

Drewitt's Rule and the origin of the augment

Ian Hollenbaugh
ihollenbaugh@humnet.ucla.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES
Program in Indo-European Studies

EAST COAST INDO-EUROPEAN CONFERENCE
19 June 2021

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Proposal
- 3 Assessing the evidence
- 4 Conclusion
- 5 Comparative evidence



Drewitt's Rule

- **Drewitt's Rule:** In Homer, augmented verbs tend not to be followed by the conjunction δέ (Drewitt 1912).

regular: νόησε δέ 'and (s)he noticed' (//. 5.669, etc.)

rare: ἐκάλυψε δέ 'and (s)he hid' (//. 3.381=20.444)

(a ratio of about 18:1 among Aorists)

- Willi (2018:367, 378–9) has pointed out that Drewitt's Rule has implications for the origin of the augment, particularly according to the Bréal–Strunk model.

Bréal–Strunk model

- Bréal (1900): The augment originated as an “emphatic” particle:
 - ▶ Gk. ἦ ‘truly, indeed, certainly’
 - ▶ Ved. ἴ ‘id.’
- Strunk (1994): A PIE “free adverb” *é ‘(then) indeed’ would have been lengthened to *é̄ when not attached to another element, such as a verb.

Willi 2018

- Willi (2018:378): If the augment had the same origin as ῆ̂:
 - ▶ Not expected: AUGMENTLESS VERB + δέ 'and' (Drewitt's pattern)
 - ▶ Expected: “narrative units” of ῆ̂δέ 'and' + AUGMENTLESS VERB.

- Willi (2018:367): Why, if the augment was originally an independent adverb, do we never find constructions of the type:
 - ▶ *ἔ δὲ θῆκε 'and (s)he placed'

Willi 2018

- Bottin (1969:102, 110–11): The combination VERB + δέ is far more typical of narrative (both inside and outside of direct speeches) than of dialogue.
 - ▶ “‘Drewitt’s Rule’ is thus inseparable from the preference for non-augmented pasts in Homeric narrative” (Willi 2018:368).
 - ▶ Drewitt (1912) finds that the Aorist in sequential narration and the Imperfect/Pluperfect in general are regularly augmented in Homer, particularly outside quoted speech.

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Proposal**
- 3 Assessing the evidence
- 4 Conclusion
- 5 Comparative evidence



Claims

- Willi's *ἐ δέ + AUGMENTLESS VERB *is* found:
 - ▶ type ἦδέ + AUGMENTLESS VERB

- This accounts for his expected “narrative units” of ἦδέ + AUGMENTLESS VERB, which are not infrequent:
 - ▶ E.g., μὲν κλύον ἦδὲ πίθοντο ‘they listened and obeyed’ (Il. 9.75, etc.).

Claims

- Roughly analogous to “tmesis”: type ἀπὸ δ’ ἴκετο ‘and he came’ (*Od.* 12.2).
 - ▶ Cf. similarly Gothic: *ga-u-laubeis du sunau gudis* (Jn 9:35) ‘Do you believe in the son of God?’.
 - ▶ Goth. *-u* < **h₂u* ~ **-h₂o* ‘to that’, ‘also’, ‘and’ (LIPP:II.334 ff.).
- Because δέ normally stands second in its clause, whenever ῆ̂ is present we get ῆ̂δέ + AUGMENTLESS VERB.
- When ῆ̂ is absent, the verb that would otherwise have followed is necessarily at the front of the clause instead, such that δέ is still in second position, hence the type AUGMENTLESS VERB + δέ.

Claims

- This latter type is so frequent precisely because the augment is dispreferred in narration in Homer.
 - ▶ The fact that narrative events tend to be sequential favors the use of the connective.
 - ▶ The fact that the context is narrative disfavors the augment.
- If this is so, then Willi's (2018) objections are not well founded and cannot in themselves be used to dismiss the Bréal–Strunk hypothesis of the origin of the augment.

Claims

- The Bréal–Strunk model is in line with the claims of Hollenbaugh 2020:
- Argued on independent grounds that the augment originally indicated “certainty” or “Wirklichkeit” (Wackernagel, 1926–8 [2009]:181 “actual occurrence”).
 - ▶ So in Homeric (gnomic, futurate, and “perfect-like” Aorist).
 - ▶ In Vedic reinterpreted as an indicative marker (its presence rules out modal readings that the injunctive allows).
- The evidence of supposed cognates to $\hat{\eta}$ is difficult to assess; some attempt will be made at the end of this talk (Ved. \acute{a} , Lat. \bar{e}).

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Proposal
- 3 Assessing the evidence**
- 4 Conclusion
- 5 Comparative evidence



Metrics

- The augment is not metrically guaranteed after ἦδέ ‘and’.
 - ▶ Exception: ἦδὲ ἔφασκε ‘and said’, 3x in the *Odyssey*).
- Thus ἦδέ + the Aorist of πείθομαι ‘obey’ is variously written:
 - ▶ ἦδ’ ἐπίθοντο or ἦδὲ πίθοντο
- We may reasonably suppose that at least a fair number of what were originally of the type ἦδὲ πίθοντο were later reinterpreted as ἦδ’ ἐπίθοντο (so written uniformly in West’s (1998–2000, 2017) editions).

Connective ἤδέ

- ἤδέ has certain advantages that would have favored its extraction as a pure connective:
 - ▶ For one thing, it permits conjunction of the type “A AND B” rather than “A B AND” (as with δέ on its own).
 - ▶ The existence of ἤδέ thus increases the inventory of the prosodic shape of conjunction with δέ, providing more options available for use in particular metrical positions.

Connective ἦδέ

- In addition, it is metrically convenient, occurring regularly after bucolic diaeresis:

(1) τριχθὰ δὲ οἴκηθεν καταφυλαδόν, **ἦδὲ φίληθεν**
 ἐκ Διός (*Il.* 2.668–9).

‘And they settled in three companies according to tribe, **and they were favored** by Zeus’.

- ▶ Also other positions: E.g., ἔκχεον ἦδ’ εὖχοντο θεοῖς αἰειγενέτησιν
 ‘they poured out and prayed to the everlasting gods’ (*Il.* 3.296).
- ▶ ἦμέν after strong caesura (*Od.* 14.201) or at line beginning (*Il.* 7.301, *Od.* 8.383–4).

Metrics

- By contrast, a putative *ἔ δέ or *ἔδέ would not suit this metrical position, nor could it be placed at the beginning of the line (e.g., *Od.* 8.383–4) (so too with *ἔμέν).
- Still, the sequence *ἔ δέ/*ἔδέ + AUGMENTLESS VERB could have been suitably placed after a caesura, as ὁ δέ:
 - ▶ After strong caesura: Cf. πόντον ἐπιπλείων. ὁ δὲ χώσατο ‘sailing over the sea. And he got angry’ (*Od.* 5.284).
 - ▶ After weak caesura: Cf. ἐκ δὲ δόρυ σπάσεν αὐτίς. ὁ δὲ βραχε χάλκεος Ἄρης ‘and she drew the spear back out. And brazen Ares howled’ (*Il.* 5.859).
 - ▶ After hephthemimeral caesura: Cf. ὦς εἰπὼν ἐν χερσὶ τίθει, ὁ δὲ δέξατο ‘So saying, he put (her) in his hands, and the other received (her)’ (*Il.* 1.446).

Length

- Willi (2018:378) claims that “Strunk’s lengthening hypothesis is weakened by the observation that ῆ̂ is long also in ῆ̂δέ... despite being attached to another element.”
- However, a conspiracy of factors can be taken to explain why we get ῆ̂δέ rather than *ἔδέ.

Length

- The metrical convenience of ῆδέ just mentioned would favor its use over *ἐδέ in important slots of the hexameter.
- The simplex form ῆ is frequent on its own, and analogy might have prevented its short form occurring before δέ (also μέν, etc.).
- Even stronger than analogy may have been opacity:
 - ▶ If the connective was indeed extracted from an original ῆ δέ, then it would actually require *shortening* for speakers to produce *ἐδέ.
 - ▶ This is unlikely if, as I believe, the split between ῆ and ἐ- had already taken place by the time of Homer (i.e., ῆ was no longer understood as a lengthened underlying /e/).

Accent

- Another issue is that, by all appearances, the augment is a strongly accented element:
 - ▶ Cf. the Ved. augment \acute{a} -, which is always accent bearing.
 - ▶ The Greek accent never moves further back than the augment, despite the Law of Limitation (e.g., $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\omicron\nu$ 'I obtained').
 - ▶ Willi (2018:380, n.64) wonders whether the inherited accent on the augment contributed to the rise of recessive accentuation in the Greek verbal paradigm.
- How then can such a strongly accented element lose its accent in composition with Wackernagel particles?

Accent

- First, we cannot be certain that manuscript HΔE did not represent ῆ́ δέ in Homer.
 - ▶ Cf. ῆ́ μὲν μοι (*Il.* 1.77), ῆ́ μὲν ἐμοί (*Il.* 14.275), ῆ́ μὲν δῆ (*Il.* 3.430).
 - ▶ ῆ́ μὲν καὶ νέος ἐσσι... ἄτὰρ πεπνυμένα βάζεις
'You are young yet, but you speak prudently' (*Il.* 9.57–8).
 - ▶ ῆ́ with certain enclitics: ῆ́ ποτε (*Il.* 1.240) and ῆ́ ῥά (*Il.* 3.183, etc.).
 - ▶ This would resemble its treatment when followed by clearly stressed postpositives: ῆ́ μάν/μήν, ῆ́ μάλα, ῆ́ μέγα, ῆ́ πολύ, ῆ́ δῆ.
- Second, the accentuation of ῆ́δῆ seems to be part of a larger phenomenon, wherein “ῆ́ βεβαιωτικόν becomes a mere ‘particle-fulcrum’” (Dunkel 1997:21).

Accent

- ἤμέν/-δέ are treated as proclitic, with graphic accent on the final syllable, as with other proclitics:
 - ▶ μετά, παρά, ἀλλά, ἀτάρ, αὐτάρ
 - ▶ ἰδέ, οὐδέ, μηδέ (despite accented μή).
 - ▶ Likewise ἦ(Ϝ)έ ‘or’ (cf. Lat. -ve, Skt. -vā).
- So in ἦδέ we do not have /ḥ̂ + δέ/ but deaccented /ḥ + δε/.
 - ▶ But cf. West 1998–2000:p.XVIII on ἦτοι ‘verily’ (“non ḥ̂τοι”):
“circumflexus enim ante encliticum in accentum abiit”
(cf. also ἦ-δη ‘already’).

Syntax and diachrony

- Analogy to tmesis of preverbs is only an analogy:
 - ▶ The augment cannot synchronically be separated from its verb, as preverbs can.
 - ▶ When not in tmesis the augment is always closest to the verbal root (as in Skt.): e.g., προσ-έ-ειπεν '(s)he addressed'.
 - ▶ Unlike preverbs, ἦ 'truly' is not limited to use with verbs (e.g., ἦ δὴ λoύγiα ἔργ' (*Il.* 1.518)), as with Skt. *ā*.
 - ▶ Unlike the augment, ἦ is not restricted by tense, mood, or finiteness.
- The split between the asseverative particle and its doublet that was incorporated into the verbal morphology must have occurred prehistorically (above distributional facts shared by Ilr.).

Syntax and diachrony

- There need not have been a stage at which the augment, *per se*, was “separable” in the same sense that preverbs are in Homer.
- Rather, the emphatic particle $*e/\bar{e}$ carried certain implicatures, which became conventionalized and partially incorporated into verbal morphology.
- But, perhaps facilitated by their phonological dissimilarity, the two forms underwent a total lexical split (unlike preverbs).
- Still, the verbal implicatures brought out by the asseverative particle $\hat{\eta}$ remain detectable in certain cases.

Use in speech

- While formulae of the type ἦδὲ πύθοντο are common, we also find ἦδέ in direct speech, precisely where the type νόησε δέ is scarce.
 - (2) πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι
υἱὲς ἐνὶ μεγάρῳι ἦμὲν τράφεν ἦδ' ἐγένοντο.
'And many other sons likewise have been born and raised in his palace' (Od. 14.200–1).
- Peculiar to have an Aorist with “perfect-like” interpretation lacking augment (τράφεν), which is rarely found (Drewitt 1912:44).
- But if the ἦ-element found in ἦμὲν originally had some association with the augment, then the apparent absence of the augment on τράφεν is less remarkable (cf. similarly *Od.* 8.383–4, also in speech).

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Proposal
- 3 Assessing the evidence
- 4 Conclusion**
- 5 Comparative evidence



Summary

- A benefit of this analysis is that it explains Drewitt's Rule as a matter of course:
 - ▶ Since $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ normally stands second in its clause, when clause-initial $\hat{\eta}$ was present, then $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ would naturally follow it and the verb would follow the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (type $\hat{\eta}\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ » $\hat{\eta}\delta'$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$).
 - ▶ When there was no $\hat{\eta}$, the verb would stand at the front of its clause, such that the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ was still in second position (type $\nu\acute{o}\eta\sigma\epsilon$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$).

Summary

- Under this view, Drewitt's Rule becomes trivial:
 - ▶ Where the augment is not there, the augment is not found (νόησε δέ); where it is there, it is found (ἤδὲ πίθοντο/ἤδ' ἐπίθοντο).
- This accounts for the observed distribution, thereby motivating Drewitt's Rule, while also eliminating the problem for the Bréal–Strunk model raised by Willi (2018).

Summary

- By Willi's (2018:379) own assessment, the Bréal–Strunk model is the most compelling of the hypotheses (aside from his own) concerning the origin of the augment.
- Given the explanatory power of this hypothesis not only for Drewitt's Rule but also for the supposed original meaning of the augment as a marker of certainty (Hollenbaugh 2020), it seems reasonable not to rule out the Bréal–Strunk model in our pursuit of the augment's origin.

Table of Contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Proposal
- 3 Assessing the evidence
- 4 Conclusion
- 5 Comparative evidence**



Latin evidence for asseverative *ē

■ Latin ē (per Dunkel 1997:21):

- ▶ *ēcastor, ēiuno, ēquirīne*
- ▶ *e nos lasas iuvate* 'Hey Lares, help us!' (Carmen Arvale)
- ▶ *edi* (Titinus), *edepol* < *ē *dejuoj*, *ē *dejuē*

Vedic evidence for asseverative *ē

- Vedic \acute{a} – postpositive, mostly after nominals, but:

- (3) *sá hí śmā dhánváḡṣitaṃ dātā ná **dāty** \acute{a} paśúḥ* (RV V.7.7ab).
'Since he like cattle mowing the land (such that it is) deathless/inhabitable, is always **mowing it down**'.
- (4) *vísṡvā dvéśāṃsi jahí cáva ca \acute{a} kṛdhi víśve **sanvantu** \acute{a} vásu* (RV VIII.53.4ab).
'Smash all hatreds and bring them low. Let all (of us) **really win goods**'.

Vedic evidence

- The equation Gk. $\hat{\eta}$ = Ved. \acute{a} is generally dismissed because Ved. \acute{a} is postpositive (so Willi 2018:379).
- Yet Dunkel (1997:21–2) argues that some cases of pre-verbal Ved. \acute{a} have an asseverative function (comparing Gk. $\hat{\eta}$).
 - ▶ “[M]any cases of R̥gvedic \acute{a} usually taken *faute de mieux* as the preverb continue the emphatic particle used sentence-initially, comparable to its continuants in Greek ([including] $\hat{\eta}$, $\hat{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu/-\delta\acute{\epsilon}$)” (Dunkel 1997:25–6).

Vedic evidence

- “Many” is a considerable overstatement, but there may be some.

(5) *ā devānām abhavaḥ ketúr agne (RV III.1.17a).*

‘Yes, you have become the beacon of the gods, o Agni’.

(6) *ā tú na indra kauśika mandasānáḥ sutám piba (RV I.10.11ab).*

‘Hey you, o Indra, (god) of Kuśika, to reach exhilaration drink our pressed (soma)’.

(similarly *RV IV.32.1ab, VIII.82.4a*)

Vedic evidence

- Some possible cases are not “sentence-initial,” though they are pre-verbal:

(7) *sá sunvatá índraḥ sūryam á devó riṇaṇi mártiyāya stavān* (RV II.19.5ab).

‘He, Indra, for the (soma-)presser, a god for a mortal, **really ceded** the sun when praised’.

(8) *áhāni gṛdhrāḥ páry á va águḥ* (RV I.88.4a).

‘For days (like) vultures they **have been wheeling all around** (this insight) for you’ (but cf. Jamison 2015–:ad loc.).

Vedic evidence

- Dunkel (1997:22) compares Ved. $\acute{a} \dots \acute{á}$ to Hmc. ἤμεν... ἠδέ:

(9) $\acute{á} tva sahasram \acute{á} \acute{s}atam \dots váhantu$ (RV VIII.1.24).

'Here(?) let a thousand, here(?) let a hundred convey you'.

(10) $\acute{á} no r\acute{á}dh\bar{a}msi savita stavádhy\bar{a} \acute{á} r\acute{á}yo yantu párvatasya r\bar{a}t\acute{a}ú$
(RV VII.37.8ab).

'Here(?) let rewards come to us to be praised, o Savitar;
here(?) let the riches of the mountain come at (the time for)
giving.'

Is the Bréal–Strunk hypothesis viable?

- The Homeric evidence seems to support some connection between the augment and $\hat{\eta}$ ‘truly’.
- But the Vedic and Latin evidence is incredibly slight and essentially uninformative as regards an asseverative $*\bar{e}$.
- While the usage of the augment in Vedic and Homer is in line with viewing its original function as adverbial in the sense ‘really, truly’, and though there is an asseverative particle \acute{a} in the *RV*, the equation $\hat{\eta} = \acute{a}$ is difficult on both syntactic and functional grounds.

Willi 2018

- Willi's (2018) own idea is that the augment originated as a reduplicating syllable of reduplicated Aorists and was extracted as a perfectivizing prefix.
- This predicts incompatibility with $-\sigma\chi$ -forms and the special affinity of the augment for the Aorist, rather than the Pluperfect or Imperfect.
- But this creates more problems than it solves. Not predicted are:
 - ▶ Augmented Imperfects and Pluperfects.
 - ▶ Augmentless modals and non-finite forms.
 - ▶ Augmentless Present and Future?
 - ▶ Lack of augment in narration.

Watkins 1963

- Watkins (1963:15), comparing the Luwian sentence connective *a-* ‘and then’ and (functionally) Old Irish *no* and Hittite *nu* ‘id.’, proposes that the augment was originally “a sentence connective used with injunctive forms (with secondary endings) in the function of continuous narration”.
 - ▶ *no-bered* ‘took’, *no-m-bered* ‘took me’.
- But Willi (2018:377) objects that “if Watkins’s theory were true, we should obviously expect the augment to be most common in continuous narrative, precisely where it is not at home” (i.e., in Homer and the *R̥gveda*).

Asseverative to connective

- Still, the trajectory from asseverative particle/adverb to sentence connective is plausible:
 - ▶ Cf. Hitt. *šū* if from asseverative **h₁su* 'well, truly' (Zimmer 1994:160, 165, n.17; cf. LIPP:II.299, Dunkel 2007:57).
 - ▶ Restricted to the Preterite due to the certainty of past events.

Asseverative to connective

- Cases where *šū* is not followed by a Preterite in Hittite are explained by Goedegebuure (*CHD*, s.v.) as motivated by a desire to insist on the reality of the clause.

(11) *še-e-r=a-a=š-ša-an GADA-an pé-eš-ši-e-mi š=u-uš* [(LÚ-aš)]
na-at-ta a-uš-zi (KBo 17.1+ iv 22, OH/OS).

'And I throw a cloth over it (a basket), such that (= to be sure that) no man will see them (the contents).'

[Thanks to Craig Melchert for this comparison and information.]

Asseverative to connective

- In principle, then, the “sentence connective” and “asseverative particle” hypotheses are not necessarily mutually exclusive.
- Indeed, Dunkel (2007:57) suggests that Luw. *a-* could continue asseverative $*eh_1$, which in his view also gave Gk. $\hat{\eta}$ and Ved. asseverative \acute{a} (cf. LIPP:II.209–10).





Summary

- The augment indicates certainty in Homer and marks indicative mood in Vedic (Hollenbaugh 2020).
- Its connection with an asseverative particle is accordingly attractive.
- Nonetheless, it is difficult to say anything definitive about its etymology on the basis of the evidence as we have it, particularly as regards a possible connection with known asseverative particles (Gk. ἦ, Ved. \hat{a}) and/or sentence connectives (Luw. *a-*).
- So, while I think the original function of the augment is clear enough, its etymology cannot be definitively established, at least for now.






Thank you!





References I

-  Bottin, Luigi. 1969. Studio dell'aumento in Omero. *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 10:69–145.
-  Bréal, Michel. 1900. Les Commencements du verbe. *MSL* II:268–84.
-  Drewitt, J. A. J. 1912. The Augment in Homer. *The Classical Quarterly* 6 (1 and 2): 44–59 and 104–120.
-  Dunkel, George E. 1997. Mono- and Disyllabic *á* in the *R̥gveda*. In *Syntaxe des langues indo-iraniennes anciennes: Colloque international – Sitges (Barcelona) 4–5 mai 1993*, edited by Éric Pirart. Sabadell, Barcelona: Editorial AUSA.





References II

-  Dunkel, George E. 2007. Chips from an Aptotologist's Workshop I. In *Verba Docenti: Studies in Historical and Indo-European Linguistics Presented to Jay H. Jasanoff by Students, Colleagues, and Friends*, edited by Alan J. Nussbaum, 53–61. Ann Arbor / New York: Beech Stave Press.
-  ———. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*. Vol. I–II. Heidelberg: Winter.
-  Hollenbaugh, Ian. 2020. Augmented reality: A diachronic pragmatic approach to the development of the IE injunctive and augment. Paper presented at the 39th East Coast Indo-European Conference, Blacksburg, Virginia, 12–14 June 2020.
https://ihollenbaugh.files.wordpress.com/2020/12/augmented_reality_a_diachronic_pragmatic.pdf.

References III

-  Jamison, Stephanie W. 2015–. *Rigveda Translation: Commentary*. WordPress. <http://rigvedacommentary.alc.ucla.edu/>.
-  Strunk, Klaus. 1994. Relative Chronology and Indo-European Verb-System: The Case of Present-and Aorist-Stems. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 22 (3–4): 417–434.
-  Wackernagel, Jacob. 1926–8 [2009]. *Lectures on Syntax: With Special Reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic*. Edited and translated by David Langslow. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.
-  Watkins, Calvert. 1963. Preliminaries to a historical and comparative analysis of the syntax of the Old Irish verb. *Celtica* 6:1–49.

References IV

-  West, Martin L. 1998–2000. *Homeri Ilias*. Vol. I–II. Berlin / Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
-  ———. 2017. *Homerus Odyssea*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
-  Willi, Andreas. 2018. *The Origins of the Greek Verb*. Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press.
-  Zimmer, Stefan. 1994. Griech. ;(-) usw.: Ablautstufe und Wortart. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 55:157–91.