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

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

Abstract. – This article discusses the augment use and absence in Iliad 6. In our research, we will only use forms that are confirmed by the metre. We therefore start by outlining which criteria are used to determine a metrically secure form and apply them to Iliad 6. Then we discuss the forms in which there are still doubts. To decide
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on those forms (both simplex and compound forms), we use the “Barrett - Taida method”, which states that forms with doubtful augmentation can be analysed by comparing them to the metrically secure forms of the same paradigm. The corpus of forms that is thus obtained, will be the basis for the analysis. We divide the analysis in three parts: morphological, syntactic and semantic. At the end, we try to analyse the results with the theory of “evidentiality”, the linguistic marking of information source.

1. Why this chant / work?

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

2. Metrically secure forms

The prototypical hexameter has the following structure:

\[ \text{-- } \text{±} \text{±} / \text{-- } \text{±} \text{±} / \text{-- } \text{±} \text{±} \text{±} / \text{-- } \text{±} \text{±} \text{±} / \text{-- } \text{±} \text{±} \text{±} / \text{-- } \text{±} \text{±} \text{±} / \text{-- } \text{±} \text{±} \text{±} \]

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

In determining “word end”, we consider enclitics to be part of the word after which they appeared \(^1\). The following criteria will be used to determine the metrical guarantee of a transmitted verb form with or without augment (the criteria are listed in order from validity and applicability, starting with the formal and then proceeding to the metrical ones).

---

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

2. The absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the elision of the dative plural ending of consonant stems in -σι/-ψι/-ξι.

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

4. As a word final -υ is never elided, (un)augmented forms are secure, if the opposite required such an elision.

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

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

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

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


3. C. Grashof (1852, p. 11), J. La Roche (1869, p. 76, 80, but see p. 125-129), I. Bekker (1872, p. 22-23), D. Monro (1891, p. 349-350), P. Maas (1923, p. 27), P. Chantraine (1948, p. 86), R. Wachter (2000, p. 74); there are only 19 exceptions in the entire Homeric corpus, the list of which can be found in J. La Roche (1869, p. 125-129).


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

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

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

11. The presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the creation of monosyllabic verb forms (short and long) before the caesura¹¹.


11. W. MEYER (1844, p. 983) noted that the combination of a dactylic word and a monosyllabic word before the caesura in the third foot was avoided; already C. HOFFMANN (1842, p. 20-21) pointed out that it was unusual to end the sentence in the foot before the actual pause. C. SICKING (1993, p. 81) argued that a monosyllabon at the end of a sentence, colon or verse was avoided. In F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 40-41), this rule was applied to a corpus of epic Greek, namely 7566 verses of the Iliad (chants 1, 4, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 16, 19, 23 and 24), 5260 of the Odyssey (chants 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 13, 14, 19, 21 and 24) and the entire Homeric corpus. The analysis showed that only 9 instances of a monosyllabon at the end of a verse and 13 monosyllabics before a caesura could be found in the Iliad; in the Works and Days, there were 10 monosyllabics at the end of a verse and 11 before a caesura; in the Iliad, there were 126 monosyllabics at the end of a verse and 62 before a caesura; in the Odyssey, 78 monosyllables at the end of the verse and 20 before a caesura were attested.
12. As a monosyllabic form is avoided at the end of the verse, an augment is secure if the opposite would create a monosyllabic verb form at 6b.

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

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

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

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

12. We were unable to find out which scholar had first stated this bridge; G. Hermann (1817, p. 216) already observed that a word end there was dispreferred, but not excluded, when special emphasis was needed. C. Hoffmann (1842, p. 20-21) catalogued this caesura among the caesurae minores, but stated that a caesura in this position was possible, if something spectacular was announced or if the poet spoke about Zeus. See also A. Wistrand (1933, p. 56), R. Sjölund (1938, p. 63), B. Snell (1986, p. 16), H. Barnes (1986, p. 141), M. Van Raalte (1986, p. 90), C. Sicking (1993, p. 81), I. Taida (2010, p. 253).


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


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


19. C. Hoffmann (1842, p. 22) noted that the caesura at 2b weakened the verse and catalogued this caesura among the caesurae minores in the subcategory (caesurae) versum mollientes and C. Grashof (1852, p. 11) noted that an incision after the trochee in the 2nd foot was avoided. In his overview of the different caesurae, G. Hermann (1817, p. 212) did not discuss caesurae at 2b and 2c, which means that he did not consider word end at this position a possibility. See also M. Cantilena (1995, p. 34).
skholia, already Nikanor (2nd century AD) mentioned that a caesura at 2b, ἡ τομὴ κατὰ τὸν ἕβδομον χρόνον, was avoided, hence the term “Nikanor’s Bridge”\(^{20}\). B. Giseke had already stated that a word that started in the first foot should not end at the end of the second foot (be it in spondaic or in dactylic form) \(^{21}\), and was thus the “founding father” of Meyer 1b. The applicability of these laws to early epic is debated given the fact that there are between 4 and 6 % of exceptions and W. Meyer himself restricted his law to post-Homeric epic (but Hoffmann, Grashof and Giseke applied it to epic Greek as a whole) \(^{22}\). In an in-depth study, M. Cantilena addressed Meyer’s Law (which he restricted to the prohibition of word end at 2b) and the constraint against word end after the trochee in the 2nd foot. He noted that Meyer 1a (but not 1b) \(^{23}\) was violated in about 7 % of the verses in the Iliad and in 6 % of the verses in the Odyssey and that the constraint against word end after the trochee of the second foot was violated in 11 % of the verses in the Iliad and in 10 % of the verses in the Odyssey \(^{24}\). He admitted that 6 % of violations were not much, but nevertheless concluded that the definition “metrical law” was too strong, because some common formulae violated this rule and because the 6 % was very high, when compared with the 0,3 % violations of Hermann’s Bridge and 0,08 % of the prohibition of an bipartite hexameter \(^{25}\). We, however, believe that 6 % is not that much (com-

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

\(^{21}\) B. GISEKE (1864, p. 128-135).

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


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

\(^{24}\) M. CANTILENA (1995; the tables are found on pages 30-32); this had also been noted by N. PORTER (1951, p. 16), R. BEEKES (1972, p. 4-6, without mentioning neither B. Giseke nor W. Meyer), H. BARNES (1986, p. 128-129), B. SNELL (1986, p. 14). Similar figures were given by C. SICKING (1993, p. 80).

\(^{25}\) M. CANTILENA (1995, p. 40-42). The difference in the percentages of observance between Meyer’s Law and Hermann’s Bridge was also noted by R. BECK (1972, p. 214). Before H. Fraenkel wrote the first version of his colometric analysis, T. STIFLER (1924, p. 337) had already noted that a trochaic caesura in the fourth was
pared to the 3% of spondees and 15% of exceptions to the digamma). The fact that these rules applied in later poetry is an indication that the tendency was already present in Homeric and Hesiodic epic: the Alexandrinians and Imperial epicists fine-tuned and optimised the hexameter, so if they felt that this rule had to be adhered to, it must mean that they considered the rule already valid for Homer. Some scholars even argue that a word at 2b or 2c is forbidden tout court, even for words that started in the second foot, but we think that it is too broad a formulation, especially since the Imperial epicist Nonnos (5th century AD) had many word ends at 2b. In Iliad 6, we have 27 violations of Meyer 1a (5%), 13 of Meyer 1b (2,5%) and 7 in which it could be 1a or 1b (1,5% – depending on whether one reads the augment or not).

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

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

### 3. Metrically insecure forms

The following instances are metrically insecure.

1. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the genitive singular ending in -οιο is insecure, because -ου followed by ἐ- is metrically equivalent to -οιο followed by a consonant and -ου is not always shortened before another vowel; this only avoided, but not in the second foot (i.e. that Hermann’s Bridge was observed, but Meyer’s Law not). The figures of the bipartite hexameter are found in M. MARRA, op. cit., (n. 9), quoted in M. CANTILENA [1995, p. 40-42] – non uidimus.

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

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

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


32. In the Iliad, the diphthong -ου appears 412 times in hiatus (i.e. before another vowel or diphthong) and is shortened in 275 instances (67%), which means that is not shortened in 33% of the cases; already D. MONRO (1891, p. 355-356) noted that the long vowel and long diphthongs were the least likely to be subject to shortening, followed by the diphthongs -ευ and -ου, whereas the diphthongs with -ι were shortened much more often than not. R. SJÖLUND (1938) did not distinguish between the -ι and -ο.
applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above; inversely, an augmented verb form preceded by the genitive ending -οι is not secure either; sometimes, both are transmitted, as is the case in *Iliad 6, 313 where both Ἀλεξάνδροι βεβήκα and Ἀλεξάνδρον ἐβεβήκα can be found in the manuscripts.

2. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the dative plural ending in -σι of the -a or -o stems is insecure, because PIE had an ending *-oīs as well (the old Indo-European instrumental plural); this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above; it is not certain anymore that the ending -oīs was the oldest, as was argued before. In the 2nd declension the ending -oīs can continue the old Indo-European instrumental plural *-oīs, so that a sequence -oīs followed by a consonant as in σολήσειν: ἕκτωρ δὲ καταγνήτοισι κέλευσε “[...] to rob [him of his armour]. Hektor ordered his brothers [...].” (*Iliad 15, 545) is metrically equivalent to καταγνήτοις ἐκέλευσε, and, as the 1st and 2nd declension influenced each other, a Proto-Greek dative plural *-oīs was created after the -o- stems, thus rendering -oīs followed by a consonant metrically insecure. In addition, Mycenaean also has dative plural endings in -o and -(α) (standing for -ois and -ais) and -o i and -a i (standing for -oīi and -aihi from earlier -oīsi and -aisi with the s having fallen out intervocalically and being restored only later).

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

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

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

36. E. Vilborg (1960, p. 57), P. Chantraine (1964, p. 40-41), O. Panagl (1976, p. 88-89), A. Bartoňek (2003, p. 167, 188), A. Bernabé & E. Lužán (2006, p. 147-148). C. Ruijgh (1958, p. 111-112; 1967, p. 76-79) interpreted both the endings -o and -a and -(α) and -ai as -ois and -ais, because in his opinion it would not have been logical that the intervocalic s had been restored in the 3rd declension, as in ti-ri-si “three” (dative plural), but not in the 2nd declension. A. Bartoňek (2003, p. 167) and A. Bernabé & E. Lužán (2006, p. 147) objected to this suggestion, by stating that no in other context the second element of a diphthong was written and that it therefore would be strange why it had happened in that specific inflectional form (although A. Bartoňek did not rule out C. Ruijgh’s interpretation altogether). Maybe Mycenaean was at a stage in which the intervocalic s in the dative plural of the 3rd declension had been restored already on the force of the datives in -ksi, -psi and -ssi whereas this had not yet happened in the -a- and -o- stems?
4. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the final short -α of adverbs, adjectives and nouns is insecure 38; this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above.

5. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the final -ο of adverbs, verbal endings and pronouns is insecure 39; this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above.

6. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the final -ε of adverbs, verbal endings, adjectives, nouns, pronouns is insecure 40; this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above; J. La Roche argued that the dual ending -ε was never elided 41, but this rule is not observed in all manuscripts; as such, we will have to discuss these instances on a case by case basis.

7. An unaugmented verb form preceded by the final -ι of certain adverbs is insecure 42; this only applies if either of the forms does not violate one of the rules mentioned above.

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

9. Similarly to the instance discussed above, are verb forms preceded by a short closed syllable: if the verb form has a syllabic augment that is followed by a single consonant, the augment is not secure: ὃν ἔθηκε and ὃν θῆκε are metrically equivalent, if ὃν does not stand under the ictus.

10. F. Spohn argued that in case of a caesura at 3b (the so-called trochaic caesura in the third foot), a dactyl is preferred in the second foot, especially if the first foot had been a dactyl as well 43. J. La Roche went even further and argued that the preferred metrical structure before a caesura at 3b was ‒ᴗ (a trochee) followed by ᴗ‒ᴗ (an amphibrachys) 44. We believe that “Spohn’s Bridge” (as we would coin this rule) is related to the preference of a dactyl in the second foot 45, and the avoid-

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


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

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

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

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

45. J. BARNES (1711, p. 93; but on page 420 he argued exactly the opposite), J. VOSS (1826, p. 8-9), J. LA ROCHE (1869, p. 100-109).
ance of two spondees in the first two feet of the hexameter. On the other hand, verses starting with two spondees are attested in 11 to 17 % of the verses, depending on the work or chant 46, so that we cannot speak of a real metrical inhibition or bridge. All instances will thus have to be discussed on a case by case basis. In *Iliad* 6, there are 11 % of double spondees.

4. Application of these rules to *Iliad* 6

The verb forms that are secure by the rules under § 2 are called “type A”. In *Iliad* 6, the secure forms have their guarantee because of the following factors mentioned above 47:

1. no unmetrical verses: ῥῆξε (6), φιλέεσκε (15), ἐξενάριξε (20, 30, 36), βῆ (21), τέκ (22), ἐνήρατο (32), ναίε (34), ἠλε (35), ἔλ. (38), φοβέοντο (41), ἐξεκυλίσθη (42), ἐλλίσσετο (45), φάτο (51), ἔτρεψεν (61), ἐξέσπασε (65), απίθησεν (102), ἐλελίχθησαν (106), ἔσταν (106), λάβεν (107), ἐλελίχθη (109), συνίτην (120), ἔνεσαν (121), σεῦε (133), δύσεθ' (136), ἔθελε (137), ἔθελον (138), ἦν (140), γένετ' (153), τέκεθ' (154), ῥῆξαν (157), ἀνέσχον (159), πεῖθ' (162), ἐβεβήκει (165), φάτο (166), λάβεν (166), ἄκουσε (166), ἐλέεσκε (167), πέμπε (168), ἡγεσία (170), βῆ (171), ἔξενασσε (174), ἔσταν (174), ἔργα (175), ἔργον (176), ἔκλεισε (179), φάτο (185), ἔφατε (187), ἔτρεβε (189), γνωσκε (191), κατέρυκε (192), δύκε (193), τόμος (194), ἔπλεθε (201), ἔπλεθε (205 – cf. infra), πέμπε (207), ἔγενο (210), φάτο (212), ἔξενα (217), κάλλους (223), ἐκέλευσε (223), ἀπέκλεισε (233), ἔξελε (234), ἔσαν (237, 242), ἔνεσαν (244), κοιμότα (246, 250), ἔσαν (248), ἡλύθε (251), φῦ (253), ὀνόμαζε (253), ἄνήκεν (256), ἡμειβέτ' (263), ἔτρεψε (282), κάλλους (287), ἔλεε (291), ἄνηγαγε (292), φῆνα (293), βῆ (296), ἔνεσαν (297), οὐδείς (298), ἔργα (303), ἤρα (304), ἔφατ' (311), ἔσαν (315), ἔξε (319), θέε (320), νείκεσσε (325), ἐβεβήκει (336), φάτο (342), ὀφελ' (345), τέκε (345), ὀφελλόν (350), θῆκε (357), ἡμειβέτ' (359), ἤκαν (370), ἔστη (371), ἔκλεισε (386), ἦ (390), ἀκούσε (392), ἔρθε (398), κίεν (399), καλέσσε (402), μείδησε (404), φῦ (406), ὀνομαζέ (406), πέρσα (415), ἔξενασσε (417), ἔφατε (419), ἔσαν (421), κῖον (422), βασίλευσε (425), ἔγαγε (426), ἐκέλευ (434), ἄνωθεν (444), μάθον (444), ἄριστε (460), ἐρέε (460), ἔλεε (472, 494), κύσε (474), ἔσσε (475), ἐλέε (484), ἔσαν (485), ἦκαν (497), ἔβηθε (503), σεῦε (505), ἐβεβήκε (513), φῦ (514), ὀρίζε (516), ἐκέλευ (519);

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

7. no short monosyllabic verb forms: ἔπτε (205), ἔνεσχον (301), ἦ (390), κατέδυ (504);

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

47. The text is quoted after H. Van Thiel (1991, 1996 and 2011), because his edition is more conservative than M. West (1998, 2000) – see for this problem also R. Führer & M. Schmidt (2001). For a complete apparatus, one has to consult A. Ludwich (1902) and M. West (1998; 2000) (especially in cases when different readings involving the augment are attested, H. Van Thiel did not mention all variants in the apparatus).
8. Hermann’s Bridge: γείνατο (24, 26), ὄσατο (62), ἐκεῖ (75), μήσατο (157), πιστώσαντο (233), ἔφατ’ (253, 406, 485), λάμπετο (319), τεκμήραντο (349), τέτμεν (374), πὴλέ (474), δέξατο (483);

9. no bipartite hexameter, “Varro’s Bridge”: ἑκόκλετο (66, 110), ἕδειδμεν (69), ἐκεῖτο (295), ἐνείκεσας (333), ἐρύετο (403), ἐπειρήσανθ’ (435);

10. no spondaic fifth foot: ἔθηκεν (8), ἔδοτην (19), ἔβητην (40), ἔστη (43), ἐπειθε (51), ἐμείνας (126), ἔριζεν (131) 48, ἀνώγει (240) 49, ἔπειθε (51), ἀνέσχον (301);

11. no monosyllabic verb forms (short and long) before the caesura: ἀπέβη (116), προσέφη (342), ἔκειτο (295), ἐνείκεσας (333), ἐρύετο (403), κατέδυ (504), προσέρχεσθαι (520);

12. no monosyllables in 6b: ἐστη (43), ἔκειτο (295), ἀνέσχον (301);

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

15. no elision before the caesura: πέρησε (10), μήγη (25), ἔγειρε (105), ἔλασσεν (158), λάβεν (166), σεβάςσατο (167), σεβάςσατο (192), γήθησεν (212), δίδου (219), σεβάσσατο (417), πὴλέ (474), δέξατο (483);


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

For the verb forms that are not secure (the ones as described in § 3) and/or for forms in which both augmented and unaugmented forms are transmitted, the method devised by W. S. Barrett and I. Taida will be used to determine if the (un)augmented form was the original. When only one form is transmitted, the starting point is the transmitted verb form, as we believe that that form should only be changed in extreme circumstances. When analysing cases in which both the augmented and the unaugmented verb forms were attested in Euripides, W. S. Barrett decided to look at the other instances of that specific verb in Euripides; he divided the attestations in three categories: metrically secure augmented forms, uncertain forms and metrically guaranteed unaugmented forms. Whichever of the guaranteed forms was more common, had to be adopted in the doubtful instances 50. I. Taida applied this method to the Homeric Hymns to Demeter and to Hermes (although not to all doubtful instances) 51. He expanded W. S. Barrett’s modus operandi and included as criterion the passage in which the form occurred.

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

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


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

a) the overall figures of metrically secure forms;

b) the position in the verse of the attested verb forms;

c) the type of passage in which the form is attested (a form with an augment in a gnome or simile is more likely to be correct);

d) the type of form: in case of doubt, a pluperfect, dual and iterative in -σκ- are more likely to have been unaugmented (cf. infra) \(^{53}\);

e) if the verb forms themselves do not allow for a conclusion, we will see if the preceding noun can shed any light on it (e.g. is this word more often attested in its elided or unelided form?);

f) if this is not possible, we look at the attestations in the entire epic corpus;

g) if this is still not possible, we look at other poetic genres;

h) if a decision is still not possible, the form is undecided.

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

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

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

1. Τρώων δ’ οἰώθη καὶ Ἀχαιῶν φύλοπις αἰνή (6, 1).

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

2. πολλά δ’ ἀρ’ ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθ’ ἴθυσε μάχη πεδίοιο (6, 2).

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

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

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

---

52. I. Taida (2007, p. 4-5; 2010, p. 251).
53. In this, we follow I. Taida (2007, p. 4-5; 2010, p. 251) as well.
no metrical support for the transmitted reading (but this does not mean that we want to insert the augment into the text).

4. τόν ρ’ ἔβαλε πρῶτος κόρυθος φάλον ἰπποδασείης (6, 9).
In this instance, the form ἔβαλε is insecure, because throughout the early epic Greek corpus, the augmented form ἔβαλε is only metricaly secure 11 times, whereas the unaugmented βάλε appears 140 times. As such, there is no metrical support for the transmitted form here.

5. ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ πῆξε, πέρησε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀστέον εἴσσο (6, 10).
In this instance, the augmented form would be expected if “Spohn’s Bridge” were valid, but the unaugmented πῆξε is attested throughout the early epic Greek corpus 8 times in a metricaly secure form, whereas the augmented counterpart is never attested; as such, the form πῆξε can be considered secured by internal evidence.

6. αἰχμὴ χαλκείη: τὸν δὲ σκότος ὄσσε (6, 11).
This instance is somewhat more complicated, because the unaugmented κάλυψεν is only attested 6 times, whereas the augmented ἐκάλυψεν is found 20 times; as such, one could state that there is no certainty about the transmitted form, but looking at ὄσσε can solve the problem: the unelided form ὄσσε is metrically secure 47 times throughout the early epic Greek corpus and 10 times in the 5th foot (as is the case here), but the elided ὄσσ’ is never metrically secure. It thus seems that ὄσσε is preferred here and, by consequence, also κάλυψεν is preferred.

7. Ἀξυλόν δ’ ἄρ’ ἐπεφνε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης (6, 12).
Here, both ἄρ’ ἐπεφνε and ἄρα πέφνε are possible. The augmented ἐπεφνε is attested 8 times throughout the early epic Greek corpus and the unaugmented πέφνε 5 times. Moreover, both forms violate Meyer’s first law: the augmented violates Meyer 1a and the unaugmented 1b. As Meyer 1a is violated more often than 1b (1a is violated 27 times in Iliad 6 and 1b only 13 times) and the augmented form is attested more frequently than the unaugmented one, ἐπεφνε has preference.

8. Τευθρανίδην, ὃς ἔναιεν ἐὑκτιμένη ἐν Ἀρίσβῃ (6, 13).
In this instance, the transmitted ἔναιεν would be preferred, if “Spohn’s Bridge” were valid, but the augmented ἔναιεν is only attested 8 times and the unaugmented ναῖεν 20 times. Most augmented forms are found at the end of the verse, whereas the unaugmented form is preferred at the beginning of the verse or after the bucolic caesura; there is only one instance in which a form is metrically secure in this position, namely the unaugmented ναῖαν in Odyssey 9, 222 where the verb form also appears at the beginning of the sentence. The transmitted form is nevertheless to be preferred, because otherwise we would have a spondee in the 2nd foot. Overall, a spondee is already less common than a dactyl in the second foot 54, but a spondee with the second half being long by position and not by a naturely long vowel or diphthong is even less common 55: out of the 529 verses in Iliad 6, we counted only 171 with a spondee in the second foot (which is only 32 %) and of those 171, only 54 have a second half foot that is long by position (which is again 32 %). This makes that about 10 % of the verses in this chant have a spondaic second foot with a

54. See already E. O’NEILL (1942, p. 159).
55. This had been noted already by A. MEILLET (1910, p. 41-42).
second half foot that is long by position. Therefore, the augmented form is preferred here.

9. ἀφνείος βιότοι, φίλος δ’ ἦν ἀνθρώποι (6, 14).

In this instance, the form under discussion is ἦν. At first sight, it seems metrically secure, but since L. Meyer and A. Nauck 56, scholars have argued that in most instances, the form is equivalent to the unaugmented ἔεν. Moreover, as ἦν is a contracted form of the augment and the vowel of the stem, it would violate Gerhard-Wernicke’s Law. When the form ἦεν is followed by a noun starting with a consonant, a substitution with (the unattested) ἔεν is equally possible. The scholars advocating the change argue that ἦν, ἔν and ἔεν would have been written EEN in the oldest alphabet, but using the pre-Euclidean alphabet as origin and justification for changing the Homeric text is in our opinion opening Pandora’s box. Moreover, the problem with the substitution of ἦν and ἔην by ἔεν is that the latter form is never attested (not even in instances where it would be metrically necessary) and therefore some caution is needed 57. In this instance, ἦν is not equivalent to ἔσκ’ (as ἦεν would be to ἔσκεν), because the latter form would require an elision before the caesura. It is also difficult to see how and why ἔσκ’ would have been replaced by ἦν. In short, we believe that the transmitted form can be defended here and will discuss the (alleged?) difference between ἦν, ἔν and ἔσκ- later on.

10. ἀλλά οἱ οὔ τις τῶν γε τότ’ ἐρκεσε λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον (6, 16).

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

11. πρόσθεν ὑπαντίσας, ἀλλ’ ἄμφω θυμὸν ἀπηύρα (6, 17).

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

12. ἔσκεν ὑφηνίοχος: τὼ δ’ ἄμφω γαῖαν ἐδύτην (6, 19).

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

13. Βουκολίων δ’ ἦν υἱὸς ἀγαυοῦ Λαομέδοντος (6, 23).

This issue was addressed in 6, 14.

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

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


15. Μηκιστηϊάδης καὶ ἀπ’ ὄμων τεύχε’ ἔσύλα (6, 28).
   The instance here is insecure, because throughout the early epic Greek corpus, the augmented form is metrically secure once as is the unaugmented form. The elided τεύχε’ is metrically secure 26 times in the fifth foot and the unelided τεύχεα 29 times. As such, no decision can be made.

16. Ἀστύαλον δ’ ἂρ’ ἔπεφνε μενεπτόλεμος Πολυποίτης (6, 29).
   This was addressed in 6, 12.

17. καὶ δὴ μιν τάχ’ ἔμελλε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆς Αχαιῶν (6, 52).
   In this instance, the augmented form is secure, because ἔμελλε is attested metrically secure in 21 instances (and 2 cases of ἦμελλε with long augment), whereas the unaugmented μέλλε is only found 5 times.

18. ἀντίος ἠλθε θέων, καὶ ὁμοκλήσας ἔπος ἡδὰ (6, 54).
   As ἠλθε is a syncopated form of ἠλωθε and ἔλωθε is never attested, the augment in ἠλθε can count as secure 58.

19. ἀντίος ἠλθε θέων, καὶ ὁμοκλήσας ἔπος ἡδὰ (6, 54).
   The form ἡδα is insecure, because we cannot distinguish metrically between ἡδα and αὐδα; given the fact that the verb twice has the unaugmented iterative ἤμελλε and twice the unaugmented dual προσαυδήτην, we are inclined to think that the augment in this form could very well have been original, especially since this is a speech introduction, but as we have no independent metrical evidence, we have to consider this form to be insecure.

20. οὔτα κατὰ λαπάρην: ὃ δ’ ἀνετράπετ’, Ἀτρείδης δὲ (6, 64).
   The form οὔτα is insecure, because we cannot say if the form is augmented or not.

21. οὔτα κατὰ λαπάρην: ὃ δ’ ἀνετράπετ’, Ἀτρείδης δὲ (6, 64).
   The form ἀνετράπετ’ is a compound and thus we look at the figures of the simplex; in this case, the simplex has 9 metrically secure 3rd person singular thematic middle aorist forms versus 2 unaugmented ones; as such, the augment in ἀνετράπετ’ can count as secure here.

22. ὣς εἰπὼν ὄτρυνε μένους καὶ θημίν ἐκάστου (6, 72).
   The metre does not allow us to decide if ὄτρυνε was augmented or not; the unaugmented iterative ὀτρῦνεσκον is attested and this seems to indicate that the verb conformed to the “normal” augment uses, but as we have no independent confirmation by the metre, the form has to count as insecure.

23. Ἴλιον εἰσανέβηςαν ἀναλκείσι δαμέντες (6, 74).
   The augment in the compound form εἰσανέβηςαν is secure, because the simplex has 5 augmented third plural aorist forms with a secure augment against 2 unaugmented forms.

24. ὣς ἔφατ’, Ἕκτωρ δ’ οὐ τι κασιγνήτῳ ἀπίθησεν (6, 102).
   In this case, one could have had ὥς φάτο, Ἕκτωρ with hiatus or with the consonantic effects of the initial h still operative, but given the fact that ὣς ἔφαθ’ or ὥς ἔφατ’ disagreed.

58. H. JACOBSON (1909) disagreed.
ἔφατ’ are more common than ὣς φάτο and that ὣς ἔφαθ’, οἱ is preferred over ὣς φάτο, τοι in spite of τοι still being used in the epic language, make us think that the transmitted ὣς ἔφαθ’, Ἕκτω can be considered secure here 59.

25. αὐτίκα δ’ ὣς ὄχεων σὺν τεύχεσιν ἄλτο χαμάζε (6, 103).
It is impossible to know if ἄλτο was augmented or not, because it is metrically equivalent to (the unattested) ἴλτο.

26. πάλλων δ’ ὄξεια δοῦρα κατὰ στρατόν ὄχετο πάντη (6, 104).
The form ὄχετο is metrically insecure, because the metrical value of the augmented and unaugmented form is the same.

27. Ἀργεῖοι δ’ ὑπεχώρησαν, λῆξαν δὲ φόνου (6, 107).
The augment of the compound form ὑπεχώρησαν is insecure, because the simplex has only 5 metrically insecure aorist forms and no secure augmented forms. As such, there is no metrical back up for the augment in this case.

28. ἀμφὶ ὑπὸ μν ἐφιρὰ τύπτε καὶ αὐχένα δέρμα κελαινὸν (6, 117).
The unaugmented form τύπτε is secure here, because throughout the early epic Greek corpus the verb has 11 metrically secure unaugmented forms and no metrically secure augmented forms.

29. ἄντυξ ἣ πυμάτη θέεν ἀσπίδος ὀμφαλέσσῃ (6, 118).
The unaugmented θέεν is secure, because the verb has 7 metrically secure unaugmented forms and no augmented ones 60.

30. τὸν πρότερος προσέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης (6, 122).
The augment in the compound form προσέειπε is secure, because the simplex has 102 secure augmented forms and only 33 unaugmented ones.

31. δὴν ῦν, ὡς ἃ θεοῖσιν ἐπουρανίοισιν ἔριζεν (6, 131).
This has been addressed before in 6, 14.

32. θύσθλα χαμὶ κατέχευαν ὑπ’ ἀνδρόφόνου Λυκούργου (6, 134).
The augment in the compound κατέχευαν is secure, because the simplex has 27 augmented form and 21 unaugmented ones.

33. δύσεθ’ ἁλὸς κατὰ κῦμα, Θέτις δ’ ὑπεδέξατο κόλπῳ (6, 136).
There is no independent metrical confirmation for the augment in the compound form ὑπεδέξατο, because the simplex has 11 augmented forms and 10 unaugmented ones in early epic Greek and 42 augmented forms and 39 unaugmented ones throughout the entire hexametric corpus. These figures are too close to allow for a final decision.

34. καὶ μιν τυφλὸν ἔθηκε Κρόνου πάϊς: οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἐπὶ δὴν (6, 139).
The augment in ἔθηκε would be an illustration of what F. Spohn and J. La Roche argued for and would also confirm the dispreference for a verse starting with a double spondee, but there is no independent metrical confirmation for the augment in this form, because the augmented form is less common than the unaugmented one

59. See also F. De Decker (forthcoming) on Homeric Hymn to Demeter, 39.
60. See also F. De Decker (2017, p. 109) on Iliad 1, 483.
(55 against 67) and the augmented one is largely preferred at the end of the verse; moreover, the only form that has been attested with metrical certainty in this position, is the unaugmented one.

35. ἦν, ἐπεὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀπήχθετο πάσι θεοῖσιν (6, 140).
   As was argued before, it is impossible to decide if verbs starting with a short vowel followed by two or more consonants had an augment or not. The same applies to verbs starting with a diphthong.

36. τὸν δ’ αὖθ’ Ἰππολόχου προσηψόνα φαΐδμος υἱός (6, 144).
   This was discussed in 6, 54.

37. ἔνθα δὲ Σίσσυφος ἔσκεν, ὃ κέρδιστο γένετ’ ἀνάρθρω (6, 153).
   This has been discussed before as well (6, 14). We have no reason to doubt the unaugmented nature of (as almost all iteratives are augmentless) and it would be difficult to explain why and how ἔσκεν would have replaced ἦεν.

38. αὐτὰρ Γλαῦκος ἐπεμήνατο ἀμύμονα Βελλεροφόντην (6, 155).
   This would be another illustration for F. Spohn and J. La Roche, and in this instance there is some metrical evidence in favour of the augmented form ἐπεμήνατο: there are 8 metrically secure augmented forms against 5 unaugmented ones.

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

40. ὅς ῥ’ ἐκ δήμου ἔλασσεν, ἐπεὶ πολύ φέρτερος ἦεν (6, 158).
   This has been discussed before (6, 14 and 6, 153).

41. τῷ δὲ γυνῇ Προῖτον ἐπεμήνατο δὶ’ Ἀντεία (6, 160).
   The augment in ἐπεμήνατο is insecure, because the form is only attested here and we therefore have no independent confirmation of the form.

42. ἢ δὲ γυνακόμην Προῖτον βασιλῆο προσηψόνα (6, 163).
   This has been discussed before (6, 54).

43. ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ Λυκίην ἠξε Ξάνθόν τε ῥέοντα (6, 172).
   This problem has been addressed before (6, 140).

44. προφρονέως μην τίνα ἰναξ Λυκίης εὐρείης (6, 173).
   The absence of the augment in τίνα can count as secure here, because the verb has 24 metrically secure unaugmented forms and only 4 augmented forms.

45. καὶ τότε μὲν ἐρέειν καὶ ἤτει σήμα ἴδεσθαι (6, 176).
   This problem has been addressed before (cf. 6, 140).

46. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σήμα κακὸν παρεδέξατο γαμβροῦ (6, 178).
   This has been addressed before (6, 136).
47. περφνέμεν: ἥ δ’ ἄρ’ ἐσθ  θείον γένος οὐδ’ ἀνθρώπων (6, 180).
This has been addressed before (6, 14).

48. καὶ τὴν μὲν κατέπεφνε θείον θεράσσι θύήσας (6, 183).
As was shown in 6, 12 the augmented forms of the simplex are more common than the unaugmented ones and therefore, the augment in the compound form counts as secure as well.

49. δεύτερον αὐτὸ Σολύμοις μαχέσσατο κυδαλίμοις (6, 184).
There is only one metrically secure attestation of the 3rd person unaugmented aorist singular form and no augmented form. This on itself would not be secure to determine the form, but the dative form Σολύμοις is the only one that is attested and is therefore secure here as well; if that form is secure, so is the unaugmented μαχέσσατο.

50. τὸ τρίτον αὐτὸ κατέπεφνε Αμαζόνας ἀντιανείρας (6, 186).
This has been addressed in 6, 183.

51. ἔσθε λόχον: τοὶ δ’ οὔ τι πάλιν οἶκόνδε (6, 189).
The form νέοντο is difficult to analyse: in early epic Greek, there are 2 metrically secure augmented forms and 2 metrically secure unaugmented forms; the rest of the paradigm has only 3 unaugmented forms, making it more likely that the unaugmented form might have been preferred here as well. More importantly, οἶκόνδε without elision is metrically secure 30 times, of which 22 in the fifth foot, whereas οἶκόνδ’ with elision is metrically secure 3 times and only once in the fifth foot. As such, οἶκόνδε has preference here and if οἶκόνδε has preference, so has the unaugmented form.

52. πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνεν ἀμύμων Βελλεροφόντης (6, 190).
This has been addressed in 6, 183.

53. ἡ δ’ ἔτεκ’ αντίθεον Σαρπηδόνα χαλκοκορυστή (6, 196).
In early epic Greek, there are 83 metrically secure unaugmented active aorist forms against only 7 augmented forms; as such, there is no metrical confirmation for the transmitted augment in this instance.

54. Λαοδαμείῃ μὲν παρελέξατο μητίετα Ζεύς (6, 198).
The simplex form has two metrically secure augmented and two unaugmented forms; in post-Homeric epic Greek, there is one metrically secure augment. There is therefore no metrical confirmation for the augment in παρελέξατο.

55. ἡ δ’ ἔτεκ’ ἀντίθεον Σαρπηδόνα χαλκοκορυστή (6, 199).
This has been discussed in 6, 196.

56. ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ καὶ κεῖνος ἀπήχθετο πᾶσι θεοίς (6, 200).
This has been discussed before (6, 140).

57. μαρνάμενον Σολύμοις κατέκτανε κυδαλίμοις (6, 204).
The augment in κατέκτανε can be considered secure, because the simplex has 19 metrically secure augmented forms against 9 unaugmented forms.
58. Ἰππόλοχος δὲ μ’ ἔτικτε, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ φήμι γενέσθαι (6, 206).
In this instance, both μ’ ἔτικτε and με τίκτε would have been possible, but the augmented form has preference as was argued in 6, 155; moreover, μ’ ἔτικτε would violate Meyer 1a whereas με τίκτε conflicts with Meyer 1b; as 1a is violated more often than 1b, this is an additional reason to consider the augment secure here.

59. πέμπε δὲ μ’ ἔς Τροήν, καὶ μοι μάλα πόλλ. ἐπέτελλεν (6, 207).
The augment in the compound form ἐπέτελλεν is secure, because the simplex has 5 metrically secure augmented forms and no unaugmented ones.

60. ἤγχος μὲν κατέπηξεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ (6, 213).
The augment in the compound κατέπηξεν cannot be confirmed, because the simplex has 8 unaugmented forms and no augmented forms (as was argued in 6, 10).

61. αὐτὰρ δ’ μειλιχίοισι προσήύδα ποιμένα λαῶν (6, 214).
This was discussed in 6, 54.

62. οἰ δ’ καὶ ἀλλάζοισι πόρον ξεινῆια καλά (6, 218).
The absence of the augment in πόρον can count as secure, because there are 38 unaugmented forms versus 2 augmented forms.

63. καὶ μῖν ἔγω κατελειπον ἵππον ἐν δώμασ’ ἐμοῖσι (6, 221).
The augment in this compound form is insecure, because the simplex has 10 augmented forms and 11 unaugmented ones.

64. πάσας ἑξείης: πολλαὶ δὲ κήδε’ ἐφῆπτο (6, 241).
This problem has been addressed before (6, 140).

65. ὃς ἔφαθ’, ἣ δὲ μολοῦσα ποτὶ μέγαρ’ ἀμφιπόλοισι (2, 286).
This instance has been addressed before (6, 102).

66. αὐτὴ δ’ ἐς θάλαμον κατεβήσετο κηώεντα (6, 288).
The augment in this compound form is secure, because the augmented simplex ἐβήσετο is attested 8 times and the unaugmented one βήσετο 5 times.

67. ὃς κάλλιστος ἔην ποικίλμασιν ἠδὲ μέγιστος (6, 294).
This has been addressed before.

68. ἀστήρ δ’ ὃς ἀπέλαμπε: ἔκειτο δ’ νείατος ἄλλων (6, 295).
The reason why the augment in this form can be considered secure, is that the passage is a simile and in the Homeric similia, the augment is preferred (cf. infra).

69. βῆ δ’ ίέναι, πολλαὶ δὲ μετεσσεύοντο γεραιαί (6, 296).
The augment in this compound verb is secure, because the simplex has 8 augmented forms and no unaugmented ones.

70. τὴν γὰρ Τρῶες ἔθηκαν Αθηναίης ἱέρειαν (6, 300).
This has been discussed before (6, 139).

71. ὃς ἔστατ’ εὐχομένη, ἀνένειε δ’ Παλλᾶς Αθήνη (6, 311).
The augment in this compound form cannot be confirmed, because the simplex verb form has 5 metrically secure augments, but 14 unaugmented forms.
The problem of verbs starting with a diphthong has been discussed before (6, 140). In his Homer edition, West argued that all past tense forms of the verb starting with the diphthong εὐ- or εὑ- had to be changed into ηὐ- or ηὑ-, because the augment had been removed during the transmission. As the verb starting with a short diphthong did not receive a long diphthong augment anymore as of the Koine period, the long diphthongs were no longer written in the manuscripts either. In doing so, M. West argued that he followed A. Fick. This is only partly true, as A. Fick reintroduced the long diphthongs into the texts, not because he believed that they were removed, but because he believed that the poet used the augment whenever he could: as the augment was already firmly established in the prose writings of the poet’s age, it necessarily meant that poet knew the augment and used it accordingly, and only left it out when the metre forced him to do so. This is only partly true, as A. Fick reintroduced the long diphthongs into the texts, not because he believed that they were removed, but because he believed that the poet used the augment whenever he could: as the augment was already firmly established in the prose writings of the poet’s age, it necessarily meant that poet knew the augment and used it accordingly, and only left it out when the metre forced him to do so.

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

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

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

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

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

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


63. A. Fick (1883, p. 34).
80. τὸν δ’ αὐτὲ προσέειπεν Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής (6, 332).
This has been discussed in 6, 122.

81. ἥμην ἐν θαλάμῳ, ἔθελον δ’ ἄχει προτραπέσθαι (6, 336).
What was said about ἥστο, applies to ἥμην as well.

82. ὰρμησ’ ἐς πόλεμον: δοκεί δὲ μοι ὤδε καὶ αὐτῷ (6, 338).
This has been addressed before (6, 140).

83. ἐνθά με κύμ’ ἀπόερσε πάρος τάδε ἐργά γενέσθαι (6, 348).
The verse under discussion is the only instance in which the verb form is attested; it is therefore impossible to determine if the absence of the augment is secure or not.

84. οὐδ’ εὗρ’ Ἀνδρομάχην λευκόλενον ἐν μεγάροις (6, 371).
This has been discussed in 6, 312.

85. πύργῳ ἐγείθηκε γοῦσά τε μυρομένη τε (6, 373).
This has been discussed in 6, 140.

87. Σκαιάς, τῇ ἄρ’ ἔμελλε διεξίμεναι πεδίονδε (6, 393).
This was addressed before (6, 52).

88. ἐν τὸν ἄλοχον πολύδωρον ἐναντίη ἥλθε θέουσα (6, 394).
This was addressed before (6, 54).

89. Ἠετίων ὃς ἐναιεν ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὑληέσσῃ (6, 396).
This has been addressed in 6, 13.

90. ἤ οἱ ἐπείτ’ ἤντησ’, ἅμα δ’ ἀμφίπολος κίεν αὐτῇ (6, 399).
This problem has been addressed in 6, 140.

91. Ἀνδρομάχη δὲ οἱ ἐγείθ παρίστατο δάκρυ χεύσα (6, 405).
This problem has been addressed in 6, 140.

92. ἤτοι γὰρ πατέρ’ ἄμον ἄπεκταν δίος Ἀχιλλεύς (6, 414).
This has been addressed in 6, 204.

93. Θῆβην ὑψίπυλον: κατὰ δ’ ἐκτανεν Ἡτίωνα (6, 416).
As was stated in 6, 204, there are 19 verb forms with a metrically secure augment against 9 metrically secure unaugmented forms; this makes the presence of the augment in this instance more likely.
94. ἀλλ' ἄρα μὲν κατέκης εἰς ἓν τετεσ δαιδαλέοισιν (6, 418).
The transmitted augment in this compound form cannot be confirmed, because the simplex verb form has only one metrically secure form, and it is an unaugmented one.

95. ἥδ' ἐπὶ σῆμι ἔσεν: περὶ δὲ πτελέας ἐφύτευσαν (6, 419).
This has been addressed before (6, 134).

96. πάντας γὰρ κατέπεφνε ποδάρκης δῖος Αχιλλεύς (6, 423).
This has been addressed before (6, 183).

97. ὃς δ' γε τὴν ἀπέλυσε λαβὼν ἀπερείσι' ἀποινα (6, 427).
This has also been addressed before (6, 27).

98. πατρὸς δ' ἐν μεγάροις βάλ' Ἀρτεμις ισχέαιρα (6, 428).
As was argued in 6, 9, the unaugmented form is attested much more often and can therefore count secure here as well.

99. τὴν δ' αὖτε προσέπειε μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἐκτωρ (6, 440).
This has been addressed before (6, 122).

100. Τρῖων ἱπποδάμων ὅτε Ἄιδων ἀμφεμάχον (6, 461).
The augment in this compound form can be considered secure, because the simplex has 12 secure augment forms and only one unaugmented form.

101. ἐκ δ' ἐγέλασε πατήρ τε φίλος καὶ πότνια μήτηρ (6, 471).
The augmented form is less attested in early epic Greek than the unaugmented one (5 against 9). In the entire hexametric corpus, the augmented form is slightly more common than the unaugmented one (31 against 28), but is attested in certain metrical positions. There is a decided preference for the form to start in 2b, but this is the only instance in which the form appears in 1b. As ἐκ δ' ἐγέλασσε is the “tmesis-variant” of ἐξεγέλασσεν (which always has a secure augment), we hesitatingly consider the augment here to be secure as well.

102. καὶ τὴν μὲν κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ παμφανόωσαν (6, 473).
As was argued in 6, 139, nothing can be said about the simplex and, consequently, this applies to the compound as well.

103. χειρί τε μὲν κατέρεξεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (6, 485).
There are 6 metrically secure augmented simplex verb forms and no unaugmented forms, so the augment in κατέρεξεν is secure.

104. ἵππουριν: ἄλοχος δὲ φίλη οἰκονομείζε (6, 495).
As was argued in 6, 189, οἰκονομείζε has preference in the fifth foot; as such, also the unaugmented beβήκει has preference here.

105. Ἐκτορὸς ἀνδροφόνῳ, κιχήσατο δ' ἐνδοθί πολλάς (6, 498).
The absence of the augment in κιχήσατο can be considered secure, because the verb form is attested 7 times with a metrically guaranteed absence of the augment and is never attested with an augment. Moreover, the verb form is followed by a 2nd

---

64. See F. De Decker (2017, p. 81-82) on Iliad 1, 40.
65. See F. De Decker (2017, p. 95-96) on Iliad 1, 267.
position clitic and in those instances, the augment is mostly absent (cf. infra). κιχήσατο is a tetrasyllabic verb form and they tend to be unaugmented much more often as well (cf. infra).

106. ἄμφιπόλους, τῆςν δὲ γόον πάσησιν ἐνόρσε (6, 499).

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

107. οὐ γάρ μιν ἔτ’ ἔφαντο ὑπότροπον ἐκ πολέμου (6, 501).

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

108. Ἕκτορα δῖον ἔτετμεν ἄδελφον εὖτ’ ἄρ’ ἔμελλε (6, 515).

The verb form itself does not allow for a decision: there are three metrically secure augmented forms attested and all of them appear at verse end, and there are four metrically secure unaugmented forms, of which two appear at the beginning of the verse and two after the bucolic caesura. The formula Ἕκτορα δῖον, on the other hand, is attested 6 times within the verse and always has the form ‒ᵣᵣ ‒ᵣᵣ ‒ᵣᵣ –, which makes it likely that it had that metrical form here as well; if that is the case, the augmented form is secure (the formula also appears 19 times at the end of the verse, but there no conclusion is possible on the final syllable).

109. Ἕκτορα δῖον ἔτετμεν ἄδελφον εὖτ’ ἄρ’ ἔμελλε (6, 515).

This has been discussed in 6, 52.

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

This has been addressed before (6, 122).

111. δηθύνων, οὐδ’ ἔλθον ἑναίσιμον ὡς ἐκέλευε (6, 519).

This form has been discussed in 6, 54.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augmented forms</th>
<th>Unaugmented forms</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A refers to forms that are “metrically secure”, B to “forms that are guaranteed by internal reconstruction and comparison”, and C to “forms that are metrically insecure and impossible to determine”. There are 45 forms of the type C.

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

1. The augment is always used or absent, when the opposite would render the form unmétrical, but this does not mean that the augment is only metrically motivated. This does not mean that the use is facultative and that augment use and absence are solely metrically motivated, as is often argued 66. It is true that certain forms can only be used with or without augment, but that does not mean that the poet used them only out of métrical grounds. For several forms, synonyms or other forms in the paradigm existed. The *Paradebeispiel* is the form ὀνόμηνε “s/he called out”: the past tense forms of ὀνομαίνω can only be used without augment and thus seemed without evidentiary value in the discussion on use and absence of the augment, but there is the synonymous form ὀνομάζει, which can build forms with an augment (such as the attested ὀνόμασας “you called/named” in *Odyssey* 24, 339 besides the unaugmented synonym ὀνόμηνας “you called/named” in *Odyssey* 24, 341) and without an augment (such as ὀνόμαζε “s/he called”, used mostly in speech introductions) 67.


67. For these forms, see K. AMEIS & C. HENTZE (1895, p. 167), P. CHANTRAINE (1953, p. 483) and J. RUSSO, M. FERNÁNDEZ GALLIANO & A. HEUBECK (1992, p. 399), all of them noted that the augmented ὀνόμασας was only found in this passage, but none of them discussed the use and absence of the augment in these synonyms. See F. DE DECKER (2016, p. 37-38, 2017, p. 124-125) for more examples and a more detailed analysis.
2. It has been argued that the aorist had more augmented forms than the imperfect. The figures quoted above indicate that in *Iliad* 6 this statement is true for our corpus of A and for the A+B forms.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aorist type</th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigmatic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduplicated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-aorist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive -θη-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive -η-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

4. Pluperfects tend to be much more unaugmented, because in most cases, a pluperfect form described the result of a completed action in a more remote past, and therefore the absence of the augment is more or less “expected” (cf. *supra*). *Iliad* 6 is an exception in that respect: we have 2

---

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


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


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

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

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

73. The unaugmented instance are ἐδείδιμεν (99), ἠνώγει (170) and ἐβεβήκει (513). The unaugmented instances are ἀνώγει (240) and ἠνώγει (444) – both A forms, and ἐβεβήκει (313, 495) – both B forms. We interpret ἠνώγει, ἰνώγει and ἐνώγει as pluperfects of ἴνωγα and ἐνώγα as a thematic pluperfect. The oldest pluperfects had the same endings as the perfect and distinguished themselves from the perfect only by the augment, as is confirmed by Vedic (G. MEKLER [1887, p. 46 and 49-57], B. DELBRÜCK [1897, p. 226], K. BRUGMANN [1900, p. 378-379; 1904, p. 547-548, 1916; p. 493-496], P. THEME [1929], E. SCHWYZER [1939, p. 767, 777], H. RIX [1976, p. 257], Y. DUHOUX [1992, p. 436]). For an analysis of the Vedic pluperfect, see P. THEME (1929) and M. KÜMMEL (2000). There is no agreement on the existence of an Indo-European pluperfect, but most scholars it already existed in PIE, see K. BRUGMANN (1904, p. 484), O. SZEMERÉNYI (1990, p. 323), M. KÜMMEL (2000, p. 82-86) and B. FORTSON (2010, p. 81). For another opinion, see J. WACKERNAGEL (1920, p. 185) and J. KATZ (2007, p. 14). These thematic pluperfect forms therefore belong to the oldest layers of the epic language (G. MEKLER [1887], E. SCHWYZER [1939, p. 777]). In a later stage, the pluperfects in ε replaced the older thematic forms in ἐ whenever metrically possible: G. MEKLER (1887, p. 63-64 and 73) pointed out that 127 of the 190 attested pluperfects are found at the end of the verse, where they could cover an older thematic perfect form. See also N. BERG (1977, p. 228 with reference to Mekler), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 777), M. PETERS (1997, p. 212), M. BECKWITH (2004, p. 77-80), J. KATZ (2007, p. 9-10).


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

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

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

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

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

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

1. A verb form remains generally unaugmented, when it is followed by a 2nd position clitic or postpositive. This was first noted by J. Drewitt and expanded to all “Wackernagel-clitics” by W. Beck; we therefore call this rule “Drewitt-Beck”. The reason for the absence of the augment is that in a sequence γνῶ δὲ … the verb is the first accented word of the sentence or colon, and the particle is thus linked to it; if the form were augmented, i.e. ἔγνω δὲ …, we would have a sequence *(h₁)έ-ģnḥ₁-de* in which the enclitic verb form would precede the enclitic particle, but this is violation of the clitic chain rules: in a sequence of enclitic or postpositive words, the connective particles come first, then the other particles, then the pronouns and

---

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

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

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


the verb forms are only put at the end of the chain \(^{82}\) (even if one does not assume that the verb in PIE was enclitic, the sequence augmented verb form followed by clitic would still violate Wackernagel’s Law, because in that case, the Wackernagel clitic would only appear in the 3\(^{rd}\) position). This applies to \(Iliad\) 6 as well: there are 19 verb forms with reference to past that are followed by a clitic and 17 of them are unaugmented \(^{83}\); of the 2 augmented verb forms, both are of type A \(^{84}\). We give one example (the verb is put in bold face and the clitic is underlined):

\[
\text{βῆ} \text{ δὲ μετ’ Αἴσηπον καὶ Πήδασον, οὖς ποτε νύμφη [...] (Iliad 6, 21.)}
\]

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

2. Kiparsky argued that in PIE in a sequence of marked forms only the first one was marked and the others appeared in the neutral form \(^{85}\): in a sequence of past tense forms only the first one was put in the indicative (with augment in Indo-Iranian and Greek) and the others following it in the in- junctive, as this form was both tenseless and moodless. In epic Greek, an unaugmented verb form often appears when it is coordinated with a preceding augmented verb form by the connecting particles καί, ἰδέ, τε, ἅμα τε, τε καί, and δέ. We give one example (the augmented verb form is underlined, whereas the unaugmented or “reduced” form is put in bold face):

\[
\text{ός ἄρα φωνήσας κόρυθ’ εἵλετο φαιδίμος Ἐκτωρ}\\
\text{ἰππουριν: ἀλοχός δὲ φίλη οἶκόνδε βεβήκει. (Iliad 6, 494-495.)}
\]

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

P. Kiparsky himself argued that the rule was absolute, but that many ex-


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

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

ruled out that the injunctive could be used to mention events, as K. Hoffmann had argued 86, because such a “memorative” was typologically rare, if not non-existent 87. S. Levin, who agreed with P. Kiparsky, noted that in many instances either the reduction did not occur or the augmented form was preceded by an unaugmented one; in addition, there were several passages in which only unaugmented forms were found 88. In his analysis of the Vedic injunctive, R. Lazzeroni observed that the reduction often did not occur and that there were passages with only augmented indicatives, only injunctives or injunctives preceding the indicative 89. He concluded from that augmented indicative and injunctive were simple and mutually interchangeable variants 90. A similar argument can be found in H. Pelliccia’s study of Greek epic: he argued that the earliest Greek epic did not have speeches, that the injunctive was a valid category referring to timeless (Hymnal) events and that the reduction was still a valid rule; then the rule was no longer understood and the poet(s) felt that the augmented and unaugmented forms could be used without distinction. In a later stage—in which the augment had become more common—speeches were added; as a consequence, more augmented forms were introduced into the poems. As formulae could now appear with an augment in a speech and without it in narrative passages, the forms with and without an augment were even more considered to be equivalent, leading to a complete loss of the original distinction 91. The question can only be answered by looking at the data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaugmented forms following an augmented form (“examples”)</th>
<th>Augmented forms following an augmented form (“exceptions”)</th>
<th>Unaugmented forms preceding an augmented form (“reverse reductions”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This yields the following percentages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentages of rule observation</th>
<th>Percentages of rule observation, including the reverse reductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 70 %</td>
<td>A+B 58 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 56 %</td>
<td>A+B 48 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86. K. Hoffmann (1967) used the term Memorativ; for his theory, cf. infra.
87. P. Kiparsky (2005, § 1): There seem to be no languages with a mood whose function is "mentioning" or "reminding".
That the reduction was a strict rule in epic Greek, is clearly contradicted by the facts, as the rule only “operated” in less than 60% of the cases (and even in less than 50% if one counts the unaugmented forms preceding an augmented verb form as exceptions as well) and a vast majority of them have augments that cannot easily be removed (even if one wanted to go that far to make the rule work). We believe that the reduction was a tendency to avoid too many augmented forms in one single passage and not a strict rule governing an entire chant or work. If the rule were strict, we would expect the chants or books of the Greek and Indic epics to start with an augmented form and to have almost no other augmented forms anymore. This is clearly not the case. Moreover, we also think that there were semantic elements that could “overrule” the reduction (an example will be discussed later on). An example of a passage where not too many augmented forms were allowed, is the battle description in *Iliad* 6, 1-44 where we have 9 augmented forms and 19 unaugmented forms (of which 1 precedes the first augmented verb form).

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

\[ χεῖρας τ' ἀλλήλων λαβέτην καὶ πιστώσαντο. (Iliad 6, 233.) \]

They took each other’s hand and swore friendship.

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

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

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

---

92. As was noted by P. Kiparsky (1968) and S. Luraghi (2014).
servations from previous scholars and check to what extent the data from *Iliad* 6 confirm this.

1. The augment is used, when actions in a recent past are described or when a past action still has relevance for the present 94. This explains why the augment is used in sentences with the adverb νῦν, as this refers to an action in the immediate past 95. In *Iliad* 6, there are no instances of a past tense form with νῦν, but there are instances of past actions still being present at the moment of speaking. One example is (the augmented form is underlined):

\[ \text{Ἀστυάνακτ': ὁὶος γὰρ ἐρύετο Ἴλιον Ἕκτω. (Iliad 6, 403.)} \]

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

In this passage, Homer described why Hektor’s son was called “Astyanax” (“city-ruler”), namely because Hektor was still keeping Troy safe and warding off the attacks of the Greek army. As this describes a past action that continues until the present day and is still valid, the augment is used 96.

2. When actions in a remote or mythical past are described, the augment is absent 97. *Iliad* 6 contains two remote passages, namely the speeches by Glaukos (154-211) and Diomedes (215-231), in which they described their genealogies and common remote past as guest friends, and these passages have very few augmented forms.

3. Another important distinction is that between speeches and narrative descriptions. The latter has much less augmented forms than the former 98. There are two explanations for this: the first one argues that the speeches belong to the younger linguistic stratum and therefore have much more augmented forms 99, the other argues that speeches involve more interaction between speaker and audience and make more reference to recent events, whereas

---

94. A. Platt (1891) used the term “perfect aorist” to describe these forms. See also J. Drewitt (1912a; 1912b; 1913), E. Bakker (1999a; 2002; 2005).
96. That is why we added “still” to the translation.
97. For Homer, see already A. Platt (1891) and J. Drewitt (1912a, 1912b). K. Hoffmann (1967, p. 160-213) noted the use of the injunctive in contexts that he described as *fernere nicht historische Vergangenheit*. See also K. Strunk (1968) and W. Euler (1995).
99. This theory was taken the furthest by H. Pellecchia (1985), cf. supra, p. 287 and footnote 91.
narrative descriptions are by definition more remote and less linked to the present \textsuperscript{100}. The speeches in \textit{Iliad} 6 can be divided into two categories, with or without the speeches by Glaukos and Diomedes \textsuperscript{101}; the narratives can be divided into narrative with those speeches or narrative without, and also narrative with or without speech introductions and conclusions. As speech introductions and conclusions are actually the transition between speeches and narrative and vice versa, they are a category on their own and will be discussed separately \textsuperscript{102}. The figures are \textsuperscript{103}:

\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Augmented & Unaugmented & Percentage of \\
\hline
\textbf{Speeches} & & & & & & \\
With the speeches of Glaukos and Diomedes & 24 & 37 & 52 & 58 & 32 \% & 39 \% \\
Without these speeches & 13 & 19 & 23 & 24 & 36 \% & 44 \% \\
\hline
\textbf{Narrative} & & & & & & \\
Without these speeches & 32 & 55 & 65 & 72 & 33 \% & 43 \% \\
With these speeches & 41 & 69 & 90 & 102 & 31 \% & 40 \% \\
\hline
\textbf{Overall figures in Iliad 6} & 67 & 112 & 122 & 136 & 35 \% & 45 \% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

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

\begin{center}
\textbf{We give one example from the speech of Glaukos (the augmented forms are put in bold face):}
\end{center}

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{104} The reason why the overall percentages are higher than both speeches and narratives, is that the overall figures also contain the speech introductions and conclusions.
So she spoke; anger took hold of the king, when he heard [that story]. In this passage, Glaukos related how king Proitos became angry after he had heard the (lying) tale by his wife Anteia, who claimed that Bellerophon had tried to rape her. As this is a remote and genealogical story (almost mythical) and thus belongs to the distant past, no augments are used.

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

ἐνθά οἱ ἠπιόδωρος ἐναντίη ἠλύθε μήτηρ. (Iliad 6, 251.)

There, his [sc. Hektor’s] mother, carrying many gifts, came to meet him. This verse described how Hekabe came to meet Hektor hoping to convince him not to go and face Akhilleus in battle.

αὐτίκ’ ἀπὸ κρατὸς κόρυθ’ ἔλετο φαιδίμος Ἕκτωρ (Iliad 6, 472).

Immediately, shining Hektor took the helmet from his head. In this passage, Homer described how Astyanax became scared by seeing Hektor’s flashing helmet, how he and Andromakhe starting laughing and how he then eventually took off the helmet.

5. When a repeated or habitual action in the past is described, the augment is often absent. As a repeated action usually does not communicate something new, the absence of the augment is expected (cf. the previous point). This is especially clear in the verb forms combined with αἰέν / αἰεί “always”. This adverb indicates a repetition of the verbal action and of the 49 metrically secure past tense forms that are attested with this adverb in epic Greek, 40 are unaugmented. There are no examples of αἰέν / αἰεί in
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Iliad 6, but there are descriptions of habitual actions, as in the following
description of Priam’s house (hold) in 6, 242-250 (we take one sentence
from the passage which has 4 unaugmented verbs):

κοιμῶντο Πριάμοι παρὰ μνηστῇς ἀλόχοισι. (Iliad 6, 246.)

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

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

6. A special case of the augment absence in past tense forms that de-
scribe a repeated action, are the iteratives in -sk-: with one exception 107, all
these forms are unaugmented 108. This absence is mostly explained from a
semantic point of view (besides the morphological argument that was men-
tioned before): they describe repeated actions in the past or a single action
that was repeated by several characters and mostly appear in narrative parts;
as such, they usually do not refer to single and unexpected events (contexts
in which the augment was used more often) 109. These verb forms are often
combined by an optative of the repeated action in the past 110, or with αἰεί 111.
Sometimes, the subject is an indefinite character. There are 3 iterat-
ives in Iliad 6 and all of them are unaugmented 112. One of the best ex-
amples is the following sentence:

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

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

108. P. Buttmann (1830, p. 382), C. Grashof (1852, p. 14), D. Monro (1884,
J. Drewitt (1912a, p. 44), C. Mohrmann (1933, p. 90), P. Chantraine (1948,
(1858, p. 10) pointed out that this has been observed already by the Etymologicum
Magnum.

2016, p. 101-102; 2017, p. 139-140).
110. F. Pagniello (2007),
112. The instances are φιλέεσκεν (15), καλέεσκε (402) and ἀριστεύεσκε (460).
"Ἡκτορὸς ἥδε γυνὴ ὃς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι. (Iliad 6, 460.)

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

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

Besides those three iteratives, there are also two instances of ἔσκεν 113. It is argued that they have iterative value as well, contrary to the other past tense forms of εἰμί 114. This is only partly true: ἔσκεν often has iterative value and can in most instances be translated by “used to be”, but there are passages in which the difference between ἔσκεν and ἦν / ἦν / ἐς / ἐν is hardly noticeable:

'Αξυλόν δ’ ἄρ’ ἔπεφνε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης
Τευθρανίδην, ὃς ἐναιεν ἐὐκτιμένῃ ἐν Αρίσβῃ
ἀφνειὸς βιότοιο, φίλος δ’ ἦν ἀνθρώποισι
πάντας γὰρ φιλέσκεν ὅδῳ ἔπι οἰκία ναίοιν.

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

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

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

113. The instances are 19 and 153.
(re)occur at any time in the present. There are no gnomic aorists in *Iliad* 6, but there is one example with a gnomic or a statement of general validity:

\[ \text{τῷ δὲ θεοὶ κάλλός τε καὶ ἠνορέην ἐρατεινὴν ὤπασαν: αὐτάρ οἱ Προῖτος κακὰ μήσατο θυμῷ. (Iliad 6, 156-157.)} \]

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

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

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

---

115. L. Döderlein was the first to use this term: *Da nun dieser Aorist in allgemeinen Sätzen und Denksprüchen seinen eigentlichen Platz findet, so dürfte er in den Grammatiken zweckmässig der gnomische Aorist genannt werden* (L. Döderlein [1847], p. 316, emphasis taken from the original text). The literature on the gnomic aorist is large, some examples (the list is obviously not exhaustive): E. Moller (1853 and 1854), F. Franke (1854), B. Van Groningen (1948), A. Salomon (1960), A. Peristerakis (1962), C. J. Ruijgh (1971, one of the most detailed treatments), A. Faulkner (2005). That the gnomic aorist was almost always augmented in Homer, had been noticed very early on: A. Platt (1891), G. Herbig (1896, p. 250-270), B. Delbrück (1897, p. 302), J. Wackernagel (1904, p. 5; 1920, p. 181), K. Brugmann (1916, p. 11, who noted that there was no explanation for this fact), J. Drewitt (1912a; 1912b and 1913), H. Hirt (1928, p. 171-173). It has been accepted since. See most recently F. Pagniello (2002, p. 74-84), E. Bakker (2005, p. 131-135), A. Faulkner (2005, p. 68-69) and Bertrand (2006b, p. 241).

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

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


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

> ὡς υἱὸς Πριάμου Πάρις κατὰ Περγάμου τεύχεσι παμφαίνων ὅς τ’ ἠλέκτωρ ἐβεβήκει. (*Iliad* 6, 512-513.)

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

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

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

---

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

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


121. For Vedic, see J. Avery (1880, p. 330), B. Delbrück (1888, p. 354-355: *so habe ich mich doch überzeugt, dass der Injunctiv nicht selten (die Stellen s. bei Avery) in dem Sinne des Indicativ Praesentis gebraucht wird, doch so, dass die Beziehung auf die Gegenwart des Sprechenden nicht hervortritt, vielmehr nur in dem Sinne, dass eine Verbalaussage ausgedrückt werden soll, welche sich weder auf die Zukunft, noch auf die Vergangenheit bezieht. – emphasis is ours*), L. Renou (1928, p. 71-73), J. Gonda (1956, p. 33-46), K. Hoffmann (1967, *passim*, but especially p. 119), K. Strunk (1968, p. 290–294), R. Lazzeroni (1977), M. West (1989), W. Euler (1995), P. Mumm (1995); an analysis of the Iranian augment and injunctive use is missing. The situation in Iranian is further complicated by the fact that Avestan has very little augments, whereas Old-Persian almost never omits it. For Avestan, see A. Williams Jackson (1892, p. 136: “in Av. the augment is comparably rare, the instances of its omission far exceed in proportion those of the Vedic Sanskrit”; and on page 177), H. Reichelt (1909, p. 93-94), J. Kelens (1984, p. 245-249), R. Beekes (1988, p. 150) and F. Martínez González & M. De Vaan (2001, p. 84-85); for Old-Persian, see F. Martínez González & M. De Vaan (2001, p. 84: *el aumento se encuentra empleado sistemáticamente en griego clásico, en antiguo indio y en perso antiguo*), K. Hoffmann & B. Forssman (2004, p. 181-182). For Old-Persian and Avestan, see already A. Meillet (1915, p. 115: *Précédées de l’augment, ces formes expriment le passé; en ce sens, l’emploi de l’augment est constant en perse, par opposition à l’Avesta où l’augment n’est à peu près pas employé et au Védā où il est facultatif*). This difference is difficult to explain, but might – in our opinion – be due to the different nature of the texts: whereas the Old-Persian texts are mostly inscriptions referring to acts in a somewhat recent past, the Avestan texts are mainly mythical stories. As such, the difference in augment use would fit the distinction recent versus remote past, as in Homer; an in-depth study needs to shed light on this problem.
10. Speech introductions mark the transition from narrative to speeches and deserve special attention by the audience, as the audience is almost “drawn into the dialogue” \(^{122}\); the poet highlights them by using a augmented verb form much more often than not \(^{123}\). The data from *Iliad* 6 confirm this: there are 27 introductions, of which 5 are undefinable \(^{124}\), 16 augmented (12 of type A) \(^{125}\) and 6 unaugmented (all type A) \(^{126}\). We give one example:

\[
\text{Νέστωρ δ’ Ἀργείοισιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν ἀΰσας. (Iliad 6, 66.)}
\]

Nestor shouted out loudly and called out to the Argives.

In three instances, the unaugmented speech introduction has a syntactic explanation: in the introduction ἔπος τ’ ἔφατ’ ἔκ τ’ ὀνόμαζε \(^{127}\), the first *verbum dicendi* is augmented, but the second is not because of the above mentioned reduction rule.

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

\[
\text{ὡς ἔφατ’ εὐχομένη, ἀνένευε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη. (Iliad 6, 311.)}
\]

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

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

12. In his analysis of the augment in the aorist forms in the speeches of the *Iliad*, E. Bakker argued that the augment was less common in negative sentences \(^{130}\), unless the negation was linked to the speaker’s deixis \(^{131}\). This analysis has two shortcomings: it leaves out the narrative parts and is re-

---

\(^{122}\) This was pointed out by P. Mumm *apud* De Decker (2015a, p. 60), who used the term *Verlebendigung*.


\(^{124}\) The instances are ηὔδα (54), προσηύδα (144, 163, 214, 343).

\(^{125}\) The instances are ἐλλίσσετο (45), ἐκέκλετο (66, 110), προσέειπε (112, 332, 440, 517), ἔφατ’ (253, 406, 485), ἠμείβετ’ (263, 359), ἠρᾶτο (304), μετὰ δὲ δμῳσὶν ἔειπεν (375), πρὸς μύθον ἔειπεν (381), προσέφη (520).

\(^{126}\) The instances are ἔπε (75, 475), ἐκ τ’ ὀνόμαζε (253, 406, 485), νείκεσσεν (325).

\(^{127}\) This is attested in lines 253, 406, 485.

\(^{128}\) The instances are ὡς ἔφαθ’ (122, 286), ὡς ἔφατ’ (311), ἦ ῥα (390).

\(^{129}\) The instances are ὡς φάτο (51, 166, 212, 342).


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Augment percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation: speeches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation: narratives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation: speeches without</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaukos and Diomedes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: speeches without</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaukos and Diomedes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation: narratives with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaukos and Diomedes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall: narratives with</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaukos and Diomedes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech introductions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall negation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures indicate that negation *per se* is not a factor influencing the augment use, but in narrative and in the speeches that have narrative or remote mythical character (Glaukos and Diomedes), the percentage of augments in negated sentences is even lower than in positive sentences (in the speeches by Glaukos and Diomedes no single augmented form in a negative sentence can be found)\(^{133}\). Most augmented forms in a negative sentence are found in speeches\(^{134}\), where the link with the speaker’s deixis, as posited by E. Bakker, is indeed present. This is not surprising, as narrative passages are already less augmented, and a negation removes the action even more

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

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

\(^{134}\) The augmented forms in negative sentences in speeches are ἐδείδιμεν (99), ἦν (131, 140), ἦλθον (519). The unaugmented forms in speeches are ἐξενάριξε (417), ἄνωγεν (444).
from the deixis, hence the predominance of unaugmented verb forms in negative sentences. An example from a narrative passage is

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches with Glaukos’s and Diomedes speeches</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches without Glaukos’s and Diomedes’s speeches</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narratives without Glaukos’s and Diomedes’s speeches</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narratives with Glaukos’s and Diomedes’s speeches</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall figures of subordination</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to the overall figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A+B</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches with Glaukos’s and Diomedes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches without Glaukos’s and Diomedes’ speeches</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narratives without Glaukos’s and Diomedes’s speeches</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narratives with Glaukos’s and Diomedes’s speeches</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall figures in Iliad 6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

135. The unaugmented forms in narrative passages are ἀπίθησεν (102), τέτμεν (374), δῆθυνεν (503). In Glaukos’s speech, the following two forms can be found: πιθ’ (162), νεόντο (189).

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

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

\[ \text{ἔνθ’ αὖτε Γλαύκῳ Κρονίδης φρένας ἔξελετο Ζεύς. (Iliad 6, 243.)} \]

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

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

\[ \text{τὸν δ’ Ἐκτωρ νείκεσσεν ἰδὼν αἰσχροῖς ἐπέεσσι. (Iliad 6, 325.)} \]

Hektor saw him and scolded him with ugly words.

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

11. Analysis of a passage

In this subchapter, we will apply the rules and trends described above to the following passage. As will become clear, we are dealing with tendencies and trends, not with catch-all rules (as was stated above, the augmented forms are underlined, the unaugmented ones are put in bold face and the insecure forms are expanded):
Then, godly Akhilleus indeed killed our father, destroyed the city of the Kilkians, Thbes with the high walls, a city good to live in, he then killed Eetion, but did not rob him of his armour as he restrained himself in his mind from doing this, but he burnt him in his well-wrought battle gear and threw a gravemound over him; and the Nymphs living in the mountains, daughter of aigis-bearing Zeus planted elm trees (on the grave). In the palace there were seven brothers of mine, all of them went down into the Hades on that single day. For Akhilleus, swift of foot, hew all of them down, as they were pasturing their cattle rolling in their gait and their white sheep.

We now discuss the individual verb forms.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

– κίον (422): this form is unaugmented, because the emphasis is not on their death, but on the fact that they met their death at the hands of Akhilleus (which is mentioned in the next verse).
– κατέπεφνε (423): this is the last and final statement: “Akhilleus killed them all”. This needs emphasis (in the sense of Mumm’s analysis) and is therefore augmented. As was the case with κατὰ δ’ ἐκτινευ and ἀπέκτινε, the presence of the augment was determined by internal reconstruction.

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

12. The augment as an evidential marker?

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

137. The first in-depth treatment was the volume of W. Chafe & J. Nicholls (1986), but no uniform definition was given there. For a historical overview of “evidentiality” as a term and concept, see W. Jacobsen (1986). One of the first to describe the mandatory indication of one’s source of information, was F. Boas (1911b, p. 43 and 1911c, p. 443). In his work on Amero-Indian languages, he did not use the term “evidentiality”, nor did he treat the issue in detail, but he did mention that in several languages it was necessary for speakers to indicate on which grounds or by which observation, they came to the statement they had just made. For the concept, see also E. Sapir (1921, p. 108-109). W. Jacobsen (1986, p. 3) limited evidential marking to instances in which the speaker had no direct evidence for the statement, but already F. Boas and E. Sapir included eye-witness accounts as well (but they did not use the term “evidentiality”). For the definition, see M. Faller (2002, p. 2: “the grammatical encoding of the speaker’s (type of) grounds for making a speech act”), A. Aikhenvald (2003a, p. 3; 2004, p. 1; 2015, p. 239), C. Brugman & M. Macauley (2015, p. 201-202), E. Visser (2015, p. 179). See also B. Joseph (2003b, p. 97): evidentiality can be defined as the indication of the source of a speaker’s information, of the modality by which that information was gained, and/or the speaker’s stance (i.e., the attitude) towards the truth of the information (emphasis is ours). A. Aikhenvald & R. Dixon (2017b, p. 7) used the slightly different grammaticalized marking of information source.
categories, but the basic distinction is that of direct / visual versus indirect / non visual, although it might be better to use (as was first done by M. Faller) “best evidence available” (or best possible grounds in her words) instead of “visual / direct”. It can occur with verbs in the present, past and future, but is most common in the past. We believe that the augment in Iliad 6 (and in epic Greek in general) was part of an evidential system distinguishing visual/direct versus non-visual/indirect evidence. In this system, the augmented verb forms were the marked ones, describing past actions still valid for the present and actions in the immediate past that occurred in the presence of the speaker, indicating that the speaker witnessed or participated in the action. We are aware that scholars on evidentiality almost never mention the oldest Indo-European languages, let alone discuss examples from them, but, with the exception of Drewitt-Beck’s clitic rule, which might be a syntactic constraint known only in Greek (as neither Vedic, Avestan nor Armenian have any remnants of it), all the other observations can be explained in the evidential framework.

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

142. A1 in the terminology of A. Aikhenvald (2004, p. 25-28; 2015, p. 241), but she did not discuss neither Greek nor any other Indo-European language.
144. According to W. ADELAAR (2017, p. 674), in Quechua and Aymaran languages, some evidential markers have to yield their place to clitics as well. If this could be confirmed in other evidential languages, the Greek situation would become less problematic.
expressis verbis. The constraints and rules on the use of evidential markers are similar to those for the augment, as can be seen below:

1. The use of visual evidentials explains why the events that directly concerned Andromakhe were related with augmented verb forms, whereas the verbs in the speeches by Glaukos and Diomedes were not. Neither Glaukos nor Diomedes had been a witness to Bellerophon enduring his hardships and being welcomed at the court of Oineus, whereas Andromakhe had to live through the murder of her family since the day it happened.

2. The reduction of augmented forms into one augmented form followed by different unaugmented forms is paralleled in evidential languages: when the evidential marker has been expressed already and is clear from the context, it does not have to be repeated on each form.

3. In stories in the remote or more distant past, the augment is missing: the absence of visual evidentials in remote and mythical stories has many parallels in evidential languages.

4. The use of the augment in general truths and similia can be explained by visual evidentiality, as visual evidentials can be used to state general truths within the speaker’s realm.

5. Evidential marking is less common in negative sentences, but is not excluded. Even in languages without grammatical evidential marking, neg-
ative sentences can have less distinctions in past tense marking than affirmative sentences 152.

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

Conclusion

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

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

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