

DOUBLETS IN THE ODYSSEY

The purpose of this article is to examine a neglected formulaic element in Homer, which we may call the doublet, and to establish its nature and function by comparison with—mainly—Irish narrative literature.¹ By doublet is meant a combination of two terms which are to all intents synonymous. Without attempting to give a new definition of formula it may be useful to say that both the doublet and the noun-epithet formula—and perhaps only these two—are formulae of the *style* of heroic narrative. They belong to the special language of the bard, they are part of the fabric of narrative irrespective of that narrative's content. Other types of formula arise from the incidents of narrative, for example, a combat formula, or from the need to indicate passage of time or transition, for example, a retiring or getting-up formula, and so on. To resort to ancient terminology, doublets and noun-epithets belong to the form of epic, while other formulae belong to the matter. Since formulae of the matter use the language of epic, they may contain noun-epithets or doublets or both. That is why the doublet and the noun-epithet are formulae in themselves and also formulaic elements in other formulae.

It may be opportune here to consider briefly an aspect of the noun-epithet, which will show it as a twin tool, with the doublet, of the epic composer's craft. Much has been written on the epithet itself, its thrift, position in the line, the limitations metre impose, and so on; what is emphasized here is something anterior to such considerations, something more basic, namely, that the epithet, as far as it can, echoes the noun, is the shadow of its substance, an inseparable familiar, so to speak. The epithet seeks to add nothing to the concept which the noun already enshrines in itself. This is indeed a strange objective on the part of the epithet and in practice one not easily attained. However, to demonstrate the practice it will perhaps suffice to review briefly the first 150 lines of *Odyssey* 1.

Nouns which represent natural features or objects give epithets the clearest scope, for their nature does not change or develop. Features of this class in the passage chosen are *caves*, described as *hollow* (σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι, 15, 74); an *island*, described as *flowed-about* by water (νήσω ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, 50); the *sky*, described as *broad* (οὐρανὸν εὐρύν, 67); and *sponges*, described as *many-holed* (σπόγγοισι πολυτρήτοισι, 111). It will be seen that the epithet defines the noun almost in a dictionary manner. Caves can be large, dark, inhabited, sub-let, but no cave can fail to be hollow. Islands can be small, or wooded: flowed about by water (or traffic, perhaps), they must be.

Close to this class are animals, whose native qualities may be regarded as unchanging. *Flocks of sheep* are described as *timid* (μῆλ' ἄδιδά, 92), *cattle* as *shambling*, *horn-curved* (εἰλίποδας ἔλικας βούς, 92).

¹ Munro, e.g., dismisses the phenomenon in a short, though notable, comment on *Od.* 15.175: 'γενεή τε τόκος τε is an example of the kind of hendiadys formed by two nearly synonymous words: e.g. κραδίη θυμός τε, ὕβρις τε βίη τε, βουλή τε νόος τε, ἀνείρεαι ἡδὲ μεταλλᾶς, μάχης ἡδὲ πολέμου, Lat. more modoque, Germ. "Art und Weise". The two meanings are fused, as it were,

into a single more complete conception.' Parry does not deal with the topic. The term doublet has been used in a broader sense to characterize the rehandling or recurrence of analogous thematic material. See, e.g., B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*, p.238 et al. (Hermes Einzelschrift 1968, Heft 21).

Natural features of landscape also may be likely to have a leading characteristic. *Troy* is said to be *broad* (Τροίη ἐν εὐρείῃ, 62), and *Pylos*, *sandy* (Πύλον ἡμαθόεντα, 93). The matter is already becoming complex, for Homer can (and does) stress other characteristics of these places. However, as far as one can explore, these epithets are reflections of qualities native to the places concerned, qualities not accidental or acquired (cases like Πύλον Νηλήϊον are understandable extensions²). Gods and men, viewed simply as beings, have epithets which reflect the supposedly essential qualities of the substantive. In our passage we have *immortal gods* (ἀθανάτων θεῶν, 79), and *blessed gods* (μακάρεσσι θεοῖσι, 82).

When it comes to named gods and persons, the epithet may be said to be more substantive than the noun; for the name itself can do no more than identify the person, and it falls to the epithet to indicate the particular talent or quality which marks out the individual. It is indeed true that heroes and heroines can have epithets of a general, laudatory kind, which belong to them as heroic rather than individual (much as we would see a distinction between *a noble man* and *a nobleman*): it must be recognized that heroic literature always distinguishes persons, their gods, and their milieu as of superior quality. However, prominent characters are likely to have epithets which indicate a particular or individual quality. In the present passage *Odysseus* is described as, in general, *godlike* (ἀντιθέω Ὀδυσῆι, 21), and *wise* (Ὀδυσῆι δαίφρονι, 48, 83), and, in particular, *of enduring mind* (Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, 87, 129). The only epithet applied to Telemachus is general, *godlike* (θεοειδής, 113). As yet he has not distinguished himself, but, in contrast, *Orestes* is described as *far-famed* (τηλεκλυτός . . . Ὀρέστης, 30), for, although youthful, he has won wide fame by avenging his father's murder. *Zeus* is both *Olympian* and *cloudgathering* (Ὀλυμπίου, 27; νεφεληγερέτα, 63). *Poseidon* is both *earthholding* and *earth-shaking* (γαίηοχος, 68; ἐνοσίχθων, 74) in accordance with his chthonic nature.

As with persons, possessions or man-made things are of superior quality, and epithets may, in general, emphasize this or give some desirable attribute to be expected in such goods: in our passage *sandals* are *beautiful* (καλά, 96), a *spear* is *stout* (ἄλκιμον, 99) and tipped with *sharp bronze* (ὀξεῖ χαλκῷ, 99). A table is *polished* or *smoothed* (ξεστήν, 138), as is also the *spear-receptacle* which receives the spear of Athene (εὐξόου, 128). A *palace* is *high* (δόμου ὑψηλοῖο, 126), a *pillar* or *pillars* are described as *tall* (μακράς, 53–4, μακρὴν, 127), which saves their nature from recession into mere props.

In the case of abstract nouns the difficulty of providing an epithet which goes to the heart of the abstraction is greater. The first example in the passage chosen is the *day of return* (νόστιμον ἡμαρ, 9), where the substantive is itself

² In *Iliad* 24.255–6 Priam calls himself utterly ill-fated since he begot excellent sons in *broad* Troy only to see them perish (he does not say *unlucky* Troy). On the other hand Latin poets, although they use epithets of Homeric type, also use such combinations as, for example, 'damnosas . . . artes' (Ov. *Metam.* 8.215), referring to 'the arts of Daedalus whereby he made wings for himself and his son, Icarus—'arts which would bring him loss'. This is an interesting liberation of the epithet, but it is not Homeric. The only somewhat analogous

development in Homer which comes to mind is Penelope's statement that Odysseus had gone to look on 'evil Troy that may not be named' (ῥῆκετ' ἐποψόμενος Κακοῖλιον οὐκ ὀνομαστήν, *Od.* 19.260, 596, and 23.19). The phrase appears to be a formula and while the prefix *κακο-* could be regarded as an epithet the real epithet is *οὐκ ὀνομαστήν*, *not to be named*, whereby the poet rejects in a novel manner the very idea not merely of an epithet but even of the very noun itself.

general and its particular nature here is conveyed by the epithet, the whole idea being equivalent to *νόστος* (itself a complex notion), just as the analogous expressions *δούλιον ἥμαρ* and *ἐλεύθερον ἥμαρ* mean slavery and freedom. We have also *destruction* characterized by *steep* (*αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον*, 11, 37) in which phrase the community of ideas is obvious enough. Then also we have *counsel* or *decision* described as *unerring* (*νημερτέα βουλήν*, 81). In this case the epithet bears the main burden of significance, since the decision concerned is divine decision and its chief attribute is that it does not fail of fulfilment.

A final example from the passage may serve to sum up this aspect of the epithet's nature and function, namely *ἄλοχον μνηστήν*, 36, *wedded wife*. This translation nicely gives the sense of identity inherent in the Greek words, though accidentally. Languages derived from Indo-European do not distinguish between wife and woman (the word *wife* itself is not Indo-European). *Ἄλοχος* (related to *λέχος*, *λόχος*, Lat. *lectus*, O. Ir. *lige*, 'lying') means female bedfellow, while *μνηστός* (connected with *μνάομαι*, Ir. ben. *mná*, 'woman', cf. *γυνή*, Boeot. *βανά*) is no more than the adjective 'made a woman' (Homer's word for suitors is *μνηστήρες*, 'men after women!').

If then Homer is characterizing nouns which have in themselves the qualities which the epithet wholly or partly conveys, if, to state the matter with ludicrous bluntness, Homer is talking about hollow hollows, or islandy islands, sheepy sheep, spongy sponges, womaned women, we must ask ourselves in what circumstances such combinations make sense. The combination represents a double image but a single idea, and the constant recurrence of the figure or device is obviously useful in the context of *oral* narrative. It is an oral device. Its function may be to slow the narrative and relax or ease the attention of the listener. It also helps the narrator in so far as the nouns give him, so to speak, their own epithets. They spring to mind without his having to reflect or ponder.

To say they spring to mind without reflection is not the same as saying that long experience enables the bard to find the epithet as readily as he finds the noun, absent-mindedly, one might say, although this is, perhaps, very true. What is concerned here is the method of the tradition, which is a visionary method. The tradition envisages³ ideas and, in the case of nouns, the epithet's function is not at all to elaborate the idea of the noun but to emphasize it by repetition of the image; or, if the noun cannot fully convey the idea, to complete the picture. There is but one picture, one image in the mind of the tradition.

Reflection or pondering is a hallmark of written literature. In general, oral literature lacks reflection. Even where it occurs, it is a sort of in-built reflection, implanted by the tradition, which may recur again and again, a reflex rather than a free, personal reflection which the artist hits on in the course of his work. The oral narrator cannot pause to reflect in the course of narration/composition, and so his epithets, and even his 'reflections', while they are far from thoughtless or unmeticulous, are nevertheless not 'free' but preconceived. On the other hand, the writer is free to reflect and include in his work elements which come to him in a process of composition which has no urgency, which permits of revision and change. The example of a Latin epithet given above (n.2)—*damnosas artes*, arts which were fated to bring loss—has a reflective quality, the writer looks

³ The operation of vision in heroic literature is a large question of which the

epithet-noun combinations is a small aspect.

to future events and his epithet is both prophetic and ironic, but is in no way linked inherently to *arts*. To take a line from *Paradise Lost*, 'in adamantine chains and penal fire', here Milton's first epithet is Homeric or oral in its quality, but *penal* reflects on the purpose of the fire, has no inherent connection with fire itself, and is not Homeric.

If it is admitted that the intention of the noun-epithet is to present a single idea through a double image, it will be immediately obvious that the doublet is a similar device which realizes its intention with even greater precision. For the two terms which combine, two nouns or two verbs and so on, are grammatically of the same class. A convenient example of a doublet is provided by the common English expression *with might and main*. In fact an almost exact translation or anticipation of this occurs in the *Odyssey*, *δύναμις καὶ χεῖρες* (20, 237 *et al.*).⁴ These terms, strength and hands, are not strictly synonymous but are made so by metaphor and the intention of the composer. It is clear that the very existence of synonyms implies a long tradition of language in its artistic application. Furthermore the general principle of 'thrift' would militate against the large-scale provision of synonyms, apart from this special usage where the development of synonyms is part of the composer's thrift—the economical way of conveying a strong visual image.

Another expression, a formula of transition—*αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ρ' ὀμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὄρκον*—occurs five times in the *Odyssey* and we deem it to be a doublet. A grammarian might argue (and synonyms of their nature invite argument) that *to swear* and *to complete the oath* are not the same thing. One might imagine in an elaborate oath of the kind described in *Iliad* 3, where imprecations are called down upon the party whichsoever may prove false to the oath, that *completing* the oath might be a technical term for the imprecation and so on. Even if this were so, it makes no difference to the reality of the doublet above. In each Homeric instance the mere assurance of a verbal oath is sought and given. There is no question of technicality. The device is purely one of emphasis. On the other hand, the line *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεισάν τ' ἐπιόν θ' ὄσον ἤθελε θυμός* (*Od.* 3.342), although it is indeed a formula, does not contain a doublet but merely two ideas which are closely associated. In some instances there may be room for doubt. For example, the expression *αἵματι καὶ λυθρῷ πεπαλαγμένον*, *stained with blood and gore*, occurs in the *Iliad* and twice in the *Odyssey*; blood and gore, though closely related, as are the corresponding Greek terms, may not necessarily be thought of as conveying a single idea. It is important that two apparently synonymous terms are found to recur, for it must be kept in mind that doublets are formulae. Without recurrence there is no indication that a doublet is part of the system which the tradition has established as useful to itself.

In the following sets of doublets the caesura is indicated. It relates to the doublet in the same way as it relates to the noun-epithet. References are by book and line to the *Odyssey* (O.C.T., 2nd edn., Allen). The caesura is classified at the top right-hand corner by the figures 3.1 (i.e. -/UU) for 3rd foot caesura, 3.2 (i.e. -U/U), 4.1, etc.

⁴ Another doublet of similar meaning, *χειρῶν καὶ σθένος πειρήσσομαι*, occurs in

Od. 21.282.

- 1 (3.2)
- | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------------|
| 1.145 ἐξείης ἔζοντο
also 3.389; 24.385
10.233 εἶσεν δ' εἰσαγαγούσα
15.134 ἐξέσθην δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα
17.86 χλαῖνας μὲν κατέθεντο
also 17.179; 20.249 | } | <u>κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε</u> |
|--|---|------------------------------------|

- 2 (3.2)
- | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 1.169 ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπέ
also 4.486; 8.572; 11.140; 11.170; 11.370; 11.457; 15.383;
16.137; 24.256; 24.287 | } | <u>καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον</u> |
|--|---|-------------------------------|

Here the doublet straddles the caesura, so to speak, it lies across the caesura divide. In such a case we should expect, as is the case, that the line is composed as a whole. The whole line is exactly repeated, not the doublet alone.

- 3 (3.2)
- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1.231 'ξεῖν' ἐπεὶ ἄρ δὴ ταῦτα μ'
also 15.390
7.243 τοῦτο δέ τοι ἐρέω ὃ μ'
also 15.402
19.171 ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς ἐρέω ὃ μ'
23.99 ἐξομένη μῦθοισιν
24.478 τέκνον ἐμόν, τί με ταῦτα | } | <u>ἀνείρεια ἡδὲ μεταλλᾶς</u>

ἀνείρεια οὐδὲ μεταλλᾶς
διείρεια ἡδὲ μεταλλᾶς |
|---|---|---|

Doublets are flexible, and variations such as οὐδέ, 'nor' for ἡδέ, 'and' are normal.

- 3a (3.2)
- | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 3.69 νῦν δὴ κάλλιόν ἐστι
3.243 νῦν δ' ἐθέλω ἔπος ἄλλο
14.378 ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ οὐ φίλον ἐστι
15.362 τόφρα τί μοι φίλον ἔσκε
16.465 οὐκ ἔμελέν μοι ταῦτα | } | <u>μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἐρέσθαι</u> |
|---|---|-------------------------------|

It is convenient to list the above doublet under 3a as the meaning coincides with 3. Apart from the difference in verbal mood the metrical need here is a doublet beginning with a consonant. In table 3 where an initial vowel is required, there is an oddity in the last example, where the composer is forced to substitute διείρεια for ἀνείρεια to avoid hiatus.⁵

- 4 (3.2)
- | | | |
|--|---|----------------------------------|
| 1.294 φράζεσθαι δὴ ἔπειτα
4.117 μερμήριξε δ' ἔπειτα
also 10.151; 24.235
4.120 ἦος ὃ ταῦθ' ὥρμαινε
also 5.365; 5.424
4.813 πολλέων, αἶμ' ἐρέθουσι
6.118 ἐξόμενος δ' ὄρμαινε | } | <u>κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν</u> |
|--|---|----------------------------------|

⁵ διείρομαι with μεταλλῶ is not, however, unique. See *Il.* 1.550; for pattern

of the first limb of the doublet see *Od.* 4.492.

15.211	εὖ γὰρ ἐγὼ τόδε οἶδα	}	(κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν)	(3.1)	
20.10	πολλὰ δὲ μερμήριξε				
5					
1.353	σοὶ δ' ἐπιτολμάτω	}	<u>κραδίη καὶ θυμός</u>	ἀκούειν	
4.548	ὥς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ		” ”	” ”	ἀγῆνωρ
8.204	τῶν δ' ἄλλων ὅτινα		<u>κραδίη θυμός τε</u>	κελεύει	
14.517	πέμψει δ', ὅππῃ σε		” ”	” ”	
also 15.339					
15.395	τῶν δ' ἄλλων ὅτινα		κραδίη καὶ θυμός	ἀνώγει	
16.81	πέμψω δ', ὅππῃ μιν		κραδίη θυμός τε	κελεύει	
also 21.342					
18.61	ἔειν', εἴ σ' ὀτρύνει		κραδίη καὶ θυμός	ἀγῆνωρ	
18.274	ἀλλὰ τόδ' αἰνὸν ἄχος		κραδίην καὶ θυμόν	ἰκάνει	
21.198	εἴπαθ' ὅπως ὑμέας		κραδίη θυμός τε	κελεύει	

Here the doublet, which does not occupy the full half-line, combines with various words and itself has two forms, one ending in a consonant, the other in a vowel. The form *κραδίη καὶ θυμός* (with *ἀγῆνωρ*) occurs a number of times in the *Iliad*. The other form, *κραδίη θυμός τε*, necessary with *κελεύει*, also occurs in the *Iliad*. However, in 15.395 the half-line *κραδίη καὶ θυμός ἀνώγει* is equivalent in sense and metre to the usual *κραδίη θυμός τε κελεύει* and accordingly it offends against the law of 'thrift'. The explanation of its occurrence is that the end element, *θυμός ἀνώγει*,⁶ occurs often in both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. It is a small illustration of how the tradition's law of 'thrift' is broken by the tradition's own complexity.

		6	(3.2)
2.23	ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὥς τοῦ λήθεται	}	<u>ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων</u>
4.100	ἀλλ' ἔμπης πάντας μὲν		
14.40	ἀντιθέου γὰρ ἄνακτος		

This doublet, though not frequent, is well distributed in the *Odyssey* and occurs twice in the *Iliad*. The idea of sorrow and its manifestation is expressed in many other ways, some of them by doublets. For example, the doublet *ὀδυρόμενην, γοόωσαν*, occurs twice in the *Odyssey*, and *γοάοντά τε μυρόμενόν τε* also in the *Iliad*. See also table 19.

		7	(3.1)
2.24	τοῦ ὃ γε δακρυχέων	}	<u>ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε</u>
also 24.425			
2.160	ὃ σφιν εὐφρονέων		
also 2.228; 7.158; 24.53			
4.773	τοῖσιν δ' Ἀντίνοος		
also 7.185; 8.25 (Ἀλκίνοος)			
16.394	τοῖσιν δ' Ἀμφίνομος		
also 18.412; 20.244			

⁶ *θυμός ἀνώγει* occurs e.g. *Il.* 18.176; 22.142; and *Od.* 11.266; 14.395. *θυμός*

ἀνώγει is also common.

		8	(3.2)
2.165	ἐγγὺς ἐὼν τοῖσδεσσι	<u>φόνον καὶ κῆρα</u>	{ φυτεύει φέροντες φυτεύσω
4.273	Ἀργείων Τρώεσσι		
also 8.513			
17.82	εἰ δέ κ' ἐγὼ τούτοις		

Not very frequent but well distributed and occurring also in the *Iliad*. Nos. 9, 10, and 11 have meanings close to no. 8. κῆρ is associated also with θάνατος, and θάνατος with μόρος and with πότμος (and θάνατος—as well as φόνος—also with μοῖρα).

		9	(3.1)
2.283	οὐδέ τι ἴσασιν	<u>θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν</u>	
2.352	διωγενῆς Ὀδυσσεὺς	" "	-ς ἀλύξας
also 5.387			
3.242	φράσσαντ' ἀθάνατοι	<u>θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν</u>	
12.157	ἧ κεν ἀλευάμενοι	" "	φύγομεν
15.275	τῶν ὑπαλευάμενος	" "	μέλαιναν
16.169	ὥς ἂν μνηστῆρσιν	" κῆρ'	ἀραρόντε
17.547	πᾶσι μάλ', οὐδέ κέ τις	" "	-ς ἀλύξει
also 19.558			
22.14	οἱ τεύξω θάνατόν	<u>τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν</u>	
22.66	ἧ φεύγειν, ὅς κεν	<u>θάνατον καὶ κῆρας ἀλύξει</u>	
24.127	ἡμῖν φραζομένη	<u>θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν</u>	
24.414	μνηστῆρων στυγερὸν	<u>θάνατον καὶ κῆρ' ἐνέπουσα</u>	

This doublet is treated with some freedom by reason of the fact that the regular epithet μέλαιναν is replaced by participles or verbs, by eliding the -a of κῆρα and using the plural κῆρας when elision is not desired. Moreover, in one case, 22.14, θάνατον is also given an epithet (κακόν), which extends the doublet beyond the limit of the 3rd-foot caesura. This remarkable instance is complicated by the fact that the same version of the doublet occurs at *Iliad* 21.66, where the line as a whole is *not* the same: ἐκφυγέειν θάνατόν τε κακὸν καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν.⁷

		10	(4.1)
9.61	ὥλονθ'· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι φύγομεν·	<u>θάνατόν τε μόρον τε</u>	{
11.409	ἀλλὰ μοι Αἴγισθος τεύξας		
16.421	μάργε, τίη δέ σὺ Τηλεμάχῳ		
20.241	μνηστῆρες δ' ἄρα Τηλεμάχῳ		

Not very frequent, but well distributed through the *Odyssey*.

		11	(3.2)
2.9	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ 'ρ' ἤγερθεν	<u>ὀμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο</u>	
also 8.24; 24.421			

Here the doublet transgresses the barrier of the caesura but, as before, the unusual feature is explained by the fact that all occurrences of the line are identical. The line is composed as a whole. However, it is remarkable that *Iliad* 1.57 shows a variation before the doublet, namely, οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὀμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο. The *Iliad* also shows the pattern found in the three *Odyssey* instances (*Il.* 24.70).

⁷ Another instance in the *Iliad* (16.47) begins differently and omits μέλαιναν.

		12	(3.1)
4.196	κλαίειν ὅς κε θάνησι	<u>βροτῶν καὶ πότμον ἐπίσπη</u>	
4.562	Ἄργει ἐν ἱπποβότῳ	<u>θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν</u>	
5.308	ὥς δὴ ἐγὼ γ' ὄφελον	” ”	
11.197	οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἐγὼν	ὀλόμην καὶ πότμον ἐπέσπον	
11.389	οἴκῳ ἐν Ἀιγίσθοιο	θάνον καὶ πότμον ἐπέσπον	
also 24.22			
12.342	λιμῷ δ' οἴκτιστον	θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν	
14.274	ποίησ' ὥς ὄφελον	” ”	

This doublet, being verbal, is able to use a variety of forms within the requirements of metre. In 4.196 the doublet is so worded as to overstep the boundary of the caesura. 11.197 is an oddity in that *ὀλόμην* replaces what would be the normal and admissible word *ἔθανον*.

		13	(3.2)
1.289	εἰ δέ κε <u>τεθνηῶτος</u>	<u>ἀκούσης μηδ' ἔτ' ἐόντος,</u>	
2.220	” ”	ἀκούσω ”	

The two occurrences are not very widely separated and the doublet transgresses the limit of the caesura. However, the whole line is the unit of composition (with a mere change of person). The doublet is analogous to no. 13a which has a better distribution.

		13a	(3.2)
4.834	ἧ ἤδη τέθνηκε	<u>καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδαο δόμοισι</u>	
also 24.264; 15.350 (τεθνᾶσι)			
20.208	εἰ δ' ἤδη τέθνηκε		

The limit of the caesura is transgressed, but the whole line is the unit of composition and the link (*καί*) follows the caesura. This doublet is sometimes joined with a doublet of contrary meaning, no. 14.

		14	(3.1)
4.540	ἦθελ' ἔτι <u>ζῶειν</u>	<u>καὶ ὀρᾶν φάος ἡελίου.</u>	
also 10.498			
4.833	ἦ που ἔτι ζῶει	” ὀρᾷ ” ”	
also 14.44; 20.207 (εἶ)			

This doublet transgresses the limit of the caesura and yet the line as a whole is not uniform: the commencement varies (*ἦθελ'* and *ἦ* (or *εἶ*) *που*). Relieving the anomaly is the fact that the 'joint' of the doublet, *καί*, follows the caesura. Each limb of a doublet may have an independent existence (although such detached existence is quite rare). In fact the unit *εἶ που ἔτι ζῶει* occurs in the *Iliad* (19.327). A somewhat casual variation of the doublet occurs at 24.263, namely, *ἀμφὶ ξείνῳ ἐμῷ, εἶ που ζῶει τε καὶ ἔστω*. Another variation (which transgresses the caesura limit) is at 16.439: *ζῶντος γ' ἐμέθεν καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ δερκομένοιο*. However, the doublet is joined at the caesura and occupies the whole line. The same (though not quite) occurs at *Iliad* 1.88: *οὐ τις ἐμεῦ ζῶντος καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ δερκομένοιο*.

		15	(3.2)
3.374	Τηλεμάχου δ' ἔλε χεῖρα	<u>ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν</u>	
4.311	Τηλεμάχῳ δέ παρίζεν	” ”	
4.610	χειρὶ τέ μιν κατέρεξεν	” ”	

also 5.181

6.254	ἄτρυνεν δ' Ὀδυσῆα	"	"
7.330	εὐχόμενος δ' ἄρα εἶπεν	"	"
8.194	ἀνδρὶ δέμας ἐῖκυῖα	"	"
8.291	ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ	"	"
also 10.280 (μοι); 11.247; 15.530			
10.319	ῥάβδῳ πεπληγυῖα	"	"
15.124	πέπλον ἔχουσ' ἐν χερσὶν	"	"
16.417	Ἀντίνοον δ' ἐνένιπεν	"	"
17.215	τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν νείκεσεν	"	"
18.78	Ἀντίνοος δ' ἐνένιπεν	"	"
also 21.84; 21.167; 21.287			
21.248	ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπεν	"	"
23.96	Τηλέμαχος δ' ἐνένιπεν	"	"

Very frequent, serving to introduce passages of direct speech. A variant of the second term is ἔπος φάτο φώνησέν τε (4.370: ἡ δ' ἐμεῦ ἄγχι στάσα ἔπος φάτο φώνησέν τε). This is metrically identical with no. 15 and accordingly offends against the so-called law of thrift. Probably there is a confusion here with another doublet in which φώνησέν is added to ἀπαμειβετο, where answers are being introduced. In the *Odyssey* there are ten doublets of the type τὸν δ' αὖτ' Ἀλκίνοος ἀπαμειβετο φώνησέν τε.

16 (3.1)

7.136	εὔρε δὲ Φαιήκων	ἡγήτορας ἡδὲ μέδοντας
7.186	κέκλυτε, Φαιήκων	ἡγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες
also 8.26; 8.97; 8.387; 8.536		
8.11	δεῦτ' ἄγε, Φαιήκων	" "
11.526	ἐνθ' ἄλλοι Δαναῶν	" "
13.186	δήμου Φαιήκων	" "
13.210	ῆσαν Φαιήκων	" "

Ἠγήτορες ἡδὲ μέδοντες is a doublet even though the two terms are not synonymous. The terms imply no distinction of persons, the same persons are both 'chiefs' and 'counsellors'.

17 (4.1)

2.281	τῷ νῦν μνηστήρων μὲν ἔα	βουλὴν τε νόον τε
3.128	ἀλλ' ἔνα θυμὸν ἔχοντε	νόῳ καὶ ἐπίφρονι βουλῇ
4.267	ἦδη μὲν πολέων ἐδάην	βουλὴν τε νόον τε
11.177	εἰπέ δέ μοι μνηστῆς ἀλόχου	βουλὴν τε νόον τε
12.211	ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνθεν ἐμῇ ἀρετῇ	βουλῇ τε νόῳ τε
13.305	ῶπασαν οἴκαδ' ἰόντι ἐμῇ	" "
16.374	αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐπιστήμων	" "

Here the alternative dative and accusative give flexibility. In one case (3.128) the terms are reversed and the metrical value adapted to the line by means of an epithet, the whole doublet now starting at the 3rd caesura.

18 (4.1)

5.126	ᾧ θυμῷ εἷξασα, μίγη	φιλότῃ καὶ εὐνῇ
10.335	εὐνῇ καὶ φιλότῃ	πεποιθόμεν ἀλλήλοισιν
15.421	" "	τά τε φρένας ἡπεροπεύει
23.219	ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀλλοδαπῷ ἐμίγη	φιλότῃ καὶ εὐνῇ

Here, in two cases, the order of the two terms is reversed and the doublet is then accommodated between the beginning of the line and the 3rd caesura. This is an unusual place for doublets (and for noun-epithets). The doublet occurs also in the *Iliad* in its normal order and position.

		19	(3.2)
4.801	παύσειε κλαυθμοῖο	γόοιό τε δακρυδέντος	
17.8	κλαυθμοῦ τε στυγεροῖο	” ”	
21.228	παύεσθον κλαυθμοῖο	γόοιό τε, μή τις ἴδῃται	
24.323	ἀλλ' ἴσχεο κλαυθμοῖο	γόοιό τε δακρυδέντος	

This doublet in all cases transgresses the barrier of the caesura, yet there is no constant pattern in the line as a whole. The most stable part of the pattern is the second term, which starts in all cases at the caesura. The idea, 'weeping and wailing', has not here attained a fixed formulation.

		20	(3.1)
2.378	αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ὄμοσάν	τε τελεύτησάν τε τὸν ὄρκον	
also 15.304; 15.438; 18.59; 10.346	(ὄμοσέν . . . τελεύτησέν)		

This doublet transgresses the barrier of the caesura. However, the line is composed as a whole, and the link (τε) of the doublet follows the caesura.

Something should here be said about the caesura in view of its role in determining the position of doublets (and noun-epithet formulae). In an article, 'Homer and Irish Heroic Narrative', *CQ* N.S. 19.1 (1969), suggestions were made as to the part played by noun-epithets in the formation of the hexameter. Using the work of C. Watkins on the paroemiac (forms of the paroemiac correspond to the metrical units contained by 3rd, 4th, and bucolic caesura to the end of the hexameter), and noting that the 'paroemiac' element within the hexameter was the main vehicle for noun-epithets, the article suggested that the hexameter may have developed from a base (if one may call the second half of the line a base) which had achieved a degree of metrical fixity.

The tables above show that the doublet is in the same boat as the noun-epithet. Its starting-point is the 3rd-foot or 4th-foot caesura. If, unusually, it starts before the 3rd-foot caesura, the line is composed as a whole and the link (καί etc.) falls after the caesura. The bucolic caesura is a common starting-point for short noun-epithets (such as *φαιίδμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ, παρθένος ἀδμήης, φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων*, etc.); this metrical unit is too short to admit a doublet (as far as we have observed), but the bucolic caesura often marks the second limb of the doublet, for example, *ἐπεφράσατ' ἥδ' ἐνόησεν* (8.94), *ὑπέσχετο καὶ κατένευσε* (4.6), and many instances from the tables above. While both noun-epithets and doublets may occupy the first half of the hexameter, it is a rare occurrence, as the tables indicate for the doublet. Thus these two devices, noun-epithet and doublet, emphasize the caesurae as structural divisions, not mere word divisions in the hexameter. Two short passages may be quoted by way of illustration:

Ἥμος δ' ἡριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἥως,
 ὄρνυτ' ἄρ' ἐξ εὐνήφω Ὀδυσσῆος φίλος υἱός,
 εἴματα ἐσσάμενος, περὶ δὲ ξίφος ὀξὺ θέτ' ὦμω

ποσσι δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροῖον ἐδήσατο καλὰ πέδιλα,
βῆ δ' ἔμμεν ἐκ θαλάμοιο θεῶ ἐναλίγκιος ἄντην.
(*Od.* 2.1–5)

τῷ νῦν μνηστήρων μὲν ἔα βουλὴν τε νόον τε
ἀφραλέων, ἐπεὶ οὔτι νοήμονες οὐδὲ δίκαιοι·
οὐδέ τι ἴσασιν θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν
ὅς δὴ σφι σχεδὸν ἔστιν, ἐπ' ἥματι πάντας δλέσθαι.
(*Od.* 2.281–4)

Another short quotation may illustrate the structural importance of the bucolic caesura in the Homeric hexameter (even without the occurrence of short final noun-epithets):

τοῖσιν γὰρ μέγα πῆμα κυλίνδεται οὐ γὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
δὴν ἀπάνευθε φίλων ὧν ἔσσεται, ἀλλὰ που ἤδη
ἐγγὺς ἐὼν τοῖσδεσσι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φυτεύει
πάντεσσιν·
(*Od.* 2.163–6)

The two devices of the style—what may be called the vessels of traditional thought—are concentrated in the second half of the line, while the narrative motion is mainly in the first half of the line. To put the matter another way, the second half of the line tends to dwell (often by means of double imagery) on an aspect of the thought which, by the very fact that it is dwelt on, or stands momentarily still, must be traditional and preconceived. This concentration of traditional imagery holds the picture briefly in the second half of the line which is the best place for a bard, under pressure of long composition, to deploy the great resources of the tradition which magnify and stretch and bring into larger focus a great variety of ideas. The oral poet may have looked on the hexameter more as two units than as one.

The last quotation above (*Od.* 2.163–6) also illustrates a contrary tendency of the Homeric hexameter, that it is apt to carry on from one line to another (a tendency much extended by Virgil's technique). Parry's elucidation of enjambement, the run-on from one line to another, is most instructive and thorough.⁸ He defines 'necessary enjambement' as a run-on necessary to complete the sense, not merely to round off or amplify. Necessary enjambement, he says, seems to be due 'to an unusual functioning of the technique of formulas which, not grouping themselves within the verse, have made necessary the enjambement'. He notes that in a certain line 'Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες', 'a purely ornamental phrase of the epithet type', enables the poet to complete the line while reserving the first half of the next line for the completion of his thought. Furthermore he says: 'A point to be exactly investigated in the Homeric technique is that of the ornamental device for filling the last half of the verse, so that the thought of the first half can be carried on from the beginning of the following line.'

Parry's point of view, although he clearly intended further investigation, is logical and accords with the facts, if we accept such descriptions as *purely ornamental phrases*. But it seems to imply that Homer was somehow saddled with a sort of god-given vessel, the hexameter, which he had to fill, partly by

⁸ *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, ed.

A. Parry, pp.461–4; also pp.251 ff.

resort to ornamental epithets; and further that the poet found no difficulty in expressing his thought if he were allowed to do so in the first half of lines (in cases of enjambement), and so filled the intervening space with mere ornament.

Apart altogether from enjambement these 'ornamental' formulae generally occupy the second half of the line. Parry's investigations show this clearly for the noun-epithet. The same is true for the doublet as the tables above show. It is not 'an unusual functioning of the technique of formulas', but their usual functioning, which causes enjambement. If Homer wants to say 'May the gods grant to you to sack the city of Priam', no doubt he can say it in a line. What he does say is 'May the gods grant to you, (the gods) who have their homes on Olympus, to sack the city of Priam.'

Our view of this phenomenon differs from that of Parry but not markedly so. Parry's view would imply a distinction between the narrative movement—the flow and advance of the thought—and the narrative ornament, that is, such features as epithet formulae. We hold that these latter features are as much part of the thought as anything else. If the idea 'who have their homes on Olympus' occurred only once in the Homeric tradition, we—or a Homeric audience—would be in no position to regard it as ornament. The fact that it is quite familiar to us, that we can and do shut it out when it occurs, makes no difference to its nature. It is part of the thought structure—traditional thought—and, so far from being ornamental, is the essential gangway on which the composer's narrative must proceed. The function of epithet formulae and doublets, from the bard's point of view, is to allow the visionary eye to rest momentarily on certain features of the thought. Without such pauses of the thought, which slow the forward movement, a storyteller, whether he composes in prose or verse, would not be able to tell a long tale. The tradition, like a prompter, constantly intervenes to help him. He has frequent recourse to epithet and doublet, facets of traditional thought, which moment by moment take over and leave his mind free to concentrate on the narrative movement, the shape of things to come, which he must review many times, ranging forward with, in Homer's phrase, the speed of thought.

'Necessary' enjambement, then, can arise in Homer out of the very structures, the line and its parts, to which the poet usually confines himself. It is not surprising that in post-Homeric hexameters, where mere word divisions rather than structural sense-groups mark the caesurae, necessary enjambement becomes frequent. The thought structure is no longer confined by the metrical units. But even in Homer enjambement, necessary and otherwise, is sufficiently common to pose the question of how far his thought structure has outstripped the metrical structure. The poet's 'periods'—the loose cohesion of syntax which winds often through many lines at a time—suggest, not independence of the line and formula but so confident a mastery of them as to give the appearance of independence. Whether this mastery in turn suggests training and study, the cult of memory, advance meditation and so on, such as is on record in regard to the Irish tradition,⁹ is a question for serious consideration.

⁹ For evidence from Greek and Roman writers on the Celts and their men of learning see J. J. Tierney, 'The Celtic Ethnography of Posidonius', *Proc. Royal Irish Academy*, Vol. 60, C, 5 (Dublin, 1960)—especially Caesar, *B.G.* 6.14, on

Druids (*sic*), their long training and dependence on memory.

The repertoire of an Old or Medieval Irish *fili* was enormous—five fifties of main tales and two fifties of subordinate tales. (See E. O'Curry, *Lectures on the*

To return to the doublet, confirmation of it as a formula of the style is afforded by the Irish tradition. The two narrative traditions, the Irish and the Greek, both use these devices of the style, noun-epithet and doublet, and we assume that they do so for the same reason, namely, that they are both essentially oral narratives. This assumption is a problem in itself. Since all narrative before the age of mechanical or electronic recording can reach us only through the medium of writing, we are comparing written texts as if they were oral records. Nevertheless, even without the support of a contemporary analogy, such as the Parry-Lord exploration of the Yugoslav tradition of poetic song, much circumstantial evidence can be derived from the texts themselves. Parry has shown convincingly, where he compares Homer and Virgil, that the poverty of certain features and the prominence of contrary features are explicable only by the hypothesis that the one is an oral poet and the other a writer. Ordinary folktales, including Irish folktales, although they throw light on oral technique, do not normally exhibit the special techniques we are discussing, which are techniques of *long* tales.

There is, however, one facet of contemporary Irish folklore—the telling of long hero tales—which exhibits the Homeric (or, as they are better described, oral) features of long formulae, doublets and, to a lesser extent, noun-epithets. This facet of modern storytelling is related to the earlier manuscript tales which reflect the tradition of their day, a tradition both oral and aristocratic. Accordingly, to demonstrate the use of doublets in the Irish tradition we depend firstly, on long hero tales recorded by word of mouth in our own day, and secondly, on earlier heroic (or romantic) tales recorded in manuscript.

First, the living tradition may be represented, for convenience of reference, by *Béaloides*, the journal of The Folklore of Ireland Society. Vol. 1 (no. iv (1928), 329–42) contains a longish story entitled ‘Céatach’. The first paragraph has the phrase ‘i n-a chaisleán agus a dheagh-árús’, *in his castle and fine mansion*. Three lines further we find ‘a cháil agus a chliú’, *his fame and reputation*, and ‘a dhraoidheacht agus a dhiabhaluidheacht’, *his magic and devilry*. It will suffice for our purpose to translate a single other sentence from the story: ‘If you were a true hero or good champion, you would not leave a place or location, corner or angle, spot or recess, without searching it sharply, keenly, and then you would find out for yourself the place where battle and wily-slaughter is carried on.’¹⁰

In regard to the manuscript tradition, the later versions of tales, say from about 1400 on, often correspond, in their length, to what would be considered long oral tales—an hour or more—and can hardly be regarded as summary in any degree. Any tale text will serve our purpose, so ubiquitous is the doublet

Manuscript Materials of Ir. Hist., Dublin, 1861, repr. Bibliography and Reference Series 87, Burt Franklin, New York. Appendix no. LXXXVIII, pp. 583–4). In the Book of Leinster version of the *Táin* (the longest heroic tale of the Ulster cycle), the penultimate paragraph reads: ‘A blessing on every one who shall faithfully memorise the *Táin* as it is written here and shall not add any other form to it’ (*Táin Bó Cúalgne*, ed. with transl. Cecile O’Rahilly, Dublin Inst. for

Advanced Studies, 1970, p. 272.)

For memory and mental composition in a bardic school see extract from the Clanricarde Memoirs and Letters publ. by O. J. Bergin, *Jour. Ivernian Soc.* 5 (1912).

¹⁰ ‘Dá mbadh fíor-ghaisgidheach nó curadh maith thú, ní fhágfaí áit ná ionad, ceard ná cearn, ball ná clúid gan cuartú go grinn géar, agus annsin gheobhthá amach duit féin an áit i n-a dtugtar cath agus caon-chosgar!’

as a feature of the style. To give an initial illustration we refer again to the article mentioned above, Homer and Irish Heroic Narrative. The article quotes (pp.6–7) in translation a passage from a fifteenth-century tale, 'In Gilla Decair', in order to verify certain expressions as formulae (though not specifically as doublets). Of the nine expressions so verified four, *his weals and his wounds, healthy and whole, hearts and spirits, slumber and steady sleep*, are doublets, the others being examples of noun-epithets. It would be pointless to pile sample on sample. A single example, this time from an early-modern Romance, dating from about 1600, can show how this one device not only stretches out the expression of the thought but almost assails the ears with a barrage of 'double talk': 'When they had *spent and concluded* that *time and period* however, and when the *party* of their *wounded and injured*, the *company* of their *ill and ailing* were *voyage-worthy and travel-ready*, they set about going *zestfully joyfully* to their *ship and speedy vessel* to leave Norway straight away.'¹¹ It should be noted that in the original all the doublets are alliterative, as is regularly the case, and thus they are more euphonious and less obtrusive.

While Homer does not give the same single-minded attention to the doublet as is exhibited above, nevertheless he has regular recourse to it and at times gives it a striking prominence. For example *Od.* 18.381–4 are four consecutive lines with a doublet in each. Or again, consider the following passage from the same book (78–87).

Ἀντίνοος δ' ἐνένηπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε·
 'νῦν μὲν μήτ' εἴης, βουγαίε, μήτε γένοιο,
 εἰ δὴ τοῦτόν γε τρομέεις καὶ δεΐδιας αἰνῶς,
 ἄνδρα γέροντα, δῦν ἄρημένον, ἧ μιν ἰκάνει.
 ἀλλ' ἔκ τοι ἐρέω, τὸ δὲ καὶ τετελεσμένον ἔσται·
 αἶ κέν σ' οὔτος νικήσῃ κρείσσων τε γένηται,
 πέμψω σ' ἡπειρόνδε, βαλὼν ἐν νηϊ μέλαινῃ,
 εἰς Ἐχέτον βασιλῆα, βροτῶν δηλήμονα πάντων,
 ὃς κ' ἀπὸ ῥίνα τάμησι καὶ οὐατα νηλεὶ χαλκῷ,
 μήδεά τ' ἐξερύσας δῶν κυσὶν ὦμα δάσασθαι.'

Here there are four doublets which, along with noun-epithets and equivalent expressions, slow and control the flow and movement (our own style is already infected!) of the thought.

Pairings of words which are not doublets will often arise in narrative by the very association of ideas. To an oral composer these are a welcome resource which aid the doublet and noun-epithet in stretching the expression of the thought. Such associations (e.g. *κίθαρις καὶ αὐοιδή*, 1.159, or *εἰς ὄρχηστὺν τε καὶ ἡμερόεσσαν αὐοιδήν*, 1.421, are very common in Homer (and, of course, may be formulae, as these examples are).

Triplets (and even foursomes) occur in Homer but not commonly. The usefulness of triple imagery, whether synonyms or not, as a *narrative* technique is limited. The composition is harder, the image is more obtrusive and likely to extend to the whole line, which is not so helpful in narrative progress. The

¹¹ Íar ccaitheamh 7 iar ccoimhchinneadh na rée 7 na roi-aimsire sin dóibh, dano, 7 iar mbeith ion-aistir 7 ion-imtheachta dá n-áos cneadh 7 crécht, 7 dá lucht othrais 7 easláinte, ro gabhadh lámh ar imtheacht

leó go luinneach luáthgháireach dochum a loinge 7 a luáth-arthraigh d'fhágbháil na hIruaidhe fó chédóir (*Tóraigbeacht Taise Taoibhbhíle*, ed. Máire Ní Mhuirgheasa, Dublin, 1954, p.78, 2133–9).

Irish tradition of prose narrative admits triplets and sets of four more readily. However, unless for special reasons or special effects, the doublet is vastly preferred. Like the king's three sons in folktales it is the economical minimum to which the family can be reduced. It enables images and ideas to be stressed without interrupting the flow of the narrative.

At the beginning we suggested that the doublet and noun-epithet were perhaps the only formulae of the style. In the first half of the hexameter especially there occur many combinations of words—*ἀντὰρ ἐπεὶ*, for example, or *καὶ τότε*, which recur dozens of times and pass as formulae. If they are formulae, they are not formulae of the style. Such expressions are the everyday devices of relating actions to one another, of imparting movement to narrative. We all require such expressions—'and then', 'but when', 'but then', and use them constantly.

In discussing the traditional formula (*M.H.V.*, p.276) Parry gives a formula scheme consisting of *ἀντὰρ ἐπεὶ* ('ρ') followed by a verb of the metrical value $\bar{\bar{u}}\bar{u}-\bar{u}$, and expressing the idea 'but when he (we, they) had done so and so'. The ideas so expressed are almost unlimited in their possible variety and, so far as the *ideas* are concerned, the term formula is almost meaningless. We might as well call every word in the dictionary a formula in itself. What justifies Parry is the fact that the expressions are metrically equivalent units, the hexameter line as far as the 3rd-foot caesura. They are purely metrical formulae. The fact that they have been given, of necessity, a metrical shape and recur constantly does not make them formulae in the sense that the duplicated images of the noun-epithet and the doublet are formulae. These latter, on the other hand, are formulae which serve a narrative not a metrical purpose. In the one case metre *creates* formulae out of ordinary syntax. In the second case metre dresses up what is already a formula, thus causing a certain amount of confusion; as if at the midnight of a masked ball some guests disclosed beneath their masks other masks.

These two devices, the noun-epithet and the doublet, are simple enough in themselves, but, when a tradition provides them in rich abundance, they become a technique which takes the instant pressure out of narrative, and enable the teller of long tales to practise his own real art, the Fabian art of delay.

University College Dublin

K. O'NOLAN