma.b\), excluded from the sub-pattern above solely for the presence of hiatus – a feature which nonetheless allows for an even stronger connection with \(\text{[i} \text{a}_\text{a} \text{chi}_{\text{a}} \text{s} \text{a}_\text{n} 4c]\) from a phonetic point of view.

§3.2 The occurrences of the \(\eta\)-type: identifying analogical modifications

In the scholarship on the \(\eta\)-type of the impf. of ε\(\text{t} \mu\), its occurrences in specific verse-positions have so far not been considered. However, they might provide important evidence for the origin of the \(\eta\)-type. Two are the near-exclusive metrical positions for these forms:

- Verse-initial as 1\textsuperscript{st}-foot dactylic words.
- Before bucolic caesura as 4\textsuperscript{th}-foot dactylic words.

The former is by far the more frequent, with 22 occurrences in total. It is also the only position for \(\eta\text{siav}\) in the \textit{Iliad} (10.197, 13.305, 17.495), whereas in the \textit{Odyssey} it is used twice in the first foot (20.7, 24.13) and twice in the fourth foot before bucolic caesura (19.436, 24.9). Similarly, 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. \(\eta\text{tov}\) is in the first foot in 15 out of its 20 Homeric occurrences, while 1\textsuperscript{st} sg. \(\eta\text{ta}\) is used only in the first foot, and exclusively in the \textit{Odyssey} (4.427, 4.433, 4.572, 10.309).

As for the position before bucolic caesura, the ἥ- type occurs here less frequently, with 13 instances in total. This is the only attested position for all the compounds, which are clearly impossible to use at the beginning of the hexameter: ἐπήϊεν (II. 17.741), κατήϊεν (Od. 10.159), ἀνήϊον (Od. 10.146, 10.446 and 10.274), and ἐπήϊσαν (Od. 11.233). The same applies to ἱον, which is used before bucolic caesura in both its occurrences (Od. 23.370, 24.501). As for the other simplex verbs, ἱαν, as already seen, occurs twice in this position (Od. 19.436, 24.9), while ἱε occupies the fourth foot only three times (II. 1.47, 24.596, Od. 7.7).

Sections §3.2.1 and §3.2.2 will specifically focus on the occurrences of 3rd pl. ἱαν. In particular, I will show how ἱαν is consistently used as a metrical doublet of [οἱ/αἱ δ’ ἱαν], mostly in enjambment as an alternative to pattern β. This metrically functional use will strongly support the kunstsprachlich origin of the ἥ- type, which has already been demonstrated through the observations in §2.1 and §2.2. Furthermore, the analysis of the occurrences of ἱα and ἱε will show how the position in enjambment became the traditional one for the ἥ- type. At the same time, interesting parallels will also be found for the fourth-foot occurrences of ἱαν in §3.2.2, which will provide persuasive conclusions on ἱον as well.

§3.2.1 First-foot occurrences
A noteworthy characteristic of the first-foot occurrences of the ἥ- type is that they are always found in the so-called ‘necessary’ enjambement. With this term, Parry (1929: 216-7) defined the metro-syntactic construction where a sentence (or thought) is not complete by verse-end. He also distinguished between two types of necessary enjambement: the first (and less common) is represented by the use of a subordinate clause in the first line, followed by its main clause in the second; the other type is an actual division of a word-group between two lines. The latter, as will be observed, is the syntactic context of the occurrences of the ἥ- type in verse-initial position.  

---

70 Some editors report ἀνήιον for Od. 10.274, but as shown by West (2017: 213) this confusion arose from an imprecision in Ludwich’s edition.

71 The second type is here simply referred to as ‘necessary’. Kirk (1985: 33) calls it ‘integral’. It is also interesting to notice that in Homer the type of word in necessary enjambement is very often the main verb of the preceding line – cf. Kirk 1985: 33, whose example of ‘integral’ enjambement is Il. 4.449, starting with [Ἐκλήντ’].
§3.2.1.1  
First-foot ᾧσαν and its relationship with pattern β

As already observed, all the three occurrences of ᾧσαν in the Iliad are in the first foot:

a.  
Il. 17.494-5
1. τοῦσι δ’ ὀμα Χρομίος τε καὶ Ἀρητος θεωειδῆς
2. ᾧσαν ἀμφότεροι· μᾶλα δὲ σφισιν ἐξέπετο θυμός

b.  
Il. 10.196-7
1. τοῖς δ’ ὀμα Μηριόνης καὶ Νέστορος ἄγλαος νιός
2. ᾧσαν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ κάλεον συμμητίασθαι

c.  
Il. 13.304-5
1. τοῖς Μηριόνης τε καὶ Ἡδομενεὺς ἄγοι ἀνδρῶν
2. ᾧσαν ἐς πόλεμον κεκορυθμένοι αἴθοπι χαλκῷ

The pattern underlying these three passages can be schematised as follows:

Pattern δ  
1. [τοῖς δ’ ὀμα]PrP [(-) - (-)]Nom.Subj. [((-) - - - - - -)]Nom.Subj.+Mod.  
2. [ أخيναι]V

In particular, passages δ.α and δ.β share important similarities, which allow for the identification of a more specific structure:

Pattern δ.α, β  
1. [τοῖς(1) δ’ ὀμα]PrP.Comit. [(-) - - - (-)]Nom.Subj. [((-) - - - - - -)]Nom.Subj.+Mod.NP  
2. [ أخيναι]V

Both passages start with a phrase of comitative value, which stretches up to the second-foot arsis in δ.α.1. This phrase is always in verse-initial position in Homer, but δ.α and δ.β are the only Homeric passages where it is followed by two subjects and a verb in enjambement, whereas in all its other occurrences the main verb is included in the same line. The two subjects are coordinated as increasing members, according to Behagel’s law, and the word in necessary enjambement at the beginning of the second line is the main verb.

---

72 “Along with these went Chromios and godlike Aretos both together, and the spirit within each had high hopes”.
73 “And with them went Meriones and Nestor’s glorious son, since the kings themselves called these to take counsel with them”.
74 “Such were Meriones and Idomeneus, leaders of armies, as they went on into the fighting helmed in the bright bronze”.
75 Il. 2.524 and 2.747 have [τοῖς δ’ ὀμαν] followed by [τεσσαράκοντα μέλαιναι νῆας ἐποντο]. [τοῖς δ’ ὀμαν] also occurs in Il. 12.372 (τοῖς δ’ ὀμα Πανδίων Τεύκρου φέρε καμπύλα τόξα), while the second instance of [τοῖς δ’ ὀμαν] is in Od. 14.471 (τοῖς δ’ ὀμα τρίτος ἢρχον ἐγώ· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἄνωθεν).
As for δ.c, there are elements which suggest an AM of the pattern underlying δ.a and δ.b\(^{77}\). In particular, the syntax of δ.c needs to be adjusted to the structure of a simile, which starts in l. 298 with [οἶος τ] (referring to the vehicle Ares). Therefore, instead of the comitative [τοιοῦτος δ'] άμα], the singer employs a phonetically echoing [τοιοῦτος], which functions as a correlative to [οἶος τ] and introduces the tenor of the simile. Furthermore, the term ἀγοί here refers to both heroes, thus breaking Behagel’s law\(^{78}\).

It is here maintained that the trisyllabic structure of [ἥσαν] represents a metrically useful alternative to [οἳδ'] ἱσαν] of pattern β, which has been analysed in §3.1.1. Let us compare one of the instances of pattern β with δ.b and δ.c:

\(\beta.a\) (expanded): Ίλ. 23.112-4

| ἐπὶ δ’ ἄνηρ ἑσθλὸς ὀρώαρη, Μηριώνης, θεράπων ἁγαπήνορος Ἡδομενής, οἶ δ’ ἱσαν ὕλοκομοις πελέκεας ἐν χερσὶν ἐχοντες\(^{79}\)

\(\delta.b\) Ίλ. 10.196-7

tοῖς δ’ ἀμα Μηριώνης καὶ Νέστορος ἀγλαὸς νίὸς ἡσαν- αὔτοι γὰρ κύλεον συμμητιάσθαι

\(\delta.c\) Ίλ. 13.304-5

tοῖοι Μηριώνης τε καὶ Ἡδομενεῦς ἁγοὶ ἄνδρῶν ἡσαν ἐς πόλεμον κεκορυθμένοι αἴθοσι χαλκῷ

In the first passage, the men led by Meriones set out to cut wood, as they have previously been ordered by Agamemnon (Ιλ. 110-112). As already explained in §3.1.1, the first foot of Ίλ. 23.114 belongs to a pattern where a pyrrhic 3rd-pl. past tense is used after [οἳδ'] at the beginning of a new sentence. The instances of pattern δ, on the other hand, contain a verb semantically equivalent to ἱσαν, but used in a necessary enjambement. The syntactic context is therefore the main difference between \(\beta.a\) and δ.b.c, especially considering that the two heroes mentioned in \(\beta.a\) are also found in the instances of

---

\(^{77}\) The trigger for this AM might have been the mention of the hero Meriones, who is also one of the subjects in δ.b.1.

\(^{78}\) There are also a few features suggesting a character of isolated AM for δ.c. The term ἀγοι is used as an epithet only in this passage, whereas in all its other occurrences (Ιλ. 3.231, 12.61 = 17.335, 12.346 = 12.359, 23.160) it is a noun functioning as subject. As for what follows [ἥσαν] in δ.c.2, this is the only case where the widespread formula [κεκορυθμένο* αἴθοσι χαλκοῦ] does not have its perf. pll. in the nom. sg.

\(^{79}\) “And a great man led them in motion, Meriones, the henchman of courtly Idomeneus. These then went out and in their hands carried axes to cut wood”.
pattern $\delta$. In $\beta.a$, a new sentence is started with $[o\iota \delta^{'} \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$, after the previous one has been completed with a line filled by the mention of two heroes. In $\delta.b$ and $\delta.c$, the sentence is not complete after the noun-epithet formulae, so that the verb needs to be used in necessary enjambment. In addition to this, the dactylic structure of $[\iota \iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$ perfectly replicates the prosody of $[o\iota \delta^{'} \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$ of pattern $\beta$, so as to be a metrical alternative to be used in enjambment. The complementary distribution can therefore be described as follows:

$$[\text{-}]_{pr.} [\delta^{'} \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]_V$$ Pattern $\beta$. Beginning of a new sentence.

$$[\iota \iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]_V$$ Pattern $\delta$. Necessary enjambment.

Where it was not possible to start the line with $[o\iota \delta(\dot{e})]$ – as the subjects had already been mentioned – the artificial $[\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu]$ came in handy. Therefore, $[\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$ was used as a metrical doublet of the whole syntactic structure $[\text{-}]_{pr.} [\delta^{'} \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$, so as to provide an alternative both metrically and syntactically through its kunstsprachlich dactylic prosody.

This analysis may provide a possible reason for the bards to create a form like $\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu$: the shift from $[o\iota \delta^{'} \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$ to a syntactic structure in necessary enjambment might have led them to shape a word that could fit the first-foot dactyl. Consequently, the formula-based analysis in this section further confirms the kunstsprachlich nature of the $\iota \iota$-type, already demonstrated in §2.2 through philological evidence. Furthermore, it is hardly a coincidence that the $\iota \iota$-type is found mostly in the first foot and in the same type of enjambment observed for pattern $\delta$ (cf. §3.2.1.2). The metrical usefulness of a form like $\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu$ was all the more significant in its metrical equivalence to $[o\iota \delta^{'} \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$, which offered alternative forms in the complementary distribution between two opposite syntactic contexts (i.e. sentence-initial vs enjambment).

The connection between pattern $\beta$ and $[\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$ is even more visible in the occurrences of the latter in the Odyssey. The position of $[\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$ in enjambment can be once again observed in them, just as it will be seen for all the occurrences of $\iota \iota \iota$ and most of those containing $\iota \iota \iota$ (§3.2.1.2). Since this kind of position is clearly traditional, the next two passages are labelled under pattern $\delta$ in Appendix II. This is not to suggest that the occurrence of $[\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$ in enjambment represents a pattern by itself. The only aim is to conventionally link the two occurrences of $[\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$ from the Odyssey to the ones in the Iliad, since the position in enjambment is clearly a traditional element for the $\iota \iota$-type.

One of the two occurrences of $[\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu_{1c}]$ in the Odyssey can be strongly connected with the structure observed for $\beta.b$ in §3.1.1:

$$\delta.d \quad Od. \text{ 20.6-8}$$

1. κείτ’ ἕρησιν ὡς ταῖς δ’ ἐκ μεγάρῳ γυναῖκες
2. $\iota \iota \iota \sigma \alpha \nu$, αἱ μηστηρίσαν ἐμισγέσκοντο πάρος περ,
3. ἀλλήλησι γέλω τε καὶ εὐφροσύνην παρέχουσαι

β.γ

II. 24.647 = Od. 4.300, 7.339, 22.497

αἱ δ’ ἵσαν ἐκ μεγάροιο δάος μετά χερσίν ἔχουσαι

Od. 20.6-8 is an example of AM at its best. After [καὶ] ἐγρηγορῶν, which ends in enjambment the previous sentence, the poet completes the line with a phrase reminiscent of the formula [αἱ δ’ ἵσαν ἐκ μεγάροιο δάος μετά χερσίν ἔχουσαι], which has found much more success in the Odyssey than in the Iliad. However, δ.δ.1 could not obviously be completed with [αἱ δ’ ἵσαν ἐκ μεγάροιο] because of the metre, so this formula was analogically modified through three stratagems. Firstly, it is expanded with [γυναῖκες], so that ταῖς seems to acquire the function of a proper article – unlike αἱ in δ.β. Secondly, the verb is moved to the next line in a necessary enjambement. Finally, the lexical item ἔχουσαι of the SP formula is somehow salvaged through the use of παρέχουσαι in δ.δ.3. The participle is also kept in its verse-final position, in a normal process of cumulation by the addition of a participial clause, and the literal meaning ‘holding the torch’ of [δάος ἔχουσαι] has been altered into the metaphorical idea of ‘offering laughter and joy’.

Again, the parallel between [αἱ δ’ ἵσαν] and ἣςαν must have been in the poet’s mind when creating the AM of δ.δ. The same can be assumed for the other first-foot occurrence of ἣςαν in the Odyssey:

πάρ δ’ ἵσαν Ὄκεανος τε ῥοῖς καὶ Λευκάδα πέτρην,

ἥδε πάρ’ Ἑλλιόσπορο πύλασ καὶ δήμον Ὀνείρων

ἡςαν: αἴων ἄκοντο κατ’ ἀσφόδελον λειμῶνα,

ἐνθα τε ναίουσι ψυχαί, εἰδώλα καμώντων

Od. 24.11-14

The first line of this passage, which has been labelled as β.η in §3.1.1, represents a particular instance of pattern β. Here the poet does not use the pronoun to refer to the ghosts of the slain suitors, but instead employs the adverb πάρις to describe the kind of motion they are performing. Considering that the subject of the previous sentence is Hermes, this line also represents a syntactic oddity, since in the Homeric language a shift of subject is usually indicated by the use of a pronoun, such as the article. What is more, in 1. 12 the poet adds other places they ‘came past’, and this is where his AM is taken further: instead of finishing the sentence at ἤςαν – which is perfectly possible from a

80 “[There Odysseus] lay, awake […]. Now the women who had up to now been accustomed to sleep with the suitors came out of the hall, laughing with each other and full of high spirits”.

81 “Past the waters of Oceanus they came, and the rock of Leucas, past the gates of the Sun and the country of dreams, and very soon reached the meadow of asphodel, which is the dwelling-place of shades, phantoms of men done with life”.
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syntactical point of view – he expands it by starting the next line with [ἡ Ἱσαν]. What is particularly odd about this passage is that this type of cumulation does not usually happen with finite verbs, but rather with adjectives, participles, or adverbs, i.e. with circumstantial information added in the next line to expand the passage (often due to a rhapsodic elaboration)\textsuperscript{82}. The connection in this passage between [πὰρ δ Ἱσαν] and [ἡ Ἱσαν] is plain, and corroborates the one between pattern β and the occurrences in enjambment of [ἡ Ἱσαν]. In particular, in Od. 24.13 the augmented verb closely echoes the phrase with the unaugmented one thanks to its trisyllabic structure, although the syntax of the passage does not require the use of [ἡ Ἱσαν] in enjambement.

§3.2.1.2 The traditional enjambment: the occurrences of Ἰα and Ἱε

As already explained, a form like Ἱσαν was a syntactic-metrical alternative to [οἱ δ᾽ Ἱσαν] due to its dactylic structure and traditional position in necessary enjambment. At the same time, [ἡ Ἱσαν] cannot occur at the beginning of a sentence also because of its prosody. According to the usual Homeric syntax, new sentences usually have a second-position particle or a first-position conjunction. The most frequent particles are δὲ and τέ, whose use after [ἡ Ἱσαν] would cause an unmetrical cretic sequence\textsuperscript{83}. Thus, the syntactic functionality of [ἡ Ἱσαν] in enjambment is intertwined with specific metrical constraints. On the other hand, the same cannot be said for 1\textsuperscript{st} sg. Ἰα and 3\textsuperscript{rd} sg. Ἱε. Accordingly, the syntactic structures below would be entirely possible from a metrical point of view:

\begin{itemize}
  \item *[ἡ Ἰα/δὲ 2a CC]\textsuperscript{84}
  \item *[ἡ Ἰα/δ᾽ V–2a]\textsuperscript{85}
\end{itemize}

Nevertheless, they are never found in the Homeric poems, where first-foot [ἡ Ἰα] and [ἡ Ἰε] always occur in necessary enjambment. It is clearly not a coincidence that this kind of syntactic occurrence is always found for the verse-initial Ἰα-type forms, even when it is not required by metrical constraints.

The position in enjambment was therefore a traditional feature of the Homeric first-foot Ἰα-type, and its origin lies in the use of [ἡ Ἱσαν] as a syntactic alternative to [οἱ δ᾽ Ἱσαν].

\textsuperscript{82} This form of enjambment is called ‘unperiodic’ by Parry (1929: 22), whereas Kirk (1985: 31-3) calls it ‘progressive’. It basically consists in an ‘unnecessary’ addition, which “can be confined to a single ‘runover’ word, or to a phrase lasting to the main caesura, or to a longer clause” (Kirk 1985: 32).

\textsuperscript{83} The same obviously goes for other frequent second-position particles like μὲν and γὰρ. The metrical possible [ἡ Ἱσαν] [ἀρσα, CC] and [ἡ Ἱσαν, ἀρσα, C] would still be extremely odd, since both ἀρσα and ἀρσ usually follow another particle (e.g. δ᾽ ἀρσ, t᾽ ἀρσ) or conjunction (e.g. ὤς ἀρσ, ὦδ ἀρσ; cf. Chantraine 1963: 344 for ὦδτ (μήτ) ἀρ τέ), rather than a sentence-initial verb.

\textsuperscript{84} Cf. [ἔστετο, δὲ σκέπτομαι] (II. 2.46), [ἔστετο, δὲ φθορά] (II. 2.791), [ἔστετο, δὲ Πράμα] (II. 3.105).

Let us now look at the occurrences of Hom. 1st. sg. ἤ iota, found exclusively as first-foot dactyl and in enjambement:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆας, δόθ᾽ ἔστασαν ἐν ψαμάθοιςν,

髫, πολλὰ δὲ μοι κραδὶς πόρφυρε κιόντι

Od. 4.426-7

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆας ἂμ᾽ ἀντιθέοις ἐτάροις νησὸν ἀν᾽ ὑλήεσαν· ἐγὼ δ᾽ ἐς δώματα Κίρκης

髫, πολλὰ δὲ μοι κραδὶς πόρφυρε κιόντι

Od. 4.432-3

καὶ τότε δὴ παρὰ θῆνα θαλάσσης εὐφυπόροι καὶ τότε δὴ παρὰ θῆνα θαλάσσης εὐφυπόροι

髫, πολλὰ θεοὶς γουνούμενος· αὐτὰρ ἐταίρους

Od. 4.432-3

As can be observed, in 3 out of its 4 occurrences, ἤ iota is found in the same formula, with the previous line containing an emphatic ἐγώ⟨ν⟩. The occurrence in Od. 4.433 is the only one which does not fit this pattern, although it partially reproduces it through the use of [πολλὰ2b].

Another interesting feature of the occurrences of ἤ iota is that they are found exclusively in the Odyssey and mostly in book 4. As observed in Ch. 2 §2.3, when specific formulaic structures tend to be concentrated within a limited space – such as the same episode, book or group of adjacent books – memory seems to be playing a certain role. Although it is ultimately hard to prove individual authorships within the Homeric oral production, limited occurrences can be interpreted as a creation used in (and probably remained limited to) specific passages of the bards’ tradition. In the case of ἤ iota, this principle applies only partially, due to its occurrence in book 10, but the exclusive presence

---

86 “I went back to my ships, to where they were beached on the sands, and my heart was darkly troubled as I went”.
87 “And I returned to my ships together with my godlike companions, and as I went my heart was darkly troubled”.
88 “[Hermes then departed] through the wooded island […] and I went on towards Circe’s palace; and as I went my heart brooded darkly on many things”.
89 “Then […] I made my way along the shore of the broad-wayed sea, with many prayers to the gods; and [I took with me three] companions”. Od. 4.432 is actually absent in many MSS (cf. Heubeck-West-Hainsworth 1988: 220), and accordingly expunged by West. If this were accepted, the line starting with [ἡια1c] would be immediately preceded by [ἡμος δ’ ήργενεαι φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ηώς]. In this case, [ἡια1c] would actually occur in Parry’s second type of necessary enjambement (cf. §3.2.1).
of ἥτα in the Odyssey seems to show that, as far as the Homeric tradition is concerned, this 1st sg. was an artificial form – and possibly an artificial creation – of the oral tradition of this specific poem. The 3rd pl. form ἀναρα, on the other hand, seems to have been more ‘successful’, since it is used in both poems and in different constructions (cf. §3.2.2) as a metrical-syntactic alternative to [ὄς δ’ ἀρα]. Accordingly, 1st sg. ἥτα is likely to have been derived from ἀναρα through the following four-part analogy:

[ἣναρα : ἀναρα :: ἥτα : ἥτα]

As further confirmation of this analogical derivation, the occurrences of ἥτα always reproduce the traditional position in enjambement of 3rd pl. [ἣςαρα,] seen in pattern δ.90

The idiomaticity, so to speak, of the enjambment of the first-foot ἦτ-type finds its strongest confirmation in the use of 3rd sg. ἦτε, which occurs exactly in this type of syntactic position 15 times out of 20. As already seen, despite the possibility for dactylic [ἣτειειστ] to be followed by a particle, this metrical-syntactic structure is never found at the beginning of a sentence. At the same time, unlike in the case of ἀναρα, the occurrences of ἦτε in enjambment cannot be explained as an AM of specific SP patterns containing its corresponding unaugmented form, i.e. ἦτε.91

It is nonetheless possible to identify a metrically functional use for ἦτε as well. In particular, except for verse-final ἦτα (cf. §1.2), the following complementary distribution can be outlined among the Hom. 3rd-sg. forms: [ἣτειειστ], [ἣτεν], [ἣτε V]. As can be observed, the existence of ἦτ’ should make ἦτε redundant – or vice versa. This might be the reason why ἦτε is not found in the Iliad, not even as a variant to ἦτ’ in II. 1.609, 7.307. On the other hand, the tradition of the Odyssey seems to have preserved the form, but ἦτ’ occurs once again in the first foot (and in necessary enjambement) in Od. 5.150, with ἦτεν as a variant only in one manuscript. There are also several occurrences in which the

90 Even if Od. 4.432 were expunged, [ἣτειειστ] in Od. 4.433 would still occur in a type of necessary enjambement, with no second-position particle or conjunction following it (cf. n. 89).

91 The only exceptions might be the identical Od. 17.36 and Od. 19.53: [ἳ δ’ έτν ἐκ θαλάμου περίφρων Πηνελόπεια]. A similar syntactic structure can be found in the formula [ἣναρα ἐξάκολοθον ἤτα]. A similar syntactic structure can be found in the formula [ἢνεν ἐξακολούθων ἤτα] (ll. 13.214, Od. 16.178), so that the relationship between sentence-initial [ἢ δ’ έτν] and [ᾧννεν] in enjambment can be compared to that between [ὄς δ’ έταν] and [ᾧννεν]. Furthermore, the occurrences of [ἢ δ’ έτν] show a clear phonetic echoing of [ἣναρα] – quite similar to what will be observed in §3.2.2 for the fourth-foot occurrences of ἀναρα. At the same time, [ἃ δ’ έτν] occurs only twice and exclusively in the Odyssey, which suggests an analogical construction based both on the occurrences of [ᾗννεν] and on those of [ᾧννεν]. Pattern β, on the other hand, shows a much wider extension, which could function as SP for the use of [ἣςαρα,] in enjambement.
first-foot ἤιε is followed by a word beginning with a consonant, which makes possible its replacement with ἤιεν. This form, however, is never found as a variant in the textual tradition of these passages.

Ultimately, the ἤι-type seems the traditional form of the impf. of εἶμι for the first-foot occurrences, to the extent that usually no replacement of it can be found in the textual tradition, despite the prosodic equivalence of ἤιεν both with [ἡ’ V] and [ἡιε C]. The same applies to the three 4th-foot occurrences of ἤιε (Il. 1.47, 24.596, Od. 7.7), where it is always followed by a word starting with a consonant. It might be argued that the only reason for this is that a dactylic structure is generally preferred in the Homeric hexameter. According to this observation, one might simply conclude that the bards preferred the dactylic alternative (ἡιε) to the spondaic one (ᾖεν), but this seems to be only a partial explanation. It can hardly be a coincidence that the metrical positions where ἤι’ and ἤιε are nearly uncontested variants are exactly the first foot, already observed for ἤισαν (§3.2.1.1) and ἤια, and the fourth foot before 4c, which will be analysed in §3.2.2. Even more noteworthy is the fact that in all its 1st-foot occurrences ἤιε stands in necessary enjambement, as already explained.

§3.2.2 Pattern ε and the fourth-foot occurrences of ἤισαν and ἤιον

The same function as metrical alternative to [οι δ’ ἵσαν] can also be observed for the fourth-foot occurrences of ἤισαν. Furthermore, as already mentioned in §3.1.2, the use of [ἡισαν] may have been influenced by the instances of pattern γ as well.

One of the two passages containing fourth-foot ἤισαν can be included within a formulaic structure where different forms of the ἤι-type are found. Its most inclusive template is the following:

Pattern ε \[\text{[− − −]}\text{VP.3.pl.impf.εἰμι [ἡρξε δ’ − − π]}\text{VP}\]

The first verb in this pattern holds two specific features in all its instances: a 3rd-pl. form of the impf. of εἰμι and a dactylic scansion. Due to its prosodic structure, this pattern can be used both in the first and second hemistich of the hexameter, as can be observed in the two instances below:

a. Il. 18.516
οι δ’ ἵσαν· ἡρξε δ’ ἄρα σφιν Ἄρης καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη

b. Od. 24.9
δοὺς αὐτὸ τετριγυιαί ἢμ’ ἤισαν· ἡρξε δ’ ἄρα σφίν

92 Il. 1.307, 7.213, 11.557, 13.602, 17.666; Od. 8.457. The verse-initial [ἡἰν ἤιν] in Od. 21.302 should be added to these cases, since the possessive adjective can make position in the Homeric language – cf. verse-final [θυγατέρας ἤν] (e.g. Il. 5.371) and verse-initial [ἄρνυμενος ἤν] (Od. 1.5).

93 See n. 58.

94 “So these shades came on together, squeaking; and [Hermes …] was their leader”.
A specific sub-pattern can be identified clearly for the two passages at hand:

\[
\text{Sub-Pattern } \varepsilon.a, b \quad [\text{ισαν}]_{\text{VP.3pl.impt.ισαν}} [\text{ἠργε} \delta' \ άρα σφιν,}]_{\text{VP}}
\]

The only differences between the two passages are their metrical position in the hexameter and the first long of the first verbal phrase. As for the latter feature, these two instances of pattern \( \varepsilon \) show once more how the trisyllabic structure of ήσαν is meant to replicate the dactylic \([\text{όλωιδι} \ δ' \ ίσαν]\) in a different syntactic context. More specifically, in \( \varepsilon.b \) [ήσσαν\_3b], though not used in enjambment as in pattern \( \delta \), is nonetheless found in a syntactic position where \([\text{αϊ δ' ίσαν}]\) is not possible, since the subject has already been mentioned. In particular, the sentence containing [ήσσαν\_3b], which is the tenor of a simile, includes the participial phrase \([\text{αϊ τετριγυαίαστι}]\), which implies ‘ψυχαί’ and functions as subject of the sentence\(^95\).

The same dactylic structure is clearly offered by the thematic [ήιον\_4c] as well. This form occurs only in two passages from the Odyssey, whose structure perfectly corresponds to the basic template of pattern \( \varepsilon \):

\(c. \quad \text{Od. 23.370} \)

\[\text{ὁδεῖαν ἔδε θύρας, ἐκ δ' ἠιον- ἠργε δ' Ὀδύσσεως}\]  

\(d. \quad \text{Od. 24.501} \)

\[\text{ὁδεῖαν ῥα θύρας, ἐκ δ' ἠιον, ἠργε δ' Ὀδύσσεως}\]  

In both passages Odysseus and other companions go out of the house – in \( \varepsilon.c \) after the slaughter of the suitors, in \( \varepsilon.d \) to meet the suitors’ relatives who have come to claim payback. As already seen in §3.2.1.2 for ήια, the occurrence of a specific form in a limited space of the poems can be a hint of an isolated creation. This applies perfectly to the two occurrences of ήιον, which is used exclusively in a limited portion of the Odyssey, and in a pattern shared both by ίσαν and ήισαν. Even more tellingly, \( \varepsilon.b \) also occurs in book 24 of the Odyssey, thus corroborating the ‘clustering’ character of the ήι-\( \)type in this pattern.

The fact that \( \varepsilon.b, \varepsilon.c \) and \( \varepsilon.d \) are concentrated within a limited portion of the Homeric poems supports their consideration as an AM, whose SP is represented by \( \varepsilon.a \). This passage, as already seen in §3.1.1, can also be connected to pattern \( \beta \), where it was labelled as \( \beta.d \). The AM consisted in shifting the metrical position of \( \varepsilon.a \) as follows:

---

\(^{95}\) The participle \([\text{τετριγυαίαστι}]\) covers the same metrical position in Il. 23.101, where it is preceded by a verb of motion (ἀγκετοι) and refers to a ‘ψυχή’ – just as \([\text{τετριγυαίαστι}]\) in Od. 24.9 refers to the ‘souls’ of the suitors.

\(^{96}\) “They […] opened the doors and went out; and Odysseus led the way”.

\(^{97}\) See n. 96. For the reason why West prints ὀδείαν for both passages, cf. Ch. 1 §2.4.2 and Ch. 1 n. 97.
This also causes a change in the syntactic structure, so that [οὐδ' ἵσαν] can no longer be used. As a solution to this, the trisyllabic forms of the impf. of ἵσαν represented a ready-at-hand metrical replacement in the traditional repertoire. Furthermore, as already observed, the distribution of ε.ε and ε.δ might even hint at a specific authorship, which seems also responsible for the isolated morphological innovation of ἱσαν – probably through analogy to ἱε, as seen in §1.2. As for ε.β, this is also the only passage from the Odyssey containing the phrase [ἤρχε δ’ ἄρα σφι(ν)], which for the rest is found exclusively in the Iliad98.

Another factor which might have triggered the AM of ε.β is the traditional use of ἵσαν before bucolic caesura, as illustrated through pattern γ in §3.1.2. In particular, the last 4th-foot occurrence of ἱσαν left to analyse shares interesting features with a few instances of pattern γ:

\[ γ.g \quad Od.19.436 \]

\[ ἱχνι’ ἄρευνόντας κύνες ἱσαν, αὐτάρπ ὅπισθεν99 \]

\[ γ.β \quad Ii. 17.266 \]

\[ τόσσῃ ἄρα Τρδες ἵσαν, αὐτάρπ Ἀγαῖοι100 \]

\[ γ.ε \quad Ii. 20.75 \]

\[ δός οἱ μὲν θεοὶ ἄντα θεών ἵσαν, αὐτάρπ Ἀγαλλέους101 \]

As observed in §3.1.2, the presence of an η-stem noun is a recurring feature within pattern γ, and can also be seen in the only occurrence of (φ)ἵσαν ‘they knew’ in the Iliad ([Εὐρυνόμη ἵσανε]). The sub-pattern identified through these passages was described as follows:

Sub-Pattern γ.α, γ.δ, γ.ε, γ.θ  
\[ [(-) (\omega) -\eta(C)_{4a}]_{\text{Noun}} \quad [(\phi)\text{iσαν} \_{4c}] \]

Passage γ.β was actually excluded from this sub-pattern due to the hiatus between [ιαχι]ααα and [ιαναε], but it is exactly in virtue of the hiatus that the phrase [ιαχι]ααα contains an impressive phonetic echoing of [ἱσαν]. Furthermore, 4th-foot ἱσαν in Od. 19.436 is followed by [αὐτάρπαθ], which represents a further connection with a few instances of pattern γ. For all these features, Od. 19.436 has been labelled as γ.γ, as can also be seen in Appendix II. Therefore, the occurrences of ἵσαν have once more proved to be the SP of a specific usage of ἱσαν. In particular, its trisyllabic and

98 Ii. 5.592, 14.134, 14.384, 16.552, 18.516.
99 “[Ahead of them] went the hounds, seeking a scent, and behind came [the sons of Antolycus].”
100 See n. 64.
101 See n. 67.
dactylic structure is again crucial in replicating the prosody of a pattern containing ἵσαν. This is plainly visible if we compare the structure of γ, as represented in §3.1.2:

Pattern γ  

\[\text{Noun}\ [\text{ίσαν}\_ac]\ _\text{V}\]

e.β  

\[\text{Noun}\ [\text{ἤϊσαν}\_\text{ac}]\ _\text{V}\]

The correspondence is all the more conspicuous if we also consider the frequent occurrence in pattern γ of first-declension nouns (ἐνοπῇ ἵσαν4c, ἰαχῇ ἵσαν4c, Ἐὐρυνόμη ἵσαν4c), whose -η- seems to be echoed by the LA of ἤϊσαν.

§3.3 Final remarks

I have demonstrated how the trisyllabic structure of ἤϊσαν provides a metrical-syntactic alternative to ἵσαν, both in its 1st- and 4th-foot occurrences. The syntactic functionality is particularly visible in the verse-initial instances of ἤϊσαν, as its consistent position in necessary enjambement is a significant alternative to the occurrences of [οὐ/αί δ’ ἵσαν1c]. Even more impressive is the exclusive recurrence in necessary enjambement for all the verse-initial forms of the Hom. ἤ- type, even though it is not metrically required in the case of [ἣνα1c] and [ἣε1c]. All these elements suggest that the origin of the ἤ- type lies in the use of ἤϊσαν as a functional word both from a metrical and syntactic point of view, especially in the verse-initial construction above.

By adding an analogical LA to ἵσαν, the result was a form which could be used as an alternative to [-ίσαν], both in its 1st- and 4th-foot occurrences. The syntactic functionality is particularly visible in the verse-initial instances of ἤϊσαν, as its consistent position in necessary enjambement is a significant alternative to the occurrences of [οὐ/αί δ’ ἵσαν1c]. Even more impressive is the exclusive recurrence in necessary enjambement for all the verse-initial forms of the Hom. ἤ- type, even though it is not metrically required in the case of [ἣνα1c] and [ἣε1c]. All these elements suggest that the origin of the ἤ- type lies in the use of ἤϊσαν as a functional word both from a metrical and syntactic point of view, especially in the verse-initial construction above.

By adding an analogical LA to ἵσαν, the result was a form which could be used as an alternative to [[-1a]Nom.Pl.Pr. [ἵσαν1c]] at the beginning of the hexameter. As illustrated in §2.3, this LA was drawn from the occurrences of artificial ἥειδ- < ἐπαίδ-. This represents one of the several inter-paradigmatic connections between the impf. of εἶμι and the ppf. of ἐπαιδα, especially considering the near-perfect morphological correspondence between ἵσαν ‘they went’ and (F)ἵσαν ‘they knew’. Explaining ἤϊσαν as deriving from ἤ-ίσαν is even more straightforward when looking at the functional use of the ἤ- type in FPs. More specifically, the poets obtained a metrical-syntactic alternative to [[-1a]Nom.Pl.Pr. [ἵσαν1c]] by simply adding an artificial LA to ἵσαν itself. This way they created a suitable augmented counterpart, given that the sprachwirklich one, i.e. ἤϊσαν, could not achieve the same result. Similarly, ἤϊσαν offers a useful metrical-syntactic alternative in the fourth foot as well, and thanks to its LA it phonetically echoes certain occurrences of [ἵσαν4c] preceded by [-ηα] or [-ηια].
Chapter 5

Hom. ἡϊκτο

This chapter will include a study of 3rd sg. med. ἡϊκτο ‘she resembled’, found four times exclusively in the Odyssey. A long-augment theory has recently been supported for this form by Jasanoff-Katz (2014), while its morphology and the formulaic analysis of its occurrences prompt a useful discussion on the blurred line between preserved archaism and Homeric artificial creation, and most importantly on how such an issue might be solved through a method based on the analysis of FPs.

Before undertaking this investigation, it is necessary to analyse the other forms of ἔοικα occurring in the Homeric poems, and to define the typical morphology of this perfect in the Homeric language. Subsequently, a comparison between the use of traditional ἐκτοῖα and that of ἡϊκτο will show once again how an artificial form is employed as a metrically functional alternative in an AM. Furthermore, it will be possible to explain the ἦ- of ἡϊκτο as an artificial and analogical temporal augment, thus adding another instance to the one already seen in ἠείδ- (← ἔειδ-).

§1 Das alte intransitive Perfekt ἔοικα

The title above is a direct quotation of Frisk (GEW: 530), and effectively provides the two features of ἔοικα from which this chapter needs to start: its archaic character and its intransitive value. They are both crucial in deciding whether the pluperfect middle forms of ἔοικα are preserved archaisms or Homeric innovations.

The second aim is to describe a feature which will be fundamental in the discussion of ἡϊκτο: the constant presence of a disyllabic stem in the Homeric paradigm of ἔοικα, in both zero-grade (ϝε(ϝ)ικ-) and o-grade (ϝε(ϝ)οικ-) forms. In particular, a formulaic structure containing ἐκτοῖα (with disyllabic ἐκ-) will be considered in §3.2 as the SP of the AM containing ἡϊκτο, and the consistent use of the paradigm of ἔοικα with reduplication will be fundamental for the critical discussion of the morphology of ἡϊκτο in §2.4.
§1.1 Forms and occurrences of Hom. ἐοικα

Although there is no agreement on any cognate forms outside ancient Greek, ἐοικα is generally considered as an old perfect. This is due not only to a certain degree of morphological conservatism, but also to its stative value, shared with what are considered to be the oldest Greek perfects. Accordingly, an original *ye-oijk- can be safely reconstructed, and the Homeric language partially preserves the ancient o-grade/zero-grade alternation in the indicative active, as clearly shown on the one hand by 1st sg. ἐοικα, 2nd sg. ἐοικας, 3rd ἐοικε, on the other by 2nd du. ἐκτο and 3rd du. pff. ἐκτη. Although pff. med. ἐκτο ἐκτο and pttl. ἐκτιά ἐκτος seem also to show a reduplicated zero grade, their morphology has been subject to discussion, and will therefore be examined in depth further below (see respectively §2 and §1.3). As for the 3rd sg. pff. ἐοικα, its morphology has already been discussed in Ch. 1 §2.4.1 and §2.4.2, where I also showed that it cannot be derived from a long-augmented form through QM.

For the rest, 3rd pl. pff. ἐοικεσαν and most participle forms present what seems to be an analogical extension of the full grade (r)οικ-. The same phenomenon, after all, can be observed since Homer in the λέλοια-type perfect, where the o-grade is usually extended to the whole active conjugation, but a different interpretation might be adduced at least for nom. sg. ἐοικώς, as will be explained in §1.2. Finally, quite striking is the form ἐισκεῖατ - found only in ll. 18.418 – not only for its aberrant morphological structure, but also for its verse-final position making the hexameter spondaic.

From a prosodic point of view, a preservation of the initial digamma can be assumed from several passages where the presence of *y- prevents hiatus (e.g. ll. 15.90, Od. 1.208) or makes

---

1 Cf. DELG: 338; Beekes 2010: 435. As for possible extra-Greek cognates, a candidate is found by IEW: 1129 in the Baltic family represented by Lith. ∴vykti ‘to happen’ ‘to get real’, pa-vēiklas ‘example’ and Latv. vēkt ‘to prepare’. Frisk (GEW: 530), however, considers this hypothesis doubtful, and Beekes (ibid.) also shows scepticism against it. In his dictionary, Chantraine simply states that the reconstructed root *yeik- finds no cognates in other IE languages (DELG: 339). An alternative and more recent view on the matter is offered by LIV: 669-70, where the Greek verb is linked to the PIE root *yeik- ‘to enter’. On the nominal side, a number of words semantically joined with the idea of ‘settling in’ belong to this family, such as Ved. viś- ‘settlement’, OCSI. viṅ, ‘village’, Gr. οἶκος, Lat. uīc. As for the relevant verbal forms, Ved. viṣati ‘to settle down’ and OAv. viṃaṭā ‘to prepare oneself’ are listed under this root in LIV. The meaning ‘to be similar’ ‘resemble’ of Gr. ἐοικα is then explained with the following semantic development: hinzutreten > nahekommen > gleichkommen (LIV: 670 n. 4). As for the possible semantic development in the Avestan verb (‘to get ready’), cf. Kümmel 2000: 658.

2 E.g. οἶδα, πέζοιθα, δέδω - i.e. the Attic form with an analogical zero grade, while Hom. δείδω is likely to be the original 1st sg. perf. indic. from *de-dwoj- (cf. Sihler 1995: 573).

3 Cf. GEW: 530; DELG: 338; Beekes 2010: 435.

position (e.g. *Il. 8.305, Od. 8.194)\(^5\), but there are also cases which show no consideration of it. In order to assess properly to what extent the original labial glides\(^6\) of *\(\text{ṷ}e\)-\(\text{ṷ}o\)-\(\text{ṷ}i\)k-/*\(\text{ṷ}e\)-\(\text{ṷ}i\)k- still affect the metre, two theoretical premises are to be stated:

- The consideration of digamma must have been normal in the oldest layer of composition, and thus contributed to the shaping of the most traditional formulaic structures.
- After the complete loss of digamma, two possible scenarios took place: either a rigid continuation of traditional patterns (e.g. using an \(\tau\)-dative before a form of сосκα despite hiatus) or a break from them through features of the evolving language (e.g. \(\nu^1\) сосκε in *Il. 23.649). The ambiguity of the former scenario will be usually described as a ‘metrical consideration’ in the present chapter.

A good example of what Jones (2008: 105) calls “the paradox of archaism” are the passages where the textual tradition shows \(\nu\)-movable before forms of сосκα. On the one hand, none of them can be taken as certain evidence of specific chronological layers, since a later addition of \(-\nu\) after loss of digamma can always be assumed wherever it was metrically possible, e.g. in cases where a dat. pl. in -\(\sigma\)t is followed by a form of сосκα. On the other hand, moving from the specific formulae to the patterns underlying them, it must be assumed that a FP like [-\(\sigma\)t (\(\varphi\))сосκ-/(\(\varphi\))сосκ-] was originally based on the metrical consideration of initial digamma to prevent hiatus between the dat. pl. in -\(\sigma\)t and the form of сосκα.

Most of the \(\circ\)-grade forms are used after a short vowel, so that initial \(*\text{ṷ}t\)- prevents hiatus, while their disyllabic structure (i.e. \(\text{ṫ}-\text{сосκ}\)-) makes the assumption of an original consideration of internal \(*\text{ṷ}t\)- self-evident. As for the zero-grade forms, [\(\text{ṫ}κτο\text{ʨν}_\text{ʨ}\)] (4x, always verse-final), [\(\text{ṫ}κτο\text{ʨ}_\text{ʨ}\)] (1x in *Od. 4.27) and [\(\text{ṫ}κτο\text{ʨ}_\text{ʨ}\)] (1x in *Il. 23.107) are always used after a short vowel: this proves not only the metrical consideration of initial \(*\text{ṷ}t\)-, but also the disyllabic structure of a reduplicated zero-grade (\(\text{ṫ}-\)), which provides the last short of a dactyl and the first long of the following foot. Initial \(*\text{ṷ}t\)- is also confirmed by the lengthening by position of preceding syllables in 5 occurrences of the feminine participle \(\text{ṫ}κο\text{ʨ}(\nu)\) (II. 3.386, 8.305, 9.399; Od. 8.194, 13.222). Finally, there are also passages with a complete lack of consideration of initial \(*\text{ṷ}t\)-, in particular in some occurrences of сосκε (e.g. II. 3.286, 3.459, Od. 6.60), and in two passages where the ppl. сосκα is preceded by an elided word: ([\(\text{ǩ̄l}^1\) \(\text{ṫ}κο\text{ʨ}_\text{ʨ}\)] in *Il. 23.66, and [\(\delta^1\) \(\text{ṫ}κο\text{ʨ}_\text{ʨ}\)] in *Od. 5.337.

---

\(^5\) Cf. n. 1, where it can be observed that all the hypothetical roots of сосκα are reconstructed with *\(\text{ṷ}t\). Cf. also *DELG*: 339, where Cypr. \(\text{ϝεικόνα}\) is mentioned as further confirmation of initial digamma.

\(^6\) I.e. the digamma of the reduplication syllable (*\(\text{ṷe}\)-), and the one at the beginning of the verbal root (*\(\text{ṷo}\,\text{ʝk}\)-/ *\(\text{ṷi}\)k-).
§1.2 ἐικ- or ἐκ-? The problem of the nom. sg. forms of the ppl. of ἔοικα

So far, the forms that have been left out of the discussion are the two ppl. med. ἔκτο ἢ κτο and the ppl. ἐκός ἐκκιά. While the former will be discussed in depth in §2, it is now necessary to analyse the morphology of ἐκός and ἐκκιά and the problems posed by it. This will be particularly crucial for the formula-based analysis in §3, since the AM containing ἢ κτο will be derived from a SP pattern with ἐκκιά.

As for the nom. masc. sg. ppl., the variant ἐκός is actually found only once in Homer (II. 21.254), while ἔοικός occurs 27 times always in verse-final position. The former presents a problematic morphology and a prosodically unclear attestation. More specifically, the original form should be *ye-ŋik- yöś > *ϝε-ϝικ-ϝός7, and from a prosodic point of view the only Homeric occurrence of ἐκός cannot underlie such structure: *[τῦ ϝε-ϝικ-ϝός2a] at the beginning of II. 21.254 would cause cretic sequence. It is morphologically unjustified to derive this form from *ϝεικ-, given the consistent presence of reduplication in the Hom. paradigm of ἔοικα (cf. §1.1)8. Furthermore, the unusual form ἐκός may simply be explained as a later development, since there are no phonological changes for the original cluster *-κ-ϝ- other than loss of digamma9, nor is there any occurrence in Homer where this cluster makes position10. It is then entirely possible that in the Homeric language the digamma had already been completely lost in the internal cluster of *ϝεικ-, so that its disyllabic perfect stem could be used in the thesis without contravening the metre11.

At the same time, it is tempting to see the frequent o-grade [ἦκόζος] as a re-elaboration of an original *ϝε-ϝικ-ϝός in verse-final position12, which was still preserved in the oldest layer of the hexametric composition. This evolution is strongly supported by the occurrence of verse-final

---

8 At the same time, a lack of reduplication is probably the synchronic result in Att. εικός, considered as non-reduplicated by Schwyzer (1939: 541, 766-7), but it cannot be posited as original for the ppl. of ἔοικα (contra Kuryłowicz 1956: 105).
9 There is obviously an important difference between a PIE labiovelar and what we have here called a ‘cluster *-κ-ϝ-’. The latter is a secondary labiovelar cluster formed after later processes of composition. The difference in treatment between these two phonological elements is clearly shown in Mycenaean, where on the one hand the labiovelars are still preserved (cf. Bartoněk 2003: 138-9), such as in to-ro-qa, i.e. t(h)rok’hā (cf. τροφή), while on the other the perfect participle *τετυχθῶ(h)a (cf. Hom. τετυχθῶ) is written as te-tu-ko-wo-a/tu-te-tu-wo-a2 (see infra).
10 Cf. Chantraine 1973: 158-64 (specifically for the Homeric language), and Sihler 1995: 159-60, 185-6 for the ancient Greek treatment of original consonant clusters with digamma.
11 Cf. GEW: 530, where *ϝε-ϝικ-ϝός is also considered as an acceptable origin for [ἠικός], and Chantraine 1961: 190, who cautiously mentions both interpretations (*ϝε-ϝικ or *ϝικ) without giving away any definitive conclusion.
12 Cf. Leumann (1959: 255), who considers ἔοικός as a “künstlicher Ersatz für älteres *ϝε-ϝικ-ϝός”. This form of the ppl. of ἔοικα occurs 27 times in the Homeric poems always in verse-final position.
[τετευχός] in Od. 12.423, which is an impressive archaism considering its intransitive meaning ‘manufactured’. Remarkably, the same intransitive value is found in Myc. te-tu-ko-wo-a (or te-tu-ko-wo-α), i.e. tetukhw(o)h(ι)ε. Based on the Mycenaean evidence, an older *τε-τυχ-ϝός can easily be reconstructed for Od. 12.423. This would perfectly be in line with its archaic intransitive value, and it would also show how the loss of the cluster *-χ-ϝ- brought to an analogical reshaping based on the e-grade forms of the paradigm of τεύχω (e.g. ἔτευξα in Od. 4.174). If this is accepted, ἐοικός offers a perfect parallel: the original morphology as reconstructed is *ϝ-ϝικ-ϝός, which fits verse-final position, and the o-grade forms of the paradigm of ἐοικα offered the perfect analogy to restore the metre after loss of the cluster *-κ-ϝ-. Consequently, the isolated [εικόζα] in Il. 21.254 should simply be considered as a later form, at a stage when its stem ἐικ- could be used in the biceps with scansion [~]. This is also strongly suggested by the fact that its isolated occurrence replicates the typical use of the feminine ἐικοῖα after arsis, a pattern which will be analysed further below. Therefore, the scansion of ἐικ- as a biceps, which is expected in fem. ἐικοῖα (see infra), was analogically extended to [εικόζα] of Il. 21.254.

As for the nom. fem. sg. ἐικοῖα, its original structure *ϝ-ϝικ-νία (< *ϝε-ϝικ-us-ιh2), unlike that of the nom. masc. sg., poses no obstacle to assuming a disyllabic biceps ἐι- from the reduplicated zero-grade *ϝε-ϝικ-. At the same time, it might be argued that it is hard to confirm this through Homeric metrics, given that ἐικοῖα is always found after a syllable in arsis. That is, its first two vowels, which always constitute a thesis, can be scanned either as two short syllables (i.e. ἐι- < *ϝε-ϝικ-) or as a long one (i.e. diphthong ει- < υεικ-). The latter structure would clearly imply the creation of a stem υεικ-, which had to be perceived synchronically as non-reduplicated like ρειδ- in the paradigm of οἶδα. While this was clearly the result later in Attic (e.g. εικός), it is completely unwarranted to assume it in Homer. The Hom. paradigm of ἐοικα, as already seen, clearly shows the presence of a reduplication syllable, so that assuming a lack thereof in the participle is simply inconsistent. After all, when it comes to ancient Greek, the only plausible archaic example of non-reduplicated perfect is ultimately οἶδα.

---

14 Bader (1969: 62) considers the possibility that Homeric τετευχός is a “réarrangement d’un *τετυχρός", but ultimately takes it to be a form analogical to the indicative, just as she interprets ἐοικός (see n. 17).
15 Cf. Szemerényi 1996: 290; Clackson 2007: 128; Willi 2018: 19. Schwyzter (1939: 766-7) also mentions οἶκα – judged by Frisk (GEW: 530) as the product of Ἕφαερες from ἐοικα – clearly a late creation and unattested in Homer, as well a ἕργατα (Il. 16.481, Od. 10.283), which is generally seen as the (non-reduplicated) 3rd pl. perf. med. of ἕργον ‘to enclose’ (cf. Janko 1992: 380). This form, however, is not guaranteed by the metre, although a v.l. ἕργατε does not seem attested
Furthermore, the fact that the two initial vowels of ἔικοια are never in arsis is a clear indication of their consideration as a biceps. This is a strong difference, for instance, from the Homeric use of εἰḋος, whose first syllable (< * FName) is often found in arsis\(^\text{16}\). Such a use should be expected in εἰκοία as well, if its stem was really perceived as containing a diphthong. This means that the original disyllabic stem of ἔικοια, which is inherited, must have been kept even at a later stage when the loss of intervocalic digamma could have caused ἔικ- to become monosyllabic with a diphthong. This might also have been helped by occurrences like ἔικτον and ἔικτην, whose disyllabic stem is required by the metre (cf. §1.1). Accordingly, as already argued, even the later and isolated ἔικος occurs after a strong tempo, by analogy to ἔικοία\(^\text{17}\).

The archaism of disyllabic ἔι- in the zero-grade forms of ἔικα is also indirectly confirmed by the analogical instances with ὄ-grade. As already seen in §1, they are represented by most ppl. forms and 3rd pl. ἐοίκεσαν. On the one hand, the explanation of ἔικος as an analogical replacement of ἕ-ῥικ-ρός can be used for all the ‘longer’ cases of the participle, i.e. *𝔽Ε-ῬΙΚ-ΡΟΤ- > ἐοίκοτ.\(^\text{18}\), while a

\(^{16}\) In particular, εἰḋος is used 37 times in verse-final position as the disyllabic final word of the hexameter, with occurrences like [ἕ εἰḋος], [ἵᾳμακα εἰḋος], and [μῆδα εἰḋος] confirming the morphological structure * FName-ρός.

\(^{17}\) The conclusions reached in this section find their opposite in a theory by Bader (1969), which is here considered unacceptable. Bader argued that the original form of εἰκοία is *ϝικοία, which might be restored in [κάλα *ϝικοίας] in II. 23.66 and [αἴθιη δέ *ϝικοίας] in Od. 5.337, and considered εἰκοία as analogical to the original masc. ppl. *ϝικός, which she described as an e-grade non-reduplicated form based on the single occurrence of [ϝικός\(\text{\(\text{\(2\))}\)} in II. 21.254. Bader’s conclusion is that the original forms *ϝικός and *ϝικοία were used, respectively, after long vowel (as shown only by [ϝικός\(\text{\(\text{\(2\))}\)} in II. 21.254), and after short vowel (*ϝικοία in II. 23.66, Od. 5.337). As a consequence of this rigid distribution, according to Bader, two analogical forms were created: ἐοίκος to use the masc. ppl. after short vowel too, and εἰκοία for the usage of the feminine form after long vowel as well. Apart from the argumentation I have provided above, which is enough to show that [ϝικός\(\text{\(\text{\(2\))}\)] is later, and that εἰκοία cannot derive from a non-reduplicated form, it is also much more economical to see the only two cases where *ϝικοία might be restored (i.e. κάλ’ ἐ. and αἴθιη δ’ ἐ.) as later passages, where initial *Ϝ- was no longer considered in hexametric composition (cf. §1.1).

\(^{18}\) Alternatively, if these forms originated in a later stage of the oral composition, their .ordinal grade can be explained as a metrical requirement, given that a zero-grade would have caused a pyrrhic sequence (李白κοτ-), just as in the case of ἐοίκεσαν (see infra).
zero-grade stem would have caused a pyrrhic sequence in the 3rd pl. pff. active, i.e. *ἐ-ῐ-κε-σαν\(^{19}\). All this analogical reshaping could perfectly have been avoided with a monosyllabic pronunciation of the stem, i.e. ει- as a diphthong. Yet, dactylic *(ϝ)εἰκεσαν and *(ϝ)εἰκος-\(\-\)ε\(\-\)ε\(\-\)ε\(\-\)ς/ας are nowhere attested. This is further evidence that *(ϝεικ- was simply not an option in the paradigm of Hom. ἔοικα. Instead, the zero grade *(ϝε-ϝικ- was actually in contrast with the o-grade forms, and traditionally scanned as disyllabic, to the extent that even after loss of intervocalic digamma it was still unacceptable to use it as a diphthong in arsis.

§1.3 Preliminary conclusions on the morphology and use of Hom. ἔοικα
The analysis offered above shows specific features in the paradigm of Hom. ἔοικα, which will prove to be useful further below in the discussion on the use of ἥικτο:

- The partially preserved o-grade/zero-grade alternation, its stative value, and the consideration of digamma in most occurrences show that ἔοικα is an old Greek perfect.
- At the same time, the analogical extension of the o-grade in the active can already be seen in ἔοικεσαν and in most participle forms, as well as in the aberrant ἐικοῦια.
- The zero grade is clearly preserved in the dual forms ἔικτον and ἐικτην.
- It should also be assumed for ἐικοῦα, not only for reasons of historical morphology, but also for the constant use of its zero-grade stem as a biceps in the weak tempo.
- At the same time, verse-final ἔικτος has been here considered as an analogical replacement of an older *(ϝεικρός, so that an original disyllabic zero grade should be assumed for this ppl. form as well.
- In general, the use of the zero-grade forms demonstrates that even after complete loss of digamma the traditional scansion of their stem was ἔικ-, while the analogical cases in ἐου- (i.e. ἐικός, the ‘longer’ ppl. forms and ἐοίκεσαν) show that even when the zero-grade stem was (or had become) unmetrical, its diphthongisation was not an option in Homeric diction.

§2 The middle forms of the pff. of ἔοικα
In the Homeric paradigm of ἔοικα, the 3rd sg. pff. act. ἔφκει has already drawn our attention due to its peculiar morphology, and because of the long-augment theory advanced by some scholars. Although this kind of interpretation was only rarely suggested for ἥικτο (cf. Ch. 1 §2.1), the

\(^{19}\) It should also be noticed that this form is the only Homeric instance of an alpha-thematic ending in the pff. plural, whose athematic form in Homer is always built to the zero grade and devoid of -ε- (e.g. βέβασαν, ἔστασαν, δείσαν, μέμασαν, ἔσαν).
morphology of this middle pluperfect is nonetheless of great interest for a number of reasons. Firstly, the initial ἥ-, though not considered as an actual LA by most scholars, presents the same phonological oddity as the one seen for forms like ἥϊσαν and ἥειδη, and as such has prompted several, quite different theories in the Homeric scholarship. Secondly, while the morphology of the unaugmented counterpart ἥκτο will be here considered as a possible archaism, it will be shown that the ἥ- of ἥκτο is best explained as an analogical temporal augment – an explanation which will necessarily be linked to the interpretation of ἥειδη in Ch. 3 §2.2. Finally, as will be seen in §3, the formula-based method can provide us with a valid explanation for the origin of a form like ἥκτο within the Homeric Kunstsprache.

§2.1 Occurrences

The Homeric pluperfect middle forms of ἔοικα, as already seen, are ἥκτο and ἥκτο. The former is attested only in the following line:

καὶ μοι ὑκαστ’ ἐπέτελλεν, ἥκτο δὲ θέσκελον αὐτῷ 20

Il. 23.107

The form ἥκτο, on the other hand, occurs in four passages from the Odyssey, always in the same second-hemistich formula:

ἐἴδωλον ποίησε, δέμας δ’ ἥκτο γυναικί 21

Od. 4.796

χειρί τέ μιν κατέρεξε· δέμας δ’ ἥκτο γυναικί 22

Od. 13.288

ἀλλ’ ἡ γε σχεδὸν ἠλθέ· δέμας δ’ ἥκτο γυναικί 23

Od. 16.157

οὐρανόθεν καταβάσα, δέμας δ’ ἥκτο γυναικί 24

Od. 20.31

---

20 “And the likeness to him was wonderful, and it told me each thing I should do”.
21 “She formed a phantom, making it in shape like a woman”.
22 “And stroked him with her hand. In appearance she was now like a […] woman”.
23 “But [the swineherd’s departure] did not go unnoticed [by Athena], and she [drew close] in the likeness of a […] woman”.
24 “Down from the sky came [Athena] in the form of a woman”.
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§2.2 Reduplicated aorists?

Schwyzer (1939: 653 n. 8) prefers to derive ἥικτο from *ε-ϝε-ϝικ- rather than from *η-ϝε-ϝικ, and agrees with Schulze (1910: 185 and n. 2) on considering it as a reduplicated athematic aorist. Schulze’s theory, however, can easily be dismissed on morphological grounds: except for alpha-thematic formations such as (ἐ)ειπας and ἠνεικαν, which can be considered as later innovations, reduplicated aorists are always thematic in Homer. More specifically, their structure never consists in a zero-grade \( C_1e-C_1C \) (or \( C_1e-C_1iC \) or \( C_1e-C_1uC \)) immediately followed by secondary endings.

At the same time, Schulze (ibid.) supports his theory with another factor which is interesting for the present research, namely the voice of ἥικτο/ἡϊκτο. This point is not thoroughly explained by Schulze or Schwyzer, but a clarifying interpretation is given by Hackstein (1989: 48): “reduplizierte Kausativvoriste büßen in medialer Flexion ihre Kausativfunktion ein und können intransitive Bedeutung erhalten“ – e.g. λελαθεῖν ‘to make forget’ next to λελαθείσθαι ‘to make oneself forget’ > ‘to forget’. What is therefore implied in Schulze’s theory – and seemingly shared by Schwyzer – is that ἥικτο is used with the intransitive value of ‘to make oneself like’. Similarly, the form chosen by the scholiasts to gloss ἥικτο is ὁμοιωτο, i.e. ‘she made herself like’, ‘she became like’. This meaning, however, seems rather a synchronic attempt to explain a form as odd as the middle of ἔοικα, instead of a value which can actually be assumed from the Homeric text. The contexts in which ἥικτο and ἥκτο are used are basically equivalent to that of the active forms of the pluperfect, as shown by the examples below:

\[
\text{στήτην ἐγγὺς ἑόντε, δέμας δ’ ἄνδρεσσιν ἥικτην}^{28} \\
\text{Il. 21.285}
\]
\[
\text{ἔιδος τε μεγεθός τε φυήν τ’ ἔγχιστα ἐόκει}^{29} \\
\text{Il. 2.58}
\]
\[
[\ldots]\text{δέμας δ’ ἥικτο γυναικι}^{30} \\
\text{Od. 13.288}
\]

27 The only forms that might be interpreted as such are κέκλυθι (Il. 10.284; Od. 14.462, 15.307) and κέκλυτε (11x in Il., 20x in Od.), but it seems much easier to consider them as perfect imperatives (cf. Willi 2018: 71).
28 “[Poseidon and Athena] came near him and stood beside him with their shapes in the likeness of mortals”.
29 “And in appearance and stature and figure it most closely resembled splendid Nestor”.
30 “In appearance she was now like a […] woman”.
Since the meaning of ἤικτο and ἤικτο is ultimately the same as that of e.g. ἤικτην, an evolution from a causative-intransitive value is purely conjectural. Therefore, there is a clear semantic equivalence between ἤικτο/ἤικτο and the ppf. active forms of ἐοικα, which seems to make their coexistence redundant. As will be seen in the next section, this feature actually represents a peculiarity of the Homeric language, and might therefore be crucial in understanding whether ἤικτο is an archaic form or a relatively recent innovation.

§2.3 Pluperfect middle: an archaism?

It is therefore necessary to interpret ἤικτο and ἤικτο as pluperfect forms: the reduplicated zero-grade (*ϝε-ϝικ-) is perfectly preserved in the disyllabic structure of ἤικτο, and their athematic conjugation is expected in the middle. It is precisely their middle voice that now needs to be discussed. As will be shown below, pluperfects middle have been considered as archaic formations in the history of the PIE perfect. Such a view would crucially affect the interpretation of Hom. ἤικτο, and needs therefore to be investigated by looking at the Homeric evidence used to prove its validity. It should also be specified that this section will not consider the initial long vowel of ἤικτο. Consequently, it will mostly refer to ἤικτο, as it is an uncontroversial instance of reduplicated zero-grade med. ppf. devoid of augment. The difficulties posed by the initial ἦ- of ἤικτο – including the possibility of interpreting this verb as non-reduplicated – will be the main focus in §2.4.

At first glance, middle endings should come as surprising for an old stative perfect like ἐοικα. In particular, even the oldest perfects of transitive verbs tend to lack a middle conjugation, and to have strong affinity with their corresponding present middle. At the same time, already in Mycenaean med. perf. participles are well-attested – while act. participles are represented by very few instances – and they generally show a passive value when linked to transitive verbs. After all, the semantic similarity between intransitive stative perfects and middle verbs might have prompted

31 “And the likeness to him was wonderful”.
32 Cf. Chantraine 1927: 21: “La valeur réfléchie et celle d’état que l’on attribue aussi au moyen est exprimée par le parfait lui-même: ἀλωλά veut dire « je suis perdue ». Les désinences moyennes semblent donc superflues”. Cf. Ved. bhāyate and bibhāya, vārta and vavārta – which can be linked to Lat. revertitut as opposed to the act. perfect revertit – Gr. πέποιθα and πείθομαι, and Av. manyete and mānnūs, which offer another parallel with Latin in the pair meminiscor : memini. Meillet (1922: 67) also mentions ἔφθορα as opposed to φθείρομαι, and γέγονα/γήγομαι. Cf. also Willi 2018: 210 for the connection between the reconstructed endings of the PIE perfect and those of the PIE middle.
the use of middle endings with the perfect stem at an early stage. Accordingly, “within Greek the new middle perfects were a success” (Willi 2018: 220), and they might represent an innovation of Proto-Greek, or even of Proto-Indo-European.

A perfect like ἔοικα, however, has no corresponding transitive present – apart from the late and factitive ἔσκω and due to its intransitive voice, a middle conjugation would seem redundant. Despite this, not only does ἔοικα have middle forms in the ppf., but also they fit one of the two paradigmatic distributions usually attested in Homer:

- Middle perfects with no corresponding active forms, e.g. ἐλήλατα/ἐλήλατο, μέμνηται/μεμνημένοι, κέκλημα/κεκλήματο.
- Middle and active perfect forms for the same paradigm, but with no semantic distinction.

As for the former type, it is easily explained with the fact that a distinction between an active transitive perfect and a middle intransitive one is likely to be a later development. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that in Homer there are very few cases of semantic opposition between active and middle perfect in the same paradigm, which can all be interpreted as later forms. Considering the correspondences between perfect and middle endings in PIE, the semantics of the oldest Greek perfects, and the Homeric evidence, it is therefore fair to assume that a distinction between ‘transitive active’ and ‘stative middle’ is a relatively late development.

As for the latter type of distribution, ἐϊκτο and ἥϊκτο are clearly included, given that their semantics are identical to the active ppf. (cf. §2.2). In particular, Chantraine (1927: 49) included them among the instances which might prove an archaic coexistence, previously suggested by Meillet (1922: 64; 1923), of active endings in primary tenses with middle ones in secondary tenses and in the participle. Chantraine therefore focussed on Homeric instances of pluperfects middle having the

---

36 Chantraine (1927: 21-2) reports the following exceptions: βέβληκαι ‘(s)he ‘hit’ / βέβληται ‘is/has been hit’, λέλοπε ‘has left’ / λέλειμμανοι ‘(having been) left’ and ἔδηδως ‘having eaten’ / ἔδηδοται ‘has been eaten’. The ppf. βέβληκαι is considered by Chantraine as recent, probably because of its kappatic structure, just like the e-grade of λέλειμμανοι seems to hint at its creation in a late stage of the Homeric tradition. As for ἔδηδως, Chantraine points out that the root of this verb does not seem to have produced a perfect in other IE languages (cf. Ved. ādmi, Lat. ēst, Arm. utem), and that ἔδηδοται can be an analogical creation to ἔκπέποτα, which occurs in the same line (Od. 22.56).
37 Cf. Wackernagel’s (1904) stages in the semantic evolution of the Greek perfect – in particular the third one, when the focus on the result of a past action brought to perfects like ὅπωπε ‘has seen’ – and a discussion and reconsideration of them in Willi 2018: 228-31.
38 The archaic use of middle endings for the perf. participle might be shown by cases like δέδαε/δεδαμένος, κεκορηότε/κεκορημένοι, τετιηώς/τετιημένος, πεφυγότες/πεφυγμένος. Though it would be quite interesting to link this
same meaning as their corresponding perfect active forms. In line with the Homeric evidence, and in agreement with Meillet’s deduction, Chantraine (1927: 54) concludes that the use of middle endings in the perfect system started in the pluperfect as an archaic process, whereas middle perfects should be considered as secondary forms. In particular, according to Chantraine (1927: 56-7), middle endings were first used for the pff. singular forms due to their problematic morphology: considering that a PIE (?) structure for the act. pff. should have been $C_1eC_1O C_m$, $C_1eC_1O C_s$, $C_1eC_1O C_s$-t, the pluperfect of oïdα, for example, would have resulted as 1st sg. ὑ(φ)οιδα – i.e. a form identical to 1st sg. perf. ind. – 2nd sg. ὑ(φ)οίς and 3rd sg. ὑ(φ)οῖς, while the singular persons of the pff. of ἐσικα would have been 1st sg. ὑ(φ)ε(φ)οικα, 2nd sg. ὑ(φ)ε(φ)οικε, 3rd sg. ὑ(φ)ε(φ)οικε. These forms could never exist because of their lack of morphological clarity, so that according to Chantraine (1927: 57) “le procédé le plus simple était de former le plus-que-parfait avec les désinences moyennes”. Chantraine does not try to establish whether this construction is already PIE: all that can be stated with certainty is that in Homer it was already a disappearing relic. Finally, Chantraine (1927: 58-60) argues that two analogical processes eventually took place:

- an active pluperfect was built to those verbs whose conjugation was mostly active;

part of Chantraine’s theory to the large presence of middle perf. participles in Mycenaean, this chapter needs nonetheless to focus on the instances of pluperfects.

39 Apart from ἐκτόθήκτο, Chantraine (1927: 49-51) also mentions ἄρωμπτο in Il. 14.15, which seems to have the same meaning as κατερήριπεν in Il. 14.55; ἔποχατο in Il. 12.340, which is connected by Chantraine to συνοχοκότε of Il. 2.218; ἔμαθα, well-attested next to perf. ἡμορρας and μέμβλετο ‘he was concerned’, attested in Il. 21.516 and connected with act. perf. μεμήλε. Finally, Chantraine (ibid.: 52) finds another example in the coexistence of the frequent pff. middle (ἐ)τέυκτο and the isolated τετευχώ of in Od. 12.423 (cf. §1.2). Since the focus is here on the Homeric language, the instance of pff. κεχάρητο used by Chantraine (1927: 53) has been excluded, because it occurs in the later Sc. 65. The comparison in this case is with the active form κεχαρηότα in Il. 7.312, which has the same intransitive meaning (‘to rejoice”).

40 And participles, see n. 38.

41 Cf. With 2018: 220 (while explaining Chantraine’s theory): “Because there were no ‘secondary’ perfect endings, a straightforward way to form a past tense to the perfect qua stative present was to resort to the normal ‘secondary’ endings”. This interpretation would also explain why the Homeric language preserves very archaic pff. act. forms in the dual and plural (e.g. ἐκπιθεμέν, ἐκπην, γαγάνη, ἔστιμεν), but not in the singular, which in Homer already shows -α, -ας, -ει (cf. Ch. 3 §1.1 and n. 4), or a thematic inflection (e.g. ἢνογον and ἢνογε beside ἢνογεα and ἢνογεα).

42 As to the choice of the middle endings to solve the morphological issues of the pff. sg., a better reason is given by With (2018: 220), who considers the ‘intransitivity’ of the oldest pluperfects (corresponding to that of the oldest perfects) as the main factor. Cf. also With 2018: 220 n. 34: “if the use of middle endings had been just a mechanical remedy, one might expect forms like 3sg. ὑ(φ)ε(φ)οικτο; nor can it be maintained that the middle endings were mere apophonic variants of the active ones, used preferentially in preretal contexts”.
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- the middle endings were later extended to the perfect as well, thus creating forms like μέμβλετ(α), already attested in Homer (Il. 19.343).

According to the former point, ἐῴκη might be a later replacement of ἐϊκτο, while originally the inflection of the ppf. of ἔοικα might have consisted in a singular with middle endings, and a plural/dual with active ones, as shown by the semantic equivalence between ἐϊκτο and ἐϊκτην.

Once again, a troublesome dilemma is presented: does the scarce number of occurrences prove that ἐϊκτο is a relic of an older linguistic stage, or on the contrary that it is merely a Homeric artificial innovation? Apart from ἐϊκτο, the most convincing piece of evidence provided by Chantraine is the perf. ppl. τετευχώς in Od. 12.423\textsuperscript{44}. As already seen in §1.2, its intransitive value is equivalent to that of the middle forms of the same paradigm, including ppf. med. (ἐ)τέτυκτο, and it is perfectly paralleled by Myc. te-tu-wo-a. Furthermore, as already seen, [τετευχώς] can easily be considered as an adjustment of an original *τε-τυχ-φός in verse-final position after loss of cluster *χ-ϝ-. It might therefore be evidence of an archaism preserved as an isolated occurrence in the Odyssey, just like ἐϊκτο would be an isolated relic in the Iliad\textsuperscript{45}, with its augmented counterpart used only in the Odyssey.

To sum up, the Mycenaean evidence suggests that middle perfects are an old formation at least in ancient Greek, and accordingly they are widely attested in Homer as well. In particular, the Homeric poems generally preserve a clear distinction between transitive active and stative middle, so that middle perfects either lack corresponding transitive active forms – except for very few later cases – or have the same intransitive value of the (stative) active forms. The ppf. ἐϊκτο seems to fall into

\textsuperscript{44} As for the other examples (for which see n. 39), either they seem to show an actual semantic difference (ἐπόγχα, ἐμφάρτο), or their morphology is problematic (ἐφήρυκτο, μεμβλετο). In particular, in Il. 12.340 the variant ἐπόγχα (≠ ἐπόγχα) is highly preferable to ἐπόγχα for the sense of the sentence ("all [the gates] had been shut"), and as such accepted in West’s edition (1998: 366; for a discussion of the complex textual tradition of this passage, cf. Hainsworth 1993: 355). If this is the case, then ἐπόγχα would rather be another example of coexistence for the same verb of a transitive active (ἀν-διογχ) conjugation and an intransitive middle-passive one – a feature which has been described above as belonging to a later stage of the Homeric language. A similar situation may be assumed for the contrast between ἐμμορησ and ἐμφάρτο, since they have both a different syntactic construction – as noticed by Chantraine himself (1927: 50) – and a different semantics as well (cf. Schwyzer 1939: 777 n. 2). As for μέμβλετο, the form is “morphologisch unklar” (Hackstein 1989: 49), especially for the suspicious thematic -το. Similarly, ἐφήρυκτο in Il. 14.15 shows a puzzling morphology, since there is no sign of Attic reduplication – unlike in the case of κατερήσας in Il. 14.55.

\textsuperscript{45} That is, τετευχώς would represent a more archaic stage when the intransitive value held both in the perf. act. and ppf. med. (ἐτέτυκτο), while forms like perf. med. τέτυκται would show the later analogical extension of middle endings to the perf. as well. The paradigm of ἐοικα, on the other hand, would show the later alpha-thematic conjugation of the active ppf. singular in ἐῴκη, while ppf. ἐϊκτο would represent the archaic use of middle endings in the ppf. sg. with the same intransitive value of the perf. act. (e.g. ἐοικε) and the ppf. act. pl./du. (e.g. ἐϊκτην).
the second category, and might therefore be considered as a preserved archaism. At the same time, the attestations of the ppf. middle of ἕοικα are exclusively in hexametric poetry\textsuperscript{46}. Although this factor might tip the scale in favour of an artificial origin, it is not enough to reach such a conclusion. The ppf. ἔικτο might also be an archaism preserved in an isolated passage of the \textit{Iliad}, and possibly in other passages of the lost portion of epic poetry (cf. Ch. 2 §2.3), and its limited use in the Homeric poems might rather suggest that as a relic it felt odd already to the Ionian bards\textsuperscript{47}. The second factor to take into account, then, is represented by the considerations of historical linguistics offered in this section. On the one hand, it is not possible to thoroughly assess the issue of a Proto-Greek (or PIE) middle ppf., as it would require more space than the present thesis allows for. Nonetheless, it can be here stated that Chantraine’s reconstruction does provide a possible origin of a form like ἔικτο, and that despite the scarcity of Homeric instances, the occurrence of τετευχώς is a striking parallel for its correspondence to the Mycenaean evidence. Therefore, the reasons why ἔικτο can be considered an archaism are the following:

- unlike the ἥ- of the impf. of ἐμυ and the long-augmented ἥμιδ-, it can be explained persuasively through the historical morphology of ancient Greek, because it is exactly the expected middle form for the Homeric ppf of ἕοικα (unaugmented zero-grade, athematic, disyllabic stem, and middle secondary endings), and its morphology is paralleled by the numerous (and mostly unaugmented) ppf. middle in the Homeric language;
- although being one of the very few ppf. middle used next to a ppf. active, their equivalent semantics is still in line with the possible evolution of the Greek (and PIE) perfect as an old stative conjugation.

In accordance with these conclusions, the formula-based method does not seem to help in the only occurrence of ἔικτο, while it will be crucial in §3 to confirm the artificial status of the initial syllable of ἔικτο. As already noticed by Hackstein (1989: 54), the only Homeric occurrence of ἔικτο does not offer any parallel with metrical-syntactic constructions containing other forms of ἕοικα. To explain the issue in detail, let us look again at the occurrence of ἔικτο in \textit{Il.} 23.107:

\textsuperscript{46} In particular, ἔικτο is found in Apollonius Rhodius (\textit{Argon.} 2.39, 4.1612), a fragment by Euphorion (fr. 64.1 Powell), Nonnus (\textit{Dyonisiiaca} 43.12) and Moschus (\textit{Megara} 110). It is also attested three times in the \textit{Anthologia Graeca} (2.1.20, 321, 348, all epigrams attributed to Christodorus) and twice in the Homeric \textit{centos} preserved in the \textit{Eudocia Augusta}. The augmented ἕικτο, on the other hand, occurs in Nonnus’ \textit{Dionysiaca} (25.434, 42.167, 47.535) and in Quintus’ \textit{Posthomera} (5.28, 7.567, 12.411). In addition to the ppf. forms, later hexametric poetry also developed a perfect middle, as shown by ἕικταυ (Nicander \textit{Ther.} 747 and \textit{Alexipharmaca} 377; \textit{De martyrio sancti Cypriani} 2.423). Furthermore, ἕικταυ in \textit{Ther.} 658 shows an analogical extension of the augment, as well as the striking προσείξαι in Eur. \textit{Alc.} 1063.

\textsuperscript{47} It surely felt odd and interesting to the ancient writers after Homer, as proved by the fact that several scholiasts felt the need to gloss it together with ἕικτο (see §2.2).
καὶ μοι ἐκαστ’ ἐπέτελλεν, ἔκτο δὲ θέσκελον αὐτῷ

The strongest parallel for the first hemistich can be found once again in book 23 of the *Iliad*, specifically in the part of l. 95 before bucolic caesura: [καὶ μοι ταῦτα ἐκαστ’ ἐπετέλλεις] In this line, Achilles asks Patroklos’ ghost: “how is it […] you […] tell me all these several things?” Slightly later, in l. 107 – after Patroklos’ ghost has disappeared – he recounts: “it told me each thing I should do”. This can hardly be considered as a Homeric FP, since the first half of the line containing ἔϊκτο simply reprises what Achilles had already said a few lines before – in Parry’s terms, the repetition is not systemic (cf. Ch. 2 §1.1). Although the position of ἐπέτελλε (ν) is relatively frequent in the Homeric poems, and particularly in the *Iliad*, none of its occurrences shows a second hemistich which may be compared to that of *Il.* 23.107, especially considering that several of them contain a noun-epithet formula right after [ἐπέτελλες] As for the second half of the line containing ἔϊκτο, its features are even more isolated. The adjective θέσκελος is used in the acc. neut. sg. and before 5c only here, while verse-final [αὐτῷ6c] is nowhere else found in a sentence with a form of ἐοικα.

In conclusion, ἔϊκτο cannot be explained as an artificial and metrically functional variant of other forms of the paradigm of ἐοικα, nor can its morphology be justified with metrical-syntactic constraints within an AM. This is in line with the fact that its morphological structure can be explained with a persuasive evolution in the diachronic development of ancient Greek. Finally, although the second hemistich where ἔϊκτο occurs seems an isolated creation in the Homeric poems, it is entirely possible that this pff. form occurred in the same construction or in different ones in the lost portion of the epic tradition.

§2.4 ἔϊκτο: possible explanations

As can be noticed, the augmented ἔϊκτο has been left out from the conclusions of the previous section. While a theory of historical morphology can explain a pff. middle like ἔϊκτο, the initial long vowel of ἔϊκτο poses additional problems. As already explained in Ch. 1 §2.1, the hypothesis of a LA for this form did not find much support in the earliest scholarship. After all, assuming a LA would imply a loss of digamma between the LA itself and the reduplication vowel (* nghĩa- > ἔ=ε- with subsequent contraction), but not between the reduplication vowel and the zero-grade (ἠίκ-). This problem led

---

49 *Il.* 5.320: [βοὴν ἀγάθος Διομήδης6c]; *Il.* 9.179: [Γερήνιος ἵππος Νέστωρ6c]; *Il.* 11.785: [Μενοίτιος Ἀκτορος νηῦς6c]; *Il.* 11.840: [Γερήνιος ὡρας Χαλκιδῆς6c]; *Il.* 24.780 (although not a hero’s formula): [μελανάων ὤρα νηῦς6c]; *Od.* 17.186: only partially with [ἄνας ἐμῷ6c].
50 It occurs with forms of ἐοικα in other passages, but in a different position (e.g. *Od.* 4.654 [τῷ δ’ αὐτῷ6c πάντα ἐοικε6c]; *Od.* 6.60 [αὐτῷ2b ἐοικε6b].
Chantraine (1973: 479) to mention the possibility of a lack of reduplication in ἵκτο, which would be extremely atypical for the pluperfect of ἔσκα – and which also implies the use of a LA of doubtful origins.

At the same time, as already seen in Ch. 1 §2.4.1, a lack of reduplication is actually part of a theory by Jasanoff-Katz, according to which the sequence *eïeu- underwent an earlier loss of the first digamma and contraction in specific ppf. forms. According to them, it was exactly the synchronic lack of a reduplication syllable in e.g. ἵκτο that caused the analogical extension of a LA to the non-reduplicated ppf. of οἶδα. The discussion in Ch. 1 §2.4.1 focussed on the ppf. with an alleged QM, i.e. ἥκτει, ἥκριςει, ἥόλπει. It was shown that the sound [ɛ:], which is the expected result of the contraction of their initial *eïeu-, never undergoes QM in Homer. The example of ἵκτο, however, offers a different picture. As already seen in Ch. 3 §2.2, Hackstein (2002: 257) derived the augmented form of ἵκτο from *e-Γε-Γικ- through the following process: *e-γειικτο > *eiikto > eiikto51. As already explained, this would be possible thanks to what I have been calling Brugmann-Schwyzer’s dissimilation, according to which in Homer (or Ionic) ει (representing /lç/ in Attic-Ionic) would be written as η (i.e. /ç/ or /lç/) before ε and η, e.g. χέρηη/χέρεια. Brugmann (1898) considered this as an actual phonological dissimilation, but it is more accurate to follow Schwyzer (1939: 243) in considering it as a graphic convention to avoid *-ειυ- in the metakharakterismos from EI52. Thus, an Urtext like El was more likely to be transcribed as η where the metre would require it (as in *ΔΕΜΑΣΔΕΙΚΤΟ), and explaining occasional alternations like χέρηη/χέρεια as graphical adjustments overcomes the inconsistency of Brugmann’s evidence, which appears to be too scant and aleatory to allow for an actual phonological tendency53.

At this point, one might conclude that Jasanoff-Katz’ theory works at least for ἵκτο, especially if it is integrated with the dissimilation suggested by Hackstein. The prototypical form of

---

51 This theory is supported by Ittzés (2008: 167), who finds it valid for Hom. ἰσκε as well.

52 Schwyzer does not seem to consider -ειυο as a spelling that was necessarily avoided. Accordingly, he explains χέρης as analogical to χέρηη, but he is also forced to suppose that τελής (always in the form τελήςσας in Homer) replaces an original -ΕΕ-, though with reservations. After all, the writing -ειυο- is actually attested in the Homeric poems for pres. inf. and 3rd sg. ind. of verbs in -ειολ-έιο, including τελέεια in Od. 6.234 and 23.161.

53 In particular, Brugmann’s (1898: 156-7, 159-60) strongest examples for this Homeric alternance between η and ει are the following: τελής (always as τελήςσας in Homer) ‘perfect’, next to forms of τέλεός (cf. also Lejeune 1955: 117), χέρηη, χέρης ‘inferior’ next to χέρεια, and σπήη σπήσας ‘cave’ next to σπέιςσας, which is considered by Brugmann (1898: 160) as underlying an original Ionic σπάειας with the Att. ending -ους (cf. Ch. 1 §2.4.1). He also mentions Ἡρακλῆη, but as Schwyzer (1939:243) notices Homer has gen. sg. -κλῆς too. In addition to this, τελής seems simply be analogical to e.g. φωνήες (cf. DELG: 1063). Therefore, the dat. sg. forms (χέρηη and σπήη) seem to be the strongest examples, so that Brugmann’s dissimilation can simply be limited to cases of graphically avoided *ειυ.
ηὕκτο, i.e. *e-ϝεύκτο, must then belong to a time when the intervocalic [w] between the reduplication syllable and the stem had not been lost completely. This is a specific requirement of Jasanoff-Katz’ theory, since the resulting ή- with hiatus implies an earlier loss of the first digamma, possibly as a dissimilatory phenomenon between the two labial glides. The presence of the second digamma in *eϝευ- would therefore be crucial for a dissimilation (i.e. loss of the first digamma) to happen. If we combine Jasanoff-Katz’ theory with Hackstein’s use of Brugmann-Schwyzer’s dissimilation, the evolution of ήὕκτο should have been as follows:

I. (before loss of intervocalic [w]): *eϝεύκτο
II. (early loss in eϝευ- and contraction): *ϝεύκτο
III. (complete loss of intervocalic [w]): *ϝίκτο
IV. (Brugmann-Schwyzer’s dissim.): ήίκτο

Although in stage III both the initial *ϝ- and internal *-ϝ- of (ϝ)ϝ(ϝ)ίκτο were no longer perceived, the disyllabic pronunciation of the stem, i.e. ἐί-, could be perfectly preserved thanks to its traditionality in the zero-grade forms of ἕοικα, which has been confirmed in §1.2, and most importantly because it could be metrically relevant, as in the formula [δέμας δ’ ήίκτο γνακι].

There is, however, a number of problems with stages I and II above. First of all, pluperfects tend to be unaugmented in Homer. Whether this is interpreted as a morphological limitation, or as a feature linked to the original semantics of the augment, it is still undeniable that a form as complex as *eϝεύκτο would be peculiar in a very early stage of the Homeric language. Even if stage I were accepted despite this issue, the reconstruction of a prototypical formula like *δέμας δ’ ἐϝέϝικτο γνακι would still be at odds with its distribution in the Homeric poems. More specifically, is it possible that such an old formula is found only in the Odyssey? In the Iliad, as will be seen in §3, the participle ἐκεῖνα is found instead in similar formulaic structures, e.g. in [δέμας ἐκεῖνα]. More

---

54 Cf. Jasanoff-Katz 2014: 258 n. 18. In particular, they refer to the possibility that ἐμίῳ ‘to vomit’ has no trace of digamma in Homer for the dissimilatory loss of υ- (cf. Lat. vomere) before a labial, and that the same might be observed in ὀπτῷο ‘to be married’ if connected with Ved. vap- ‘strew’ (which seems to me quiteimaginative from a semantic point of view). They also refer to Nikolaev’s (2007: 169–70) theory of a dissimilation [ϝ υ/R > Φ υ/R] for ἐρος, ἐλπη, ἐμῖο and Hom. forms of Λχίλλευς with one -λ-, although they generically claim that they do not agree with all his conclusions.

55 Moreover, if the second *-Ϝ- had been lost at the same time, a more likely outcome would have been †ἐϝίκτο.


57 Cf. Willi 2007: 47

58 After all, augmented ppf. are found in Homer, although they constitute the minority.

59 An original *ϝεύκτο might have been used in other FPs which are lost to us, but since [δέμας δ’ ήίκτο γνακί] is the only formula where Hom. ἠίκτο is attested, it is here used as the only possible example of original *ϝεύκτο resulting in ἠίκτο.
importantly, it will be shown that the FPs containing ἐἰκοῖα are attested both in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey*, and that they frequently show a metrical consideration of initial *ṷ-*, as exemplified exactly by the metrical lengthening of -μας in [δέμας ἐἰκοῖα] (scanned as [⸗—|—|—]). This suggests that the FPs containing ἐἰκοῖα were created in an old stage of the oral composition, so that they could spread and be attested in both poems – which is also a clear sign of their success. The formula [δέμας δ’ ἠίκτο γυναικί], on the other hand, has a more suspicious distribution, as it shows a considerable success in the *Odyssey*, but none in the *Iliad* or in any other passage of archaic poetry. As explained in Ch. 2 §2.3, forms that are concentrated in just one poem or specific portions of the epic tradition might hint at specific branches of the oral production. We would therefore be forced to conclude that *δέμας δ’ ἠείκτο γυναικί* was created at a very early stage – so early that intervocalic [w] was still preserved – but exclusively in the oral tradition of the *Odyssey*. Albeit theoretically possible, such a conclusion is nonetheless hard to accept due to the partiality of the occurrences of ἠίκτο and, even more significantly, the comparison with old FPs containing (̣)ἐἰκοῖα – which will be analysed in more details in §3.1.

Turning to stage II, we face the same problem explained in Ch. 1 §2.4.1: the homogeneous evidence for the early loss of intervocalic [w] in Attic-Ionic makes it hard to prove an even earlier loss in *eueũ-*. We may therefore add this issue both to the difficulties explained above in accepting an old formula containing *ἐφέικτο*, and to the inaccuracy of Jasanoff-Katz’ theory in justifying a QM in ἐφικεί, ἐφόλπει, and ἐφόργει (cf. Ch. 1 §2.4.1). Furthermore, an exceptional sound change is not necessary to reach stages III and IV above. As already explained (§1.2, §1.3), the zero-grade forms of ἐοικα were traditionally disyllabic, which means that a consideration of ἐĩ- was possible at any stage of the Homeric tradition. This could happen even after intervocalic [w] had been lost, due to the tendency of the Homeric language to preserve archaisms in established FPs – especially if they are metrically irreplaceable. At the same time, initial [w] generally shows more resistance in the Homeric language, which may prove that it was lost at a later stage in Ionic as well. Dropping Jasanoff-Katz’ theory, we may therefore suppose the following evolution for ἠίκτο:

1. (initial [w] and ‘traditional’ ἐĩ):  *yeikto

2. (use of syllabic augment):  *eyeikto

---

60 At the same time, it should be noted that initial [w] was probably lost later than the intervocalic one in Ionic, although the evidence in this dialect makes it hard to define specific chronological layers. At any rate, the origin of a formulaic structure like [δέμαςως ἐἰκοῖα] still needs to be quite archaic, but a form like *ἐφέικτο* should be placed at an even earlier stage.


62 Similarly, Knight (1820) suggested ἐφεῖκτο as the original form for all the four occurrences of ἠίκτο.
3. (loss of intervocalic [w]): *ēikto
4. (Brugmann-Schwyzer’s dissim.): Ṯίκτο

In such a picture, the contraction of *ē- was supposedly compulsory for the need to avoid a sequence of three short vowels (i.e. *ēēi-) while preserving the traditionally disyllabic zero-grade ēt-.

Hackstein’s theory might therefore still be supported if the starting point were *(e)meikto instead of an excessively archaic *(e)meuikto. At the same time, we would still have an old formula in *[δὲμας δ’ έρέϊκτο γυναικί], since the addition of a syllabic augment would imply a consideration of initial [w], which is still a considerably archaic feature in Ionic. This seems to leave us with the same problem explained before: could an old formula – so old to contain an initial [w] – be limited only to the tradition of the Odyssey? We would thus be left with two possibilities, which are ultimately conjectural: either *[δέμας δ’ έρέϊκτο γυναικί] was available to the oral tradition of the Iliad, but was nonetheless discarded for reasons which cannot be understood – especially considering that *[δέμας έϊκυῖα], which shows the same metrical consideration of initial [w], occurs both in the Iliad and in the Odyssey – or *[δέμας δ’ έρέϊκτο γυναικί] was used elsewhere in the portion of epic tradition which is now lost. More convincingly, the attestations of [δέμας δ’ ήίκτο γυναικί] can bring to the alternative conclusion that this formula is a relatively late creation in the oral tradition of the Odyssey, and that as such it remained limited to this poem within the Homeric oral production. This assumption seems also supported by the above-mentioned comparison with the more successful FPs containing ēικωκα.

At the same time, it might be argued that adding a syllabic augment to ēίκτο was possible even after complete loss of initial [w] in Ionic. After all, Hom. ἔπει can always be interpreted either as an archaic use of the syllabic augment before *ﺘ- or as a usage which resisted in the formulaic diction thanks to its metrical usefulness. The singers might therefore have treated ēίκτο as beginning with a certain sound thanks to cases like [δέμας ēικωκα]. However, the addition of a syllabic augment would still produce a very odd sequence of three short vowels, i.e. *ēei-, an option which bards were likely to discard in a relatively late creation. This has already been observed in Ch. 1 §2.4.1 in the discussion on the morphology of ἄφκει, ἄφλπει, and ἄφργει. In particular, I pointed out that a sequence of three short vowels was likely to be avoided in a process of affixation as late as the augmentation of ppf. forms. More specifically, if we accepted stages 1–4 above, Ḯίκτο and the ppf. analysed in Ch. 1 §2.4.1 would be the only examples of an original *ēeiV- after the optional process of augmentation.

As a preliminary summary, it is now possible to provide an outline of the reasons to discard the origin of Ḯίκτο as being from *(e)memktō:

---

since ἤικτο is attested only in a formula which belongs exclusively to the *Odyssey*, it is likely
to be a later product of the oral tradition of this specific poem.

- As such, it cannot underlie a very archaic *eὔικτο*, especially considering the difficulties
posed by Jasanoff-Katz’ theory.

- It might still underlie an original *eeίκτο even after complete loss of intervocalic and initial
digamma, given that both the consideration of an initial sound in ἤικτο and the disyllabic zero-
grade stem -eι- might have become traditional features in the Homeric diction.

- However, the reconstruction of an original *ἐεικτο* for ἤικτο, as well as for ἔδικται, ἔδιλπει, and
ἐώργει, finds three obstacles: it is not paralleled by any other examples of prefixation in Homer; it is at odds with the rare augmentation of Homeric ppf.; in general, the augmentation
of ppf. forms is supposed to be a later process, in which a sequence of three short vowels was
likely to be avoided.

- Since the occurrences of ἤικτο, specifically, suggest a later stage of the epic diction, the
creation of a form like *ἐἐίκτο* was all the more unlikely.

If the derivation of ἤικτο from an augmented *ἐἐ(ϝ)ίκτο* cannot be accepted, only two options
are left to explain its origin. On the one hand, the original text might have been *[δέμαςδὲἔικτο*],
which was supposed to be written as *ΔΕΜΑΣΔΕΙΚΤΟ* before the *metacharacterismos*. A
misunderstanding as [δ’ ηι-] was perfectly possible, but this option is hardly tenable for the violation
of Hermann’s bridge in [δὲ ἔ-]. Therefore, only one possibility is left: an analogical temporal
augment was applied to ἥικτο to fit the 3rd sg. med. pff. into the hexameter. This was suggested for
ἤικτο by Ruijgh (1971/2, p. 167), and is here considered as an artificial process both for the attestation
of ἤικτο limited to poetry, and for its metrical functionality, which will be observed in §3.2. The same
has been suggested in Ch. 3 §2.2, for the origin of ἠειδ- from a temporally augmented ἐειδ-, just as
Hom. ἡν has been explained as an artificial ‘double’ augmentation of ἡν in verse-initial position.
Furthermore, since the creation of [δέμας δ’ ἤικτο γνωακί] happened at a later stage when initial
digamma had been lost, an analogical temporal augment could be perfectly well applied to ἥικτο64.

The preservation of the disyllabic stem -ει-, on the other hand, is perfectly in line with what has been
concluded in §1.3, especially considering that in [δέμαςδὲ.Hour] such a traditional feature was
also metrically required. It is therefore possible to reformulate the hypothetical evolutions described
before (i.e. stages I-IV and 1-4) with the following stages:

1. (traditional ἤιτ- and optional consideration of *ὑ-): *(ὑ)eικτο
2. (analogical temporal augment to fit the metre): *棹κτο

The reasons behind stage 2 will be explained in detail in the following section. As for stage 1, the neglect of initial digamma can be clearly seen in the textual tradition of *Il.* 23.107, where ν-movable is solidly attested in [ἐπέτελελευθέρων] before [ἐκικτον]b. It obviously happened already during the Ionic oral tradition, and consequently affected the fashioning of ἤκτο in its formula by allowing the analogical use of a temporal augment.

§3. Analysis of the occurrences through the formula-based method

An analysis of the occurrences of ἤκτο will ultimately show that this form is part of an analogical innovation of an older FP. The investigation will receive strong support from a study by Hackstein (1989), which seems to represent the only example in the Homeric scholarship of an approach similar to our formula-based method. At the same time, a more detailed study of FPs will be here provided, so that Hackstein’s analysis will be integrated with new observations, and with the conclusions drawn from the previous sections of this chapter.

In particular, the formula-based analysis will reach the following results:

- [δέμας δ’ ἤκτο γυναικί] is an AM of the tradition of the *Odyssey*, and it moves from a SP containing ἔκοινα and found both in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

- The temporal augmentation of ἤκτο was an artificial necessity to replicate the prosody of the SP formula containing ἔκοινα.

§3.1 The formulaic patterns

The formula containing ἤκτο, and occurring four times in the *Odyssey* (§2.1), can be inserted in a second-hemistic FP underlying the following passages:

a.1. Od. 4.796
εἰδώλου ποίησε, δέμας δ’ ἤκτο γυναικί

a.2. Od. 13.288
χειρί τε μιν κατέρεξε· δέμας δ’ ἤκτο γυναικί

a.3. Od. 16.157
ἀλλ’ ἤ γε σχεδὸν ἠλθε· δέμας δ’ ἤκτο γυναικί

65 The passages containing ἤκτο have been labelled with the same letter and differentiated through numbers, given that they all contain the same formula [δέμας δ’ ἤκτο γυναικί]. What precedes this formula might be useful in identifying the exact origin of ἤκτο, as will be seen in §3.2, but for now the focus is solely on what will be labelled as pattern ζ. For the translations of these four passages, see nn. 21-4.
a.4.  Od. 20.31
οὐρανόθεν καταβάς, δέμας δ’ ἡμῖν γυναικὶ.

b.  II. 8.305
καλὴ Καστιάνειρα δέμας ἑίκυῖα θεῇσιν 66

c.  II. 11.638
ἐν τῷ ρά σφι κύκησε γυνὴ ἑίκυῖα θεῇσιν 67

d.  II. 19.286
ἐἰπε δ’ ἄρα κλαίουσα γυνὴ ἑίκυῖα θεῇσιν 68

e.  Od. 7.291
παιζούσας, ἐν δ’ αὐτῇ ἑν ἑίκυῖα θεῇσιν 69

f.  II. 22.151
ἡ δ’ ἐτέρη θέρεϊ προρέει ἑίκυῖα γαλάζη 70

The FP which embraces the second hemistich of all the passages above is as follows:

Pattern ζ(α-φ)

It is also possible to identify different sub-patterns, depending on the iambic (except for [προρέει μι]) word preceding the form of ἑοικα. In particular, three specific sub-patterns can be outlined:

Sub-Pattern ζ.1.1 (α(1-4), b)71

Sub-Pattern ζ.2 (c, d)

Sub-Pattern ζ.3 (e, f)

The first two structures will be crucial in the discussion in §3.2, as well as the traditional position of ἑοικα found in all the three sub-patterns above. ζ.1.1, in particular, also occurs with a

---

66 “Lovely Kastianeira […] with the form of a goddess”.
67 “In this the woman like the immortals mixed them [a potion]”.
68 “The woman like the immortals mourning for him spoke to him”.
69 “[Your daughter’s maidservants] playing […] and she among them looking like a goddess”.
70 “But the other in the summer-time runs water that is like hail”.
71 For practical reasons, the numeration of the passages is continuous regardless of the sub-patterns. The single passages will therefore be indicated just with the Greek letter of the main pattern and their specific Latin letter (e.g. ζ.β rather than ζ.1.1.β). The same type of indication is kept in Appendix II.
small alteration in the following two passages, which show again the use of δέμας, a form of ἔσκα, and a dative together in a formulaic structure:

g. II. 17.323
Αἰνεῖαν ὄτρυνε δέμας Περίφαντι ἔσκος

h. II. 21.285
στήπην ἐγγύς ἰόντε, δέμας ὁ ἀνδρεσσιν ἐκτην

Sub-Pattern ζ.1.2 (g, h) [δέμας]_1a]Acc.Resp. [⇨ – ωs_b]Dat. [⇨ – ωs_b]v.ἔσκα

The alteration consists in a swap not only of position, but also of prosodical structure between the dative and the verbal form of ἔοικα. At the same time, patterns ζ.1.1 and ζ.1.2 have two important elements in common:
- They both contain the accusative of respect δέμας and, with alternatively inverted order, a verbal form of ἔοικα and a dative (sg. or pl.).
- They are both in the second half of the hexameter, which is an element in common with all the sub-patterns of ζ seen so far.

The former of the two features above is found once again in another formula containing ἐκτην, but used in the first hemistich of the hexameter. The accusative δέμας cannot therefore occur in initial position, as exemplified by the following passages:

i. Od. 8.194
ἀνδρὶ δέμας ἐκτην, ἔπος τ’ ἐφατ’ ἡκ τ’ ὀνόμαξεν

j. Od. 13.222
ἀνδρὶ δέμας ἐκτην νέω, ἐπιβότορι μῆλων

Just as in the case of ζ.2, their structure clearly shows an actual formula, since all the constituents can be represented in the template with specific lexical elements (cf. Ch. 2 §2.2):

Sub-Pattern ζ.1.3 (i, j) [ἀνδρὶ]_1b]Dat. [δέμας]_2a]Acc.Resp. [ἐκτην]_3b]v.ppl.ἔσκα

This syntactic order is altered in the three following passages:

k. II. 22.227
Δηφόβῳ ἐκτην δέμας καὶ ἀτερέα φωνήν

72 “[Had not Apollo in person] stirred on Aineias; he had assumed the form of [the herald] Periphas”.
73 “[Poseidon and Athene swiftly] came near him and stood beside him with their shapes in the likeness of mortals”.
74 “[Athena] likening herself to a man […] spoke out, addressing him”.
75 “[Athena] likening herself in form to a young man, a herdsman of sheep”.
76 “And [Athene] likened herself in form and weariless voice to Deüphobos”.
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l. II. 13.45
εἰσάμενος Κάλχαντι δέμας καὶ άτειρέα φωνήν

m. II. 17.555
εἰσοσμένη Φοίνικι δέμας καὶ άτειρέα φωνήν

In particular, they show a metrical expansion up to 4a, with [δέμας\textsubscript{4a}] constantly occurring as the third word, and the verb and dative used in syntactically- and prosodically-exchangeable positions (as has been seen between \(\zeta.1.1\) and \(\zeta.1.2\)). Furthermore, the second hemistich is always the same, so that it can be included in the structure of the sub-pattern:

\textbf{Sub-Pattern \(\zeta.1.4(k-m)\):}

\[
[−−−−2a] \text{Dat./V.ppl. ἐἰκύα} \quad [−−−−3b] \text{Dat./V.ppl. ἔοικα} \quad [\text{δέμας}\textsubscript{4a}] \text{Acc. Resp.} \quad \text{καὶ άτειρέα φώνην} _{6c} \quad \text{Acc. Resp. NP}
\]

Passages \(\zeta.l\) and \(\zeta.m\), in particular, show how the middle participle of ἐἰκύα could replace the active one of ἔοικα in these sub-patterns with δέμας and a dative\textsuperscript{79}.

We can therefore observe a macrostructure, represented by the use of δέμας, a form of ἔοικα, and a dative in the same hemistich in \(\zeta.1.1\), \(\zeta.1.2\), \(\zeta.1.3\) (and in \(\zeta.k\) with expansion to 4a)\textsuperscript{80}. Two more features can be drawn from all the sub-patterns observed above:

- The initial [w] of ἐκόηα is always metrically considered: it makes position after δέμας (\(\zeta.b,i,j\)), and it prevents hiatus after γυνή (\(\zeta.c,d\)) and Δηφόβῳ (\(\zeta.k\)).
- The second syllable of [δέμας] is always lengthened by position and used in arsis (\(\zeta.a(1-4),b,g-m\)).

Their importance will be plain in the next section, where a theory by Hackstein will be used to show how the ἴ- of ἶκτο came about.

\section*{§3.2 Hackstein's theory revisited}

In the previous section, a strong connection between ἶκτο and ἐκόηα has been found in the sub-pattern \(\zeta.1.1\). Hackstein (1989) used this connection to explain how ἶκτο was artificially created as a metrical replacement of ἐκόηα. In particular, Hackstein (1989: 52) explained that in \textit{Od.} 4.796, i.e. \(\zeta.a.1\), the poet wanted to obtain a variant with a finite verb of the phrase [δέμας\textsubscript{4a}, ἐκόηα\textsubscript{5b}] of \(\zeta.b\), but

\textsuperscript{77} “[Poseidon] likening himself in form and weariless voice to Kalchas”.

\textsuperscript{78} “[Athene] likened herself in form and weariless voice to Phoinix”.

\textsuperscript{79} Cf. also \textit{Od.} 2.268, 401: [Μέντορι ἐἰκύα ἠμὲν δέμας ἢδὲ καὶ αὐδήν].

\textsuperscript{80} Similarly, Hackstein (1989: 52), though not providing an analysis of sub-patterns as detailed, explains that the changes in the position of these three members, and the different morphology of the forms of ἔοικα are the two factors causing all the different ‘variations’.
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the act. ἔῳκεῖ was clearly impossible to use. Hackstein (1989: 53) therefore identified a possible analogy followed by the poets to create ἔϊκτο: just as [ἔωκός] alternates with [ἔϊκτηνες] in what has been here called sub-pattern ζ.1.2, so should ἔϊκοια alternate with a finite verb which phonologically echoes the stem of the dual forms, i.e. a zero-grade ἔικ- with the second syllable long by position. This feature could be achieved in an artificial middle ppp. like ἔϊκτο, which allowed the poet to overcome the absence of an active 3rd sg. form that could replace [ἔϊκοιας]. Furthermore, the need to start a new sentence, with a consequent use of a finite verb and the particle δέ, is the element used by Hackstein (1989: 53) to identify the precise origin of the formula [δέμας δ’ ἔϊκτο γυναικί]. As he noticed, a compulsory element in the occurrences of the nom. fem. sg. ἔϊκοια is that it must agree with the subject of the governing clause, but this “Identität” is respected in all the occurrences of ἔϊκτο except one: Od. 4.769, i.e. ζ.α.1. More specifically, this is the only case where the subject of ἔϊκτο does not coincide with the syntactic subject of the previous clause, but rather with its object, i.e. εἰδωλον (of Iphthime). This change of subject, as explained by Hackstein, did not allow the poet to use ἔϊκοια, as it could not agree with εἰδωλον, and might therefore have prompted the creation of an analogical hemistich with a finite verb, in order to start a whole new sentence.

Hackstein’s description of the use of the artistic ἔϊκτο has striking similarities with our formula-based method, especially for its comparison with FPs containing other forms of ἔοικα, to which an artificial variant could be built. In particular, ζ.α.1 might really represent the ‘moment of origin’ of the AM containing ἔϊκτο, as well as of the artificial creation of ἔϊκτο itself. Such a level of exactness is the most accurate result and highest aim of our formula-based method, as explained in Ch. 2 §2.3. Finally, ἔϊκτο could be used as a metrically functional alternative to ἔϊκοια also in virtue of the semantic equivalence between active and middle forms in the paradigm of ἔοικα, as observed in §2.2.

At the same time, Hackstein’s theory is also based on different conclusions from those reached in §1.3, §2.3 and §2.4, and it needs to be integrated with the more accurate description of FPs provided in §3.1. In particular, Hackstein considered all the middle forms of ἔοικα as kunstsprachlich, including ἔικτο, and as already observed in §2.4 he explained ἔϊκτο as the result of the augmented *εμεϊκτο. However, in §2.3 it has been concluded that ἔϊκτο can perfectly well be an archaic relic preserved in the Homeric diction, while only the initial ἦ- of ἔϊκτο has been interpreted as an artificial

---

81 Hackstein (1989: 52) provides the three following reasons: ἔ>window is “metrisch nicht mit ἔϊκοια austauschbar”; its ‘bacchic’ structure is not apt for the position of [ἔϊκοια], since it would violate Hermann’s bridge; a word like ἔ>window would also go against the tendency to avoid word-end before the sixth foot if the fifth one is a spondee. All these reasons show that ἔ>window is not generally suitable for replacing ἔϊκοια before 5b, but the first one is already enough to explain why it could not replace it specifically in pattern ζ.1.1.
creation. In particular, in §2.4 it has been explained as an analogical temporal augment applied to ἔικτο at a time when initial [w] was no longer an obstacle, but was rather ignored or traditionally preserved in FPs for metrical usefulness. Hackstein himself portrays a contradicting picture in considering ἔικτο both as a later artistic creation, and as a form resulting from a very archaic *eιεύικτο. It is simply more economical to see an analogical temporal augmentation, whose purpose was to make ἔικτο prosodically equivalent to ἔικυα. Consequently, the disyllabic zero grade of ἔικτο was not simply analogical to the dual forms ἔικτον and ἔικτην, as believed by Hackstein, but it was rather a traditional feature of all the zero-grade forms of ἔοικα, as concluded in §1.3. In particular, given that ἔικτο is likely to be an archaic form, the only artificial feature of ἦικτο is its analogical temporal augment, which is found only in poetry. For the rest, this augmented pff. simply replicates the archaic morphology of its unaugmented counterpart ἔικτο.

With these premises in mind, it is now possible to have a closer look at the FPs of ἔοικα and ἦικτο. In particular, pattern ζ.1.1. can be reproposed here below:

\[ [δέμας]_{Acc.Resp.} \rightarrow [\dddot{\text{ἐ}}\text{oικα}]_{V.\acute{\text{oioi}}} [\dddot{\text{ἐ}}\text{ικτο}]_{Dat.}\]

In order to start a new sentence with it, the bard needed the following elements to be respected:

- The second syllable of δέμας had to be lengthened by position, as it always is in all its instances in the sub-patterns of ζ.
- The form of ἔοικα needed to be a finite verb, and prosodically equivalent to [ἔικυα]. Since ἔεοικεύ, as pointed out by Hackstein, could not be used\(^\text{82}\), the only alternative 3rd sg. indicative form known to the bards was the middle pff. ἦικτο. This word could easily be adjusted to the prosody of [ἕικυα], i.e. \([\dddot{\text{ἐ}}\text{oικα}]\), by lengthening the initial ἐ-, which was possible thanks to an analogy with temporally augmented past tenses. As for the former requirement above, the lengthening by position of the second syllable of [δέμας] was easily obtained by using δέ in a typical epic coordination with a previous independent clause, just like in ζ.\(\text{h}\) (i.e. \([\dddot{\text{δέμας}} \dddot{\text{δ}} \\text{ἀνδρεσσίν ἔικτηνοι}])

A consideration of the sub-patterns outlined in §3.1 can also enlarge Hackstein’s view, and allow for a further comparison with another structure containing [ἕικυα]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-pattern ζ.2</th>
<th>[γυνῇ]_{Nom.γυνή}</th>
<th>[ἕικυα]_{V.\acute{\text{oioi}}}</th>
<th>[θεήσιν]_{Dat.}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-pattern ζ.1.1.a(1-4)</td>
<td>[δέμας]_{Acc.Resp.}</td>
<td>[δʔ ἦικτο]_{Dat.γυνή}</td>
<td>[γυνακί]_{Dat.γυνή}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{82}\) Furthermore, this analysis shows once again how the form *ἔεοικεύ never existed in the Homeric diction (cf. Ch. 1 §2.4.2). It would have been perfect to replace ἔοικα, provided that it was followed by a vowel or diphthong for the correction of ει. Alternatively, since avoiding word-end at 5c with a spondaic fifth foot was a tendency, rather than an actual rule, *ἔεοικεύ could also have been followed by a disyllabic dative. However, this reconstructed form is once again purely conjectural, as shown by the bards’ use of an augmented ἔικτο instead.
This comparison shows how pattern $\zeta.2$ also contributed to shaping the formula containing $\hat{\eta}i\kappa\tau o$. The word $\gamma\nu\eta\eta$ is found in both patterns, and its different inflection represents an interesting reversal of perspective. More specifically, whereas in $\zeta.2$ the lexical item $[\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\iota\alpha\varsigma_b]$ always refers to a woman\textsuperscript{83} ([$\gamma\nu\eta\eta_{4b}$]) compared to the immortal goddesses ([$\theta\epsilon\iota\kappa\sigma\iota\nu\varsigma_{6c}$]), in $\zeta.1.1$ the syntactically implied or logical subject of $[\hat{\eta}i\kappa\tau o_{6b}]$ is always a goddess (Athena) taking the form ([$\delta\epsilon\mu\alpha_{4a}$]) of a woman ([$\gamma\nu\alpha\kappa\iota\kappa_{6c}$]).

§3.3 Final remarks

In the analysis offered in §3.2, two opposite usages can be observed. On the one hand, the participle $[\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\iota\alpha\varsigma_{5b}]$ recurs in a traditional position, which is kept in different syntactic structures within a larger system (sub-patterns $\zeta.1.1$, $\zeta.2$ and $\zeta.3$), and the original $\ast y$- is always metrically considered, thus making position or preventing hiatus. All these elements are in line with the archaic character of $\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\iota\alpha$ as outlined in §1.2. On the other hand, the pluperfect $\hat{\eta}i\kappa\tau o$ occurs always in the same formula, which remains isolated within the Odyssey and presents strong syntactic affinities with some sub-patterns of $\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\iota\alpha$; furthermore, its temporal augmentation needs to underlie an absence or loss of the initial digamma. The formula $[\delta\epsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma\delta \hat{\eta}i\kappa\tau o \gamma\nu\alpha\kappa\iota\kappa_{6c}]$ can therefore be considered as an AM moving from the occurrences of $[\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\iota\alpha_{5b}]$.

The reason behind this AM is once again the necessity for the poet to find an alternative from both a metrical and a syntactic point of view, as already observed in the relationship between $[\hat{\eta}i\sigma\alpha\varsigma_{1c}]$ and $[\iota\sigma\alpha\varsigma_{1c}]$ in Ch. 4. In the case of $\hat{\eta}i\kappa\tau o$, a finite verb needed to replace $[\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\iota\alpha_{5b}]$ after $[\delta\epsilon\mu\alpha_{4a}]$, and the choice of the middle ppf. was due both to the impossibility of using $\epsilon\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota$ in such context, and the fact that the middle $\hat{\eta}i\kappa\tau o$ offers the same disyllabic zero-grade as that of $\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\iota\alpha$. The semantic equivalence between middle and active forms (cf. §2.2) made the use of the middle pff. unproblematic, but the form $\hat{\eta}i\kappa\tau o$, which is likely to be an inherited and preserved archaism (cf. §2.3), needed a final adjustment to fit the metre. As observed in §2.4, any attempt to derive $\hat{\eta}i\kappa\tau o$ from an original form with intervocalic digamma(s) is ultimately at odds with the limited distribution of the formula $[\delta\epsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma\delta \hat{\eta}i\kappa\tau o \gamma\nu\alpha\kappa\iota\kappa_{6c}]$. Furthermore, the creation of an augmented pluperfect with a sequence of three short vowels (i.e. $\epsilon\epsilon\epsilon$-) would be quite odd and theoretically unparalleled. It is

\textsuperscript{83} i.e. Hecamede (Nestor’s slave) in Il. 11.683, and Briseis (crying over Patroclus’ corpse) in Il. 19.286. The other occurrences of $[\epsilon\iota\kappa\nu\iota\alpha \theta\epsilon\iota\kappa\sigma\iota\nu\varsigma]$ show the same thematic connotation, with the fem. pple. referring to Castianeira (one of Priam’s brides) in Il. 8.305 (i.e. $\zeta\beta$), and to Nausicaa (described by Odysseus to her father) in Od. 7.291 (i.e. $\zeta e$). Finally, Il. 22.151 (i.e. $\zeta f$) seems to represent an AM, where one of the two springs ($\pi\gamma\alpha\rho i$) of the Scamander is said to resemble hail.
therefore more economical to see in [ἐ]ϊκτοςβ] an analogical temporal augmentation applied to ἐικτό, with the aim to obtain an artificial form to be used as metrical-syntactic variant to [ἐικοῖαςβ].
Chapter 6
Hom. ἀπηύρα

The 3rd sg. ἀπηύρα ‘he took/snatched away’ occurs 19 times in the Homeric poems, always in verse-final position except for Od. 4.646. The only Homeric instance of the 2nd sg. ἀπηύρας is again at the end of the hexameter in Il. 8.237, just as the participle ἀπούρας in its ten occurrences. A 1st sg/3rd pl. ἀπηύρων is also attested 6 times in the Homeric poems. Finally, the sigmatic aorist ἀπόερα- has also been linked to the root of ἀπηύρα: it occurs in Il. 6.348 (ἀπόερα), 21.329 (ἀποέρασε) and 21.283 (ἀποέρσῃ).

Four features of ἀπούρας/ἀπηύρα will be examined in this chapter:
1. Its root, especially to establish what type of aorist ἀπηύρα might be.
2. The allegedly Aeolic sound change [V-ϝρ-] > [Vυρ-] across the morpheme boundary, in order to confirm that ἀπηύρα is a preserved Aeolic form in the Homeric text. This will also allow us to explain the long alpha in ἀπηύρα, and to establish the initial *ṷ- of its root.
3. The occurrences in solid formulaic systems, which will further confirm the antiquity of ἀπηύρα.
4. Its seemingly ‘long’ augment, which will be explained as an analogical temporal augment applied to original *ἀπεύρα, again with the help of the formula-based method.

On the one hand, the artificial use of a temporal augment in ἀπηύρα was ultimately not required to produce a metrically alternative form, as the original *ἀπεύρα had the same prosodic value. At the same time, the Homeric occurrences of προσηύδα might have served as a model for the ‘long’ augment of ἀπηύρα, so that the formula-based method will still come in handy. At any rate, a study of ἀπηύρα is crucial to the present thesis for two reasons: it refutes one of the most supported cases for the existence of a LA in ancient Greek, and it provides a further example of analogical temporal augmentation together with ἣν (← ἔν), ἥειδη (← ἑιδ-), and ἥικτο (← ἔικτο).

§1. Root and morphological classification of ἀπηύρα

The interpretations of ἀπηύρα as an old root aorist or as an original sigmatic aorist will be here considered as the most likely. The sigmatic-aorist hypothesis, in particular, offers new perspectives on the Homeric language thanks to the possible parallel case of ἑγήρα, and it would still confirm both the antiquity of ἀπηύρα and the morphological oddities which led to specific misunderstandings by the bards.
1.1 A root aorist?

Generally speaking, two features of ἀπηύρα are accepted by most scholars: the root-initial *ṷ-, and its vocalization after the augment (i.e. *-wpdb- > -wpdb-). The latter feature has led many to consider the form as Aeolic, as will be seen in detail in §2.1. As for the root, the initial *ṷ- seems to be the only point of agreement among all scholars. The two main difficulties have been to define the morphology of this verb, and to find any cognate words both within and outside Greek. The former issue can be summarised in two types of view: theories considering ἀπηύρα as an athematic root aorist, and those suggesting a different morphological interpretation.

The latter view is mainly represented by Sommer (1909: 64-5), Boisacq (1950: 71) and Frisk (GEW: 125). Sommer’s theory will be described in §1.3, as it is partly relevant to the interpretation of ἀπηύρα as a sigmatic aorist. Boisacq, on the other hand, has been the only one to define ἀπηύρα as an imperfect “avec valeur aoristique”, and to pose ἀπηύρα and ἀπηύρων as forms of equal origin and belonging to the same paradigm. This hypothesis, however, lacks morphological accuracy1, whereas the interpretation of ἀπηύρων as an analogical and later form will be here preferred. Frisk, on the other hand, starts from a root *er-2, and derives from it both ἀπηύρα as an epic asigmatic aorist – to which he suggests ἀπούρας might have been formed secondarily – and ἀπόερσε, which he describes as “ein entsprechender σ-Aorist”3. However, the relationship between these two forms will be better explained in §1.2, where it will be shown that they cannot be related.

The rest of the relevant scholarship agrees on considering ἀπηύρα as a root aorist. This interpretation has depended on the morphological structure of its corresponding participle ἀπούρας. In particular, Ahrens (1891: 543-4) suggested an initial vocalised digamma, thus posing a root *ϝαρ-, and consequently classified the participle as a root aorist form through a comparison with ἀποδράς, ἀποκτάς4. The participle might therefore be derived from *ἀπο-ϝαρ-ντ-ς with subsequent vocalisation

---

1 In particular, Boisacq suggested a root *αερ, thus connecting ἀπηύρα to ἁερό ‘to raise’, ‘to lift’ and (γ)έρω ‘to drag’. It is unclear, however, why ἁερό and ἐρόω are both indicated as comparable elements if *αερ- is considered as the root of ἀπηύρα. Moreover, Boisacq fails to explain how a (contract?) imperfect like ἀπηύρα/ἀπηύρων could be formed to the root *αερ, especially considering the parallel present ἁερό.

2 He also mentions two of the roots listed in VWIS as possible etymologies for the “Wurzel ἐρ- ‘reißen, greifen’”, namely *ἐρ- “ergreifen, nehmen, finden” – related by VWIS: 280 to Gr. εὑρίσκω, OI fuar – and *αερ- “aufreißen, ritzen” – linked by VWIS: 286-7 to e.g. Gr. ῥάκος ‘rag’, OSax wrītan ‘to scratch’, ‘to write’.

3 Therefore, in Frisk’s theory ἀπόερσε would be one of the many Homeric sigmatic aorists to liquid stems preserving the liquid – especially those which did not exist in Attic, e.g. -ήρας, ἀράς, ἐκρας, κέλεια (cf. Chantraine 1973: 173).

4 Ahrens simply writes ἀπούρας and derives it from *ἀποφράς, without addressing the barytonesis of the form which is usually handed down by the textual tradition.
of ῥ, and its apparent barytonesis has been explained as an Aeolic feature, just as the articulation [a:] of the final long vowel of 3rd sg. ἀπήφρα (cf. §2.1). At the same time, the scholarship supporting a root-aorist theory for ἀπηφρα is split between two reconstructions of its root: *yɛr-/*yɛr- or *yɛr-/*yɛr-. The former has already been seen in Frisk’s theory, and was previously proposed by Schwyzer (1939: 740) as well, who considered ἀπηφρα as a root aorist. The active ἀπηφρα, according to Schwyzer, is a zero-grade form with LA and analogical to the middle, of which only one form is attested in Pseudo-Hes. Sc. 173: ἄπουράμενοι. He therefore reconstructs it with an originally short final vowel, i.e. *ἄπηφρα, while he takes ἄπο(ρ)έφε to be a sigmatic aorist with full grade of the root.

Schwyzer’s argument is also based on a comparison with the Hom. active forms ἐκτα, κτάς, which according to Chantraine (1973: 381) as well are secondary formations to ἐκτατο and κτάμενος. These two forms are attested in Homer with a passive sense, just as ἄπουράμενοι in Sc. 173, and 3rd sg. act. ἐκτα mostly occurs in verse-final position like ἄπηφρα. For these similarities, Meister (1921: 101-2) considers ἄπηφρα and ἄποφρας as morphologically equivalent to ἐκτα, κατακτάς, as well as to οὐτά, thus positing *ἄπηφρα and *ἄποφρας as the original forms. He adds that the final long vowel in ἄπηφρα was a secondary lengthening due to the special treatment of syllables in verse-final position in hexameter poetry.

However, as noticed by Strunk (1958: 124), ἄπουράμενοι should not be taken as a starting point for the morphology of ἄπηφρα, due to its isolated attestation in a later work of doubtful authorship such as the Shield. Furthermore, a major difference between ἐκτα and ἄπηφρα is that the former is attested as ἐκτα in its only occurrence which is not verse-final (Od. 11.410), whereas ἄπηφρα has a final long vowel in Od. 4.646 before bucolic caesura. Another important piece of evidence for the quantity of the final alpha comes from the analogical creation of Hom. 1st sg/3rd pl ἄπηφρων,

---

5 An example he uses to demonstrate the vocalization of the digamma is ταλαφρινος < *ταλα-φρινος. This sound change will be identified in §2.1 as Aeolic.

6 Another middle form is the v.l. ἄφουρατο for Od. 4.646 instead of ἄφουρα. It is attested only in late printed editions, not in the MSS, and is therefore rejected both by Ludwich (1889: 95) and West (2017: 90). Cf. also Meister 1921: 101, who strongly condemns the use of the v.l. ἄφουρατο by contemporary scholars.

7 Schwyzer (1939: 740 n. 5) also suggests the full-grade athematic *ἄφηφρα(t) as a possible original form, through a comparison with Skt. əvar ‘umschloß’. The ppl. ἄποφρας, then, is derived by Schwyzer (ibid.) from *ἀπο-φρ-ατ-, i.e. an athematic aorist with the ‘weak’ allomorph of the ppl. suffix.

8 Hence the root is reported as *φφρα- by e.g. Bechtel (1914: 50), Chantraine (1973: 379), Harðarson (1993: 184). See n. 6 for the variant ἄφουρατο in Od. 4.646 and the reason why it should be rejected.
which took place after ἀπηύρα was felt as the 3sg. imperfect of an -άω verb\(^9\). For this to happen, the final -α of ἀπηύρα needed to be considered as long in the bards’ tradition, which was clearly not the case for ἕκτα or οὔτα.\(^{10}\)

The considerations above lead us to consider ἀπηύρα as a root aorist with final long vowel in the singular. The formation of a root aorist from a telic root (‘to snatch (away)’) is quite expectable, and the morphology of ἀπηύρα is perfectly paralleled by the ancient Homeric instances of root aorists showing ablaut (e.g. (ἔ)βην/βάτην, ἔφθη/φόμενος, ἔπτατο) or an extension of the long vowel to all the persons of the act. indic. (e.g. (ἔ)στημεν, (ἔ)βημεν).\(^{11}\) This comparison suggests for ἀπηύρα an original root *vr- with a final *-h. This would explain the quantity of the final vowel, while its articulation [a:] can be considered an Aeolism, as will be confirmed in §2.1. Along this line, Chantraine (DELG: 95) proposes a thème II *vrh2- , just as Strunk (1958: 125) posits a set-root yer- realised as Vollstufe II (-vrā-) in the root aorist. A root *yer-/y-r- is therefore to be rejected, but in the next sections it will be shown that the Schwebeablaut *vrh2-/*rēh2 is not supported by the evidence either.

---

9 For this interpretation of ἀπηύρον, cf. Schwyzer 1939: 740 n. 5; Strunk 1958: 118; Chantraine 1973: 380 (with the specification that the long alpha of the aorist was kept as an Aeolism, and then reinterpreted by Ionian singers as a contraction of an -άω verb); Hárðarson 1993: 184.

10 Considering the evidence of the Homeric text, ἀπηύρα can be considered as a ‘regular’ root aorist with long vowel in the singular, whereas ἕκτα οὔτα might be both explained as secondary formations to the middle κτάμενος and οὐτάμενος (cf. Chantraine 1973: 380-1). The main issue with this view is that both middle forms have a passive sense in Homer, which makes them likely to be secondary themselves – just like ἀπουράμενοι in Sc. 173. It is however hard to explain why ἕκτα and οὔτα seem to be the only Greek root aorists showing a zero grade in the singular.

11 Cf. Chantraine 1973: 378-9; Duhoux 2000: 357-8. Cf. also Sihler 1995: 562, who takes the original paradigm to have been in the full grade in all the persons, with shortening only in the 3rd pl. (e.g. ἔβαν, ἔγνον) due to Osthoff’s law.

12 It should also be pointed out that roots ending in *RH- are not supposed to have developed any forms with a short vowel in the stem. More specifically, ἐτήμεν does not necessarily derive from a generalised *telh2-, since *tlh2- would yield the same result. Basically, forms like **έτλάμεν or **έγνομεν were impossible from a historical phonological point of view, whereas the shortening of the vowel was expected in the original 3rd pl. due to Osthoff’s law (but not in the later 3rd pl. with ending -σαν, cf. ἔγνωσαν in Od. 10.397).
§1.2 ἀπόερσε as a cognate form?

As already mentioned, ἀπηύρα and ἀπόερσε have often been considered related.13 This sigmatic aorist occurs three times in the Homeric poems:

\[\text{ἔνθα με κύμι’ ἀπόερσε πάρος τάδε ἔργα γενέσθαι}\]
\[\text{Il. 6.348}\]
\[\text{δὴν ρά τ’ ἐναυλοῖς ἀποέρση χειμένι περίσσεα}\]
\[\text{Il. 21.283}\]
\[\text{μή μὴν ἀποέρσειε μέγας ποταμὸς βαθυδίνης}\]
\[\text{Il. 21.329}\]

The Schwebeablaut mentioned at the end of the previous section is clearly required if ἀπόερσε is considered a cognate form. This sigmatic aorist would then have the Vollstufe I yerh₂-, but the loss of the final laryngeal between consonants (i.e. *-rh₂s- > -ρσ-) is hard to justify.17 While this is already enough to doubt any derivation of ἀπόερσε from the same root of ἀπηύρα, alternative and more satisfying interpretations are also possible for the etymology of ἀπόερσε. In particular, Forssman (1980: 192) did not take it to be related with ἀπηύρα, and instead derived its stem from *uert- ‘to turn’ (cf. Lat. uerto, Ved. vartate). He also found a cognate in ἕρρω ‘to go away’, ‘to disappear’, ‘to go to ruin’,18 and explained the derivation of ἕρρω from uert-jō with a new sound change, according to which the cluster *-rtj-, unlike *-rs-19, became -ρρ- in Greek.20 This would explain why ἕρρω

14 “Where the waves would have swept me away before all these things had happened”.
15 “[As if I were a boy and a swineherd] swept away by a torrent when he tries to cross in a rainstorm”. Both here and in Il. 21.329, the metrical position of ἀποέρση requires an odd scansion [w w w]. I could not find any comment on this, either in critical editions (e.g. Allen 1931b: 252, 254; van Thiel 1996: 409, 411; West 2000: 253, 255) or in commentaries (e.g. Richardson 1993: 76). At the same time, this metrical irregularity is not found in Il. 6.348, where ἀποέρση has the expected scansion [w w w].
16 “Lest he be swept away in the huge deep-eddying river”. For the odd prosody of ἀποέρση, cf. n. 15.
18 A link between ἀπόερσε and ἕρρω was also made in VWIS: 292-3, but the root suggested for both verbs was uers- (with Lat. uerro as further cognate), and ἀπηύρα was also included in the set of cognate forms.
19 The cluster *-rs- has two possible outcomes in Greek (cf. Lejeune 1955: 106-8; Sihler 1995: 218): 1. -ρρ- in Attic (but see Lejeune 1955: 106-7 for isolated instances in other dialects, e.g. Arc. ἀρρεντερον, Phoc. θαρρος), and -ρσ- in other dialects (e.g. Hom.-Ion. ἄρρος, ἄρσην vs. Att. ἄρρος, ἄρφην); 2. in the sigmatic aorists of liquid-stems, loss of σ with compensatory lengthening in Att.-Ion. (e.g. ἐρθειρά) and Cret. (e.g. παραγγείλαμεν) – but Homer also shows forms preserving -ρσ- (cf. Chantraine 1973: 173) – and assimilation into -ρρ- in Aeolic (e.g. Lesb. ἐρθηρα).
20 It is also implied that in *-rtj- the cluster -tj- did not give -σ-, unlike in the case of *-ntj- in Greek (for which cf. Sihler 1995: 191).
shows the geminate in all its dialectal attestations. Furthermore, Forssman finds two more examples of the sound change in ὄφορος ‘going backwards’, which he relates to ἔρρω, and κάρρων, a Doric comparative corresponding to Ion. κρέσσων and derivable from *κάρτ-ιον.

On the one hand, if Forssman’s theory on ἔρρω were accepted, the sigmatic aor. ἀπόερσε would attest to the presence of the root *ụert- in ancient Greek together with another cognate verb. Furthermore, regardless of ἔρρω, a derivation of ἀπόερσε from the root *ụert- would be unproblematic both from a phonological and a semantic point of view. In particular, ἀπόερσε < *ἀπο-ρέρτ-σ- would be perfectly paralleled by other Homeric instances, and the factitive sense ‘to cause to turn oneself’, quite expected in a sigmatic aorist (cf. infra), would be suitable for the three ‘water’ contexts where the verb at hand occurs. At the same time, deriving ἀπόερσε from the root *yers- of Lat. uerro, as suggested by VWIS: 292-3, seems also to be a valid hypothesis. Phonologically speaking, an aorist like -ɛρσε < *yers-se can be compared to Hom. τελέσσαι/τελέσαι < *teles-sai and εὕσελθαν < *eus- (cf. Lat. āuro, ussī). From a semantic point of view, a derivation from *yers- would be even more straightforward, as the basic meaning of this IE root is ‘to wipe/brush away’, ‘to

---


22 Forssman’s view might also explain the inconsistency between ἄφορος and its synonym πάλινορσος. Chantraine (DELG: 145) tries to solve it by suggesting for ἄφορος both a dissimilation and a possible derivation from ὀρρος ‘rump’. The former factor, however, is not clearly explained, whereas the latter is at odds with the fact that ὀρρος is attested only in Attic, while its Ionic counterpart is ὀρσο- in compounds (cf. DELG: 797). Following Forssman’s theory, ἄφορος might instead be derived from *ἄψ- (ϝ)ορτ-ιος, whereas πάλινορσος might be related to ὀρνυμι (”par étymologie populaire”, according to DELG: 797).

23 This form is attested only in an inscription in Laconian and in one from Corinth. Bechtel (1923: 324-5) simply took it to be evidence that these two Doric dialects had the same treatment of -ρσ- as Attic, together with Dor. γέρρον in Alcm. 131 Page, and Hesych. “χέρρον- τὴν χέρσον γῆν. Λάκκωνες”.

24 Beekes (2010: 186, 464) fully agrees with Forssman, and LIV: 691-2 accepts this possibility for ἔρρω and ἀπόερσε. In CEG 11 (2006): 353, a zero-grade *ụrt-jo > *ράρτ-jo > *ράρρο is rather reconstructed, with later analogy to the frequent e-grade of the Greek present system. The reasons for this are “l’absence de justification morphologique d’un degré *e pour un ancien présent intrasitif en *-je/lo […] et surtout la non-application de la loi de Sievers”. The latter issue is addressed by Barber (2013: 359-60) as well, who considers ἔρρω as a later and secondary form on semantic grounds, thus justifying *ụert-je/lo with e-grade as original.

25 Forssman himself (1980: 192 n. 65) gives the two Homeric examples of ὀμέρασι (< *ἀμέρδ-σαι) and -πέρσαι (< *πέρθ-σαι).

26 VWIS connects this root to ἔρρω and ἀπήρω as well. The derivation of the former from *yers- has here been rejected (see n. 21). See n. 33 for the reason why it cannot work for ἀπήρω either.

sweep”\textsuperscript{28}, and the three Homeric occurrences of the sigmatic aorist ἀπόερσε can be all translated (and have been translated\textsuperscript{29}) with the same meaning.

Another interesting feature of Forssman’s theory is that he assigned transitive-factitive value to ἀπόερσε (“fortreißen”) as the causative of ἔρρω (“fortgehen”), as it is expected in a sigmatic aorist formed to an intransitive verb (Forssman 1980: 192). Regardless of the possible validity of Forssman’s interpretation of ἔρρω, this observation uncovers a major issue in considering ἀπηύρα and ἀπόερσε as cognate forms. The coexistence of a root aorist and a sigmatic one for the same root is usually observed in Homer when there is a contrast, respectively, between intransitive and factitive\textsuperscript{30}. This relationship, however, is absent in the case of ἀπηύρα and ἀπόερσε: the former has the transitive value of ‘snatching away’, whereas the latter refers specifically to the action of ‘sweeping away’ done by the water. The sense of ἀπόερσε is clearly not factitive if compared to that of ἀπηύρα.

It is therefore incorrect to relate ἀπόερσε to ἀπηύρα both on morphological and semantic grounds. The sigmatic aorist ἀπόερσε can easily be derived from different roots, and there seems to be no link between the meanings of the two verbs. Accordingly, they will be considered unrelated in this chapter, which leaves us with no evidence or need to suppose a Schwebeablaut in the root of ἀπηύρα.

§1.3 A sigmatic aorist?

It seems therefore better to follow LIV: 699 and suggest *ṷrh\textsubscript{2}-lṝh\textsubscript{2} ‘wegnehmen’ as a possible root for ἀπηύρα, without any need for a Schwebeablaut. This etymology would obviously work well for a root aorist: *\textsuperscript{2}nd sg. -ɜrh\textsubscript{2}-s > -uράς, \textsuperscript{3}rd sg. -ɜrh\textsubscript{2}(-t) > -uρᾶ, ppl. -ɜrh\textsubscript{2}-nt-s > *-uρᾶς\textsuperscript{31}. Alternatively, ἀπηύρα may also be considered as an archaic sigmatic aorist which underwent contraction\textsuperscript{32}, based on further Homeric evidence. The explanation of this hypothesis can start from

\textsuperscript{28} For possible cognate verbs from this root, cf. LIV: 690-1 – which however derives ἀπόερσε from *yert-, as seen in n. 24.

\textsuperscript{29} E.g. Lattimore (1951) translates all three occurrences with “swept away”, as can be seen in nn. 14-16.

\textsuperscript{30} E.g. ἔβην/ἔβησα, ἔστην/ἔστησα (cf. Chantraine 1961: 181).

\textsuperscript{31} For the vocalisation of *-y-, see §2.1.

\textsuperscript{32} This hypothesis brings to the same type of conclusion reached in §1.2. If ἀπηύρα is an original sigmatic aorist, the existence of the sigmatic ἀπόερσε is clearly redundant – unless it belongs to a different dialect, which is nonetheless impossible to prove from the evidence, given that the only archaic attestation of ἀποερσ- is in Homer. One might argue that ἀπόερσε was a later reshaping into a recognisable sigmatic aorist, but it should rather be assumed that the bards could not recognise the original morphology of ἀπηύρα, as also shown by the fact that ἔγηρᾶ – i.e. another possible contracted sigmatic aorist (see infra) – was never corrected into something like †ἔγερσε.
Sommer’s (1909: 64-5) suggestion of the IE root *uers- for ἀπηύρα – also supported by VWIS, as seen in §1.2 – and of *ἀπ-ή-φρασ-ον as its original form, i.e. a thematic aorist built to *ųrs- and related to ἀπόςφας (< *uers-). The form *ἀπ-ή-φρασ-ον, according to Sommer, underwent contraction after loss of intervocalic sigma: *ἀπ-ή-φρασ-ε > *ἀπήφρα. This view is ultimately to be rejected because the contraction envisaged by Sommer is completely unparalleled in thematic aorists33, but the idea of an original contraction might still be recovered and morphologically redefined. More specifically, if the ending of 3rd sg. ἀπηύρα is derived from the contraction of *-ase after loss of intervocalic sigma, it is possible to explain this verbal form as an original sigmatic aorist, rather a thematic one.

In this case, there would also be a possible parallel in Hom. ἐγήρα ‘(s)he grew old’. This verb is attested in verse-final position three times in the Homeric poems (Il. 7.148, 17.197; Od. 14.67), but the long quantity of the alpha seems confirmed by κατέγηρα before bucolic caesura in Od. 9.51034. Szemerényi interpreted ἐγήρα as an old sigmatic aorist35, and considered it as further evidence in Greek for a long-grade stem in the indicative active singular of the PIE s-aorist36. He therefore reconstructed an original *gēr-s-t, also based on a comparison with the participle stem γηραν- as attested in Hom. γηράς (Il. 17.197)37. Barton (1982: 32-4), on the other hand, integrated Szemerényi’s intuition with a more accurate root *gērh2-, given that the final laryngeal can be assumed from γέρας (< *gērh2-s), γραος (from *γρας- < *gērh2- “with a suffixal u-element”38), as well as from Ved. aor. jāri-s-, which also seems to show the same long grade as ἐγήρα39. Barton (1982: 43) then poses *egērase(t) as the original form of ἐγήρα, with the final laryngeal vocalising before the sigmatic suffix of the aorist, and PIE *-s-t replaced in Proto-Greek by *-s-e(t)40. It would therefore be possible

---

33 In addition to this, posing an original *ἀπ-ή-φρασ-ον also implies that ἀπηύρων is part of the original paradigm. As already seen, this form should rather be considered as an analogical creation. Thus, any derivation from the root *uers- seems unwarranted for ἀπηύρα as well – cf. n. 26.

34 Cf. Barton 1982: 43 n. 32. Cf. also §1.1 for the occurrence of [ἀπηύρων] in Od. 4.646.


36 For the theory of a long grade in the s-aorist active, the supporting evidence, and possible explanations, cf. Schwyzer 1939: 751 – who nonetheless considers ἐγήρα as a later form to γηρας, which replaced an original *γρας (ibid.: 708); Kuryłowicz 1956: 159-60, 272-3; Strunk 1985: 498-507; Willi 2018: 489-98.

37 As for the accent of the participle, Barton (1982: 43) explains it as the result of the analogy στάντ- : στάς = γηράντ- : Χ, once the original morphology of ἐγήρα could no longer be grasped.

38 Barton 1982: 33.


40 This theory can also be found in Strunk 1985: 505, who adds Cypr. ἠφες as another possible example (but cf. Schwyzer 1939: 751 for an opposite view on this form). Cf. also Harðarson 1993: 73 n. 49. Tremblay (2005: 651) argues against it
to consider a similar phonological process for ἀπήρα, thus deriving it from *-υρή2-s-t > *-υρά-s-e(t) > *-ϝρᾶς41. A similar explanation would also work for the participle: *-υρή2-s-ντ-s > *-υρά-s-αντ-ς42 > *-ϝρᾶς.

Reconstructing ἐγήρα as an old sigmatic aorist implies that this verb is evidence for a long-grade in the PIE active s-aorist. Such ablaut is clearly attested in Vedic43, and more evidence seems to come from Slavic44 and, to a lesser degree, Latin45, Celtic46, and Tocharian47, whereas the essential lack of it in Greek might be explained with the application of Osthoff’s law48 and the formation of many sigmatic aorists from older root aorists, whose original full grade showed no lengthening49. Furthermore, Barton’s view produces a more coherent picture than a root-aorist theory50, and there

by observing that in Mycenaean the s-aorist 3rd sg. always ends in -V-se – whereas in other contexts Linear B shows the loss or reduction to aspiration of intervocalic sigma. Based on this, he concludes that *-ασ(e) was replaced directly with *-ασα, without any loss of sigma in between. This view, however, does not consider the Homeric examples of aorists where the sigma was not restored, e.g. Hom. ἱςμα, ἱςσανα (cf. Harðarson 1993: 75). Moreover, as noted by Willi 2018: 490, it is also possible that ἐγήρα was “not remade into ἔγηρασ(σ)ε vel sim. because of the parallelism with the common intransitive aorists in *-ά(t): ἐβῆ, ἐστη, ἐτλη, ἐφθη”.

41 This outcome is in contrast with Eichner’s law, according to which a PIE laryngeal would not colour a long vowel (cf. Eichner 1973; Meier-Brügger 2003: 119-20). At the same time, there seem to be no examples which can confirm the application of this law in ancient Greek, mostly because of the difficulty to reconstruct an actual lengthened grade, or the alternative possibility of explaining a long vowel with laryngeal loss (e.g. σφήν ‘wedge’, which can also be derived from *shēh-: cf. Pronk 2019: 141-2). For a discussion and refutation of the instances used to prove Eichner’s law, including ancient Greek ones, cf. Pronk 2019: 125-44 (and ibid.: 121-2 for bibliography).


46 Cf. McConé 1991: 64-9, who suggests the possibility of an original lengthened grade in the ἓ-preterites.

47 Cf. Willi 2018: 468-73 for a full discussion and bibliography.


49 Cf. Barton 1982: 32, who gives the example of ᾚξενάα as the replacement of older *-(h)ε-ιευγ-ν (cf. Ved. inj. yojam); cf. also Willi 2018: 490.

50 The idea of ἐγήρα replacing an older *ἐγρᾶ (cf. Schwzyzer 1939: 708) finds no correspondence in Vedic, and is ultimately based on the assumption of a set-root variant (*gnore-) or a zero-grade one (*ograf-), which can be hypothesised
are also several inconsistencies in considering ἔγηρᾶ as a secondary formation to γηρᾶς, which is more likely to be an analogical long-vowel formation itself51.

On the one hand, a thorough discussion on a possible PIE long-grade s-aorist cannot find place in the present section52, and would also have little relevance to the case of ἀπημόρᾶ, since the reconstruction of an original long-grade *-yṛēh2-, though theoretically possible, would be ultimately unfalsifiable53. At the same time, accepting the preservation of a PIE long-grade in ἔγηρᾶ can not only confirm its status of archaic aorist, but also provide a very ancient comparandum for an original *-āse > -ā in 3rd sg. ἀπημόρᾶ. In particular, it can be suggested that the hypothetical contraction between the vocalised laryngeal and the ending made both ἔγηρᾶ and ἀπημόρᾶ morphologically unrecognisable. This would perfectly explain why the s zagmatic suffix was not restored, while at the same time new analogical forms were created out of morphological misunderstandings, such as γηρᾶς and ἀπημόρῶν. The main achievement of this section, therefore, is to have provided an original and alternative interpretation of ἀπημόρᾶ, whose main conclusions can be drawn from a root-aorist theory as well:

1. ἀπημόρᾶ has a final long vowel;
2. according to its morphology, it can be considered as a very old verbal form;

only for γορᾶς with no verbal parallels. Peters (1980: 314), on the other hand, reconstructs *e-γοράς t as the original root aorist, but in this case the presence of a long vowel is hard to justify (cf. Harðarson 1993: 72-3, who also criticises Peters’ idea that *egōrā needed to be ‘normalised’ into a form with final long vowel). Furthermore, the picture would be more consistent if a zagmatic aorist corresponded to the thematic non-characterised present *γέρω (cf. Ved. jara-), which can be reconstructed from the “lexicalised former present participle” (Barton 1982: 38) γέρονν-ντ- ‘old man,’ and which was later replaced by the characterised pres. γηρᾶς. Accordingly, *γέρω must have had a ‘durative’ Aktionsart (cf. Barton 1982: 41), while its zagmatic aorist ἔγηρᾶ expressed a ‘terminative’ one (cf. Harðarson 1993: 74).

51 The derivation of ἔγηρᾶ from γηρᾶς is supported by Drinca (1995: 94 n. 244), while Schindler (1975: 267) suggested the possibility for the long vowel of γηρᾶς to derive from an older acrostatic inflection. However, Ved. jardəs- seems to suggest both a proterokinetic inflection – which was analogically levelled in ancient Greek – and the short-vowel γέρας as the original form. Cf. also Barton 1982: 32 n. 4, who explains the semantic relationship between γέρας and γηρᾶς with Kuryłowicz ‘Fourth Law of Analogy’ (cf. Kuryłowicz 1949: 30): the new form γηρᾶς took over the original meaning of the older form γέρας, i.e. ‘old age’, whereas γέρας remained as bearer of the secondary function, i.e. ‘gift of honour’.

52 For the rejection of the existence of such ablaut in PIE, cf. Drinca 1995 (in particular: 8-11 for Sanskrit; 26-31 for Avestan; 34-48 for Slavic; 76-92 for Latin; 93-5 for Greek). On the other hand, a further possible example in ancient Greek might be found in the aor. γημαι- ‘married’, if considered as a long-grade aorist from the root *γεμ- ‘to seize’ (cf. Willi 2018: 491 n. 202 for bibliography). Other less convincing cases are μῆδομαι (supported by Willi 2018: 490-l), and ἔρρηξα (suggested by Szemerényi 1996: 282, but cf. DELG: 938; Beekes 2010: 1282-3; Willi 2018: 491 n. 201).

53 That is, both -yṛēh2-s-e and -ṛēh2-s-e would produce the same outcome -pā < -ṛē-se.

54 In addition to it, γηρᾶς is also likely to be analogical to root aorists such as (-)δρᾶδρᾶναι, (-)γονονον (cf. Barton 1982: 44). See also n. 37 for the accent of γηρᾶς.
3. for all the features mentioned above, it was eventually misunderstood by Ionian bards.

§1.4 Possible cognates, and preliminary conclusions on the morphology of ἀπηύρα

The antiquity of ἀπηύρα, which is drawn from both theories (root aorist, sigmatic aorist) here considered as most likely, is at odds with the strong isolation of its root. All that seems to be left of it in Greek is the root or sigmatic aorist ἀπηύρα, ἀπούρας. Furthermore, there seem to be no cognates outside Greek either.55

Sommer’s, Boisacq’s and Schwyzer’s attempts to find cognates have already been mentioned and deemed invalid (see §1.1, §1.3). A third attempt in the relevant scholarship was to connect ἀπηύρα to the root *yery-. This was first suggested by Bechtel (1914: 50), who considered vera- and veru- as two parallel disyllabic ‘bases’, attested respectively in ἀπηύρα and τέρος. This theory was later revived by Strunk (1958: 124-6), who considered *yery- as an allomorph coexisting with *yera, thus connecting ἀπηύρα to ἔρως ‘to drag’56. The violence in the meaning ‘to snatch away’ of ἀπηύρα would be in harmony with the idea of ‘dragging away’ expressed by ἔρως, but the evidence to support a “Nebeneinander von seṭ- und u-Basen” (Strunk 1958: 125) is quite scarce and problematic.58 Furthermore, assuming this alternation would require again a Schwebeablaut between *yérē-h2- in the indicative singular of ἀπηύρα (with zero grade in the participle) and *yér-u- in ἔρως. Moreover, Strunk’s theory, even if accepted, would not allow us to find any cognates outside Greek, as no satisfying etymology has yet been given for ἔρως. Consequently, the antiquity of ἀπηύρα/ἀπούρας, which is clearly confirmed by the morphological features analysed in §1.1 and §1.3, can receive no support from IE etymologies due to the baffling isolation of its root.61

In conclusion, the study carried out in the previous sections has shown that ἀπηύρα and ἀπούρας can be considered either as forms of an ancient root aorist preserved in the epic language, or as an original sigmatic aorist. Both theories are based on the most likely structure of the root of

56 Bechtel mentioned ἀτέρμινος and τέρος, ἀτρύος as comparable examples of the alternance (cf. n. 58).
57 Boisacq had also mentioned ἔρως as a possible cognate verb, but he had also linked ἄτιρω through a root *a̱μερ which, as already seen in n. 1, can hardly be justified.
58 This type of alternance seems attested only in the family of τέρην, τέρω, and τέρος (cf. DELG: 1067-8; Beekes 2010: 1458, 1471, 1514 s.u. τρόω).
59 Which has resulted to be unnecessary once ἀπόσερε has been discarded as a possible cognate of ἀπηύρα (§1.2).
60 Cf. DELG: 359-60; Beekes 2010: 467-8.
61 At the same time, the attestation of this root in only one language can be seen as further evidence against a feature as old as Schwebeablaut.
ἀπηύρᾱ, i.e. *ụrēh₂-ṝṛh₂− – with no need for a Schwebeablaut, since ἀπόερσε cannot be a cognate form, nor can ἀπηύρᾱ be linked to the root of ἔρω in any satisfying way. Furthermore, both interpretations can explain the long vowel in the indicative 3rd sg., whose quantity has been here confirmed through the Homeric evidence. Finally, they can both explain how ἀπηύρᾱ could be misunderstood already at the time of the bards, with the subsequent creation of the analogical ἀπηύρων and, after the Homeric oral tradition, of the middle ἀπηύρατο (cf. §1.1).

§2. The sound change [V-ϝρ-] > [Vυρ-] and the ‘long’ augment of ἀπηύρᾱ

In this section, there will be a thorough explanation of two elements left out of the morphological analysis in §1: the sound change *ἄπο-ϝρ- > ἄπουρ-, and the seeming LA of ἀπηύρᾱ. The former will confirm the initial digamma of the root, which could not be proved through the comparative method in §1. It will also be possible to consider ἀπηύρᾱ as an archaic Aeolic form, which can explain the articulation [a:] of its final long vowel, and the barytonesis of the participle ἄπουρας. On the other hand, in §2.2 the -η- of ἀπηύρᾱ, often interpreted as a LA, will be justified through a relatively old temporal augmentation.

The analysis carried out in this section will be crucial to confirm that ἀπηύρᾱ/ἀπουρας was not only an archaic relic, but also a form particularly odd for Ionian bards. Their misunderstanding of ἀπηύρᾱ must then have happened for three main reasons: its Aeolic features; its status as ancient root or sigmatic aorist; the isolation of its root. As already seen, the peculiarity of an aorist like ἀπηύρᾱ is the reason behind the creation of ἀπηύρων in the Homeric tradition. In addition to this, later grammarians and scholia, though perfectly aware of the Aeolic feature [Vυρ-], were not able to recognise ἀπηύρα as one of its instances. For the same misunderstanding, and under the analogical influence of the Homeric diction, an original *ἄπεώρα could receive a temporal augment, as will be argued in §2.2.

§2.1 [V-ϝρ-] > [Vυρ-]: an Aeolic phenomenon

Part of the morphological structure of ἄπουρας/ἀπηύρα requires the assumption that initial *ᵻ- was preserved in a diphthong before the resonant *ᵻ. The sound change [V-ϝρ/λ] > [Vυρ/λ] is described by Lejeune (1972: 181) as typical of first-millennium Greek, when the groups *ᵻr and *ᵻl saw the formation of a diphthong in the preceding syllable. His examples are ταλαύρινος, καλαύροψ, ἄπουρας and εὐρός. According to Lejeune (ibid.: 181-2), there are two groups of exception showing restoration of -ϝρ/λ- with subsequent analogical outcomes: the reduplicated perfects of verbs beginning with *ϝρ- and *ᵻλ-, such as εἰρῄμαι, εἰρῄμαι, εὑλόμαι, which according to Lejeune underwent compensatory
lengthening after loss of digamma; those words where *ϝρ- and *ϝλ- were after the augment or the first term of a compound. In the latter case, -υ- assimilates with the following liquid (e.g. Att. ἐρρήθην, ἀπόρρητος), whereas the Cypriot dialect shows its preservation in ε-ϝρέτασαντο (ε-ve-re-ia-sa-tu). Lejeune (1972: 182) then concludes by mentioning some Aeolic glossae which “présentent le traitement intérieur normal”, namely αὐρηκτος and εὐράγη instead of Att. ἀρηκτος, ἐρράγη.

It should first be noticed that the sound change [V-ϝρ] > [Vعلامة] could happen in the evolution of εὐρύς only if a prothetic vowel preceded its zero grade. Its existence, however, cannot be proved with comparative evidence. Consequently, the most persuasive instances provided by Lejeune are the Homeric forms ταλαύρινος, καλαύρις, and ἀπηύρα, as well the Aeolic glossae αὐρηκτος and εὐράγη. Furthermore, Lejeune’s exceptions seem rather to describe the regular phonology of Att.-Ion. Greek, where the sound change of -Vϝρ- is always -Vϝρ- in augmented and compound forms, or ειρ- in perfect forms. This means that ἀπούρας itself seems to represent a significant exception according to Lejeune’s analysis, as the outcome of the compound *ἀπο-ϝρας should actually have been ἄποφρας.

At this stage, it would therefore be tempting not only to correct Lejeune’s interpretation by excluding the sound change [V-ϝρ] > [Vعلامة] from Attic-Ionic, but also to deem it as solely Aeolic, given the glossae αὐρηκτος and εὐράγη. This would then allow for the interpretation of ταλαύρινος, καλαύρις and ἀπηύρα as Homeric Aeolisms. This picture, however, is complicated by the forms of εὐρίσκω attested in Attic-Ionic. In particular, the perf. εὖρη- can be derived from *ye-ϝρε, while the aorist εὖρον, which occurs both in Homer and in Attic-Ionic, was reconstructed by Beckwith (1994) as a reduplicated *ye-υρε-ε/ο-. The absence of the laryngeal, which instead seems to be found in the perf. εὐρηκα < *υβρι- or *υμε, is explained by Beckwith with an early loss after resonant in reduplicated or compound forms (i.e. *Ce-Ϧrh1-ε/ο- > *Ce-Ϧrh1-ε/ο-), while the evolution of *ye-

---

62 The relevant scholarship suggests for εὐρύς either a zero grade with prothetic vowel or a metathesis in the full grade (cf. GEW: 593; DELG: 370; Beekes 2010: 484, who seems more convinced by the latter hypothesis). The comparison with the Ilr. Evidence – i.e. Skt. uṛi- Av. vouru-, Skt. vāras- – would suggest the reconstruction of *urH-ā- for the adjective and *uṛH-os for the neuter noun. However, these PIE forms should have given in Greek, respectively, ἄφρος and ἄφρος. Therefore, as stated by Beekes (2010: 484), “the reconstruction remains problematic”, and it is ultimately impossible to prove the existence of a prothetic vowel deriving from a laryngeal, due to a lack of convincing evidence from other IE languages.


64 The hypothesis of a reduplicated aorist can already be found in Schwzyer 1939: 748; GEW: 592; DELG: 369.

65 For examples of this phonological outcome, cf. Beekes 1969: 242-5 and 1988: 60-1; Mayrhofer 1986: 129. The most certain examples of this loss in ancient Greek are γίγνομαι and νοσονός (< *gnuH1-), but ἱγρος ‘brain’ < *en-kṛH2- may also be added to them (cf. Beekes 1969: 243; Nussbaum 1986: 72-4).
The transition from an 'labial' *ye-ur- to εὐρ- would also represent a *comparandum of [V-ϝϝ] > [Vυρ]. At the same time, it would be necessary to explain why the sequence *ye-ur- did not undergo the same dissimilation which can be hypothesised for εὐπον < *ye-υκk'.66 Beckwith (1994: 26) states too vaguely that “the labial dissimilation may have worked differently before *-r-”, although a perfect like εἰρήμαι clearly represents a counterexample if it is explained through a dissimilation of *ye-ur-', rather than a compensatory lengthening due to loss of *-r-.68 The main difference between perfect forms like εἰρήμαι, εἰρομαί and εἰλυμαί (< *ye-υμαί) and those developing -ρρ- (e.g. ἐρράθην) is that the former originally had two consecutive *υ- in their reduplicated stem. This brings us to assume two distinct developments in Attic-Ionic: ειρ- from *ye-υr- through dissimilation, and ἐρρ- from *eυr- through assimilation (e.g. augmented forms). Consequently, εὐρον cannot effectively prove a ‘pan-Greek’ sound change [V-ϝϝ] > [Vυρ], and Beckwith’s interpretation makes this verbal form a controversial exception in Attic-Ionic. At the same time, considering that the only difficulty in Beckwith’s theory is the unparalleled phonological outcome of *ye-υr- in Attic-Ionic69, it is also possible to consider εὐρον as an archaic inter-dialectal loan. This interpretation might be supported by the fact that its initial aspiration can only be explained as an analogical feature, probably based on the aorist εἰλινον70. Such a modification would perfectly make sense in a word borrowed from a different dialect, and considering that the rest of the evidence shows that the sound change [V-ϝϝ] > [Vυρ-] was typical of Eastern Aeolic (see infra), this might be exactly the dialect from which the loan-word εὐρον was obtained.

In this section, [V-ϝϝ] > [Vυρ-] will therefore be considered as a development typical of Eastern Aeolic, as this is the dialect for which the most certain evidence is found. To confirm that

---

66 Cf. Chantraine 1961: 175. This dissimilation must have happened quite early, namely before the sound change -υk' > -υk- could take place.


68 This interpretation applies to perfect forms to roots starting with *ς-, e.g. εἰλήμαι, εἰλόθε (cf. Chantraine 1961: 186), but Lejeune (1972: 181) extended this compensatory lengthening to the perfects εἰρήμαι, εἰρομαί and εἰλυμαί despite their different morphology, as he interpreted them as analogical formations. However, their hypothetical status as ‘secondary’ forms (cf. also McDonald-Zair 2012: 35 n. 1) is at odds with the frequent occurrence of the perf. εἰρήμαι and εἰλυμαί already in Homer.

69 That is, according to the evidence, *ye-υr-e/o- should have given *ευρο in Attic-Ionic. For the rest, Beckwith’s theory is based on a well-attested laryngeal loss, and the comparison with OIr. fūar (Beckwith 1994: 27) seems to provide a valid parallel for a reduplicated past tense, given that it might derive from *ye-υr- (> *yōur- > fōr- > fūar, cf. Thurneysen 1946: 428).

70 Cf. Beckwith 1994: 26 n. 17; McDonald-Zair 2012: 35.
ἀπούρας is an Aeolic form with a specifically Aeolic sound change, it is necessary to prove the following points:

- Initial *ϝϝ- was somehow preserved in Eastern Aeolic.
- This preservation led to verbs starting in εϝ- after a process of augmentation.

As specified by Bechtel (1921: 11), Aeol. -ϝϝ- < -ϝϝ- is found “wenn sie [scil. “Anlautgruppe Ϝϝ”] sich in der Composition an einen Vokal anschließt”, while initial Ϝϝ- is mostly indicated with the spelling βϝ- for the Aeolic poets. This is in strong contrast with the evidence for initial digamma both in the inscriptions from Lesbos, which show a complete absence of it71, and in the prosody of the lyric poets, whose inconsistences suggest that the digamma had been lost in initial position already in 7th-cent.-BCE spoken Eastern Aeolic72. The present research will therefore focus on words originally starting with *ϝϝ-73, in order to show that this cluster was more resistant in Aeolic than simple *ϝ-. Given the morphology of ἀπούρας, a particular attention will be given to those forms starting with *ϝϝ- and to which a prefix was added. Their evidence includes the following cases:

1. Augmented forms: εὑράγη; εὑρήξε; ἦπηύρα
2. Verbs with preverb: ἀποὑρας
3. Use of privative alpha: αὐρηκτος
4. Isolated compounds: ταλαύρινος, καλαύρος

Therefore, among the different denotations of the sound [w] found in papyri and grammarians’ treatises for Alcaeus’ and Sappho’s texts74, the instances of interest for the present chapter are the graphic representations of initial [w] before [r]. There are three kinds of them:

73 Among the excluded Aeolic instances of diphthongs resulting from the original presence of a *ϝ-, we can mention ναῦς and σάους, whose diphthongs actually emerge from original clusters – respectively, *ναυσιος (cf. DELG: 707; Beekes 2010: 995) and *αυσιος (cf. DELG: 376-7; Beekes 2010: 492-3) – through assimilation in *-υαυ- of a previous *-ἠυ-, and simplification of the geminate (cf. Hodot 1990: 67; Sihler 1995: 185; Miller 2014: 249). To these examples it is possible to add clusters resulting from processes of composition, such as αὐαδήν (Sa. 22.5), and αὐαδός (Alc. 303A.22), all deriving from *α-σάδην (i.e. privative alpha added to the stem of ἁδός; cf. ἁ-δής in Beekes 2010: 509), and Hom. αὐέρπαμ (εἰ *ἀν-ερπόω) and καινάξας in Hes. Op. 666, 693 (cf. West 1978: 323; Ercolani 2010: 380).

The ancient sources also mention forms with an intervocalic -w- which might stand for an original digamma, in contrast with the absence of intervocalic digamma in inscriptions. Examples of this type are αὐόλατα/αὐόλατα in Alcaeus (as opposed to epic ἀλτη or contracted ἀλη), and ἀὧρα, which is often reported by the ancient sources as Aeolic, but is found nowhere in the literary evidence.

74 In particular, the actual letter <ϝ> is found only for the reflexive 3rd pers. pronoun and its corresponding possessive adjective, e.g. ἤς, τὸν ἄν (cf. Bowie 1981: 74-7). As pointed out by Miller (2014: 249), this strong preservation can be linked to the resistance of the cluster *ϝς- (> * aşama) generally observed in Aeolic (cf. n. 73), as opposed to the frequent
1. οὐρ-.

The form οὐρηξίς reported by Trypho might be a phonetic writing of the sound\textsuperscript{75}, which is at odds with the typical use of beta (cf. \textit{infra}) and stands as an impressively isolated instance.

2. (ε-/α-)υρ-

This spelling is found in cases of prefixation (e.g. augment, privative alpha), and as such it can perfectly be compared with that of ἄπουρας/ἄπηρα. The only certain example in the textual tradition of the Lesbian poets is εὐρηξίς\textsuperscript{76} (Alc. 179.2\textsuperscript{77}). Accordingly, when Herodianus (2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. CE)\textsuperscript{78} is describing this ‘additional’ υ as an \textit{ethos} of Aeolic speakers, he reports αὐρηκτόν and εὐράγη among the examples\textsuperscript{79}. The Homeric language would then present their Ionic counterparts in ἄρρηκτος (\textit{Il.} 2.490, 21.447), ἔρρηξε (\textit{Il.} 3.348, 7.259, 13.124, 17.44) and ἐρρήξαι (\textit{Il.} 12.291). Accordingly, when Herodianus (2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. CE)\textsuperscript{78} is describing this ‘additional’ υ as an \textit{ethos} of Aeolic speakers, he reports αὐρηκτόν and εὐράγη among the examples\textsuperscript{79}. The Homeric language would then present their Ionic counterparts in ἄρρηκτος (\textit{Il.} 2.490, 21.447), ἔρρηξε (\textit{Il.} 3.348, 7.259, 13.124, 17.44) and ἐρρήξαι (\textit{Il.} 12.291). Although neither αὐρηκτόν nor εὐράγη have any literary attestations, they both present two main features in common with εὐρηξίς: the spelling -υ- where there should originally have been a digamma, and a process of composition where the second member is a form of the verb ῥήγνυμι. Herodian’s examples can therefore be considered trustworthy.

A particular case is represented by ἐπιρρόμβεισι ‘they hum’ in Sa. 31.11-2. The lengthening by position of the second syllable of the preverb seems to prove an original initial sound for ῥομβέω ‘to whirl’, although the etymology of this verb is debated\textsuperscript{80}. At any rate, even if we accept that -ρρ- is proof of an original *ṷ-\textsuperscript{81}, the spelling -υρ- would not have been possible because the final iota of ἐπί could not make a diphthong with the following -ṷ-. Consequently, the spelling -ρρ- was probably metrical neglection of simple *ṷ-. Another sign found for Aeolic [w] is intervocalic <ũ> in e.g. ἄνάταν/ἀνάτασις – see n. 73.

\textsuperscript{75} Cf. Bowie 1981: 79-80, who defends the authenticity of the spelling.

\textsuperscript{76} Another possible instance is εὐρόσαο in Alc. 350.4, but this form is actually one of several emendations done to this line. It is found in the edition by Lobel-Page (1955: 272) as the only correction to Hoffmann’s emendation (i.e. [ἄεθλον μέγαν, ἐρρήσαο δ’ ἐκ πόνων]), and it is accepted by Voigt (1971: 319). The textual tradition gives [μέγαν ἄθλον καὶ ἐκ πόνων αὐτούς ῥόσασθαι] with inverted word-order and a syntactic structure which hardly fits in the fragment. Cf. also Liberman 1999: 155.

\textsuperscript{77} I follow Voigt’s (1971) edition for the numbers of Sappho’s and Alcaeus’ fragments.

\textsuperscript{78} Περί κλίσεως ὄνομάτων 2.640, 10-1.

\textsuperscript{79} The example of αὐρηκτός was picked up again much later by Eustathius (\textit{Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem} 3.868, 22) in the 12\textsuperscript{th} cent CE, but there is no evidence of it in literature or inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{80} Cf. \textit{DELG}: 935-6; Beekes 2010: 1280.

\textsuperscript{81} Difficulties are met both in the connection with MLG \textit{wrampen} ‘to contract (one’s) face’, and by the derivation of ῥεμβ-/ῥόμβ- from *ṷer- ‘to turn’ through the addition of expressive consonantal sounds (cf. \textit{DELG}: 936; Beekes 2010: 1280). Miller (2014: 249 n. 102) simply reports *ṷreemb-, which cannot obviously be accepted as an IE root.
the only choice in the text of the papyrus preserving Sa. 31, and the emendation to ἐπιβρόμβεισι, accepted by Voigt (1971: 60), is a possible solution for this passage.

3. βρ-.

This spelling was introduced from the 3rd cent. BCE and became the canonical one in grammarians and scholia for the representation of initial βρ- in the texts of the Aeolic poets. The textual tradition, on the other hand, shows a constant variation between βρ- and ρ-. Many of the words attested with βρ- certainly had an initial digamma – although some of them offer difficult etymologies – such as βραδίνως (Alc. 129.22), forms of βρόδον, βρακέ (Sa. 57.3), and (attested only in grammarians and scholia) βρίσοδα and βρύτηρ/βρύτωρ.

The consistency of metrical lengthening before βρ-, with only one case of metrical neglection in the variant [παδός βραδίναν] in Sa. 102.2, is in stark contrast with the high frequency of cases where ‘simple’ initial digamma is prosodically ignored in Aeolic lyrics (cf. supra). Furthermore, the beta appears not to be added to any word which certainly did not have an original initial digamma.

82 However, as noticed by Bowie (1981: 82), “the beta appears not to be added to any word which certainly did not have an original initial digamma”.

83 Cf. DELG: 929; Beekes 2010: 1269.

84 βρόδα in Sa. 96.13, where it makes position. The other three attestations (βρόδον in Sa. 55.2, βρ[όδον] in Sa. 94.13 and βροδοςι in Sa. 2.6) and the compounds βροδοδάκτυλος (Sa. 96.8), βροδοπαχες (Sa. 58.19) and βροδοπαχες (Sa. 53.1) cannot be evaluated from a metrical point of view. Although the word ρόδον seems to have entered the Greek vocabulary very early, it was not necessarily borrowed from Old Iranian *yrdā (cf. also Arm. vard), especially considering its o-vocalism attested since Myc. wo-do-we (wordowen, epithet of oil: cf. DMic II: 439-40). For a discussion of its etymology, cf. DELG: 942; Beekes 2010: 1289-90.

85 In this case too, the etymology is quite uncertain, to the point that Beekes (2010: 1273) mentions a pre-Greek status among the possible options. The initial digamma, however, is once again confirmed by the attestations in poetry, and there is an interesting possibility of linking the word to Skt. vrścāti ‘to fell’ and vrksā- ‘tree’.

86 The initial digamma of βίζα is confirmed by Myc. wi-ri-za (cf. DELG: 939; Beekes 2010: 1285).

87 As noted by Bowie (1981: 83 n. 1), this word might be linked either to ἐρύω or to ἐρομαι. Although the initial digamma of the latter seems to leave no trace in Homer (for this issue in the reconstruction of its root, cf. Solmsen 1901: 245-8; GEW: 568-9; DELG: 358-9; Hackstein 2002: 123-31; Beekes 2010: 466-7), Myc. u-ru-to (wruntowi, ‘they are watching’: cf. Palmer 1963: 44, 151; Bartoněk 2003: 321, 325, 339) confirms initial digamma for ἐρομαι, and it is safe to assume the same for ἐρύω both on the basis of some Homeric instances (e.g. Il. 4.506, 5.836, 8.21) and from the epic/Aeol. compound αὐρήω < *āν-ϝρήω. At the same time, it seems impossible to find correspondences for ἐρύω outside Greek (cf. DELG: 360; Beekes 2010: 468; cf. also §1.4 and n. 60).

88 The only evidence for an initial digamma in this word are the cases where it makes position, e.g. βραδίνω in Sa. 115.2, and Hesychius’ gloss βραδανίνη. Hooker (1977: 28) argues that [παδός βραδίναν] might be an analogical formation to the above-mentioned βραδίνω in Sa. 115.2. For the uncertainties about the etymology of this word, cf. DELG: 930; Beekes 2010: 1270-1.
whatever phonetic value may be assigned to the beta\(^9\), the cases where it makes position show that the cluster [wr] “must have been pronounced […] and written in Sappho’s time” (Miller 2014: 249 n. 102)\(^9\). Accordingly, Sappho and Alcaeus are the only poets for whom the digraph βρ- is used. The fact that the different spelling βρ- is not only preferred, but also indicated as a specifically ‘Aeolic’ trait by scholia and grammarians, is good evidence that in Aeolic an original digamma had been preserved before -ρ- until a certain stage and in a certain form. More specifically, apart from words whose initial digamma cannot be proved with certainty, or possible cases of ‘hyper-betacism’\(^9\), the use of βρ- shows that the cluster *\(μ\)ρ- was somehow preserved at least in the Aeolic poetic tradition followed by Alcaeus and Sappho, and that it survived long enough to cause the presence of a diphthong in relatively more recent processes of composition, such as augmentation (εὔρηξε, εὐράγη), and use of other prefixes like privative alpha (αὐρηκτος).

The Hom. ppl. ἀπούρας and the indicative ἀπηύρας/ας clearly present the same Aeolic sound change observable in εὔρηξε and αὐρηκτος. The same can be said for the Homeric forms ταλαώρινος and καλαῦρος. The former occurs only in \(II. 23.845\)\(^9\), and seems to refer to “a herdsman’s staff, which was thrown to drive back the cattle to the herd” (Beekes 2010: 622)\(^9\). Chantraine (\(DELG: 465; 1973: 158\)) considers the compound as Aeolic, but with an unexplained first member. The second one, on the other hand, seems to show the same root of ῥόπαλον, i.e. ‘club’, ‘cudgel’\(^9\). The reconstruction of the second term as *καλα-ροπ- is also supported by the occurrences of ῥόπαλον in \(II. 11.559\) and \(Od. 9.319\), where it makes position\(^9\), so that the evolution *καλα-ροπ- > καλαὐροπ- can be posited with confidence. As for ταλαῴρινος, its meaning of ‘shield-bearer’, ‘protected by the
shieldootnote{Or ‘shield-enduring’, as argued by Richardson 1940: 87-9. For further discussion on the word ταλαύρινος and its recurring formula, cf. Leumann 1950: 196-202 and Triumpy 1950: 38.} is plain in all its occurrencesootnote{This adjective occurs in the same formula [ἀπόθεμα Ἅρη, ταλαύρινον πολεμιστήν] in Il. 5.289, 20.78, 22.267 (translated by Lattimore as “to glut with his blood Ares the god who fights under the shield’s guard”). The fourth Homeric occurrence is in Il. 7.239, which shows a clear example of AM in direct speech: [Αζαλέην, τό μοί ἐστι ταλαύρινον πολεμίζειν] (“[the ox-hide] tanned into a shield which is my protection in battle”).}.

A derivation of its first member from the same root as that of ἐτλη is therefore straightforward, specifically in the degree ταλα- attested in several compounds (e.g. ταλαεργός, ταλαπένθης, ταλάφρον), and resulting from a “degré zero et avec voyelle d’appui” (DELG: 1051). As for the second member ῥινός ‘skin of man/animal’, ‘hide’, its initial digamma is confirmed by the Aeolic gloss γρίνος · δέρμα, as well as by Myc. wi-ri-no and wi-ri-ne-joootnote{Cf. DELG: 940 for a possible connection with ἰνη and A-Sax. writan. Beekes (2010: 1287), on the other hand, argues that “Germanic -i- must derive from PIE *-ei- in view of Go. writs with a short i”, and that this would be at odds with the long ἰ found in Greek. He then considers a pre-Greek origin as possible, though without giving specific reasons for it. As for Myc. wi-ri-ne-jo, cf. also Ruijgh 1967: 240; DMic II: 434.}.

The derivation of this compound from *ταλα-ρινος is therefore certainootnote{Basically, forms like ταλάρρινος, ταλάρρος and ἄτπορρας could never exist in Ionic.}.

In conclusion, ἄποταρας/ἄπιθρα, ταλαύρινον and καλαύρσα must represent typical examples of Aeolic loan words in the Homeric language, whose sound change [V-ρρ-] > [Vρρ-] in a process of composition could not be changed into [Vρρ-] for the lack of Ionic counterpartsootnote{As opposed to e.g. ἐτλη < *h₂e-tilēh₂-t.}. Moreover, the Aeolic origin of ἄπηύρα justifies both the barytonesis of the ppl. ἄποταρας, and the articulation [aː:] of the final long vowel, whether the verb is interpreted as a root aoristootnote{In this case, -ἀ would come from an archaic contraction, which was probably not turned into- η both for its status of morphological relic and because ἄπηύρα did not belong to the Ionic lexis. The preserved -ἀ in Hom. ἔγηρα offers a perfect parallel.} or as a sigmatic oneootnote{Followed by Peters 1987: 271, and Ittzés 2008: 168.}.

### §2.2 The ‘long’ augment of ἄπηύρα

The initial *y- of the stem has been confirmed by the study of the Aeolic sound change [V-ρρ-] > [Vρρ-], and it has been a feature of general consensus in the relevant scholarship, despite the apparent lack of cognates and the impressive range of different hypotheses on the root of ἄπηύρα. At the same time, this initial *y- has also been used to conform ἄπηύρα to the other instances of ‘long’ augment before *y- (cf. Ch. 1 §2.1). A different theory was formulated by Wackernagel (1878: 270-1)ootnote{Followed by Peters 1987: 271, and Ittzés 2008: 168.}, who explained the augment of ἄπηύρα with a confusion with the forms of the verb ἐπαιρίσκω/ἐπαιρέω,
as possibly shown by the meaning of ἀπηύρα in Hes. Op. 240 and Eurip. Androm. 1030: ‘to be blessed with’, ‘to have harm or benefit from something’. This overlap, according to Wackernagel, caused the replacement of the original -ε- with the same ‘temporal’ η found in the attested preterite forms of ἐπαυρέω.105

For both the passages quoted above, the form ἀπηύρα is transmitted unanimously. Accordingly, as noticed by West (1978: 217), “although Hesiod elsewhere uses ἀπηύρα correctly for ‘took away’ (Th. 423), and ἐπαυρεῖ for ‘partakes of’ (Op. 419)107, in Op. 240 he seems to have been victim of the same confusion as Euripides in Androm. 1030108. This suggests that ἀπηύρα was an only-partially understood archaism already in archaic literature, and that it might therefore have been mistaken with a temporally augmented verb. However, for this confusion to happen, the form ἀπηύρα should have been the starting point. That is, the misunderstanding supposed by Wackernagel seems facilitated by the temporal augmentation of the past forms of ἐπαυρέω, rather than being the actual reason for the presence of -η- in ἀπηύρα. Accordingly, West’s (1978: 217) observation quoted above shows that in the present system there was no confusion by Hesiod, who would use ἐπαυρεῖ in the correct meaning. Therefore, for such misunderstanding to take place, the form ἀπηύρα needed to be already attested, so that the speakers could mistake its -η- as the temporal augmentation of a verb starting with α-. Actually, ἀπηύρα needed to be the ‘canonical’ form, as the tradition of the Homeric text clearly shows (cf. infra).

104 A similar line of interpretation was followed by Meyer (1896: 556), who took ἀπηύρα to derive from *ἀπαυράω as a corruption in the textual tradition of original *ἀπέφρα. However, a present ἐπαυρέω is found only as a conjectural form in late grammarians, so that it is unlikely to be the starting point of a reading as widespread and consistently attested as ἀπηύρα (see infra). If anything, ἐπαυρέω should be considered as the result of a misunderstanding of ἀπηύρα, given that this Homeric form was eventually taken to be a contract verb (as shown by the creation of ἀπηύρων), and that its apparent temporal augment -η- could underlie either -ε- or -α-.

105 i.e. ἐπηύρετο in Arist. Ethica Nicomachea 1163a.21 (cf. Rackham 1934: 510-1); ἐπηύρομην in Eurip. Hel. 469 (cf. Dale 1967: 98); ἐπηύρον in Aesch. Prom. 28, which is actually an emendation by Elmsley, since the entirety of the textual tradition shows ἀπηύρα, except for ἐπηύρο in one manuscript (cf. Thomson 1932: 50; Griffith 1983: 88). Wackernagel himself (1878: 270) defines ἀπηύρα as a “schlechte Lesart”. Finally, the only attestation of ἐπηύρε(ν) (quoted by Wackernagel as well) is again an emendation suggested by Herwerden for Androm. 1030, whereas all the manuscripts agree on ἀπηύρα (cf. Lloyd 1994: 153).

106 For the passage by Hesiod, West (1978: 217) points out that ἐπαυρεῖ is clearly just a conjecture of the 14th-cent. manuscript Triclinius.

107 Cf. also Sinclair 1925: 100.

108 Sinclair (1925: 100), on the other hand, suggests that ἀπηύρα in Hes. Op. 240 might be “a later reading belonging to the time when ἐπαυρέω had come to share with ἐπαυρέω the meaning ‘enjoy’, ‘suffer’”, and that the actual confusion might have started from Euripides’ time.
What is most interesting about Wackernagel’s theory is that it starts from the expected augmented form of the root or sigmatic aorist built to *\( \mu r h_2 \)-\( \mu r e h_2 \): *\( \dot{\alpha} \pi e\nu r\dot{\alpha} < *\( \dot{\varepsilon} \)-\( \varepsilon \)ρ\( \alpha \), with the same Aeolic outcome seen for \( \varepsilon \rho r\dot{\alpha} \) in §2.1. At the same time, since the -η- of \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta r\dot{\alpha} \) cannot be explained as a misunderstanding with a specific temporally augmented preterite, it can more simply be considered as an analogue temporal augment applied to original *\( \dot{\alpha} \pi e\nu r\dot{\alpha} \). This theory was formulated by Vara Donado (1990: 27), who suggested that the original form with the expected syllabic augment, i.e. *\( \dot{\varepsilon}-\varepsilon \rho\dot{\alpha} > \#\varepsilon\rho\dot{\alpha} \)\(^{109}\), was felt as unaugmented due to its lack of morphological clarity, and consequently received a second (temporal) augmentation, probably following the model of past-tense forms like \( \eta r\rho \varepsilon \). It is therefore more economical to assume that the analogous extension of the temporal augment to the original *\( \dot{\alpha} \pi e\nu r\dot{\alpha} \) happened before the misunderstanding of \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta r\dot{\alpha} \) in Hes. Op. 240.

A possible obstacle to Vara Donado’s theory is that the form *\( \dot{\alpha} \pi e\nu r\dot{\alpha} \) is never attested in the textual tradition, except for a v.l. \( \alpha \pi e\nu [\rho] \alpha \) found in one papyrus for II. 16.828\(^{110}\). This peculiarly strong coherence puts \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta r\dot{\alpha} \) in a different situation from that of other Homeric verbs starting with \( \alpha \nu-\varepsilon \nu- \) and appearing in papyri and manuscripts with both variants (i.e. \( \alpha \nu-\varepsilon \nu \)- and \( \eta u- \))- in their past tenses, e.g. \( \eta r\rho\varepsilon /\varepsilon r\rho\varepsilon \). In addition to this, the validity of Vara Donado’s theory is weakened by the fact that the use of a temporal augment would have been metrically unnecessary – unlike in the case of \( \eta \nu < \varepsilon \nu, \eta \zeta \varepsilon \dot{\eta} < \varepsilon \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \)- and \( \eta \kappa t \dot{o} < \varepsilon \kappa t \dot{o} \) – especially considering that augmentation itself is facultative in the Homeric language, and that the textual tradition shows a strong inconsistency in the case of temporal augment not required by the metre\(^{111}\). Why did the Ionian bards not keep a past tense like \( \dot{\alpha} \pi e\nu r\dot{\alpha} \), just like they would use the unaugmented \( \varepsilon r\rho \varepsilon \) and \( \varepsilon \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \) in their Kunstsprache?

The solution to both problems, however, can easily be found in the fact that \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta r\dot{\alpha} \), as already explained, must have been a particularly odd form for the Ionian bards. Whether it is interpreted as a root aorist or an original s-aorist, its morphology represented a relic at the time of the Ionic oral composition, while the sound change [-\( \text{V} \text{u} \text{r} \)-] in the participle \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \theta r\dot{\alpha} \) and 3rd sg. *\( \dot{\alpha} \pi e\nu r\dot{\alpha} \) confirms that this verb was originally Aeolic. Just as \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta r\dot{\alpha} \) was created out of a misunderstanding of the final long alpha in \( \dot{\alpha} \pi \eta r\dot{\alpha} \), so could an original *\( \dot{\alpha} \pi e\nu r\dot{\alpha} \) be affected by analogical processes due to its extraneity from the Ionic dialect. Finally, it needs to be specified that this analogical process

\(^{109}\) Vara Donado actually speaks of a ‘disyllabic’ structure for the initial \( \dot{\varepsilon} \), which he transcribes as \( \ddot{\varepsilon} \) (!). This inaccuracy, however, does not invalidate his conclusion.


had to occur both in the bards’ oral tradition, which explains why ἀπηύρα is basically the only variant attested in the textual tradition, and after Osthoff’s law had stopped operating.\(^{112}\)

At the same time, Vara Donado’s theory needs to be integrated with an important parallel case that can be found in the Homeric poems. Another verb is always transmitted in the textual tradition with a temporal augmentation that is not required by the metre: 3rd sg. ηὔδα ‘(s)he spoke’. This imperfect, just like ἀπηύρα, is always found in verse-final position (87x) except for Il. 1.92, where it stands before bucolic caesura. Its compounds προσηύδα and μετηύδα are also constantly augmented and occur in verse-final position in most cases, though with a much more extended use before 4c, even in recurring FPs (e.g. [προσηύδα μετηύδα Φοίβος Απόλλωνες]; [προσηύδα/μετηύδα Φοίβος Απόλλωνες]).

The main difference between ἀπηύρα and ηὔδα, however, is that the so-called temporal augment of the latter can be explained as an inherited feature. This verb is a denominative from αὔδη, whose root started with laryngeal *h₂-\(^{113}\). In the Homeric language, as already seen in Ch. 1 §2.2, the past tenses to stems beginning with *H- often occur with an inherited temporal augment. In addition to this, augmentation is particularly frequent in the Homeric lines introducing direct speech\(^{114}\), which obviously represent the typical context of the occurrences of ηὔδα and its compounds. Consequently, the initial *ã- (> Ion. η-) of the imperfect of αὔδαω occurs with consistency in the Homeric diction, and is the only variant found in the textual tradition. Considering the use of ηὔδα in verse-final position and its constant temporal augmentation, it is possible to find in this verb a model for the analogical temporal augmentation of ἀπηύρα. Furthermore, the morphology of ηὔδα, i.e. a contract imperfect of an -άω verb, is in line with the analogical creation of ἀπηύρων, which, as already seen, resulted from the misunderstanding of ἀπηύρα as a contract 3rd sg. imperfect. Finally, the next section will offer a description of the FPs containing προσηύδα, which offer impressive similarities with certain FPs where ἀπηύρα occurs.

All the reasons why ἀπηύρα was an unfamiliar verb to the Ionian bards made this aorist susceptible to analogical reshaping. It is therefore possible to explain the temporal augment of ἀπηύρα not simply as an adjustment of a past tense considered unaugmented, as Vara Donado thought, but rather as an analogy to the inherited (and constantly attested) augmentation of προσηύδα, thanks to significant similarities between the two verbs in their formulaic usage.

\(^{112}\) For examples of restorations of long vowels after the application of Osthoff’s law, including analogical ones, cf. Lejeune 1955: 189.

\(^{113}\) Chantraine (DELG: 21) prefers to reconstruct *h₂wód- for αὔδη. Peters (1980: 65-6), on the other hand, defends an outcome αὥδ- from *h₂yd- instead of ὦδ-. Cf. also Beekes 2010: 168.

§2.3 Formulaic patterns, and the model of προσηύδᾱ

As can be seen in Appendix II, most occurrences of the forms of ἀπηύρᾱ can be linked to the pattern labelled as η, or to any of its sub-patterns, in a significantly frequent verse-final position. As for the noun functioning as object in the VP, this is always in the singular except for τεύχε(α), and it can refer to the opponent’s life (e.g. θυμόν, ἤτορ), weapons (e.g. τεύχεα), or prayer (εὐχα), as well as to the abstract concepts of glory (κόδος), freedom (ἐλεύθερον ἦμαρ) or wealth (δίλβον). Appendix II also illustrates prosodical expansions and AMs of the pattern (η.1, η.2, η.3, η.4), and even patterns θ and ι can be seen as AMs starting from the basic structure of η (see Appendix II nn. 4 and 5).

The impressive coherence of the structures in which ἀπηύρᾱ occurs clearly confirms the antiquity of this verb in epic diction. At the same time, it can also be a hint of its oddity in the contemporary language of the Ionian bards, as little variation can be expected in the use of an unfamiliar verb. Accordingly, it is here considered no coincidence that the form with which the bards seem to have experimented the most is the analogical ἀπηύρων: all its occurrences belong either to constructions alternative to the most frequent pattern η (θ.β, ι.β, κ.β), or to AMs of it (η.χ, η.γ, η.ζ). Two of them in particular (η.γ, ζ) form a sub-pattern of their own, where the inanimate object is replaced by the accusative of the person [Ἀστεροπαῖονς5b] (cf. Appendix II n. 3).

Finally, the formula-based method can corroborate the conclusions reached in §2.2 by showing that the FPs of προσηύδᾱ share important similarities with those of ἀπηύρᾱ. In particular, this compound verb is mostly preceded by a NP containing the syntactic object and ending at 5b. The most frequent formula showing this structure is the famous [ἔπεα πτερόεντα5b προσηύδα6c], whose underlying pattern can be effectively compared with an instance of what has been called sub-pattern η.1 in Appendix II:

\[
\text{[ἔπεα πτερόεντα5b]Obj(inanim.)+Mod.NP [προσηύδα6c]V}
\]

\[
\text{[μελιῆδεα θυμόν5b]Obj(inanim.)+Mod.NP [ἀπηύρα6c]V}
\]

Common structure:

\[
\text{[ψ-ψ-ψ-ψ-ψ-ψ5b]Obj(inanim.)+Mod.NP [-ηυ- x6c]V}
\]

The main difference is ultimately the syntactic order of the inanimate object and its attribute, which nonetheless form prosodically equivalent phrases used before prosodically equivalent verbs. The overlap of syntactic patterns was clearly facilitated by the fact that both προσηύδᾱ and ἀπηύρᾱ can take a double accusative of the inanimate object and of the person\textsuperscript{115}. Accordingly, προσηύδᾱ can also be preceded by the accusative of the addressee, as shown by the following formulae: [Δία

\textsuperscript{115} Cf. the frequent occurrences of [καί μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα] (e.g. ΙΙ. 16.6, 17.74). As for ἀπηύρᾱ, see e.g. η.α, d, e, p in Appendix II. In some of its occurrences, ἀπηύρᾱ also takes a dative of the person, e.g. η.ε and pattern θ in Appendix II.
Kroniónasb προσηύδασc, [θείον κύρικαςb προσηύδαςc], [Προτών βασιλῆαςb προσηύδαςc], [καὶ Αὐτομέδονταςb προσηύδαςc], [καὶ Ίδομενῆαςb προσηύδαςc]. The pattern underlying all of them can perfectly be the analogical model for the occurrences of [Ἀστεροπαίονςb ἄπηυρονςc] in sub-pattern η.4 (see Appendix II n. 3).

In summary, there seems to be a particular connection between the occurrences of προσηύδα and those of the forms of ἄπηυρα both for their prosodical equivalence in verse-final positions, and for the metrical-syntactic similarities of their FPs, also helped by their similar syntactic constructions. This shows that the inherited long diphthong in verse-final προσηύδα might have been analogically applied to verse-final ἄπηυρα, as this verb was ultimately extraneous to Ionian bards.

§2.4 Final remarks

The focus of this chapter has been more on defining the root and the morphological structure of ἄπηυρα, than on analysing the FPs in which it is contained. The reasons for this are the puzzling isolation of this verbal form, and the possibility of explaining its LA as an analogical temporal augmentation which is not required by the metre. Both these points put ἄπηυρα in a different position than the one observed for the other long-augmented verbs, since in their cases it has been possible to explain the use of an artificial LA with the need to obtain a metrically (and often syntactically) acceptable alternative to forms of the spoken language. The aorists *ἀπεύρα and ἄπούρας, however, were neither sprachwirklich for the Ionian bards nor kunstsprachlich. Instead, they were Aeolic forms, as has been confirmed in §2.1 through an analysis of the sound change [V-ϝρ-] > [Vυρ-] across the morpheme boundary.

It has been possible to reconstruct a root *ѵρh2-ũreih2-, whose final laryngeal is perfectly reflected in the final long vowel of ἄπηυρα. This verbal form might thus be linked to all the long-vowel root aorists to laryngeal-final stems – with Aeolic barytonesis in the ppl. ἄπούρας and retention of [a:] in ἄπηυρα. Alternatively, a comparison with Hom. ἐγήρα has opened the fascinating possibility of interpreting ἄπηυρα as a contracted sigmatic aorist, although an original long grade would be obscured in the final outcome from *-u̯rēh2-s-e-t (> *-ϝρattività). Both hypotheses confirm not only that ἄπηυρα is an archaic verbal form, but also that no Schwebeablaute *-u̯reih2/*-u̯erh2 needs to be posited. Accordingly, any connection between ἄπηυρα and ἄποερσε has been deemed invalid from a morphological point of view (*-u̯erh2-s- should not give -ερσ-) and on semantic grounds, especially considering the possibility of explaining the etymology of ἄποερσε with more persuasive roots.

Another important conclusion is that the original form of the 3rd sg indic. should have been *ἀπεύρα, which was later modified into ἄπηυρα by analogy to other temporally augmented verbs. In particular, a specific model has been found in προσηύδα, whose FPs show impressive similarities to
those of ἀπηύρα. The formula-based method has therefore shown how structural connections between FPs could lead to AMs which were not required by the metre. More specifically, a form like *ἀπεύρα, which was ultimately extraneous to Ionian bards for all the reasons outlined above, could receive an analogical temporal augmentation through the influence of the extremely frequent FPs of the prosodically equivalent προσήυδα, whose long diphthong was actually an inherited temporal augment.
Conclusions

The focus of this thesis has been on four case-studies in Homer: ppf. ἠείδη(-ς), impf. of εἴμι in ἠἰ-, ppf. ἠκτο, and 3rd sg. ἀπήφρα. Apart from the fact that they are part of the oldest evidence of an ancient Greek LA, the reasons for choosing them as the main subject of the thesis are three features which none of the verbs of groups 2-5 (Ch. 1 §1) presents at the same time:

- their LA ἠ- has been interpreted by part of the scholarship as separate from the stem, rather than reconstructed in a process of contraction (e.g. *ἡϝε-) or QM (e.g. *ἡο- > ἐω-).
- their LA is metrically required – a feature that applies to ἀπήφρα as well, if this verb is considered as the result of a LA added directly to a past tense *-ϝρᾶ;
- it is possible to explain their morphology as artificial, i.e. metrically functional and alternative to real language counterparts when these cannot find space in the hexameter.

The discussion in Ch. 1 §2.1. has shown that a LA cannot be reconstructed as an inherited morpheme for Greek or Vedic. In particular, there is no etymological correspondence between the sets of instances in these two languages presented in Ch. 1 §1, nor is there any morphological ground to explain the presence of a LA before resonants, except for the Vedic cases whose stems can be reconstructed with an initial laryngeal (Ch. 1 §2.3). Accordingly, most of the verbs labelled under groups 2-5 have been explained through alternative processes of analogical reshaping. Wyatt’s theory of a prothetic vowel contracting with the syllabic augment has been rejected (Ch. 1 §2.2), given the lack of external evidence, and the frequent inconsistency within the same paradigm – e.g. ἠείδη < *ἡϝείδ-, but also εἶδον < *ἐϝείδ-. The verbs of group 2 can rather be interpreted as cases of temporal augmentation analogically applied to stems which had lost their initial consonant. This explains the Homeric variants ἠργ- and ἠλπ- next to ἐργ-/ἐφργ- and ἐλπ-, as well as the use of ἠ- in later forms such as ἠκεῖν. In the case of ἠδῆ, the analogical use of a temporal augment seems relatively early, given the essential lack of a variant εἶδ- in the textual tradition despite the possibility of replacing ἠδ- with *ϝείδ- in most of its occurrences. Such an early use of an analogical temporal augment was entirely possible not only because of the early loss of [w] in Attic-Ionic, but also thanks to the existence of inherited models, namely the temporal augments due to an initial laryngeal (e.g. ἡα < *ἡε-ἡες-η, ἠγε < *ἡε-ἡες-ετ).

The verbs of group 3 were already explained by the earliest scholarship with an analogical use of a LA abstracted from the semantically-akin [ἡθλόου : θέλω] (Ch. 1 §2.1). As for the Homeric verbs of group 4, these cannot be the result of QM, since it has been proved that this phenomenon would generally not occur in the Homeric language for cases of hiatus after loss of digamma (Ch. 1 §2.4.1). Furthermore, the ppf. ἐὡκεῖ, ἐὡλπεῖ and ἐὡργεῖ can be explained with a ‘hyper-characterisation’
which could have taken place already during the Homeric tradition, since it allowed a morphologically clear structure while avoiding an unusual sequence like ἔεο- (Ch. 1 §2.4.2).

The remaining occurrences of groups 4-5 can be explained in several possible ways (Ch. 1 §2.4.2), such as by analogy to the ‘hyper-characterised’ forms above, or by addition of a syllabic augment to a stem with long vowel. It was also possible to reach a safe conclusion that applies to all the verbs of groups 2, 4 and 5: they do not prove the existence of an inherited morpheme ἰ- as an alternative to ἐ-. Instead, their hypothetical LA seems to be the coincidental result of different analogical processes, while an actual LA can be supposed only for the verbs of group 3. Even these verbs, however, are the result of a specific analogical process starting from one preterit whose augment ἰ- is simply inherited, i.e. ἰθελον, and it was shown that this use of a separate ἰ- is attested only for post-Homeric forms such as ἰμελλον, ἰδονάμην and ἰβουλόμην (and, according to my hypothesis, for the ἰτ-type, see below).

All the processes mentioned above were outlined for verbal forms which are attested not only in poetry, but also in post-Homeric prose. This suggests that something like the analogical temporal augment in ἰργάζετο was a fact of the ordinary spoken language. At the same time, the analysis in the first part of the introduction also provided a first glimpse of artificially created forms in Homer. In particular, ἰήνδανε, which is exclusively Homeric, is best explained as an artificial creation that allowed the poets to use ἰνδανε after 3b without ruining the metre. The same conclusion has been reached in Ch. 3 §2.2 for the artificial stems ἐελδ‑ and ἐελπ‑. The formula-based method allowed me to identify the origin of these forms in the following FP:

\[ [-2c] \text{Dat.Pr. } \{θυμός\}_{\text{Nom.Subj.}} \quad [-\sim - \sim - 4c] \text{v} \quad [-\sim - \sim - X6c] \text{V.Infin.(+ Compl.)} \]

It was shown that the verb before 4c is often a past tense of ἐλδομαι and ἐλπομαι with a syllabic augment, which is metrically necessary to avoid a bipartite hexameter or a trochee before 4a – just as in the case of ἰήνδανε. At the same time, when the present forms of ἐλδομαι and ἐλπομαι were used in the same pattern, they received an artificial additional ἐ‑ for the same purpose, leading to the creation of an exclusively poetic stem ἐελδ‑/ἐελπ‑.

The example above is a clear illustration of the templates used in my formula-based method. Its aim was to confirm the artificial character of certain Homeric forms by looking at the formulaic structures in which they are used. The principles of the method are the following:

- The unit of Homeric diction is not Parry’s over-rigid idea of the formula, but rather formulaic patterns, i.e. metrical-linguistic constructions of several layers (semantics, morphology, syntax, pragmatics and metrics) shared by two or more concrete formulae in the epic diction without essential alterations to their structure. Alterations can nonetheless happen, and produce different sub-patterns.
- A FP can be represented with a template – inspired by Bozzone’s (2014) research – which provides all the necessary information of metrics (including subscript indications of metrical positions) and linguistics (e.g. word class, syntactic function, information structure).

- The structure of templates can range from a fully lexically-filled representation (i.e. a formula, see infra) to a merely syntactic configuration, depending on the level of abstraction.

- A formula has been considered as the concrete realisation of a FP into a fully lexically-filled template, and it can also represent the only type of occurrence of a sub-pattern, as seen for e.g. sub-pattern ζ.2 (Ch. 5 §3.1 and Appendix II).

- The use of templates allows for a detailed metrical-linguistic analysis of formulaic structures of Homeric diction, and particularly of the ways they may be analogically modified.

- Through the formula-based method, it is possible to illustrate how and why an AM could derive from a specific SP.

The method can therefore describe the reasons behind the creation of a form in the Homeric Kunstsprache, since artificial words provided a functional alternative to their counterparts in the spoken language when these could not fit into the prosodical realisation of a specific pattern. As already explained, one of the reasons why the thesis focussed on the group 1 verbs is that they can be interpreted as artificial products of the Homeric diction. The formula-based method was therefore crucial in confirming their artificial character.

At the same time, the interpretation of each of the group 1 verbs as artificial started from an analysis of historical phonology and morphology, and the consideration of whether their occurrences are distributed only in poetic texts. The latter criterion, in particular, was used with caution, since an archaism can be preserved even as an isolated occurrence, as seen for ἔκτο and τετευχώς in Ch. 5 §2.3. Accordingly, I argued that the stem ἡειδ- was artificial for three reasons: it is attested only in the Homeric hexameter and poetry inspired by it; ἡδ- cannot come from ἡειδ-, as this would require a very early contraction which is at odds with both the widespread attestation of ἡδ- (as opposed to the scant instances of ἡειδ-), and the presence in Homer of forms like ἔειπε and νῆς; finally, as already argued regarding Wyatt’s prothetic vowel, there is no evidence of historical linguistics to explain the presence of ἴ before (ϝ)ειδ-.

It was also maintained that the origin of the artificial ἡειδ- starts from another artificially created stem, i.e. ἔειδ- (Ch. 3 §2.2). Its existence in the poetic repertoire is corroborated by the use of [ἕισαιοι] in the FP seen above for ἔειδ- and ἔειλπ-, as well as by the existence of an artificial participle ἔεισαμεν- from ἔειδομαι, which shows how a present stem ἔειδ- could also be built for the same verb. Therefore, an artificial ἔειδ- could be abstracted from ἔεισαμεν-, or from any augmented indic. ἔεισα-, or simply through analogy to the artificial ἔειδομαι and ἔειλπομαι. In addition to this, a
v.l. εἰδομένη is widely attested at *Od.* 6.24, and might therefore confirm that the stem ἐειδ- was already part of the bards’ repertoire – and that as such it was reused in later poetry from Pindar’s ἐειδόμενος. I therefore explained the long-augmented Ἰειδ- as an artificial creation, which was obtained by applying an analogical temporal augment to the stem ἐειδ-. This was obviously possible thanks to the poets’ awareness of the etymological connection between εἰδόμαι and οἶδα.

Consequently, I described a specific chronology of the use of an analogical LA in Homer, which can be outlined as follows:

- The artificial stem ἐειδ- could easily receive an analogical temporal augment to obtain a form alternative to Ἰδεε or Ἰδη. This functionality is clearly shown by the use of Ἰειδη in *Od.* 9.206 (Ch. 3 §3.2), while Ἰειδης in *Il.* 22.280 is an alternative to other possible forms of the paradigm (e.g. Ἱδησθα) which could not fit a specific metrical gap in a highly original passage (Ch. 3 §3.1).

- A LA could then be abstracted from a form like Ἰ-ειδη and be used analogically in other paradigms. In particular, the usage of a newly-fledged LA for the impf. of εἰμι would be quite plausible, considering the several analogical connections between this paradigm and the ppf. of οἶδα (Ch. 3 §2.1; Ch. 4 §1.1).

- The LA abstracted from Ἰειδη could then be added to the Homeric zero-grade forms of the impf. of εἰμι to obtain the dactylic Ἰ- type.

The steps above provide a coherent origin and evolution of an apparent but artificial LA in the Homeric language. Since both the occurrences of the impf. of εἰμι (Ch. 4 §1.1, §1.2, §1.3) and elements of historical morphology (Ch. 4 §2.1, §2) show that the Ἰ- type cannot be a development of spoken Ionic, the formation of a stem with hiatus like Ἰ- needed to be based on an analogical model for the initial eta, which is easily found in Ἰειδ- (← ἐειδ-).

As for the reason why the artificial Ἰ- type was created, I showed through the formula-based method that it originated from the following FPs:

\[ [-]_ν, [δ’ ἵσαν]_ν \quad \text{Pattern } \beta. \text{ Beginning of a new sentence.} \]

\[ [ἡ] ἵσαν_ν \quad \text{Pattern } \delta. \text{ Necessary enjambement.} \]

The artificial [ἡ] ἵσαν_ν perfectly replicates the dactylic structure of [ο/αί δ ἵσαν_ν], which is typically found at the beginning of a sentence in verse-initial position. The alternative [ἡ] ἵσαν_ν fulfills the same functions with just one important difference: it is used in necessary enjambement. This is because [ἡ] ἵσαν is employed when the subjects have already been mentioned in the previous line, which makes the use of [ο/αί δ ἵσαν_ν] syntactically impossible. This analysis has therefore added an important corollary to the use of artificial creations: they were not only metrically functional, but could also offer a syntactic alternative. This is reflected by the fact that all the Ἰ- type forms in verse-initial
position are used in necessary enjambment, even though ἦσαν and ἦδε could be followed by a particle like δὲ or μὲν without any metrical disruption (Ch. 4 §3.2.1.2). In addition to these important results, a connection between ἦσαν and ἦδε has been found in 4th-foot occurrences as well (Ch. 4 §3.2.2), where [η/] seems to replicate the FP [[(−) (−) − —][φ]τελ] through phonetic echoing. The origin of the ἦ- type in specific usages of the 3rd pl. corroborates the theory described above for the Homeric LA: among several similarities, the near-identical morphology of ἦδε ‘they knew’ could facilitate the analogical use of the LA of ηδε- to obtain the dactylic 3rd pl. ἦδαι, to which the other ἦ- type forms could be analogically built.

The forms ἦκτο and ἦρα are excluded from the narrative described above for the use of a Homeric analogical LA. As argued in Ch. 3 §2.2, abstracting a LA from ἦκτο would imply a reanalysis of this pff. form as ἦκτο, which would be at odds with the consistent presence of a reduplication syllable in the paradigm of Hom. ἦκτο (Ch. 5 §1.3). This problem is clearly inexistent in the reanalysis of ἦκτο as long-augmented, given that (φ)ηδ- is unquestionably the Hom. stem for most of the paradigm of ηδα. The analysis of FPs (Ch. 5 §3.1, §3.2) also allowed me to revisit a theory by Hackstein (1989) and describe the analogical creation of ἦκτο as follows:


The impossibility of ἐκαίσα made the poet opt for the middle (and semantically equivalent) counterpart, which nonetheless needed to receive an analogical temporal augment to cover the prosodical extension of [ἐκαίσα]. 3rd sg. ἦκτο is therefore shaped as a metrical and syntactic variant to ἐκαίσα, which is further confirmed by the following comparison with another formula containing the nom. sg. fem. ppl.:


I consequently explained the pff. ἦκτο as another case of analogical temporal augmentation. More specifically, just as an artificial ἦδαι could receive temporal augmentation to obtain ἦδαι-, so the preserved archaism ἦκτο could undergo the same process to give a metrically functional ἦκτο – which was perfectly possible after loss of initial [w].

As for ἄπηρα, after a detailed examination of its opaque morphology (Ch. 6 §1.1–§2.1), I agreed with the reconstruction of *μῆρη-μῆρη- (> *-μῆρη-), to which either a root (cf. ἐβην) or a sigmatic aorist (cf. Hom. ἐγῆρα) was built. The form was also Aeolic, as shown by the sound change [Vθ-] > [Vηθ-], the barytonesis of the pff. ἄπουρας, and the retention of final [a:] in the indicative. For all these reasons, ἄπηρα was an alien form for the Ionian bards, and as such was liable to analogical reshaping due to a misunderstanding of its morphology. This is shown by the analogical creation of 1st sg./3rd pl. ἄπωρον, clearly due to the re-interpretation of ἄπηρα as the imperfect of an -άω verb.
I argued that another analogy operated by the Ionian bards was to apply a temporal augment to *ἀπεύρᾱ, which is the expected original form of the 3rd-sg. indicative. At the same time, the reason behind this cannot be the same as the one observed for the other three case-studies. More specifically, ἀπηύρᾱ did not provide any metrically functional alternative, as it is prosodically equivalent to *ἀπεύρᾱ. This means that the formula-based method could not find a SP with a genuine counterpart to ἀπηύρᾱ. An analogical influence, however, could come from the FPs of verse-final προσηύδᾱ, whose temporal augment is an inherited feature from laryngeal loss in *h1e-h2eud-. The reason why ἀπηύρᾱ could undergo this analogical influence lies exactly in the fact that it was not a familiar word to Ionian bards. Furthermore, the analogical creation of ἀπηὔρων, and the fact that (προσ)αὐδάω is a contract verb can hardly be a coincidence. The case-study of ἀπηύρᾱ has therefore shown another possible use of the formula-based method: the intricate connections between FPs could cause analogical processes which were not required by the metre, but which could still affect archaisms or foreign words that were no longer fully understood by the Ionian bards.

In conclusion, can we claim that there is no such thing as a ‘long augment’ in ancient Greek? A morpheme of this kind seems to be used in the verbs of group 3, and I have hypothesised the same type of process in the relationship between ἡείδη and the ἡ-τype of the impf. ἀμµ, though through a different model. At the same time, the analogical application of temporal augmentation has been used for many forms, namely the group 2 verbs, ἡϊκτο, ἀπηύρᾱ, and ἡείδη itself. The reason why this process has been considered as kunstsprachlich for the three verbs of group 1 is that they ultimately remain forms of the epic diction. Their analogical temporal augment was therefore just subservient to the rules of the hexameter, and the exigencies of composing through FPs – except for ἀπηύρᾱ, whose analogical temporal augment was simply due to a misunderstanding of its morphology.

It can therefore be concluded that there is no such thing as a single explanation for all the cases of LA in ancient Greek. At the same time, an augment with lengthened vowel in past tenses – i.e. what is usually called ‘temporal augment’ – was an inherited feature for certain verbs, and could therefore be generated by analogy for other verbs that had lost their initial consonant. This is how I explained the creation of ἡειδό- and ἡϊκτο (only attested in poetry and therefore kunstsprachlich), while I proposed a similar explanation, but with different modalities, for ἀπηύρᾱ, and the use of an actual LA drawn from ἡ-ειδό- for the ἡ-τype. The second achievement of the thesis is thus to show how an innovative method can help us spot artificial creations, and the dynamics behind their usage in the Homeric diction.
Table I: SH and QM in Homer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Intact Hiatus</th>
<th>Shortening in Hiatus</th>
<th>Quantitative Metathesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>στείομεν θείομεν</td>
<td></td>
<td>στειομεν θειομεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ατρείδαο</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ατρειδεω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ναυτάων</td>
<td></td>
<td>ναυτεων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>νήα νηός νήες νηόν</td>
<td>νεός νέες νεόν</td>
<td>νεά</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>νηός ‘temple’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>βασιλήα βασιλήος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>τεθνηότα</td>
<td></td>
<td>τεθνεωτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ήος²</td>
<td></td>
<td>έος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τήος³</td>
<td></td>
<td>τέος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IV</td>
<td>Μενέλαιο</td>
<td></td>
<td>Μενέλεω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Λγέλαιος</td>
<td></td>
<td>Λγέλεως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Εύνηος</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ακρόνεος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>έωσφόρος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Apart from the mention of νέα, which is the only instance of QM for Type II, the rest of the boxes in Table I does not provide all the Homeric examples, but simply shows whether SH and QM are attested at all for each type.
2 Cf. Ch. 1 n. 78.
3 Cf. Ch. 1 n. 78.
Table II: ppf. of oída

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homer</th>
<th>‘Older’ Attic⁴</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg</td>
<td>ἤδεα</td>
<td>ἤδη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg</td>
<td>ἤδησθα / ἤειδης(-εις)</td>
<td>ἤδησθα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg</td>
<td>ἤδει ἤδη(-ει) ἤειδη(-ει)</td>
<td>ἤδει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ἤσμεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ἤσπε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III: philological study of impf. of ἐμ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Homeric Greek</th>
<th>Older Attic</th>
<th>(RV) Vedic⁵</th>
<th>PIE⁶</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sing.</td>
<td>ἐμ</td>
<td>ἐμ</td>
<td>āyam</td>
<td>*(h₁e-)h₁éj-η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sing.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ἐμεσθα</td>
<td>(άις)</td>
<td>*(h₁e-)h₁éj-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sing.</td>
<td>ἐι / ἐε / ἐει / ἐεμ</td>
<td>ἐει</td>
<td>āit</td>
<td>*(h₁e-)h₁éj-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st plur.</td>
<td>ἐμεν</td>
<td>ἐμεν</td>
<td>(άιμα)</td>
<td>*(h₁e-)h₁i-με</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd plur.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ἐπε</td>
<td>áita/áitana</td>
<td>*(h₁e-)h₁i-τε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd plur.</td>
<td>ἐισαν / ὑσαν / ἐιον ἵσαν</td>
<td>ἐισαν</td>
<td>ἀyan / yan</td>
<td>*(h₁e-)h₁j-έντ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd dual</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ἐτονν</td>
<td>áitam</td>
<td>*(h₁e-)h₁i-ʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd dual</td>
<td>ἐτην</td>
<td>ἐτην</td>
<td>(áitām)</td>
<td>*(h₁e-)h₁i-ʔ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Cf. Berg 1977: 214; Sihler 1995: 579. 1st sg ἤδειν and 2nd sg ἤδεις (analogical to 3rd sg. -ει: cf. Willi 2018: 225 n. 53) are found in later Attic authors such as Demosthenes, while those attested in MSS of earlier authors (e.g. Aristoph. Nubes 329, Thesm. 554) are usually considered suspicious (cf. Smyth 1920: 218). As for the plural, the forms ἤδεμεν ἤδετε ἤδεσαν are later formations, and analogical to the ‘regular’ pluperfect with alpha-thematic conjugation.

⁵ Cf. Macdonell 1916: 130. The PIE accent pattern (for which cf. Clackson 2007: 125) has already been altered, unlike in the impf. of as- ‘to be’ (āsám, ās, āsá, āsamá, āstá, āsán). The 1st du. áiva is not attested in the Rigveda, just like the 2nd sg., 1st pl. and 3rd du., while the only injunctive form is 3rd pl. yan (cf. RVL II: 408).

⁶ The athematic secondary endings for the 1st and 2nd pl. are those suggested by Clackson (2007: 125) for PIE ‘to be’. As for the dual, no ending can be reconstructed with certainty (cf. Szemerényi 1996: 235).
Table IV: Hom. impf. of ἗μι

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+DIPH +THEM</th>
<th>+DIPH –THEM</th>
<th>-DIPH +THEM</th>
<th>-DIPH –THEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+AUGMENT</td>
<td>ἤε(v) ἤομεν</td>
<td>ἤει ἐπῆσαν</td>
<td>ἤεν(ν) / ἤι / ὁἵεν</td>
<td>ἤία</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-AUGMENT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ἵεν(ν)</td>
<td>ἵεν / ὁἵεν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V: examples of prosodic expansions of pattern ß

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simplest form</th>
<th>Expansion 1</th>
<th>Expansion 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
<td>ἵσαν</td>
<td>ὁ Ï</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ὁ Ï | ἵσα
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Chapter 3: Hom. ἡείδη

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Il. 18.403-4</td>
<td>1. ἀφρό μορμύρων ρέεν ἀσπετος· οὐδὲ τις ἄλλος</td>
<td>2. ἡδεσεν οὔτε θεῶν οὔτε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Od. 9.205-6</td>
<td>1. ἡδὼν ἀκηράσιον, θείον ποτόν· οὐδὲ τις αὐτόν</td>
<td>2. ἡείδη δυμώνον οὐδ’ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνι οἶκο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Il. 24.697-8</td>
<td>1. ἱππους, ἡμίονοι δὲ νέκυν φέρον. οὐδὲ τις ἄλλος</td>
<td>2. ἐγνοί πρόςθ’ ἄνδρον καλλιζώνον τε γυναικών</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Od. 7.246-7</td>
<td>1. ναεῖ εὐπλόκαμος, δεινή θεός· οὐδὲ τις αὐτή</td>
<td>2. μίσγεται οὔτε θεῶν οὔτε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Il. 17.401-2</td>
<td>1. ἡματι τῷ ἐτάνυσσε κακὸν πόνον· οὔδ’ ἄρα πώ τι</td>
<td>2. ἡδεε Πάτροκλον τεθνηότα δίος Ἀχιλλεύς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 4: ἵ-type of the impf. of ἵμυ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern β</th>
<th>([-1a])Nom.Pr. (\sim -2c)Conj.+V.3pl.pret.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>(\text{Il. 23.114}) oἱ δ’ ἴσαυ ὑλοτόμους πελέκεας ἐν χερσίν ἔχοντες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>(\text{Il. 24.647} = \text{Od. 4.300, 7.339, 22.497}) oἱ δ’ ἴσαυ ἐκ μεγάρου δάος μετὰ χερσίν ἐχοῦσαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>(\text{Od. 10.103}) oἱ δ’ ἴσαυ ἐκβάντες λείην ὁδὸν, ἦ περ ἁμαζαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>(\text{Il. 18.516}) oἱ δ’ ἴσαυ· ἤρχε δ’ ἄρα σφιν Ἀρης καὶ Παλλᾶς Ἀθήνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>(\text{Il. 13.795}) oἱ δ’ ἴσαυ ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἀτάλαντοι ἀέλλη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moved to verse-final position:

| f.        | \(\text{Il. 24.247}\) ἦ καὶ σκηπανίῳ δίεπ’ ἀνέρας· oἱ δ’ ἴσαυ ἥξω |
| g.        | \(\text{Od. 18.110}\) ἄψ δ’ ὃ’ ἐπ’ οὐδόν ἠὼν κατ’ ἄρ’ ἥξετο· τοῖ δ’ ἴσαυ εἰσω |

Isolated AM

<p>| h.        | (\text{Od. 24.11}) πάρ δ’ ἴσαυ Ὡκεανοῦ τε ῥοὰς καὶ Λευκάδα πέτρην |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern γ</th>
<th>[\varepsilon γ]Noun [ίσαν4c]</th>
<th>Sub-Pattern γ.a, c, d, f</th>
<th>[\varepsilon γ]Noun [(p)ίσαν4c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.  Il. 3.2</td>
<td>Τρόμες μὲν κλαγγῇ τ’ ἐνοπῇ τ’ ἰσαν ὄρνιθές ὃς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.  Il. 17.266</td>
<td>τόσση ἄρα Τρόμες ἰαγη ἰσαν· αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.  Il. 4.429</td>
<td>ἤγεμόνον· οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι ἄκην ἰσαν, οὐδὲ κε φαίης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.  Il. 19.45</td>
<td>καὶ μὰν οἱ τότε γ’ εἰς ἄγορην ἰσαν, οὖνεκ’ Ἀχιλλέος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.  Il. 20.75</td>
<td>ὃς οἱ μὲν θεοὶ ἄντα θεῶν ἰσαν· αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλέος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.  Il. 18.405</td>
<td>ἄλλα Θέτις τε καὶ Εὐρυνόμη ἰσαν, αἱ μ’ ἐσάωσαν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g  Od.19.436</td>
<td>ἰχν’ ἐρευνώντες κύνες ἰῆσαν, αὐτὰρ ὄσιόθεν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. [ἡῖσαν1c]ν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.  Il. 17.494-5</td>
<td>1. τοῖσι δ’ ἅμα Χρομίος τε καὶ Ἀρητὸς θεοειδῆς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ἰῆσαν ἀμφότεροι· μάλα δὲ σφισιν ἔλλεπτο θυμός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.  Il. 10.196-7</td>
<td>1. τοῖς δ’ ἅμα Μηριόνης καὶ Νέστορος ὄγλαος νιῶς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. ἡσαν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ κάλεον συμμητιάσθαι

c.  Ἰ. 13.304-5
1. τοῖοι Μηριόνης τε καὶ Ἄδωμενεὺς ἁγοί ἄνδρῶν
2. ἡσαν εἰς πόλεμον κεκορυθμένοι αἴθοπι χαλκῷ

*Other passages containing [ἡσαν] in enjambment*

d. Ὀδ. 20.6-8
1. κεῖτ’ ἐγγηγορῶν· ταί δ’ ἐκ μεγάρου γυναῖκες
2. ἡσαν, αἱ μνησθήσαν ἐμισγέσκοντο πάρος περ,
3. ἀλλήλησι γέλω τε καὶ εὐφροσύνην παρέγουσι

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>VP.3pl.imperf.εἰμι [ἡρχε δ’ ὑ -]</th>
<th>VP.3pl.imperf.εἰμι [ἡρχε δ’ ἀρά σφιν]</th>
<th>VP.3pl.imperf.εἰμι [ἡρχε δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Pattern ε.a,b</td>
<td>[ἡσαν] [ἡρχε δ’ ἀρά σφιν]</td>
<td>[ἡρχε δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς]</td>
<td>[ἡρχε δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-pattern ε.c,d</td>
<td>[ἡσαν] [ἡρχε δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς]</td>
<td>[ἡρχε δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς]</td>
<td>[ἡρχε δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a.  Ἰ. 18.516 | ὀδ’ ἡσαν· ἡρχε δ’ ἀρὰ σφιν Ἀρης καὶ Παλλᾶς Λήνη | |
| b.  Ὀδ. 24.9 | ὃς αἱ τετριγυῖα ἀμ’ ἡσαν· ἡρχε δ’ ἀρὰ σφιν | |
| c.  Ὀδ. 23.370 | ὃξιαν δὲ θύρας, ἐκ δ’ ἡσαν· ἡρχε δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς | |
| d.  Ὀδ. 24.501 | ὃξιαν ὑπ’ θύρας, ἐκ δ’ ἡσαν· ἡρχε δ’ Ὀδυσσεύς | |
Chapter 5: ἥκτο

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.1. Od. 4.796</td>
<td>εἶδολον ποίησε, δέμας δ’ ἥκτο γυναικί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.2. Od. 13.288</td>
<td>χειρί τέ μν κατέρεξε: δέμας δ’ ἥκτο γυναικί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.3. Od. 16.157</td>
<td>ἄλλ’ ἢ γε σχεδόν ἢλθε: δέμας δ’ ἥκτο γυναικί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.4. Od. 20.31</td>
<td>οὐρανόθεν καταβὰσα- δέμας δ’ ἥκτο γυναικί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Il. 8.305</td>
<td>καλὴ Καστιάνειρα δέμας εἰκύια θεῆσιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Pattern ζ.2</th>
<th>[γυνή]<em>{Ax} Nom. [ἐκυιάς]</em>{Sz} V.ζικτά [θεῆσιν]_{bc} Dat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. Il. 11.638</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ ρά σφι κύκησε γυνή εἰκυία θεῆσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Il. 19.286</td>
<td>εἶπε δ’ ἀρα κλαίουσα γυνή εἰκυία θεῆσιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Pattern ζ.3</th>
<th>[(ς) ς -]V.3sg. [ἐκυιάς]_{Sz} V.ζικτά [ς - ϊπσον]Dat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Od. 7.291</td>
<td>παιζούσας, ἐν δ’ αὐτῇ ἔδω ἐκυία θεῆσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Il. 22.151</td>
<td>ἢ δ’ ἓτερη θέρει προρέει ἐκυία γαλάζη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sub-Pattern ζ.1.2 | \[\text{δέμας} \text{\textsubscript{4a}}\text{Acc.Resp.} \quad [\sim - \sim \text{\textsubscript{b}}\text{Dat.} \quad [\sim - \chi_6\text{V.\varepsilon\iota\omicron\kappa}]]
  | g.  | Il. 17.323  
Αἰνείαν ὄτρυνε, \text{δέμας} \text{Περίφαντι ἐοικός} |
  | h.  | Il. 21.285  
στήτην ἐγγὺς ἰόντε, \text{δέμας} δ’ ἄνδρεσσιν ἐῴκτην |
| Sub-Pattern ζ.1.3 | \[\text{ἄνδρι}\text{\textsubscript{1b}}\text{Dat.} \quad \text{δέμας} \text{\textsubscript{2a}}\text{Acc.Resp.} \quad \text{ἐκυια} \text{\textsubscript{3b}}\text{V.ppl.\varepsilon\iota\omicron\kappa}]
  | i.  | Od. 8.194  
\text{ἄνδρι} \text{δέμας} \text{ἐκυια}. ἔπος τ’ ἐφατ’ ἐκ τ’ ὀνόμαζεν |
  | j.  | Od. 13.222  
\text{ἄνδρι} \text{δέμας} \text{ἐκυια} νέω, ἐπιβώτορι μῆλων |
| Sub-Pattern ζ.1.4 | \[\sim - \sim - \text{\textsubscript{2a}}\text{Dat/V.ppl.\varepsilon\iota\omicron\kappa} \quad [\sim - \sim \text{\textsubscript{3b}}\text{Dat/V.ppl.\varepsilon\iota\omicron\kappa} \quad \text{δέμας} \text{\textsubscript{4a}}\text{Acc.Resp.}\quad [\kappa α\text{τειρέα φώνη} \text{\textsubscript{6c}}\text{Acc.Resp.NP}]]
  | k.  | Il. 22.227  
Δηϊφόβῳ \text{ἐκυια} \text{δέμας} καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν |
  | l.  | Il. 13.45  
εἰσάμενος Κάλχαντι \text{δέμας} καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν |
  | m.  | Il. 17.555  
εἰσαμενή Φοίνικι \text{δέμας} καὶ ἀτειρέα φωνήν |
### Pattern η

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[− −\text{5b}]\text{Acc.,Obj.}</th>
<th>[− −\text{6c}]\text{V.,άπηύρα}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a.</strong></td>
<td>Il. 6.17</td>
<td>πρόσθεν ὑπαντιάσας, ἀλλ’ ἄμφω θυμὸν ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b.</strong></td>
<td>Il. 17.236</td>
<td>νήπιοι· ἢ τε πολέσσιν ἐπ’ αὐτὸ θυμὸν ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c.</strong></td>
<td>Il. 21.296</td>
<td>Τρωίκον, δὲς κε φύγησι· σὺ δ’ Ἑκτορὶ θυμὸν ἀπούρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d.</strong></td>
<td>Od. 13.270</td>
<td>ἀνθρώπων ἐνόησε, λάθον δὲ ἐ θυμὸν ἀπούρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e.</strong></td>
<td>Il. 11.115</td>
<td>ἐλθὼν εἰς εὐνήν, ἀπαλὸν τέ σφ’ Ἑτορ ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f.</strong></td>
<td>Il. 11.432</td>
<td>τοιώδ’ ἄνδρε κατακτείνας καὶ τεῦγ’ ἀπούρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g.</strong></td>
<td>Il. 15.462</td>
<td>Ἑκτορ’, ἀτὰρ Τεῦκρον Τελαμώνιον ἐγχος ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h.</strong></td>
<td>Od. 18.273</td>
<td>οὐλομένης ἐμέθεν, τῆς τε Ζεὺς ὀβεθὼν ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The only occurrence which is left out of this table is Il. 9.107: [ἐβηγης\text{5c} κλασίθθην\text{6b} ἀπούρας\text{6c}]. Apart from the verse-final position of the ppl ἀπούρας, this occurrence is an isolated AM based on the substitution of the usual object of pattern α with a word expressing motion and governed by the main verb.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-pattern η.1</th>
<th>[(,) (,) (→) (→)]Obj.Mod. [→ − 5b]Acc.Obj. [→ − 8c]V.ἀπηύρα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Il. 10.495</td>
<td>τὸν τρεισκαίδεκατον μεληδέα θυμὸν ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Od. 11.203</td>
<td>σῆ τ’ ἀγανοφροσύνη μεληδέα θυμὸν ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Il. 21.201</td>
<td>τὸν δὲ κατ’ αὐτόθι λείπεν, ἔπει φίλον ἦτορ ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Il. 24.50</td>
<td>αὐτὰρ ὁ γ’ Ἐκτορα διὸν, ἔπει φίλον ἦτορ ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Il. 11.334</td>
<td>θυμοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς κεκαδὼν κλυτὰ τεύχε’ ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Il. 17.125</td>
<td>Ἐκτορ μὲν Πάτροκλον ἔπει κλυτὰ τεύχε’ ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Il. 6.455</td>
<td>δακρύωσσαν ἄγηται ἐλεύθερον ήμαρ ἀπούρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Il. 16.831</td>
<td>Τρωιάδας δὲ γυναίκας ἐλεύθερον ήμαρ ἀπούρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Il. 20.193</td>
<td>ληιᾶδας δὲ γυναίκας ἐλεύθερον ήμαρ ἀπούρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Il. 8.237</td>
<td>τῇδ’ ἄτη ἄσας καὶ μιν μέγα κύδος ἀπηύρας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-pattern η.2</td>
<td>[σχεδὸν\textsubscript{3c}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. II. 16.828</td>
<td>&quot;Εκτωρ Πιλικάδης σχεδὸν ἐγγεῖ θυμὸν ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. II. 20.290</td>
<td>τὸν δὲ κε Πηλειδῆς σχεδὸν ᾠρι θυμὸν ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. II. 21.179</td>
<td>ἄλλα πρὶν Ἀχιλεὺς σχεδὸν ᾠρι θυμὸν ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. II. 9.273</td>
<td>τὰς μὲν τοι δόσει, μετὰ δ’ ἔσσεται ἔν τὸ τ’ ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. II. 23.291</td>
<td>ὑποὺς δὲ Τριφώς ὑπαγε ζυγόν, οὔς ποτ’ ἀπηύρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. II. 9.131</td>
<td>τὰς μὲν οἱ δόσσω, μετὰ δ’ ἔσσεται ἔν τὸ τ’ ἀπηύρων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-pattern η.4</td>
<td>(()−3c)Rel.(+Conj.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. II. 23.560</td>
<td>δόσω οἱ θώρηκα, τὸν Ἀστεροπαῖον ἀπηύρων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The position of the instrumental dat. in this pattern seems to be connected to that of the indirect-object dat. in η/b, c.

3 The main AM in this sub-pattern is that the form of ἀπηύρα is preceded by an accusative of the person, instead of an inanimate object. Although the two passages occur at a very short distance in the same book of the Iliad, they do not represent a repetition of the same sentence, as shown by the different antecedents of the relative pronoun. This is therefore a sub-pattern, and its limited instances hint at an analogical innovation which remained isolated within a specific portion of the Homeric poems, where its origin probably lies.
Although θ.a shows an object before the form of ἀπηύρα, θ.b has a completely different construction from pattern η, with a clear influence from sub-pattern η.3 in the use of the time adverb ποτε.

This pattern might have been created out of the impossibility of using γέρας according to pattern η. A predicative [αὐτός] therefore takes the usual position of the object, in a typical use of peripheral elements to fill up metrical gaps. This way γέρας can be used right before it in accordance with Hermann’s bridge.

This is considered as an AM within pattern ι for two reasons: it shows a nominative expressing the subject (just as [αὐτός] refers to the subject predicatively), and [Πάτροκλος] replaces [γέρας] by covering its metrical position as well, since the object is expressed previously with the relative [ὐ].

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern θ</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sub/Obj</th>
<th>Conj.+Dat</th>
<th>Encl</th>
<th>θ.1b</th>
<th>θ.1c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[〜〜〜4a]</td>
<td></td>
<td>~ ~ ~</td>
<td>~ ~ ~</td>
<td>~ ~ ~</td>
<td>~ ~ ~</td>
<td>~ ~ ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Od. 3.192</td>
<td></td>
<td>oĩ φύγον ἐκ πολέμου, πόντος δέ oĩ óu tiv’ ἀπηύρα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Od. 13.132</td>
<td></td>
<td>oĩκαδ’ ἐλεύσεσθαι: νόστον δέ oĩ óu ποτ’ ἀπηύρων</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern ι</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Αcc.OBJ</th>
<th>Nom.Pred.Subj</th>
<th>ι.1b</th>
<th>ι.1c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[γέρας]</td>
<td></td>
<td>γέρας</td>
<td>αὐτός</td>
<td>ἀπηύρας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. II. 1.356, 1.507, 2.240</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἤτιμησεν· ἐλών γάρ ἔχει γέρας αὐτός ἀπηύρας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. II. 19.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>ἠματὶ τῷ, ὅτ’ Ἀχιλλῆς γέρας αὐτός ἀπηύρων</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolated AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. II. 23.800</td>
<td></td>
<td>τεύχεα Σαρπῆδοντος, ἀ μιν Πάτροκλος ἀπηύρα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Although θ.a shows an object before the form of ἀπηύρα, θ.b has a completely different construction from pattern η, with a clear influence from sub-pattern η.3 in the use of the time adverb ποτε.

5 This pattern might have been created out of the impossibility of using γέρας according to pattern η. A predicative [αὐτός] therefore takes the usual position of the object, in a typical use of peripheral elements to fill up metrical gaps. This way γέρας can be used right before it in accordance with Hermann’s bridge.

6 This is considered as an AM within pattern ι for two reasons: it shows a nominative expressing the subject (just as [αὐτός] refers to the subject predicatively), and [Πάτροκλος] replaces [γέρας] by covering its metrical position as well, since the object is expressed previously with the relative [ὑ].
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| Pattern κ | \([-\omega 1b\) Conn.+Encl. \([\betaη\pi 2a\) Dat.Mod. \([\dot{\alpha}\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\sigma\tau\omicron\zeta 3b\) \([-\omega 4c\) V.ζηηροσ | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| \[a. Od. 4.646 \] \[\dot{η} \in \beta\eta \dot{\alpha}\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\sigma\tau\omicron\zeta \dot{\alpha}\pi\eta\rho\omicron\alpha \eta \mu\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu\nu \] | \[b. Il. 1.430 \] \[\tau\eta\nu \\rho\alpha \beta\dot{\eta} \dot{\alpha}\dot{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\sigma\tau\omicron\zeta \dot{\alpha}\pi\eta\rho\omicron\nu \cdot \dot{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\alpha\rho\omicron\theta\upsilon\delta\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\ ] \[\alpha\mu\tau\alpha \' \Omega\delta\upsilon\sigma\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\zeta\ ] |
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