

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

AN INQUIRY INTO THE USE AND MEANING OF THE FORMS ῥΕΘΗΚΕ(N) AND ΘΗΚΕ(N) IN THE *ILIAD*: SYNTAX AND SEMANTICS

Keywords: augment, Homeric Greek morpho-syntax, injunctive, textual criticism

Abstract

In this article, I discuss the use and absence of the augment in the 3rd singular forms ἔθηκε(ν) and θῆκε(ν) in the *Iliad*. In the previous article (De Decker 2020), I explained why I chose this corpus and determined the value of the different forms. Here I proceed to the actual analysis of the forms: do they confirm the previous syntactic and semantic observations that have been made for the use and absence of the augment (the clitic rule by Drewitt and Beck, the reduction rule by Kiparsky and the distinctions: speech versus narrative, foreground versus background and remote versus recent past)?¹

1. The syntactic factors

1.1. Drewitt–Beck’s clitic rule

It has been argued in the past that a past tense form followed by a 2nd position clitic or a postpositive (enclitics and words that cannot be put in the beginning of a sentence) is generally unaugmented. This was first noted by Drewitt (1912b: 104, 1913: 350) and was expanded to the entire Homeric corpus by Beck (1919).² The figures of the *Iliad* overall confirm this.

¹ The acknowledgements are the same as in De Decker (2020).

² Beck specifically linked this phenomenon and the placement of the ‘Wackernagel clitics’. The rule is therefore best called ‘Drewitt–Beck’s Rule’. See also Marzullo (1952: 415), Bottin (1969: 99–102), Rosén (1973: 316–320), Bakker (1999: 53–54), Mumm (2004: §5.3), De Lamberterie

	Examples of the A type (i.e. unaugmented forms)	Examples of the A+B type	Exceptions of the A type (i.e. augmented forms)	Exceptions of the A+B type	Percentage of A examples	Percentage of A+B examples
Speeches	53	54	12	14	82	79
Narrative	595	612	90	105	87	85
Speech introductions	28	28	5	5	85	85
Overall figures	676	694	107	124	86	85

In our corpus here we only find one example (that confirms the rule):

(EX.01) **θῆκε** δ' ἐπὶ νευρῆ· τὸν δ' αὖ κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ. (*Iliad* 8,324)³
 'He put it (sc. the arrow) on the bowstring, but then Hektor with the flashing helmet (hit) him.'⁴

In this verse, **θῆκε** is followed by **δ'**, which is a word that cannot appear at the beginning of the sentence, and therefore, the unaugmented form is used.

1.2. Kiparsky's reduction rule

Kiparsky (1968) argued that in PIE in a sequence of marked forms only the first one was marked and the others appeared in the neutral form:⁵ 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. In epic Greek, an unaugmented verb form often appears when it is coordinated with a preceding augmented verb form by the connecting particles **καί**, **ιδέ**, **τε**, **ἄμα τε**, **τε καί**, and **δέ**. This is called *conjunction reduction* (Kiparsky 1968; Fortson 2004: 140; Clackson 2007: 132; Luraghi 2014), although *markedness reduction* might be a better term. Kiparsky himself argued that the rule was absolute, but that many examples of it were obscured by the transmission; for Vedic, he explicitly ruled out that the injunctive could be used to mention

(2007: 53), García-Ramón (2012: B.2.3), De Decker (2015a: 56, 2015b: 249–250, 312, 2016a: 56–59, 2017: 79, 128–129), Hajnal (2016a: 13, 2016b: 446–447), Rodeghiero (2017: 634).

³ In what follows, augmented forms will be underlined and unaugmented forms will be put in bold face.

⁴ As was stated before, all translations are my own, unless stated otherwise.

⁵ Kiparsky expanded this in 2005 (discussing Hoffmann 1967), but the basic ideas of 1968 remained the same. See Hajnal (1990: 54–55, 2016a: 13, 2016b: 447–448), Szemerényi (1990: 282–284, 1996: 265–266), Pagniello (2002: 8–17), García-Ramón (2012: §B.2), Luraghi (2014) and De Decker (2015a: 57–59, 2015b: 250–254, 2016a: 58–71, 2017: 83–84, 130–135).

events, as Hoffmann (1967) had argued,⁶ because such a “memorative” was typologically rare, if not non-existent.⁷ Levin (1969), who agreed with Kiparsky, noted that in many instances either the reduction did not occur or the augmented form was preceded by an unaugmented one; in addition, there were several passages in which only unaugmented forms were found. Earlier researches revealed that this is not a strict rule, but only a tendency: in Hesiod and *Iliad* 1 and 6, there were more unaugmented forms that followed an augmented form than augmented forms, but there will still be a considerable number of exceptions (De Decker 2016a: 58–71 for Hesiod; 2016b: 286–288 for *Iliad* 6; 2017: 130–135 for *Iliad* 1). An analysis of the data in the *Iliad* gives the following picture:

	Examples of the A type (i.e. unaugmented forms)	Examples of the A+B type	Exceptions of the A type (i.e. augmented forms)	Exceptions of the A+B type	Percentage of A examples	Percentage of A+B examples
Speeches	441	513	328	530	57	49
Narrative	2479	3118	968	1693	72	65
Speech introductions	35	40	6	16	85	71
Overall figures	2955	3671	1302	2239	69	62

We note that especially in speeches the number of exceptions is particularly high, which indeed raises the issue if this rule is a rule at all. Space constraints prevent me from addressing the question in detail here, but given the fact that there are other reductions such as the use of the plural after having used the dual already,⁸ or the simplex after the compound form had appeared already,⁹ one could reasonably assume that there must have been some kind of constraint against using the

⁶ He used the term *Memorativ*.

⁷ Kiparsky (2005: §1): “There seem to be no languages with a mood whose function is ‘mentioning’ or ‘reminding’”. See also Kloekhorst (2017: 300). I address this later on.

⁸ This analysis goes back to Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1827, quoted in Strunk (1975: 237) and Viti (2011: 602). Strunk (1975: 234–239) provided an analysis of Homeric and Attic (Xenophonic) instances to show that Greek did not need to mark the dual more than once. See Strunk (1975: 234–239), Fritz (2011: 50–51, with reference to Kiparsky 1968 and Strunk 1975), Viti (2011: 598–604, with reference to Corbett 2000: 14) and De Decker (2015b: 158–159) for the reduction in the dual and De Decker (2017: 132–134) for the instances of *Iliad* 1. For typological parallels, see Corbett (2000: 14, 42–50), but this reduction was not discussed in Cysouw (2011) or Moravcsik (2017).

Some examples of this reduction are *Iliad* 1,304–305; 1,328–329; 1,332–333; 6,233; 16,475; 22,160–161; 24,97–98; 24,711–712; *Odyssey* 22,114–115; 22,187–193; 22,201–203; *HH* 2,379–380; 4,503–505.

⁹ Wackernagel (1924: 177); Clausen (1955: 49–51): “a Greek or Latin author sometimes reiterates a compound verb, either immediately or at a brief interval, in its simple form with the same

same marked form too often in one series and I would argue that the reduction was restricted to actions within the same domain (e.g. the process of preparing a feast, the act of speaking, the act of recognizing someone, etc.),¹⁰ and that the use of augmented and unaugmented forms besides one another was not a random poetic choice, but a relic from the period in which this constraint was still operative.

In the corpus under investigation this rule in its strictest formulation (as Kiparsky seems to have done) does not operate: 24 examples that confirm the rule (of which 19 are of the type A),¹¹ but there are 32 forms that contradict the observation (of which 23 are of the type A).¹² I now give one example in favour and one against it (the augmented forms are underlined while the unaugmented ones are set in bold face and the metrically insecure forms are italicized; italicized forms that are underlined indicate forms that are metrically insecure, but in which internal reconstruction makes the augment preferred; italicized forms that are put in bold face indicate forms that are metrically insecure, but in which internal reconstruction makes the absence of the augment preferred):

(EX.02) ἔστη ἔχων δύο δοῦρε· μένος δέ οἱ ἐν φρεσὶ **θῆκε** (*Iliad* 21,145)

‘He stood (in front of the river) with two spears in his hand and in his mind he (sc. Xanthos) had breathed courage.’

The verb form θῆκε is unaugmented, because it is preceded by the augmented ἔστη. There are also exceptions, as can be seen below.

(EX.03) Ἀτρεΐδης δ’ ἐβόησεν ἰδὲ ζώννυσθαι **ἄνωγεν**

Ἀργείους· ἐν δ’ αὐτὸς ἐδύσατο νώροπα χαλκόν.

κνημίδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμησιν ἔθηκε

καλὰς ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας·

(*Iliad* 11,15–18)

‘The son of Atreus shouted loudly and ordered the Argives to gird themselves. He himself put on the shining bronze. First, he placed his beautiful shin pads around his legs, assembled out of beautiful ankle pieces.’

The augmented ἐβόησεν is followed by the unaugmented ἄνωγεν, but also by the augmented ἐδύσατο and ἔθηκε.

Sometimes, rules 1.1 and 1.2 operate simultaneously, as can be seen in the following instance (that had been discussed briefly before):

meaning’; Watkins (1967); Dubois (1986: 217–218 for the phenomenon in the Greek dialects). Dunkel (1978) was sceptical, but Patri (2007) showed that this rule was Indo-European after all.

¹⁰ This was described by Meillet (1913: 115–116) for Armenian and expanded to the other languages with an augment by De Lamberterie (2007: 39, 45).

¹¹ The metrically secure instances are *Iliad* 2,318; 6,303; 8,218; 8,324; 9,460; 10,46; 10,571; 12,399; 18,375; 18,476; 18,615; 21,145; 23,263; 23,700; 23,748; 23,750; 23,826; 23,886; 24,101 and the other instances are 9,547; 10,466; 23,269; 23,653; 24,538.

¹² The instances are *Iliad* 2,319; 3,330; 3,336; 6,139; 9,483; 10,257; 10,261; 11,17; 15,480; 16,137; 17,569; 19,369; 20,324; 21,82; 22,368; 23,265; 23,270; 23,382; 23,400; 23,406; 23,527; 23,568; 23,704 and the other instances are 9,207; 12,450; 19,407; 21,172; 21,524; 21,525; 22,422; 23,751.

(EX.04) ἦτοι δὲ μὲν φαρέτρης ἐξείλετο πικρὸν οἰστόν,
θῆκε δ' ἐπὶ νευρῆ· τὸν δ' αὖ κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ.

(*Iliad* 8,323–324)

'He took a sharp arrow from his quiver and put it on the bowstring, but then Hektor with the flashing helmet (hit) him.'

There are also instances in which the reduction rule seems to operate inversely, namely that an unaugmented form precedes an augmented one.¹³ One such instance is

(EX.05) Ζεὺς **θῆκεν**, καὶ ἔδωκε κατακτάμεν ἦν κ' ἐθέλησθα. (*Iliad* 21,484)

'(Since) Zeus had made you (to be a lioness among the women) and has given you the power to kill whomever you want.'

In this instance Hera attacks Artemis for siding with the Trojans and for having received the power to kill women at random by Zeus. The form θῆκεν is the first in the passage and is unaugmented, while ἔδωκε is augmented and follows the unaugmented form (the augment in this verb is of type B, but is nevertheless defensible because an unaugmented verb form would create a verse with a spondee in the first and second foot, and that is not so common: in the Iliadic corpus mentioned above, we have 945 instances out of 7483 verses, which is 13%).

(EX.06) τὸν μὲν ἀρίζηλον **θῆκεν** θεὸς ὅς περ ἔφηνε·
 λαῶν γάρ μιν ἔθηκε Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω.

(*Iliad* 2,318–319)

'The god who had made him appear, made him very visible; the son of Kronos with the crooked mind then turned him into a stone.'

In this instance, one first has the unaugmented θῆκεν, then the augmented ἔφηνε and then again an augmented ἔθηκε, although it is preceded by the augmented form ἔφηνε.

1.3. The position of the verb and the (direct) object: *Verberststellung* and OV-VO

The next issue we have to address is if there is a clear connection between augment use and the position of the verb in the sentence or verse and the position of the (direct) object and the verb (the so-called OV or VO placement). When the verb appears at the beginning of the sentence, it is more often than not unaugmented (Chantraine 1948: 482; Kiparsky 1968: 41; Bertrand 2006a; De Lamberterie 2007: 37, 56–57; De Decker 2016a: 71–74).¹⁴ In PIE and in other old Indo-European languages such as Anatolian, Vedic Sanskrit and Greek, the sentence-final position

¹³ This observation was made by Levin (1969) and Lazzeroni (1977: 12–15) already, but they drew different conclusions from it, Levin agreed with Kiparsky while Lazzeroni did not.

¹⁴ Van Thiel (1991: xxvi) pointed out that this had been observed already by the Byzantine scholars.

(*Verbendstellung*) was the default one (regardless whether one considers the verb in PIE to be enclitic or not).¹⁵ When the verb was thus put at the beginning of the sentence (*Verberstellung*), it already received emphasis by its position,¹⁶ and therefore did not need any additional focus by adding an augment. *Mutatis mutandis* the same can be said about verbs put in necessary enjambment,¹⁷ a feature that will be discussed later on. In the corpus under investigation here there is not a single augmented verb form that appears at the beginning of the sentence or verse. It has also been argued that verbs that are followed by their direct object tend to be much less augmented than verbs that are preceded by it (De Lamberterie 2007: 48–52; Rodeghiero 2017: 635–639). I cannot investigate here whether Homeric Greek had OV or VO word order, but I looked at books 1–2, 483, 3–9 and 11–17 and found the following data describing the use of (un)augmented forms when used with OV or VO word order.

OV order	A augments	A+B augments	A unaugmented	A+B unaugmented	Percentage of A examples	Percentage of A+B examples
Speeches	224	326	225	244	50	57
Narrative	414	617	875	973	32	39
Speech introductions	140	208	40	44	78	83
Overall figures	778	1151	1140	1261	41	48

¹⁵ That the verb final position was default was noticed before by Bergaigne (1877, 1879), Delbrück (1878: 17, 1888: 17), Kühner, Gerth (1904: 595), Watkins (1963: 48, 1998: 68), Kuryłowicz (1968: 72), Fortson (2010: 142–144), Fritz (2010: 384). The idea that the verb final position is the unmarked one and the initial one is marked, goes back to Delbrück (1878: 17–19). It was expanded to the languages discovered shortly before and after Delbrück’s death by Dressler (1969). For PIE in general see Watkins (1963: 48), Fortson (2010: 142–144), Fritz (2010: 384), and for Hittite see also Luraghi (1990: 88–89, 110–117) and Bauer (2011).

¹⁶ For the common practice (almost a linguistic universal) to put the focalized element in sentence initial position, see Li, Thompson (1976: 465). The problem is that this applies to Hittite and Vedic Sanskrit, but not to Classical Greek. The default position of the verb in Classical Greek is neither sentence-final (Dik 1995, 2007) nor sentence-initial. Instances of *Verberstellung* (V₁ in Dik’s notation) in Classical Greek do not always involve new information: Schwyzer, Debrunner (1950: 693–695) argued that a sentence-initial verb links the action with what precedes and Dik (1995) stated that the sentence-initial position referred to something already known. She later modified her earlier research by stating that “all new-sentences are always verb-initial, but not all verb-initial sentences are all-new” (Dik 2007: 54). For epic Greek, the situation is not so clear-cut, because to the present day no in-depth investigation into the meaning of the sentence initial position of the finite verb form has been performed.

¹⁷ I use this term in the meaning that Parry (1929: 203) ascribed to it.

VO order

	A augments	A+B augments	A unaugmented	A+B unaugmented	Percentage of A examples	Percentage of A+B examples
Speeches	67	95	118	130	36	42
Narrative	188	292	606	644	24	31
Speech introductions	8	12	13	17	38	41
Overall figures	263	399	737	791	26	34

The data show that an OV order has less unaugmented forms than VO and the corpus under investigation here confirms the connection between augment use/absence and OV/VO word order: in the sentences with VO word order, we find that there are 12 unaugmented forms (of which 9 of the type A) and 3 augmented ones (of which only 1 of type A),¹⁸ whereas the sentences with OV have 39 augmented forms (of which 32 of the type A) and 19 unaugmented forms (all type A).¹⁹ I give an example of an augmented verb form with OV word order and an unaugmented verb with VO word order.

(EX.07) τῷ πρώτῳ· ἀτὰρ αὖ τῷ δευτέρῳ ἵππον ἔθηκεν. (*Iliad* 23,265)

‘(...) for the first one, but for the one finishing second he set (as price) a horse (...).’

In this instance the verb form ἔθηκεν appears at the end of the verse and is preceded by the direct object ἵππον.

(EX.08) Αὐτὰρ Πηλεΐδης θῆκεν σόλον αὐτοχόωνον. (*Iliad* 23,826)²⁰

‘But then the son of Peleus put (forward) a massive lump of iron.’

In this instance the unaugmented θῆκεν is followed by the direct object σόλον αὐτοχόωνον.

In fact, the clitic rule, the *Verberststellung* and the VO–OV distinction are (at least to a large extent, if not completely) faces of the same coin. When the verb appears

¹⁸ The unaugmented VO instances are *Iliad* 6,357; 8,218; 8,324; 9,460; 9,547 (type B); 12,399; 18,476; 23,269 (type B); 23,653; 23,700; 23,826; 24,538. The augmented VO instances are 6,482; 21,172 (type B); 21,524 (type B).

¹⁹ The unaugmented OV instances are *Iliad* 1,55; 2,318; 2,482; 5,445; 6,303; 10,46; 10,571; 16,223; 17,541; 18,375; 21,145; 21,484; 23,153; 23,263; 23,748; 23,750; 23,799; 23,826; 23,886; 24,101. The augmented OV instances are *Iliad* 1,2 (type B); 2,319; 3,321; 3,330; 3,336; 6,6; 6,139; 8,188; 9,207; 9,483; 10,257; 10,261; 10,466 (type B); 11,17; 12,450; 15,478; 15,480; 16,131; 16,137; 17,470; 17,569; 19,12 (type B); 19,369; 19,407 (type B); 20,324; 21,82; 21,525 (type B); 22,44; 22,368; 22,422 (type B); 23,265; 23,270; 23,382; 23,400; 23,406; 23,527; 23,568; 23,704; 23,751 (type B).

²⁰ Surprisingly enough, the verse with an augmented verb and OV order would have been possible as well: Αὐτὰρ Πηλεΐδης σόλον αὐτοχόωνον ἔθηκεν is a perfectly acceptable hexameter.

in the first position of the sentence, it becomes the focus of the statement, as it is not its normal position. It is, however, a tendency of clitics to attach themselves to words in focus (Janse 1993, 2014: 24–25). As such, it is only expected that they would seek the Wackernagel position after the first focused word of the sentence. The same applies to the VO word order: when the verb occupies the first position of the sentence, the object can only follow the verb.

2. The analysis itself: The semantic criteria

I now discuss the semantic observations on the augment and apply them to the corpus that has been established before.

2.1. Foreground versus background

The most important distinction that can be made about the use and absence of the augment is the distinction foreground/emphasis versus background. The augment is present when pivotal moments in the story or new elements are described, but is not used in actions that describe the background. In the *Iliad* dressing for battle is an important action (as is e.g. preparing an offering and a feast)²¹ and these actions are described with mostly augmented verb forms. In Book 23 both Patroklos and Hektor have already died, and the main elements of that book are the mistreatment of Hektor's body and the funerary games held in honour of Patroklos. The price setting for those games is one of the highlights, and the verbs involved in those descriptions are emphasized (either by the augment or by other features such as VO word order or enjambment, cf. *infra*).

One example is the following passage (as always, the unaugmented forms are put in bold face, the augmented ones are underlined and the forms that are metrically insecure are italicized; forms that are italicized and bold, are unaugmented forms of which the absence of the augment was established on the basis of internal comparison and forms that are italicized and underlined have an augment that was established on the basis of internal comparison):

(EX.09) ὡς εἰπῶν <u>ᾠτρυνε</u> μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου.	(210)
μᾶλλον δὲ στίχες <u>ἄρθεν</u> , ἐπεὶ βασιλῆος ἄκουσαν .	(211)
ὡς δ' ὅτε τοῖχον ἀνήρ ἀράρη πυκνιοῖσι λίθοισι	(212)
δώματος ὑψηλοῖο βίας ἀνέμων ἀλεείνων,	(213)
ὡς ἄραρον κόρυθές τε καὶ ἀσπίδες ὀμφαλόεσσαι.	(214)
ἀσπίς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' <u>ἔρειδε</u> , κόρυς κόρυιν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ:	(215)
ψαῦον δ' ἰππόκομοι κόρυθες λαμπροῖσι φάλιοισι	(216)
νευόντων, ὡς πυκνοὶ <u>ἐφέστασαν</u> ἀλλήλοισι.	(217)
πάντων δὲ προπάροιθε δὴ ἀνέρε θωρήσονται	(218)
Πάτροκλός τε καὶ Αὐτομέδων ἕνα θυμὸν ἔχοντες	(219)

²¹ For an analysis of the prototypical actions in the *Iliad* see Arend (1933).

πρόσθεν Μυρμιδόνων πολεμιζέμεν. αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς	(220)
βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν ἐς κλισίην, χηλοῦ δ' ἀπὸ πῶμ' <u>ἀνέωγε</u>	(221)
καλῆς δαιδαλέης, τήν οἱ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα	(222)
θῆκε ἐπὶ νηὸς ἄγεσθαι ἐὺ πλῆσασα χιτώνων	(223)
χλαινάων τ' ἀνεμοσκεπέων οὐλων τε ταπήτων.	(224)
ἔνθα δέ οἱ δέπας ἔσκει τετυγμένον, οὐδέ τις ἄλλος	(225)
οὔτ' ἀνδρῶν πίνεσκειν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ αἶθοπα οἶνον,	(226)
οὔτέ τεφ σπένδεσκε θεῶν, ὅτε μὴ Διὶ πατρί.	(227)
τό ῥα τότ' ἐκ χηλοῖο λαβῶν <u>ἐκάθηρε</u> θεεῖω	(228)
πρῶτον, ἔπειτα δ' <u>ἔνιψ'</u> ὕδατος καλῆσι ῥοῆσι,	(229)
νίψατο δ' αὐτὸς χεῖρας, ἀφύσσατο δ' αἶθοπα οἶνον.	(230)
<u>εὔχετ'</u> ἔπειτα στὰς μέσῳ ἔρκει, λεῖβε δὲ οἶνον	(231)
οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδῶν: Δία δ' οὐ λάθε τερπικέραυνον:	(232)

(*Iliad* 16,210–232)

'So he spoke and incited the power and spirit of each man. They put themselves in battalions, after they heard the king. As when a man assembles a wall with thick stones to keep off the violence of the winds of the high roof, so the helmets and hollow shields were assembled. Shield leaned on shield, helmet on helmet, man on man. The helmets with horse hair touched with the shining horns the people that were leaning. So close to each other they had put themselves. In front of all of them two men put on their armour, Patroklos and Automedon, who were of one spirit to fight in front of the Myrmidons. But Akhilleus entered the tent, opened the lid of a beautiful and well-wrought chest, that Thetis with the silver feet had put to be taken with him and had filled it well with tunics, mantles to keep out the winds and woollen carpets. Inside there was a well-wrought goblet, and no one else from the men would drink shining wine from it nor would he (sc. Akhilleus) pour a libation for any of the gods from it, except for father Zeus. He took the goblet out of the chest, cleaned it first with incense and washed it then with beautiful streams of water, washed his own hands and poured the shining wine into it. Standing in the middle of the enclosure he prayed, poured the wine and looked at the bright sky, and did not go unnoticed to Zeus who finds pleasure in the thunder.'

In this passage Homer describes how Akhilleus incited the Myrmidons to fight bravely under the guidance of Patroklos, who was about to enter the battle field disguised as Akhilleus. The passage has 14 unaugmented forms with 13 of the type A (ἔσκει is probably unaugmented because it has -σκ- in it, but as this form is not an original iterative, one cannot be sure) against 4 augmented ones with 1 of the type A (ᾠτρυνε is probably augmented, because otherwise we have a spondee in the second foot with a second half foot long by position and not by nature, ἀνέωγε because it appears in verse final position and ἔνιψ' because a violation of Nikanor-Meyer is more common than one of Giseke-Meyer) and 3 forms that are undeterminable (ἄρθεν, ἐφέστασαν and εὔχετ' can be read with and without augment without violating any metrical rule): only the verbs referring to the preparation by Akhilleus of the offer and prayers to the gods to request a safe homecoming and success (namely ἐκάθηρε and ἔνιψ', but that augment is not entirely certain) have the augment.²² The fact that the audience

²² See for this passage also Mumm (2004: §5.3).

knows that this will be in vain adds a dramatic effect to the passage. The other actions referring to this procedure are placed in sentence initial position and are followed by a clitic, and have no augment because of that. The verb form $\theta\eta\kappa'$ is unaugmented, because the action to which it refers does not belong to the main storyline: it appears in a subordinate clause and states that the coffer out of which Akhilleus is taking the gifts was given to him by his mother Thetis, but at that moment of the story the origin of the coffin has no importance and therefore the verb has no augment.

A special case of a “meal scene” is the following passage.

(EX.10) ὡς **φάτο**, Πάτροκλος δὲ φίλῳ ἐπεπειθελ' ἑταίρῳ. (205)
 αὐτὰρ ὃ γε κρεῖον μέγα **κάββαλεν** ἐν πυρὸς αὐγῇ, (206)
 ἐν δ' ἄρα νῶτον ἔθηκ' ὄϊος καὶ πίονος αἰγός, (207)
 ἐν δὲ σὺδος σιάλοιο ῥάχιν τεθαλυῖαν ἀλοιφῇ. (208)
 τῷ δ' **ἔχεν** Αὐτομέδων, **τάμνεν** δ' ἄρα διὸς Ἀχιλλεύς. (209)
 καὶ τὰ μὲν εὖ **μίστυλλε** καὶ ἀμφ' ὀβελοῖσιν ἔπειρε, (210)
 πῦρ δὲ Μενoitιάδης **δαίεν** μέγα ἰσόθεος φῶς. (211)

(*Iliad* 9,205–211)

‘So he spoke and Patroklos obeyed his beloved comrade. Then he threw a large chopping block in the heat of the fire, placed the back of a sheep and a fat goat on it, and the chine of a fat hog, shining because of the oil. Automedon kept that for him, and shining Akhilleus divided (the pieces), cut them well into pieces and put them on a spit. The son of Menoitios, the great godlike hero, made the fire burn.’

In book 9 Agamemnon decides, advised by Nestor, to send an embassy to Akhilleus begging him to return to the battle. The delegation is constituted by Phoinix, Aias and Odysseus, and the heralds Odios and Eurybates. When Akhilleus sees them approaching, he orders Patroklos to prepare a meal for them. This passage describes how Patroklos and Akhilleus prepare a meal for the Greek envoys. This description is peculiar in that it is the only instance in the *Iliad* in which a guest is offered meat from animals that had been slaughtered before (Arend 1933: 69). The unusual meal preparation (sc. putting already prepared meat on the fire) therefore starts with an augmented verb form.

Several other distinctions have been suggested in the literature and will be discussed below, but even within those distinctions, the deciding factor remains the presence/absence of emphasis and foreground.

2.2. Speeches versus narrative passages

It has been noted before that narrative passages have much less augmented forms than the speeches (Koch 1868; Platt 1891: 223; Monro 1891: 62; Drewitt 1912a; Chantraine 1948: 484; Bottin 1969: 110–128; Basset 1989; West 1989; Bakker 1999, 2005: 114–153; Mumm 2004; De Decker 2016b: 289–291, 2017: 96, 136–137). In this corpus, there are 15 forms that appear in a speech: 10 are augmented (of which 8 of type A)²³

²³ The augmented instances in speeches are *Iliad* 2,319; 3,321; 6,139; 9,483; 17,470; 22,44; 22,422 (type B); 23,333 (type B); 23,406; 24,531.

and 5 are not (of which 4 of type A – the exceptions will be discussed later on).²⁴ The figures confirm the preference for augmented forms in speeches, but they do not show that the augmented forms abound in speeches and are completely missing in narrative. The augment use in speeches and narrative is also dependent on other factors: in speeches without a clear connection to the present or in sentences that relate something unimportant, the augment is not used. This has been noted before for the speeches by Nestor in *Iliad* 1 and by Glaukos and Diomedes in *Iliad* 6.²⁵ I give one example from a speech:

(EX.11) Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἰδηθεν μεδέων κύδιστε μέγιστε
 ὀπότερος τάδε ἔργα μετ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἔθηκε
 τὸν δὸς ἀποφθίμενον δῦναι δόμον Ἄϊδος εἶσω.

(*Iliad* 3,320–322)

‘Father Zeus, most honourable and greatest guardian, from the Ida, give that the one from the both of them who has put the misery on both of us may be killed and go down to the House of Hades.’

This passage is taken from the duel in Book 3 where Menelaos and Paris will decide in a single fight who will have Helen as his wife. When the duel is announced, undefined Trojans and Greeks alike pray and ask Zeus to punish the responsible for the Trojan War. The form ἔθηκε is augmented because it appears in a speech and clearly refers to the present situation, namely the duel at hand. The augment use is therefore not solely “speech-based”, but can also be explained by the fact that the action described by ἔθηκε is very near and present for the audience (the duel is occurring before their eyes and they are living with the consequences of the marital conflict between Paris and Menelaos).

2.3. New versus old

The augment is used in verb forms that emphasize an event and/or communicate something surprising or a new element in an enumeration of events (Mumm 2004; De Decker 2016a: 81–84). This can be combined with the previous and following points: as speeches often communicate something that is important for the speaker and sometimes unknown to the hearer, the use of the augment in speeches is expected; also in narrative, certain actions can be highlighted (although there are several instances in which the augment appears without a clear reason). This is especially the case for the descriptions of warriors gearing up and dressing for battle. Such a typical passage can be found in:

(EX.12) ὦς ἄρ' ἔφραυ, πάλλιν δὲ μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἐκτωρ (324)
 ἄψ ὀρώων: Πάριος δὲ θοῶς ἐκ κληῖρος ὄρουσεν. (325)
 οἱ μὲν ἔπειθ' ἔζοντο κατὰ στίχας, ἦχι ἐκάστω (326)

²⁴ The unaugmented instances are *Iliad* 2,318; 9,460; 10,46; 21,484; 24,538 (type B).

²⁵ Already Koch (1868: 27–28) noted that speeches could have narrative elements, and he pointed at Nestor's speech in *Iliad* 1 specifically; see also Monro (1891: 62), Chantraine (1948: 484), Basset (1989: 14) and De Decker (2017: 136–138) for *Iliad* 1.

ἵπποι ἀερσίποδες καὶ ποικίλα τεύχε' <u>ἔκειτο</u> :	(327)
αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισιν <u>ἐδύσατο</u> τεύχεα καλὰ	(328)
δῖος Ἀλέξανδρος Ἑλένης πόσις ἠῦκόμοιο.	(329)
κνημίδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμησιν <u>ἔθηκε</u>	(330)
καλάς, ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας:	(331)
δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσι <u>ἔδυνεν</u>	(332)
οἷο κασιγνήτοιο Λυκάονος: <u>ἤρμοσε</u> δ' αὐτῶ.	(333)
ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν <u>βάλετο</u> ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον	(334)
χάλκεον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε:	(335)
κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ κυνέην εὐτυκτον <u>ἔθηκεν</u>	(336)
ἵππουριν: δεινὸν δὲ λόφος καθύπερθεν <u>ἔνευεν</u> :	(337)
<u>εἶλετο</u> δ' ἄλκιμον ἔγχος, ὃ οἱ παλάμηφιν <u>ἀρήρει</u> .	(338)
ὣς δ' αὐτως Μενέλαος ἀρήϊος ἔντε' <u>ἔδυνεν</u> .	(339)

(*Iliad* 3,326–339)

'So they spoke. Hektor with the shining helmet looked away and drew lots. Quickly Paris's lot jumped out (of the box). They (sc. the armies) set themselves in rows, where each man's high stepping horses and their bright armour stood. But then shining Alexandros, husband of Helen with the beautiful hair, put on his beautiful armour around his shoulders, placed his beautiful greaves around his legs, assembled out of beautiful ankle pieces. Second, he put the corselet of his brother Lykaon over his chest and fitted it on himself. Around his shoulders he threw the bronze silver-studded sword, and then his big and sturdy shield. He then put his well-wrought helmet with horse hair on his strong head. Terribly, the crest nodded from above. He then took his famous sword, that fitted in his palms. And warlike Menelaos put on his weaponry in the same way.²⁶

This passage describes how Hektor draws lots to see who can throw his javelin first in the duel between Menelaos and Paris, and how both warriors proceed to putting on their armour and preparing for the duel. Battle preparations and putting on armour are typical scenes in Homer and such descriptions are often highlighted (Arend 1933: 92–98). As such, the augment is used to describe the individual steps (as can be seen in the underlined forms).²⁷ The unaugmented form *πάλλεν* does not have an augment, because it appears in sentence-initial position and is followed by a clitic; the form *ἀρήρει* is unaugmented because it appears in a subordinate sentence and does not belong to the act of dressing itself. There are two unaugmented forms that surprise: first, *ᾄρουσεν*, because announcing who is allowed to throw his spear first, is not a mere descriptive element, but an important advantage in the battle, and second, the unaugmented *βάλετο*. The form *ἔφην* has a metrically secure augment, because monosyllables are avoided before pauses, caesurae and at 6b.²⁸ The forms

²⁶ This translation is based on Murray, Wyatt (1999: 152).

²⁷ See also Rodeghiero (2017: 631–632).

²⁸ I was unable to find out which scholar had first stated this bridge, but Bekker (1863: 148) noted that very few verses had a sixth foot that ended in a monosyllabic word. Before him, Hermann (1817: 216) had already observed that a word end there was dispreferred, but not excluded, when special emphasis was needed. Hoffmann (1842: 20–21) catalogued this caesura among the *caesurae minores*, but stated that a caesura in this position was possible, if something

ἔκειτο and ἔδυνεν (339) have an augment that can be considered type B because of the metrical form $\cup\text{--}\cup$ at the end of the verse (cf. *supra*), and in case of ἔδυνεν also because ἔδυνεν is more common than δύνε; the form ἴζοντο is more likely than not augmented, because if it is not augmented, the second foot would have a spondee with a second half foot long by position, and this is, though not impossible, still much less common.²⁹ The augment in ἤρμοσε is impossible to determine.

The same applies to the similar passages, such as *Iliad* 11,15–20 and 16,130–139.

These passages can serve as evidence that Kiparsky's reduction rule was not a mechanic syntactic law of Homeric Greek.

2.4. Recent versus remote/mythical past

Scholars have observed that the augment is used, when actions in a recent past are described or when a past action still has relevance for the present,³⁰ and that it tends to be absent when actions in a remote or mythical past are described.³¹ This has been linked with the use of the augment in sentences with the adverb νῦν, as this refers to an action in the immediate past (Platt 1891; Drewitt 1912a: 44; Bottin 1969: 87–89, 135–136; Bakker 1999: 53, 60–62; García Ramón 2012: F1b; De Decker 2015b: 289, 315, 2016a: 289). The corpus has four examples of an augmented verb and the adverb νῦν, of which three are metrically secure and one is undeterminable.³² I first give two examples of the augment use in an action in the recent past.

(EX.13) Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
 οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,
 πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν.

(*Iliad* 1,1–3)

'Sing, goddess, about the wrath of Akhilleus, son of Peleus, a deadly one that brought sorrows to countless Akhaians and threw many strong souls down into the Hades.'

These are the opening lines of the poem and they clearly refer to something that in the mind of the poet has just happened and an event that will dominate the poem.³³

spectacular was announced or if the poet spoke about Zeus. Meyer (1884: 983) noted that the combination of a dactylic word and a monosyllabic word before the caesura in the third foot was avoided. See also Meister (1921: 6), Sjölund (1938: 63), Snell (1982: 16), Barnes (1986: 141) and Sicking (1993: 81), who argued that a monosyllabon at the end of a sentence, colon or verse was not preferred.

²⁹ I refer to the corpus of 7483 verses mentioned above: there are 779 verses with a spondee in the second foot with a second half foot long by position, this is 10%.

³⁰ Platt (1891) used the term "perfect aorist" to describe these forms. See also Drewitt (1912a, 1912b, 1913), Bakker (1999, 2002, 2005).

³¹ For Homer, see already Platt (1891) and Drewitt (1912a, 1912b). Hoffmann (1967: 160–213) noted the use of the injunctive in contexts that he described as "fernere nicht historische Vergangenheit". See also Strunk (1968) and Euler (1995).

³² *Iliad* 17,470, 21,82 and 23,406 are secure; 23,333 is undeterminable.

³³ For more details on this passage see De Decker (2017: 148–149).

(EX.14) Τυδεΐδew ἴπποισι δαΐφρονος, οἷσιν Ἀθήνη
νῦν ὤρεξε τάχος καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ κῦδος ἔθηκεν.

(*Iliad* 23,405–406)

‘(I am not ordering you to compete) with the horses of the battle-minded son of Tydeus, to them Athene has now endowed with speed and to the man she has given honour.’

In this passage during the funerary games for Patroklos, Antilokhos shouts to his horses that they should be brave but should not try to compete with Diomedes’s horses since Athene has just given them strength. As Antilokhos is referring to events that are happening at this very moment, the augment is used in ὤρεξε and ἔθηκεν. As the verbs refer to two different aspects (the speed of the horses and the honour of Diomedes), the reduction rule has not operated and both ὤρεξε and ἔθηκεν are augmented.

Rather than a mere distinction recent versus remote past, I believe that the examples are more indicative of the distinction foreground-background. In the corpus under investigation, there are only two instances that refer to a remote past and in one of them an augmented form is used and in another one, an unaugmented form. While two forms are too little to make a decisive judgement, the augment use in the passages does in fact confirm what has been stated above.

(EX.15) εἰ δέ τις ἀθανάτων γε κατ' οὐρανοῦ εἰλήλουθας, (128)
οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγε θεοῖσιν ἐπουρανόισι μαχοίμην. (129)
οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ Δρύαντος υἱὸς κρατερὸς Λυκόοργος (130)
δὴν ἦν, ὅς ῥα θεοῖσιν ἐπουρανόισιν ἔριζεν: (131)
ὅς ποτε μαινομένοιο Διωνύσοιο τιθήνας (132)
σεῦε κατ' ἠγάθειον Νυσηΐον: αἶ δ' ἅμα πᾶσαι (133)
θύσθλα χαμαὶ κατέχευαν ὑπ' ἀνδροφόνοιο Λυκούργου (134)
θεινόμεναι βουπλήγι: Διώνυσος δὲ φοβηθεῖς (135)
δύσεθ' ἄλως κατὰ κύμα, Θέτις δ' ὑπεδέξατο κόλπῳ (136)
δειδιότα: κρατερὸς γὰρ ἔχε τρόμος ἀνδρὸς ὀμοκλή. (137)
τῷ μὲν ἔπειτ' ὀδύσαντο θεοὶ ῥεῖα ζῶντες, (138)
καί μιν τυφλὸν ἔθηκε Κρόνου πάϊς: οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δὴν (139)
ἦν, ἐπεὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀπήχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσιν: (140)
οὐδ' ἂν ἐγὼ μακάρεσσι θεοῖς ἐθέλοιμι μάχεσθαι. (141)

(*Iliad* 6,128–141)

‘If you are one of the immortals and have come from heaven, I would not fight against the gods in heaven. For the son of Dryas, the strong Lykourgos did not live long, he who fought with the heavenly gods and once stormed against the nurses of the raging Dionysos through the holy Nysean hill. Together they shattered their offerings on the ground, hit with an ox-goad by the manslaying Lykourgos. Struck with fear Dionysos hid himself under the wave of the sea and Thetis covered him, fearful, in her bosom. The strong shivering held him because of the threatening shouts of the man. Him (L) hated then all the gods who live in all easiness and blind made him the son of Kronos and he did not live much longer, since he was hated by all the gods. I therefore would not want to fight the blessed gods.’

In this passage Diomedes addresses Glaukos and asks him if he is a god; if he is, he will not fight him, because it is very unwise to challenge and upset the immortals. In order to prove his story, he relates the mythical story of Lykourgos who was so hated by the gods that Zeus struck him with blindness. In spite of the story belonging to the mythical past, the verb has an augment. This can be explained by the fact that the divine punishment is highlighted here and serves as a deterrent in Diomedes's mind.

(EX.16) ἦ δὲ χολωσαμένη δῖον γένος ἰοχέαιρα	(538)
ᾤρσεν ἔπι χλοῦνην σὺν ἄγριον ἀργιόδοντα,	(539)
ὄς κακὰ πόλλ' ἔρδεσκεν ἔθων Οἰνήος ἀλώην:	(540)
πολλὰ δ' ὄ γε προθέλυμα χαμαὶ βάλε δένδρεα μακρὰ	(541)
αὐτῆσιν ῥίζησι καὶ αὐτοῖς ἄνθεσι μῆλων.	(542)
τὸν δ' υἱὸς Οἰνήος ἀπέκτεινεν Μελέαγρος	(543)
πολλέων ἐκ πολίων θηρήτορας ἄνδρας ἀγείρας	(544)
καὶ κύνας: οὐ μὲν γάρ κε δάμη παύροισι βροτοῖσι:	(545)
τόσσοις ἔην, πολλοὺς δὲ πυρῆς ἐπέβησ' ἀλεγεινῆς.	(546)
ἦ δ' ἄμφ' αὐτῷ θῆκε πολὺν κέλαδον καὶ αὐτὴν	(547)
ἀμφὶ σὺδὸς κεφαλῇ καὶ δέρματι λαχνήεντι,	(548)
Κουρήτων τε μεσηγῦ καὶ Αἰτωλῶν μεγαθύμων.	(549)

(*Iliad* 9,538–549)

'The goddess that shoots arrows, the divine offspring, grew angry at that and sent against them a fierce wild boar with sharp teeth, that caused much havoc at his will to the orchard of Oineus. Many high trees he uprooted and threw to the ground with their roots and even with the fruits of the apple trees themselves. The son Oineus, Meleagros, killed it after he had gathered many hunters and dogs from many cities, since it would not have been tamed by a few men, so big was it and many it drove into the painful pyre. But the goddess incited over him, over the head and the hairy skin of the boar, much battle noise and war-cry in the middle between the Kouretes and the great hearted Aitolians.'

In this passage Phoinix tells Akhilleus that his stubborn refusal to save the Akhians might turn him into a second Meleagros, who also refused to help his fellow countrymen out of personal resentment and only intervened when the houses next to his own were already burning. The example here is taken from a passage that describes how Artemis was angered with Meleagros's city and sent a wild boar that caused destruction and panic, but that the city remained safe as long as Meleagros was willing to protect it. In the middle of the story, however, Phoinix alludes to the reason why Meleagros became angry with his fellow countrymen (but he does not tell the story entirely): the boar that Meleagros killed, caused a rift between him and his mother's brothers. He killed them, his mother cursed him and he withdrew from battle. The reason why he withdrew from battle is less pivotal to the story (just as the reason why Akhilleus is angry is of lesser importance to Phoinix as well, he just wants his friend to return to battle and save the Greeks), hence its being narrated only partially. The form θῆκε has no augment, not because it appears in a remote story, but because it has no foregrounded value in this remote story.

2.5. Gnomic aorists

A special instance of foregrounding is the Homeric use of the augment in general truths and proverbs: they describe a general truth the knowledge of which is based on past experiences and refer to past actions of which the correctness is still valid at the moment of speaking or to actions that occurred in the past, but could (re)occur at any time in the present.³⁴ Such actions and descriptions mostly, if not always, illustrate and confirm what the speakers or poets are saying, so almost by definition they are foregrounded and emphasized. In the entire *Iliad* I counted 23 augmented gnomic aorists (of which 16 were of the type A) and 5 unaugmented (4 of type A).³⁵ This shows that the augment is overwhelmingly preferred in the gnomic aorist, but not absolutely mandatory either.

There is only one example in the corpus we are investigating here:

(EX.17) ᾧ δέ κε τῶν λυγρῶν δῶη, λωβητὸν ἔθηκε. (*Iliad* 24,531)

‘To whom he gives from the jar of pains, him he makes a failure.’

This verse belongs to Akhilleus’s speech to Priam after he (P) came to his tent to beg for the release of Hektor’s dead body. Akhilleus explains to Priam that the gods bestow good and evil upon mankind. This verse states that the man who receives from Zeus out of the jar of evils will turn into a failure; as this is a general truth, ἔθηκε is augmented. This statement is clearly foregrounded by Akhilleus, because he wants to show to Priam (and to himself) that absolute happiness does not exist and all mortals have to carry their burdens.

³⁴ The literature on the gnomic aorist is large, but I cannot address the issue here. That the gnomic aorist was almost always augmented in Homer, had been noticed very early on: Platt (1891), Herbig (1896: 250–270), Delbrück (1897: 302), Wackernagel (1904: 5, 1920: 181), Brugmann (1916: 11, who noted that there was no explanation for this fact; this goes against his earlier explanation of 1890: 185 and 1892: 1276–1277 that in origin the gnomic aorist was unaugmented and acquired its augment only when the augment became more and more established in Greek epic diction), Drewitt (1912a, 1912b, 1913), Hirt (1928: 171–173). See more recent: Pagniello (2002: 74–84), Bakker (2001: 18–23, 2005: 131–135), Faulkner (2005: 68–69), Bertrand (2006b: 241), De Decker (2016a: 55–67, 87–90, 2017: 92, 140–141).

³⁵ The unaugmented instances are *Iliad* 4,320, 9,320, 11,28, 24,49.

Other exceptions are *Odyssey* 8,481, 14,465 (an instance of ἀνήκε), 17,271; *Theogony* 447 (the absence of the augment is not secured by the metre in that specific instance), *Works and Days* 17–20 (if the aorists in this passage are indeed gnomic), 345, 702–705, 740–741 (cf. De Decker 2016a: 55–67).

In *Iliad* 17,99 both πῆμα κλίσθη and πῆμ' ἐκκλίσθη are transmitted (the augmented form occurs in only one papyrus). Platt (1891: 219, writing before the papyrus was available) suggested to read the augmented form. It is difficult to decide which variant to choose, as the augmented one could be defended by the simile-nature of the passage and the unaugmented form, because it makes the verse end in √-√.

Iliad 14,382 is in my opinion not a gnomic aorist, but describes the distribution of the weaponry according to the nature of the individual fighter and does not convey any notion of general truth.

2.6. Homeric *similia*

Closely related to the use of the augment in the gnomic aorist, is its use in the *similia*, the Homeric comparisons in which Homer compared a battle scene or another event to a scene from everyday life (mostly in the agricultural sphere) (Platt 1891; Drewitt 1912a, 1912b, 1913; Chantraine 1948: 484; Shipp 1972: 120; Bakker 1999: 64, 2002: 75–77, 2005: 114, 121, 131–134). As the similes compare an action in the recent past with occurrences in the past, and “they are ‘close’ to the audience, in evoking a domestic rather than heroic, reality” (Bakker 1999: 64, 2005: 114), their link with the present and the audience is evident and the use of the augment therefore does not surprise,³⁶ but as was the case with the gnomic aorist, the use of the augment in the *similia* is not absolute: in the *Iliad* there are 113 augmented instances (of which 82 of type A) and 13 unaugmented instances (of which 11 A type forms).³⁷

In this corpus, there is one example:

(EX.18) ὡς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἰκάνει
 ἄσπεος αἰθομένοιο, θεῶν δέ ἐ μῆνις **ἀνήκε**,
 πᾶσι δ' ἔθηκε πόνον, πολλοῖσι δὲ κήδε' **ἐφήκεν**
 ὡς Ἀχιλεὺς Τρώεσσι πόνον καὶ κήδε' ἔθηκεν.

(*Iliad* 21,522–525)

‘As when smoke from a burning city goes up into the broad sky, the anger of the gods has been set loose on it and puts toil on all of them and throws sorrows on many of them. In that way Akhilleus created pain and sorrow for the Trojans.’

In this passage Akhilleus causes so much death and destruction among the Trojans that his fury is compared to a god who is enraged with a certain city and decided to lay her waste. The augment in ἔθηκε (524) is insecure (cf. *supra*), but the fact that it

³⁶ Bakker (2005: 114, 121, 131–134), Shipp (1972: 120) stated that “(the augment use) illustrates the linguistic similarity of proverbial comments and similes”.

³⁷ The exceptions are *Iliad* 3,4 (αἴ τ' ἐπεὶ οὖν χειμῶνα φύγον καὶ ἀθέσφατον ὄμβρον “when they were fleeing winter and the unheavenly rain”, where the constraint against an elision at the caesura guarantees the unaugmented form, against Bakker (2001: 8–9) who considered this instance to be insecure because he thought that the augment could be added in the text even if it meant having a caesura with an elision), 4,75 (of type B), 4,279, 4,483 (the absence of the augment is guaranteed by Tiedke-Meyer's Law, cf. Part I of the article), 5,770, 15,682 (the absence of the augment is guaranteed by Hermann's Bridge and even Platt (1891: 219) hesitated in adding the augment here, although several codices have the augmented form), 16,633, 16,634 (unless one interprets them with Janko (1992: 391–392) as presents and not as pluperfects and imperfects), 21,523, 21,524, 23,223 (where Platt (1891: 220) argued that the metre prevented the poet from using the augmented form, which is true but does not explain why he did not use an augmented alternative), 23,432 (which is, as 21,523 and 21,524 an instance of ἦκ- and -ῆκ-, cf. *infra*).

The observation made for the unaugmented gnomic aorist in 17,99 applies to the verb form in the simile of 23,693, where both κύμ' ἐκάλυπεν and κύμα κάλυπεν are transmitted. As was the case in 17,99, the unaugmented form seems to be supported by the verse end in ~~, whereas the simile-nature of the passage would lend its support to the augmented form. The difference between 17,99 and 23,693 is that in the former the augmented form is found in only one papyrus, whereas in the latter several codices have the augmented form. Given that the gnomic aorist and the *similia* are generally augmented, it might be advisory to catalogue the forms as type B augments.

appears in a simile, makes it more likely that the augmented form is the right one. The form ἔθηκεν (525) does not belong to the simile anymore but makes the description return to the actual event. Remarkable are the two unaugmented forms, ἀνῆκε and ἐφῆκεν. In his analysis of the augment, Platt (1891: 218–219, 234–235) argued that the simplex and compound forms in ῆκ- and -ῆκ- might very well have been augmented after all. As ἔθηκ- and ῆκ- exist both and the augmented form can be ancient (from **e-yeh₁-*), it is in my opinion more likely that the forms in ῆκ- and -ῆκ- were actually unaugmented.³⁸ In that case, the unaugmented forms are exceptions to the rule that the *similia* were always augmented.

3. Conclusion

The investigation of the forms in the *Iliad* showed that the use and absence of the augment in ἔθηκ(ε)(ν) and θῆκ(ε)(ν) are not metrically motivated, but can be explained by an interaction of syntactic and semantic factors. I found that more than any other explanation the distinction foreground/emphasis versus background could explain the augment use most adequately: regardless whether used in a speech, a narrative description, subordinate or negative sentence, the verb form was augmented when the speakers and/or poets wanted to highlight certain aspects of their statements (e.g. when warriors dress for battle). As the Homeric *similia* and the gnomic aorists refer directly to the speakers' and hearers' worlds, they are by definition foregrounded, hence the predominant augment use in those contexts. The augment was not needed when the verb had received its emphasis by another means already, e.g. an enjambment, a sentence-initial position or an VO word order. I also found that Kiparsky's reduction rule was only operative if the verb forms described the same action.

References

Online sources

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

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>

Printed sources

Arend W. 1933. *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*. Berlin.

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.

³⁸ See also Monro (1891: 60) and Chantraine (1948: 481). The forms were listed, but the issue was not addressed in neither Veitch (1879: 330–331), Kühner, Blass (1892: 203–204) nor Chantraine et al. (2009: 441–442).

If Peters (1976), followed by LIV²: 225, is right in reconstructing **h₁ieh₁* or **Hieh₁*, the original augmented form would have been *ῆῆκε. Peters's argument was that the long ι in Attic ἦῆκε could only be explained by a reduplicated form **h₁i-h₁ieh₁-mi* (via **ijēmi* the form would have evolved into **ihēmi* and then into *hīēmi* or in Greek script ἦῆμι).

- Bakker E. 2001. Similes, augment and the language of immediacy. – Watson J. *Speaking volumes. Orality & literacy in the Greek & Roman world*. Leiden: 1–23.
- 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).
- Barnes H. 1986. The colometric structure of the Homeric hexameter. – *GRBS* 27: 125–150.
- Basset L. 1989. L'augment et la distinction discours/récit dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssee. – Casevitz M. (ed.). *Études homériques*. Lyon: 9–16.
- Bauer A. 2011. Verberststellung im Hethitischen. – Krisch T., Lindner T. (eds.). *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog*. Wiesbaden: 39–48.
- Beck W. 1919. *De augmenti apud Homerum usu*. Giessen.
- Bekker I. 1863. *Homerische Blätter*. [Erster Band. Beilage zu dessen *Carmina Homerica*]. Bonn.
- Bergaigne A. 1877. *Essai sur la construction grammaticale considérée dans son développement historique*. Paris.
- Bergaigne A. 1879. Essai sur la construction grammaticale. – *MSL* 3: 1–51.
- Bertrand N. 2006a. La localisation des formes intransitives d'ἴσθημι. Le rôle de ἔσθη et στάς dans le récit homérique. – *GAIA* 10: 47–96.
- Bertrand N. 2006b. Présence du passé dans l'épopée homérique. À propos de *Pointing to the past* de EJ Bakker. – *GAIA* 10: 237–243.
- Blumenthal H. 1974. Some Homeric evidence for the history of the augment. – *IF* 79: 67–77.
- Bottin L. 1969. Studio dell'aumento in Omero. – *SMEA* 10: 69–145.
- Brugmann K. 1890. *Griechische Grammatik*. München.
- Brugmann K. 1892. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. [vol. 2.2]. Strassburg.
- Brugmann K. 1916. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. [vol. 2.3]. Strassburg.
- Chantraine P. 1948. *Grammaire homérique*. Paris.
- Chantraine P., Masson O., Perpillou J., Taillardat J. 2009. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.
- Clackson J. 2007. *Indo-European linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge.
- Clausen W. 1955. Silva Coniecturarum. – *AJP* 76: 47–62.
- Corbett G. 2000. *Number*. Cambridge.
- Cysouw M. 2011. The expression of person and number: A typologist's perspective. – *Morphology* 21: 419–443.
- 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. 2016a. A contrastive analysis of the Homeric and Hesiodic augment, with special focus on Hesiod. – *IJDL* 13: 33–128.
- De Decker F. 2016b. The augment use in *Iliad* 6: An evidential marker? – *LEC* 58: 259–317.
- De Decker F. 2017. Ὀμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν: An analysis of the augment use in *Iliad* 1. – *JIES* 45: 58–171.
- De Decker F. 2020. Metrical and morphological observations on the use of ἔθηκε(v) and θῆκε(v) in the *Iliad*. – *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 137.1: 67–81.
- De Lamberterie C. 2007. L'augment dans le texte arménien de l'Évangile. – *REArm* 30: 31–57.
- Delbrück B. 1878. *Syntaktische Forschungen III. Die Altindische Wortfolge aus der Çata-pathabrāhmana*. Halle.

- Delbrück B. 1888. *Syntaktische Forschungen V. Altindische Syntax*. Halle.
- Delbrück B. 1897. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen II*. Strassburg.
- Dik H. 1995. *Word order in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam.
- Dik H. 2007. *Word order in Greek tragic dialogue*. Oxford.
- Dressler W. 1969. Eine textsyntaktische Regel der idg. Wortstellung. – *KZ* 83: 1–25.
- Drewitt J. 1912a. The augment in Homer. – *CQ* 6: 44–59.
- Drewitt J. 1912b. The augment in Homer (continued). – *CQ* 6: 104–120.
- Drewitt J. 1913. A note on the augment. – *CP* 8: 349–353.
- Dubois L. 1986. *Recherches sur le dialecte arcadien*. [3 vols]. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Dunkel G. 1978. Preverb deletion in Indo-European? – *KZ* 92: 14–26.
- Euler W. 1995. Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen. – Smoczyński W. (ed.). *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume. Part One*. Cracow: 137–142.
- Faulkner A. 2005. Aphrodite's aorists: Attributive sections in the Homeric hymns. – *Glotta* 81: 60–79.
- Fortson B. 2004. *Indo-European language and culture: An introduction*. Oxford.
- Fortson B. 2010. *Indo-European language and culture: An introduction*. [2nd edition]. Oxford.
- Fritz M. 2010. Indogermanische Syntax. – Meier-Brügger M. (ed.). *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin: 374–412.
- Fritz M. 2011. *Der Dual im Indogermanischen*. Heidelberg.
- García-Ramón J. 2012. TAM, augment and evidentiality in Indo-European. [Handout from the Workshop *Grammatische und lexikalische Strukturen im Wandel* held in Cologne, March 21 – 23.2012].
- Hajnal I. 1990. Die mykenische Verbalform *e-e-to*. – *MSS* 51: 21–75.
- Hajnal I. 2016a. Induktive versus abductive Rekonstruktion: das Beispiel des griechischen Augments. [Handout from the Workshop in Honour of M. Job on March 2 in Göttingen].
- Hajnal I. 2016b. Induktive versus abduktive Rekonstruktion: das Beispiel des griechischen Augments. – *IF* 121: 435–453.
- Herbig G. 1896. Aktionsart und Zeitstufe. – *IF* 6: 157–270.
- Hermann G. 1817. *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae*. London.
- Hirt H. 1928. *Indogermanische Grammatik IV. Doppelung, Zusammensetzung, Verbum*. Heidelberg.
- Hoffmann C. 1842. *Quaestiones Homericae*. Clausthal.
- Hoffmann K. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg.
- Janko R. 1992. *The Iliad: A commentary*. [vols 13–16]. Cambridge.
- Janse M. 1993. The prosodic basic of Wackernagel's law. – Crochetière A., Boulanger J., Ouelon C. (eds.). *Les langues menacées: Actes du XVe Congrès international des linguistes*. Sainte-Foy (QC): 19–22.
- Janse M. 2014. *Inleiding tot de Homerische taal en metriek*. Gent.
- Kiparsky P. 1968. Tense and mood in Indo-European syntax. – *FL* 4: 30–57.
- Kiparsky P. 2005. The Vedic injunctive: Historical and synchronic implications. – Singh R. (ed.). *The yearbook of South Asian languages and linguistics*: 219–235. [accessed online: www.degruyter.com/view/book/9783110186192/10.1515/9783110186185.219.xml].
- Kloekhorst A. 2017. The Old Hittite and the Proto-Indo-European tense-aspect system. – *IF* 122: 295–307.
- Koch K. 1868. *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*. Braunschweig.
- Kühner R., Blass F. 1892. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. [vol. 2]. Hannover.
- Kühner R., Gerth B. 1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre*. [vol. 2]. Hannover.

- Kuryłowicz J. 1968. *Indogermanische Grammatik. II Akzent. Ablaut*. Heidelberg.
- Lazzeroni R. 1977. Fra glottogonia e storia: ingiuntivo, aumento e lingua poetica indoeuropeo. – *SSL* 17: 1–30.
- Levin S. 1969. Remarks on the ‘historical’ present and comparable phenomena of syntax. – *FL* 5: 386–390.
- Li C., Thompson S. 1976. Subject and topic: A new typology of language. – Li C. (ed.). *Subject and topic*. New York: 457–489.
- LIV² = Rix H. (ed). 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden.
- Luraghi S. 1990. *Old Hittite sentence structure*. London.
- Luraghi S. 2014. Conjunction reduction. – Giannakis G. (ed.). *The encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek language and linguistics*. Leiden: 362–363.
- Marzullo B. 1952. *Il problema omerico*. Firenze.
- Meillet A. 1913. *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg.
- Meister K. 1921. *Die homerische Kunstsprache*. Leipzig.
- Meyer W. 1884. Zur Geschichte des griechischen und des lateinischen Hexameters. – *SBAW* 4: 979–1089.
- Monro D. 1891. *A grammar of the Homeric dialect*. Oxford.
- Moravcsik E. 2017. Number. – Aikhenvald A., Dixon R. 2017 (eds.). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic typology*. Cambridge: 440–476.
- Mumm P. 2004. Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments. – Krisch T. (ed.). *Analecta homini universali dicata*. [Festschrift für Oswald Panagl]. Stuttgart: 148–158.
- Murray A., Wyatt W. 1999. *Homer Iliad. Books 1–12*. Cambridge (MA).
- Pagniello F. 2002. *The augment in Homer*. [PhD Thesis, University of Georgia at Atlanta].
- Patri S. 2007. Remarque sur le positionnement syntaxique du déterminant adverbial (pré-verbe) en indo-européen. – *IF* 112: 26–38.
- Parry M. 1929. The distinctive character of enjambement in Homeric verse. – *TAPA* 60: 200–220.
- Peters M. 1976. Attisch *hīēmi*. – *Die Sprache* 22: 157–161.
- Platt A. 1891. The augment in Homer. – *JPh* 19: 211–237.
- Rodeghiero S. 2017. L’aumento in Omero tra narrazione e sintassi. – Logozzo F., Poccetti P. (eds.). *Ancient Greek linguistics. New approaches, insights and perspectives*. Berlin: 625–640.
- Rosén H. 1973. Satzbau und augmentloses Tempus in Homerischen Tatsachenbericht. – *FoL* 6: 315–330.
- Schwyzler E., Debrunner A. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik. Teil II. Syntax*. München.
- Shipp G. 1972. *Studies in the language of Homer*. Cambridge.
- Sicking C. 1993. *Griechische Verslehre*. München.
- Sjölund R. 1938. *Metrische Kürzung im Griechischen*. Uppsala.
- Snell B. 1982. *Griechische Metrik*. Göttingen.
- Strunk K. 1968. Zeit und Tempus in den altindogermanischen Sprachen. – *IF* 73: 279–311.
- Strunk K. 1975. Zum Verhältnis von Wort und Satz in der Syntax des Lateinischen und Griechischen. – *Gymnasium* 82: 225–239.
- Szemerényi O. 1990. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt.
- Szemerényi O. 1996. *Introduction to Indo-European linguistics*. Oxford.
- Van Thiel H. 1991. *Homeri Odyssea*. Hildesheim.
- Veitch W. 1879. *Greek verbs. Defective and irregular*. Oxford.
- Viti C. 2011. The use of the dual number in Homer. – Krisch T., Lindner T. (eds.). *Indogermanistik und Linguistik im Dialog*. Wiesbaden: 595–604.

- Wackernagel J. 1904. *Studien zum griechischen Perfektum*. Göttingen.
- Wackernagel J. 1920. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*. I. Basel.
- Wackernagel J. 1924. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*. II. Basel.
- Watkins C. 1963. Preliminaries to a historical and comparative analysis of the syntax of the Old Irish verb. – *Celtica* 6: 1–49.
- Watkins C. 1967. An Indo-European construction in Greek and Latin. – *HSCP* 71: 115–119.
- Watkins C. 1998. Proto-Indo-European: Comparison and reconstruction. – Giacalone Ramat A., Ramat P. (eds.). *The Indo-European languages*. London: 25–73.
- West M. 1989. An unrecognized injunctive usage in Greek. – *Glotta* 67: 135–138.