

THE AUGMENT IN HOMER.

I.

THOUGH the problem of the Homeric augment eventually needs a rather intricate handling, it can at first be stated quite simply. Briefly, the facts are these:

A. True present-aorists, such as are seen in the similes and gnomes, take the augment *idiomatically*.¹ In the whole of the similes there are only sixteen unaugmented aorists; three of the instances are difficult (Γ 4, Δ 279, O 682), but the rest could be emended by slight changes.²

B. Iteratives do not take the augment; ν 7 is the only certain exception.

C. In the narrative proper both the aorist and the imperfect are relatively much less often augmented than they are in speeches.³

D. Within the speeches themselves there is a curious difference of treatment. (a) What may be called the *present-reference* aorist (or 'aorist-for-perfect'), nearly always takes the augment. For example, the aorist with νῦν shows hardly any unaugmented forms except such as βουλευσατο or ἰκόμην. (b) On the other hand, true *preterite* aorists (i.e. aorists which have a plain past sense) can very well dispense with the augment even in speeches. Augmented forms are indeed commoner here than in narrative proper, but in the *Iliad* not very greatly so. In the *Odyssey* there is a striking change; among true past aorists in speeches we find an enormous rise in augmentation.

These points suggest one thing clearly enough. It is not the augment that creates or emphasizes the past meaning in any tense. The iterative, a purely narrative tense, does not admit the augment. The present-aorist, a typically non-narrative tense, can hardly exist without it. Nor is the fact surprising, if we suppose that originally the augment was an interjection or particle, which would mark some connexion with, or reference to, the present. In Greek, as in Sanskrit, the invariable use of the augment in historical tenses may very well be a later growth. If this view is taken as probable, it at once raises the question how we are to understand the mixture

¹ Professor Platt.

² In Ψ 223 ἀράχῃσι is possible.

³ Koch, cited by Munro and by Platt.

of forms found in Homeric narrative. Can any special sense be assigned to the augmented verbs as opposed to the others, or must we look upon the interchange as purely scansional? That the latter is the true answer cannot be doubted. Take the following phrases:

$$\begin{cases} \text{καὶ ἀκόντισε δουρὶ φαεινῷ} \\ \text{μέλεον δ' ἠκόντισαν ἄμφω} \\ \text{χώρατο δ' αἰνῶς (δ' Ἔκτωρ)} \\ \text{ἐχώσατο φώνησέν τε.} \end{cases}$$

It is useless to try to differentiate the meaning of the two forms; but in each pair the metrical reason for the interchange is quite obvious. Compare further such lines as N 408, 605, Σ 217, T 14, Φ 147, where it would be hard to explain the augment, or the want of it, by the sense.

Compelled to admit that the use is scansional, can we now settle that one form was normal and idiomatic, while the other was merely a metrical device? Professor Van Leeuwen (*Ench.*, pp. 330 sqq.) definitely takes the line that it is the unaugmented form that is the metrical licence. But even on a bare count of the instances, the view is a paradox. Here are the statistics:¹

AORIST, NARRATIVE PROPER (SIMILES AND GNOMES OMITTED).

				Unaugmented.		Augmented.
<i>Iliad</i>	2354	...	1673
<i>Odyssey</i>	1031	...	911

It is a little odd, to say the least of it, that the metrical licence should in narrative be actually more frequent than the idiomatic form. Nor do the figures for the imperfect give much help; for though the gross statistics for this tense in narrative show rather more augments, the increase is due only to phrases which introduce speeches or resume from them. If these imperfects are roughly split off, the remaining instances show even less augmentation than was found in the aorist:

IMPERFECT, NARRATIVE PROPER (GROSS STATISTICS).

				Unaugmented.		Augmented.
<i>Iliad</i>	1671	...	1325
<i>Odyssey</i>	830	...	817

When the introductions and resumptions of speeches are roughly subtracted, the figures become:

				Unaugmented.		Augmented.
<i>Iliad</i>	1538	...	844
<i>Odyssey</i>	691	...	430

¹ The Clarendon Press edition (*recensuit* D. B. Monro, 1901) is used throughout.

On this showing we ought perhaps to try the opposite view—viz., that in narrative it was the unaugmented verb which originally was idiomatic. To test the view, we must inquire what is the metrical evidence for the unaugmented and augmented forms respectively. In later recitation augments may often have been inserted, and in MSS. the same tendency becomes quite irrational (Dr. Leaf on E 425). Here, as for most points, the metre is the only clue; and we must take a separate count of the instances where either the unaugmented or the augmented form is clearly maintained by the verse. In this reckoning, and in the others given presently, the books B 484-end, Θ, I, K, Ψ, and Ω, will be tabled by themselves; the rest of the *Iliad* will be called 'the *Iliad* without B² etc.' When this is done, the following are the figures for the unaugmented and the augmented forms made certain by the metre:

AORIST, NARRATIVE PROPER.						
			Unaugmented.		Augmented.	
			Metrically Certain.	Uncertain.	Certain.	Uncertain.
<i>Iliad</i> without B ² etc.	1537	303	543	732
B ² etc.	441	73	159	239
<i>Odyssey</i>	859	172	339	572

IMPERFECT, NARRATIVE PROPER.						
<i>Iliad</i> without B ² etc.	876	257	227	367
B ² etc.	307	98	103	147
<i>Odyssey</i>	527	164	137	293

The table shows clearly the great proportion of unaugmented forms maintained by the scansion. The metrical evidence very strongly suggests two things: In the first place, augmented tenses were originally avoided in narrative—the use may have been as low as 1 in 5; secondly, the augment has later been inserted in a majority of the instances where the metre would receive it. If the augment had really been used in narrative as often as it is read, a much larger percentage of instances would be inherent in the verse. For example, in the *Iliad* without B² etc. the text gives 104 augmented aorists in similes; no less than sixty-three of these augments are needed by the metre. That is to say, where the augment was really used, it shows fewer metrically doubtful examples than we find in narrative. The converse case is that of the iteratives. Though an estimate here is more difficult, perhaps about 5 in 9 of the instances may be said to be maintained by the scansion. That is to say,

when unaugmented forms are used, they ought to show a *higher* ratio of metrically doubtful examples than we see in the narrative aorist. There is only one way of reconciling all the facts. We must suppose that a large proportion of the narrative augments are later insertions; it is the unaugmented form which in narrative was preferred as idiomatic, while the augment was used sparingly and only for the sake of the verse.

The one way to escape this conclusion would be to show that a considerable proportion of the unaugmented verbs in narrative have, on general principles, some clear metrical advantage as opposed to the augmented forms. There are many aorists in which the augment would give a bad scansion—e.g., ἀλάπαξε, περιόνησε, βάλε, πάπτηνε, etc. Let us call the unaugmented form of these aorists metrically *preferential*. Now, if these preferential forms were in the majority in narrative, we might see in them some explanation of the common unaugmented use; but, even on an extreme reckoning, they are hardly more than 2 in 7 of the unaugmented aorists (*Iliad* without B² etc., narrative). The proportion is not nearly large enough to account for the facts; and we must remember, too, that among the certain examples of the narrative augment (*Iliad* without B² etc.) aorists like ἤρπε or ἠπείλησε are about 1 in 4; these augments are as directly preferential as is the unaugmented form in βάλε or πάπτηνε.

Professor Van Leeuwen's view—that the augmented tenses are the commoner, and that it is the unaugmented form which is the metrical licence—is due to two assumptions. In the first place, the difference of treatment in the speeches is dismissed as irrelevant, and the peculiarity of the present-aorist is mentioned only as disputable; all aorists—narrative, speech-narrative, present-reference, and true-present—are lumped together. Secondly, nearly all the instances which are here called 'metrically certain,' are by Professor Van Leeuwen included in the class here distinguished as 'metrically preferential'; thus, βῆ at the start of a line, and ἀκόντισε after the weak caesura, and λῦσε after the fourth diresis, are by him supposed to be metrically explicable. That there is good metrical *evidence* for these forms is obvious; but is there a metrical *explanation*? Professor Van Leeuwen's theory is as follows: Originally the hexameter had an anacrusis, and besides this the third foot was laxer, admitting first-pæons, cretics, etc.; later, when the anacrusis was dropped and the third foot simplified, it was natural that augments should be omitted—e.g. an original

ἔστη δὲ μάλ' ἐγγὺς ἰὼν καὶ ἠκόντισε δουρὶ φαεινῷ

would become (the change seems certainly for the better)

στῆ δὲ μάλ' ἐγγὺς ἰὼν καὶ ἀκόντισε κ.τ.λ.

Such a view is only hypothetical, and there is little support for the hypothesis.¹

¹ The point has been discussed (*Classical Quarterly*, April, 1908, pp. 94 sqq.).

Both ἔσση and ἡκόντισε are, in general, convenient scansiones. It is true that if you will start the line (as we now have it) with words like ἔβη, ἔβησε or ἔβήσεται, you must leave out the augment; but if the augment is normal, why start the line with such forms? Further, the unaugmented aorist is very common, as Professor Van Leeuwen notices, after the fourth diaeresis; yet no one suggests that an anacrusis has been lost here. Lastly, even if it were directly revealed that the hexameter first had an anacrusis and then dropped it, the sure fact of the changed verse would make but a hazardous theory of the omitted augment. We should have on our hands the unthinkable coincidence of Vedic literature, which also drops the augment—most of all, it is said, in the true past aorist—but the metrical conditions seem to be quite different.

Dismissing this anacrusis, let us take the supposition in a rather more probable sense—viz. that the augment was normal and idiomatic, but at the beginning of the line, or after the fourth diaeresis, it was suppressed by metrical necessity. Even this view leads to great difficulties. There are other scansional breaks where we often find a pause in the sense; but after these pauses we do not see the augments which the metre here would naturally admit. For instance, though ἔβη δέ could not start the line, ἔβη δ', ἔβη δ' ἄρα, ἔδν δέ μιν, etc., look as if they might very well stand after the weak caesura. In the whole *Iliad* such scansiones are not found in narrative proper. Again, ἔθηκε δέ or ἔπαυσε δέ might very well be used after the third trochaic; but in the *Iliad* there are no narrative examples. Conversely, though combinations like θέσαν δ' or πόπεν δέ οἱ are placed after the weak caesura, yet in the *Iliad* (narrative) ἔθεσαν δ' and ἔποπεν δέ οἱ are not placed after the strong. The facts are curious, and point to a principle which we shall meet again later.

Everything that has come to light here suggests that we should do well to try another view. It is the augmented form, apparently, which in narrative is introduced under pressure of the metre. The true past aorist was originally unaugmented; when the augment was added, it gave to the tense either a true present meaning (ideal), or some shade of present-reference (actual). As time went on, the augment was understood differently, and became the great sign of a past tense. This change has affected the epics in two ways. In the first place, it was beginning to be felt even in the earliest periods of the verse; and secondly, the further progress of the use put constant pressure on the tradition, modifying most of the aorists and imperfects where the augment was not excluded by the metre. Our view so far is fully in accordance with the facts; but we have still to make out how the supposed change in the use of the augment could have arisen and continued.¹

Two things at least are likely to have helped here. In the first place the shade in a present-reference tense varies so much that there can scarcely be

¹ It is essential that the causes assigned should be possible in Sanskrit too.

any hard and fast line between present-reference and true past. The meaning of the two can under certain circumstances nearly coincide, and make the use of the augment immaterial. For example, the tense-distinction between 'that is the tallest man I have ever killed' (ἐκτανόν) and 'that was the tallest man I ever killed' (κτάνον, H 155) can often be a mere subtlety. So an aged angler may speak, in either tense, about that monstrous fish which he killed, or has killed, κοῦρος ἑών. The fish—εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε—lay πολλός τις on the bank long ago; but its ounces, like the dead man's inches, are a present glory.

Another cause may be seen in the primitive generalizing sentences. According to their content, these fall into two distinct types. One kind—e.g. '(they contended) as a lion and a boar fight together'—is, and must essentially remain, a generalization; as such, it depends entirely upon the present tense—*fight* not *fought*. The other sort—e.g. '(they came out) at the time when the sun rises'—readily changes its tense to 'when the sun rose'; the loss of the generalization here is no great matter. In the same way, it is likely that the choice between a conceivable

δφρ' ἄρ τ' ἔστ' ἡὼς καὶ ἀέξεται ἱερὸν ἥμαρ (ideal present¹)

and δφρα μὲν ἡὼς ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἥμαρ (actual past)

might eventually turn on euphony and scansion.² Now and then the form of such phrases is wholly ambiguous (e.g. H 433). In ν 93 we see the sort of combination in which a present aorist could gradually come to be felt as preterite.³ The instances are Odyssean; but the process, *in actual speech*, was presumably very much older.

It is, then, natural to think that the change in the augment may have been partly mediated by the unstable sense of some generalizing clauses which were easily shifted to the particular. Far greater must have been the effect of the protean present-reference tense, so that we should expect to find that the true past aorist first suffered augmentation more readily in speeches than in narrative proper; and this is exactly what we do find. The converse change—the use of the unaugmented aorist as an ideal present—hardly makes its way in. It is a very rare licence, and perhaps did not arise until unaugmented forms were felt merely as 'epic.'

The other great narrative tense, the imperfect, could not be directly affected by generalization. But it could be, and was, affected by present-reference; and this may have gone so far as to give the tense one use in which it was felt as a true present (οὐδ' ἄρα . . . ἦεν, which is twice found in similes O 274, Φ 495). Augmentation of the narrative imperfect was no doubt much helped—it may originally have been made possible—by the analogy of the past aorist. It is to be noticed that the treatment of the imperfect generally seems less archaistic than that of the aorist. In spite of this the imperfect is the less augmented of the two; and we may infer that augmentation of past tenses

¹ Of course, not *historic* present.

² cf. A 735, which is clearly past.

³ ἡ]ῶς became disliked.

began with the aorist, and spread gradually to the imperfect, and even more slowly to the pluperfect. The iterative is in a still better position. The tense, like some uses of the subordinate optative, is due to an effort to formulate particular past recurrence as opposed to generalization; naturally, the augment οὐχ ἤκει οὐδὲ ἤξει δεῦρο.

II.

THE TEMPORAL AUGMENT, AND THE TYPE ἄκουσε.

The foregoing sketch may perhaps satisfy the reader that there is some *prima facie* support for the view taken here. But the case cannot be completely presented, until we have looked more closely into the detailed facts of augmentation. In framing the tables which follow, an attempt has been made to sort out some of the more doubtful examples, so that anyone may apply his own method of reckoning. Attention is drawn to some special points:

(a) Unaugmented aorists and imperfects following the weak caesura—e.g. Αἶαντε || καλέσσατο or τοῖσιν || ὀμίλει—are counted as metrically certain, though the text gives twenty-three narrative syllabics with elision here (e.g. κατὰ μῆρ' || ἐκάνη).

(b) Dibrachs in -εν (with not more than one initial consonant; types βάλεν and φέρεν) are *not* counted as certain *except* when -ν closes the bucolic. The same principle has been applied to ἔλεν.

(c) Long-vowel forms—ἡγεμόνευε, ἡγεῖτο, ἡγήσατο, ἦστο, ἵθυσε, etc.—are entirely neglected, except where the augment is shown qualitatively (e.g. ἡρᾶτο).

(d) The imperfect of εἰμί is also omitted, since here (if only on account of ἔσκειν, etc.) metrical evidence by itself is often indecisive.

(e) ἄλτο is taken as unaugmented (probably ἄλτο), but the compounds are regarded as uncertain, and Α 532 is reckoned as ἔαλτο; εἶσε is taken as ἔσσε, and εἵρυσσε(-αν) as Φείρυσσε(-αν).

(f) In the metrically unsecured classes, the columns headed 'Syllabic A' give all instances such as "Ηφαιστος μὲν δῶκε or οὐδ' ἔτορε ζῶσθηρα, where the insertion or omission of the augment would make a distinct, but not impossible, scansional change.

In other respects the tables will be found to explain themselves.

AORIST, NARRATIVE PROPER (i.e., SPEECHES OMITTED ; ALSO SIMILES AND GNOMES).																								
Augmented.													Unaugmented.											
Certain.													Uncertain.											
Temporal in <i>arsi</i> .													Temporal before two consonants.											
Temporal in <i>thesi</i> .													Diphthongs.											
<i>εθε-ετο</i> , and compounds.													<i>φθ</i> .											
Contracted in <i>arsi</i> .													<i>ταυρ</i> .											
Syllabic.													<i>ἀπαισα</i> .											
													Syllabic A.											
													Syllabic in compounds.											
Temporal.													Temporal.											
<i>εθε</i> , etc., and compounds.													<i>εθε-ετ</i> .											
													<i>εθρε-ετ</i> .											
													<i>αλτο</i> .											
													<i>-ετ</i> in bucolic.											
													Syllabic after third trochaic.											
													Other Syllabic.											
Temporal before two consonants, etc.													Temporal before two consonants, etc.											
Diphthongs.													Diphthongs.											
Syllabic A.													Syllabic A.											
Syllabic in compounds.													Syllabic in compounds.											
A	1	3	—	—	19	10	—	—	1	1	15	22	10	2	1	—	—	—	3	42	—	4	9	1
B ¹	—	1	1	—	13	4	—	—	2	—	6	10	11	2	—	—	—	—	1	28	2	2	1	—
Γ	1	3	2	1	19	6	1	—	—	—	9	12	9	—	—	—	—	1	2	26	2	2	1	—
Δ	5	3	—	—	10	10	—	—	1	—	11	8	13	1+1	—	—	2	2	1	54	1	5	5	12
E	10	4	3	—	30	12	—	—	—	—	20	21	33	6+1	2	—	—	12	92	19	10	—	—	
Z	3	1	2	—	15	7	—	—	—	1	8	17	9	3	—	—	—	1	3	22	1	3	3	19
H	4	—	1+1	—	17	12	1	—	—	—	10	23	9	6	1	—	—	1	2	40	3	3	6	—
Λ	9	3	2	1	32	18	1	—	—	1	11	18	38	5+1	—	1	1	1	3	80	1	12	9	1
M	5	—	—	—	9	4	1	—	—	—	14	7	11	1	—	—	—	2	54	—	—	—	—	16
N	10	3	4	—	30	21	—	—	3	—	15	16	27	2	—	—	4	1	5	65	—	14	16	8
Ξ	9	—	3	—	25	6	—	—	—	—	9	12	20	2	—	—	—	2	55	—	1	9	13	—
O	4	—	3	—	31	20	1	—	—	1	20	14	24	4	—	—	—	2	8	66	1	5	12	—
Π	12	3	3	—	35	10	1	1	—	1	24	26	27	7+1	—	1	4	2	9	130	1	6	21	2
P	10	4	—	—	26	11	1	1	2	—	12	15	32	4	—	—	—	1	11	64	2	3	13	1
Σ	2	1	1+1	1	9	7	2	—	2	—	4	12	11	1	1	—	—	1	6	44	1	2	8	1
T	—	—	—	—	8	3	—	—	—	—	7	5	6	1	—	—	—	—	4	24	—	—	—	—
Φ	10	1	—	—	20	15	—	—	—	1	7	12	12	2	—	—	3	2	8	36	—	7	12	—
Χ	4	1	2	—	20	12	1	—	1	2	13	16	14	3	—	—	2	4	9	58	—	3	9	6
X	3	1	—	—	10	8	2	1	—	—	8	9	8	1	—	—	—	—	1	4	28	1	3	1
Totals	102	29	31	3	378	196	11	5	12	10	223	275	324	57	5	3	24	100	1002	15	94	187	7	—
B ²	—	—	1	—	5	6	—	—	—	—	11	5	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	26	—	—	2	—
Θ	7	—	2	—	18	8	—	—	—	—	9	13	21	2+1	—	1	—	1	9	57	1	2	11	1
I	—	—	—	—	13	1	1	—	—	—	3	12	5	1	1	—	—	—	1	15	—	1	6	—
K	5	—	4	1	20	6	1	1	—	1	7	23	10	2	—	—	—	—	2	45	2	3	5	—
Ψ	10	2	1	1	46	30	4	—	1	2	23	17	28	3	2	1	—	1	9	106	2	16	3	—
Ω	2	4	1	—	16	13	3	—	—	—	11	26	20	2	—	—	2	—	5	57	2	5	11	—
Totals	24	6	9	2	118	64	9	1	2	3	64	96	85	12	6	2	2	2	26	306	7	11	51	4
Odyssey	65	14	19	1	240	126	3	3	1	—	164	275	167	24	9	1	3	15	71	569	4	31	134	3

IMPERFECT, NARRATIVE PROPER : (A) AUGMENTED.																				
		Metrically Certain.										Metrically Uncertain.								
		<i>ῥίσι, ῥίσιαν.</i>	Other temporal <i>in arsi</i> .	<i>ῥησιβρο.</i>	<i>ἴκι, ἁνέων.</i>	Other temporal <i>in thesis</i> .	<i>ἀσι ἐφαρ'.</i>	<i>ἐπος ῥ' ἐφαρ'.</i>	<i>ἐμῆλλε -ορ.</i>	Contracted <i>in arsi</i> .	Other syllabic.	Initial vowels.	Aspirates.	<i>ῥήσσι</i> and compounds.	Other diphthongs.	Other aspirates.	<i>-έφην, -εφώρεε.</i>	Other compounds.	Syllabic A.	Miscellaneous.
<i>Iliad</i> (not B ³ etc.) ...	13	23	33	11	6	92	15	7	16	151	82	15	105	27	5	111	89	135	14	
B ³ etc. ...	2	21	16		1	13	2	3	8	64	44	5	23	5	4	31	33	48	8	
<i>Odyssey</i> ...	14	25	25	3	9	71	23	5	9	72	72	9	128	18	6	140	62	89	37	

IMPERFECT, NARRATIVE PROPER : (B) UNAUGMENTED.														
	Metrically Certain.										Metrically Uncertain.			
	<i>ἀνδρᾶς</i> , ¹	<i>ἀνδρεὺς</i> -ον. ¹	<i>ἀνδέρω</i> .	<i>ἀνδραῖστρο</i> .	<i>τε, τρῶ, τῶν</i> .	Other temporal.	<i>τε</i> and compounds.	<i>ὅς φάτο</i> , etc.	<i>ἐπέειπε</i> , etc.	<i>ἔλετο</i> , -οντο.	<i>ἤσανε</i> .	-ει in bucolic.	Syllabic after third trochaic.	Other syllabic.
	Temporal.	Diphthongs.	<i>τοῖα</i> , <i>τοῦ</i> , etc.	<i>ἔειπ</i> , * etc.	<i>ἔειπε</i> , etc.	Syllabic A.	Compounds.	Miscellaneous.						
<i>Iliad</i> (not B ² etc.)	15	12	3	1	21	143	26	6	2	29	3	9	57	588
B ² etc. ...	2	5	2	—	8	8	23	3	8	—	—	—	23	210
<i>Odyssey</i> ...	23	21	1	11	17	89	7	79	4	43	5	4	41	321

The tables show an abundance of unaugmented forms in both epics, but most of all in the *Iliad* without B² etc. Augments, on the other hand, are not so common, and from the metrically certain instances it may be gathered that their use is restricted by three principles, which must now be discussed. The temporal augment is perhaps clearest, and will be considered first.

We can get a very good idea of the narrative temporal, merely by looking

¹ The figures include only those instances which occur in the introductions or resummptions of speeches.

² The accent is neglected, as it was in ἀφῆκε, etc.

at the eight metrically certain instances in the pluperfect—*ἡρήρευτο* Γ 358, Δ 136, Η 252, Λ 436; *ἡρήρει* Μ 56; *ῥώρει* Σ 498; *ἡνώγει* Ω 190, and *ἡνώγον* ζ 216. The primary example is *ἡρήρευτο*, where the use of the augment is exactly parallel to the lengthening of a short syllable under ictus (*ἡρήρευτο* : : *Οὐλύμποιο*). The extension to *ἡρήρει* (and *ῥώρει*) is secondary; but even here the *ρ* still keeps us in sight of the tradition, which is quite lost in *ἡνώγει-ον*, by this time perhaps felt as imperfects.

The same principle applies to a great majority of the aorist temporals—they are used to modify forms such as tribrachs or antispasts, which are troublesome owing to the general conditions of the verse. In the *Iliad* without B² etc. (narrative) there are for the aorist 131 examples of the temporal augment before one consonant. Of these, 102 are *in arsi*; and of the 102, at least 89 fall under the primary scheme—that is to say, the forms when deaugmented would scan as follows:

Open tribrachs—type *ᾔλετο*, 14; type *ἔριπε*, 30; type *ἔλασε*, 13.

Tribrachs with *-ν*—type *ἔριπεν*, 10; type *ἔλασεν*, 9.

Closed tribrachs—7 *ἔλυθον* + 1 *ἔλασαν*.

Analogous to antispasts—*ἐπηπείλησ'* Α 319, *ἀπηλοίησεν* Δ 522, *ἀπηνήναντο* Η 185.

Open tetrabrachs—Π 190, Χ 471.

The remaining 13 *in arsi* are:

*ἡκέσατ'*¹ Ε 901, *ἡράσατ'* Π 182.

ἥυσεν Α 275, 586, Μ 439, Ν 149, Ρ 247; *ἀπύραξεν* Ξ 497.

ἥλειψαν Σ 350; *ἰάνθη* Ο 103, *ὠρίνθη* Π 509; *παρηέρθη* Π 341; *ἰέκσθη* Ξ 283.

The last eleven instances must be compared with the corresponding forms *in thesi*.

The twenty-nine temporals *in thesi* are divided into two types:

(a) *ἀάσατο* Α 340², *ἡγάσσατο* Γ 181, *ῥέξαθ'* Ε 851.

ἡλεύατο Ν 184, 404, 503, Π 610, Ρ 305, 526, Χ 274; *ἡτίμασεν* Α 11.

ἡλύπαπε Β 245, Γ 427, Ρ 141, *ἡρύκακε* Ε 321, Τ 458, Φ 594; *ἡκόντισαν* Π 336.

(b) ? *ἔκοντο* Α 484, Γ 264, Ε 367.

ἡκουσε Π 531 (? ? Χ 447), *ἥυσε* Α 462 (? Ε 784, Α 10, Σ 217), *ᾠῆξε* Ζ 298.

ἡγειραν Ρ 261, *ἡγερθεν* Α 57.

Nearly all the examples in (b) are rather doubtful; *ἔκοντο* may be a false simplification of *ἀφίκοντο*; *στάς* (*στᾶς*) *ἥυσε* admits *στή καὶ αὔσε*; *ἀνόιξε*

¹ Really a speech-augment (Ε 402); the natural ictus is *ἡκέσατο*. Π 182 *ἡράσατ'* is Odyssean, but perhaps not quite so difficult as *ἡκέσατ'*, because of the *ρ*.

² The line shows five rarities, and the scansion is unexampled, even in the speeches.

(ἀνέφξε) could conceivably stand for ὦξε. In fact, had not the type appeared in *arsi* (eleven in all, see above), the instances in *thesi* would hardly be worth discussion.

But even if we keep all these aorists as they are given in the text, we must still be surprised at the *extreme rarity of the temporal augment with amphibrachs* like ἄκουσε, αὔσε, etc. The ratio of the augmented and unaugmented forms is shown in the following table (*Iliad* without B² etc., aorist, narrative proper) :

	Augmented, <i>in thesi.</i>	Augmented, <i>in arsi.</i>	Unaugmented.
Type αὔσε	9	5	63
„ αὔσαν	2	1	11
„ ἐρείσθη	—	4	9
„ ἐπόρουσε	—	1	51
„ ἐπόρουσαν	—	—	3
„ ἔλασσε	—	—	17
„ ἀπέμεσσε	—	—	1
„ προέρεσαν	—	—	1
Totals	11	11	156

The figures make it quite clear that there was something against the augmentation of these amphibrachs. Thus ὄρουσε, a very common aorist, is never augmented; ἔλασσε, too, and its type do not appear. Nor is it to be thought that originally such aorists were often augmented where in the text, as we have it, a compound like ἐπόρουσε has been substituted. The position is really the reverse—ὄρουσε has not been deaugmented to admit the preposition; the preposition is used to obviate ὄρουσε. Compounded or uncompoundd, these verbs normally refuse the augment, and their treatment is exactly like that of the fixed amphibrachs (ἄχ') ἀριστον, etc. For instance, the aorists are often combined with an elided dibrach—as in μέγ' αὔσε, θπ' ἄκουσε, καὶ τότ' ὄλοντο, ἄμ' ὅπασσε, etc. We can hardly suppose that reciters at a later time put in these words to gratify a brute prejudice against ἔκουσε, etc. In the first place, the later tendency was in favour of the augment, not against it; and secondly, the phrases in question often conclude the verse, so that to be consistent we should have to assume a number of lines ending with ἔκουσε and the like—a scansion which cannot be proved anywhere in the two epics. Again, the unaugmented aorist is sometimes preceded by μέν (as in Λ 233); if in such cases we suspect an original augment ousted by the particle, we shall have the disappointment of finding that where μέν occurs, it really does contrast with the next clause. In fact, while noticing a wealth of devices to avoid this augment, we shall come upon nothing to suggest that their use was not original. Type ἄκουσε was consciously maintained; and the rule—for it is a kind of rule—became stereotyped. It can be seen, though not

so clearly,¹ in B² etc., and in the *Odyssey*. The augments (aorist, narrative) are :—*in arsi*, ἦϋσεν Θ 227, ἰάνθη Ψ 598; *in thesi*, ὤϊξε Ω 446, ὤρεξε Ω 102, ἡγερθεν Ω 790, ἡειραν Ω 590; in the *Odyssey*—*in arsi*, ἡλειψεν τ 505, ἡνικεν σ 300, χ 493, ἦϋσεν ω 530, ὤϊξεν α 436, γ 392, χ 399, ὤϊξαν ψ 370, ω 501; *in thesi*, ἴκοντο γ 488, ο 186, 193, π 335, ρ 85, 178, ω 362, ἡκουσε ρ 492, ἡγερθεν β 9, θ 24, ω 421. (Neglected—δ 784, τ 89, χ 354, 361.)

Contrast the figures for the corresponding unaugmented forms :

Type	ἄϋσε	B ² etc.	...	<i>Odyssey</i> .
„	ἄϋσαν	19	...	44
„	ἐρείσθη	6	...	8
„	ἐπύρουνσε	5	...	6
„	ἐπύρουνσαν	13	...	8
„	ἐλασσσε	—	...	2
„	ἐλασσσε	5	...	9
„	ἐλασσσαν	1	...	1
„	παρέλασσ'	2	...	-av 1
Totals	—	...	—
				51		79

If we are right in supposing that this dislike of augmented amphibrachs was early petrified into a sort of rule, we can get evidence from the similes, where aorists such as ὄρουσε should not appear—for the simile would insist on the augment, and the amphibrach would steadily refuse it. It seems that this difficulty was really felt; for in the whole of the similes, out of 147 aorists (indicative) there are only two of this kind—viz. ἡλυξε Δ 476, and ἐξήλασσαν Δ 562 (neglected—ἦιξε Δ 118). The form ἐξήλασσαν is not really an exception, as will be explained later; but even if it be reckoned, the proportion, 2 in 147, seems rather small for this kind of aorist, especially as in narrative (*Iliad* without B² etc.) ὄρουσε and analogues are about 1 in 18 of all the aorists used (both augmented and unaugmented together).

The facts, then, all point in one direction. There was some special preference for the unaugmented form in aorists like ἄκουσε. The preference is not hard to understand. In early times, we may suppose, a past sense had not been fully mediated for the augment, and consequently the use was avoided in narrative, except where there was some strong scansional inducement. Verbs like ὄρουσε offer no such inducement; indeed, general metrical principles are against their augmentation, which gives an *unnecessary* spondee. Hence the type was originally less augmented than any other except ἀλάπαξε, etc. Later, since in old narrative there were no precedents for ὥρουσε, etc., the non-augmentation of amphibrachs became a petrified epicism or 'rule.'

It will probably be objected that the epic avoidance of spondees is uncertain and capricious, and could hardly account for the rigid maintenance of ὄρουσε, etc. The objection, as far as it goes, is quite unanswerable. Clearly, the mere fact that ὥρουσε gives an extra spondee, could never have

¹ The treatment of the imperfect is less conservative.

kept out the augment. We must see that, if there was any liking for the narrative augment, the adherence to *δρουσε* and the petrification of the type are wildly inconceivable. The truth must be the other way about. In the earliest period the unaugmented form was proper to a true past meaning, and the augment did not, and could not, *show* such meanings, though it had been so far mediated that it was just compatible with them. But though the process had gone so far, the augment was still distinctly felt as a metrical licence. As such, it would scarcely be employed where it must, on general principles, give a spondaic scansion; for with type *δρουσε* there are a number of possibilities by which—*ρήιδίως*—both the augment can be avoided and the dactyl maintained.

The reader, however, will feel another difficulty. 'On your view,' he will say, 'there should be nothing against the augmentation of bacchiacs like *δρίνθη*. Final *-η* of this kind is rarely shortened; and so unless *δρίνθη* is restricted to the end of the verse, it must give an extra spondee. You may write *ωρίνθη δέ οί ἦτορ* or *πᾶσιν δρίνθη θυμός*, but in either case you will get the spondee which was always in the word.' The objection would be fatal, except for the fact that it is just the bacchiacs, and the bacchiacs only, which are freely augmented, as is proved by the table above, in which they were included merely to show the difference of treatment. The 129 open amphibrachs (*ἄυσε* etc.)¹ have six augments *in arsi*, and the fifteen closed amphibrachs have one; the thirteen bacchiacs have four.

The reader, still unconvinced, will ask, 'Why did Homer augment the type *ἀλεύατο* more than the type *ἄκουσε*, if he disliked the spondee?' The question is embarrassing merely because the facts are intricate. To begin with, the statistics for both types are hampered by standing lines. There would be no example of type *ἤκουσεν in arsi* except for the verse *ἤυσεν δέ διαπρύσιον*, etc.—a surprising combination, since *ἄυσε δέ* would be the natural ictus. The phrase is plainly secondary or 'shifted,' as the place of *διαπρύσιον* alone is enough to show; and it is to be noticed also that the line makes an introduction to speeches. The augment is everywhere curiously unrestricted in these introductions and resumptions. Thus, in type *ἀλεύατο* too,² both *ἡλύπατε* and *ἡγάσασατο* introduce speeches. It cannot be denied, however, that the relative frequency of the augment with type *ἀλεύατο* is mainly due, not to the formulae introducing a speech, but to the standing line

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἄντα ἰδὼν ἡλεύατο χάλκεον ἔγχος (φαίδιμος"Εκτωρ)

which seems to be a shift from phrases with *καὶ ἀλεύατο* (Λ 360, cf. H 254). In the standing line, the dislike of penthemimeral *-εν* (*ἶδεν καὶ ἀλεύατο*) out-

¹ *ἔλασσε*, etc., are here omitted, since *ἔλασσεν* is hardly a possible scansion. Type *ἔλασσε* must be compared with *ἔλασε*, etc. An admissive dactyl is the most convenient scansion of all; and type *ἔλασε* a little outnumbered type *ἔλασσε*, but not type *ἔλασσε* + type *ἔλασε*.

² In the *Iliad* without B³ etc. (narrative) there are forty-six instances of type *ἀλεύατο*, and eighteen instances of the corresponding augmented aorists (*ἡλεύατο*, etc.).

weighed the dislike of the augment. There can be no doubt that, of the two types *ἄκουσε* and *ἀλεύατο*, the latter is much the more difficult to handle. It has only one convenient place in the verse, and that place is after the weak caesura. When a phrase leading up to one of these verbs is shifted, the shift may be, and often is, such that it carries only to the *strong* caesura. In that case, if the sense—or some metrical reason, as in *ἰδὼν ἡλεύατο*—excludes the use of *καί*, then aorists of this type must be either augmented or compounded—they may be moved on to the next foot, but here too they must be either augmented or compounded, because of the fourth trochaic. If type *ἀλεύατο* could have been compounded, no doubt the puzzle would have been solved in that way; but there seems to have been something against compounds with this scansion—in the *Iliad* without B² etc. the instances are rare, and apparently Odyssean (B 269, T 314). Though the augment was disliked, it seems for a long time to have been felt as better (in this scansion) than a preposition. Some obscure consciousness of this fact (it may be) has traditionally preferred *ἡμείβετο* in the *Iliad*, though *ἀπαμείβετο* (*Odyssey*) is the more natural use. Augments, then, like *ἡλεύατο* do indeed give a spondee, but it is a spondee that often can only be avoided by rejecting the whole combination. It is interesting that except in the standing line P 305, etc., there are in the *Iliad* without B² etc. perhaps only nine places where the combination was not rejected; and of the nine, no less than four are introductions of speeches. The scansional difficulty above discussed was no doubt one of the chief reasons why in later styles, where shifted phrases are much employed, the type *ἀλεύατο* goes downhill. In B² etc. (narrative) there are only five examples—augmented, Ψ 99, 542; compounded, Ω 165; simple, Θ 118, Ψ 204. In the narrative of the *Odyssey* there are two augmented (ν 17, 303) and fifteen unaugmented instances. Of these last, ε 482, ρ 304, σ 200 are compounded; ν 300 is more like a speech-scansion, and ρ 67 gives another way of handling the problem (cf. Ξ 515; a different licence is seen in Ξ 171).

Among the imperfect temporals we find, neglecting *ἡμείβετο* and *ἀπαμείβετο*, only Odyssean instances of the forbidden scansions:

1. Type *ἀκούετο*—augmented, ὠπίζετ' Σ 216, ἡμάρτανε Κ 372, ἡφύσσετο ψ 305, ὠϊέτο ν 349, ὠρίνετο σ 75; (neglected, ν 9, ω 318); compounded, ἔσαγγείρετο O 240, Φ 417. The unaugmented (and simple) forms are as follows:

	<i>Iliad</i> (not B ² etc.).	B etc.	<i>Odyssey</i> .
Open — — —	13	4	6
Closed — — —	8	2	4

2. Type *ἄκουε*—augmented:

(a) *In arsi*—ἡεῖδεν θ 514, ἔκανεν Θ 47, ἔκανον O 151, X 147, τ 432, ἡρίθμει ν 218, ἡγύν | εον Σ 493, ὠμόλυνεν Σ 539.

(b) *In thesi*—ἦειδε α 154, χ 331, σὺν δ' ἤειπεν . . . καὶ ἐξήλανεν K 499, ἵκανε A 431, B 17, 168, E 868, Z 370, 392, 497, ρ 28, 255, ἵκανον Γ 145, Δ 210, E 780, Σ 520, K 526, ο 101, ὥπαζε Θ 341, ὥπυι N 429, Σ 383, ὥφελλε (?) π 174.

The unaugmented forms are :

	<i>Iliad</i> (not B ³ etc.).	B ² etc.	<i>Odyssey</i> .
Type ἄκουε	29	10	16
ἵκανε	13	2	7
Type ἄκουον	4	5	13
ἵκανον	1	2	1
Type κατέρυκε	3	2	5
ἀφίκανε	1	—	2
Type αὐτεῖ	7	1	5
ὁμόργνυ	1	—	—
ἀπομόργνυ	2	—	—
αὐτευν	1	—	—
	62	22	49

For consistency's sake, ἵκα|ανε-ον etc. ought perhaps to be taken as false simplifications of ἀφίκανε-ον etc. ; but the treatment of the imperfect is so much less archaistic than that of the aorist, that unless a given example can be shown to be other than Odyssean, it is not worth much speculation. The difference of Odyssean work here is remarkable, and is focussed in K 499, where the augments—apparently used in good faith¹—are really unparalleled. The aorist ἐξήλασαν (Λ 562) is of course quite another thing. In a simile the augment is essential ; and if the sense needs ἐξ, a spondee cannot be avoided—ἐξήλασαν gives a spondee just as much as ἐξήλασαν ; short-tmesis (ἐκ τ' ἤλασαν) is no help, and long-tmesis (e.g. καὶ ἐξ ὄνον ἤλασαν αὐτως) is disliked even with the temporal (Λ 480 stands alone in the similes).

Before we leave this kind of augment, there is still one point which needs notice. It has already been remarked that most of the aorists illustrate Professor Schulze's scheme of short syllables under ictus—the unaugmented forms would be open tribrachs, open antispasts, etc. The question naturally arises whether e.g. ἤριπε (in narrative) really represents an augment at all. Ought we to suppose a short syllable lengthened by ictus ? This could be written ἔριπε or εἶριπε, precisely as εἰληλούθει is maintained in the text. Just at first sight the view is plausible, especially when we think of a peculiarity generally attaching to tribrachs and antispasts that are scanned with the first syllable under ictus. It is an intelligible theory that such words ought to *end* with a vowel ; and it is an interesting fact that so many of them *begin* with one. Surely the explanation must be this : When the first syllable e.g. of

¹ If such a phrase applies to the genially atasthalous K, who is also responsible for the scansion παρώχκεν δὲ πλέων νύξ.

'Απόλλωνα is put under ictus, two birds are killed with one stone—not only is an antispast abolished, but the fourth epitrite which results is an admissive¹ scansion; equally, with *άνερα δ' άνήρ, άνερες άλλοι*, etc., a tribrach is suppressed—*κρατερήφι βίηφι*—in favour of an admissive Adonian.² Admissive scansions of this type are much needed, to carry on from the bucolic, which gives the only convenient place in the verse for closed second paeons or open cretics like *πολυδαιδάλου, μεταφρένω*, etc. Hence the seemingly irrational property of the fifth foot—this *arsis* looks, more than the others, as if it had some occult virtue by which it could lengthen short syllables. The truth is that every *arsis* had this power; but lengthened admissives like *άνερες άλλοι* or *Ούλύμποιο* are especially suitable after the bucolic. It is obvious that if *ήριπε* and the like were treated in this way, they would afford just those admissive scansions which were so much needed; and the circumstance may lead us to think that these aorists are not necessarily augmented, when they function as dactyls.

Against any such theory may be set two sheer facts. In the first place, narrative temporals occur *in thesi*, and cannot be removed completely. Secondly, the most difficult augment and the one which might most plausibly be taken as a lengthening by ictus—viz. *ίκετο*—appears in two similes, Λ 88 and Ω 481. Both of the similes, it is true, are Odyssean; still, here is *ίκετο* clearly augmented, as it probably is also in Λ 227 and Ξ 174 (elisions) and Ξ 283. As has been hinted above, *ίκετο* was presumably the last of these aorists to admit the augment. We may infer that in the other forms, such as *ήριπε*, augmentation had long ago replaced ictuation. The fact that *ήριπε* in narrative proper is never elided or scanned with -ν, is at first sight disquieting; but as will be shown later, it can be explained very simply.

¹ For brevity I use 'admissive' to mean *beginning with a vowel*.

² By 'Adonian' I mean any kind of — — — — —; the special scansion — — — — — will be called an Adoniac.

J. A. J. DREWITT.

(To be continued.)