

## Lautensach's Law and the Augment of Compound-Verbs in EY-

By DONALD J. MASTRONARDE, Berkeley

Modern editions of fifth-century Attic tragedy and comedy show some disarray in their presentation of the augment and reduplication of verbs formed from compounds in *εὐ-*. Page's Aeschylus, Murray's Euripides (vol. 3), Diggle's Euripides (vols. 1, 2), and Coulon's Aristophanes present forms like *εὐφήμεσεν* (*Pers.* 389), *εὐτύχησεν* (*Or.* 542), *εὐσθένει* (*Cycl.* 2), *εὐτύχει* (*Hec.* 18), *εὐδοκίμηκεν* (*Nubes* 1033), whereas other editions (Biehl's *Orestes*, Daitz's *Hecuba*, Dover's *Clouds*) print *ηὐ-* in the same places.<sup>1)</sup> The origin of the disagreement is what may be termed Lautensach's law, namely, that in fifth-century Attic a verb beginning in *εὐ-* (or *εὐ-*) has augment and reduplication in *ηὐ-* (or *ηὐ-*) unless it is formed from a compound with the adverb/prefix *εὐ̄*, in which case the augmented and reduplicated forms still exhibit *εὐ-*. The purpose of this note is to point out that Lautensach's law is based on a faulty inference from the evidence of Attic inscriptions and to recommend that future editors of Attic drama be consistent in using *ηὐ-* as augment and reduplication for all verbs in *εὐ-*.

Faced with confusion in the evidence of the medieval manuscripts and in the advice of the ancient grammarians, early nineteenth-century Hellenists argued over the propriety of *ηὐ-* vs. *εὐ-*. Elmsley (on *Medea* 194 [= 191 ed. suae]) and Dindorf favored restoring *ηὐ-* everywhere as the genuine classical Attic form. Lobeck and Ellendt<sup>2)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> Cf. also *εὐιάζεις* Soph., *Ichneutai* (fr. 314), 227 Radt. Murray inconsistently chose to print *ἠὐφρανας*, *ἠὐφρανε* in *Or.* 217, 287 despite advocating *εὐτύχει* and *εὐλαβεῖτο*.

<sup>2)</sup> C.A.Lobeck, *Phrynichi Eclogae* (Leipzig 1820), 140–141, arguing against Elmsley; F.Ellendt and H.Genthe, *Lexicon Sophocleum*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin 1872) s.vv. *εὐχομαι* (*εὐξάμην* instead of *ἠὐξάμην* in *Phil.* 1019) and *εὐθύνω* (*εὐθύνε* instead of *ἠὐθύνε* in *Ant.* 1164), alibi. These scholars place too much faith in the way the words are written in medieval manuscripts, where *εὐ-* far outnumbers *ηὐ-*. This preference for *εὐ-* is still followed in Dain-Mazon's Sophocles, although forms like *ἠὐρον*, *ἠὐρηκα*, *ἠὐθύνε* are now almost universally printed by editors of fifth-century Attic authors. Incautious reliance on the manuscript evidence is still evident in F.T.Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, vol. II (Testi e documenti per lo studio dell'Antichità, 55.2 [Milano

argued that *εὐ-* should everywhere be preferred. Later in the nineteenth century, the evidence of Attic inscriptions was brought to bear to prove forms like *ἠῦρον* to be correct. But in an unargued dictum on Eur. *Her.* 1221 Wilamowitz advocated discrimination between *εὐ-*compounds and other verbs in *εὐ-*, and this practice was fully argued for in the work of Otto Lautensach, *Grammatische Studien zu den griechischen Tragikern und Komikern: Augment und Reduplikation* (Hannover 1899), 47–49, 146–149.<sup>3</sup>) Lautensach's recommendation was cited (though not fully followed) by Murray (vol. 3, *praefatio* iii-iv) and by Coulon (tome 1, xxviii-xxix) but has been tacitly rejected by many other editors and was never, so far as I know, endorsed by Wackernagel or Schwyzer (who lists *ἠύτῳχησα* as a normal form, *Griechische Grammatik* I.656). In judging Lautensach's law there are three kinds of evidence to consider: the manuscripts, the statements of grammarians, and Attic inscriptions.

As for the manuscripts, I agree with Lautensach that their evidence is late, variable, and unreliable, and need not be given any weight. But some manuscripts do carry *ἠὺ-* in verbs of both types, compounded and uncompounded (even though manuscripts normally have, in the commonest relevant form, *εὔρον* for *ἠῦρον*). The behavior of the scribes, for whom *εῦ* and *ἠῦ* sounded exactly the same, may be attributed to the inculcation of traditional grammatical rules, and thus the evidence of the manuscripts is merely an imperfect reflection of the tradition of the grammarians.

The surviving notes of the grammarians are all much later than the classical period, and it is not clear what sort of reliable information on the practice of the classical period they would have been able to draw upon.<sup>4</sup>) Moreover, the grammarians are not unanimous.

---

1981]), 240 n. 1: after correctly describing the evidence of Attic inscriptions, he adds "even in classical Attic literature (Th. Isoc. Pl. X. etc.) *εῦ-* was sometimes left unaugmented and unreduplicated," referring to Veitch and LSJ, whose reports are based on the manuscripts of those authors.

<sup>3</sup>) Without full argument, Lautensach had earlier declared "die mit *εὔ* zusammengesetzten Verba werden auf att. Inschr. nicht augmentiert": *Verbalflexion der attischen Inschriften* (Programm Gotha 1887), 5.

<sup>4</sup>) The earliest grammarians and editors, in Alexandria, may have been able to look at a few books which dated from the period 400–350, though the majority of the books in their library probably came from after 350. Athenian inscriptions were also collected and studied for other purposes, and we know of one case in which old Attic pronunciation/spelling was proven from inscriptional evidence (the rough breathing in *Ἀζηνεῖς*, *Ἐρχνεῖς*, *Ἀλιεῖς*): cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford

Lautensach gives preference to the opinions which advocate leaving the first syllable unchanged: a passage in the *Etymologicum Magnum* advocates internal, second-syllable augment for compound verbs in which *εὐ-* or *δυσ-* is followed by a vowel (this is undoubtedly a postclassical phenomenon); two entries in the *Suda* allege that *εὐλόγησα* is "more Attic" than *ηὐλόγησα* and that one says *εὐλογημένος*, not *ηὐλογημένος*.<sup>5)</sup> This claim is clearly an inheritance from Atticist authorities. But when we note that the gloss (*ηὐξάμην*) given for *εὐλόγησα* reflects a postclassical meaning of the verb and that classical authors almost never<sup>6)</sup> used the aorist of this verb, we cannot have much confidence in such authority. On the other hand, Herodian<sup>7)</sup> plausibly describes *ηὐ-* as Attic and comments on the suppression of this by *εὐ-* in Koine (the very process assumed by modern authorities on phonology), and in his examples he treats *ηὐφράνθη* or *ηὐφραϊνόμεν* on a par with *ηὐχόμεν*. In judging between these conflicting authorities, it seems clear to me that one should give the preference to Herodian, not the anonymous Atticist source, as Lautensach did.

The really authoritative evidence would be that of Attic inscriptions, if any relevant forms were extant from the late fifth or early fourth century. In the old Attic alphabet the difference between *ηὐ-* and *εὐ-* could not be written (but like other phonetic distinctions not

---

1968), 248. But it is uncertain whether this sort of hard evidence was available to or exploited by the mainstream grammarians and Atticists.

<sup>5)</sup> Et. magn. 399, 41–49, s.v. *εὐφραίνω*: τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐμορίου καὶ τοῦ δῦσ ἀρχόμενα ῥήματα ἀτρεπτον τηρεῖ τὴν ἀρχήν, ἔσωθεν δὲ αὐξάνεται· οἶον εὐορκῶ, εὐόρκου; *Suda* ε 3561 *εὐλόγησα* καὶ οὐκ *ηὐλόγησα*. ὡς Ἀττικώτερον γὰρ τὸ *εὐλόγησα*. *εὐλογημένος* γὰρ λέγεις καὶ οὐκ *ηὐλογημένος*; *Suda* η 646 *ηὐλόγησα*· *ηὐξάμην*. καὶ *εὐλόγησα*, ὡς Ἀττικώτερον.

<sup>6)</sup> There are about 1000 instances of *εὐλογησ-/ηὐλογησ-* (aorist and future) in the currently available licensed, copyright data of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, University of California, Irvine. Almost all of these are in the Septuagint and the Christian Fathers. There are no classical instances of the aorist indicative, but cf. Arist. *Eq.* 564 *εὐλογησαι*; Isocr. *Philip.* 144 *ἂν εὐλογήσειαν*; postclassical adesp. nov. com. CGFPR 286,17 *εὐλογησαι*.

<sup>7)</sup> *Grammatici Graeci* III: 2: 2.789.7–12 (from Choeroboscus, *Grammatici Graeci* IV: 2: 51.34–52.9): ἡ εὐ δίφθογγος ὡς μὴ ἔχουσα γνήσιον μέγεθος (τὸ γὰρ ὁ οὐκ ἔστι γνήσιον μέγεθος τοῦ ε, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ο) ὀφείλει τρέπειν τὸ ε εἰς η, ὡς καὶ παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς. *ηὐφράνθη* γὰρ λέγουσι καὶ *ηὐχόμεν*. ἀλλ' ἐπεκράτει κατὰ κοινὴν διάλεκτον ἡ εὐ δίφθογγος μὴ τρέπεσθαι οἶον *εὐχομαι* *εὐχόμεν*, *εὐφραϊνομαι* *εὐφραϊνόμεν*, *εὐχαριστῶ* *εὐχαρίστουν* καὶ ἴσως χάριν *εὐφωνίας*, ὡς λέγει ὁ Ἡρωδιανός; cf. Et. magn. 400, 26–33 s.v. *εὐχόμεν* καὶ *εὐφραϊνόμεν*: ἰστέον ὅτι παρ' ἡμῖν φυλάττεται, παρὰ δὲ Ἀθηναίοις τρέπεται.

represented in that alphabet, this one did exist). It could be written in the new Attic (Ionic) alphabet, but by the middle of the fourth century the distinction in sound between  $\eta\acute{\upsilon}$ - and  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}$ - was being lost, so that spellings with  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}$ - after about 350 are not probative. The inscriptions cited by Lautensach to support his theory are in fact from the last decades of the fourth century, later than the date at which a mason incised *EYΛEI* as an augmented form of *αύλέω*. Because of the changes in Attic pronunciation which occurred during the course of the fourth century, it is illegitimate to infer from inscriptional *εὐεργέτηκεν* and the like that  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}$ -compounds were not augmented or reduplicated in fifth-century Attic pronunciation. Cf. Leslie Threatte, *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*. I (Berlin 1980) 384–385; Schwyzer, I. 203 and 655.

Although there is no surviving classical inscription which attests  $\eta\upsilon$ -augmentation in  $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}$ -compound verbs, neither the evidence of the grammarians nor the postclassical Attic inscriptions should properly be considered to support Lautensach's claim. All analogies from Attic habits of augmentation of compounds of other kinds suggest that it is unlikely that augment was dispensed with in the case of this single class of verbs. The preferred assumption, until decisive inscriptional evidence appears,<sup>8)</sup> is that Herodian was right to see no difference between *εὐφραίνομαι* and *εὐχομαι* and that *εὐτυχέω* and the like were pronounced with temporal augment in the age of Euripides and Aristophanes (and written with  $\eta\acute{\upsilon}$ - when the Ionic alphabet was used, as it may already have been in Attic books before 403). Therefore editors, using the Ionic alphabet and seeking to reflect the pronunciation and Ionic orthography of Attic drama, should use  $\eta\acute{\upsilon}$ - in all cases.<sup>9)</sup>

<sup>8)</sup> My colleague L. L. Threatte, who is preparing the second volume of his *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions*, reports that he has not yet identified any new evidence on this question from the period 400–350.

<sup>9)</sup> The relevant verbs and passages are: *ἠὺδοκίμηκεν* *Nub.* 1033; *ἠὺεργέτησα* *Plut.* 835; *ἠὺθένει* Cratinus fr. 362 Kassel-Austin; *ἠὺλαβεῖτο* *Or.* 748, 1059; *ἠὺλογ-* Eur. fr. 347, 2 N<sup>2</sup>, *Eccl.* 454; *ἠὺσθένει* *Cycl.* 2; *παρηυτρέπισται* *Cycl.* 594; *ἠὺτρεπισμέν-* *IA* 1111, *Plut.* 626; *ἠὺτυχ-* *Pers.* 506, *Hec.* 18, 301, 1208, 1228, *El.* 8, *Herc.* 613, 1221, *Tro.* 935, *IT* 329, *Hel.* 1030, *Or.* 542, *Ba.* 1024, Eur. fr. 285, 20 N<sup>2</sup>, TrGF adesp. 1b, 24; *ἐπηυφήμησεν* Aesch. fr. 350, 4 Radt, *IT* 1403, *ἀνηυφήμησεν* *Trach.* 783, *ἠὺφήμει* *Pers.* 389; *ἠὺφραν-* *Acharn.* 5, *Or.* 217, 287; *ἠὺωχημέν-* *Vesp.* 1306, *Lys.* 1224. In Soph. *Ichneutai* (fr. 314), 227 Radt *ἠὺίαζες* should probably be read, whether or not *εὐοῖ* and *εὐιος* are actually related to *εὐ*: cf. *οἰμώζω*, *ὄμιωζα*. In postclassical drama, cf. *εὐπορηκώς* Diphilus fr. 42, 19 Kassel-Austin; *εὐτύχηκε* Bato fr. 1, 2 Kassel-Austin (from Stobaeus); *διευτυχ-*

What Lautensach did not do was make a case based on historical linguistics, and it is still open to anyone wishing to distinguish between *ἠύχόμεν* and *εὐτύχου* to construct such a case. Students of Hellenistic and Roman papyri and of Hellenistic dialect inscriptions have sometimes seen a difference in the ratios of the type *ἠύχόμεν*: *εὐχόμεν* and the type *ἠτύχου*: *εὐτύχου*. They have concluded that in Hellenistic times Greeks were much more likely to write *εὐ-* in the augmented and reduplicated forms if they felt the presence of the adverb *εὖ* and somewhat more inclined to preserve the school-taught spelling *ἠύ-* in other verbs in *εὐ-*. On this view, the orthography of compounded verbs in *εὐ-* leads the way in suppression of the traditional spelling, and the orthography of the others readily follows suit.<sup>10</sup>) The same may have been true in the period 350–300 in Attica, but this would not imply that compounded verbs in *εὐ-* were unaugmented at an earlier date.

Another argument from historical linguistics might be constructed from the view that in early Greek verbs beginning with a “short” diphthong normally exhibited no change in the secondary tenses.<sup>11</sup>) But this view is not undisputed,<sup>12</sup>) and even if it is accepted, (1) it would not justify a distinction between *ἠύχόμεν* and *ἠτύχου*, and (2) regularization of temporal augment even for such verbs would have been well established in Attic by the age of classical drama.<sup>13</sup>)

Apollodoros fr. 2 Kock, adesp. 116, 2 Kock; *ἠτρέπιζον* Men. *Dysc.* 940 (Papyrus, saec. iii–iv p.); *εὐφραίνόμεν* Philemon fr. 153, 2 Kock.

<sup>10</sup>) E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, Bd. I, II. Teil<sup>2</sup> (Berlin 1938), 111 n. 2, refers to E. Schweizer, *Grammatik der Pergamenischen Inschriften* (Berlin 1898), 172–3; K. Hauser, *Grammatik der griechischen Inschriften Lykiens* (Basel 1916), 106; R. Helbig, *Grammatik der Septuaginta, Laut- und Wortlehre* (Göttingen 1907), 75–6; W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis* (Leipzig 1903), 205.

<sup>11</sup>) So, e.g., Hermann Hirt, *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (Heidelberg 1902), 339: “Regelrecht ist vielmehr bei allen anlautenden Diphthongen Kurzdiphthong, wie ihn Homer noch hat, *εὔδον, καθεὔδον; ἠὔδον* tritt erst bei Plato auf.”

<sup>12</sup>) Cf. K. Brugmann, *Griechische Grammatik*<sup>3</sup> (München 1900), 266: “die scheinbar augmentlosen herodot. Formen der mit *αί-, εὐ-, αὐ-* beginnenden Verba wie *αἴτεε, εὔχετο, αὔξετο* ... können die lautgesetzliche Fortsetzung von urgr. Formen mit *āi-, ēu-, āu-* gewesen sein ...”

<sup>13</sup>) Murray (vol. 3, iv), believing that *εὐτυχέω* was not augmented, was tempted to argue (against Lautensach, 149) that *δυστυχέω* was not augmented in drama either (in *OT* 262 some manuscripts fail – as often – to mark prodelision, and in *Ion* 1457 he rejects Bothe’s easy change): cf. Et. magn. quoted in note 5 above. This view is thoroughly implausible, since nearly-contemporary Attic prose authors attest augment and reduplication for this verb.