

A PRINCIPLE OF COMPOSITION IN HOMERIC VERSE¹

ROGER BECK

IT HAS LONG BEEN REALIZED that there exists in Homeric verse (as in all Greek hexameter poetry) some sort of structural bridge in the area of the line immediately preceding the medial caesura:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} - & / & \sim & / & \sim & / & - & / & \overline{\sim & / & \sim & / & -} & // & \sim & // \\ (0) & 1 & 1\frac{1}{2} & 2 & 3 & 3\frac{1}{2} & 4 & 5 & 5\frac{1}{2} \end{array}$$

First of all, word-ends are noticeably less frequent at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 than at any other of the individual points in the first half of the line.² Statistics show increasingly high totals for the first four points (1, $1\frac{1}{2}$, 2, and 3) and again for the alternatives for the medial caesura (5 and $5\frac{1}{2}$), but at the two intervening points the totals drop considerably. The following, as an example, are H. N. Porter's figures for two sample passages of 1,000 lines from each epic (*Il.* 5.1-6.91 and *Od.* 5.1-7.176):³

Point	Number of word-ends	
	<i>Iliad</i>	<i>Odyssey</i>
1	387	383
$1\frac{1}{2}$	303	335
2	523	548
3	618	602
* $3\frac{1}{2}$	156	127
*4	195	250
5	499	529
$5\frac{1}{2}$	608	577

¹The theory advanced in the present study is a refinement of certain views put forward in my doctoral thesis: *Meter and Sense in Homeric Verse* (University of Illinois 1971) esp. 241-264. It is appropriate that I should here record my deep appreciation of the criticisms and encouragement of my adviser, Dr John J. Bateman, during the long process of formulating these views.

²The system of numeration is basically that of E. G. O'Neill Jr., "The Localization of Metrical Word-Types in the Greek Hexameter," *YCIS* 8 (1942) 103-178. There is, however, a slight difference in that here the numbers designate the *boundaries* between syllables, while in O'Neill's system they designate the syllables themselves: e.g.,

$\overset{1\frac{1}{2}}{\mu\eta\nu\nu}/\overset{1\frac{1}{2}}{\alpha\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon}$ as opposed to $\mu\eta\nu\nu\ \overset{1\frac{1}{2}}{\alpha\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon}$. I have also added a point "0" for use later in connexion with the *start* of syntactic units at the beginning of the line.

³"The Early Greek Hexameter," *YCIS* 12 (1951) 1-63, Tables VIII-XIII, p. 57 f. These word-end tables (VIII ff.) are sometimes slightly at variance with the earlier tables (I ff.) in which the statistics are arranged in accordance with Porter's system of cola. In all cases I cite the word-end tables.

When $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 are taken in conjunction and allowance is made for those lines in which word-ends occur at *both* points, we find in the *Iliad* sample 673 lines and in the *Odyssey* sample 651 lines in which a word-end occurs *neither* at $3\frac{1}{2}$ *nor* at 4. In a substantial majority of Homeric lines, then, *both* points are spanned by a single word.

Nevertheless, word-ends do occur at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and/or 4 in approximately one line out of every three, and one can scarcely describe such a rate of occurrence as infrequent. In fact, it is only when one takes into account the location of *preceding* word-ends that any sort of real restriction on word-ends at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 begins to appear. A word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4, it is found, is usually preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3. The restriction, then, seems to inhibit word-ends at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 only when *not* preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3. The restriction was first described in full—though as a feature of the later hexameter only—by Wilhelm Meyer in 1884.⁴ Meyer asserted categorically that the restriction was not observed by the pre-Alexandrian poets. This, however, is an over-simplification. Though exceptions occur fairly frequently in Homeric verse, and though, as G. S. Kirk has rightly emphasized,⁵ they include such typical formulaic lines as τὸν (τῆν) δ' ἡμεῖβερ' ἔπειρα . . . , etc. (*Il.* 48x, *Od.* 24x), nevertheless lines in which a word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 *is not* preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3 are quite rare *in comparison with* lines in which a word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 *is* preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3. Of the 327 lines in Porter's *Iliad* sample in which a word-end occurs at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and/or 4, a preceding word-end does *not* occur at 2 or 3 in only 33. Similarly, in the *Odyssey* sample a word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and/or 4 *is not* preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3 in only 29 out of 349 lines.

It was partly to explain this restriction (together with the much stricter one at $7\frac{1}{2}$, i.e. "Hermann's Bridge") as something more than an arbitrary taboo on certain word-end positions and sequences that Hermann Fränkel put forward his theory of cola.⁶ According to Fränkel the Greek hexameter line is normally composed of four short cola defined by three caesurae, each of which has a number of alternative positions. The first (A) caesura falls at 1, $1\frac{1}{2}$, 2, or 3, the second (B) at 5 or $5\frac{1}{2}$ and the third (C) at 7 or 8:

⁴"Zur Geschichte des griechischen und des lateinischen Hexameters," *Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philolog. u. hist. Classe der königl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München* (1884) 979–1089, esp. 980. For further details of the early scholarship on this topic see O'Neill (above, n. 2) 171–175.

⁵"Studies in Some Technical Aspects of Homeric Style: I. The Structure of the Homeric Hexameter," *YCIS* 20 (1966) 97.

⁶"Der kallimachische und homerische Hexameter," *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1926) 197–229. The same article, slightly revised and titled "Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter," appears in Fränkel's *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (2nd ed., Munich 1960) 100–156. References will be to this later work.

A.....	B...	C....	
- / ~ / ~ / - / ~ ~ - / ~ / ~ - / ~ ~ / - ~ ~ - x			
1 1½ 2 3	5 5½ 7 8		

Now, of the four alternatives for the A caesura 2 and 3 are by far the commonest, so much so, indeed, that Porter in his re-working of Fränkel's theory dismissed the other two altogether.⁷ The commonest type of second colon consists, therefore, either of a single word extending from 2 or 3 to the B caesura at 5 or 5½ or of two words filling the same interval:

2 3	5 5½
/ - / ~ ~ - / ~ /	

Now, in the first case there will be no intervening word-end at 3½ or 4, and in the second any word-end that does occur at 3½ or 4 will be preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3. According to Fränkel's theory, then, composition by cola accounts first for the fact that word-ends are much less frequent at 3½ and 4 than at other points in the first half of the line and secondly for the fact that when a word-end does occur at 3½ or 4 it is usually preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3.

The theory of cola has the great advantage of explaining the restriction on word-ends at 3½ and 4, together with other structural phenomena, in terms of the composition of the line as a whole. It does, however, have certain weaknesses. Most of these have been effectively pointed out by Kirk in a recent critique that covers both Fränkel's original theory and Porter's variant form.⁸ On the other side, and likewise recently, Fränkel's version of the theory has been ably reaffirmed by L. E. Rossi and W. B. Ingalls.⁹ There is thus no dearth of up-to-date and cogent critical material on the theory of cola as a whole. Accordingly, I shall here limit myself to such objections to the theory as concern in particular the restriction at 3½ and 4. At present, my intention is simply to suggest that the theory of cola is not so overwhelmingly convincing as to leave no room at all for advancing an alternative hypothesis to account for the structural phenomena in question.

The most serious weakness in the theory of cola, from our present point of view, is the unsatisfactory nature of the A caesura, especially when compared with the B caesura. (The same charge can be made against the C caesura, too, though that does not concern us here.) The B caesura has two regular alternatives, 5 and 5½, and a word-end occurs at one or other

⁷*Op. cit.* (above, n. 3).

⁸*Op. cit.* (above, n. 5).

⁹Rossi, "Estensione e valore del 'colon' nell' esametro omerico," *Studi Urbinati* 39 (1965) 239-273; Ingalls, "The Structure of the Homeric Hexameter: A Review," *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 1-12.

point in the overwhelming majority of lines (e.g., in all but twelve lines in Porter's *Iliad* sample and in all but thirteen in his *Odyssey* sample). Whenever a word-end does not occur at 5 or $5\frac{1}{2}$, then a word-end will occur at 7 (thereby creating, according to the theory, a tripartite, rather than a quadripartite, line structure). At the A caesura, however, the options are by no means as limited and straightforward. To account fully for the word-end distribution in the first half of the line, Fränkel must allow that the A caesura (i) has *four* regular alternatives (1, $1\frac{1}{2}$, 2, and 3), (ii) can also fall at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 by "postponement," or (iii) can even on occasions be bridged entirely. In fact, the A caesura can fall at *any* point between the start of the line and the B caesura, or else not be realized at all! So wide is this range of options that one wonders whether we are dealing with a real feature of the composition at all, rather than with a truism in disguise.

Nor, moreover, in Fränkel's system can it be claimed that lines without an A caesura at 1, $1\frac{1}{2}$, 2, or 3 are particularly rare, and hence that they constitute the merest handful of exceptions to the otherwise strict observance of the regular alternatives. There are, of course, very few such instances in which the A caesura is missing altogether as a result of a single word extending from the start of the line to the B caesura at 5 or $5\frac{1}{2}$. In our two samples we find only four such instances in all. Somewhat more frequent, though still quite rare, are those instances in which a single word extends from the start of the line to $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4. In the samples there are 14 such instances (*Il.* 7x, *Od.* 7x), the word concerned ending in every instance at $3\frac{1}{2}$. This, however, by no means exhausts the instances in which, according to Fränkel's theory, the A caesura is either postponed beyond its regular alternatives or bridged entirely. Fränkel maintained that appositive words (i.e., pre- and postpositives) cannot be considered "full words" (*Vollwörter*) in their own right, but must rather be taken to form "word-groups" (*Wortbilder*) either with each other (e.g., *Il.* 5.24 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\text{-}\delta\eta\text{-}\acute{\omicron}\iota\ldots$) or else with neighbouring "full words" (e.g., *Il.* 5.23 $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'\text{-}\text{"}\text{Ἡ}\phi\alpha\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\ldots$, 42 $\delta\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\pi\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\text{-}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ldots$). There is thus, in Fränkel's view, no real word-end *after* a prepositive or *before* a postpositive. It follows, then, that caesurae cannot fall at those points either. Now word-groups which span the first four points in the line and which therefore either postpone the A caesura or else bridge it entirely are relatively common. In the first 100 lines of the two samples I find, following Fränkel's rules on appositives,¹⁰ no fewer than 18 examples (*Il.* 10x, *Od.* 8x), of which eleven postpone the caesura to $3\frac{1}{2}$, three postpone it to 4, and four bridge it entirely.¹¹

In his re-working of the theory, Porter drastically simplified the colo-

¹⁰*Op. cit.* (above, n. 6) Anh. I, 142-147.

¹¹*Il.* 5.23, 35, 42, 43, 54, 59, 62, 69, 86, 100, *Od.* 5.25, 46, 49, 76, 88, 94, 95, 96.

metry of the first half of the line by dismissing Fränkel's first two alternatives for the A caesura and by abandoning his concept of the postponed caesura. For Porter the A caesura is realized either at 2 or 3 or else not at all. Superficially at least, these changes achieve a neat similarity between the A caesura and the B caesura (2 and 3 corresponding as a simple pair of alternatives to 5 and $5\frac{1}{2}$). They ensure, moreover, with any combination of caesural alternatives, a balance between two cola of approximately equal length in the first half of the line.¹² The great drawback, however, is that the abolition of 1 and $1\frac{1}{2}$ as caesural alternatives raises to a disturbingly high total the number of lines without an A caesura at all, and here, of course, the parallel between the A caesura and the B caesura breaks down. In the *Iliad* sample there is no word-end at 2 or 3, and hence no A caesura, in 97 lines. In the *Odyssey* sample the corresponding total is 105 lines.

Nevertheless, it could well be maintained that the occurrence of a word-end at 2 or 3 in approximately nine lines out of every ten constitutes a frequency high enough to establish the postulated A caesura as a definite structural norm. Now such a contention is quite convincing as long as one considers only the raw statistics of word-end occurrence. However, as soon as the words concerned are examined in their actual context in the language of the verse, it becomes very evident that in many lines with a word-end at 2 and/or 3 a caesura at one or other of those two points would define a most implausible pair of units as the two initial cola: e.g., *Od.* 5.89 *αὔδα δ' τι/φρονέεις*. In the first 100 lines of the *Iliad* sample alone I find no less than 13 such instances and in the first 100 lines of the *Odyssey* sample no less than 18.¹³ In most of these instances the postulated A caesura actually falls *after* a prepositive (e.g., *Il.* 5.13 *τῷ μὲν ἀφ'/ἱπποῖν*) or *before* a postpositive (e.g., *Il.* 5.42 *δούπησεν / δὲ πεσών*), for Porter abandons Fränkel's concept of the "word-group" and admits no distinction between appositives and other word-types.

One of the factors that makes Porter's postulated norm of an A caesura which either falls at 2 or 3 or else is bridged entirely so hard to accept is the regular occurrence of clause boundaries at $1\frac{1}{2}$ (e.g., *Od.* 5.15 *ἴσχει· δ' οὐ δύναται . . .*) and even on occasions at 1 (e.g., *Il.* 5.147 *πληγῆ', ἀπὸ δ' αὐχένος ὤμων . . .*). If word divisions at points in the first half of the line other than 2 or 3 always (or very nearly always) fell only between words closely related to each other within some larger unit (e.g., *Od.* 5.4 *Ζεὺς/ὑψιβρεμέτης*), then the contention that the A caesura is bridged unless

¹²The desire for symmetry was, in fact, Porter's main motivation in altering Fränkel's colometry. A similar wish for cola of roughly equal lengths in the second half of the line as well led him to substitute 9 for 7 as an alternative (to 8) for the C caesura.

¹³*Il.* 5.13, 42, 43, 44, 59, 69, 70, 86, 89, 92, 93, 97, 100, *Od.* 5.2, 15, 25, 28, 33, 39, 42, 49, 52, 56, 59, 76, 82, 84, 88, 89, 95, 96.

realized at 2 or 3 would be more convincing. As it is, the existence of lines with clause boundaries at $1\frac{1}{2}$ (and even at 1) seems to compel the view—supposing that one is entertaining a four-colon theory at all—that the A caesura can be realized at points other than 2 or 3 regardless of whether a word-end also occurs at 2 or 3.

In this respect it is Fränkel's original system with its four regular alternatives for an A caesura at 1, $1\frac{1}{2}$, 2, or 3 that does proper justice to the distribution of clause boundaries in the first half of the line. Indeed, the preferred locations for the major divisions in the language of the verse, or, as he termed them, for "strong sense-breaks" (*starke Sinnes-einschnitte*), was one of the starting points for Fränkel's theory and furnished its real statistical base. Using figures for the frequency of punctuation marks as a rough index, Fränkel demonstrated that "strong sense-breaks" are concentrated at positions in one or other of three groups: at 1, $1\frac{1}{2}$, 2, and 3, at 5 and $5\frac{1}{2}$, at 7 and 8. These three groups become, as we have seen, the A, B, and C caesurae with their various alternatives. When there is no "strong sense-break" at any of the alternatives for a particular caesura, so the argument continues, there will normally be some "weaker sense-break" down to the level of a mere division between words.

Now, in general, Fränkel's colometry does reflect quite well, from the standpoint of sense and syntax, the structure of the great majority of lines in Homeric verse.¹⁴ This, however, at least as far as the first half of the line is concerned, is scarcely remarkable. Simply as a function of its own length and of the length of words in the Homeric vocabulary, the first half of the line (unlike the longer second half) will usually be composed of a single pair of units in the form either of two individual words (e.g., *Il.* 5.6 *λαμπρόν/παμφαίνῃσι*) or of a word and a word-group (in either order; e.g., *Il.* 5.1 *ἔνθ'·αὖ/Τυδείδῃ*, *Od.* 5.6 *μνησαμένη·/μέλε·γάρ·οι*) or of two word-groups (e.g., *Il.* 5.8 *ᾠρσε·δέ·μιν/κατὰ·μέσσον*).¹⁵ In these circumstances the postulated A caesura cannot help but mark the single "sense-break" in the first part of the line. This, however, requires no theory of composition by cola to explain it; it is simply the consequence of the filling of the given interval with words and word-groups of the standard lengths available.

Matters would, of course, be very different if the A caesura always (or

¹⁴This has been well demonstrated by Ingalls (*op. cit.* [above, n. 9] 11), who properly corrects the impression created by Kirk's critique in which, somewhat unfairly, Porter's colometry *alone* is tested against the sense of the verse but the theory of cola *as a whole* found wanting (*op. cit.* [above, n. 5] 88 f.).

¹⁵Following Fränkel's guide-lines on appositives, I find that this is the case in 74 out of the first 100 lines in the *Iliad* sample and in 76 out of the first 100 in the *Odyssey* sample.

very nearly always) marked the clear “sense-break” between two initial units *regardless of whether or not* the first half of the line consisted of a single pair of words/word-groups. Such, however, is not the case. In a significant number of lines where three or more words/word-groups are involved the first half of the line does *not* divide unambiguously into two components at one of the alternative positions for the A caesura. Quite often a real ambiguity exists either between two of the regular alternatives—e.g., *Il.* 5.2 δῶκε μένος καὶ θάρσος ($1\frac{1}{2}$ or $3\frac{1}{2}$), *Od.* 5.99 Ζεὺς ἐμέ-γ’ ἠνώγει (1 or $2\frac{1}{2}$)—or else between a regular alternative and $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4—e.g., *Il.* 5.7 τοῖδ’ οἱ πῦρ δαῖεν (3 or $4\frac{1}{2}$), 90 οὔτ’-ἄρα ἔρκεα ἴσχει (2 or $4\frac{1}{2}$).¹⁶ In the latter case the caesura *by definition* always occurs at the regular alternative, since in Fränkel’s system a postponed caesura at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 only occurs when a single “heavy word” (*schweres Wort*) or word-group spans all four of the preceding positions. But the automatic preference of a regular alternative over $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 does not, of course, necessarily reflect the realities of sense and syntax in context. Admittedly, there are very few instances in which a regular A caesura is followed by what is clearly a more significant “sense-break” at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 and in which, as a result, the colometry conflicts violently with the sense and syntax. A conflict of that type may be seen, for example, in *Od.* 7.34:

νῆυσί/θοῆσιν τοῖ γε/πεποιθότες/ὠκείησι

Here the A caesura must fall at $1\frac{1}{2}$ according to Fränkel’s colometry. Yet, clearly, if the first half of the line is to be divided into two units according to sense and syntax, the division must come at 4: νῆυσί θοῆσιν/τοῖ γε/. . . However, as pointed out, such extreme conflicts between the postulated colometry and the sense and syntax are rather rare.¹⁷ Much more frequent are those ambiguous instances (such as *Il.* 5.7 and 90, above) in which neither a regular alternative nor $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 functions as the single “sense-break” between two clearly differentiated units. Actually, in many such instances, if the first half of the line is to be divided into units at all, the

¹⁶Statistics here are inevitably somewhat subjective. However, to give a rough idea of the frequencies involved, in the first 100 lines of the *Iliad* sample there are some 23 lines with more than two words/word-groups in the first half; in only ten of these, I find, does the first half of the line divide unambiguously into two initial cola (e.g., *Il.* 5.17 ἔγχεος, οὐδ’—ἔβαλ’ αὐτόν, 52 βάλλειν/ἔγρια πάντα). The corresponding figure for the *Odyssey* sample is eleven out of 23. The lines in which there seems to me to be *no* one, single, obviously dominant “sense-break” in the first half are *Il.* 5.2, 7, 14, 22, 29, 31, 36, 70, 71, 89, 90, 92, 95, *Od.* 5.8, 16, 25, 26, 40, 44, 51, 56, 68, 82, 99, 100.

¹⁷It was, however, essentially instances of this type that led Rossi (above, n. 9) to jettison Fränkel’s ruling that the A caesura is realized at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 only as a result of “postponement” caused by a single “heavy word” (or word-group) of more than six *morae* occupying first place in the line. Rossi allows $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 to function as regular alternatives for the A caesura even when preceded by a word-end at 1, $1\frac{1}{2}$, 2, or 3.

lines with the sequence $1\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $5\frac{1}{2}$ ought to be by far the rarest in that comparatively small group in which a word-end occurs at $3\frac{1}{2}$ without a preceding word-end at 2 or 3. Such, however, is not the case. In our *Iliad* sample, for instance, there are 27 lines in which a word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}$ is not preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3; the sequence $1\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $5\frac{1}{2}$ is found in six of them. The corresponding figure in the *Odyssey* sample is five occurrences out of 18. Actually, in the *Odyssey* sample the sequence $1\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $5\frac{1}{2}$ is the *commonest* in the restricted group, while in the *Iliad* sample it shares that status with the sequences 1 - $3\frac{1}{2}$ - $5\frac{1}{2}$ and $1\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$ -5! Kirk's explanation cannot, then, be correct, since the very sequence that the restriction is above all supposed to suppress turns out to be one of the more readily tolerated.

To reach a more satisfactory solution to these problems one must, I believe, return to the position (i) that the restriction both at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 has a *single* explanation and (ii) that the explanation is to be elicited by looking beyond the raw statistics for word-end occurrence to take into account the *relationships* of words in context. Also, I share with Fränkel and Porter the view that (iii) the restriction proper, i.e., the inhibition on word-ends at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 unless preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3, is very much a *secondary* effect whose ultimate cause is something altogether larger and more fundamental. For Fränkel and Porter the restriction was the result of composition by cola. Here, however, I shall suggest a basic cause of an entirely different nature. I shall suggest that the restriction is the result—actually, a rather minor result—of a previously undetected principle of composition which limits, directly and drastically, the words which may normally *start* at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4.

As a first step in explaining this principle, I propose to focus attention on three individual examples:

- Il. 5.69 Πήδαιον δ' ἄρ' ἔπεφνε Μέγης, Ἀντήνορος υἱόν
 356 ἤμενον· ἥερί δ' ἔγχος ἐκέκλιτο καὶ ταχέ' ἵππω
 112 πὰρ δὲ στὰς βέλος ὠκύ διαμπερὲς ἐξέρυσ' ὦμον

Now in each of the above lines the word starting at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 is a part, or *element*, of some clearly identifiable syntactic unit. In the first line ἔπεφνε is an element of the clause Πήδαιον δ' ἄρ' . . . , etc., in the second ἔγχος is an element of the clause ἥερί δ' . . . , etc., and in the third ὠκύ is an element of the phrase βέλος ὠκύ. Now each of these units itself started at a definite point earlier in the line. The clause Πήδαιον δ' ἄρ' . . . started at 0 (i.e., at the beginning of the line), the clause ἥερί δ' . . . at 2, and the phrase βέλος ὠκύ at 3. In the first line, then, we can say that the word starting at $3\frac{1}{2}$ /4 continues a unit that started at 0, in the second that it continues a unit that started at 2, and in the third that it continues a unit that started at 3. This relationship between a word and the syntactic

unit which it continues may be represented by putting an initial bracket at the start of the unit and an asterisk in front of the new word beginning at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$:

Il. 5.69 (Πήδαιον δ' ἄρ' *ἔπεφνε . . .
 356 ἤμενον· (ἡέρι δ' *ἔγχος . . .
 112 πὰρ δὲ στὰς (βέλος *ὥκ' . . .

Now the principle of composition whose operation in Homeric verse I wish to establish concerns this very relationship between the word starting at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ and its syntactic unit. Roughly put, the principle limits words starting at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 to those which continue units which themselves started no earlier than the beginning of the line or which, if they did start earlier than the beginning of the line, will subsequently be complete at the caesura.²¹ In the great majority of instances, as I shall demonstrate, the word starting at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit which itself started (as in the three examples above) either at 0 or at 2 or 3. Occasionally, however, the starting point of the unit continued is 1 or $1\frac{1}{2}$. Examples are *Il.* 5.480, where φίλην continues a phrase (ἄλοχόν τε φίλην) which started at 1, and *Il.* 5.318, where νιόν continues a phrase (ἔδν φίλον νιόν) which started at $1\frac{1}{2}$:

ἔνθ' (ἄλοχόν τε *φίλην ἔλιπον καὶ νήπιον νιόν
 ἡ μὲν (ἔδν φίλον *νιόν ὑπεξέφερον πολέμοιο

Occasionally, too, the word that starts at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit which itself started earlier than the beginning of the line but which is subsequently complete at the caesura. An example is *Od.* 5.371, where βαῖνε continues a clause (αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς . . . , etc.) which started in the previous line but which is subsequently complete at $5\frac{1}{2}$ (completion of a syntactic unit will be represented, as below, by a final bracket):

αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
 ἀμφ' ἐνὶ δούρατι *βαῖνε)

Exceptions to the principle, i.e., instances in which a word starting at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit which started earlier than the beginning of the line and which is still incomplete at the caesura, are extremely rare. As we shall see, there is only a single instance in each of our 1,000 line samples.

Perhaps the most important point to appreciate is that the principle defines not so much a regularity in the structure of the individual lines as *a regularity in the development of the verse as a whole*, the term "verse" being here used to mean the continuous flow of language which repeats, line after line, the given metrical pattern of the hexameter. In effect, the principle determines what may normally be *added*, or *brought into*, this

²¹From here on the term "caesura" will be used exclusively, and without further qualification, of the medial caesura at 5, $5\frac{1}{2}$, or 7.

flow of language as it expands, line after line, across the two points in question. In the majority of lines, as one can tell simply from word-end statistics (above, 214), no new element is added either at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or at 4; the two points are spanned by a single word. But in approximately one line out of every three some new word does start at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$. This new word, however, is almost always a mere continuation of some syntactic unit which has started just beforehand (i.e., no earlier than the beginning of the line) or which, if it has not started just beforehand, will be complete immediately afterwards at the caesura. Even in these instances, then, the two points are still spanned by a single entity which will be complete immediately afterwards if it did not (as it usually does) begin shortly before. The only difference is that the bridging entity, instead of being a single word, is a syntactic unit of two or more words. The principle thus regulates the introduction of new words at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 in a manner complementary to the bridging of the two points by a single word.

Before we can start to substantiate the principle with an analysis of the relevant lines in the two samples, there are certain matters that require clarification and comment. First, the unit continued by the new word added at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ must in every instance be understood to be the unit *directly* continued. Thus, in *Il.* 5.112 (above) the unit continued by $\acute{\omega}\kappa\upsilon$ is the phrase $\beta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma \acute{\omega}\kappa\upsilon$ that started at 3, not the clause $\pi\acute{\alpha}\rho \delta\acute{\epsilon} \dots$, etc., that started at 0. In a sense, of course, the clause is also continued, but continuation is *indirect* and is effected *via* the continuation of the phrase. Secondly, it is *not* part of the present theory that a "sense-break" will always have occurred at the starting point of the unit continued. Contingently this may well be so, as, for example, in *Il.* 5.356 (above), where a major break has obviously occurred at 3. Often, however, there can have been no break at all, as is clearly the case, for example, in *Od.* 5.108, where the unit continued (i.e., the phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \nu\acute{o}\sigma\tau\omega$) started at 3 immediately after the prepositive conjunction $\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\rho$:

$\omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\delta' \cdot \acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\rho (\acute{\epsilon}\nu * \nu\acute{o}\sigma\tau\omega \text{ 'Αθηναίην ἀλίτοντο$

Thirdly, one should bear in mind that the word added at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ does not always continue a unit which has developed without interruption since it was first introduced. In *Il.* 6.6, for example, $\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\gamma\gamma\alpha$ continues a phrase ($\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma \phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\gamma\gamma\alpha$) which started at 0 but which was then interrupted by the verb $\rho\acute{\eta}\xi\epsilon$:

$\text{Αἴας δὲ πρῶτος Τελαμώνιος, ἕρκος 'Αχαιῶν,$
 $(\tau\rho\acute{\omega}\omega\upsilon\omicron\varsigma \rho\acute{\eta}\xi\epsilon * \phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\gamma\gamma\alpha$

Sometimes, as in the above example, the interruption is quite substantial. More often, however, in this particular area of the line the intruding element is merely a particle or conjunction, as for example in *Il.* 5.82,

where the unit *directly* continued, i.e., the phrase αἱματόεσσα χεῖρ, was interrupted by the conjunction δέ:

(αἱματόεσσα δέ *χεῖρ πεδίῳ πέσε

A fourth matter of some importance concerns those instances in which something more than an individual word is added at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$. Consider the following example:

Il. 5.461 (Τρωὰς δέ στίχας *οὔλος ἄρης ὅτρυνε μετελθών

The word that starts at 4 is the attributive adjective οὔλος. This adjective itself introduces a syntactic unit, namely the phrase οὔλος ἄρης. Now, clearly, it is the phrase as a whole, not the individual word, that directly continues a unit that started at a point earlier in the same line, since it is the phrase, not the word, that is an element of the clause Τρωὰς δέ . . . , etc. Here, then, it would be more accurate to speak of the *unit* that starts at 4 continuing a unit that itself started no earlier than the beginning of the line. To avoid misrepresentation, therefore, I shall use the indefinite term “material” to cover both single words and units of more than a single word introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$. Actually, in the great majority of instances the material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ does consist solely of an individual word. Even short phrases are seldom introduced there, and the introduction of a clause is rare in the extreme, there being only a single instance in the two samples, i.e., *Od.* 6.285:

(ὥς ἐρέουσιν, *ἐμοὶ δέ κ' ὀνείδεα ταῦτα γένοιτο

A further matter requiring comment is my use of the term “complete.” In saying that the unit continued by the material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ will normally be *complete* at the caesura if it started earlier than the beginning of the line, I do not mean to imply that the unit necessarily *ends* there. In *Il.* 5.579, for example, the clause τὸν μὲν ἄρ' . . . , etc, which began in the preceding line, is brought to completion at the caesura by its verb νύξε:

τὸν μὲν ἄρ' Ἄτρείδης δουρικλειτὸς Μενέλαος
ἐσταότ' ἔγχει *νύξε) κατὰ κληῖδα τυχήσας

The clause does not, however, end at the caesura, being subsequently continued by the participial construction κατὰ κληῖδα τυχήσας. In such instances, though, this later continuation is irrelevant. What matters is that *prior* to the caesura the development is such that the unit continued by the addition of material at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ is *first* brought to completion and *could* end there. The term “complete,” then, is here used strictly with reference to a particular moment in the development (i.e., the caesura). It implies nothing as to the unit's final end point.

Finally, there is the matter of postpositives. In our analysis we should,

I believe, disregard all lines in which the material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ consists solely of a postpositive (e.g., *Il.* 5.85 Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ *ἄν γνούς) or of two postpositives in succession (e.g., *Il.* 5.421 Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ ρά *ῥι *μοι κεχολώσαι). This is not because a postpositive is somehow not an individual word in its own right, but because in the context of the verse's development the *introduction* of a postpositive is *equivalent* to transition across a point without any introduction of new material. This may appear something of a quibble, but I believe that it is the correct deduction to be drawn from the following facts. First, at the two points in the line at which new material is *always* introduced, i.e., at the start of the line and at the caesura, a postpositive is *never* introduced.²² Secondly, at the one point at which the introduction of material *per se* is severely *restricted*, i.e., at $7\frac{1}{2}$, the introduction of postpositives is freely *tolerated*. In the *Iliad* sample, for example, postpositives account for the material introduced at $7\frac{1}{2}$ in 36 out of a scant 48 instances, and in the *Odyssey* sample for 42 out of 53. It seems, then, that in the development of the verse the introduction of a postpositive is *not* equivalent to the introduction of material of other sorts, and that we are therefore right in setting aside such instances in a separate category. In our *Iliad* sample postpositives alone are introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ in 29 lines and in our *Odyssey* sample in 37.²³

We are now in a position to substantiate the principle with an analysis of the 297 lines in the *Iliad* sample and the 312 lines in the *Odyssey* sample in which new material other than a postpositive or postpositives is introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$. What we seek to prove is the following:

That, normally, any material introduced into the verse at $3\frac{1}{2}$ or 4 continues a syntactic unit which itself started no earlier than the beginning of the line or which, if it did start earlier than the beginning of the line, will subsequently be complete at the caesura.

1) In 75 lines in the *Iliad* sample and in 77 in the *Odyssey* sample material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit that started at 3: *Il.* 5.2, 8,

²²Of the caesura this is not quite true to the letter. There are actually six instances in the entire *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in which either a postpositive is introduced at the caesura or else there is no caesura at all: *Il.* 3.205, 220, 10.453, 23.668, *Od.* 4.544, 18.376.

²³*Il.* 5.53, 61, 85, 94, 172, 195, 232, 246, 298, 340, 385, 392, 402, 411, 421, 472, 511, 532, 567, 591, 592, 595, 601, 684, 689, 739, 762, 901, 6.38, *Od.* 5.6, 29, 39, 48, 120, 161, 215, 278, 286, 309, 347, 356, 357, 363, 364, 369, 389, 411, 442, 6.55, 57, 66, 119, 154, 182, 216, 242, 284, 292, 301, 303, 7.22, 55, 71, 103, 159, 174. As postpositives I have counted, with one exception, only those words which cannot and do not figure as first word in a clause (see esp. K. J. Dover, *Greek Word Order* [Cambridge 1960] 12 f.). The exception is δῆ, which occasionally does introduce a clause (e.g., δῆ τότ' ἔπειτ' ἡρᾶτο . . .). I have not, however, included those parts of εἰμί and φημί which are generally enclitic but which also figure quite regularly as first word in a clause and which, unlike postpositives proper, are occasionally introduced at the caesura (e.g., *Od.* 3.188 εὖ μὲν Μυρμιδόνas/*φασ' ἔλθέμεν).

18, 24, 60, 63, 64, 67, 74, 88, 105, 112, 116, 131, 136, 148, 161, 184, 187, 196, 197, 214, 215, 230, 240, 278, 296, 303, 330, 331, 344, 362, 371, 374, 377, 378, 384, 394, 395, 398, 433, 438, 456, 457, 467, 490, 517, 528, 535, 545, 553, 555, 564, 572, 608, 656, 665, 672, 683, 699, 715, 718, 820, 863, 876, 880, 902, 903, 907, 6.7, 13, 25, 57, 80, 87, *Od.* 5.27, 36, 37, 44, 51, 55, 61, 63, 80, 98, 106, 108, 183, 193, 210, 223, 242, 289, 294, 327, 334, 352, 366, 377, 390, 402, 409, 421, 425, 439, 445, 449, 455, 461, 465, 6.25, 28, 33, 37, 42, 50, 51, 67, 77, 84, 95, 123, 158, 164, 166, 173, 177, 200, 218, 241, 271, 274, 305, 317, 326, 7.2, 3, 23, 26, 38, 40, 66, 67, 69, 95, 99, 109, 113, 135, 139, 147, 149. In somewhat less than half of these instances the unit continued is a clause. Particularly common are those in which material is added to (i) the relative pronoun *ὅς, ἥ, ὃ*, etc., or (ii) the anaphoric pronoun *ὁ, ἡ, τό*, etc., + *δέ/δ'*. Examples:

- i) *Il.* 5.378 *Αἰνείαν*, (*ὅς *ἐμοὶ πάντων πολὺ φίλτατός ἐστιν*)
- ii) *Il.* 5.371 *μητρὸς ἐῆς*· (*ἡ δ' *ἀγκὰς ἐλάζετο θυγατέρα ἦν*)

In the majority of other instances a phrase is continued by the addition of a noun or equivalent (i.e., a pronoun or substantival adjective) to (i) a preposition or (ii) a modifier (i.e., an adjective, dependent genitive, demonstrative, or article). Examples:

- i) *Od.* 5.27 *μνηστῆρες δ'* (*ἐν *νῇ παλιμπετὲς ἀπονέωνται*)
- ii) *Il.* 5.215 *εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ* (*τάδε *τόξα φαεινῶ ἐν πυρὶ θείην*)

Also fairly common are instances in which (i) a modifier is added to a noun or equivalent, or (ii) some element is added to *καί*. Examples:

- i) *Il.* 5.112 *πὰρ δὲ στὰς* (*βέλος *ὥκ' διαμπερὲς ἐξέρυσ' ὦμον*)
- ii) *Od.* 6.271 *ἀλλ' ἱστοὶ* (*καὶ *ἐρετμὰ νεῶν καὶ νῆες εἶσαι*)

2) In 49 lines in the *Iliad* sample and in 52 in the *Odyssey* sample material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit that started at 2: *Il.* 5.17, 52, 118, 126, 129, 162, 167, 171, 174, 204, 222, 223, 267, 310, 313, 321, 349, 356, 363, 376, 382, 396, 406, 428, 434, 454, 466, 481, 484, 495, 529, 606, 621, 648, 721, 781, 794, 806, 853, 870, 881, 893, 6.2, 16, 41, 46, 51, 56, 69, *Od.* 5.12, 57, 73, 94, 101, 105, 139, 160, 162, 164, 212, 216, 267, 271, 273, 281, 300, 323, 339, 422, 423, 462, 484, 6.11, 44, 130, 132, 138, 147, 161, 165, 174, 184, 187, 189, 201, 205, 220, 225, 247, 249, 268, 277, 283, 291, 293, 299, 308, 7.106, 114, 118, 154. In approximately half of these instances the unit continued is a clause. Example:

Od. 5.139 *ἐρρέτω*, (*εἰ μιν *κείνος ἐποτρύνει καὶ ἀνώγει*)

In most of the other instances a phrase is continued (i) by the addition of

a noun to a modifier, conjunction, or preposition. Less common are instances in which (ii) a modifier is added to a noun. Examples:

- i) *Il.* 5.376 οὐτά με (Τυδέος *υἱός, ὑπέρθυμος Διομήδης
- ii) *Od.* 7.114 ἐνθα δὲ (δένδρεα *μακρὰ πεφύκασι τηλεθώντα

3) In nine lines in the *Iliad* sample and in ten in the *Odyssey* sample material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit that started at $1\frac{1}{2}$: *Il.* 5.169, 251, 318, 430, 536, 611, 625, 888, 6.86, *Od.* 5.131, 150, 408, 451, 6.56, 69, 153, 7.29, 64, 152. Examples (in the first the unit continued is a clause, in the second a phrase):

- i) *Od.* 5.150 ἦι', (ἐπεὶ δὴ *Ζηνὸς ἐπέκλυεν ἀγγελιάων
- ii) *Il.* 5.430 ταῦτα δ' (*Ἀρηι *θοῶ καὶ Ἀθήνη πάντα μελήσει

4) In eight lines in the *Iliad* sample and in ten in the *Odyssey* sample material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit that started at 1: *Il.* 5.89, 147, 219, 480, 519, 533, 624, 759, *Od.* 5.110, 133, 200, 260, 295, 304, 370, 6.20, 167, 287. Examples (again, in the first the unit continued is a clause, in the second a phrase):

- i) *Il.* 5.147 πλῆξ', (ἀπὸ δ' αὐχένος *ὦμον ἐέργαθεν ἡδ' ἀπὸ νώτου
- ii) *Od.* 5.200 οἱ δ' (ἐπ' ὀνείαθ' *ἐτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἱαλλον

5) In 146 lines in the *Iliad* sample and in 153 in the *Odyssey* sample material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit that started at 0: *Il.* 5.7, 14, 16, 22, 23, 29, 35, 36, 42, 43, 59, 69, 70, 71, 82, 90, 92, 100, 101, 103, 122, 127, 137, 139, 154, 160, 177, 181, 185, 188, 199, 207, 224, 228, 237, 245, 257, 263, 271, 273, 275, 277, 283, 299, 300, 304, 312, 314, 323, 336, 338, 341, 342, 347, 353, 355, 360, 361, 364, 365, 370, 373, 375, 381, 383, 393, 404, 405, 420, 422, 442, 461, 475, 510, 516, 537, 538, 539, 540, 543, 547, 554, 570, 571, 580, 584, 593, 603, 604, 609, 616, 617, 630, 635, 638, 641, 643, 652, 660, 670, 671, 675, 677, 680, 726, 749, 758, 761, 765, 796, 799, 800, 802, 805, 809, 812, 815, 817, 824, 825, 832, 837, 843, 850, 858, 859, 862, 877, 890, 891, 892, 895, 896, 898, 6.6, 10, 12, 23, 29, 37, 45, 52, 65, 73, 77, 83, *Od.* 5.16, 25, 35, 40, 41, 46, 49, 56, 76, 82, 88, 96, 103, 113, 114, 118, 129, 137, 141, 151, 170, 173, 179, 182, 184, 187, 190, 195, 198, 202, 208, 218, 226, 237, 241, 243, 244, 246, 247, 248, 257, 258, 261, 262, 263, 265, 275, 276, 285, 290, 292, 298, 319, 326, 331, 341, 355, 358, 361, 376, 379, 397, 400, 401, 407, 410, 413, 418, 427, 428, 440, 447, 448, 450, 464, 487, 6.1, 4, 9, 12, 13, 26, 27, 34, 48, 52, 60, 62, 72, 86, 100, 102, 107, 110, 116, 117, 149, 150, 151, 155, 162, 163, 171, 180, 188, 190, 195, 203, 212, 221, 227, 228, 231, 243, 255, 256, 273, 285, 300, 314, 325, 329, 7.14, 18, 28, 30, 32, 34, 47, 48, 53, 54, 56, 60, 68, 73, 76, 82, 86, 88, 90, 92, 100, 117, 120, 123, 134, 140, 153, 157, 160, 167, 171. In the great majority of these instances (roughly, in four out of every five) a clause is continued,

most often (i) by the addition of its verb, but also frequently (ii) by the addition of some other element. Examples:

- i) *Il.* 5.7 (τοῶν οἱ πῦρ *δαῖεν ἀπὸ κρατὸς τε καὶ ὤμων
 ii) *Il.* 5.355 (εὕρεν ἔπειτα *μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ θοῦρον Ἄρηα

In the other instances the unit continued is generally (i) a phrase (often an interrupted phrase—see above, 223—continued by its noun); also not uncommon are (ii) participial constructions (usually continued by the participle itself). Examples:

- i) *Il.* 5.92 (πολλὰ δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ *ἔργα κατήριπε κάλ' αἰζηῶν
 ii) *Od.* 5.49 (τὴν μετὰ χερσὶν *ἔχων πέτετο κρατὺς ἀργειφόντης

Note how in these and similar examples one identifies the unit *directly* continued (i.e., respectively, the phrase and the participial construction) and *not* the larger and more obvious units (i.e., the clauses) that also started at 0 (see above, 227).

6) In nine lines in each sample material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit that started in the preceding line but which is subsequently complete at the caesura: *Il.* 5.3, 289, 503, 579, 813, 886, 6.54, 59, 79, *Od.* 5.74, 78, 371, 481, 492, 6.91, 140, 7.11, 15. In every instance the unit continued is a clause, the material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ being usually the verb. Example:

- Od.* 6.91 ταὶ δ' ἀπ' ἀπήνης
 εἴματα χερσὶν *ἔλοντο)

Note that in certain instances the clause, though *complete* at the caesura, does not *end* there (see above, 226, and the example quoted).

7) In a single line in each sample material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit that started in the preceding line but which is *not* subsequently complete at the caesura:

- Il.* 5.634 τίς τοι ἀνάγκη
 πτώσσειν ἐνθάδ' *έόντι μάχης ἀδαήμονι φωτί;
Od. 5.287 ἦ μάλα δὴ μετεβούλευσαν θεοὶ ἄλλως
 ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆι *έμειο μετ' Αἰθιόπεςσιν έόντος

These two instances are the only exceptions to the principle in the 2,000 lines of the samples. In each case a participial construction (έόντι μάχης ἀδαήμονι φωτί, έμειο μετ' Αἰθιόπεςσιν έόντος) is added at $3\frac{1}{2}$ to a clause (τίς τοι . . . , etc., ἦ μάλα δὴ . . . , etc.) that started earlier than the beginning of the line. Since the participial construction is itself incomplete at the caesura, the clause which it continues is also incomplete there.

If it be granted that the facts are substantially as presented in the above analysis, the question now remains of how the principle as a whole is to be interpreted. It is, I would suggest, essentially a means of simplify-

ing and regularizing the composition by maintaining at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 a kind of zone across which, line after line, the development of the verse is characterized solely by the *continuation* of that which started shortly before (i.e., no earlier than the beginning of the line) or which, on the rare occasions when it did not start shortly before, will be complete immediately afterwards (i.e., at the caesura). More often than not, what is continued is simply an individual word that spans both points in succession, or else, what is tantamount to a single word, the sequence of a postpositive (or postpositives) following a word of some other type (see above, 224 f.). On the remaining occasions, when new material in the form of a non-postpositive word or phrase does start at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and/or 4, what is continued is the syntactic unit of which the material introduced is an element. The principle thus generates, as the verse develops line after line over the zone in question, the effect of an invariably smooth transition in which new additions are consistently kept within strict limits. This regular effect of a smooth transition in the development of the verse across points $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 is an aspect of the epic's poetic form. It is something which is expected and sensed by the poet's audience, i.e., by the listener or reader. It is a norm which the poet himself realizes as a limitation on the range of syntactic patterns which he will regularly employ in the development of his verse across that part of the line.

Though logically independent of it, the principle fits well with the theory of oral composition. Clearly, the limitation on the range of syntactic patterns which the principle defines is an example of the very type of simplification and standardization which is both essential to, and typical of, impromptu composition by oral verse-makers. It could well be argued, then, that the original function of the principle was to bring about precisely this simplification and standardization of syntactic patterns as an aid to the poet in the line-by-line development of his verse. The suggestion would still be reasonable even if the Homeric poems as we have them were not themselves orally composed, since it would be quite feasible to suppose that the limitation remained in effect by inertia even after its simplifying function had been outmoded by the advent of literate composition and by the lifting of the pressures and requirements of the old oral method. What makes it, to my mind, doubly likely that the principle, at least in its origin, has to do with the circumstances and needs of oral composition is the fact that the two points where there is a limitation on the introduction of new material, $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4, immediately precede the caesura, which is the one point inside the line at which new material must *always* be introduced. I would suggest, then, that in the context of oral verse-making the principle may well have been a device to simplify the composition at the crucial time when the poet is reaching the point at which he must invariably bring in new material. In the development of

the verse over the first half of the line point 3 is the last point at which he may introduce something radically new. Thereafter, and until the caesura, all that he may normally add is a continuation of some unit that either started shortly beforehand or else will be complete immediately afterwards. The poet is thus afforded, by the restraints of his habitual practice, a sort of bridge over which the verse is brought uneventfully to the caesura and the inevitable introduction of new material there.²⁴

All that now remains is to relate the principle limiting the introduction of material at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ to the much narrower restriction with which this study started, i.e., the restriction on word-ends at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 unless preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3. Here I would suggest that the rarity of word-ends at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 not preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3 is not the result of a specific inhibition against that particular phenomenon *per se*, but rather a structural side effect of the limitations on the introduction of material at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ during the *development* of the verse. As we have seen, material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ usually (i.e., in approximately nine instances out of every ten) continues a syntactic unit which started either at 0 or else at 2 or 3. But whenever material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit which started at 2 or 3, the word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ will *ipso facto* be preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3. Turning now to those instances in which material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit which started at 0, we note that by far the commonest are those in which the unit continued is a clause. But when a clause starts at 0, in most instances its introductory elements will extend as far as 2 or 3, and the word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ will thus, in these circumstances too, be preceded by a word-end at 2 and/or 3: e.g., *Il.* 5.7 τοῖόν οἱ πῦρ δαῖεν . . . , 14 οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ σχεδὸν ἦσαν Sometimes, of course, the introductory element(s) will extend only as far as 1 or $1\frac{1}{2}$, in which case there may well be no intervening word-end at 2 or 3: e.g., *Il.* 5.23 ἀλλ' Ἥφαιστος ἔρυτο. Rarely, though, will a word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ follow *no* preceding word-end earlier in the line (one such infrequent instance is *Il.* 5.671 μερμήριξε δ' ἔπειτα . . .). On balance, then, among instances of this commonest type of all (i.e., those in which the unit continued is a clause that started at 0), instances in which a word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ is *not* preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3 are fairly rare. This relative scarcity, when taken in conjunction with all those instances in which a word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ is necessarily preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3 simply because material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a syntactic unit that started at 2 or 3, is sufficient to account for the

²⁴This line of argument is supported by the existence of a corresponding bridge and a corresponding limitation on the introduction of material at the four points which immediately precede the line-end, i.e., 9, $9\frac{1}{2}$, 10, and 11. Looked at from a different standpoint, points 9, $9\frac{1}{2}$, 10, and 11, like $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4, also precede a point at which new material must always be introduced, i.e., point 0 or the beginning of the following line. The facts pertaining to this other bridge are given in my thesis (above, n. 1), 107–185.

over-all infrequency of instances in which a word-end at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ is *not* preceded by a word-end at 2 or 3. Such instances, of course, are only *comparatively* rare. In absolute terms they occur not that infrequently (see above, 214), and among those instances in which material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}/4$ continues a unit that started at 1 or $1\frac{1}{2}$ or in the preceding line they are by no means uncommon. We conclude, then, that the apparent restriction on certain word-end sequences in the first half of the line is no more than a minor and fortuitous consequence of the much more fundamental limitation, defined by our principle, on the syntactic units normally continued by material introduced at $3\frac{1}{2}$ and 4 in the course of the verse's development.

ERINDALE COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO