The use and absence of the augment in the forms ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) and δῶκ(ε)(ν) in the *Odyssey*,

with a brief discussion on the origin of the augment

(Filip De Decker, FWO Vlaanderen - Universiteit Gent).

1. Introduction.

In Classical Greek prose the past tense is indicated by obligatorily adding a prefix ἐ- to the verb form. In Greek epic and lyric poetry and in the oldest Greek prose texts this prefix is not mandatory. Many studies have been dedicated to the problem of the origin and meaning of the augment, but no agreement has been reached so far. In addition, most studies have focused on the *Iliad* or have discussed only certain passages and chants. A study of an entire work or of a single root is still missing and so is a work comparing the use of the augment in the different languages that have the augment. In what follows, I will discuss the forms ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) and δῶκ(ε)(ν) in the *Odyssey*.[1]

2. The choice of this specific corpus.

I chose the forms ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) and δῶκ(ε)(ν) in the *Odyssey*, 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; as all forms are in the 3rd person singular, the difference in number cannot have been a criterion for (not) using the augment; 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,[2] 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; the *Odyssey* was chosen because this work has been less researched than the *Iliad* when it comes to investigations into the augment.[3]

3. Determining the corpus: the metrically secure forms.

The prototypical hexameter has the following structure:

— ‿‿ // — ‿‿ // — ‿‿ // — ‿‿ // — ‿‿ // — ‿

1a 1b 1c   2a 2b 2c   3a 3b 3c   4a 4b 4c   5a 5b 5c   6a 6b

In determining "word end", I count enclitics as part of the word after which they appeared.[4] I consider the presence or absence of the augment secure,

  1. if the opposite creates an unmetrical verse;

  2. if the opposite requires the elision of the dative plural ending of consonant stems in -σι/ -ψι/-ξι, the dative singular ending in -ι, the -o and -α of the article or the word final -υ;[5]

  3. if the opposite requires the violation Hermann's Bridge: this bridge states that there cannot be a word end between 4a and 4b, and is one of the strictest bridges in epic poetry, with very few exceptions (about 0,3%);[6]

  4. if the opposite yields a spondaic fifth foot: only 2 to 3% of the verses have a spondee in the fifth foot (and spondaic fifth feet with a word end at the end of the foot are avoided).[7]

In all the other instances the presence or absence of the augment has to be determined on a case-by-case analysis.[8]

---

[3] The works by BAKKER (1999, 2005) and MUMM (2004) only discuss on the aorist in the *Iliad*; BAKKER (2002) deals with the aorist in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollon*. I can refer to BERTRAND (2006a) for a similar investigation into the augment use in ἔστη and στῆ.

[4] See AHRENS (1852:200); GISEKE (1864:127), MEYER (1884:980), MAAS (1923:30-31), FRAENKEL (1960), WEST (1982:37), SNELL (1982:68), NÜNLIST (2000:112), TAIDA (2007:9), OSWALD (2014:421).
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.

[5] 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 (1966:45); KORZENIEWSKI (1968:24); WACHTER (2000:74-75). 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 -υ is not discussed in LA ROCHE (1869), which means that he had not found any instances in which it occurred.

[6] HERMANN (1805:692-693; 1817:213 (*caesura quarti trochaei) rarissima est et studiose vitatur*), SPITZNER (1816:9-12), VAN LEEUWEN (1890, focusing on the exceptions), MONRO (1884:lxxv; 1891:340), ALLEN & SIKES (1904:15-16, mentioning the exceptions), BASSETT (1919:372), O'NEILL (1942:170-171), KORZENIEWSKI (1968:30-34), BEEKES (1972), SNELL (1986:13-16), WEST (1982:36-38, 1997:222-225), BARNES (1986), VAN RAALTE (1986:97-98), SICKING (1993:73-79), NÜNLIST (2000:112).

[7] GERHARD (1816:142-147); HERMANN (1817:220); LUDWICH (1866:1-23); LA ROCHE (1869:84-85); MAAS (1923:22); KOSTER (1962:66-68); KORZENIEWSKI (1968:30); WEST (1982:37); SNELL (1986:13-16); VAN RAALTE (1986:37-38); SICKING (1993:73-74). For a detailed treatment of spondaic verses in epic Greek, see LUDWICH (1866).

4. The metrically secure forms in our corpus.

I now list the instances in which the forms are secure. The 14 augmented forms are secure, because they prevent a spondaic fifth foot.[9] There are 26 metrically secure unaugmented forms, of which 9 are guaranteed by their verse initial position (the only position in the verse where ἔδωκε cannot be used),[10] 10 are guaranteed by Hermann's Bridge,[11] 3 after the caesura at 3a,[12] and 4 in other positions.[13]

5. The augment and its origin.

Before I address the use of the augment in the forms ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) and δῶκ(ε)(ν), I will address the morphology and the meaning of the augment in epic Greek. I first discuss the morphology of the augment. The augmented verb form is a compound of an orthotonic particle *(h₁)é and a verb form (possibly enclitic) with secondary endings.[14] This is clearly shown by the accentuation in Greek and Vedic.[15] When a Vedic verb is compounded and accented, the accent is always put on the preverb immediately preceding the verb form and never on a preverb preceding another preverb; similarly, the accent is always put on the augment when an augmented form is accented.[16] The Greek accentuation preserves the old compound status as well: although the general rule in Greek verbal accentuation states that the accent should be protracted as far as possible, the accent could never be placed further than the augment, as it could also never be placed further than the last preverb: one has to accentuate the imperative παρέκδος and not †πάρεκδος, and also παρέσχον, and not †πάρεσχον.[17]

  In Greek, the augment is the mandatory marker of the past tense in literary prose and in (most) prose inscriptions, but in the Mycenaean tablets (the oldest Greek texts) it is almost always absent,[18] and in epic and lyric poetry it seems optional.[19] There are two questions: is

---

[8] See TAIDA (2007, 2010) and DE DECKER (2016a, 2017a) for such studies.
[9] The instances are *Odyssea*, I,125; IV,172; V,351; VII,150; XIV,63; XV,207; XV,388; XV,429; XVII,76; XVII,199; XVII,567; XIX,396; XXI,34; XX,146.
[10] The instances are *Odyssea*, I,263; III,40; III,63; IV,262; V,234; V,237; VI,79; IX,203; X,19.
[11] The instances are *Odyssea*, II, 116; V,408; VII,35; VII,110; VII,260; VIII,44; XX,70; XXI,13; XXI,31; XXIV,73.
[12] The instances are *Odyssea*, III,53; V,437; XIV,112.
[13] The instances are *Odyssea*, IV,209; X,237; X,318; XIX,238.
[14] The interpretation of the augmented form as an accented augment and enclitic verb form goes back to at least WACKERNAGEL (1877:469-470) and BRUGMANN (1890:149, 1904:288, 485).
[15] WACKERNAGEL (1877:469-470), BRUGMANN (1890:149), MONRO (1891:77), MEILLET (1937:243).
[16] MACDONELL (1910:315).
[17] MEILLET (1937:243); BALLY (1947:100); PROBERT (2007:47).
[18] For the use and absence of the augment in Mycenaean, see VILBORG (1960:104, 106), CHANTRAINE (1964:312), RUIJGH (1967:91, 2011:272), BOTTIN (1969:83), DUHOUX (1987, 1992:88-90), RIX (1992:229), BARTONĚK (2003:337), BERNABÉ & LUJÁN (2006:200-201), GARCÍA-RAMÓN (2012:§H, 2017:672).

the presence and absence of the augment is a specificity of epic Greek and what is its meaning? Many scholars have argued that the augment was an optional marker of past tense and that its presence or absence of the augment is determined by the metrical requirements.[20] Related to this, is the assumption that the absence of the augment was an archaism and possibly a relic from the period in PIE when the augment had not yet been established as a verbal marker (provided that it already existed in Indo-European verbal morphology), or a remnant from the Indo-European *Dichtersprache*.[21] The augment was considered to be a younger linguistic trait, which explained why it was more common in the *Iliad* than in the *Odyssey* and more common in the *Works and Days* than in the *Theogony*. The discovery of Mycenaean made the connection between the absence of the augment and the poetic language difficult to maintain: as the texts were administrative prose, one would expect the augment to be present, if it had already been part of the language at the time and if its absence in poetry was only a poetic trait. Nevertheless, the assumption that the oldest texts did not have the augment, has remained. This can be seen in Pelliccia's study of Greek epic: he argues that the earliest Greek epic did not have speeches and that the unaugmented forms (the so-called injunctives) were used to refer to timeless (*Hymnal*) events. In a later stage -in which the augment had become more common- speeches were added; as a consequence, more augmented forms were introduced into the poems. As formulae could then appear with an augment in a speech and without it in narrative passages, the forms with and without an augment were even more considered to be equivalent.[22] The main problem with this is that the distribution of augmented and unaugmented forms is less random than one would expect if the sole deciding criterion had been the metre: as will become clear later on, past tenses in narrative and in speeches that refer to a distant past have less augmented forms than speeches that describe past actions in the recent past,[23] and that verb forms that describe a past action in a recent past have more often the augment.[24] Moreover, past tenses in the gnomic aorist (i.e.

SCHMITT (1967:65-67) explained the unaugmented forms in Mycenaean as reporting injunctives (see also PANAGL 1976:87 and GARCÍA-RAMÓN 2012:§H, 2017:672).

[19] For the absence of the augment in Pindar, see GILDERSLEEVE (1885:lxxxv) and WILLCOCK 1995:23, without discussing the meaning and uses. The use and absence of the augment have not been addressed in other works such as VERDENIUS (1987, 1988) nor in the Pindaric syntax by HUMMEL (1993).

[20] CURTIUS (1873:134-135), DELBRÜCK (1879:68), RZACH (1876:431), MEYER (1891:561), MONRO & ALLEN (1908:vi-vii), HOFFMANN (1970:36-37), WEST (1973:179, 1998:xxvi-xxvii), PELLICCIA (1985:15, 97-98, 108-109), JANKO (1992:11), BECKWITH (1996:5), WACHTER (2000:97-98), GARCÍA-RAMÓN (2017:672).

[21] DELBRÜCK (1879:68), WACKERNAGEL (1942:1-4).

[22] PELLICCIA (1985, especially 31-35).

[23] KOCH (1868), BASSET (1989).

[24] PLATT (1891).

general truths)[25] and in the *similes* (i.e. the Homeric comparisons in which Homer compared a battle scene or another event to a scene from everyday life (mostly in the agricultural sphere)) have almost exclusively augmented forms.[26]

A second problem is that the absence of the augment in Mycenaean rules out that the absence is only a poetic trait. It is clear that the augment cannot have been a simple marker of past tense, because in that case, we would expect it to appear in Mycenaean prose and more evenly distributed in all the parts of epic (including and especially in the parts of the remote past). The distribution of augmented and unaugmented forms lead scholars to explain the augment in epic Greek as *a deictic suffix* (sic) *that marked the completion of the action in the presence of the speaker*,[27] or as an element that indicated that the speaker vouched for the statement and/or acted as if s/he has witnessed it him/herself.[28]

In order to solve this problem, we could ask if the other languages and language families in which the augment is attested, can provide some insight into this problem. The augment is attested as part of the verbal morphology in 3 languages or language families besides Greek, namely Phrygian, Armenian, and Indo-Iranian. In Phrygian (attested in texts from the 7th century BC until the 7th century AD), it seems to be the mandatory marker of the

---

[25] DÖDERLEIN was the first to use this term: *Da nun dieser Aorist in allgemeinen Sätzen und Denksprüchen seinen eigentlichen Platz findet, so dürfte er in den Grammatiken zweckmässig der g n o m i s c h e A o r i s t genannt werden* (1847:316, emphasis taken from the original text). The literature on the gnomic aorist is large, some examples (the list is obviously not exhaustive): MOLLER 1853 and 1854, FRANKE 1854, VAN GRONINGEN 1948, SALMON 1960, PERISTERAKIS 1962, RUIJGH 1971 (one of the most detailed treatments), FAULKNER 2005.
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), DREWITT (1912a), (1912b) and (1913), HIRT (1928:171-173). It has been accepted since. See most recently PAGNIELLO (2002:74-84), BAKKER (2005:131-135), FAULKNER (2005:68-69) and BERTRAND (2006b:241).
BRUGMANN (1890:185) first thought that the timeless meaning of the aorist (as it appears in the similes and the gnomic aorist) was first limited to the injunctive and spread only later to the indicative once augmented and unaugmented forms were no longer distinguished. In his later works, he no longer repeated this and only stated that there was no explanation for the preponderance of the augmented forms (1916:11).
The augment use in the gnomic aorist is nevertheless not absolute, as can be seen in *Iliad* 4,320; 9,320; *Odyssey* 8,481; *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 2016b:55-67).

[26] PLATT (1891); DREWITT (1912a, 1912b, 1913); CHANTRAINE (1948:484); SHIPP (1972:120); BAKKER (2002:75-77, 2005:114, 121 and 131-134).

[27] BAKKER (2005:147); this had already been observed by PLATT (1891:227), almost with the same words. The augment is not a suffix, but a prefix.

[28] MUMM (2004:§10, personal communication per e-mail on July 15th 2016) *Diese (sc. die Augmentfunktion, the function of the augment FDD) gehört ihrer kategoriellen Systematik nach in den Bereich der subjektiven Modalität, d.h. der vom Sprecher bezeichneten Quellen für die Gültigkeit seiner Aussage. Das Augment wird gesetzt, wenn der Sprecher (Erzähler oder Redner) die Gültigkeit oder Wichtigkeit seiner Aussage nicht nur präsupponiert, sondern forciert oder für sie einsteht. Da dahinter grundsätzlich ein besonderes Äußerungsinteresse steht, folgt automatisch ein besonderer Bezug auf die Gegenwart (der redenden Figur oder der Erzählzeit)* (underlining is mine). For the evidential nature of the augment, see also GARCÍA-RAMÓN (2012) and DE DECKER (2016a).

past tense in the texts that survive,[29] but since only inscriptions are attested and no poetry or literary prose, we cannot determine if the augment had a special meaning or was the past tense marker; moreover, there are several unaugmented verb forms attested,[30] but a detailed analysis of augmented and unaugmented verb forms is still missing. As soon as Armenian (first attested from the 5th century AD) was identified as an Indo-European language, it was noted that the augment is only used in verb forms that would otherwise be short monosyllabic forms.[31] The morphological constraint was not the only deciding factor in the augment use. Meillet showed that the augment could be left out if the form was linked to a preceding form with an augment[32] and de Lamberterie has made clear that the augment did not appear in instances where one would expect it to appear, when there was a negation or a question marker and in sentences in which the verb appeared in sentence initial position.[33] The largest family in which the augment is attested in Indo-Iranian. In the Indic branch, the augment is not mandatory in RigVedic Sanskrit but the augmented verb forms are more common than the unaugmented ones (which are called "injunctives"); in the Vedic texts after the RigVeda, the number of unaugmented forms decreased further and in Classical Sanskrit, the augment has become the mandatory marker of the past tense.[34] In the Iranian branch, the augment is almost omnipresent in Old Persian, but in the Avestan texts, the augmented forms are less common than the unaugmented ones.[35] At first sight, this seemed to confirm the suggestion that the forms without augment are the oldest and the augment is an innovation. If this is so, the forms with and without augment must have the same meaning. This is not the case, however. It has been shown that in the RigVeda the unaugmented verb forms are not equivalent to the augmented forms: the former refer to timeless actions (sometimes in a remote and mythical past, but not always),[36] whereas the latter refer to actions in a definable past.[37] This is a clear

---

[29] BRIXHE (1994:173-174, 2008:77), FORTSON (2004:91-92), CLACKSON (2007:123). The use of the augment in Phrygian was not mentioned in BRUGMANN (1904:484-486), although at the time Phrygian texts were already available.

[30] HAAS (1966:227-228), DIAKONOFF & NEROZNAK (1985:22-24), OREL (1997:399-400).

[31] This was first noted by PETERMANN (1837:196). It has been accepted ever since and can be found in the standard works such as MEILLET (1903:94, 1913:94), GODEL (1975:112), THOMSON (1975:39), DE LAMBERTERIE (1994:146), CLACKSON (2008:136).

[32] MEILLET (1913:113-115).

[33] DE LAMBERTERIE (2007).

[34] AVERY (1880:329), MACDONELL (1910:315, 1916:122). See also the discussion in HOFFMANN (1967:27-42, figures can be found on page 36).

[35] This had been noted already by BOPP (1833:755), see also BARTHOLOMAE (1878:164), REICHELT (1909:93-94), MEILLET (1915:115), KELLENS (1984:245-249), FORSSMAN & HOFFMANN (2004:181-182), SKJAERVØ (2017:529).

[36] AVERY (1880:330), DELBRÜCK (1888:354-355, *so habe ich mich doch überzeugt, dass der Injunctiv nicht selten (die Stellen s. bei Avery) in dem Sinne des Indicativ Praesentis gebraucht wird, doch so, dass die Beziehung auf die Gegenwart des Sprechenden nicht hervortritt, vielmehr nur in dem Sinne, dass eine Verbalaussage ausgedrückt werden soll, welche sich weder auf die Zukunft, noch auf die Vergangenheit bezieht*.

indication that there must have been a distinction between augmented and unaugmented forms. Although a detailed study on the injunctive in Iranian (and more specific in Avestan) is missing, the data of the Iranian languages are in agreement with this distinction: whereas the Old-Persian texts are mostly inscriptions referring to acts in a somewhat recent past, the Avestan texts are mainly mythical stories. As such, the difference in augment use in the Iranian data would fit the distinction between the use of the augmented forms in contexts of the recent past and injunctives in descriptions of timeless actions and/or actions in a mythical or remote past.

These observations can be applied to epic Greek as well. It explains why the *Odyssey* has more augmented verb forms than the *Iliad*: as Odysseus is relating his own adventures, it is almost self-evident that these stories will be related with augmented forms. The same value for the augment can also be established for Hesiod: the *Theogony* refers to a mythical past and therefore has fewer augmented forms; the *Works and Days*, on the other hand, provide advice for every-day life and are situated against the background of the conflict between Hesiod and his brother Perses, and therefore provide a much closer link to the present and to the audience, and are an eye-witness account *par excellence*.[38] In the next subchapter, I will analyse the semantics of the augment of the forms ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) and δῶκ(ε)(ν) and show that it is this deictic-"evidential" meaning what constitutes the original functions of the augment, namely to describe an action, that occurred in the presence of the speaker and that s/he wanted to emphasise, and to foreground important elements in narrative discourse. Obviously, there are exceptions as well.

6. The actual analysis: the semantic criteria.

In this subchapter, I discuss the semantic observations on the augment and apply them to our corpus.

6.1. Speeches versus narrative passages.[39]

The first important distinction is that between speeches and narrative descriptions. The latter has much less augmented forms than the former.[40] There are two explanations for this: the first one argues that the speeches belong to the younger linguistic stratum and therefore have

---

- underlining is mine), RENOU (1928:71-73), GONDA (1956:33-46), HOFFMANN (1967 *passim* but especially 119), STRUNK (1968:290-294), LAZZERONI (1977), WEST (1989), EULER (1995), MUMM (1995).
[37] HOFFMANN (1967:145-160).
[38] DE DECKER (2016b: 75-76, 111-112).
[39] We have classified Odysseus' speeches in books 9 to 12 as narrative and not as speeches, because Homer is relating the stories through Odysseus.
[40] KOCH (1868); PLATT (1891:223); MONRO (1891:62); DREWITT (1912a); CHANTRAINE (1948:484); BOTTIN (1969:110-128); BASSET (1989); WEST (1989); BAKKER (2005:114-153); MUMM (2004).

much more augments,[41] the other argues that speeches involve more interaction between speaker and audience and make more reference to recent events, whereas narrative descriptions are by definition more remote and less linked to the present.[42] Of the 14 augmented verbs in our corpus, 7 appear in a speech and 7 in narrative passages, and of the 26 unaugmented forms, 10 appear in a speech and 16 in a narrative passage.[43] The figures confirm the preference for augmented forms to be used in speeches and unaugmented ones to be used in narrative, but it is not the case that the augmented forms abound in speeches and are 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,[44] and applies to our corpus as well, as we will see later on.

6.2. New versus old.

The augment is used in verb forms that emphasise an event and/or communicate something surprising or a new element in an enumeration of events.[45] 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). I now discuss two examples. The first is (the augmented forms are underlined while the unaugmented ones are put in bold face and the metrically insecure forms are italicised):

(EX.01) ἕως ὁ ταῦθ' *ὥρμαινε* κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,

ἐκ δ' Ἑλένη θαλάμοιο θυώδεος ὑψορόφοιο

ἤλυθεν Ἀρτέμιδι χρυσηλακάτῳ ἐικυῖα.

τῇ δ' ἄρ' ἅμ' Ἀδρήστη κλισίην εὔτυκτον ἔθηκεν,

---

[41] This theory was taken the furthest by PELLICCIA (1985), cf. supra.

[42] This viewpoint was already adopted by PLATT (1891) and DREWITT (1912a), and was expanded by BAKKER (1999a, 2005:114-153) and MUMM (2004).

[43] The augmented forms in a speech are *Odyssea*, IV,172; VII,150; XIV,63; XV,388; XV,429; XVII,76; XVII, 567.
The unaugmented forms in a speech are *Odyssea*, I,263; II,116; IV,209; IV,262; V,408; VII,35; VII,260; VIII,44; XIX,238; XXIV,73.
The augmented forms in a narrative passage are *Odyssea*, IV,125; V,351; XV,207; XVII,199; XIX,396; XXI,34; XXII,146.
The unaugmented forms in a narrative passage are *Odyssea*, III,40; III,53; III,63; V,234; V,237; V,437; VI,79; VII,110; IX,203; X,19; X,237; X,318; XIV,112; XX,70; XXI,13; XXI,31.

[44] 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 (2017a:136-138) for *Iliad* 1.

[45] MUMM (2004); DE DECKER (2016b:81-84).

Ἀλκίππη δὲ τάπητα **φέρεν** μαλακοῦ ἐρίοιο,

Φυλὼ δ' ἀργύρεον τάλαρον **φέρε**, τόν οἱ ἔδωκεν

Ἀλκάνδρη, Πολύβοιο δάμαρ, ὃς ἔναι' ἐνὶ Θήβῃς

Αἰγυπτίῃς, ὅθι πλεῖστα δόμοις ἐν κτήματα κεῖται:

ὃς Μενελάῳ *δῶκε* δύ' ἀργυρέας ἀσαμίνθους,

δοιοὺς δὲ τρίποδας, δέκα δὲ χρυσοῖο τάλαντα.

χωρὶς δ' αὖθ' Ἑλένη ἄλοχος **πόρε** κάλλιμα δῶρα:

χρυσῆν τ' ἠλακάτην τάλαρόν θ' ὑπόκυκλον **ὄπασσεν**

ἀργύρεον, χρυσῷ δ' ἐπὶ χείλεα **κεκράαντο**.

τόν ῥά οἱ ἀμφίπολος Φυλὼ *παρέθηκε* φέρουσα

νήματος ἀσκητοῖο βεβυσμένον: αὐτὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ

ἠλακάτη **τετάνυστο** ἰοδνεφὲς εἶρος ἔχουσα.

ἕζετο δ' ἐν κλισμῷ, ὑπὸ δὲ θρῆνυς ποσὶν ͜ἦεν. (*Odyssea*, IV, 120-136).

"While he was pondering these things in his mind and spirit, Helen came out of the high-roofed and well-scented bedroom, resembling Artemis with her golden bow. Together with her, Adreste set up a well-wrought couch, Alkippe brought a carpet of soft wool and Phylo carried a silver basket, that had given her Alkandre, wife of Polybos, who lived in Egyptian Thebes where most possessions are found in the houses. He gave Menelaos two silver bathtubs, two tripods, ten talents of gold. Besides that, his wife provided Helen with the most beautiful of gifts: she offered a golden distaff, a silver basket running on wheels- its edges had been finished off with gold. The maid Phylo brought it and placed it besides her, stuffed with curiously wrought yarn. The distaff, however, was holding purple-dark wool and was spread out over it. She was seated on the bed and beneath her feet there was a stool."

In this passage there are three elements that Homer wants to communicate about Menelaos and his household: Helen's appearance (the augmented ἤλυθεν), the entry of the servants with the gifts (the augmented ἔθηκεν) and the origin of these gifts from Egypt, where Helen and Menelaos had been lavishly honoured by their hosts (the augmented ἔδωκεν). Three augmented verb forms refer to these three aspects; the augment in ͜ἦεν is unexplained (although one could argue that the form is the result of a metrical lengthening, as one reviewer suggested or metrically insecure, as it is the metrical equivalent to ἔσκε). It is true, as a reviewer points out, that the forms τετάνυστο and κεκράαντο never attested in the epic corpus with an augment, but ἐκεκράαντο would theoretically have been possible in the hexameter and I therefore believe that its absence is a deliberate choice by the poet. It is true that the

form τετάνυστο cannot appear in an hexameter with an augment, but I personally think that if the poet had wanted to use an augmented verb form he would have done so (e.g. by using a synonym or applying metrical lengthening).[46]

6.3. Foreground versus background.

Related to the previous point, is the fact that the augment is not used in actions that describe the background. One example is the following passage.

(EX.02) ναίει ἐϋπλόκαμος, δεινὴ θεός, ἥ με λαβοῦσα

ἐνδυκέως <u>ἐφίλει</u> τε καὶ <u>ἔτρεφεν</u> ἠδὲ <u>ἔφασκε</u>

θήσειν ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήραον ἤματα πάντα:

ἀλλ' ἐμὸν οὔ ποτε θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν <u>ἔπειθεν</u>.

ἔνθα μὲν ἑπτάετες **μένον** ἔμπεδον, εἵματα δ' αἰεὶ

δάκρυσι **δεύεσκον**, τά μοι ἄμβροτα **δῶκε** Καλυψώ: (*Odyssea*, VII,255-260).

"There lives (Kalypso) with her beautiful hair, a formidable goddess. She took me in (as a guest), loved me profoundly, and fed me and told me that she would me make me immortal and ageless for all days (to come). But she did not persuade my heart in my chest. Seven years I stayed there in that place and I wetted with my tears the clothes, the immortal ones, that Kalypso had given me."

In this passage, Odysseus describes how Kalypso tried by different means to convince him to stay with her and become immortal, but that he refused. Her attempts and his resistance to her begging are related with augmented verb forms. The long period of his stay (7 years) and his constant crying are narrated with unaugmented verb forms. The verb δῶκε is unaugmented, because it is not important for the story that Odysseus was wetting the clothes he received from Kalypso; the main point was the she wanted him to stay but that he refused and was unhappy there.

6.4. Recent past.

The augment is used, when actions in a recent past are described or when a past action still has relevance for the present.[47] This explains why the augment is used in sentences with the adverb νῦν, as this refers to an action in the immediate past.[48]

(EX.03) τῶν ὕβρις τε βίη τε σιδήρεον οὐρανὸν ἵκει.

καὶ γὰρ νῦν, ὅτε μ' οὗτος ἀνὴρ κατὰ δῶμα κιόντα

---

[46] Two examples of this are the doublets ὀνόμασας and ὀνόμηνας, (both meaning "you called") and ἀπαμείβετο ἠμείβετο (both meaning "s/he answered").

[47] PLATT (1891) uses the term "perfect aorist" to describe these forms. See also DREWITT (1912a, 1912b, 1913), BAKKER (1999, 2002, 2005).

[48] PLATT (1891); DREWITT (1912a:44); BOTTIN (1969:87-89, 135-136); BAKKER (1999:53, 60-62); GARCÍA-RAMÓN (2012:F1b).

οὔ τι κακὸν ῥέξαντα βαλὼν ὀδύνῃσιν ἔδωκεν,

οὔτε τι Τηλέμαχος τό γ' ἐπήρκεσεν οὔτε τις ἄλλος. (*Odyssea*, XVII,565-568).

"Their (sc. the suitors') arrogance and their abuse of power go to the iron sky. Also now, when I was going through the house and was not doing anything wrong, this man hit me and gave me pain, and neither Telemakhos nor another man warded it off."

In this passage, Odysseus complains to Eumaios that he just has been the subject of physical abuse by the suitors. As he refers to something that has happened only a short while ago, the augment is used.

In our corpus, there is one instance, which clearly contradicts this distinction.

(EX.04) ῥεῖα δ' ἀρίγνωτος γόνος ἀνέρος ᾧ τε Κρονίων

ὄλβον ἐπικλώσῃ γαμέοντί τε γεινομένῳ τε,

ὡς νῦν Νέστορι **δῶκε** διαμπερὲς ἤματα πάντα

αὐτὸν μὲν λιπαρῶς γηρασκέμεν ἐν μεγάροισιν,

υἱέας αὖ πινυτούς τε καὶ ἔγχεσιν εἶναι ἀρίστους. (*Odyssea*, IV,207-211).

"Easily recognisable is the lineage of a man to whom Kronos grants happiness when he marries and when he is born; just as he has now given Nestor the privilege that throughout his entire life he himself can comfortably grow old in his palace and that his sons are clever and the best in fighting with the sword."

The passage here is pronounced by Menelaos and refers to Zeus' power to grant mortals happiness and compares this to his favouring of Nestor. As this is a past event that continues to the present day and as the verb is combined with νῦν, we would expect the augment; it is missing, however and the absence is secure, because the dative singular ending -ι is not elided. A reviewer of the journal suggested that the absence of the augment in this case could be due to the fact that the speaker did not consider Nestor to be close to him at the moment of speaking. This is less likely in my opinion, since Menelaos is speaking to Telemakhos and Peisistratos, who has just introduced himself as Nestor's son. As such, Nestor seems present in the conversation. Another reviewer of the journal considered the absence of the augment in this instance to be regular, because the act of granting of a very old age happened in the remote past. The fact that Nestor is still alive at the moment of speaking, proves in my opinion that we are dealing here with an action in the past that is still valid today and that has a close connection to the present day, which makes the second suggestion less likely. The passage is similar to the statement, made by Nestor in *Iliad* 1, when he tried to convince Akhilleus to obey Agamemnon's authority:

(EX.05) σκηπτοῦχος βασιλεύς, ᾧ τε Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκεν. (1,279)

"the scepter-bearing king, to whom Zeus has given his fame."

In this specific instance Nestor states that kings have to be obeyed because they received their power from Zeus. Agamemnon has been king for a long time and kings before him have received their power from Zeus as well. A further correspondence between the Iliadic and the Odyssean passage is that both passages have an instance of the so-called "τε épique", which is used in statements of general validity.[49] A difference between the passages is that the Iliadic one could be interpreted as a gnomic aorist (cf. infra) and that it is therefore always valid, whereas the Odyssean passage only refers to the specific case of Nestor.

6.5. Remote past.

When actions in a remote or mythical past are described, the augment is usually absent.[50] As one reviewer puts it, this is probably due to the fact that events in a remote past are less likely to be foregrounded; as the authors/speaker can sometimes decide to add salience to events in a remote past as well, they are not always unaugmented. I give two examples of instances with an unaugmented form in a speech, that refers to an event in the remote past (as always, the unaugmented forms are put in bold face, the augmented ones are underlined and the forms that are metrically insecure are italicised).

(EX.06) ὡς δ' ὅτε Πανδαρέου κούρας **ἀνέλοντο** θύελλαι:

τῆσι τοκῆας μὲν **φθῖσαν** θεοί, αἱ δ' *ἐλίποντο*

ὀρφαναὶ ἐν μεγάροισι, **κόμισσε** δὲ δῖ' Ἀφροδίτη

τυρῷ καὶ μέλιτι γλυκερῷ καὶ ἡδέϊ οἴνῳ:

Ἥρη δ' αὐτῇσιν περὶ πασέων **δῶκε** γυναικῶν

εἶδος καὶ πινυτήν, μῆκος δ' *ἔπορ'* Ἄρτεμις ἁγνή,

ἔργα δ' Ἀθηναίη **δέδαε** κλυτὰ ἐργάζεσθαι.

εὖτ' Ἀφροδίτη δῖα <u>προσέστιχε</u> μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον,

κούρης αἰτήσουσα τέλος θαλεροῖο γάμοιο

ἐς Δία τερπικέραυνον, ὁ γάρ τ' εὖ οἶδεν ἅπαντα,

μοῖράν τ' ἀμμορίην τε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων

τόφρα δὲ τὰς κούρας ἅρπυιαι <u>ἀνηρείψαντο</u>

καί ῥ' *ἔδοσαν* στυγερῇσιν ἐρινύσιν ἀμφιπολεύειν:

ὣς ἔμ' ἀϊστώσειαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες, (*Odyssea*, XX,66-79).

"As when the windstorm lifted up the daughter of Pandareos. The gods had killed their parents and they were left behind as orphans in the palace. Godly Aphrodite took care (of them) with cheese, sweet honey and sweet wine. Here gave them above all (other) women beauty and cleverness; Artemis granted them stature and Athene thought them to work the famous crafts. When godly Aphrodite went to the high Olympos to ask for the girls a date for a blooming marriage from Zeus, who delights in thunder, for he knows everything, good and bad luck of all the mortal men, on that very moment, the Harpuiai ("Snatchers") snatched the girls and gave them to the baneful Erinyes to act as maidens. May the (immortals gods) who possess the Olympos, make me disappear in a similar way."

In this passage, Penelope cryingly prays to Artemis she be killed immediately. In order to beg for this act of mercy, she relates the story of the Pandareos' daughters who were orphans and sent by Zeus to be maidens for the Erinyes as an act of divine mercy. As this is a mythical story, situated in a distant past, there are very few augmented verb forms.

The same applies to the explanation by Agamemnon to Akhilleus of his (Ak) funeral in *Odyssey* XXIV, 37-96: that passage is a good illustration for the distinction between (an) action(s) in the remote past and a past action that is still valid today. *Odyssey* 24 starts with Hermes leading the army of suitors into the Hades. At that very moment, Akhilleus and Patroklos meet Agamemnon. Akhilleus expresses his sorrow to Agamemnon about his baneful death at home, wishing he (Ag) had died in Troy and received a hero's funeral. Agamemnon replies by explaining to Akhilleus how his (Ak) burial took place. That speech relates an event 10 years ago (Akhilleus being killed before Troy fell and Odysseus having wandered for 10 years before reaching Ithaka) and thus refers to something in a more remote past. In that speech, which goes from verse 36 until 97, there are 7 verb forms with a metrically secure augment and 24 with a metrically secure absence of the augment (one of them being δῶκε referring to the amphora that Thetis gave to the Greeks to gather Akhilleus' remains). This can be explained by the fact that the speech refers to something in a more remote past and to something in which the addressee was not consciously present. The most important element of the story is related with an augment, however: when Agamemnon tells Akhilleus that his fame will last forever and that it has not died, he uses the augmented form ὤλεσας ("you have destroyed", line 93). As such, this passage (if chant 24 is authentic) is a fitting conclusion for the feud between two of the most protagonists of the Homeric epics and this passage clearly echoes Akhilleus' statement in *Iliad* 1, in which he stated that fighting in Troy would cause him to die in Troy and never return home, but would at the same time grant him immortal fame.

6.6. Gnomic aorists.

A special instance of "closeness to the speaker" 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 (cf. supra).

6.7. Homeric similes.

Closely related to the use of the augment in the gnomic aorist, is its use in the similes (cf. supra). 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*,[51] their link with the present and the audience is evident and the use of the augment therefore does not surprise.[52]

> (EX.07) οἱ νέοι. ἦ γὰρ τοῦ γε θεοὶ κατὰ νόστον <u>ἔδησαν</u>,
>
> ὅς κεν ἔμ' ἐνδυκέως <u>ἐφίλει</u> καὶ κτῆσιν **ὄπασσεν**,
>
> οἷά τε ᾧ οἰκῆϊ ἄναξ εὔθυμος <u>ἔδωκεν</u> (*Odyssea*, XIV, 61-63).
>
> "(when) the younger (kings) rule. The gods, however, surely bounded down the return of someone would have loved me very much and would have given a large gift, such as a well-minded king gives his servant."

In this passage, Eumaios describes to Odysseus who is still disguised as beggar and who has not yet revealed himself, his absent master Odysseus as he knew him. He praises him as a good and generous master, who loved his servants and rewarded them largely. The augment in ἔδησαν refers to the present situation, as Eumaios is describing Odysseus' fate as a consequence of divine intervention which is still valid today. The augment is used in ἐφίλει, because it refers to Odysseus as well; it is missing in ὄπασσεν, because the verb belongs to the same action and description of Odysseus as a generous master. The form ἔδωκεν is augmented, because it compares Odysseus to a righteous king; as such, it can be explained as a simile or (more likely) a gnomic aorist.

6.8. Negation and negative sentences.

In his analysis of the augment in the aorist forms in the speeches of the *Iliad*, Bakker argued that the augment was less common in negative sentences,[53] unless the negation was linked to

---

[51] BAKKER (2005:114).

[52] BAKKER (2005:114, 121 and 131-134); SHIPP (1972:120) states that *(the augment use) illustrates the linguistic similarity of proverbial comments and similes*.

[53] BAKKER (2005:126).

the speaker's deixis.[54] Our corpus confirms this: on the 43 attested forms, 2 appear in a negative sentence and all 2 are unaugmented.[55] As such, it seems that our corpus confirms Bakker's thesis (which was never tested for the *Odyssey*) and it seems logic that the augment would not be used when an action is described, that has <u>not</u> occurred, but two examples are too few to allow for a solid judgement.

6.9. Subordination.

As a subordinate clause usually describes something that either occurred before the action of the main clause and/or was less important than it, we would expect the number of augmented forms to be less than in main clauses. There are 16 forms attested in a subordinate clause, of which 6 are augmented and 10 are not.[56] These figures indicate that mere subordination was not enough to account for the absence of the augment. When we look at the type of clauses in which the augment was used, we see that 4 are attested in a relative clause, one in a temporal clause and one in a conditional clause with irrealis meaning;[57] the augment was left out in 5 relative clauses, 4 in an ἐπεί-clause and in one conditional clause with irrealis meaning.[58] This seems in accordance with the distinction foreground versus background, because relative clauses can be considered to be more closely related with their main clause than conditional or temporal clauses. It had been noted before that temporal ἐπεί-clauses were less augmented than causal ones.[59] There is one example that is ambiguous.

(EX.08) λαῖτμα μέγ' ἐκπερόωσιν, ἐπεί σφισι **δῶκ'** ἐνοσίχθων: (*Odyssea*, VII,35).

"They pass over the great gulf of the sea, because the Earth-Shaker has given them (this craft)."

In this verse, Athene explains why the Phaiakians were so renowned in sea-faring: as Poseidon granted them this knowledge, they were able to lead anyone safely over the sea. The ἐπεί-clause is not temporal here and thus the absence of the augment is somewhat surprising, especially since the expertise of the Phaiakians still existed, when Athene pronounced her words. One could argue, following what a reviewer of the journal noted on the passage describing Nestor's old age, that the granting of the seafaring expertise by Poseidon to the Phaiakians happened in a remote past and that therefore the absence of the augment is

---

[54] BAKKER (2005:128-130).
[55] The instances are *Odyssea*, I,263; V,437.
[56] The augmented instances are *Odyssea*, IV,125; IV,172; VII,150; XV,207; XVII,76; XVII,567. The unaugmented ones are *Odyssea*, II,116; III,53; IV,262; V,408; V,437; VII,35; VII,260; X,237; X,318; XXI,13.
[57] The instances in the relative clauses are *Odyssea*, IV,125; VII,150; XV,207; XVII,76; the irrealis can be found in *Odyssea*, IV,173 and the temporal clause example in *Odyssea*, XVII,567.
[58] The instances in the relative clause can be found in *Odyssea*, II,116; III,53; IV,262; VII,260; XXI,13; the ἐπεί-clauses are *Odyssea*, V,408; VII,35; X,237; X,318 and the irrealis is *Odyssea*, V,437.
[59] PLATT (1891:220); BAKKER (2005:125-127).

expected, but, as I argued above, the action occurred in the past, but its consequences are still valid today.

7. The actual analysis: the syntactic factors.

7.1. "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 has first been noted by Drewitt and has been expanded to the entire Homeric corpus by Beck.[60] This rule is a direct consequence of the fact that the augment was in origin an accented autonomous word. If a 2nd position clitic is used in the verse, it has to be put in the second position,[61] and can therefore not be preceded by an augmented verb form.[62] If it were preceded by an augmented verb form (a compound of an orthotonic particle and an enclitic verb form), the clitic would be put at the 3rd position in the sentence and in the 2nd position within the clitic chain. Clitics such as δέ, μέν, γάρ, τε or ῥα appear first in the clitic chain and precede enclitic pronouns and verbs.[63] The verb has to become orthotonic in such instances and is not augmented. If the verb had been augmented and a 2nd position clitic had been used in the sentence, the expected word order would be:

$$* (h_1)\acute{e} = \qquad k^we \qquad = deh_3t$$

Augment   –   Clitic –   Verb form

This is not the case, because in Greek the augment cannot be dissolved from the verb form. Consequently, the verb form has to come first, and the clitic has to follow the verb:

$$*d\acute{e}h_3t = \qquad k^we$$

Verb   Clitic

If one does not assume that the verb in PIE was enclitic, the sequence augmented verb form followed by clitic still violates Wackernagel's Law, because in that case, the Wackernagel clitic would only appear in the 3rd position: $*(h_1)\acute{e}\text{-}d\acute{e}h_3\text{-}k^we$.

---

[60] DREWITT (1912b: 104, 1913: 350), BECK (1919). Beck specifically links 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); DE LAMBERTERIE (2007:53); GARCIA-RAMON (2012:B.2.3); DE DECKER (2015a:56, 2015b:249-250, 312, 2016b:56-59, 2017a:79, 128-129); HAJNAL (2016a:13, 2016b:446-447).

[61] This is based on the observations by BERGAIGNE (1878:91-93, for Latin, Greek, Indo-Iranian and Germanic) and Delbrück (1878:47-48, for Vedic prose) and WACKERNAGEL (for all Indo-European languages known at the time of publication, 1892), who state that enclitic words have to come second in a sentence.

[62] DREWITT (1912b:104).

[63] This had been noticed already by MONRO (1891:335-338), before Wackernagel posited his famous Law. For the clitic chain see WACKERNAGEL (1892:336), DELBRÜCK (1900:51-53, with reference to Monro), BRUGMANN (1904:682-683), KRISCH (1990:73-74), RUIJGH (1990), WILLS (1993), WATKINS (1998:70).

This rule applies to our corpus as well: there are 10 instances in which a form is followed by a clitic and in all instances, the form is unaugmented.[64] I give one example (in what follows, augmented forms will be underlined and unaugmented forms will be put in bold face).

(EX.09) τὰς ἐρέων Ὀδυσῆϊ συνήντετο, **δῶκε** δὲ τόξον (*Odyssea*, XXI,31).[65]

"He met Odysseus while he was asking about them (sc. the mares) and gave him the bow."

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

7.2. Kiparsky's reduction rule.

Kiparsky argues that in PIE in a sequence of marked forms only the first one was marked and the others appeared in the neutral form:[66] 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, ἰδέ, τε, ἅμα τε, τε καί, and δέ. This is called *conjunction reduction*,[67] although *markedness reduction* might be a better term. This is not confined to augmented indicatives, but also applied to case,[68] moods,[69] tense[70] and compounding.[71] Kiparsky himself maintains that the rule was absolute, but that many examples of it were obscured by the transmission; for Vedic, he explicitly rules out that the injunctive could be used to mention events, as Hoffmann has argued,[72] because such a "memorative" was typologically rare, if not non-existent.[73] Levin, who agrees with Kiparsky, notes 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

---

[64] The instances are *Odyssea*, III,40; III,63; V,234; V,237; VI,79; IX,203; X,19; XXI,31; XXIV,23.

[65] The text is taken from VAN THIEL (1991), compared to the editions of LUDWICH (1889, 1891) and LA ROCHE (1867 and 1868). The queries were performed with the *Chicago Homer* and the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

[66] KIPARSKY (1968); he 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; 2016b:58-71, 2017a:83-84, 130-135).

[67] KIPARSKY (1968), FORTSON (2004:140), CLACKSON (2007:132), LURAGHI (2014).

[68] KIPARSKY (1968:54-55), but this aspect of the reduction rule is much more debated than the others, as it is not entirely certain that the reduction of case did actually occur, see DE DECKER (2016b:59-60) for a critical discussion.

[69] KIPARSKY (1968 *passim*).

[70] KIPARSKY (1968:39-42).

[71] 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 meaning*; WATKINS (1967).

[72] HOFFMANN (1967) used the term *Memorativ*; for his theory, cf. supra.

[73] KIPARSKY (2005:§1): *There seem to be no languages with a mood whose function is "mentioning" or "reminding"*.

unaugmented forms were found.[74] Earlier researches revealed that this is not a strict rule, but only a tendency: in Hesiod and *Iliad* 1, there were more unaugmented forms that followed an augmented form than augmented forms, but there will still a considerable amount of exceptions.[75] Our corpus has 6 examples arguing for the reduction and 4 against it.[76] All examples in favour are also examples of Drewitt-Beck's clitic rule, so that their evidentiary value is rather limited. We give one example in favour and one against it:

(EX.10) ὣς ἄρ' ἔπειτ' ἠρᾶτο καὶ αὐτὴ πάντα τελεύτα

δῶκε δὲ Τηλεμάχῳ καλὸν δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον (*Odyssea*, III,62-63).

"So she (sc. Pallas Athene) prayed and completed everything herself, and gave Telemakhos a beautiful two-handled cup."

The first verb form is augmented and the two other ones are unaugmented, but the absence of the augment in τελεύτα is not metrically guaranteed;[77] the absence of the augment in δῶκε can also be explained by the fact that it is followed by δέ.

Let us now discuss an example of an exception to the rule, taken from our corpus and already discussed above. In the passage EX.01 mentioned above, one would expect all verbs to be unaugmented after ἤλυθεν (the punctuation signs are a modern addition and has in all likelihood a very limited historical value), but there are nevertheless three verbs that violated the rigid reduction rule: ἔθηκεν, ἔδωκεν and ἦεν (but cf. supra).

I believe that the rule was not as absolute as Kiparsky believes it to be, but think that it was rather a strong tendency against using too many augmented forms in one passage; for if the rule were strict, one would expect one (and only one) augmented form in every sentence or even chant of the Homeric epics, the RigVeda and the Avestan Gāθās and Yašts, but this is clearly not the case. On the other hand, there are several reductions that indicate that the process as described by Kiparsky might have been active after all. Especially the "combination" of dual and plural forms is remarkable: in Homer, it often occurs that in a series of verb forms referring to a duality only one is put in the dual, whereas the others appear in the plural.[78]

---

[74] LEVIN (1969).

[75] DE DECKER (2016b:58-71) for Hesiod and (2017a:130-135) for *Iliad* 1.

[76] The examples in favour are *Odyssea*, III,63; V,234; V,237; VI,79; XXIV,73. The exceptions are *Odyssea*, IV,125; XIX,396; XXI,34.

[77] As no augmented forms of this verb are attested (neither in the aorist nor in the imperfect), it is likely that the unaugmented form is original here, but since the metre does not offer an absolute guarantee, we cannot be sure.

[78] This analysis goes back to Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1827, quoted in STRUNK (1975:237). STRUNK (1975:234-239) provided an analysis of Homeric and Attic (Xenophontic) instances to show that Greek did not need to mark the dual more than once. See STRUNK (1975:234-239) and FRITZ (2011:50-51, with reference to KIPARSKY 1968 and STRUNK 1975). See also DE DECKER (2015b:157, 252 for examples in speech introductions and 2017a:74-77 for instances in *Iliad* 1).

8. Conclusion.

The investigation of the forms in the *Odyssey* hopes to have shown that the augment use and absence were not metrically motivated, but could be explained by an interaction of syntactic and semantic factors. The augment was avoided, when the past tense form was followed by a 2nd position clitic and its absence was preferred when an augmented form was already preceding. It was used in statements of general validity, actions describing a recent past, and when new elements in a story were added; it appeared more often in speeches than it was in narrative passages; it was dispreferred in stories relating a more distant or even mythical past, in sidenotes and in long narrative descriptions. It goes without saying that we are only dealing with tendencies and not with absolute rules, and that, as a consequence, there are exceptions to the rules mentioned, but I believe that, overall, the tendencies can explain most of the (un)augmented forms in early epic Greek.

Abstract.

In this article, I discuss the use and absence of the augment in the 3rd singular and plural forms ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) and δῶκ(ε)(ν) in the *Odyssey*. I use the metrically secure forms and list the criteria to determine these secure forms. I then analyse those forms and check if 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 & Beck, the reduction rule by Kiparsky and the distinctions speech versus narrative, foreground versus background and remote versus recent past).

Dr. Filip De Decker
Postdoctoral Researcher FWO Vlaanderen
Department of Linguistics
Section Greek Linguistics
Universiteit Gent
http://research.flw.ugent.be/en/filip.dedecker

9. Bibliography.

AHRENS, H. (1852): *Griechische Formenlehre des Homerischen und Attischen Dialektes*, Göttingen.
ALLEN, T. (1912): *Homeri Opera*. Tomus V, Oxford.
ALLEN, T. (1931): *Homeri Ilias*, Oxford.
AMEIS, K. (1870): *Ilias. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Erster Band. Zweites Heft. Gesang 4-6*, Leipzig.
AMEIS, K. & HENTZE, C. (1895): *Homers Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt. Gesang 13-24*. Leipzig.
AMEIS, K. & HENTZE, C. (1900): *Anhang zu Homers Odyssee Schulausgabe 4. Gesang 19-24*. Leipzig.
AVERY, J. (1880): The Unaugmented Verb Forms of the Rig and Atharva Vedas, *JAOS* 11, p. 326-365.
BADER, F. (1994) (ed): *Les langues indo-européennes*. Paris.
BAKKER, E. (1999): Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer, in: KAZAZIS, J. & RENGAKOS, A. (eds). *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris. N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart, p. 50-65.
BAKKER, E. (2002): Remembering the God's Arrival, *Arethusa* 35, p. 63-81.

BAKKER, E. (2005): *Pointing at the past: from formula to performance in Homeric poetics*, Cambridge, MA.

BALLY, C. (1947): *Manuel d'accentuation grecque*. Bern.

BARNES, H. (1986): The Colometric Structure of the Homeric Hexameter, *GRBS* 27, p. 125-150.

BARTOLOTTA, A. & BUIJS, M. & KÖLLIGAN, D. (2017): Modality and Injunctive in Ancient Greek. Presentation during the Conference "Charting the Semantic Space of Ancient Greek Modality" on May 6th, 2017 in Paris.

BARTONĚK, A. (2003): *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*, Heidelberg.

BARTHOLOMAE, C. (1878): *Das altiranische Verbum in Formenlehre und Syntax*. München.

BASSET, L. (1989): L'augment et la distinction discours/récit dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée. In: CASEVITZ, M. (ed.) *Études homériques*. Lyon, p. 9-16.

BASSETT, S. (1919) The Theory of the Homeric Caesura According to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine, *AJP* 40, p. 343-372.

BECK, W. (1914): *De augmenti apud Homerum usu*, Giessen.

BECKWITH, M. (1996): *The Greek Reduplicated Aorist*, PhD Thesis Yale.

BECKWITH, M. (2004): Homeric ἠνώγεον (Η 394), ἐρρίγει (ψ 216) and the Imperfect Origins of the Greek Pluperfect, *KZ* 117, p. 76-85.

BEEKES, R. (1972): On the Structure of the Greek Hexameter: O'Neill Reinterpreted, *Glotta* 6, p. 1-10.

BEKKER, I. (1858): *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Prius. Ilias*, Bonn.

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.

BERGAIGNE, A. (1877): *Essai sur la construction grammaticale considérée dans son développement historique*. Paris

BERNABE, A. & LUJAN, E. (2006): *Introducción al griego micénico: gramática, selección de textos, glosario*. Zaragoza.

BERTRAND, N. (2006a): La localisation des formes intransitives d'ἵστημι. Le rôle de ἔστη et στάς dans le récit homérique, *GAIA* 10, p. 47-96.

BERTRAND, N. (2006b): Présence du passé dans l'épopée homérique. À propos de *Pointing to the Past* de EJ Bakker, *GAIA* 10, p. 237-243.

BLUMENTHAL, H. (1974): Some Homeric Evidence for the History of the Augment, *IF* 79, p. 67-77.

BOPP, F. (1833): *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen*. Berlin.

BOTTIN, L. (1969): Studio dell'aumento in Omero, *SMEA* 10, p. 69-145.

BRIXHE, C. (1994): Le phrygien. Bader 1994, p. 165-178.

BRIXHE, C. (2008): Phrygian, Woodard 2008, p. 69-80.

BRÜGGER, C. (2009): *Basel Kommentar. Band VIII: 24. Gesang. Faszikel 2: Kommentar*, Berlin.

BRUGMANN, K. (1890): *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

BRUGMANN, K. (1892): *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II.2. Strassburg.

BRUGMANN, K. (1900): *Griechische Grammatik*. München.

BRUGMANN, K. (1904): *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg.

BRUGMANN, K. (1916): *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II.3, Strassburg.

CHANTRAINE, P. (1948): *Grammaire homérique*, Paris.

CHANTRAINE, P. (1953): *Grammaire homérique. Tome II : Syntaxe*, Paris.

CHANTRAINE, P. (1964): *Morphologie historique du grec*, Paris. (deuxième édition revue et augmentée).

CLACKSON, J. (2007): *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge.

CLACKSON J. (2008) Armenian, Woodard 2008, p. 124-144.

CLAUSEN, W. (1955): Silva Coniecturarum, *AJP* 76, p. 47-62.

CURTIUS, G. (1873): *Das Verbum der griechischen Sprache, seinem Baue nach dargestellt*. Erster Band. Leipzig.

DE DECKER, F. (2015a): The augment in Homer, with special attention to speech introductions and conclusions, in: DE DECKER, F. e.a. (eds) *JournaLIPP 4 Proceedings of the 21st LIPP Symposium*, p. 53-71. Online publication: 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. Online publication: https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17995/

DE DECKER, F. (2016a): The Augment Use in *Iliad* 6: an Evidential Marker? *LEC* 84, p. 259-317

DE DECKER, F. (2016b): A contrastive analysis of the Homeric and Hesiodic augment, with special focus on Hesiod, *IJDL* 13, p. 33-128.

DE DECKER, F. (2017a): Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν: an analysis of the augment use in *Iliad* 1, *JIES* 45, p. 58-171.

DE DECKER, F. (2017b): The Augment in Epic Greek: Homer, Hesiod, the Hymns and the Epic Fragments. Presentation held at the Indo-European Seminar in Cambridge on October 12th 2017.

DE LAMBERTERIE, C. (1994): L'arménien. Bader 1994, p. 137-163.

DE LAMBERTERIE, C. (2007): L'augment dans le texte arménien de l'Évangile, *REArm* 30, p. 31-57.

DELBRÜCK, B. (1878): *Syntaktische Forschungen III. Die Altindische Wortfolge aus der Çatapathabrāḥmana.* Halle.

DELBRÜCK, B. (1879): *Syntaktische Forschungen IV. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, Halle.

DELBRÜCK, B. (1888): *Syntaktische Forschungen V. Altindische Syntax*. Halle.

DELBRÜCK, B. (1893): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. I, Strassburg.

DELBRÜCK, B. (1897): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. II, Strassburg.

DELBRÜCK, B. (1900): *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. III, Strassburg.

DÖDERLEIN, L. (1847): *Reden und Aufsätze*, Erlangen.

DIAKONOFF, I. & NEROZNAK, V. (1986): *Phrygian*. Delmar.

DREWITT, J. (1912a): The Augment in Homer, *CQ* 6, p. 44-59.

DREWITT, J. (1912b): The Augment in Homer (continued), *CQ* 6, p. 104-120.

DREWITT, J. (1913): A Note on The Augment, *CP* 8, p. 349-353.

DUHOUX, Y. (1987): Les débuts de l'augment grec : le facteur sociolinguistique, *Minos* 20-22, p. 163-172.

DUHOUX, Y. (1992): *Le verbe grec ancien*. Louvain-la-Neuve.

EULER, W. (1995): Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen, in: SMOCZYŃSKI, W. (ed). *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume, Part One*. Cracow, p. 137-142.

FAULKNER, A. (2005): Aphrodite's Aorists: Attributive Sections in the Homeric Hymns, *Glotta* 81, p. 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: Blackwell.

FRAENKEL, H. (1960): Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter, in: FRAENKEL, H., *Wegen und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*. München, p. 100-56.

FRANKE, F. (1854): *Ueber den gnomischen Aorist*. Leipzig.

FRITZ, M. (2011): *Der Dual im Indogermanischen*. Heidelberg.

FRITZ, M. & JOSEPH, B. & KLEIN, J. 2017 (eds): *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics I*. Berlin.

FÜHRER, R. & SCHMIDT, M. (2001): Review West 1998, *GGA* 253, p. 1-32.

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 21st -23rd 2012.

GARCÍA-RAMÓN, J. (2017): The Morphology of Greek. Fritz & Joseph & Klein 2017. 654-682.

GERHARD, E. (1816): *Lectiones Apollonianae*. Leipzig.

GIANNAKIS, G. (2014): (ed). *The Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden .

GILDERSLEEVE, B. (1885): *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York.

GISEKE, B. (1864): *Homerische Forschungen*, Leipzig.

GODEL, R. (1975): *An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden.

GONDA, J. (1956): *The Character of the Indo-European Moods*. Wiesbaden.

GRASHOF, C. (1852): *Abhandlung zur Kritik des Homerischen Textes in Bezug auf die Abwerfung des Augments*. Düsseldorf.

HAAS, O. (1966): *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler*. Sofia.

HAJNAL, I. (1990): Die mykenische Verbalform *e-e-to*, *MSS* 51, p. 21-75.

HAJNAL, I. (2016a): Induktive versus abductive Rekonstruktion: das Beispiel des griechischen Augments. Handout from the Workshop in Honour of Michael Job, held on March 2, 2016 in Göttingen.

HAJNAL, I. (2016b) Induktive versus abduktive Rekonstruktion: das Beispiel des griechischen Augments, *IF* 121, p. 435-453.

HALE, M. (1987): Notes on Wackernagel's Law in the language of the Rig Veda, in: WATKINS, C. (ed). *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*, Berlin, p. 38-50.

HERBIG, G. (1896): Aktionsart und Zeitstufe, *IF* 6, p. 157-270.

HERMANN, G. (1805): *Orphica*, Leipzig.

HERMANN, G. (1817): *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae*, London.

HIRT, H. (1928): *Indogermanische Grammatik IV. Doppelung, Zusammensetzung, Verbum*, Heidelberg.

HOFFMANN, K. (1967): *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg.

HOFFMANN, K. (1970): Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbums, *MSS* 28, p. 19-41.

HOFFMANN, K. & FORSSMAN, B. (2004): *Avestische Laut- und Flexionslehre*. Innsbruck.

HUMMEL, P. (1993): *La syntaxe de Pindare*. Leuven.

JANKO, R. (1982): *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: diachronic development in epic diction.* Cambridge.

JANKO, R. 1992. *The Iliad: a commentary. Volume 13-16*. Cambridge.

JANSE, M. (2003): The Metrical Schemas of the Hexameter, *Mnemosyne* NS 56, p. 343-348.

JANSE, M. (2014): *Inleiding tot de Homerische taal en metriek*, Gent.

KELLENS, J. (1984): *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden.

KIPARSKY, P. (1968): Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax, *FL* 4, p. 30-57.

KIPARSKY, P. (2005): The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications, in: *The Yearbook of South East Asian Studies* 2005. Accessed online: http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/injunctive.article.pdf .

KIRK, G. (1966): Studies in Some Technical Aspects of Homeric Style, *YCS* 20, p. 75-152

KIRK, G. (1985): *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 1-4*, Cambridge.

KIRK, G. (1990): *The Iliad: A Commentary. Books 5-8*, Cambridge.

KOCH, K. (1868): *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*, Braunschweig.

KORZENIEWSKI, D. (1968): *Griechische Metrik*. Darmstadt.

KRISCH, T. (1990): Das Wackernagelsche Gesetz aus heutiger Sicht, RIX & EICHNER 1990, p. 64-81.

KÜHNER, R. & BLASS, F. (1890): *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. Erster Band. Hannover.

KÜHNER, R. & BLASS, F. (1892): *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. Zweiter Band. Hannover.

KÜHNER, R. & GERTH, B. (1898): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre.* Erster Band. Hannover.

KÜHNER, R. & GERTH, B. (1904): *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Theil. Satzlehre.* Zweiter Band. 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. (1882): *Das Augment des griechischen Verbum*. Linz.

LA ROCHE, J. (1893): *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Zweiter Theil. Leipzig.

LATACZ, J. (2000): (ed). *Homer Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*, Berlin.

LAZZERONI, R. (1977): Fra glottogonia e storia: ingiuntivo, aumento e lingua poetica indoeuropeo, *SSL* 17, p. 1-30.

LEVIN, S. (1969): Remarks on the 'Historical' Present and Comparable Phenomena of Syntax, *FL* 5, p. 386-390.

LSJ= LIDDELL, H. & SCOTT, R. & JONES, H. & MCKENZIE, R. 1996. *Greek-English Lexicon*, with a revised Supplement. With the Help of Many Scholars. Oxford.

LUDWICH, A. (1866): *Quaestionis de Hexametris Poetarum Graecorum Spondaicis Capita Duo*. Halle.

LUDWICH, A. (1885): *Aristarchs 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.

LURAGHI, S. (2014): Conjunction Reduction, GIANNAKIS 2014, p. 362-363.

MACDONELL, A. (1910): *Vedic Grammar*. Strassburg

MACDONELL, A. (1916): *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford.

MARZULLO, B. (1952): *Il problema omerico*, Firenze.

MEIER-BRÜGGER, M. (1992a): *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. I, Berlin.

MEIER-BRÜGGER, M. (1992b): *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. II. Berlin.

MEIER-BRÜGGER, M. (2010): *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin.

MEILLET, A. (1903): *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparéé de l'arménien classique*. Vienna

MEILLET, A. (1913): *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg.

MEILLET, A. (1915): *Grammaire du vieux perse*. Paris.

MEILLET, A. (1937): *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Paris.

MEISTER, K. (1921): *Die homerische Kunstsprache*. Leipzig.

MEYER, G. (1891): *Griechische Grammatik*, Leipzig.

MOHRMANN, C. (1933): *Homerische Spraakleer*, Nijmegen.

MOLLER, E. (1853): Ueber den gnomischen aorist, *Philologus* 8, p. 113-129.

MOLLER, E. (1854): Ueber den gnomischen aorist. Zweiter artikel, *Philologus* 9, p. 346-366.

MONRO, D. (1884): *Homer. Iliad Books I - XII*, Oxford.

MONRO, D. (1891): *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*, Oxford.

MONRO, D. & ALLEN, T. (1908): *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros I - XII continens*, Oxford.

MORRIS, I. & POWELL, B. (1995): (eds). *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden.

MUMM, P. (1995): Verbale Definitheit und der vedische Injunktiv, in: HETTRICH, H. & HOCK, W. (eds). *Verba et Structurae*. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk, Innsbruck, p. 169-193.

MUMM, P. (2004): Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments, in: KRISCH, T. (ed). *Analecta homini universali dicata*. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl, Stuttgart, p. 148-158.

MURRAY, A. & WYATT, W. (1999a): *Homer Iliad*. Books 1-12, Cambridge, MA.

MURRAY, A. & WYATT, W. (1999b): *Homer Iliad*. Books 13-24, Cambridge, MA.

NEGRI, M. (1976): Studi sul verbo greco II, *Acme* 29, p. 233-250.

NÜNLIST, R. (2000): Homerische Metrik, LATACZ 2000, p. 109-113.

O'NEILL, E. (1942): The localization of metrical word types in the Greek hexameter, *YCS* 8, p. 105-178.

OREL, V. (1997): *The Language of the Phrygians*, Delmar.

OSWALD, S. (2014): Metrical Laws, GIANNAKIS 2014, p. 419-423.

PAGNIELLO, F. (2002): *The Augment in Homer*, PhD Thesis, University of Georgia at Atlanta.

PAGNIELLO, F. (2007): The past-iterative and the augment in Homer, *IF* 112, p. 105-123.

PANAGL, O. (1976): Die mykenische Sprache. In: PANAGL, O. & HILLER, S. (eds) *Die frühgriechischen Texte aus mykenischer Zeit*. Darmstadt, p. 78-100.

PELLICCIA, H. (1985): *The Structure of the Archaic Greek Hymns*, PhD Thesis Yale.

PERISTERAKIS, A. (1962): *Essai sur l'aoriste intemporel en grec*, Athens.

PETERMANN, J. (1837): *Grammatica Linguae Armeniacae*. Berlin.

PLATT, A. (1891): The Augment in Homer, *JPh* 19, p. 211-237.

POEHLMANN, H. (1858): *Quomodo poetae epici augmento temporali usi sint*. Tilsit.

PORTER, N. (1951): The Early Greek Hexameter, *YCS* 12, p. 1-64.

PROBERT, P. (2007): *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Greek*. Bristol.

REICHELT, H. (1909): *Altawestisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg.

RENOU, L. (1928): Les formes dites d'injonctif dans le RgVeda. In: *Étrennes linguistiques offertes par quelques amis à Émile Benveniste*. Paris, p. 63-80

RICHARDSON, N. (1993): *The Iliad: A Commentary. 6: 22-24*, Cambridge.

RISCH, E. (1974): *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin.

RIX, H. (1976): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*, Darmstadt.

RIX, H. (1992): *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*, Darmstadt. 2. erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage.

RIX, H. & EICHNER, H. (1990) (eds): *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie. Jakob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, Wiesbaden.

ROSÉN, H. (1973): Satzbau und augmentloses Tempus in Homerischen Tatsachenbericht, *FoL* 6, p. 315-330.

RUIJGH, C. (1958): Les datifs pluriels dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien, *Mnemosyne* IV 11, p. 97-116.

RUIJGH, C. (1967): *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam.

RUIJGH, C. (1971): *Autour de "te épique"*, Amsterdam.

RUIJGH, C. (1990): La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel, RIX & EICHNER 1990, p. 213-233.

RUIJGH, C. (2011): Mycenaean and Homeric Greek. In: Duhoux, Y. & Morpurgo-Davies, A. (eds). *A Companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek, Texts and their World*. Louvain-la-Neuve, p. 251-298.

RUSSO, J. & FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO, M. & HEUBECK, A. (1992): *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume III: Books XVII – XXIV*. Oxford.

RZACH, A. (1876): *Der Dialekt des Hesiodos*. Leipzig.

SALMON, A. (1960): L'aoriste dit gnomique, *LEC* 28, p. 402-423.

SCHMITT, R. (1967): Zwei Bemerkungen zum Augment, *KZ* 81, p. 63-67

SCHWYZER, E. (1939): *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München.

SCHWYZER, E. & DEBRUNNER, A. (1950): *Griechische Grammatik. Teil II. Syntax*. München.

SHEWAN, A. (1912): The Homeric Augment, *CP* 7, p. 397-411.

SHEWAN, A. (1914): The Homeric Augment Again, *CP* 9, p. 189-191.

SHIPP, G. (1972): *Studies in the Language of Homer*, Cambridge.

SICKING, C. (1993): *Griechische Verslehre*. München.

SNELL, B. (1982): *Griechische Metrik*, Göttingen.

SKJAERVØ, P. (2017): The Morphology of Iranian, Fritz & Joseph & Klein 2017, p. 503-549.

SPITZNER, F. (1816): *De versu Graecorum heroico maxime Homerico*. Leipzig.

SPITZNER, F. (1832): *Homeri Iliadis Vol. I*. Gotha.

STRUNK, K. (1968): Zeit und Tempus in den altindogermanischen Sprachen, *IF* 73, p. 279-311.

STRUNK, K. (1975): Zum Verhältnis von Wort und Satz in der Syntax des Lateinischen und Griechischen, *Gymnasium* 82, p. 225-239.

SZEMERÉNYI, O. (1990): *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. 4. erweiterte Ausgabe, Darmstadt.

SZEMERÉNYI, O. (1996): *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*, Oxford.

TAIDA, I. (2007): Elision and Augment in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, *Exemplaria Classica* 11, p. 3-12

TAIDA, I. (2010): Augment in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes, *Hermes* 138, p. 250-258.

THOMSON, R. (1975): *An Introduction to Classical Armenian*. Delmar.

Van Groningen, B. (1948): Quelques observations sur l'aoriste gnomique, in : *Studia Varia Carolo Guilielm Vollgraf*, Amsterdam, p. 49-61.

Van Leeuwen, J. (1890): Homerica IV, *Mnemosyne* 18, p. 265-299.

Van Leeuwen, J. (1918): *Enchiridium dictionis epicae*, Leiden.

Van Raalte, M. (1986): *Rhythm and Metre. Towards a Systematic Description of Greek Stichic Verse*, Assen.

Van Thiel, H. (1991): *Homeri Odyssea*, Hildesheim.

Van Thiel, H. (1996): *Homeri Ilias*, Hildesheim.

Van Thiel, H. (2011): *Homeri Ilias*, Second edition. Hildesheim.

Vilborg, E. (1960): *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*. Göteborg.

Verdenius, W. (1987): *Commentaries on Pindar I*. Leiden.

Verdenius, W. (1988): *Commentaries on Pindar II*. Leiden.

Wackernagel, J. (1877): Der griechische verbalaccent, *KZ* 23, p. 457-470.

Wackernagel, J. (1892): Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *IF* 1, p. 333-437.

Wackernagel, J. (1904): *Studien zum griechischen Perfektum*, Göttingen.

Wackernagel, J. (1920): *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I. Basel.

Wackernagel, J. (1924): *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, II. Basel.

Wackernagel, J. (1942): Indogermanische Dichtersprache, *Philologus* 95, p. 1-19.

Wachter, R. (2000): Grammatik der homerischen Sprache, Latacz, 2000, p. 61-108.

Watkins, C. (1967): An Indo-European Construction in Greek and Latin. *HSCP* 71, p. 115-119.

Watkins, C. (1998): Proto-Indo-European: Comparison and Reconstruction, in: Giacalone Ramat, A. & Ramat, P. (eds). *The Indo-European Languages*, London, p. 25-73.

Weiss, M. (2009): *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor.

Wernicke, F. (1819): *Tryphiodorou Alosis Iliou*, Leipzig.

West, M. (1973): Greek Poetry 2000 - 700 BC, *CQ* NS 23, p. 179-193.

West, M. (1982) *Greek Meter*, Oxford.

West, M. (1987): *Introduction to Greek Metre*, Oxford.

West, M. (1989): An Unrecognized Injunctive Usage in Greek, *Glotta* 67, p. 135-138.

West, M. (1997): Greek Meter. Morris & Powell 1997, p. 217-238.

West, M. (1998): *Homerus Ilias. Volumen I: Rhapsodiae I - XII*, Berlin.

West, M. (2000): *Homerus Ilias. Volumen II: Rhapsodiae XIII - XXIV*, Berlin.

Willcock, M. (1995): *Pindar. Victory Odes*. Cambridge.

Wills, J. (1993): Homeric Particle Order, *KZ* 106, p. 61-81.

Woodard, R. (2008) (ed) *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*. Cambridge.