

THE AUGMENT USE IN *ILLIAD* 10: A Test Case from Later and Non-Homeric (?) Greek Epic *

Résumé. — Cet article examine l'emploi de l'augment dans le dixième chant de l'*Iliade* (connu comme la *Dolonie*). Comme il est assez généralement admis que ce livre est un ajout postérieur à l'*Iliade*, il permet de vérifier si les explications que j'ai proposées ailleurs concernant l'emploi de l'augment chez Homère sont également valables pour des compositions postérieures ou si les poètes plus tardifs se servent de l'augment comme simple expédient métrique. On distingue les formes qui sont métriquement sûres (type A), les formes qui peuvent être déterminées par reconstruction et comparaison internes (type B) et les formes qui sont peu sûres et indéterminables (type C). Les formes de type A et B sont soumises à une analyse syntaxique, sémantique et pragmatique. L'analyse syntaxique examine la « règle de clitiques » et la « règle de réduction ». L'analyse sémantique part d'observations faites par divers chercheurs selon lesquelles les formes augmentées se réfèrent à des actions passées récentes, proches du locuteur et de l'auditeur : l'augment y met en évidence les éléments qui sont au centre de l'histoire ou fonctionne comme une sorte de marqueur évidentiel indiquant que le locuteur ou le narrateur a été lui-même témoin des événements et s'en porte garant ; l'absence de l'augment signifierait que le locuteur n'en a pas de connaissance directe et/ou ne veut pas faire de déclaration catégorique à ce sujet. L'analyse montre que la présence de l'augment dans le chant X de l'*Iliade* peut effectivement s'expliquer par ces facteurs sémantiques et pragmatiques, alors qu'une explication métrique supposerait une distribution beaucoup plus aléatoire.

Abstract. — This article addresses the augment use in Book 10 of the *Iliad* (the so-called *Doloneta*). As most scholars assume that this book is not genuinely Homeric, but a later addition to the *Iliad*, it could serve as a test case to see if the explanations I provided elsewhere for the augment use are valid for later works as well or if the author(s) of these later works use(s) the augment as a metrical tool. I distinguish between forms that are metrically secure (type A), forms that can be determined by

* This article was made possible by a fellowship BOF.PDO.2016.0006.19 of the research council of the Universiteit Gent (BOF, *Bijzonder Onderzoeksfonds*), by a travel grant V426317N for a research stay in Oxford (provided by the FWO Vlaanderen, *Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Vlaanderen*, Science Foundation Flanders) and by a postdoctoral fellowship 12V1518N, granted by the FWO Vlaanderen. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and the editors, Herman Seldeslachts and Toon Van Hal, for their detailed feedback and useful comments, and for the invitation to contribute to this Festschrift-edition of *LEC*. All errors, inconsistencies and shortcomings are mine.

internal reconstruction and comparison (type B) and forms that are insecure and undeterminable (type C). The A and B forms are subjected to a syntactic, semantic and pragmatic analysis. For the syntactic analysis, I investigate the clitic and the reduction rule. For the semantics, I start from observations on the augment use by various scholars who stated that the augmented forms refer to recent past actions, close to speaker and hearer, and that the augment highlights the more pivotal elements in the story or that it is a kind of evidential marker indicating that the speaker or narrator vouches for his statement by claiming that he has “witnessed” the events himself; the absence of the augment would mean that the speaker has no direct knowledge of it and/or does not want to make an emphatic statement about it. The analysis shows that the augment use in *Iliad* 10 can indeed be explained by these semantic and pragmatic factors, whereas a metrical explanation would require a much more random distribution.

1. Introduction

This article addresses the augment use in the controversial Book 10 of the *Iliad* (the so-called *Doloneia*). As most scholars assume that this book is not genuinely Homeric (see especially G. DANÉK [1988]), but a later addition to the *Iliad* (although the exact date is debated)¹, it could serve as a test case to see if the explanations provided for the augment use are valid for later works as well or, conversely, if such later works simply use the augment as metrical tool. Before examining possible syntactic, semantic and pragmatic accounts for explaining the absence or presence of the augment, I will first distinguish between forms that are metrically secure (type A, discussed in § 2), forms that can be determined by internal reconstruction and comparison (type B), and forms that are insecure and undeterminable (type C). Types B and C are the topic of § 3. After surveying the evidence (§ 4), the A and B forms will be the basis for the actual investigation (§ 5).

My starting point is the hexameter, here printed in the notation of M. JANSE (2003; 2014):

— ˘˘ // — ˘˘ // — ˘˘ // — ˘˘ // — ˘˘ // — ˘˘
 1a 1b 1c 2a 2b 2c 3a 3b 3c 4a 4b 4c 5a 5b 5c 6a 6b

2. The metrically secure forms

To determine the metrically secure status of an (un)augmented form, caesurae, metrical bridges, and (un)permitted elisions are to be taken into

1. In assuming that Book 10 might be of later date I follow especially G. DANÉK (1988), but I have not investigated the issue in detail myself.

account. More in particular, an (un)augmented form is metrically secure, if the opposite form requires²

- i. the elision of a dative singular ending in -ι;
- ii. elision of the -ι in τι;
- iii. the elision of the -ι in περι-/περί;
- iv. the elision of a dative plural ending in -σσι of the consonant stems (but not in -εσσι, which can be elided, although it is not that common);
- v. the elision of an -υ (which is *never* elided);
- vi. the creation a short monosyllabic verb form (regardless whether at the end of the verse, before a caesura or anywhere else in the verse);
- vii. the violation of Hermann's Bridge: this metrical law, which is probably the strictest of all bridges, states that there cannot be a word end between 4b and 4c;
- viii. the violation of Varro's Bridge: Varro stated that every Greek verse had to have a caesura in the third foot, and consequently, this rules out the existence of the so-called bipartite hexameters, i.e. hexameters that have a word end at 3c without a caesura at 3a or 3b;
- ix. a collision of an elision and a caesura (especially at 3a and 3b);
- x. the violation of Gerhard's Bridge: this metrical law states that if the 5th foot is a spondee, there should not be word end at 5c;
- xi. the violation of Giseke's (- Meyer's) Law; this law states that a word starting in the first foot of the hexameter should not end at the end of the second foot (i.e. at 2c), be it in spondaic or dactylic form;
- xii. the violation of Gerhard - Hilberg's Law; this law is closely related to the previous one and states that if the second foot of the hexameter is a spondee, word end at 2c is only allowed if the second half foot is long by nature;
- xiii. the violation of "Nikanor's Bridge" (also known as Meyer's first Law): this law states that a word that starts in the first foot should not end at 2b;
- xiv. the violation of Meyer's third law: this bridge states that there should not be a word end after 5a, if there is already a word end at 3a;
- xv. the violation of Tiedke's law (also known as "Meyer's fourth law"): this metrical bridge (which is related to the previous one to a certain extent) states that there should not be a word end at 4a and 5a in the same verse. Tiedke stated that clitics and prepositions are allowed exceptions (because

2. For a more detailed account of these principles and detailed references, see F. DE DECKER (2016b, p. 260-268; 2017a, p. 59-73; 2019a, p. 47-52; 2020, § 3, forthcoming a, § 2, forthcoming b, § 2); a description of (some of) the laws can also be found in D. KORZENIEWSKI (1968, p. 30-35), M. WEST (1982, p. 35-38), A. VERGADOS (2013, p. 59-61) and S. OSWALD (2014). I cannot discuss the individual metrical phenomena in detail here.

they count as belonging to the preceding or following words), so that word end after \acute{o} ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}$) does not count as a violation;

- xvi. the violation of Gerhard - Wernicke's Law: this bridge is closely related to the ones by Giseke (cf. xi) and Gerhard - Hilberg (cf. xii) and states that if the fourth foot is a spondee and has word end at 4c, the second half foot should only be naturally long.

These criteria, allowing us to determine the presence and absence of the augment in about 220 forms, are catalogued as type A.

3. Judging the metrically insecure forms

The criteria in § 2 leave more than 100 forms undetermined.

In order to address them I proceed as follows, with the transmitted form(s) being the starting point (in decreasing order of importance)³:

- (1) at verse end forms of the shape $\upsilon - \upsilon$ or $\upsilon - -$ are preferred; if the debated form / one of the debated forms has this format, it is preferred; this guarantees the augment in the following forms: $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron$ (75, 504), $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\nu$ (336), $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha$ (358), $\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon$ (466)⁴;
- (2) as was stated above, word end at 2c with a spondee in the second foot is rare, and a spondee with the second half foot long by position is extremely rare (especially when the word starts in the 1st foot; cf. Gerhard - Giseke - Hilberg); when the 2nd foot is a dactyl and the debated forms both violate Giseke's and Meyer's Laws (word end at 2c and 2b of word starting in the first foot), the variant that violates 2b has preference, because word end at 2b of word starting in the first foot is more common than word end at 2c; this explains the augment in $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon$ (365) and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\phi\epsilon\nu\epsilon\nu$ (488; cf. *infra* for both forms); the instances of $\delta\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon$ (255, 268) are exceptions and will be discussed later on;
- (3) if the final syllable of the word preceding the debated form / one of the debated forms form is never elided or always elided elsewhere in epic, it is likely that it will be the case in the instance under investigation; this guarantees the augment in $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\rho' \acute{\epsilon}\phi\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ (465), because $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\rho'$ is always elided when followed by a finite verb form and especially in speech conclusions, as is the case here (moreover,

3. For more details and references, see F. DE DECKER (2016b; 2017; forthcoming b: § 3) and earlier also I. TAIDA (2004; 2007; 2010). Below I only discuss the rules that apply to Book 10.

4. I use the edition by H. VAN THIEL (1996; 2011) but always compare it with those of A. LUDWICH (1892), D. MONRO and T. ALLEN (1908) and M. WEST (1998).

the 34 instances of the unaugmented φώνησεν are all of the type φώνησέν τε);

- (4) if a debated form does not yield word end at 2b or 2c, that one is preferred, as word end at 2b or 2c is less common (even if the word does not start in the 1st foot), unless the words are proclitic as is the case in τοῖ δ' ἐπέτοντο (514; cf. *infra*);
- (5) if a debated form does not create a spondee with a second half foot being long by position, that one is preferred; this means that the augment in ἦλθε (140), ὤτρυνε (158), ἠρτύνετο (302), ἐπέφομεν (478), ὄρμαινε (507) is secure, as the short versions would create a second half foot long by position. This also means that the forms of the type ὤτρυνε are impossible to judge (type C), when the (augmented) vowel appears under the ictus, as is the case in: ἔλκετο (15), ἐφίζανε (26), ἐπέγρετο (124), ἐδριόωντο (198), ἦρχε (203), ὠρμήθησαν (359), ἴξον (470), ὄρνυτ' (483), ὄρσεν (518), ὤμωξεν (522), ὄρτο (523), ἠσπάζοντο (542), ἐφίζανέτην (578);
- (6) dual forms and pluperfects are more likely to be unaugmented, which guarantees the absence of the augment in βάτην (469);
- (7) if no other criteria are available, the number of metrically secure attestations of the same paradigm decide⁵: if there are more unaugmented than augmented forms, the unaugmented variant is more likely to be correct and vice versa; this determines the augment in the following forms: ἔκλυον (47; 25/15)⁶, ἔρεξ' (51; 5/1), ἔφαθ' (218, 227, 313)⁷, ἔφατ' (240)⁸, ἐνόησεν (224; 53/17), ἔσπεο (285; 8/0)⁹, ἔκλυε (295; 25/15), ἔμελλε (365; 21/5)¹⁰, ἐνόησα (550; 53/17); as Toon Van Hal points out to me, this criterion is only valid in case the (un)augmented form is much more common and therefore one can ask if the numbers alone for ἐπέφομεν (478; 8/5, but see also § 3.5)¹¹ and ἔπεφνε (488; 8/5, but see also § 3.2) suffice to state that the augmented form is preferred;
- (8) when the Homeric Greek data is insufficient or inconclusive, I take the post-Homeric epic works into account as well; this determines the augment in the following forms: ἔστυνε (16; in Homer there are no metrically secure instances, but in post-Homeric epic Greek, there

5. Cf. W. BARRETT (1964, p. 361-362) and I. TAIDA (2007; 2010).

6. Cf. I. TAIDA (2007, p. 7-8), F. DE DECKER (2017, p. 82-83 and 92-93).

7. Cf. F. DE DECKER (2016a, p. 273-274).

8. Cf. F. DE DECKER (2016a, p. 273-274).

9. F. DE DECKER (2017, p. 158-159).

10. F. DE DECKER (2016a, p. 273).

11. F. DE DECKER (2016a, p. 271).

are 35 augmented forms and no unaugmented ones), ἐκίχανον (150; 3/0 in Homer and 4/1 in post-Homeric epic Greek);

- (9) if still no decision can be reached, the form cannot be determined and is omitted from the analysis. Contrary to Barrett and Taida, who argued that in such cases a unanimous reading of the codices should be respected and adopted *faute de mieux*¹² (in case of different readings no decision is possible), I will not include those forms, because I prefer some internal support for the forms.
- (10) In case of compound forms: the number of metrically secure forms of the simplex decide on the compound form, unless one of the previous criteria (especially on the type of form or passage) takes preference. As such, the following compound forms have an augment of type B: προσέειπε (36, 81, 168, 248, 412; 135/64), προσέειπεν (64, 119, 340), ἐπέτρειψεν (116; 4/2 in Homer, 5/3 in post-Homeric epic), διέσσυτο (194; 7/1), ἀπετράπετ' (200; 10/2), μετέειπε (219, 241; 135/64), μετέειπεν (233), παρέδραμεν (350; 2/0), ἐπεβήσετο (529; 8/2), κατέβησαν (541; 8/5, moreover, the unaugmented βῆσαν is only attested at the beginning of the verse and after the bucolic caesura). All the other compound verb forms have an insecure augment (type C): ἀνεστενάχιζ' (9; no simplex instances attested), ἐπετράπομεν (59; 0/1), ἀπέπεμπεν (72; 5/27), ἐπέτρεπε (79; 0/5), διαφαίνεται (199; 6/24), ἐπεμαίετο (401, no simplex forms attested), κατέδησαν (567; 7/11), ἀπενίζοντο (572; no simplex forms attested)¹³, ἀνέψυχθεν (573; no simplex forms attested). In spite of the simplex figures, we can consider the following forms to be secure as well: the unaugmented ἔνδυνε (21, 131; 9/8), because the augmented ἐνέδυνε is never attested (in spite of it being metrically more convenient with its two short syllables instead of a single syllable long by position length; cf. *infra* and *supra*); ἐπίδραμέτην (354), because dual forms are much more likely to be unaugmented than augmented¹⁴ (J. La Roche printed ἐπεδραμέτην, because the compound forms never lacked the augment elsewhere¹⁵); κατένευσε (393), because

12. W. BARRETT (1964, p. 362), I. TAIDA (2010, p. 257).

13. Codices A and W have the unaugmented ἀπενίζοντο (M. WEST 1998, p. 311).

14. C. GRASHOF (1852, p. 29), J. LA ROCHE (1870a, p. xv; 1882, p. 19, but see following note), A. PLATT (1891, p. 213-214), E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 651), L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 94, with reference to E. SCHWYZER), H. BLUMENTHAL (1974, p. 75), P.-A. MUMM (2004, p. 148), F. DE DECKER (2015a, p. 54; 2015b, p. 247). Already F. VON THIERSCH (1826, p. 338) alluded to the unaugmented nature of compounded dual forms.

15. Cf. J. LA ROCHE (1870c, p. 62 and 142-143; 1871, p. 73).

there is a form *κάννεύσας* attested¹⁶, so if the poet wanted to use an unaugmented form, he could have written *κάννευσε*; *ἀνέσχεθε* (461), because the unaugmented *ἄσχεθε* could also have been used and *κατεδύσето* (517), because the unaugmented *δύσето* is only used in verse-initial position or after the bucolic caesura and never in the middle of the verse;

- (11) The last problem concerns those verb forms that start either with a syllable that is long by position or with a diphthong. The rule in Greek grammar is that verbs starting with a short vowel form their augment by lengthening the vowel. One could argue that verbs starting by a vowel could have added an additional augment, as was the case in *ἔην* besides *ἦν*, but when no “augmented” forms are attested, I prefer to catalogue these forms as insecure: since there is no **ἔηστο* attested besides *ἦστο*, I consider the latter to be insecure rather than unaugmented. The same applies to forms of the type *ἰλάσκοντο*. Verbs starting with a long vowel *α* are insecure too, because the metre does not allow to distinguish between the “unaugmented” long *α* and the augmented *η*. This is especially the case for the forms of *αἴσσω* with its long initial syllable. As a consequence, the following forms are insecure as well: *εὔδον* (2, 152, 471), *εὔρ’* (34), *εὔρεν* (74), *εὔδ’* (155), *ἔστρωτο* (155), *προσηύδα* (163, 191), *εὔρον* (181), *εἶατο* (182), *ἦῦδα* (377, 461), *εὔδε* (474), *ἐπώχετο* (487), *ἔστασαν* (520, 569), *ἄϊε* (532), *εἶρητο* (540). One could argue that forms such as the unaugmented iterative *ὀτρύνεσκον* are securely unaugmented, because iteratives are never augmented, but as they are always found in the first half of a foot, the absence is not secure. The same applies to the verb *αὐδάω*: it has an unaugmented iterative form *αὐδήσασκε* and an unaugmented dual form *προσαυδήτην* (both being elements favouring the absence of the augment), next to the augmented speech introductions *ἦῦδα* and *προσηύδα*¹⁷, but as the forms cannot be determined with certainty, I have to leave them out of the discussion.

When the criteria mentioned above can be used to ascertain the status of a form, this form is catalogued as type B; if not, it is of type C. There are however a number of more complicated cases where other elements play a role as well, which I discuss below.

ὦς ἔφατ’, ἔδδεισεν δὲ περὶ ξανθῷ Μενελάῳ (240)

So he spoke and he feared for blond Menelaos.

16. *Odyssey*, 15, 464.

17. For an analysis of these speech introductions, see F. DE DECKER (2015a, p. 54, 61, 63; 2015b, p. 257-261).

As I have argued elsewhere¹⁸, the augmented ἔδδεισεν has preference, because the unaugmented form is only attested at the beginning of the verse or after the bucolic caesura and there are no certain instances of the unaugmented δεῖσεν with an anlaut *dw-*, whereas all secure augmented forms are always scanned *-dd-* or *-dw-*.

Τυδείδῃ μὲν δῶκε μενεπτόλεμος Θρασυμήδης (255)

Thrasymedes with his mind set on battle gave it to the son of Tydeus.

This is a very problematic instance, because all codices have the unaugmented δῶκε, but this form violates Giseke - Meyer's and Gerhard - Hilberg's Laws. Bekker suggested to read ἔδωκε¹⁹, but this does not solve the problem. The only reason to accept the transmitted δῶκε is that the augmented ἔδωκε in Homer almost exclusively occurs at the end of the verse.

Σκάνδειαν δ' ἄρα δῶκε Κυθηρίῳ Ἀμφιδάμαντι (268)

He gave Skandeia to Amphidamas from Kythera.

This instance is very similar to the previous one: as violations of Nikanor's Bridge are more common than that of Giseke - Meyer (in the 7483 verses of *Iliad* 1, 2 [v. 1-483], 3-9, 11, 16, 22 and 24, there are 466 instances on 7483 that have word end at 2b with a word starting in the first foot, whereas only 217 end at 2c when the word starts in the first foot), one would expect the augmented ἔδωκε (as printed by Bekker)²⁰, but all codices have the unaugmented δῶκε. The only reason to accept the unaugmented δῶκε is the fact that the augmented ἔδωκε is almost exclusively found in Homer at the end of the verse.

οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδὲ Τρῶας ἀγήγορας εἶασεν Ἴκτωρ (299)

Hektor did not let the brave Trojans (sleep).

At first sight the form εἶασεν has a metrically secure augment, but the verb ἔαω has also forms with anlaut *ei-* in non-past tenses, with the *ei-* being the result of metrical lengthening. When *ei-* occurs under the ictus, its length is secure, but when it appears in the second half foot, it can very often conceal older uncontracted forms that underwent metrical lengthening, after the contraction occurred: when the imperfect εἶων appears in the second half foot, it can contain an older and uncontracted ἔάων, but under the ictus this is not possible. The same applies to the apparent augmented iteratives εἶασκον: all these forms possibly reflect an older ἔάασκον²¹. As the length

18. Cf. F. DE DECKER (2017, p. 79-80).

19. Cf. I. BEKKER (1858, p. 156).

20. Cf. I. BEKKER (1858, p. 156).

21. Cf. C. GRASHOF (1852, p. 14), A. NAUCK (1877, p. 133), R. KÜHNER and F. BLASS (1892, p. 406). W. VEITCH (1873, p. 208) consider the forms εἶασχ' / εἶασκ to

of εἶασεν is secure here, I would consider εἶασεν to be a type B augment (not type A, as I cannot rule out metrical lengthening entirely).

ἔλπετο γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀποστρέψοντας ἐταίρους (355)

For he hoped in his heart that his friends from the Trojans were coming to turn him back.

In this instance one could argue that the form ἔλπετο is insecure, because the initial ε appears under the ictus and can thus be long by position (cf. *infra*), but as the augmented ἐέλπετο is also attested and since ἔλπετο is followed by a clitic, it is more likely that this form is an original unaugmented form (type B).

ποικίλου ἐκ δίφροιο νοήσατο χερσὶν ἐλέσθαι (501)

He thought to grasp it with his hands from the nicely-wrought chariot.

There are no metrically secure instances of the middle aorist forms of νοέω, but what argues in favour of the transmitted form νοήσατο is the fact that tetrasyllabic verb forms generally tend to be unaugmented²², that the genitive in -οιο is more common than that in -ου and that the form νοήσατο (and not ἐνοήσατο) is quoted in the lexica and commentaries (such as Eustathios). Moreover, Apollonios of Rhodes, *Argonautika*, IV, 1409, has an unaugmented νόσατο (the contracted version of νοήσατο).

τόζω· τοὶ δ' ἐπέτοντο θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν (514)

with the bow. They jumped towards the fast ships of the Akhaians.

In this case the avoidance of word end at 2b is not applicable, since τοὶ δ' could be interpreted as being proclitic to the next word. There are 2 metrically secure augmented and 1 unaugmented form in early Greek epic (I assume here that the language of the *Shield of Herakles* is early epic Greek) and 1 metrically secure augment in post-Homeric epic Greek. Unfortu-

be from εἶάω, a metrically lengthened epic form, see also P. CHANTRAINE (1968, p. 308-309). D. MONRO (1891, p. 61) only states that εἰ- was the augment of ἐάω, but did not discuss the iterative forms. The most thorough treatment of this verb is offered by A. NUSSBAUM (1998, p. 1-84, and especially p. 70-72 for the iterative forms). J. POKORNY (1959, p. 915) and HJ. FRISK (1960, p. 434) discuss the etymology, but are silent on the augment. P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 319, 323) and E. SCHWYZER (1939, p. 682, 752) discuss the forms, but not the augment or the (supposed) metrical lengthening, whereas M. KÜMMEL (2001, p. 254) refers to A. NUSSBAUM (1998) for the Greek forms. Surprisingly enough, the verb is not discussed in W. WYATT (1969), the standard work on metrical lengthening, nor is the metrical lengthening mentioned in P. CHANTRAINE *et al.* (2009, p. 248).

22. In the *Iliad* there are 21 (17A) augmented and 214 (177A) unaugmented tetrasyllabic verb forms, in the *Odyssey* there can be found 14 (12A) augmented and 149 (128A) unaugmented tetrasyllabic verb forms, and in *Iliad* 10 we find 9 (8A) unaugmented tetrasyllabic forms but no augmented forms.

nately, the small numbers make it impossible to judge the form and hence ἐπέτοντο is of type C.

οὐδ' ἀλασκοπιὴν εἶχ' ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων (515)

Apollon did not have a blind sight.

In this instance the unaugmented form ἔχεν would have been possible as well and the elided form εἶχ' is only attested once elsewhere (Hesiod, *WD*, 89), whereas ἔχεν is attested 30 times and metrically secure 23 times. The reason why I would preserve the reading here and consider it secure, is that it would be difficult to see how the augmented εἶχ' would have ousted the unaugmented ἔχεν, as the latter was much more common.

4. The augment: facts and figures

The criteria described above yield the following data²³:

| <i>Iliad</i> 10 | A augments | A+B augments | A unaugmented | A+B unaugmented | % A augments | % A+B augments |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Book 10 | | | | | | |
| Aorist | 56 | 90 | 75 | 80 | 43 | 53 |
| Imperfect | 34 | 52 | 44 | 47 | 44 | 53 |
| Pluperfect | <i>1</i> | <i>1</i> | <i>10</i> | <i>10</i> | | |
| Total | 91 | 144 | 129 | 137 | 41 | 51 |
| Speeches | | | | | | |
| Aorist | 17 | 25 | 15 | 15 | 53 | 63 |
| Imperfect | <i>1</i> | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| Pluperfect | <i>1</i> | <i>1</i> | 0 | 0 | | |
| Total | 19 | 28 | 17 | 17 | 53 | 62 |
| Narrative | | | | | | |
| Aorist | 36 | 51 | 55 | 61 | 40 | 46 |
| Imperfect | 16 | 32 | 40 | 43 | 29 | 43 |
| Pluperfect | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | | |
| Total | 52 | 84 | 105 | 114 | 33 | 42 |
| Speech introductions | | | | | | |
| Aorist | 2 | <i>14</i> | 5 | 5 | | |
| Imperfect | <i>17</i> | <i>18</i> | 2 | 2 | | |
| Pluperfect | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Total | 19 | 32 | 7 | 7 | 73 | 82 |

23. When scarcity of data (less than 25 instances) prevented me from making a judgement, I italicised the figures and did not calculate an average.

Based on the data of A and B forms, I will analyse the presence and absence of the augment in *Iliad* 10 by scrutinising possible syntactic, semantic and pragmatic explanations. I start with the syntactic level, where I subsequently investigate the clitic and the reduction rule.

5. The syntax of the augment in *Iliad* 10

5.1. Drewitt (- Beck)'s clitic rule²⁴

In early epic Greek the augment is very often (but not always) “missing”, when the verb form is followed by a “2nd position clitic”²⁵. 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 and I therefore decided to call it “Drewitt - Beck’s clitic rule”²⁶. I interpret this as a syntactic phenomenon, because it is closely related to Wackernagel’s Law²⁷, which states that clitics appear in the 2nd position in the sentence²⁸. The reason for the absence of the augment is that in a sequence γνῶ δὲ ... the verb is the first accented word of the sentence or colon, and the particle is thus linked to it; if the form were augmented, i.e. ἔγνω δὲ ..., we would have a sequence *(h₁)é-ǵneh₃-de in which the enclitic verb form would precede the enclitic particle, but this is a violation of the clitic chain rules: in a sequence of enclitic or postpositive words, the connective particles come first, then the other particles, while the pronouns and the verb forms are only put at the end of the chain²⁹ (even if one does not assume that the verb in PIE was enclitic,

24. Cf. J. DREWITT (1912b, p. 104; 1913, p. 350) and W. BECK (1919). W. Beck specifically linked this phenomenon and the placement of the “Wackernagel clitics”. See also B. MARZULLO (1952, p. 415), L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 99-102), H. ROSÉN (1973, p. 316-320), E. BAKKER (1999, p. 53-54), Ch. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007, p. 53), J.-L. GARCÍA-RAMÓN (2012, B.2.3), F. DE DECKER (2015a, p. 56; 2015b, p. 249-250, 312; 2016a, p. 56-58; 2017, p. 128-129; 2019a, p. 78-79, forthcoming b, § 8.1), I. HAJNAL (2016a, p. 13; 2016b, p. 446-447), S. RODEGHIERO (2017, p. 634).

25. By this I mean an enclitic or a word that cannot be put at the beginning of a sentence. These are sometimes called “Wackernagel clitics” too.

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

27. Cf. J. WACKERNAGEL (1892).

28. For this explanation, see F. DE DECKER (2016a, p. 56-58; 2016b, p. 285-286; forthcoming b, § 8.1). See already W. BECK (1919).

29. This had been noticed already by D. MONRO (1891, p. 335-338), before J. Wackernagel posited his famous Law. For the clitic chain see J. WACKERNAGEL

the sequence augmented verb form followed by a clitic would still violate Wackernagel's Law, because in that case, the Wackernagel clitic would only appear in the 3rd position, viz. *(h₁)é-ǵnéh₃-de). The overall data of epic Greek show the following:

| <i>Iliad</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 676 | 694 | 107 | 124 | 86 | 85 |
| Speech | 53 | 54 | 12 | 14 | 82 | 79 |
| Narrative | 595 | 612 | 90 | 105 | 87 | 85 |
| Speech introductions | 28 | 28 | 5 | 5 | 85 | 85 |

| <i>Odyssey</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 443 | 452 | 114 | 138 | 80 | 77 |
| Speech | 60 | 63 | 21 | 28 | 74 | 69 |
| Narrative | 301 | 305 | 64 | 72 | 82 | 81 |
| <i>Apologoi</i> ³⁰ | 56 | 58 | 25 | 34 | 69 | 63 |
| Menelaos's speech ³¹ | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 75 | 75 |
| Speech introductions | 20 | 20 | 2 | 2 | 91 | 91 |

(1892, p. 336), B. DELBRÜCK (1900, p. 51-53, with reference to D. Monro), K. BRUGMANN (1904, p. 682-683), Th. KRISCH (1990, p. 73-74), C. J. RUIJGH (1990), J. WILLS (1993), C. WATKINS (1998, p. 70).

30. The *Apologoi* refer to Books 9-12 in which Odysseus explains to the Phaiakians how his men died due to their own stupidity and how he tried to save them in vain. Because he tries to justify his actions, these books are called *Apologoi*. In those books, there are also "genuine" speeches, e.g. when Odysseus speaks to his men or to the gods.

31. In Book 4, Menelaos was asked why he did not act and avenge the death of his brother Agamemnon. In a very long speech, he tried to defend himself and explain why he could not have done anything to prevent the murder from happening. I consider this to be a special case as well.

| <i>Theogony</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 33 | 34 | 8 | 10 | 80 | 77 |

| <i>Works and Days</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | | |

| <i>HH 2</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 22 | 26 | 3 | 3 | 88 | 90 |

| <i>HH 3</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 27 | 27 | 2 | 2 | 97 | 97 |

| <i>HH 4</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 12 | 12 | 4 | 4 | | |

| <i>HH 5</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 9 | 9 | 3 | 3 | | |

When we apply this to *Iliad* 10, we obtain the following data:

| <i>Iliad</i> 10 | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Narrative | 22 | 23 | 8 | 9 | 73 | 72 |
| Speech | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Speech introduction | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| Total | 24 | 25 | 12 | 14 | 67 | 64 |

It is true that *Iliad* 10 only has 579 verses and that one book might not be statistically relevant³², but it is remarkable that the figures differ significantly from the other epic works (including the *Homeric Hymns*, or at least the ones that have enough data).

5.2. P. Kiparsky's reduction rule

The second syntactic observation involves the use of the augment in a sequence of more than one past tense form. P. Kiparsky argued that in PIE in a sequence of marked forms only the first one was marked and the others appeared in the neutral form³³: in a sequence of past tense forms only the first one was put in the indicative (with augment in Indo-Iranian and Greek) and the others following it in the injunctive, as this form was both tenseless and moodless. He called this phenomenon *conjunction reduction*, although “markedness reduction” might have been a better term. As can be seen by the number of exceptions, the absence of the augment cannot be the result of a simple syntactic rule alone but other factors must have played a role. One therefore wonders whether this phenomenon was a strict rule, or only a tendency, or a rule that was no longer understood as such, or not a rule at all. The problem is that there are a considerable number of exceptions (or passages where at least one form did not undergo the “expected” reduction). The data for epic Greek are:

| <i>Iliad</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 2955 | 3671 | 1302 | 2239 | 69 | 62 |
| Speech | 441 | 513 | 328 | 530 | 57 | 49 |
| Narrative | 2479 | 3118 | 968 | 1693 | 72 | 65 |
| Speech introductions | 35 | 40 | 6 | 16 | 85 | 71 |

32. As Toon Van Hal points out to me, the data of Book 10 might be statistically relevant after all. It would be interesting to recreate this test with other non-early-epic works.

33. Cf. P. KIPARSKY (1968; 2005). See also I. HAJNAL (1990, p. 54-55; 2016a, p. 13; 2016b, p. 447-448), O. SZEMERÉNYI (1990, p. 282-284; 1996, p. 265-266), F. PAGNIELLO (2002, p. 8-17), J.-L. GARCÍA-RAMÓN (2012, § B.2), S. LURAGHI (2014) and F. DE DECKER (2015a, p. 57-59; 2015b, p. 250-254; 2016a, p. 53 and 58-71, 2016b, p. 286-288; 2017, p. 83-84, 103, 129-134), S. RODEGHIERO (2017, p. 634); for a detailed discussion, see F. DE DECKER (2016a, p. 58-71).

| <i>Odyssey</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 2070 | 2522 | 1152 | 1890 | 64 | 57 |
| Speech | 491 | 588 | 434 | 681 | 53 | 46 |
| Narrative | 1068 | 1339 | 437 | 778 | 71 | 63 |
| <i>Apologoi</i> | 442 | 517 | 259 | 398 | 63 | 57 |
| Menelaos's speech | 30 | 36 | 15 | 22 | 67 | 62 |
| Speech introductions | 39 | 42 | 7 | 11 | 85 | 79 |

| <i>Theogony</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-----------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 190 | 198 | 110 | 152 | 63 | 57 |

| <i>Works and Days</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 26 | 29 | 37 | 53 | 41 | 35 |

| <i>HH 2</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 99 | 106 | 52 | 68 | 66 | 61 |

| <i>HH 3</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 81 | 90 | 43 | 60 | 65 | 60 |

| <i>HH 4</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 66 | 74 | 69 | 95 | 49 | 44 |

| <i>HH 5</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 46 | 54 | 25 | 40 | 65 | 57 |

We clearly see that the number of observations differs from text to text and according to text type (narrative, speech, speech introduction, etc.) and it is therefore obvious that we cannot speak of a rigid rule. When we apply this to *Iliad 10*, we obtain the following data:

| <i>Iliad 10</i> | A observed (unaugm.) | A+B observed (unaugm.) | A exceptions (augmented) | A+B exceptions (augmented) | % A observed | % A+B observed |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Narrative | 71 | 92 | 39 | 61 | 65 | 60 |
| Speech | 7 | 10 | 8 | 12 | 47 | 45 |
| Speech introductions | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Total | 79 | 104 | 47 | 73 | 63 | 59 |

The “reduction data” involving the augment use are much closer to the data of the rest of epic Greek. The conclusion is that the syntactic data on the augment provide a diffuse picture: the clitic data deviate from the other Greek epic works, but the reduction data are what one would expect. In short, the differences between Book 10 and the rest cannot be explained in terms of syntax (alone).

On the other hand, other types of reduction make it very likely that the concept as described by P. Kiparsky was not completely inexistent in Indo-European. It may therefore be better to argue that the reduction was restricted to actions within the same semantic frame (e.g. the process of preparing a feast, the act of speaking, the act of recognising someone, etc.)³⁴, and that the use of augmented and unaugmented forms side by side was not a random poetic choice, but a relic from the period in which this constraint was still operative. One additional example is the use of the dual: in a series of

34. This was described by A. MEILLET (1913, p. 115-116) for Armenian and expanded to the other languages exhibiting the augment by Ch. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007, p. 39,45).

forms referring to two entities³⁵, 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 again³⁶. There are some examples of (and exceptions to) this reduction in *Iliad* 10:

τῷ δ' ἐπει οὖν ὄπλοισιν ἐνὶ δεινοῖσιν ἐδύτην,
βάν ῥ' ἰέναι, λιπέτην δὲ κατ' αὐτόθι πάντας ἀρίστους.
τοῖσι δὲ δεξιὸν ἦκεν ἐρωδιὸν ἐγγυὸς ὁδοῖο
Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη· τοὶ δ' οὐκ ἶδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι
νύκτα δι' ὀρφναίην, ἀλλὰ κλάγγαντος ἄκουσαν. (272-276).

When they then had armed themselves with their terrible weapons, they went on their way, left all the best fighters there on the same place. Pallas Athene sent them a favourable bird on their right side. They did not see it, because of the dark night, but they heard it crying.

In this passage the poet describes how Odysseus and Diomedes prepared for battle, left the others in the camp, received a favourable bird omen by Athene, and while they did not see it, were able to hear it. The first verb is put in the dual, ἐδύτην, but of the four verbs following it, three are in the plural (βάν, ἶδον, ἄκουσαν) and only one in the dual (λιπέτην).

χλωρὸς ὑπαι δειούς· τῷ δ' ἀσθμαίνοντε κινήτην
χειρῶν δ' ἀψάσθη· ὃ δὲ δακρύσας ἔπος ἠῦδα (376-377).

[...] green from fear. Breathing heavily they caught him and seized him by the hands. Crying he spoke a word [...]

In this instance the poet describes how Odysseus and Diomedes capture Dolon and seize him with their hands. As both verbs are in the dual (κινήτην and ἀψάσθη), the “number reduction rule” is violated.

35. In most cases a dual form refers to two entities, but there are instances in which a dual form was used to refer to more than two elements or persons, see J. LA ROCHE (1893, p. 175-180), D. MONRO (1891, p. 162), R. KÜHNER and B. GERTH (1898, p. 16), E. SCHWYZER and A. DEBRUNNER (1950, p. 46-51), P. CHANTRAINE (1953, p. 28-29), A. VERGADOS (2013, p. 548). R. Kühner, B. Gerth and P. Chantraine ascribed the variation between the two numeri in many instances to metrical reasons. See most recently C. VITI (2011).

36. This analysis goes back to Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1827, quoted in K. STRUNK (1975, p. 237). K. STRUNK (1975, p. 234-239) provides an analysis of Homeric and Attic (Xenophontic) instances to show that Greek did not need to mark the dual more than once. See K. STRUNK (1975, p. 234-239), C. VITI (2011, p. 598-604), M. FRITZ (2011, p. 50-51, with reference to P. KIPARSKY [1968] and K. STRUNK [1975]). See also F. DE DECKER (2015b, p. 157, 252) for examples in speech introductions, ID. (2016a, p. 288) for instances in *Iliad* 6 and ID. (2017, p. 132-134) for *Iliad* 1. For the co-occurrence of dual and plural forms, see especially J. LA ROCHE (1893, p. 175-180) and also the previous footnote.

αὐτοὶ δ' ἰδρῶ πολλὸν ἀπενίζοντο θαλάσση
 ἐσβάντες κνήμας τε ἰδὲ λόφον ἀμφὶ τε μηρούς.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σφιν κῦμα θαλάσσης ἰδρῶ πολλὸν
 νίψεν ἀπὸ χρωτὸς καὶ ἀνέψυχθεν φίλον ἦτορ,
 ἔς ῥ' ἀσαμίνθους βάντες εὐξέστας λούσαντο.
 τῷ δὲ λοεσσαμένῳ καὶ ἀλειψαμένῳ λίπ' ἐλαίῳ
 δείπνῳ ἐφιζανέτην, ἀπὸ δὲ κρητῆρος Αθήνη
 πλείου ἀφυσσόμενοι λείβον μελιθεῖα οἶνον. (572-579)

They themselves washed the abundant sweat off their shins, neck and thighs by going into the sea. When the waves of the sea had washed away the abundant sweat and their beloved heart had cooled down, they stepped into the well-polished bathtubs and bathed themselves. After they had bathed and anointed them with the fat olive oil, they sat down for dinner, drew wine from a large jar and poured it offering it to Athene.

This last example shows that it cannot even be ruled out that the poet did no longer know the dual, as he seems to use plural and dual forms side by side, beginning with a plural form ἀπενίζοντο and then alternating in both participles (plurals in ἐσβάντες, βάντες, and duals in λοεσσαμένῳ and ἀλειψαμένῳ) and finite verbs (plurals in λούσαντο and λείβον, and a dual in ἐφιζανέτην). Remarkably, the metre cannot have been the main cause, because in ἀπενίζοντο, ἐφιζανέτην and λείβον the plural form cannot be exchanged for a dual or vice versa (and maybe also in βάντες, since βάντε would create a hiatus before the caesura), but in ἐσβάντες, λούσαντο, λοεσσαμένῳ, ἀλειψαμένῳ and ἀφυσσόμενοι the plural and dual forms are metrically equivalent.

6. The semantics and pragmatics of the augment in *Iliad* 10

Stating that the semantics and pragmatics of the augment have been amply studied, is an understatement³⁷. Early on, K. Koch already noted that the augment was used more frequently in speeches than in narrative, unless the speeches contained narrative elements as well (e.g. Nestor's speech in *Iliad* 1)³⁸. A. Platt and J. Drewitt showed that (1) the augment was used with verbal forms that have general validity, (2) have present reference, (3) can be translated with the English present perfect (e.g. in gnomes and *similia*)³⁹, and (4) was avoided in genuine past contexts. In his analysis of the augment in Archaic Greek, L. Bottin confirmed the preference for

37. For recent studies (besides E. BAKKER [1999; 2002; 2001] and P.-A. MUMM [2004]), see F. DE DECKER (2015a; 2016a; 2016b; 2017; 2018; 2019a; 2019b; forthcoming a; forthcoming b), R. ALLAN (2017), S. RODEGHIERO (2017), R. LAZZERONI (2017).

38. K. KOCH (1868, especially p. 24-32); for Nestor's speech, see also F. DE DECKER (2017, p. 96, 136-138).

39. A. PLATT (1891); J. DREWITT (1912a; 1912b; 1913).

unaugmented forms in narrative parts, styling this particular usage as “lo stile narrativo”⁴⁰. Later on, L. Basset distinguished between *discours* and *récit*⁴¹. For Vedic Sanskrit, K. Hoffmann described the use of the unaugmented forms as *erwährend* and specific to mythical descriptions⁴², contrasted them with the indicative forms, which belonged to the *historische Vergangenheit*⁴³. Recently, E. Bakker, elaborating on these observations, argued that the augment marked completion of the verbal action and nearness to the speaker (“a deictic suffix that marked the completion of the action near the speaker”)⁴⁴. Along similar lines, P.-A. Mumm described the function of the augment as adding emphasis⁴⁵. The explanations mentioned above can be combined and summarised as follows: by using unaugmented forms (injunctives), the speakers and/or narrators describe and mention what has happened⁴⁶, whereas by using augmented forms (the indicatives) they do not only relate it, but also state it as a fact and reaffirm its value⁴⁷. This may explain the presence of the augment in gnomes, *similia* and speech introductions, and its absence in iterative forms⁴⁸. *Iliad* 10 confirms this hypothesis, but we only have one gnomic aorist (224), one simile (7) and one iterative form (490). Elsewhere, I have shown that speech introductions take the augment when they are constructed with an addressee⁴⁹, which is confirmed by the data of speech introductions in *Iliad* 10 and the whole of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*:

40. L. BOTTIN (1969, p. 110-128).

41. L. BASSET (1989).

42. K. HOFFMANN (1967, p. 198): *Injunktiv-Reihen lassen sich, dem Hauptthema des Rg-Veda entsprechend, vor allem bei der Darstellung mythologischer Tatbestände aufzeichnen* [underlining is mine].

43. K. HOFFMANN (1967, p. 160-213; for the use of the indicative forms in the actual past, see p. 145-160); see also W. EULER (1995) and P.-A. MUMM (1995).

44. E. BAKKER (2001, p. 15; 2005, p. 147).

45. E. BAKKER (1999, p. 59; 2001, p. 14-23; 2005, p. 123-124); P.-A. MUMM (2004, especially § 8). See also O. HACKSTEIN (2010, p. 405): “the augment serves as a foregrounding device attaching salience to the proposition”.

46. Cf. K. HOFFMANN (1967, p. 104-106 and 266-267): *Zeitstufenlosigkeit und Nicht-Bericht („Erwähnung“) sind demnach der Funktion des Injunktivs eigentümlich* [p. 267].

47. P.-A. MUMM (2004, § 8 and § 10). The use of a less remote past tense to add emphasis to a statement is not a specificity of Indo-European languages and can be found in Amerindian languages as well, see J. MARTIN (2010).

48. See especially E. BAKKER (1999, 2001).

49. Cf. F. DE DECKER (2015a).

| <i>Iliad</i> 10 | A augments | A+B augments | A unaugmented | A+B unaugmented | % A augments | % A+B augments |
|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| With ⁵⁰ addressee | 16 | 28 | 3 | 3 | 84 | 90 |
| Without ⁵¹ addressee | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | | |

| <i>Iliad</i> | A augments | A+B augments | A unaugmented | A+B unaugmented | % A augments | % A+B augments |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| With addressee | 214 | 320 | 71 | 86 | 75 | 79 |
| Without addressee | 34 | 46 | 65 | 69 | 34 | 40 |

| <i>Odyssey</i> | A augments | A+B augments | A unaugmented | A+B unaugmented | % A augments | % A+B augments |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| With addressee | 190 | 364 | 54 | 61 | 78 | 86 |
| Without addressee | 35 | 43 | 82 | 86 | 30 | 33 |

Below I give the overall data (speech and narrative) of *Iliad* 10 compared to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, showing that there is only little difference between the “genuine” epic works and the controversial book 10, if any.

| <i>Book</i> 10 | A augments | A+B augments | A unaugmented | A+B unaugmented | % A augments | % A+B augments |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 91 | 144 | 129 | 137 | 41 | 51 |
| Speeches | 19 | 28 | 17 | 17 | 53 | 62 |
| Narrative | 52 | 84 | 105 | 114 | 33 | 42 |

50. The augmented speech introductions with an addressee are 36 (B), 42 (A), 60 (A), 64 (B), 81 (B), 86 (A), 102 (A), 119 (B), 128 (A), 140 (A), 143 (A), 168 (B), 219 (B), 233 (B), 241 (B), 248 (B), 277 (B), 302 (B), 318 (A), 340 (B), 382 (A), 390 (A), 412 (B), 423 (A), 426 (A), 446 (A), 508 (A), 554 (A). The unaugmented ones are 81 (A), 328 (A), 476 (A).

51. The augmented speech introductions without addressee are 158 (B), 283 (A), 369 (A), 400 (A) and the unaugmented instances are 158 (A), 532 (A), 543 (A).

| <i>Iliad</i> | A augments | A+B augments | A unaugmented | A+B unaugmented | % A augments | % A+B augments |
|--------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 2211 | 3394 | 4015 | 4425 | 36 | 43 |
| Speeches | 621 | 884 | 655 | 712 | 49 | 55 |
| Narrative | 1332 | 2125 | 3201 | 3532 | 29 | 38 |

| <i>Odyssey</i> | A augments | A+B augments | A unaugmented | A+B unaugmented | % A augments | % A+B augments |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Overall | 1981 | 3044 | 2939 | 3262 | 40 | 48 |
| Speeches | 718 | 1026 | 709 | 807 | 50 | 58 |
| Narrative | 673 | 1064 | 1560 | 1715 | 30 | 38 |
| <i>Apologoi</i> | 326 | 483 | 476 | 529 | 41 | 48 |
| Menelaos's speech | 23 | 37 | 37 | 39 | 38 | 49 |

The figures quoted above show that the traditional distinction between speech and narrative applies to *Iliad* 10 as well, but the mere appearance of a verb in a speech or narrative does not automatically render it (un)augmented (as was the case in the other songs of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as well)⁵². It is therefore necessary that we take a closer look at the 41 speeches and 23 narrative passages⁵³, although most speeches do not have past tense verbs. We would expect that the passages and speeches that describe the entry and the (inter)actions of the main protagonists (Diomedes, Odysseus, Dolon, and to a lesser extent Nestor and Agamemnon) have augmented verb forms to describe these highlights. The data are more diffuse, however. In the first narrative passage (1-35) we find 8 (7A) augmented and 11 (10A) unaugmented verb forms. The passage describes how Agamemnon and Menelaos were uncertain about which actions to take. Agamemnon therefore decided to consult Nestor. We note that in this passage only one augmented verb refers to Menelaos, namely εἴλετο (31). Most augmented forms refer to Agamemnon (ἔστανε, 16; ἐδήσατο, 22; ἐέσσατο, 23; εἴλετο,

52. As can be seen in the analyses of *Iliad* 1 (F. DE DECKER 2017), *Iliad* 6 (F. DE DECKER 2016a), and of epic Greek in general (F. DE DECKER forthcoming a and forthcoming b).

53. The speeches are 37-41, 43-59, 61-63, 65-71, 82-85, 87-101, 103-118, 119-127, 129-130, 141-142, 144-147, 159-161, 164-167, 169-176, 192-193, 204-217, 220-226, 234-239, 242-247, 249-253, 278-282, 285-294, 303-312, 319-327, 329-331, 341-348, 370-371, 378-381, 383-389, 391-399, 401-411, 413-422, 424-425, 427-445, 447-453, 462-464, 477-481, 509-511, 533-539, 544-553, 555-563. The narrative parts are 1-35, 72-80, 131-140, 148-157, 162, 177-190, 194-202, 218, 227-232, 240, 254-277, 295-301, 313-317, 328, 332-329, 349-368, 372-377, 454-461, 465-475, 482-507, 512-532, 540-542, 564-579.

24; and also ἦνασσε, 33) or to the suffering of the Greek (ἦλυθον, 28); the augmented ἐπάλυνεν (7) appears in a simile. This makes it more probable that the emphasis was not put on Menelaos (which is confirmed by Nestor's later statements). Besides the use of the augmented forms, there are also un-augmented forms in contexts where we would expect an augmented form: as φαίνεται (17) describes how Agamemnon decides to consult Nestor, we would expect this form to be augmented, but this is not the case.

No (un)augmented verb forms occur in the speech 37-41. In the next speech (43-59) we find 4 (2A) augmented and 3 (A) unaugmented verb forms. In that speech Agamemnon voices his discontent about Zeus' favouring of the Trojans in general and of Hektor in particular. Of the 5 verbs, 3 are augmented. The unaugmented θῆχ' (46) and μήσατ' (52) can be explained, because the former has already been announced by ἐτράπετο (45) and the latter brings nothing new either (ἔρρεξε, 49, and ἔρεξ', 51, have already described Hektor's *aristeia*). The forms ἰδόμεν and ἔκλυον (both 47) both refer to something that Agamemnon has experienced himself and one would therefore assume the forms to be augmented. Why the first one is unaugmented and the second one is augmented, remains unclear. In the two next speeches (61-63, 65-71) there are no (un)augmented forms.

The narrative part following these speeches (72-80) describes Agamemnon's consultation of Nestor. This request for advice constitutes an important moment in this book, but nevertheless the narrative description contains 3 (A) unaugmented forms and only one (B) augmented one.

We have no past tense forms in Nestor's speech (82-85). In his answer to Nestor (87-101), Agamemnon complains that of all mortals Zeus has made him endure the most. Given that this is the most important statement in the conversation, it does not surprise that the verb is augmented (ἐνέηκε, 89). Nestor's response (103-118) contains only one unaugmented verb (ᾔφελεν, 117), but this form introduces a wish and is thus not entirely linked to a real verbal action. Nestor voices his discontent about the fact that it should actually be Menelaos, and not Agamemnon, who should be leading the expedition. In his response (119-127) Agamemnon tries to defend Menelaos, but he mostly describes his own actions and initiatives. As his speech refers to his own actions, performed in the recent past, the verb forms used in it are all augmented (3A). In Nestor's answer (129-130) there are no past tense forms.

In the next narrative passage (131-140) the poet relates how Nestor prepares for battle and proceeds to Odysseus' tent. The description of Nestor preparing for battle follows the narrative of a typical scene: in these scenes, the poet describes a warrior gearing for battle, an assembly being summoned, the preparation of a sacrifice and subsequent meal, or a guest

being welcomed⁵⁴. As such, these scenes are often related with augmented verb forms, as was the case in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: these events are an integral part of the story and are not only used to “fill the lines”, but also to create a connection with the audience, draw it into the story and mark what is important⁵⁵. After the dressing scene, the poet describes Nestor’s arrival at Odysseus’ tent. Odysseus, noticing that people are approaching, inquires about who they are and why they have come to him. The passage has 4 (3A) augmented and 4 (A) unaugmented forms. Odysseus’ reactions (ἤλυθ’, 139; ἐκ δ’ ἤλθε, 140) are described with augmented forms, as are the verbs in the description of Nestor preparing for battle (ἐδήσατο, 132; εἴλετο, 135), but contrary to other arming scenes, such as *Iliad* 2, 37-47; 3, 330-338; 15, 478-483; 16, 130-139 and 19, 369-374 (all involving εἴλετο as well), there are less augmented forms here. The most problematic form in this series is undoubtedly ἀνέγειρε (138). As the most important action in this description is that Nestor awakens Odysseus, one would expect that verb form to be augmented, yet this is not the case. In the subsequent speeches between Odysseus and Nestor (141-142, 144-147) there are no past tense forms. Nestor succeeds in convincing Odysseus to accompany them and they proceed to Diomedes’ tent. The next passage (148-157) describes their journey to Diomedes. It contains 9 (A) unaugmented verb forms and only one (B) augmented form. This is very surprising, given the fact that Odysseus and Diomedes will be the Greek protagonists of the story.

In the interactions between Nestor and Odysseus on the one hand and Diomedes on the other (159-161, 164-167) there are no past tense forms, and in Nestor’s response to Diomedes (169-176) there is one augmented form (ἔειπε, 169), which refers to something that Diomedes has just said. After that Diomedes prepares himself and dresses for battle as well. Afterwards the three warriors proceed to the guards of the camp (177-190). The passage has 3 (A) augmented and 6 unaugmented (A) forms: the augmented ones refer to Diomedes’ preparations (ἔέσσατο, 177; εἴλετο, 178) and to the arrival of the three at the encampment (ἔμιχθεν, 180). In the next narrative passage (194-202) the poet describes how the leaders of the army meet after darkness has fallen. The augmented verb forms refer to Nestor’s continuous walking forward (διέσσυτο, 177), the arrival of Meriones and Nestor’s son (two additional warriors who will join the council, ἦσαν, 199), how the night has fallen (ἐκάλυψεν, 201) and how the place where they will meet on has been abandoned by Hektor (ἀπετράπετ’, 200). The unaugmented verb

54. For analyses of typical scenes, see W. AREND (1933), B. FENIK (1968), E. VISSER (1987), S. REECE (1993), C. BOZZONE (2016), E. MINCHIN (2016), and for *Iliad* 10, see G. DANEK (1988, p. 205-229).

55. For this analysis, see E. MINCHIN (2016).

forms relate that the leaders follow Nestor (ἔποντο, 194; κεκλήατο, 195), that Meriones and Nestor's son asked themselves to participate (κάλεον, 197 – the poet wants to emphasise that they joined, not why they decided to do so), and that the two new warriors were speaking among themselves (πίφασκον, 202), before Nestor was going to address them. The focus in this passage is on Nestor and less on the other Greek leaders.

In his speech (204-217), Nestor refers to Hektor's murderous *aristeia*, but in spite of the clear link to the present, the verb is unaugmented (δαμάσαντο, 210). In Diomedes' response (220-226), there is one augmented form, the gnomic aorist ἐνόησεν (224).

After hearing Diomedes, many Greek warriors express their willingness to participate in the expedition (227-232): this is reflected by 7 augmented and one unaugmented verb forms, emphasising the unity within the Greek camp. In the speeches following their expressed commitment (234-239, 242-247, 249-253) there are no past tense forms.

In the next passage (254-277), the poet narrates the final preparations by Diomedes and Odysseus, the origins of their weaponry and the divine support they will receive during their expedition. This passage has 4 (A) augmented and 17 (15A) unaugmented verb forms. As expected, the gearing-for-battle scene is described with augmented verb forms (ἐδύτην, 254, 272; ἔθηκε, 257, 261) and the origins of the armour with unaugmented forms (as they lie in a more remote past and are not part of the main storyline), but what remains unexplained is why the verb referring to the divine support of the gods (ἦκεν, 274) does not have an augment⁵⁶.

Then both Odysseus and Diomedes pray to Athene. In Odysseus' prayer (278-282) we find no past tense forms, but in Diomedes' one (285-294) there are 4 augmented and 3 unaugmented forms. The forms without augment refer to events in a more remote past and the absence of the augment is expected. Two of the augmented verb forms refer to help provided by Athene to Diomedes' father (ἔσπεο, 285; παρέστης, 290). For these two verbs a link between speaker and addressee can be established and the presence of the augment is therefore not surprising. The form ἦει (286) refers to Diomedes' father who was a herald in the Greek army, and this could be compared to what Diomedes is about to do at that very moment. As such, the augment in that form is also expected. One augmented verb form (ἦγαγεν, 293), however, remains to be explained: it refers to the sacrificial animal that Diomedes will offer to Athene upon successful completion of

56. It has been argued that ἦκε and its compounds were in fact augmented (A. PLATT 1891, p. 218), but the fact that an augmented ἔηκε also exists, makes this less likely, see D. MONRO (1891, p. 60) and P. CHANTRAINE (1948, p. 481).

the expedition, but whether this suffices to explain the use of the augment is doubtful.

The next narrative passage relates how Odysseus and Diomedes prepare for battle (3 augmented and one unaugmented verb form) and how Hektor incites the Trojans to remain attentive; as the verbs εἶσεν (299) and κικλήσκετο (300) refer to the same action, only one of them is augmented, whereas ἔσαν (301) is unaugmented, because it belongs to the background description of the Trojan army. In Hektor's speech to the Trojans (303-312) there are no (un)augmented verb forms. In response to Hektor's speech, Dolon steps forward and his entry (313-317) is described with 5 augmented verb forms, because he is one of the important characters of the story in Book 10. In Dolon's speech to Hektor (319-327) and in Hektor's answer (329-331) there are no past tense verb forms.

In the next narrative passage, Hektor finishes his speech, Dolon prepares for his expedition and embarks on it. The verbs with an augment are (1) ἀπώμοσε (332), because it refers to the fact that Hektor's oath will not be fulfilled, (2) ἐβάλλετο (333), because it is the first verb in the description of Dolon's battle preparations (in fairness, the use of the augmented imperfect form ἐβάλλετο is extremely rare), (3) ἔμελλεν (336), because the verb foretells that Dolon will never return (this verb form was also used in *Iliad* 16, 46-47 to predict that Patroklos' request for Akhilleus' armour was equal to him asking for his own death) and (4) ἐφράσατο (339), because it highlights that Odysseus has noticed Dolon. The other verbs remain unaugmented. After seeing Dolon, Odysseus addresses Diomedes (341-348), but there are no past tense forms in that speech. In the next narrative passage (349-368), the poet describes the encounter between Diomedes and Odysseus, and Dolon. In this description there are no augmented verb forms referring to Diomedes and Odysseus nor to Athene's support for these Greek heroes, but only the verbs describing Dolon's actions (but not all of them) have an augment (παρέδραμεν, 350; ἀπέην, 351; ἔστη, 354; ἐνόμα, 358; ἔμελλε, 365). Then, Diomedes notices Dolon as well and tells him to stand still (370-371). In Diomedes' speech to Dolon there are no (un)augmented verb forms. The narrative passage following that speech (372-377) relates that Diomedes throws a missile at Dolon, deliberately missing him, that Dolon is struck with fear and that Odysseus and Diomedes succeed in catching him. The augmented verb forms refer to Diomedes' intended miss (ἡμάρτανε, 372), the spear's entry into the earth (and this belongs to the missing by Diomedes, ἐπάγη, 374), Dolon's standing still (ἔστη, 374). Dolon's fear is unexpectedly described with an unaugmented verb form (τάρβησεν, 374 and γίνετ', 375), and equally unexpected is the use of the unaugmented κινήτην (376) to refer to Dolon's capture.

After being taken captive, Dolon pleads for his life (378-381), but there are no (un)augmented verb forms in that speech. Odysseus responds (382-389) by asking whether he was sent by Hektor or came on his own command. In the first question the augmented form προέηκε (388) is used and in the second one, the unaugmented ἀνήκε (389)⁵⁷. At first sight, one could argue that this passage is a perfect illustration of the reduction rule, as both verbs have the same pragmatic status, but upon closer inspection one can also state that Odysseus considers the first suggestion to be more likely, and that his assumption would explain “his” use of the augment in the first form, but not in the second. Dolon answers truthfully (391-399) and as he refers to actions in his immediate past and vicinity, all verbs are augmented. Odysseus continues interrogating Dolon (401-411), but the use of the augment surprises: there are no augmented verbs in his speech and while one could explain τέκε (404) as referring to a more remote past and maybe also δαμάσαντο (411) as belonging to the background of the situation (although this is very much present in the Greeks’ minds), one cannot easily explain the unaugmented λίπες (406), because this refers to an action and a person that are very much present. In the subsequent interactions (413-422, 424-425) there are no past tense forms. Dolon continues providing information and reveals to Odysseus and Diomedes where he found the horses. The use of the augment in ἔειπον (445) is easily explained, as it refers to the immediate past, but the combination of the unaugmented ἴδον (436) and the augmented ἦλυθ’ (440) to refer to the same action in the more remote past, is unexpected. In response to Dolon’s request to be spared, Diomedes answers that he is now in their power and that there is no reason for them to spare him, as he could continue to cause sorrows to the Greek, if he stayed alive (447-453). The verb (ἴκεο, 448) refers to the immediate past and is therefore augmented.

In the lines 454-461 Dolon’s death is described in graphic terms. There are 4 (A) augmented forms, the speech conclusion of Diomedes’ speech (ἦ, 454), Dolon’s attempt to plead for his life (ἔμελλε, 454) and the description of how the head is hewn off, while it was still speaking (ἐμίχθη, 457). The fourth augmented verb is ἀνέσχεθε (461) and appears when Odysseus thanks Athene for her help by pointing out the spoils. In Odysseus’ actual grateful prayer to the goddess (462-464) there are no past tense forms.

The next passage (465-475) describes how Dolon’s spoils are taken away from him and how Odysseus and Diomedes proceed in their search for the horses. There are only two augmented verbs and 4 (3A) unaugmented verbs in this passage: ἐφώνησεν (465) is a speech conclusion, but that alone

57. See the previous note.

cannot account for the augment (although speech conclusions have much more augmented than unaugmented forms)⁵⁸ and ἔθηκε (466) is augmented, not because it describes the spoil-taking, but because it refers to the fact that these spoils will act as marking point for Odysseus and Diomedes later on, when they return from battle (526-529).

After finding the horses, Odysseus informs Diomedes that these are the horses about which Dolon had been speaking (477-481). There is one unaugmented form, πίφασκε (478), and one augmented one, ἐπέφνομεν (478). Both verbs clearly refer to the recent past, and the only possible difference in augment use is that the latter refers to the speaker and addressee themselves, whereas the former refers to the slain Dolon, who is obviously no longer present. In lines 482-507 the battle between the guardians of the horses and Odysseus and Diomedes is described: there are 7 (4A) augmented and 11 (10A) unaugmented forms in this passage. The augmented forms refer to the killing of opponents (ἔπεφνεν, 488; ἀπηύρα, 495; ἐπέστη, 496) and to the stealing of the horses (ἤειπεν and ἐξήλαυεν, 499), both of which are the most important elements in the story. Surprising is the absence of the augment in ἔμπνευσε (482), which describes Athene's inciting of the heroes, she being the main guardian angel of both Greek heroes, and in λύε (498), although it also refers to the stealing of the horses. Equally unexpected are the augments in ἔκειτο (504) and ὄρμαινε (507), especially since μερμήριζε (503) was unaugmented, although it refers to the same action as ὄρμαινε.

In Athene's speech to Diomedes (509-511) there are no (un)augmented verb forms.

In lines 512-532, the battle between Diomedes and Odysseus and the Trojans is related, as is their return to the camp of the Greeks. There are 10 (6A) augmented and 8 (A) unaugmented forms in this passage. Augmented are the verbs that refer to Diomedes' noticing of Athene's support (ζυνέηκε, 512), to the entry into the battle by Diomedes and Odysseus (ἐπεβήσετο, 513; ἐπέτοντο, 514), Apollon's intervention into the battlefield (εἶχ', 515; κατεδύσετο, 517), to the killing of Dolon (ἴκανον and ἔκταν, both 526), to the return of Odysseus and Diomedes (ἔβαν, 525; ἐπεβήσετο, 529) and to Odysseus' approval and satisfaction about what had happened (ἔπλετο, 531). Surprising is the absence of the augment in τίθει (529), because it refers back to the spoils of Dolon, and in πετέσθην (530), because it refers to the return to the Greek camp.

58. In the *Iliad* there are 218 augmented (83A) augmented and 99 (98A) unaugmented speech conclusions, and in the *Odyssey* 207 (87A) augmented and 108 (105A) unaugmented speech conclusions.

When Nestor notices Diomedes and Odysseus approaching the camp, he starts shouting and addresses them. In his speech (533-539) there are no past tense forms. The poet then describes the successful return of the two warriors and joyful welcome they receive in the camp. Nestor immediately notes the horses and inquires about their origin. This speech (544-553) contains 1 (B) augmented and 3 (A) unaugmented verb forms. The low number of augmented forms is surprising given the fact that Nestor refers to something that is clearly close to all of them and happened in the very recent past. The only unaugmented form that can reasonably be explained is *πόρεν* (546), because it has an undefined subject and refers to a less concrete event, but the other verbs refer to either the addressees (*λάβετον*, 545) or the speaker (the unaugmented *ἴδον* and the augmented *ἐνόησα*, both 550). In his answer (555-563), Odysseus describes what happened and uses 3 (A) augmented verb forms to do so. This is noteworthy, because these verbs refer to the same actions as Nestor described in his speech.

The last passage (564-579) describes how Odysseus shows the horses to the army, how the soldiers rejoice in seeing them, how they welcome back Diomedes and Odysseus, and how they start preparing sacrifices for Athene, the protector of the two heroes. There is only one augmented form, *διήλασε* (564), in the description, as the verb refers to the horses about which Nestor inquired and Odysseus answered. The other verb forms are unaugmented, because they describe actions that are less important for the story. Contrary to what would be expected, *θῆκ'* (571) and *λείβον* (579) are also unaugmented, in spite of the fact that the former refers to the display of Dolon's spoils and the latter to the sacrifice in honour of Athene.

7. Conclusion

This paper has shown that the semantic and pragmatic explanations for the augment use in epic Greek are generally speaking also applicable to *Iliad* 10. In so doing, we assume that the dichotomy Dolon vs. Diomedes - Odysseus is the main storyline (with Dolon being more prominent than the two others). We also have to mention some remarkable exceptions, such as the absence of the augment in the descriptions of Nestor and Odysseus going to Diomedes, the divine support by Athene, Dolon's capture and the sacrifice to Athene, and in the speeches by Odysseus interrogating Dolon and Nestor inquiring about the origin of the horses.

After analysing Book 10 and comparing it with the rest of the epic corpus, it is thus safe to state that the augment use in Book 10 does not significantly differ from the rest of the epic corpus (with the exception of the clitic rule). It cannot be denied that there are some notable exceptions in the semantic analysis, but other analyses (such as the ones of *Iliad* 1 and 6, and

of HH 2 and 5) showed that those works also had (several) instances where the use of the (un)augmented form could not easily be explained. The overall distinction between narrative and speeches, the data of the speech introductions and the clitic rule (in spite of the fact that there are much more exceptions in Book 10 than elsewhere) rule out that the augment use was metrically motivated. My conclusion is therefore that at least in the use of the augment no real differences between the *Doloneia* and the rest of the epic corpus can be discerned. This would not be surprising per se, if one assumes that it was an addition originating in the early Greek epic period (this agreement in augment use does not invalidate the divergences between the *Doloneia* and the *Iliad* in the [formulaic] language, as was shown by G. DANEK [1988]). Future research will have to determine the extent to which / if the augment use in other non-Homeric epic works displays (significant) differences from that in “genuine” early epic Greek.

Filip DE DECKER
FWO Vlaanderen & Universiteit Gent
filipdedecker9@gmail.com

Bibliographical references

Online databases:

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/inst/tsearch.jsp>

Chicago Homer: <https://homer.library.northwestern.edu/html/application.html>

Perseus: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:collection:Greco-Roman>

- R. ALLAN (2017): "Tense and Aspect in Greek: Two Historical Developments; Augment and Perfect", in S. RUNGE and C. FRESCH (eds.), *The Greek Verb Revisited*, Bellingham, p. 81-121.
- W. AREND (1933): *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer*, Berlin.
- E. BAKKER (1999): "Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer", in J. KAZAZIS and A. RENGAKOS (eds.), *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris. N. Maronitis*, Stuttgart, p. 50-65.
- E. BAKKER (2001): "Similes, Augment and the Language of Immediacy", in J. WATSON (ed.), *Speaking Volumes. Orality & Literacy in the Greek & Roman World*, Leiden, p. 1-23.
- E. BAKKER (2002): "Remembering the God's Arrival", *Arethusa* 35, p. 63-81.
- E. BAKKER (2005): *Pointing at the Past: from Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*, Cambridge (MA).
- W. BARRETT (1964): *Euripides Hippolytos. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford.
- L. BASSET (1989): "L'augment et la distinction discours/récit dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée", in M. CASEVITZ (ed.), *Études homériques*, Lyon, p. 9-16.
- W. BECK (1919): *De augmenti apud Homerum usu*, Giessen.
- I. BEKKER (1858): *Carmina Homerica. Volumen prius. Ilias*, Bonn.
- I. BEKKER (1863): *Homerische Blätter. Erster Band. Beilage zu dessen Carmina Homerica*, Bonn.
- I. BEKKER (1872): *Homerische Blätter. Zweiter Band. Beilage zu dessen Carmina Homerica*, Bonn.
- H. BLUMENTHAL (1974): "Some Homeric Evidence for the History of the Augment", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 79, p. 67-77.
- L. BOTTIN (1969): "Studio dell'aumento in Omero", *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 10, p. 69-145.
- C. BOZZONE (2016): "The Mind of the Poet: Cognitive and Linguistic Perspectives", in F. GALLO (ed.), *Omero: Quaestiones Disputatae* (Ambrosiana Graecolatina, 5), Milano, p. 79-105.
- K. BRUGMANN (1900): *Griechische Grammatik*, München.
- K. BRUGMANN (1904): *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg.

- K. BRUGMANN (1916): *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II.3, Strassburg.
- P. CHANTRAINE (1948): *Grammaire homérique*. Tome I : *Phonétique et morphologie*, Paris.
- P. CHANTRAINE (1953): *Grammaire homérique*. Tome II : *Syntaxe*, Paris.
- P. CHANTRAINE (1964): *Morphologie historique du grec*. Deuxième édition revue et augmentée, Paris.
- P. CHANTRAINE (1968): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Tome I : A – K, Paris.
- P. CHANTRAINE, O. MASSON, J. PERPILLOU and J. TAILLARDAT (2009): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Achevé par Olivier Masson, Jean-Pierre Perpillou et Jean Taillardat. Avec, en supplément, les Cahiers d'étymologie grecque (1-10), par Alain Blanc, Charles de Lamberterie et Jean-Louis Perpillou*, Paris.
- J. CLACKSON (2007): *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*, Cambridge.
- G. DANEK (1988): *Studien zur Dolonie*, Wien.
- F. DE DECKER (2015a): “The Augment in Homer, with Special Attention to Speech Introductions and Conclusions”, in F. DE DECKER *et al.* (eds.), *JournaLIPP 4. Proceedings of the 21st LIPP Symposium*, p. 53-71. Online publication: <https://lippub.lmu.de/index.php/lipp/article/view/4841/2723>
- F. DE DECKER (2015b): *A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Speech Introductions and Conclusions in Homer*, PhD Thesis LMU München. Online publication: <https://edocub.uni-muenchen.de/17995/>
- F. DE DECKER (2016a): “The Augment Use in *Iliad* 6: an Evidential Marker?”, *Les Études classiques* 84, p. 259-317.
- F. DE DECKER (2016b): “A Contrastive Analysis of the Homeric and Hesiodic Augment, with Special Focus on Hesiod”, *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 13, p. 33-128.
- F. DE DECKER (2017): “Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν: an Analysis of the Augment Use in *Iliad* 1”, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 45, p. 58-171.
- F. DE DECKER (2018): “The Use and Absence of the Augment in the Forms ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) and δῶκ(ε)(ν) in the *Odyssey*, with a Brief Discussion of the Origin of the Augment”, *Listy filologické* 141, p. 7-44.
- F. DE DECKER (2019a): “The Augment Use in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (HH 2)”, *Glotta* 85, p. 46-100.
- F. DE DECKER (2019b): “The Augment Use of Greek ἔειπον / εἶπον in Epic Greek: an Evidential Marker?”, *Symbolae Osloenses* 92, p. 2-56.
- F. DE DECKER (forthcoming a): “The Semantics and Pragmatics of the Augment in Epic Greek”, in *Proceedings of the International Congress of Ancient Greek Linguistics*.
- F. DE DECKER (forthcoming b): “A Morphosyntactic Analysis of the Augment in Epic Greek”, in *Proceedings of the Arbeitstagung of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft*.
- B. DELBRÜCK (1900): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*, III, Strassburg.
- J. DREWITT (1912a): “The Augment in Homer”, *Classical Quarterly* 6, p. 44-59.

- J. DREWITT (1912b): "The Augment in Homer (continued)", *Classical Quarterly* 6, p. 104-120.
- J. DREWITT (1913): "A Note on the Augment", *Classical Philology* 8, p. 349-353.
- W. EULER (1995): "Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen", in W. SMOCZYŃSKI (ed.), *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume*, Part I, Cracow, p. 137-142.
- B. FENIK (1968): *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description*, Wiesbaden.
- H. FRAENKEL (1960): "Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter", in H. FRAENKEL, *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens. Literarische und philosophiegeschichtliche Studien*. Herausgegeben von Franz TIETZE, Zweite, erweiterte Auflage, München, p. 100-156.
- Hj. FRISK (1960): *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Band I: A-Ko, Heidelberg.
- M. FRITZ (2011): *Der Dual im Indogermanischen*, Heidelberg.
- J.-L. GARCÍA-RAMÓN (2012): "TAM, Augment and Evidentiality in Indo-European". Handout from the Workshop *Grammatische und lexikalische Strukturen im Wandel* Held in Cologne, March 21st-23rd 2012.
- G. GIANNAKIS (ed.) (2014): *The Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, Leiden.
- C. GRASHOF (1852): *Abhandlung zur Kritik des homerischen Textes in Bezug auf die Abwerfung des Augments*, Düsseldorf.
- O. HACKSTEIN (2010): "The Greek of Epic", in E. BAKKER (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Malden, p. 401-423.
- I. HAJNAL (1990): "Die mykenische Verbalform e-e-to", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 51, p. 21-75.
- I. HAJNAL (2016a): "Induktive versus abduktive Rekonstruktion: das Beispiel des griechischen Augments". Handout from the Workshop in Honour of Michael Job, Held on March 2, 2016 in Göttingen.
- I. HAJNAL (2016b): "Induktive versus abduktive Rekonstruktion: das Beispiel des griechischen Augments", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121, p. 435-453.
- K. HOFFMANN (1967): *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg.
- R. JANKO (1982): *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*, Cambridge.
- R. JANKO (1992): *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Volume 4: *Books 13-16*, Cambridge.
- M. JANSE (2003): "The Metrical Schemas of the Hexameter", *Mnemosyne* NS 56, p. 343-348.
- M. JANSE (2014): *Inleiding tot de Homerische taal en metriek*, Gent.
- P. KIPARSKY (1968): "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax", *Foundations of Language* 4, p. 30-57.
- P. KIPARSKY (2005): "The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications", in *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, 2005 [accessed online: <http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/injunctive.article.pdf>].
- K. KOCH (1868): *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*, Braunschweig.
- D. KORZENIEWSKI (1968): *Griechische Metrik*, Darmstadt.

- Th. KRISCH (1990): “Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht”, in H. RIX and H. EICHNER (eds.), 1990, p. 64-81.
- R. KÜHNER and F. BLASS (1892): *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. Zweiter Band, Hannover.
- R. KÜHNER and B. GERTH (1898): *Griechische Grammatik. Satzlehre*. Erster Band, Hannover.
- M. KÜMMEL (2001): “**h₁ueh₂* ‘verlassen, aufgeben; ablassen, aufhören’”, in LIV², p. 254
- Ch. DE LAMBERTERIE (2007): “L’augment dans le texte arménien de l’Évangile”, *Revue des Études arméniennes* 30, p. 31-57.
- J. LA ROCHE (1869): *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Leipzig.
- J. LA ROCHE (1870a): *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang I-IV*, Berlin.
- J. LA ROCHE (1870b): *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang V-VIII*, Berlin.
- J. LA ROCHE (1870c): *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang IX-XII*, Berlin.
- J. LA ROCHE (1871): *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXI-XXIV*, Berlin.
- J. LA ROCHE (1882): *Das Augment des griechischen Verbum*, Linz.
- J. LA ROCHE (1893): *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Zweiter Theil, Leipzig.
- J. LATACZ (ed.) (2000): *Homer Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*, Berlin.
- R. LAZZERONI (1977): “Fra glottogonia e storia: ingiuntivo, aumento e lingua poetica indoeuropeo”, *Studi e saggi linguistici* 17, p. 1-30.
- R. LAZZERONI (2017): “Divagazioni sull’aumento in Omero”, in G. MAROTTA and F. STRIK LIEVERS (eds.), *Strutture linguistiche e dati empirici in diacronia e sincronia*, Pisa, p. 33-56.
- LIV² = H. RIX *et al.* (eds.) (2001): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden.
- LSJ = H. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, H. JONES and R. MCKENZIE (1996): *Greek-English Lexicon*, with a Revised Supplement, Oxford.
- A. LUDWICH (1892): *Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars prima. Homerii Ilias. Volumen prius*, Leipzig.
- S. LURAGHI (2014): “Conjunction Reduction”, in G. GIANNAKIS (ed.), 2014, p. 362-363.
- B. MARZULLO (1952): *Il problema omerico*, Firenze.
- A. MEILLET (1913): *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg.
- E. MINCHIN (2016): “Repetition in Homeric Epic: Cognitive and Linguistic Perspectives”, in M. ANTOVIĆ and C. PAGÁN CÁNOVAS (eds.), *Oral Poetics and Cognitive Science*, Berlin, p. 12-29.
- D. MONRO (1884): *Homer. Iliad Books I-XII*, Oxford.
- D. MONRO (1891): *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*, Oxford.
- D. MONRO and T. ALLEN (1908): *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros I-XII continens*, Oxford.
- P.-A. MUMM (1995): “Verbale Definitheit und der vedische Injunktiv”, in H. HETRICH and W. HOCK (eds.), *Verba et Structurae. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk*, Innsbruck, p. 169-193.

- P.-A. MUMM (2004): "Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments", in Th. KRISCH (ed.), *Analecta homini universali dicata. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl*, Stuttgart, p. 148-158.
- A. MURRAY and W. WYATT (1999): *Homer Iliad. Books 1-12*, Cambridge (MA).
- A. NAUCK (1877): *Homeri Ilias cum potiore lectionis varietate edidit Augustus Nauck. Pars prior*, Berlin.
- A. NUSSBAUM (1998): *Two Studies in Greek and Homeric Linguistics*, Göttingen.
- S. OSWALD (2014): "Metrical Laws", in G. GIANNAKIS (ed.) (2014), p. 419-423.
- F. PAGNIELLO (2002): *The Augment in Homer*, PhD Thesis, University of Georgia (Atlanta).
- F. PAGNIELLO (2007): "The Past-Iterative and the Augment in Homer", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 112, p. 105-123.
- A. PLATT (1891): "The Augment in Homer", *The Journal of Philology* 19, p. 211-237.
- J. POKORNY (1959): *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern.
- H. RIX (1992): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*, 2., korrigierte Auflage. Darmstadt. 2. erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage.
- H. RIX and H. EICHNER (1990) (eds.): *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, Wiesbaden.
- S. REECE (1993): *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*, Ann Arbor.
- S. RODEGHIERO (2017): "L'aumento in Omero tra narrazione e sintassi", in F. LOGOZZO and P. POCETTI (eds.), *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*, Berlin, p. 625-640.
- H. ROSÉN (1973): "Satzbau und augmentloses Tempus in Homerischen Tatsachenbericht", *Folia Linguistica* 6, p. 315-330.
- C. J. RUIJGH (1971): *Autour de "τε épique"*, Amsterdam.
- C. J. RUIJGH (1990): "La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel", in H. RIX and H. EICHNER (eds.) (1990), p. 213-233.
- E. SCHWYZER (1939): *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik. Band 1: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*, München.
- E. SCHWYZER and A. DEBRUNNER (1950): *Griechische Grammatik. Band II: Syntax*, München.
- C. J. SICKING (1993): *Griechische Verslehre*, München.
- B. SNELL (1982): *Griechische Metrik*, Göttingen.
- K. STRUNK (1975): "Zum Verhältnis von Wort und Satz in der Syntax des Lateinischen und Griechischen", *Gymnasium* 82, p. 225-239.
- O. SZEMERÉNYI (1990): *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. 4. erweiterte Ausgabe, Darmstadt.
- O. SZEMERÉNYI (1996): *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, Oxford.
- I. TAIDA (2004): "Elision and Augment in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite", *Research Journal of Graduate Students of Letters* (Hokkaido University) 4, p. 95-103.

- I. TAIDA (2007): "Elision and Augment in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*", *Exemplaria Classica* 11, p. 3-12.
- I. TAIDA (2010): "Augment in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*", *Hermes* 138, p. 250-258.
- H. VAN THIEL (1996): *Homeri Ilias*, Hildesheim.
- H. VAN THIEL (2011): *Homeri Ilias*. Second edition, Hildesheim.
- F. VON THIERSCH (1826): *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*, Leipzig.
- W. VEITCH (1873): *Greek Verbs. Defective and Irregular*, Oxford.
- A. VERGADOS (2013): *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text and Commentary*, Berlin.
- E. VISSER (1987): *Homerische Versifikationstechnik. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*, Stuttgart.
- C. VITI (2011): "The Use of the Dual Number in Homer", in Th. KRISCH and Th. LINDNER (eds.), *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog: Akten der XIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 27. September 2008 in Salzburg*, Wiesbaden, p. 595-604.
- J. WACKERNAGEL (1892): "Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1, p. 333-436 [= J. WACKERNAGEL (1953), p. 1-104].
- J. WACKERNAGEL (1906): "Wortumfang und Wortform", *Göttinger Gelehrte Nachrichten*, p. 147-184 [= J. WACKERNAGEL (1953), p. 148-185].
- J. WACKERNAGEL (1953): *Kleine Schriften*, I. Göttingen.
- C. WATKINS (1998): "Proto-Indo-European: Comparison and Reconstruction", in A. GIACALONE RAMAT and P. RAMAT (eds.), *The Indo-European Languages*, London, p. 25-73.
- M. WEST (1982): *Greek Meter*, Oxford.
- M. WEST (1989): "An Unrecognized Injunctive Usage in Greek", *Glotta* 67, p. 135-138.
- M. WEST (1998): *Homeri Ilias*. Volumen I: *Rhapsodiae I-XI*, Berlin.
- J. WILLS (1993): "Homeric Particle Order", *Historische Sprachforschung* 106, p. 61-81.
- W. WYATT (1969): *Metrical Lengthening in Homer*, Roma.

