FILIP DE DECKER
FWO Vlaanderen, Universiteit Gent
filipdedecker9@gmail.com

METRICAL AND MORPHOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS ON THE USE OF *ἜΘΗΚΕ(Ν)* AND *ΘΗΚΕ(Ν)* IN THE *ILIAD*

Abstract

In this article, I analyze the use and absence of the augment in the 3rd singular forms *ἔθηκε(ν)* and *θῆκε(ν)* in the *Iliad* and try to determine the value of the transmitted forms. In doing so I first analyze the forms by checking permitted elisions and by applying metrical laws, bridges and caesurae. The forms that can be analyzed by those criteria are of type A (metrically secure). I then proceed to the forms whose value cannot be established by these metrical criteria and check if an "internal reconstruction" can solve the issue. The method I use is based on Barrett's metrical and morphological analyses of the augment in Euripides and Taida's analyses on the augment in the Homeric Hymns. This method analyzes the metrically insecure forms by looking at their position in the verse, the passages in which they appear, and by comparing them to the metrically secure forms in the same paradigm. The forms that can be analyzed by this method are catalogued type B; the forms that cannot are of type C. The forms of type A and type B will be the basis for subsequent syntactic and semantic analyses of the augment use in these forms in the *Iliad* (elsewhere in this journal).[1]

---

1. The choice of this specific corpus

I chose the forms *ἔθηκε(ν)* and *θῆκε(ν)* in the *Iliad*,[2] for the following reasons: all these forms belong to a very common root and are thus attested in a variety of contexts; the forms are all active, so that the augment use could not be dependent on the choice of diathesis; they are all third person singular forms and as such, the number is ruled out as criterion; in the past, it has been argued that aorists were more often augmented than imperfects and that younger aorists had more augments than older forms (Blumenthal 1974; Lazzeroni 1977: 15–17, 23; Mumm 2004: §2.1), but since all the forms are in the *k*-aorist, they all have the same tense and the same type of aorist; the forms under discussion can be used in any position in the verse, which significantly reduces the chance that the metre was the main (let alone the sole) motivating factor for the use and absence of the augment.[3]

2. Determining the corpus: the metrically secure forms

As is known, the augment is not mandatory in epic Greek nor is it always guaranteed in our transmitted text.[4] In order to obtain reliable data, I will use the following methodology.

The prototypical hexameter has the following structure:[5]

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

In determining "word end", I consider enclitics to be part of the word after which they appeared, and proclitics to belong to the word that follows (see Ahrens 1852: 200; Giseke 1864: 127; Meyer 1884: 980; Maas 1923: 30–31; Fraenkel 1960; West 1982: 37; Snell

---

[2] I include *Iliad* 10, although many scholars doubt its authenticity, but for the investigation at hand, the issue is irrelevant. The text is quoted after Van Thiel (1996, 2010) and is compared to West (1998, 2000) and Ludwich (1892, 1897).

[3] The works by Bakker (1999, 2005) and Mumm (2004) only discussed the aorist in the *Iliad*; Bakker (2002) dealt with the aorist in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollon* (HH 3).

[4] See De Decker (2019: 54–55, footnote 30) for a discussion.

[5] This is the notation used by Janse (2003, 2014).

1982: 68; Nünlist 2000: 112; Taida 2007: 9; Oswald 2014: 421).[6] To determine the validity of the presence or absence of the augment in ἔθηκε(ν) and θῆκε(ν), I use the following rules:

1. the absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite creates an unmetrical verse;

2. the absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the elision of the dative plural ending of consonant stems in -σι/-ψι/-ξι, the dative singular ending in -ι or the word final -ν (Spitzner 1816: 167; Grashof 1852: 11; La Roche 1869: 76, 80; Bekker 1872: 22–23; Kühner, Blass 1890: 230–240; Monro 1891: 349–350; Maas 1923: 27; Schwyzer 1939: 403; Chantraine 1948: 86; Koster 1962: 45; Korzeniewski 1968: 24; Wachter 2000: 74–75);[7]

3. the absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the violation of Hermann's Bridge: this bridge states that there cannot be a word end between 4b and 4c, and is one of the strictest bridges in epic poetry, with very few exceptions (about 0,3%);[8]

4. an augmented or unaugmented form is considered secure, if the opposite creates a caesura at the end of the third foot: bipartite hexameters were avoided; as this had been noted already at least as early as Varro, it is sometimes called "Varro's Bridge" (Gerhard 1816: 127–128; Voss 1826: 63, with some examples in epic Greek, such as *Iliad* 15,18; *Odyssey* 10,58 and *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (HH 2), 202; Ahrens 1852: 199–200; Lehrs 1860: 513; Bekker 1863: 142 (the original article dated from 1859); Von Christ 1874: 182, 199; Monro 1884: lxxiv–lxxv; Maas 1923: 22; Stifler 1924: 348; Sjölund 1938: 64; Koster 1962: 70–71; Korzeniewski 1968: 34; Ingalls 1970: 1; Cantilena 1995: 39–40 (he also referred to an unpublished MA thesis discussing this topic: M. Marra. 1992/1993. *Il problema dell' esametro bipartito*. MA Thesis Università di Venezia – *non uidi*); Gentile, Lomiento 2003: 270, referring to Pseudo-Hephaistion (2nd century AD?) as the author of the metrical prohibition);

5. the use or absence of an augment is secure, if the opposite yields a spondee in the fifth foot with word end at that foot (Gerhard 1816: 142–147; Hermann 1817: 220; Bekker 1863: 147–148; Maas 1923: 22; Korzeniewski 1968: 30; West 1982: 37; Snell 1982: 13–16; Van Raalte 1986: 37–38; Sicking 1993: 73–74);

6. an augmented or unaugmented form is considered secure, if the opposite creates a word end at the end of the second foot with a spondee with position-length in the second half, especially when the word started in the first foot already (this is

---

6   O'Neill (1942) struggled with this problem, as he stated on page 109 that enclitics did not belong to the word, but on page 110 wrote that word and enclitic formed a bigger conglomerate.

7   For the dative plural, there are only 19 exceptions in the entire Homeric corpus, the list of which can be found in La Roche (1869: 125–129). The elision of -ν was not discussed in La Roche (1869), which means that he had not found any instances in which it occurred.

8   It was first noted by Hermann (1805: 692–693, 1817: 213): "(caesura quarti trochaei) rarissima est et studiose vitatur", Spitzner (1816: 9–12) and has been accepted ever since, see also Korzeniewski (1968: 30–34), Snell (1982: 13–16), West (1982: 36–38, 1997: 222–225), Van Raalte (1986: 97–98) and Sicking (1993: 73–79).

sometimes known as "Giseke-Gerhard's Law"; I checked 7483 verses of Iliad 1, 2,1–483, 3–9, 16, 22 and 24, and found that only 82 verses had a word end at the end of the second foot with a spondee by position, that is 1%; there were only 53 verses in this corpus in which there was a spondee in the second foot with the second half foot being long by position and the word having started in the first foot, that is 0,7%) (Gerhard 1816: 140, only about the spondee of the second foot; Giseke 1864: 128–134; Hilberg 1879: 129, 263; see most recently Oswald 2014: 422);[9]

7. related to the previous observation is the fact that the use or absence of the augment is secure if the opposite creates a word starting in the first foot and ending at 2c, especially when the word ends in a spondee, either by nature or by position (the prohibition of word end at 2c of a word starting in the first foot is known as Giseke's Law – Giseke's Law is sometimes called "Giseke-Meyer", because Meyer reiterated it without apparently knowing that Giseke had already established this law) (Giseke 1864: 128–134);[10]

8. the presence or absence of the augment is secure, if the opposite creates a word that starts in the first foot and that ends at 2b (this is a consequence of a law known as Meyer's (1884: 980) First Law:[11] a word starting in the first foot should not end at neither 2b nor 2c – the avoidance of word end at 2b had been noted already by the Greek metrician Nikanor, 2nd century AD, and therefore I suggested to call the law "Nikanor-Meyer", whereas Cantilena called it *il ponte di Nicanore*[12]): in the Iliadic corpus of 7483 verses (cf. supra) there are 466 instances that violate this rule (which is 6% exceptions – this is considerably less than e.g. the violations of the digamma);

9. the augmented or unaugmented form can be considered secure if the opposite verb form makes a caesura coincided with elision (Von Thiersch 1826: 338; Grashof

---

[9] Oswald considered these laws to be post-Homeric, but the small number of exceptions in Homeric Greek clearly indicates that they apply to it as well.

[10] Oswald (2014: 422) considered this to be post-Homeric, but Giseke himself specifically applied his law to Homer as well. See also the previous footnote.

[11] Before Meyer, scholars had already stated that word end at 2b was avoided (without restricting it to words starting in the first foot): the first modern scholar to do it was Voss. In HH 2,300 the transmitted αἶψα πίθοντο created a word end at 2b, which he changed it into αἶψ' ἐπίθοντο (Voss 1826: 89); in HH 2,438, Voss considered the transmitted γηθοσύνας δὲ δέχοντο to be disturbing the rhythm and corrected it into γηθοσύνας δ' ἐδέχοντο. Although he did not explicitly mention a restriction or prohibition against a word end at 2b, these corrections make him if not the founder, then at least one of the earliest predecessors of this Law. Von Thiersch (1826: 209) stated that no trochaic or dactylic caesura was allowed in the second foot, if the verse had a caesura in the third foot. In his *Odyssey* edition, Bothe (1834: 133) argued that πᾶσ' ἔντοσθε φάνεσκε (*Odyssey* 12,241) – which has a word end at 2b with a word starting in the first foot – did not sound very well and had better be πᾶσ' ἔντοσθ ἐφάνεσκε *euphoniae gratia* (in his words). After Voss and Bothe, Hoffmann (1842: 22) noted that the caesura at 2b weakened the verse and catalogued this caesura among the *caesurae minores* in the subcategory (*caesurae*) *versum mollientes* and Grashof (1852: 11) noted that an incision after the trochee in the 2nd foot was avoided. In his overview of the different caesurae, Hermann (1817: 212) did not discuss a caesura at 2b, which means that he did not consider word end at this position a possibility. See Cantilena (1995: 34) and De Decker (2016: 262–264, 2017: 62–66) for a history of Meyer's laws.

[12] This was the title of Cantilena (1995), see also De Decker (2016: 264).

1852: 16, 25; Bekker 1863: 141, the original dates from 1859; Drewitt 1912: 50; Mazon 1942: 134; Taida 2007: 3, 2010: 250);[13]

10. an augmented or unaugmented form is considered secure, when the opposite leads to the violation of (Meyer-)Tiedke's law (Tiedke 1873: 15–27; Meyer 1884: 987–988); this metrical bridge 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 they count as belonging to the preceding or following words), so that word end after *ὁ (ὅ) δέ* does not count as a violation.

3. The metrically secure forms in the corpus

There are 80 instances of *ἔθηκε(ν)* and *θῆκε(ν)* in the corpus, of which 34 metrically secure augmented forms and 30 metrically secure unaugmented forms. 27 augmented forms are secure because of the avoidance of a spondaic fifth foot with word end,[14] and 7 are because of the avoidance of a spondaic second foot with position length and word end at the foot.[15] The 30 metrically secure unaugmented forms are divided as follows: 5 forms that were secured by the fact that the preceding vowel was unelidable,[16] 11 are guaranteed by their verse initial position (the only position in the verse where *ἔθηκε* cannot be used),[17] 8 non-verse initial instances are guaranteed because adding the augment would make the verse unmetrical,[18] 5 are guaranteed by Hermann's Bridge,[19] and 1 because of Nikanor-Meyer's Law as can be seen below:

> (EX.01) *ἀλλά τις ἀθανάτων παῦσεν χόλον, ὅς ῥ᾽ ἐνὶ θυμῷ*
> *δήμου θῆκε φάτιν καὶ ὀνείδεα πόλλ᾽ ἀνθρώπων* (*Iliad* 9,459–460)
> 'But someone of the immortals stopped my anger, who put in my mind the rumour of the people and the envy of many men.'[20]

In this instance the unaugmented *θῆκε* is secure, because *δήμου ἔθηκε* would create a verse with a word starting in the first foot and ending at 2b.

---

[13] The co-occurrence of elision and caesura is not non-existent, but nevertheless rare, see West (1982: 10, 36).

[14] The instances are *Iliad* 3,321; 3,330; 3,336; 6,6; 6,482; 8,188; 9,483; 10,257; 10,261; 11,17; 15,478; 15,480; 16,131; 16,137; 17,569; 19,369; 20,324; 21,82; 22,44; 23,265; 23,270; 23,382; 23,400; 23,406; 23,527; 23,704; 24,531.

[15] The instances are *Iliad* 2,319; 6,139; 9,207; 12,450; 17,470; 22,368; 23,568.

[16] The instances are *Iliad* 1,55 (dative plural ending); 8,218 (dative plural ending); 18,375 (dative singular ending); 21,145 (dative plural ending); 24,101 (dative singular ending).

[17] The instances are *Iliad* 6,303; 8,324; 10,466; 10,571; 16,223; 17,541; 18,476; 23,153; 23,263; 23,799; 23,866.

[18] The instances are *Iliad* 2,318; 2,482; 6,357; 18,615; 21,484; 23,748; 23,750; 23,826.

[19] The instances are *Iliad* 5,445; 10,46; 12,399; 23,653; 23,700.

[20] Unless noted otherwise, all translations are my own.

4. Analyzing the metrically insecure forms

In the corpus under investigation here there are 16 instances, in which the rules described above do not allow us to decide with certainty on the presence or absence of the augment. To discuss these forms that are metrically insecure (i.e. not guaranteed by the rules in §3), I will use a method that is based on that of Barrett and Taida (Barrett 1964: 361–362; Taida 2004, 2007, 2010; De Decker 2016: 259–282, 2017: 58–124). When analyzing cases in which both the augmented and the unaugmented verb forms were attested in Euripides, Barrett (1964: 361–362) decided to look at the other instances of that specific verb in tragedy and comedy and divided the attestations in three categories: metrically secure augmented forms, uncertain forms and metrically guaranteed unaugmented forms. Whichever of the guaranteed forms was more common, had to be adopted in the doubtful instances. Taida applied this method to the Homeric Hymns to Hermes and Demeter, and compared the verb form under investigation to the attestations of that tense in the entire epic corpus.[21] Whereas Barrett adopted the variant with most metrically secure attestations, Taida (2004, 2007, 2010) also took metrical and semantic observations into consideration, such as the position of the form in the verse compared to the metrically secure forms in that very same position, the application of metrical laws and type of passage in which the form occurred (augmented verb forms in gnomes and *similia* were catalogued as securely augmented and iteratives in -*sk*- were securely unaugmented). My method is based on that by Barrett and Taida, but differs in some aspects. I use the following criteria in descending order of importance:

1. at verse end forms of the shape ˘–˘ or ˘–– are preferred (as had been noted already by Aristarkhos) (Von Thiersch 1826: 338);[22] if the debated form / one of the debated forms has this format, it is preferred; I want to add, however, that the *Wortbild* plays a role here as well and that enclitics and proclitics are part of the word they belong to;[23]

2. the (un)augmented form has preference if the opposite causes the shortening of a long vowel or long diphthong: long vowels and long diphthongs undergo much less shortening than short diphthongs (Von Hartel 1874a, especially page 48, 1874b: 1–13; Sjölund 1938: 43, 58–70);

3. the (un)augmented form has preference if the opposite causes a word end at 2b or 2c; word end at 2b and 2c is not impossible, but nevertheless not common in

---

the aforementioned Iliadic corpus of 7483 verses, I found 819 instances of word end at 2b (11%) and 750 of word end at 2c (10%);

4. if the augmented and the unaugmented variant both violate Giseke-Meyer's Law and Nikanor-Meyer's Law (word end at 2c and 2b of word starting in the first foot respectively), 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 (and, as was stated above, a spondee at 2c is very rare in any case, so rare even that an augmented form that preserves a dactyl in the second foot can count as metrically secure); in the Iliadic corpus of 7483 verses, I found 466 violations of Nikanor-Meyer's Law (6%) and 217 of Giseke-Meyer's Law (3%);

5. the (un)augmented form has preference if the opposite creates a spondee with the second half foot having a vowel that is long by position:[24] spondees are less common than dactyls,[25] and spondees with a second half foot being long by position and not by nature are even less common (Meillet 1910: 43); in the corpus there are 885 spondees with position length in the first foot (12%), 779 in the second foot (10%), 306 in the third foot (4%) and 433 in the fourth foot (6%);

6. if the final syllable of the word preceding the verb form is never elided or always elided elsewhere in epic, it is likely that it will be the case in the instance under investigation;

7. if a form is attested at the end of the verse or sentence, it is more likely that the augmented form has preference, whereas a verb form in verse or sentence initial position is more likely to be unaugmented;

8. dual forms and pluperfects are more likely to be unaugmented;[26]

9. sometimes the context decides: if the debated form appears in a simile or gnome, it is more likely that the augmented one will be correct; if the debated form has an iterative suffix, the unaugmented variant is most likely correct;[27] this criterion can only be used for passages where the preponderance of (un)augmented forms is significant: the fact that a form appears in a speech does not make its augmentation more likely, because there are a considerable number of unaugmented forms

---

[24] Already Grashof (1852: 9, 14) alluded to this.

[25] See Bekker (1863: 147–148), Ludwich (1885: 301–350 for the data on dactyls and spondees in epic Greek; especially the table on page 321) and O'Neill (1942: 159). For spondees in general see Ludwich (1866).

[26] The absence of the augment in pluperfect forms had been noticed already by Aristarkhos, see La Roche (1866: 423). See also Buttmann (1830: 318, 1858: 127–128), Koch (1868: 20–21), La Roche (1882: 32–39), Platt (1891: 231), Monro (1891: 61), Chantraine (1948: 481–482, with reference to both Aristarkhos and La Roche), Bottin (1969: 124–129, with a list of forms), De Decker (2015b: 245–246).

The absence of the augment in dual forms had also been noted already before, see Grashof (1852: 29), La Roche (1870a: xv, 1882: 19; but in 1870b: 62, 142–143 and 1871: 73 he argued in favour of the transmitted augmented dual compound form *ἐπεδραμέτην* in *Iliad* 10,354 and also printed it, because the compounds of *ἔδραμον* never lacked the augment anywhere else), Platt (1891: 213–214), Schwyzer (1939: 651), Bottin (1969: 94, with reference to Schwyzer), Blumenthal (1974: 75), Mumm (2004: 148), De Decker (2015a: 54, 2015b: 247). Already von Thiersch (1826: 338) alluded to the unaugmented nature of compounded dual forms.

[27] This will be discussed in much more detail in the subchapters dealing with the semantics.

in speeches as well, but the fact that an unaugmented form appears in a narrative passage makes its unaugmented nature more likely, because narrative passages have a significantly higher number of unaugmented than augmented forms;[28]

10. if none of the criteria mentioned above is decisive, the number of metrically secure attestations in Homeric Greek (Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns) will decide;

11. when there are not sufficient data in Homeric Greek or if these data are inconclusive, I take the post-Homeric epic works into account as well;

12. if still no decision can be reached, the form cannot be determined and will not be used in the analysis; Barrett (1964: 362), and Taida (2010: 257) argued that in such cases a unanimous reading of the codices should be respected and adopted *faute de mieux*; although I understand their specific approach here, I will nevertheless not do this, because I prefer some internal support for the forms (in case of different readings in different manuscripts no decision is possible);

13. the compound forms: as compound verb forms were in origin a preverb and a simplex verb form, the same rules as for simplex forms can be applied. In many cases the certainty of the augment of the compound verb can only be ascertained by comparing it to the metrically secure instances of the simplex form.

The forms will thus be classified into three types:
- type A: the presence or absence of the augment is metrically secure;
- type B: the presence or absence of the augment is supported by internal evidence;
- type C: the presence or absence of the augment is metrically insecure and undeterminable by internal evidence.

5. The metrically insecure forms in our corpus

Below, I apply the rules described above to the 16 insecure instances.

> (EX.02) *οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρί᾽ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε᾽ ἔθηκε* (*Iliad* 1,2)
> 'the destructive (anger) which brought pain and suffering to countless Akhaians'

Both the unaugmented *ἄλγεα θῆκεν* as the augmented *ἄλγε᾽ ἔθηκε* would be possible, but the augmented form has preference, because in verse final position *ἔθηκε* is more common than *θῆκεν* and because words of the metrical form ⏑–⏑ occur more often at verse end than those of the form –⏑.[29] *ἔθηκε* is therefore of type B. The same applies to *ἔθηκε* in the following instances:

---

[28] See previous note.

[29] This had already been noted for Iliad 1, 9 and 18, and Odyssey 4, 5 and 9 by Bekker (1863: 149 – the original article dated from 1859) and was consistently applied in his 1858 Iliad-edition (often against the codices). See also Miller (2014: 97) on this passage, but without further references. It was already the opinion of Aristarkhos (see Schmidt 1854: 428–431 and Chantraine 1948: 481). For this specific instance, see De Decker (2017: 76–77).

(EX.03) *θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρίκην· δέελον δ' ἐπὶ σῆμά τ' ἔθηκε* (*Iliad* 10,466)
'he put the spoils on a tamarisk and placed a clear sign on top of them.'

(EX.04) *Ὣς ἄρα φωνήσασα θεὰ κατὰ τεύχε' ἔθηκε* (*Iliad* 19,12)
'So spoke the goddess and she put the armour down.'

(EX.05) *ὣς Ἀχιλεὺς Τρώεσσι πόνον καὶ κήδε' ἔθηκεν* (*Iliad* 21,525)
'In that manner Akhilleus created pain and sorrow for the Trojans.'

(EX.06) *Τρωσί· μάλιστα δ' ἐμοὶ περὶ πάντων ἄλγε' ἔθηκε* (*Iliad* 22,422)
'for the Trojans, but among all people he has caused pain mostly for me.'
ἡμιτάλαντον δὲ χρυσοῦ λοισθήϊ' ἔθηκε (*Iliad* 23,751)
'And he put half a talent of gold (as price) as the last price.'

The following instance seems to belong to the previous category, but the interpretation of *λοισθήϊ'* poses some problems. I agree with most etymological dictionaries that *λοισθήϊ'* is an elided neuter plural *λοισθήϊα* 'as last price' (Frisk 1970: 135; Chantraine et al. 2009: 420),[30] but there is also the reading *λοισθῆϊ* which – if adopted by the editor – would be the only instance of a noun *λοισθεύς* and would mean 'for the slowest'.[31] In that case, the augment in *ἔθηκε* would be secure.

(EX.07) *γυῖα δ' ἔθηκεν ἐλαφρά, πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ὕπερθεν* (*Iliad* 5,122, 13,61, 23,772)
'S/he made his limbs supple and also his feet and hands above.'

In this instance, the augmented *δ' ἔθηκεν* is transmitted in all the codices and from a semantic point of view, the augment would be perfectly explainable, as this verse is used when a god(dess) makes a mortal appear bigger and more battle prone, and such intervention always involve a certain degree of emphasis. From a metrical point of view however, this reading violates Nikanor-Meyer's Law, as it has a word starting in the first foot and ending at 2b. The unaugmented *δὲ θῆκε* would be expected, but it is not attested in any of the manuscripts; therefore, *ἔθηκε* is of type C.

(EX.08) *πᾶσι δ' ἔθηκε πόνον, πολλοῖσι δὲ κήδε' ἐφῆκεν* (*Iliad* 21,524)
'It (sc. the anger of the gods) put toil on all of them and threw sorrows on many of them.'

The augment seems uncertain, because of the violation of Nikanor-Meyer's Law, but this passage appears in a simile (a comparison often used in epic poetry to compare a scene on the battlefield to an event in everyday life) and in *similia* the augment is much more present than in other passages (cf. infra). On the other hand, the simile

---

[30] This form has not been addressed in Faesi (1858: 387) nor in Ameis, Hentze (1886: 86, 1888: 87). The etymological dictionaries of Prellwitz (1905: 273–274) and Boisacq (1916: 587 "destiné au dernier, n. pl. le prix réservé au dernier") only mention the neuter form and not the noun in *-εύς*.

[31] See Richardson (1993: 252) who rejected this reading.

in which this form occurs (*Iliad* 21,522–524) has two metrically secure unaugmented forms (ἀνῆκε and ἐφῆκεν) and no augmented forms.[32] Given the fact that only the augmented ἔθηκε is attested in the manuscripts and that the form occurs in a simile, the augment might be accepted after all (type B).

> (EX.09) ἣ δ᾽ ἀμφ᾽ αὐτῷ θῆκε πολὺν κέλαδον καὶ ἀϋτὴν (*Iliad* 9,547)
> 'But the goddess incited around it (sc. the head of the boar) much battle noise and war-cry.'

In this instance, only the unaugmented form θῆκε has been transmitted, although ἔθηκε would fit the metre as well. Determining the right form is not so straightforward here, since reading θῆκε (as is done in all codices) requires a violation of Giseke's Law, as we then have a word that starts in the first foot and ends at 2c (I consider the sequence ἀμφ᾽ αὐτῷ to be one word as it involves a proclitic preposition and the word governed by the preposition); reading ἔθηκε would have the advantage that a word end at 2b (Nikanor-Meyer) occurs more often than a word end at 2c (Giseke-Meyer), but at the same time it would require the long diphthong in αὐτῷ to be shortened and such shortenings are comparably rare.[33] I therefore would side with the transmitted reading θῆκε and consider the form as a type B. The following instances pose the same problems:

> (EX.10) τῷ δὲ τετάρτῳ θῆκε δύω χρυσοῖο τάλαντα (*Iliad* 23,269)
> 'for the one finishing fourth he put two talents of gold.'

> (EX.11) ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ καὶ τῷ θῆκε θεὸς κακόν, ὅττί οἱ οὔ τι (*Iliad* 24,538)
> 'But the god put yet another evil on top of it, because to him no (generation of ruling children was born in his palace).'

In this instance ἐπὶ καὶ τῷ can be considered to be one word (two proclitics and one word) and therefore the same reasoning as the previous instance can be applied here as well. Spohn argued that a caesura at 3b had to be preceded by a dactyl in the second foot, especially when the first foot was a dactyl as well (Spohn 1816: 57; see also La Roche 1869: 102–110; Ameis 1870: 103; Ameis, Hentze 1900: 93). If this metrical law were correct, it would mean that the unaugmented form would become problematic, but an investigation of this (supposed) metrical bridge yields the following results: *Iliad* 1 has 611 verses and in 165 this law is violated (27%), *Iliad* 5 has 909 verses with a violation in 157 of them (17%) and *Iliad* 7 has 472 verses with a violation in 96 (20%). It is therefore clear that this supposed metrical bridge is not valid and that there is no metrical inhibition against the unaugmented form.

---

[32]   Some argue that ἧκε and its compounds in fact augmented (Platt 1891: 218), but the fact that an augmented ἔηκε also exists, makes this less likely (Monro 1891: 60; Chantraine 1948: 481).

[33]   Cf. footnote 25.

(EX.12) *αὐδήεντα δ' ἔθηκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη·* (*Iliad* 19,407)
'Here with the white arms had made him able to speak.'

The augment in this verse is not metrically secure, but has nevertheless preference because the unaugmented form *αὐδήεντα δὲ θῆκε* would violate the constraint against word end at 2c of a word starting in the first foot (Giseke-Meyer) and that law has much less violations than the one against word end at 2b of a word starting in the first foot (Nikanor-Meyer). I thus consider *ἔθηκε* as type B. The same applies to the example below:

(EX.13) *μεσσοπαγὲς δ' ἄρ' ἔθηκε κατ' ὄχθης μείλινον ἔγχος.* (*Iliad* 21,172)
'He made the ash spear stick in the middle of the river bank.'

The unaugmented *μεσσοπαγὲς δ' ἄρα θῆκε* would violate Giseke-Meyer's Law and that is very rare. The augmented form counts therefore as type B.

(EX.14) *καὶ νῦν τέρματ' ἔθηκε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.* (*Iliad* 23,333)
'And now shining Akhilleus swift of foot has put (there) turning points.'

In this instance the augmented *τέρματ' ἔθηκε* and the unaugmented *τέρματα θῆκε* are both equally possible (a word end at 2b or 2c of words that do not start in the first foot is equally (un)common. At first sight one could argue that the use of the word *νῦν* in this sentence would speak in favour of the augment,[34] but upon closer look this preference is only apparent, because the preference for augmented forms with *νῦν* is only clear in speeches and not in narrative: in the *Iliad* there are 46 augmented and 27 unaugmented forms that are metrically secure and of those 46 augmented forms, only 4 appear in narrative (as is the case here) and of the 27 unaugmented ones, 9 appear in narrative, which gives a distribution of 4 augments and 9 unaugmented forms in narrative and this does not support the augment here; in the *Odyssey* we have 26 augmented and 15 unaugmented forms that are metrically secure, with 23 of the 26 augmented forms and 13 of the 15 unaugmented forms appearing in a speech, thus rendering the data for the narrative parts inconclusive. From a semantic point of view the augment can certainly be defended (as it adds a new element in the description of the funerary games), but there is no metrical basis for it and therefore I would classify the form as type C. As was the case in EX.07, only the augmented form can be found in the codices and one could argue that the transmitted text should be used in the analysis. On the other hand, the unaugmented forms are only found in the manuscripts when the verb appears in the beginning of the sentence, after the bucolic diaeresis, after a long vowel or diphthong and when the verse would not allow for an augmented form. Although I personally do not believe in massive generalizing tendencies in the transmission of any author, it cannot be entirely excluded that the augmented forms intruded on

---

[34]   Again, I refer to the semantic part of the discussion (further on in this journal).

the field of the unaugmented ones and ousted some of them. For that reason, I will not use these instances in the analysis.

Our investigation has established the following data:

- type A forms: 34 augmented and 30 unaugmented forms;
- type B forms: 9 augmented and 3 unaugmented forms;[35]
- type C forms: 4 metrically insecure forms (in all instances ἔθηκεν is transmitted).[36]

6. Conclusion

In this first part I first described my methods to determine the value of the transmitted forms and then I applied them to the corpus under investigation. I distinguish between forms for which the metre gives certainty and forms for which we can only acquire relative certainty by using internal comparison. By using those methods I was able to establish a corpus of 43 (34 A and 9 B) augmented and 33 (30 A and 3 B) unaugmented forms. The use of the (un)augmented forms will be analyzed in the next parts of the article.

References

Online sources

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

Printed sources

Ahrens H. 1852. *Griechische Formenlehre des Homerischen und Attischen Dialektes*. Göttingen.
Ameis K. 1870. *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band. Zweites Heft. Gesang 4–6.* Leipzig.
Ameis K., Hentze C. 1886. *Homers Ilias. Erläuterungen zu Gesang XXII–XXIV*. Leipzig.
Ameis K., Hentze C. 1888. *Homers Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXII–XXIV.* Leipzig.
Ameis K., Hentze C. 1900. *Anhang zu Homers Odyssee Schulausgabe 4. Gesang 19–24*. Leipzig.
Bakker E. 1999. Pointing to the past: Verbal augment and temporal deixis in Homer. – Kazazis J., Rengakos A. (eds.). *Euphrosyne. Studies in ancient epic and its legacy in honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart: 50–65.
Bakker E. 2002. Remembering the God's arrival. – *Arethusa* 35: 63–81.
Bakker E. 2005. *Pointing at the past: From formula to performance in Homeric poetics*. Cambridge (MA).
Barrett W.S. 1964. *Euripides Hippolytos. Edited with introduction and commentary*. Oxford.
Bekker I. 1858a. *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Prius. Ilias*. Bonn.
Bekker I. 1858b. *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Alterum. Odyssea*. Bonn.

---

[35] The augmented instances are *Iliad* 1,2; 10,466; 19,12; 19,407; 21,172; 21,524; 21,525; 22,422; 23,333; 23,751 and the unaugmented ones are *Iliad* 9,547; 23,269; 24,538.

[36] The instances are *Iliad* 5,122; 13,61; 23,333; 23,772.

Bekker I. 1863. *Homerische Blätter.* [Erster Band. Beilage zu dessen *Carmina Homerica*]. Bonn.

Bekker I. 1872. *Homerische Blätter.* [Zweiter Band. Beilage zu dessen *Carmina Homerica*]. Bonn.

Blumenthal H. 1974. Some Homeric evidence for the history of the augment. – *IF* 79: 67–77.

Boisacq E. 1916. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Heidelberg.

Bothe F. 1834. *Homeri Carmina. Recognovit et explicuit Fredericus Bothe. Odysseae volumen alterum. Lib. IX – XVI*. Leipzig.

Bottin L. 1969. Studio dell'aumento in Omero. – *SMEA* 10: 69–145.

Buttmann P. 1830. *Ausführliche griechische Sprachlehre*. [Erster Band]. Berlin.

Buttmann P. 1858. *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin.

Cantilena M. 1995. Il ponte di Nicanore. – Fantuzzi M., Pretagostini R. (eds.). *Struttura e storia dell' esametro greco*. Roma: 9–68.

Chantraine P. 1948. *Grammaire homérique*. Paris.

Chantraine P., Masson O., Perpillou J., Taillardat J. 2009. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.

De Decker F. 2015a. The augment in Homer, with special attention to speech introductions and conclusions. – De Decker F., Jakob K., Klumm M., Kunzmann M., Lindbüchl I., Stoll T. (eds.). *JournaLIPP 4 Proceedings of the 21st LIPP symposium*: 53–71. [https://lipp.ub.lmu.de/index.php/lipp/article/view/4841/2723].

De Decker F. 2015b. *A Morphosyntactic analysis of speech introductions and conclusions in Homer*. [PhD Thesis LMU München; https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17995/].

De Decker F. 2016. The augment use in *Iliad* 6: An evidential marker? – *LEC* 58: 259–317.

De Decker F. 2017. Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν: An analysis of the augment use in *Iliad* 1. – *JIES* 45: 58–171.

De Decker F. 2019. The augment in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter (HH 2). – *Glotta* 95: 46–100.

Drewitt J. 1912. The augment in Homer (continued). – *CQ* 6: 104–120.

Faesi J. 1858. *Homers Iliade, erklärt von J. U. Faesi*. [Zweiter Band]. Berlin.

Fraenkel H. 1960. Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter. – Fraenkel H. *Wegen und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*. München: 100–156.

Frisk H. 1970. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. [part 2]. Heidelberg.

Gentile B., Lomiento L. 2003. *Metrica e ritmica. Storia delle forme poetiche nella Grecia antica*. Mondadori.

Gerhard E. 1816. *Lectiones Apollonianae*. Leipzig.

Giseke B. 1864. *Homerische Forschungen*. Leipzig.

Grashof C. 1852. *Abhandlung zur Kritik des Homerischen Textes in Bezug auf die Abwerfung des Augments*. Düsseldorf.

Hermann G. 1805. *Orphica*. Leipzig.

Hermann G. 1817. *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae*. London.

Hilberg I. 1879. *Das Princip der Silbenwägung in der griechischen Poesie*. Wien.

Hoffmann C. 1842. *Quaestiones Homericae*. Clausthal.

Ingalls W. 1970. The structure of the Homeric hexameter: A review. – *Phoenix* 24: 1–12.

Janse M. 2003. The metrical schemas of the hexameter. – *Mnemosyne* [NS] 56: 343–348.

Janse M. 2014. *Inleiding tot de Homerische taal en metriek*. Gent.

Koch K. 1868. *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*. Braunschweig.

Korzeniewski D. 1968. *Griechische Metrik*. Darmstadt.

Koster P. 1962. *Traité de métrique grecque*. Leiden.

Kühner R., Blass F. 1890. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre.* [vol. 1]. Hannover.

La Roche J. 1866. *Die homerische Textkritik im Alterthum nebst einem Anhange über die Homerhandschriften*. Leipzig.

La Roche J. 1867. *Homeri Odyssea ad fidem librorum optimorum edidit J. La Roche. Pars prior*. Leipzig.

La Roche J. 1868. *Homeri Odyssea ad fidem librorum optimorum edidit J. La Roche. Pars posterior*. Leipzig.

La Roche J. 1869. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig.

La Roche J. 1870a. *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang I–IV*. Berlin.

La Roche J. 1870b. *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang IX–XII*. Berlin.

La Roche J. 1871. *Homer für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang XXI–XXIV*. Berlin.

La Roche J. 1882. *Das Augment des griechischen Verbum*. Linz.

Lazzeroni R. 1977. Fra glottogonia e storia: ingiuntivo, aumento e lingua poetica indoeuropeo. – *SSL* 17: 1–30.

Lehrs K. 1860. Enige bemerkungen zur caesur des hexameters. – *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 6: 513–531.

Ludwich A. 1866. *Quaestionis de Hexametris Poetarum Graecorum Spondaicis Capita Duo*. Halle.

Ludwich A. 1885. *Aristarch Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurteilt von Arthur Ludwich. Zweiter Theil*. Leipzig.

Ludwich A. 1889. *Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars altera. Odyssea. Volumen prius*. Leipzig.

Ludwich A. 1891. *Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars altera. Odyssea. Volumen alterum*. Leipzig.

Ludwich A. 1892. *Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars prima. Homeri Ilias. Volumen prius*. Leipzig.

Ludwich A. 1897. *Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars prima. Homeri Ilias. Volumen alterum*. Leipzig.

Maas P. 1923. *Griechische Metrik*. Leipzig.

Mazon P. 1942. *Introduction à l'Iliade*. Paris.

Meillet A. 1910. Sur la valeur du ϝ chez Homère. – *MSL* 16: 29–45.

Meyer W. 1884. Zur Geschichte des griechischen und des lateinischen Hexameters. – *SBAW* 4: 979–1089.

Miller D. 2014. *Ancient Greek dialects and early authors. Introduction to the dialect mixture in Homer, with notes on lyric and Herodotus*. Berlin.

Monro D. 1884. *Homer. Iliad books I–XII*. Oxford.

Monro D. 1891. *A grammar of the Homeric dialect*. Oxford.

Mumm P. 2004. Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments. – Krisch T. (ed.). *Analecta homini universali dicata*. [Festschrift für Oswald Panagl]. Stuttgart: 148–158.

Nünlist R. 2000. Homerische Metrik. – Latacz J. (ed.). *Homer Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*. Berlin: 109–113.

O'Neill E. 1942. The localization of metrical word types in the Greek hexameter. – *YCS* 8: 105–178.

Oswald S. 2014. Metrical Laws. – Giannakis G. (ed.). *The Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek language and linguistics*. Leiden: 419–423.

Platt A. 1891. The Augment in Homer. – *JPh* 19: 211–237.

Prellwitz W. 1905. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache*. Göttingen.

Richardson N. 1993. *The Iliad: A commentary*. [vol. 6, books: 22–24]. Cambridge.

Schmidt M. 1854. Aristarch – Homerische excurse 1: Augment. – *Philologus* 9: 426–434.

Schwyzer E. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München.

Sicking C. 1993. *Griechische Verslehre*. München.

Sjölund R. 1938. *Metrische Kürzung im Griechischen*. Uppsala.

Snell B. 1982. *Griechische Metrik*. Göttingen.

Spitzner F. 1816. *De versu Graecorum heroico maxime Homerico*. Leipzig.

Spohn F. 1816. *De extrema Odysseae parte, inde a rhapsodiae Ψ versu CCXCVII aevo recentiore orta quam Homerico*. Leipzig.

Stifler T. 1924. Das Wernicksche Gesetz und die bukolische Diärese. – *Philologus* 79: 323–354.

Taida I. 2004. Elision and augment in the Homeric hymn to Aphrodite. – *Research journal of graduate students of letters* [Hokkaido University] 4: 95–103.

Taida I. 2007. Elision and augment in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. – *Exemplaria Classica* 11: 3–12.

Taida I. 2010. Augment in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*. – *Hermes* 138: 250–258.

Tiedke H. 1873. *Quaestionum Nonnianarum Specimen*. Berlin.

Van Raalte M. 1986. *Rhythm and metre. Towards a systematic description of Greek stichic verse*. Assen.

Van Thiel H. 1996. *Homeri Ilias*. Hildesheim.

Van Thiel H. 2010. *Homeri Ilias*. [2nd edition]. Hildesheim.

Von Christ W. 1874. *Metrik der Griecher und Römer*. Leipzig.

Von Hartel W. 1874a. *Homerische Studien II*. Wien.

Von Hartel W. 1874b. *Homerische Studien III*. Wien.

Von Thiersch F. 1826. *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*. Leipzig.

Voss J. 1826. *Hymne an Demeter. Übersetzt und erläutert*. Heidelberg.

Wachter R. 2000. Grammatik der homerischen Sprache. – Latacz J. (ed.). *Homer Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*. Berlin: 61–108.

West M. 1982. *Greek meter*. Oxford.

West M. 1997. Greek meter. – Morris I., Powell B. (eds.). *A new companion to Homer*. Leiden: 217–238.

West M. 1998. *Homerus Ilias*. [vol. 1: *Rhapsodiae I–XII*]. Berlin.

West M. 2000. *Homerus Ilias*. [vol. 2: *Rhapsodiae XIII–XXIV*]. Berlin.