

FILIP DE DECKER
Marie Skłodowska-Curie European Fellowship holder
Università di Verona
filipdedecker9@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-2863-5801

STUDIES IN TENSE, ASPECT AND AUGMENT USE: AN UNRECOGNIZED (?) TIMELESS INJUNCTIVE IN EARLY EPIC GREEK. PART 2: ACTUAL ANALYSIS

Keywords: Epic Greek, verbal morpho-syntax, injunctive, augment, tempus-aspect

Abstract

Since West's seminal 1989 article, it has been assumed that there were (only) four instances in epic Greek (Homer, Hesiod and the Homeric Hymns) in which the injunctive (often called an unaugmented indicative in the commentaries) could be interpreted as having a timeless (or omnitemporal) meaning. In the second part of the article, I will argue and show that there could be more of these injunctive forms than West originally argued for. I will also analyze several other instances in which an injunctive has been transmitted, instances in which it refers to a background action or an event in a remote past, and argue that some injunctive forms indeed describe the timeless habits of the gods, while others are not timeless, but refer to actions in a remote or even mythical past, or describe background actions; moreover, even some indicative present forms could conceal older timeless injunctive forms (without arguing that the indicative forms should be altered, however). In all these instances I will also investigate and describe the aspectual stems, as well as show that their use can be explained by the distinction perfective – imperfective, which agrees with what we would find in Attic Greek and is not controlled by the metre.¹

¹ As had been stated already before part1, this research was conducted at the Università degli Studi di Verona during the project *Particles in Greek and Hittite as Expression of Mood and Modality* (PaGHEMMo), which has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020

1. Homer

1.1. *Iliad* 1,528–530

In *Iliad* 1, there are two passages in which verbs could refer to the timeless habits of the gods.

(EX.01)

(528) ἡ καὶ κυανέησιν ἐπ' ὄφρῦσι **νεῦσε** Κρονίων

(529) ἀμβρόσιαι δ' ἄρα χαῖται ἐπερρώσαντο ἄνακτος

(530) κρατὸς ἀπ' ἀθανάτοιο: μέγαν δ' **ἐλέλιξεν** Ὀλυμπον. (*Iliad* 1,528–530)²

'He spoke and the son of Kronos nodded with his dark eyebrows, the immortal hairs flowed waving from the ruler's immortal head and he shook the giant Olympus.'³

In these lines, Homer relates how Zeus nodded in agreement with Thetis after she requested the Greeks be punished for their dishonouring of Akhilleus. The form under discussion is ἐπερρώσαντο, which is transmitted in the form of an indicative aorist. It is true that the augment is not metrically secure, but all the manuscripts have the augmented form (and as the augmented ἐρρώσαντο is attested more often than the unaugmented ρώσαντο, the transmitted augment is likely to be correct).⁴ It is the only augmented form besides ἦ.⁵ The question is whether ἐπερρώσαντο is timeless in this instance or not. This could be the case if one assumes that the verse describes how Zeus' hair always flows in the wind, but one could also argue that it simply referred to Zeus' flowing hair on his head at the moment when he shook Olympus, so the reference was to a specific instance rather than a description of a timeless habit. Even if this is the case, one could ask why the augmented indicative was used in a narrative passage (assuming that the augment was added throughout the transmission and that the form has no probative value seems too easy a solution). I would argue that the indicative was used to disambiguate and to indicate that the divine description was not timeless. The forms νεῦσε and ἐλέλιξεν are injunctives, but as they clearly refer to the moment Zeus nods, they are not ambiguous. This is

research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant Agreement Number 101018097.

I would also like to thank the journal's reviewers and the editor for their detailed comments, their useful remarks and suggestions for improvement. It goes without saying that all shortcomings, inconsistencies and errors are mine and mine alone.

The title is in homage to the sadly missed Martin Litchfield West.

² As was stated before, metrically secure augmented forms are underlined, metrically secure unaugmented forms (the injunctives) are in boldface, metrically insecure forms are italicized; when a form is insecure, but transmitted as augmented, it is italicized and underlined and when it is insecure and unaugmented, it is italicized and in boldface. Metrically insecure indicative present forms are also italicized, while metrically secure indicatives are underlined twice (when part of the investigation).

³ Unless noted otherwise, all translations are my own.

⁴ For this method, see De Decker (2017: 113–119, 2022: 205–206).

⁵ I refer to De Decker (2015: 107–109, 2018: 137–139, 2022: 159–162) for the interpretation of ἦ as an augmented aorist.

not the case for ἐπερρώσαντο, however, because as an injunctive it could be misinterpreted as timeless. As such, ἐπερρώσαντο cannot be considered a timeless aorist. As to the use of the tenses, all the forms have an aorist-stem, because all the actions refer to a single and completed action (for which the aorist with its perfective meaning is the ideal stem).

1.2. *Iliad* 1,601–604

(EX.02)

(601) ὦς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἡμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα

(602) **δαίνυντ'**, οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς εἵσης,

(603) οὐ μὲν φόρμιγγος περικαλλέος ἦν ἔχ' Ἀπόλλων,

(604) Μουσάων θ' αἰ **ᾄειδον** ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπι καλῆ. (*Iliad* 1,601–604)

'So they feasted the entire day until the sun set and their spirit did not lack anything from the fitting meal, nor from the brilliant lyre that Apollon has and that of the Muses, who sing in answer with their beautiful voice.'

In these verses, Homer relates how the gods feasted after Zeus had become enraged with Here, and Hephaistos had cooled down the tense atmosphere. During the feast, the gods enjoy their food and listen to the songs of the Muses. In this passage, we find three forms without an augment, δαίνυντ', ἔχ' and ᾄειδον, against one augmented form, ἐδεύετο. δαίνυντ' and ἐδεύετο clearly refer to the past as they describe what happened at the specific moment when the gods started their feast. The forms ἔχ' and ᾄειδον are different and their past reference is not so clear, as the latter describes the Muses habitual singing with their beautiful voices and the former relates that Apollon has a lyre. As the Muses have always sung and will always continue to do so, ᾄειδον narrates a timeless and eternal habit, and it, therefore, seems difficult to state that it is a past tense, which is why the description "unaugmented imperfect" is inappropriate in this context. What is valid for ᾄειδον, could also apply to ἔχ': this form refers to the fact that Apollon is the god of the lyre, who has always had it, has it now and will have it in the future as well. Both ἔχ' and ᾄειδον are *zeitstufenlos* and therefore do not refer to the past alone. They belong to a present stem, because they are durative and because ἔχ' refers to a state, namely 'have, possess' and ᾄειδον to a durative and ongoing action, that is '(continue to) sing', and not a completed action. The same applies to the non-timeless δαίνυντ' and ἐδεύετο: neither are completed and, therefore, also have a present stem.

Also in *Iliad* 2, there are two passages with (apparently) timeless injunctives.

1.3. *Iliad* 2,546–551

In the next example, we find the present indicative (which is in italics) besides two aorist injunctives, an augmented aorist and imperfect.

(EX.03)

(546) οἱ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον ἐϋκτίμενον ποτλίεθρον

(547) δῆμον Ἐρεχθίδος μεγαλήτορος, ὃν ποτ' Ἀθήνη

(548) **θρέψε** Διὸς θυγάτηρ, **τέκε** δὲ ζείδωρος ἄρουρα,

(549) καὶ δ' ἐν Ἀθῆνῃς εἶσεν ἑῷ ἐν πίονι νηῶ:

(550) ἔνθα δέ μιν ταύροισι καὶ ἄρνοιόϊς ἰλάονται

(551) κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν: (*Iliad* 2,546–551)

'They held Athens, a well-built stronghold, the house of the valiant Erekhtheus, whom once upon a time Athene, daughter of Zeus, nurtured, whom the fertile ground bore and whom she established (as ruler) in Athens, in her own large temple. There the young among the Athenians appease her with (offerings of) bulls and rams, as the years go by.'

These lines appear in the so-called *Catalogue of Ships* and when describing the contingent coming from Athens, Homer relates the foundation of the city in the remote past and recounts how young Athenians continuously offer, in gratitude and with prayers, bulls and rams to Athene. This new entry in the *Catalogue* is recalled with an indicative form, εἶχον. As was stated above, the augmented forms are used to highlight new information and, as this constitutes a new entry in the *Catalogue*, the augment is used. The present stem is used because εἶχον is not perfective: 'hold' is an activity and not an achievement or accomplishment. The indicative present ἰλάονται is more problematic, as we might have expected a timeless injunctive in this context. To begin with, there are two elements that speak against a timeless injunctive. First, the verb does not describe a timeless habit of *the gods*. Second, it can also be conceived as referring to the present, as even at the moment of speaking, young men in Athens are performing sacrifices to Athene. In such a case, the present indicative is expected and simply refers to the present. On the other hand, it has to be noted that ἰλάονται is metrically equivalent to the injunctive ἰλάοντο and one could argue that the injunctive was the oldest form and was substituted during the creation of the poems or the transmission of the text, but in fact all the manuscripts contain the indicative and, while the habit of offering still occurs today, it nevertheless also has a timeless component, but, and this is the conclusive argument against its timeless nature, it does not refer to the gods. The two injunctives, θρέψε and τέκε, do not describe a timeless habit, but relate a single and completed event in a remote past: Erekhtheus has already been raised and fed, so that these actions are completed (hence described in the aorist), and as the injunctive is used in such instances as well, the injunctives are regular (but not timeless). The indicative εἶσεν poses certain problems in this short story. When one interprets the story as belonging to a remote past, an indicative form is unexpected; when one assumes that this passage describes timeless habits (which it does not in my opinion), the indicative is equally problematic. While there is no entirely convincing solution, I would tentatively argue that the augmented form was used because the action referred to the establishment of Athens and the Erekhtheion, two entities which still existed at the moment the poet uttered the verses. One could even call this aorist an *aetiological aorist* as it explains the origin of the Erekhtheion, (for this term, see De Decker 2020: 452 where this term was suggested for the first time albeit with some doubts as to the necessity to create a new category). Another example of a similar aorist would be the augmented aorist ἔσχεν in *HH* 5,198–199, where the name of Aineias is explained as being derived from αἰνὸν ἄχος 'shameful pain' because it described the embarrassment that Aphrodite underwent by having a child with a mortal man (De Decker 2019: 44).

1.4. *Iliad* 2,591–600

(EX.04)

- (591) οἱ δὲ Πύλον τ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Ἀρήνην ἐρατεινὴν
 (592) καὶ Θρύον Ἀλφειοῖο πόρον καὶ εὐκτιτον Αἰπὺ
 (593) καὶ Κυπαρισσήεντα καὶ Ἀμφιγένειαν ἔναιον
 (594) καὶ Πτελεὸν καὶ Ἔλος καὶ Δώριον, ἔνθά τε Μοῦσαι
 (595) ἀντόμεναι Θάμυριν τὸν Θρήϊκα **παῦσαν** αἰοιδῆς
 (596) Οἰχαλιῆθεν ἰόντα παρ' Εὐρύτου Οἰχαλιῆος:
 (597) **στεῦτο** γάρ εὐχόμενος νικησέμεν εἰ περ ἄν αὐταὶ
 (598) Μοῦσαι ἀείδοιεν κούραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο:
 (599) αἶ δὲ χλωσάμεναι πηρὸν **θέσαν**, αὐτὰρ αἰοιδῆν
 (600) θεσπεσίην **ἀφέλοντο** καὶ **ἐκλέλαθον** κιθαριστύν: (*Iliad* 2,591–600)

'They dwelt about Pylos and inhabited the lovely Arene, Thryon at the crossing of the Alpheios, well-built Aipy, Kyparisseeis, Amphigeneia, Pteleos, Elos and Dorian, where the Muses encountered the Thracian Thamyris and stopped him from singing, when he was going away from Oikhalie and from Eurytos, son of Oikhalieus. He boasted and bragged that he would win, even if the Muses themselves, daughters of aegis-bearing Zeus, were to sing (in competition against him). They became enraged, rendered him lame, but also took away the divine power to sing and hid his cither.'

In these lines, also taken from the *Catalogue of Ships*, Homer describes the battalions from Pylos and the neighbouring cities, and also relates how a certain Thamyris committed hubris in boasting that he would even surpass the Muses when singing. They, in turn, became very much enraged and punished him cruelly for his transgressions. The injunctives, παῦσαν, στεῦτο, θέσαν, ἀφέλοντο and ἐκλέλαθον do not refer to a timeless habit but to an action in a remote and mythical past. The use of the injunctive is justified here, although it is not an example of a timeless injunctive, but of a remote-past-injunctive, as was the case with θρέψε and τέκε in the example discussed above. The aorist is used, because the revenge of the Muses was a single event and the verb forms describing it are all perfective.

The two augmented indicatives, ἐνέμοντο and ἔναιον, describe a new entry in the *Catalogue* and as this new entry is highlighted, these forms use the augment and are in the indicative. The present stem is employed because they describe actions that have not been completed.

1.5. *Iliad* 5,334–342

(EX.05)

- (334) ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἐκίχανε πολὺν καθ' ὄμιλον ὀπάζων,
 (335) ἔνθ' ἐπορεξάμενος μεγαθύμου Τυδέος υἱὸς
 (336) ἄκρην οὐτάσε χεῖρα μετάλμενος ὄξει δουρὶ
 (337) ἀβληχρὴν: εἶθαρ δὲ δόρυ χροὸς ἀντετόρησεν
 (338) ἀμβροσίου διὰ πέπλου, ὃν οἱ Χάριτες **κάμμον** αὐταί,
 (339) πρυμνὸν ὑπερθέναρος: **ῥέε** δ' ἄμβροτον αἶμα θεοῖο
 (340) ἰχώρ, οἷός περ τε **ρέει** μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν:
 (341) οὐ γὰρ σῖτον ἔδουσ', οὐ πίνουσ' αἶθοπα οἶνον,
 (342) τοῦνεκ' ἀναίμονές εἰσι καὶ ἀθάνατοι **καλέονται**. (*Iliad* 5,334–342)

‘But when he found her, following (her) through the large crowd, then the son of the magnanimous Tydeus rushed forward against her and, leaping forward, wounded the top of her soft hand with his bronze spear. The spear immediately tore through the skins making up the immortal dress, which the Kharites themselves had wrought for her, over the edge of the base of the palm. The immortal blood of the goddess, *ikhor*, flowed (from the wound), as it flows from the blessed gods. For they do not eat food, nor drink clear wine. Therefore, they are bloodless and are called immortal.’

In these lines, Homer first related how Diomedes attacked Aphrodite, causing her to bleed, before explaining why the blood of the gods is not called blood but *ikhor*, as they are immortal. All the forms are indicative present forms and while one could explain this by the fact that this description was valid at the time when Diomedes challenged Aphrodite, valid also at the time the poet sang this passage and at the time when it was written (supposing that the poet believed in the Olympian gods), the lines nevertheless also have a timeless meaning and for that reason one might have expected the injunctive (as would have been the case in the RigVeda, cf. supra). It should be noted, however, that ῥέει and καλέονται are equivalent to the injunctives ῥέει(ν) and καλέοντο and that ἔδουσ’ and πίνουσ’ contain an older form with the ending *-nt*, an ending for which some metrical evidence exists.⁶ As ῥέει is used with a *τε-épique*, this might have “blocked” the use of the injunctive (as was discussed before when we considered the use of the augment with *τε-épique*). The only indicative that is metrically secure and that cannot be substituted by an injunctive is εἶσι, and this might be due to the fact that the root **h₁es-* did not have an injunctive present in the singular (in the plural ἔσαν exists). The indicative imperfect ἦεν or the semi-iterative ἔσκε would convey the wrong message, as they only refer to the past (for the absence of the injunctive in the root **h₁es-*, see Praust 2003). Having said this, the fact remains that all the manuscripts have the indicative and not the injunctive, and changing the forms is not an option. All these forms are in the present stem because they refer to actions that have not been completed.

There are two injunctives in this passage, ῥέει and κάμουν, but neither of them is timeless: the former belongs to the plain narrative without emphasis and the latter does not refer to a timeless habit by the Kharites, but to a single action they undertook in a remote and mythical past (for such descriptions the injunctive is the most suitable mood).

The form ἐκίχωνε has the augment and is in the indicative, as it describes how Diomedes caught Aphrodite: the act of a mortal chasing and attacking an immortal is

⁶ Von Hartel (1871: 111–114) applied this to Homer and referred to Ahrens (1843: 28–29), Misteli (1868: 109–112), and Curtius (1869: 166–167) but the latter three did not discuss the Homeric evidence. Vogrinz (1889: 28–29) noted this metrical irregularity and admitted that it could be explained by the old ending **-nt* (for this he referred to Ahrens, Curtius and von Hartel), but stated that it was impossible to decide beyond any doubt that it was indeed an archaism and not a metrical licence. Monro (1891: 349) also considered it possible that it was an archaism, but noted that the instances were, surprisingly enough, only attested in the *Odyssey*. Chantraine did not discuss it in his chapter on metrical lengthenings and shortenings (1948: 93–112), but considered the long scansion as a metrical lengthening and not as an archaism (1948: 471).

In many instances, the apparent irregularity was “fixed” by inserting a particle δ’ (as in *Odyssey* 7,341).

so unusual that the poet felt the need to highlight it. The form ἀντετόρησεν is attested with the augment in all the manuscripts, but there is no metrical not “epic-internal” evidence to determine whether or not the augment was the original form.

The form οὔτασε can be an indicative or an injunctive and as we have no certainty about its exact nature, it has to remain beyond the scope of the present discussion. οὔτασε and ἀντετόρησεν are in the aorist, because they refer to a single and completed action. κάμω also describes a completed action and is thus in the aorist. ῥέε, just as with all the other present stem forms, refers to an ongoing and uncompleted action (“the blood kept flowing, was flowing”). The use of the present stem in ἐκίχανε is unexpected, because with its meaning ‘find’ it seems to refer to a completed action. Here, however, the completion is not highlighted but instead the ongoing search before actually finding her, as is also seen in the present participle ὀπάζων.

1.6. *Iliad* 24,602–617

(EX.06)

- (602) καὶ γάρ τ' ἠῦκομος Νιόβη ἐμνήσατο σίτου,
 (603) τῇ περ δώδεκα παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν **ὄλοντο**
 (604) ἕξ μὲν θυγατέρες, ἕξ δ' υἱέες ἠβώνοντες.
 (605) τοὺς μὲν Ἀπόλλων **πέφνεν** ἀπ' ἀργυρέοιο βιοῖο
 (606) χωόμενος Νιόβῃ, τὰς δ' Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα,
 (607) οὔνεκ' ἄρα Λητοῖ **ἰσάσκετο** καλλιπαρήφ:
 (608) **φῆ** δοιῶ τεκέειν, ἦ δ' αὐτὴ **γείνατο** πολλούς:
 (609) τῷ δ' ἄρα καὶ δοιῶ περ ἐόντ' ἀπὸ πάντας ὄλεσσαν.
 (610) οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐννῆμαρ **κέατ'** ἐν φόνῳ, οὐδέ τις ἦεν
 (611) κατθάψαι, λαοὺς δὲ λίθους **ποίησε** Κρονίων:
 (612) τοὺς δ' ἄρα τῇ δεκάτῃ **θάψαν** θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες.
 (613) ἦ δ' ἄρα σίτου **μνήσατ'**, ἐπεὶ **κάμει** δάκρυ χέουσα.
 (614) νῦν δέ που ἐν πέτρῃσιν ἐν οὔρεσιν οἰοπόλοισιν
 (615) ἐν Σιπύλῳ, ὅθι *φασὶ* θεάων ἔμμεναι εὐνὰς
 (616) νυμφάων, αἶ τ' ἀμφ' Ἀχελώϊον ἐρρώσαντο,
 (617) ἔνθα λίθος περ εἴουσα θεῶν ἐκ κήδεα *πέσσει*. (*Iliad* 24,602–617)

‘For even the fair-haired Niobe remembers (to take) food; her twelve children had died in her house, six daughters and six sons strong in their youth. The latter Apollon killed with his silver bow, angry with Niobe, and the former Artemis, the shooter of arrows, since she had often compared herself to Leto with the beautiful cheeks: she said that she had borne only two children, but she herself had borne many more. Those (Apollon and Artemis), albeit being only two, killed all (Niobe’s children). Nine days they lay dead and there was no-one to bury them. Zeus had turned the people into stones. On the tenth day, the creatures from heaven buried them. She even remembered to eat, after she had finished shedding tears. Now she stands somewhere among the rocks in the lonely mountains in Sipylus, where people say that the beds of the Nymphs are, who dance around the Akheloos. There she, though being a stone, broods over the pain that came from the gods.’

After Akhilleus informed Priam that he had done everything Priam had asked, he proceeded to tell Priam that he should have a meal before returning. In order to convince him to eat, he relates the mythical story of Niobe. She had twelve children

and insulted the goddess Leto by telling her that she had only borne two. In order to avenge Niobe's insolence, Apollon and Artemis (Leto's two children) killed all her children, who remained unburied for nine days, because Zeus turned all the humans into stones. Akhilleus tells Priam that as even in her endless grief Niobe did not forget her food, so should he not forget to eat either. At the beginning of his story, he wants to draw attention to the tale and thus uses the augmented ἐμνήσατο. Then he begins to describe the mythical story and all the verb forms are in the injunctive (with the exception of ἦεν). García-Ramón (2012: 444) argued that the use of the augmented ἐμνήσατο (602) besides the unaugmented μνήσατ' (613) proved that there was no difference between augmented and unaugmented forms in Homeric Greek, but in my opinion, the first form is augmented to start the story and gain Priam's attention, whereas the second belongs to the actual mythical story. Moreover, the augmented ἐμνήσατο is used with a *τε-épique*, which seems to have some type of gnomic nuance (cf. *supra*). The augmented aorist ἐρρώσαντο, which is metrically secure, is somewhat unexpected, as it clearly refers to a timeless habit, but as it is constructed with a *τε-épique*, this could account for the use of the augment (for the figures, see earlier in part one of the article, in §3.1 and §3.2).⁷ Even if this is the case, the use of an augmented indicative against an injunctive is surprising, as the passage refers to an event in a remote and mythical past and also describes a timeless action. The use of the aorist indicative is thus a clear exception. The use of the present indicative forms φασί and πέσσει is less troubling, as a link with the present might be clear from νῦν δέ in line 614 and in the case of πέσσει, one could argue that it is metrically equivalent to the injunctive πέσσει(ν), but also that φασί is metrically secure. The aspectual choices in this passage agree with the distinction perfective – imperfective (De Decker 2023: 71–74), as all the aorist forms refer to single and/or completed actions, with one exception, namely ἐρρώσαντο. This does not seem to refer to either a single nor a completed action and the use of the aorist could thus not be anticipated. The aorist form ἐρρώσαντο is attested on several occasions, however, and might have the inchoative meaning 'started to dance'. Alternatively, and more likely, the form has to be contrasted with πέσσει: the latter is in the present stem, because Niobe is constantly brooding on the pain and injustice that the gods have inflicted upon her, while ἐρρώσαντο is in the aorist, because the Nymphs are not always dancing in the mountains: they often dance, but they also start and stop, so that their action can somehow be conceived as perfective (contrary to Niobe's complaining). The other forms of the present stem describe states. The only exception is φῆ, which belongs to a verb that does not have an aorist in epic Greek (but *verba dicendi* can be used with the present stem even if it refers to a completed action when the consequences of a speech are also taken into account, see De Decker 2022: 67–109, 168–169 for this specific verb).

⁷ Ruijgh (1971: 412–413, 738) discussed this passage, but he did not address the use of the augment and was uncertain about the use of the particle in this context.

1.7. *Odyssey* 24,1–4

(EX.07)

- (1) Ἑρμῆς δὲ ψυχὰς Κυλλήνιος ἐξεκαλεῖτο
- (2) ἀνδρῶν μνηστήρων: ἔχε δὲ ῥάβδον μετὰ χειρὶ
- (3) καλὴν χρυσεῖην, τῇ τ' ἀνδρῶν ὄμματα θέλγει
- (4) ὦν ἐθέλει, τοὺς δ' αὐτε καὶ ὑπνῶντας ἐγείρει: (*Odyssey* 24,1–4)

'Kyllenian Hermes called out the souls of the suitors and had his beautiful golden staff in his hands, with which he misleads the eyes of the humans whom he wants to (mislead) and awakens the ones who are sleeping.'

In these lines, Homer describes how Hermes led the murdered suitors into Hades. In doing so, he adds a description of Hermes' staff with which he enchants, misleads and awakens the sleeping humans. The verbs referring to the staff's capacities, θέλγει, ἐθέλει and ἐγείρει, are in the present indicative, but they are all metrically equivalent to a present injunctive. The first form, however, is used with a *τε-éripique*, which prefers the indicative over the injunctive.

The form ἐξεκαλεῖτο employs the augment and is in the indicative, because it describes a new event in the story, namely the entry of the suitors into Hades: ἔχε is in the injunctive, because it simply relates that Hermes has a staff and as this fact is not part of the main storyline, it is "mentioned", but not highlighted. All the verbs have a present stem because they refer to states or actions that have not been completed. This also applies to ἐξεκαλεῖτο, which describes Hermes' ongoing calling to the suitors' souls.

After discussing the possible timeless injunctives in Homer (from which only *Iliad* 1,603–604 can be considered to be timeless, whereas the other instances belong to the remote past), we now proceed to the analysis of similar instances in Hesiod.

2. Hesiod

We now discuss the instances in Hesiod, four of which are found in *Theogony* and one in *Works and Days*.⁸ The next two passages involve the combination of a present indicative and an unaugmented imperfect. The first passage is the exordium of the *Theogony*.

2.1. Hesiod, *Theogony*, 1–10.

(EX.08)

- (1) μουσῶων Ἐλικωνιάδων ἀρχώμεθ' αἰδεῖν,
- (2) αἴ θ' Ἐλικῶνος ἔχουσιν ὄρος μέγα τε ζάθεόν τε,
- (3) καί τε περὶ κρήνην ἰοιδέα πόσσ' ἀπαλοῖσιν
- (4) ὄρχεῦνται καὶ βωμῶν ἐρισθενέος Κρονίωνος:
- (5) καί τε λοεσσάμεναι τέρενα χροῖα Περμησσοῖο

⁸ This subsection builds on earlier research by West (1989), Clackson (2007: 132), De Decker (2016: 102–106).

- (6) ἦ Ἴππου κρήνης ἦ Ὀλμειοῦ ζαθέοιο
 (7) ἀκροτάτῳ Ἑλικῶνι χοροὺς ἐνεποιήσαντο,
 (8) καλοὺς ἱμερόεντας, ἐπερρώσαντο δὲ ποσσίν.
 (9) ἔνθεν ἀπορνύμεναι κεκαλυμμέναι ἤερι πολλῶ
 (10) ἐννόχαι **στεῖχον** περικαλλέα ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι. (Hesiod, *Theogony*, 1–10)⁹

‘Let us start by singing the (the virtues of) the Helikonian Muses, who possess the great and divine mountain of the Helikon; and they dance on their tender feet around the purple well and the altar of the strong son of Kronos; and after they have washed their tender skin in the well of Permessos, Hippios or Olmeios, they perform beautiful and sweet dances on the top of the Helikon and (gently) move around on their feet. From there they move forth, covered in thick invisibility, and walk around at night sending forth their very lovely voices.’

Hesiod starts his *Theogony* with an incantation to the Muses and then describes their habits, namely walking around, dancing and singing on the top of the Helikon. This description contains two metrically secure indicative present forms, ἔχουσιν and ὀρχεῦνται, two augmented aorist forms, ἐνεποιήσαντο and ἐπερρώσαντο, which are metrically equivalent to the respective injunctive forms, but are chosen because of the internal reconstruction of the epic language and metre: ἐπερρώσαντο is preferred, as the augmented ἐρρώσαντο is attested more often than the unaugmented ῥώσαντο and since neither ἐμποιή(σαντο) nor ἐνιποιή(σαντο) are attested in epic Greek, ἐνεποιήσαντο is more likely to be correct. In this respect, West (1989: 136–137) noted that while these specific augments were insecure, others were in fact metrically secure and that, therefore, the problem of the augmented aorist forms remained (and thus, implicitly, he stated that the augment in these forms could also be correct in this context). With the exception of ἐπερρώσαντο, the three indicative forms have all been used in combination with a *τε-épique*, which, as was stated above, seems to attract the indicative and “block” the injunctive. The only form that remains to be investigated is the injunctive στεῖχον. This form has been explained in three different ways. The first is that it is a past tense (Ruijgh 1971: 900 and Rijksbaron 2009: 245 both used the description *nettement passé*, with Rijksbaron 2009: 245, 261–263 describing the form as a *focalizing imperfect*). This begs the question as to why the augment was missing in this specific form, whereas the other forms in this passage, which the scholars consider to be past as well, have the augment. The second explanation was made by West (1989: 135–137), who noted that the augmentless form was preceded by a present indicative and argued that the augmentless form was not a past tense, but an injunctive describing the habits of the Muses, which were undefined as to their temporal reference (they could occur in the past, present and/or future). The third explanation was that by Clackson (2007: 132), who, following another suggestion by West (1989: 135), interpreted the form as the result of *markedness reduction* and assumed that the form was a reduction of an indicative. In Clackson’s opinion, the sequence indicative – indicative was reduced to indicative – injunctive. The three theories all have their problems. Although I would personally agree with

⁹ Besides the usual marking of the past tense forms, the present indicative forms are underlined twice.

West's timeless explanation, it cannot be denied that the use of the two metrically secure and the two possible indicative forms with a *τε-έριque* makes the timeless explanation in this passage less likely. Similarly, Clackson's explanation is problematic in that the first two indicative forms are followed by two other indicative forms and only one injunctive form. If we were dealing with a genuine reduction-schema, only ἔχουσιν would have been in the indicative and the other forms would have been in the injunctive. Moreover, in some of the examples discussed below, an explanation of *markedness reduction* is excluded, as there are no indicative forms in the description (see *Theogony* 924–926, below). The aspect use in this passage is also worth mentioning. While the use of the present stem in this passage is expected, the two aorists, ἐνεποιήσαντο and ἐπερρώσαντο, pose problems. If one interprets them as inchoative or a completed action, the question is why ὄρχεῦνται is not an aorist as well.

2.2. Hesiod, *Theogony*, 268–296

In the following Hesiodic passage, a present indicative is also followed by an injunctive (called an “imperfect without augment” in some commentaries) (West 1989: 135–136):

(EX.09)

- (265) Θαύμας δ' Ὀκεανοῖο βαθυρρείταιο θύγατρα
 (266) ἠγάγετ' Ἡλέκτρην: ἠ δ' ὠκείαν τέκεν Ἴριν
 (267) ἠύκοντας θ' Ἀρπυίας, Ἀελλώ τ' Ὀκυπέτην τε,
 (268) αἶ ῥ' ἀνέμων πνοιῆσι καὶ οἰωνοῖς ἄμ' ἔπονται
 (269) ὠκείης πτερύγεσσι: μεταχρόνια γὰρ ἴαλλον. (Hesiod, *Theogony*, 265–269)

‘Thaumas took as his wife Elektra, daughter of the deep-flowing Okeanos, and she bore him the swift Iris, and the fair-haired Harpyiai, Aello and Okypetes, who follow the blasts of the winds and the birds with their swift wings, as they fly high in the sky.’

In this passage, Hesiod related that Thaumas married Elektra and that she bore him the Harpyiai. As this story is a new element in Hesiod's genealogy, the first verb, ἠγάγετ', is augmented, whereas the second, τέκεν, which belongs to the same story, is unaugmented, because both ἠγάγετ' and τέκεν describe the “process” of begetting children. After the Harpyiai's birth has been narrated, Hesiod describes their habit of flying high in the sky. The description of the timeless habit contains an indicative present ἔπονται and an injunctive present ἴαλλον. The latter is metrically secure, but the former is metrically equivalent to the injunctive ἔποντο. It is, therefore, possible that in origin *both* verbs were in the injunctive. It is, however, also possible to interpret the injunctive ἴαλλον, in this instance at least, as a reduced form, but as we argued above and will reiterate below, the mere application of the reduction rule cannot explain the use of the injunctive. A reviewer suggests that the translation of ἴαλλον should be ‘they flew’ as the form is an imperfect, but I would beg to differ as in my opinion the interpretation as a timeless injunctive and an injunctive with a past tense meaning is more appropriate. Pelliccia (1985: 75) argued that Hesiod used this form as an aorist, but it is difficult to see how this would be formally justified. The use of the different aspectual stems poses no problem in this context as the aorist ἠγάγετ' and τέκεν refer to completed actions and the present stem forms,

the indicative ἔπονται and the injunctive ἴαλλον, to activities in the Vendlerian sense (i.e. actions that have not been completed).

Regardless of which explanation is correct (the “timeless” or the “reduced” injunctive), the absence of the augment and the use of the injunctive in Hesiod in these two passages constitute a remarkable syntactic archaism.

The two previous examples from the *Theogony* involved an injunctive present, but below we have two aorist injunctives.

2.3. Hesiod, *Theogony*, 916–917

(EX.10)

(916) ἐξ ἧς οἱ Μοῦσαι χρυσάμπυκες ἐξεγένοντο

(917) ἐννέα, τῆσιν ἄδον θαλαίαι καὶ τέρψις αἰοιδῆς. (Hesiod, *Theogony*, 916–917)

‘From her (sc. Mnemosyne) the nine Muses with golden hairbands came into the world, for whom festivities and the enjoyment of songs were/are delightful.’

In this passage, Hesiod described how the Muses came into existence. Mnemosyne gave birth to them and they have enjoyed feasting and music ever since that moment. As this description was a new entry in Hesiod’s mythical catalogue, this had to be highlighted and, therefore, the augmented ἐξεγένοντο was used. The problem is the injunctive ἄδον. On the one hand, one could explain it as being a result of the reduction-rule (as was also suggested by a reviewer of the journal), but that explanation has the problem that the temporal reference is different. While ἐξεγένοντο refers to the past, ἄδον refers to the past, but also to the present and the future: their preference for music is an element that does not exclusively belong to the past, since they still like music today and will continue to do so tomorrow and forever ever after, and the action described by ἄδον is, therefore, best interpreted as timeless, or in this case, omnitemporal. The second possible explanation of the injunctive ἄδον is thus that the mood refers to a timeless habit of the Muses. In my opinion, this explanation is the most convincing. Moreover, a reduction-explanation is not possible in the following instance.

2.4. Hesiod, *Theogony*, 924–926

(EX.11)

(924) αὐτὸς δ’ ἐκ κεφαλῆς γλαυκώπιδα γείνατ’ Ἀθήνην

(925) δεινὴν ἐγρεκύδοιμον ἀγέστρατον ἀτρυτώνην,

(926) πότνιαν, ἣ κέλαδοί τε ἄδον πόλεμοί τε μάχαι τε. (Hesiod, *Theogony*, 924–926)

‘By himself, out of his head, he brought the owl-eyed Athene to life, the terrible, the battle-rouser, the leader of armies, the Unwearied, the mistress, for whom battle noise, warfare and fights were/are delightful.’

These verses describe how Zeus fathered and bore Athena himself without involving Hera. The explanation for the injunctive ἄδον is the same as that discussed above: Athena’s conception was an action in the past, but her preference for battles is not. She enjoyed battles in the past, takes pleasure in them now and will always like them.

As such, the form ἄδον is a timeless injunctive and, as γείνατ' is also an injunctive,¹⁰ a *markedness reduction*-interpretation is excluded. In the two passages discussed above, only the aorist stem is used and while this poses no problems for ἐξεγένοντο or γείνατ' (both refer to completed actions), it raises certain issues regarding ἄδον, as this form has neither an ingressive nor a completed meaning.

Below, we find another passage in which *markedness reduction* cannot explain the use of the injunctive (this is an instance that was not discussed in West 1989, but is nevertheless very important in the current discussion).

2.5. Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 526–528

(EX.12)

(526) οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἥελιος δείκνυ νομὸν ὀρηθῆναι,

(527) ἀλλ' ἐπὶ κυανέων ἀνδρῶν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε

(528) στρωφᾶται, βράδιον δὲ Πανελλήνεσσι φαίνει. (Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 526–528)

'For the Sun does not show a pasture to start it a rangeland towards which it can set out, but instead (immediately) roams to the dark men's people and city, and shines more tardily for all the Greeks.'

In this passage, Hesiod described how the Sun spent more time in Africa than in Greece, and how human beings had to remain inside, because the absence of the sun made it too cold outside. The form δείκνυ gives the impression of being an unaugmented imperfect (Veitch 1879: 172), but it is usually interpreted as a present (Schmidt 1982: 232). Paley (1861: 67) noted that there were two codices that had the reading δείκνει and assumed that this was the form δεικνύει, read with synizesis, but most scholars explain the form as an Aiolism comparable to the 3rd person singular present indicative τίθη 's/he puts' (Edwards 1971: 110; West 1978: 291).¹¹ On the other hand, Troxler (1964: 88) considered it a present with secondary endings, which seems a rather desperate attempt to explain this irregular form. As Hesiod came from Boiotia, an Aiolism cannot be ruled out, but this form does not have to be interpreted as a present indicative. What has contributed to the confusion is the fact that originally injunctives were interpreted as augmentless past tense indicatives, but in the case of δείκνυ, this is very difficult, because it does not refer to the past and can, therefore, not be explained as an "imperfect". At first sight, it seems that we are dealing with an instance of a "reverse reduction" between an injunctive and an indicative (i.e. the reduced form appearing before the marked form), but there is an alternative and more appropriate explanation. As the indicatives στρωφᾶται and φαίνει are metrically equivalent to the injunctives, στρωφᾶτο and φάεινε (and all the 3rd person singular forms in -ει with epic correction of the final diphthong are equivalent to injunctives, as was also pointed out by Levin 1969: 387–389), one could argue that this passage originally described the timeless habit (or at least the Greek

¹⁰ As was argued in De Decker (2016: 83), the absence of the augment in this verb form is very difficult to explain.

¹¹ Kühner and Blass (1892: 199) mentioned this possibility, but asked if δείκνυι could have been meant instead of δείκνυ.

belief that this was a habit) of the sun to spend more time in Africa than in Greece. As δείκνυ could not be “changed” into an indicative, this injunctive form survived. This passage provides in my opinion a strong *pièce de conviction* for the existence of the timeless injunctive in epic Greek (but was, as I stated before, not discussed in West 1989).¹² As all the actions in this passage are incomplete, or better ongoing, the present stem is used.

After dealing with Homeric and Hesiodic Greek, the Homeric Hymns will be addressed.

3. The *Homeric Hymns*

3.1. *HH* 3,1–10

The first passage we discuss is the *prooimion* of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollon*.

(EX.13)

- (1) μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο,
- (2) ὅν τε θεοὶ κατὰ δῶμα Διὸς τρομέουσιν ἰόντα:
- (3) καὶ ῥά τ' ἀναΐσσουσιν ἐπὶ σχεδὸν ἐρχομένοιο
- (4) πάντες ἀφ' ἐδράων, ὅτε φαίδιμα τόξα τιταίνει.
- (5) Λητώ δ' οἷη *μίμνε* παραὶ Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ,
- (6) ἢ ῥα βίον τ' ἐχάλασσε καὶ ἐκλήϊσε φαρέτρην,
- (7) καὶ οἱ ἀπ' ἰφθίμων ὤμων χεῖρεσσιν ἔλοῦσα
- (8) τόξον ἀνεκρέμασε πρὸς κίονα πατρὸς ἐοῖο
- (9) πασσάλου ἐκ χρυσέου: τὸν δ' εἰς θρόνον εἴσεν ἄγουσα. (*HH* 3,1–10)

‘I will remember and not forget Apollon, who shoots from afar, for whom the gods shiver when he comes near to Zeus’ home and all immediately jump up from their chairs when he approaches and when he strings his famous bows. As only Leto remains seated beside Zeus, who rejoices in thunder, she who releases the bow (of Apollon) and fastens his quiver, and when taking his bow with her hands from his powerful shoulders, she attaches it on a golden peg to a pillar in his father’s home and she leads him inside and sets him on his throne.’

In the *prooimion* of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollon*, the poet describes how Leto, Apollon’s mother, is the only one who does not jump up from her chair in fear when Apollon enters the room. In this passage, we have the aorist indicatives, ἐχάλασσε, ἐκλήϊσε, ἀνεκρέμασε and εἴσεν, the present indicatives, τρομέουσιν, ἀναΐσσουσιν and τιταίνει, and an injunctive present, μίμνε. The latter form raises many questions, the first of which concerns the tense and aspect (aorist or imperfect?), with the second regarding the tense and mood [(augmented) indicative imperfect or (unaugmented) injunctive present?]. Schneidewin (1847: 4–8, also quoted in Baumeister 1860: 119) suggested reading μεῖνε instead of μίμνε, because in this way only presents and aorists exist. Göttling (quoted in Schneidewin 1847: 5) and also Allen, Sikes (1904: 70, 268)

¹² West (1978: 291) discussed the form, but not the absence of the augment or the interpretation as an injunctive.

argued that the imperfect was used in this context as an aorist,¹³ while Baumeister (1860: 119) and Christensen (quoted in Gemoll 1886: 121) considered it to be a pluperfect. None of these explanations seems necessary, as we could very well conceive this imperfect as one of repetition, as Gemoll (1886: 121) did.¹⁴ In my opinion, the aspectual distinction, as argued for by Gemoll, is by and large correct in this case and there is no need to change the tense and aspect, but I would not assume that we are dealing with a repeated action in μίμνε, because, as Bakker (2002: 65–66) rightly argued, it is difficult to see how this action could have been repeated, as after an initial appearance the gods could not possibly be alarmed by Apollon anymore, and so I would assume, following Monro (1891: 67), that the present stem forms are used with a *continuous action* and the aorist forms with a *single or momentary action*. Also in this passage, the use of the different tenses can be explained within the framework of perfective / completed versus imperfective / ongoing as described above. The forms of the present stem, including μίμνε, describe ongoing actions without completion (the gods jump up and Apollon continues to string his bow), whereas the aorist forms, including the participle ἐλοῦσα, clearly refer to actions that prevent Apollon from creating fear among the gods (she loosens the bow, takes it from his shoulders, hangs it on a peg and makes him take his seat). The use of the injunctive is more problematic. One could argue that the absence of the augment in μίμνε is not guaranteed by the metre,¹⁵ but the augmented variant is not attested and would require the shortening of a long vowel, which is relatively uncommon.¹⁶ The unaugmented form is thus most probably correct. That μίμνε would be in the injunctive, because it describes a timeless habit, is unusual because one could then ask why all the other forms are in the indicative (and metrically secure). I would argue that the use of the unaugmented μίμνε in this instance is due to the fact that it describes the setting for the continuous fear of the gods (expressed in the indicative present, because the present stem expresses duration) and the single intervention by Leto to “disarm” her son and lead him inside Zeus’ palace. As these lines are taken from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollon* (my underlining), there is a clear near-deixis and, therefore, the pivotal actions are related in the indicative stem and not in the injunctive, so there is no need to interpret the indicative presents as historical presents. The poet describes the event to Apollon’s faithful followers as if it is happening before their own eyes (as was argued in Bakker 2002). Moreover, we note that almost all the present and aorist indicatives are used with a *τε-épique* (for the figures see above in part I, §3.1 and §3.2), which would explain why the indicative and not the injunctive is used. To conclude, μίμνε is indeed an injunctive, but not because it is timeless (as West 1989: 135–136 interprets it), but because it describes the setting against which the real events occur. A reviewer (already quoted above) stated that the use of the present stem alone (in his/her opinion, this form was an imperfect) would suffice for the description of the setting, but that is in my opinion not entirely true, because

¹³ Götting was quoted in Schneidewin (1847: 5), who also referred to Hermann (1801: 242–246). See also Hermann (1806: 170) on *HH* 19,29 (cf. *infra*).

¹⁴ In spite of some scepticism, Allen and Sikes (1904: 70) did not exclude Gemoll’s explanation.

¹⁵ West and others analyzing this passage failed to notice this.

¹⁶ For this, see von Hartel (1874a, especially page 48, 1874b: 1–13), Sjölund (1938: 43, 58–70). Metrical shortening has received much less attention than metrical lengthening.

then one would have to explain why only this form had no augment in the *prooimion*. I would argue that the present stem was used for the ongoing and uncompleted action and the injunctive because the form was descriptive, rather than highlighting.

3.2. HH 5,1–24

The *prooimion* of HH 5 (the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*) also poses problems with regard to the theory of the injunctive as a mood for timeless descriptions, since indicatives (augmented aorists and indicative presents) are combined with injunctive aorists without any clear distinction.¹⁷

(EX.14)

- (1) Μοῦσά μοι ἔννεπε ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης
- (2) Κύπριδος, ἣ τε θεοῖσιν ἐπι γλυκὺν ἴμερον ὤρσε
- (3) καὶ τ' ἐδαμάσσατο φύλα καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,
- (4) οἰωνούς τε διῖπετέας καὶ θηρία πάντα,
- (5) ἡμὲν ὄσ' ἤπειρος πολλὰ τρέφει ἡδ' ὅσα πόντος:
- (6) πᾶσιν δ' ἔργα μέμηλεν εὖστεφάνου Κυθερείης.
- (7) τρισὰς δ' οὐ δύναται πεπιθεῖν φρένας οὐδ' ἀπατήσαι:
- (8) κούρην τ' αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην:
- (9) οὐ γάρ οἱ εὔαδεν ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης,
- (10) ἀλλ' ἄρα οἱ πόλεμοί τε ἄδον καὶ ἔργον Ἄρης,
- (11) ὑσμῖναί τε μάχαι τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ ἔργ' ἀλεγύνειν.
- (12) πρώτη τέκτονας ἄνδρας ἐπιχθονίους ἐδίδαξε
- (13) ποιῆσαι σατίνας καὶ ἄρματα ποικίλα χαλκῶ:
- (14) ἡ δέ τε παρθενικὰς ἀπαλόχροας ἐν μεγάροισιν
- (15) ἀγλαὰ ἔργ' ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θεῖσα ἐκάστη.
- (16) οὐδέ ποτ' Ἀρτέμιδα χρυσηλάκατον κελαδαινῆν
- (17) δάμναται ἐν φιλότῃ φιλομμειδῆς Ἀφροδίτῃ:
- (18) καὶ γὰρ τῇ ἄδε τόξα καὶ οὔρεσι θῆρας ἐναίρειν,
- (19) φόρμιγγές τε χοροὶ τε διαπρύσιοί τ' ὄλολυγὰι
- (20) ἄλσεά τε σκιδόντα δικάϊων τε πτόλις ἀνδρῶν.
- (21) οὐδὲ μὲν αἰδοίῃ κούρη ἄδεν ἔργ' Ἀφροδίτης
- (22) Ἰστίῃ, ἣν πρώτην τέκετο Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης,
- (23) αὐτίς δ' ὀπλοτάτην, βουλῇ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,
- (24) πότνιαν, ἣν ἐμῶντο Ποσειδάων καὶ Ἀπόλλων: (HH 5,1–24)¹⁸

‘Muse, tell me of the works of golden Aphrodite from Kypros, who drove sweet longing into gods and tamed the tribes of mortal men, who is ruling over air-borne birds and all animals. The creatures which the mainland feeds or the sea are all engaged in the works of the well-crowned Kytherean goddess. Three spirits she was unable to win over or deceive: owl-eyed Athene, virgin-daughter of aegis-bearing Zeus, whom the works of golden Aphrodite did not please. Battles and the work of Ares do bring her pleasure, as do battles, fighting and the preparation of brilliant deeds. She was the first to instruct the craftsman who live on the earth to build chariots and various waggons with bronze. She also instructed the soft-skinned maidens in the brilliant acts within

¹⁷ The issue was dealt with in much more detail in De Decker (2019: 55–61 (on the *prooimion*) and 61–64 (on the tense usage and the denomination of the type of aorist).

¹⁸ In this example too the metrically secure present indicative forms have been underlined twice.

the household, and put (her knowledge) in every bosom. Nor is the smiling goddess Aphrodite able to tame the loud-sounding Artemis with arrows of gold, by using lust. Pleasing to her are archery and the slaying of wild beasts in the mountains, and also the music of lyres, choirs (of singers), very sharp cries, shadowy groves and the city of righteous men. Aphrodite's works were not pleasing to the chaste maiden Hestia, whom Kronos with a crooked mind had begotten as the oldest; the youngest again, a mistress by the will of the aegis-bearing Zeus, whom Poseidon and Apollon courted.'

There are four injunctive forms in this passage. The last, τέκετο (22), does not refer to a timeless habit, but to an event in a mythical past. The injunctive use in that form is expected. The three other instances, ἄδον (10), ἄδε (18) and ἄδεν (21), refer to the habits of the different goddesses, Athene, Artemis and Hestia, who all spurn Aphrodite (and physical love); in (9) and (10) Athene's preferences are described with an indicative and an injunctive, so that one could argue that the injunctive is a type of *moodless mood* or the result of a *conjunction reduction*, but after (10), two more indicatives follow, so that the reduction-explanation is excluded; in (18), the injunctive forms is preceded by an indicative, but this does not apply to ἄδεν in (21). This passage, thus, provides some counter-examples to the interpretation of the injunctive as the mood describing the timeless habits of the gods (as they are mostly expressed in the indicative in this context), but also fails to support the reduction-rule. An alternative explanation could be that only the forms that apply to the goddess Aphrodite are in the indicative, but this is only partially correct: while the rule is observed in the indicatives ἐδαμάσσατο (3), δύναται (7), εὔαδεν (9), δάμναται (17), which all refer to Aphrodite and in the injunctives ἄδον (10) and ἄδε (18), which do not refer to her, it does not apply to the injunctive ἄδεν (21), which refers to physical love and is thus clearly related to Aphrodite, but has no augment, and in the indicatives ἐδίδαξε (12, 15), which refer to Athene's preferred actions, but not Aphrodite's and yet have the augment. As to the aspectual choices, ἄδον and ἄδεν, these pose the same questions as above, but with the other forms, the use seems to be in agreement with the distinction discussed above: the present forms refer to actions that remain(ed) ongoing and have not been completed, namely τρέφει, δύναται, δάμναται, or had not been completed, but had the notion of *de conatu* (which is a case of imperfectivity *par excellence*), as in ἐμῶντο. The aorist forms, on the other hand, refer to actions that have been completed.

3.3. HH 5,256–273

In the following passage of HH 5 (the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*), only the indicative present and the aorist have been used, although they apparently refer to timeless habits.¹⁹

(EX.15)

(256) τὸν μὲν ἐπὶν δὴ πρῶτον ἴδη φάος ἡελίοιο,

(257) νύμφαι μιν θρέψουσιν ὄρεσκῶι βαθύκολποι,

¹⁹ For a more detailed analysis, the reader is referred to De Decker (2019: 27–28, 46–48).

- (258) αἶ τόδε βαιετάουσιν ὄρος μέγα τε ζάθεόν τε:
 (259) αἶ ῥ' οὔτε θνητοῖς οὔτ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἔπονται:
 (260) δηρὸν μὲν ζώουσι καὶ ἄμβροτον εἶδαρ ἔδουσι,
 (261) καὶ τε μετ' ἀθανάτοισι καλὸν χορὸν ἐρρώσαντο.
 (262) τῆσι δὲ Σειληνοὶ τε καὶ εὖσκοπος ἀργεῖφόντης
 (263) ἰ μίσγοντ' ἐν φιλότῃτι μυχῶ σπειών ἐροέντων.
 (264) τῆσι δ' ἄμ' ἢ ἐλάται ἢ ἐ δρύες ὑψικάρηνοι
 (265) γεινομένησιν ἔφυσαν ἐπὶ χθονὶ βωτιανείρη
 (266) καλαὶ τηλεθάουσαι ἐν οὔρεσιν ὑψηλοῖσιν.
 (267) ἰ ἐστᾶσ' ἠλίβατοι, τεμένη δέ ἐ κικλήσκουσιν
 (268) ἀθανάτων: τὰς δ' οὐ τι βροτοὶ κείρουσι σιδήρω.
 (269) ἀλλ' ὅτε κεν δὴ μοῖρα παρεστήκη θανάτοιο
 (270) ἄζάνεται μὲν πρῶτον ἐπὶ χθονὶ δένδρεα καλά,
 (271) φλοιὸς δ' ἀμφιπεριφθινύθει, πίπτουσι δ' ἄπ' ὄζοι,
 (272) τῶν δέ χ' ὁμοῦ ψυχὴ λείποι φάος ἡλείοιο.
 (273) αἶ μὲν ἐμὸν θρέψουσι παρὰ σφίσιν υἴὸν ἔχουσαι. (HH 5,256–273)

'When he first sees the light of the sun, the deep-bosomed Nymphs who live in the mountains and are raised by the mountains will nurture him. They inhabit the high and holy mountain and follow neither mortals nor immortals. They live long, eat eternal food and rush around with the immortals in beautiful dances. With them the Seilenoi and the sharp-looking slayer of the Argos mingle in love in the innermost part of the lovely caves. Together with them, when they are born, silver firs and oaks with very high peaks spring up on the man-nurturing earth, both flourishing beautifully in the high mountains. There they stand high and they are called the holy spaces of the immortals. Mortals do not cut them with iron. But when the fate of death comes near them, first their beautiful leaves dry up on the earth, then the bark around them fades away, the branches fall down and then together their (the Nymphs and the trees) soul would leave the light of the sun. These Nymphs will keep my son among them and will raise him.'

In this passage, the poet describes how the Nymphs will nurture Aineias as soon as he sees the light of day. The poet also adds a very elaborate description as to their origin and their eternal habits. As we are dealing with a description of timeless actions, we would have expected the present injunctive to be used, but in fact we only find present indicatives, *βαιετάουσιν*, *ἔπονται*, *ζώουσι*, *ἔδουσι*, *κικλήσκουσιν*, *ἄζάνεται*, *ἀμφιπεριφθινύθει* and *πίπτουσι*, an indicative perfect, *ἐστᾶσ'*, and indicative aorists (augmented), *ἐρρώσαντο* and *ἔφυσαν*. Only *ἔπονται* and *ἀμφιπεριφθινύθει* are equivalent to a present injunctive, while *μίσγοντ'* could be a present indicative or a present injunctive (unaugmented imperfect): as the ending *-αι* in the medio-passive verbal endings can be elided, *μίσγοντ'* can stand for *μίσγονται* (present indicative) or *μίσγοντο* (present injunctive). In light of the present forms that surround the verb, an interpretation as a present form seems more likely, but one could also state that the form was originally an injunctive, either as result of a reduction with the preceding indicatives or because the verb describes the timeless habits of the Nymphs. However, given that we have no other injunctive forms in this passage, the interpretation as an indicative is much more probable. At first, the exclusive use of the indicative forms seems problematic, as the context does indeed relate events that have always happened and will always reoccur, but this only appears to be the case.

In this passage, the Nymphs are conceived as part of Aphrodite's *hic et nunc* as they will be the nurses that will raise and care for Aineias. They are, therefore, not timeless and remote characters, but belong to the immediate deixis and are very much involved in the Hymn. This also explains why the augment is used with the aorist forms. That we are dealing with a specific event related to the near-future and not something timeless, is also proved by the future-subjunctive $\theta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\psi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ and explains why the subjunctive and the optative in this passage are accompanied by a modal particle $\kappa\epsilon(v)$ / χ' . This passage is thus not evidence for the non-existence of the injunctive nor is it an exception to the expected uses of the injunctive (aorist and present). Most verb forms are in the present stem and refer to ongoing and uncompleted actions. There are only two aorist forms, $\xi\psi\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$ and $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$, and while the former clearly refers to a completed action, this is not the case for the latter, but, as we have seen before, $\epsilon\rho\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ and its compounds are often used in the aorist where we would expect a form from the present stem.

3.4. HH 19,19–29

The last passage is from the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*.

(EX.16)

- (19) σὺν δὲ σφιν τότε νύμφαι ὄρεστιάδες λιγύμολποι
 (20) φοιτῶσαι πυκνὰ ποσσὶν ἐπὶ κρήνη μελανύδρω
 (21) μέλπονται, κορυφήν δὲ περιστένει οὖρεος ἠχώ:
 (22) δαίμων δ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα χορῶν τοτὲ δ' ἐς μέσον ἔρπων
 (23) πυκνὰ ποσὶν διέπει, λαῖφος δ' ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφαινόν
 (24) λυγκὸς ἔχει λιγυρήσιν ἀγαλλόμενος φρένα μολπαῖς
 (25) ἐν μαλακῷ λειμῶνι τόθι κρόκος ἦδ' ὑάκινθος
 (26) εὐώδης θαλέθων καταμίσγεται ἄκριτα ποίη.
 (27) ὕμνευσιν δὲ θεοῦς μάκαρας καὶ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον:
 (28) οἶόν θ' Ἑρμείην ἐριούνιον ἔξοχον ἄλλων
 (29) ἔννεπον ὡς ὃ γ' ἅπασι θεοῖς θεὸς ἄγγελός ἐστι
 (30) καὶ ῥ' ὃ γ' ἐς Ἀρκαδίην πολυπίδακα, μητέρα μῆλων,
 (31) ἔξικετ', ἔνθα τέ οἱ τέμενος Κυλληνίου ἐστίν. (HH 19,19–29)

'With them the mountain nymphs, sweet-singing, visiting with their feet the depths of the well with dark water, then sing (their song) and Ekho resounds around the top of the mountain. The god, walking slowly into the middle of the choirs, now here, then there, firmly performs with his feet. He has the blood-coloured lynx skin on his back, entertaining his heart through the sweet songs (of the Muses) in the soft meadows, where the crocus and the well-scented and blooming hyacinth endlessly mingle in the grass. They sing about the blessed gods and the high Olympos, as they speak about the messenger Hermes, excelling above all others, who is the swift herald for all the gods and came to Arkadie with the many wells, the mother of the sheep. There is the temple of the Kyllenian god.'

In this passage in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*, the poet describes how the Muses praise Pan. Most of the finite verb forms are in the present indicative, but one verb is in the present injunctive, $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\nu\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu$, and one in the aorist injunctive, $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\iota\kappa\epsilon\tau'$. One could argue that the absence of the augment in $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\nu\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu$ is metrically insecure, but even if $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\nu\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu$

were augmented, it would still be the only form from the present stem that was not an indicative present. As with *μίμνε* in *HH* 3,5, the use of the unaugmented imperfect *ἔννεπον* has troubled scholars and most ascribed to the form the meaning of an aorist, but avoided a discussion of the absence of the augment.²⁰ West (1989: 135–136) argued that the injunctive was timeless in this instance, but although I agree that we are dealing with an injunctive, I nevertheless believe that the reason for its use has to be sought elsewhere. The present indicatives *μέλπονται*, *περιστένει*, *διέπει*, *ἔχει* and *καταμίσγεται* all (somehow) refer to Pan and as he is the subject of the Hymn, I believe that the indicative was used to create a connection between the listener and the god. However, for *ὑμνεῦσιν* this is not the case, as this verb describes the Muses singing about all the gods (this form is metrically insecure, as it is equivalent to the injunctive *ὑμνειον*, with metrical lengthening in the second syllable as in *ὑμνείουσαι* in *Works and Days* 2) and *ἔννεπον* specifically refers to the Muses praising Hermes (Pan's father), rather than the subject of the Hymn. In line with what I argued in the previous Hymn, it could be argued in this context as well that the verbs that have a connection to Pan and/or refer to a group to which Pan belongs (as is the case in the description of all the immortal gods) are used in the indicative, whereas the verbs that do not refer to him, have the injunctive. The only exception then would be *ἔστι* in line 31, but in that specific instance, the indicative was used because the verb does not have an injunctive present in the singular (cf. *supra*). The aorist injunctive, *ἔξικετ'*, on the other hand, refers to an event in a mythical past that is not related to Pan and, therefore, the injunctive and not the indicative is used. As almost all the verbs refer to uncompleted actions, are in the present stem and as only *ἔξικετ'* describes a completed action, it is the only verb form in the aorist.

4. Conclusion

In this article, divided into two parts, I investigated the existence of the timeless injunctive in epic Greek and analyzed all the appropriate passages. In part I, I started by briefly discussing the injunctive and the augment in epic Greek, establishing certain basic rules (built on earlier research) and addressing some important criticism raised by the reviewers of the journal, such as the problem of the gnomes, *similia*, the *Hymnic aorist* and *τε-épique*, the comparison with the Vedic injunctive and the problems posed by the absence of the augment in Mycenaean, and finally the role played by the aspectual choices. In general, the injunctive is used to mention what happened in a narrative (and is therefore the most suitable for background depictions), to narrate events in a more remote and mythical past and for the description of the timeless habits of the gods, whereas the augmented indicative is used to highlight events, either near the speaker and listener, or about the god(s)/goddess(es) to whom the Hymn is dedicated. The absence of the augment in Mycenaean certainly excludes that the use and/or absence of the augment in epic Greek was determined

²⁰ Hermann (1806: 170), Baumeister (1860: 354–355), Allen and Sikes (1904: 268), Càssola (1975: 576). Gemoll (1886: 338) did not discuss the tense use nor the augment.

by metrical factors alone, but the distinction, namely mentioning – highlighting, applies to Mycenaean as well, as those texts were mostly written by scribes who simply described without any specific emphasis what happened in the administrative institutions, how much tax was paid and by whom, and who possessed what. The injunctive was the most suitable form in such contexts and there was no need to use the augmented forms. Then, I briefly considered aspect in general, but with a specific focus on epic Greek, and, as suggested by the reviewers, I used the distinction perfective versus imperfective as a frame in the discussion and analysis of certain passages in order to exemplify my arguments. The analysis of the individual passages was performed in part 2 and the findings were as follows. The injunctives in *Iliad* 1,601–604 (ἄειδον and ἔχ'), *Theogony* 268–296 (ἱαλλον), 916–917 (ἄδον), 924–926 (ἄδον) and *Works and Days* 526–528 (δείκνυ) are all timeless. Those in *Iliad* 2,254–551 (θρέψε and τέκε), 2,591–600 (παῦσαν, στεῦτο, θέσαν, ἀφέλοντο and ἐκλέλαθον) and 5,334–342 (κάμον) are not timeless, but describe a single action in a remote past, a context in which one would also expect the injunctive.

In *HH* 3,1–10, the injunctive μίμνε was not timeless, but described the background against which the events involving Apollon unfolded, and in *HH* 19,19–29, the injunctive ἔννεπον (which is actually metrically insecure) was used, not because it described a timeless habit *per se*, but because it described a divinity that was not the protagonist of the Hymn. Additionally, the injunctive ἐξίκετ' was used because it referred to a single action in a remote past and not because it was timeless.

This brings us to the exceptions, namely instances in which mythical and/or timeless actions are described, but are nevertheless related with indicative forms. In *Iliad* 24,613–617 and *Odyssey* 24,1–4, the indicative forms are equivalent to the injunctive form, with the exception of ἔρρωσαντο in *Iliad* 24,616, and while in most of these instances, a *τε-épique* is used, which seems to block the use of the injunctive, the use of the indicative in these timeless contexts (even in the cases in which one could replace the indicative by an injunctive) is somewhat surprising. In *Theogony* 1–10, we only have one injunctive form, στεῖχον (10), while the other forms are all in the indicative (some are metrically insecure, but others are guaranteed by the metre). As was the case in the work of Homer, most of these indicative forms appear with a *τε-épique*, but that does not explain the use of the indicative. In *HH* 5,1–24, the use of the indicative to refer to the actions of Aphrodite is by and large confirmed, as only ἄδεν (*HH* 5,21) is an exception to the rule, but in contrast to this, there are two injunctives as well as two indicatives that refer to the habits of other gods, namely ἐδίδαξε (*HH* 5,12, 5,15), and these indicatives are unexpected.

Finally, there are instances in which the indicative use can in fact be explained. In *HH* 5,256–273, the indicatives are used, because the actions described are closely connected to Aphrodite and the indicative use is, therefore, not an exception. In *Iliad* 1,528–530, the indicative ἐπερρώσαντο (529) was used, because the action described was not timeless and using the injunctive in that description could have caused ambiguity.

In almost all the instances, with respect to both indicatives and injunctives, the aspectual distinctions could be explained by the distinction perfective - imperfective and the classification by Vendler (1957).

To conclude, I hope to have shown that there are indeed remnants of an injunctive in early epic Greek, in the work of Homer and Hesiod, as well as in the *Homeric Hymns*, and while not all of the instances adduced prove the timeless nature of the injunctive, the evidence for the value of the injunctive for remote, mythical and simply reportative elements in a story, is in my opinion firmly established and agrees with the analyses for Vedic by Avery (1885), Delbrück (1888: 354–355), Renou (1928) and Hoffmann (1967).

References²¹

- Ahrens H.L. 1843. *De Linguae Graecae Dialectis. Liber Secundus. De dialecto dorica.*
- Allen T., Sikes E. 1904. *The Homeric hymns.* London: MacMillan.
- Avery J. 1885. The unaugmented verb forms of the Rig and Atharva Vedas. – *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 11: 326–365.
- Bakker E. 2002. Remembering the God's arrival. – *Arethusa* 35: 63–81.
- Baumeister A. 1860. *Hymni Homerici. Recensuit, apparatus criticum collegit, annotationem cum suam tum selectam variorum subiunxit Augustus Baumeister.* Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Brügger C. 2018. *Homer Iliad. The Basel commentary. Book XVI.* [Transl. by B.W. Millis and S. Strack. Ed. by S.D. Olson]. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.
- Cassola F. 1975. *Inni Omerici.* Firenze: Mondadori.
- Clackson J. 2007. *Indo-European linguistics: An introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chantraine P. 1948. *Grammaire homérique. Vol. 1: Phonétique et morphologie.* Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chantraine P. 1953. *Grammaire homérique. Vol. 1: Syntaxe.* Paris: Klincksieck.
- Chicago Homer [available at: <https://homer.library.northwestern.edu/html/application.html>, accessed: 30 January 2023]
- Curtius G. 1869. Zur Bildung des griechischen Nominativ Singularis. – (*Curtius'*) *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik* 2: 159–175.
- De Decker F. 2015. *A morphosyntactic analysis of speech introductions and conclusions in Homer.* [unpublished PhD dissertation, LMU München]. [available at: <https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17995/>].
- De Decker F. 2016. A contrastive analysis of the Homeric and Hesiodic augment, with special focus on Hesiod. – *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Historical Reconstruction* 13: 33–128.
- De Decker F. 2017. "Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν: An analysis of the augment use in *Iliad* 1. – *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 47: 58–171.
- De Decker F. 2018. The tense usage in the speech conclusions with past reference in Homer. – *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 46: 109–151.
- De Decker F. 2019. Studies in Greek epic diction, metre and language: The augment use in *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (HH 5). – *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Historical Reconstruction* 16: 1–86.
- De Decker F. 2020. A semantic-pragmatic analysis of the augment in epic Greek, applied to some longer passages. – Leiwo M., Vierros M., Dahlgren S. (eds.). *Papers on Ancient*

²¹ As was the case in part 1, I only quote here the works that were used in part 2; for the works used in part 1, the reader is referred to the references there.

- Greek linguistics. Proceedings of the ninth international colloquium on Ancient Greek linguistics (ICAGL 9). 30 August – 1 September 2018.* Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica: 447–477.
- De Decker F. 2022. *Studies in Homeric speech introductions and conclusions: Tense, aspect, augment, mood, modality, and modal particle.* Alessandria: Edizioni dell' Orso.
- De Decker F. 2023. A contrastive study of the co-occurrence of the augmented, unaugmented and iterative forms in -σκ- in *Iliad* 24. – (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 134: 9–95.
- Delbrück B. 1888. *Syntaktische Forschungen V. Altindische Syntax.* Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses.
- Edwards G. 1971. *The language of Hesiod.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- García-Ramón J. 2012. En travaillant à une grammaire du mycénien. – Carlier P. e.a. (eds.). *Études mycéniennes 2010 : actes du XIIIe Colloque international sur les textes égéens : Sèvres, Paris, Nanterre, 20–23 septembre 2010.* Pisa: Serra: 435–454.
- Gemoll A. 1886. *Die homerischen Hymnen.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- Goodwin W. *Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb.* Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Hermann G. 1801. *De emendanda ratione Graecae grammaticae.* Leipzig: Fleischer.
- Hermann G. 1806. *Homeri Hymni et Epigrammata.* Leipzig: Weidmann.
- Hoffmann K. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Kühner R., Blass F. 1892. *Griechische Grammatik. Formenlehre.* Zweiter Band. Hannover: Hahn.
- Levin S. 1969. Remarks on the 'historical' present and comparable phenomena of syntax. – *Foundations of Language* 5: 386–390.
- Misteli F. 1868. Über die accentuation des griechischen. – (*Kuhns*) *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 17: 81–134.
- Monro D. 1891. *A grammar of the Homeric dialect.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Paley F. 1861. *The epics of Hesiod, with an English commentary.* London: Whittaker.
- Pelliccia H. 1985. *The structure of the Archaic Greek Hymns.* [unpublished PhD dissertation, Yale University].
- Perseus [available at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collection?collection=Perseus:collection:Greco-Roman>, accessed: 30 January 2023]
- Renou L. 1928. Les formes dites d'injonctif dans le RgVeda. – [sine editore] *Étrennes linguistiques offertes par quelques amis à Émile Benveniste.* Paris: Paul Geuthner: 63–80.
- Richardson N. 2010. *Three Homeric hymns: To Apollo, Hermes and Aphrodite (Hymns 3, 4 and 5).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rijksbaron A. 2009. Discourse cohesion in the proem of Hesiod's *Theogony*. – Bakker S., Wakker G. (eds.). *Discourse cohesion in Ancient Greek.* Leiden: Brill: 241–265.
- Rowe, C.J. 1978. *Essential Hesiod. Theogony 1–232, 453–733 works and days 1–307 with introduction and notes by C.J. Rowe.* Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Ruijgh C.J. 1971. *Autour de "τε épique". Études sur la syntaxe grecque.* Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Schmidt M. 1982. δεικνυμι. – Voigt E. (eds.). *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos.* 10. Lieferung: βάδην – Διώνη. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht: 232–233.
- Schneidewin F. 1847. *Die homerischen Hymnen auf Apollon.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Sjölund R. 1938. *Metrische Kürzung im Griechischen.* Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells.
- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae [available at: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/inst/tsearch.jsp>, accessed: 30 January 2023].
- Troxler H. 1964. *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods.* Zürich: Juris.
- Veitch W. 1879. *Greek verbs. Defective and irregular.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Vendler Z. 1957. Verbs and times. – *The Philosophic Review* 66: 143–160.
- Vogrinz G. 1889. *Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes*. Paderborn: Schönigh.
- Von Hartel W. 1871. Homerische Studien I. – *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften aus Wien* 68: 383–468.
- Von Hartel W. 1874a. *Homerische Studien II*. Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn.
- Von Hartel W. 1874b. *Homerische Studien III*. Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn.
- West M. 1978. *Hesiod. Works and days*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- West M. 1989. An unrecognized injunctive usage in Greek. – *Glotta* 67: 135–138.