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Abstract*

In this article, we will show that the use of the augment in Homeric speech introductions and conclusions was not random, but could be explained by morphometric, syntactic and semantic constraints. Later, these rules were no longer understood: the augment became a mandatory marker of past tense in Greek prose, while its absence in Homer (which was also motivated by rules and constraints) was reinterpreted as an archaism and an element of the poetic language. The article only focuses on Homeric speech introductions and conclusions, and leaves out a discussion of Homer and epic poetry in general, of Mycenaean and the other Indo-European languages that have the augment.1

1 Introduction

The augment was originally an accented deictic particle *h₁é ‘then, in that case’,2 and was not mandatory in Indo-European verbal morphology. In Greek and in several other Indo-European languages, it evolved into a prefix e- that could be added to past tense forms of the indicative (imperfect, aorist and pluperfect). In the oldest Greek prose texts, Mycenaean (13th century BC), it was almost always absent,3 while in Homer unaugmented verbal forms were more common than augmented ones.4 In Classical Greek, however, it had become the

* Special thanks go to Olav Hackstein, Peter-Arnold Mumm and Dieter Gunkel (LMU München) for sharing their thoughts in a detailed discussion on the augment. We also would like to thank Dieter Gunkel, Ivo Hajnal (Innsbruck) and Sonja Zeman (LMU München) for observations they made during the discussion of this paper.

1 The augment has been treated extensively and was even debated among Alexandrian scholars. Studies of the Homeric augment have been made by Grashof (1852), Poehlmann (1858), Koch (1868), La Roche (1867: 76-80 and 99-102; 1882), Platt (1891), Drewitt (1912a, 1912b and 1913), Shewan (1912 and 1914, in response to Drewitt), Beck (1919), Chantraine (1948: 479-484), Bottin (1969), Blumenthal (1974), West (1989), Basset (1989), Strunk (1994), Bakker (1999a and 2005), Mumm (2004), Lehnert (2005, an analysis of the augmentation in the first two books of the Iliad based on Mumm (2004) and with a short overview of previous scholarship on pages 1-8; unfortunately, he neglected all the other explanations; and 2012, a very brief discussion), Willi (2005), Pagniello (2007), Hackstein (2011b: 32 f.) and García-Ramón (2012).

The most detailed analysis of verbal forms in compounds is Dottin (1894), but we were unable to consult it ourselves (it was quoted in Chantraine 1948 and Bottin 1969).

For a thorough analysis of previous scholars (especially from the 19th century), one can consult Bottin (1969). As Bakker (2005: 115) pointed out, Bottin (1969) is the only thorough overview of scholarship from 1850 until 1969. The only aspect that he did not discuss, was Franz Bopp’s theories on the origin of the augment: Bopp explained the augment either as a negative suffix denying the present state or as a shorter form of the emphatic particle è. This was repeated by Bréal (1900). For an analysis of Bopp’s theories, see Strunk (1994).

2 I follow here the analyses by Bopp (1833, quoted in Strunk 1994), Bréal (1900) and Strunk (1994), who stated that the augment was related to the emphatic particle è (see previous note).

3 For the absence in Mycenaean, see Vilborg (1960: 104), Hooker (1980: 62) and Bartoněk (2003: 337). The only certain augmented form is a pe do ke ‘he gave away’, but Luria (1960) interpreted it as apesidoke and in that case, that form would have been unaugmented as well (we personally find that explanation rather unlikely in light of the double preverb). The augment in Mycenaean has been treated by Hoenigswald (1964), Mumm (2004), Ruijgh (2011, edited posthumously) and García-Ramón (2012), but in-depth analysis of the augment in Mycenaean cannot be performed here.

4 Koch (1868: 27), Platt (1891: 229 f., doubting the accuracy of Koch’s figures), Monoř (1891: 402), Drewitt (1912a: 44-47 and 1912b), Chantraine (1948: 484, also doubting Koch’s figures), Basset (1989), Bakker (1997b: 52, noting that Koch’s observations were intrinsically right, and 2005: 115).
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mandatory marker of past tense with forms in the indicative, while the absence of the augment was reinterpreted in later poetry as an archaism or Homerism. An example of an augmented form is:

(1) ἐ-παιδεύ-ἐ-τε
       e-paideú-e-te
‘you educated’. IMPF 2 PL.’

The only observation that has been made on the use of the augment in speech introductions, is that they are more often augmented than not.6

Table 1: Augmented verb forms in speech introductions and conclusions7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speech introductions</th>
<th>Speech conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augmented</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaugmented</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speech conclusions have not been discussed in the literature so far. In what follows, we will address the augment use from a morphometric, syntactic and semantic point of view.

2 Morphometric observations on the augment use

a) The most important observation is that the augment is always used or left out if the opposite would render the form unfit for the verse.8 This does not mean that the augment use was solely motivated by the metre, because in many instances, both augmented and unaugmented forms would have fitted the metre. An example of an introduction in which only an unaugmented form could be used, is:

(2) ὁ ἐφορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε
       hó =sphin eú phroné:ν agoré:sato kai metéeipe
he them.DAT being well-intended speak in the assembly. AOR 3SG and speak (to a large group).AOR 3SG
‘He spoke in the assembly and addressed them with good intentions’ (Iliad 1,73).

b) Older forms, such as duals and root aorists, usually remain unaugmented,9 while younger forms, such as the sigmatic aorist and the medio-passive aorist in the, are more often augmented.10 This is an archaism from the period, when the augment was not yet mandatory.11 An example from a speech conclusion is:

(3) τῶ γε κλαίοντε προσαυδήτην βασιλῆα
       τό:=ge kliaíonte prosaudé:te:n basilé(w)α
so the two weeping the two spoke. IMPF 3 DU king.ACC
‘and so the two of them spoke tearfully to the king’ (Iliad 11,136).

5 The Alexandrian scholar Aristarkhos (3rd – 2nd century BC) already considered a non-augmented form to be poie:tikó:teron ‘more poetic’ but did not remove all the augmented forms from the text; for an analysis of his criteria to accept or deny the existence of an augment, see Schmidt (1854a and 1854b).
6 Bakker (2005: 126 f.); Drewitt (1912a: 44) had already implicitly stated that speech introductions were more often augmented than not.
7 The figures are based on Fingerle (1939: 308-342 and 349-355).
8 As Peter-Arnold Mumm points out to us, the augment is thus never used against the metre.
9 As Peter-Arnold Mumm points out to us, this means that the dual somehow excluded the use of the augment and that the dual ceased to be productive before the augment became grammaticalised.
10 Blumenthal (1974), but his study was criticised because the corpus was deemed too limited. See Bottin (1969: 92-96) for a list of all dual forms.
11 We leave out the discussion of whether the absence of the augment was a feature of the Indo-European Dichtersprache, as Delbrück (1879: 68) and Wackernagel (1942: 1-4) argued, or that the absence was due to the fact that PIE in general did not have the augment yet.
c) The augment is always used when the form without it would yield a short open monosyllabic verb form (horror monosyllabi). This explains the difference in augmentation between the following two sentences:

(4) Άγισθος δολόμητις, ἔπεις κτάνε πολλὸν ἀρείον.
Aigisthos.NOM deceitful.NOM since kill.AOR 3SG much.ADV someone better.ACC
‘deceit-minded Aigisthos, since he had killed someone far superior’ (Odyssey 3,250).

(5) Άγισθον δολόμητιν, ὃς οἱ πατέρα κλυτὸν έκτα
Aigisthon.ACC deceitful.ACC who.NOM SG him.DAT famous.ACC kill.AOR 3SG
‘deceit-minded Aigisthos, who had killed his famous father’ (Odyssey 3,308).

This explains why the verb form ἔ ‘s/he spoke’ is always augmented: the non-augmented form *h2eģt would have become ἴeὶ and eventually Greek ἴα. Such a form would not have survived, and therefore the form had to be augmented:

(6) έ καὶ ἀναίξας ἐριὸνος ἀρμα καὶ ἵππους
Debe.IMPF 3PL and jump.AOR PTCP quick running chariot.ACC and horses.ACC
‘he spoke, and the quick running jumped on the chariot and horses’ (Iliad 24,442).

This constraint is applied only to open monosyllabic verb forms. As such, the following verb was not augmented, because it has a closed syllable:

(7) ὢς φάν, τῷ δ’ ἀσπαστὸν ἐείσατο κοιμήθηναι
So speak.IMPF 3PL to him lovely it seemed.AOR sleep.INF.AOR
‘so they spoke, and it seemed welcome to him to go to sleep’ (Odyssey 7,343).

d) The augment is not used when its use would require the elision of a rare case ending such as the dual in E, the dative singular in I or the dative plural in SI or if a form would become unclear by the elision. The following example is revealing:

(8) ὢς εἰπὼν Αἰάντε καλέσσατο καὶ Μενέλαον
So speak.AOR PTCP the two Aiantes.ACC he called out.AOR and Menelaos.ACC
‘So he spoke and called out to both Aiantes and to Menelaos’ (Iliad 17,507).

In this instance, the verb form kaléssato can only be unaugmented, because the sequence Aiant’ ekaléssato would be ambiguous, as it could either mean ‘he called Aias’ or ‘he called both Aiantes’. As such, only Aiantē kaléssato is possible.

e) A last remark is that compound verbs are almost always augmented, even when there are syntactic or semantic constraints against the augment (such as being used in a negative sentence or being followed by a clitic). One example is:


14 La Roche (1869: 76-82 and 113).

15 As was stated in footnote 1, the standard work is Dottin (1894), but we were unable to consult the work.
In this instance, proséphe: is a compound and is augmented, although it appeared in a negative sentence (cf. infra).

3 Syntactic observations

In the next subchapter, we discuss the syntactic constraints that influence the use and absence of the augment.

a) A verb form that is followed by a 2nd position clitic\(^{16}\) is in most cases not augmented.\(^{17}\) Below are the figures of past-tense verb forms that are followed by a 2nd position clitic. There are 1746 past tense forms that are followed by a clitic, and they are distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simplex verb form is followed by a clitic</th>
<th>Compound verb form is followed by a clitic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1693</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaugmented</td>
<td>Augmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1282</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An augmented verb form is a compound of an orthotonic particle *é and an (in origin enclitic) verb form:

\[(10) \; \text{éeipe} \]
\[\text{*e} = \text{wek}^\prime \text{e} \]
\[\text{‘s/he spoke’} \]

That an augmented form is a sort of compound, is confirmed by the accentuation in Greek and Vedic.\(^{18}\) When a Vedic verb is compounded and accented, the accent is always put on the preverb immediately preceding the verb form and never on a preverb preceding another preverb; similarly, the accent is always put on the augment when an augmented form is accentuated. The Greek accentuation preserves the old compound status as well: although the general rule in Greek verbal accentuation states that the accent should be protracted as far as possible, the accent could never be placed further than the augment, as it could also never be placed further than the last preverb.\(^{19}\) The following two forms show this:

\[(11) \; \text{par-ék-dos} \quad \text{par-é-skhon} \]
\[\text{‘give out (as addition)!’} \quad \text{‘I provided’} \]

If an enclitic or a word that cannot be put at the beginning of the verse is used in the verse, it has to be put in the second position.\(^{20}\) As we stated above, the augmented verb form

\(^{16}\) We use the term ‘2nd position clitic’ to indicate those words that cannot be put at the first position in the sentence. They are not all enclitic, and therefore the term clitic or enclitic would be incomplete.

\(^{17}\) This was first mentioned by Drewitt (1912b: 104) and expanded in Beck (1919). The instances of dé were counted in Bottin (1969: 99-105).

\(^{18}\) Wackernagel (1877: 469 f.), Monro (1891: 77), Meillet (1937: 243). For the accentuation, see Bally (1947: 100) and Probert (2007: 47). For the Vedic accentuation and compounding, see Macdonell (1910: 315).


\(^{20}\) This is based on the observations by Bergaigne (1878: 91-93 for Latin, Greek, Indo-Iranian and Germanic) and Delbrück (1878: 47 f. for Vedic prose) and Wackernagel (1892 for all Indo-European languages known at the time of publication), who stated that enclitic words had to come second in a sentence.
is a compound of an orthotonic particle and an enclitic verb form. If a 2nd position clitic followed an augmented verb form, the word order would be the following:

(12) ἔπειρε τε
    ἔπειρε τε
    ‘and s/he spoke’

*e = wek"e = k"e
Augment – enclitic verb form - clitic

A sequence enclitic verb followed by a clitic particle violates the clitic chain rules, however. In Greek, the (clitic) coordinating particles are put first in the clitic chain, followed by the other particles, then the pronouns and the verb forms can only appear at the very end of the chain.21 A sequence augmented verb – clitic would have to be reconstructed as follows:

(13) *e = k"e = wek"e
Augment – Clitic – Verb form

This sequence is impossible in Greek, because the augment can never be dissolved from the verb in Greek. As such, the verb had to be accentuated and act as the first orthotonic word of the sequence, being followed by the clitic:

(14) ἔπειρε τε
    ἔπειρε τε
    *wek"e = k"e
Verb  Clitic

This explains the absence of the augment in the following instances (verb and clitic are put in bold face):

(15) μέσσοι δ’ ἀμφοτέροιν σκῆφτρα σχέον, ἔπειρε τε μύθον
méssoi d’ amphotéron skêphra skhéthon, eîpré= te mûthon
middle.DAT SG both.GEN PL sceptres.ACC hold.AOR3PL speak.AOR3SG and ↓
word.ACC

‘They held the sceptre in the middle of both and he spoke a word’ (Iliad 7,277).

(16) ὥς ἐφατ’: αἶδετο γὰρ θαλερὸν γάμον ἐξονομήναι
hós éphat’: aîdeto gár thaleron gamon eksonomênai
so speak.IMPF 3SG feel shame.IMPF 3SG indeed lustful marriage.ACC mention.AOR
‘So she spoke, and she was ashamed to mention lustful marriage’ (Odyssey 6,66).

b) A verb form was often not augmented when it was connected with a preceding augmented verb form by the connecting particles kai ‘and’, te ‘and’, háma te ‘together with’, te kai ‘and’ or idé ‘and’. An augmented form is marked and in a series of marked forms only the first one needed to be marked. This is called conjunction reduction and was first noticed by Kiparsky (1968).22 He observed that in Indo-Iranian and Greek in a sequence of marked forms such as augmented indicatives or imperatives, the first form was marked, but the next one(s) were replaced by the injunctive.23 Starting from the idea that the injunctive was neutral as to time,

---


22 He expanded this in Kiparsky 2005 (discussing Hoffmann 1967), but the basic ideas of 1968 remain the same. We personally believe that ‘markedness reduction’ might be a better term.

23 This is not only the case with augmented verb forms, but also occurred in a sequence of dual forms (see Strunk 1975: 234-239, without using the phrase ‘conjunction reduction’; Fritz 2011: 50 f.) or in a sequence of modal forms. For Greek, the injunctive was replaced with the infinitive in the case of a sequence of more than one imperative. Kiparsky (1968: 54 f.) expanded this idea to the Indo-Iranian (and maybe also Indo-European) vâyav indraś ca ‘O Vâyu and Indra’ construction, in which the vocative was the marked form and the nominative the
Kiparsky stated that the absence of the augment in these verbal forms was due to ‘conjunction reduction’: the first form was marked and the others were left unmarked and neutral.\(^{24}\) A sequence

\[
\text{Verb } + \text{PAST } \ldots \text{Verb } + \text{PAST}
\]

evolved into

\[
\text{Verb } + \text{PAST } \ldots \text{Verb } - \text{PAST}.
\]

Kiparsky’s suggestion offers an explanation for many instances where augmented and non-augmented forms co-occur with hardly any semantic difference visible. This rule explains why the speech conclusions with ‘s/he spoke’ are followed by a verb that is often not augmented.\(^{25}\) The 88 speech conclusion formulae with ‘are always part of a sentence in which other verb forms occur as well, and in 82 instances the connection is made with kai or hama te. In 55 instances, the verbal form following ‘he was not augmented.

Examples of this reduction are (the verb forms in question are put in bold font):

\[
\begin{align*}
(17) & \quad \text{hò:s } \text{ár}’ \text{épēt’ } \text{ērēto} \quad \text{kai} \quad \text{αυτή} \quad \text{πάντα} \quad \text{τελεύτα} \\
& \quad \text{so} \quad \text{then next pray.IMPF 3SG and herself.NOM everything.ACC.PL finish.IMPF 3SG}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(18) \quad \text{toīs } \text{dé} \quad \text{ίδων} \quad \text{νείκεσσεν} \quad \text{έπος} \quad \text{τ’} \quad \text{έφατ’} \quad \text{έκ } \text{τ’ } \text{όνόμαζεν} \\
\quad \text{them.ACC see.AOR PCP insult.AOR 3SG word.ACC and speak.IMPF 3SG out and call.IMPF 3SG}
\]

‘He saw them, insulted them, spoke a word and called out’ (\textit{Odyssey} 3,62).

Verbs connected with the connecting particle kai are much more often subject to this reduction than forms connected with the connective-adversative dé ‘and, but’. Kiparsky tried to explain this by arguing that the augmentation of many verbs was a later regularisation during the transmission.\(^{26}\) There is another explanation, however. The particle dé did not mark a mere transition, but adds new information, while kai connected two (or more) aspects of the same action or event.\(^{27}\) When dé is not used as a simple connective but is contrasting different

\[\text{unmarked one. This combination of vocative and nominative had been noted before, namely by Wackernagel (1878: 280 f.), Delbrück (1879: 28, who stated that the Sanskritist Theodor Benfey was the first to notice this feature, 1888: 105 f.), Haskell (1885: 66), Caland (1890: 544 f.), Monro (1891: 155) and Platt (1909). Platt argued that the rule applied only to \textit{Anreden} linked by te but not when the persons addressed were connected by kai. According to Platt this rule applied to Attic prose as well, but not to Pindar (\textit{but the rule seemed too subtle for the Boeotian wit}). Verdenius (1987: 116 f.) flatly denied that this was a rule at all. We believe that the rule cannot be denied, but there is an alternative to the \textit{markedness reduction} possible as well. Schwyzer-Debrunner (1950: 63) assumed that the PIE particle *\textit{k}w* only connected words but not sentences, and therefore considered the use of the nominative to be logical: as the vocative is a sentence on its own, the nominative is not connected but simply an apposition to the vocative (that the apposition to a vocative could be put in the nominative had been noted by Delbrück (1900: 195 f.), to whom Schwyzer-Debrunner referred (with the wrong page number 396 instead of 196)). For a detailed study of this address formula see Zwolanek (1970, we owe this reference to Peter-Arnold Mumm). She argued, following Caland (1890: 544 f.), that the case following the vocative was determined by the function of the syntagma in the sentence: if the function of the addressees was subject in the sentence, the first element was put in the vocative and the other(s) in the nominative; when they were object, the first one was put in the vocative and the others in the case (dative or accusative) they had in the sentence. Especially Avestan showed many instances of this construction.\]

\[\text{Kiparsky (1968: 36).}\]

\[\text{Peter-Arnold Mumm (personal communication) was more sceptical: if the augment in ō had become the norm, the speakers might not have felt it as augmented form anymore and consequently, it might not have been triggered the reduction anymore.}\]

\[\text{Kiparsky (1968: 41 f.); Rosén (1973) tried to do the same.}\]

actions, the verb forms connected by it are not subject to the markedness reduction;28 when dé connects actions that are closely linked, the verbs linked are subject to the reduction. One example is:

(19) ἢ καὶ ἀναίξας ἐριόνυος ἀρμα καὶ ἔπους
ἐκαὶ ἀναίξας ἐριόνυος ἀρμα καὶ ἔπους
he spoke.AOR and having jumped.AOR quick running chariot.ACC and horses.ACC
‘he spoke, and the quick running (Apollo) jumped on the chariot and horses’
καρπαλίμοις μάστιγα καὶ ἄνια λάζετο χερσίν,
karpalímo:s mástitiga kai hé:nia ládzeto kherínn
quickly whip.ACC and reins.ACC he took.IMPF with his hands
‘quickly he grasped the whip and reins with his hands’
ἐν δ’ ἐπνεοῦ στι ἐπνεοῦ στι ἐπνεοῦ στι
‘he spoke, and the quick running (Apollo) jumped on the chariot and horses’
καὶ ἐνδ’ ἐπνεοῦ στι καὶ ἡμιόνοις μένος ἦ.
kaì end’ épneus’ kai he:miónois ménoz ēú.
into he blew.AOR horses.DAT and mules.DAT strength.ACC good.ACC
‘and blew strong force into his horses and mules’ (Iliad 24,442-444).

In this instance, Homer described how Apollo finished speaking, jumped on his chariot and took the reins in his hand. He then proceeded to incite his mules and horses. This is a surprising action as gods did not usually incite their horses. As such, this new action was not merely connected to the previous one, but was contrasted with it: the first verb ἥ was augmented, but ládzeto was not, because it was connected to ἥ by καί. The verb form épneuse added new information and was therefore augmented.

c) The verse initial position of the verb usually leads to the absence of the augment.29 As the Verberstellung is a very marked position for the verb,30 there is less for an additional verbal marker. The majority of these non-augmented instances of a verse initial verb form could also be explained by the fact that the verb forms are followed by a 2nd position clitic, but this solution does not apply to all of them. Metrical reasons cannot be excluded, but are not the only explanation, as forms such as égno: ‘he knew’ and éste: ‘he stood’ could be used at the beginning of the verse.

(20) ἐπνεοῦ ἐπνεοῦ στι Διὸ τ’ ἄλλοισιν τε θεοῖσι
ἐπνεοῦ ἐπνεοῦ στι Διὸ τ’ ἄλλοισιν τε θεοῖσι
he spoke.AOR praying.AOR PTCP Zeus.DAT and other.DAT PL and gods.DAT
‘he spoke, praying (loudly) to Zeus and the other gods’ (Iliad 6,475).

(21) θρῆνειν: ἐνθα = κεν οὗ = τιν’ ἄδακρτον γ’ ἐνόησας
θρῆνειν: ἐνθα = κεν οὗ = τιν’ ἄδακρτον γ’ ἐνόησας
they wailed.IMPF there MP not someone.ACC not cried for.ACC notice.AOR 2SG
‘they wailed, and there you could not have seen anyone not crying’ (Odyssey 24,61).

28 Bakker (1997b: 52 and 2005: 116) who nevertheless doubted the existence of conjunction reduction. This was also pointed out by our colleague Dr. Dieter Gunkel (LMU München, personal communication during the discussion after the presentation).
29 Chantraine (1948: 482), Bertrand (2006a), De Lambarterie (2007: 37, 56 f.). Van Thiel (1991: xxvi) pointed out that this had been observed already by the Byzantine scholars.
30 That the verb final position was default, had been noticed before by Bergaigne (1879), Delbrück (1878: 17 and 1888: 17), Kühner-Gerth (1904: 595), Watkins (1963: 48, 1998: 68), Fortson (2010: 142-144), Fritz (2010: 384). The idea that the verb final position is the unmarked one and the initial one is marked goes back to Delbrück (1878: 17-19). It was expanded to the languages discovered after his (Delbrück’s) death by Dressler (1969). For PIE in general, see Watkins (1963: 48), Fortson (2010: 142-144), Fritz (2010: 384), and for Hittite see also Luraghi (1990: 88 f. and 110-117) and Bauer (2011).
31 In this verse the variant eîpe d’ was suggested by Aristarchos and was preferred by Kirk (1990: 223), but Van Thiel and West printed ἐπεν. The absence of the augment in both readings can be syntactically explained.
4 Semantic observations

a) Although there is no agreement on a special meaning of the augment and although most scholars assume it to be randomly used, the semantic explanation of the augment can be summarised as follows: the augment is a deictic suffix that marked the completion of the action in the presence of the speaker, and puts the past action into the foreground. More specifically, it is used:

- more often in speeches than in narrative,
- to describe a past action is valid for or linked to the present situation,
- to mark the transition from narration into direct speech,
- to stress new information.

b) Past tense forms used in speech introductions with an addressee have the augment.

The tables for the simplex verbs are the following:

Table 3: (Aimplex) past tense forms of verba dicendi with an addressee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Augmented with person addressed</th>
<th>Unaugmented with person addressed</th>
<th>Augmented without person addressed</th>
<th>Unaugmented without person addressed</th>
<th>Total instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agoreúo:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ameíbomai</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audáo:</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phe:mí:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pho:néo:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


33 Bakker (2005: 147); this had already been observed by Platt (1891: 227, almost with the same words).


37 Drewitt (1912a: 44), Bakker (1995: 126 f.). It is noteworthy that the deictic pronouns almost exclusively occur in speeches, see Bakker (1999b) and De Jong (2012). As pointed out by Peter-Arnold Mumm (p.c.), the transition from narrative to direct speech involves a Verlebendigung and the audience is drawn into the dialogue itself.

The augment in Homer

The tables for the compounds are the following:

Table 4: (Compound) past tense forms of *verba dicendi* with an addressee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Augmented with person addressed</th>
<th>Unaugmented with person addressed</th>
<th>Augmented without person addressed</th>
<th>Unaugmented without person addressed</th>
<th>Total instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proseeipon</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meteeipon</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosphe:mi</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaphe:mi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosphe:néo:</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metapho:néo:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prosaudáo:</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>2 (in a conclusion)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metaudáo:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of an introduction with an addressee is (addressee and verb are put in bold face):

(22) **τὴν δ’ ἥμειβετ’ ἐπείτα πατήρ ἄνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε**

Tēn d’ ἐμείβετ’ ἐπείτα pate:r andrón = te theôn = te

Her. ACC he answered. IMPF then father.NOM men GEN PL and gods. GEN and

‘Then the father of humans and gods answered her’ (Iliad 1, 544).

Speech introductions without addressee or introductions for a soliloquy remain unaugmented. The instances of verbs with a soliloquy are *(w)ei.pe pros hòn megalé:tora thu:môn* ‘he spoke to his own strong spirit’ (11 instances)39 and *proti (w)òn mu:thé:sato thu:môn* ‘he spoke to his own mind’ (4 instances).40 An example is:

(23) **όγθησας δ’ ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὅν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν**

olatile:sa:s d’ ára (w)ei.pe pros hôn megalé:tora thu:món

become angry. AOR PTCP indeed he spoke. AOR towards his strong minded spirit. ACC

‘Angry, he spoke towards his own strong spirit’ (occurring 11 times).

c) The speech conclusions with *phe:mí* ‘I speak’ have the augment, when they are expanded with a participle because the participle adds new information about the manner of speaking. There are 44 instances of such an extension,41 and in 31 cases the verbal form is augmented.42

(24) **δος ἔφατ’ ἐυχόμενος, τοῦ δ’ ἐκλευε Παλλάς Αθήνη**

hô:s épaf’ euukónemos toû d’ éklye Pallás Athé:ne:

so he spoke. IMPF praying him. GEN hear. IMPF 3 SG Pallas Athena. NOM

‘so he spoke praying, and Pallas Athena heard him’ (Odyssey 3,385).

---

39 The instances are Iliad 11,403; 17,90; 18,5; 20,343; 21,53; 21,552; 22,98 and Odyssey 5,298; 5,355; 5,407 and 5,464.
40 The instances are Iliad 17,200; 17,442 and Odyssey 5,285; 5,376.
41 The instances are Iliad 1,43; 1,357; 1,457; 5,106; 5,121; 6,311; 8,198; 10,295; 11,592; 12,442; 15,337; 16,46; 16,249; 16,527; 19,301; 19,338; 20,364; 20,373; 20,393; 21,161; 21,361; 22,429; 22,437; 22,515; 23,184; 23,771; 24,314; 24,746; 24,760; 24,776 and Odyssey 2,80; 2,267; 3,385; 6,328; 9,413; 9,536; 16,448; 20,22; 20,102; 22,210; 23,181 and 24,438.
42 The instances are Iliad 1,43; 1,457; 5,106; 5,121; 6,311; 8,198; 10,295; 11,592; 15,337; 16,249; 16,527; 19,301; 19,338; 20,393; 22,429; 22,437; 22,515; 23,771; 24,314; 24,746; 24,760; 24,776 and Odyssey 2,267; 3,385; 6,328; 9,413; 9,536; 20,22; 20,102 and 23,181.
d) The speech conclusions with *pheːmí* were augmented when the speaking influenced a large audience or provoked a reaction of the addressee. In 194 verses, the subject of the next sentence differs in number from the speech conclusion with *pheːmí*. In 176 instances, the form of *pheːmí* is augmented, and in 18 instances it is not.

Table 5: Change in person number between the verb of the speech conclusion with *pheːmí* and that of the next sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in person number (first the conclusion, then the number of the next sentence)</th>
<th>Total instances</th>
<th>The form of <em>pheːmí</em> is augmented</th>
<th>The form of <em>pheːmí</em> is not augmented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ˢᵗ p. sg. versus 3ʳᵈ p. sg.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ˢᵗ p. sg. versus 3ʳᵈ p. pl.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ʳᵈ p. sg. versus 1ˢᵗ p. sg.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ʳᵈ p. sg. versus 3ʳᵈ p. pl.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ʳᵈ p. pl. versus 1ˢᵗ p. sg.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ʳᵈ p. pl. versus 3ʳᵈ p. sg.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>194</strong></td>
<td><strong>176</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The change in subject number indicates a contrast between the person(s) who spoke and the person(s) addressed. Such a contrast is found in dialogues and in reactions to speeches in an assembly.

(25) ὥς ἐφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἄρα τοῖς μᾶλα μὲν κλών ἣδ’ ἐπίθοντο ἡοːς ἐπιθ’ ἤο τούτα μᾶλα μὲν κλών εἰς Δ’ ἐπιθόντο so he spoke. IMPF they then him. GEN very PTCL hear. IMPF 3PL and obey. AOR 3 PL

‘So he spoke, they listened attentively to him and obeyed him’ (used seven times).

e) The speech conclusions combined with *άρα* ‘indeed’ are mostly augmented.

Table 6: Speech conclusions with *άρα*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Augmented conclusion</th>
<th>Unaugmented conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐέιπον</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>ἡοːς ἀρά tis (w)έιπεςκεν is attested 6 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔ</td>
<td>ἐ ῥα is attested 51 times</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pheːmí</em></td>
<td>ἡοːς ἀρ’ ἐφάν is attested 9 times, ἡοːς ἀρ’ ἐπή: is attested 18 times</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>phoːnéo:</em></td>
<td>ἡοːς ἀρ’ ἐφοːνε:σεν is attested 9 times</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

43 The instances are *Iliad* 2,278; 12,442; 20,373; 21,114; 21,284; 23,184 and 23,287 and *Odyssey* 2,337; 4,703; 7,434; 10,321; 11,97; 12,192; 21,366; 22,68; 23,205 and 24,345.
44 The instances are *Iliad* 7,379; 9,79; 14,133; 14,378; 15,300; 23,54; 23,738.
45 The instances are *Iliad* 4,85; 17,423; 22,375 and *Odyssey* 4,772; 13,170; 23,152.
46 The instances are *Iliad* 3,161; 3,324; 7,181; 7,206 and *Odyssey* 9,413; 17,488; 18,75; 18,117 and 21,404.
47 The instances are *Iliad* 1,584; 5,111; 5,607; 21,136; 21,502 and *Odyssey* 2,377; 8,482; 17,409; 17,462; 18,185; 19,361; 19,386; 19,503; 20,120; 22,433; 22,465; 23,181 and 24,397.
48 The instances are *Iliad* 10,465; 19,276 and *Odyssey* 2,257; 10,229; 17,57; 19,29; 21,163; 21,386 and 22,398.
The particle ára creates a contrast between what was said before and the action following the speaking. This contrast explains the use of the augment.

(26) ὧς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, λῦσεν δ' ἄγορήν αἰσηρήν  
    ἐρ:σα ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, λῦσεν δ' ἄγορήν αἰσηρήν 
    so indeed he spoke. AOR he loosened. AOR assembly. ACC quick. ACC  
    ‘So indeed he spoke, and he immediately broke up the assembly’ (Iliad 19, 276).

(27) ὧς ἄρ' ἐφη, ποταμὸς δὲ χολόσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον  
    ὧς ἄρ' ἐφη, ποταμὸς δὲ χολόσατο κηρόθι μᾶλλον 
    so indeed speak. IMPF 3SG river. NOM but become angry. AOR 3SG in his heart very  
    ‘So indeed he spoke, but the river became very angry in his heart’ (Iliad 21, 136).

f) As the augment stresses new information, it is used with the following words, indicating an immediate or unexpected action: aîpsa ‘suddenly, quickly’; autíka ‘immediately’; nûn ‘now’.

Table 7: augmented verb forms and aîpsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Augmented forms and autíka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Augmented forms and nûn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of a speech introduction is:

(28) αἶψα δ' Ἀθηναίην ἐπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα  
    αἶψα δ' Ἀθηναίην ἐπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα 
    Suddenly PTCL to Athena. ACC words. ACC winged. ACC PL he spoke. IMPF  
    ‘Suddenly, he spoke winged words to Athena’ (Iliad 8, 351).

Table 7: augmented verb forms and aîpsa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Augmented forms and autíka

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
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</table>

Table 9: Augmented forms and nûn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Augmented</th>
<th>Unaugmented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aorist</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluperfect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An example of a speech introduction is:

(28) αἶψα δ' Ἀθηναίην ἐπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα  
    αἶψα δ' Ἀθηναίην ἐπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα 
    Suddenly PTCL to Athena. ACC words. ACC winged. ACC PL he spoke. IMPF  
    ‘Suddenly, he spoke winged words to Athena’ (Iliad 8, 351).

g) The augment is absent in negative clauses because the negation removes the link with the actual situation (the negation and the verb form have been put in bold face):  

(29) ἥτοι Ἀθηναίη ἄκεων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπε  
    ἥτοι Ἀθηναίη ἄκεων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπε  
    Indeed Athen. NOM unwilling. NOM be. IMPF 3SG and not something say. AOR 3SG  
    ‘Indeed, Athene was (very) unwilling and did not say anything’ (Iliad 4, 22).

(30) ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδέ Διὸς πείθε  
    ὥς ἔφατ', οὐδὲ Διὸς πείθε  
    So speak. IMPF 3SG and not of Zeus he persuaded. IMPF mind. ACC that. ACC PL speaking  
    ‘So he spoke, but he did not persuade Zeus’ mind saying those words’ (Iliad 12, 173).

50 In Attic, the aorist is also very common with nûn, see Rijksbaron (2002: 29).
h) Unaugmented forms are preferred in clauses that are introduced by *epeí* ‘since, after’ and *êmos* ‘when, after’, as these clauses belong to narrative parts, actions in a more remote past and descriptions of background actions. The figures are:

| Table 10: Augmented forms and *epeí* |
|---|---|
| Augmented | Unaugmented |
| 224 | 290 |

| Table 11: Augmented forms and *êmos* |
|---|---|
| Augmented | Unaugmented |
| 12 | 24 |

An example is:

(31) ὤς φάτο, βῆ δ’ ἀπ’ ὄνειρος ἐπεῖ τὸν μῦθον ἀκουσέν ὁ δὲ: φάτο ἐπὶ δ’ ἀρ’ ὄνειρος ἐπεῖ τὸν μῦθον ἀκουσέν

so speak.IMPF.3SG go.AOR.3SG then dream.NOM since the word.ACC hear.AOR.3SG

‘So he spoke, the dream then departed, since it had heard the word’ (*Iliad* 2.16).

i) The augment is missing when repeated actions are described, because such descriptions do not add new information. As such, the augment is mostly missing with the word *aiei* ‘always’.

| Table 12: Augmented forms and *aiei* |
|---|---|---|
| Unaugmented | Augmented | Total |
| 41 | 15 | 56 |

An example is:

(32) αἰεὶ δὲ σμερδόνων βοῶν Δαναοῖς κέλευεν

always terrible.ADV shout.PRES PTCP Danaans.DAT he ordered.IMPF

‘He continuously incited the Danaans, shouting terribly’ (*Iliad* 15.687;15.732).

j) The iteratives in *SK* are not augmented, because they describe long-lasting or repeated actions in the past, or single actions that are repeated by different and undefined characters.

| Table 13: The *sk* preterites and the augment |
|---|---|---|
| Forms | Unaugmented | Augmented |
| SK | 307 | 5 |
| phásko: | 4 | 13 |

In this table, the verb *phásko*: ‘I speak’ was included as a separate category because although this verb was originally the iterative of *phe:mí*, it did not have this meaning in Homer anymore and later created an entire paradigm, contrary to the other *SK* forms.

The absence of the augment is particularly visible in speech introductions with this suffix: they refer to a single speech that was repeated by many different but unspecified characters (the suitors, the Greek or Trojan soldiers, Odysseus’s men,…). As they all had an indefinite subject *tis* ‘someone’ and were constructed without addressee, they were less

52 For *epeí* see Bakker (2005: 125 f.).
53 Buttmann (1830: 382), Grashof (1852: 14), Monro (1891: 62), Smyth (1894: 464), Kühner-Blass (1892: 81), Drewitt (1912a: 44), Mohrmann (1933: 90), Chantraine (1948: 481 f.), Bakker (2005: 127), Pagniello (2007). Poehlmann (1858: 10) pointed out that this had been observed already by the *Etymologicum Magnum*.
54 For a list of speech introductions and conclusions with *sk* verbs, see Fingerle (1939: 285-294) and Schneider (1995: 13 f.).
clearly linked with the present situation or with the audience, and as a consequence, the verbal forms were not augmented. An example is:

\[
(33) \text{ὥδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν ἱδῶν ἔς πλησίον ἄλλον} \\
\text{hó:de dé tis } \text{(w)eípesken id:ò:n es ple:síon állon}
\]

so someone.NOM he spoke often.AOR seeing.AOR to next.ACC SG other.ACC SG

‘So then one spoke looking at his neighbour’ (*Iliad* 2.271).

## 5 Conclusion

This article has demonstrated that the presence and absence of the augment were not primarily the result of poetic freedom, but could be explained by morphometric, syntactic and semantic rules and constraints. The augment is used to stress new information, to link a past action with the present or audience and indicates a contrast between characters in the audience or real world. This is confirmed by the speech introductions and conclusions. The verbs in speech conclusions are augmented when they describe a speech that influenced a large group or a speech that caused an immediate reaction by the addressee, or when they describe how the speaking occurred (in most cases this is done by adding a participle to the conclusion). Speech introduction verbs are augmented when they are constructed with an addressee; when the speaking involves no interaction- i.e. in a soliloquy, when there is no addressee or when a group of undefined characters is speaking- the augment is absent, because those speeches do not involve interaction with the audience. As the Homeric language was an artificial language without a prescriptive grammar and with influences from everyday speech, the rules and constraints were never absolute. In later Greek prose, the augment became mandatory, whereas later poets (such as the Alexandrinians and those in the Imperial Age) interpreted the coexistence of augmented and non-augmented forms as inherent to poetry, and used the augment more randomly, but this needs to be investigated in more detail.
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