Andrzej Wilanowski

Transitiveness of passive forms in Homer : based on the first book of the "Iliad"

Andrzej Wilanowski
University of Silesia, Katowice

Transitiveness of Passive Forms in Homer Based on the First Book of the *Iliad*

Abstract: The deliberations presented in the article are the attempt to bring closer and verify the views on the transitiveness, to point some difficulties and make some suggestions about possible classifications. The general aim, however, is to analyse specific examples, i.e. the passive forms that occur in the first book of the *Iliad*. It seems that the presented method of analysing the text may give a chance for new interpretation, increase the preciseness and eliminate the burden of the traditional notions.

Key words: Homer, *Iliad*, transitive, passive, language

Transitiveness, the grammatical and semantic property of the verb seems to have been of minor interest in linguistic research. The attempts at its characterization are marked by generalizations or divisions, which are the result of difficulties connected with the necessity of analysing the two areas mentioned above — semantic and grammatical. The relation between them in this case is very close and significant. The syntactic structure, however, is not an obvious reflection of the semantic interpretation of the verb. Thus, defining transitiveness by determining the shared area of these two aspects requires an intuitive approach which should not dominate, though.

On the other hand, transitiveness is connected with such important syntactic categories as object and voice — the latter considered crucial in many theoretical deliberations concerning verbs.

The aim of the first part of this work is to bring closer and verify the views on this issue as well as to point some difficulties and make some suggestions about possible classifications. The general aim, however, is to analyse specific exam-

ples, i.e. forms which occur in the text. The closer look at the theory will provide a proper background for that kind of examination.

The material chosen for analysis provides verb forms at a particular stage of the development of their meaning. In this work it is derived from the *Iliad*. In the 8[1]th century BC, the estimated time of the *Iliad*'s origin[1], the process of forming the passive aorist in ancient Greek had hardly been completed[2] and therefore the examination of the character of passive forms, meaning and syntactic position in the text of that time seems to be interesting and well grounded.

In ancient Greek there are separate passive forms in the future and aorist tenses only. Other tenses' forms make no formal distinction between the passive and the middle voice. This fact determines the area of analysis, which is also limited to the forms that occur in the first book of the *Iliad*[3]. The linguistic material of that size should be sufficient to reach some conclusions and put forward some possible interpretations concerning the passive forms and their transitiveness in the *Iliad*. This work, however, should be considered only as a part of a bigger one that has to be undertaken to give us relatively objective view on the enquired issue.

The linguistic analysis consisting in careful observation of the syntactic and semantic relations in the text is a method imposed by that kind of material and problem to be discussed. Thus, it is used in this work. The main point of reference in this case is grammar of the language of the analysed text and a syntactic structure of a particular sentence in which passive forms occur. The other important element that has to be taken into consideration is the meaning of the analysed verb form, hence the lexicographical definitions is referred to. Finally, the context that is not a part of a particular syntactic structure is studied, so that the complete characterization of the element to be described can be obtained.

Firstly, some crucial terms shall be briefly outlined. According to the definition[4], a transitive verb (*transitivum*[5]) is in limited, grammatical sense the verb that needs an object. It also has to be possible for the whole sentence having that verb as a predicate to be transformed into the passive voice. Then, the direct object of

---

[1] Cf. K. Kumaniecki, J. Mańkowski: *Homer*. Warszawa 1974, p. 53.

[2] Cf. D.B. Monro: *Homeric Grammar*. Bristol Classical Press 1998, p. 45, § 44.

[3] All the quoted fragments of the *Iliad* come from the edition by G. Dindorf: *Homeri Ilias*. Lipsae—Teubner 1899. The version of the text from the electronic edition is also taken into account: T.W. Allen: *Homeri Ilias*. Oxford 1931.

The article presents the analysed examples chosen from the author's dissertation as the most interesting ones.

[4] Cf. K. Polański: "Czasownik przechodni (transitivum)". In: *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*. Ed. K. Polański. Wrocław 1999, p. 98.

[5] Lat. *transitus* — passage over.

an active sentence becomes a subject of the passive one[6]. In wider, semantic sense the transitive verb is the one that has an object, no matter what grammatical form the object takes.

In the further part of this entry an intransitive verb (*intransitivum*[7]) is defined as lacking in the features mentioned above. However, the verbs transitive in semantic sense are a common element, and therefore two groups can be distinguished: the verbs intransitive in grammatical but transitive in semantic sense and the verbs intransitive in both senses[8]. This group contains the verbs which do not take any objects as the action described is restricted to the agent[9].

Such a definition indicates the problem with differentiating between semantic and grammatical area when the verb is to be identified as transitive or intransitive. It is also noticeable that some doubts may appear when transitiveness of reflexive verbs is described. In this case, the action is restricted to the agent, but the grammatical position corresponding with an object (position of a reflexive pronoun) may appear.

The concept of transitiveness rarely occurs in descriptive grammars and it is not analysed in detail. For example, when the direct object is defined, a syntactic dependence on a transitive verb (i.e. the one that can be transformed into passive) is said to be the feature of this object, although not a necessary one[10]. This problem and the definition from the linguistic encyclopaedia will be discussed later.

Tadeusz Milewski in his work *Wstęp do językoznawstwa* defines transitive and intransitive verbs using a concept of syntactic connotation. According to his definition, a transitive verb connotes a nominative subject, and an accusative object (so the verb opens a place in a sentence for these cases), and an intransitive verb connotes a nominative subject only[11]. Then, the author discusses the two syntactic schemas of a transitive and intransitive sentence — the former having three elements: a subject, a direct object and a transitive predicate which describes the action transferred from the subject to the object; the latter having two elements only: an intransitive predicate and a nominal part the state of which is described by the predicate[12].

When differences between these two schemas are analysed, crucial and functional terms of agent and patient[13] are usually introduced to describe the nominal

---

[6] It is pointed out in the quoted definition that in the Greek language the described transformation is also possible for the verbs governing genitive and dative. Cf. K. Pol a ń s k i: "Czasownik przechodni…", p. 98.

[7] Lat. *In-* — a negation, *transitus* — passage over.

[8] Cf. K. Pol a ń s k i: „Czasownik przechodni…", p. 98.

[9] Cf. ibidem.

[10] Cf. A. Na g ó r k o: *Zarys gramatyki polskiej*. Warszawa 2003, p. 289.

[11] Cf. T. Mil e w s k i: *Wstęp do językoznawstwa*. Łódź—Warszawa—Kraków 1960, p. 44.

Syntactic connotation is a quality of lexeme consisting of opening a place or places for other lexemes or the group of lexemes. Cf. H. Wr ó b e l: *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Kraków 2001, p. 238.

[12] Cf. T. Mil e w s k i: *Wstęp do językoznawstwa*..., pp. 116—117.

[13] An agent is an entity from which the action starts and a patient is an entity to which the action passes over. Cf. T. Mil e w s k i: *Językoznawstwo*. Warszawa 1976, p. 99.

parts of the sentence regardless of their formal realisation. The terms refer to the semantic sphere[14].

Ancient Greek is a nominative-accusative language[15] so in Greek there is no greater difficulty in distinguishing the formal subject as far as tradition is concerned. Characterising it as an agent, patient or stating that it does not qualify to any of these categories — analysing the relation between the agent, patient, subject and object is more problematic, however, it is of essential importance when describing the passive voice (patient is a subject then) and interpreting transitiveness. We shall focus on these questions and bring closer some of John Lyons' views and opinions.

John Lyons in his *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*[16] analyses the linguistic issues using mainly English to make exemplifications. In the chapter concerning the agent and the patient the author describes a subject as an agent when the predicate is either transitive or intransitive verb, but not the stative one (the noun which is the object in a transitive sentence is the patient then)[17]. Thus, it is clear that the agent is not characterised by opposition — it may occur in a sentence without the patient. The subject of the intransitive sentence may be the agent, but the verb or the sentence is described as intransitive when the action is not transferred. The relation between the two elements, the existence of such a relation, determines transitiveness.

Such view on the problem corresponds, as the author claims, with traditional semantic interpretation of transitiveness[18]. He notices, however, the difficulty in interpreting some of the verbs, for instance those of perception such as *to hear*, which is syntactically transitive. The problem appears when the direction in which the action is transferred is to be indicated, especially, since Lyons considers verbs of that kind as stative, non-progressive[19], having pointed out that the subject of the stative verb cannot be the agent. Lyons states, nevertheless, that the classification made on the basis of the semantic definition is correct if it is possible to apply such a definition to the major number of syntactically corresponding verbs. We can also assume, as John Lyons notices[20], that perception is most commonly understood as the action which to some extent or in some way passes to the perceived object. It follows that the verb should be regarded as active one and its subject as the agent.

Another group of verbs that the author distinguishes is the group of transitive verbs which do not have to take the object. The verb in such a situation may be considered intransitive, but since the verb is of a transitive nature it seems to be

---

[14] Cf. T. M i l e w s k i: *Wstęp do językoznawstwa...*, pp. 117—118.

[15] Cf. ibidem, p. 117.

[16] J. L y o n s: *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge 1968—1995.

[17] Cf. ibidem, p. 341.

[18] Cf. ibidem, p. 350.

[19] Cf. ibidem, p. 351.

[20] Cf. ibidem.

more convincing to describe such a construction as pseudo-intransitive and to use a term "the deletion of the object", following John Lyons[21]. The term "pseudo-intransitive" corresponds with formal lack of the object and with an empty position in semantic sphere.

Sentences with reflexive verbs that do not have any formal determinant of reflexivity are termed "the implicitly reflexive sentences" and are also classified as pseudo-intransitive constructions[22]. The implicitly reflexive sentence is a sentence with the deletion of the object when the object is identified with the subject. The reflexive sentences then are semantically transitive, but the subject (the agent) may be identified with the object (the patient). Thus, the action is restricted to the subject — the agent, but it definitely has a transitive character. The same situation occurs in the case of the explicitly and implicitly reflexive sentences. And so, once more, the term "pseudo-intransitive" is associated with formal issues only.

In nominative-accusative language the subject identified by formal means is usually the agent (the topic of the passive voice will be discussed later). Lyons states that it is one of the conditions held in Latin and Greek (and other Indo-European languages)[23]: "One of the two nouns in transitive sentences (and, when the 'notional' category of 'actor' is clearly applicable, it is the noun which denotes the 'actor') is marked with the same case-inflexion (the 'nominative') as the subject of intransitive sentences"[24].

The author also raises the question of equating the agent with the subject in the nominative-accusative languages or using the agent as a criterion for identifying the subject. He indicates that "in the sentences *Wealth attract robbers* and *Riches attract robbers*, the subjects are *wealth* and *riches* (according to the criterion of subject-verb concord)"[25] but they are not the agents. The noun *robber* is the agent[26]. According to Lyons, this fact does not challenge thoroughly the traditional opinion "that the subject of an active, transitive sentence is the initiator of the action, and the object of the 'patient' or 'goal'"[27]. The decisive factor in this case is the tendency for the greater number of the transitive verbs to take an animate noun as a subject. In intransitive sentence such a tendency is rare.

We may state now that it is hard to determine unquestionably whether an inanimate noun may have an agentive nature or not. An inanimate object cannot act. It can influence animate ones, however. There is no doubt that the evoked reaction depends on the reacting object, on its psyche. The process of that kind appears also

---

[21] Ibidem, pp. 360—361.
[22] Ibidem, pp. 361—363.
[23] Cf. ibidem, p. 342.
[24] Ibidem.
[25] Ibidem, p. 341.
[26] Cf. ibidem.
[27] Ibidem.

in some cases when the subject is animate and the sentence is transitive e.g. *This cat irritates her.* In this case, although it is obvious that the *cat* is the agent, it is not clear without any contextual information if it acts or if the irritation is only the woman's reaction to the cat's existence. We shall define the noun *cat* as the agent because it is an animate noun. However, it seems that we would not assume that the woman is the agent even if we could conclude from the context that this sentence describes solely her reaction to the cat, though at the moment it does nothing but exists. Such a difficulty would also occur if the subject of that sentence were an inanimate noun. Thus, it seems acceptable to identify an agent with an inanimate noun for example in the sentence: *Wealth attracts robbers*.

Lyons does not allow that kind of interpretation[28]. He regards the animate character of a noun as "the 'notional' basis for the system of transitivity"[29]. The author describes the sentence *Wealth attracts robbers*, which is the example of a transitive sentence, as " 'parasitic' upon the more 'normal' type of transitive sentences with an animate subject"[30] and unsatisfying "the conditions of the 'ideal' system"[31], in which an inanimate noun cannot be agentive. It looks as if he made that assumption while deliberating not only the ideal system but also other ones. This type of sentences should be regarded, then, as syntactically, formally transitive, but semantically intransitive. According to semantics, the action cannot start from the subject that is not the agent. It is rather questionable to state that the predicate *attracts* describes the action that passes from the agent *robbers* to the subject.

As we can see, the analysis of transitiveness will require some careful semantic and formal interpretation, identification of the agent or the patient, closer look at their formal realisation and the position in syntax. In a transitive sentence the subject may be an agent, the sentence is semantically transitive then, though it may be formally identified as an intransitive one when the object is deleted. The subject of a transitive sentence may also be a patient[32] and the sentence is in the passive then. Finally, it may be difficult to decide clearly if the subject is an agent or a patient, as in the quoted sentence *Wealth attracts robbers*, and then the sentence is formally, syntactically transitive. In an intransitive sentence the subject may have the agentive or neutral character. Variously understood element of passing of the action (of its effects) from an agent to a patient even if they do not have a surface realisation seems to be in most cases the main factor that lets us decide whether the construction is transitive or not. Thus, the element associated with the semantic definition is the most important one.

---

[28] Neither does the definition from the linguistic encyclopaedia. According to that definition, only an animate and conscious entity may be the agent. Cf. K. P o l a ń s k i: "Agens". In: *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa…*, p. 20.

[29] J. L y o n s: *Introduction…*, p. 359.

[30] Ibidem.

[31] Ibidem.

[32] Cf. K. P o l a ń s k i: "Pacjens (patiens)". In: *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa…*, p. 417.

Let us consider now the issue of transitiveness as it is presented or rather signalled in descriptive grammars of the ancient Greek. The way they treat the syntactic matters is traditional. The traditional terms with semantic background are used in the definitions which, however, are based mostly on the analyses of the surface grammatical structure.

The question of transitiveness is signalled, for example, by Marian Auerbach and Marian Golias — the accusative being mentioned as a case of the direct object, the transitive verb is defined as the one that can be transformed into passive[33].

The definition of transitiveness corresponding with this sentence has been referred to earlier in this work — the transitive verb is a verb that takes an object and can be transformed into passive, when the object becomes a subject.

In accordance with that criterion, in the Greek language, verbs that govern cases other than the accusative might be regarded as transitive as they can be transformed into passive. Although the case that is characteristic for the direct object is the accusative case and, for example, in Latin transitive verbs take the direct object almost only in the accusative[34], a group of verbs in Greek governing genitive or dative can be transformed into passive with the genitive or dative objects becoming subjects in the nominative[35]. Thus, sentences of such a syntactic construction are, in the light of the definition taken from the linguistic encyclopaedia[36], semantically transitive, as the verb takes the object. However, the problem is to decide if they are grammatically transitive following the definition that a verb is transitive if the direct object of an active sentence becomes the subject of the passive one. Hence the terms "direct" and "indirect object" will be the next discussed question.

In Polish linguistics the direct object is the (first) element which has the (first) place[37] by the verbs that can be changed into passive so it is the one that becomes the nominative subject in the passive sentence[38]. In Polish such an object is usually in the accusative and when negated it takes the genitive, but it may also be in the genitive or instrumental case in declarative sentences. Indirect objects are the elements that take all other places by the main element[39].

---

[33] Cf. M. A u e r b a c h, M. G o l i a s: *Gramatyka grecka*. Warszawa 1985, p. 164, § 159.

[34] Cf. Z. S a m o l e w i c z, T. S o ł t y s i k: *Składnia łacińska*. Bydgoszcz 2000, p. 28, § 15.

[35] Cf. M. A u e r b a c h, M. G o l i a s: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 164, § 159, p. 180, § 197; cf. H.W. S m y t h: *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge 1956, p. 395, § 1745: „Active or middle verbs governing the genitive or dative may form (unlike the Latin use) a personal passive, the genitive or dative (especially if either denotes a person) becoming a subject of the passive".

[36] Cf. K. P o l a ń s k i: "Czasownik przechodni…", p. 98.

[37] A place filled by the subject is not taken under consideration here. Otherwise, the direct object would be said to fill the second place.

[38] Cf. S. K a r o l a k: "Dopełnienie". In: *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa…*, p. 125.

[39] Cf. ibidem.

Alicja Nagórko states that the direct object is the object of the transitive verb, which she also defines as the one transformable into passive[40]. She also notices that the genitive and the instrumental are sometimes cases of the direct object and become subjects in the passive voice[41]. The indirect object is then the object of the intransitive verb and it is put in different cases. The transitive verb can also take indirect object usually in the dative. It generally refers to the receiver of the results of the action (*dativus commodi* or *incommodi*)[42]. There is the reference to semantics then, but the fact that this object does not become the subject in the passive voice still remains the decisive criterion.

Since, on the one hand, transitiveness is defined on the basis of the fact that the verb can be transformed into passive and the direct object changes its position and, on the other hand, we define the direct object on the grounds of its different positions in the active and the passive voice and on transitiveness of the verb, it seems acceptable to admit that on the grammatical level transitiveness of the verb depends only on its ability to be transformed into passive, as this ability of the verb is the syntactic representation of the semantic element of transitiveness.

It has been mentioned above that in the Polish language cases other than the accusative may be used to mark the indirect object. According to Greek descriptive grammar, it is possible for the action to pass from the subject to the object noun put into genitive, for example, when the scope of the action is limited to a part of the object[43]. The conditions, however, are fulfilled: the verb can be transformed into passive and then the object becomes the subject. That object has, as it seems, the first (and the only) place by the verb[44], so it may be a direct object. Thus, the verb governing the genitive case may be regarded as grammatically transitive.

If the object is a noun in the dative, the verb may be a three-place verb[45] with two objects — one is a noun in the accusative and the other one in the dative. When the sentence is transformed into passive, the object with the accusative noun is not the only one that can become the subject, provided the indirect object of the active sentence is animate[46]. Still, the verb's ability to be transformed into passive remains the criterion which decides that the verb is grammatically transi-

---

[40] Cf. A. Nagórko: *Zarys gramatyki polskiej…*, pp. 289—290. There are lexically conditioned exceptions to this rule.

[41] Cf. ibidem, p. 290.

[42] Cf. ibidem, p. 291.

[43] Cf. M. Auerbach, M. Golias: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 168, § 168; cf. W.W. Goodwin: *Greek Grammar*. Boston 1900, p. 233, § 1097—1098.

[44] Cf. fn. 38.

[45] The subject is included in this number.

[46] Cf. D.Q. Adams: "Passives and Problems in Classical Greek and Modern English". *Working Papers in Linguistics* 1971, no. 10, p. 2; cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 396, § 1748: „An active verb followed by an accusative of a direct object (a thing) and an oblique case of a person, retains, when transferred to the passive, the accusative of the direct object, while the indirect object becomes the nominative subject of the passive".

tive. There is yet another possibility — when the verb has only one object and it is in the dative. It seems that this is also a grammatically transitive verb if it can be transformed into passive, and if the object becomes the subject. The object in the dative would be the direct object then.

Douglas Q. Adams writes about Greek: "There one finds large classes of verbs which either optionally or obligatorily take a direct object in the dative or genitive"[47]. Verbs of that kind, as the author says, could not be transformed into passive until the 5th century BC[48]. We do not know, however, how he defines the direct object and if he regards the objects of the verbs of the time when the passivization applied only to the object in the accusative as direct objects. Taking into consideration the foregoing statements, we might conclude that this class of verbs at some point became grammatically transitive.

However, the construction of that type (with the object in the genitive or dative) occurring in the Greek language is, according to the definition taken from already quoted encyclopaedia, an example that there is no necessary association between passivization and transitiveness[49]. That kind of verb, although it can be transformed into passive, is regarded here as a "multi-place intransitive verb", i.e. the verb that takes the indirect object and not the direct one[50].

The direct object is identified with the accusative and that seems to be the problem. When the criterion which decides if the object is direct is the fact that this object becomes the subject in the passive construction this identification (the direct object — the accusative case) corresponds with what Adams says[51] and is correct, but applies only to the state before the 5th century BC.

That criterion used without any temporal limits occurs in *Greek Grammar* by Herbert W. Smyth. He states: "Verbs capable of taking a direct object are called *transitive* because their action *passes over* to an object. Other verbs are called *intransitive*"[52]. He notices that intransitive verbs are used as transitive and the verbs usually transitive often take the indirect object[53]. The direct and indirect object are both clearly defined: "An object may be *direct* (in the accusative) or *indirect* (in the genitive or dative)"[54] and "The accusative is the case of the direct object. The accusative is used with all transitive verbs (and with some intransitive verbs used transitively)"[55].

---

[47] D.Q. Adams: "Passives and Problems in Classical…", p. 4.

[48] Cf. ibidem, p. 5.

[49] Cf. S. Karolak: "Passivum". In: *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa…*, p. 424.

[50] Cf. ibidem.

[51] D.Q. Adams: "Passives and Problems in Classical…", p. 4.

[52] H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 257, § 920; cf. C. Pharr: *Homeric Greek: A Book for Beginners*. [Sine loco et dato ed.], p. 298, § 1062: „A transitive verb is one whose action *passes over* to an object in the accusative".

[53] Cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 257, § 920.

[54] Ibidem, p. 257, § 919; „The object of a transitive verb is always put in the accusative". Ibidem, p. 389, § 1706.

[55] Ibidem, p. 354, § 1533.

It seems that in some cases the object in dative or genitive is considered indirect only because the direct one is equated with the accusative case, although there is no syntactic or semantic motivation. This problem may be partly solved by using the category *complement* apart from the category *object*.

Then, the status of partitive genitive, when it holds a place by the transitive verb, is somewhat different: "The genitive may serve as the immediate complement of a verb, or it may appear, as a secondary definition, along with accusative which is the immediate object of the verb"[56].

The situation is similar with the dative. In one of its functions it is also referred to as the "direct complement of verbs"[57]: "The dative may be used as a sole complement of many verbs that are usually transitive in English"[58]. The dative is then the only complement of the verb, but also the direct complement. Still, such a construction is considered intransitive, though it can be transformed into passive: "An intransitive verb taking the dative can form a personal passive, the dative becoming the nominative subject of the passive"[59]. The dative in other position is the "indirect complement of verbs"[60], and when it fills one of the three places by the verb and the accusative fills the other one, the dative is the "indirect object"[61]. Thus, the indirect complement is the indirect object, but the direct complement is not the direct object.

According to these opinions, what determines whether the verb is regarded as transitive is the fact that the verb takes the object in the accusative. It is then the model characteristic for Latin and not for Polish. The difference is that while the sentence in Latin is transformed into passive only the object in the accusative can become the nominative subject[62], so only the object in the accusative is the direct object, while the Greek syntax is in this regard similar to Polish rather than Latin. It is hard to find the reason to make a distinction between the object and the complement and to accept the definition which says that only the object in the accusative is the direct object. Even if, in some respect, there is a semantic difference between the object in the genitive or dative and the object in the accusative, the object in the genitive or dative may still meet the syntactic and semantic criteria that the direct object has to meet.

Having analysed such arguments we may come to the conclusion that, provided we resigned from identifying the direct object with the accusative, Greek might be in this respect regarded as the language system close (at least since the 5th

---

[56] Ibidem, p. 320, § 1339.

[57] Ibidem, p. 338.

[58] Ibidem, p. 338, § 1460; cf. C. P h a r r: *Homeric Greek…*, p. 287, § 996; W.W. G o o d w i n: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 223, § 1046—1048.

[59] H.W. S m y t h: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 340, § 1468.

[60] Ibidem, p. 340.

[61] Ibidem, p. 340, § 1469.

[62] Cf. M. A u e r b a c h, M. G o l i a s: *Gramatyka Grecka…*, p. 180, § 197.

century BC) to the ideal one, in which the criterion for deciding whether the verb is transitive equates the semantic and grammatical transitiveness. The syntactic connotation and the action passing from the agent to the patient, being semantics issues, may be considered then the most important criteria while defining grammatical transitiveness[63].

Such a set of criteria, with a greater stress put on semantics, could be helpful in changing the situation described by H.W. Smyth: "The distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs is a grammatical convenience, and is not founded on an essential difference of nature"[64]. The indirect object would be characterised as the object filling the third place by the verb, while the second place is filled by the accusative. This position would be used to define the indirect object, rather than the relation in passive transformation. The difference between the direct objects marked with different cases would be of semantic character then, not being the criterion for transitiveness. The accusative would still stay a case characteristic to the direct object but this category would become open for the cases that usually perform other functions.

Greek descriptive grammar describes also an intransitive use of transitive verbs, when the verb that usually takes the object is used without it, because of "the ellipsis of a definite external object"[65] or because the verb is used "absolutely, i.e. with no definite object omitted"[66]. These constructions may be the examples of discussed earlier deletion of the object and may be regarded as pseudo-intransitive.

The other term used in the title of this work is the term *passive*. We shall discuss the category of the active and passive voice trying to emphasise its relation with transitiveness and set the position it will take in the analysis of the text.

The category of voice, though regarded as a morphologic, has a syntactic character, as Alicja Nagórko states[67]. Its semantic shade results in arranging the elements according to priority[68], but as a consequence the meaning changes.

The general definition by Tadeusz Milewski says that the category of voice settles the relation of the transitive verb to the subject and the object[69]. The characterization of the voices in a syntactic schema of the Polish language consists in analysing the direction in which the action passes, i.e. from the subject to the object (the active voice), from the subject and back to it (the reflexive voice), and

---

[63] Cf. C. Pharr: *Homeric Greek…*, p. 298, § 1063: "An intransitive verb is one whose action does not pass over to an object".

[64] H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 389, § 1708.

[65] Ibidem, p. 389, § 1709.

[66] Ibidem.

[67] Cf. A. Nagórko: *Zarys gramatyki polskiej…*, p. 104.

[68] Ibidem.

[69] T. Milewski: *Językoznawstwo*. Warszawa 1976, p. 101.

to the subject in nominative (the passive voice)[70]. It is important that the category of voice is discussed with respect to transitive verbs.

The active voice, as Alicja Nagórko says, reflects the natural hierarchy when the doer or the entity that has a particular property or is in some state, so the element with the highest rank is in the position of subject, which is the most important one[71]. There is no comment that this category is limited to the transitive verbs. It is hard not to remark that kind of limitation while characterizing the passive voice, especially since not the morphological but the syntactic aspect of this category is the most important one. The passive voice insists in reversal of the natural hierarchy[72], which is possible only when there is another element apart from the main one in the basic schema. In the passive voice, the agent has the lower position in the hierarchy (it is an adjunct and may be omitted) while the object of the active sentence becomes the subject of the corresponding passive sentence[73]. Thus, in the passive voice the patient is the subject. Since the passive voice is characterised in this way, it seems correct to use the same method of description for the active voice. This category would then apply to the two- and three-place verbs only.

The traditional Greek grammar distinguishes three voices: the active, the passive and the middle voice (*activum*, *passivum* and *medium*)[74].

The active voice in Greek has the same meaning as in Polish, although some active verbs may replace the passive of others[75]. The characterization of the active voice is done by stating that "the active voice represents the subject as performing the action of the verb"[76].

The middle voice signals that the action in some particular way concerns the subject itself, its belongings or the area around it. The subject may be at the same time the object of the action (and then it has the same meaning as the active voice with the reflexive pronoun as the object of the verb). Another possibility is that the action is done in the subject's interest or with its strong commitment[77].

When the subject of the sentence is the object of the action expressed by the verb, it is the passive voice. The passive voice developed from the middle voice taking its forms in most cases. The aorist and the future tense are exceptions, although "many future middle forms are used passively"[78].

---

[70] Cf. ibidem.

[71] Cf. A. Nagórko: *Zarys gramatyki polskiej…*, p. 105.

[72] Cf. ibidem.

[73] Cf. J. Lyons: *Introduction…*, p. 376.

[74] Cf. H.W. Smyth: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 107, § 356; cf. M. Auerbach, M. Golias: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 180.

[75] Cf. ibidem, p. 180, § 196.

[76] H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 389, § 1703.

[77] Cf. M. Auerbach, M. Golias: *Gramatyka grecka…*, pp. 181—182; cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, pp. 390—394.; cf. D.B. Monro: *Homeric Grammar…*, p. 9, § 8.

[78] H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 394, § 1737.

In the passive voice, ὑπό with the genitive is usually used to express the agent, but also other prepositions with this case may be used in this function: ἀπό, διά, ἐκ, παρά, πρός; or ὑπό with the dative[79].The agent may also appear marked with the dative alone as a *dativus auctoris*[80]. The dative is also used "when the agent is a thing"[81].

The suggestions about the relation between the form and the meaning of the verb are also worth discussing, especially as they concern the forms to be analysed. The general rule says: "In verbs with both first and second tenses […] the first tense is usually transitive […], the second intransitive"[82]. In Greek grammar books, we may also find comments that are relevant to the passive aorist forms: the second passive aorist developed from active intransitive forms, and with time, it gained the passive meaning[83]. Aoristic forms that end with -ην being at the same time the forms of intransitive verbs have the active meaning[84]. The first passive aorist may have the active or middle meaning[85].

According to Smyth, "in Homer all the second aorist forms in -ην are intransitive except ἐπλήγην and ἐτύπην *was struck*. Most of the forms in -θην are likewise intransitive in Homer"[86].

Deponent verbs are another example of the disagreement between the form and the meaning: "Deponent verbs have an active *meaning* but only middle (or middle and passive) *forms*. If its aorist has the middle form, a deponent is called a middle deponent […]; if its aorist has the passive form, a deponent is called a passive deponent […]. Deponents usually prefer the passive to the middle forms of the aorist"[87]. However, they may have a passive meaning sometimes, for example, the passive aorist of the middle deponents has a passive meaning[88].

Thus, the link between the form and the meaning is not obligatory. The passive form may have meaning other than passive and occur in the sentence that is not passive. Therefore, the form of the verb form is not the only factor that determines whether the sentence is active or passive. The necessary criterion is the arrangement position of the agent and the patient.

The grammatical form of the analysed word, the meaning of the word and

---

[79] Cf. ibidem, p. 398, § 1755.

[80] Cf. ibidem, p. 343, § 1488; cf. M. Auerbach, M. Golias: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 176, § 186.

[81] H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 344, § 1494.

[82] C. Pharr: *Homeric Greek…*, p. 298, § 1064; cf. ibidem, p. 247, § 864; cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 220, § 819.

[83] Cf. M. Auerbach, M. Golias: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 182; cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 395, § 1739, p. 181, § 591, p. 219, § 802.

[84] Cf. M. Auerbach, M. Golias: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 182.

[85] Cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 219, § 804.

[86] Ibidem, p. 395, § 1740.

[87] Ibidem, p. 107, § 356.

[88] Cf. ibidem, p. 220, § 810; cf. D.B. Monro: *Homeric Grammar…*, p. 44, § 44.

the syntax of the sentence should be taken into account in a grammatical description. It seems that in the definitions and opinions presented in the Greek descriptive grammars there is an element that requires clarification or augmentation, and it pertains to the way the concept of voice and its relation with transitiveness is understood. The descriptive grammars clearly suggest that the category of active verbs contains transitive and intransitive verbs: "Active verbs are *transitive* or *intransitive*"[89]. They may have both meanings[90]. Such a statement is correct, when we assume that it concerns only the form and perhaps the character of the verb, but not the syntax of the whole sentence. As said above, the subject of the intransitive verb may be the agent. Then the verb has the active meaning (regardless of this fact it may have an active form). When the verb is stative, the subject cannot be considered the agent. It seems, however, that in both cases it is not the syntactic category of voice that is discussed. This category should be reserved for the transitive verbs, and the intransitive verbs could be described as having active or stative character or meaning. Then, the active form would have the transitive or intransitive meaning, in the intransitive meaning it would have the active or stative meaning, in the transitive meaning it would have the active meaning (or the passive one, for example, in one of the interpretations of the verbs like hear and see) and would be categorised as syntactically active[91]. The situation for the passive form would be similar, but the verb in the passive form having the active or middle meaning would be syntactically active and the one having the passive meaning would be categorised as syntactically passive. The passive voice would concern only the transitive and pseudo-intransitive verbs.

The attempts to make critical review of the definitions are not of the definitive character, though naturally some conclusions are based on the decisions and answers given to the discussed problems. It is not the aim of such a review to create a rigid framework for the text to be fitted into. The aim is to provide the background for the analysis. The interpretation of the text will be an attempt to investigate thoroughly the grammatical and semantic structure analysing as many references in the context as possible. To decide whether the passive form is transitive, it has to be established in the first place whether the subject is the agent, the patient or none of them. These categories are essential in the description of transitiveness. Positions of the objects and other positions that might express the agent will undergo the semantic analysis. It is necessary to consider that these positions may not be realized. The observations will eventually be compared with the notions about transitiveness presented above.

---

[89] H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 389, § 1704.

[90] Cf. M. Auerbach, M. Golias: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 180, § 196.

[91] The verb in the active form may substitute the passive form of another verb. It has the transitive meaning then, although the voice is syntactically passive. Cf. J. Lyons: *Introduction…*, p. 415.

Example 1
Iliad, I 9

ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε
Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.
Τίς τάρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;
Δητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός· ὁ γὰρ βασιλῆϊ χολωθεὶς   9
νοῦσον ἀνὰ στρατὸν ὄρσε κακήν, ὀλέκοντο δὲ λαοί
οὕνεκα τὸν Χρύσην ἠτίμασεν ἀρητῆρα
Ἀτρεΐδης·

The form that we will focus on while analysing this fragment is the first aorist passive participle of the verb χολόω. It is a nominative singular masculine. The participle is in concord with a demonstrative pronoun ὁ[92], which is the subject of the analysed sentence. The subject of the sentence is an agent as the pronoun refers to the animate noun υἱός, and it is Apollo who is mentioned here. The group consisting of the pronoun and the participle is accompanied by the dative which is syntactically connected with the participle. The noun in dative is an animate noun βασιλῆϊ — we learn from the context that it is Agamemnon.

Agentive character of the subject of the sentence with ὄρσε as a predicate contradicts the patientive character that the subject of the sentence with the participle changed into the predicate should have. It could be the suggestion that the participle χολωθεὶς is a form with an active or intransitive meaning. The connection between this participle and the subject of the sentence with the personal verb is weakened to some extent as it is the circumstantial participle (*participium coniunctum*) with the causal meaning not the attributive one. We may assume rather predicative use of the participle and the stronger connection or symmetry with the predicate ὄρσε. There is still some contrast between the active and passive form. It seems, however, of lesser importance and although both sentences have the same subject, the cause and effect relation and the fact that an aorist participle expresses action prior to that of the main verb makes the connection weaker by creating some temporal and spatial distance between the actions concerning the subject and therefore the subject may change its character. Thus, it may be interpreted as a patient for one of the predicates and an agent for the other one.

Considering a wider context, we can say more about the character of the interaction between Apollo and Agamemnon. The direct cause of the Apollo's wrath is the fact that τὸν Χρύσην ἠτίμασεν ἀρητῆρα Ἀτρεΐδης. Although the disposition of the events in the text depends on the composition, it is possible to observe

---

[92] There are two versions of the text. In the quoted edition Ð — a demonstrative pronoun, which can also serve as a relative pronoun. According to the electronic edition, the form of the pronoun is Ó. Then the basic form is Ój, and it is written as Ó mainly when the pronoun serves as a demonstrative pronoun. The decision is not crucial in this case. Cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, pp. 284—287.

the cause and effect relations and notice the sequence: Agamemnon's insult to the priest, the Apollo's wrath, the sending of the plague, and the death of many people. Obviously, the first cause is the cause of all the effects, but the immediate consequence of the Agamemnon's act is the Apollo's wrath. The description of the action that directly causes the wrath may be regarded as some suggestion about the direction of passing over of the action expressed by the participle χολωθεὶς. It has to be pointed out, however, that the Agamemnon's action was not directed straight against Apollo and that provoking the god's anger was not Agamemnon's major intention. On the other hand, it is hard to assume that, regardless of his intention, what he does could not be described as provoking the anger, as he was fully aware of Chryses' dignity and status[93].

Such an interpretation lets us identify the character of the participle and the syntax as passive, and thus the transitive meaning of the analysed form. In this case, the dative βασιλῆϊ would be unusual as the element expressing an agent. Although it is an animate noun, and therefore easy to regard as the agent, it occurs in the dative. In Greek dative may be used in the passive construction as a *dativus rei efficientis* and express an acting thing or it may be used as a *dativus auctoris* particularly when the verb is in the past tense. However, when the animate noun is the agent it is usually marked with ὑπό with the genitive.

If we consider that it is more probable that the subject; being an agent in the sentence with ὄρσε as a predicate keeps its agentive character in relation with the participle the combination of the active character and the passive form appears. We know from the context that the wrath is directed against Agamemnon. When we apply the criterion saying that the verb is transitive if it takes an object, we may regard the meaning transitive and the syntactic voice passive or middle. In this case, the middle voice would express the commitment of the subject. When we interpret the form as active or middle, we pay less attention to the aspect of causality which is contextually motivated or the fact that the designatum of the noun βασιλῆϊ has the character of the source of the anger. Of course, the analysed construction does not meet the criterion of passivization and the object is not in the accusative case. If we take into account the common understanding of the grammatical transitiveness, the analysed form cannot be considered grammatically transitive. What is even more important, the meaning of the verb in such a context is not marked by transitiveness. It casts doubts on the way the semantic transitiveness is defined or suggests that the dative is not the object but has a different function.

Another interpretation appears when βασιλῆϊ is considered to be *dativus causae*. Let us assume that Agamemnon did not intend to make the god angry. The participle would then express the subject's emotional state and have intransitive meaning. The problem is that anger can be at the same time a kind of state and to

---

[93] The words said by Agamemnon in the twenty eighth verse seem sufficient as a reference: μή νύ τοι οὐ χραίσμῃ σκῆπτρον καὶ στέμμα θεοῖο.

some extent a kind of activity. Moreover, as an activity it turns toward the factor that causes it by acting or by simply existing and, therefore, it is difficult to identify the function of the dative and to decide whether the construction is transitive or not. However, if we assume that the participle is rather attributive, we stress its stative character. It is linked with the reduction of the predicative character of the participle[94], though it is somewhat limited by the fact that there occurs the element indicating the cause.

Another argument for interpreting the meaning and the syntax as passive is the meaning of the basic — active form of the verb χολόω, which, according to the dictionaries, means: 'anger', 'provoke', 'enrage'[95]. The verb is transitive and takes an object in the accusative. The active form meets the criteria for grammatical transitiveness. There are no syntactic obstacles then for this verb to be transformed into the passive voice.

Smyth also uses the two forms: ἐχολώθην and a middle aorist form, as an example of the passive usage of the middle voice. Both of them have passive meaning[96]. The interchangeability of these forms is also pointed out by Monro, but he apparently signals a different direction — the passive forms have the middle meaning[97]. It seems to stay in accordance with what has been said earlier about the meaning of the passive voice, especially in Homer's poems.

In the dictionary by H.G. Liddel and R.A. Scott the passive and middle forms of χολόω are translated as 'to be angered' or 'provoked to anger'[98], which seems to suggest the passive meaning. On the other hand, the passive aorist form χολώθην (together with the perfect forms) is described as *verbum intransitivum*, and the dative it takes is the *dativus personae* and it is said to be the indirect object. The genitive that may appear accompanying this form expresses the cause. It may be an argument against the causative function of the dative, which may rather be *dativus incommodi* having the character of the indirect object and indicating transitiveness, at least the semantic one. Evidently intransitive meaning 'be angry' for the middle and the passive is suggested by the G. Autenrieth's dictionary[99]. Then, in this case the participle would mean just 'angry'.

C. Pharr also deems this form intransitive, as it takes dative[100]. However, he translates it as 'having been enraged'[101] not 'having been angry'.

---

[94] Cf. Ł. Tofilski: "Funkcje semantyczno-składniowe imiesłowu greckiego w pierwszej mowie Lizjasza". *Classica Wratislaviensia* 2001, Vol. 22, pp. 31—48.

[95] Cf. *Słownik grecko-polski*. Ed. Z. Abramowiczówna. Warszawa 1965, Vol. 4, p. 630; cf. H.G. Liddel, R.A. Scott: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford 1996, p. 1997; cf. G. Autenrieth: *Homeric Dictionary*. London 1984, reprinted 1998, p. 331.

[96] Cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 218, § 802, § 802 D.

[97] Cf. D.B. Monro: *Homeric Grammar…*, p. 44, § 44.

[98] H.G. Liddel, R.A. Scott: *A Greek-English Lexicon…*, p. 1997.

[99] G. Autenrieth: *Homeric Dictionary…*, p. 331.

[100] Cf. C. Pharr: *Homeric Greek…*, p. 34, § 83, p. 287, § 996.

[101] Ibidem, p. 34, § 83.

It seems then that the analysed form may be regarded as intransitive, although in this case the problem of classification of the dative βασιλῆϊ arises, especially in the context of semantic transitiveness and the syntactic connotation as the criterion of transitiveness in general. The active or the middle meaning is for semantic reasons the hardest to justify. It is possible, however, to describe the form as transitive and the voice as passive, although it is not typical to mark the agent with dative. The conclusion being to some extent a generalization may be reached after having analysed all the forms of this verb that occurs in Homer's poems.

Example 2
Iliad, I 47

Ὣς ἔφατ᾽ εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ᾽ ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων,
βῆ δὲ κατ᾽ Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων χωόμενος κῆρ,
τόξ᾽ ὤμοισιν ἔχων ἀμφηρεφέα τε φαρέτρην·
ἔκλαγξαν δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ὀϊστοὶ ἐπ᾽ ὤμων χωομένοιο,
αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος· ὃ δ᾽ ἤϊε νυκτὶ ἐοικώς.   47

Another form is the first aorist passive participle of the verb κινέω. It is in the genitive singular and the word is in concord with the pronoun αὐτός. It is a construction of the genitive absolute. The participle has no complements. The passive form of the verb with no signalised reference does not let us assume that the subject of the sentence in which this construction appears could be the object of the participle. No other element from the context could be the object. Except for the subject there is no element that indicates the agent for the participle κινηθέντος. The pronoun, which is in accordance with the participle and would be the subject of the sentence analogous to the analysed construction, refers to Apollo, so it is animate. The verb expresses movement. The subject has then an agentive character. The fact that there is no object leaves two possible interpretations — the form is intransitive or pseudo-intransitive.

There is a difficulty resulting from the fact that the reflexive meaning is in ancient Greek one of the meanings of the middle voice. The question arises whether the sentence of this kind should be considered pseudo-intransitive because there is no position of the object, or whether to regard the morphological determinant of the voice as the element indicating the object. Such a verb is not semantically intransitive. It may be assumed that the middle voice with the reflexive meaning is the special case of pseudo-intransitiveness which could be described basing not on the criterion of the optional occurrence of the object but on the criterion of the possibility for the middle construction to be transformed into the active one with the reflexive pronoun.

Smyth indicates the general characterization of this verb. He classifies the verb into a group of active verbs whose passive aorist often has the reflexive or the middle meaning, and he translates the form ἐκινήθην as "*was moved* or *moved*

myself"[102]. However, it seems that it could be more appropriate to translate this form as 'moved'. Especially, as in the light of Lyons' opinions it is hard to regard 'moved myself' as reflexive for the form is not considered implicitly reflexive and pseudo-intransitive but intransitive[103]. We shall return to this question later.

There is no position of the object in this example and it seems that there is no element of reflexivity. The participle expresses the movement that accompanies other action which also has intransitive and active character: βῆ δὲ κατ' Οὐλύμποιο καρήνων. The interpretation is rather clear and indicates intransitive usage.

> Example 3
> *Iliad*, I 57
>
> Ἐννῆμαρ μὲν ἀνὰ σρατὸν ᾤχετο κῆλα θεοῖο,
> τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ἀγορήνδε καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς·
> τῷ γὰρ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη·
> κήδετο γὰρ Δαναῶν, ὅτι ῥα θνήσκοντας ὁρᾶτο.
> οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τε γένοντο,   57
> τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς·

The form ἤγερθεν is the first aorist passive indicative of the verb ἀγείρω in the third person singular. The pronoun οἳ is the subject and refers to the Danaans. There are no elements in the surface realization that could be regarded as the object or the agent except for the position of the subject. The subject is animate. The second clause in the compound sentence has a predicate ὁμηγερέες γένοντο. The clauses are joined by the coordinating conjunction *and*.

The situation described by these predicates is the result of Achilles' action expressed in the sentence: τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ἀγορὴν δὲ καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς. That kind of semantic connection could be the basis for the assumption that in the clause with the passive form the agent is omitted, but Achilles is the agentive force. We would regard the subject as a patient, and the clause as transitive, semantically and grammatically passive. The character of the adjective ὁμηγερέες may be also an argument for this interpretation, as the adjective has the meaning similar to the meaning of a passive participle and is a predicate adjective in the clause which to a large degree is equivalent to the analysed one. That kind of redundancy is typical for an epic[104].

The analysed verb in the basic form has the transitive, active meaning, so it could have passive forms with the passive meaning. Pharr translates the form ἤγερθεν as "they were assembled"[105].

---

[102] H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 222, § 814.
[103] Cf. J. Lyons: *Introduction…*, pp. 351ff.
[104] Cf. G.S. Kirk: *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Cambridge 1985, reprinted 1995, Vol. 1, books 1—4, p. 59.
[105] C. Pharr: *Homeric Greek…*, p. 61, § 152.

On the other hand, there is no agentive element in positions other than the position of the subject, the subject is animate and there is no object — these three facts suggest that we can regard the analysed verb as intransitive or pseudo-intransitive. Although the predicate adjective of the other clause has the passive character it is an intransitive sentence describing a situation, a state. We may regard this fact as an argument for intransitiveness of the discussed verb if we consider the clause with ὁμηγερέες semantically equivalent to the one with the passive aorist form, as we have done before, and if we take into account that the subject in both clauses is the same.

If we reject the passive interpretation we should notice the difference between the analysed clauses. The subject by the predicate ἤγερθεν has the agentive character, the action described has the active character. This character may appear in the active or middle voice and that is impossible for the stative one, and the second clause has the stative character.

Let us compare the verb ἀγείρω, especially its passive forms that are deemed intransitive[106] with the verb *gather*. When intransitive, it seems to take as subject only the nouns in plural and the collective or uncountable nouns. It is also syntactically analogous to the verb *move* used by J. Lyons in the analysis of transitiveness as this verb has both transitive and intransitive meanings[107]. Both move and gather may take a reflexive pronoun if the subject is an animate noun e.g.: *He moved* and *He moved himself*; *People gathered in that building* and *People gathered themselves in that building*. It is not, however, the same situation as with the implicitly reflexive sentence. The fact that the verb can take a reflective pronoun is only a matter of stressing the agentive character of the subject[108]. The Polish sentences: *On poruszył się* or *Ludzie zgromadzili się*, are not reflexive either. The crucial factor is not the surface realisation but the semantic element. Similarly, the form ἤγερθεν could not be deemed pseudo-intransitive, even if it were possible to replace this form with an active one having a reflexive pronoun[109].

According to this interpretation, the sentence taking no object is semantically and grammatically intransitive.

When the context is taken into account, it seems that the analysed form may be interpreted in two ways: as transitive with the passive meaning and syntax, and as intransitive.

---

[106] Cf. G. Autenrieth: *Homeric Dictionary…*, p. 3; cf. H.G. Liddel, R.A. Scott: *A Greek-English Lexicon…*, p. 7; cf. *Słownik grecko-polski...*, Vol. 1, p. 8.

[107] Cf. J. Lyons: *Introduction…*, pp. 351ff.

[108] It seems that John Lyons has not considered such a case in his analysis.

[109] Cf. Example 2.

Example 4
Iliad, I 59

Ἀτρεΐδη νῦν ἄμμε πάλιν πλαγχθέντας ὀΐω   59
ἂψ ἀπονοστήσειν, εἴ κεν θάνατόν γε φύγοιμεν,
εἰ δὴ ὁμοῦ πόλεμός τε δαμᾷ καὶ λοιμὸς Ἀχαιούς·

The next form to be analysed is πλαγχθέντας. In the commentary by G.S. Kirk[110] and in the electronic edition the form is παλιμπλαγχθέντας. The first version we shall analyse is the one written separately, as it occurs in the quoted edition.

The form is the first aorist passive participle in the accusative singular. The basic form of the word is πλάζω. The participle is the attributive adjective qualifying the pronoun ἄμμε, which is the subject in the *accusativus cum infinitivo* and refers to the Achaeans. The participle has no objects and there is no grammatical position of the agentive adjunct. However, there is, in the context, the element that could refer to the agent and it is the plague sent by Apollo, and therefore Apollo can be regarded as the indirect agent.

The subject of the sentence with ἀπονοστήσειν as a predicate is an agent, although the sentence is intransitive. If we tried to interpret the participle or the analogous sentence as passive, we would have to assume, as we did in the first example, that the subject is agentive and passive at the same time. Once again, it is the argument for considering the meaning other than passive. However, the participle may be considered circumstantial (*participium coniunctum*) with the temporal meaning, and like the causal meaning in the first example the temporal one in this case weakens the contradiction. The participle would then translate as 'held off', 'repelled' and the adverb πάλιν would complete the meaning characterizing the direction. Such a meaning of the adverb, which can also describe the recurrence of an action, is characteristic for the early epic[111]. In this interpretation the form is regarded as transitive, syntactically and semantically passive.

To interpret the form as having the intransitive meaning ('having receded', 'having turned away from') we have to diminish the strength of the connection between the situation that induces Achilles to say the words quoted in this fragment and the cause of the Achaeans' miseries. At the same time we put a greater stress on the semantic relation with the verb ἀπονοστήσειν. The action expressed by the participle would describe a manner or a condition. Such a character is implied especially by the adverb νῦν. The agentive subject in *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction would have the same character in the sentence equivalent to the participle.

---

[110] Cf. G.S. K i r k: *The Iliad…*, p. 59.
[111] Cf. H.G. L i d d e l, R.A. S c o t t: *A Greek-English Lexicon…*, p. 1292.

In the analysis of the form παλιμπλαγχθέντας[112] (the basic form is παλιμπλάζω) the fact that according to the dictionaries this word occurs in Homer only as a passive aorist participle is to some extent a limitation. In the dictionaries one finds only the passive meaning[113]: 'foiled', 'driven back'. It seems, however, that also this time, in accordance with the context, it is possible to consider the form intransitive.

Example 5
Iliad, I 187

[…] ἐγὼ δέ κ' ἄγω Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρηον
αὐτὸς ἰὼν κλισίηνδὲ τὸ σὸν γέρας ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς
ὅσσον φέρτερός εἰμι σέθεν, στυγέῃ δὲ καὶ ἄλλος
ἶσον ἐμοὶ φάσθαι καὶ ὁμοιωθήμεναι ἄντην.   187

Another passive form (of the verb ὁμοιόω) is the passive aorist infinitive ὁμοιωθήμεναι and it is a part of *accusativus cum infinitivo* construction. It has no object and the adverb ἄντην is the only modifier. There is no agentive element in position other than the one of the subject. Such an element in the context could indicate the passive voice. The action clearly does not leave the subject. This fact is determined by the intention of Agamemnon saying the quoted words. He himself remarks that his action is aimed at awing Achilles (ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς ὅσσον φέρτερός εἰμι σέθεν) and intimidating the others (στυγέῃ δὲ καὶ ἄλλος), so that they will restrain their audacity. Restraining the audacity should stop them from action which is expressed in the *accusativus cum infinitivo* constructions. They depend on the main verb — στυγέῃ, and are analogous. The first infinitive (φάσθαι) does not have the passive meaning.

We shall consider whether the action is intransitive or pseudo-intransitive — middle, reflexive[114]. The decision may be based on the semantic analysis of the word and on the comparison with other occurrences of the analysed form. The dictionary by G. Autenrieth reports that this verb occurs in Homer only in the analysed form[115] and only twice. The dictionary describes the form as intransitive[116]. It seems, however, that this word may have a reflexive meaning, especially when it is modified by ἄντην, and it may be equivalent to the active form with a reflexive pronoun as an object.

---

[112] According to D.B. Monro, having the temporal meaning the participial compound form may be written separately. Cf. D.B. Monro: *Homeric Grammar…*, p. 121, § 125.

[113] Cf. G. Autenrieth: *Homeric Dictionary…*, p. 245; cf. H.G. Liddel, R.A. Scott: *A Greek-English Lexicon…*, p. 1292.

[114] Cf. Example 2.

[115] Cf. G. Autenrieth: *Homeric Dictionary…*, p. 231.

[116] Cf. H.G. Liddel, R.A. Scott: *A Greek-English Lexicon…*, p. 1225.

The form would be pseudo-intransitive in a particular, suggested earlier[117], interpretation of this term. There is no object in the surface realization and there is practically no possibility to add such a position. The form is the only determinant; in this case, the passive not the middle form.

Example 6
Iliad, I 200

θάμβησεν δ᾽ Ἀχιλεύς, μετὰ δ᾽ ἐτράπετ᾽ αὐτίκα δ᾽ ἔγνω
Παλλάδ᾽ Ἀθηναίην· δεινὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν·   200

Another form is the first aorist passive indicative in the third person plural. It may be regarded as a form of two verbs which, however, have almost the same meaning — the verbs φαείνω and φαίνω. The first one is the poetic equivalent of the second one.

The verb φαίνω has two passive aorist forms ending in -θην and in -ην. In the descriptive grammars of Greek we find the remark that in such a situation usually the -θην form is transitive and the -ην form is intransitive[118].

The subject of the analysed sentence may be considered animate. The Athena's eyes are the subject. There is also the pronoun οἱ, which is the personal pronoun in the dative singular and refers to Athena or Achilles.

If the pronoun refers to Athena (that is G.S. Kirk's[119] and C. Pharr's[120] proposition) it is not the agent. The dative itself is not a typical way of marking the personal agent. Such a classification in this case is not possible for semantic reasons. It seems that the animate subject is the agent. The sentence, then, is definitely neither semantically nor syntactically passive. The form φάανθεν does not take the object in the accusative, so it may be regarded as grammatically intransitive. Semantically, it has no reflexive character, so it cannot be considered pseudo-intransitive. It is the example of the intransitive meaning of the first aorist passive form, although the analysed verb has also the second aorist passive forms. The dative of the personal pronoun (οἱ) has the function of *dativus commodi*[121]. The meaning of the pronoun that is used in this function is often similar to the genitive in a possessive function[122]. *Dativus commodi* is classified by H.W. Smyth as a „modifier of the sentence"[123]. It is not an object nor is it an indirect complement. Such a classification may be deemed accurate as the action seems to be neither semantically nor grammatically transitive.

---

117 Cf. Example 2 and Example 3.
118 Cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 222, § 819.
119 Cf. G.S. Kirk: *The Iliad…*, p. 74.
120 Cf. C. Pharr: *Homeric Greek…*, p. 106, § 292.
121 Cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 342, § 1481.
122 Cf. D.B. Monro: *Homeric Grammar…*, p. 136, § 143.
123 H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 341.

There is another possible interpretation, when we regard that οἱ refers to Achilles. This interpretation is less probable because of the lack of the element referring to the context. The expressed thought would be too general then and rather obscure in the context. However, it is not an argument that could definitely eliminate this version and make the analysis groundless. According to such an interpretation, ὄσσε and δεινὼ are the nominative cases of the subject and the predicate adjective and the verb φάανθεν is the copula[124]. It would mean 'to appear', 'to seem' and it would have an intransitive character. The pronoun would also be *dativus commodi* having, however, slightly different meaning.

The problem of the semantic nature appears, then. It is difficult to decide what the direction of the perception and what a kind of assessment is. It seems, however, that the interpretation presented above satisfactorily meets the syntactic and semantic criteria, and a further analysis would distract us from the main issue.

Example 7
Iliad, I 266

οὐ γάρ πω τοίονς ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδὲ ἴδωμαι,
οἷον Πειρίθοόν τε Δρύαντά τε ποιμένα λαῶν
Καινέα τ᾽ Εξάδιόν τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Πολύφημον
Θησέα τ᾽ Αἰγεΐδην, ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτοισιν·
κάρτιστοι δή κεῖνοι ἐπιχθονίων τράφεν ἀνδρῶν·   266
κάρτιστοι μὲν ἔσαν καὶ καρτίστοις ἐμάχοντο
φηρσὶν ὀρεσκᾠοισιμ καὶ ἐκπάγλως ἀπόλεσσαν.

The form τράφεν is the next form we shall analyse. It is the second aorist passive indicative of the verb τρέφω and it is the third person plural. The pronoun κεῖνοι is the subject. In positions other than the position of the subject, there is no element that could be considered the agent.

Smyth classifies τρέφω into the group of verbs that "[…] show the result of their action upon a substantive or adjective predicate to the direct object"[125]. The accusative in this case is then the predicate accusative and it is the accusative of the result. In the analysis of this example, it is important to remark that the verbs that in the active voice take the accusative of the object and the predicate accusative, in the passive voice take the double nominative — the subject and the predicate nominative[126].

The adjective κάρτιστοι could be a predicate nominative in this situation. It would suggest that the verb is in the passive voice so it is transitive. However,

---

[124] Cf. M. Auerbach, M. Golias: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 164, § 157.

[125] H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 357, § 1579.

[126] Cf. ibidem, p. 362, § 1618; cf. M. Auerbach, M. Golias: *Gramatyka grecka…*, p. 167, § 163.

some intransitive verbs also take double nominative. We should take into consideration that the second aorist passive forms often have the intransitive meaning, especially when the verb has forms of both the first and the second passive aorist. We can find information that the second passive aorist of this verb may have the intransitive and the passive meaning[127], but we should probably agree that the lack of the agent or even the contextual reference to the agent is the decisive argument for classifying the verb as intransitive.

It seems that none of the presented interpretations can be categorically rejected.

Example 8
Iliad, I 464

αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' εὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο,
αὐέρυσαν μὲν πρῶτα καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν,
μηρούς τ' ἐξέταμον κατά τε κνίσῃ ἐκάλυφαν
δίπτυχα ποιήσαντες, ἐπ' αὐτῶν δ' ὠμοθέτησαν·
καῖε δ' ἐπὶ σχίζῃς ὁ γέρων, ἐπὶ δ' αἴθοπα οἶνον
λεῖβε· νέοι δὲ παρ' αὐτὸν ἔχον πεμπώβολα χερσίν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρα κάη καὶ σπλάγχνα πάσαντο,   464
μίστυλλόν τ' ἄρα τἆλλα καὶ ἀμφ' ὀβελοῖσιν ἔπειραν,
ὤπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα.

Κατακάη, the next passive form we shall analyse is the second passive aorist indicative in the third person singular. There is a tmesis — κατὰ is separated from the verb by μῆρα.

Μῆρα is the subject of the clause, it is an inanimate noun and it is not an agent. Two interpretations are possible. If we assume that the subject is a patient, the syntax is passive. Otherwise the clause is intransitive.

The second passive aorist, as mentioned above, often has intransitive meaning. There is such an indication also in reference to the verb καίω[128]. This form may be easily considered intransitive because of the meaning of the verb, the character of the subject, and because there is no object.

However, if we notice what the character of all other actions in the situation described in the text is, we may observe that the context indicates the agentive element. It can be omitted in the surface realization of the analysed clause. In the previous sentences as well as for the next predicates the Danaans and Chryses are the subject. They prepare the sacrifice and participate in offering it to Apollo. They are the ones who burn the pieces of the flesh of the thighs (μῆρα). In such a case, the subject would be a patient, and the clause would be transitive with the passive syntax.

---

[127] Cf. H.W. Smyth: *Greek Grammar…*, p. 182, § 595.
[128] Cf. ibidem, p. 701.

The analysed verb is singular, although the subject is plural. It is possible in Greek, if a neuter noun is a subject. The number differentiates this predicate form the other predicates in the context. They are all plural and the Danaans are the subject, although there is no noun or pronoun in the position of the subject. There is also a neuter plural noun by πάσαντο the predicate of the clause joined with the analysed one by the coordinating conjunction *and*. The noun, however, is the object, and is indicated semantically and syntactically by πάσαντο which is a deponent verb and has the active meaning 'to eat'[129]. This difference is an argument against the interpretation of the κάη as the middle, transitive form with the object μῆρα, although this interpretation seems possible according to Greek grammars. In this case, the fact that the verb is singular could be explained by the distinct subject — Chryses himself (ὁ γέρων) would end the act of burning.

It is hard to decide categorically whether the verb is passive or intransitive, especially after analysing this single example only, but the intransitive interpretation of this form seems more probable.

Creating a complete definition of transitiveness is not an easy task. The deliberations presented above might be regarded as the suggestion that the grammatical and semantic spheres should be more unified while defining transitiveness. The greatest stress should be put on semantics, as the meaning of the verb is the main factor deciding about this quality of the verb. The fact that a verb takes an object is the most important syntactic element reflecting transitiveness. However, the meaning of the verb should always be taken into consideration in the first place. We should also agree that the syntactic category of the voice is the category reserved for the transitive verbs and notice the difference between the active syntax and the active character of a verb.

There are four participles and two infinitives among the thirteen passive forms[130] in the first book of the *Iliad*. The other forms are indicatives. Six forms are definitely intransitive. Two forms may be interpreted as pseudo-intransitive. The remaining five forms may be considered syntactically passive. Although the interpretation is not unequivocal, a rather big generalization has to be made to reject it.

The element that may be the agent in position other than the subject occurs only in the first example, though its form is not typical for such a function. In the other cases, with the exception of Example 7, a wider context is the basis of a passive interpretation. Considering Example 7 as passive seems to be the most controversial.

There are four second aorist passive forms, and two of them may be interpreted as passive (including Example 7).

---

[129] Cf. H.G. L i d d e l, R.A. S c o t t: *A Greek-English Lexicon…*, p. 1347.

[130] In the conclusion all the occurrences of the passive aorist forms in the first book of the *Iliad* are included. They are analysed in the author's Master's Dissertation, on which the article is based.

The question remains open because of the limited material analysed in this work. The complete view on this issue may be reached in the analysis of the whole texts of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

It seems that the presented method of analysing the text may give a chance for the new interpretation, increase the preciseness and eliminate the burden of the traditional notions.