

## The use and absence of the augment in the forms ἔδωκ(ε)(v) and δῶκ(ε)(v) in the *Iliad*, compared and contrasted with the overall data of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*

Filip De Decker

Universiteit Gent (Ghent, Belgium); University of Verona (Verona, Italy);  
filipdedecker9@gmail.com

**Abstract.** In this article, I discuss the use and absence of the augment in the 3<sup>rd</sup> singular forms ἔδωκ(ε)(v) and δῶκ(ε)(v) in the *Iliad*. This article is a continuation of earlier research into the augment in other epic works (*Odyssey*, Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and the Epic Cycle) and other verbal roots (such as ἔθηκε/θήκε and ἔειπε/ἔϊπε), but as all these works and verbs have their own semantics, I decided to perform individual investigations, the data of which are then compared and contrasted with the data of the entire Homeric works. In order to have reliable data that are not influenced by the transmission, I only use the metrically secure forms. First, I list the criteria to determine whether or not a form can be considered secured by the metre (metrical bridges, caesurae, and permitted and prohibited elisions) and then apply these rules to all instances of ἔδωκ(ε)(v) and δῶκ(ε)(v) in the *Iliad*. Once the corpus has been established, I analyse the forms and the passages in which they occur. In my analysis I check if they agree with the previous syntactic and semantic observations that have been made for the use and absence of the augment (Drewitt-Beck's clitic rule, Kiparsky's reduction rule and the distinctions between speech and narrative, foreground and background, and remote and recent past). Occasionally, the data of the corpus were too small to allow for a judgement, but in those instances, to decide on the issue, I compared the results obtained in my investigation to the data of the entire *Iliad* and/or *Odyssey*. The current investigation does indeed confirm the findings of earlier research, namely that the use of augmented and unaugmented forms is not governed by chance or the metre, but by syntactic and semantic factors. As a final *caveat* it has to be added, however, that some exceptions do remain and that none of the rules quoted above is absolute.

**Keywords:** augment, injunctive, Greek verbal syntax, epic Greek, Homer, *Iliad*, Indo-European verbal system, aorist.

**Acknowledgment.** The article was made possible by a fellowship BOF.PDO.2016.0006.19 of the research council of the Universiteit Gent (BOF, *Bijzonder Onderzoeks-fonds*), by a travel grant V426317N for a research stay in Oxford and a travel grant V403120N for a research stay in Verona (provided for by the FWO Vlaanderen, *Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Vlaanderen*, Science Foundation Flanders) and by a postdoctoral fellowship 12V1518N, granted by the FWO Vlaanderen. It was conducted and finalised while working as a visiting scholar in Verona at the ERC Starting Grant Project Pre-Classical Anatolian Languages in Contact (PALaC, Grant Agreement n. 757299), under the guidance of the Principal Investigator, Professor Federico Giusfredi.

## Наличие и отсутствие аугмента в формах ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) и δῶκ(ε)(ν) в «Илиаде» в сравнении с особенностями употребления аугмента в «Илиаде» и «Одиссее»

**Ф. Де Декер**

Гентский университет (Гент, Бельгия); Университет Вероны (Верона, Италия);  
filipdedecker9@gmail.com

**Аннотация.** В статье обсуждаются особенности употребления аугмента в формах 3 л. ед. ч. ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) и δῶκ(ε)(ν) в «Илиаде» Гомера. Статья является продолжением серии исследований, посвященных употреблению аугмента в других эпических памятниках (в «Одиссее», «Гомеровских гимнах», поэмах эпического цикла и Гесиода), а также на материале других глаголов (например, ἔθηκε / θῆκε и ἔειπε / εἶπε). Результаты частных исследований планируется в дальнейшем сравнить с данными всего гомеровского корпуса. В статье используются метрически надежные формы с указанием критериев метрической надежности. Предлагается анализ того, насколько наличие или отсутствие аугмента соответствует предлагавшимся ранее синтаксическим и семантическим объяснениям (правило клитик Древитта и Бека, правило редукции Кипарского, выражение противопоставлений речь vs. нарратив, основное vs. фоновое действие, давнее vs. недавнее прошедшее).

**Ключевые слова:** аугмент, аорист, иньюнктив, древнегреческий синтаксис, Гомер, индоевропейский глагол

## 1. The choice of this specific corpus

I chose the forms ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) and δῶκ(ε)(ν) in the *Iliad*,<sup>1</sup> for the following reasons: all these forms belong to a very common root and are thus attested in a variety of contexts; the forms are all active, so that the augment use could not be dependent on the choice of diathesis; they are all third person singular and as such, the number is ruled out as criterion; in the past, it has been argued that aorists were more often augmented than imperfects and that younger aorists had more augments than older forms,<sup>2</sup> 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 (with the exception of the verse initial position,

---

<sup>1</sup> I include *Iliad* 10, although many scholars doubt its authenticity, but for the investigation at hand, the issue is irrelevant. The text is quoted after [Van Thiel 1996, 2010] and is compared to [West 1998, 2000; Monro, Allen 1902a, 1902b; Ludwich 1892, 1897; Nauck 1877; La Roche 1873; Bekker 1858]. West's editions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, although considered nowadays to be the standard, are often less reliable and more controversial than Van Thiel's, because West often preferred reintroducing archaisms, such as replacing contractions by short vowels (sometimes even with an elision before the caesura), and striking "secondary" iota subscriptum in some verbal endings such as the third person singular ending in -ησι but not in the second person singular in -ησθα. For a critical discussion of the *Iliad*-editions, see [Janko 2000] and [Führer, Schmidt 2001]. There are also some notable differences between the *Iliad*-edition [West 1998, 2000] and the edition of *Odyssey* [West 2017], such as the augmentation of the verb ἔλκω: regardless of the transmission, West augmented every form of this verb in the edition of *Iliad*, but left the augment out in each form in the *Odyssey*; the same applies to the pluperfect of the verb οἶδα: in the *Iliad* this was consistently printed as the unaugmented εἶδη (a form that has never been attested in any manuscript), but ubiquitously augmented in the edition of *Odyssey*, ἦδη.

A discussion of the origin of the augment (including Willi's reduplication theory as argued in [Willi 2007, 2018: 358–417], the augment in Mycenaean and other non-epic Greek literary texts and the augment in other Indo-European languages cannot be performed here (it was done in [De Decker 2018: 10–16]).

<sup>2</sup> The difference between the different types of aorists had been suggested by Blumenthal [1975: 72–77], followed by Lazzeroni [1977: 22–23].

because ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) cannot be used there), 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.<sup>3</sup> The reason to choose this verb and limit the investigation to the *Iliad* alone is due to the fact that other verbs are used in other contexts and that while the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* might treat the same epic material, their content and set-up is fundamentally different: there are much more speeches and interactions in the *Odyssey* and the temporal span is much larger, whereas the *Iliad* is more narrative and more restricted in its timeframe, and therefore it would not be suited to investigate one verbal stem for the entire epic corpus. An additional reason for performing separate investigation per epic work is that the work would otherwise surpass the limits of a normal article.

## 2. Determining the corpus: the metrically secure forms

As is known, the augment is not mandatory in epic Greek nor is it always guaranteed in our transmitted text.<sup>4</sup> In order to have reliable data, I will use the following methodology, which is the same for the entire corpus of epic. I address the criteria in more detail, because the problematic transmission and the metrical insecurity of many forms require a more thorough investigation to acquire usable data.

The prototypical hexameter has the following structure:<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The works by Bakker [1999; 2005] and Mumm [2004] only discussed on the aorist in the *Iliad*; Bakker [2002] dealt with the aorist in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollon* and Bertrand [2006a] with the augmented and unaugmented forms of root aorist στῆ/ἔστη.

<sup>4</sup> For an overview of the scholarship, see [Bottin 1969: 69–82; De Decker 2015b: 241–290 (with a list of 20 rules governing the augment use), 2016a: 34–37; 2018: 10–16 (on the origin and semantics); Willi 2018: 358–381].

In the large works on Greek and Indo-European syntax [Delbrück 1871; 1893; 1897; 1900; Stahl 1907] the origin and meaning of the augment has not been addressed.

<sup>5</sup> This is the notation used by Janse [2003; 2014].

— $\ddot{\omega}$ //	— $\ddot{\omega}$ //	— $\ddot{\omega}$ //	— $\ddot{\omega}$ //	— $\ddot{\omega}$ //	— $\ddot{\omega}$
1a 1b 1c	2a 2b 2c	3a 3b 3c	4a 4b 4c	5a 5b 5c	6a 6b

In determining “word end”, I consider enclitics to be part of the word after which they appeared, and proclitics to belong to the word that follows.<sup>6</sup> To determine the validity of the presence or absence of the augment in  $\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa(\epsilon)(v)$  and  $\delta\tilde{\omega}\kappa(\epsilon)(v)$ , I use the following rules:<sup>7</sup>

- 1) the absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite creates an unmetrical verse; this guarantees the forms in *Il.* 1, 347; 2, 103, 2, 104; 2, 105; 5, 2; 5, 26; 5, 266; 5, 272; 5, 363; 5, 325; 6, 193; 7, 149; 7, 154; 7, 303; 7, 471; 10, 269; 10, 270; 11, 20; 11, 244; 16, 252; 16, 655; 21, 32; 22, 404; 22, 470; 23, 390; 23, 512; 23, 824; 23, 864; 23, 896;
- 2) the absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the elision of the dative plural ending of consonant stems in  $-\sigma\upsilon/ -\psi\upsilon/-\xi\upsilon$ , the dative singular ending in  $-\iota$ , the  $-\alpha$  of the relative pronoun or the article, or the word final  $-v$ ;<sup>8</sup> this guarantees the absence of the augment in *Il.* 12, 437; 13, 727; 15, 310; 15, 455; 16, 799; 17, 193; 17, 698; 23, 296; 23, 612; 23, 616;

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> For more details the readers are referred to [De Decker 2017: 59–73; 2019: 47–56].

<sup>8</sup> See [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  $-v$  was not discussed in [La Roche 1869], which means that he had not found any instances in which it occurred.

- 3) the absence or presence of the augment is secure, if the opposite requires the violation Hermann's Bridge: this bridge states that there cannot be a word end between 4b and 4c, and is one of the strictest bridges in epic poetry, with very few exceptions (about 0,3 %);<sup>9</sup> this guarantees the absence of the augment in *Il.* 17, 698; 23, 612; 23, 616 (in these three cases together with the elision of the dative ending), *Il.* 24, 594;
- 4) the use or absence of an augment is secure, if the opposite causes the violation of Gerhard-Hilberg's Law, which 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;<sup>10</sup> this guarantees the augment in *Il.* 10, 255; 13, 730; 14, 86; 16, 250; 21, 84; 21, 216;
- 5) the use or absence of an augment is secure, if the opposite yields the violation of Gerhard's Bridge, which states that if the 5<sup>th</sup> foot is a spondee, there should not be word end at 5c;<sup>11</sup> this guarantees the augment in *Il.* 1, 279; 2, 827; 5, 397; 7, 4; 8, 216; 9, 367; 11, 243; 11, 288; 11, 300; 11, 704; 15, 719; 16, 844; 18, 456; 19, 204; 19, 414; 21, 41; 23, 298; 23, 746.

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. [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 1982: 13–16; West 1982: 36–38, 1997: 222–225; Barnes 1986; Van Raalte 1986: 97–98; Sicking 1993: 73–79; Nünlist 2000:112].

<sup>10</sup> See [Gerhard 1816: 140; Hilberg 1879: 129, 263; Grashof 1852: 15–16; Vergados 2013: 60; Oswald 2014: 422 (limiting it to post-classical Greek only). Although they did not name this law explicitly, Bekker [1858, 1863] and Nauck [1877] used it in their editions (often changing the texts against the manuscripts, cf. *infra*).

<sup>11</sup> See [Gerhard 1816: 142–147; Hermann 1816: 220; Bekker 1863: 147–148; Monro 1891: 341; Maas 1923: 22; Korzeniewski 1968: 30; West 1982: 37; Snell 1982: 13–16; Van Raalte 1986: 37–38; Sicking 1993: 73–74; Vergados 2013: 59–60 (about *HH* 4 specifically)]. For a detailed treatment of spondaic verses in epic Greek, see [Ludwich 1866].

We have established the augment in 23 forms and the absence of it in 40 forms; there are 19 forms that cannot be determined by metrical laws and they will be left out of the discussion. I now proceed to the actual analysis.

### 3. The actual analysis: the syntactic factors

#### 3.1. “Drewitt-Beck’s clitic rule”

It has been argued in the past that a past tense form followed by a 2<sup>nd</sup> position clitic or a postpositive (enclitics and words that cannot be put in the beginning of a sentence) is generally unaugmented. This was first noted by Drewitt and was expanded to the entire Homeric corpus by Beck (who also included a syntactic analysis for this phenomenon).<sup>12</sup> Our corpus confirms this: there are 9 instances in which a form is followed by a clitic and in all instances, the form is unaugmented,<sup>13</sup> as is the case for in δῶκε in the *Odyssey* (in that work there are 10 instances and all have an unaugmented verb).<sup>14</sup> This is in line with the overall data of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: in the *Iliad* there are 676 instances without augment versus 107 with it, which makes 86 % of unaugmented forms, while in the *Odyssey* there are 443 instances without augment versus 114 with it, which makes 80 % of unaugmented forms [De Decker 2020a: 471].

<sup>12</sup> See [Drewitt 1912b: 104, 1913: 350; Beck 1919]. Beck specifically linked this phenomenon and the placement of the “Wackernagel clitics”. The rule is therefore best called “Drewitt-Beck’s Rule”. See also [Marzullo 1952: 415; Bottin 1969: 99–102; Rosén 1973: 316–320; Bakker 1999: 53–54; de Lamberterie 2007: 53; García-Ramón 2012: §B.2.3; De Decker 2015a: 56, 2015b: 249–250, 312, 2016a: 56–59, 2017: 79, 128–129, 2018: 29–31 (with a more detailed syntactic analysis applying Wackernagel’s Law and the Greek accentuation rules to this phenomenon); Hajnal 2016a: 13, 2016b: 446–447].

<sup>13</sup> The instances are *Il.* 1, 347; 5, 325; 6, 193; 7, 149; 7, 154; 21, 32; 23, 390; 23, 512; 23, 896.

<sup>14</sup> See [De Decker 2018: 30] with a list of the instances.

We give one example (in what follows, augmented forms will be underlined and unaugmented forms will be put in bold face).

- (1) **δῶκε** δ' Ἐρευθαλίωνι φίλῳ θεράποντι φορῆναι  
 'He gave it to Ereuthalion, his beloved servant, to carry it.' (Il. 7, 149).

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

### 3.2. Kiparsky's reduction rule

Kiparsky argued that in PIE in a sequence of marked forms only the first one was marked and the others appeared in the neutral form:<sup>15</sup> 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 forms 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*,<sup>16</sup> although *markedness reduction* might be a better term. This is not confined to augmented indicatives, but also applied to case,<sup>17</sup> moods,<sup>18</sup> tense<sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup> 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; De Decker 2015a: 57–59; 2015b: 250–254; 2016a: 58–71; 2017: 83–84, 130–135].

<sup>16</sup> [Kiparsky 1968; Fortson 2004: 140; Clackson 2007: 132; Luraghi 2014].

<sup>17</sup> [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 2016a: 59–60] for a critical discussion.

<sup>18</sup> [Kiparsky 1968] *passim*.

<sup>19</sup> [Kiparsky 1968: 39–42].

and compounding.<sup>20</sup> Kiparsky himself argued that the rule was absolute, but that many examples of it were obscured by the transmission; for Vedic, he explicitly ruled out that the injunctive could be used to mention events, as Hoffmann had argued,<sup>21</sup> because such a “memorative” was typologically rare, if not non-existent.<sup>22</sup> Levin, who agreed with Kiparsky, noted that in many instances either the reduction did not occur or the augmented form was preceded by an unaugmented one; in addition, there were several passages in which only unaugmented forms were found.<sup>23</sup> 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 be a considerable amount of exceptions.<sup>24</sup> The corpus used in this investigation has 13 examples,<sup>25</sup> but also 5 exceptions.<sup>26</sup> The overall figures of the *Iliad* confirm the tendency, but also show that there are many exceptions: there are 2955 unaugmented verb forms that follow an augmented form, but also 1302 augmented forms that do, which makes an observation rate of 69 %, while the *Odyssey* has 2070 unaugmented forms and 1152 augmented ones, yielding an observation rate of 64 % [De Decker 2020a: 471].

I now give one example in favour and one against it (as was stated above, the augmented forms are underlined while the unaugmented ones are put in bold face and the metrically insecure forms are italicised):

<sup>20</sup> [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].

<sup>21</sup> Hoffmann [1967] used the term *Memorativ*.

<sup>22</sup> [Kiparsky 2005:§1]: *There seem to be no languages with a mood whose function is “mentioning” or “reminding”*), see also [Kloekhorst 2017: 300].

<sup>23</sup> [Levin 1969]. For a detailed discussion of this phenomenon see [De Decker 2016a: 58–71] and for a possible explanation combining semantics and syntax, see [De Decker 2020a: 455–456; 2020b: 114–115].

<sup>24</sup> [De Decker 2016a: 58–71] for Hesiod and [De Decker 2017: 130–135] for *Iliad* 1).

<sup>25</sup> The examples are *Iliad* 1, 347; 2, 103; 2, 104; 2, 105; 5, 325; 10, 269; 10, 270; 11, 244; 15, 455; 16, 252; 22, 404; 23, 612; 23, 616.

<sup>26</sup> The exceptions are *Iliad* 16, 250, 18, 456; 19, 414; 21, 41; 23, 746.

- (2) ἦ ῥα, καὶ Ἀντιλόχοιο Νοήμονι δῶκεν ἑταῖρον  
 ἵππον ἄγειν· ὃ δ' ἔπειτα λέβηθ' ἔλε παμφανόοντα.  
 Μηριόνης δ' ἀνάειρε δύω χρυσοῖο τάλαντα  
 τέτρατος, ὡς ἔλασεν. πέμπτον δ' ὑπελείπει ἄεθλον,  
 ἀμφίθετος φιάλη· τὴν Νέστορι δῶκεν Ἀχιλλεὺς  
 Ἀργείων ἄν' ἀγῶνα φέρων, καὶ ἔειπε παραστάς  
 'So he spoke and he gave to Noemon, Antilokhos's friend a horse  
 to carry. He then took the ever-shining cauldron. Meriones, as he  
 had finished fourth, lifted two talents of gold (as prize). The fifth  
 prize, a saucer with two handles, remained. Akhilleus carried it  
 through the assembly of the Argives and gave it to Nestor, and  
 standing next to him, he spoke.' (*Il.* 23, 612–617).

In this instance, the augmented ἦ is followed by the unaugmented δῶκεν, ἔλε, ἀνάειρε, ἔλασεν and δῶκεν.

There are also exceptions, as can be seen below.

- (3) καὶ νῦν κεν αὐτῆμαρ πόλιν ἔπραθον, εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων  
 πολλὰ κακὰ ῥέξαντα Μενoitίου ἄλκιμον υἱὸν  
 ἔκταν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι καὶ Ἑκτορι κῦδος ἔδωκε  
 'And now they would have sacked the city on that same day, if  
 Apollon had not killed the brave son of Menoitios, who was doing  
 many evil things, and had given fame to Hektor.' (*Il.* 18, 454–456).

In this instance, ἔδωκε is augmented, although it is preceded by the augmented forms ἔπραθον and ἔκταν.

It seems that the rule was not as rigid as Kiparsky believed it to be and it is therefore more likely that it was rather a strong tendency against using too many augmented forms in one passage;<sup>27</sup> 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 Gāthās and Yašts, but this is clearly not the case.

<sup>27</sup> As was described by Meillet [1913: 115–116] for Armenian and expanded to the other languages with an augment by de Lamberterie [2007: 39, 45].

## 4. The actual analysis: the semantic criteria

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

### 4.1. Speeches versus narrative passages

The first important distinction is that between speeches and narrative descriptions. The latter has much less augmented forms than the former.<sup>28</sup> There are two explanations for this: the first one argues that the speeches belong to the younger linguistic stratum and therefore have much more augments,<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup> There are 17 forms of our corpus attested in a speech of which 12 are augmented<sup>31</sup> and 5 are unaugmented.<sup>32</sup> There

---

<sup>28</sup> [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].

<sup>29</sup> This theory was taken the furthest by Pelliccia [1985, especially 31–35]: he argued that the earliest Greek epic did not have speeches, that the injunctive was a valid category referring to timeless (*Hymnal*) events and that the reduction was still a valid rule. Later, the rule was no longer understood and the poet(s) felt that the augmented and unaugmented forms could be used without distinction. In a later stage, in which the augment had become more common, speeches were added and as speeches were younger, they had more augmented forms and this then led to more augmented forms being introduced into the poems. As a formula could now appear with an augment in a speech and without it in a narrative passage, the forms with and without an augment were even more considered to be equivalent, leading to a complete loss of the original distinction.

<sup>30</sup> This viewpoint was already adopted by Platt [1891] and Drewitt [1912a], and was expanded by Bakker [1999; 2005: 114–153] and Mumm [2004].

<sup>31</sup> The forms are *Il.* 1, 279; 5, 397; 9, 367; 11, 288; 11, 704; 13, 730; 14, 86; 15, 719; 16, 844; 19, 414; 21, 84; 21, 216.

<sup>32</sup> The instances are *Il.* 5, 266; 5, 272; 7, 154; 13, 727; 24, 594.

are 46 forms attested in narrative, of which 35 are unaugmented<sup>33</sup> and 11 augmented.<sup>34</sup> 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 completely missing in narrative. The augment use in speeches and narrative is also dependent on other factors: in speeches without a clear connection to the present or in sentences that relate something unimportant, the augment is not used. This had been noted before for the speeches by Nestor in *Iliad* 1 and those by Glaukos and Diomedes in *Iliad* 6,<sup>35</sup> and is confirmed by the overall figures of the *Iliad*: we have 621 augmented and 655 unaugmented forms in a speech (49% augments) against 1344 augmented and 3201 unaugmented forms in narrative (29% augments) [De Decker 2020a: 465]. The data of the *Odyssey* depict a similar picture, but that work has also two passages in which speech acts as narrative, namely Menelaos' defence speech (in Book 4 Menelaos was asked why he did not act and avenge the death of his brother Agamemnon, and in a very long speech, he tried to defend himself and explain why he could not have done anything to prevent the murder from happening—this could be called *Menelaos' Apologoi*) and Books 9–12, the so-called *Apologoi* (in these books Odysseus explains to the Phaiakians how his men died due to their own stupidity and how he tried to save them, but did not succeed. As he tries to defend his actions, these books are called *Apologoi*. In those books, there are also “genuine” speeches, e.g. when Odysseus speaks to his men or to the gods). Below I give the data for those works as well [De Decker 2020a: 466–467; 2020b: 112–113]: we

---

<sup>33</sup> The instances are *Il.* 1, 347; 2, 103; 2, 104; 2, 105; 5, 2; 5, 26; 5, 325; 5, 363; 6, 193; 7, 149; 7, 303; 7, 471; 10, 269; 10, 270; 11, 20; 11, 244; 12, 437; 15, 310; 15, 455; 16, 252; 16, 665; 16, 799; 17, 193; 17, 698; 21, 32; 22, 404; 22, 470; 23, 296; 23, 390; 23, 512; 23, 612; 23, 616; 23, 684; 23, 824; 23, 896.

<sup>34</sup> The instances are *Il.* 2, 827; 7, 4; 8, 216; 10, 255; 11, 300; 16, 250; 18, 456; 19, 204; 21, 41; 23, 298; 23, 745.

<sup>35</sup> 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; De Decker 2017: 136–138].

have 718 augmented and 709 unaugmented forms in a speech (50 % augmentations) against 673 augmented and 1560 unaugmented forms in narrative (30 % augmentations), 326 augmented and 476 unaugmented forms in *Odysseus' Apologoi* (41 % augmentations) against 23 augmented and 37 unaugmented forms in *Menelaos' Apologoi* (38 % augmentations). It will be noted that not only the figures between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are strikingly similar, but also that the defence speeches by Odysseus and Menelaos are very close in augmentation and that they constitute a middle ground between speech and narrative.

#### 4.2. 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.<sup>36</sup> 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).

- (4) Ἑκτωρ Πριαμίδης, ὅτε οἱ Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκε  
 ‘Hektor, son of Priam, when Zeus gave him fame...’ (*Il.* 8, 216; 11, 300; 19, 204).

This formula appears three times in the *Iliad* to emphasise that Hektor received his fame from Zeus. Therefore, the verb form ἔδωκε is augmented. A special case of unexpected information is the following passage:

- (5) ὦς Τρῶες ποταμοῖο κατὰ δεινοῖο ῥέεθρα (25)  
 πτώσσον ὑπὸ κρημνούς. ὃ δ' ἐπεὶ κάμει χεῖρας ἐναίρων,  
 ζωὸς ἐκ ποταμοῖο δωδέκα λέξαστο κούρου

<sup>36</sup> [Mumm 2004; De Decker 2016a: 81–84; 2018: 13–14 with more references and quotes; 2020a: 459–456; 2020b: 107–115].

ποινήν Πατρόκλοιο Μεινοιτιάδαο θανόντος:  
 τοὺς ἐξῆγε θύραζε τεθηπότας ἤυτε νεβρούς,  
**δήσε** δ' ὀπίσσω χεῖρας εὐτμήτοισιν ἰμάσι, (30)

τοὺς αὐτοὶ **φορέεσκον** ἐπὶ στρεπτοῖσι χιτῶσι,  
**δῶκε** δ' ἐταίροισιν κατάγειν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας.  
 αὐτὰρ ὃ ἄψ **ἐπόρουσε** δαΐζέμεναι μενεαίνων.  
 ἔνθ' οὖει Πριάμοιο *συνήντετο* Δαρδανίδαο  
 ἐκ ποταμοῦ φεύγοντι Λυκάονι, τόν ρά ποτ' αὐτὸς (35)

ἦγε λαβὼν ἐκ πατρὸς ἄλωῆς οὐκ ἐθέλοντα  
 ἐννύχιος προμολών· ὃ δ' ἐρινεὸν ὀξεῖ χαλκῷ  
**τάμνε** νέους ὄρηκας, ἴν' ἄρματος ἄντυγες εἶεν·  
 τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἀνώϊστον κακὸν ἤλυθε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.  
 καὶ τότε μὲν μιν Λῆμνον εὐκτιμένην **ἐπέρασσε** (40)

νηυσὶν ἄγων, ἀτὰρ υἱὸς Ἰήσονος ὦνον **ἔδωκε**:  
 κεῖθεν δὲ ξεινός μιν **ἐλύσατο** πολλὰ δ' **ἔδωκεν**  
 Ἴμβριος Ἡετίων, **πέμψεν** δ' ἐς δῖαν Ἀρίσβην:  
 ἔνθεν ὑπεκπροφυγῶν πατρώϊον **ἵκετο** δῶμα.  
 ἔνδεκα δ' ἤματα θυμὸν **ἐτέρπετο** οἷσι φίλοισιν (45)

ἐλθὼν ἐκ Λήμνοιο: δυωδεκάτη δὲ μιν αὖτις  
 χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος θεὸς **ἐμβάλεν**, ὅς μιν **ἐμელε**  
 πέμψειν εἰς Αἶδαο καὶ οὐκ ἐθέλοντα νέεσθαι.  
 τὸν δ' ὡς οὖν **ἐνόησε** ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς  
 γυμνὸν ἄτερ κόρυθός τε καὶ ἀσπίδος, οὐδ' **ἔχεν** ἔγχος, (50)  
 ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ῥ' ἀπὸ πάντα χαμαὶ **βάλε**: **τεῖρε** γὰρ ἰδρῶς  
 φεύγοντ' ἐκ ποταμοῦ, κάματος δ' ὑπὸ γούνατ' **ἐδάμνα**:  
 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα **εἶπε** πρὸς ὄν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν:

‘So the Trojans along the course of the terrible river shrank under the bluffs. He, when his hands grew weary with killing, chose out and took twelve young men alive from the river to be vengeance for the death of Patroklos, the son of Menoitios. These, bewildered with fear like fawns, he led out of the water and bound their hands behind them with thongs well cut out of leather, with the very belts they themselves wore on their ingirt tunics, and gave them to his companions to lead away to the hollow ships, then himself whirled back, still in a fury to kill men. (25–33)

And there he came upon a son of Dardanian Priam as he escaped from the river, Lykaon, one whom he himself had taken before and led him unwilling from his fathers gardens on a night foray. He with the sharp bronze was cutting young branches from a fig tree, so that they could make him rails for a chariot, when an unlooked-for evil thing came upon him, the brilliant Akhilleus, who that time sold him as slave in strong-founded Lemnos carrying him there by ship, and the son of Iason paid for him; from there a guest and friend who paid a great price redeemed him, Eëtion of Imbros, and sent him to shining Arisbe; and from there he fled away and came to the house of his father. For eleven days he pleased his heart with friends and family after he got back from Lemnos, but on the twelfth day once again the god cast him into the hands of Akhilleus, who this time was to send him down unwilling on his way to the death god. Now as brilliant swift-footed Akhilleus saw him and knew him naked and without helm or shield, and he had no spear left, but had thrown all these things on the ground, being weary and sweating with the escape from the river, and his knees were beaten with weariness, disturbed, Akhilleus spoke to his own great-hearted spirit: (34–53).<sup>37</sup> (*Il.* 21, 25–53).

After Patroklos was killed and the news came to Akhilleus, he became inhumanely angry and started killing many Trojans and taking others as prisoners and slaves. That was related with mostly unaugmented verb forms (25–33: 1 augmented and 7 unaugmented forms). During his killing spree, Akhilleus suddenly noticed a Trojan he had spared in the past; as Akhilleus was killing scores of Trojans avenging Patroklos's death, the fact that he spared someone in the past is remarkable, hence the preponderance of augmented forms in that part of the story (34–53: 11 augmented and 6 unaugmented forms). The passage also shows that Kiparsky's reduction rule was not a mechanic syntactic law of Homeric Greek.

---

<sup>37</sup> Translation from the *Chicago Homer*.

### 4.3. 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.

- (6) ἀλλὰ θεῶν ὄριστος, ὃν ἠΰκομος **τέκε** Λητώ,  
ἔκταν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι καὶ Ἔκτορι κῦδος ἔδωκε  
 ‘But the best of the gods, whom Leto bore, has killed him in the front  
 line of the battle and has given fame to Hektor.’ (*Il.* 19, 413–414).

This passage describes how Akhilleus horse Xanthos told him that Patroklos had died by the hands of Apollon and as a consequence of his own carelessness and hybris, and not because they (sc. the horses) had failed him. This is a very unusual passage (there are no parallels in the *Iliad* of speaking horses). As Xanthos’s explanation that they are not to blame is the most important element in the story, the verbs referring to Patroklos’s death are augmented. Later in his speech, Xanthos will even prophesy Akhilleus’s own death.

### 4.4. 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.<sup>38</sup> This explains why the augment is used in sentences with the adverb νῦν, as this refers to an action in the immediate past.<sup>39</sup>

- (7) νῦν ἡμῖν πάντων Ζεὺς ἄξιον ἦμαρ ἔδωκε  
 νῆας ἐλεῖν, αἱ δεῦρο θεῶν ἀέκητι μολοῦσαι  
 ‘Now Zeus has given us this day worthy of all to take the ships,  
 which came here against the will of the gods...’ (*Il.* 15, 719–720).

<sup>38</sup> Platt [1891] used the term “perfect aorist” to describe these forms. See also [Drewitt 1912a, 1912b, 1913; Bakker 1999, 2002, 2005].

<sup>39</sup> [Platt 1891; Drewitt 1912a: 44; Bottin 1969: 87–89, 135–136; Bakker 1999: 53, 60–62; García Ramón 2012: §F1b].

In this passage, Hektor incited the Trojans that the moment had now come to destroy the Greek ships for once and for all. As Hektor's speech refers to an action that has just occurred, the augment is used in ἔδωκε.

#### 4.5. Remote past

When actions in a remote or mythical past are described, the augment is absent.<sup>40</sup> The distinction background/foreground and near/remote past also applies to speeches: when a speaker relates something that s/he experienced in the near past, s/he uses augmented verb forms, but when remote stories are related, the unaugmented forms are used. I now give two examples illustrating the absence of the augment in a description of an event in a remote past:<sup>41</sup>

- (8) ἀλλ ὅτε δὴ γίνωσκε θεοῦ γόνον ἦν ἔοντα  
αὐτοῦ μιν κατέρυκε, δίδου δ ὅ γε θυγατέρα ἦν,  
δῶκε δέ οἱ τιμῆς βασιληΐδος ἥμισυ πάσης:  
καὶ μὲν οἱ Λύκιοι τέμενος τάμιον ἔζοχον ἄλλων  
καλὸν φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης, ὄφρα νέμοιτο.  
'But when the king understood that he was of noble birth of a god,  
he held him there, gave him his daughter, offered him half of the  
entire kingly privilege; the Lykians cut out a piece of land, bigger  
than all the others, excellent to carry fruits and to plough, that he  
could rule over.' (*Il.* 6, 191–195).

This passage occurs in Glaukos's speech to Diomedes in which he explained that his lineage went back to Bellerophon. He also related his (B) exploits and adventures. As they belong to the remote past, the Bellerophon-story has very few augmented forms [De Decker 2016b: §10.2, §10.3].

<sup>40</sup> For Homer, see already [Platt 1891; Drewitt 1912a, 1912b]. Hoffmann [1967: 160–213] noted the use of the injunctive in contexts that he described as *fernere nicht historische Vergangenheit*. See also [Strunk 1968; Euler 1995].

<sup>41</sup> See [Bakker 1999: 54–56] for a discussion of *Iliad* 2, 100–107.

- (9) τὴν ῥά ποτ' ἐξ Ἐλεῶνος Ἀμύντορος Ὀρμενίδαο  
 ἐξέλετ' Αὐτόλυκος πυκινὸν δόμον ἀντιτορήσας,  
 Σκάνδειαν δ' ἄρα δῶκε Κυθηρίῳ Ἀμφιδάμαντι:  
 Ἀμφιδάμας δὲ Μόλω δῶκε ξεινήϊον εἶναι,  
 αὐτὰρ ὁ Μηριόνη δῶκεν ᾧ παιδί φορῆναι:  
 ‘Autolykos stole it out of Eleon at one time from Amyntor, son  
 of Ormenidas, after he had broken into his house. He gave it  
 to Amphidamas from Kypros in Skandeia. Amphidamas gave it  
 to Molos to be a guest gift and he gave it to his son to carry it.’  
 (*Iliad* 10, 266–270).

This passage described the origin of Odysseus’s helmet: it was first stolen by his grandfather Autolykos and then “travelled” as a gift between several families before ending with Odysseus again. This story refers to a set of events far from the current story and therefore there are no augmented verb forms used. The description of the helmet is not part of the main storyline either and could also be an example of a background description being narrated with unaugmented verb forms.

There are nevertheless also stories where not all remote events are related with an unaugmented verb form. In our corpus, we find the following story about the funerary games in honour of Patroklos:

- (10) Πηλεΐδης δ' αἶψ' ἄλλα τίθει ταχυτῆτος ἄεθλα (740)  
 ἀργύρεον κρητῆρα τετυγμένον: ἕξ δ' ἄρα μέτρα  
 χάνδανεν, αὐτὰρ κάλλει ἐνίκα πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶψα  
 πολλόν, ἐπεὶ Σιδόνες πολυδαίδαλοι εὖ ἤσκησαν,  
 Φοίνικες δ' ἄγον ἄνδρες ἐπ' ἠεροειδέα πόντον,  
 στήσαν δ' ἐν λιμένεσσι, Θόαντι δὲ δῶρον ἔδωκαν: (745)  
 υἱὸς δὲ Πριάμοιο Λυκάονος ὄνον ἔδωκε  
 Πατρόκλῳ ἥρωϊ Ἰησονίδης Εὐνήος.  
 καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλεὺς θῆκεν ἀέθλιον οὗ ἑτάριοιο,  
 ὃς τις ἐλαφρότατος ποσσὶ κραιπνοῖσι πέλοιτο:  
 δευτέρῳ αὖ βουῖν θῆκε μέγαν καὶ πίονα δημῶ, (750)  
 ἡμιτάλαντον δὲ χρυσοῦ λαισθήϊ' ἔθηκε.  
 ‘At once the son of Peleus set out prizes for the foot-race:  
 a mixing-bowl of silver, a work of art, which held only six

measures, but for its loveliness it surpassed all others on earth by far, since skilled Sidonian craftsmen had wrought it well, and Phoenicians carried it over the misty face of the water and set it in the harbour, and gave it for a present to Thoas. Euneos, son of Iason, gave it to the hero Patroklos to buy Lykaon, Priams son, out of slavery, and now Akhilleus made it a prize in memory of his companion, for that man who should prove in the speed of his feet to run lightest. For second place he set out a great ox with fat deep upon him, and for the last runner half a talents weight of gold.<sup>42</sup> (*Il.* 23, 740–751).

In this passage Homer described how Akhilleus organised the funerary games for Patroklos and set out the prizes for the winners in the different disciplines. One of the prizes is a silver mixing bowl. Its history is not the main line of the story and yet, there are three augmented verb forms. One could argue that the augment in ἔδωκε connects the remote story with the present day situation of Akhilleus via Patroklos to whom the games are dedicated, but that does not apply to ἔδωκαν.

What has been noted in §4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 is an additional illustration of the fact that the distinction speech — narrative was not the main deciding factor, but that the use of the augment was determined by the factors recent versus remote past and foreground versus background. More than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* this is shown by the augmentation figures of Hesiod:<sup>43</sup> the *Theogony* describes the cosmogony and refers to a mythical past, and has 118 augmented and 220 unaugmented verb forms, which is 35 % (comparable to that of the *Iliad*), while the *Works and Days* are a description of how to live one's life and an exhortation to his brother Perses to act righteously and refrain from betraying him, and thus refer to everyday life more than any other work from early epic Greek, and have 52 augmented and 33 unaugmented forms, which is 61 %, the highest percentage of augmented forms of any early epic Greek work.

<sup>42</sup> Translation taken from the *Chicago Homer*.

<sup>43</sup> The analysis was made in [De Decker 2016a].

#### 4.6. Gnostic 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.<sup>44</sup> There are two examples of this in our corpus (1, 279 and 13, 730). One example is

- (11) σκηπτούχος βασιλεύς, ᾧ τε Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκεν  
 ‘... the sceptre-bearing king, to whom Zeus has given the fame.’  
 (*Il.* 1, 279).

---

<sup>44</sup> Döderlein was the first to use this term: *Da nun dieser Aorist in allgemeinen Sätzen und Denkprüchen seinen eigentlichen Platz findet, so dürfte er in den Grammatiken zweckmässig der gnomische Aorist genannt werden* ([Döderlein 1847: 136], emphasis taken from the original text). The literature on the gnostic aorist is large, some examples (the list is obviously not exhaustive): [Moller 1853; 1854; Franke 1854; Van Groningen 1948; Salmon 1960; Peristerakis 1962; Ruijgh 1971 (one of the most detailed treatments); Faulkner 2005].

That the gnostic aorist was almost always augmented in Homer, had been noticed very early on: [Platt 1891; Herbig 1896: 250–270; Delbrück 1897: 302; Wackernagel 1904: 5; 1920: 181; Brugmann 1916:11 (who noted that there was no explanation for this fact); Drewitt 1912a; 1912b; 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; Bertrand 2006b: 241; De Decker 2016a: 87–100; 2019: 61–65]. Allan [2016] and Wakker [2017] disagree with the assumption that the augment marks emphasis, but she (W) cannot explain why it is used in contexts that do not necessarily refer to past contexts alone (as is the case with the gnostic aorist), while he (A) assumes that the augment marked perfectivity.

The augment use in the gnostic aorist is nevertheless not absolute, as can be seen in *Il.* 4, 320; 9, 320; 14, 382; 24, 49; *Od.* 8, 481; 14, 465; 17, 271; *Theogony* 418, 442, 447 (the absence of the augment is not secured by the metre in that specific instance), 974 and *Works and Days* 17–20 (if the aorists in this passage are indeed gnostic), 345, 702–705, 740–741 (cf. [De Decker 2016a: 55–67]). See also [Wakker 2017].

In this verse Nestor told Akhilleus that it was his duty to obey Agamemnon, because as a king he had received his power and fame from Zeus. This is a general truth: in the eyes of the Greeks, all kings acquired their power by the grace of Zeus [De Decker 2017: 96, 141].

#### 4.7. Homeric *similia*

Closely related to the use of the augment in the gnomic aorist, is its use in the *similia*, the Homeric comparisons in which Homer compared a battle scene or another event to a scene from everyday life (mostly in the agricultural sphere).<sup>45</sup> As the similes compare an action in the recent past with occurrences in the past, and *they are “close” to the audience, in evoking a domestic rather than heroic, reality* [Bakker 2005: 114], their link with the present and the audience is evident and the use of the augment therefore does not surprise [Bakker 2005: 114, 121, 131–134]. In our corpus, there is one example:

- (12) ὧς εἰπὼν πυλέων ἐξέσσυτο φαίδιμος Ἴεκτωρ,  
 τῷ δ ἄμ Ἀλέξανδρος κί ἀδελφεός: ἐν δ ἄρα θυμῷ  
 ἀμφότεροι μέμασαν πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι.  
 ὧς δὲ θεὸς ναύτησιν ἐελδομένοισιν ἔδωκεν  
 οὔρον, ἐπεὶ κε κάμωσιν ἐϋξέστης ἐλάτησι (5)  
 πόντον ἐλαύνοντες, καμάτῳ δ ὑπὸ γυῖα λέλυνται,  
 ὧς ἄρα τῷ Τρώεσσιν ἐελδομένοισι φανήτην.

‘So speaking Hektor the glorious swept on through the gates, and with him went Alexandros his brother, both of them minded in their hearts to do battle and take their part in the fighting. And as to men of the sea in their supplication the god sends a fair wind, when they are breaking their strength at the smoothed oar-sweeps, driving over the sea, and their arms are weak with weariness, so these two appeared to the Trojans, who had longed for them.’<sup>46</sup> (*Il.* 7, 1–7).

<sup>45</sup> [Platt 1891; Drewitt 1912a; 1912b; 1913; Chantraine 1948: 484; Shipp 1972: 120; Bakker 2002: 75–77; 2005: 114, 121, 131–134].

<sup>46</sup> Translation taken from the *Chicago Homer*.

The form ἔδωκεν is augmented, because it compares the help that the Trojans under pressure receive from Hektor and Alexandros (i.e. Paris) to the favourable wind that seafarers receive when they are in trouble and hope for a divine salvation.

The observations of §4.6 and §4.7 are confirmed by an analysis of the entire epic corpus, but at the same time these overall epic data show that we cannot speak about an absolute rule: in Homer and Hesiod we have 48 augmented (16 in the *Iliad*, 9 in the *Odyssey*, 8 in the *Theogony* and 15 in the *Works and Days*) and 15 unaugmented gnomic aorists (4 in the *Iliad*, 3 in the *Odyssey*, 3 in the *Theogony* and 5 in the *Works and Days*), which is 76 % augmentation, and 97 augmented (83 in the *Iliad*, 14 in the *Odyssey*, and none in Hesiod) and 15 unaugmented forms in a simile (11 in the *Iliad*, 3 in the *Odyssey*, 1 in the *Theogony* and none in the *Works and Days*), which is 87 % augmentation [De Decker 2020a: 467].

#### 4.8. 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 [Bakker 2005: 126], unless the negation was linked to the speaker's deixis [Bakker 2005: 128–130]. In our corpus, there are three examples of ἔδωκεν or δῶκε combined with a negation, and there are 1 unaugmented (24, 594) and 1 augmented form (18, 456). Two examples are clearly insufficient to decide whether or not Bakker's observation is correct. Moreover, the augmented example is found in narrative, whereas the two unaugmented examples are found in a speech and are closely related to the speaker's and addressee's deixis. Even the metrically secure instances are problematic and we will discuss them below.

- (13) καί νύ κεν αὐτῆμαρ πόλιν ἔπραθον, εἰ μὴ Ἀπόλλων  
πολλὰ κακὰ ῥέξαντα Μενoitίου ἄλκιμον υἱὸν  
ἔκταν ἐνὶ προμάχοισι καὶ Ἴκτορι κῦδος ἔδωκε

‘And now they would have sacked the city on that same day, if Apollon had not killed the brave son of Menoitios, who was doing many evil things, and had given fame to Hektor.’ (*Il.* 18, 454–456).

The instance here described how Troy would already have been destroyed by the hands of Patroklos, if Apollon had not intervened and made Hektor kill him. This is a counterfactual construction, but what is counterfactual is the destruction of the city by the hands of Patroklos; the divine intervention and Hektor’s subsequent killing of Patroklos are real. The negated sentence is something that did occur. As such, the augment is not so unexpected. On the other hand, not all counterfactual *εἰ μή*-clauses have augmented verb forms [Krisch 1986].

- (14) μή μοι Πάτροκλε σκυδμαινέμεν, αἶ κε πύθῃαι  
εἰν Ἄϊδός περ ἐὼν ὅτι Ἔκτορα δῖον ἔλυσα  
πατρὶ φίλω, ἐπεὶ οὐ μοι ἀεικέα **δῶκεν** ἄποινα

‘Do not become angry with me, Patroklos, when you find out, even though you are in the Hades, that I have released divine Hektor to his beloved father, since/after he gave me a not unfitting ransom for it.’ (*Il.* 24, 592–594).

In this verse, Akhilleus begged for forgiveness from Patroklos after he released Hektors body. He stated that Priam had given a very large ransom for it. The sentence clearly refers to something in the recent past with reference to the deixis of both Akhilleus and Patroklos, and yet the verb is unaugmented. One could argue that the scope of the negation does not apply to the verb *δῶκεν* but rather to the adjective *ἀεικέα*, but the fact that the negation does not stand next to the adjective makes that less likely in my opinion. Even if the negation did not govern the verb, the absence of the augment is still remarkable. Arguing that the *ἐπεὶ*-clause is just a subordinate temporal clause describing the background is insufficient in my opinion, because there is a causal relationship between the paying of the ransom and the release of the body.

#### 4.9. 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, one would expect fewer augmented forms in subordinate clauses than in main clauses.<sup>47</sup> There are 16 forms attested in a subordinate clause, of which 7 are augmented<sup>48</sup> and 9 are not.<sup>49</sup> These figures indicate that mere subordination is not enough to account for the absence of the augment, but when we look at the 7 unaugmented instances, we note that 3 of the augmented instances are made up of the temporal clause Ἐκτῶρ Πριαμίδης, ὅτε οἱ Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκε, which has the augment, because it stresses that Hektor receives his protection from Zeus. The other augmented instance of a subordinate clause in narrative is the counterfactual example, discussed above. The three instances in a speech also involve events very close to the speaker and/or addressee (in 9, 367 ἔδωκε refers to the fact that Akhilleus received Briseis as a gift, before she was taken away from him and in 21, 216 ἔδωκε is used to describe that Zeus has given Akhilleus the power to kill as many Trojans as he wants). As such, we see that the augmented examples convey an element of focus. The augment in 5, 397 might surprise, unless we assume that Dione uses the verb to describe the pains caused to gods by other gods or mortals. There are nevertheless some exceptions, namely unaugmented instances where we would expect the augmented form:

- (15) πρίν γ ὅτε δὴ Ζεὺς κῦδος ὑπέρτερον Ἐκτορι δῶκε  
 ‘Until then Zeus gave the greater glory to Hektor.’ (*Il.* 12, 437).

---

<sup>47</sup> De Decker [2017: 146–147] explained the avoidance of augmented forms in subordinate clauses by *the fact that a subordinate clause is (almost by definition) the background and not the main line, and that the link to the present is therefore even more absent than in narrative in general.*

<sup>48</sup> The instances are *Il.* 5, 397; 8, 216; 9, 367; 11, 300; 18, 456; 19, 204; 21, 216.

<sup>49</sup> The instances are *Il.* 5, 266; 11, 20; 12, 437; 13, 727; 15, 310; 17, 193; 22, 470; 23, 296; 24, 594.

The absence in this instance is surprising because it describes Zeus's favouring of Hektor, but is related by an unaugmented verb form. Is it one of the exceptions proving the rule?

Besides this instance, also in 13, 727 the unaugmented δῶκε (and not ἔδωκε) is used to describe the fact that Hektor received his power from Zeus and in 24, 594 δῶκε describes the ransom Akhilleus received to release Hektor (cf. supra). The other unaugmented instances are six relative clauses, of which one (5, 266) described an event in a mythical past (the rape of Ganymedes) and five other instances, in which background information about the origin of a person or object are given.<sup>50</sup> One example of a subordinate clause with an unaugmented verb form is

(16) Ἀτρείδης δ' ἐβόησεν ἰδὲ ζώννυσθαι ἄνωγεν (15)

Ἀργείους: ἐν δ' αὐτὸς ἐδύσατο νόροπα χαλκόν.

κνημῖδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμησιν ἔθηκε

καλὰς ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας:

δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνε,

τόν ποτέ οἱ Κινύρης δῶκε ξεινήϊον εἶναι. (20)

πεύθετο γὰρ Κύπρονδε μέγα κλέος οὔνεκ Ἀχαιοὶ

ἔς Τροίην νήεσσιν ἀναπλεύσεσθαι ἔμελλον:

τοὔνεκά οἱ τὸν δῶκε χαριζόμενος βασιλῆϊ.

τοῦ δ' ἦτοι δέκα οἶμοι ἔσαν μέλανος κυάνοιο, (25)

δώδεκα δὲ χρυσοῖο καὶ εἴκοσι κασσιτέροιο:

κυάνεοι δὲ δράκοντες ὀρωρέχαστο ποτὶ δειρῆν

τρεῖς ἐκάτερθ' ἴρισσιν εὐικότας, ἅς τε Κρονίων

ἐν νέφεϊ στήριξε, τέρας μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

‘And Atreus’s son cried out aloud and drove the Akhaians to gird them, while he himself put the shining bronze upon him. First he placed along his legs the beautiful greaves linked with silver fastenings to hold the greaves at the ankles. Afterwards he girt on about his chest the corselet that Kinyras had given him once, to be a guest present. For the great fame and rumour of war had carried to Kypros how the Akhaians were to sail against Troy

<sup>50</sup> The instances are *Iliad* 11, 20; 15, 310; 17, 193; 22, 470; 23, 296.

in their vessels. Therefore he gave the king as a gift of grace this corselet. Now there were ten circles of deep cobalt upon it, and twelve of gold and twenty of tin. And toward the opening at the throat there were rearing up three serpents of cobalt on either side, like rainbows, which the son of Kronos has marked upon the clouds, to be a portent to mortals.’<sup>51</sup> (*Il.* 11, 15–28).

These verses describe how Agamemnon dressed for battle and the origin of his body armour. What is important is that Agamemnon prepares for battle (hence the augmented verb forms), the origin of his weapons and armour is of lesser importance (hence only one augmented verb form and 6 unaugmented verb forms, one being δῶκε in line 20 in a subordinate clause).

On their own, the data of §4.8 and 4.9 are too small to allow for decisive judgements, but when we compare them to the overall data of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and make a breakdown per part of speech, we note that it is not the mere presence of a negative element or the use in a subordinate clause that decides on the presence or absence of the augment, as negative and subordinate clauses in a speech and narrative have about the same degree of augmentation as their affirmative and main clause counterparts: for the *Iliad* overall (as quoted above already), we have 621 augmented and 655 unaugmented forms in a speech (49% augments) against 1344 augmented and 3201 unaugmented forms in narrative (29% augments), for negation we have 65 augmented and 56 unaugmented forms in a speech (54% augments — higher than expected) against 87 augmented and 184 unaugmented forms in narrative (32% augments) and for subordination there are 192 augmented and 200 unaugmented forms in a speech (49% augments) against 220 augmented and 355 unaugmented forms in narrative (38% augments — the only outlier in the data); for the *Odyssey* overall (as quoted above already as well), we have 718 augmented and 709 unaugmented forms in a speech (50% augments) against 673 augmented and 1560 unaugmented forms in narrative (30% augments), 326 augmented and 476 unaugmented forms in *Odysseus*’

---

<sup>51</sup> Translation taken from the *Chicago Homer*.

*Apologoi* (41 % augments) against 23 augmented and 37 unaugmented forms in *Menelaos' Apologoi* (38 % augments), while for the negation we have 82 augmented and 64 unaugmented forms in a speech (56 % augments) against 24 augmented and 45 unaugmented forms in narrative (35 % augments), 23 augmented and 30 unaugmented forms in *Odysseus' Apologoi* (43 % augments) against 3 augmented and 3 unaugmented forms in *Menelaos' Apologoi* and for subordination we have 207 augmented and 205 unaugmented forms in a speech (50 % augments) against 119 augmented and 249 unaugmented forms in narrative (32 % augments), 52 augmented and 80 unaugmented forms in *Odysseus' Apologoi* (39 % augments) against 3 augmented and 7 unaugmented forms in *Menelaos' Apologoi* [De Decker 2020a: 469; 2020b: 112–113]. As we observed with the discussion of speech versus narrative, foreground versus background and recent versus remote/mythical past, the conclusion seems be that more than any other criterion, the distinction foreground versus background is the main factor deciding on the use of the augment.

## 5. Conclusion

The investigation of the forms in the *Iliad* showed the use and absence of the augment were not metrically motivated, but could be explained by an interaction of syntactic and semantic factors. The augment was not used, when the past tense form was followed by a 2<sup>nd</sup> position clitic and was not preferred (or even avoided) when the verb form was preceded by another augmented form. It was used in statements of general validity (gnomic aorists and *similia*), actions describing a recent past, and when new elements in a story were added and it appeared more often in speeches than it was in narrative passages; it was not preferred (or even avoided) in stories relating a more distant or even mythical past, in side notes 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 above, but we believe that, overall, the tendencies can explain most of the (un)

augmented forms in early epic Greek. The data in this investigation almost completely agree with those of the investigation into the same form in the *Odyssey* (more than I would have expected given the somewhat different nature and content of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*). The comparison the overall data in early epic Greek confirms the data of this small investigation, but also highlights that the main factor determining use of the augment were the distinctions between foreground and background, and recent versus more remote / mythical past as is most strikingly shown in the differences between Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, but also showed that there were a substantial amount of exceptions, even in the categories of the gnomic aorist and the *similia*, which are generally considered to be exclusively augmented.

## References

### *Online resources:*

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

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

- Ahrens 1852 — H. Ahrens. *Griechische Formenlehre des Homerischen und Attischen Dialektes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1852.
- Allan 2016 — R. Allan. Tense and Aspect in Greek: Two Historical Developments; Augment and Perfect. S. E. Runge, C. J. Fresch (eds.). *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016. P. 81–121.
- Allen, Sikes 1904 — T. Allen, E. Sikes. *The Homeric Hymns*. London: Macmillan, 1904.
- Bakker 1999 — E. Bakker. Pointing to the Past: Verbal Augment and Temporal Deixis in Homer. J. Kazazis, A. Rengakos (eds.). *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris. N. Maronitis*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1999. P. 50–65.
- Bakker 2002 — E. Bakker. Remembering the Gods Arrival. *Arethusa*. 2002. Vol. 35. P. 63–81.
- Bakker 2005 — E. Bakker. *Pointing at the past: from formula to performance in Homeric poetics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Barnes 1986 — H. Barnes. The Colometric Structure of the Homeric Hexameter. *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies*. 1986. Vol. 27. P. 125–150.

- Basset 1989 — L. Basset. L'augment et la distinction discours/récit dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée. M. Casevitz. *Études homériques*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux, 1989. P. 9–16.
- Bassett 1919 — S. Bassett. The Theory of the Homeric Caesura According to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine. *American Journal of Philology*. 1919. Vol. 40. P. 343–372.
- Beck 1972 — R. Beck. A Principle of Composition in Homeric Verse. *Phoenix*. 1972. Vol. 26. P. 213–231.
- Beck 1914 — W. Beck. *De augmenti apud Homerum usu*. Giessen: Noske, 1914.
- Beekes 1972 — R. Beekes. On the Structure of the Greek Hexameter: 'O'Neill' Interpreted. *Glotta*. 1972. Vol. 6. P. 1–10.
- Bekker 1858 — I. Bekker. *Carmina Homerica. Volumen Prius. Ilias*. Bonn: Marcus, 1858.
- Bekker 1863 — I. Bekker. *Homerische Blätter. Beilage zu dessen Carmina Homerica*. Vol. 1. Bonn: Marcus, 1863.
- Bekker 1872 — I. Bekker. *Homerische Blätter. Beilage zu dessen Carmina Homerica*. Vol. 2. Bonn: Marcus, 1872.
- Bertrand 2006a — N. Bertrand. La localisation des formes intransitives δ'ῶστημι. Le rôle de ἔστη et στάς dans le récit homérique. *Gaia*. 2006. Vol. 10. P. 47–96.
- Bertrand 2006b — N. Bertrand. Présence du passé dans l'épopée homérique. À propos de *Pointing to the Past* de E. J. Bakker. *Gaia*. 2006. Vol. 10. P. 237–243.
- Blumenthal 1975 — H. Blumenthal. Some Homeric Evidence for the History of the Augment. *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 1975. Vol. 79. P. 67–77.
- Bottin 1969 — L. Bottin. Studio dell'aumento in Omero. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici*. 1969. Vol. 10. P. 69–145.
- Brugmann 1900 — K. Brugmann. *Griechische Grammatik*. München: Beck, 1900.
- Brugmann 1916 — K. Brugmann. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 2. Iss. 3. Strassburg: Trübner, 1916.
- Chantraine 1948 — P. Chantraine. *Grammaire homérique*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1948.
- Chantraine 1953 — P. Chantraine. *Grammaire homérique. Tome II: Syntaxe*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1953.
- Clackson 2007 — J. Clackson. *Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Clausen 1955 — W. Clausen. Silva Coniecturarum. *American Journal of Philology*. 1955. Vol. 76. P. 47–62.
- De Decker 2015a — F. De Decker. The augment in Homer, with special attention to speech introductions and conclusions. *JournalLIPP*. 2015. Vol. 4. P. 53–71.
- De Decker 2015b — F. De Decker. *A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Speech Introductions and Conclusions in Homer*. PhD Thesis. München: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, 2015. (<https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17995>; accessed on 17.05.2022).

- De Decker 2016a — F. De Decker. A contrastive analysis of the Homeric and Hesiodic augment, with special focus on Hesiod. *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics*. 2015. Vol. 13. P. 33–128.
- De Decker 2016b — F. De Decker. The augment use in Iliad 6: an evidential marker? *Les études classiques*. 2016. Vol. 84. P. 259–317.
- De Decker 2017 — F. De Decker. Ὀμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν: an analysis of the augment use in *Iliad 1*. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*. 2017. Vol. 45. P. 58–171.
- De Decker 2018 — F. De Decker. The use and absence of the augment in the forms ἔδωκ(ε)(v) and δῶκ(ε)(v) in the *Odyssey*, with a brief discussion of the origin of the augment. *Listy Filologické*. 2018. Vol. 141. P. 7–44.
- De Decker 2019 — F. De Decker. Studies in Greek epic diction, metre and language: the augment use in *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (HH 5). *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics*. 2019. Vol. 16. P. 1–86.
- De Decker 2020a — F. De Decker. The semantics and pragmatics of the augment in epic Greek. A semantic-pragmatic analysis of the augment in epic Greek, applied to some longer passages. M. Leiwo, M. Vierros, S. Dahlgren (eds.). *Papers on Ancient Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the Ninth International Colloquium on Ancient Greek Linguistics (ICAGL 9). 30 August — 1 September 2018, Helsinki*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2020. P. 447–477.
- De Decker 2020b — F. De Decker. An overall analysis of the augment in epic Greek and with facts and figures and applied to some longer passages. H. Bichlmeier, L. Repanšek, V. Sadovski (eds.). *Vácāmsi miśrā kṛṇavāmahai. Proceedings of the international conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies and IWoBA XII, Ljubljana 4–7 June 2019, celebrating one hundred years of Indo-European comparative linguistics at the University of Ljubljana*. Hamburg: Baar, 2020. P. 103–125.
- Delbrück 1879 — B. Delbrück. *Syntaktische Forschungen IV. Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1879.
- Delbrück 1893 — B. Delbrück. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. I*. Strassburg: Trübner, 1893.
- Delbrück 1897 — B. Delbrück. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. II*. Strassburg: Trübner, 1897.
- Delbrück 1900 — B. Delbrück. *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen. III*. Strassburg: Trübner, 1900.
- Döderlein 1847 — L. Döderlein. *Reden und Aufsätze*. Erlangen: Enke, 1847.
- Dressler 1969 — W. Dressler. Eine textsyntaktische Regel der idg. Wortstellung. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*. 1969. Vol. 83. P. 1–25.
- Dressler 1972 — W. Dressler. Über die Rekonstruktion der indogermanischen Syntax. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*. 1972. Vol. 85. P. 5–22.

- Drewitt 1912a — J. Drewitt. The augment in Homer. *Classical Quarterly*. 1912. Vol. 6. P. 44–59.
- Drewitt 1912b — J. Drewitt. The augment in Homer (continued). *Classical Quarterly*. 1912. Vol. 6. P. 104–120.
- Drewitt 1913 — J. Drewitt. A note on the Augment. *Classical Philology*. 1913. Vol. 8. P. 349–353.
- Euler 1995 — W. Euler. Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen. W. Smoczyński (ed.). *Kuryłowicz Memorial Volume, Part One*. Cracow: Uniwersytet Jagielloński Wydział Filologiczny, 1995. P. 137–142.
- Faulkner 2005 — A. Faulkner. Aphrodites Aorists: Attributive Sections in the Homeric Hymns. *Glotta*. 2005. Vol. 81. P. 60–79.
- Fortson 2004 — B. Fortson. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2004.
- Fortson 2010 — B. Fortson. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An introduction*. 2 ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 2010.
- Fraenkel 1960 — H. Fraenkel. Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter. H. Fraenkel. *Wegen und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*. München: Beck, 1960. P. 100–156.
- Franke 1854 — F. Franke. *Ueber den gnomischen Aorist*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1854.
- Führer, Schmidt 2001 — R. Führer, M. Schmidt. Review West 1998. *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*. 2001. Vol. 253. P. 1–32.
- García-Ramón 2012 — J. García-Ramón. 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.
- Gentile, Lomiento 2003 — B. Gentile, L. Lomiento. *Metrica e ritmica. Storia delle forme poetiche nella Grecia antica*, Mondadori: Mondadori Università, 2003.
- Gerhard 1816 — E. Gerhard. *Lectiones Apollonianae*. Leipzig: Gerh. Fleischer d. J., 1816.
- Giseke 1864 — B. Giseke. *Homerische Forschungen*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1864.
- Goodwin 1900 — W. Goodwin. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Boston: Ginn, 1900.
- Grashof 1852 — C. Grashof. *Abhandlung zur Kritik des Homerischen Textes in Bezug auf die Abwerfung des Augments*. Düsseldorf: H. Voß, 1852.
- Hajnal 1990 — I. Hajnal. Die mykenische Verbalform *e-e-to*. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*. 1990. Vol. 51. P. 21–75.
- Hajnal 2016a — I. Hajnal. 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, 2016.

- Hajnal 2016b — I. Hajnal. Induktive versus abduktive Rekonstruktion: das Beispiel des griechischen Augments. *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 2016. Vol. 121. P. 435–453.
- Herbig 1896 — G. Herbig. Aktionsart und Zeitstufe. *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 1896. Vol. 6. P. 157–270.
- Hermann 1805 — G. Hermann. *Orphica*, Leipzig: C. Fritsch, 1805.
- Hermann 1816 — G. Hermann. *Elementa Doctrinae Metricae*. Lipsiae: Apud Gerh. Fleischerum Iun, 1816.
- Hilberg 1879 — I. Hilberg. *Das Princip der Silbenwägung in der griechischen Poesie*. Wien: Hölder, 1879.
- Hirt 1928 — H. Hirt. *Indogermanische Grammatik IV. Doppelung, Zusammensetzung, Verbum*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1928.
- Hoffmann 1842 — C. Hoffmann. *Quaestiones Homericae*. Clausthal: Schweiger, 1842.
- Hoffmann 1967 — K. Hoffmann. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1967.
- Hoffmann 1970 — K. Hoffmann. Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbums. *Münchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*. 1970. Vol. 28. P. 19–41.
- Janko 2000 — R. Janko. Review West. 1998. *The Classical Review* (New Series). 2000. Vol. 50. P. 1–4.
- Janse 2003 — M. Janse. The Metrical Schemas of the Hexameter, *Mnemosyne* (New Series). 2003. Vol. 56. P. 343–348.
- Janse 2014 — M. Janse. *Inleiding tot de Homerische taal en metriek*. Gent: Academia Press, 2014.
- Kiparsky 1968 — P. Kiparsky. Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax. *Foundations of Language*. 1968. Vol. 4. P. 30–57.
- Kiparsky 2005 — P. Kiparsky. The Vedic Injunctive: Historical and Synchronic Implications. *The Yearbook of South East Asian Studies*. 2005. (<http://www.stanford.edu/~kiparsky/Papers/injunctive.article.pdf>; accessed on 17.05.2022).
- Kloekhorst 2017 — A. Kloekhorst. The Old Hittite and the Proto-Indo-European Tense-Aspect System. *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 2017. Vol. 122. P. 295–307.
- Koch 1868 — K. Koch. *De augmento apud Homerum omisso*. Braunschweig: Meyer, 1868.
- Korzeniewski 1968 — D. Korzeniewski. *Griechische Metrik*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968.
- Krisch 1986 — T. Krisch. *Überlegungen zur Herkunft und Entwicklung der irrealen Konditionalsätze des Altgriechischen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1986.
- Kühner, Blass 1890 — R. Kühner, F. Blass. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre*. 1 Bd. Hannover: Hahn, 1890.
- de Lamberterie 2007 — Ch. de Lamberterie. L'augment dans le texte arménien de l'Évangile. *Revue des études arméniennes*. 2007. Vol. 30. P. 31–57.

- La Roche 1869 — J. La Roche. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1869.
- La Roche 1873 — J. La Roche. *Homeri Ilias ad fidem librorum optimorum edidit J. La Roche. Pars prior*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1873.
- Latacz 2000 — J. Latacz (ed.). *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar: Prolegomena*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2000.
- Lazzeroni 1977 — R. Lazzeroni. Fra glottogonia e storia: ingiuntivo, aumento e lingua poetica indoeuropeo. *Studi e Saggi Linguistici*. 1977. Vol. 17. P. 1–30.
- Levin 1969 — S. Levin. Remarks on the Historical Present and Comparable Phenomena of Syntax. *Foundations of Language*. 1969. Vol. 5. P. 386–390.
- LSJ — H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, S. J. Henry (eds.). *A Greek English lexicon. With a revised supplement 1996*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Ludwich 1866 — A. Ludwich. *Quaestionis de Hexametris Poetarum Graecorum Spondaicis Capita Duo*. Halle: Typis Orphanotrophi, 1866.
- Ludwich 1885 — A. Ludwich. *Aristarchs Homerische Textkritik nach den Fragmenten des Didymos dargestellt und beurteilt von Arthur Ludwich. Zweiter Theil*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1885.
- Ludwich 1892 — A. Ludwich. *Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars prima. Homeri Ilias. Volumen prius*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1892.
- Ludwich 1897 — A. Ludwich. *Homeri Carmina recensuit et selecta lectionis varietate instruxit Arthurus Ludwich. Pars prima. Homeri Ilias. Volumen alterum*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1897.
- Luraghi 2014 — S. Luraghi. Conjunction Reduction. G. Giannakis (ed.). *The Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill, 2014. P. 362–363.
- Maas 1923 — P. Maas. *Griechische Metrik*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923.
- Marzullo 1952 — B. Marzullo. *Il problema omerico*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1952.
- Meillet 1913 — A. Meillet. *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1913.
- Meyer 1884 — W. Meyer. Zur Geschichte des griechischen und des lateinischen Hexameters. *Sitzungsberichte der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. München: Franz, 1884. P. 979–1089.
- Moller 1853 — E. Moller. Ueber den gnomischen aorist. *Philologus*. 1853. Vol. 8. P. 113–129.
- Moller 1854 — E. Moller. (1854) Ueber den gnomischen aorist. Zweiter artikel. *Philologus*. 1854. Vol. 9. P. 346–366.
- Monro 1884 — D. Monro. *Homer. Iliad Books I–XII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884.
- Monro 1891 — D. Monro. *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1891.

- Monro, Allen 1902a — D. Monro, T. Allen. *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros I–XII continens*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.
- Monro, Allen 1902b — D. Monro, T. Allen. *Homeri Opera: Iliadis libros XIII–XXIV continens*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.
- Mumm 2004 — P. Mumm. Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments. T. Krisch, Th. Lindner, U. Müller (eds.). *Analecta homini universali dicata: Arbeiten zur Indogermanistik, Linguistik, Philologie, Politik, Musik und Dichtung; Festschrift für Oswald Panagl zum 65. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart: Heinz, 2004. P. 148–158.
- Nauck 1877 — A. Nauck. *Homeri Ilias cum potiore lectionis varietate. Pars prior*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1877.
- Nünlist 2000 — R. Nünlist. Homerische Metrik. J. Latacz (ed.). *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2000. P. 109–113.
- O’Neill 1942 — E. O’Neill. The localization of metrical word types in the Greek hexameter. *Yale Classical Studies*. 1942. Vol. 8. P. 105–178.
- Oswald 2014 — S. Oswald. Metrical Laws. G. Giannakis (ed.). *The Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill, 2014. P. 419–423.
- Pagniello 2002 — F. Pagniello. *The Augment in Homer*. PhD Thesis, University of Georgia at Atlanta, 2002.
- Pagniello 2007 — F. Pagniello. The past-iterative and the augment in Homer. *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 2007. Vol. 112. P. 105–123.
- Pelliccia 1985 — H. Pelliccia. *The Structure of the Archaic Greek Hymns*. PhD Thesis. Yale, 1985.
- Peristerakis 1962 — A. Peristerakis. *Essai sur l’aoriste intemporel en grec*. Thèse: Université de Paris; Université de Athènes, 1962.
- Platt 1891 — A. Platt. The Augment in Homer. *The Journal of Philology*. 1891. Vol. 19. P. 211–237.
- Rosén 1973 — H. Rosén. Satzbau und augmentloses Tempus in Homerischen Tatsachenbericht. *Folia Linguistica*. 1973. Vol. 6. P. 315–330.
- Ruijgh 1971 — C. Ruijgh. *Autour de “te épique”*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1971.
- Salmon 1960 — A. Salmon. L’aoriste dit gnomique. *Les études classiques*. 1960. Vol. 28. P. 402–423.
- Schwyzler 1939 — E. Schwyzler. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. München: Beck, 1939.
- Shipp 1972 — G. Shipp. *Studies in the Language of Homer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Sicking 1993 — C. Sicking. *Griechische Verslehre*. München: Beck, 1993.
- Snell 1982 — B. Snell. *Griechische Metrik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- Spitzner 1816 — F. Spitzner. *De versu Graecorum heroico maxime Homeric*. Leipzig: Weidmannia, 1816.

- Strunk 1968 — K. Strunk. Zeit und Tempus in den altindogermanischen Sprachen. *Indogermanische Forschungen*. 1968. Vol. 73. P. 279–311.
- Szemerényi 1990 — O. Szemerényi. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. 4. erweiterte Ausgabe. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990.
- Szemerényi 1996 — O. Szemerényi. *Introduction to Indo-European Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Taida 2007 — I. Taida. Elision and Augment in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. *Exemplaria Classica*. 2007. Vol. 11. P. 3–12.
- Van Groningen 1948 — B. Van Groningen. Quelques observations sur l'aoriste gnomique. *Studia Varia Carolo Guilielm Vollgraf*. Amsterdam: Noordhollandse Uitgeversmaatschappij, 1948. P. 49–61.
- Van Leeuwen 1890 — J. Van Leeuwen. *Homerica IV. Mnemosyne*. 1890. Vol. 18. P. 265–299.
- Van Raalte 1986 — M. Van Raalte. *Rhythm and Metre. Towards a Systematic Description of Greek Stichic Verse*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1986.
- Van Thiel 1996 — H. Van Thiel. *Homeri Ilias*. Hildesheim; New York: Olms, 1996.
- Van Thiel 2010 — H. Van Thiel. *Homeri Ilias*, 2 ed. Hildesheim; New York: Olms, 2010.
- Vergados 2013 — A. Vergados. *The “Homeric Hymn to Hermes”: Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2013.
- Wackernagel 1904 — J. Wackernagel. *Studien zum griechischen Perfektum*. Göttingen: Dieterich, 1904.
- Wackernagel 1920 — J. Wackernagel. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*. Vol. 1. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1920.
- Wackernagel 1924 — J. Wackernagel. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*. Vol. 2. Basel: Birkhäuser, 1924.
- Wachter 2000 — R. Wachter. Grammatik der homerischen Sprache. J. Latacz (ed.). *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar. Prolegomena*. 2000. P. 61–108.
- Wakker 2017 — G. Wakker. The Gnomie Aorist in Hesiod. K. Bentein, M. Janse, J. Soltic (eds.). *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*. Leiden: Brill, 2017. P. 84–99.
- Watkins 1967 — C. Watkins. An Indo-European Construction in Greek and Latin. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. 1967. Vol. 71. P. 115–119.
- West 1982 — M. West. *Greek Meter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- West 1989 — M. West. An Unrecognized Injunctive Usage in Greek. *Glotta*. 1989. Vol. 67. P. 135–138.
- West 1997 — M. West. Greek Meter. I. Morris, B. Powell (eds.). *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden: Brill, 1997. P. 217–238.

- West 1998 — M. West. *Homerus Ilias. Volumen I: Rhapsodiae I–XII*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 1998.
- West 2000 — M. West. *Homerus Ilias. Volumen II: Rhapsodiae XIII–XXIV*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2000.
- Willi 2007 — A. Willi. Of aspects, augments, aorists — or how to say to have killed a dragon. C. George, M. McCullagh, B. Nielsen, A. Ruppel, O. Tribulato (eds.). *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective*. Cambridge Cambridge University Press, 2007. P. 34–48.
- Willi 2018 — A. Willi. *Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.