

## THE AUGMENT USE IN THE FIVE OLDEST ODES OF PINDAR

FILIP DE DECKER

filipdedecker9@gmail.com

Universiteit Gent & FWO Vlaanderen and Università degli Studi di Verona

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2863-5801>

Texto recebido em / Text submitted on: 23/04/2020

Texto aprovado em / Text approved on: 02/03/2021

### Abstract

In this short article I discuss the augment use in Pindar's five oldest Odes (based on the text of the editions by Snell & Maehler<sup>1</sup> in the Teubner and Race in the Loeb), namely Pythian 10 (498 BC), Pythian 6 (490), Pythian 12 (490), Olympian 14 (488, if correctly dated) and Pythian 7 (486). As the augment use in Pindar has never been studied in detail before and commentaries often do not mention it, I use the observations made for epic Greek as basis, more specifically that the augment is used to refer to foregrounded actions and actions in the recent past, and that it remains absent when actions in a remote or mythical past are related. I start by outlining these observations, then I determine which (un) augmented forms in Pindar are secured by the metre (the transmission of Pindar's Odes has not been unproblematic) and at the end apply the epic observation to the metrically secure forms of these five Odes. My investigation will show that the verb forms referring to the *near-deixis* (the victor's deeds, his origins and those of his city and the mythical characters with whom he is compared), are augmented, whereas the forms referring to other (mythical) actions remain unaugmented, but, as was the case with epic Greek, there are nevertheless also exceptions.<sup>1</sup>

**Keywords:** Pindar, Greek verbal morphology, augment, lyric Greek.

---

<sup>1</sup> This article was made possible by a postdoctoral fellowship 12V1518N, granted by the FWO Vlaanderen.

## 1. The augment in epic Greek

While the augment in epic Greek has been intensively studied,<sup>2</sup> its use in other genres, such as lyric, elegiac and tragic poetry, has received much less attention or has been neglected altogether: scholars hardly ever discussed Pindar's use of the augment,<sup>3</sup> noting only that it could be omitted and was optional,<sup>4</sup> and sometimes added or removed against the metre.<sup>5</sup>

Regarding epic Greek, Koch already very early on noted that the augment was used more in speeches than in narrative, unless the speeches contained narrative elements as well (e.g. Nestor's speech in *Iliad* 1).<sup>6</sup> Platt and Drewitt showed that (1) the augment was used with verbal forms that have general validity, (2) verbs with the augment have present reference, (3) they can be translated with the English present perfect (e.g. in gnomes and *similia*),<sup>7</sup> and (4) the augment was avoided in genuine past contexts. In his analysis of the augment in Archaic Greek, Bottin confirmed the preference for unaugmented forms in narrative

<sup>2</sup> Recent studies (in the last 30 years) are Basset 1989; West 1989; Bakker 1999, 2001, 2002; Mumm 2004; Pagniello 2002, 2007; Bertrand 2006a, 2006b, 2010: 579-588; Garcia-Ramón 2012; De Decker 2015a, 2016a, 2016b, 2017, 2018a, 2018b, 2019a, 2019b, ftc a, ftc b; Hajnal 2016a, 2016b; Allan 2017; Wakker 2017; Lazzeroni 2017; Rodeghiero 2017 and also (much more controversial) Willi 2007, 2018: 344-417. For an overview of previous scholarship, see Bottin 1969: 69-82; De Decker 2015b: 241-290 with a list of 20 rules governing the augment use, 2016a: 34-37, 2018a: 10-17; Willi 2018: 358-381.

The scholarship on Homer is much larger than that of other early epic works (for Hesiod, see West 1989, De Decker 2016a and Wakker 2017, and for the Homeric Hymns, see Bakker 2002 for the Homeric Hymn to Apollon and De Decker 2019a for the Homeric Hymn to Demeter and 2019b for the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite).

<sup>3</sup> The augment was not addressed in Fennell 1879, 1883; Schroeder 1922, but see 1900: 40-42, following footnote; Farnell 1932; Carey 1981; Gerber 1982, 1999, 2002; Privitera 1982; Verdenius 1987, 1988; Cannata Ferra 1990. The Pindaric syntax by Hummel 1993 did not discuss the augment either. Braswell 1988, 1992, 1998 stated that the augment was often added against the metre (cf. *infra*) and argued that the temporal augment was known to Pindar, but he did not discuss the use/absence of the augment.

<sup>4</sup> Seymour 1882: 224 *the augment is often omitted*; Gildersleeve 1885: lxxxv; Schroeder 1900: 40-42; Kirkwood 1982: 31 *omission of syllabic augment is frequent, of temporal augment occasional*; Willcock 1995: 23.

<sup>5</sup> Schroeder 1900: 40-42; Young 1965: 260-261; Braswell 1998: 90-91.

<sup>6</sup> Koch 1868, especially 24-32; for Nestor's speech, see also De Decker 2017: 96, 136-138.

<sup>7</sup> Platt 1891; Drewitt 1912a, 1912b, 1913.

parts, styling this particular usage as *lo stile narrativo*.<sup>8</sup> Later on, Basset distinguished between *discours* and *récit*.<sup>9</sup> For Vedic Sanskrit, Hoffmann described the use of the unaugmented forms as *erwähnend* and specific to mythical descriptions,<sup>10</sup> contrasted them with the indicative forms, which belonged to the *historische Vergangenheit*.<sup>11</sup> Recently, Bakker, elaborating on these observations, argued that the augment marked completion of the verbal action and nearness to the speaker (*a deictic suffix that marked the completion of the action near the speaker*).<sup>12</sup> Along similar lines, Mumm and Bertrand described the function of the augment as adding emphasis and pathos.<sup>13</sup> The explanations mentioned above can be combined and summarised as follows: by using unaugmented forms (injunctives), the speakers and/or narrators describe and mention what has happened,<sup>14</sup> whereas by using augmented forms (the indicatives) they do not only relate it, but also state it as a fact and reaffirm its value.<sup>15</sup>

In the next subchapters I will apply these findings to the five oldest Pindaric Odes and determine how/if they can be applied to Pindar's lyric as well. I admit that the corpus is limited, but I still believe that it can serve as an indication.

## 2. The analysis of the Pythian Ode 10

This Ode, which is the oldest one written by Pindar, celebrates the victory of Hippokleas, from Larissa in Thessaly, in the Pythian *diaulos*. Pindar first celebrates Thessaly by linking it to Sparta via Herakles. Then

<sup>8</sup> Bottin 1969: 110-128.

<sup>9</sup> Basset 1989.

<sup>10</sup> Hoffmann 1967: 198: *Injunktiv-Reihen lassen sich, dem Hauptthema des Rg-Veda entsprechend, vor allem bei der Darstellung mythologischer Tatbestände aufzeichnen.* (underlining is mine).

<sup>11</sup> Hoffmann 1967: 160-213, for the use of the indicative forms in the actual past, see 145-160; see also Euler 1995 and Mumm 1995.

<sup>12</sup> Bakker 2001: 15, 2005: 147.

<sup>13</sup> Bakker 1999: 59, 2001: 14-23, 2005: 123-124; Mumm 2004, especially § 8. See also Hackstein 2010: 405: *the augment serves as a foregrounding device attaching salience to the proposition* and Bertrand 2006a, 2010: 579-588.

<sup>14</sup> Hoffmann 1967: 104-106, 266-267: *Zeitstufenlosigkeit und Nicht-Bericht („Erwähnung“) sind demnach der Funktion des Injunktivs eigentümlich* - quote is from page 267).

<sup>15</sup> Mumm 2004: § 8 and § 10, Bertrand 2006a, 2010: 579-588; De Decker (ftc a, ftc b).

he praises the victor, whose victory due to Apollon's support and the victor's genes, his father being victorious in the games as well. Pindar continues by saying that a mortal who can obtain victories himself and can also see his son become a victor reaches the *summum* of human happiness. This is comparable to the life of the Hyperboreans, a people knowing no misfortune and living in a land where the Muses often sing. Pindar then relates how Perseus once visited this land, and how he also slew the Medousa with help of Athena and freed his abducted mother Danae. Then Pindar turns away from the divinities, states that poets should vary their manner of praise and finishes by hoping that the victor will be loved in his homeland.<sup>16</sup>

As the myth of Perseus plays an important role in Pythian 12 as well, it is best to summarise it here.<sup>17</sup> Danae was the daughter of King Akrisos who had received an oracle that his daughter would bear a son who would kill him. He locked her in a tower, but Zeus came to her through golden rain and fathered Perseus with her. As a result, Akrisos put Danae and Perseus in box in the sea. Washed ashore in Seriphos, Diktys found them and welcomed them. When his brother, Polydeukes, the king of Seriphos, wanted to marry Danae against her will, Perseus decided to leave and to bring him the Gorgo's head a marriage gift. On that journey he received help from Hermes and Athene, who told him that the Graiai could lead him to the Nymphs, who have the weapons needed for the killing of the Medousa. He then proceeded to the Graiai, the daughter of sea god Phorkys with only one tooth and eye. Perseus stole the eye and forced them to reveal where he could find the Nymphs. He then travelled to the Nymphs, obtained the weapons and continued his journey to the land of the Hyperboreans, where he slew the Medousa and put her head in his magical box. On his return home, he first rescued Andromede and married her, before reaching Seriphos, freeing his mother and turning Polydeukes into a stone, after which he gave the Medousa-head to Athene, who put it on her shield. Eventually, Perseus killed his grandfather during a discus-throwing contest.

I now analyse the use of the augment in this Ode. I list all the forms and determine whether or not they are metrically secure. There are 4

<sup>16</sup> For this introduction see Gildersleeve 1885: 349-351; Race 1997: 366-367, 388-389, cf. infra.

<sup>17</sup> See Käppel 1997 with an overview of the ancient sources on this myth as well.

augmented and 4 unaugmented verb forms in this Ode, besides the ones that were metrically insecure.<sup>18</sup>

ἀνέειπεν (P10,9): the unaugmented ἀνά(�)ειπεν would not violate the metre either and therefore this form is not metrically secure.

ἔπραξεν (P10,11): at this position in the verse a word of the ο— seems to be preferred, but the requirement is not absolute (see P10,47 or P10,59), and therefore, this form is not metrically secure.

Both forms are transmitted with an augment, which could be explained by the fact that they refer to the recent victory, but as the forms are not guaranteed by the metre, nothing can be said with certainty.

ἔθηκε (P10,15): this form is augmented, because it refers to the victories of Hippokleas' father and is thus close to the deixis of the victor.

ἔδαισατο (P10,31): this verb is augmented, because it introduces Perseus, the main mythical character, and describes how he visited the Hyperboreans, the prototypical example of a worriless and blessed people.

μόλεν (P10,45): the absence of the augment in this form is somewhat surprising, as it refers to the arrival of Perseus and to the fact that he was the son of Danae and that he was guided by Athene. The only possible explanation is that Perseus' arrival had been announced already and that it did not contain any new information anymore.

ἄγειτο (P10,45): as the α of ἄγειτο is long by nature, it is impossible to decide whether the form is augmented or not.

ἔπεφνεν (P10,46), ἥλυθε (P10,47): these forms are augmented, because they refer to the heroic exploits of Perseus to kill the Medousa and to avenge the kidnapping of his mother, Danae, by turning the people into stone using the Gorgon's head.

ἔρωτες ἔκνιξαν φρένας (P10,60): the sequence ᔁρωτες ᔁκνιξαν φρένας is a correction by Mair for the transmitted ᔁρως ᔁκνιξε φρένας or ᔁκνιξε ᔁρως φρένας (quoted in the *Etymologikon Mega*), and was adopted by Snell & Maehler and Race.<sup>19</sup> Aldus Manutius suggested ᔁρως ᔁκνιξέ γε φρένας, while Hermann suggested ᔁρως ὑπέκνιξε φρένας and Boeckh ᔁρως ὑπέκνισε φρένας.<sup>20</sup> Considering all the suggestions, I believe that the correction by Aldus

<sup>18</sup> My starting point is the edition by Snell & Maehler 1987, but occasionally I prefer the transmitted reading over the conjectures printed in their edition (this is then noted in the footnotes).

<sup>19</sup> Snell & Maehler 1987: 98; Race 1997: 374.

<sup>20</sup> Aldus was quoted in Heyne 1798: 394, who printed his correction; Hermann 1798: 297; Boeckh 1811: 123. Boeckh's correction was adopted by Bergk 1843: 132; Fennell 1879: 248; Gildersleeve 1885: 117.

is the closest to the transmitted text. The form ἔκβιξε is a gnomic aorist and describes a general truth. It is thus very near to the deixis of poet, audience and victor, but the transmitted forms, albeit all augmented, are not metrically secure, since they violate the metre. The probative value is therefore limited. Gnomic aorists tend to be augmented in epic Greek:<sup>21</sup> in the *Iliad* we have 16 metrically secure augmented and 4 unaugmented gnomic aorist forms,<sup>22</sup> in the *Odyssey* there are 10 metrically secure augmented and 3 unaugmented forms,<sup>23</sup> in the *Theogony* there are 8 augmented and 3 unaugmented forms,<sup>24</sup> and in the *Works and Days* we find 13 augmented and 5 unaugmented instances.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> An overview of the scholarship on (the origin of) the gnomic aorist cannot be performed here; the literature on this topic is large, but for in-depth discussions with more literature on the topic, see Platt 1891; Bakker 2001, 2002; Pagniello 2002: 74-84; De Decker 2016a: 87-99 and Wakker 2017.

<sup>22</sup> The augmented instances are *Iliad* 1.279, 9.509, 9.633, 13.278 (one could interpret this instance as a simile as well), 13.730, 13.734, 13.734, 16.689, 17.32, 10.177, 18.108, 18.309, 19.131 (in this instance one can doubt the gnomic nature, as one could also argue that the fact that Zeus send Ate to the humans and that she causes problems afterwards, is simply an action in the past with relevance for the present, but the fact that Ate causes problems for mankind is a general truth), 19.222, 20.198, 24.531 and the unaugmented ones are 4.320, 9.320, 11.28 (adding the augment against the transmission here would require the elision of the dative singular ending in -ι and that is so rare, that the unaugmented form can count as secure, against Platt 1891: 220), 24.49.

<sup>23</sup> The augmented instances are *Odyssey* 1.216, 7.217, 8.579 (in this instance both the augmented and the unaugmented form have been transmitted, West printed the augmented form, but Van Thiel the unaugmented one; the augmented form can count as secure because otherwise we would have a word starting in the first foot, ending in the second one and having an end syllable long by position, which is extremely rare; this law has been discovered by Gerhard, Giseke, and Hilberg, and states that if the second foot of the hexameter is a spondee, word end at 2c is only allowed if the second half foot is long by nature, see Gerhard 1816: 140; Giseke 1864: 128-134; Hilberg 1879: 129, 263; Vergados 2013: 60), 11.201, 11.433, 14.87, 14.464, 14.466, 19.334, 19.592 and the unaugmented ones 8.431 (adding the augment against the codices as was suggested by Platt 1891: 218; Wackernagel 1904: 6 and Chantraine 1948: 484 would require an elision and a caesura to coincide and this is very rare, so that the absence of the augment can count as secure), 14.465, 17.271.

<sup>24</sup> The augmented instances are *Theogony* 418, 442, 443, 608, 615, 805, 974, 974 and the unaugmented ones are 512, 601, 602.

<sup>25</sup> The augmented instances are *WD* 92, 218, 224, 242, 246, 289, 345, 355, 355, 372, 451, 508, 676, 677 and the unaugmented ones 20 (in this instance also the present indicative is transmitted, but the unaugmented gnomic aorist is clearly the *lectio difficilior*, although one could not even exclude that it is an unaugmented imperfect or an present injunctive), 345, 705, 741, 804 (if this one is indeed gnomic).

**τόδ’ ἔζενξεν** (P10,65): as τόδ(ε) is actually quasi-proclitic, it is impossible to decide whether the original text had τόδ’ ἔζενξεν or τόδες ζενξεν and this form is not metrically secure. If the transmitted form were to be trusted, the use of the augment could be explained by the fact that it refers to the victor and his willingness to favour the poet. The link with the *near-deixis* would thus be very clear.

### 3. The analysis of the Pythian Ode 6

This Ode is dedicated to Xenokrates who won a chariot race, but most of the Ode is devoted to his son, Thrasyboulos, who is compared to Antilokhos, a young warrior who decided to die to save his father, Nestor. Besides eulogising Thrasyboulos, Pindar also praises Aphrodite and the Graces.<sup>26</sup>

**ἔγεντο** (P6,28): this verb is augmented, because it introduces Antilokhos, the mythical exemplum used as praise for Thrasyboulos. The codices have ἔγένετο, which Schmid corrected ἔγένετο into ἔγεντο and all other editors adopted his correction.<sup>27</sup> The transmitted reading was accepted by De Pauw, Hermann and Heyne, who stated that in the first iambus of this Ode a tribrachys could be used as well,<sup>28</sup> but this was not mentioned in e.g. Snell & Maehler's metrical overview of this Ode.<sup>29</sup>

**ὑπερέφθιτο** (P6,30): if this form is a pluperfect, it is impossible to decide whether or not it is augmented, but if it is a root aorist, it is augmented and in that case the augment would indicate and emphasise the exceptional sacrifice Antilokhos made in favour of his father.

**ἄρμ’ ἐπέδα** (P6,32): in this position in the Ode, a word of three syllables is preferred at the end, but words of four syllables (as in Ἐμμενίδαις, line 5, or in ἐν καθαρῷ, a preposition followed by a noun such as in line 14) are also found, so that I consider this elided form to be non-mandatory and metrically insecure.

**ἔφεπεν** (P6,33), **βόασε** (P6,36): these forms are unaugmented, because they do not refer to Antilokhos, but to Nestor (Antilokhos' father), who was

<sup>26</sup> For the introduction see Gildersleeve 1885: 315-316; Race 1997: 322-323.

<sup>27</sup> Heyne 1798: 335 mentioned Schmidt's correction. Snell & Maehler 1987: 84 stated that the correction was made by Triklinios.

<sup>28</sup> De Pauw, mentioned by Heyne 1798: 335; Heyne 1798: 335; Hermann 1798: 285.

<sup>29</sup> Snell & Maehler 1987: 83.

chased and in danger, and shouted to his son for help. As Nestor is not the main protagonist of the story, the forms have no augment.

ἀπέριψεν (P6,37): there is no difference between the augmented ἀπέριψεν and the unaugmented ἀπόριψεν, and the form is therefore insecure, but if one accepted the transmitted form, the augment would refer to the fact that Nestor's plea did not miss its effect.

πρίατο (P6,39): this form is unaugmented and that is remarkable, because it refers to Antilokhos and he is the main protagonist and serves as mythical exemplum. One could explain the absence by the fact that this is not a new action. That Antilokhos would die for his father had been announced already by ὑπερέφθιτο (P6,30) and implied by ἀπέριψεν (P6,37).

ἐδόκησεν (P6,40): this form is augmented, because it states that Antilokhos is held in high esteem because of his sacrifice. This form announces the transition from the myth to the deixis of victor and poet.

ἔβα (P6,45): this form is augmented, because it directly refers to Thrasyboulos and the present day.

εὗρες (P6,50): it is impossible to know if this form was augmented or not, because εὗρες and ηὗρες would both fit the metre. This also applies to ἐφεῦρε (P12,7) and εὗρεν (P12,40).

#### 4. The analysis of the Pythian Ode 12

This Ode is dedicated to Midas, who won the flute-contest. As the flute is considered an invention by Athene, she is the goddess who is praised along the victor and as surrounding myth the story of Perseus and Danae is used (cf. supra). I now analyse the forms in the Ode.

ἐφεῦρε (P12,7): see εὗρες in P6,50.

ἄτε (P12,10): as the α of ᄂτε is long by nature (see e.g. *Odyssey* 1,298), it is impossible to decide whether the form is augmented or not.

ἄνυσεν (P12,11): this aorist is an augmented aorist, because it introduces the story of Perseus (the main myth in this Ode) and also already announces his victory. The form ᄂνυσεν is the reading of the codices, but the skholia have ᄂνυσσεν, which was changed into ᄂνυσσεν by Boeckh,<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Boeckh 1811: 128. This reading was also printed by Mommsen 1866: 125; Gildersleeve 1885: 121, 365 and Schroeder 1900: 269.

but as the transmitted reading can be defended (Race translated “cried out in triumph”),<sup>31</sup> I see no reason to change it.

ἀμαύρωσεν (P12,13): this is an unaugmented aorist (as the ἀ- is short, the form is unaugmented). This could be surprising, because the protagonist of the blinding is Perseus and he is the main mythical character in this Ode (the blinding to which Pindar refers, is actually the theft of the single eye that the Graiai possessed). One could tentatively argue that the blinding is not the main action in Perseus’ story, but rather the killing of the Medousa and the stone-turning of Polydektes (cf. infra). Φόρκοι’ ἀμαύρωσεν is the reading of the codices, but Hermann and Boeckh changed it into Φόρκοιο μαύρωσεν,<sup>32</sup> presumably because the ending -οιο is never elided in epic Greek. In Hesiod both the verb ἀμαυρώ and μαυρώ are attested (the former in *WD* 693 and the latter in *WD* 325) and the former is much more common, so that I see no compelling reason to doubt the transmitted text.<sup>33</sup> Reading Φόρκοι’ ἀμαύρωσεν or Φόρκοιο μαύρωσεν does not affect the analysis of the augment.

θῆκε (P12,14): this form refers to the fact that Perseus avenged the kidnapping and forced marriage of his mother and turned Polydektes, who was responsible for this, into stone by using the Gorgo’s head against him. As this is the most important action in the entire Perseus-story, we would have expected an augmented verb form, and yet θῆκε is unaugmented and that is a notable exception.

ἐρρύσατο (P12,19): this form is augmented, because it describes how Athene protected and guided Perseus on his mission. As Athene is the goddess of the flute-playing and Perseus the main mythical character, the augment use in a verb form referring to both of them is logical.

τεῦχε (P12,20): this form refers to the creation of the flute-playing by Athene. As the victor obtained his victory in flute-playing and the goddess of the flute is Athene, we would have expected the augment here. This, again, is a notable exception.

εὔρεν (P12,22): see εὔρες in P6,50.

ώνόμασεν (P12,23): This form describes how Athene not only created a new instrument, but also give it its name. This form describes an action

<sup>31</sup> Race 1997: 391. This reading was also printed by Snell & Maehler 1987: 102.

<sup>32</sup> Boeckh 1811: 128, Hermann was quoted in Bergk 1843: 139 who adopted this correction and by Mommsen 1866: 125, who maintained the transmitted form. The correction was also printed by Snell & Maehler 1987: 102 and Race 1997: 392.

<sup>33</sup> The transmitted form was printed by Schroeder 1900: 269.

performed by Athene and explains the origin and name of an instrument that still exists at the moment of speaking. Such aetiological descriptions often have the augment (a famous example is the explanation of Aineias' name in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite 198-199).<sup>34</sup> As this form refers to an action by Athene in which she favoured mankind and provides an explanation for the name of an instrument that is linked to the victor, the *near-deixis* is clear and the use of the augment is expected. The form ὠνόμασεν is found in the codices, but Mommsen changed it into ὠνύμασεν (probably because that form was used in Pindar's dialect),<sup>35</sup> but as ὠνόμασεν is the form that can be found in epic as well, it cannot be excluded that Pindar used it because of its epic veneer. As such, I see no reason to adopt the change (contrary to Snell & Maehler and Race).<sup>36</sup>

## 5. The analysis of the Olympian Ode 14

This very short Ode is dedicated to Asopikhos and honours predominantly the Kharites (Graces).<sup>37</sup> There are only two forms in this Ode.

ἐμολον (O14,18): this form is augmented, because it refers to the entry and arrival of the poet himself. The *near-deixis* is therefore clear.

ἐστεφάνωσε (O14,24): this form is augmented, because it describes how the entire world and even the deceased relatives of Asopikhos (Persephone refers to the Underworld) need to know that he has been crowned as a winner. Again, the *near-deixis* is clear.

## 6. The analysis of the Pythian Ode 7

This equally very short Ode is dedicated to Megakles for his victory in the chariot race. He belonged to a prominent Athenian family with a pedigree from Kleisthenes to Perikles (the Alkmaionidai-family) and Pindar not only praises Megakles and Apollon, but also Athens as a city, by clearly referencing the role of Athens in rebuilding the temple of Apollon in 548 BC.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>34</sup> De Decker 2019: 44.

<sup>35</sup> Mommsen 1866: 125. This had already been suggested by Hermann 1809: xxi.

<sup>36</sup> Schroeder 1900: 269; Snell & Maehler 1987: 102; Race 1997: 392.

<sup>37</sup> Race 1997: 209.

<sup>38</sup> Race 1997: 331.

ἔτευξαν (P7,12): this form refers to the restoration of Apollon's temple by the Alkmaionidai-family and as this belongs to the praise of Athens and is closely connected to the victor's family, the use of the augment is expected.

## 7. Conclusion

In this short article I discussed the use of the (un)augmented forms in the five oldest odes of Pindar. As starting point I used the observations made for the augment use in epic Greek, namely that the augment was used to refer to past actions in the *near-deixis* or to emphasise certain elements in the discourse or story. I applied this to the five oldest Pindaric Odes and after establishing the metrically secure forms, I was able to determine that this distinction was also valid for Pindar; when events that referred to the poet, the victor, his family or city, the god(dess) to whom the hymn was dedicated or to the main mythical protagonist (every Pindaric Ode had one myth as “decoration”) were related, the augment was used, but when other past events were related or reference was made other characters in the myths, the augment was not used. It is true that the number of instances in these oldest Odes is relatively small and that there are some exceptions as well. For the absence of the augment in πρίστο (P6,39), μόλεν (P10,45) and ἀμαύρωσεν (P12,13) an explanation can be found, but in θῆκε (P12,14) and τεῦχε (P12,20) the absence of the augment is very surprising and cannot be explained. Although this is no explanation for the exceptions, it has to be noted that there are also noteworthy exceptions in epic Greek. Future research will have to show if these uses also apply to the larger and largest Pindaric Odes (such as P4).

## References

- Allan, R. (2016), “Tense and Aspect in Greek: Two Historical Developments; Augment and Perfect”, in S. Runge & C. Fresch (eds.), *The Greek Verb Revisited*. Bellingham: Lexham Press, 81-121.
- Bakker, E. (1999), “Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer”, in J. Kazazis & A. Rengakos (eds), *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris. N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart: Steiner, 50-65.
- Bakker, E. (2001), “Similes, Augment and the Language of Immediacy”, in J. Watson (ed.), *Speaking Volumes. Orality & Literacy in the Greek & Roman World*. Leiden: Brill, 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: Centre of Hellenic Studies. <https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/5165>
- Basset, L. (1989), “L’augment et la distinction discours/récit dans l’Iliade et l’Odyssé”, in M. Casevitz (ed.), *Études homériques*. Lyon: Travaux de la Maison de l’ Orient, 9-16.
- Bergk, T. (1843), *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. Leipzig: Reichenbach.
- Bertrand, N. (2006a), “La localisation des formes intransitives d’ἔστημι. Le rôle de ἔστη 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.
- Bertrand, N. (2010), *L’ordre des mots chez Homère. Structure informationnelle, localisation et progression du récit*. PhD thesis. Sorbonne.
- Boeckh, A. (1809), *Über die Versmasse des Pindaros*. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung.
- Boeckh, A. (1811), *Pindari Opera quae supersunt*. Tomus Primus. Leipzig: Weigel.
- Bottin, L. (1969), “Studio dell’aumento in Omero”, *SMEA* 10: 69-145.
- Braswell, B. (1980), “Three Linguistic Notes on Pindar”, *Glotta* 58: 205-222.
- Braswell, B. (1982), “Two Supplementary Notes on Pindar”, *Philologus* 126: 310-313.
- Braswell, B. (1988), *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Braswell, B. (1992), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One*. Fribourg: University Press.
- Braswell, B. (1998), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Cannatà Fera, M. (1990), *Pindarus Threnorum Fragmenta*. Roma: Edizioni dell’ Ateneo.
- Carey, C. (1981), *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar*. New York: Arno.
- Charnraine, P. (1948), *Grammaire homérique*. Paris: Klincksieck
- De Decker, F. (2015a), “The augment in Homer, with special attention to speech introductions and conclusions”, in F. De Decker, K. Jakob, M. Klumm, M. Kunzmann, I. Lindbüchl, & T. Stoll (eds), *JournalLIPP 4 Proceedings of the 21<sup>st</sup> 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* 84: 259-317.
- De Decker, F. (2017), “Ομηρος ἔξ Όμηρου σαφηνίζειν: an analysis of the augment use in *Iliad* 1”, *JIES* 47: 58-171.
- De Decker, F. (2018a), “The augment use of Greek ἔειπον / εἶπον in epic Greek: an evidential marker?”, *SO* 92: 2-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00397679.2019.1586133>
- De Decker, F. (2018b), “The use and absence of the augment in the forms ἔδωκ(ε) (v) and δῶκ(ε)(v) in the *Odyssey*”, *Listy Filologické* 141: 7-44.
- De Decker, F. (2019a), “The augment use in *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (HH 2)”, *Glotta* 95: 46-100.
- De Decker, F. (2019b), “Studies in Greek epic diction, metre and language: the augment use in *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (HH 5)”, *IJDL* 16: 1-86.
- De Decker, F. (ftc a), “The semantics and pragmatics of the augment in epic Greek”, To appear in the Proceedings of the *International Congress of Ancient Greek Linguistics*.
- De Decker, F. (ftc b), “A morphosyntactic analysis of the augment in epic Greek”, To appear in the Proceedings of the *Arbeitstagung of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft*.
- 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.
- Euler, W. (1995), “Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen”, in W. Smoczyński (ed), *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume, Part One*. Cracow: Universitas, 137-142.
- Farnell, L. R. (1932), *Pindar. A Commentary*. London: Macmillan.
- Fennell, C. A. M. (1879), *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fennell, C. A. M. (1883), *Pindar: The Nemean and Isthmian Odes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- García-Ramón, J. L. (2012), “TAM, Augment and Evidentiality in Indo-European”. Handout from the Workshop *Grammatische und lexikalische Strukturen im Wandel* held in Cologne, March 21<sup>st</sup> - 23<sup>rd</sup> 2012.
- Gerber, D. (1982), *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Gerber, D. (1999), “Pindar, Nemean 6: A Commentary”, *HSCP* 99: 33-91.

- Gerber, D. (2002), *A Commentary on Pindar Olympian Nine*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Gerhard, E. (1816), *Lectiones Apolloniana*e. Leipzig: Fleischer
- Gildersleeve, B. L. (1885), *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York: Harper.
- Giseke, B. (1864), *Homerische Forschungen*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Hackstein, O. (2010), “The Greek of Epic”, in E. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 401-423.
- 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: 435-453.
- Hermann, G. (1798), „Commentatio de Metris Pindari“, in C.G. Heyne, *Pindari Carmina cum Lectionis Varietate et Adnotationibus iterum curavit Chr. Gottl. Heyne*. Volumen III. Göttingen: Dieterich, 180-356.
- Hermann, G. (1809), *De Dialecto Pindari Observationes*. Leipzig: Klaubarth.
- Heyne, C. G. (1798), *Pindari Carmina cum Lectionis Varietate et Adnotationibus iterum curavit Chr. Gottl. Heyne*. Volumen I. Göttingen: Dieterich.
- Hilberg, I. (1879), *Das Princip der Silbenwägung in der griechischen Poesie*. Wien: Hölder.
- Hoffmann, K. (1967), *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Hummel(-Israel), P. (1993), *La syntaxe de Pindare*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Käppel, L. (1997), *Perseus*. Consulted online: “Perseus”, in Der Neue Pauly, Herausgegeben von: Hubert Cancik, Helmuth Schneider (Antike), Manfred Landfester (Rezeptions- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte). Consulted online on 10 April 2020 <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347\\_dnp\\_e915230](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_dnp_e915230)>
- Kirkwood, G. (1982), *Selections from Pindar. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Koch, K. (1868), *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*. Braunschweig: Meyer
- Lazzeroni, R. (1977), “Fra glottogonia e storia: ingiuntivo, aumento e lingua poetica indoeuropeo”, *SSL* 17: 1-30.
- Lazzeroni, R. (2017), “Divagazioni sull’ aumento in Omero”, in G. Marotta & F. Strik Lievers (eds.), *Strutture linguistiche e dati empirici in diacronia e sincronia*. Pisa: Pisa University Press, 33-56.
- Mommsen, T. (1866), *Pindari Carmina Edidit Tycho Mommsen*. Berlin: Weidmann.

- Mumm, P.-A. (1995), “Verbale Definitheit und der vedische Injunktiv”, in H. Hettrich & W. Hock (eds), *Verba et Structurae. Festschrift für Klaus Strunk*. Innsbruck: IBS, 169-193.
- Mumm, P.-A. (2004), “Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments”, in T. Krisch (ed), *Analecta homini universalis dicata. Festschrift für Oswald Panagl*. Stuttgart: Heinz, 148-158.
- Pagniello, F. (2002), *The Augment in Homer*. PhD Thesis, University of Georgia at Atlanta. Electronic Publication.
- Pagniello, F. (2007), “The past-iterative and the augment in Homer”, *IF* 112: 105-123.
- Platt, A. (1891), “The Augment in Homer”, *JPh* 19: 211-237.
- Privitera, G. A. (1982), *Pindaro: Le Istmiche*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Race, W. (1997), *Pindar: Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rodeghiero, S. (2017), “L‘aumento in Omero tra narrazione e sintassi”, in F. Logozzo & P. Poccetti (eds.), *Ancient Greek Linguistics. New Approaches, Insights, Perspectives*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 625-640.
- Schroeder, O. (1900), *Pindari Carmina Recensuit Otto Schroeder*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Schroeder, O. (1922), *Pindars Pythien*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Seymour, T. D. (1882), *Selected Odes of Pindar, with Notes and an Introduction*. Boston: Ginn.
- Snell, B., & Maehler, H. (1987), *Pindarus. Pars I. Epinicia*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Turyn, A. (1952), *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Verdenius, W. (1987), *Commentaries on Pindar I*. Leiden: Brill.
- Verdenius, W. (1988), *Commentaries on Pindar II*. Leiden: Brill.
- Vergados, A. (2013), *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Wackernagel, J. (1904), *Studien zum griechischen Perfektum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Wakker, G. (2017), “The Gnomic Aorist in Hesiod”, in K. Bentein, M. Janse, & J. Soltić (eds.), *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*. Leiden: Brill, 84-99.
- West, M. (1989), “An Unrecognized Injunctive Usage in Greek”, *Glotta* 67: 135-138.
- Willcock, M. (1995), *Pindar. Victory Odes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Willi, A. (2007), “Of aspects, augments, aorists – or how to say to have killed a dragon”, in C. George, B. Nielsen, A. Ruppel, & O. Tribulato (eds), *Greek*

- and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 34-48.
- Willi, A. (2018), *The Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Young, D. (1965), “Some Types of Scribal Errors in Manuscripts of Pindar”, *GRBS* 6: 247-273.
- Young, D. (1983), “Pindar Pythians 2 and 3: Inscriptional ποτέ and the ‘Poetic Epistle’”, *HSCP* 87: 31-48.