

FILIP DE DECKER
FWO Vlaanderen, Universiteit Gent
filipdedecker9@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-2863-5801

SOME LOOSE ENDS IN THE ANALYSIS OF THE FORMS ἜΘΗΚΕ(N) AND ΘΗΚΕ(N) IN THE ILIAD: THE EXCEPTIONS, THE COMPOUNDS, THE LINK WITH MYCENAEAN AND THE ORIGIN OF THE AUGMENT

Keywords: epic Greek, Mycenaean, augment, injunctive, historical Greek syntax

Abstract

In the final part of the investigation into the use of the (un)augmented 3rd singular forms ἔθηκε(ν) and θηκε(ν) in the *Iliad*, I focus on some loose ends, such as the enjambments, the compound forms, the formulaic nature of the epic language, the subordinate and negative sentences, and on some thornier issues such as the exceptions to the rules and the Mycenaean *te ke* and *do ke* and what this can tell us about the original meaning and origin of the augment.¹

2. Some loose ends

2.1. Enjambment²

As will have become clear, there are many passages in which the verb is unaugmented in spite of its focused actions. In several cases, the fact that the verb is unaugmented can be explained by its position in the verse or sentence: the focused and emphasized nature of verb forms in sentence-initial position has been discussed

¹ The acknowledgements are the same as in De Decker (2020a).

² An in-depth study of Homeric enjambment can unfortunately not be done here. The first seminal study is M. Parry (1929), but see also Bakker (1990).

before, but we now need to take a closer look at the forms in necessary enjambment, by which is meant, in the sense of M. Parry, that the verb in the next line continues and finalizes the thought of a sentence that started in the previous verse. The verb is needed, because without it being mentioned, it is unclear what is meant. As with many features of the Homeric language, one can always state and argue that (at least certain instances of) the necessary enjambment was (were) forced upon the poet by the metre,³ but I am rather reluctant to ascribe features of the epic language to the metre alone and think that if the poet wanted to do or say something, he would have done so. Consequently, I also believe that if he placed a verb at the beginning of the next sentence he might very well have done so deliberately. I give two examples.

(EX.01) Ὡς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ ἔθεν ὑψόσ' αἰείρας
θῆκεν ἀνά μυρικήν· δέελον δ' ἐπὶ σῆμά τ' ἔθηκε
 συμμάρψας δόνακας μυρικής τ' ἐριθιλέας ὄζους.
 (*Iliad* 10,465–467)

'So he spoke, he lifted the spoils from him, put them on a tamarisk bush, made a clear sign besides them and pulled reeds and very long twigs from the tamarisk together.'⁴

In this passage the poet describes how Odysseus finished praying to Athene, promising a gift after their mission and made a sign for the spoils of Dolon. The placing of the spoils is a non-trivial element in the story, as it marks the successful completion of the endeavour on which they embarked and also indicates that they will pay special homage to Athene. Therefore, a degree of emphasis is needed and this is conveyed by the enjambment in the first form and by the augment in the other form.

(EX.02) ὧς εἰπὼν τὴν μὲν **λίπεν** αὐτοῦ, **βῆ** δ' ἐπὶ φύσας: (468)
 τὰς δ' ἐς πῦρ ἔτρεψε **κέλευσέ** τε ἐργάζεσθαι. (469)
 φύσαι δ' ἐν χοάνοισιν ἐείκοσι πᾶσαι ἐφύσων (470)
 παντοίην εὐπρηστον αὐτμὴν ἐξανιεῖσαι, (471)
 ἄλλοτε μὲν σπεύδοντι παρέμμεναι, ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτε, (472)
 ὄππως Ἥφαιστός τ' ἐθέλοι καὶ ἔργον ἄνοιτο. (473)
 χαλκὸν δ' ἐν πυρὶ **βάλλεν** ἀτειρέα κασσίτερόν τε (474)
 καὶ χρυσὸν τιμῆντα καὶ ἄργυρον: αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα (475)
θῆκεν ἐν ἀκμοθέτῳ μέγαν ἄκμονα, **γέντο** δὲ χειρὶ (476)
 ραιστήρα κρατερὴν, ἐτέρηφι δὲ **γέντο** πυράγρην. (477)
 (*Iliad* 18,468–477)

'He spoke so and left her on the same place, but he went to his bellows, turned them into the fire and ordered them to work. All the twenty bellows blew on the melting pots and they produced a very hot burning wind from all directions for him to be active now here and then there, wherever Hephaistos wanted to work and the work went forward. He threw the bronze, the indestructible tin, the valuable gold and

³ As was suggested for several cases by Bakker (1990: 15–16).

⁴ Unless noted otherwise, all translations are my own.

the silver in the fire. And then he put the big anvil on the anvil-block, he gripped the strong hammer with the one hand and with the other hand (he took) the pair of fire-tongs.⁵

This passage describes how Hephaistos started assembling new weaponry for Akhilleus on Thetis's request. There are seven unaugmented and only two augmented verb forms. The form θῆκεν is preceded by the augmented ones ἔτρεψε and ἐφύσων. One could therefore argue that this form has no augment because of the reduction rule (as is the case with 4 other unaugmented forms), but the augment use cannot simply be explained in terms of that rule. The fact that the sentence starts with two unaugmented forms is a bit more problematic; while the absence of an augment in βῆ can be explained by the fact that it is followed by a clitic, the absence of an augment in λίπεν is not explainable in terms of the reduction or clitic rule. The different stages of the assembling of the armour are related with unaugmented forms, but all of them can be explained (with the exception of βάλλεν): θῆκεν is used in enjambment and has VO word order, the first γέντο is followed by a clitic, stands in sentence-initial position and has VO word order and the second γέντο has VO word order. The two augmented forms in this passage refer to the two protagonists/main elements: Hephaistos and his bellows, as both of them will be the ones creating the new weapons and armour for Akhilleus.

2.2. 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 2001: 15–17, 2005: 126–130; Mumm 2004: §5.4; De Lamberterie 2007: 45, 51–52), unless the negation was linked to the speaker's deixis (Bakker 2001: 15–17, 2005: 126–130). There are only two examples and in one example the augment is used (*Iliad* 23,526–527), and in the other it is not (8,217–219). Two instances are not enough to decide on the link between negation and augmentation and to determine if the augment use in the negative sentences is also governed by the distinction foreground – background. The two examples will be discussed below.

(EX.03) καί νύ κ' ἐνέπρησεν πυρὶ κηλέω νῆας εἵσας,
εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε Ἀγαμέμνωνι πότνια Ἥρη
αὐτῷ ποιπνύσαντι θοῶς ὀτρῦναι Ἀχαιοῦς.
(*Iliad* 8,217–219)

'And now he would have set fire on to the ships with the burning fire, if Here had not made Agamemnon eager and had not put in his mind (the desire) to quickly incite the Akhaians.'

In this instance Homer describes how Hektor would have set fire to the Greek ships, if Here had not put in Agamemnon's mind to incite the Greek to fight back. The form

⁵ The translation is based on that of the Chicago Homer.

θῆκ' appears in a negative (and subordinate) clause and is therefore unaugmented. What is remarkable, however, is that in this description the action of the main clause appears in an affirmative sentence but is unreal and counterfactual (the ships were not burnt down), whereas the action in the negative and subordinate clause did take place, as Here has in fact incited Agamemnon and thus prevented the burning of the ships. Both actions are therefore foregrounded, and the absence of an augment in θῆκ' is unexpected.

(EX.04) εἰ δέ κ' ἔτι προτέρω γένετο δρόμος ἀμφοτέροισι,
τὼ κέν μιν **παρέλασσαν** οὐδ' ἀμφήριστον ἔθηκεν.
(*Iliad* 23,526–527)

'If the run between the two of them had been any longer, he would have surpassed him and there he would have made it (sc. his victory) undisputable.'

The example under discussion here describes the chariot race between Antilokhos and Menelaos. Before the race started, Antilokhos received advice from his father Nestor on how to win the race with trickery. The passage here states that if the race had gone any further, Menelaos would have surpassed Antilokhos and that there would have been no discussion. The emphasis in this passage is clearly on Menelaos's victory (which has been stolen from him) and therefore the augment in ἀμφήριστον ἔθηκεν is expected. This is a litotes and might therefore not be a real example of a negation. As the formula ἀμφήριστον ἔθηκεν also appears in a positive context (23,382), it could theoretically also be possible that the formula was extended from the positive into the negative context here,⁶ but I prefer the semantic explanation.

Both examples involve foregrounded events and the unaugmented instance is therefore an exception.

2.3. 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.⁷ As I argued above, I suspect that it is not just subordination that causes the augmentlessness but rather the distinction foreground – background. In the corpus under investigation, there are 3 forms in a subordinate clause and all three are unaugmented,⁸ but this sample is too small to allow for any conclusive remarks.

The example 8,218 (EX.03) does not agree with the distinction foreground – background and is an exception, as was argued above.

⁶ For an overview of possible metrical and formulaic expansions of (un)augmented formulae, see De Decker (2015b: 277–282).

⁷ 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".

⁸ The instances are *Iliad* 9,460, 16,223, 21,484.

The verse 16,223 (EX.09 from De Decker 2020b) can serve as an illustration: in that passage the fact that Akhilleus received his coffer from his mother Thetis has no direct influence on the storyline, hence the unaugmented verb form.

Platt and Bakker argued that in case of the ἐπεὶ-sentences the augment was used when the subordinate clause was close to the speaker and had causal meaning, but that it remained absent when the meaning was temporal and descriptive (Platt 1891: 220, 225–226; Bakker 2001: 13–14, 2005: 125–126). In this respect, the following instance is an important exception:

(EX.05) τοξοφόρῳ περ εὐούση, ἐπεὶ σὲ λέοντα γυναιξὶ
Ζεὺς **θῆκεν**, καὶ ἔδωκε κατακτάμεν ἦν κ' ἐθέλησθα.
(*Iliad* 21,483–484)

‘(...) bow bearing as you may be, since Zeus made you to be a lioness among the women and has given you the power to kill whomever you want.’

In this instance Here attacks Artemis for siding with the Trojans and for having received the power to kill women at random from Zeus. Here’s reproach is clearly causal and linked to the immediacy, as she is addressing Artemis and nevertheless, θῆκεν is unaugmented. In this instance the action of the subordinate clause is clearly foregrounded (Here is angry with Artemis, because she has received her powers from Zeus and not from any other god). In spite of this, θῆκεν is unaugmented.

One can clearly see that the three examples in the subordinate clauses here do not really confirm the distinction foreground – background (as there are two exceptions on three examples), but the small sample might have skewed the data.

3. Compounds and tmesis: the case of κατέθηκ(ε) versus κατὰ ... θῆκε / ἔθηκε

One reviewer raises the issue of tmesis (this is the phenomenon by which later “Attic” compound verbs appear in poetry with the preverb and the verb form separated; the term is misleading as it gives the impression that tmesis is the abnormal situation, while it is in fact the compounds that are younger) and asks if a difference can be discerned between cases of κατέθηκ(ε) versus κατὰ ... θῆκε / ἔθηκε. As there is no agreement on a uniform definition for the concept “tmesis” and the exact transition and chronology of the transition of adverbs into preverbs and prepositions respectively are debated, I work with a rather restricted definition of the concept and consider the separation of preverb and verb to be a case of tmesis, only if one cannot yet interpret the adverb/preverb as a preposition.

This is the reason why, contrary to the reviewer’s suggestions, I do not include the following instances quoted below, because in all these verses the preverbs (put in bold face) can be seen as genuine prepositions already.

(EX.06) τῷ γὰρ **ἐπι** φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη.
(*Iliad* 1,55)

‘The goddess, Here with the white arms, had put (this thought) in his mind.’

(EX.07) κρατὶ δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμῳ κυνέην εὖτυκτον ἔθηκεν.
(*Iliad* 3,336; 15,480; 16,137)

'He then put his well-wrought helmet with horse hair on his strong head.'⁹

(EX.08) ἦ δ' ἄρα πέπλον ἐλοῦσα Θεανῶ καλλιπάρῃος
θῆκεν Ἀθηναίης ἐπὶ γούνασιν ἠῦκόμοιο.
(*Iliad* 6,302–303)

'Theano with the beautiful cheeks took the garment and put it on the knees of Athene with the nice hair.'

(EX.09) ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν εἴσελθε καὶ ἔξεο τῶδ' ἐπὶ δίφρῳ
δᾶερ, ἐπεὶ σε μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκεν
εἴνεκ' ἐμεῖο κυνὸς καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἄτης,
οἷσιν ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε κακὸν μόρον, ὡς καὶ ὀπίσσω
ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ' ἀοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοισι.
(*Iliad* 6,354–358)

'Now come in and sit on this double chair, brother in law, since the toil falls mostly on your shoulders, because of me, doglike woman, and the blindness of Alexandros. On us Zeus has put a bad fate and even for mankind to come we will remain the object of songs.'

(EX.10) καὶ νύ κ' ἐνέπρησεν πυρὶ κηλέῳ νῆας εἴσας,
εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε Ἀγαμέμνονι πότνια Ἥρη
αὐτῷ ποιπνύσαντι θοῶς ὀτρῦναι Ἀχαιοὺς.
(*Iliad* 8,217–219)

'And now he would have set fire on to the ships with the burning fire, if Here had not made Agamemnon eager and had not put in his mind (the desire) to quickly incite the Akhaians.'

(EX.11) ἦτοι ὁ μὲν φαρέτρης ἐξείλετο πικρὸν οἶστόν,
θῆκε δ' ἐπὶ νευρῆ· τὸν δ' αὖ κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ.
(*Iliad* 8,323–324)

'He (sc. Teukros) took a sharp arrow out of his quiver and put it on his bowstring, but Hektor with the shining helmet (struck) him.'

(EX.12) Ὡς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ ἔθεν ὑψόσ' αἰείρας
θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρικήν· δέελον δ' ἐπὶ σῆμά τ' ἔθηκε
συμμάρψας δόνακας μυρικής τ' ἐριθηλέας ὄζους.
(*Iliad* 10,465–467)

'So he spoke, he lifted the spoils from him, put them on a tamarisk bush, made a clear sign besides them and pulled reeds and very long twigs from the tamarisk together.'

⁹ Translation taken from Murray, Wyatt (1999).

(EX.13) κνημίδας μὲν πρῶτα **περὶ** κνήμησιν ἔθηκε.
(*Iliad* 3,330; 11,17; 16,131; 19,369)

‘First, he placed his beautiful shin pads around his legs, assembled out of beautiful ankle pieces.’

(EX.14) καλῆς δαιδαλέης, τήν οἱ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
θῆκ’ **ἐπὶ** νηὸς ἄγεσθαι ἐὺ πλῆσασα χιτῶνων
χλαινάων τ’ ἀνεμοσκεπέων οὐλων τε ταπήτων.
(*Iliad* 16,222–224)

‘(...) from a lovely wrought (chest), that Thetis with the silver feet had given him to be taken onto the ships after she had filled it with tunics, clothes that protect one against the wind and blankets made of wool.’

(EX.15) πολλὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἐξάλμενος ἐν γὰρ Ἀθήνη
ἵπποις ἦκε μένος καὶ **ἐπ’** αὐτῷ κῦδος ἔθηκε.
(*Iliad* 23,399–400; 23,400–23,406)

‘(...) as he was far in front of the others. Athene had sent strength into his horses and had put glory onto him.’

(EX.16) ἀλλ’ **ἐπὶ** καὶ τῷ θῆκε θεὸς κακόν, ὅττι οἱ οὐ τι
παίδων ἐν μεγάροισι γονὴ γένητο κρειόντων.
(*Iliad* 24,538–539)

‘But the god put on top of it something bad as well, since he received no offspring of powerful sons in his palace.’

There are four instances of κατέθηκ(ε) and three of κατὰ ... θῆκε / ἔθηκε and I will discuss the augment use in them below. Before I start, I need to address the augment in κατέθηκε. In this form the augment is not entirely certain, since one could also read *κατάθηκε. A singular form *κάτθηκε is not attested, but the plural κάτθεσσι is and this makes me assume that the poet had the option of choosing an unaugmented form, if he wanted to. This secures the augment in κατέθηκε (type B). I now proceed to κατέθηκ(ε) versus κατὰ ... θῆκε / ἔθηκε.

(EX.17) Ἦ, καὶ ἀπὸ στομάχους ἀρνῶν **τάμε** νηλεῖ χαλκῷ·
καὶ τοὺς μὲν κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονὸς ἀσπαίροντας
θυμοῦ δευομένους ἀπὸ γὰρ μένος εἶλετο χαλκός.
οἶνον δ’ ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφυσσόμενοι δεπάεσσι
ἔκχεον, ἦδ’ εὔχοντο θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησιν.
ὦδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν Ἀχαιῶν τε Τρώων τε:
(*Iliad* 3,292–297)

‘So he spoke and he cut the throats of the lambs with the pitiless bronze, and those he dropped on the ground gasping and losing their breath. The bronze took their life away. They poured wine out of the mixing bowl, drew from the drinking vessels and prayed to the gods that will always be there. So someone of the Akhaians and Trojans would say:’

In this passage Homer describes how Agamemnon finished outlining the conditions under which the duel between Paris and Menelaos will take place. Agamemnon's actions are important in the story, whereas the transition from Agamemnon to the common soldiers who hope that the duel will lead to the end of the war are less important and therefore described with an unaugmented verb form.

(EX.18) ὡς <u>ἔφατ'</u> , <u>ἔδδεισεν</u> δ' Ἑλένη Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,	(418)
βῆ δὲ κατασχομένη ἐανῶ ἀργῆτι φαεινῶ	(419)
σιγῆ, πάσας δὲ Τρωὰς λάθεν : ἤρχε δὲ δαίμων.	(420)
αἶ δ' ὅτ' Ἀλεξάνδροιο δόμον περικαλλέ' ἴκοντο ,	(421)
ἀμφίπολοι μὲν ἔπειτα θοῶς ἐπὶ ἔργα τράποντο ,	(422)
ἦ δ' εἰς ὑπόροφον θάλαμον κίε δία γυναικῶν.	(423)
τῆ δ' ἄρα δίφρον ἐλοῦσα φιλομμειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη	(424)
ἀντί' Ἀλεξάνδροιο θεὰ <u>κατέθηκε</u> φέρουσα:	(425)
ἔνθα <u>κάθιζ'</u> Ἑλένη κούρη Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο	(426)
ὄσσε πάλιν κλίνασα, πόσιν δ' <u>ἠνίπαπε</u> μύθῳ:	(427)

(Iliad 3,418–427)

'So she spoke and Helen, daughter of Zeus, became frightened, went along covering herself silently in the bright shining robe and remained unseen for all the Trojan women. The goddess went in front. When they arrived at the house of Alexandros, the servants then quickly went to their tasks. The most shining of women went to the highly roofed room. Sweetly smiling Aphrodite took a chair for her, brought her and put her in front of Alexandros. There Helen, daughter of Zeus who carries the aegis, sat down, turned her eyes again away and scolded her husband with words.'

After Aphrodite saved Paris from defeat in the duel with Menelaos, she wants Helen to engage in love making with him. Helen reacts angrily and refuses, to which Aphrodite responds by threatening her. In these lines Homer describes how Helen becomes frightened by these threats, obeys the goddess, follows her to their bedroom and how Aphrodite takes Paris to the room as well. When Paris arrives, Helen scolds him. The main actions of the passage are augmented: Aphrodite's speech, Helen's fear, Aphrodite's bringing together of Helen and Paris and Helen's insults towards Paris. We see from this passage that the compound forms do not differ in augment use from the forms in tmesis.

(EX.19) ὡς φάτ' Ἀθηναίη, τῷ δὲ φρένας ἄφροني πεῖθεν :	(104)
αὐτίκ' <u>ἐσύλα</u> τόξον ἐῦξοον ἰξάλου αἰγὸς	(105)
ἀγρίου, ὃν ρά ποτ' αὐτὸς ὑπὸ στέρνοιο τυχήσας	(106)
πέτρης ἐκβαίνοντα δεδεγμένος ἐν προδοκῆσι	(107)
βεβλήκει πρὸς στήθος: ὃ δ' ὑπτιος ἔμπεσε πέτρη.	(108)
τοῦ κέρα ἐκ κεφαλῆς ἐκκαϊδεκάδωρα πεφύκει :	(109)
καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀσκῆσας κεραοξὸς <u>ἤραρε</u> τέκτων,	(110)
πάν δ' εὖ λειήνας χρυσέην <u>ἐπέθηκε</u> κορώνην.	(111)
καὶ τὸ μὲν εὖ <u>κατέθηκε</u> τανυσσάμενος ποτὶ γαίῃ	(112)
ἀγκλίνας: πρόσθεν δὲ σάκεα σχέθον ἐσθλοὶ ἑταῖροι	(113)
μὴ πρὶν ἀναΐξειαν ἀρήϊοι υἴες Ἀχαιῶν	(114)
πρὶν βλῆσθαι Μενέλαον ἀρήϊον Ἀτρέος υἰόν.	(115)

(Iliad 4,104–115)

‘So spoke Athene, and persuaded the fool’s heart in him. Straightway he unwrapped his bow, of the polished horn from a running wild goat he himself had shot in the chest once, lying in wait for the goat in a covert as it stepped down from the rock, and hit it in the chest so it sprawled on the boulders. The horns that grew from the goat’s head were sixteen palms’ length. A bowyer working on the horn then bound them together, smoothing them to a fair surface, and put on a golden string hook. Pandaros strung his bow and put it in position, bracing it against the ground, and his brave friends held their shields in front of him for fear the warlike sons of the Akhaians might rise up and rush him, before he had struck warlike Menelaos, the son of Atreus.’¹⁰

After the duel between Paris and Menelaos did not produce a clear winner, because Aphrodite dragged Paris away from the battle, Agamemnon proclaimed Menelaos to be the winner and asked the Trojans to return Helen. As Greeks and Trojans are so worn out by the war, the Trojans are willing to comply. That would mean that Troy would not be sacked after all, which did not suit Here nor Athena. The latter tried to break the truce by inciting the Trojan Pandaros to shoot an arrow at Menelaos. In this passage Homer described how Athena’s words convinced him to shoot, how Pandaros’ bow was made in the past and how Pandaros did indeed shoot at Menelaos. The augmented κατέθηκε describes the height of the passage, namely the moment when he puts the arrow on his bow. Here again, we see that the compound forms do not differ in augment use from the forms in tmesis. The most important action is the shot taken by Pandaros and this is described with the augment κατέθηκε. The use of the augment in ἦραρε is unexpected, because the assembling of the bow does not really belong to the highlights of the story.

ὡς εἰπὼν οὗ παιδὸς ὀρέξατο φαίδιμος Ἔκτωρ:	(466)
ἄψ δ’ ὁ πάϊς πρὸς κόλπον ἐϋζώνοιο τιθήνης	(467)
ἐκλίθη ἰάχων πατρὸς φίλου ὄψιν ἀτυχθεῖς	(468)
ταρβήσας χαλκὸν τε ἰδὲ λόφον ἵπποχαίτην,	(469)
δεινὸν ἀπ’ ἀκροτάτης κόρυθος νεύοντα νοήσας.	(470)
ἐκ δ’ ἐγέλασσε πατὴρ τε φίλος καὶ πότνια μήτηρ:	(471)
αὐτίκ’ ἀπὸ κρατὸς κόρυθ’ εἴλετο φαίδιμος Ἔκτωρ,	(472)
καὶ τὴν μὲν κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ παμφανώωσαν:	(473)

(*Iliad* 6,466–473)

‘Shining Hektor spoke thus and reached out to his child, but the child cried and immediately crawled back to the bosom of the nurse with the beautiful girdle, fearful because of the sight of his beloved father and frightened by the bronze and the helmet with horse hair when he saw it shaking heavily from the top of the helmet. His beloved father and his queenly mother started laughing, and Hektor immediately took his helmet from his head and put it down on the shining ground.’

These lines belong to one of the most famous and touching passages of the entire *Iliad*, namely Hektor’s goodbye to his wife Andromakhe. Homer describes how Hektor first drew a gloomy picture about Andromakhe’s future (and that of Troy) and that he had no other choice but to assume his responsibility and fight for the city. After his

¹⁰ Translation from the *Chicago Homer*.

words he wanted to take his son, but Astyanax became scared by seeing Hektor's flashing helmet. As a result, Hektor and Andromakhe started laughing and Hektor eventually took off the helmet. The augmented forms describe the main actions: the fear of the little boy and his crawling back to his nurse's breast, the laughter of both parents and Hektor's taking his helmet off.

Two other compounds are ἐπέθηκε (attested three times)¹¹ and ἀπέθηκ'. We will now check if there are also instances in tmesis of those verbs and if a comparison between ἐπέθηκε and ἐπι ... ἔθηκε / ἤθηκε and between ἀπέθηκ' and ἀπο ... ἔθηκε / ἤθηκε is possible. From the latter we have no examples of tmesis attested, so that the comparison is not possible. There are only three instances that can be compared (two of which appear in the debated book 10. There is one important problem here, however and that is that there is no independent evidence to ascertain the augment in ἐπέθηκε. Contrary to κατέθηκε we cannot decide whether the augment was preferred or not. It is true that the augmented form is attested in all codices in all instances, but as I stated before, there is no independent evidence and therefore, I have to leave the examples out of the discussion. As a result, it is also not possible to compare the augment use in ἐπέθηκε and ἐπι ... ἔθηκε / ἤθηκε.

4. The formulaic nature of epic diction and the use of the augment

A reviewer of the journal correctly pointed out that some of the forms ἔθηκε(v) and ἤθηκε(v) appear in formulae that are used on more than one occasion and wondered if one was allowed to count such instances more than once. This is a valid point and one that cannot be answered so easily. Since Milman Parry's groundbreaking discoveries on the oral nature of Homeric poetry,¹² it cannot be denied that early epic Greek (and especially Homer) is highly formulaic and that the poet(s) reused and expanded formulae. In its extreme form Parryism reduces epic poetry to a stock of readymade verses from which the poet(s) only had to choose the metrically adequate formula. I cannot discuss this issue in detail here, but for several actions (speech introductions and killing opponents) several metrically equivalent formulae exist,¹³ which means that the poet's/poets' choice could not have been motivated by the metre alone. Moreover, the verses under discussion are/is κνημίδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμησιν ἔθηκε (3,330; 11,17; 16,131; 19,369). This belongs to the scene of the warrior who dresses for battle. Gearing up for battle is one of the prototypical scenes of the

¹¹ The instances are 4,111, 14,169 and 24,589.

¹² See especially M. Parry (1928). In A. Parry (1971) all the works by Milman Parry were collected by his son, Adam Parry.

I would like to point out that the bases of his work were laid by German scholars such as Wolf (1795), Düntzer (1866: 1–4), Ellendt (1864: 1–34), Witte (1913: 2241). A. Parry (1971: 4–5) himself admitted this, but it has been mostly forgotten since.

¹³ See Visser (1987) for killing opponents, and Edwards (1969, 1970), Riggsby (1992), Machacek (1994) for speech introductions. I discussed this in more detail in De Decker (2015: 6–8), with more bibliographic references.

Iliad (Arend 1933: 92–98), and I therefore believe that the choice of this specific formula is not driven by the metrical needs, but rather by the dramatic and/or narrative needs of the story: only certain warriors are described when preparing for battle and I believe that this serves a narrative purpose, namely increasing the suspense. As such, I think it is justified to consider the different passages in which a battle dress episode is related as individual instances and not a merely repeated and “copy-pasted” passage.

5. The exceptions

Inevitably, there are exceptions to every rule. In this subchapter we list and address them. Only the ones that have not been addressed before, will be treated here.

(EX.20) τῷ γὰρ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ **θῆκε** θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη. (*Iliad* 1,55)
‘The goddess with the white arms, Here, had put this in his mind.’

In this passage Homer describes that it is Here who has incited Akhilleus to ask for a seer who should explain why the soldiers are dying of the plague. This divine intervention is very important in the story, as the introduction of Kalkhas and his subsequent explanation will lead very quickly to the destructive wrath and discordance, and yet, θῆκε remains without an augment.

(EX.21) ὣς **φάτο**, Τυδεΐδης δ' ἀνεχάζετο τυτθὸν ὀπίσσω (443)
μῆνιν ἀλευάμενος ἑκατηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος. (444)
Αἰνεΐαν δ' ἀπάτερθεν ὀμίλου **θῆκεν** Ἀπόλλων (445)
Περγὰ μιν εἰν ἱερῇ, ὅθι οἱ νηὸς γ' ἔτέτυκτο. (446)
ἦτοι τὸν Λητώ τε καὶ Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα (447)
ἐν μεγάλῳ ἀδύτῳ **ἀκέοντό τε κύδαινόν τε**: (448)
αὐτὰρ ὁ εἰδῶλον **τεῦξ'** ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων (449)
αὐτῷ τ' Αἰνεΐα ἴκελον καὶ τεύχεσι τοῖον, (450)
ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' εἰδώλῳ Τρῶες καὶ δῖοι Ἀχαιοὶ (451)
δῆουν ἀλλήλων ἀμφὶ στήθεσσι βοείας (452)
ἀσπίδας εὐκύκλους λαισῆϊά τε πτερόεντα. (453)

(*Iliad* 5,443–453)

‘So he spoke and the son of Tydeus gave ground a little backwards, avoiding the anger of Apollon who shoots from afar. Apollon then set Aineias far from the throng in holy Pergamos, where a temple had been built for him. There Leto and Artemis who shoots arrows healed him in the great temple. Apollon with the silver bow fashioned an image resembling Aineias and his armour, and around that image the Trojans and the shining Akhaians hit each other on the chests on round shields with bull-hides and fluttering bucklers.’¹⁴

In this passage Apollon removes Aineias, who is being attacked by Diomedes, from the battlefield. In spite of this remarkable divine intervention, the verb θῆκεν is

¹⁴ The translation is taken from Murray, Wyatt (1999: 238).

unaugmented. One could argue that Apollon's intervention had been alluded to before, but the fact that a god removes a mortal warrior from the battlefield and replaces him with a real life image is so uncommon and is definitely worth highlighting. One would therefore have expected the augment.

The instance 8,218 (EX.03) has been discussed before.

(EX.22) Ἀργείους καὶ νῆας, ἐπεὶ Διὸς ἐτράπετο φρήν.
Ἐκτορέοις ἄρα μᾶλλον ἐπὶ φρένα **θῆχ'** ἱεροῖσιν.

(*Iliad* 10,45–46)

'(Let us see if someone will save) the Akhaians and the ships, since Zeus's mind has turned away. He now puts his mind much more to the offerings of Hektor.'

In these verses Agamemnon complains that Zeus has turned his head away from the Greek army and is now favouring Hektor and the Trojans. The absence of the augment can only be explained if one assumes that Zeus changing his mind and him supporting Hektor now are two facets of the same action. Otherwise, one would expect θῆχ' to be augmented, as it appears in a speech, clearly refers to actions that are happening at this very moment and is important in the mind of the Greeks.

The instance 21,484 (EX.05 from De Decker 2020b) has been discussed above.

(EX.23) Πηλεΐδης δ' αἰψ' ἄλλα **τίθει** ταχυτήτος ἄεθλα (740)
ἀργύρεον κρητήρα τετυγμένον: ἕξ δ' ἄρα μέτρα (741)
χάνδανεν, αὐτὰρ κάλλει ἐνίκα πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν (742)
πολλόν, ἐπεὶ Σιδόνες πολυδαίδαλοι εὖ ἤσκησαν, (743)
Φοίνικες δ' **ἄγον** ἄνδρες ἐπ' ἠεροειδέα πόντον, (744)
στήσαν δ' ἐν λιμένεσσι, Θόαντι δὲ δῶρον ἔδωκαν: (745)
υἱὸς δὲ Πριάμοιο Λυκάονος ὦνον ἔδωκε (746)
Πατρόκλω ἥρωϊ Ἰησονίδης Εὐνης. (747)
καὶ τὸν Ἀχιλλεὺς **θῆκεν** ἀέθλιον οὐ ἐτάροιο, (748)
ὅς τις ἐλαφρότατος ποσσὶ κραιπνοῖσι πέλοιτο: (749)
δευτέρω αὖ βοῦν **θῆκε** μέγαν καὶ πίονα δημῶ, (750)
ἡμιτάλαντον δὲ χρυσοῦ λισσθήϊ' ἔθηκε. (751)
στῆ δ' ὀρθός καὶ μῦθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔειπεν. (752)

(*Iliad* 23,740–752)

'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, Priam's 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 half a talent's weight of gold as last prize. He then stood upright and spoke a word among the Argives.'¹⁵

¹⁵ The translation is taken from the *Chicago Homer*, but I adapted the orthography to be consistent.

In this passage Homer describes how Akhilleus organized the funerary games for Patroklos and set out the prizes for the winners in the different disciplines. Book 23 describes how Akhilleus organized the funerary games in honour of Patroklos. They constitute an important element of the story in that book (Book 23 is the intermezzo between the fierce battle of Akhilleus and Hektor in book 22 and the supplication by Priam to return Hektor's body and the subsequent granting of the request by Akhilleus in book 24), and usually the different actions of the price setting are either related with an augmented form or with a verb with VO word order or necessary enjambment. This passage does not “conform” to the rules of foreground and background: it describes how Akhilleus continued setting prices after the wrestling contest between Aias and Odysseus had ended in a tie. The first verb, however, is τίθει and this is an unaugmented imperfect. The augment in ἐνίκα is not easily explained either, because specifications about the different prices were not described with augmented forms in other contexts. We then have the two unaugmented forms θῆκε in 23,748 and 23,750: they name new steps in the price setting and therefore we would expect an augment. As far as the augmented ἔδωκε and ἔδωκαν are concerned, 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. This passage is therefore a good illustration that the rules did not apply universally and that many exceptions still occur.

6. The Mycenaean evidence in the discussion

The last issue that needs to be addressed is the position of Mycenaean in this discussion. Whereas epic Greek has both the augmented and the unaugmented forms, ἔθηκε(v) and θῆκε(v), we only find the unaugmented form *te ke* in the Mycenaean tablets, which are the oldest attested Greek texts. Moreover, the augment is almost always absent in Mycenaean.¹⁶ This fact makes the connection between the absence of the augment and the poetic language difficult to maintain: as the texts were administrative prose, one would expect the augment to be present, if it had already been part of the language at the time and if its absence in poetry was only a poetic trait. The absence of the augment in Mycenaean clearly rules out that the absence is only a poetic trait.¹⁷ It is clear that the augment cannot have been a simple marker of past tense, because in that case, we would expect it to appear in Mycenaean prose and more evenly distributed in all the parts of epic (including and especially in the parts of the remote past). This remains a problem, unless one starts from the unaugmented

¹⁶ For the use and absence of the augment in Mycenaean, see Vilborg (1960: 104, 106), Chantraine (1964: 312), Ruijgh (1967: 91, 2011: 272), Bottin (1969: 83), Hajnal (1990), Duhoux (1987, 1992: 88–90), Rix (1992: 229), Bartoněk (2003: 337), Bernabé, Luján (2006: 200–201), García-Ramón (2012: §H, 2017: 672).

¹⁷ Hoenigswald (1964) argued that the absence of the augment in Mycenaean showed that the scribes used a poetic language or at least allowed poetic traits in their language, but this is highly unlikely.

forms. Taking ‘mentioning’ (i.e. Hoffmann’s interpretation of the injunctive) as basic meaning, one can easily explain the Mycenaean forms as being the normal ones: the scribes simply stated that person X or Y had given or paid a certain amount or portion.¹⁸ The scribes did not feel the need to additionally emphasize or highlight this, contrary to Homeric Greek where certain elements were sometimes in need of being emphasized. The Mycenaean data are thus not in contradiction with Homeric Greek, they are no indication of an older language stage, nor do they render the explanation of the augment as a deictic or emphatic marker invalid. The very few augmented forms indicate that the augment was starting to expand its use (as we can see in Homeric Greek as well).

Before concluding, I would like to use the Mycenaean evidence to address Andreas Willi’s theory on the origin of the augment (there are several other observations to make, but I cannot discuss it in detail here). He argued that the augment was in origin a reduplication and that this explained its use in events of the recent past, in aorist forms, in speech introductions, in gnomic aorists, in similia (Willi 2007, 2018: 348–416).¹⁹ In his opinion the augment first was a genuine reduplication of verbal roots starting in **h₁-* and marked the perfect-notion. Then it evolved into perfectivity and eventually it acquired past tense notion.²⁰ It was first used with aorists, then with completive imperfects and then grammaticalized into the marker of past tense. In addition to this, Willi claimed that the injunctive in Indo-Iranian did not refer to timeless actions, but was used for actions in a more remote past or in narrative (“histoire” in the sense of Benveniste), whereas the augmented forms were used in a more recent past or in speech (-like contexts, “discours” in the sense of Benveniste) (Willi 2018: 398–410).²¹ By doing this he reintroduced the idea of “a past-referencing narrative injunctive” (Willi 2018: 410). This is problematic, not because the injunctive never refers to the past (it often does), but because it overlooks that there are many instances in which the injunctive does not have modal meaning, but simply refers to a situation that has no link to present or past (and these instances cannot all be interpreted away).²² The situation of Mycenaean

¹⁸ Schmitt (1967: 65–67), see also Panagl (1976: 87), Mumm (2004: §11.1) and García-Ramón (2012: §H, 2017: 672).

¹⁹ The idea that the augment was in origin a reduplication, had been suggested almost 200 years ago already as can be seen in von Thiersch (1826: 337–338) and Buttmann (1854: 119–120).

²⁰ The evolution perfect → perfectivity → past tense is not uncommon, as can be seen in Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca (1994: 51–105).

²¹ See already Kiparsky (2005: §1): “There seem to be no languages with a mood whose function is “mentioning” or “reminding”” and Kloekhorst (2017: 300).

²² Hoffmann (1967 passim, but especially 119) noted the use of the injunctive in contexts that he described as “fernere nicht historische Vergangenheit”.

This had been noted before already, see Avery (1880: 330), Delbrück (1888: 354–355; “so habe ich mich doch überzeugt, dass der Injunctiv nicht selten (die Stellen s. bei Avery) in dem Sinne des Indicativ Praesentis gebraucht wird, doch so, dass die Beziehung auf die Gegenwart des Sprechenden nicht hervortritt, vielmehr nur in dem Sinne, dass eine Verbalaussage ausgedrückt werden soll, welche sich weder auf die Zukunft, noch auf die Vergangenheit bezieht”; underlining is mine), Renou (1928: 71–73), Gonda (1956: 33–46). After Hoffmann, it had been noted by Strunk (1968: 290–294), Lazzeroni (1977), West (1989), Euler (1995), Mumm (1995).

complicates the theory of Willi even more. If we assume that the augment marked the perfectiv(ity) and would refer to a recent past, we would expect it to be abundantly present in the texts, as they by definition refer to something that has been completed in the recent past (“person X has just paid his taxes”). This is clearly not the case, however. In order to explain the Mycenaean evidence, Willi (2018: 391) had to concede that the unaugmented forms were used to simply mention that the action had occurred: “Thus, just as in narrative contexts the unaugmented aorist is the pragmatically neutral default option for an epic singer, so it is here for the record-keeper”. This agrees with the explanation of the augment as a foregrounding device, but it is difficult to see how this is compatible with the explanation of the augment as a perfectiv(ity) marker and even more how this differs from the explanation that the unaugmented forms in Mycenaean just plainly stated the facts and did not add any personal information of the scribe.

7. Conclusion

The investigation of the forms ἔθηκε(v) and θῆκε(v) in the *Iliad* showed that the use and absence of the augment in ἔθηκ(ε)(v) and θῆκ(ε)(v) are not metrically motivated, but can be explained by an interaction of syntactic and semantic factors. In this last part of the investigation I paid particular attention to the use of ἔθηκ(ε)(v) and θῆκ(ε)(v) in compounds and tmesis and found that the augment use did not differ significantly between these two different constructions. I then looked at the cases of enjambement which are a special case of emphasis. I then explained why the recurring verses are probably not plain repetitions, but deliberate choices by the poet. I also listed and addressed the exceptions (which are inevitable for any rule and explanation). Finally, I compared the Mycenaean evidence and the Homeric data and found that they do not contradict each other, but rather confirm the augment as foregrounding device. Both sources also make the explanation of the augment as an original reduplication less likely.

References

Online sources

Chicago Homer: <http://homer.library.northwestern.edu/html/application.html>
 Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>

Printed sources

Arend W. 1933. *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer*. Berlin.
 Avery J. 1880. The unaugmented verb forms of the Rig and Atharva Vedas. – *JAOS* 11: 326–365.
 Bakker E. 1990. Homeric discourse and enjambement: A cognitive approach. – *TAPA* 120: 1–21.
 Bakker E. 2001. Similes, augment and the language of immediacy. – Watson J. *Speaking volumes. Orality & literacy in the Greek & Roman world*. Leiden: 1–23.

- Bakker E. 2005. *Pointing at the past: From formula to performance in Homeric poetics*. Cambridge (MA).
- Bartoněk A. 2003. *Handbuch des mykenischen Griechisch*. Heidelberg.
- Bernabé A., Luján E. 2006. *Introducción al griego micénico: gramática, selección de textos, glosario*. Zaragoza.
- Bottin L. 1969. Studio dell'aumento in Omero. – *SMEA* 10: 69–145.
- Buttmann P. 1854. *Griechische Grammatik*. Berlin.
- Bybee J., Perkins R., Pagliuca W. 1994. *The evolution of grammar*. Chicago.
- Chantraine P. 1964. *Morphologie historique du grec*. [deuxième édition revue et augmentée]. Paris.
- De Decker F. 2015. *A Morphosyntactic analysis of speech introductions and conclusions in Homer*. [PhD Thesis LMU München; <https://edoc.ub.uni-muenchen.de/17995/>].
- De Decker F. 2017. Ὀμηρον ἐξ'Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν: An analysis of the augment use in *Iliad* 1. – *JIES* 45: 58–171.
- De Decker F. 2020a. Metrical and morphological observations on the use of ἔθηκε(v) and θῆκε(v) in the *Iliad*. – *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 137: 67–81.
- De Decker F. 2020b. An inquiry into the use and meaning of the forms ἔθηκε(v) and θῆκε(v) in the *Iliad*: Syntax and semantics. – *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 137: 135–156.
- De Lamberterie C. 2007. L'augment dans le texte arménien de l'Évangile. – *REArm* 30: 31–57.
- Delbrück B. 1888. *Syntaktische Forschungen V. Altindische Syntax*. Halle.
- Duhoux Y. 1987. Les débuts de l'augment grec: le facteur sociolinguistique. – *Minos* 20–22: 163–172.
- Duhoux Y. 1992. *Le verbe grec ancien*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Düntzer H. 1866. *Homers Ilias. Erklärende Schulausgabe. Erstes Heft. Buch I–VIII*. Paderborn.
- Edwards M. 1969. On some 'answering' expressions in Homer. – *CP* 64: 81–87.
- Edwards M. 1970. Homeric speech introductions. – *HSCP* 74: 1–36.
- Ellendt J. 1864. *Drei homerische Abhandlungen*. Leipzig.
- Euler W. 1995. Der Injunktiv, die archaischste Verbalkategorie im Indogermanischen. – Smoczyński W. (ed.). *Kuryłowicz memorial volume. Part one*. Cracow: 137–142.
- García-Ramón J. 2012. TAM, augment and evidentiality in Indo-European. [Handout from the Workshop *Grammatische und lexikalische Strukturen im Wandel* held in Cologne, March 21–23.2012].
- García-Ramón J. 2017. The morphology of Greek. – Fritz M., Joseph B., Klein J. (eds.). *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics I*. Berlin: 654–682.
- Gonda J. 1956. *The character of the Indo-European moods*. Wiesbaden.
- Hajnal I. 1990. Die mykenische Verbalform *e-e-to*. – *MSS* 51: 21–75.
- Hoenigswald H. 1964. Mycenaean augments and the language of poetry. – Bennett E. (ed.). *Mycenaean studies*. Madison: 179–182.
- Hoffmann, K. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg.
- Kiparsky P. 2005. The Vedic injunctive: Historical and synchronic implications. – Singh R. (ed.). *The yearbook of South Asian languages and linguistics*: 219–235. [accessed online: www.degruyter.com/view/book/9783110186192/10.1515/9783110186185.219.xml].
- Kloekhorst A. 2017. The Old Hittite and the Proto-Indo-European tense-aspect system. – *IF* 122: 295–307.
- Lazzeroni R. 1977. Fra glottogonia e storia: ingiuntivo, aumento e lingua poetica indoeuropeo. – *SSL* 17: 1–30.

- Machacek G. 1994. The occasional contextual appropriateness of formulaic diction in the Homeric poems. – *AJP* 115: 321–335.
- Mumm P. 1995. Verbale Definitheit und der vedische Injunktiv. – Hettrich H., Hock W. (eds.). *Verba et Structurae*. [Festschrift für Klaus Strunk]. Innsbruck: 169–193.
- Mumm P. 2004. Zur Funktion des homerischen Augments. – Krisch T. (ed.). *Analecta homini universali dicata*. [Festschrift für Oswald Panagl]. Stuttgart: 148–158.
- Murray A., Wyatt W. 1999. *Homer Iliad. Books 1–12*. Cambridge (MA).
- Panagl O. 1976. Die mykenische Sprache. – Panagl O., Hiller S. (eds.). *Die frühgriechischen Texte aus mykenischer Zeit*. Darmstadt: 78–100.
- Parry M. 1928. *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère: essai sur un problème de style homérique*. Paris.
- Parry M. 1929. The distinctive character of enjambement in Homeric verse. – *TAPA* 60: 200–220.
- Parry A. 1971. *The making of Homeric verse. Collected papers of Milman Parry, collected by Adam Parry*. Oxford.
- Platt A. 1891. The augment in Homer. – *JPh* 19: 211–237.
- Renou L. 1928. Les formes dites d'injonctif dans le RgVeda. – Meillet A. (ed.). *Étrennes linguistiques offertes par quelques amis à Émile Benveniste*. Paris. 63–80.
- Riggsby A. 1992. Homeric speech introductions and the theory of Homeric composition. – *TAPA* 122: 99–114.
- Rix H. 1992. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen. Laut- und Formenlehre*. [2. erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage]. Darmstadt.
- Ruijgh C. 1967. *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam.
- Ruijgh C. 2011. Mycenaean and Homeric Greek. – Duhoux Y., Morpurgo-Davies A. (eds.). *A companion to Linear B: Mycenaean Greek, texts and their world*. Louvain-la-Neuve: 251–298.
- Schmitt R. 1967. Zwei Bemerkungen zum Augment. – *KZ* 81: 63–67.
- Strunk K. 1968. Zeit und Tempus in den altindogermanischen Sprachen. – *IF* 73: 279–311.
- Vilborg E. 1960. *A tentative grammar of Mycenaean Greek*. Göteborg.
- Visser E. 1987. *Homerische Versifikationstechnik. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*. Stuttgart.
- von Thiersch F. 1826. *Griechische Grammatik, vorzüglich des homerischen Dialektes*. Leipzig.
- West M. 1989. An unrecognized injunctive usage in Greek. – *Glotta* 67: 135–138.
- Willi A. 2007. Of aspects, augments, aorists – or how to say to have killed a dragon. – George C., Nielsen B., Ruppel A., Tribulato O. (eds.). *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European perspective*. Cambridge: 34–48.
- Willi A. 2018. *The origins of the Greek verb*. Cambridge.
- Witte K. 1913. Homeros. – Pauly A., Wissowa G. et al. (eds.). *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 8: 2213–2247.
- Wolf F. 1795. *Prolegomena ad Homerum*. Halle.

