IX.—Homer and Huso III: Enjambement in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song

ALBERT B. LORD

ALLSTON, MASS.

An analysis of selected passages from the Homeric poems and the Southslavic heroic narrative songs indicates that necessary enjambement is markedly less frequent in the latter than in the former. This difference in degree between two generically similar poetries can be accounted for by the fact that the Greek language and the Homeric hexameter are more flexible and richer in formula variety than Serbo-Croatian and the Southslavic decasyllabic verse.*

The "deferred" or "run-over" words in the Homeric poems have attracted some attention in the past[1] because they occur often enough to form a characteristic pattern and, therefore, they must be significant. It has been shown[2] that the hexameter marks the unit of thought in the poems, and that when the sense is carried on into the next line the enjambement is frequently unperiodic, the ideas of the second line being added to an already complete thought. Some of the run-over words (οὐλομένην in the second line of the *Iliad* is a good example) fall into this category. But in about one quarter of the cases investigated by Parry the thought is not completed by the end of the hexameter, and the listener must go on to the next line. Some of the run-over words are involved in necessary enjambement, and it is this sort of enjambement which concerns us here.

The problem is one of comparative literature. Since the oral character of the Homeric poems is generally accepted (although not always understood) it is reasonable to expect that any stylistic trait, such as enjambement, which reflects that character, will be common to all oral narrative verse. If differences are found, they

---

* Completion of this paper has been delayed, unavoidably; see *PAPhA* 70 (1939) xxxix.

[1] See among others: T. D. Seymour, *Homeric Language and Verse* (Boston, 1889) 9 ff.; H. W. Prescott, "The Position of 'Deferred' Nouns and Adjectives in Epic and Dramatic Verse," *CPh* 7 (1912) 35–58; S. E. Bassett, "The So-called Emphatic Position of the Runover Word in the Homeric Hexameter," *TAPhA* 57 (1926) 116–148.

[2] M. Parry, "The Distinctive Character of Enjambement in Homeric Verse," *TAPhA* 60 (1929) 200–220, and "Whole Formulaic Verses in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song," *TAPhA* 64 (1933) 179–197.

should be explicable by reference to local variations of language or meter or tradition. Rather than being generic, such differences are apt to be differences of degree.

In analysing the enjambement in six hundred lines of the *Iliad* and a like number of the *Odyssey*, Parry discovered[3] the following: no enjambement occurred in an average of 48.5 per cent of the cases from the *Iliad* and 44.8 per cent of the cases from the *Odyssey;* unperiodic enjambement was found in 24.8 per cent of the verses from the *Iliad* and 26.6 per cent of those from the *Odyssey;* and finally, necessary enjambement occurred in an average of 26.6 per cent of the lines from the *Iliad* and 28.5 per cent of the lines from the *Odyssey*. He showed further that unperiodic enjambement was about twice as frequent in the Homeric poems as in the *Aeneid* or the *Argonautica*, and that necessary enjambement was only about half as frequent. Thus he asserted that unperiodic enjambement was a distinctive characteristic of the Homeric style, and of the difference in the frequency of necessary enjambement in Homer and the later poets he wrote: "It is a difference which in itself does not bring out so strikingly as does unperiodic enjambement the way in which Homer orders his thought. But in it above all lies the marked beat and swing of the Homeric rhythm."[4]

In turning to Southslavic oral narrative verse, as we have done in the two previous articles in this series,[5] for corroboration from another oral epic poetry, we find that the heroic decasyllabic line of the Southern Slavs contains the unit of thought of the singer even more rigorously than the Homeric hexameter. Of the 2400 lines which were analysed, 44.5 per cent showed no enjambement, 40.6 per cent showed unperiodic enjambement, and only 14.9 per cent were followed by necessary enjambement.[6] Thus the distinctive character of unperiodic enjambement becomes more distinctive by 14.9 per cent, and necessary enjambement less frequent by 12.7 per cent. Or, in other words, whereas the thought is com-

[3] *TAPhA* 60 (1929) 204, note 9.

[4] *Ibid.* 217–218.

[5] "Homer and Huso I: The Singer's Rests in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song," *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 106–113, and "Homer and Huso II: Narrative Inconsistencies in Homer and Oral Poetry," *TAPhA* 69 (1938) 439–445.

[6] Six hundred lines were analysed from each of two poems by Salih Ugljan of Novi Pazar (Parry Collection Texts Nos. 668 and 649) and a like number of lines from each of two poems by Avdo Međedović of Bijelo Polje (Parry Collection Texts Nos. 12389–12441 and 12428). The results are tabulated below (I indicates no enjambement, II, unperiodic enjambement, and III, necessary enjambement):

plete by the end of the line in 72.4 per cent of the cases in Homer, it
is completed in 85.1 per cent of the instances from the Southslavic
poets.   This difference of 12.7 per cent is great enough to warrant
further investigation.   The reward in terms of enriched under-
standing of the processes of both the poetries involved is well worth
the labor.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

There are five common types of necessary enjambement in the
Southslavic poems, and they account for almost all the cases which

<p style="text-align:center">Salih Ugljan</p>

	Text No. 668 (Sung)			Text No. 649 (Dictated)		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
1–100	56	31	13	59	34	7
201–300	41	44	15	52	38	10
401–500	50	37	13	47	42	11
601–700	56	37	7	59	35	6
801–900	43	42	15	51	35	14
1001–1100	57	28	15	55	35	10
	303	219	78	323	219	58
Average %	50.5	36.5	13	53.8	36.5	9.7

Average for both poems: I, 52.2; II, 36.5; III, 11.3

<p style="text-align:center">Avdo Međedović</p>

Texts Nos. 12389–12441 (Sung)				Text No. 12428 (Dictated)			
	I	II	III		I	II	III
1–100	29	50	21	1–100	31	53	16
2001–2100	33	39	28	101–200	38	43	19
4001–4100	34	49	17	201–300	39	44	17
6001–6100	38	46	16	301–400	48	41	11
8001–8100	46	47	7	401–500	37	42	21
10001–10100	26	50	24	501–600	43	33	24
	206	281	113		236	256	108
Average %	34.3	46.9	18.8		39.4	42.6	18

Average for both poems: I, 36.9; II, 44.7; III, 18.4

Average for four poems: I, 44.5; II, 40.6; III, 14.9

have been considered.   The first type is the line at the beginning of
a speech in which the speaker addresses his audience.   It consists
of a noun in the vocative case plus some word or phrase, frequently
in apposition, to fill out the line.

> Sultan Selim, od svijeta sunce,
> *Sultan Selim, light of the world,*
> > Ugljan, 668, 27[7]
>
> Majko moja, đeneta ti tvoga,
> *Mother, by thy hope in paradise,*
> > Ugljan, 649, 16
>
> Ljubo moja, Ismihan hanuma,
> *My love, Lady Ismihan,*
> > Međedović, 12389, 36
>
> Lički beže od Like krvave,
> *Lički beg from the bloody Lika,*
> > Međedović, 12428, 117

Only part of the thought is expressed in this line and the listener
must have the following line to complete it, and yet the part which
is expressed is in itself complete.   This is the most *un*necessary
type of necessary enjambement.

The second common type involves the line which contains a
preceding subordinate clause.

> Kad ća caru knjiga čatisala,
> Pa pokupi paše i vezire,
> *When this message reached the emperor,*
> *He gathered his pashas and vezirs,*
> > Ugljan, 668, 33–34
>
> A kad dođo pred odajska vrata,
> Kad na vrata dva mrka soldata.
> *And when I arrived at the door of the room,*
> *There were two grim soldiers at the door.*
> > Ugljan, 649, 240–241
>
> Da nijesu ovaki junaci,
> Ne bi za nji znale kraljevine.
> *If they were not such heroes,*
> *The kingdoms would not have known of them.*
> > Međedović, 12389, 4009–4010
>
> Samo da ga pominjemo često,
> Pa će nam svuj Bog pomagati,
> *If we only remember him often,*
> *Then will God help us in all things,*
> > Međedović, 12428, *3–4*

---

[7] The first number refers to the text and the second to the line of that text.

These two types cover the largest number of cases, but there are three others that are worth mentioning even if they are not so frequent. The third is akin to the preceding subordinate clause, and consists of a preceding adverbial phrase.

> Jednom vaktu a starom zemanu,
> *Once upon a time in the days of old,*
> <div align="right">Ugljan, 668, 11</div>
> No u jutru prije zore ravne,
> *But in the morning, just before dawn,*
> <div align="right">Međedović, 12389, 2082</div>

Sometimes the verb of the main clause requires a clause to complete its meaning. This constitutes a fourth type of necessary enjambement.

> Ja sam čula đe svetina priča,
> Đe se Bosna kupi cip cijela,
> *I have heard people say,*
> *That all of Bosnia is being gathered,*
> <div align="right">Ugljan, 668, 675–676</div>
> Bog će viđet', a viđet' Krajina,
> Šta će Luka Pavičević radit'.
> *God will see, and so will the men of the Border,*
> *What Pavičević Luka will do.*
> <div align="right">Međedović, 12389, 2053–2054</div>

Finally there are a few instances of parallel constructions of the "either . . . or," "not only . . . but also," "not this . . . but that" variety, which carry the listener on to a second line to finish the thought.

> Al nam valja Bagdat prifatiti,
> Al Stambola zemlju jostaviti,
> *Shall we take Bagdad,*
> *Or leave the country of Stambol,*
> <div align="right">Ugljan, 668, 38–39</div>
> Nisu rušpe, ni su nuradije,
> No šorvani od hiljade groša,
> *They were neither ducats nor dubloons,*
> *But they were clusters of a thousand piasters,*
> <div align="right">Međedović, 12441, 8089–8090</div>

Now, in all of these instances[8] we do not find a single case of an adjective in one line modifying a noun in the next, or the subject in one line separated from its verb in the following line, or of any

---

[8] The tabulation of the instances of the six types of necessary enjambement in the four poems analysed is as follows (I indicates line of address, II, preceding subordinate

integral part of the sentence structure separated by the pause at the end of the line from another integral part.   There is a pause in time, if not in sense, when we reach the end of a verse, because a part of the thought has been completed.   No words have been left dangling, searching for something to modify.

However, cases of this type of necessary enjambement can be found in Southslavic oral narrative verse, although they are rare. It is significant that only one instance of it was found in the 1200 lines selected from the songs of Salih Ugljan.   Ugljan's style is much less complex than Međedović's, as a study of the table in note 6 indicates, with its large percentages of both unperiodic and necessary enjambement.   In line 443 of Text 668 he sings:

> Prvu što je knjigu jopravijo,
> *The first letter which he dispatched,*

and the accusative has no verb to govern it until the next line:

> Sprema Šali sa grada Mojstara.
> *He sent to Shala of the city of Mostar.*

More striking examples are drawn from Avdo's songs:

> Husejine, ja sam jutros, sine,
> Kod hanume mrku kahvu pijo.
> *Husejin, my son, this morning I*
> *Drank black coffee with my lady.*
>   12389, 75–76

Here the subject and the auxiliary verb are separated from the past participle which they govern..

> Tu je, babo, Delibegoviću,
> Ima tuna na riznice blago,
> *There is there, my father, Delibegović,*
> *There is there treasure in chests,*
>   12389, 2016–2017

clause, III, complementary clause, IV, adverbial phrase, V, parallel construction, and VI, division of basic parts of the sentence):

	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
668	27	35	9	2	4	1
649	2	42	8	4	2	0
12389–12441	9	60	25	1	2	16
12428	9	60	23	9	1	6
Totals	47	197	65	16	9	23

In this instance the verb in the first line has no subject until the end of the second line is reached.

> Svi hajvani aga carevije
> Pred mehanu za čatal svezani,
> *All the horses of the imperial lords*
> *Were tied by their halters before the inn,*
>   12428, 267–268

The subject here with its modifiers is in one line and the verb and its modifiers in the second.

The sixth type of necessary enjambement occurs in less than one per cent of the verses investigated, and, with a single exception, all the cases are found in the songs of a singer whose style is extreme in its disregard of formula and meter.[9]   Had he wished to do so, Avdo could have expressed himself adequately within the more conventional formula patterns.   Thus in the second example above he could have sung:

> Husejine, moj milosan sine,
> Ja sam jutros mrku kahvu pijo,
> Kod hanume u šikli odaji.
> *Husejin, my dear son,*
> *I drank my black coffee this morning*
> *With my lady in our beautiful room.*

These lines are made up entirely of common formulas, and the enjambement is more within the tradition.   In the same way, instead of the third example above Avdo could (and this time more correctly) have sung:

> Sad, moj babo, Delibegoviću,
> Ima tuna na riznice blago,
> *Now, my father, Delibegović,*
> *There is treasure there in chests,*

Or he could have sung more simply:

> Tu je, babo, na riznice blago,
> *There is treasure there, father, in chests,*

But the habit of the patronymic was too strong and it slipped in, even though it necessitated beginning the sentence again in the next line.

---

[9] That Avdo is different from the more normal singer Salih Ugljan is apparent from a study of the table in note 6 above.   Further investigation of this singer's individuality will be most rewarding, but this is not the place for it.

These exceptions can be traced to the faulty juxtaposition of formulas in the rapidity of oral composition. It is significant that there are fewer instances of this in his dictated song, when he was composing more leisurely, than in the sung text.

*   *   *

All six of these types (with the minor exception of the preceding adverbial phrase) were noted in the Homeric poems also. There are lines of address, such as A 17:

Ἀτρεῖδαί τε καὶ ἄλλοι ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί.

And these are whole formulaic verses of exactly the same sort as in the Southslavic poetry. There are examples, too, of a preceding subordinate clause, though they are much less frequent in Homer,[10] and these are likewise familiar whole formulaic verses, such as A 57:

οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο,

or I 92:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο.

The place of the Southslavic complementary clause is taken in Greek by the complementary infinitive, which Serbo-Croatian uses sparingly. A simple case of this is found in A 18–19:

ὑμῖν μὲν θεοὶ δοῖεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἐκπέρσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν, εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἱκέσθαι,

and again in P 68–69:

ὣς τῶν οὔ τινι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἐτόλμα
ἀντίον ἐλθέμεναι Μενελάου κυδαλίμοιο.

Finally, there are a few instances of parallel constructions, of which ι 56–57 are excellent examples:

ὄφρα μὲν ἠὼς ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἦμαρ,
τόφρα δ' ἀλεξόμενοι μένομεν πλέονάς περ ἐόντας.

But these types account for only a small percentage of the verses which are followed by necessary enjambement. Nor would they give us "the marked beat and swing of the Homeric rhythm" of which Parry speaks.[11] To find this we must turn to the sixth type of necessary enjambement which by far predominates in the Ho-

---

[10] See Parry, *TAPhA* 60 (1929) 216.

[11] *Ibid.* 218.

meric poems, but which is so rare in the Southslavic as to be prac-
tically non-existent. Of it Parry wrote:[12] "The second sort of
necessary enjambement is that in which the word group is divided
between two verses. It differs from all the types of enjambement
which I have hitherto cited in that it does not mark a break in time
or sense at the end of the hexameter. Since all other orderings of
words fall in the other classes, the word group here will be made up
in all cases of the unbroken complex formed by the basic parts of
the clause — subject, verb, and object, and of the words directly
modifying these basic parts. The reader is unable to form a whole
picture of a single action until he has this whole complex of words
and has set its parts in their proper place in regard to each other,
and so it is that no break can be made in the thought until the word
group is ended."

A half dozen examples will suffice to illustrate this point. In
E 29–30 the subject is in the first line and the verb in the second:

<div align="center">

ἀτὰρ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη

χειρὸς ἑλοῦσ' ἐπέεσσι προσηύδα θοῦρον Ἄρηα·

</div>

I 96–99 affords three examples of necessary enjambement in quick
succession: (1) a vocative; (2) an instance of an adjective at the
end of one line agreeing with a noun at the beginning of the next;[13]
and (3) a case of a verb in one line governing a direct object in the
next.

<div align="center">

Ἀτρείδη κύδιστε, ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγάμεμνον,

ἐν σοὶ μὲν λήξω, σέο δ' ἄρξομαι, οὕνεκα πολλῶν

λαῶν ἐσσι ἄναξ καὶ τοι Ζεὺς ἐγγυάλιξε

σκῆπτρόν τ' ἠδὲ θέμιστας, ἵνα σφίσι βουλεύῃσθα.

</div>

The enjambement at the end of P 84 and 85 illustrates several com-
binations: (1) the verb in one line followed by its object in the next;
(2) a pronoun in one line with its modifying participle as a run-over
word in the next line. It is also significant that in these two ex-
amples, as well as in line 97 of the preceding, the bucolic diaeresis
plays an important role.

<div align="center">

πάπτηνεν δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα κατὰ στίχας, αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω

τὸν μὲν ἀπαινύμενον κλυτὰ τεύχεα, τὸν δ' ἐπὶ γαίῃ

κείμενον·

</div>

[12] *Ibid.* 217.

[13] Parry. *ibid.* 218–219.

And from the *Odyssey*, which has a slightly higher percentage of instances of necessary enjambement:

> ἀλλὰ Ποσειδάων γαιήοχος ἀσκελὲς αἰὲν
> Κύκλωπος κεχόλωται, ὃν ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀλάωσεν (a 68–69),

> ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τὴν νῆσον ἀφίκετο τηλόθ' ἐοῦσαν,
> ἔνθ' ἐκ πόντου βὰς ἰοειδέος ἠπειρόνδε
> ἤιεν, ὄφρα μέγα σπέος ἵκετο, τῷ ἔνι νύμφη
> ναῖεν ἐυπλόκαμος· τὴν δ' ἔνδοθι τέτμεν ἐοῦσαν (ε 55–58),

and

> τῇ δ' ἄρ' ἅμ' ἀμφίπολοι φέρον ὄγκιον, ἔνθα σίδηρος
> κεῖτο πολὺς καὶ χαλκός, ἀέθλια τοῖο ἄνακτος (φ 61–62).

These examples are no exceptions to the formulaic style of Homer. Ἀτὰρ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη in E 29 contains one of the most familiar epithets in the poems and is an echo of θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, but unlike this, which usually looks backwards for its verb, ἀτὰρ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη looks forward, and belongs to a system of formulas beginning with ἀτάρ or some such word after the first short syllable of the third foot and reaching to the end of the line. To this system ἄφαρ δέ σε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη in X 270 also belongs, as does τοὺς δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη in Δ 439. This is in turn akin to B 279 παρὰ δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη and B 446 μετὰ δὲ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, which begin one syllable sooner in the verse but perform the same function. In the same way χειρὸς ἑλοῦσ' in E 30 is found once again in the same position in Δ 542, where it follows ἄγοι δέ ἑ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη at the end of the preceding line, which reminds us of ἀτὰρ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη of E 29. It is also closely related to A 323, Δ 154, Λ 488, and η 168.

Οὕνεκα πολλῶν in I 97 is found again less than twenty lines further on, by reflection at least, in ἀντί νυ πολλῶν of I 116, and it belongs to the rather extended systems of formulas beginning after the bucolic diaeresis with words like οὕνεκα and αὐτάρ (cf. Τ 42, 75, and 283), and to other systems in the same position in the line ending with some form of πολύς, of which N 797 ἐν δέ τε πολλά and a 1 ὃς μάλα πολλά are examples. And immediately following ἀντί νυ πολλῶν of I 116 we find λαῶν ἐστιν ἀνὴρ in I 117, which recalls λαῶν ἐσσι ἄναξ at the beginning of I 98. These two initial formulas are in turn related to systems which include Δ 91 and 202 λαῶν, οἵ οἱ ἕποντο and β 234 and ε 12 λαῶν, οἷσιν ἄνασσε, and so on.

Καί τοι Ζεὺς ἐγγυάλιξε at the end of I 98 is also no exception, but it belongs with B 436 ὃ δὴ θεὸς ἐγγυαλίζει, and Λ 192 τότε οἱ κράτος

ἐγγυαλίξω, and Ψ 278 ὁ δ' αὖτ' ἐμοὶ ἐγγυάλιξεν. Σκῆπτρόν τ' ἠδὲ θέμιστας
in I 99 was used in exactly the same position in another instance of
necessary enjambement in B 206.

Finally, to complete the discussion of the examples quoted
above from the *Iliad*, αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω at the conclusion of P 84 belongs
to the same systems of post-bucolic diaeresis formulas as οὕνεκα
πολλῶν in I 97.   It is found again at the end of A 199, Ξ 154, λ 153,
and τ 392, and it is related to οὐδέ τις ἔγνω in Ω 691, and οὐδέ μιν ἔγνω
in ν 188.   Even τὸν μὲν ἀπαινύμενον κλυτὰ τεύχεα, which looks at first
sight as if it were unique, in spite of the familiar κλυτὰ τεύχεα for-
mula, has a parallel in Λ 582, τεύχε' ἀπαινύμενον 'Απισάονος. Τὸν δ'
ἐπὶ γαίῃ at the end of P 85 and κείμενον, which completes it at the
beginning of P 86, are matched by οἱ δ' ἐπὶ γαίῃ in Λ 161, followed by
κείατο as a run-over word in the next line. Κείμενον itself belongs to
systems which include X 43, ρ 331 and 410, χ 327, H 265, Φ 404,
and so on.

<p align="center">*   *   *</p>

The answer to the question of why necessary enjambement is
more frequent in Homer than in the Southslavic poetry, therefore,
is that the Homeric style is richer in traditional devices for carrying
the thought beyond the end of the line.   The language of Homer,
with its abundance of participles and its fondness for complementary
infinitives, both of which are little used in Serbo-Croatian, is a
more subtle vehicle for thought than the straightforward Slavic
tongue.   This, too, is a contributing factor.   But most of all, the
hexameter has infinitely more possibilities for formula variety than
the shorter and stricter decasyllabic verse.   Its length allows oppor-
tunity for a thought to be completed before the end of the line (at
the bucolic diaeresis, for example) and for a new thought to have
its beginning before the hexameter has run out.   In this way there
were built up systems of formulas stretching from any one of a
number of pauses within the line to its end, and from the beginning
of the line to any one of the pauses.   These systems of formulas
complemented each other.   And this is the milieu in which the
"run-over" word came into being.   Thus the traditional style
adapted itself to the length of the hexameter, which contributed as
its share the several places in the line where a pause is allowed.
And so, on occasion, one verse flows on uninterrupted into the
next with a sort of modulation entirely foreign to Southslavic oral
narrative song.

That tradition had no such problem confronting it. Its ten-syllable line was a convenient length and it had only one strong pause, after the fourth syllable. The language helped, too, for it was partial to brevity, to a succession of main clauses, sometimes rather loosely knit together. And, finally, the musical accompani-ment joined the conspiracy, adding the short and forceful bowing and an occasional trill to emphasize the end of the verse. So that the Southslavic singing of heroic song gives an impression of staccato virility and bold simplicity. But it lacks the flexibility which we find so perfectly exemplified in the Homeric poems, and a truly fine singer like Avdo Međedović may find the frugality of the verse restricting. Homer could have had no such complaint.