

THE HOMERIC AUGMENT:

A DEICTIC PARTICLE

by

FREDERICK JAMES PAGNIELLO, III

(Under the direction of Jared Klein)

ABSTRACT

Within Homeric Greek is attested the augment, *e-*, that is prefixed to preterits of the verbal system. Scholarship has long accepted the view of this particle as the marker of past-time whose appearance is solely governed by the needs of the meter; hence, the absence of the augment marks unaugmented preterits as metrical variants, but functional equivalent with the augmented preterits. The recent scholarship by Bakker has suggested that the Homeric augment is actually a deictic particle. Although limited to character speeches and gnomic periods (i.e., statements of general truths), his study suggests that the appearance of augmented preterits correlates with the degree of deixis associated within the narrative environment. The purpose of this study is to examine the thesis of the deictic augment within the context of the entire corpus of Homer. We will show that the appearance of the Homeric augment is essentially a deictic particle. This will show that the Vedic injunctive (formally an unaugmented preterit) does not exist within

Homeric Greek, and that it is furthermore an innovation concomitant with the reanalysis of the augment into a temporal marker. This will furthermore show that the thesis of the deictic augment provides a better account for the various traces of the particle, the proto-augment, that are attested outside of the verbal system within various Indo-European languages, thus pointing to the proto-augment having existed within Proto-Indo-European.

INDEX WORDS: Augment, Augmented Preterits, Deictic Particle, Homeric Augment, Homeric Greek, Preterits, Proto-Augment, Proto-Indo-European, Temporal Marker, Thesis of the Deictic Augment, Unaugmented Preterits, Vedic Augment, Vedic Injunctive, Vedic Sanskrit

THE HOMERIC AUGMENT:

A DEICTIC PARTICLE

by

FREDERICK JAMES PAGNIELLO, III

B.S., The University of Bridgeport, 1979

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

©2002

Frederick James Pagnello, III

All Rights Reserved

THE HOMERIC AUGMENT:

A DEICTIC PARTICLE

by

FREDERICK JAMES PAGNIELLO, III

Approved:

Major Professor: Jared Klein

Committee: Marlyse Baptista
Michael Covington
Theodore Lewis
William Provost

Electronic Version Approved:

Gordhan L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2002

DEDICATION

To the following people do I dedicate this work, which would never have come to pass without their support. My dear parents, whose willingness to tolerate my desire to achieve this degree was irreplaceable, and most especially my mother's love of museums, which instilled me with a love of scholarship and science. Linda Lassman, Sharon Carroll-Ventura, Denise Wolff, and Tony Bassette, four dear friends who graciously lent their ears to me in a time of troubles. Carmine Vaccarino, Alan Vernon and Irene Spiegelman, without whose generous support by their letters of recommendation greatly assisted in my having been into graduate school. Don McCreary and Debbie Schmidt for their aid at several critical junctures. And, of course, Jared Klein, my teacher and mentor. Without his guidance and kindness toward my quite often tempestuous nature, and his constant faith in my abilities, my journey would have indeed been cut short; my ship would never have reached its port, so to speak. To all of you I am most deeply indebted. It is a debt that I can ever fully repay. *Multas gratias vobis nobillimis multo libenter ago.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The achievement of a Ph.D. is much like a journey. It is something of one of those role-playing games, in which players strike their ways through a dungeon to reach a treasure. It is a trip often fraught with perils and dangers, and most certainly enough traps that seem insurmountable lest someone of greater wisdom and knowledge show the way. And let us not forget to mention abidance, for you, the student are but an apprentice learning the ropes of a new profession, so to speak. It was not so much the mere facts that each professor gave, but rather the respective implications and impacts in the field of linguistics that offered the greatest profit to the student.

In this regard, I've been blessed with a number of guides in my journey. These individuals now only gave their knowledge and experience, but their time, one of the most precious commodities one has. First and foremost I must give credit to my teacher Jared Klein. In no way can his role ever be understated. His expertise in the field of Indo-European studies is formidable, yet he freely welcomes any student who is willing to learn. He may be critical, as he should be, but always in a positive way so that the student becomes better for the experience. The private conferences in his office were at least as illustrative as the classroom lectures; it was a one-on-one experience that went beyond the mere extemporization of facts. He is also one of the most tolerant persons I've ever met. As many a person can attest, I have a rather tempestuous nature, which for reason I will not explicate at the moment has become so much fiercer in the past four years. This he tolerated beyond what one could consider reasonable, for which I am

eternally grateful. Nor can I forget his call back in 1992, when he inquired about my letters of recommendation. His telling me that I would be well-suited as a grad student and research assistant pretty much took my breath away. What I couldn't have gotten at any price a decade earlier was placed at my table.

I can say this for the other professors in my tenure as a graduate student, although for varying degrees in their respective cases. Debbie Schmidt has been no less an influence in the development of my scholarly attributes with respect to linguistics as well as my personal nature. She freely shared her knowledge and expertise of phonology with her students, although the most memorable experiences with her were during my preparations for my qualification exams; the private conferences allowed us to discuss the various aspects of phonology in greater depth than permitted in the lecture room. She also imparted to me a more than passing interest in the field of syntax, which prior to her advanced lectures was something of a “necessary evil.” It is unfortunate that she, one of immense talent, had to resign from the University because of serious illness.

Other professors played no less a role in my development within the general field of scholarly inquiry. Don McCreary assisted me greatly with my first conference presentation from the initial abstract to the final presentation. His attendance at the actual presentation was in a way disconcerting (after all, your teacher is hearing everything you say), but also supportive (all the more so when he gives the occasional nod that “you’ve got it right”). No less important was an assistantship he generated for me in my third semester at the University. It was a demonstration of his confidence in my abilities as a potential candidate in the program.

Michael Covington made syntax a bearable subject for me, a person for whom that area of linguistics originally held only a marginal interest. Had anyone of lesser caliber taught the course, I would more than likely have lost interest prior to the halfway mark. His advice and pointers with regard to the techniques of syntactic analysis proved invaluable toward my successful completion of his course. Just as important, however, was his willingness to answer any question that I might pose to him regardless of the field. His advice with respect to modern computer programming facilitated my reacquaintance with my former profession as well as a speedy acquisition of the latest techniques required for programmers.

My experiences with Fredric Dolezal have been on a more limited basis, though despite this, quite profitable. The most enjoyable course with him was a seminar on language and perception. Here we discussed one of the underlying relationships between human perception and the overt structural realization of language on the surface. Although he demanded quality, he gave you the leeway and latitude to find the answer. When my first presentation on Aristotelian classification was less than expected, he offered advice on how to better approach the research, most especially with specific modern scholars who have investigated this subject in detail. I would say, however, the most important aspect was the freedom in your major research project, which for me (an investigation into human perception and its incorporation into language) was one of the most enjoyable papers I've ever written as a graduate student.

Nancy Felson's contribution to the dissertation is, in a word, inestimable. It was her course on the *Iliad* that opened a major door into the underlying thematic structure of that Homeric epic. In a sense she gave me the way to push my understanding of Homer

to a greater height. Just as important was an insight into narratology, which prior to her course was something of an obscure arcania; I knew of it, but had no idea how to approach such a study. In these two respects she provided me the tools with which I could successfully analyze Homer in both a grammatical and thematic light. Indeed, without the latter the former could never have been accomplished, for what a writer says is governed by the underlying thoughts and emotions. No less important was her willingness to tolerate my “quaint” emotional structure, which I will admit can be very trying at times.

I must also mention professors Baptista, Platter, Thibodeau, Curtis, LaFleur, Algeo and Provost. Although my experience with each was very limited, their respective contributions in a way are integral bricks in the foundation of my scholarly education. Although I have never been a student of hers, Marlyse Baptista has always offered her time to answer any of my questions. Indeed, her thesis on pluralization in Creoles (i.e., governed by underlying principles of grammar) provided some additional support for my own study of the principles underlying the appearance of the augment in the Homeric verbal system. She also willingly volunteered as a member of my doctoral committee when requested by my teacher Jared Klein at the eleventh hour. Philip Thibodeau’s course on the Greek playwright Aristophanes reinforced the skills in the Greek language that I had acquired from Nancy Felson. Charles Platter’s courses on Attic Greek had provided a foundation for further studies into that language. This professor always took the time to answer my questions concerning the Greek language. My one course with Robert Curtis, an introduction to the culture of Classical Rome, gave me insights into a culture that I had only dallied with; his influence remains with me to this day as I

continue my studies of that wonderful civilization. Richard LaFleur for just offering his advice to any question that I may have. John Algeo, for making the study of the grammar of contemporary English a delight; the knowledge from his course still come in handy years after he first presented them. William Provost, of course, who as the head of the linguistics program gave generous support for an extension of my candidacy, without which I would not have inscribed these words; and who agreed to be a member of my doctoral committee, which was necessitated by the unfortunate resignation of Debbie Schmidt.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY.....	xiii
CHAPTER	
1 THEORETICAL ISSUES CONCERNING THE AUGMENT.....	1
2 ANALYSIS.....	23
2.1 Introduction.....	23
2.2 Augmentless Preterits: Atemporal Signification.....	30
2.3 Temporally Distal Events.....	47
2.4 Homeric Narratives: The Battle Scenes.....	61
2.5 Homeric Similes: The Case of the GnomiC Aorist.....	74
2.6 The Past-iterative.....	84
2.7 <i>tiktō</i> -preterits.....	108
3 DISCUSSION.....	118
3.1 Introduction.....	118
3.2 Comparison of Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek.....	119
3.3 The Homeric Augment: A Deictic Particle.....	133
3.4 The Augment in Proto-Indo-European.....	143
3.5 Concluding Remarks.....	152

NOTES.....154

REFERENCES170

ABBREVIATIONS

JB.	Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa
RV.	Rigveda
ŚB.	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa
VS.	Vājasaneyi-Samhitā

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine in detail the Homeric augment to determine the underlying principles governing its distribution within the epics of Homer. It is necessary to obtain an accurate and full understanding of the Homeric augment in order to develop a full description of the verbal system attested within Homer. The original purpose of this work was to undertake a comparative analysis of the injunctive in Greek and Vedic Sanskrit. Formally, injunctives are unaugmented preterits, but they are functionally restricted to atemporal environments and therefore stand in syntactic complementary distribution with augmented preterits. Although injunctives appear to exist in Homer, they comprise a fairly minor functional class. The vast majority of augmentless preterits in Homer (well over 90%) appear in temporal environments, where they seem to be in free variation with augmented preterits. The apparent absence of any clear functional distinction between augmented and augmentless preterits in the Homeric verbal system contrasts with Vedic Sanskrit, where the injunctive is clearly atemporal, as demonstrated by Hoffmann (1967, 1970). Although the significance of the Homeric augment is not clear, the research of Bakker (1999), as well as that of Platt (1891) and Hirt (1927a,b), suggests a nontemporal interpretation.

My intent has been judiciously to select passages for inclusion in the analysis. I have therefore limited my corpus of data to metrically assured occurrences of the augment.

Exactly what constitutes the original Homer is still a matter of conjecture. This lack of consensus is clearly rooted in the shortage of any secure diagnostic by which one might accurately gauge the provenience of a particular verse or sequence of verses. Scholars differ as to whether the name Homer refers to a single poet or many authors. This invariably leads to radically varying interpretations as to the original state of the epics. It is not surprising that scholars dispute the status of various sections or even entire books of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. For example, Book X of the *Iliad* is generally considered a later addition on linguistic grounds, though some scholars attribute its authorship to Homer based on thematic content. Other sections of Homer, such as the *battle of the gods* (*Iliad* XXI) have been frequently rejected as incompatible with the general tenor of the *Iliad*. Given the lack of any firm guideline as to what is original, no passage should be summarily excluded from the analytical corpus, though it is nonetheless prudent to restrict oneself initially to those passages that are relatively undisputed.

This study has several goals. First among these is an understanding of the Homeric augment. This provides a foundation for a comparison of the verbal systems of Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit. Such a comparative analysis is made possible by Hoffmann's thorough investigation of the Vedic injunctive. Furthermore, the suggestion by Hirt (1927a) of the attestation of the morpheme comprising the augment outside the compass of the verbal system points to an Indo-European provenience of this morpheme (which I call the proto-augment).

It is for this reason that I have chosen a tripartite division of this dissertation. First, in Chapter 1 we will discuss the various attempts by scholars to explicate the nature

of the Homeric augment; this will begin with a general overview of the augment in Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit, including a brief discussion of the work of Hoffmann (1967), as well as the recent thesis of Bakker (1999). Chapter 2 of the dissertation will consist of case studies investigating the employment of the augment in various types of constructions. In contrast to previous examinations of Homer, I wish to consider the precise environment within which a given preterit appears. In my analysis I will take into account recent work on narrative such as that of Fleischman (1990) and Chafe (1994). It is important to note the relationship of the augment to the expressive qualities of the narrative environment, among them, vividness, intensity, temporal recency, and focus. One must likewise investigate those verbs that show a strong affinity for a particular state of augmentation (such as the preterits of *tiktō* ‘bear’ that hardly ever take the augment). This approach to the data offers a comprehensive overview of the distribution of the augment across the entire narrative environment of Homer. Thus, the purpose of this section is to generate a set of data that illustrates some principles governing the appearance of the augment. Given the nature of human language, exceptions and/or contradictions are expected within the corpus of data; these will be noted wherever they appear. No conclusions can be drawn at this stage, since we must examine the entire set of data both internal to Homeric Greek and external in comparative relationship with Vedic Sanskrit. The full discussion of the data is then reserved for section three. Chapter 3 of the dissertation is divided as follows. Chapter 3.1 will provide an overview of the goals of the discussion. In Chapter 3.2, we will examine the work of Hoffmann in greater detail to see whether it is applicable to the Homeric verbal system. We will show that only a small percentage of unaugmented preterits in Homer exhibit the functional

qualities of the injunctive. This will allow us to address the question of the significance of the augment in Homer. In Chapter 3.3, we will consider the corpus of data from Chapter 2 in light of Bakker's conception of the augment. Within the discussion we will show that the Homeric augment possesses deictic value, and for this reason its appearance is governed by the thematic content of the narrative. In Chapter 3.4 we will discuss the proto-augment within the larger context of Proto-Indo-European. We will show that it is easier to account for the traces of the particle attested variously in nonverbal formants by assuming the proto-augment as being present in Proto-Indo-European, and we will also show that it is far easier to account for its attestation within Greek and Sanskrit as a shared retention than as an innovation in each. We will present a model for the development of the proto-augment from a deictic particle into a temporal marker of preterits with the concomitant changes motivated by this morphological reanalysis. In Chapter 3.5 we will offer suggestions for future research with regard to the augment and the verbal systems in Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit.

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL ISSUES CONCERNING THE AUGMENT

The augment, a verbal prefix *e- which combines with verbal endings to signify past-time, is a feature characteristic of Indo-Iranian, Greek, and, with a very different implementation, Classical Armenian. It is best represented in Sanskrit and Greek, large-corpus languages in which it functions as the marker of past-time for preterits; in Armenian, however, it serves merely as a phonological prop vowel. In Iranian it is attested on an ancient level in Old Persian, a Western Iranian language, but not in Avestan, an Old East Iranian language. Its presence in Eastern Iranian at an early period may be inferred, however, from its existence in Yaghnobi,¹ a contemporary North-East Iranian language centered in the Kuhistan region of Tajikistan.

As is usual in comparative and historical linguistics, we will be fundamentally concerned with the oldest attested layer in each language, as this will afford the earliest examples of the data necessary for our investigation. In the case of Sanskrit, the earliest attested text is the Rigveda, a collection of more than 1000 orally composed hymns dating from the middle of the second millennium B.C. This text shows the earliest appearance of the augment as the overt marker of past-time that is restricted to declarations that are clearly temporal. Furthermore, this body of literature shows the widest use of the injunctive – formally an unaugmented preterit – which is restricted to narrative environments for which overt signification of past-time is omitted either because of the atemporal nature or structural configuration of the text. Later

developments within the language resulted in the augment becoming a mandatory fixture on preterits, so that by the period of Classical Sanskrit (approximately 500 B.C.) the injunctive had been reduced to a mere relic of its former self; the unaugmented preterit was solely limited to the prohibitive construction.

In the case of Greek one must acknowledge the existence of two widely separated early layers. The oldest attested form of Greek is Mycenaean, a South Greek dialect (approximately 1200 B.C.), which does not show injunctive forms and for which the augment is virtually nonexistent save for two possible examples: *a-pe-do-ke* (*apedoke*) PY Fr 1184.1, where the augment is affixed between the preverb *ap-* and the verb *doke*; and *a-pe-e-ke* (*apeke*, perhaps *apheke*) PY An 724.2.5.7, where the augment on the verb is obscured by the spelling.² However, the verbal system of this language is not fully known to us. Mycenaean, for example, does not exhibit either the subjunctive or optative, and among finite verb forms only the third person singular is attested. Risch (1959) suggests that the omission of the augment was a stylistic characteristic of chancellery documents (consisting largely of records revealing transactions of individuals and lists of items involved in these transactions) rather than an innovation unique to the dialect. The problem here is the lack of sufficient data to draw any conclusions as to the status of the augment in pre-Homeric Greek.

The second layer of Greek, separated from the Mycenaean period by the four to five centuries comprising the Greek “dark ages,” is Homeric, the oldest layer of Greek to employ the augment. The Homeric dialect is considered by many scholars to be a *Kunstsprache*, a literary construct employed for composing poetry and containing linguistic features from several of the Greek dialects known from the subsequent history

of the language, particularly Aeolic and (East-)Ionic (cf. Meister 1921). As such, it retains older and newer forms side by side, as in the genitive singular ending for masculine and neuter nominal *o*-stems, where the more archaic *-oio* and the younger *-ou* both occur. This dialectal admixture would not be very useful for the separation and identification of various layers and contributions to a preexisting text, however. One would need some sort of diagnostic for a proper examination of the Homeric texts. The problem, in part, involves the questions *who?* and *where?* (who was Homer and where did he flourish?) or even whether the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were the product of a single author. If the poems were the product of one man, then the dialect admixture within his poems points to the non-unique origin of the poetic language. A poet exposed to a varied literary milieu would have at hand an assortment of formulae, idioms, lexical collocations, etc. handed down via the oral tradition and would have utilized these as seemed appropriate within the metrical structure of poetic verse. This is similar to what one finds within the Yugoslav oral bardic tradition (as investigated by Lord 1960), in which a young bard learns his craft from the established masters. The corpus of thematic material and metrical formulae are reflective of the societal milieu inhabited by the bards. At the same time, however, there is no such thing as *the* oral tradition; as shown by Finnegan (1977), there is no set of criteria that defines oral literary traditions per se, although they generally share certain characteristics that include the passing of thematic material and formulae (which are subject to changes in language and culture within the social milieu of the poet) from generation to generation.

We must therefore exclude Mycenaean data and rely exclusively on Homer for any comparative analysis of the early Greek augment with that of the Rigveda. An immediate

difficulty posed by this comparison is that Homeric augment differs significantly from that of Vedic Sanskrit. True, some augmentless Homeric preterits function in a manner similar to the Vedic injunctive: Nestor's statement *all' ou pōs hama panta theoi dosan anthrōpoisin* 'But the gods do not grant all things to men at the same time' (II.IV.320) serves to express a general character of the gods rather than an actual event per se. However, the vast majority of augmentless preterits in Homer are functionally indistinguishable from their augmented counterparts. For example, in II.I.305 the unaugmented preterit *anstētēn* 'the two of them got up' signals an action in past time. A further incongruity is caused by the aorist in gnomic periods, which describe an enduring quality of a person or object and are devoid of any specific temporal reference. In Homer, such aorists are as a rule augmented despite their general sense. Truths and general characteristics are neither restricted nor specified with respect to any particular temporal reference frame, and therefore one would predict the absence of the augment as temporal marker in these declarations. This would not be the case if the value of the augment in Homer was not fundamentally temporal. In fact, the augment shows a non-uniform distribution throughout the temporal environment of the main narrative in Homer: some passages, such as descriptions of battles and declarations of birth, contain few (if any) augmented preterits, whereas others contain many.

A third old dialect of Indo-European that exhibits the augment is Classical Armenian.³ The earliest attested material in this language consists primarily of a translation of the Bible (both the Old and New Testaments) dating from the early fifth century A.D. Here we find the augment used in a very restricted environment: it is prefixed to an aorist verb form that would otherwise either be monosyllabic or consist of

a single consonant. In all other circumstances preterit forms are unaugmented. Thus, the augment is purely a phonological marker of predictable occurrence. In the post-classical stratum the augment was extended mechanically to monosyllabic vowel-initial verbs (ex. *ēac* ‘he/she led’). Eventually the augment lost its significance in the verbal morphology and vanished from the language. One finds a trace of the augment in all forms of the aorist (e.g. *eka* ‘I came,’ *ekar* ‘you [sg.] came’) of *gal* ‘to come’ of Modern Armenian,⁴ but these verb forms are suppletive; the augment itself signifies no grammatical information. Given the functional scope of the augment in Classical Armenian (essentially a phonological prop vowel), our analytical corpus of data will be restricted to the earliest attested texts of literary Greek and Sanskrit.

In Greek and Sanskrit present- and past-time are signified by, respectively, primary and secondary endings. The primary endings are marked by the so-called *hic-et-nunc* particle *i*; the secondary endings by the absence of this particle. In the classical stratum of both languages the augment is employed as a subsidiary indicator of past tense in the imperfect (an imperfective preterit), aorist (perfective preterit) and pluperfect (built to the perfect, originally a stative present).⁵ Note the following forms of the verb ‘carry, bear’ in Sanskrit and Greek, together with their respective PIE reconstructions:

Present Indicative

	Sanskrit	Greek	PIE
	1 <i>bhārāmi</i>	<i>phérō</i>	* <i>bhérō</i>
Sg {	2 <i>bhārasi</i>	<i>phéreis</i>	* <i>bhéresi</i>
	3 <i>bhārati</i>	<i>phérei</i>	* <i>bhéreti</i>
	1 <i>bhārāmas</i>	<i>phéromen</i> ⁶	* <i>bhérom</i> ^e / <i>s</i>
Pl {	2 <i>bhāratha</i>	<i>phérete</i>	* <i>bhérete</i>
	3 <i>bhāranti</i>	<i>phérousi</i> ⁷	* <i>bhéronti</i>

Imperfect Indicative

	Sanskrit	Greek	PIE
Sg	{ 1 <i>ábharam</i>	<i>épheron</i>	* <i>ébherom</i>
	{ 2 <i>ábharas</i>	<i>épheres</i>	* <i>ébheres</i>
	{ 3 <i>ábharat</i>	<i>éphere</i>	* <i>ébheret</i>
Pl	{ 1 <i>ábharāma</i>	<i>ephéromen</i>	* <i>ébherome</i>
	{ 2 <i>ábharata</i>	<i>ephérete</i>	* <i>ébherete</i>
	{ 3 <i>ábharan</i>	<i>épheron</i>	* <i>ébheront</i>

As seen from the above forms, particularly from Sanskrit (but also from the third persons singular and plural in Greek), the primary and secondary endings are frequently distinguished by an *-i*, which signifies the non-past tense and is suffixed to the personal endings in the singular and the third person plural only,⁸ giving the primary endings. Within the Indo-European dialects generally the *i*-particle was lost in some languages or groups (such as Italic and Germanic) and retained in others (e.g., Hittite, Indo-Iranian, Greek, Balto-Slavic). This particle can be found in various endings in Greek, including, as indicated above, the third person singular and plural present active indicative endings of thematic verbs (respectively, *-ei* and Att.-Ion.-*ousi*, Dor.-*onti*), the 1Sg, 3Sg and 3Pl present active indicative athematic endings (respectively, *-mi*, Att.-Ion.-*si*/Dor.-*ti*, and Att.-Ion.-*āsi*/Dor.-*nti*),⁹ and the 1Sg, 2Sg, 3Sg and 3Pl present mediopassive indicative endings (respectively, *-mai*, *-sai*, *-tai* and *-ntai*). The following comparisons may therefore be made between the primary and secondary athematic active indicative endings:

	Primary	Secondary
Sg	{ 1 * <i>-m-i</i>	* <i>e-...-m</i>
	{ 2 * <i>-s-i</i>	* <i>e-...-s</i>
	{ 3 * <i>-t-i</i>	* <i>e-...-t</i>
Pl	{ 1 * <i>-mes</i>	* <i>e-...-me</i>
	{ 2 * <i>-te</i>	* <i>e-...-te</i>
	{ 3 * <i>-nt-i</i>	* <i>e-...-nt</i>

This *i* was most likely a deictic particle, indicating the “here and now,” and would have been employed to differentiate the present endings from those of the past. This would certainly have been motivated by the fact that both the present and imperfect used the same tense/aspect stem and therefore needed some way of distinguishing verbs in the non-past from their past counterparts. We are at a loss to explain the absence of the *i*-particle in the first and second person plural endings, although the former utilizes an *-s* in order to distinguish present from past.

Note that the augment and *i*-particle stand in complementary distribution. The augment never appears with any verb marked with primary endings, and in post-Homeric Classical Greek and Classical Sanskrit is a mandatory concomitant of the secondary endings. The augment and any secondary endings therefore represent in these linguistic stages a discontinuous morpheme complex, as the verbal base always stands between the augment and the personal endings (i.e., *epheres* < *e-* + *phere-* + *-s*).

The augment was, in origin, an independent orthotonic morpheme, traces of the original state of which are variously retained in certain Indo-European languages. The strongest evidence for the regrammaticalization of the augment from an independent orthotonic morpheme into an affix comes from Vedic Sanskrit, where in main clauses the verb is never accented when noninitial but treated as an enclitic to a preceding lexical item: *agním ĩle* ‘I call upon Agni’ (RV I.1.1). In the composition of augment and finite verb, any accent on the verb (e.g., when it is sentence-initial or in a subordinate clause) will fall upon the augment: *ápāma sómam* ‘We have drunk soma’ (RV. VIII.48.3). Indices of the primordial character of the augment are also evident in Greek. In the verbal system, the accent is recessive, but is subject to the constraint that the pitch rise be

no further than three morae from the end of the word (the nominal type *ánthrōpos* ‘man, human being’ is an exception). In multiple preverbatum the accent never recedes beyond the preverb immediately contiguous to the verbal base: *sum-pró-es*, not [×]*súm-pro-es*; *par-én-thes*, not [×]*pár-en-thes*. Augmented preterits are also subject to this rule: *par-é-skhon*, not [×]*pár-e-skhon*,¹⁰ which shows that the augment is treated as a preverb to some degree.

Traces of adverbial value for the augment are occasionally evident within sentential structures. In his investigation of the historical present of various languages (among them Latin and Sanskrit), Kiparsky (1968) showed that only one verb – usually the first – in a narrative continuum is overtly marked for past-time, whereas a subsequent verb conjoined with it is in the present-tense but interpreted as a preterit. Kiparsky relates this use of the historical present to that of the injunctive, in that the augment was originally an adverbial tense-marking particle that was introduced only once in a series of verbs syntactically conjoined. Subsequent verb forms underwent a process of *conjunction-reduction*, in which an already established tense (and mood) morpheme was deleted. Kiparsky claims that in both Greek and Sanskrit the injunctive served as a formant unmarked for tense, though later this class of verb became moribund and subsequently disappeared in toto in almost all of the Indo-European languages. The verbal systems of the various languages underwent a reanalysis, in which the present-tense assumed the function of the injunctive. This process would have been relatively straightforward in a language such as Latin, for which one set of personal endings was reinterpreted as a marker of person and number and the temporal signification was effectuated by other means. In languages such as Greek and Sanskrit this process of reanalysis occurred in the framework of tense and aspect signified by, respectively

personal endings and the stem of the verb. In the later stages of these languages the injunctive was discarded in favor of the historical present. In Classical Sanskrit the injunctive is reduced to a form occurring only in prohibitive clauses in association with the particle *mā́*.

An extension of Kiparsky's hypothesis is the investigation of Rosén (1973), who found that temporal clauses in Homeric Greek exhibit a structure of TENSE/ADVERB-VERB-SUBJECT, as in II.I.169 *nun d' eimi Phthiēnd'* 'And **now** I shall go to Phthia' and II.I.59 *tēi dekatēi d' agorande kalessato laon Akhilleus* 'But **on the tenth (day)** Achilles called the host to council' (note the unaugmented *kalessato*). He then goes on to show that if a preceding subordinate clause possesses temporal or conditional force, a following main clause in narrative continuative value may show the syntactic configuration of <VERB> *de* with an unaugmented verb form. *de*, which functions as a conjunction in the apodosis of either a conditional or temporal period, is also found as a superordinate (i.e. main clause) conjunction in relation to augmentless preterits. A main and subordinate clause that together form a single period require tense to be specified only once, as illustrated in the following example:

II.II.182 *hōs phath', ho de ksuneēke theas opa phōnēsasēs,*
 bē de theein
 Thus she [Athena] spoke, and he [Odysseus] knew the voice of
 the speaking goddess, and he quickly got up and left.

According to Rosén's thesis, the clause in which the augmented preterit *ksuneēke* appears (182) serves as a temporal specifier: Odysseus departed only after Athena had spoken to him (cf. p. 321). The Rosén-construction applies only to clauses that form a substructure within the overarching narrative and therefore accounts for only a portion of all narrative

structures within Homer. There are, however, some exceptions to the expected rules of syntactic configuration, one being an inversion in the position of the augmented preterit from the initial subordinate clause to the following main clause. Alternatively, subordinate and main clause may be inverted. Occasionally, however, the augment is absent in both clauses, an unexpected circumstance, since past-time is expected to be overtly signified once within the construction. The latter structure casts doubt on the validity of Rosén's discussion,¹¹ which predicates the overt indication of tense within a syntactic period. The absence of the augment would suggest that no functional relationship really exists between the augment and the structural integrity of subordinate/superordinate conjoined clauses.

Drewitt (1912), in his analysis of the distribution of the augment in Homer, found that the constellation <VERB> *de* is far less frequent for preterits which take the syllabic augment (*e-*) than for those subject to the temporal augment (a lengthening of the initial vowel in vowel-initial verbs). In Greek *de* always appears in second position in its clause. Drewitt noted that if the syllabic augment were still perceived by the speaker of Greek to be adverbial (that is, to reflect a trace of its former status as an independent free form, then there should be some examples of *de* immediately postpositive to the augment. However, there are no examples of Homer of such a configuration (i.e., ^x*e de lipon*). The syllabic augment in Homer is always prefixed directly onto the verb base, which prohibits any particle from being interposed between them. Drewitt nevertheless concluded that the syllabic augment *e-*, even though contiguous to the verb base, still retained some trace of its older status as an independent particle (with the attendant conclusion that the temporal augment, when not actually a contraction of **e-* and a following vowel, was

simply a morphophonemic process and involved no primordial morpheme as such). Drewitt's proposal of an "adverbial" syllabic augment was strongly criticized by Schewan (1912), who claimed that the appearance of the augment was governed by metrical necessity; if a syllabic augment does not appear, it is due to the metrical space available within the verse and not to any speculations with regard to its reflecting a quasi-independent status within Homeric Greek. This rebuttal to Drewitt merely continues the accepted view of the Homeric augment as a temporal marker. It is flawed in one key respect by its assumption that the verbal systems of Homeric and Classical Greek are fundamentally equivalent. The question Schewan should have addressed, therefore, is *what is the nature of the augment that accounts for its distribution as attested in Homer?*, which avoids the long-standing tacit acceptance in Homeric scholarship of the augment as a prefix specifying past-time. Bakker (1999) voiced this criticism in his investigation of the augment, since prior investigations ignored the possibility of linguistic changes that might have arisen during the interval of three to four centuries separating the two strata.

Scholarship has been generally uniform in its acceptance of an Indo-European source of the augment, though no *communis opinio* exists with regard to its etymology. Watkins (1963) believed that the Luwian particle *a-* "... goes back regularly to IE *é-[the augment]" (p. 15). This, however, is very uncertain, since it is based only upon a sound correspondence in the absence of any functional relationship. This objection was registered by Strunk (1994), who discussed the entire history of scholarship on the origin of the augment morpheme, beginning with Bopp. Bopp's account of the augment was itself based primarily on sound correspondances which Strunk shows to have been

invalidated by later discoveries within Indo-European linguistics. Other scholars have proposed that the augment was in origin an adverbial particle and posited meanings for the augment based upon its temporal signification in Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek: a temporal ‘früher’ or ‘einmal’ or a spatial-deictic sense ‘then and there’ with a later extension onto the temporal axis (cf. Szemerényi 1989, p. 322). Some scholars, such as Reichelt (1908) and Krahe (1959) propose that the particle was in origin a temporal marker. Others suggest meanings of various shades that would have offered a point of departure for the particle’s grammaticalization as a temporal marker. Thumb and Hauschild (1959, p. 190) propose ‘true’ and ‘certainly’ while simultaneously rejecting the value ‘at this time’ earlier posited by Brugmann (1904, p. 288).¹² Similar to this is Bréal’s ‘vraiment’ (quoted from Schwyzer 1939, p. 652). These fail to address the restriction of the augment to preterit forms, since an emphatic marker (as implied by the semantics of Bréal, as well as Thumb and Hauschild) is equally appropriate to an imperative and prohibitive – and possibly even a present – to strengthen the force of a declaration. Hirt (1928, p. 171) believed that the original value of the augment was to signal “Perfektivierung,” a development parallel to the Irish preposition *ro* and the German prefix *ge-* of the past-passive participle. In this case the augment would at first have been prefixed to the aorist, since a perfectivizing marker would be semantically incompatible with an imperfect as signifier of noncompletive actions.

These proposals, although suggestive, fail to provide a viable etymon. They assume that the point of departure for the augment was some particle that was retained only in a few languages of South Eastern Indo-European but otherwise disappeared without a trace. However, we should expect to find traces of the original particle in relic

form throughout the Indo-European family. A relic of an old adverbial particle might be retained in values other than that of the augment in languages that otherwise discarded it from their respective productive lexicons.

There is support for a pan-Indo-European conception of the augment. It is a suggestion broached by Hirt (1927a) very briefly in his treatment of Indo-European morphology. He noted that the particle **e* that underlies the augment may be attested variously in Indo-European languages in lexical items exhibiting deictic force: Skt. *a-sau* ‘that,’ *a-sya* ‘of this,’ *a-smai* ‘to/for this (dative singular);’ Gk. *e-kei* ‘there’ (and, though not mentioned by Hirt, the pronoun *ekeinos* ‘that one’), *e-ti* ‘further, yet;’ Lat. *et* ‘and;’ Umbr. *e-smei* ‘to/for him (dative singular).’ Hirt did not provide an etymology for this **e*, preferring instead merely to state the difficulty (if not the impossibility) of discerning the original meaning of the particle. The dative singular forms of the suppletive **i/e* pronoun cited above are significant, given the reflection of a PIE **e-smēi* in both Sanskrit and Italic. The form **e-smēi* and **e-* thus date from a very old stratum of PIE. (We defer a more detailed discussion of **e-smēi* with its implications for the Indo-European augment until Chapter 3.4.) The data would in any event suggest that the augment existed in the protolanguage, but shifted its value in a select group of Indo-European languages. Furthermore, traces of the original particle would be retained as relics throughout various Indo-European languages, presumably in a more basic value outside the verbal system.

In contrast to its employment in the classical strata of both Greek and Sanskrit, as described above, in earlier stages of these languages the augment is not an obligatory feature of preterits. Scholars have frequently believed the augment to be facultative; a

particular appearance of the prefix would have been solely governed by metrical necessity. The data seemed to support this view. Wackernagel (1926) noted that in Homer unaugmented and augmented preterits were equivalent in function (p. 212). Underlying this was the acceptance of a PIE verbal system within which overt marking of past-time was not fully incorporated into verbal morphology. It is not likely that the secondary endings indicated past-time, since they are regularly employed with non-indicatives. For example, in Greek the secondary endings appear on optatives, which are unmarked for tense. For this reason Hoffmann argued that the secondary endings were not marked for tense (1967, 1970). Adverbials and particles with various meanings, such as ‘earlier,’ ‘at that time’ and ‘yesterday’ arguably provided the means for specifying past time (cf. Brugmann 1904, p. 486). Thurneysen (1885, p. 173), however, went so far as to cast the augment into a subsidiary role, which could specify past-time to a degree. The view that the augment was not a mandatory fixture in Homer and the Vedas was generally accepted by Indo-European scholarship as indicative of the true state of affairs, and may be summed up by the words of Platt (1891, p. 216) “... it may be presumed that at the time of [Greek and Sanskrit’s] separation the augment could be added or not at pleasure with those tenses [i.e., preterits].” The appearance of the augment in Homer was therefore thought to be governed solely by the metrical requirements of the verse, a position reflected in such standard works as Smyth (1920, p. 147) “... the augment was not necessarily added to mark past-time” and Chantraine (1958, p. 481) “L’augment n’était pas un élément essentiel d’une forme d’indicatif prétérit.”

This theory of the augment was, however, predicated upon analyses which did not take into account the narrative environment. All preterits were analyzed *en masse* under

the assumption of the augment as temporal marker. It should be noted that Watkins (1963), in addition to Kiparsky (1968) and Rosén (1973), arguably did incorporate the question of narrative environment in their respective analyses. This was only in regard to the syntax exhibited by sequential and coordinate/subordinate structures, however. They did not address issues relating to the thematic nature of the discourse (i.e., factual reports, emphatic declarations, vivid descriptions). A closer examination of the pre-classical texts of Greek and Sanskrit reveals a need to factor in narrative environment as reflected by characters speaking within the story or narrators themselves explicating the progression of action. For example, the selection of the type of narrative – first person vs. third person singular – is predicated upon the degree of empathy the writer or composer wishes to impart to the reader/hearer (cf. Fleischman 1990, Chafe 1994). A writer/composer may likewise incorporate dialogue in a variety of forms to impart a particular sense that cannot easily be expressed by a narrative, such as the personal views of a character. A further consideration is the importance of the underlying theme of the narrative itself. We should therefore expect that some sort of underlying relationship exists between the appearance of the augmented preterit and the thematic nature of a given section of text within Homer. If the augment were the signifier of past-time, a correlation should exist between its appearance and the contextual requirements of the narrative structure. As a corollary to this, a difference in the relationship of the augment to its narrative environment in Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit would point to fundamental distinctions in the two languages.

Kiparsky's thesis of conjunction reduction permitted the omission of a past tense affix in multiply conjoined preterits following a single verbal form overtly marked for

past-time. At the external level affixes provide the hearer with the information necessary for proper interpretation; at internal levels, they supply the information required for the production of lexical and syntactic structures. A morphological marker cannot be omitted unless information sufficient for parsing a structure is otherwise provided. We would have to say that a preterit was regularly subject to *aphaeresis*, the process by which a vowel at the beginning of a word may be dropped without loss of meaning: English *round* < *around*, *'bout* < *about*, and *'gainst* < *against*. This would effectively relegate the augmentless preterit in Homer to the status of a (metrical) variant. This in turn could only be true if the augment as a temporal marker were fully incorporated within the morphology of the verbal system, at which time the speaker perceived augmented and augmentless preterits as equivalent. Such a state of affairs presupposes the augment to be highly archaic and to function as an element of a discontinuous morpheme complex; the speakers would perceive the unaugmented preterit as an abbreviated verbal form. If, on the other hand, the augment was not yet fully incorporated into the verbal system, we should expect the appearance of augmentless preterits within temporal environments to be governed by some underlying principle. Augmentless preterits would probably be attested in locations in which past-time was overtly specified by adverbial particles and syntactic constructions (such as *conjunction reduction*), and in rare cases where tense was clearly understood by context.

An affix cannot be governed merely by a functional rule predicated upon metrical opportunism. Within the linguistic corpus of Homer no affixes are employed in a facultative way. The augment would be the sole example of a morpheme which could ignore the requirements and constraints inherent to the system of word-building. If

context provides sufficient information for proper interpretation of tense, then a methodology lies at the root of the absence of the augment. One cannot, however, argue that the context of past-time is clearly indicated in all cases. Unaugmented preterits may appear isolated from any temporal markers, such as adverbials of past-time. One of the arguments in favor of the multi-strata thesis of Homer is the disparity in the frequency of the augment within narrative continua and character speech. It was felt that the latter were mostly post-Homeric additions as indicated by the greater appearance of augmented preterits, which were at this point the established form. According to this line of reasoning isolated unaugmented preterits were simply imported from narrative. Such an argument is too broad to be of much value, as it predicates the provenience of a particular section of text solely on the basis of the augment. There is, for example, no reason to discount the possibility that an entire section of text has been transferred from narrative into character speech. One could propose, for example, based purely on the general absence of the augment in his speech, that the *deeds of Nestor* in Book I of the *Iliad* was originally a narrative of some past actions of this character. This assumes, however, that some later poet within the Homeric tradition merely incorporated a previously existing text into a dialogue. This is hardly the basis for judging whether the *deeds of Nestor* is the contribution of a post-Homeric poet, especially in view of the skillful employment of the character of Nestor in the role of mediator between conflicting parties.

The argument concerning the facultative nature of the augment is predicated upon the assumption that preterits are employed uniformly throughout the text without regard to contextual environment. The generally accepted view, which is found in most grammars of ancient Greek, is that the augment is a marker of past-time. Scholars have

promulgated this thesis in their disputations about Homer; it is a major pillar in the critical rejection by Schewan (1912, p. 398) of Drewitt's metrical analysis of Homer. Not all scholars reiterated the *communis opinio*, however; as early as 1891 Platt argued against a temporal augment, though only with regard to the aorist (p. 227). He states quite openly (p. 213) that "... the augment, both syllabic and temporal, is no original feature of the past tense." The most salient facet of Platt's argument is the large number of augmented aorists attested in gnomic periods and those translatable in English as present-perfects, which signify, respectively, atemporal general truths and actions completed in the immediate past. A relationship of the augment to contextual environment was recognized to exist to some degree; the prefix was analyzed as a type of marker of the present by Platt, which would account for its predominance in essentially "present" tense environments, including those signaling the completion of some action in either the immediate past and/or whose effects remain in the present (in contrast to an event in the more remote past, the after-effects of which have no temporal relevance for the interlocutors). This could likewise be extended to statements of general truths, which express qualities of permanent duration.

In later Classical Greek the augment has become fully incorporated together with the secondary endings as a mandatory fixture of the morphology of the verbal system. This is, perhaps, only roughly from the 4th c. B.C. onwards, as prior to this date there are texts attesting a "looser" employment of the augment. The poetess Sappho, who flourished in the 6th c. B.C. not infrequently "omitted" the affix, which Ahren (1891, pp. 164 - 165) describes as "... das sicherste Merkmal epischen Dialekte." Perhaps, or perhaps not, since it is not unreasonable to assess the data as reflecting a period when the

augment had not yet assumed its status as a temporal marker. Herodotus, who lived a century later than the poetess from Lesbos, regularly employed augmentless preterits for certain verb forms (cf., Hadley 1877, p.106, fn.309, Goodwin 1879, p.130, Curtius 1880, p.132), most significantly in the past-iteratives in *-skon*. The past-iterative is frequently attested within the compositions of Herodotus, but otherwise vanished as a verbal category from the Greek language. More curious is the state of affairs reflected within the *Homeric Hymns*, a corpus of poems dedicated to the gods of the Greek pantheon. Most (if not all) of this body of work postdates its namesake. Pelliccia (1986) examined these hymns and discovered that their verbal system strongly paralleled that attested in the Vedas, which date to roughly 1000 B.C.¹³ This at the very least suggests that the verbal systems of Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit differ with respect to the employment of the augment, which was subject to a reanalysis of its primal semanto-syntactic structure earlier in the latter than in the former language.

Hoffmann (1967) analyzed the texts of Vedic Sanskrit with respect to their narrative environments. He found that augmentless preterits are restricted to atemporal environments, such as the explication of the inherent nature of a person and the consequent result of an action instead of its actual occurrence; specific events in past-time are expressed by augmented preterits. In narrative structures, then, the injunctive¹⁴ (formally an augmentless preterit) essentially stands in complementary distribution with augmented preterits. In a later paper Hoffmann (1970) extended the basic tenor of this morphological analysis (including the contention that the secondary endings do not signify past-time) to the Indo-European family as a whole, suggesting that the injunctive is a very old feature of the family.¹⁵ Verbal stems essentially carry lexical meaning and

verbal aspect, a trait inherited by (and reflected in) the earliest Sanskrit, though by the time of Classical Sanskrit the imperfect, aorist and perfect are essentially interchangeable.

In his investigation of the Homeric augment, Bakker (1999) rejected the view that the Homeric augment was a temporal particle. This was a radical departure from his earlier investigations, in which he had assumed the standard conception of the augment (Bakker 1996) and the injunctive (Bakker 1996, 1997). According to these earlier works augmentless preterits, being unmarked for tense, could be employed by the poet to signify events as if they were occurring at the moment of speaking. In his later work, Bakker (1999) reexamined the augment with regard to deixis. This is a question that scholars had never adequately addressed: what is the relationship of the speaker's perception to his respective declarations? Bakker noticed that the main verb in statements for which there was a strong perception of *hic-et-nunc* deixis (such as temporal recency and personal experience, and overt reference to the here and now) tended to be augmented. Achilles' declaration of Apollo's anger *hos k' eipoi hoti tosson ekhōsato Phoibos Apollōn* 'who can tell why Phoebus Apollo is so angry?' (Il.I.64) refers to his own personal experience ('He does not tell a story or refer to the past; instead, he is speaking in his own lived-in present' [p.2]). After slaying Hector, Achilles says to his men ... *tonde d' agōmen. // ērametha mega kudos· epephnomen Hektora dion* ... '...and let us take him [here with us]. We have won ourselves enormous fame; we have killed the great Hector' [p. 2] (Il.XXII.392-3); he speaks of an event of the immediate past as he points to the body of Hector (whom he refers to with the deictic pronoun *tonde* 'that one'). He noted, furthermore, that the degree of augmentation for aorists explicating

events of the “present” (i.e., the so-called “now past,” equivalent to the present perfect of Modern English) was greater than for those in descriptions of events set in the more remote past. In essence, then, the frequency of augmentation is directly proportional to the degree of temporal currency, a fact noted by Platt. This implied that the augment was related to the topicality of an action, which would include the signification of temporal recency. This conception of the augment could easily explicate the paradox of the augmented aorist within the gnomic period in Homer. Bakker shows that similes, which lie in the domain of the gnomic period, are “intensely visual” in that their subjects are found in the “everyday world of the audience” (p. 4). The flight of flies and bees, the characteristic nature of a mule or the mists upon a mountain were experiences and sights well-known to the contemporaries of Homer. The topical currency of familiar phenomena of regular occurrence in the natural world contrasts significantly with the descriptions of battles and the gods, which are more removed – and hence stand in more abstract relevance – to the audience. Bakker concludes that the Homeric augment is fundamentally deictic and signifies in some fashion closeness and/or vividness, for which prototypical examples are, respectively, actions of the immediate past and similes.

Bakker’s notion represents a radical departure from the commonly accepted view of the augment; its role as a temporal marker would be an innovation postdating Homer. This is supported, in part, by the research of Hirt (as discussed above), who claimed that the particle that became the augment left traces throughout the Indo-European languages. It is significant that these traces involve universally elements possessing clear deictic force. Furthermore, scholars such as Platt, noted a strong relationship between temporal recency and the appearance of the augment. It was this quality that essentially explained

the higher frequency of augmented preterits in speeches, since only a character could speak of events in the immediate past. It is interesting to note that the frequency of augmentation in narrator and character speeches is essentially equivalent. This fact was duly noted by Schewan (1912, p. 402) in his critique of Drewitt's thesis; Drewitt appealed to incongruities in the distribution of the augment in support of a multi-author origin of the Homeric epics. That augmented preterits should be prevalent in character speech is not unexpected, given that this is the only environment in which one could properly speak of events of the recent past. (This would explain the frequency of the so-called "present-perfect" aorists in speeches, as noted by Platt.) The research of Bakker and Hirt thus suggests that the augment was in origin a deictic particle. For this reason we term this the Bakker-Hirt thesis. Curiously, this non-temporal interpretation of the augment seems to be implied in several statements of Platt (1891): "It is admitted apparently that the augment, *é*, was originally an interjection which was afterwards amalgamated with the verbform it emphasizes [p. 215];" "The augment, [prior to the split-up of the languages possessing the augment] a separate interjection or particle of emphasis, was used with certain tenses of the indicative, and with no other mood [p. 216]." It is our intention to show the following with regard to the patterns of augmentation within Homer: a) they can be accounted for by a deictic augment; b) they fall under the productive rules of verbal morphology; c) the augment may appear in temporal environments, although the frequency of occurrence in such cases is governed by deixis. Thus, the patterns of augmentation within Homer point to the augment as a deictic particle and thereby reflect of its older state within PIE.

CHAPTER 2

ANALYSIS

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this section of the dissertation is to justify a selected database that may be employed for detailed analysis. Underlying the analysis in Chapter 2 is the relationship of the preterit and its surrounding narrative environment. As we have seen in Chapter 1, this has been mostly ignored by scholars in their respective investigations into the Homeric augment. Further compounding the problem has been the tacit assumption of the Homeric augment's status as a past-tense marker (cf. the statements from the various grammars cited in Chapter 1), which has led to the inevitable conclusion that the augment's appearance is governed by the meter. As noted in the previous chapter, a few scholars, including Drewitt and Bakker, have considered the Homeric augment in a different light.

Bakker's investigation, however, is limited to speeches, and to a small degree gnomic periods, and as such is incomplete. The fact remains that the majority of augmented preterits occur outside of these two specific environments. Augmented preterits are attested within the main narrative in individual verses which do not, as a rule immediately manifest any type of vivid deixis. Furthermore, augmented preterits are found in character speeches that refer to events located in the distant past; the individual events within the description are not necessarily vivid – and certainly not temporally

recent – despite the appearance of an augmented preterit. Finally, the augmentation of certain preterits is based purely on metrical necessity. If there is any validity to the Bakker-Hirt thesis (as defined in Chapter 1), we should expect to find some principle predicated upon deixis governing the appearance of the augment in Homer. This should be overtly manifested at the surface, that is, by the thematic context of the augmented words.

What appears on the surface is dictated by the thematic structure of the text. By this we mean the degree to which a passage evinces vividness, emphasis, importance, spatial distance, and temporal recency. An action that has occurred moments ago would display a degree of deixis greater than that of an event decades in the past. One should broaden this by the incorporation of the relationship of the person to the text, such as a speaker introducing shared memories or well-known facts. In this case one may speak of the “mind’s eye,” that is, facts and knowledge that are foregrounded in the person’s mind (such as in the case of Homeric similes, which as Bakker argued, are indeed vivid by their subject matter). Words do not appear on the surface merely to fill the available space, but rather to express the thoughts of the writer/composer. The selection of words is governed by the internal thematic structure of a sentence and by the thematic relationship existing between clauses within complex syntactic structures. For example, one would not expect a particle of emphasis, such as *indeed*, to stand in a neutral declaration devoid of emphasis. A particle that signifies a conclusion, such as *therefore*, is expected only in the final statement of a logical argument. The underlying meanings of words, and the principles governing their use, should therefore be reflected in their appearance in a text. This could manifest itself in a variety of ways, among them the

frequency of their distribution and their restriction to a particular narrative environment. One should expect a deictic particle to be restricted to an environment reflective of that quality. If this quality were purely spatial, then we should expect the particle to be excluded from non-spatial environments. However, the particle's appearance outside of this "primary" function may point to a complex circumstance in which the particle is in the process of reanalysis.

It is therefore necessary to find some means of selecting data that reduces the risk of interpretive corruption. Narratology can provide a vehicle to effect this, since it questions the relationship of the surface text to the underlying thoughts and feelings of the writer. A text exhibits a certain degree of integrity with respect to syntactic structure and the words contained within the structure, since they both serve to describe a series of events that comprise a thematic plot. This is the essential core of Werth's investigations into narrative structure (1984). One may envision an overarching structure as a *world view* (not his term), which is essentially the conceptual field for a discussion; it provides the reference for which one may engage in meaningful discourse. A *world view*, moreover, may contain a substructure of *world views*, each of which may likewise contain their own respective substructures. Furthermore, these structures are linked together by *coherence*, that is, each respective structure is thematically related to those within its surrounding narrative environment. It is for this reason that statements outside of the *world view* create problems; unless the speakers are oriented to a new thematic topic, an incongruous statement must be interpreted within the present scope of the discourse. Curiously, Werth shows that incongruous statements can often be interpreted;

humans will reject a series of unrelated statements only when the attempt to extract a meaningful relationship from them proves impossible.

The technical aspect of writing/composing goes hand-in-hand with the concept of the *world view*, for it is by the judicious selection of unique syntactic structures that a thematic topic is expressed to the reader/hearer. Narrative in the third person singular provides the basis for the dispassionate statement of facts. In contrast, speeches provide a conduit by which the writer allows a character to describe some portion of a story in his own words and thereby passes the role of narrator temporarily to the character.¹⁶ However, it is often the case that the line between narrator and character is blurred. Fleischman (1990), dealing with literary compositions, shows that speeches play a significant role within a narrative by providing the writer a vehicle to illustrate the inner thoughts of a character. By permitting the character to speak, the reader is offered a first-hand account by the character. This may be rendered, furthermore, as representing the thoughts within the speaker's mind, or even as a report by a third party. Hence, the writer may manipulate the reader's perceptions in shifting the degree of "closeness" by allowing the characters to "speak" to the reader in their own words, or by allowing the reader/hearer to "enter" their minds through their thoughts. It is the character, and not the writer, that is "speaking." Speeches are a means of establishing a sympathetic relationship between the character and the reader; it is for this reason that dialogues reflect the speech patterns of the characters.¹⁷ As part of her investigation, Fleischman demonstrates the relationship between memories and their respective surface representations: events in deep memory are rendered by preterits, whereas those in shallow memory are often expressed by presents (pp. 37-39).

Fleischman's research has had a significant impact on the work of Chafe (whose earlier studies she cites in her work discussed above), since any given experience would as a matter of course automatically be incorporated into long-term storage (that is, deep memory). Chafe's work (1994) was crucial to Bakker's earlier studies of the augment (1996, 1997), since the latter were predicated upon the relation between human perception and its realization at the surface in human language. An important investigation into human discourse that Chafe conducted was the Pear Bicycle experiment: test subjects were asked to describe the events in a film that was shown to them. This experiment showed that memories on the surface were expressed in the present-tense, whereas those that had been incorporated into deeper memory were rendered by preterits. Although not without problems in its application to the current study,¹⁸ the experiment demonstrated the importance of human perception in the overt representation of human discourse. Chafe demonstrated this by a thorough discussion of literary forms. A writer will select the person of the narrative according to the degree of empathy, sympathy and omniscient knowledge s/he wishes to represent to the reader. Speeches may also occur outside of their expected circumstances: a writer may exhibit the state of mind of a character in isolation by a soliloquy. Furthermore, details within a story may be represented in a different manner by the selection of a demonstrative article: an object normally associated with some activity will take the definite article; in contrast, that which is unique normally takes the indefinite article. The degree of familiarity should be reflected in the surface form to some degree.

The appearance of a speech pattern is predicated upon the thematic content of the story in which it appears, as it essentially gives shape and texture to the narrative. This

provides us with the means of selecting data that will best serve in this investigation of the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis. This should be governed with an eye to thematic structure (as defined above). First, I will exclude from the analysis most of the main narrative. It is here that the augment appears to be governed solely by the needs of the meter;¹⁹ as discussed earlier, there is no assured method by which one may judge the thematic implications expressed by the poet. Second, I restrict the data to preterits with metrically assured augments. For example, preterits of compound verbs (almost all of which are augmented) are excluded, given the absence of a diagnostic by which one may judge which particular example has an original augment. Likewise, any augment that could have been inserted by replacing a preceding vowel is *de facto* excluded from the analysis.²⁰ The only exceptions to this are those augmented and unaugmented preterits guaranteed by bridge constraints, which specify the location of word boundaries within the metrical framework; an augmented preterit of ambiguous status would therefore be included in the analysis if the absence of the augment resulted in a violation of a bridge constraint.²¹ In general, we select the data subject to the following criteria: 1) only those narrative environments are considered in which qualities associated with deixis (among them emphasis, vividness, spatio-temporal nearness, or combinations of these) are clearly manifested by the surrounding environment; 2) augmented preterits must be metrically assured; and 3) specific verbs showing a preference for a particular state of augmentation are included. The following categories are encompassed under these conditions:

- atemporal preterits – A few aorists in Homer do not signify events in past-time. Generally unaugmented, these preterits serve as declarations of atemporal qualities, such as the innate and general nature of some

character or the permanent result of an action (the so-called resultative aorist, which stresses the *result* – and not the occurrence – of an action).

- distal events – Within the speeches in Homer one finds descriptions of events that occurred years prior to the present time of the story line. Characters (both gods and men) often elaborate on some important point they wish to make by the introduction of some experience that is not from the recent past. In general, these speech segments are characterized by a relatively low rate of occurrence of the augment.
- Homeric battle scenes – A battle scene is a type of narrative that provides a detailed description of the progression of combat: the wielding of the weapon, the charge of the combatants, and the final resolution. A heavy concentration of aorists, a relatively low occurrence of the augment, and an implied short duration of the action generally characterize these passages.
- Homeric similes – Within Homer one finds descriptions of the natural world and everyday experiences that are unspecified with respect to time and structurally stand outside of the main narrative. For this reason they are atemporal. They play an important role in Homer by equating an action within the main narrative with the qualities expressed in the simile, and thus serve as a means of emphasizing some thematic element (such as the courage of a character at a critical juncture). Curiously, the aorists in Homeric similes almost always take the augment despite the atemporal quality of the similes.

- The past-iterative – This preterit, with a handful of exceptions, does not take the augment. Quite significantly, the past-iterative does not appear to express an action within a narrative sequence, but rather is restricted to descriptions of background material. It thus appears to be functionally distinct from all other types of preterits.
- *tiktō*-preterits – The basic meaning of *tiktō* is ‘I bring forth,’ signifying by extension “birth” and “lineage.” For this reason it is regularly employed in expressions of parental relationship, lineage and kinship. More significant is the virtual absence of augmented preterits in both tense-stems of this verb.

2.2 Augmentless Preterits: Atemporal Signification

The preterit in Homer generally signifies an action that has transpired in past-time. Verbal aspect plays a role by its functional description of the event; a completed action is signaled by the perfective tense-stem, whereas an action innately continuative (i.e., non-completed in its temporal time frame) is restricted to the imperfective tense-stem. In the *Odyssey*, Odysseus thanks Euryalus for the gift of a sword, wishing that he may never miss “what thou hast given me” *ho de moi dōkas* (Od.viii.414-5). *dōkas*, an unaugmented aorist, signifies Euryalus’ presentation of his sword as completed; an imperfect *didous* could only express the action as in the process of occurring (i.e., *which you were giving me*).

The functional range of the preterit is, however, not restricted to the signification of actions in past-time. Within Homer one finds preterits for which time is not an important factor. The best known instance is the gnomic aorist, which generally occurs with the augment and stands in declarations of a general truth or innate characteristic, which are fundamentally atemporal expressions.²² These statements are also prevalent in similes (discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2.5), which emphasize a section of the narrative by metaphoric association with common, everyday experiences. In Book III of the *Iliad*, the Achaean host begins its assault upon the walls of Troy. A great cloud of dust generated by the marching of the soldiers is made more vivid by a simile, which describes the mist normally associated with the peaks of mountains.²³

Il.III.10 *eut' oreos koruphēisi Notos katekheuen omikhlēn*
 poimesin outi philēn, kleptēi de te nuktos ameinō,
 Even as when the South Wind sheddeth a mist over the peaks of
 a mountain, a mist that the shepherd loveth not, but that to the
 robber is better than night ...

The cloud of dust raised by the feet of the soldiers marching upon the field is reinforced by an equation with the mist which arises in nature; a fictional description is reinforced by the quality of a natural phenomenon familiar to the poet's intended audience. That this passage is ancillary to the main narrative is seen by a comparison of thematic content. The verses preceding the simile describe the marching of the Achaean host upon the fields before the walls of Troy. The only mountains of any significance within the *Iliad* are Olympus, the home of the gods, and Ida, upon which Zeus sits watching events unfold before Troy; neither has been introduced by the poet at this point in the story. Moreover, the simile speaks of a mountain, which is related to the main story only by

virtue of the equivalence of the cloud of dust of the soldiers and the thick mist upon the mountain caused by the South Wind; the shepherd and the robber, to whom the simile refers, merely illustrate the qualities of the mist and are otherwise unimportant to the story. The functional role of this class of metaphor is purely didactic/illustrative within the structure of the main narrative.

There is a second group of preterits that are not closely associated with temporal specificity. They form a type of functional class within the verbal system by their signification of the results of an action, such as the endowment of the rights of kingship or some special skill (as in *Od.viii.414-5*). In contrast to gnomic aorists, they tend to be unaugmented. Thematically, these preterits differ from those that describe an event within the general flow of action of a narrative structure. These preterits express ideas that are independent of time: general characteristics and innate qualities of the gods. They may also refer to the result of an action rather than its actual occurrence, such as the bestowing of a particular skill that results in the recipient, a mortal, standing above all others. Such an action could be employed in a figurative context; the gift of a god could be a metaphorical expression of divine rights. We should therefore expect these preterits to be unmarked for time. Furthermore, declarations of quality, character, and nature are generally nonactional. Such statements serve to define the various facets of a character. We should expect that such preterits would not take the augment; as discussed in Chapter 2.1, the appearance of a deictic augment should be related to such factors as vividness, intensity, emphasis, and temporal recency. Didactic statements are, as a rule, relatively neutral; they merely explain and elaborate. In contrast, similes describe elements of the natural world that are very formulaic to the contemporaries of Homer. Flies around a

milk pail or wasps swarming forth are everyday occurrences, but in contrast, the direct intervention of the gods on a personal level would only have occurred on an infrequent basis and certainly not for the asking; in Homer one regularly reminds the gods of past devotions (e.g., Chryses to Apollo II.I.37-42), or offers of holocausts (e.g., the Achaeans to Apollo II.I.446-74).

In Book II of the *Iliad* Odysseus attempts to restore order to the general chaos effected by Agamemnon's command that the host depart for home. If he found any member of the host participating in the pandemonium, he would strike him with his staff and order him to return to his place in the general assembly. He tells the people that they must obey their king:

II.II.203 *“ou men pōs pantes basileusomen enthad' Akhaioi·
ouk agathon polukoiraniē· heis koiranos estō,
heis basileus, hōi dōke Kronou paīs agkulomēteō
skēptron t' ēde themistas, hina sphisi bouleuēisi.”*
*“In no wise shall we Achaeans all be kings here. No good
thing is a multitude of lords; let there be one lord, one king, to
whom the son of crooked-counselling Cronos hath vouchsafed
the scepter and judgments, that he may take counsel for his
people.”*

The statement in which *dōke* stands does not refer to an actual event, in which Zeus would have bestowed certain gifts upon Agamemnon. The history of the scepter is documented earlier (II.II.101-108); Hephaestus himself forged the scepter, which he gave to Zeus, from whom it eventually made its way to Pelops, Atreus and finally Agamemnon. A symbol of royal power from the gods, this scepter symbolizes the divine right of the king to rule. Hence, the bestowing of the scepter by Zeus can only be

understood as a metaphor. The scepter itself, then, represents the transfer of kingship from the king to his heir, the one destined to ascend the throne. *dōke* is a figurative expression of “giving” signifying Zeus’ approval of the one who wields the scepter. This is underscored by the implication that Agamemnon’s kingdom is somehow descendent from, and parallel to the kingship of Zeus; they are kings of their respective domains. The other divinely-accorded privilege is *themistas*, which in its plural form (as here) refers to the “body of traditional rules or precedents” (Cunliffe 1924, p. 187), which customarily are at the core of a culture. The granting of these rights, as in the case of the scepter, is a figurative expression of the right of kingship, an endorsement and approval from the divine king to his earthly counterpart, and stands outside of the temporal realm. Furthermore, the statement is relatively nonactional, as it merely expresses a general characteristic of kingship; nor is it particularly deictic, given the nonspecific nature of the statement that merely defines the quality of divinely endowed kingship.

This metaphor of “divine gifts” is also the theme expressed in Diomedes’ speech in book IX of the *Iliad*, in which he strongly criticizes Agamemnon for his earlier reproach of his unmanliness in war. He points out the two-sided nature of Agamemnon’s own character:

Il.IX.37 *“soi de diandikha dōke Kronou païs agkulomēteō.
skēptrōi men toi dōke tetimēsthai peri pantōn
alkēn d’ ou toi dōken, ho te kratos esti megiston.”*
*“But as for thee, the son of crooked-counselling Cronos has
endowed you in divided wise: with the scepter he has granted
to you to be honored above all, but he did not give you valor,
wherein is the greatest might.”*

This passage reiterates the scepter-theme of Odysseus' speech (II.II.206); here it is expressed in concert with a comment on the battle prowess (*alkēn*) of the one who wields the scepter. In this case, however, the speaker uses the concept of divinely endowed gifts to criticize Agamemnon, who though he wields the scepter as king, acts in a cowardly manner. Thematically, the passage serves as a vehicle for Diomedes to chastise Agamemnon: although a god-anointed king, he possesses no more bravery than anyone else of the host. The scepter, as discussed earlier, is a symbol of the relationship between mortal and divine kingship. *alkēn*, in contrast, is absent in Agamemnon, and this is a character flaw, conceptualized figuratively as a "failure" on the part of Zeus to grant the gift of *alkēn*. Such acts of endowment from a god do not constitute actions per se, but rather permanent and enduring results; they are, furthermore, expressed in descriptions of the general nature of Zeus as the one who bestows the virtues of heroes and kings. As in the previous example, this passage falls outside of the temporal realm; it is essentially a neutral declaration of the timeless qualities of a god and their repercussions in men.²⁴

A metaphoric relationship between the immortals and mortals may serve to stress some point of view within the narrative structure. The declaration that a character's skill is, in some fashion, divine in origin accentuates that skill as superior among mortals. The nature of such a statement runs the gamut from mere praise of innate excellence to an implication of a deeper adeptness of a character. As in the previous examples, these statements are introduced for illustration and explanation and do not refer to the occurrence of an action per se. In Book ii of the *Odyssey*, Antinous mentions three skills of Penelope as having been divinely bestowed:

Od.ii.116

“..., *ho hoi peri dōken Athēnē*
erga t' epistasthai perikallea kai phrenas esthlas

kerdea te”

“... , that Athena has endowed her above other women with knowledge of fair handiwork and a noble heart, and wiles, ...”

The declaration that *erga perikallea*, *phrenas esthlas* and *kerdea* were granted by Athena indicates that they are incomparable and extol the possessor as one of superior excellence. It is not likely that *dōken* is meant to refer to some real action in the past, since the passage appears in the context of praise that centers around Penelope. Her wisdom and superior skills, implied by *phrenas esthlas kerdea te* ‘a noble heart and wiles’ and *erga t’ epistasthai perikallea* ‘knowledge of fair handiwork,’ are somehow divine. This is most significant with regard to the first of these qualities, which is normally associated with Athena. Hence, the bestowing of divine gifts serves to place a mortal beyond his/her peers, rather than give an account of some event in the past. Furthermore, the descriptions of Penelope’s skills do not betray any sense of deixis, since they merely enumerate her abilities per se. There is therefore little reason to provide an overt marker of past-time and/or deixis in this passage.

In book viii of the *Odyssey*, the king of the Phaeacians, Alcinous, summons his minstrel Demodocus to provide entertainment during a feast. He describes the skill of the bard in the poetic arts as without equal among men by affirming once again their god-given provenience:

Od.viii.43

“... *kalesasthai de theion aoidon*

Dēmodokon· tōi gar hra theos peri dōken aoidēn terpein, hoppēi thumos epotrunēisin aeidein.”

“And summon hither the divine minstrel, Demodocus; for to him above all others has the god granted skill in song, to give delight in whatever way his spirit prompts him to sing.”

Unlike the dual implicational nature of Diomedes' speech, the words of Alcinous serve only to praise the bard. Nor is Demodocus just any poet, but a *theion aoidon* 'divine minstrel;' this places him in a class beyond most of his profession. The adjective *theios*, when applied to a mortal, signifies "of the nature of the gods," hence, "denoting a superlative degree of excellence and beauty" (Cunliffe 1924, p.187). Thus, the phrase *theion aoidon* serves to emphasize the superior, god-given abilities of Demodocus. As in the three passages previously discussed, *dōken* (44) does not refer to an actual event in the past but merely highlights Demodocus' skill. The belief that a poet is inspired by the gods is evident from the opening line of the *Iliad*: *mēnin aeide, thea, Pēlēiadeō Akhilēos* (Il.I.1) 'Sing to me, o goddess, of the wrath of Achilles, son of Peleus.' In the introductory verse of the *Odyssey* the poet likewise asks for the divine aid of the Muse in order to tell his story. Similarly the poet calls upon the Muse for help prior to his commencement of a new section, as in the catalogue of ships in *Iliad* II; he himself lacks the skill otherwise to recount the particulars (Il.II.484-93). Therefore, Od.viii.43-4 describes a general, timeless characteristic of the gods in relation to poets.

Odysseus expresses the very same sentiments in his praise of Demodocus, who declares his intention to sing the tale of the Trojan Horse. He has already been moved to tears by the bard's skillful rendition of the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles (Od.viii.74ff). Thus impressed, Odysseus asks Demodocus to sing of the wooden horse, the ruse which was the key to the fall of Troy,²⁵ adding the promise:

Od.viii.496 "ai ken dē moi tauta kata moiran kataleksēis,
autik' egō pasin muthēsomai anthrōpoisin,
hōs ara toi prophrōn theos ōpase thespin aoidēn."

“If thou dost indeed tell me this tale aright, I will declare to all mankind that the god has of a ready heart granted thee the gift of divine song.”

The metaphor of the divine gift plays a significant role in this passage. Odysseus was quite impressed by the bardic skills manifested in the recitation of his quarrel with Achilles; by associating the bard’s skill with the god (probably the Muse), he implicitly affirms Demodocus’ talent to be virtually unequalled. Indeed, Odysseus is taken aback by the skill of the poet, who describes the events in such detail as if he were there or had met one who was a member of the armada against Troy (Od.viii.491). Odysseus is clearly agitated by the lays presented at the feast; he openly weeps several times during the performance. His emotional reaction to the *tale of the wooden horse* is reinforced by the simile which describes a woman’s grieving over her fallen husband amid a raging battle (Od..viii.523-30). Odysseus will praise Demodocus to the world as one without equal if the poet’s lay of the events surrounding the wooden horse is at least equal to his earlier performances. Given the belief in the gods as the source of a poet’s continuous inspiration, the augmented aorist *ōpase* in Od.viii.498 describes a timeless quality of the gods of poetry: they are always with you, the poet without peer.

Hector employs the expression of the divine gift in his praise of Telamonian Ajax. When their personal combat has been halted because of the onset of early evening, the two combatants exchange gifts as tokens of friendship. In his speech, Hector praises the various skills of his opponent, among them a mastery of the spear:

II.VII.288 *“Aian, epei toi dōke theos megethos te biēn te
kai pinutēn, peri d’ egkhei Akhaiōn phertatos essi,
nun men pausōmestha makhēs kai dēiōtētos*

sēmeron·”

“Ajax, seeing god gave thee stature and might, aye, and wisdom, and with thy spear thou are pre-eminent above all the Achaeans, let us now cease from battle and strife for this day.”

Within the *Iliad*, the main weapon for combat is the spear. To praise one’s ability with the spear is to ascribe to him the status of a warrior of superior skill; it is the mark of his character, a statement of innate ability. With this adulation comes a description of Ajax’s physical and mental faculties, which are ascribed to divine origin. As in the previous examples, the explication of a mortal’s abilities as divinely endowed emphasizes their status as superior attributes. Thus, as seen in the previous examples, the declaration that some skill or quality has been granted by the gods serves as a description of character and does not refer to an actual event per se.

Nestor’s reference to Achilles’ parentage in Il.1.280 falls under the same rubric of describing the innate quality or defining characteristic of a person. Nestor attempts to mediate the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles, when it has become obvious that they are unable to reconcile their differences in council. He advises them to cease their quarrel and accept his advice. Achilles should respect the rights due to Agamemnon, the leader of the host, even though his mother is Thetis, a goddess:

Il.I.280 *“ei de su karteros essi, thea de se geinato mētēr,
all’ hode pherteros estin, epei pleonessin anassei.”*
*“Though thou art valiant, and a goddess mother bore thee, yet
this one [Agamemnon] is the mightier, seeing he is king over
more.”*

The fact that a goddess gave birth to Achilles is, in this passage, less important than the expression of his divine origin; it is a defining characteristic, signifying a unique status

among mortals. The sense of the statement is “you are the son of a goddess.”²⁶ Furthermore, Achilles is *karteros* ‘valiant,’ having shown himself to be a warrior of the highest degree; this contrasts with *pherteros*, signifying the power accorded Agamemnon as the rightful king. Nestor introduces these qualities to signify the superior nature of Achilles, though they are expressed in a conditional protasis as a caveat: regardless of your nobility (which you indeed possess), Agamemnon is the leader of the host. That Nestor would refer to Achilles’ mother in any other way than in regard to the quality of his character would be pointless.

Related to the above passages is the following example from Book IV of the *Iliad*. Agamemnon has just gone throughout the host to rouse the Achaeans to battle after the Trojan archer Pandarus had wounded Menelaus and thereby triggered a recommencement of the fighting. After the king praises his warlike nature, Nestor replies:

Il.IV.318 *“Atreidē, mala men toi egōn etheloimi kai autos
hōs emen hōs hote dion Ereuthaliōna katektan.
all’ ou pōs hama panta theoi dosan anthrōpoisin.”*
*“Son of Atreus, verily I myself could wish that I were such a
one as on the day when I slew goodly Ereuthalion. But in no
wise do the gods grant to men all things at one time.”*

In the first clause, Nestor expresses his wish that he were a young man (319). Functionally, this is an approbation of Agamemnon’s desire for an army of young men with Nestor’s martial prowess. He qualifies this statement by a reference to his slaying of Ereuthalion;²⁷ the implication of this statement, the strength of his youth, functions as an attribute of physical prowess. The action of the gods, their granting of skills is not limitless among mortals, as explicated in the second clause; this is itself a statement of

the general nature of the gods. *dosan*, an unaugmented aorist, cannot signify an action set in past-time. The clause of this preterit stands in contrast with the wish-clause, whose main verb is *etheloimi*, a present optative. Any relationship in the narrative structure of the *alla*-clause (321) with the *hōs*-clause (320) is ruled out, for II.IV.318-19 form a single expression of a wish for youth that is exemplified by an event in the speaker's past. Second, the *alla*-clause is thematically similar to Odysseus' description of the granting of skills by the gods as a general quality of their nature; therefore the statement is timeless. To understand *dosan* as referring to past time would be erroneous, as it would imply the gods' performance of this action at the time of Ereuthalion's death. Here this statement acts as a counterpoint to Nestor's wish: he would like to be young again, but the gods will not necessarily grant one's wish.

The underlying meaning of several statements of the gods is to signal ongoing or constant states. Although they may be rendered by translators as normal preterits, these statements are generally atemporal in nature, signifying an action normally associated with a deity. In book IV of the *Iliad*, Zeus accedes to Hera's wish for the destruction of Troy by the Achaeans. She must, however, reciprocate if he chooses to sack any city dear to her. The Trojans, Zeus points out, have always honored him well:

II.IV.48 *“ou gar moi pote bōmos edeucto daitos eīsēs,
loibēs te knisēs te· to gar lakhomen geras hēmeis.”*
*“For never at any time was my altar in lack of the equal feast,
the drink-offering and the savor of burnt-offering, even the
worship that is our due.”*

The verb *lagkhanō* can denote the rightful portion allotted to an individual, such as due honors to mortals and sacrificial perquisites for gods. A literal interpretation of *lakhomen*

would be “for we (have) received that due honor as our rightful portion,” which for Zeus comprises the holocausts prescribed as part and parcel of the divine and sacred worship. The interpretation of this verb as a preterit would refer to the sacrifices of the Trojans; they are the topical referents of the speech. This statement of divine rights, however, falls under the rubric of general characteristics. Zeus describes the Trojans as having performed their religious duties with a singular consistency. The *daitos eīsēs* always graced his altar; it is the *geras*, the due honor expected by a god.²⁸ The rendering of the *geras* is signified first literally by the imperfect *ou ... edeueto*, and as such does not refer to any one specific occurrence of the rites of worship. It probably refers to the honors the Trojans have given to Zeus in the past. Prior to this passage Zeus says *taōn moi peri kēri tiesketo Ilios hirē* ‘Sacred Ilios [the Trojan people] was most honored of my heart’ (Il.IV.46); *tiesketo* is a past-iterative, a class of verb that is essentially distributive (cf. Chapter 2.9). Furthermore there is no example in Homer of a present-iterative (i.e., a token of the iterative class with a primary ending; nor one which represents an action in present time). Thus, the imperfect *ou ... edeueto* would be a reason for Zeus’ great devotion, which is itself expressed by *tiesketo* (i.e., the city was wont to be honored beyond all others by him). As an aorist, *lakhomen* ought to signify either a singular occurrence or the completion of an action extended over a period of time, as if to state that the Trojans no longer proffer the due rites of worship, a transgression for which Zeus should not be opposed to the destruction of Troy. This latter is clearly not the meaning of the passage. Rather, the obligatory worship to the gods is a concomitant facet of their relationship with mortals, essentially a sacred contract. An interpretation without temporal specificity, in contrast, captures the essential import of Zeus’ declaration: the

Trojans have always performed their obligations to me, as is my right as a god. The unaugmented aorist *lakhomen* expresses an idea that falls outside of the temporal realm.

In *Iliad* XXIV Apollo strongly rebukes the other gods for their lack of concern over Achilles' continual desecration of Hector's body. Achilles has not yet dealt with the anger which arose from the death of his friend Patroclus; he continues to vent his rage against Hector, who had killed Patroclus in battle. Apollo tells the gods that this daily dragging of Hector's body behind a chariot must cease. He points out that all grief comes to an eventual end; men quell their distress over the loss of a loved one. The Fates, he says, have given mortals a powerful gift:

Il.XXIV.46 *“mellei men pou tis kai philteron allon olessai,*

ēe kassignēton homogastrion ēe kai huion·

all' ē toi klausas kai oduramenos methēke·

tlēton gar Moirai thumon thesan anthrōpoisin.”

“Lo, it may be that a man hath lost one dearer even than was this – a brother, that the selfsame mother bore, or a son; yet verily when he hath wept and wailed for him he maketh an end; for an enduring soul have the Fates given unto men.”

This extract from Apollo's speech introduces a hypothetical situation involving the death of a loved one. The survivor eventually overcomes his grief at the loss. Beyond the implication of the ongoing nature of life – one must put the past behind him – it is a statement of the general character of mortals, whose strength derives from the soul endowed by the Fates. Achilles, in contrast, continues to vent his rage, despite the fact that he has proffered funerary rites to Patroclus. That his behavior exceeds the limits of acceptability is underscored by Apollo's description of him as *oloos* 'ruthless'²⁹ (Il.XXIV.39) and as a fierce lion (41-3). The exemplum of the grieving mortal serves as

a contrast to the depredations of Achilles, who therefore stands outside the societal norms and is now a type of outcast; he is undeserving of the sympathy of the gods (39). When he speaks of the mortal, Apollo is describing his innate nature, to which Achilles ought to conform. The reference to the soul serves only to qualify the innate nature of mortals, and therefore the action of the *Moirai* ‘Fates’ cannot signify a particular occurrence, which would be meaningless within the thematic context of the narrative structure.

One should note that these preterits may be translated in the present tense. This has already been illustrated in three examples (all aorists): *katekheuen* (II.III.10); *lakhomen* (II.IV.49); and *dosan* (II.IV.320). They could not easily signify an event in past-time because of context or thematic structure. *katekheuen* cannot refer to the North wind blowing through the fields of Troy; its figurative use is guaranteed by the reference to robbers and shepherds that are unrelated to the Iliadic themes of war, loyalty and honor. The other two aorists, likewise, cannot be understood in any context of temporal specificity. They clearly express general characteristics of the gods that are true at all times, and therefore are restricted to no particular point in time. Common to these preterits is their reference to the quality, nature, and permanent result of an action. This third type of reference essentially expresses the first two, given that an action results in a change of status; a person becomes brave, strong, or perhaps known for a particular action. For example, in Book XXIV of the *Iliad*, Hecabe laments Priam’s intention to go and retrieve Hector’s body, saying:

II.XXIV.203 “*pōs etheleis epi nēas Akhaiōn elthemen oios,
andros es ophthalmous hos toi poleas te kai esthlous
huieas eksenarikse;*”

“How art thou fain to go alone to the ships of the Achaeans to meet the eyes of the man who hath slain thy sons, many and valiant?”

She mentions this particular action of Achilles to dissuade Priam from his intentions. Here it serves as a rhetorical question in a passage which essentially asks *How can you go visit a man who has killed your sons?* That Achilles has committed these actions is less important than his role as being the source of the action. One could render *hos toi ... eksenarikse* as “who is the slayer of your sons, many and valiant” without affecting the underlying sense of the declaration.³⁰ This contrasts with Priam’s earlier lament over the death of his sons at the hands of Achilles: *tossous gar moi paidas apektane tēlethaontas* ‘so many sons of mine hath he slain in their prime’ (Il.XXII.423). That this statement refers to an action in past-time is clear from the context of comparison: Achilles has caused Priam more pain than any other Achaean. It would be difficult to understand *apektane* other than as a description of an event in the past.

There is thus a greater range of temporal interpretation for preterits signifying non-specific actions, such as innate characteristics and qualities, and general truths.³¹ The overt specification of temporality by either a temporal or deictic particle would be superfluous in such instances. The contextual environment of the narrative is the primary determinant as to the value of a particular preterit. For example, a narrative structure describing the various elements within a particular course of action are generally set in past-time; it is a description of events that are temporally anterior to the audience’s present. This is, however, not applicable to gnomic periods (as in the case of the Homeric simile),³² which are expressions of general truths that are not subject to temporal specificity. Despite their representation by augmented preterits, they are rendered in the

present tense, as in the case of II.III.10-11 that is discussed at the beginning of this chapter. They may appear within a section of a narrative sequence signifying actual events, though the proper interpretation of the atemporal statement is made on the basis of its thematic content and other aspects of its syntactic structure. The majority of statements possessing atemporal signification are not otherwise marked within the interpretive frame of the narrative. Apollo's description of the grieving mortal would be incomprehensible if it were not interpreted as a brief exposition on the nature of mortals;³³ its sole function within the speech is a counterpoint to the actions of Achilles. Nestor's declaration that mortal attributes – one's gifts and skills – are unequally distributed by the gods (II.IV.321) is a statement of general truth emphasizing the speaker's present physical state. Similar to this is the exposition of the sceptered king by Odysseus (II.II.203-6), who sought to halt the floodtide of chaos which arose after Agamemnon's recommendation to abandon the siege of Troy. He offers an example of some king whom Zeus favors; it is this one, whom the Achaeans should follow and who is their present leader, that is numbered among such kings. The examples discussed in this chapter involve gnomic aorists, as they describe qualities and characteristics that are essentially timeless. They appear, however, in the context of facts and information about a character within the story, and are not particularly vivid. The Homeric simile (a type of gnomic period) refers to the everyday experiences of the audience, which falls within the thematic norms of "vividness" and hence contains a preponderance of augmented preterits (cf. Chapter 2.5).

The single counterexample in this discussion might be *ōpase* (Od.viii.498). Since it describes the bardic skills of Demodocus, we should expect an unaugmented *opase*.

However, note that this is the first time that the speaker, Odysseus, has heard Demodocus perform. He reacts strongly to the poet's singing of events in the Trojan War that he has experienced firsthand. It is for him an experience far more powerful than for the Phaeacians. Odysseus' description is a vivid praise of the poet whose skill he so admires, and hence it is expressed by an augmented preterit.

2.3 Temporally Distal Events

Within the speeches of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* one finds narratives that describe events situated in the non-recent past. These passages are expositions of shared cultural knowledge recounting the history of a group or the experiences of the individual speaker. A feature common to these passages is their subsidiary thematic role within Homer. In general, the characters introduce for didactic purposes in their respective speeches some event that occurred decades prior to the present-time of the story line.

The majority of these passages are located within the *Iliad*. We may account for this by the fundamental character of each Homeric epic. The story line of the *Iliad*, set in the tenth year of the siege of Troy, is centered on Agamemnon's transgression against Achilles and the tragedy that arises from this conflict of wills. The affairs of the Olympian gods serve as heavenly parallels to, and reinforcement of earthly events.³⁴ It is for this reason that one common theme within the *Iliad* is the divisiveness existing among the gods; several of the conflicts among the immortals in the undefined past are recounted in the speeches of both immortals and mortals. The *Odyssey*, in contrast, relates the trials of Odysseus as he strives to return to his native Ithaca after the fall of Troy. Only a

handful of the gods play a significant role in this story, the most important of whom is Athena. Her salience arises from her active assistance to both Odysseus in his journey home and to his son Telemachus in his search for his father; the other immortals are otherwise quite limited in their respective appearances within the story.

The preterits in these passages are unaugmented. Among those instances where the augment appears, only a few (those that are metrically assured) should not be treated as later emendations. In such cases one may justifiably argue in favor of textual corruption. For example, editors and diaskeuasts may have added the augment at the expense of a preceding vowel, thereby changing the text to reflect the grammar of their contemporary, post-Homeric language. Such data does not significantly impact the theoretical framework of this discussion, however, since as discussed in Chapter 2.1, we concern ourselves here only with unambiguous cases. The augmented preterits in these narrative environments seem to suggest a relationship between non-augmentation and temporal distance. We would expect this in relationship to the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis, since a deictic augment should be restricted to environments that are clearly deictic. Temporal recency and descriptions of well-known facts (such as the natural world depicted in similes) show this quality. However, as discussed in Chapter 2.1, the concept of deixis should be extended to vivid declarations, because these often serve to foreground some point within the speech. Hence, we should expect the augment to appear to a significant degree in these types of statements, even if it were describing an event that is temporally unspecified or distant. On the other hand, the augment should be sparsely attested in passages which describe nonactional events and/or lack vividness.³⁵

The common denominator of these passages, as stated above, is the description of non-recent events. It is for this reason that the characters of each passage are mainly the immortal gods and earthly heroes such as Heracles, who flourished some three generations prior to the Trojan War. Nestor, the head of the Pylian contingent of the Achaeans, was a child in the prime of Heracles; at the time of the events chronicled in the *Iliad*, he is the oldest of the Achaeans. Any youthful deeds of the king of Pylos would certainly have to be described as temporally distal events. Far removed from the present-time of the main narrative of Homer are the deeds of the Olympians, whose temporal provenience dates from Zeus' birth and his leadership in usurping the throne from his father Cronos. In the deeds chronicled within many of these passages one encounters the theme of strife and conflict among the Olympians. It is invariably a clash of wills centered around Zeus' exertion of power over the other immortals, the outcome of which is his ultimate triumph over them either by his own hand or aided by a god sympathetic to his plight. One of the Olympian tales chronicled in the *Iliad* is the fall of Hephaestus, who was hurled by Zeus to earth as punishment for challenging his authority. Hephaestus recounts these events in Book I of the *Iliad* to caution his mother Hera about a confrontation with Zeus. He recalls the consequences of his previous failure to protect her at the time she fomented discontent against Zeus:

Il.I.590 “*ēdē gar me kai allot’ aleksemenai memaōta*
hriipse podos tetagōn apo bēlou thespesioio,
pan d’ ēmar pheromēn, hama d’ ēeliōi katadunti
kappeson en Lēmnōi, oligos d’ eti thumos enēen-
entha me Sinties andres apha komisanto pesonta.”

“Yea, at a time ere this, when I was fain to save thee, he caught me by the foot and hurled me from the heavenly threshold; the

whole day long was I borne headlong, and at set of sun I fell in Lemnos, and but little life was left in me. There did the Sintian folk make haste to tend me for my fall.”

These events are part of an ongoing strife, which arises from Hera’s opposition to Zeus. Of the many sons Zeus had sired upon mortal women the greatest was Heracles, who became the target of Hera’s wrath. The result, however, was her defeat and punishment at the hand of Zeus, whom Hephaestus sought to obstruct. In the end, Zeus merely brushes aside the attempt and casts Hephaestus out from Olympus. This action occurs some three generations prior to the events in the *Iliad*, and is therefore set in the distal past. Of special interest is *ēdē*,³⁶ a temporal marker that can signify both the “past” and “present.” The specific interpretation relies on a point that is defined on the temporal axis; *ēdē* specifies the “present” and “past” with, respectively, the temporal reference point in the future and present. Furthermore, *ēdē* exhibits the properties of deixis, and in many instances serves to focus the attention of the reader/hearer upon the action presented in the story. For this reason, then, *ēdē* is itself a deictic particle that in the above passage serves to place the action in past-time from the characters’ point of view and to draw Hera’s attention to the presentation. In a sense, then, Hephaestus is saying “remember these events that occurred in the past.” By the same token, however, the passage is fairly nonactional; the speaker is merely recounting a shared history as an admonition.

Of the preterits in the above passage, only *enēen*, the third person singular imperfect of *eimi* ‘be’, is augmented. All other preterits are unambiguously unaugmented with the exception of *kappeson*, the contracted form of *kat^e/apeson* in which the vowel of the second syllable, equally likely to have been *e* or *a*, has been elided (with regressive

assimilation of the *t* to the *p*). The only “strict” rule of elision in Homer is that involving the augment following a preceding *i* in word-final position: the *i* regularly appears instead of the augment.

Thematically, II.I.590-94 recounts the consequences of a direct confrontation with Zeus, and is therefore essentially didactic. Hephaestus’ speech merely recounts what befell him after Zeus hurled him down to earth. None of the clauses within the sequence of action – the expulsion from Olympus, the fall to earth, and the ministrations by the Sintians – expresses a particularly vivid action. As for *enēen*, the third person singular imperfect of *eneimi* ‘I exist (in a specified place),’ the majority of preterits to this verb in Homer are attested with the augment regardless of narrative environment.³⁷ To claim that II.I.594 is emphatic by virtue of the augmented preterit, implies that all statements with an augmented *eimi*-preterit are emphatic, a palpable absurdity, given that most such statements are structures of predication involving a copula.

In Book V of the *Odyssey*, Zeus finally responds to Odysseus’ prayers to return home to Ithaca. For the past seven years the goddess Circe has kept Odysseus on her island of Ortygia. She obeys Zeus’ commands, but not before expressing her dissatisfaction to his messenger Hermes: the gods have taken mortals as lovers with relative impunity, a privilege that is not accorded to the goddesses. The events described within this passage (the mortal lovers of the goddesses) are not contemporaneous with the events of the main narrative. Structurally, this passage consists of two independent vignettes that illustrate a bias against a goddess taking a mortal lover:

Od.v.121 “*hōs men hot’ Ōriōn’ heleto hrododaktulos Ēōs,*
 tophra hoi ēgaasthe theoi hreia zōontes,
 hēos en Ortugiēi khrosothronos Artemis hagnē

*hois aganois beleessin epoikhomenē katepephnen.
 hōs d' hopot' Iasiōni eūplokamos Dēmētēr,
 hōi thumōi eiksasa migē philotēti kai eunēi
 neiōi eni tripolōi· oude dēn ēen apustos
 Zeus, hos min katepephne balōn argēti keraunōi.”*

“Thus, when rosy-fingered Dawn took to herself Orion, ye gods that live at ease begrudged her, till in Ortygia chaste Artemis of the golden throne assailed him with her gentle shafts and slew him. Thus too, when fair-tressed Demeter, yielding to her passion, lay in love with Iasion in the thrice-plowed fallow land, Zeus was not long without knowledge thereof, but smote him with his bright thunder-bolt and slew him.”

Here augmentation is metrically assured for only two preterits: *ēgāasthe* and *ēen*. *katepephne* (2X, one with *n*-mobile [Od.v.124]) is a compound, for which the augment could have been a post-Homeric emendation. Two verbs are unaugmented: *heleto* (121), whose clause is joined with (122) by the adverb *tophra* ‘then, at that time;’ and *migē* (126), whose clause stands in a section that parallels (121-24) and *oude dēn ēen apustos* ‘not long without knowledge’ (127) implies the ‘then, at that time’ of *tophra*. This passage differs from the example discussed above, which was composed of series of clauses which comprise a single event, in describing two separate and unrelated events bound by the common theme of deprivation of rights accorded the goddesses. It shares with the earlier passage, however, the feature of detailing past events. In each case the inclusion of the passage within its speech is supportive of the main point of the speaker, who obviously would like to focus attention on perceived wrongs. With regard to

thematic structure Circe is not sharing memories, but presenting them in a protest against Zeus' command.

These passages are not exclusively limited to the experiences of the gods. There are several stories that center around mortals. The latter are structurally and thematically identical with the narratives of the gods, showing minimal employment of the augment and a didactic presentation of background material. However, the stories explicating the deeds of mortals are distinct from those of the gods in possessing a specified time depth. Nestor, king of Pylos, is the oldest among the Achaeans. Three generations in age at the time of the Trojan War (Il.I.251-53),³⁸ he has known a broad range of experiences, which he mentions in various speeches throughout the *Iliad*. In *Iliad* I, Nestor recounts his participation in the war against the Centaurs, which seems to have occurred some forty years earlier. Nestor fought with men whom he believes superior to those with him before Troy and who yet listened to his advice and counsels. By pointing out the actions of superior men, Nestor hopes to defuse the animosity which has arisen between Agamemnon and Achilles. As in the case of Il.I.590-94 (discussed above), *ēdē* at the beginning of the speech serves to direct the characters' focus to the history being presented as an admonition from the speaker, an eyewitness to the events:

Il.I.260 *“ēdē gar pot' egō kai areiosin ēe per humin
 andrasin hōmilēsa, kai ou pote m' hoi g' atherizon.
 ou gar pō toious idon aneras oude idōmai,
 hoion Peirithoon te Druanta te poimena laōn
 Kainea t' Eksadion te kai antitheon Poluphēmon
 Thēsea t' Aigeidēn, epieikelon athanatoisin
 kartistoi dē keinoi epikhthoniōn traphen andrōn
 kartistoi men esan kai kartistois emakhonto*

*phērsin oreskōioisi kai ekpaglōs apolessan.
 kai men toisin egō methomileon ek Pulou elthōn
 tēlothen eks apiēs gaiēs· kalesanto gar autoi·
 kai makhomēn kat' em' auton egō· keinoisi d' an ou tis
 tōn hoi nun brotoi eisin epikhthonioi makheoito·
 kai men meu bouleōn ksunien peithonto te muthōi·”*

“Ere now have I consorted with warriors that were better men than ye, and never did they set me at naught. Such warriors have I never seen since, nor shall see, as Peirithous was and Dryas, shepherd of the host, and Caeneus and Exadius and godlike Polyphemus, and Theseus, son of Aegeus, peer of the immortals. Mightiest were these of all men reared upon the earth; mightiest were they, and with the mightiest did they fight, even with the beasts that had their lairs among the mountains, and in terrible wise did they destroy them. With these men I had fellowship, when I had come from Pylos, from afar from a distant land; for of themselves they called me. And in fight I took my part as mine own man; but with them could no man fight of all mortals that now are upon the earth. Aye, and they harkened to my counsel, and gave ear to my words.”

This passage shows predominantly unaugmented verb forms: a fundamental characteristic of the chronicles of the gods. The only augmented preterits within this passage are *emakhonto* (267) and *hōmilēsa* (261). The former stands in a clause which does not form a narrative sequence with the surrounding text, but rather explicates a particular deed associated with historical personages.³⁹ In the case of *hōmilēsa* (261), note the associated *ēdē* (260), which presents Nestor’s consorting as if from the point of view of an eyewitness in vivid recollection. Nestor’s goal is to achieve an amicable resolution to the discord that has arisen between Agamemnon and Achilles. He focuses

on the history of legendary heroes from the past as if to emphasize their relevance as role models in the present. If these heroes of yesteryear had valued Nestor’s advice, then surely Agamemnon and Achilles should now do so as well. This is the crucial point of the entire speech, the final statement by which the speaker believes he will convince the two contending parties to lay aside their differences: “if heroes who performed great and noble deeds listened to my words, then you who are lesser men should heed my advice as well.”

The tale of Pandareus’ daughters is another story of mortals set in the remote past; it is temporally proximate to the life of Pelops.⁴⁰ In Book XX of the *Odyssey*, Penelope prays to Artemis for deliverance from the suitors, who will not cease in their demand for her to select one of them as her new husband. Penelope dreams of an escape regardless of the cost, which would be preferable to the suitors’ constant badgering of her and their wasting of the estate. While praying to the goddess, she recounts the ultimate fate of Pandareus’ daughters after his death. This passage is characterized by the presence of relatively few preterits with metrically assured augment (e.g. *prosestikhe* and *anēreipsanto*). None of the individual clauses within the passage evince *prima facie* strong emphasis or signify a particularly vivid action. The speaker merely incorporates a historical event into her supplication to a goddess:

Od.xx.66 “*hōs d’ hote Pandareou kouras anelonto thuellai·*
tēisi tokēas men phthisan theoi, hai d’ eliponto
orphanai en megaroisi komisse de di’ Aphroditē
turōi kai meliti glukerōi kai hēdei oinōi·
Hērē d’ autēisin peri paseōn dōke gunaikōn
eidos kai pinutēn, mēkos d’ epor’ Artemis hagnē
erga d’ Athēnaiē dedae kluta ergazesthai.

*eut' Aphroditē dia prosestikhe makron Olumpon,
 kourēis aitēsousa telos thaleroio gamoio,
 es Dia terpikeraunon – ho gar t' eu oiden hapanta,
 moiran t' ammorien te katathnētōn anthrōpōn –
 tophra de tas kouras harpuiai anēreipsanto
 kai hr' edosan stugerēisin erinusin amphipoleuein.”*

“... even as on a time storm-winds bore away the daughters of Pandareus. Their parents the gods had slain, and they were left orphans in the halls, and fair Aphrodite tended them with cheese, and sweet honey, and pleasant wine, and Hera gave them beauty and wisdom above all women, and chaste Artemis gave them stature, and Athena taught them skills in famous handiwork. But while beautiful Aphrodite was going to high Olympus to ask for the maidens the accomplishments of gladsome marriage – going to Zeus who hurls the thunderbolt, for well he knows all things, both the happiness and the haplessness of mortal men – meanwhile the spirits of the storm snatched away the maidens and gave them to the hateful Erinyes to deal with.”

In book XIV of the *Iliad*, the god Dream reminds Hera of her previous intrigues against Zeus' son Heracles as he was returning home from his sack of Troy. An approximate dating of this event is afforded by the Achaean Tlepolemus, who is one of Heracles' sons; he briefly mentions his father's earlier sack of Troy (II.V.640-42). Since Tlepolemus is an adult in the time frame of the *Iliad*, we may date the earlier sack to a few decades prior to the events described within the text:

II.XIV.249 *“ēdē gar me kai allo teē epinussen ephetmē
 ēmati tōi hote keinos huperthumos Dios huios
 epleen Iliothēn Trōōn polin eksalapaksas.*

*ē toi egō men ethelksa Dios noon aigiokhoio
 nēdumos amphikhutheis· su de hoi kaka mēsao thumōi
 orsas' argaleōn anemōn epi ponton aētas,
 kai min epeita Koōnd' eu naiomenēn apeneikas
 nosphi philōn pantōn. ho d' epegromenos khalepaine
 hriptazōn kata dōma theous, eme d' eksokha pantōn
 zētēi· kai ke m' aiston ap' aitheros embale pontōi,
 ei mē Nuks dmēteira theōn esaōse kai andrōn·
 tēn hikomēn pheugōn, ho d' epausato khōomenos per.
 hazeto gar mē Nukti thoēi apothumia erdoi.”*

*“For ere now in another matter did a behest of thine teach me
 a lesson, on the day when the glorious son of Zeus, high of
 heart, sailed forth from Ilion, when he had laid waste the city
 of the Trojans. I, verily, beguiled the mind of Zeus, that
 beareth the aegis, being shed in sweetness around him, and
 thou didst devise evil in his heart against his son, when thou
 hadst roused the blasts of cruel winds over the face of the deep,
 and thereafter didst bear him away unto well-peopled Cos, far
 from all his kinfolk. But Zeus, when he awakened, was wroth,
 and flung the gods hither and thither about his palace, and me
 above all he sought, and would have hurled me from heaven
 into the deep to be no more seen, had Night not saved me –
 Night that bends to her sway both gods and men. To her I
 came in my flight, and besought her, and Zeus refrained
 himself, albeit he was wroth, for he had awe lest he do aught
 displeasing to swift Night.”*

This passage contains a significant number of metrically assured augmented preterits (4 out of 12). Three occur in sequential order in the initial four lines with *epinussen*, the first of the series, standing in the prefatory statement to the narrative proper (250-61); the

fourth, *esaōse*, stands in a statement explicating the consequences of Zeus' rage. The augmented preterit *epausato* is ambiguous; it is preceded by *d'*, which could represent *de* plus an original *pausato*.⁴¹ The unaugmented *mēsao* is metrically assured by its location within the verse; an augmented preterit would result in a trochaic word division of the fourth metron |*hoi kak' e*|*mēsa*, a pattern which is generally avoided in the hexameter (cf. Devine and Stephens 1984, p. 11). Note that *ēdē* introduces the account as a shared memory. Furthermore, in contrast to the examples discussed above, this passage serves as a caution to Hera against proceeding with her plan. The reason for the more frequent appearance of the augment here may be gleaned from another version of this story, the punishment of Hera, which appears in Book XV of the *Iliad*. After Zeus has awakened from the sleep which Dream placed upon him, he confronts Hera over her continued interference with his punishing of the Achaean host.⁴² He warns her to cease and desist from her present course of action, and reminds her of the consequences of her actions against Heracles. These events occurred three decades prior to the Trojan War, and are contemporaneous with Nestor's account of the heroes that was discussed above:

Il.XV.18 “*ē ou memnēi hote t' ekremō hupsothen, ek de podoiin*
akmonas hēka duō, peri khersi de desmon iēla
khrowseon arrēkton· su d' en aitheri kai nephelēisin
ekremō· ēlasteon de theoi kata makron Olumpon,
lusai d' ouk edunato parastadon· hon de laboimi
hriptaskon tetagōn apo bēlou ophr' an hikētai
gēn oligēpeleōn· eme d' oud' hōs thumon aniei
azēkhthēs odunē Hēraklēos theioio,
ton su ksun Boreēi anemōi pepithousa thuellas
pempsas ep' atrugeton ponton kaka mētioōsa,
kai min epeita Koōnd' eu naiomenēn apeneikas.

ton men egōn enthen hrusamēn kai anēgagon autis

Argos es hippoboton kai polla per athlēSanta.

tōn s' autis mnēsō, hin' apollēksēis apataōn."

"Dost thou not remember when thou wast hung from on high, and from thy feet I suspended two anvils, and about thy wrists cast a band of gold that might not be broken? And in the air amid the clouds thou didst hang, and the gods had indignation throughout high Olympus; howbeit they availed not to draw nigh and loose thee. Nay, whomsoever I caught, I would seize and hurl from the threshold until he reached the earth, his strength all spent. Yet not even so did the ceaseless pain for godlike Heracles leave my heart, whom thou when thou hadst leagued thee with the North Wind and suborned his blasts, didst send over the unresting sea, by thine evil devising, and thereafter didst bear him away unto well-peopled Cos. Him did I save from thence, and brought again to horse-pasturing Argos, albeit he had labored sore. Of these things will I mind thee yet again so that you will desist from deceptions."

The degree to which the augment appears here is significantly higher than in the passages cited above. Of the total number of preterits within this narrative, five are augmented; the four remaining preterits appear without the augment.⁴³ All the preterits, those with and without the prefix, are (with the exception of *ekremō* [18]⁴⁴) metrically assured. This contrasts significantly with the other passages, in which some of the verb forms are ambiguous. One would not expect such an appearance of augmented preterits in a description of temporally distal events. Within Zeus' recollection to Hera of the punishment he inflicted upon her (18-24), three augmented preterits (*ekremō* [21], *ēlasteon* [21] and *edunato* [23]; their respective augments are guaranteed by the meter)

appear in sequence; the unaugmented *iēla* is located within a complex structure of two clauses under *de*-coordination that suggests an example of *conjunction-reduction*. A fifth preterit, the augmented imperfect *aniei*, rounds off the account in its description of the emotional distress that Zeus suffered because of the toils inflicted upon his son Heracles. Note the absence of *ēdē* from this passage. It is the augmented preterit that focuses on the description of the individual actions, regardless of the absence of deictic adverbs.⁴⁵

Il.V.18-31 has the same function as the other passages discussed earlier. A character, in this case Zeus, describes an event in the past for didactic purposes. Hera's constant interference in the battles around Troy disrupts the natural flow of events as planned by Zeus: the inflicting of heavy loss of life upon the Achaeans by the Trojans. With Dream's aid, Hera temporarily thwarted this plan by rallying the Achaeans to a victory. The constant meddling by Hera into Zeus' plans provides a background for understanding the context of Zeus' speech. Zeus had repeatedly forbade his wife to interfere with his promise to Thetis,⁴⁶ and for a time Hera did accede to his demand. Now, he must respond to her latest action, which is nothing less than a direct assault on his supreme authority among the gods; and he makes it clear that he will not brook any further meddling into his affairs. The speech is prefaced by the statement "*ē ou memnēi hote t' ekremō hupsothen, ek de podoiin,*" which serves to bring to Hera's mind as vividly as possible an episode in her past. Furthermore, the augmented preterits focus in on each detail of her punishment. Thus, Zeus presents a historical account as if it were occurring before Hera's eyes. This, combined with the earlier threat of punishment (*se plēgēisin himassō* '... I will scourge thee with stripes' [Il.XV.17]), serves as a last-and-final warning; it is the strongest form of admonishment.

2.4 Homeric Narratives: The Battle Scenes

Among the narrative structures of Homer one finds passages dedicated to the description of battle scenes. These are characterized by predominantly unaugmented preterits of imperfective and perfective aspect stems. Within these battle scenes individual actions, such as the approach of the combatants, their wielding of weapons, and the result of the confrontation are generally expressed by aorists. However, background information on a character who appears within the battle: his country, friends, lineage and kinship, is not restricted to a single aspect-stem. For example, his homeland, that is, where he lives and is expected to return after the fall of Troy, is typically described by an imperfect. The same is true of a description of his parents (cf. Chapter 2.7 for a discussion of *tiktō*-preterits as signifiers of kinship). On the other hand, a statement of his birth is normally presented with an aorist.

The majority of battle scenes appear of course in the *Iliad*. The *Iliad* is not a war story per se, but rather a drama predicated upon the psychological and mental state of Achilles that arises from his mistreatment at the hands of Agamemnon; it employs the seige of Troy as the framework for this story. In contrast, the *Odyssey* relates the adventures of one man, Odysseus, in his attempt to return home to his native Ithaca after the fall of Troy. Elaborate descriptions of battles are not an element fundamental to a story recounting the journeys of a man trying to reach home except in two key sections: the slaying of the suitors (*Odyssey* xxi) and the Ithacans' retribution (*Odyssey* xxiv),

representing, respectively, Odysseus' revenge for the decimation of his estate and the demand for vengeance by the relatives of those slain by him.

A battle scene is essentially a list composed of various elements which center around a common theme. With regard to structure it is a type of catalog; in its simplest form it consists of a series of events related only by their occurrence within a common reference frame of a single battle. A battle scene provides a detailed step-by-step description of events in an environment where participants engage in direct armed confrontation with their opponents. By focusing upon several individual combats as prototypical examples, the poet epitomizes the thematic context of the overall fighting. Structurally, each individual description begins with an introduction of the combatants. The poet may choose to expand upon the basic structure by the inclusion of background information relative to the participants; this endows the narrative with a quality that goes beyond a mere description of the hapless victims of martial fortune. In Book IV of the *Iliad*, the Achaeans have recommenced the war with the Trojans. An initial description of the battle (446-56) serves as an overall reference frame for a description of the individual fighting. In this case, the poet focuses on three separate battles. The fundamental structure of a sequence of introductory declarations is extracted once the subsequent verses of elaboratory material are omitted:

II.IV.457 *prōtos d' Antilokhos Trōōn helen andra korustēn
esthlon eni promakhoisi, Thalusiadēn Ekhepōlon·
Antilochus was first to slay a warrior of the Trojans in full
armor, a goodly man amid the foremost fighters, Echeplus,
son of Thalysius.*

II.IV.473 *enth' ebal' Anthemiōnos huion Telamōnios Aias,*

ēitheon thaleron Simoeision, ...

Then Telamonian Ajax smote Anthemion's son, the lusty youth

Simoeisius, ...

II.IV.517 *enth' Amarugkeidēn Diōrea moira pedēse·*

Then was Amarynceus' son, Diores, caught in the snare of fate.

This portion of the battle scene (IV.457-539) consists of three vignettes, which are not directly related other than by their cooccurrence within a previously defined reference frame (IV.446-56). Although the respective preambles are noncontiguous within the text, the adverbial particles *prōtos~enth'~enth'* denote sequentiality of occurrence of each subsection within the overarching structure. In a strict sense, one may interpret the individual actions as temporally ordered; the adverbs place the actions, signified in the respective introductions by aorists, in sequential order.⁴⁷ A more liberal interpretation, however, would classify this type of narrative structure as essentially a catalogue, if we consider a battle scene as a listing of discrete elements as opposed to an account of sequential events. From this perspective the three vignettes may be interpreted as occurring separately and in no strict order within the overall battle. Given the adverbial particles, the first interpretation is most likely the correct one. In any case, the aorists in the introductions signify the combats as mutually independent.

A battle scene may consist mostly of a single statement with minimal background information with regard to the participants. The catalogue nature of such scenes is most obvious in this case; it is a structure composed of individual statements, each of which introduces a single element of the entire scene. The individual combats are expressed by aorists, although the aspect of the preterit signifying the background information is a function of its relationship to its surrounding narrative environment (e.g., an imperfective

describes an action coincident with the battle). A battle scene in *Iliad* VI introduces the heroic actions of several Achaeans. It is an addendum to the individual combats previously described and lacks subsidiary material beyond a brief description of the homeland of Agamemnon's victim. Further contextualizations of war, having been fully established in the previous narratives of Diomedes (II.VI.12-19) and Euryalus (II.VI.20-28), are therefore superfluous:

II.VI.29 *Astualon d' ar' epephne meneptolemos Polupoitēs·
Pidutēn d' Oduseus Perkōsion eksenariksen
egkheī khalkēiōi, Teukros d' Aretaona dion·
Antilokhos d' Ablēron enērato douri phaeinōi
Nestoridēs, Elaton de anaks andrōn Agamemnōn·
naie de Satnioentos eūrreitaō par' okhthas
Pēdason aipeinēn. Phulakon d' hele Lēitos hērōs
pheugont'· Eurupulos de Malanthion eksenariksen.
And Polypoetes staunch in fight slew Astyalus, and Odysseus
with his spear of bronze laid low Pidytes of Percote, and
Teucer goodly Aretaon. And Antilochus, son of Nestor, slew
Ablerus with his bright spear, and the king of men,
Agamemnon, slew Elatus who dwelt in steep Pedasus by the
banks of fair-flowing Satnioeis. And the warrior Leitus slew
Phylacus as he was fleeing before him; and Eurypylus laid
Melanthius low.*

This passage consists of a series of independent clauses in an extended *de*-coordinate structure. Each member of the structure describes the battle deed of an Achaean, whose victim – a Trojan – is cited only by name. An exception is the mentioning of the home of Elatus (34), who nowhere else appears in the *Iliad*. The reason background information is provided for this member of the Trojan host lies beyond the need to fill the available

metrical space. Elatus' opponent, Agamemnon, is one of the major characters within the *Iliad*; hence, this victim should be something more than a mere name among the scores of men on the field of battle. In this passage, most of the actions are described by aorists. The only imperfect is *naie* 'was dwelling (in)' (34), a state coincident with the reference frame of the battle; this is Elatus' homeland, to which he would have otherwise returned had he survived. That the declarations should be described by aorists arises from the relative independence of the respective actions; they are related only by their cooccurrence within a single battle. Each one essentially directs the reader's focus to individual points within a set. Moreover, each action expresses the death of a character upon the field of battle. As a whole, they are noncontinuous actions that are mutually independent and fall within the functional range of the perfective tense-stem.

That the actions are presented in sequence does not imply a de facto hierarchy. The individual combats described in the passage stand in an extended *de*-coordinate structure. The deaths of Elatus and Pidytes are unrelated to one another, in contrast to a recitation of the battle deaths effected in sequence by one character (e.g., Diomedes in II.VI.12-19 and Patrocles in *Iliad* XVI). Thus, II.VI.29-36 is, with the single exception noted, a simple recitation of actions without elaboration. It is a brief summary, which in combination with the more elaborate presentations of the deeds of Ajax (VI.5-11), Diomedes (VI.12-19), and Menelaus (VI.37-65) describes the commencement of hostilities between the Achaeans and the Trojans.

A defining characteristic of the battle scenes is the low frequency of appearance of the augment. Generally speaking, augmented preterits are sparsely attested within the descriptions of battle. In the passages discussed above (typical of the narrative structure

of battle scenes), the augmented preterits include only one – *enērato* (Il.VI.32) – which is metrically assured. This predominance of unaugmented preterits is likewise attested in descriptions of the battle deeds of a single character. These constitute in many instances narrative sequences describing a particular chain of events unfolding within the overall battle. The heroic deeds of Odysseus are chronicled in *Iliad* IV; he rages in martial fury to avenge the death of his friend Leucus, whom Priam’s son Antiphus had just slain. This passage exhibits the characteristics of a battle scene with functional differentiation of aspect-stem and the predominance of unaugmented preterits:

Il.IV.494 *tou d’ Oduseus mala thumon apoktamenio kholōthē,*
bē de dia promakhōn kekoruthmenos aithopi khalkōi
stē de mal’ eggus iōn kai akontise douri phaeinōi
amphi he paptēnas· hupo Trōes kekadonto
andros akontissantos· ho d’ oukh halion belos hēken,
all’ huion Priamoio nothon bale Dēmokoōnta,
hos hoi Abudothen ēlthe, par’ hippōn ōkeiaōn.
ton hr’ Oduseus hetarioio kholōsamēnos bale douri
korsēn· hē d’ heteroio dia krotaphoio perēsen
aikhmē khalkeiē· ton de skotos osse kalupse,
doupēsen de pesōn, arabēse de teukhe’ ep’ autōi.
khōrēsan d’ hupo te promakhoi kai phaidimos Hektōr·
Argeioi de mega iakhon, erusanto de nekrous,
ithusan de polu proterō· nemesēse d’ Apollōn
Pergamou ekkatidōn, Trōessi de keklet’ aüsas·
For [Leucus’] slaying waxed Odysseus mightily wroth at heart,
and he strode amid the foremost warriors, helmed in flaming
bronze; close to the foe he came and took his stand, and
glancing warily about him hurled with his bright spear; and
back did the Trojans shrink from the warrior as he cast. Not in

vain did he let fly his spear, but smote Priam's bastard son Democoon who had come from Abydos leaving his swift mares. Him Odysseus, wroth for his comrade's sake, smote with his spear on the temple, and through the other temple passed the spearpoint of bronze, and darkness covered his eyes, and he fell with a thud and upon him his armor clanged. Then the foremost warriors and glorious Hector gave ground; and the Argives shouted aloud, and drew off the bodies, and charged far further onward. And Apollo, looking down from Pergamus, had indignation, and called with a shout to the Trojans ...

The preterits in this passage consist only of aorists, which signify that the actions within the sequence are non-interrelated. The augment is essentially absent.⁴⁸ Structurally, we have an extended set of *de*-coordinated clauses. This is a feature characteristic of the battle catalogues discussed earlier. Fundamentally, however, this sequence is different from those with respect to its functional role within the overall narrative structure. This particular episode lists the actions as individual cells within a sequence in which a given character is the assumed actor until the introduction of a new performer. The poet presents each action of the character in sequential order: Odysseus becomes angry~he goes forth~he stands near the enemy~he casts his spear. It is, then, a catalogue of actions listed in the order of occurrence, whose noncoincidence and sequentiality is predicated of a single actor. This contrasts with the multiple actors cited within the battle deeds of the Achaeans of II.IV.29-36.

Iliad V.144-58, an account of the heroic deeds of Diomedes, displays the same formal structure as seen within the passage just cited. This structure is rendered somewhat opaque by the inclusion of background information on Diomedes' victims in

the battle, although the precise relationship of the clauses within the structure is made clear to the reader/hearer via adverbial particles and context. Diomedes rushes into battle subsequent to Athena's counsel in response to his prayer for success:

II.V.144 *enth' helen Astunoon kai Hupeirona, poimena laōn,
 ton men huper mazoio balōn khalkēreī douri,
 ton d' heteron ksipheī megalōi klēīda par' ōmon
 plēks', apo aukhenos ōmon eergathen ēd' apo nōtou.
 tous men eas', ho d' Abanta metōikheto kai Poluidon,
 huieas Eurudamantos, oneiropoloio gerontos·
 tois ouk erkhomenois ho gerōn ekrinat' oneirous,
 alla spheas krateros Diomēdēs eksenarikse·
 bē de meta Ksanthon te Thoōna te, Phainopos huie,
 amphō tēlugetō· ho de teireto gērai lugrōi,
 huion d' ou teket' allon epi kteatessi lipesthai.
 enth' ho ge tous enarize, philon d' eksainuto thumon
 amphoterō, pateri de goon kai kēdea lugra
 leip', epei ou zōonte makhēs eknostēsante
 deksato· kērōstai de dia ktēsīn dateonto.*

Then [Diomedes] slew Astynous and Hypeiron, shepherd of the host; the one he smote above the nipple with a cast of his bronze-shod spear, and the other he struck with his great sword upon the collar-bone beside the shoulder, and shore off the shoulder from the neck and from the back. Those then he let be, but went his way in pursuit of Abas and Polyidus, sons of the old man Eurydamus, the reader of dreams; howbeit they came not back for the old man to interpret dreams for them, but mighty Diomedes slew them. Then he went on after Xanthus and Thoon, sons twain of Phaenops, and both grown up; and their father was fordone with grievous old age, and begat no other sons to leave in charge of his possessions.

There Diomedes slew them, and bereft them of dear life, both the twain; but for the father he left lamentation and grievous sorrow, seeing he could receive them not alive returning from battle; and the next of kin divided his goods.

This battle-scene differs from the examples previously discussed in presenting more background information about the slain Trojans. Structurally, however, this passage is similar to Il.IV.494-508. First, coordinate *de*-structures link the main clauses, the primary elements signifying the progression of action within the narrative. The overall structure is, moreover, marked by the adverbial particle *entha*; the poet demarcates a particular action as a point reached within the narrative. Second, only the preterit *ekrinat'* (Il.V.150), a third person singular *s*-aorist mediopassive indicative, attests metrically-assured augmentation.⁴⁹

Later in Book V of the *Iliad*, a melee within the main battle commences with an assault by the Trojans under Hector upon the Achaean line; the Achaeans respond with their counterattack. Both sides take their share of victims. Within this battle Hector slays two Achaeans, to which Telamonian Ajax responds; this account of strike and counterstrike of, respectively, a Trojan and an Achaean serves as a model for the entire battle. Biographical information on those slain by the central character, Telamonian Ajax, is provided for a single character (Amphius, an ally of the Trojans) but is otherwise absent. This passage is therefore stylistically similar to Il.IV.494-508, while exhibiting the structural and morphological characteristics manifested in the previous examples. Extended *de*-coordination is evident here as well, and only a minority of the preterits show a metrically-assured augment:

Il.V.607 *hōs ar' ephē, Trōes de mala skhedon ēluthon autōn.*

enth' Hektōr duo, phōte katektanen eidote kharmēs
 ein heni diphrōi eonte, Menesthēn Agkhialon te.
 tō de pesont' eleēse megas Telamōnios Aias·
 stē de mal' eggus iōn, kai akontise douri phaeinōi,
 kai balen Amphion Selagou huion, hos hr' eni Paisōi
 naie poluktēmōn poulēios· alla he moira
 ēg' epikourēsonta meta Priamon te kai huias.
 ton hra kata zōstēra balen Telamōnios Aias,
 neiairēi d' en gastri pagē dolikhoskion egkhos,
 doupēsen de pesōn· ho d' epedrame phaidimos Aias
 teukhea sulēsōn· Trōes d' epī dourat' ekheuan
 oksea pamphanoōnta· sakos d' anedeksato polla.
 autar ho laks prosbas ek nekrou khalkeon egkhos
 espasat'· oud' ar' et' alla dunēsato teukhea kala
 ōmoiin aphelesthai· epeigeto gar beleessi.
 deise d' ho g' amphibasin kraterēn Trōōn agerōkhōn,
 hoi polloi te kai esthloi ephestasan egkhe' ekhontes,
 hoi he megan per eonta kai iphthimon kai agauon
 ōsan apo spheiōn· ho de khassamenos pelemikhthē.
 So spoke [Diomedes], and the Trojans came very close to them.
 Then Hector slew two warriors well skilled in fight, Menesthes
 and Anchialus, the twain being in one car. And as they fell
 great Telamonian Ajax had pity on them, and stood close at
 hand, and with a cast of his shining spear smote Amphius, son
 of Salagus, that dwelt in Paesus, a man rich in substance, rich
 in corn-land, but fate led him to bear aid to Priam and his
 sons. Him Telamonian Ajax smote upon the belt, and in the
 lower belly was the far-shadowing spear fixed, and he fell with
 a thud. Then glorious Ajax rushed upon him to strip him of his
 armor, and the Trojans rained upon him their spears, all sharp
 and gleaming, and his shield caught many thereof. But he

planted his heel upon the corpse and drew forth the spear of bronze, yet could he not prevail likewise to strip the rest of the fair armor from his shoulders, for he was sore pressed with missiles. Furthermore, he feared the strong defense of the mighty Trojans, who beset him both many and valiant with spears in their hands and, for all he was so tall and mighty and lordly, thrust him from them; and he gave ground and was made to reel.

The preterits *ēluthon* (608) and *espatat'* (621) signify relatively nondescript actions. Neither the two battle lines coming together nor Ajax's gathering of spoils are innately more intense than any of the other actions within the encompassing narrative structure. In the world depicted in Homer, the victor in a battle routinely strips the armor of his opponent as a symbol of victory. In *Iliad* VI Nestor sternly cautions his countrymen not to lag behind to gather up the spoils of war while the battle rages (67-71). More significant with respect to thematic content is 613-14, which states the present circumstances of Amphius – an ally of the Trojans – in contrast (*alla* 'but') to the previous declaration of his homeland. The character's participation in the war is expressed metaphorically by his being led to the war by *moira*, the fundamental meaning of which is 'due measure,' translated favorably as 'portion' and 'good fortune,' unfavorably as 'evil fate,' 'doom' or neutrally as the 'fate/destiny decreed by the gods' (Cunliffe 1924). Thus, two facets of the world, life and death, are personified by home and war in contrastive opposition; had he remained home, he would not have perished, though that was not the fate decreed for him.

The morphological and syntactic characteristics salient to the description of battles are not restricted to this one type of scene. In Book xii of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus

recounts to the Phaeacians the destruction of his ship and crew by Zeus as punishment for their slaughter of the kine of Helios:

Od.xii.403 *“all’ hote dē tēn nēson eleipomen, oude tis allē
phaineto gaiaōn, all’ ouranos ēde thalassa
dē tote kuaneēn nephelēn estēse Kroniōn
nēos huper glaphurēs, ēkhluse de pontos hup’ autēs.
hē d’ ethei ou mala pollon epi khronon· aipsa gar ēlthe
keklēgōs Zephuros megalēi sun lailapi thuōn,
histou de protonous errēks’ anemoio thuella
amphoterous· histos d’ opisō pesen, hopla te panta
eis antlon katekhunth’· ho d’ ara prumnēi eni nēi
plēkse kubernēteō kephalēn, sun d’ oste’ arakse
pant’ amudis kephalēs· ho d’ ar’ arneutēri eoikōs
kappes’ ap’ ikriophin, lipe d’ ostea thumos agēnōr.
Zeus d’ amudis brontēse kai embale nēi keraunon·
hē d’ elelikthē pasa Dios plēgeisa keraunōi,
en de theeiu plēto· peson d’ ek nēos hetairoi.
hoi de korōnēisin ikeloi peri nēa melainan
kumasin emphoreonto, theos d’ apoainuto noston.
autar egō dia nēos ephoitōn, ophr’ apo toikhous
luse kludōn tropios· tēn de psilēn phere kuma·
ek de hoi histon arakse poti tropin· autar ep’ autōi
epitonos beblēto, boos hrinoio teteukhōs.
tōi rh’ amphō suneergon, homou tropin ēde kai histon,
hezomenos d’ epi tois pheromēn oloois anemoisin.”*

*“But when we had left that island and no other land appeared,
but only sky and sea, then verily the son of Cronos set a black
cloud above the hollow ship, and the sea grew dark beneath it. It
ran on for no long time, for straightway came the shrieking West
Wind, blowing with a furious tempest, and the blast of the wind*

snapped both the fore-stays of the mast, so that the mast fell backward and all the tackling was strewn in the bilge. On the stern of the ship the mast struck the head of the pilot and crushed all the bones of his skull together, and like a diver he fell from the deck and his proud spirit left his bones. Therewith Zeus thundered and hurled his bolt upon the ship, and she quivered from stem to stern, smitten by the bolt of Zeus, and was filled with sulphurous smoke and my comrades fell out of the ship. Like sea-crows they were borne on the waves about the black ship, and the god took from them their returning. But I kept pacing up and down the ship till the surge tore the sides from the keel, and the wave bore her on dismantled and snapped the mast off at the keel; but over the mast had been flung the back-stay fashioned of ox-hide; with this I lashed the two together, both keel and mast, and sitting on these was borne by the dreadful winds.”

The majority of the actions here are described with extended *de*-coordination, although the appearance of adverbial particles provides texture to the narrative by demarcating the individual substructures which comprise the overall narrative. The *autar*-clause (420) signifies Odysseus’ actions in the ship as separate from that of his crew, despite their coincident occurrence: he was still in the ship while his men were floundering in the water. The frequency of augmentation is similar to that attested within the passages previously discussed; only four preterits – *eleipomen* (403), *estēse* (405), *errēks’* (409) and *ephoitōn* (xii.420) – show metrically-assured augmentation. The distribution of the augmented preterits is curiously asymmetrical. Most appear within the initial verses of the passage: three appear in the description of the oncoming storm, while the fourth signifies Odysseus pacing about the deck as the vessel disintegrates under the force of the

wind and waves. By contrast, the description of the destruction of the vessel (410-25) consists of augmentless preterits with the exception of *ephoitōn; errēks'* falls within the description of the rising forth of the storm and *katelunth'* (411) is a compound verb, where the appearance of the augment cannot be assured. However, this section of the passage provides specific details of the loss of the ship and crew, a series of events in sequential occurrence as provided by their respective order within the narrative. It is similar to an account of a battle marked by a progression of events, such as the casting of the spear, slaying of the opponent, and stripping of the armor as a trophy of war. In the storm, which is the overt manifestation of Zeus' anger, the aorists describe various actions that are related only by their occurrence within a common thematic frame. An interpretation of temporal progression is manifested, however, by the relationship between successive events (i.e., the mast which struck the ship's pilot must first have been sheared off from its mount). Odysseus' pacing about the ship is not de facto described with a greater degree of vividness than the floundering of his crew in the water. Their respective actions stand in contrast to one another, respectively the survival/life of Odysseus and the simultaneous extinction/death of his crew (which is duly signified by *autar* [420]: while he lives, they die).

2.5 Homeric Similes: The Case of the Gnomic Aorist

The simile plays an important role in Greek literature by providing an author or speaker the means of figurative expression. This type of expression generally signifies a quality that is enduring and permanent. For this reason the simile is not restricted to any

particular temporal reference frame. Given that it can describe enduring qualities and characteristics inherent in some object, the simile should be classified as a gnomic period. Structurally, the Homeric simile is composed of a tenor and a vehicle, respectively, the actual topic and the comparison. Stylistically, the vehicle serves to reinforce the thematic nature of the tenor, which provides the means by which a person may emphasize some topic of discussion by allusion: the personality of a character may be equated with the ferocity of a lion, or the swirling dust raised by an army with the dense mist surrounding the peaks of a mountain range. Thus, the focus of a discussion may be emphasized in some manner by comparison with some feature with which the listener is familiar.

The gnomic aorist, so-called because it specifies a general truth rather than the particular occurrence of an action, appears in Homer in both similes and atemporal declarations. It is curious that the gnomic aorist does not manifest the same frequency of augmentation in both environments. As discussed in Chapter 2.3, the augment is rarely attested in atemporal declarations that signify inherent qualities and characteristics. In contrast, the aorist in the Homeric simile (with few exceptions) takes the augment. Moreover, as the other analyses in Chapter 2 show, the augment is virtually unattested in statements/declarations of parental kinship (Chapter 2.7) and rarely in accounts of battle (Chapter 2.4), both of which describe events in past-time. It is hardly to be expected that a marker of past-time would be sparsely attested in historical accounts but very frequent in gnomic aorists; and then only in similes. Furthermore, as a past-time marker, one would expect the augment to appear only in the tenor and not the vehicle of the Homeric simile, since it is the former and not the latter that describes an action set in past-time.

This gnomic aorist is well-attested in classical Greek (typified by the Attic-Ionic dialect of the 4th c. B.C.), and it is generally interchangeable with the present indicative. This type of aorist takes the augment, which makes the construction highly idiomatic in the classical language since the gnomic aorist signifies a timeless characteristic/quality and not an action in past-time.⁵⁰

ēn de tis toutōn ti parabainēi, zēmian autois epethesan.

They impose (epethesan – 3Pl Aor Act Ind) a penalty upon everyone who transgresses (parabainēi – 3Sg Pres Act Subj; that is, the type of person who would commit any sort of transgression).

(Xenophon *Cyrus* I, 2, 2)

sophoi de mellonta tritaion anemon emathon

Wise sailors know (emathon – 3Pl Aor Act Ind) that a whirlwind is due in three days

(Pindar *Nemean Ode* VII, 17)

The gnomic period is attested in Homeric similes. As in the classical language, this construction expresses general truths that are independent of any particular temporal reference. Homeric similes are characteristically multimodal; often employing the subjunctive, which probably retains its sense of “possibility” despite an apparent equivalence with the indicative mood. Furthermore, adverbial particles, among them *hōs* and *ēūte*, demarcate the simile (the tenor and vehicle) from the overall narrative structure. Since the function of the Homeric simile is purely comparative, it does not express an independent truth, but rather appears in connection with some salient point that is introduced within the story. For the most part similes occur in narrative, although occasionally they appear in character speech. In the following and subsequent examples,

the substructure consisting of the tenor and the vehicle of the simile is in bold face to distinguish it from the surrounding narrative structure. We begin with a few examples of similes not showing gnomic aorists:

II.XVII.735 *hōs hoi g' emmemaōte nekun pheron ek polemoio
nēas epi glaphuras· epi de ptole mos tetato sphin
agri os ēūte pur, to t' epessumenon polin andrōn
ormenon eksaiphnēs phlegethei, minuthousi de oikoi
en selai megalōi· to d' epibre mei is anemoio.
hōs men tois hippōn te kai andrōn aikhmētaōn
azēkhēs orumagdos epēien erkhomenoisin·*

*Thus the twain [Ajax's] were hastening to bear the corpse forth
from out of the battle to the hollow ships, and against them was
strained a conflict fierce as fire that, rushing upon a city of
men with sudden onset, setteth it aflame (phlegethei - 3Sg
Pres Act Ind), and houses fall (minuthousi - 3Pl Pres Act
Ind) amid the mighty glare, and the might of the wind driveth
(epibre mei - 3Sg Pres Act Ind) it roaring on. Even so against
them as they went came (epēien - 3Sg Impfct Act Ind) ever
the ceaseless din of horses and of spearmen.*

Od.xiii.81 *hē d', hōs t' en pediōi tetraoroi arsenes hippoi,
pantes ham' hormēthentes hupo plēgēisin himasthlēs,
hupsos' aeiromenoi hripha prēssousi keleuthon,
hōs ara tēs prumnē men aeireto, kuma d' opisthe
porphureon mega thue poluphloisboio thalassēs.*

*And as on a plain four yoked stallions spring forward all
together beneath the strokes of the lash, and leaping on high
swiftly accomplish their way (prēssousi - 3Pl Pres Act Ind),
even so the stern of that (ship) leapt on high (aeireto - 3Sg
Impfct Mid Ind), and in her wake the dark wave of the loud-*

resounding sea foamed (thue - 3Sg Impfct Act Ind) mightly,

...

These similes cannot be interpreted as part of the main narrative. In each case the subject of the simile cannot be inferred to be some element within the story itself. It would be absurd to think of the wind-driven fire that rages through a city (Il.XVII.737-39) as some event contemporaneous with the battle of the surrounding narrative. Rather, it serves to reinforce the violent nature of the assault on the two Ajax's by equating the sound and fury of the Trojans with a raging fire that devastates a city. Horses on a plain have nothing to do with a ship at sea beyond a thematic reinforcement: as the horses leap so does the ship. The stern of the ship does not just leap, it *leaps into the air*; Achilles does not merely rage, but *rages without compassion and pity*. Essentially, then, a particular action is made more realistic by its association with experiences and knowledge of the real world. It displays a greater vividness than the descriptions within its surrounding narrative.

The gnomic aorist is likewise attested in Homeric similes, and usually (with less than ten exceptions) takes the augment.⁵¹ As in the preceding examples, these similes emphasize an action in the main narrative. As is the case in Classical Attic, the gnomic aorist appears to be equivalent to the present. As the following examples illustrate, such aorists in Homeric similes introduce a description that reinforces some action via thematic association. Their interpretation as part of the sequence of action depicted within the narrative structure would be incompatible with the thematic content of the story line:

Il.XI.558 *hōs d' hot' onos par' arouran iōn ebiēsato paidas*
 nōthēs, hōi dē polla peri hropal' amphis eagēi,

*keirei t' eiselthōn bathu lēion· hoi de te paides
 tuptousin hropaloisi· biē de te nēpiē autōn·
 spoudēi t' eksēlassan, epei t' ekoressato phorbēs·
 hōs tot' epeit' Aianta megan, Telamōnion huion,
 Trōes huperthumoi polugerees t' epikouroi
 nussontes ksustoisi meson sakos aien heponto.*

*And as when an ass that passeth by a cornfield getteth the
 better of boys (ebiēsato - 3Sg Aor Mid Ind) – a lazy ass about
 whose ribs many a cudgel is broken (eāgēi - 3Sg Perfct Act
 Subj), and he goeth in and wasteth (keirei – 3Sg Pres Act
 Ind) the deep grain, and the boys beat (tuptousin – 3Pl Pres
 Act Ind) him with cudgels, though their might is but puny,
 and hardly do they drive him forth (eksēlassan – 3Pl Aor Act
 Ind) when he hath had his fill (ekoressato – 3Sg Aor Mid
 Ind) of fodder; even so then did the Trojans, high of heart,
 and their allies, gathered from many lands, smite great Ajax,
 son of Telamon, with spears full upon his shield, and ever
 press (heponto – 3Pl Impfct Mid Ind) upon him.*

II.XVI.487 *ēūte tauron epephne leōn agelēphi metelthōn,
 aithōna megathumon, en eilipodessi boessi,
 ōleto te stenakhōn hupo gamphēlēisi leontos,
 hōs hupo Patroklōi Lukiōn agos aspistaōn
 kteinomenos meneaine, philon d' onomēnen hetairon·
 And as a lion cometh into the midst of a herd and slayeth
 (epephne – 3Sg Aor Act Ind) a bull, tawny and high of heart
 amid the kine of trailing gait, and with a groan he perisheth
 (ōleto – 3Sg Aor Mid Ind) beneath the jaws of the lion; even
 so beneath Patroclus did [Sarpedon] the leader of the Lycian
 shieldmen struggle (meneaine – 3Sg Impfct Act Ind) in*

death; and he called by name (onomēnen – 3Sg Aor Act Ind) his dear comrade:

II.XVII.61 *hōs d' hote tis te leōn oresitrophos, alki pepoithōs,
boskomenēs agelēs boun harpasēi hē tis aristē·
tēs d' eks aukhen' eakse labōn krateroisin odousi
prōton, epeita de th' haima kai egkata panta laphussei
dēiōn· amphi de ton ge kunes t' andres te nomēes
polla mal' iuzousin apoprothen oud' ethelousin
antion elthemenai· mala gar khlōron deos hairēi·
hōs tōn ou tini thumos eni stēthessin etolma
antion elthemenai Menelaou kudalimoio.*

And as when a mountain-nurtured lion, trusting in his might, hath seized (harpasēi – 3Sg Aor Act Subj) from a grazing herd the heifer that is goodliest: her neck he seizeth first in his strong jaws, and breaketh (eakse – 3Sg Aor Act Ind) it, and thereafter devoureth (laphussei – 3Sg Pres Act Ind) the blood and all the inward parts in his fury; and round about him hounds and herdsmen folk clamour (iuzousin – 3Pl Pres Act Ind) loudly from afar, but have no will (ethelousin – 3Pl Pres Act Ind) to come against him, for pale fear taketh hold (hairēi – 3Sg Pres Act Ind) on them; even so dared not (etolma – 3Sg Impfct Act Ind) the heart in the breast of any Trojan go to face glorious Menelaus.

Od.v.394 *hōs d' hot' an aspasio biotos paidessi phanēēi
patros, hos en nousōi kētai krater' algea paskhōn,
dēron tēkomenos, stugeros de hoi ekhrae daimōn,
aspasion d' ara ton ge theoi kakotētos elusan,
hōs Odusei aspaston eeisato gaia kai hulē,
And even as when most welcome to his children appears (phanēēi – 3Sg Aor Pass Subj) the life of a father who lies*

(kētai – 3Sg Pres Mid Ind) in sickness, bearing grievous pains, long while wasting away, and some cruel god assails (ekhrae – 3Sg Aor Act Ind) him, but then to their joy the gods free him (elusan – 3Pl Aor Act Ind) from his woe, so to Odysseus did the land and the wood seem (e eisato – 3Sg Aor Mid Ind) welcome; ...

Od.xxii.383 *tous de iden mala pantas en haimati kai koniēisi
pepteōtas pollous, hōs t' ikhthuas, hous th' haliēes
koilon es aigialon poliēs ektosthe thalassēs
dikuōi ekserusan poluōpōi· hoi de te pantas
kumath' halos potheontes epi psamathoisi kekhuntai·
tōn men t' Ēlios phaethōn ekseileto thumon·
hōs tot' ara mnēstēres ep' allēloisi kekhunto.*

But he [Odysseus] found them one and all [viz. the suitors] fallen in the blood and dust – all the host of them, like fishes that fishermen have drawn forth (ekserusan – 3Pl Aor Act Ind) in the meshes of their net from the grey sea upon the curving beach, and they all lie heaped (kekhuntai – 3Pl Perfct Mid Ind) upon the sand, longing for the waves of the sea, and the bright sun takes away (ekseileto – 3Sg Aor Mid Ind) their life; even so now the wooers lay heaped (kekhunto – 3Pl Plupfct Mid Ind) upon each other.

The appearance of the augmented gnomic aorist is problematic within the Homeric verbal system. A preterit marked for past-time should be excluded from atemporal environments, which includes the gnomic period. Let us assume, then, that the augment is not so much a marker of past-time but a concomitant of aorist and imperfect, which signified actions in past-time. Once this critical association was made (i.e., an aorist [as well as an imperfect] takes the augment), then this rule applied mechanically to

the gnomic aorist. But if this mechanical relationship held, we would expect no instances of unaugmented preterits in Homer. We have, of course, many such instances, however. Consequently, the augment could not have been an automatic concomitant of the aorist and imperfect and the use of the augment in the gnomic aorist cannot be a mechanical result of such an automatic rule. Therefore, it must have some other basis. In fact, the gnomic aorist is likely to reflect a state of affairs far more archaic than that attested in the regular structures of the narrative. The facultative augment as postulated for preterits in the narrative would then be a later innovation (restricted to poetry) that disappeared prior to Classical Greek, where the obligatory co-occurrence of augment and preterit had already crystallized into a hard and fast rule.

That the augment makes a robust appearance in only one type of atemporal environment, the Homeric simile, while remaining virtually unattested in certain types of historical accounts that are clearly set in past-time (such as parental kinship), is only “curious” or “peculiar” if the augmented preterit reflects a constellation created when the augment was the marker of past-time. As we have discussed in Chapter 1, there has never been an overall consensus concerning a purely preterital augment in Homer. The augment as a past-time marker is essentially a feature of the classical language that has frequently been assumed to exist in the language of Homer. Bakker (1999) made a brief reference to gnomic aorists in Homer, pointing out that they are by nature descriptions of the everyday world. The flights of wasps and flies, the mists on a mountain, and the torrents of water from a rainstorm are more familiar to the contemporary of Homer than the descriptions of battles or the direct intervention of the gods in a person’s life. This augment, as argued by Bakker, tends to appear in statements that are associated with

deixis. In the examples he discussed, the augmented preterit signified an event that was either overtly deictic (i.e., this man [here] the gods gave us to slay) or covertly deictic (i.e., it designated a shared memory well known to the speakers).

We may resolve the paradox of the augmented gnomic aorist in an atemporal period by considering the thematic nature of the Homeric simile, that is, vividness. Vividness, as discussed in Chapter 2.1, is a form of deixis, since the theme of the statement is foremost in the speaker's mind. Similes do not express the actions of the gods or the deeds of heroes in battle, but rather are used to relate them to other, more immediate real-world events; for this reason such statements in Homer evince the highest degree of vividness, and this is the natural environment for the appearance of the augment that as a deictic marker essentially states *voilà!* "See this here!" The poet/composer uses the simile as a means of connecting his/her work of fiction to the mindset of the reader/listener. In each of the examples cited from Homer, the descriptions concerned the natural world: the prowling lion, horses under the yoke, a fire raging through a city. Other thematic motifs attested in Homeric similes are the mists on a mountain peak, the swarming of flies around the milk pail, and the swarms of angry wasps protecting their young. These descriptions are deictic in that they point to events that can be immediately called up in the consciousness of Homer's contemporaries. For this reason, Homeric similes license the appearance of a deictic augment. Given the highly vivid nature of the themes of the similes, the augmented aorist would be the expected form, and augmentless aorists would be exceptional. And this is precisely the state of affairs in Homer: all but a handful of gnomic aorists in the Homeric similes are augmented.⁵²

2.6 The Past-Iterative

The past-iterative, a preterit built with an *-sk-* suffix, is a productive category in the Homeric verbal system. This suffix, variously defined as signifying an iterative or durative action, is widely attested in the Indo-European family in a range of values. In Latin, it is used to build verbs signifying an inchoative action (ex., *ignēscō* ‘I kindle’ ← *ignis* ‘fire’), although this value is opaque in words of the more archaic stratum of the lexicon (e.g., *poscō* ‘I ask’ from **prk-skō*). In Hittite, the suffix is the productive marker of a class of verbs signifying iterative and/or durative actions: *pí-en-ni-iš-ki-iz-zi* ‘is driving’ ← *pí-en-na-a-i* ‘drives’, *ha-aš-ki-it* ‘kept having children.’ Elsewhere in Indo-European the suffix is not associated with a single semantic value: Gk. *erkhomai* ‘I come’, Ved. *rcchāti* ‘goes’ < **(H_i)r-sk-^e/_o*.⁵³

On a productive basis Homeric Greek retains only the preterit forms built with the *-sk-* suffix.⁵⁴ These preterits are built to the same root as other preterits: *ēen* < **e-H_is-ent* vs. *eskon* < **H_is-skō-nt* (: *eimi* ‘I am’); *enaion* vs. *naiiskon* (: *naiō* ‘I live, dwell in’); *ephere* vs. *phereske* (: *pherō* ‘I bear’). Some scholars, such as Sihler, describe the distribution of this verbal type in Homer as purely metrical and based upon the need for a particular metrical shape.⁵⁵ Monro (1891, p. 47), in contrast, describes this class of preterit as “. . . carrying distinctly the notion of repeated action;” the past-iterative was motivated by the sense of the action as being regular, continuative and (arguably) predictable in occurrence. Curiously, the *-sk-* is restricted to preterits. There are no examples in Homer of an iterative built to a verb taking primary endings. This suggests a

functional specialization, all the more significant when one considers that presents and imperfects are otherwise automatically built to the same stem.

More significant, however, is the virtual absence of augmented past-iteratives. Only a handful of such forms are attested in Homer and in the aggregate appear to constitute a class of exceptions to the rule. The data clearly point to this particular class of verbs as somehow resisting the augment. The explanation cannot merely lie in the fact that the past-iterative appears only in descriptions of actions that occur in past-time either from the perspective of the reader/listener or a character within the story (albeit the past-iterative is excluded from signifying a single occurrence of an action within a narrative sequence), since other types of preterits appear with the augment in this same environment. The starting point for any explanation for the absence of the augment in the past-iterative would lie in the respective natures of this class of verb and the augment. According to the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis, the Homeric augment is fundamentally deictic. It becomes necessary to determine whether the underlying natures of, respectively, the past-iterative and the Homeric augment are somehow incompatible.

This reduces to a question of verbal aspect, that is, how an action is visualized (i.e., continuative, inceptive, punctual). In our case we are concerned with distributive and imperfective actions as distinguished by the manner in which they visualize an event. Both are fundamentally continuative, signalling a series of individual “cells” linked together. However, while the imperfective expresses an action as a contiguous series of steps, the distributive signifies an action as a series of steps spread out over time and/or space. Consider the statements *Frank was walking the dog* and *Frank was wont to walk the dog*. The first, a progressive, expresses the factual occurrence of the action without

regard to its point of origin. In contrast, the second is a general statement about the subject; it does not indicate whether he was engaged in the said activity, but rather that it was one he performed from time to time with some degree of regularity. This contrast becomes more pronounced with spatial/temporal specifiers, not all of which stand in syntactic free variation. A prepositional phrase, such as *on Tuesday*, may modify both statements, though the temporal specifier *Tuesdays*, is generally restricted to expressions of a non-specific nature. One could not say **Frank was walking the dog Tuesdays*: regular temporality is signified by a synchronically plural adverb,⁵⁶ which implies multiple occurrences (the function of the distributive). In contrast, the phrase *on Tuesday* is ambiguous as to temporal plurality and may modify either statement. We may attribute this to a specification of a single point in time. In either case it specifies a particular day of the week for the occurrence of the event, whose precise interpretation – general or particular – is predicated upon the implication of the verbal action.

The distributive sense is evident in a sizeable fraction of all the past-iterative tokens in Homer, some 78 out of a total of 226 (approximately a third). These distributive/iterative types may be divided into two semantic rubrics - distributive and iterative - which express a non-contiguous series of repetitions of a specific action. They do not signify separate classes of verbal activities, as they share the common feature of repetition, but only differ with respect to how this feature is applied in the classification of a given action.

An iterative-distributive essentially expresses a set of repetitive actions in a single temporal reference frame which can be characteristic of a group (e.g., *each said to his neighbor*) or of an individual character (e.g., *all day long, as each enemy came forth, he*

would strike them down). In the latter case the actions are non-contiguous; that is, they recur at different points in time. During the battle in Book IV of the *Iliad*, Agamemnon goes among the battle lines, urging on the host:

Il.IV.231 *autar ho pezos eōn epepōleito stikhas andrōn.*
 kai hr' hous men speudontas idoi Danaōn takhupōlōn,
 tous mala tharsuneske paristamenos epeessin·
 . . . but [Agamemnon] himself ranged on foot through the ranks
 of warriors. And whichever of the Danaans with swift steeds
 he saw eager, to these he would draw nigh, and hearten them
 earnestly, saying:

The optative *idoi* signifies the action in a general sense, rather than any specific occurrence.⁵⁷ It is a type of conditional statement, providing a background for the occurrence of the following speech, introduced by *tharsuneske*. Together the past-iterative and the optative jointly describe a prototypical example of all occurrences of the action. This structural collocation appears in Agamemnon's rebuke of those hesitant to enter the battle:

Il.IV.240 *hous tinas au methientas idoi stugerou polemoio,*
 tous mala neikeieske kholōtoisin epeessin·
 And again whichever ones he saw holding back from hateful
 war, them would he chide roundly with angry words:

As in the previous example, the two verses describe essentially a conditional action, which stands as a counterpoint to the previous one. Both actions are linked together by a *men~au*-construction, the second particle expressing a contrasting action.⁵⁸ The two passages together form a narrative unit describing an entire series of actions performed by Agamemnon.

In book XVII of the *Iliad*, Automedon fights alone against the Trojan battle lines.

His action consists of a series of attacks:

II.XVII.459 *toisi d' ep' Automedōn makhet' akhnumenos per hetairou,*
hippois aïssōn hōs t' aigupios meta khēnas·
hrea men gar pheugesken hupek Trōōn orumagdou,
hreia d' epaïksaske polun kath' homilon opazōn.
And behind them fought Automedon, albeit he sorrowed for his
comrade [Patroclus], swooping with his car as a vulture on a
flock of geese, for lightly would he flee from out of the battle
din of the Trojans, and lightly charge, setting upon them
through the great throng.

The past-iteratives serve to elaborate upon the imperfect *makhet'*, which describes Automedon's action as continuative. His onslaught is a two-part continuous action of attack-and-withdraw, rather than a single event. This type of battle maneuver consists of several actions in discrete repetition: the charioteer swoops down upon the enemy, attacks, and then withdraws. The imperfect provides the broad framework of Automedon's role within the story, whereas the past-iteratives describe his repetitive actions within the overall structure.

The chaotic nature of a storm at sea is vividly described in Book v of the *Odyssey*. Odysseus, having sailed from the island of Ogygia, is caught upon the open sea by a storm raised by Poseidon in retribution for Odysseus' action of blinding his son Polyphemus (Od.ix.382-98):

Od.v.328 *hōs d' hot' opōrinōs Boreēs phoreēisin akanthas*
am pedion, pukinai de pros allēlēisin ekhontai,
hōs tēn am pelagos anemoi pheron entha kai entha·
allote men te Notos Boreēi probaleske pheresthai,

allote d' aut' Euros Zephurōi eiksaske diōkein.

As when in autumn the North Wind bears the thistle-tufts over the plain, and bunches hold close to one another, so did the winds bear the raft this way and that over the sea. Now the South Wind would fling it to the North Wind to be driven on, and now again the East Wind would yield it to the West Wind to drive.

As in the previous example, an imperfect provides a general description of a non-completive action: Odysseus borne by the waves. The subsequent verses elaborate upon the initial statement. Odysseus is flung back and forth between the waves, passed by the winds one to another. The adverbial *entha kai entha* ‘this way and that’ and serial *allote* signifying ‘at one time ... at another’ in a *men~de*-construction reinforce the implication of a series of similar, but disconnected actions. Essentially, the character is battered from every direction by the wind in a series of repetitive actions unleashed by Poseidon.

The iterative-distributive sense is evident in the following passages. In each example past-iteratives describe a single action which is repeated at a particular point in the story:

II.II.188 *hon tina men basilēa kai eksokhon andra kikheiē,
ton d' aganois epeessin erētusaske parastas·
Whomsoever [Odysseus] met that was chieftain or man of note,
to his side would he come and with gentle words seek to
restrain him, saying:*

II.II.198 *hon d' au dēmou t' andra idoi booōnta t' epheuroi,
ton skēptrōi elasasken homoklēsaske te muthōi·*

But whomsoever man of the people he saw, and found crying aloud, him would [Odysseus] smite with his staff, and chide with words, saying:

II.VIII.269 ... *epei ar tin' oïsteusas en homilōi
beblēkoi, ho men authi pesōn apo thumon olessen,
autar ho autis iōn païs hōs hupo mētera dusken
eis Aianth'· ho de min sakei kruptaske phaeinōi·
... and when he had shot his bolt and had smitten
one in the thong, then would that man fall where he
was and give up his life, and Teucer would hie him
back, and as a child beneath his mother, so betake
him for shelter to Ajax; and Ajax would ever hide
him with his shining shield.*

II.XI.62 *hoios d' ek nepheōn, anaphainetai oulios astēr
pamphainōn, tote d' autis edu nephea skioenta,
hōs Hektōr hote men te meta prōtoisi phanesken,
allote d' en pumatoisi keleuōn·
Even as from amid the clouds there gleameth a baneful star, all
glittering, and again it sinketh behind the shadowy clouds,
even so Hector would now appear amid the foremost and now
amid the hindmost giving them commands.*

II.XI.566 *Aias d' allote men mnēsasketo thouridos alkēs
autis hupostrephtheis, kai erētusaske phalaggas
Trōōn hippodamōn, hote de trōpasketo pheugein.
And Ajax would now be mindful of his furious valour, and
wheeling upon them would hold back the battalions of the
horse-taming Trojans, and now again he would turn himself to
flee.*

II.XVII.423 *hōs ara tis eipeske, menos d' orsasken hekastou.*

Thus would one speak and arouse the might of each.

II.XVIII.544 *hoi d' hopote strepsantes hikoiaata telson arourēs,*

toisi d' epeit' en khersi depas meliēdeos oinou

dosken anēr epiōn· toi de strepsaskon an' ogmous,

hiemenoi neioio batheiēs telson hikesthai.

And whensoever after turning they came to the headland of the field, then would a man come forth to each and give into his hands a cup of honey-sweet wine; and the ploughmen would turn [the oxen] into the furrows, eager to reach the headland of the deep fallow field.

II.XVIII.599 *hoi d' hote men threksaskon epistamenoisi podessi*

hreaia mal', hōs hote tis trokhon armenon en palamēisin

hezomenos kerameus peirēsetai, ai ke theēisin·

allote d' au threksaskon epi stikhas allēloisi.

Now would they run around with cunning feet exceedingly lightly, as when a potter sitteth by his wheel that is fitted between his hands and maketh trial of it whither it will run; and now again would they run in rows toward each other.

II.XXII.194 *hossaki d' hormēseie pulaōn Dardaniaōn*

antion aïksasthai eüdmētous hupo purgous,

ei pōs hoi kathuperthen alalkoien beleessi,

tossaki min proparoithen apostrepsaske paraphthas

pros pedion· autos de poti ptolios petet' aiei.

Oft as [Hector] strove to rush straight for the Dardanian gates to gain the shelter of the well-built walls, so that his fellows from above might succor him with missiles, so oft would Achilles get ahead of him and turn him back toward the plain, but himself sped on by the city walls.

Od.viii.87 *ē toi hote lēkseien aeidōn theios aoidos,
dakru omorksamenos kephalēs apo pharos heleske
kai depas amphikupellon helōn speiskaske theoisin·
autar hot’ aps arkhoito kai otruneian aeidein
Phaiēkōn hoi aristoi, epei terpont’ epeessin,
aps Oduseus kata krata kalupsamenos goaasken.
Yea, and as often as the divine minstrel ceased his singing,
Odysseus would draw the cloak from off his head, wiping away
his tears, and taking the two-handled cup would pour libations
to the gods. But as often as he began again, and the nobles of
the Phaeacians bade him sing, because they took pleasure in
his lay, Odysseus would again cover his head and moan.*

Od.viii.374 *tēn heteros hriptaske poti nephea skioenta
idnōtheis opisō, ho d’ apo khthonos hupsos’ aertheis
hrēidiōs metheleske, paros posin oudas hikesthai.
...the one would lean backward and toss [the ball] toward the
shadowy clouds, and the other would leap up from the earth
and skillfully catch it before his feet touched the ground again.*

Of special interest is the past-iterative of *eipon* ‘I spoke’. The imperfect of *phēmi* and the aorist *eipon* are both employed to introduce a speech by a single character. In book XIV of the *Iliad*, Hera responds to Sleep, whose aid she has requested in hindering Zeus’ intentions to assist the Trojans:

Il.XIV.263 *ton d’ aute proseeipe boōpis potnia Hērē·
To [Sleep] then spake again ox-eyed, queenly Hera:*

In contrast, the past-iterative of a verb of “speaking/saying” in the same environment always introduces a prototypical example of the speech of some unspecified “everyman”

representing all members of a group. It never introduces the speech of a single specific character:

II.VII.175 *hōs ephath', hoi de klēron esēmēnanto hekastos,
en d' ebalon kuneēi Agamemnonos Atreīdao·
laoi d' ērēsanto, theoisi de kheiras aneskhon.
hōde de tis eipesken idōn eis ouranon eurun·
“Zeu pater, ē Aianta lakhein, ē Tudeos huion,
ē auton basilēa polukhrusoio Mukēnēs.”*

So said he, and they marked each man his lot and cast them in the helmet of Agamemnon, son of Atreus; and the host made prayer, and lifted up their hands to the gods. And thus would one say with a glance up to broad heaven: “Father Zeus, grant that the lot fall on Ajax or the son of Tydeus or else on the king himself of Mycene rich in gold.”

II.XVII.420 *hōs de tis au Trōōn megathumōn audēsasken·*

*“ō philoi, ei kai moira par' aneri tōide damēnai
pantas homōs, mē pō tis erōeitō polemoio.”*

hōs ara tis eipeske, menos d' opasasken hekaston.

And thus in like manner would one of the great-hearted Trojans speak: “Friends, though it be our fate all together to be slain beside this man, yet let none give backward from the fight.”

Thus would one speak and arouse the might of each.

An action may be distributed over an extended period of time rather than restricted within the spatial domain. The repetitive occurrence of an action, such as *he would drink at the bar every day* or *thrice weekly she went to fetch a pail of water*, may be categorized as possessing a sequential regularity over a span of time. In Book xi of

the *Odyssey*, Odysseus describes to the king of the Phaeacians the eternal punishment of Sisyphus in the underworld:

Od.xi.595 *ē toi ho men skēriptomenos khersin te posin te
 laan anō ōtheske poti lophon· all' hote melloi
 akron huperbaleein, tot' apostrepsaske krataiis·
 autis epeita pedonde kulindeto laas anaidēs.
 autar ho g' aps ōsaske titainomenos, ...
 Verily [Sisyphus] would brace himself with hands and feet, and
 thrust the stone toward the crest of a hill, but as often as he
 was about to heave it over the top, the weight would turn it
 back, and then down again to the plain rolled the ruthless
 stone. But he would strain again and thrust it back. . .*

Sisyphus was given the task of rolling the stone by Zeus as punishment for his revelation of divine secrets to mortals. He could not complete the task of cresting the hill, for the stone would always roll back to its point of origin on the plain. It is a predictable event: Sisyphus *always* performs the same action of thrusting the stone up a hill (*anō ōtheske poti lophon*), only to have it roll backwards at the moment of success. This series of actions is repeated over an extended period of time, which in this case is eternity. Note the imperfect *kulindeto*, which signifies the inevitable failure of Sisyphus (i.e., the stone rolling back down to the plain). In Homer one finds imperfects and aorists (forms not built to the *-sk-* suffix) that signify actions of an iterative nature,⁵⁹ although (as discussed earlier) one does not find past-iteratives signifying a single action within a narrative sequence.

The weaving of the web by Penelope in the *Odyssey* describes an iterative action over temporally discrete intervals. Penelope promises to choose one of her suitors as her

new husband after she completes a burial shroud for Odysseus, whom everyone believes is dead. The shroud was never completed, for as Antinous points out to Telemachus, she would unravel during the night whatever weaving she completed during the day:

Od.ii.104 *“entha kai ēmatiē men huphainesken megan histon,
nuktas d’ alluesken, epei daïdas paratheito.”*
*“Then by day she would weave at the great web, but by night
would unravel it, when she had let torches be placed by her.”*

This deception continued on a daily basis for three years, until one of the female slaves betrayed her mistress to the suitors.

In Book XXII of the *Iliad*, Andromache laments the death of her husband Hector. She speaks with dread of the future of their son Astyanax, and she recollects the relationship between father and son:

Il.XXII.500 *Astuanaks, hos prin men heou epi gounasi patros
muelon oion edeske kai oiōn pionā dēmon·
autar hoth’ hupnos heloi, pausaito te nēpiakheuōn,
heudesk’ en lektroisin, en agkalidessi tithēnēs,
eunēi eni malakēi, thaleōn emplēsamenos kēr.
Astyanax, that aforesaid on his father’s knees ate [=was wont
to eat] only marrow and the rich fat of sheep; but when sleep
took hold of him, and he ceased from his childish play, he
would slumber in (his) couch in the arms of (his) nanny, in
(his) soft bed, his heart satisfied with good things.*

The actions to which Andromache refers occur over a period of time: Astyanax always sat on his father’s lap to eat, after which he would then go to sleep. The past-iterative is suited to exemplify the bond between father and child by stressing a defining action of their relationship. This parent-child motif, fundamentally expressing one of the bonds of

human relationship, appears in Phoenix's plea in the embassy in Book IX of the *Iliad*.

Phoenix hoped to convince Achilles to lay aside his anger and reenter the war:

II.IX.485 *kai se tosouton ethēka, theois epieikel' Akhilleu,
 ek thumou phileōn, epei ouk etheleskes ham' allōi
 out' es dait' ienai out' en megaroisi pasasthai,
 prin g' hote dē s' ep' emoisin egō gounessi kathissas
 opsou t' asaimi protamōn kai oinon episkhōn.
 And I reared thee to be such as thou art, o godlike Achilles,
 loving thee from my heart; for with none other wouldst thou go
 to the feast neither take meat in the hall, till I had set thee on
 my knees and given thee thy fill of the savory morsel cut first
 for thee, and had put the wine cup to thy lips.*

Phoenix shares a past memory with Achilles, by which he hopes to sway him. He speaks of how Achilles behaved towards him when he was still a child: a close loving bond, essentially that of a “father” and “son.” Similar to Andromache's description of Hector and Astyanax, it exemplifies the typical behavior exhibited by a boy during his childhood.

In Book VIII of the *Iliad*, Athena and Hera are greatly concerned as they see Hector routing the Achaeans. They speak bitterly among themselves: they wish that the Trojans would be stopped, although they know that Zeus will not allow that to happen prior to the fulfillment of his promise to Thetis. Athena, to whom the Achaeans are very dear, feels betrayed by Zeus, for many times in the past she had aided his son Heracles, whom the god greatly loved:

II.VIII.362 *“oude ti tōn memnētai, ho hoi mala pollakis huion
 teiromenon sōeskon hup' Eurusthēos aethlōn.”*

“neither hath [Zeus] any memory of this, that full often I saved his son [Heracles] when he was fordone by reason of Eurystheus’ tasks.”

Note how the adverbial phrase *mala pollakis* ‘full often’ reinforces the sense of a multiple occurrence of Athena’s assistance.

In each of the following examples, the past-iteratives describe the recurrence of an action over an extended period of time:

II.II.216 *... aiskhistos de anēr hupo Ilion ēlthe*
pholkos eēn, khōlos d’ heteron poda· tō de hoi omō
kurtō, epi stēthos sunokhōkote· autar huperthe
phoksos eēn kephalēn, psednē d’ epenēnothe lakhnē.
ekthistos d’ Akhilēi malist’ ēn ēd’ Odusēi·
tō gar neikeieske· tot’ aut’ Agamemnoni diōi
oksea keklēgōn leg’ oneidea.
Evil-favored was he beyond all men that came to Ilion: he was
bandylegged and lame in the one foot, and his tow shoulders
were rounded, stooping together over his chest, and above
them his head was warpen, and a scant stubble grew thereon.
Hateful was he to Achilles above all, and to Odysseus, for it
was they twain that he was wont to revile; but now again with
shrill cries he uttered abuse against goodly Agamemnon.

II.XV.23 *“... hon de laboimi*
hriptaskon tetagōn apo bēlou, ophr’ an hikētai
gēn oligēpeleōn.”
“Nay, whomever I caught, I would seize and hurl from the
threshold until he reached the earth, his strength all spent.”

II.XX.28 *“kai de ti min kai prosthen hupotromeeskon horōntes·*
nun d’ hote dē kai thumon hetairou khōetai ainōs,
deidō mē kai teikhos huper moron eksalapaksēi”

"Nay, even aforetime were they wont to tremble as they looked upon [Achilles], and now when verily his heart is grievously in wrath for his friend, I fear lest even beyond what is ordained he lay waste the wall."

II.XXIV.11

... tote d' orthos anastas

*dineuesk' aluōn para thin' halos, oude min ēōs
phainomenē lēthesken hupeir hala t' ēionas te,
all' ho g' epei zeukseien huph' harmasin ōkeas hippous,
Hektora d' helkesthai dēsasketo diphrou opisthen
tris d' erusas perisēma Menoitia dao thanontos
autis eni klisiēi pauesketo, ton de t' easken
en koni hektanusas proprēnea.*

...and then again he would rise upon his feet and roam distraught along the shore of the sea. Neither would he fail to mark the Dawn, as she shone over the sea and the sea-beaches, but would yoke beneath the car his swift horses, and bind Hector behind the chariot to drag him withal; and when he had haled him thrice about the barrow of the dead son of Menoetius, he would rest again in his hut, but would leave Hector outstretched on his face in the dust.

II.XXIV.391 *"ton men egō mala polla makhēi eni kudianeirēi*

*ophthalmoisin opōpa, kai eut' epi nēusin elassas
Argeious kteineske, daizōn oksei khalkōi."*

"Him have mine eyes full often seen in battle, where men win glory, and when after driving the Argives to the ships he would slay them in havoc with the sharp bronze"

II.XXIV.751 *"allous men gar paidas emous podas ōkus Akhilleus*

*pernaskh', hon tin' heleske, perēn halos atrugetoio,
es Samon es t' Imbron kai Lēmnon amikhthaloessan·*

*seu d' epei ekseleto psukhēn tanaēkei khalkōi,
 polla hrustazesken heou peri sēm' hetarioio,
 Patroklou, ton epephnes· anestēsen de min oud' hōs.*"

"For of other sons of mine whomsoever he took would swift-footed Achilles sell beyond the unresting sea, unto Samos and Imbros and Lemnos, shrouded in smoke, but, when from thee he had taken away thy life with the long-edged bronze, oft would he drag thee around the barrow of his comrade, Patroclus, whom thou didst slay; howbeit even so might he not raise him up."

Od.xiv.219 *"ou pote moi thanaton protiosseto thumos agēnōr,
 alla polu prōtistos epalmenos egkhei heleskon
 andrōn dusemeneōn ho te moi eikseie podessin."*

"Never did my proud spirit forbode death, but ever as the first did I leap forth, and slay with my spear whosoever of the foe gave way in flight before me."

In the following passages the past-iteratives express repetitive actions and thereby serve to provide background information for the story:

II.IX.451 *"... hē d' aien eme lissesketō gounōn
 pallakidi promigēnai, hin' ekthēreie geronta."*

"So [my mother] besought me by my knees continually, to have dalliance with [the concubine] myself, that the old man might be hateful in her eyes."

II.XVII.408 *"pollaki gar to ge mētros epeutheto nosphin akouōn,
 hē hoi apaggelleske Dios megalōio noēma."*

"..., for full often had he heard this from his mother, listening to her privily, whenever she brought him tidings of the purpose of great Zeus."

II.XXII.153 *entha d' ep' autaōn plunoi eurees eggus easi*

*kaloi laïneoi, hothi heimata sigaloenta
pluneskon Trōōn alokhoi kalai te thugatres
to prin ep' eirēnēs ...*

*And these hard by the selfsame springs are broad washing-
tanks, fair and wrought of stone, where the wives and fair
daughters of the Trojans were wont to wash bright raiments of
old in the time of peace.*

II.XXIV.453 *... thurēn d' ekhe mounos epiblēs
eidatinos, ton treis men epirrēsseskon Akhaioi,
treis d' anaoigeskon megalēn klēida thuraōn,
tōn allōn· Akhileus d' ar' epirrēsseske kai oios·
...and the door thereof was held by one single bar of fir that
three Achaeans were wont to drive home, and three to draw
back the great bolt of the door (three of the rest), but Achilles
could drive it home even of himself.*

Od.iii.405 *ōrnut' ar' eks eunēphi Gerēnios hippota Nestōr,
ek d' elthōn kat' ar' hezet' epi ksestoisi lithoisin,
hoi ho esan proparoithe thuaōn hupsēlaōn
leukoi, apostilbontes aleiphatos· hois epi men prin
Nēleus hizesken, theophin mēstōr atalantos·
... up from his bed rose the horseman, Nestor of Gerenia, and
went forth and sat down on the polished stones which were
before his lofty doors, white and glistening with oil. On these
of old was wont to sit Neleus, counselor equal to the gods.*

Od.xviii.1 *ēlthe d' epi ptōkhos pandēmios, hos kata astu
ptōkheuesk' Ithakēs ...
Now there came up a public beggar who was wont to beg
through the town of Ithaca.*

Od.xxii.312 *“gounoumai s', Oduseu· su de m' aideo kai m' eleēson·*

*ou gar pō tina phēmi gunaikōn en megaroisin
eipein oude ti hreksai atasthalon· alla kai allous
paueskon mnēstēras” ...*

“By thy knees I [Leiodes] beseech thee, Odysseus, and do thou respect me and have pity. For I declare that never yet have I wronged one of the women in thy halls by wanton word or deed; nay I sought to check the other wooers, [whenever they would do such actions.]”

One also finds past-iteratives that signify an action that is habitual in nature, representing essentially a defining characteristic of some facet of one’s daily existence. In Book vii of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus enters the house of Alcinous, king of the Phaeacians. Invisible to all present because of the mist cast by Athena, Odysseus looks upon the revelry at the feast table:

Od.vii.136 *heure de Phaiēkōn hēgētōras ēde medontas
spendontas depaessin euskopōi argeiphontēi,
hōi pumatōi spendeskon, hote mnēsaiato koitou.
There [Odysseus] found the leaders and counselors of the
Phaeacians pouring libations with their cups to the keen-
sighted Argeiphontes, to whom they were wont to pour the wine
last of all, when they were minded to go to their rest.*

The last act of the feast is the honoring of the gods by libations. The second of these lines names the god who receives the final libation as a normal matter of course. It is an action that is expected of those partaking in a feast. The *hote*-clause, an optative of potential action, states the condition under which the action occurs; hence, the past-iterative *spendeskon* refers to a multiple and predictable occurrence of the pouring of libations.

The following are further examples in which the past-iterative signifies the habitual occurrence of an action:

- Od.x.107 *hē men ar' es krēnēn katebēseto kallireethron*
Artakiēn· enthen gar hudōr proti astu phoreskon.
[Antiphantes], who had come down to the fair-flowing spring
Artacia, whence they were wont to bear water to the town.
- Od.xi.585 *hossaki gar kupsei' ho gerōn pieein meneainōn,*
tossakh' hudōr apolesket' anabrokhen, amphi de possi
gaia melaina phaneske, katazēnaske de daimōn.
... for as often as that old man [Tantalus] stooped down, eager
to drink, so often would the water be swallowed up and vanish
away, and at his feet the black earth would appear, for some
god made all dry.
- Od.xi.591 *tōn hopot' ithusei' ho gerōn epi kheresi masasthai,*
tas d' anemos hriptaske poti nephea skioenta.
But as often as that old man [Tantalus] would reach out
toward these, to clutch them with with hands, the wind would
toss them to the shadowy clouds.
- Od.xvii.419 “*kai gar egō pote oikon en anthrōpoisin enaion*
olbios aphneion kai pollaki⁶⁰ doskon alētēi,
toiōi hopoios eoi kai hoteu kekhrēmenos elthoi·”
“For I [Odysseus] too once dwelt in a house of my own among
men, a rich man in a wealthy house, and full often I gave gifts
to a wanderer, whosoever he was and with whatsoever need he
came.”
- Od.xviii.6 *... Iron de neoi kiklēskon hapantes,*
hounek' apaggelleske kiōn, hote pou tis anōgoi·

... *but Irus all the young men called him, because he used to run on errands when anyone bade him.*

The question of past-iteratives standing in isolation can now be addressed in a satisfactory manner. Traditionally, they have been translated as signifying the occurrence of a single event. This interpretation assumes the past-iterative to be equivalent to other preterits, such as the imperfect. As we have seen in the previous discussion, however, the non-unitary nature of an action can in many cases be inferred from the background information supplied by the past-iterative. The extension of this to isolated occurrences of the past-iterative eliminates the need to assume that a particular verbal category is employed outside of its functional domain. In these cases the true nature of the past-iterative is essentially “covert.”

There are instances, however, in which past-iteratives appear to be isofunctional with other preterit types. This “interchange” offers the poet a powerful tool in metrical composition whenever the selection of one type or the other would not significantly impact the narrative structure. An object, such as a warrior’s panoply (in the first example cited below), may be described as either *the armour he was wearing at that time* or *the armour he was wont to wear*, respectively, a concurrent description or a general characterization:

II.XIII.371 ... *oud’ ērkese thōrēks*
khalkeos, hon phoreeske, mesēi d’ en gasteri pēkse.
..., nor did the corselet of bronze that he wore [= was wont to wear] avail him, but the spear was fixed full in his belly.

II.XIII.406 ... *krupthē gar hup’ aspidi pantos’ eisēi,*
tēn ar’ ho ge hrinoisi boōn kai nōropi khalkōi
dinōtēn phoreeske, duō kanoness’ araruian·

... for he [Idomeneus] hid beneath the cover of his shield that was well-balanced upon every side, which he was wont to bear, cunningly wrought with bull's hide and gleaming bronze, and fitted with two rods.

II.XXI.30 *dēse d' opissō kheiras eütmētoisin himasi,*
tous autoi phoreeskon epi streptoisi khitōsi
 ... and [Achilles] bound their hands behind [the twelve Trojan youths] with shapely thongs, which they themselves wore [= were wont to wear] about their pliant tunics.

Od.xxii.185 *Laerteō ērōos, ho kourizōn phoreeske-*
dē tote g' ēdē keito, hraphai d' elelunto himantōn-
 ... [the shield] of Laertes the hero, which he was wont to bear in his youth, but now it was laid by, and the seams of the straps were loosened.

Of these examples, the clearest instance of a distributive/iterative sense is provided by *phoreeske* (Od.xxii.185). Laertes, the father of Odysseus, is at the time of the *Odyssey* too old to bear arms. Syntactically, the subordinate clause, within which *phoreeske* stands, contrasts with the clause *dē tote g' ēdē keito*, a description of the present state of the shield; hence, both statements serve as a description of the shield at certain points in time, respectively, past and present relative to the narrative.

One can argue that the past-iteratives of *phoreō* above are, as Sihler (1995, p. 506) writes, "... a freely productive type used opportunistically," although the last example (Od.xxii.185-6) clearly points to an action of a habitual nature.⁶¹ Moreover, in all of the above examples past-iteratives appear in subordinate clauses; they serve to provide additional information rather than to express actions within the main narrative.

This function of describing background information, such as qualities and tendencies of a character or object within the story, is further illustrated by the following passages, in all of which the past-iteratives appear in subordinate clauses:

Il.XV.638 ... , *ho d' oion epephne Mukēnaion Periphētēn,*
Koprēos philon huion, hos Eurusthēos anaktos
aggeliēs oikhneske biēi Hēraklēiēi.
albeit Hector slew only one man, Periphetes of Mycenae, the
dear son of Copreus, that had been wont to go on messages
from king Eurystheus to the mighty Heracles.

Il.XXIV.471 ... *gerōn d' ithus kien oikou,*
tēi hr' Akhileus hizeske diiphilos·
... but the old man [Priam] went straight toward the house
where Achilles, dear to Zeus, was wont to sit.

Od.xvii.210 ... *bōmos d' ephuperthe tetukto*
numphaōn, hothi pantes epirrezeskon hoditai·
... and on the top was built an altar to the nymphs where all
passers-by made offerings.

Od.xxii.208 “*Mentor, amunon arēn, mnēsai d' hetarioio philoio,*
hos s' agatha hrezeskon·”
“*Mentor, ward off ruin, and remember me, thy dear comrade,*
who often befriended thee [= was wont to do good by you].”

Od.xxii.357 “*kai kēruka Medonta saōsomen, hos te meu aiei*
oikōi en hēmeterōi kēdesketo paidos eontos”
“*Aye, and let us save also the herald, Medon, who ever cared*
for me in our house, when I was a child.”

There is, however, some support for the thesis of metrical convenience (as claimed by Sihler, *op. cit.*). A few past-iteratives appear to stand in free-variation with the imperfect. These examples are limited to specific verbs, such as *eimi* ‘be’, *naiō* and *naietaō* ‘live, dwell, settle (in).’ In the following passages such verbs express actions that appear to be continuative rather than distributive or iterative:

Il.XI.672 “... *hot’ egō ktanon Itumonēa,*
esthlon Hupeirokhidēn, hos en Ēlidi naietaaske”
“...when I slew Itymoneus, the valiant son of Hypeirochus, a
man that dwelt in Elis.”

Il.XVI.717 “*Āsiōi, hos mētrōs ēn Hektoros hippodamoio,*
autokasignētos Hekabēs, huios de Dumantos,
hos Phrugīēi naieske hroēis epi Saggarioio.”
“...[even of] Asius, that was uncle to horse-taming Hector,
brother to Hecabe, a son of Dymas, that dwelt in Phrygia by
the streams of Sangarius.”

Od.iv.269 “*all’ ou pō toiouton egōn idon ophthalmoisin,*
hoion Odussēos talasiphronos eske philon kēr.”
“...but never yet have I beheld with my eyes such a one as
was Odysseus of the steadfast mind.”

The difficulty with *eske* in the description of Odysseus may lie in a rather free translation by Murray of a literal *such as was wont to be the dear heart of steadfast Odysseus*. This form may therefore not possess a value antithetical to the basic sense of the past-iterative.⁶²

It is not so easy to account for the ‘dwell’ verbs,⁶³ however. *naietaaske* and *naieske* are statements of a characters’ home. A frequentative would be more appropriate

for a description of nomadic tribes, for whom there is no one particular location but who migrate from place to place. Under such conditions, one could speak felicitously of “being wont to dwell” here or there, depending on the time of year, etc.: *In the summer the tribe was wont to dwell in the north, but in the winter they would go south.* The functional equivalence of past-iterative and imperfect in some passages may be explained by the inherent semantics of these respective verbal categories, each of which allows for a type of iterativity. The distinction between the types lies in the structure of “iterativity.” The imperfect may be thought of as a series of “cells” contiguously linked, while the past-iterative consists of “cells” linked in a non-contiguous structure, in essence expressing the action or state as a series of discrete repetitions. Thus, *The man lived in Rome* indicates an ongoing state whereas *The man was wont to live in Rome* would be felicitously employed only if the man in question frequently traveled but returned to Rome regularly as a base of operations during separate stretches of time.

The past-iterative in the language of Homer is fundamentally distributive/iterative; the verbal type expresses a multiplicity of occurrences. One may now understand the extreme paucity of augmented past-iteratives in Homer as a product of the system of grammar. A deictic augment, a type of focus particle, is incompatible with a signifier of distributiveness: focus and non-focus (or diffuseness) cannot easily be expressed at the same time. Recall that the majority of the passages cited above express qualities, characteristics and tendencies, which are for the most part descriptions and not actual events; or if they are actual events, they are non-focal (distributed in the spatial and/or temporal domains). A deictic marker would therefore signify information which stands contrary to the inherent specification of the past-iterative. Nor may one consider

the *-sk-* suffix in Homer to be a marker of past-time, since the suffix is attested throughout Indo-European as a present tense formant; that is, a marker of imperfective aspect associated with both present and past tenses. Most significantly, in Hittite the suffix marked verbs signifying actions of a distributive nature, a functional domain totally compatible with that of the past-iterative in Homer.⁶⁴

2.7 *tiktō*-preterits

The preterits of the verb *tiktō* have a unique character within Homer: they regularly lack the augment. Voice and tense-aspect stem, moreover, factor into a functional distribution according to the gender of the verbal subject, to a degree. *tiktō* is a thematic reduplicated present with zero-grade of the root (PIE **ti-tk-e-* > *tikte-*); the root PIE **tek-* ‘bring forth’ is aoristic (as seen in Gr. *etekon* ‘I brought forth’⁶⁵).

The question that concerns us here is the reason for the almost complete absence of augmented preterits of *tiktō*.⁶⁶ A restriction to statements of events that are nonvivid (i.e. neither recent nor actional) would predict a low degree of occurrence of the augment, according to the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis. For this reason we must examine these preterits with regard to their functional role in Homer.

tiktō has several meanings, among them, ‘bring forth,’ ‘give birth to,’ as well as ‘beget’ (i.e., as father). One of the uses of this verb is to express lineage and parental relationship, for which there is a correlation between the gender of the subject and the syntacto-semantic structure of the verb. Generally speaking, a male subject is associated with the active imperfect or the medio-passive aorist, whereas the active voice in the

orist is specialized for a female subject. This distribution of the *tiktō*-preterit according to gender is understandable in light of verbal aspect. The orist with its perfective aspect can signify a simple, non-progressive action, such as the act of giving birth:

- Il.I.36 ... *ton ēukomos teke Lētō*
 ... [*Apollo*] *whom fair-tressed Leto bore*
- Il.VI.345 “... *hote me prōton teke mētēr*”
 “... *when first my mother begat me*”
 (Helen to Hector)
- Il.XXII.353 “... *hon teken autē*”
 “... *whom she herself bore*”
 (Achilles to Hector)
- Od.xi.254 “*hē d’ hupokusamenē Peliēn teke kai Nēlēa,*”
 “*But she [Tyro] conceived and bore Pelias and Neleus*”
 (Odysseus to the Phaeacians)
- Od.xii.125 “... *hē min teke pēma brotoisin*”
 “... [*Krataiis*], *who bore [Scylla] as a bane to mortals*”
 (Odysseus to the Phaeacians)
- Od.xv.364 “... *tēn hoplotatēn teke paidōn*”
 “... [*Ctimene*] *whom she bore as her youngest child*”
 (Eumaeus to Odysseus)

The state of “being one’s parent” is, in contrast, a description of a kinship relationship over an extended period of time, and therefore falls within the functional scope of the imperfect. This stands in contrast to the previous examples which, because

of their female subjects, signal the act of “giving birth.” In general, the imperfect is employed in declarations of male lineage.

Il.II.628 ... *hon tikte diiphilos hippota Puleus,*
 ... [*Meges*] *whom the horseman Pyleus, dear to Zeus, begat*

Il.XXI.188 “*tikte m’ anēr polloisin anassōn Murmidonessi,*”
 “*The father that begat me is one that is lord among*
 the many Myrmidons”
 (Achilles to Asteropaeus)

Od.xix.181 “*Deukaliōn d’ eme tikte kai Idomenēa anakta*”
 “*Now Deucalion begat me and prince Idomeneus*”
 (Odysseus to Penelope)

The description of a character’s father in either speech or narrative is not restricted to the imperfect, however. Aorists in the medio-passive, in this verb functionally equivalent to the imperfect in the active voice, provide an alternative means of expression when warranted by the available metrical space. The subject of the statement is either the father or both parents of a character:⁶⁷

Il.I.741 ... *ton athanatos teketo Zeus*
 ... [*Polypoetes*] *whom immortal Zeus begat*

Il.IV.59 “*kai me presbutatēn teketo Kronos agkulomētēs,*”
 “*... and crooked-counseling Cronos begat me as the eldest of*
 his daughters”
 (Hera to Zeus)

Il.V.154 *huion d’ ou teket’ allon epi kteatessi lipesthai.*

... and begat no other son to leave in charge of his possessions.

Il.XX.230 “*Trōa d’ Erikhthonios teketo Trōessin anakta*”
 “*And Erichthonius begat Tros to be king among the Trojans*”
 (Aeneas to Achilles)

Od.xv.249 *Mantios au teketo Polupheidea te Kleiton te*
And Mantius for his part begat Polyphoides and Cleitus

Od.xxiii.61 “... *ton tekomestha*”
 “... [*Telemachus*] whom we [*Penelope and Odysseus*] begat”
 (Penelope to Eurycleia)

These distributional patterns cannot be ascribed to an element of the underlying sememic structure of the verb. The basic meaning of *tiktō* is “I produce forth,” which is supported by the variant senses attested in the text, among them, ‘bear forth,’ ‘beget’ and ‘produce.’ Although these senses are themselves inherently perfective, verbal aspect as such is not encoded within the sememic structure of the verb; rather, it is marked by the aspect-stem, which indicates how an action is conceived. A verb which is incompatible with a particular aspect may be defective, and the paradigmatic lacunas filled via suppletion with other verbs of related meaning. In the case of the root of *tiktō*, however, there is no de facto limitation to any verbal aspect, despite its perfective meaning. Thus, both the reduplicated present stem *tikte-* and aorist stem *(e)teke-* occur. One may account for the employment of the aorist tense-stem to express the act of giving birth to a child, which by its nature is a simple action with no internal constituency; for this reason the act of giving birth is restricted to the perfective aspect. In contrast, the kinship role of a

parent defines a relationship between parent and child and has the qualities of continuance and permanence, remaining even after the death of the parent and child. One may refer to parental kinship as a continuing state or as a defining quality between two individuals. For this reason, then, one may describe this role by either verbal aspect. Furthermore, the occurrence of the middle voice with male subjects in this instance would reinforce the more covert relationship of the male progenitor to the process.

This ternary distribution does not provide an exhaustive account of the entire compass of *tiktō*-preterits, but describes its most frequent usage. In statements of kinship expressed either by a mediopassive aorist or by an active imperfect, the subject is occasionally a female instead of a male:

II.II.742 *ton hr' hupo Peirithoōi teketo klutos Hippodameia*
 whom glorious Hippodameia conceived to Peirithous

II.XV.187 “... *hous teketo Rhea,*”
 “... *whom Rhea bore*”
 (Poseidon to Iris)

II.XVI.180 ... *ton tikte khorōi kalē Polumēlē,*
 ... *and him did Polymele, fair in the dance, bear*

Exceptions to the general rules are rare. Only four examples of a mediopassive aorist with a female subject are attested in Homer (including II.II.742 and XV.187 cited above); otherwise, the subject is a character's father. Active imperfects with female subjects comprise a small percentage of the total. This state of affairs points to a thematic formalism governing the application of *tiktō* within the narrative environment. A mother can be signified by the aoristic act of giving birth, while the kinship of parent and child

huion d' ou teket' allon epi kteatessi lipesthai.

... and their father was fordone with grievous old age, and [he] begat no other son to leave in charge of his possessions.

- Il.VI.344 “*daer emeio kunos kakomēkhanou okruoessēs,
hōs m' ophel' ēmati tōi hote me prōton teke mētēr*”
*“O brother-in-law of me that am a dog, a contriver of mischief
and abhorred by all, would that on that day when my mother
first gave me birth ...”*
 (Helen to Hector)

- Il.XIV.317 “*oud' hopot' ērasamēn Iksioniēs alokhoio,
hē teke Peirithoon, theophin mēstōr' atalanton*”
*“Nay, not when I was seized with love of the wife of Ixion, who
bore Peirithous, the peer of the gods in counsel”*
 (Zeus to Hera)

- Od.xv.363 “*houneka m' autē threpsen hama Ktimenēi tanupeplōi
thugater' iphthimēi, tēn hoplotatēn teke paidōn*”
*“... for she herself had brought me up with long-robed
Ctimene, her noble daughter, whom she bore as the youngest of
her children.”*
 (Eumaeus to Odysseus)

There are some twenty preterits of *tiktō* whose augmentation is questionable. These include *eteken* (Il.II.728), *etikte* (Il.V.547) and *eteken* (Od.xi.307); these may reflect the emendations of diaskeuasts who elected to modernize the text by inclusion of the augment wherever feasible. In other instances, such as *etek'* (Il.VI.199) and *etekh'* (Od.ii.131), unaugmented variants would have possessed a single mora, which is rare in Homer outside of clitics and function words. That the aorist *etebes* (Il.I.352) is text-

original is verified by a consideration of the metrical structure of the verse. If an unaugmented variant were to replace the augmented aorist cited in modern editions, the following structure would result:

Il.I.352 “/₁mēter, e/₂pei me te/₃kes ge mi/₄nunthadi/₅on per e/₆onta.”
 “Mother, seeing thou didst bear me, though to so brief a span
 of life”
 (Achilles to Thetis)

Each metron is demarcated by a vertical bar. The first and second metrons are trochaically divided: *me* ‘me’ (second metron) is an enclitic, thereby leaning on the preceding syllable *pei* and forming with it a word cluster of longum~breve (a trochee). Such a configuration of the initial two metrons of the first hemistich is unacceptable in the idiom of dactylic hexameter composition.⁶⁹ It is therefore reasonable to accept the *etekes* posited in modern editions as original to the text.

The question arises as to the justification for the appearance of the augmented aorist in the passage just noted. That the event is not of recent occurrence is obvious; Achilles is in his prime, probably in his late 20’s, thereby placing his birth some two to three decades prior to his meeting with his mother. The context of the scene, however, provides a solution. Achilles, greatly insulted by Agamemnon’s seizure of Briseis, has removed himself from his men lest they see him weep in grief. This grief, in turn, triggers a rage in Achilles, who asks his mother to intercede with Zeus on his behalf to punish both Agamemnon and the host (who did nothing to hinder the insult). This intensity underlying the scene has its roots in the fate of Achilles, to whom a short span of life has been appointed (*minunthadion per eonta* [Il.I.352]) and for whom there should be (from his point of view) great honor. The seizure of Briseis deprives a benefit of life from one

for whom death is not far off. In this context, the specification of Achilles' birth serves to reinforce the short span of life apportioned to him. The purpose of the statement, in conjunction with the remainder of the speech (Il.I.354-6), is to sway Thetis to intercede on her son's behalf. In a similar manner, the emphatic statement of birth serves to underscore the intensity of the emotional state of Priam after learning of the death of his son Hector. In his speech in *Iliad* XXII, Priam laments over his lost sons, all of whom were slain by Achilles. The constellation of augmented preterits serves to emphasize the youth of Achilles. It is a reinforcement of the belief in the Achaean's role as harbinger of destruction:

Il.XXII.421 *“Pēleus, hos min etikte kai etrephe pēma genesthai*

Trōsi.”

*“... even Peleus, that begat him [Achilles] and reared him to
be a bane to the Trojans”*

The augmented preterits of *tiktō* in the speeches of Achilles and Priam exhibit a special relationship to the experiences of the respective speaker.⁷⁰ Achilles mentions his birth because of the promise made to him of what was essentially a trade-off (long-lasting fame in exchange for a short life), which he hoped would convince his mother to intercede on his behalf to Zeus. Priam speaks of Achilles' birth as the origin of a curse, for it is that individual who has essentially decimated all his noble and fine sons, the dearest of whom was Hector. These are two examples in which the statement of birth implies something of special importance with respect to the present moment. The speaker in each case focuses on a fact that directly impacts his own welfare; he highlights the importance of an event rather than its occurrence. In this regard, then, the speakers are essentially “pointing out” something, no less than does Achilles in Il.XXII.379 *epei dē tond' andra theoi*

damasasthai edōkan ‘seeing the gods have vouchsafed us to slay this man [Hector]’, the bane of the Achaeans.

CHAPTER 3

DISCUSSION

3.1 Introduction

In this section of the dissertation, we will discuss in several contexts the analysis of Chapter 2. First, the verbal systems of Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek will be compared. It is my intention to show that the injunctive mood and temporal augment attested in Vedic Sanskrit (as clearly demonstrated by Hoffmann) do not exist in Homeric Greek. While some Homeric preterits are analogous to the Vedic injunctive, they comprise a small minority of the total number of preterits in Homer. The syntactic complementary distribution with respect to time that characterizes the opposition of preterit and injunctive in the Rigveda is simply unattested in Homeric Greek.

Second, I will show that the Homeric augment is best characterized as a deictic particle. The majority of the data, as analysed in Chapter 2, cannot be adequately accounted for via the generally accepted thesis of the temporal augment. The appearance of the augment is governed by factors outside of the temporal sphere, among them vividness, intensity, spatial reference, and temporal recency.

Third, I will discuss the augment within its Indo-European context. I will make a case for the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis, which points to the original particle that became the augment (and which I call the proto-augment) as aboriginal to Proto-Indo-European. This conception of the augment offers several etymological advantages, as well as a

scenario for the appearance of the augment per se in languages geographically situated in the S.E. region of Indo-European. I will further propose a model that accounts for the development of the proto-augment from a deictic to a temporal particle and the concomitant changes in the verbal system which this necessitated.

I will round out this dissertation with a conclusion that incorporates a summary of the entire work as well as a few ancillary comments containing some proposed avenues for future research.

3.2 The Verbal System of Vedic Sanskrit: A Comparison with Homeric Greek

In this chapter we will discuss in greater detail the work of Hoffmann (1967) and furthermore show that a Vedic-like injunctive is only marginally attested in the verbal system of Homeric Greek. In Chapter 1 we offered a brief overview of Hoffmann's investigations into the verbal system of Vedic Sanskrit. The focus of his work is the status of the augment, which prior Indo-European scholarship had believed to be purely facultative; augmented and unaugmented preterits appeared to exist in free-variation, and hence the appearance of the Vedic augment was thought to be governed by the needs of the meter. However, as Hoffmann's investigations proved, unaugmented preterits in Vedic Sanskrit are essentially restricted to atemporal environments. An exception to this is comprised of instances of what Kiparsky (1969) terms *conjunction-reduction*, in which the overt appearance of a marker of past-time on the first of a sequence of preterits eliminates the need for further marking of tense (cf. Chapter 1).

The question that Hoffmann addressed in his investigation was the true nature of the Vedic injunctive. Associated with this question is the nature of the augment, since the injunctive is formally an unaugmented preterit. Hoffmann's approach was predicated upon the relationship of the verbal system to the narrative environment. One might assume that preterits marked for past-time would normally be excluded from atemporal environments; augmented and augmentless preterits would therefore occur in a functional complementary distribution. Exceptions to this might exist, although they should be sparsely attested and represent archaic relics.

By some accounts, augmentless preterits are inherited from PIE and represent a category usually termed the injunctive. According to Brugmann (1880), the injunctive represented a particular grammatical category of the verb that appeared, in part, to function in the role of the subjunctive, yet was not itself formally a subjunctive. Brugmann thought that this category was originally limited to non-indicative use. Despite his subsequent inclusion of augmentless preterits in the indicative mood within the functional scope of the injunctive, later scholars, such as Hahn (1953) and Gonda (1956) reserve the term injunctive for unaugmented preterits functioning as modals. However, we now know, following an extensive study of the injunctive in Vedic Sanskrit by Hoffmann (1967), that in this language the interchangeability of injunctive and subjunctive is highly restricted and applies only to those constructions where the subjunctive functions as a future; the vast majority of injunctives are attested in non-modal value. Furthermore, the injunctive is a mood in its own right, as it is built to the same tense-aspect stems attested for the other moods. (One does not find, for example, an injunctive-indicative, injunctive-optative, or injunctive-subjunctive.) Hoffmann posits

five moods within the verbal system of Vedic Sanskrit: indicative, subjunctive, optative, imperative, and injunctive. The last of these, marked only for verbal aspect and person/number/voice together with secondary endings, is treated as a primitive base onto which the other moods were built (Hoffmann *ibid.*, p. 35) and therefore traces its origins back into the oldest layer of Indo-European. Just as significant is the restriction of the injunctive to statements and declarations that are essentially atemporal. According to the results of Hoffmann's investigation, the injunctive is not interchangeable with the preterit; the former is not used to signify an action that occurred in the past, and likewise the preterit that is overtly marked for past-time does not stand in atemporal declarations. Injunctives and preterits thus exist in a syntactic complementary distribution. Furthermore, the augment only appears in association with secondary endings. There are no instances in Vedic Sanskrit of the augment prefixed to verbs that take the primary endings (cf. Chapter 1). This strongly suggests that the augment in Vedic Sanskrit is a temporal marker.

The Vedic injunctives may be classified, for purposes of discussion, into two categories. The first is that of the prohibitive, which differs from the imperative as to the scope of its application. An imperative is a command, either affirmative ("Take care of the house!") or negative ("Don't go into the water!") There is no perception on the part of either the speaker or the hearer(s) of the action taking place at any time (although from a pragmatic standpoint, past time would not be referenced). Rather, the notion is one of command, that the speaker is ordering someone else to do or not to do some action. In contrast, underlying the prohibitive is the sense on the part of the speaker that some action *is* occurring, whether or not this actually is so. For example, a guard orders a

prisoner to halt. Perhaps there is no escape underway, but the guard believes there to be one. Likewise, one may say to a friend who has just heard some bad news, “Don’t cry”, believing that the other person will break into tears. Sanskrit employs only the injunctive in prohibitive clauses; other moods, such as the subjunctive, are attested in such clauses only in the later tradition. The particular stem form of injunctive that is used, either present (imperfective aspect) or aorist (perfective aspect), is a function of the type of prohibitive being expressed. One may distinguish three basic types of prohibitive within Sanskrit:

- preventive - expected action: “Don’t get all bent out of shape!” said to one who is about to be presented with disagreeable news.
- inhibitive - concurrent action: “Do not run any further!” shouted to an escaping prisoner.
- corrective - completed, but possibly recurring future action: “Don’t say that, please” uttered to some interlocutor.

The preventive, referring to an action which the speaker perceives will occur, was expressed by the injunctive aorist, as the aorist was punctual in verbal aspect and could therefore not refer to an ongoing event or state. Cf. RV. X 108, 9: “I want to make you my sister. Don’t go back (*mā́ púnar gāḥ*).” Here the verb *gāḥ*, 2Sg. Inj. Aor., expresses the speaker’s expectation that the addressee is going to depart.

On the other hand, inhibitives and correctives were expressed by the injunctive present, the latter because it refers to a (possibly) recurring action such as in JB. II 395: *mā na evaṃ bravīḥ* ‘Don’t speak to us that way’. The injunctive aorist could, however, be used in the corrective, if the speaker expected an action to be habitual and wanted to

refer to a specific instance of the action. An example of this is seen in ŚB. XIV 5, 1, 2ff: *mā maitásmin sám vadiṣṭhāḥ* (Inj. Aor.) ‘Don’t speak to me about it’.⁷¹

An inhibitive could only be expressed, however, by an injunctive present, given that the action was concurrent and thereby durative. Only the imperfective aspect could be used to express this type of action, such as when one tells a friend (who has been drinking for several hours) “Don’t drink any more!” An example of the inhibitive from Sanskrit is seen in VS. XXIII 25: *bráhman mā tvám vado bahú* ‘Brahmin, don’t you say so much’ (i.e. ‘Hey, Brahmin, shut up!’).

One also finds a robust appearance of the injunctive in non-prohibitive clauses. These can be divided into several subcategories, of which three in particular will be recognized here. First, the injunctive was used to express general circumstances, tending to characterize the subject without specifying any particular action. We may say “John drinks” in order to describe a trait of John, something he does on a regular basis. One could, for example, describe the characteristics of a god, by saying “Indra gives us gifts beyond comparison” referring to his eternal generosity which he bestows on his devotees. Consider the following Rigvedic examples:

I 67, 9a *ví yó vīrútsu ródhan mahitvā*
‘who with his might grows among the plants’

IX 22, 7a,b *tvám soma paṇibhya ā*
vásu gávyāni dhārayaḥ
‘You, Soma, do withhold the goods of the cows from
the Paṇis.’

In these sentences the injunctives *ródhan* (uncombined form *ródhat*) and *dhārayaḥ* do not refer to a particular action, but rather to the nature of some individual. In the first case,

the reference is to Agni ‘fire’, describing the raging nature of a forest fire. The second describes the universal power of the god Soma.⁷²

A second use of the non-prohibitive injunctive is for mentioning multiple events that transpired in the past, but which do not require temporal sequencing. This contrasts with reported events, where temporal sequence is important. In this regard the injunctive is well suited for the role of mentioning, as when one speaks of the deeds of the gods, treating them as actions which may be unrelated to one another. “Indra slew the demon, released the cows, let the waters flow” (paraphrasing from the Rigveda) does not in and of itself reveal any connection between these actions. Rather, it describes actions which occurred in a mythical past, and furthermore, are well-known to the listeners. It becomes unnecessary to mention overtly a temporal hierarchy: Indra slew the demon, as everyone knows, before he released the cows and made the waters flow.

The injunctive may therefore be used to describe in further detail a previously mentioned action. Hoffmann likens this use of the injunctive to describing a picture, where specific details are given in no particular sequence. Such use is found in mythological hymns, as in verses 2-5 of the Rigvedic Indra hymn I 62. In verse 2 a past action is described, the imperfect *ávindan* placing it in the distant past:⁷³ *gā́ ávindan* ‘(the Angirases) found the cows.’ The injunctives in subsequent verses describe this action, as well as others relating to it, in greater detail:

I 62, 3 *indrasyā́ngirasāṃ cestaú*
 vidát sarámā tánayāya dhā́sīm
 b́rhaspátir bhinád ádriṃ vidád gā́ḥ
 sám usríyābhir vāvaśanta nárah

‘While looking for Indra and the Angirases Saramā
 found (*vidát*) nourishment for those coming later.

[When] Brhaspati split (*bhinát*) the rock, (and) found (*vidát*) the cows, the men roared (*vāvaśanta*) together with the ruddy ones (i.e. the cows).

These are events well-known to the listeners. The poet included them in order to detail the scene which was stated in the preceding verse, where the tense was already signalled by the imperfect as being in the distant past. Injunctives were employed as no further specification of tense was required.

The injunctive also found very limited application as an equivalent to other verbal moods. One such employment was in gnomic periods, which express general truths without regard to a specific point in time, as in English *The sun rises in the East and sets in the West*. The following Rigvedic example illustrates the coordination of an injunctive with two subjunctives (VII 100, 1):

VII 100, 1 *nū́ mártō dayate saniṣyán*
 yó viṣṇava urugāyā́ya dā́sat
 prá yáḥ satrácā́ mánasā́ yájāta
 etā́vantam náryam āvívāsāt
 ‘Now the man striving for gain receives his share
 (Pres. Ind.), (one) who pays homage (Inj. Pres.) to
 wide-striding Vishnu, (and) who shall worship (Pres.
 Subj.) with (his) total mind (and) desire (Pres. Subj.)
 to win such a manly one.’

Hoffmann attributes this range of use of the injunctive to its being unencoded with respect to tense, but rather encoded with the feature of “mentioning”. This role he calls “memorative.” If we consider that person and number are encoded within the personal endings, the notion of “past” is carried by the augment, the verbal base is encoded with lexical meaning and verbal aspect, and other information, such as mood

and voice would be signaled by suffixes, the conclusion that what is left (the injunctive verbal stem itself) represents a mere reference to an action or state (*Erwähnung*, in Hoffman's terms) makes a great deal of analytical sense.

But does such a characteristic in fact exist in the injunctive forms? Certainly their use as discerned in Hoffmann's analysis bears this out. Injunctives in prohibitive clauses do not report information to the addressee, and those that simply state a fact (possibly with the sense "as is well known by everyone") do not refer to the actual occurrence of the event. Yet, how does one conceptualize the characteristics of this "memorative"? Crucial to Hoffmann's thesis is the provision of syntacto-semantic information within a discourse (cf. pp. 37-38): *I was reading a book* signifies SUBJECT, OBJECT, VERBAL ASPECT (i.e., progressive), ACTION TYPE (i.e., transitive) and TEMPORALITY. Given the absence of the augment from injunctive declarations, all of which clearly evince atemporal character, it is clear that in Vedic Sanskrit this affix is the primary signifier of past-time for verbal formants. Secondary endings are not properly temporal signifiers because they appear in non-indicative moods. However, it is not likely that the injunctive itself is encoded for anything beyond the aspect of the tense-stem and the syntacto-semantic information of the personal endings, despite Hoffmann's claims to the contrary (p. 279). We may therefore think of there being no real characteristic of memorative, but rather, a semantic lacuna of sorts. In other words, the verbal base simply states what the action is relative to its internal structure (i.e., imperfective or perfective), while the personal endings link it to a particular discourse participant or set of participants. The injunctive, not being encoded for more than this, would be used in clauses in which information other than this is irrelevant. Hence, the poet could employ this verbal

category in declarations for which the overt signification of time is either irrelevant or unnecessary.

The characteristic appearance of the augment in Homer, as presented in Chapter 2, does not lend itself to an interpretation similar to that applicable to Vedic Sanskrit. A few preterits share a functional equivalence with the Vedic injunctive:⁷⁴ aorists signifying the state resulting from an action in contrast to the occurrence of the action and preterits signifying the innate qualities and general characteristics of various characters (Chapter 2.2) are represented for the most part by unaugmented preterits. Descriptions of a quality could likewise be expressed by an unaugmented preterit, such as the unaugmented aorist *eksenarikse* (II.XXIV.205) that serves to characterize Achilles as the killer of Priam's sons but does not itself signal the occurrence of an action.⁷⁵ Although they provide a correlate to the employment of the injunctive in the Veda as formalized by Hoffmann, these instances account for only a small fraction of the sum total of cases where the augment does not occur in Homer; and even within these type of structures (which we call Homeric Vedicisms) the augment is attested. In Vedic Sanskrit, preterits that signify events in past-time would always take the augment. If the Homeric augment possessed the same value as its Rigvedic counterpart, one would expect a robust appearance of the augment in all presentations of historical events in Homer regardless of time depth. However, as discussed in Chapter 2.2 one finds only a minimal appearance of the augment in descriptions of temporally distal events. The same is true of *tiktō*-preterits; they appear infrequently with the augment, despite their reference to events in past-time (Chapter 2.7). Generally, the minimal pairs of augmented and unaugmented forms governed by temporal specificity which are so frequently found in the Vedas are absent

within the Homeric epics. Consider two passages from the *Odyssey*. In each a *didōmi*-aorist describes an action in the historical past; one shows the augment, the other does not:

Od.iv.648 *ton d' huios Phronioio Noēmōn antion ēuda·*

*“autos hekōn hoi dōka· ti ken hrekseie kai allos,
hoppot' anēr toioutos ekhōn meledēmata thumōi
aitizēi; khalepon ken anēnasthai dosin eiē.”*

Then Noemon, son of Phronius, answered him [Antinous]:

*“I [Noemon] myself gave [the ship] freely to him [Telemachus].
What else could any man do, when a man like him, his heart
laden with care, makes entreaty? It would be hard to deny the
gift.”*

Od.ix.360 *“hōs phat', atar hoi autis egō poron aithopa oinon.*

tris men edōka pherōn, tris d' ekpien aphradiēisin.”

*“So he [the Cyclops] spoke, and again I handed him the flaming
wine. Thrice I brought and gave it [to him], and thrice he
drained it in his folly.”*

(Odysseus to the Phaeacians about the Cyclops)

These passages differ only with respect to temporal proximity. Noemon gave Telemachus a ship within the recent past (perhaps seven to ten days prior to his speech); note that *dōka* is isolated from any marker or syntactic construction (such as *conjunction-reduction*) that could provide the overt signification of past-time. The speaker is certainly not referring to some quality of personality or character, since he is responding to a direct question. In the second example, Odysseus describes an action that antedates his arrival among the Phaeacians by a decade. Hoffmann's thesis would predict the appearance of the augment in both passages.

Other data as well counterindicate any correlation of the augments of Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit. As discussed in Chapter 1, unaugmented preterits signifying temporal events are readily accounted for by Kiparsky's *conjunction-reduction* hypothesis. This suggests a structural configuration in which the first preterit demarcates the initial member of a sequence of actions as a substructure within the overall narrative. Such structures are attested variously throughout Homer, as typified by the following description of the Achaeans' atonement to Apollo for Agamemnon's abusive threats towards Chryses. Only the first aorist within the sequence of three aorists is augmented:

II.I.447 ... *toi d' ōka theōi hierēn hekatombēn*
 ekseiēs estēsan eüdmēton peri bōmon,
 khernipsanto d' epeita kai oulokhtas anelonto
 And they straightway placed (estēsan) a sacred hekatomb for
 the god [Apollo], one after the other around the well-built altar,
 and then they washed (khernipsanto) their hands and took up
 (anelonto⁷⁶) the poured out barley.

In Homer one finds many exceptions to the sequential configuration of augmented and unaugmented preterits in accordance with *conjunction-reduction*. Many of these can be accounted for on metrical grounds. More problematic, however, is an augmented preterit embedded deeply within a narrative sequence⁷⁷ or its total absence, as in the following passage:

II.I.304 *hōs tō g' antibioisi makhēsamenō epeessin*
 anstētēn, lusan d' agorēn para nēusin Akhaiōn.
 After the two of them got up quarreling with hostile words
 between them, they dissolved the assembly beside the ships of
 the Achaeans.

Here *lusan*, the third plural Aorist active indicative, lacks the augment and is immediately followed by *de*. This is an example of a Rosén-construction, in which, as noted in Chapter 1, the augment regularly is absent from the main clause but present in the subordinate clause. The absence of the augment from the main clause in this example, however, suggests that the unaugmented preterit is here functionally equivalent to the augmented preterit. This passage clearly describes an action set in past-time despite the lack of any signifier of past-time.

Passages such as the above, which contain unaugmented preterits in environments where no other temporal markers are found, are highly problematic. Although atemporal (assuming, for the moment, that the augment is a marker of past-time), such preterits signify anterior events within a narrative. This negatively impacts the theories of Kiparsky and Rosén, which limit temporally unmarked preterits to syntactic constructions in which an unaugmented and augmented preterit are conjoined in some manner. Furthermore, Hoffmann’s thesis of the injunctive excludes isolated unaugmented preterits from a temporal environment. Although not attested in great numbers, such preterits are found variously throughout Homer. In the following, a typical example, the unaugmented preterit *proïei* (third person singular imperfect active indicative) refers to Agamemnon’s dispatching of two agents to take Briseis from Achilles. The action is clearly anterior to Achilles’ greeting, despite the complete absence of temporal marking by any of the previously discussed options within verbal morphology, the lexicon, or syntactic configurations of augmented and unaugmented preterits:⁷⁸

II.I.333 *autar ho egnō hēisin eni phresi phōnēsen te-*
 “khairēte, kērukes, Dios aggeloi ēde kai andrōn
 asson it’ ou ti moi ummes epaitoi, all’ Agamemnōn,

ho sphōi proiei Brisēidos heineka kourēs.”

But [Achilles] knew in his heart [that the two messengers had come for Briseis], and spoke, saying:

“Hail, heralds, messengers of Zeus and men, draw near. It is not you that are guilty in my sight, but Agamemnon, who sent you forth for the sake of the girl, Briseis.”

The examples we have cited in this section are typical of the unaugmented preterits in Homer, of which the vast majority (conservatively estimated at 90%) signify events in past-time. The apparent absence of complementary distribution between augmented and unaugmented preterits strongly contradicts the existence of a Homeric injunctive paralleling that seen in Vedic Sanskrit. Moreover, the analysis in Chapter 2 points to a relationship of the augmented preterit and its environment in Homer that is not based on time. Pro-forma catalogues, such as battle scenes and accounts of temporally distal events⁷⁹ show minimal appearance of the augment, whereas passages that evince “vividness” or relate in some way to the present moment contain a higher frequency of augmented preterits than expected. If Hoffmann’s view of the verbal system were applicable to Homeric Greek, then the augment should regularly appear in both types of passages, given their reference to events in past-time. Unaugmented preterits would be restricted to declarations and statements that are characteristically atemporal, including syntactic constructions where past-time has previously been signified (*conjunction-reduction*).

This, however, would be expected only if the augment were the same functional particle in Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit. But as shown above, in Homer the augmented and unaugmented preterit are essentially equivalent in the main narrative. There is therefore no fundamental reason, other than the tacit assumption that two archaic

languages agreeing in most other particulars in their verbal systems must agree in this one as well, to suppose that the Homeric augment was a temporal marker. Despite the fact that Homeric Greek is younger than the Rigveda by perhaps half a millennium, relative age is not straightforwardly correlated with innovation and change. The reanalysis of the augment into a temporal marker and its incorporation, essentially as part of a discontinuous morpheme, into the system of verb forms with secondary endings need not have progressed at the same rate in these two languages.

The employment of the augmentless preterit in Homer is simply not in accord with that of the Vedic injunctive. As stated above, the injunctive is excluded from temporal environments, except in very specific circumstances. There are simply too many instances of augmentless preterits in Homer that appear in temporal environments, despite the absence of overt signification of past-time. The apparent absence of any functional distinction between augmented and unaugmented preterits clearly speaks against the injunctive as a distinctive verbal category in Homer. The functional complementary distribution predicated upon temporality of the injunctive and preterit in Vedic Sanskrit is not attested in Homeric Greek. For this reason, we conclude that the injunctive does not exist in Homer. In the next section we will show that the employment of the augment in Homeric Greek is more archaic than in Vedic Sanskrit and reflects a deictic value that stands much closer etymologically to the value of the proto-augment **e* in Proto-Indo-European.

3.3 The Homeric Augment: A Deictic Particle

The first serious departure from the accepted view of the Homeric augment was postulated by Platt (1891) and Drewitt (1912), who envisioned it as somewhat different from the temporal marker of later Greek. Drewitt conceived of the augment as signifying “present time” by its strong association with aorists signifying events in the immediate past (equivalent to the present perfect in Modern English). This is the point of departure for Bakker (1999), who, however, considers these earlier conceptions to be “in a crude form” (p. 5). He notes that augmented preterits are strongly associated with statements signifying actions of greater visibility to the characters within the story; hence the appearance of an augmented preterit that signifies an action of the immediate past and/or whose results are still current. This thesis therefore posits a relationship between the particle and context predicated upon a proximity perceived by the character, who “... does not narrate but verbalizes a reality that is close; in the case of character speech the reality is the speaker’s actual situation at the moment of speaking” (p. 5). This readily accounts for the disproportionate appearance of the augment in character speech,⁸⁰ for which the range of topics is unrestricted; characters can refer to events that occurred before their eyes as well as to those temporally distal. This presents a strong contrast to the narrator, who describes a series of events completely removed from his frame of reference; the events as portrayed in Homer are at the least many decades removed from the personal experiences of the poet. By introducing a speech, the poet shifts the frame of reference to that of the character and thus introduces a degree of immediacy and intimacy otherwise absent from the narrative.⁸¹

A corollary of Bakker's hypothesis (1999) is a logical account of the virtually exceptionless appearance of the augmented preterit in the Homeric simile. This circumstance is completely unexpected in a construction which ostensibly denotes generic qualities; hence, the simile functions as a gnomic period, a depiction of qualities that are eternal and timeless. In post-Homeric Greek, the gnomic aorist represents a syntactic idiom. Traditional grammars, such as Smyth (1920, §1931), typically describe these periods as signifying an action in past time that will occur with a fair degree of certainty in the future as well. Such interpretations are valid synchronically, though diachronically an idiom within a language is essentially an archaic retention reflecting an older state of the language with subsequent developments and reanalysis. The appearance of augmented preterits within the gnomic period is a paradox in the language of Homer; one would expect that a temporal augment would be excluded from atemporal environments (as is clearly the case in Vedic Sanskrit; cf. Chapter 3.2). Bakker, however, describes the simile as a vivid description of the real world instead of a description of a general truth (pp. 4-5). It is a description of events and activities well-known to Homer's contemporaries (scenes of hunting, flies around the milk pail, the swarming forth of wasps and the mist-covered mountain) and therefore within an experiential reference frame of everyday life as opposed to the descriptions of battles and heroic deeds depicted within epic sagas. Similes as gnomic periods and character speech are thus subsumed under the same functional rubric, in which the speaker depicts a scene close to his/her perception: "in the case of character speech the reality is the speaker's actual situation at the moment of speaking; in the case of the similes, the speaker presents the scene depicted as if it is actually seen" (p. 5).⁸²

Much of the data presented within Chapter 2 of this dissertation lends strong support to the Homeric augment as a deictic particle; in the following we will discuss the analyses of Chapter 2 in summary. *tiktō*-preterits (Chapter 2.7) are among the clearest examples demonstrating the relationship between the “vividness” of the declaration and the appearance of the augment. As we have seen, metrically-assured augmented preterits of this verb are few in the extreme. We may understand this by recognizing that they present the lineage of a character as a type of digression; the speaker merely replies to a question of his parentage by the presentation of the facts of his birth (and in most cases the *tiktō*-preterit refers to an event that predates the speech by decades or even centuries). One exception is the augmented aorist *etekes* in Achilles’ speech to his mother (Il.I.352, Chapter 2.7). Decrying his ill treatment at the hands of Agamemnon, Achilles refers to his birth in order to emphasize his exceedingly short life-span, for which he should achieve great glory and remembrance. It is as if he were pointing an accusatory finger toward Thetis while saying “It was you who bore me to a short life,” and for this reason *etekes* stands thematically apart from the other occurrences of this verb. This principle is also evident in accounts of temporally distal events (Chapter 2.3), where the augment is sparsely (if at all) attested. This follows from the fact that such events lie outside the perceptual field of the characters. The fall of Hephaestus (Il.I.590-94) and the war with the beasts (Il.I.260-73) are essentially historical narratives. On the other hand, Circe’s reference to the reaction of the gods to a goddess’ taking a mortal lover, addressed to Hermes, *ēgaasthe* (Od.v.122), expresses her anger at an assumed double standard – only the male gods are permitted mortal lovers. Most significant, however, is the speech of Zeus (Il.XV.18-31) in which he reminds his wife of the punishments she suffered for the

trials she levied against Heracles. Hera has continually ignored Zeus' commands not to interfere in his fulfillment of his promise to Thetis. Having awakened from the sleep induced by Dream, he discovers that the Achaeans have in his absence rallied against the Trojans upon the field of battle and subsequently gives his wife one final warning to cease her meddling. Augmented preterits signify the punishment suffered by the addressee of the speech, which Zeus initiates with the interrogative *ē ou memnēi* 'Do you not remember?' (18) and reinforces by *tōn s' autis mnēsō* 'Of these things will I mind thee yet again' (31).

Battle scenes, in contrast, contain primarily unaugmented preterits. This is because they provide a mere listing, almost *pro forma*, of the actions, none of which is exceptionally important, within a particular context and serve as an elaboration within, not an external progression of the overall narrative continuum.⁸³ This type of passage is also attested outside of war scenes, for example in Odysseus' narrative of his travels (e.g., the destruction of Odysseus' ship by Zeus [Od.xii.409-25, Chapter 2.4]). The appearance of the augment in these passages is related to the degree of immediacy of the overall scene rather than to its constituent individual actions; few (if any) augmented preterits are found in narrative environments whose sole purpose is to elaborate upon an action.

However, that the augment should appear anywhere at all in the narrative continuum does not accord well with the conception of the augment as related to proximal deixis. As shown earlier, the augmented and augmentless preterits within a narrative continuum are essentially equivalent. In his earlier work, Bakker (1996) applied the relationship of proximity and speaker perception to the verbal system attested within Homer. He noted a striking similarity with the results of the "Pear bicycle

experiment” (Chapter 3), in which respondents were asked to describe a film they had just viewed. The respondents showed a significant use of the present tense to describe events that occurred in past-time. The researchers concluded that the selection of a tense-stem was related to the proximity of the action within the mind of the test subjects: an action perceived as occurring before the eyes of the respondent was expressed by a verbal form unmarked for tense, which in English is the present tense. Bakker compared the narrative structures of this test to Homer and concluded that the poet expressed by the augment actions which he felt as occurring before his eyes.⁸⁴ This technique of foregrounding particular knowledge is attested elsewhere in Homer, most notably in the *men~de*-construction, which introduces two elements within the mental background of the speaker (cf. pp. 85-86). This notwithstanding, however, Bakker’s description of the Homeric verbal system in his 1996 book assumed the augment to be a temporal marker, a view Bakker rejected in his later work, where he understood the augment as a deictic marker. This new conception imputes to the augment a role precisely inverse to that which Bakker, in agreement with traditional scholarship, had previously accorded it: for what formerly was thought to possess distal temporal value (the augmented preterit) is now held to signal proximal spatio-temporal value (cf. Bakker 1999, pp. 5-6).

Bakker’s conception of the augment as a marker of deixis is essentially correct. Consider, for example, the case of the past-iterative which with very few exceptions appears without the augment. As discussed in Chapter 2.6, this particular verbal formant signifies an action of a (spatially and/or temporally) distributive nature. If the original role of the augment were deictic, this would account for its non-occurrence with past-iteratives, because deixis and distributive semantics are incompatible. Deixis focuses

directly upon an object, and hence stands in strong opposition to the diffuse quality of a distributive.

A deictic augment provides a solution to the particle's overall appearance within Homer. Fundamentally, the quality of deixis encompasses within its functional domain different features, which may on the surface appear irreconcilable. The clearest of these is spatial reference to a particular object. In the declaration *ērametha megakudos·epephnomen Hektora dion* ... 'We have won ourselves enormous fame; we have killed the great Hector' (II.XXII.393), deixis is clearly indicated by the context of Hector's body lying before Achilles as he proclaims the honor won that day. Similar are gnomic periods, which describe common, everyday events of the natural world falling within the experiential field of Homer's contemporaries. Other data, as well, support this relationship of speaker perception and deixis. Declarations of events well-known to the speaker, especially those that are stressed for didactic purposes (e.g. Zeus' recollection of Hera's past sufferings by his own hand) carry a higher degree of saliency than the dispassionate report of an event, as well a heightened sense of vividness. It is this quality of "vividness" that accounts for the appearance of the augmented aorist in Homeric similes, despite the fact that they are characteristically atemporal (cf. Chapter 2.5). Although expressions of general characteristics are likewise atemporal declarations, they are relatively neutral in character and therefore, in contrast to the Homeric simile, they do not generally contain the augment. We may in this way account also for the infrequent occurrence of augmented *tiktō*-preterits, which normally do no more than signify parental kinship.

We can now address the incongruity of the gnomic aorist in Homer, which one finds in both Homeric similes and declarations of inherent qualities and characteristics. As shown in Chapter 2, the gnomic aorist shows a different frequency of augmentation in each environment: with few exceptions, it is augmented in the Homeric simile (Chapter 2.5), whereas it is sparsely augmented in all other atemporal environments (Chapter 2.2). This incongruity only exists if the augment was marked for past-time, since in that case one would expect the gnomic aorist to display the same functional characteristics in atemporal environments throughout Homer. However, recall that these two narrative environments differ significantly with respect to vividness. Homeric similes describe the natural world and everyday experiences that are familiar to the reader/hearer, and for this reason, display the highest degree of vividness. In contrast, descriptions of qualities and characteristics provide background information on characters within the story and are removed from the experience of the reader/hearer. Furthermore, it is within the vehicle of the Homeric simile, the description of the natural world, that the augmented aorist appears. Essentially, then, these two narrative environments are situated on opposite ends of the axis of vividness. The Homeric simile lies at the pole of greatest vividness, because of its high degree of actuality, calling to mind the real world knowledge of the hearer/listener. In contrast, all other atemporal statements lie at the opposite end of the scale, given that they display little actuality. The presence or absence of augmentation in the gnomic aorist reflects the differential degree of actuality of these two respective environments and is thus governed by an underlying principle of the grammar, as predicted by the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis.

We may now account for the various meanings suggested for the proto-augment. As we discussed in Chapter 1, there was never a unitary consensus as to the original meaning of the proto-augment. Among the various proposals have been Bréal's 'vraiment' ('truly'), Platt's "present-tense," Hirt's "Perfektivierung," and Brugmann's "at this time." Each of these purported to provide a point of origin from which the attested augment could have originated. One should note that these proposals are not all mutually exclusive. Platt's "present-tense" marker could have originated from some "perfective" particle, which essentially signified the completion of an action with respect to some point in time. One could likewise hypothesize a chronological relationship between the proposals of Bréal, Platt, and Brugmann. The thesis of the deictic-augment, however, lies at the basis of all these suggestions. Temporal markers reflect deixis relative to the point of view of the speaker: *that which is in the past* may be equated with *that which lies behind us*, the adverb *behind* being interpretable on both spatial and temporal axes. It would not be surprising if a distal deictic particle were to have been imported from the spatial onto the temporal axis with its appearance governed in part by the thematic structure of the narrative. An action that signifies a point of arrival on the temporal axis may also be viewed as completed. This is nothing more than Platt's "present-tense" marker that he posited for present-perfect aorists. Similarly, the deictic thesis would accommodate such proposed semantic starting points as "truly" and "indeed." A speaker could readily emphasize an action by employing some deictic particle which *points to* the action; it is not just any action but that one in particular that has occurred. Such statements thus evince a higher degree of importance with respect to the speaker's point of view; it is, then, a question of actuality. The various meanings for the augment that

have been proposed by scholars are therefore congruent; each one focuses in on a specific sense inherent in the narrative at a particular point.

A more difficult problem is provided by narrative continua, where the presence or absence of the augment seems to be governed solely by the meter. The solution to this problem lies, however, in a study of the thematic nature of the narrative structures. Consider, for example, the following passage, where one finds repeated occurrences of augmented imperfects of *ethelō* ‘I want’:

Il.X.227 *hōs ephath’, hoi d’ ethelon Diomēdei polloi hepesthai.*
 ētheletēn Aiante duō, therapontes Arēos,
 ēthele Mērionēs, mala d’ ēthele Nestoros huios,
 ēthele d’ Atrēidēs dourikleitos Menelaos,
 ēthele d’ ho tlēmōn Oduseus katadunai homilon
 Trōōn· aiei gar hoi eni phresi thumos etolma.
 So spake [Diomedes], and many there were that were fain to
 follow Diomedes. Fain were the two Aiantes, squires of Ares,
 fain was Meriones, and exceedingly fain was the son of Nestor,
 fain was the son of Atreus, Menelaus, famed for his spear, and
 fain too was the steadfast Odysseus to steal into the throng of
 the Trojans, for ever daring was the spirit in his breast.

In this passage Diomedes has called for someone to assist him in spying on the Trojans. The first statement (227), involving unaugmented *ethelon*, is a summary introduction. Each Achaean who volunteers is then noted separately. There is a heightened focus to this passage, as each Achaean desires to volunteer for the mission. The force of this passage would then be, for each Achaean who volunteered, *this one here really wanted to go*.

The constant feature underlying the appearance of the augment is vividness. This feature is found especially in the depiction of emotions, biases, and personal beliefs of the characters, as well as those of the poet. For this reason, statements that are neutral or matter-of-fact show a minimal appearance of the augment. The augment is not, of course, encoded for vividness; it is merely licensed to appear where this feature is present. It is, rather, deixis that is the defining semantic feature of the augment. This is supported by its non-occurrence with the past-iterative, as well as by other data, such as references to actions that are spatially and/or temporally deictic, including mental focus, and depictions of an event or condition as being before the eyes of a character or the audience. All these uses may be subsumed under the general rubric of foregrounding, by which a speaker wishes to highlight some point of fact within a declaration or series of declarations. This is the fundamental principle governing the appearance of the Homeric augment; the poet/composer can stress or contrast some point within a declaration, thereby giving shape, form, and contour to a composition. In this manner we can account for the appearance of the augment as governed by the needs of the composition; the use of the augment is thus analogous to that of adverbial particles, such as *ēdē* (cf. Chapter 2.4), that serve to focus the attention of the reader/hearer. Devoid of lexical meaning, the augment functions on a thematic level to enliven the discourse and anchor it in the here and now.

3.4 The Augment in Proto-Indo-European

The conception of the augment as a deictic particle (which we will call with regard to its original state within PIE the proto-augment) offers the best opportunity to understand this morpheme within a general Indo-European framework. A major problem facing scholarship has always been the origin of this particle. Although the proposed etyma have been varied and quite imaginative (Chapter 1), they have all been essentially hypothetical constructs. One has had to assume that the no trace of this item was retained except as an areal feature of South Eastern Indo-European. While there is firm evidence that clearly points to the augment as originally an independent morpheme, there is no *communis opinio* regarding its semantics. Such proposed starting points as “completive,” “really/truly,” “certainly” and various temporal variants (e.g., “earlier” and <PAST-TIME>) could all equally well have been the point of departure for regrammaticalization of an independent morpheme⁸⁵ into a bound verbal morpheme. In imputing to this morpheme a pre-temporal value which diverges greatly from that associated with the augment in later periods, the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis of the augment as an original deictic particle opens up new avenues for interpretation of this morpheme in the oldest layer of alphabetic Greek. By this reckoning, Greek alone would provide a record of the changes this particle has undergone. This new model also provides a better explanation of the augment than prior theories. A deictic particle of spatial orientation has been imported into the temporal sphere, a commonplace in linguistic history. In contemporary English one often speaks of “putting the past behind us” and “going forth into the future.” This overlap of spatial and temporal signification is reflected also in the prehistory of the *i-* particle that signified ‘here’ and whose suffixation (as discussed in Chapter 1) to the

personal endings gave rise to the primary (or present tense) endings of the PIE verbal system.

The suggestion of an original deictic value for the augment is found in the work of Hirt, who identified the proto-augment with the deictic element seen in Gk. *e-kei* ‘there’ and such pronominal forms as Sanskrit genitive singular *a-sya* ‘of him/it’, dative singular *a-smai*, and Umbrian dative singular *e-smei* ‘to him/it’ (Hirt 1927b, p. 11). Other relics of this morpheme, as suggested by Hirt, are the *e* of Lat. *e-quidem* ‘truly’ and Osc. *e-tanto* ‘tanta. Eventually this proto-augment became associated with verbal forms, transferring its spatial deixis to the temporal realm.

This conception of the proto-augment provides the best explanation for the absence of the augment from Mycenaean Greek (only two possible appearance, one of which is dubious, cf. Chapter 1). Risch (1959) ascribes the absence of the augment to the highly specialized nature of the Mycenaean documents, which also offer no evidence of subjunctives and optatives. However, that these categories are not evidenced in our Mycenaean texts does not prove that they did not exist within Mycenaean. It is unlikely that the language of record-keeping reflects the colloquial language. Finally, if the augment did exist in Mycenaean, it is highly unlikely that it was the marker of past-time for preterits. Otherwise, the various transactions in the chancellery documents that are recorded as having been completed in past-time would all be signified by verb forms possessing the augment.

Let us now reconsider the PIE verbal system. Three basic types of endings are attested: primary, secondary, and (stative) perfect. We will ignore the last as it is not germane to our discussion. The basic differentiation between the primary and secondary

endings is the *i*, or *hic-et-nunc* particle. However, the addition of this particle was manifestly a later development within PIE, and therefore it is clear that the secondary endings are more original. Prior to the innovation of the *i*-particle there would have been no way of indicating tense other than by temporal adverbs. But even this would not have been absolutely necessary whenever context itself specified tense. In English one can express the future by a temporal adverb, as in the sentence *I'm going to the store later today*,⁸⁶ and even without the adverbial phrase if the context of future time has already been defined. Verbal aspect would have helped out, since the perfective aspect could never be used for the here-and-now except in the description of an action immediately following its occurrence (such as when a sportscaster describes the action in a soccer match nearly instantaneously following the event itself). Therefore an aorist could only have been employed as a preterit. In contrast, an imperfective could have functioned as a present or a preterit.

In discussing the verbal system of Classical Greek, Palmer (1954) notes how Plato (in his *Phaedo*) described an event during the death of Socrates, when some friends of the philosopher enter and say “...we found Socrates just relieved of his shackles.” The verb form we have translated as ‘we found’ is *katelambanomen*, lit. ‘we caught, overtook, surprised’ an imperfect built to the imperfective (present) stem. According to Palmer, the imperfective aspect has presented the action as an eyewitness account, while the perfective (aorist) would simply have stated what had occurred. The question we might want to pose here is whether this is a remnant of the state of affairs in PIE. It would seem that in the proto-augment period of PIE, aspect must have played a role in the interpretation of tense. The imperfective aspect, representing a distended present, would

have specified an action whose internal constituency was considered germane (i.e. present tense), whereas the perfective aspect would have described an action whose internal constituency was irrelevant (i.e. past tense). A curious facet of the augment is its attestation within the languages that maintain this original system of aspect: Greek, Sanskrit, and Armenian (here despite extensive changes in the verbal system).⁸⁷ Languages which lack the augment filled out their verbal paradigms by developing preterit stems which themselves expressed tense, thereby rendering the augment superfluous. In languages which possessed the augment, on the other hand, this morpheme served as a means of distinguishing the imperfect from the present, as both are built to the same tense-aspect stem. Secondary endings were in themselves insufficient for this purpose, since they were employed with the subjunctive and optative moods and hence were not inherently signifiers of past-time. For the speaker, the endings of present and past would have contrasted by the presence of the *i*-particle in the former and the augment in the latter (cf. Chapter 1). As tense became the leading principle in the verbal system, the functional domain of the augment was eventually restricted to the temporal sphere. One of the causes of the reanalysis of the augment into a temporal marker would have been a weakening of its deictic value. By this scenario, the augment, originally signifying an event that was closely connected with the speaker, came to assume a temporal role. This certainly was the case with the *hic-et-nunc* particle, which by the time of the historically attested layers of Greek and Sanskrit signals strictly a temporal value. The primary endings marked by this particle do not indicate spatial deixis; they merely signify an action in present-time (or rather one that does not occur in the past, since presents are not excluded from gnomic periods and primary endings may also occur

on the subjunctive). Note that the deictic value of the augment must have been weakened to some degree already in Homer.

The **i*-⁸⁸ and **e*-particles are demonstrably present on a suppletive basis in the Indo-European proximal deictic pronoun **i/*e*. In Chapter 1 we discussed the dative singulars Umb. *esmei* and Skt. *asmai*, in which the initial vowel of each form, respectively *e* and *a*, reflects the proto-augment. Given that this pronoun is found throughout the Indo-European languages (e.g., Lat. *is/eius*,⁸⁹ Go. *is*, as well as Skt. *ayam/asmai* < **ey-om/*esmōi* ‘this one’), its constituents represent assured members of the morpheme inventory of the proto-language; and if the deictic *-i* could have been incorporated into the verbal system as a marker of present-tense, nothing stands in the way of assuming a parallel incorporation of the **e*-variant. That the role of **e* in the verbal system is not as clearly deictic as that of **i* is perhaps owing to its less clearly proximal value. In fact, in Vedic Sanskrit, whereas forms like *ayám*, *imám*, *imé*, and *imaú*, built to **i*, are proximal deictics, forms like *asya*, *asmai*, etc., built to **e*, are frequently mere anaphors, especially when not accented. Similarly, if this is the same morpheme seen in Gk. *ekeinos* (beside *keinos*) and Sanskrit *amum* ‘that one (acc.)’ (< **em-u-m*), then there is ample evidence that **e*- was not excluded on semantic grounds from occurring even within a distal deictic pronoun, a fact that would make its ultimate role as a marker of past (i.e. distal) tense in post-Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit less surprising.

There is, furthermore, the case of Gk. *ēdē*, which reflects a univerbation of *ē* and *dē*. *ēdē* is primarily an adverb whose temporal value is specified by a predefined point on the temporal axis (cf. Cunliffe 1924). As shown in Chapter 2.3, however, *ēdē* may also

focus on the actuality of a historical account. This value is inherited from *dē*, which itself endows a statement with a higher degree of vividness by offering an insight into the speaker's mind (cf. Bakker 1996, pp. 75-76, 78-79). The long vowel of *ē* can be easily generated by various lengthening processes affecting phonetically exiguous words in Indo-European.⁹⁰ One can furthermore justify the constellation of **ē dē* on semantic grounds, given that *ē* serves as an adjunct intensifier (as illustrated in Chapter 2.3 by II.XV.18 *ē ou memnēi*), which is a natural extension of the deictic value of the proto-augment. Hence, the deixis of the proto-augment could easily have been imparted to this constellation, transposed here, as in the augment itself, from the spatial to the temporal axis.

Our scenario furthermore provides an explanation for the loss of the augment elsewhere in the Indo-European family. Only traces of the proto-augment are attested in a language such as Latin, and none at all in any of the Germanic languages. This may be attributed to the loss of both the original PIE imperfect and the aorist in each of these dialects. A model for the prehistory of the augment is provided by the *i*-particle which signals present tense. As we have noted, both particles are primordial deictic markers imported into the verbal system. In its initial stage, the *i*-particle signaled a spatial “here” that implied a temporal “now.” When the primary endings came clearly to signify present tense, the verb forms taking the secondary endings became the atemporal demarcators, essentially the N-tense of Kiparsky (1968, p. 36), to which the augment could be affixed according to the context of the discourse. Only later when the underlying principle of the verbal system shifted from aspect to tense did the sense of past-time become the dominant functional domain of the augment with a concomitant

loss of all other significations, except in traces retained as archaic relics. The transformation of the augment from a deictic to a temporal particle was then complete.

The most important evidence bearing on this scenario is provided by Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit. As shown by Hoffmann (1967), the Vedic augment is the marker of past-time, which in light of the temporal signification of the primary endings, shows that the verbal system of Vedic Sanskrit has already begun to shift away from a system based on aspect to one based on tense. The older system of aspect was eventually abandoned, as reflected in the classical language, where the imperfect, aorist and perfect were essentially equivalent in their signification of an action in past-time. In contrast, the verbal system of Homeric Greek is still primarily aspectual; preterits still show signs of being atemporal verb forms merely signifying the conceptualization of an action (i.e., progressive or non-progressive). At this stage in the language, the augment still reflects to a significant degree its deictic origins. In this regard the language of Homer is more archaic than that of Vedic Sanskrit. Indeed, the verbal system of Greek does not become fully temporal until the period of the classical language (as typified by Attic-Ionic of the 4th c. BC), at which point Greek shows a remarkable similarity to Vedic Sanskrit; the verbal systems of both languages are based primarily on temporality, while retaining secondarily the older system of aspect. The verbal system of Homeric Greek therefore represents an intermediate stage between two systems based on, respectively, aspect and tense. This would support Pelliccia's (1986) thesis of the existence of a reflex of the injunctive in the *Homeric Hymns*, a body of poems dedicated to the gods, and generally accepted as younger than Homer. The developments in the verbal system of Greek

parallel those of Sanskrit, although at a later date: the augment had by post-Homeric times been reanalyzed as a temporal marker.

Within Homer, however, a small percentage of unaugmented preterits are functionally equivalent to the Vedic injunctive. These “Homeric Vedicisms” state atemporal facts of a nonactional character. On the other hand, the augment is present in those cases where the verbal action is either “vivid” or temporal. Vedic Sanskrit differs by the restriction of its augment to temporal contexts, which is the result of the fact that the original deictic particle has taken on solely temporal signification. In this stage of the language, the augmentless preterit has become specialized for atemporal signification. In a separate but related development the injunctive may appear together with augmented forms in narrative sequences in both Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit by a process of *conjunction-reduction*. It follows that the injunctive must be classified as an innovation coincident with the augment’s reanalysis into a temporal marker. Although the *form* of the injunctive is highly archaic, its implementation as a category of the verbal system is relatively recent: at a certain point a speaker could simply omit the augment in atemporal clauses. Even as an innovation, however, the injunctive mood is transitory, as seen by its disappearance from Sanskrit save for a trace in the guise of the *mā*-prohibitive clause.⁹¹

I propose the following model for the development of the proto-augment in the Indo-European family; the verbal system undergoes a progression from aspectual to temporal:

- Nontemporal/aspectual – Three tense/aspect stems of imperfective, perfective, stative-present. (The *i*- and *e*-particles at this period of

PIE are deictic stems associated with proximal deixis or, in the case of **e*, possibly neutral deixis.)

- The introduction of “present tense” by means of the *i*-particle. Atemporal signification is now restricted to verbal formants with secondary endings. The *e*-particle is still essentially deictic, as shown by its identity with the Indo-European **e*-pronoun (Umbr. *e-smei*, Skt. *a-smai*) and deictic adverbs (Gr. *e-keino* ‘[that over] there;’ cf. Hirt 1927a/b).
- The importation of the *e*-particle into the verbal system as the augment. The particle exhibits a spatial deictic value. Although the augment can appear in temporal environments indicating past-time, it is still perceived as basically a deictic marker relating the action to the *hic-et-nunc* of the speaker or, *in casu*, as a vivifying element. The system of preterits is still governed by verbal aspect: imperfective and perfective; overt signification of past-time per se is still absent.⁹²
- The reevaluation of the augment as a strictly temporal marker in co-occurrence with secondary endings. The augment had already been imported into temporal environments in deictic value. Its employment as a co-indicator of past-time entails, on the surface, a shift from proximal to distal deictic value. Most likely, however, this did not represent a direct shift of deixis but rather a weakening of the original deictic value of the **e*-particle followed by its regrammaticalization as a co-marker of tense.

- Eventually, the injunctive was lost with atemporal signification assumed by the existing functional categories of the verbal system, in particular the historical present (the system reflected in Classical Sanskrit and Classical Greek).
- Finally, the augment is lost as a morphological feature of the verbal system

3.5 Concluding Remarks

This dissertation has adduced a general principle that governs the appearance of the augment in Homer: the augment appears rarely in statements that are relatively removed from the present time and/or unhighlighted (e.g. catalogues, such as battle scenes, and descriptions of temporally distal events) but is frequent in descriptions of actions and events that evince some form of “vividness,” intensity, or emphasis. This in turn lends provisional support to the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis of the deictic augment. As noted in Chapter 2.1, however, I have deliberately restricted the portion of the text from which I have culled my data. If the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis is to be elevated to the status of a *fait acquis*, then one must take into account the entire corpus of Homer. The following are areas that remain to be investigated:

- 1) The appearance of the augment in the main narrative must still be addressed. As discussed earlier, material from this environment was generally omitted from our analysis. I based this decision on the difficulty of judging the thematic content of these passages. Although it may never be possible to account for all this material,

we should expect to find operative within it the principles that govern the deictic augment. A suggestive example in II.X.227-32 discussed in Chapter 3.3, in which various Achaeans express their desire to spy out the Trojan encampment. A general initial statement involving an unaugmented preterit precedes the specific wish of each character expressed by a series of augmented preterits.

- 2) The relative frequency of augmentation for the imperfect and aorists must still be determined. One should consider that the imperfect in Homer often assumes the functional role of the past-iterative, which vanishes from Greek by the 4th c. B.C. Recall that the “incompatibility” of the past-iterative and augment is due to their contradictory semantics which signal, respectively, distribution and focus (Chapter 2.6).
- 3) One would like to know the relationship between the augment and the pluperfect in Homer. The latter was ignored in this study, given its relative infrequency. The pluperfect signifies the completion of an action anterior to present time. However, it is built to a perfect, which at the time of Homer functioned often as a stative present. One must account for this, given that both the perfect and the secondary endings are unmarked for time.
- 4) Over and above these considerations looms the question of whether relics of the deictic augment are discernible in Vedic Sanskrit. To answer this will require a substantial investigation that will serve in many ways as the inverse of Hoffmann’s study. If, however, the question receives an affirmative response, then the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis will have been confirmed on comparative linguistic grounds.

NOTES

¹ Cf. Szemerényi (1989, p. 323).

² Vilborg (1960), p.104. Mycenaean orthography utilizes a syllabary whose symbols may represent consonant + vowel (CV) or simply a vowel (V). The accompanying symbol *PY*, “Pylos,” signifies the site where the tablet was found.

³ The augment is likewise attested in Phrygian, an extinct Indo-European language that flourished in SW Anatolia from the 8th c. B.C. to the 3rd c. A.D. (cf. Phr. *edaes*: Skt. *adhāt* ‘he established’). The language is known mainly through several hundred inscriptions written in a Greek alphabet. There is no general agreement as to the position of Phrygian within the Indo-European family; whereas some scholars believe it to be closely related to Greek, others favor a close relationship to Thracian or Illyrian.

⁴ Cf. Minassian (1980, p. 212).

⁵ In Sanskrit the augment is also used in the conditional, which is a future with secondary endings.

⁶ The corresponding form in Doric Greek is *phéromes*.

⁷ The corresponding form in Doric Greek is *phéronti*.

⁸ The apparent absence of the *i*-particle from the Greek second singular present active thematic ending can be explained by the loss of intervocalic *s*: **phéresi* > **phérehi* > **phéreī* > **phérei*, to which the *-s* of the corresponding secondary ending was then added.

⁹ Thematic and athematic verbs differ in several important respects. First, in the former the vowel **e* (termed the *thematic vowel*) is suffixed to the verb base, and this vowel undergoes qualitative ablaut (i.e. timbre change) to **o* in the first person of all numbers and third person plural. Second, the PIE 1Sg present active indicative marker was **-H₂* which resulted in the ending *-ō* (i.e., Gr. *pherō*; cf. Sanskrit which added to this **-ō* the **-mi* of the athematic endings: **bhéroH₂* > **bhārā* → *bhārāmi*).

It should be pointed out that a thematic verb does not undergo ablaut of the verbal base. That is, the vowel grade of the root and any suffix exclusive of the thematic vowel is constant, and the position of the accent is fixed (see the present indicative paradigm above). Athematic verbs, however, exhibit ablaut

either in the root (e.g., *es- ‘be’: *ésmi > Skt. *asmi* ‘I am’ vs. *smés > Skt. *smas* ‘we are’) or in the stem (e.g., nasal-infix [Sanskrit Class VII verbs] *yug^w- ‘yoke’: *yu-né-g^w-ti > *yunákti* ‘s/he yokes’ vs. *yu-n-g^w-énti > *yun̄jánti* ‘they yoke’), together with accent mobility between root/stem and ending in the singular and plural, respectively.

¹⁰ Cf. Meillet (1964, p. 243), Brugmann (1904, p. 484).

¹¹ Much of the data presented by Rosén consists of ambiguous states of augmentation (e.g. Od.viii.63 *Mous’ ephilēse, didou d’* [p. 322]) and formulaic constructions (as in the case of *bē de* discussed above [and cited in several of his discussions]).

¹² They are in agreement with Schwyzer (1939, p. 652), who considered the augment to be a mandatory prefix of the preterit.

¹³ Pelliccia apparently includes Homeric Greek within his thesis. We will show in Chapter 3.2 – 4 that the injunctive did not exist in Homer, but is rather a result of the augment’s reanalysis into a purely temporal marker.

¹⁴ Cf. Chapter 3.2 for a full discussion of the injunctive.

¹⁵ The PIE injunctive entails the existence of the augment as temporal signifier. If this were not the case, the injunctive would be an innovation unique to Vedic Sanskrit. This is a point for which some scholars argue (cf. Szemerényi 1989, p. 284, fn.15).

¹⁶ In Homer this is best illustrated in Books ix through xii of the *Odyssey*, where Odysseus rather than the narrator gives an account of his nine year attempt to reach home. The tale thus becomes a personal account of tragedy rather than an impersonal description of facts.

¹⁷ Fleischman examined a broad range of literary works from different eras and ethnic groups, among them, the French epic *Roland* and *Romancero* (the Spanish ballad tradition), as well as more contemporary works. Hence, her conclusions are not based upon a single national literature of a particular era. The relationship between the form of discourse and the degree of focus that the writer wishes to impart is covered extensively in Chapter 7.

¹⁸ In particular, the viewers of the film were not professional bards, who must undergo years of training in technique and repertoire to develop the facilities necessary to perform in public (cf. Lord 1960). The stories and the technical expertise required for performance will have been long since incorporated into

deep memory; all things being equal, the historical present will appear when the bard chooses to emphasize some point within the story. One can hardly expect this expertise to reside in the average person to the same degree as in the experienced performer.

¹⁹ If the Homeric augment were undergoing some form of reanalysis from a deictic into a temporal marker, then we should expect the earlier state of affairs to be extant in Homer. One should restrict the analysis to narrative environments in which deixis is a significant factor in the surface structure of the narrative.

²⁰ In such cases a post-Homeric diaskeuast would only have to make minor editorial changes to incorporate a non-original augment into the text. An *enthade ruke* could be made into *enthad' eruke* (Od.iv.594) by simply shifting the final *e* of *enthade* to the preterit *ruke*, and an earlier *es patrida pempsan* could become *es patrid' epempsan* (Od.iv.586) merely by replacing an *a* with an *e*. Similarly, examples such as *kuma kalupsen* (Od.v.353) and *thalassa de kēkie pollē* (Od.v.455) are omitted from the analysis; one cannot be certain whether the augment had been removed by a post-Homeric diaskeuast either to “archaize” the text or because he judged it to be spurious.

²¹ The various bridge constraints as they apply to the dactylic hexameter of Homer will be addressed as required in the analysis.

²² In Chapter 3.2, we will compare the similes of Homer and the Rigveda. It has been the view of many scholars that the appearance of only augmented aorists in this environment marks the similes as post-Homeric additions. Aorists, which are marked for temporality, would be highly idiomatic in atemporal environments; this suggests that augmented aorists were added to the text after the augment became a mandatory fixture on preterits. In his investigation into the Homeric simile, Shipp (1972, pp. 209–22) subdivides the incorporation of the similes into various periods of composition, based on the complexity of the simile. This analysis, however, rests upon the assumption that the augment signifies temporality and the relationship between a simile and its surrounding narrative environment. The second criterion is highly circumspect, since it relies upon a purely subjective technique of analysis. To say that a section of the text may or may not be removed “without violence” (p. 217) presumes that the analyst has the same insight as the original author of the poem. In the absence of a firm diagnostic of narrative analysis, such judgments are mere opinions of an interpreter.

The use of the augment as a diagnostic for the age of the Homeric simile is questionable; it requires a full understanding of the true nature of the particle. Similes and descriptions of knowledge and experiences well-known to Homer's audience are statements evincing a high degree of vividness. This provides a much stronger basis for the appearance of the augment within the gnomic period than the thesis of the gnomic aorist postdating Homer.

²³ This and all subsequent translations of Homer into English are taken from Murray (1919a, 1919b, 1924, and 1925). We have made a few editorial changes to the original translations of Murray in the interest of style and form.

²⁴ An unaugmented *dōke* (II.IX.37) is guaranteed by the first hemistich rule, which “prohibits” the trochaic division of the first and second metrons if there is a weak caesura in the third metron (cf. Devine and Stephens, 1984, p. 11). Exceptions are found in Homer, but are rare and generally occur when no other option for the configuration of the verse is available. In the present verse the first hemistich is metrically configured as follows: $|_1(\textit{soi de}) (di)|_2(\textit{andikha})|_3(\textit{dōke}) (Kro)|_4(\textit{nou}) \dots$; an augmented *edōke* would cause an avoidable violation of this bridge constraint. Although *de* is accented, the particle is postpositive (cf. Smyth 1920, §2634). As a rule, *de* never appears in initial position in a sentence. Words form clusters with their neighboring clitics and postpositives, and these are treated as indivisible metrical units within the verse (cf. Halporn et. al 1963). Bakker (1996) makes a case for *men* and *de* as representing in origin the unaccented forms of, respectively, *mēn* and *dē* (cf. pp. 75 and 80). Taken together, this suggests that the *de*-particle was originally an enclitic that later took the accent but retained its rule of second position in a sentence.

²⁵ The sack of Troy is recounted only twice in the *Odyssey*: in the lay of Demodocus (*Odyssey* viii) and in a brief reference by Menelaus to Telemachus (*Odyssey* iv). Otherwise, this tale is unmentioned elsewhere in Homer. It is curious that Demodocus, a foreigner, would have great knowledge of an event from the Trojan War. One might have expected Menelaus, a participant in the sack, to have made more than just a passing mention of the wooden horse; the general tenor of the speeches and interchanges of the characters in Book iv of the *Odyssey* shows the memories of Troy to be painful. In contrast, Demodocus is telling a story to his audience, none of whom (save Odysseus) was present when the events themselves occurred. It is for

this reason that Odysseus alone weeps during the performance, which otherwise is warmly received by the audience.

²⁶ Hera makes great use of this fact, when she objects to the gods' outrage over Achilles' abusive treatment of Hector's body (*Iliad* XXIV). She points out that Hector is purely of mortal stock and does not deserve any special treatment; the gods should not interfere with the abusive treatment of his body by Achilles, the son of a goddess and one nurtured by the gods.

²⁷ The main verb, *katektan*, is a compound verb, the majority of which in Homer are attested with the augment. However, there is no diagnostic by which one may judge which augmented compounds are original to Homer. It is primarily for this reason that compound verbs are generally excluded from our analysis.

²⁸ The offering to the gods of their rightful due is an important aspect of the culture portrayed in the *Iliad*. In Book I, Achilles suggests in council that the origin of the present crisis – the pestilence running through the host – may be an unsatisfactory hecatomb to Apollo (Il.I.65). This lack of proper sacrifice, according to Phoenix (Book IX), is the reason for Artemis' having sent a *khounēn sun agrion* 'fierce wild boar,' to punish Oeneus for his oversight.

²⁹ This word carries a powerful negative connotation, signifying an action as outside social norms; cf. Cunliffe (1924, p. 291), who cites under the lemma additional meanings, among them, 'destructive,' 'painful,' and 'bringing mischief.' *oloos* appears where there is an especially powerful force implicated in a statement; Menelaus uses the word to describe the fire that the Trojans brought forth to burn the ships (*Iliad* XIII) of the Achaeans, whose destruction would have prevented their eventual return home to Greece.

³⁰ Hoffmann (1967, p. 166) shows that in Vedic Sanskrit aorists describing a "specification of content" may be presents. These aorists describe a quality normally associated with a person which makes the description timeless. We will return to this point in Chapter 3.2 of this study.

³¹ As reflected by the variant renditions of preterit forms within this functional rubric by different translators of Homer. Consider, for example, *dōke* (Il.II.205, Odysseus' speech discussed above). Reck (1995) and Fitzgerald (1975) translate it as a present. Murray (1925) renders it as a present-perfect, which, however, can signify the (permanent) effects of a completed action; a simple past merely signifies the

completion of an action without a continuation of the results (cf., Quirk et al. 1973, §3.30). Nor does Murray adhere to a single rendition of this category of preterit, sometimes opting for the present-tense (i.e., *dosan* in Nestor's speech [Il.IV.321]) or even for a verb in the simple past. Thus, Murray renders the first of the three occurrences of *dōke* in Diomedes' speech [Il.IX.37-9] as a present-perfect and the last two (which are merely elaborations of the first) as simple past-tenses; he translates *geinato* in Nestor's declaration of Achilles' lineage as a simple past, though this form serves as an index of Achilles' semi-divine nature and not as a description of his birth per se.

³² Cf. Chapter 2.5 for a full discussion of the augmented aorist in the Homeric simile.

³³ Achilles likewise provides an object lesson via a grieving mortal (*Iliad* XXIV). In attempting to comfort Priam, who refuses to accept the hospitality he has offered, he recounts the tribulations of Niobe, all of whose children died, but who eventually overcame her grief (602-17). The distinguishing factor in Achilles' story is the identity of the character, in contrast to the unspecified subjects of Apollo's description of the grieving mortal (46-9).

³⁴ This point was brought out by Nancy Felson in her lectures on the *Iliad* at the University of Georgia. To her I owe a great debt of gratitude for her illumination and expositions of the thematic structure contained within the *Iliad*.

³⁵ Some passages are excluded from the analysis because of the ambiguity of the data. In Il.I.394-406 Achilles reminds his mother of her role in rescuing Zeus from the other Olympians; it is a historical account of events that occurred in the distant past. One finds a fair number of augmented preterits in this passage, most of which are not guaranteed by the meter. There is no means of verifying which of these augments reflect the work of post-Homeric diaskeuasts.

³⁶ Cf. Chapter 3.4 for a discussion of the etymology of *ēdē*.

³⁷ The third person singular imperfect of *eimi* 'I am' appears only with the augment. Moreover, this particular imperfect is realized by several variant forms: *ēn*, *ēen*, *eēn* and *ēēn*. The latter two are ahistorical forms that arise from artistic license as necessitated by the needs of the meter. There is no universal consensus with regard to the origin of *eēn*, however. Some scholars, such as Sihler (1995, p. 551) classify this form of *eimi* as nothing more than an "artificial literary creation." (Cf. Meister 1921, p. 108: "Denn *eēn* steht 68mal vor Konsonant, nur 10mal vor Vokal.") This suggests that this form could be an attempt to

add the augment to earlier unaugmented forms, essentially creating an “artistic” inversion of an augmented *eēn*.) Contrasting with this are others (such as my advisor Jared Klein) who account for *eēn* as a product of metathesis of length, that is, the exchange of vowel length between two contiguous vowels. There is support for this point of view in light of the form’s being attested outside of literary genres: Monro (1891, p. 14) notes the appearance of *eēn* on an Ionic inscription dated to the 5th c. B.C. This strongly suggests that the form was not merely a poetic variant. The most likely scenario is that *eēn* was an actual form native to a particular dialect of the Ionic speech continuum.

³⁸ This makes Nestor a contemporary of Heracles, even though that is not overtly stated within the *Iliad*. The Achaean Tlepolemus, one of Heracles’ sons, is participating in the siege of Troy. He would therefore be an adult between the ages of 30 and 40. It is the comparison of the ages of Tlepolemus and Nestor that guarantees Nestor to have been a contemporary of Heracles. The later tradition of Greek literature is more definitive. Nestor was a child when Heracles sacked the city of Pylos in retribution for its support of the city of Eris, with which Heracles was at war. After the fall of Pylos, Heracles set Nestor upon the throne, having first slain his brothers. Nestor’s father, who was absent at the time of the sack, had survived.

³⁹ My teacher, Jared Klein, suggests that *emakhonto* may be augmented for euphonic reasons within the conjoined syntagm *kartistoi men esan kai kartistois emakhonto*, where, as a counterpoise to the parallel *kartistoi ... kartistois*, one finds the rhythmically parallel *men e(san) ... ema(khonto)*.

⁴⁰ According to the later tradition of Greek literature; cf. Graves (1955, pp. 26-7).

⁴¹ In his *apparatus criticus*, Allen (1931, p. 50) cites manuscripts attesting *de pausatō*. The best manuscript of the tradition, Venetic A, contains the augmented preterit, however.

An analysis of the third metron of the line, within which the augment is located, does not provide a solution. The caesura would fall either after the participle *pheugōn* (strong) or *ho* (weak). However, the line is naturally divided into two clauses within a narrative progression. The strong caesura places the break at the boundary of two clauses, the logical place for a pause in the recitation.

⁴²The status of Il.XV.18-31 is open to debate. Scholarship has been divided as to the origin of these lines since classical times; Zenodotus believed them to be an interpolation by a later poet. Leaf and Bayfield (1898, p. 352-53) point out inconsistencies within the narrative structure and the presence of post-Homeric lexical items. The severe punishment meted out by Zeus is, in their view, thematically consistent with

post-Homeric literature, though these scholars note that the “fettering of gods” and their ejection from the heavens are thematic elements found in “primitive mythologies” (p. 353). The belief that these lines represent interpolations is not shared by all, however. Wilcock (1984) does not discuss the uncertainty associated with these lines in his commentary (p. 235). He notes that the punishment described by Zeus was employed in dealing with slaves in the ancient world, and it was this fact that led to the rejection of these lines as spurious. To make such a judgment, however, one must possess knowledge of the cultural and religious milieu of the poet/composer (and even, if possible, some indication of his own personal beliefs). One would then be able to assess the degree to which the poet adhered to contemporary beliefs while composing his work. This lack of consensus, however, does not impact our study. The “final” version of the *Iliad* is believed to have been produced under the auspices of Pisistratus (the tyrant of Athens). This undertaking, the so-called Pisistratine rescension, is dated to the 6th c. B.C., roughly two centuries after the latest date normally admitted for Homer. According to the general view, interpolations were added within this period of some 200 years. If this is true, then even at this late date the augment had not yet become a mandatory feature of the preterit. The theme of this dissertation is the verbal system of the language of Homer; we are not discussing Homer per se. For this reason I see no firm justification for omitting a passage such as Il.X.18-31 from the analysis.

⁴³ Homeric *hēke* is probably unaugmented. The augmented preterit in Homer is *heēke* (< **e-hēke* < **e-sēke*); the initial aspiration is ascribed to metathesis of aspiration. The augmented *hēke* (as attested in the Attic dialect of the 4th c. B.C.) is the product of the conflation of the augment and the initial vowel of the verb stem. *hriptaskon* is a past-iterative, a class of verb for which the augmented preterit in Homer is exceedingly rare (cf. Chapter 2.6). Moreover, this particular preterit appears in a statement expressing a frequentative action and therefore does not signify an actual single occurrence of an action (cf. its association with *laboimi* [opt.] and *hikētai* [subj.], neither of which expresses a factual action). For these reasons I have omitted *hriptaskon* from the tally of preterits.

⁴⁴ The editions of Homer that I have used for this study are not in unanimous agreement with regard to this particular form. Monro (1888), Murray (1925), and Allen (1931) give *ekremō*, whereas Leaf & Bayfield (1898) have *kremō*. The manuscript tradition, as cited in the *apparatus criticus* of Allen (op. cit.), shows no variations except for the omission of the *t'* in the *rhetoricum grammaticum* of Choerobus. Monro (op.

cit., p. 297) merely discusses the form's appearance with regard to the rhythm of the verse, which may suggest "... the idea of *swinging* in the air." The verb in question might, or might not, have originally had the augment. This does not impact the present study, however, since each of the next three preterits has an augment that is guaranteed by the meter. It is this succession of unambiguously augmented preterits that is the topic of the present discussion.

⁴⁵ The \bar{e} in Il.XV.18, a particle of emphasis, stresses *ou memnēi*: 'Don't you remember?!'

⁴⁶ A promise that has been made by Zeus cannot be foresworn. Cf. Il.I.526-27 :

"... *ou gar emon palinagreton oud' apatēlon*
oud' ateleutēton, ho ti ken kephalēi kataneusō."
 "... ; no word of mine may be recalled, nor is false,
 nor unfulfilled, whereto I bow my head."

⁴⁷ Cf. Smyth (1920, §§1852c, 1889, 1923); the aorist generally signifies an action that is completed and not continuative (i.e., noncoincident with the surrounding narrative environment).

⁴⁸ The only exception is $\bar{e}lthe$ (502); however, this form is attested exclusively with the augment in Homer (cf. Gehring 1891).

⁴⁹ The provenience of the augmentation of the other preterits is uncertain. *metōikheto* (Il.V.148) lies in the second hemistich, for which vowel overlength is attested to a far lesser degree than in the first hemistich. The preterit as attested may reflect the emendations of a later diaskeuast, although this is unsupported by the manuscript tradition (cf. the *apparatus criticus* in Allen 1931). *eergathen* (Il.V.147) is very difficult; there is evidence against this preterit as being augmented. The initial *e* is attested in non-preterits in Homer: *eergōn* (Il.XII.201; masculine nominative singular present active participle); *eirgō* (Il.XXIII.72; first singular present active indicative), a contracted variant of *eergō*. This data points to the prehistoric root $*H_2werg-$, 'turn;' cf. Hitt. *hurki-* 'wheel').

⁵⁰ According to the grammarians, the gnomic aorist expresses an action that will occur in the future under the same conditions in which it has occurred in the past, and likewise the non-occurrence of an action (cf. Goodwin 1876, § 30; Smyth 1920, §1931).

⁵¹ Of the preterits (almost all of which are aorists) in Homeric similes, 43 have an augment that is guaranteed by the meter; this includes $\bar{e}en$ (Il.XV.274), the only example of an imperfect attested in this construction. In comparison, only 3 unaugmented preterits are found that are guaranteed by the meter.

With regard to preterits of disputed augmentation, 19 are augmented; there are only two examples where an absent augment does not appear to be the result of metrical necessity.

⁵² We defer discussion of the gnomic aorist as it appears in all atemporal declarations in Homer until Chapter 3.3, where we will address the paradox of a robust gnomic aorist in one particular atemporal environment in the overall discussion of the Homeric augment.

⁵³ Bechtel (1936) shows that the *-sk-* suffix is the productive means for building verbs of the distributive class that stand in a functional complementary distribution with the other classes of verbs. The distributive is not equivalent to the preterit nor is it subject to any functional restrictions; in contrast, the iterative in Homeric Greek is confined to use in preterit value with secondary endings. Szemerényi (1989, pp. 293-4) notes that the archaic sense of distributive or iterative was still retained in the past-iterative in Homer. In contrast, however, Sihler (1995, pp. 505-7) argues in support of a functional equivalence of the past-iterative and the imperfect in Homer.

⁵⁴ Some *sk-*preterits in Homer are morphologically imperfects to primary *sk^o/o-* presents, such as *phasken* ‘he asserted’ (Od.iii.191; from *phaskō* ‘I say, assert’). These presents do not express repetitive actions (cf. also the participle *gēraskonta* ‘[the man] growing old’ [Il.II.663] and *boskēseis* ‘you will nourish’ [Od.xvii.559]). In contrast, true past-iteratives are deverbative formations built to both imperfective and perfective aspect stems and are functionally distinct from preterits of either aspect stem (cf. Monro 1891, §§ 48, 49).

⁵⁵ “Large numbers of Homeric forms in *-sk-* are uniquely attested, which is what one would expect of a freely productive type used opportunistically.” (Sihler 1995, p. 506)

⁵⁶ As my teacher Jared Klein points out: “historically, this is not plural but genitive (cf. German “Morgens stehe ich auf und frage ...).” Note that genitive time constructions that signify an indefinite period of time within which an action occurs are attested in both Greek (*hēmeras* ‘by day,’ *nuktos* ‘by night;’ cf. Smyth 1920, §§1444-47) and to a far lesser degree in Vedic Sanskrit (*aktós* ‘by night,’ *vástos* ‘by day;’ cf. Whitney 1889, §300a, §1115), but appear to be absent from Latin (cf. Allen and Greenough 1931, §341). This suggests that, in each of these languages where it is attested, the genitive of time is an archaic retention of a feature of PIE.

⁵⁷ In such cases the optative implies multiple occurrences of the same action and is “equivalent” to the past-iterative. This is only due to the probabilistic nature of an optative expression (i.e., “whenever the character ...”). In contrast, the past-iterative (as illustrated in the examples given above in the text) can express the actual multiple occurrences of an action outside of a conditional statement.

⁵⁸ See Klein and Condon (1993) and Klein (1988). The latter supersedes all prior studies of *au*.

⁵⁹ One finds other examples of such iteratives in Homer, in which the context verifies that they can only refer to the repetitive occurrence of an action. Thus, in the following passage the past-iterative *doskon* is conjoined with the imperfect *edune*:

Il.XIV.381 *oikhomenoi d' epi pantas arēia teukhe' ameibon*
esthla men esthlos edune, kherea de kheironi doskon.
And going throughout all the host, [the Achaeans] made exchange
of battle gear. In good armour did the good warrior harness
himself, and to the worse they gave the worse.

In post-Homeric Greek the function of the past-iterative (which has vanished from the language) has been replaced by the imperfect and the aorist (cf. Smyth 1920, §§1790, 1894, 1933, 2341).

⁶⁰ Note how *pollaki* ‘many times’ serves to reinforce the repetitive nature of *doskon* ‘I would give.’

⁶¹ Note, however, that *phoreeske* is a deverbative to *phoreō* that is itself a deverbative causative-iterative (with *o*-grade of the root and the $-ey^e/o-$ suffix; cf. Sihler 1995, §468.2) built to *pherō* ‘I carry.’ Such past-iteratives are in a sense “doubly-marked.” The question naturally arises as to what degree of difference in their functional specification past-iteratives exhibit with respect to the causative-iteratives from which they are derived. This is one topic that I would like to address in an investigation dedicated exclusively to the past-iterative (cf. Chapter 3.5).

⁶² As suggested by my teacher Jared Klein, it is possible that *talasiphronos* “itself implies duration (‘having a mind that is enduring, patient’) and this aspect of the epithet is captured in the chosen verb form.”

⁶³ The past-iterative of *phileō* is another interesting case. Fundamentally meaning ‘I love’, and therefore signifying a state, this verb can also possess the actional meaning ‘I give entertainment, hospitality.’ The frequentative occurrence of this action is clear in certain passages: *phileeske* (Il.VI.15) refers to one Aksylis, who entertained any visitor to his house. In other instances the sense of the past-iterative of *phileō*

in its stative value is durative. In book IX of the *Iliad*, Phoenix tells of his father's feelings toward a concubine *tēn autos phileesken* 'whom he himself ever cherished' (II.IX.450).

⁶⁴ My teacher Jared Klein suggests an East Ionic (Greek) origin for the past-iterative. The past-iterative was a highly productive verbal category in Hittite. Linguistic diffusion between E. Ionic Greek and some western Anatolian language (Lydian, perhaps) may be the source of the employment of these forms in Homer as well as other East Ionic based authors such as Herodotus. This influence was probably limited to preterite indicative formants only; there are apparently no present or modal iteratives attested anywhere in Greek, although present-iteratives do exist in Hittite. The past-iterative would therefore provide good evidence of interaction between the Greeks and Anatolian speakers, despite the apparent absence of written evidence that mentions such contacts.

⁶⁵ In Indo-European the aorist was originally athematic but was later thematized.

⁶⁶ As usual, we limit the discussion to those preterits with a metrically assured augment (cf. Chapter 1 and Chapter 2.1).

⁶⁷ There are only four exceptions, all in the *Iliad*, in which a female is the subject.

⁶⁸ There is a significant degree of flexibility within an oral tradition of poetry; cf. Wilcock (1978, pp.xix-xxii) and Lord (1960). One example of the aorist of *tiktō* in the active voice with a male subject is II.V.875-76: *su gar tekes aphrona kourēn, // oulomenēn*, 'for that this crazed, pestilent daughter is thine own child', where Ares complains to Zeus about Athena's participation in the war. According to Greek myth, Athena was born from Zeus' head; hence, the sense of the phrase 'thou hast given birth' must be taken literally here. This is the only instance in Homer where a male actually gives birth to his own child; parthenogenic births are otherwise associated only with goddesses.

⁶⁹ See Devine and Stephens (1984, p. 11). A governing principle within metrical composition was the proscribed rule of word boundaries, the so-called bridge constraint. In the idiom of dactylic hexameter, there was a bias, although not absolute, against the concurrent trochaic division of the first two metrons of the first hemistich. Violations of this constraint exist in Homer (e.g. *autis epeita pedonde* Od.xi.598). This is understandable from a metrical point of view in an idiom which prefers a trochaic division of the third metron, traditionally one of the possible points of division of the verse into two halves: three identically

divided metrons would be a very poor choice because of its monotonous repetition of a short pause in each unit.

⁷⁰ One of the many helpful comments given to me by my teacher Jared Klein while I was writing this dissertation.

⁷¹ The injunctive present refers to the action as ongoing, whereas the injunctive aorist refers to one specific occurrence of a habitual action. Consider a patron in a movie house who constantly leaves his seat and always slides by you. The injunctive present would refer to his future actions taken in their entirety (i.e., *Please stop getting out of your seat.*), whereas the injunctive aorist would specify a specific future action (i.e., *Please don't leave your seat again.*).

⁷² Within the soma ritual, concurrent actions were expressed by the present indicative, whereas the injunctive was used to describe general characteristics.

⁷³ As opposed to the aorist, which in Vedic describes actions in the recent past. Hoffmann notes (p. 171) that the imperfect and aorist are never coordinated together to refer to the same action, in marked contrast to the injunctive present and aorist. This implies that the Vedic injunctive present is not simply an unaugmented byform of the augmented imperfect.

⁷⁴ The greatest divergence between Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek is seen in their respective forms of the gnomic aorist. Both languages readily employ gnomic periods (such as in similes) that are unrestricted with regard to verbal mood (i.e., indicatives and subjunctives can appear in the same statement). The indicative aorist is likewise attested in the gnomic period. However, as discussed in Chapter 2.7, the gnomic aorist in Homer almost always appears with the augment. In contrast, this type of aorist is always unaugmented in Vedic Sanskrit, whose augment is marked for past-time and therefore excluded from atemporal environments. Ironically, this major distinction cannot enter the present discussion, since one must first determine just what the Homeric augment signifies. If the Homeric augment were a temporal marker, then one could claim that the Homeric simile with a gnomic aorist was added to the Homeric epics at a time when the augment was a mandatory prefix on the preterit (cf. Shipp 1972). On the other hand, the augmented gnomic aorist in Homer could be expected under the productive rules of the verbal system if the Homeric augment were not a temporal marker. As discussed in Chapter 2.5, the vivid nature of the Homeric simile strongly supports the deictic augment of the Bakker-Hirt hypothesis. In this case the

gnomic aorist is generated according to the productive rules of verbal morphology in each respective language. Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek diverge in the underlying nature of the augment, respectively a marker of tense and of deixis.

⁷⁵ Such statements, the "specification of content," are well-attested in Vedic Sanskrit (cf. Hoffmann 1967, pp. 166 - 67).

⁷⁶ The augmented form is *aneilonto*.

⁷⁷ Cf. the account of the deeds of Nestor in *Iliad* I (Chapter 2.2).

⁷⁸ *proïei* does, however, appear in the preceding narrative: *hōs eipōn proïei* ‘So saying, [Agamemnon] sent [the two heralds] forth’ (Il.I.326). My teacher Jared Klein suggests the following explanation: “It is therefore possible that we are dealing here with a feature of poetics as the bard reactivates in the minds of the audience the prior verb form for purposes of thematic linkage.” It is not likely that *proïei*, which lies inside of the speech, receives temporal reference from *egnō*, which is part of the narrative. As discussed in Chapter 2.1 a speech shifts the point of reference to that of the character, who does not have access to the omniscient knowledge of the narrator. From Achilles’ point of reference no specification of past-time is given for *proïei*.

⁷⁹ One finds augmented preterits when the speaker is focusing on specific actions (cf. Chapter 2.3).

⁸⁰ Cf. Bakker (1999, p. 3) and Monro (1891, p. 402).

⁸¹ An exception is narrative in the first person singular, in which the narrator describes events as a personal eyewitness.

⁸² It is highly instructive to note the strong stylistic similarities in the similes of Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit. In both languages the gnomic period is not restricted to a particular mood. The indicative, subjunctive, and injunctive are interchangeable in similes in Vedic Sanskrit, in contrast to their complementary syntactic distribution in other circumstances (Hoffmann 1967, p. 238). The same circumstance is seen in Homeric Greek (Monro 1891, §72.2, Smyth 1920, §§1935, 2481-2487), although the subjunctive may still retain its modal force (Monro *ibid.*, §§283.3a, 285.3a, 289.2a; cf. the discussion of the past-iterative [Chapter 2.6], which retains its functional signification within the narrative continuum).

⁸³ This is one of the functions of the Vedic injunctive, which Hoffmann (1967, p. 163); in an “erwährende Beschreibung” (“mentioning description”) facts are not chronologically ordered. One may describe this as

painting a picture; the speaker provides additional details to a topic previously introduced and/or known to the interlocutors. It is unnecessary to designate temporality in statements that describe details as opposed to signifying actions oriented on the temporal axis.

⁸⁴ There is a difficulty with this comparison. The test respondents described the film in their own words, which is very different from the techniques of the professional writer or story-teller, who has polished his craft to a high degree of proficiency. Another more critical problem is the depth of retention of the subject matter. Fleischman (1990, pp. 38-39) shows that events in long-term, or deep memory are described differently from those in short-term, or shallow memory; the frequency of appearance of the historical present is inversely proportional to the level of depth at which information is stored in memory.

⁸⁵ Perhaps even an independent word. Certainly the accentual properties of the augment in Vedic Sanskrit would support such an analysis.

⁸⁶ Note that a speaker of English would understand the tense even in an ungrammatical sentence such as **I go to the store yesterday*. Pidgins and Creoles, and even an isolating language such as Chinese, indicate tense by temporal adverb(s) and not inflection.

⁸⁷ The impoverished nature of the Phrygian corpus renders it impossible to comment on its tense and aspect system.

⁸⁸ Other examples of the **i*-particle in adverbs are: Ved. *i-há* and OAvest. *idā* ‘here.’

⁸⁹ *eius*, the genitive singular for all three genders, is most likely a conflation of the masculine/neuter **esyō* and feminine **esyās*.

⁹⁰ Strunk (1994, p. 277) notes, with reference to Wackernagel (1906), the processes to which subminimal elements of the Indo-European lexicon are exposed: “Demzufolge hat in der Entwicklungsgeschicht vieler indogermanischer Sprachen wiederholt die natürliche satzrhythmische Tendenz bestanden, vor allem kurze und überkurze Einsilbler zu ersetzen, zu dehnen oder sonstwie – etwa durch Univerbierung mit benachbarten Satzelementen und durch andere morphologische Veränderungen – zu erweitern.” Brugmann (1904, p. 485) states that vocalic lengthening is attested for independent monosyllabic words that stand before *u*, *i*, or a consonantal liquid. This suggests that the lengthened syllabic augment (as seen in Skt. *ā-yunak* ‘s/he harnessed (a horse)’ and Hom. *ēeidē* ‘s/he knew’) occurred while this morpheme was still a free item in PIE (i.e. *ēeidē* < **ē-weidē* < **ē weidē* < ***e weidē*).

⁹¹ This lends strong support to the views of scholars, such as Watkins (1969), who classify the injunctive as a later development in selected Indo-European languages (cf. Szemerényi 1989, pp. 284-85).

⁹² The gnomic aorist most likely existed in Proto-Indo-European. Note that it is widely attested in both Vedic Sanskrit and Homeric Greek, which are two of the oldest Indo-European languages. Latin, a third old Indo-European language, has the gnomic perfect (cf. Allen and Greenough 1931, §475). The Latin perfect is essentially an amalgam of the old Indo-European perfect and aorist, and has retained many of the functions of the latter. It is less likely that the gnomic aorist was an independent innovation in three different speech groups (that were essentially isolated from one another) at a point when the aorist was overtly marked for past-time in some manner. The most likely explanation is that the gnomic aorist traces its origin back to Proto-Indo-European prior to the introduction of tense into the aspect system. At this point in time the augment was still a deictic particle which could, of course, appear in vivid environments.

REFERENCES

- Ahren, H. L. 1891. *Kleine Schriften I: Zur Sprachwissenschaft*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag. (Reprinted 1977)
- Allen, T. W. 1931. *Homeri Ilias (in three volumes)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Allen, J. H. and Greenough, J. B. 1931. *Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar* (J. B. Greenough, G. L. Kittredge, A. A. Howard, and B. J. D'Ooge, eds). New Rochelle: Aristide D. Caratzas, Publishers. (Reprinted 1992)
- Bakker, E. J. 1996. *Poetry in Speech. Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 1997. "Story Telling in the Future: Truth, Time, and Tense in Homeric Epic." In E. J. Bakker and A. Kahane, eds. *Written Voices, Spoken Signs. Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 11-36.
- 1999. *Homeric Performance and the Deixis of Time and Space*. Presentation at the CAMWS Conference, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Bechtel, G. 1936. *Hittite Verbs in -SK-: A Study of Verbal Aspect*. Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, Inc.
- Brugmann, K. 1880. "Beiträge zur Conjugationslehre." In H. Osthoff and K. Brugmann, *Morphologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen. Dritter Teil*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, pp. 1-15. Reprinted in W. A. Koch, ed. 1974. *Documenta Semiotica. Serie I. Linguistik*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- 1904. *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Chafe, W. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chantraine, P. 1958. *Grammaire homérique - Tome I: Syntax*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.

- Cunliffe, R. J. 1924. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. (Reprinted 1963)
- Curtius, G. 1880. *A Grammar of the Greek Language (edited by William Smith)*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Devine, A.M. and Stephens, L.D. 1984. *Language and Meter: Resolution, Porson's Bridge and their Prosodic Basis*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Drewitt, J. A. J. 1912. "The Augment in Homer." *The Classical Quarterly VI*: 44-59, 105-120.
- Finnegan, R. H. 1977. *Oral Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitzgerald, R. 1975. *Homer: The Odyssey*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing.
- Fleischman, S. 1990. *Tense and Narrativity – From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gehring, A. 1891. *Index Homericus*. Lipsia: G. Teubner.
- Gonda, J. 1956. *The Character of the Indo-European Moods with Special Regard to Greek and Sanskrit*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Goodwin, W. W. 1876. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*. Boston: Ginn Brothers.
- Hadley, J. 1877. *A Greek Grammar for Schools and Colleges*. New York: D. Appleton & Company.
- Hahn, E. A. 1953. "Some Hittite-Sanskrit Parallels." *Language 29*: 242-54.
- Hirt, H. 1927a. *Indogermanische Grammatik Teil I: Einleitung. I. Etymologie II. Konsonantismus*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- , 1927b. *Indogermanische Grammatik Teil III: Das Nomen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- , 1928. *Indogermanische Grammatik Teil IV: Doppelung. Zusammensetzung. Verbum*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Hoffmann, K. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

- , 1970. "Das Kategoriensystem des indogermanischen Verbuns." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 28: 19-41.
- Kiparsky, P. 1968. "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax." *Foundations of Language* 4: 30-57.
- Klein, J. S. 1989. "Homeric Greek *au*: A Synchronic, Diachronic, and Comparative Study." *Historische Sprachforschungen* 101: 249-288.
- Klein, J. S. and Condon, N. J. 1993. "Gothic *-(u)h*: A Synchronic and Comparative Study." *Transactions of the Philological Society* 91.1: 1-62.
- Krahe, H. 1959. *Indogermanische Sprachwissenschaft II: Formenlehre*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lief, W. and Bayfield, M. A. 1898. *The Iliad of Homer, Books XIII – XXIV*. London: MacMillan Publishers. (Reprinted 1968)
- Lord, A. B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Reprinted 1971)
- Meillet, A. 1938. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indoeuropéennes*. University: University of Alabama Press. (Reprinted 1964)
- Meister, K. 1921. *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. (Reprinted 1966)
- Minassian, M. 1980. *Grammaire d'arménien oriental*. Delmar: Caravan Books.
- Monro, D. B. 1888. *Iliad, Books XIII – XXIV*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (Reprinted 1964)
- , 1891. *A Grammar of the Homeric Dialect*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Murray, A. T. 1924. *Homer: The Iliad (Books I – XII)*. London: William Heinemann, Ltd. (Reprinted 1971)
- , 1925. *Homer: The Iliad (Books XIII – XXIV)*. London: William Heinemann, Ltd. (Reprinted 1976)
- , 1919a. *Homer: The Odyssey (Books i – xii)*. London: William Heinemann, Ltd. (Reprinted 1976)
- , 1919b. *Homer: The Odyssey (Books xiii – xxiv)*. London: William Heinemann, Ltd. (Reprinted 1980)

- Palmer, L. R. 1954. *The Latin Language*. Oklahoma City: University of Oklahoma Press. (Reprinted 1989)
- Pelliccia, H. N. 1986. *The Structure of Archaic Greek Hymns*. Ann Arbor: UMI Dissertation Services. (Reprinted 1997)
- Platt, A. 1891. "The Augment in Homer." *The Journal of Philology*. XIX: 211-237.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and Svartvik, J. 1973. *A Concise Grammar of Contemporary English*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Reck, M. 1995. *Homer: The Iliad*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Reichert, H. 1908. *Awestisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsverlag. (Reprinted 1978)
- Risch, E. 1959. "Frühgeschichte der griechischen Sprache." *Museum Helveticum* 16: 215-27. Reprinted in A. Etter and M. Looser, eds. 1981. *Kleine Schriften zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 438-50.
- Rosén, H. R. 1973. "Satzbau und Augmentloses historisches Tempus im homerischen Tatsachenbericht." *Folia Linguistica* 6: 315-30.
- Schewan, A. 1912. "The Homeric Augment." *Classical Philology*. VII: 397-411.
- Schwyzler, E. 1939. *Griechische Grammatik, auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik (in vier Bänden)*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Shipp, G. P. 1972. *Studies in the Language of Homer*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Sihler, A. 1995. *A New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Oxford: University Press.
- Smyth, H. W. 1920. *Greek Grammar* (revised by Gordon M. Messing). Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Reprinted 1956)
- Strunk, K. 1994. "Der Ursprung des verbalen Augments – Ein Problem Franz Bopps aus heutiger Sicht." In R. Sternemann, ed. *Bopp Symposium 1992 der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: Akten der Konferenz vom 24.3.-26.3. 1992 aus Anlaß von Franz Bopps zweihundertjährigem Geburtstag am 14.9.1991*. Heidelberg: C. Winters Universitätsverlag, pp. 270-84.
- Szemerényi, O. 1989. *Einführung in die vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

- Thumb, A. and Hauschild, R. 1959. *Handbuch des Sanskrit - II. Teil: Formenlehre*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsverlag.
- Thurneysen, R. 1885. "Der indogermanische imperativ." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 27: 172-80.
- Vilborg, E. 1960. *A Tentative Grammar of Mycenaean Greek*. Göteborg: Elanders Boktryckeri Aktieborg.
- Wackernagel, J. 1906. "Wortumfang und Wortform." *Nachrichten von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, pp. 147-184. Reprinted in 1969. *Jacob Wackernagel Kleine Schriften. Herausgegeben von der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Erster Band*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 148-85.
- , 1926. *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*. Basel: Emil Birkhäuser.
- Watkins, C. 1963. "Preliminaries to a Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Syntax of the Old Irish Verb." *Celtica VI*: 1-49.
- , 1969. *Indogermanische Grammatik III/1: Geschichte der indogermanischen Verbalflexion*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsverlag.
- Werth, P. 1984. *Focus, Coherence and Emphasis*. London: Croom Helm.
- Whitney, W. D. 1889. *Sanskrit Grammar*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (Reprinted 1989)
- Wilcock, M. M. 1978. *The Iliad of Homer, Books I – XII*. London: St. Martin's Press.
- , 1984. *The Iliad of Homer, Books XIII – XXIV*. London: St. Martin's Press.