

# SOME FEATURES OF HOMERIC CRAFTSMANSHIP

MARK W. EDWARDS

*Queen's University*

1. Introduction
2. The beginning of the verse
  - 2.1. The start of a new sentence
    - 2.11. A note on use of proper names
    - 2.12. Avoidance of noun-epithet formulae at beginning of sentence
  - 2.2. "Necessary" enjambement
    - 2.21. Enjambement between adjective and following noun
      - 2.211. Adjective used quasi-substantially
      - 2.212. Adjective used quasi-adverbially
      - 2.213. Effects of habitual position of adjective
      - 2.214. Other reasons
    - 2.22. Enjambement between genitive and following noun
      - 2.221. Caused by analogy or schematization
      - 2.222. Caused by use of noun-epithet formula
      - 2.223. Used for emphasis
      - 2.224. Used in similes
      - 2.225. Other cases
    - 2.23. Enjambement between verb and predicative adjective
    - 2.24. Enjambement between verb and predicative adverb
    - 2.25. Other types of "harsh" enjambement
      - 2.251. Participle in runover position
      - 2.252. Enjambement between preposition and following noun
      - 2.253. Personal name in runover position
    - 2.26. Summary: "necessary" and "harsh" enjambement
  - 2.3. "Unperiodic" enjambement
    - 2.31. Runover adjectives
      - 2.311. With emphasis
      - 2.312. In contrast with following word
      - 2.313. Descriptive
      - 2.314. Superfluous
      - 2.315. Formulaic use
      - 2.316. Parallel phrases introduced by different runover adjectives
    - 2.32. Runover genitives
    - 2.33. Runover nouns
    - 2.34. Runover verbs
    - 2.35. Summary: use of runover words

3. Adjectives between the A and B caesurae
  - 3.1. Ornamental adjectives
    - 3.11. Immediately following noun
    - 3.12. With noun in previous verse
    - 3.13. Preceding its noun
  - 3.2. Significant adjectives
4. After the B caesura
  - 4.1. Complete phrase between B caesura and end of verse
    - 4.11. Noun-epithet formula
    - 4.12. Noun and epithet enclosing another word
    - 4.13. Appositional phrase
    - 4.14. Complete clause or sentence
  - 4.2. Sentence or clause running from B caesura and enjambling
    - 4.21. Noun-epithet formula
    - 4.22. Other phrases
  - 4.3. Adjectives between the B and C caesurae
    - 4.31. Preceding noun
    - 4.32. Following noun
    - 4.33. Following and separated from noun
    - 4.34. Followed by another adjective
    - 4.35. As "filler" before phrase etc. running from C to verse-end
    - 4.36. Significant adjectives
  - 4.4. Summary: use of adjectives between the B and C caesurae
5. After the C caesura
  - 5.1. Essential part of sentence
  - 5.2. Ornamental word or phrase
  - 5.3. New complete sentence or clause
  - 5.4. New enjambling sentence or clause
  - 5.5. Alternative endings to similar verses
  - 5.6. Summary: usage after the C caesura
6. General conclusion

## I. INTRODUCTION

This is a study of some of the techniques used by Homer in expressing his thought within the structure of his hexameter verse and the conventions of his formulaic diction.<sup>1</sup> It will review, coordinate, and amplify some of the valuable but now somewhat outdated work of pre-Parry days, and I hope may be of use as a basis for more comprehensive study of details of poetic expression in Homer.

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Professor F. M. Combellack and my colleague Professor Margaret Reesor for reading a draft of this paper and making helpful comments; responsibility for shortcomings is of course my own. My interest in the topic arose partly from a study of *Hymn to Aphrodite* 5 carried out by Mrs. Pat Getz Preziosi when she was a student at Brown University. The recent monograph by A. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* (Amsterdam 1965), came to hand after this paper was written; Hoekstra's eminently precise and logical study of adaptations of formulae

I shall examine certain techniques of sentence-construction that occur in particular parts of the Homeric verse. The most important of these are: "necessary" and "unperiodic" enjambement, and the limits of the actual carry-over of sense that occurs; the use of "runover" words at the beginning of the verse; the use of adjectives in certain conditions between the first and second caesurae; and the various constructions possible after the mid-verse caesura, especially that of beginning a new sentence or clause at the last caesura of the verse.

Throughout the consideration of these particular features, I shall lay stress on the following four general characteristics of Homeric style.

First, there is a close relationship between the sense-units of the sentence and the metrical cola, or, putting it another way, between the pauses in sense and the caesurae of the verse. It is upon these regular divisions of the verse and the sense that this study is based. The metrical units of the verse have been discussed in great detail by H. N. Porter in his article "The Early Greek Hexameter,"<sup>2</sup> and I use his terminology. Accordingly a break between words in or before the second foot will be termed the "A caesura," one in the third foot the "B caesura," and one between the fourth and fifth feet the "C caesura."<sup>3</sup> These caesurae may be illustrated by a verse that

has much reinforced my impressions of the poet's handling of his conventional diction, but since his evidence is different in nature from mine I have not rewritten my own conclusions. I am delighted to find our views are consistent.

The following bibliographical abbreviations will be used: **Bassett, Runovers** = S. E. Bassett, "The so-called emphatic position of the runover word in the Homeric hexameter," *TAPA* 57 (1926) 116-148; **Bassett, Buc.** = *id.*, "Notes on the Bucolic Diaeresis," *TAPA* 36 (1905) 111-124; **Parry, Enj.** = M. Parry, "The Distinctive Character of Enjambement in Homeric Verse," *TAPA* 60 (1929) 200-220; **Parry, L'Ép. Tr.** = *id.*, *L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère* (Paris 1928).

<sup>2</sup> YCS 12 (1951) 3-63.

<sup>3</sup> This is simplified, but sufficient for the present purpose. It should be noted that I do *not* include within the term "C caesura" the alternative caesura placed by Porter in the 5th foot (his C<sup>2</sup> caesura), by Fraenkel in the 4th foot (see Porter [above, note 2] 13ff.). Neither of these was found of much importance to this study; the caesura in the 4th foot is quite strongly marked by the number of times that a sentence or a formula begins there, but it is not so clearly marked as a fixed point around which the component parts of the sentence are fitted as are the A, B, and C caesurae. It may be mentioned that the adjective μέγας, in particular, is often prefixed to a noun-epithet formula to take it back to the B caesura (μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἑκτωρ etc.), or added to a name or noun to extend it forwards to the C caesura (Πρίαμος μέγας, τρίποδα μέγαν, etc., 18 times in all), in order to avoid the necessity of ending or beginning a phrase at the 4th foot caesura.

shows a pause in sense at each of them: *Il.* 1.158 ἀλλὰ σοί, ὦ μέγ' ἀναιδές, ἄμ' ἐσπόμειθ', ὄφρα σὺ χαίρης.

Secondly, the possibility will be considered throughout that ornamental, formulaic words and phrases may occasionally be used with sufficient force to contribute significantly to the sense and effect of the sentence.<sup>4</sup>

Thirdly, attention will be paid to the question of emphasis by position in the verse, particularly in the case of "runover" words. Words and phrases which occur in places often filled by an ornamental formula, e.g. at the end of the verse, will also be examined to see if these positions have become too weak to contain an important word.

Fourthly, the force of analogy will be brought out, both in forming certain constructions and in retaining particular words in their usual place in the verse even when their usual grammatical construction has been altered. The insertion of non-functional words either from habit, or as "fillers" to pad out the verse up to the beginning of the next significant word or phrase, will also be identified when possible.

An investigation of this type may be carried out independently of parallels from Southslavic (or other) oral poetry, because of the widely different natures of both language and metre. It also does not depend on identification of formulae in the narrow sense, that of recurrence of identical (or virtually identical) phrases, with all the dangers of chance survival of a parallel instance that this involves. It is, rather, a kind of extension of the type of schematization discovered and described by Parry, i.e. the parallel construction exemplified in Ἀχαιοὶς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε and ἐπ' αὐτῷ κῦδος ἔθηκε.<sup>5</sup> Here we shall be dealing with types of construction which may be illustrated by the parallel expressions

<sup>4</sup> I do not challenge F. M. Combellack's assertion ("Milman Parry and Homeric Artistry," *Comparative Literature* 11 [1959] 193-208) that the most highly appropriate formulaic word may be purely coincidental, any more than he would challenge my right to think Homer may have been well aware of its appropriateness. Nothing more than following one's personal taste seems possible at the moment; I like to think that Homer, like myself, could see Nausicaa's white arms as she played ball with her maidens (*Od.* 6.101), but I do not think of adolescent lubricity when Athena says she must bring Telemachus back from the beautiful women of Sparta (*Od.* 13.412). Whallon's article on the subject ("The Homeric Epithets," *YCS* 17 [1961] 97-142) seems to me to assume too easily that the poet was always able to adjust his verse in order to incorporate the length of the particular formula which the circumstances make most fitting.

<sup>5</sup> Milman Parry, "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making," *HSCP* 41 (1930) 73-147, especially 132 ff.

οὐδέ οἱ ἔπποι / τόλμων ὠκύποδες, μάλα δὲ . . . (Il. 12.50-1) and ὄν ποτ' Ἀθήνη / θρέψε Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ . . . (Il. 2.547-8).

This examination of the verse-structure is here limited to certain features (as explained above) and restricted to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. It does not include a statistical survey, as I am not sure that such a labor would at the moment be worthwhile. It may be too much to hope that this kind of approach will lead to satisfactory identification of individual peculiarities of expression, but it may be developed sufficiently to assist in distinguishing between compositions of widely different date or locality, and perhaps may throw some light on the most discussed area of the Homeric Question at the moment: were the poems put into the form in which we have them simply for a special recitation, or so that they could be learnt by other bards and repeated verbatim, or in order that they might be written down? One of the limits of the area may be defined by Parry's description of the extempore composer:

The singer of oral narrative rarely plans his sentence ahead, but adds verse to verse and verse part to verse part until he feels that his sentence is full and finished. The poet, with writing materials, can think leisurely ahead, but the singer, in the speed of his song, must compose straight on out of fixed verses and verse parts until he comes to the point where one of his characters is to speak.<sup>6</sup>

At the other extreme, the poet of the *Batrachomyomachia* informs us that he has "laid upon my knees, in my writing-tablets, this new song"—and to express this, ironically adapts to his purpose an old "oral" formula.<sup>7</sup> Current opinions on where, within these limits, Homer should be placed, are fully discussed by G. S. Kirk in a recent article,<sup>8</sup> but we have as yet no criteria for distinguishing within the poems, if indeed they exist there, such conceivable types of composition as the fossilized extempore, the traditional catalogue-type, or the carefully-constructed quasi-Miltonic. It is here that it is hoped this paper may make some contribution.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Milman Parry, "About Winged Words," *CP* 32 (1937) 59-63; this quotation from p. 60.

<sup>7</sup> *Batr.* 3; for the formula cf. *Od.* 19.401.

<sup>8</sup> "Homer and Modern Oral Poetry: Some Confusions," *CQ* n.s. 10 (1960) 271-81.

<sup>9</sup> My analysis is as comprehensive as I can make it, so far as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are concerned. Reference to the Hymns, Hesiod, and other early epic is made only

## 2. THE BEGINNING OF THE VERSE

Every verse begins with (1) the start of new sentence, or (2) "necessary" enjambement, or (3) "unperiodic" enjambement.

**2.I. The start of a new sentence.** I have only two points to make about the cases where a new sentence begins at the beginning of the verse. Both concern the use of proper names.

**2.II.** A minor illustration of the flexibility required of the composer, notwithstanding the machinery of formula, appears in the way in which the names of the main characters are used here at the beginning of a sentence. The convenient shape — ∪ ∪ — is provided by *Ἀτρείδης* and *Πηλείδης*,<sup>10</sup> and they are used quite frequently here, followed by *μέν* or *δέ*.<sup>11</sup> *Τηλέμαχος* too is so used many times. It might be expected that the similarly shaped *Πριαμίδης* would be found convenient here for Hector, but this is not the case; the shorter *Ἑκτωρ* is virtually always preferred.<sup>12</sup> Odysseus has no form equivalent to either of these shapes, and so must always be preceded by one or two introductory syllables if he is to begin the sentence.<sup>13</sup> The length of *Πηνελόπεια* bars it from all but 2nd–3rd and 5th–6th feet,<sup>14</sup> and though cases other than the nominative stand in the 2nd–3rd feet (6 times) the nominative (beginning the sentence) occurs in this position only once

when I have noticed a particularly apt parallel, illustration, or difference. I print the text of T. W. Allen in the Oxford Classical Text series (*Iliad*, 3rd. ed., 1920; *Odyssey*, 2nd. ed., 1917), but have worked from the text of J. van Leeuwen (Leyden, *Iliad* 1912–13, *Odyssey* 1917) and am much indebted to his parallel references. In quotations, an oblique stroke marks the end of the verse, when necessary; in the section on "necessary" enjambement an asterisk before the reference indicates that the enjambling sentence or clause begins at the C caesura.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Porter (above, note 2) 57, Table xi; E. G. O'Neill Jr., "Word-types in the Greek Hexameter," *YCS* 8 (1942) 144, Table 15.

<sup>11</sup> 21 and 15 times respectively. The law of economy operates to bar *Αἰακίδης* entirely from this position.

<sup>12</sup> 45 times; *Πριαμίδης* is used here to start a sentence only twice, once for Hector (*Il.* 7.258) and once for Helenus (*Il.* 13.586), in both cases padded out with *μὲν ἔπειτα* to reach a common formulaic ending running from the B caesura.

<sup>13</sup> The phrase *υἱὸς Λαέρτew* is unwieldy, will not admit *μέν* or *δέ*, and so is used only once, in an interjection (*Od.* 4.555).

<sup>14</sup> A word of this shape begins a verse only about 3 times in 1000 verses (Porter [above, note 2] 58, Table xii). The dative, with long final syllable, occurs once initially (*Od.* 16.338). *Κούρη δ' Ἰκαρίοιο* would extend to the B caesura and (for reasons discussed in the next paragraph) is never used.

(*Od.* 4.675). Presumably this use is generally avoided because the length of the name, plus the introductory syllables, classes it with noun-epithet formulae running to the B caesura, which (as discussed below) do not occur in these circumstances. This lack of balance between the available forms of the names of the principal heroes, in spite of the many case-forms where the actual names *Ἀχιλ(λ)εύς* and *Ὀδυσ(σ)εύς* themselves are metrically identical in shape, has effects which deserve a separate study.

**2.12.** Noun-epithet formulae are not used to begin the sentence and carry the verse to the B caesura. The noun-epithet phrases sometimes used here in enjambement with the preceding verse (*Πηλείδης Ἀχιλεὺς*, *Ἐκτωρ Πριαμίδης*, etc.) are, as Parry pointed out, never used to begin the sentence.<sup>15</sup> It would seem a simple and convenient technique to begin a verse with a noun-epithet formula running to the B caesura, then to complete it with (for example) verb and object in the second half of the verse; that such constructions do not occur may be because of the difficulty of inserting, and interchanging, the various particles. Whatever the reason, the technique did not develop, and even such easily composed phrases as *διογενὴς δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς* and

<sup>15</sup> Parry, *L'Ép. Tr.* 69 (of noun-epithet formulae between the beginning of the verse and the B caesura): "elles sont employées sans exception comme sujet d'un verbe qui se trouve au vers précédent." The one or two exceptions I have noticed are interesting. In *Il.* 18.239, *Ἥλιον δ' ἀκάμαντα βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη | πέμψεν* ..., the juxtaposition of two noun-epithet formulae is irregular (and ugly), and perhaps the only justification is to consider the adjective significant (this is the long day of battle); the formula recurs in Homer only in *Il.* 18.484 (the *Shield*) in normal runover usage (with *τ'* for *δ'*), as it does in *Hymn* 31.7, but in Hesiod (*Theog.* 956) has again the irregular initial form. Another case of the initial use of a noun-epithet formula is in *Il.* 24.724, where *Ἐκτορος ἀνδροφόνου* begins a new participial phrase; this with some probability may be attributed to the wish to produce an unusual emotional effect.

A similar type of exception occurs in *Il.* 3.314, *Ἐκτωρ δὲ Πριάμοιο πάϊς καὶ δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς* / . . ., where the noun-epithet formula (or extending phrase; cf. *Il.* 8.377) bridges over the B caesura. The verse is obviously modelled on *Il.* 5.704 and others where two names are similarly coupled with a bridging formula (*Il.* 1.7, 19.48) but stand at the end of a sentence and are linked to it by *τε* in place of *δέ*. It may be noticed that the other two bridging phrases, *ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν* (*Il.* 1.7) and *μενεπτόλεμος* (19.48), are used only once each in this position, and so the usage may be considered exceptional.

In *Od.* 11.512, the phrase *Νέστωρ ἀντίθεος* is unique and can hardly be considered a formula; and in its context—and since there is no particle—it can hardly be said to begin a sentence. The epithet is presumably included either from simple metrical necessity or because the sudden insertion of the name alone, without honorific adjective, would seem undignified.

*Πηλείδης δ' Ἀχιλλεύς* are not found. The simple two- or three-syllable name-forms allow much more flexibility for particles and the like, and are very common in several positions in the first half of the verse.

**2.2. "Necessary" enjambement.** Parry<sup>16</sup> uses this term to cover two kinds of enjambement. One is where the verse-end falls "at the end of a word group where there is not yet a whole thought" (p. 203), but where "the poet ends the verse at the end of a word group" (p. 216). His example is *Il.* 1.57-8, where the first verse contains a temporal clause and the second the main clause of the sentence. His second type of necessary enjambement, for which he uses Dionysius' term "prosaic enjambement" (p. 217), is where "the word group is divided between two verses," where at the end of the verse the complex of subject, verb, and object is not yet complete. He then goes on to discuss the rarity in Homer of cases where the verse-end falls between an adjective in one verse agreeing with a noun in the next.

Parry's work, though as perceptive and thorough as always, was not complete, and his analysis of necessary enjambement has been carried further by A. B. Lord.<sup>17</sup> Lord showed that Parry's term covered widely different types of enjambement, and identified six types, five of which he found in Southslavic epics as well as in Homer. These five types fall under Parry's first kind of enjambement. Lord's sixth class comprises the examples of "prosaic" enjambement, where the verse-end falls between (for example) subject and verb, or verb and object, and he gives a brief but valuable discussion of this type.

It seems to me that a further distinction can usefully be made within this last group. Inspection of cases of necessary enjambement will show that although the whole sense of the sentence is not complete at the end of the verse, actual *overlapping* of sense seldom occurs; one whole component unit of the sentence and the sense has normally been expressed, and (thanks to the case-endings) even its relationship to the remaining parts is generally fairly clear. Thus there is little difficulty in comprehending the sense of a word-group, and in forming an idea

<sup>16</sup> Parry, *Enj.* 200-220.

<sup>17</sup> "Homer and Huso III: Enjambement in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song," *TAPA* 79 (1948) 113-124, especially 120 ff.



of its place in the sentence, even if (for instance) the subject and its modifiers occupy the first verse and the verb and its object fall into the second; or vice versa. Such cases are grouped by Lord (pp. 117-18) with far harsher cases where a coherent word-group, such as adjective and noun, is divided by the verse-end in such a way that the first part remains incomprehensible until the group is completed.

To illustrate the normal kind of necessary enjambement, and the extent to which even here the sense-units are kept complete within the verse, the types which occur may be expressed in grammatical terms; and to give some idea of the frequency, I have counted the cases in two books of roughly 600 verses each, *Il.* 1 and *Od.* 17.<sup>18</sup> Leaving aside cases where the enjambement follows a pause at the C caesura, the cases of necessary enjambement may be placed in the following categories:

	Number of Cases	
	<i>Il.</i> 1	<i>Od.</i> 17
Complete participial phrase before main clause	9	15
Complete subordinate clause before main clause	15	20
Complete genitive absolute before main clause	1	—
Complete vocative phrase before main clause	3	1
Infinitive and modifiers before main clause	2	—
Complementary infinitive after main clause	12	10
Complementary noun clause after main clause	1	4
Subject whose sense has been anticipated	2	—
Object whose sense has been anticipated	1	—

In the above cases the sense and organization of the separate clauses are complete before the enjambement, though the whole sentence is

<sup>18</sup> In *Iliad* 1 verses 372-79 (= 13-16 and 22-25) were omitted, leaving a total of 603 verses; in *Odyssey* 17 verses 126-29, the first part of the bizarre simile of the doe who beds down her fawns in a lion's den, were found hopelessly intractable and were ignored, leaving a total of 602 verses. Though I cannot analyze the matter in detail here, it may be mentioned that even under a rough examination like this differences in the structure of the clauses in the two books became apparent. For instance, the following occur in *Od.* 17 but not in *Il.* 1: two cases of two participial clauses in the same verse preceding the main clause (48 = 58, 431), plus one case of two participial phrases in successive verses preceding the main clause (534-5) and a case of a participial clause preceding a pause at C (456); two cases of two subordinate clauses, each filling a verse, before the main clause (68-9, 313-4); two cases where the type of expression that usually runs from a pause at C to the end of the verse begins instead at the 4th-foot caesura (118, 172); and a considerable number of interwoven clauses, including five where the main clause begins the verse and runs to the A caesura, then is broken off by a subordinate clause (or a vocative), and is resumed later (132, 301, 309, 320, 378).

known not to be complete and the enjambement is therefore “necessary.” In the next group the clauses are not complete, but nevertheless the component parts of the sentence are grouped coherently and comprehensibly and the sense-units are complete:

	<i>Il.</i> 1	<i>Od.</i> 17
Subject and modifiers placed in leading verse	7	4
Object and modifiers placed in leading verse	4	—
Locative or temporal phrase placed in leading verse	2	—
Subject placed in following verse	3	4
Object placed in following verse	4	3
Verb placed in following verse	16	10

There remain 11 cases of necessary enjambement in *Il.* 1, and 19 in *Od.* 17 (still ignoring those occurring after a pause at C) which do not fit within the above categories; in these the elements of the thought are so spread over the two verses that at least two important constituents are found in each. Even in these, however, the units of thought are complete in themselves and do not overlap the verse-end, and in fact many of them could have been placed within the various categories except for a certain additional complexity;<sup>19</sup> only in two cases, for instance, is there a verse-end between adjective and following noun (*Il.* 1.525–6; *Od.* 17.12–3). It is thus clear that the harsh enjambement caused by splitting a word-group is quite uncommon, and that in most cases of even “necessary” enjambement the amount of overlapping sense is limited to either that of a substantially complete clause or that of the single idea of subject, or object, or verb.

The cases where enjambement occurs in a clause beginning at the C caesura (43 in *Il.* 1, 35 in *Od.* 17) have been left aside, because the shortness of the phrase (4 or 5 syllables) means that only a few words can stand before the enjambement and it is hardly reasonable to speak of sense-units. They will be discussed more fully later (below, §5.4). Harsh enjambement, however, remains rare, and in most cases the enjambement could be grouped under the categories given above. Occurrences of breaks between adjective and noun are slightly more frequent.

<sup>19</sup> For instance, the first examples in *Il.* 1 are 165–6, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν πλεῖον πολυάικος πολέμοιο / χεῖρες ἐμαὶ διέπονσι, where more than the object is in the first verse and both subject and verb in the second; and 167–8, ἐγὼ δ’ ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε / ἔρχομαι ἔχων ἐπὶ νῆας, where the last verse contains more than the simple verb.

Cases of the very harsh enjambement referred to above, where a coherent and separate unit of the sentence is split between two verses, may be considered as exceptions to the usual Homeric sentence-construction, which does not produce, under normal circumstances, enjambement harsher than the types of "necessary" enjambement listed above. The exceptions will now be categorized and, where possible, reasons suggested for the unorthodox usage.

### 2.21. Enjambement between adjective and following noun.

Parry<sup>20</sup> mentioned the rarity in Homer of enjambement between an adjective and a following noun, pointing out that almost always where it occurs the adjective is *πᾶς*, *πολύς*, or *ἄλλος*, which "are often used as substantives in the very expressions in which we now find them as adjectives, or more truly as half adjectives, for as one reads one still gives them some of their usual value" (p. 218). He gives a good explanation of one case of a descriptive adjective so used (*Il.* 9.74-5). Before him, La Roche had made a similar remark about these adjectives<sup>21</sup> and given a list of other cases of enjambement between adjective and noun. His list may be supplemented by some cases mentioned by Giseke,<sup>22</sup> and by a few additional occurrences that I have noticed.

Predicative adjectives standing before enjambement, whether or not a verb is actually expressed, may be disregarded, as the sense of the adjective is as clear before the enjambement as that of a verb or an adjective used substantively; we may compare *Od.* 19.184 ὁ δ' ἄρα πρότερος καὶ ἀρείων (endstopped), with *Il.* 2. 707-8, where the same phrase enjams into the subject ἦρως Πρωτεσίλαος, and *Il.* 19.56-7 τόδ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἄρειον / ἔπλετο, where the verb is not essential or expected.

The circumstances in which enjambement occurs between adjective and noun may be classified in the following way (in the text references, those where the enjambling sentence starts at the C caesura are distinguished by an asterisk). For purposes of comparison, it may be noted that I have found 40 cases of this type of harsh enjambement in the

<sup>20</sup> *Enj.* 218-19.

<sup>21</sup> J. La Roche, "Die Stellung des attributiven und appositiven Adjectivs bei Homer," *WS* 19 (1897) 161-188. He adds *θαμειαί*, which is treated in §2.212 below.

<sup>22</sup> B. Giseke, *Homerische Forschungen* (Leipzig 1864) 36-37.

1362 verses of Apollonius' *Argonautica* 1 (excluding *πᾶς* etc.) and 22 in the 830 verses of Quintus' *Posthomerica* 1, including such remarkable instances as *ἱπποδάμοιο* / *Ἀντιμάχοιο* (404-5). In Homer, the count depends to a much greater extent on what is considered harsh, as there are more borderline and easily-explicable cases, but (again excluding *πᾶς* etc.) I would not put it much above 30 in both poems together.

**2.211.** Cases where the adjective is used quasi-substantivally. These are often, in fact, hardly exceptions, as the adjective may have a sufficiently strong substantival meaning to give the verse adequate sense before one reaches the virtually appositional noun in the next verse. This is especially the case with those adjectives specially identified by La Roche and Parry, *πᾶς*, *πολύς*, and *ἄλλος*. It seems that the habitual usage of these adjectives as substantives (\**Il.* 18.403-4 *οὐδέ τις ἄλλος* / *ἤδ' οὐτε θεῶν οὐτε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων*), often in apposition to a following noun (*Od.* 11.489-90 *βουλοίμην . . . θητεύ-έμεν ἄλλω* / *ἀνδρὶ πᾶρ' ἀκλήρῳ*), leads eventually to their occasional use in enjambement in cases where the sense is by no means complete until the noun is reached (\**Il.* 6.411-2 *οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἄλλη* / *ἔσται θαλπωρή*).

The latter, however, are a tiny minority of cases. In the case of *πολύς*, for example,<sup>23</sup> in only a few instances of the hundreds of occurrences of forms of the word is it not either standing substantivally as "many men" or "many things," or followed by a word which has nothing more than the meaning "men" or "things" and hence could just as well be omitted: *Il.* 16.550-1 *πολέες γὰρ ἄμ' αὐτῷ* / *λαοὶ ἔποντο*, \**Od.* 11.340-1 *πολλὰ γὰρ ὑμῖν* / *κτῆματα . . . κέονται*.<sup>24</sup> These cases can hardly be said to give the effect of harsh enjambement, as happens when the noun has a significant sense.<sup>25</sup> This strong substantival

<sup>23</sup> Selected because of Lord's note on some occurrences of *οὐνεκα πολλῶν* / *λαῶν* etc. (above, note 17) 122-23.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. the obviously appositional construction in *Il.* 18.511-2 = 22.120-1 *πάντα δάσασθαι* / *κτῆσιν, ὅσῃν* . . .

<sup>25</sup> The cases where the noun following *πολύς* has significant sense may be grouped as follows: cases occurring in a simile (*Il.* 4.143-4, \*13.797-8, \*15.80-1); cases where a standard substantival phrase is picked up by the more precise *νίεες* (*Il.* 16.448-9, 24.204-5 = 520-1, *Od.* 14.200-1), or a feminine form is further qualified as *ἀμφιπόλους* (*Il.* 6.498-9) or *ψυχαί* (\**Od.* 10.529-30, not surprising in the context). There remain the odd and harsh cases, all of them occurring in sentences which start at the C caesura: *πολλὰ* / *μῆλα* (\**Od.* 9.183-4, \*24.65-6; more widely separated in \*22.335-6); *πολλὰ* / *δάκρυα* (\**Od.* 4.522-3, \*24.45-6); *πολλή* / *ἄρματροχίη* (\**Il.* 23.504-5); *πολλή* / *κόπρος*

sense is probably the reason for the frequent wide separation of *πολύς* from its noun, as in *Il.* 18.603 πολλὸς δ' ἱμερόεντα χορὸν περιισταθ' ὄμιλος.

As examples of this quasi-substantival use of other adjectives may be given the following: *Il.* 2.817–8 πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι / λαοί (as substantive in \**Il.* 16.271, \*17.164); *Il.* 14.39–40 ὁ γέραιος / Νέστωρ; *Il.* 23.577–8 χείρονες . . . / ἵπποι (cf. 23.572, where the enjambling line is omitted); *Il.* 5.860–1 δεκάχιλοι / ἀνέρες.<sup>26</sup> Perhaps on the borderline between this and what might be called harsh enjambement are, for example, *Il.* 1.525–6 τοῦτο . . . μέγιστον / τέκμων, *Il.* 14.90–1 τοῦτον . . . / μῦθον, *Il.* 20.298–9 κεχαρισμένα . . . / δῶρα.

In some cases the noun qualified by an adjective in the preceding verse is a personal name; here again, in the cases I have noticed,<sup>27</sup> the adjective is substantival in sense and the name is virtually the qualifier. Of a special character are the four cases I have noticed where a noun-epithet formula or the title of a deity is placed before and in enjambement with the name proper; these cases are peculiar but not harsh in effect.<sup>28</sup>

**2.212.** Cases where the adjective is used virtually as an adverb, and hence its meaning is of more significance than its grammatical attachment to its noun and there is no overlapping of sense within a word-group. The three occurrences of *θαμειαί* with enjambling noun are of this type, and also the single instance of *πυκιναί*;<sup>29</sup> all would normally be translated into English by an adverb. Similar to this is the use of *πολλά* in some instances (e.g. \**Od.* 12.127) and of *μέγα* in \**Il.* 1.283–4 and *Il.* 23.298–9.

**2.213.** Occasionally it is clear that an adjective which is habitually placed at the end of a verse has been allowed to remain there even when the poet is unable to place the noun earlier in that verse, and so allows

(\**Il.* 24.163–4); *πολλὰ* / . . . βόες (\**Od.* 12.127–8, perhaps adverbial); *πολλὰς* / . . . ἐκατόμβας (\**Od.* 13.349–50); and uniquely with a further-qualified noun, *πολλοὺς* / . . . πολυστερέας ἀνθρώπους (\**Od.* 11.364–5).

<sup>26</sup> Other straightforward instances are: *Il.* 1.260–1, 2.625–6, 4.90–1, 201–2, 9.383–4, 12.143–4 = 15.395–6, 13.745–6, 17.689–90, \*22.254–5, *Od.* 1.175–6, 217–8, 3.196–7, 12.96–7, 24.252–3.

<sup>27</sup> *Il.* 13.190–1, 15.506–7, 8.234–5; and 15.84–5 is similar in nature.

<sup>28</sup> *Il.* 2.714–5, 8.215–6, \*20.34–5 and \**Od.* 8.322–3 (see below, note 148), *Il.* 20.70–1.

<sup>29</sup> *Il.* 12.44, 14.422 (the same phrase), \*18.68; and *Od.* 19.516.

it to enjamb. Parry suggested this explanation for \**Il.* 9.74–5 ὃς *κεν ἀρίστην / βουλήν βουλεύσῃ*, i.e. it is modelled on the common use of ὃς *τις ἄριστος*, ὃς *μέγ' ἄριστος*. There are a number of similar cases.<sup>30</sup>

Four times the adjective ἄκρος stands at the end of a verse with its noun beginning the next verse.<sup>31</sup> Of the 24 other occurrences of ἄκρος in this position in Homer, in five it is used as a substantive, in 14 it is used adjectivally with a preceding substantive, and in the remaining five it is in the adverbial phrase *κατ' ἄκρης*. Here again it seems clear that in the four harsh cases the habitual position of the word has proved stronger than the force working against enjambement.

The same is seen in the cases of *Il.* 5.452–3, 12.425–6 *βοείας / ἀσπίδας* and *Od.* 24.228–9 *βοείας / κνημίδας*. In the first case the noun is virtually appositional, since the adjective is often used alone to mean “shield”; and the second case is irregular and distasteful, obviously suggested by the frequent occurrence of the adjective at the end of the line. Similarly, a glance at the Concordances will show how many models there are for the placing of the adjectives at the end of the verse in the cases of *Od.* 2.312–3 *πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλὰ / κτήματα* (also quasi-substantival) and *Il.* 16.348–9 *ἄμφω / αἵματος ὀφθαλμοί*.

A particularly interesting case is \**Il.* 18.18–9 *ἦ μάλα λυγρῆς / πεύσσειαι ἀγγελίης*. *Λυγρός* and its forms are very frequently found at the end of a verse, which may be reason enough; it seems possible, however, that the poet is thinking of the verses (*Il.* 17.685–6) in which Antilochus himself is summoned by Menelaos to hear the terrible news—*ὄφρα πύθῃαι / λυγρῆς ἀγγελίης*—and the same words are altered and inserted in place of the epithet *ἵπποδάμιοι*, which in three other cases concludes verses of the same construction as *Il.* 18.18.<sup>32</sup> In the course of this the embargo on adjective-noun enjambement was abandoned.

**2.214.** Cases not covered above are worth looking at individually to see if it can be determined why the enjambement has occurred. Two cases are natural enough: in *Od.* 15.374–5 an adjective qualifies two alternative nouns in the following verse, and in *Il.* 15.121–2 three adjectives qualify a noun in the following verse. The particular

<sup>30</sup> *Il.* \*6.314–5, \*15.37–8 = *Od.* \*5.185–6, *Il.* \*17.21–2, \*22.254–5.

<sup>31</sup> *Il.* 12.51–2, 15.653–4, \*17.264–5, 309–10.

<sup>32</sup> *Il.* 2.23 = 60, 4.370, 11.450.

grammatical construction required to produce the sense the poet wants compels him to plan ahead, and to allow the enjambement. Several cases involve pronouns: in *Il.* 23.371-2 οἷσιν ἕκαστος / ἵπποις, the pronouns combine to modify the subject of the verb, which is in the same verse, rather than the enjambling noun; *Od.* 1.406-7 ποίης δ' ἐξ εὔχεται εἶναι / γαίης is perhaps modelled on a schematization which appears also in *Od.* 20.192-3 τέων δ' ἐξ εὔχεται εἶναι / ἀνδρῶν, where the noun is not essential; \**Od.* 3.103-4 ἦν ἐν ἐκείνῳ / δῆμῳ ἀνέτλημεν is harsh, possibly brought about by analogy with the frequent use in this position of ἐκεῖνα etc. substantivally, and perhaps also by other lines where similar schematization leads to enjambement after a pause at the C caesura;<sup>33</sup> and in two cases the desire for emphasis may be the cause, \**Od.* 19.27-8 ὅς κεν ἐμῆς γε / χοίνικος and \**Od.* 11.166-7 = 481-2 οὐ γάρ πω σχεδὸν ἦλθον Ἀχαιῖδος οὐδέ πω ἀμῆς / γῆς ἐπέβην; in the latter instance the genitive Ἀχαιῖδος perhaps makes the break somewhat less abrupt, and the fact that the phrase is repeated, in a passage not otherwise parallel, may indicate that the schematized epanalepsis at the C caesura, plus (perhaps) the emphasis on the possessive, overrides the usual technique.

Numerical adjectives are involved in eight cases, but the proportion is not high enough to suggest any special freedom.<sup>34</sup> One repeated verse (*Il.* 18.336-7 = 23.22-3) is simple and emphatic, and the partly parallel verse *Il.* 15.746, where the adjective is substantival, suggests there may be some schematization: two other verses are similar in structure and give a kind of compound-adjective effect (*Il.* 9.85-6 ἕκατον δὲ ἑκάστῳ / κοῦροι, 2.618-9 δέκα δ' ἀνδρὶ ἑκάστῳ / νῆες); two follow a pause at the C caesura (\**Il.* 2.96-7, \*12.464-5); in *Od.* 13.97-8, the numerical adjective is coupled with another (mentioned below); and in the remaining case (*Od.* 16.247-8) the unwieldy length of the number δύω καὶ πεντήκοντα may have presented structural difficulties.

The harshest cases of adjective/noun enjambement are *Od.* 13.97-8

<sup>33</sup> Verses which (like this) begin with a two-syllable vocative, then have an ἐπεὶ-clause running to the C caesura, are found e.g. at *Il.* 3.59 = 6.333 and *Od.* 14.149; ἐκεῖνα used substantivally occurs a few lines further on (*Od.* 3.113). G. S. Kirk drew attention to this verse and to *Od.* 11.166 in a lecture to the International Congress of Classical Studies at Philadelphia (August 1964).

<sup>34</sup> I found 8 instances in the 422 verses in which the numerals 2 to 100 occur.

δύο δὲ προβλήτες ἐν αὐτῷ / ἀκταὶ ἀπορρώγες, perhaps so constructed in order to include three adjectives in the swift and vivid description; and \**Il.* 3.44–5 οὐνεκα καλὸν / εἶδος and *Il.* 13.611–2 καλὴν / ἀξίνην, difficult to explain because καλός is not common at the end of the verse, but oddly paralleled by a verse of the Delphic Oracle.<sup>35</sup>

Finally, two verses might be quoted as a fine example of inadequate technique or as an outstanding instance of intentional breaking of the rules for special poetic effect. *Il.* 16.104–5 runs:

...βάλλοντες· δεινὴν δὲ περὶ κροτάφοισι φαεινὴν  
πήληξ βαλλομένη καναχὴν ἔχε· βάλλετο δ' αἰεὶ...

Apart from the noisy repetition of the root βαλλ- three times in two verses, the poet has twice broken through the limits on enjambement to stress the force of the adjectives, for δεινὴν is stressed by its initial position in the sentence and φαεινὴ claims attention by its complete isolation from noun or article. The phraseology is normal (cf. *Il.* 13.805, 16.794, and the common uses of δεινὸν δέ and φαεινός) and the words are in their normal positions in the verse (though πήληξ generally occurs at the verse-end). Normality could be restored by reversing the position of δεινὴν and πήληξ (and then perhaps exchanging βαλλομένη and δεινὴν), but much of the unusual force of the verses would be lost. Either the poet has intentionally ignored the usual structure in order to produce this unusual force, or he began the sentence δεινὴν δέ . . ., on the analogy of the common δεινὸν δέ . . .<sup>36</sup> and with καναχὴν in mind, then found (as the reader may find) that there is no way of including the following phrases without the violent double enjambement.

## 2.22. Enjambement between genitive and following noun.

Giseke states, in his study of word-position in the *Iliad*, that only rarely is there found a genitive in one verse dependent on another noun in the following verse; he declared that the instances are mainly found in *Il.* 12, 15, 17, and 21, and tend to cluster together.<sup>37</sup> Cases are certainly

<sup>35</sup> A. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle* 2 (Oxford 1956) p. 5 no. 7 lines 3–4: οἱ περὶ καλὴν / Πειρήνην οἰκεῖτε (after a C caesura).

<sup>36</sup> The reading δεινὸν δέ might be thought more plausible here, but does not seem to occur in the manuscripts.

<sup>37</sup> Giseke (above, note 22) 47–48: “Viele Bücher haben nur ein oder gar kein derartiges Beispiel, auch *MOPΦ*, wo ziemlich auf enger Raume nebeneinander die meisten Beispiele



not frequent, in view of the number of times in which a genitive precedes the noun on which it depends,<sup>38</sup> and can to some extent be classified and accounted for. Cases are also quite rare in Apollonius and Quintus of Smyrna, though those which do occur are perhaps harsher than those found in Homer.<sup>39</sup>

The cases listed by Giseke, with others I have noticed myself, may be classified as follows:<sup>40</sup>

**2.221.** Cases which seem to be caused by analogy or schematization, where the desire to repeat the whole or part of a phrase has forced the genitive into a position which necessitates the enjambement. They are \**Il.* 5.77-8 ὃς ῥα Σκαμάνδρου / ἀρητήρ ἐτέτυκτο (cf. \**Il.* 6.605 ὃς Διὸς ἱρεὺς / Ἰδαίου ἐτέτυκτο); \**Il.* 12.254-5 αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιῶν / θέλγε νοόν (cf. \**Il.* 5.327 ἐν γὰρ Ἀπόλλων / ἦκε φόβον, and the many cases of αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ / . . .); *Il.* 12.417-8, where the poet desires to base 418 on 411 above, and the necessary qualification Δαναῶν is put into the preceding verse, where it contrasts with Λύκιοι and adds to the effect; *Od.* 9. 447-8 μῆλων / ὕστατος, where the words are based on 444 above and put into the common form of a short interrogative sentence ending in a runover word; \**Od.* 22.395-6 ἣ τε γυναικῶν / δμῳάων σκοπὸς ἔσσι, simply the genitive form of γυναικες / δμῳαί (22.421-2); *Il.* 21.142-3 and *Od.* 1.35-6, where the preferred positions (respectively) of πρεσβυράτη at the beginning of the line and of Ἀτρεΐδαο at the end seem to account for the construction; and the rather harsh \**Il.* 1.575-6 and *Od.* 18.403-4 οὐδέ τι δαίτιος / ἐσθλῆς ἔσσεται ἦδος, apparently

vorkommen, haben nicht besonders viele." The article by W. Havers, "Zur 'Spaltung' des Genitivs im Griechischen," *IF* 31 (1912) 230-44, does not include cases of enjambement.

<sup>38</sup> Havers (above, note 37) finds 190 examples in the *Iliad* of a genitive preceding the noun on which it depends and separated from it by a verb.

<sup>39</sup> Apollonius, *Arg.* 1.6-7, 182-3, 417-8 (combined with adjective-noun enjambement), 644-5, 1009-10; Quintus, *Posthom.* 1.556-7 (with adjective-noun enjambement), 568-9, 711-2, 769-70 (with adjective-noun enjambement), 785-6. There is a particularly harsh case at *Hymn to Apollo* 3.190-1.

<sup>40</sup> Only cases of genitives dependent on nouns are included, since in these the overlapping of sense is greatest. Actually genitives otherwise governed seem even more rarely to be separated from the words on which they depend by enjambement; I have noticed a genitive of comparison so separated from its adjective in \**Od.* 11.482-3 (perhaps influenced by the partly similar verse at 11.167) and *Od.* 21.344-5; a genitive dependent on an adjective in \**Od.* 20.378-9; genitives dependent on verbs in *Od.* 17.114-5 and 18.145-6; and a genitive so preceding its preposition in *Il.* 18.464-5.

based on the preferred position of ἦδος (cf. \**Il.* 11.317-8 ἄλλα μίνυνθα / ἡμέων ἔσσεται ἦδος).

**2.222.** Cases where the genitive of a noun-epithet formula ends the verse and is dependent on a noun in the following verse. Here the convenience seems to outweigh the irregularity, but the usage is rare compared with the number of occurrences of such formulae in the genitive.<sup>41</sup>

**2.223.** Cases explicable on grounds of emphasis. In *Il.* 16.840 and 18.334 Ἔκτορος is put at the start of the sentence for emphasis and the nouns on which it depends cannot be fitted within that verse.

**2.224.** Cases in or immediately following a simile. This appears to be the common denominator of six instances, but the number is hardly sufficient for conclusions to be drawn.<sup>42</sup>

**2.225.** There are a few cases which do not fit within the above categories:<sup>43</sup> *Il.* 7.44-5 may perhaps be ignored, as the τῶν at the start of the verse is in effect more a link with the previous verse than controlled by βουλήν in the following verse; in *Od.* 1.180-1=418-9 the sense is reasonably complete before νίος is added in the next verse; in *Il.* 12.235-6 the harshness is eased because Ζηνός can be construed with λαθέσθαι before βουλέων in the next verse is reached. \**Od.* 19.571-2 ἦ μ' Ὀδυσῆος / οἴκου and \**Il.* 24.462-3 οὐδ' Ἀχιλλῆος / ὀφθαλμούς perhaps result from desire for emphasis, but are chiefly remarkable for this unique occurrence of what would seem to be a useful construction; *Od.* 14.327-8 ὄφρα θεοῖο / ἐκ δρυός may perhaps be grouped with them. There remain two cases of rather awkward complication with pronouns, *Il.* 10.204-5 ἐῷ αὐτοῦ / θυμῷ and \**Il.* 18.358-9 ἦ ρά νυ σεῖο / ἐξ αὐτῆς, and the very odd \**Il.* 22.243-4 μηδέ τι δούρων / ἔστω φειδωλή; φειδωλή is a *hapax legomenon* in early

<sup>41</sup> The cases are: *Il.* 2.348-9, 491-2 (a very odd couplet: see W. W. Minton, "Invocation and Catalogue in Hesiod and Homer," *TAPA* 93 [1962] 204-5), 14.454-5, 501-2, 15.535-6, 17.740-1, 21.15-6, 184-5, 23.760-1, *Od.* 11.506-7, 23.150-1 (the phrase does not recur, but seems to have strong affinities with noun-epithet formulae). I take *Il.* 17.538-9 as genitive absolute; *Il.* 16.840-1 is considered in §2.223 below.

<sup>42</sup> *Il.* 2.457-8, 15.690-1, 17.400-1, 740-1, 21.15-16, 23.760-1 (the last three were included in §2.222 also).

<sup>43</sup> I take *Od.* 24.88-9 as genitive absolute, and δουρός in *Il.* 6.319 as dependent on πάροιθε rather than (or as much as) on αἰχμή in the following verse.

epic, and its abstract sense seems to allow it to be constructed as if it were a verb.

### 2.23. Enjambement between verb and predicative adjective.

"The [runover] adjective is almost never essential to the syntactical completeness of its clause. I have noticed but ten verses in which the runover adjective stands in the predicate, and of these, seven are in a clause which begins at the previous bucolic diaeresis."<sup>44</sup> Bassett is referring only to adjectives in the runover position, but a survey of a list of instances where enjambling adjectives do not stand in the runover position<sup>45</sup> reveals no additional cases of such an adjective used predicatively.

Of the seven exceptions Bassett found after a pause at the C caesura four involve forms of the adjective *αἴτιος*, which from its sense must always be predicative, and the other three are not at all harsh. Of the three which are not preceded by a pause at C, one involves the word *ῥηιδίως*, which is always predicative and (whether adjective or adverb) virtually always stands as first word in the line; another involves *ἄξιος*, again almost always predicative; and the last, \**Od.* 21.344–5, is harsh more because of the genitive which precedes the enjambement than from the sense of the adjective. To Bassett's examples may be added \**Il.* 21.439–40.

The important thing, however, is that in none of these eleven examples of a runover predicative adjective is there a verb expressed in the preceding line. (Actually in only one case, *Il.* 2.218–9, is the verb expressed at all.) The effect of the enjambement in these cases is therefore no greater than that of a runover verb.

### 2.24. Enjambement between verb and predicative adverb.

"A more striking fact is that the runover adverb is very rarely used as the predicate, *K* 94, ο 178, 515, and that in these rare instances the clause begins with the previous bucolic diaeresis."<sup>46</sup> These examples are not harsh, since the verb is not expressed in the preceding line, or indeed expressed at all. I have not noticed any other exceptions.

<sup>44</sup> Bassett, *Runovers*; this quotation p. 132.

<sup>45</sup> La Roche (above, note 21) 173–75. In *Il.* 18.403, *ἄσπετος* is used predicatively but the sense is strongly adverbial (the verb is in any case in the same verse).

<sup>46</sup> Bassett, *Runovers* 139.

**2.25. Other types of “harsh” enjambement.** A few other types of harsh enjambement, or suggested restrictions on enjambement, are worthy of examination.

**2.251.** Bassett remarks<sup>47</sup> that there are few instances of a runover participle which is necessary for the syntactical completeness of its clause. He lists eleven cases. Actually these are identical in effect with the innumerable cases of runover of a finite form of the verb, and the overlapping of sense is not harsh. The rarity of this type of construction probably derives from the comparative brevity of phrases dependent upon a participle, coupled with the relative rarity of enjambement of a subordinate clause.<sup>48</sup>

**2.252.** Enjambement is rare between a preposition and a following noun. The question is naturally complicated by the difficulty of deciding when a preposition is a true preposition, when an adverb, and when “in tmesis,” and similar phrases are used in what seem to be different senses and different degrees of enjambement. *Ἐν* in *ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ / δὺν’ ἄχος* (\**Il.* 19.366–7) might be taken as adverbial or “in tmesis”; in *ἐν δέ μοι αὐτῇ / στήθεσι πάλλεται ἦτορ* (\**Il.* 22.451–2) it might be a preposition governing *μοί* with *στήθεσι* appositional or locative; in *ἐν δέ τε θυμὸς / στήθεσιν ἄτρομός ἐστι* (\**Il.* 16.162–3) it might be a preposition governing *στήθεσιν* over enjambement. There are many parallels to these types of construction, involving many different prepositions.

In the previous examples the preposition was separated from its noun (if any) by other words. It is less common to find the preposition standing as last word in the verse and immediately before the noun, even when it is of suitable shape. Kirk drew attention to one possible case,<sup>49</sup> *Il.* 10.94–5 *κραδίῃ δέ μοι ἔξω / στήθεων ἐκθρόσκει*, though van Leeuwen considered *ἔξω* an adverb here.<sup>50</sup> Both views, again, are possible in the case of *ἄγχυ* in \**Il.* 5.185–6.

<sup>47</sup> *Runovers* 137.

<sup>48</sup> Three of Bassett’s instances are unusually short, running only from the C<sup>2</sup> caesura to the runover word. The only other peculiarity in his examples is the odd shape of the sentence produced by two adjacent cases of runover participles (*Il.* 14.371–2 and 372–3) followed by a third participial phrase, all preceding the main verb.

<sup>49</sup> In the lecture referred to above, note 33.

<sup>50</sup> *Homeri Carmina: Ilias* (Leyden 1912–13) note to *Il.* 1.71 (“*Ἴλιον εἴσω*”).

The clearest and most violent case of enjambement between preposition and following noun I have noticed is at \**Il.* 15.292-3 οὐ γὰρ ἄτερ γε / Ζηνὸς ἐριγδούπου. "Ἄτερ is never used elsewhere in Homer without an immediately preceding or following noun, and it seems indubitable that it here governs the enjambling genitive. The rarity of this kind of example, however, suggests that, where possible, a preposition apparently in enjambement from its noun should for preference be considered to be used adverbially.

**2.253.** Bassett declares<sup>51</sup> that there are few instances of a personal name occurring in the runover position unless it is in apposition to some word previously expressed, or has been in some way clearly implied in the context. This rarity seems to me to be no special limitation on enjambement but merely the natural result of normal Homeric usage; a proper name normally stands early in its clause if it is in any way new or unexpected. There are, on the other hand, formulaic expressions which regularly require such a runover, unanticipated subject (e.g. τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη / ...) and the effect is not specially harsh. I do not see that Bassett's rule can be supported, but I must grant that his censure of *Il.* 1.10-11 for the suddenness of ... / Ἀτρεΐδης and the irregularity of the following ὁ γάρ (p. 125) is well justified.

## **2.26. Summary: "necessary" and "harsh" enjambement.**

From the above examination it may be concluded that enjambement was readily accepted, and readily arose, between the principal parts of a sentence (subject, object, verb), without harsh effect; but that enjambement-breaks within the component word-groups of the sentence on the whole did not occur. This is natural when a poet composes by means of words, or blocks of words, which naturally fit into particular positions within a line, and between certain caesurae in the line. Thus the technique of constructing the verses usually does not lead to harsh enjambement.

The infrequency of harsh enjambement affects the sense. The meaning of a noun can be followed, after enjambement, by the qualification and amplification given by an adjective in agreement with it, but the unsupported and not readily comprehensible idea given by an attributive adjective or dependent genitive alone was not normally

<sup>51</sup> *Runovers* 123-24.

so placed as to be left incomplete at the end of a verse; usually an adjective is so placed only if substantival and sufficient in itself. The meaning of the sentence can be postponed, over enjambement, until the preceding parts are linked together by a verb or a predicative adjective, but the close link between a predicative adjective and its verb (if expressed) does not allow the verb to be placed in the verse preceding that of the essential adjective.

Where harsh enjambement, the breaking up of a coherent word-group, does occur, it results in most cases from fairly clearly identifiable causes. These are: analogy or habitual usage, as when an adjective generally used late in the line, perhaps in some schematization, tends to stay there even when circumstances force its noun to be relegated to the next verse (or when circumstances give it a noun, which it regularly does without altogether); the desire for emphasis, or some other special effect; convenience, which may keep a useful noun-epithet formula at the end of a line even when it is dependent on a noun which must go in the following verse; and finally, if the enjambling sentence begins at the C caesura.

This last condition will be more fully discussed below (§5.4), but it may be mentioned here that the constricted space available between the C caesura and the end of the verse does not have so great an effect in producing harsh enjambement as might be expected, or as great as Bassett suggests. It will have been noted that in the cases of exceptional enjambement examined above those which occur after a C caesura (references asterisked) are numerous but not overwhelmingly predominant. In those which do occur, the unorthodox constructions may result from constrictions of space. To adopt a break at C, however, shows that the poet has initiative and skill, and these qualities themselves may lead him in the direction of greater freedom in placing his words and greater daring in suspending the completion of his sense-units.

It would be considered *a priori* probable, and is perhaps proved by Lord's investigation of enjambement in Southslavic orally-composed epics, that not only the technique of composition but also consideration for the hearers' powers of comprehension might tend to bar phrases whose grammatical construction or sense remains for some time in doubt. Bassett, observing in pre-Parry days the way in which Homer

"minimizes the listener's intellectual effort," borrowed the term *civilité* to describe it.<sup>52</sup> The principle remains valid enough, but the prevalence in Homer of the C caesura, with the difficulties which subsequent enjambement must cause for both poet and listener, is a reminder of the degree of sophisticated precision which had been reached by the time of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

**2.3. "Unperiodic" enjambement.** The term is again Parry's, used for cases where, as he says, "the verse can end with a word group in such a way that the sentence, at the verse end, already gives a complete thought, although it goes on in the next verse, adding free ideas by new word groups."<sup>53</sup> He categorizes the ways of unperiodic enjambement as follows: adding a dependent clause, participial phrase, or genitive absolute; adding an adjectival idea describing a preceding noun; adding an adverb or adverbial phrase; and adding by means of a co-ordinating conjunction a word, phrase or clause of the same grammatical structure as one in the foregoing verse.

This stylistic feature is especially convenient for extending or modifying similes and standard descriptive passages to suit the poet's taste in particular circumstances.<sup>54</sup> It maintains a regular progression of thought, which may have been easier for the listener, and it may also have assisted an oral composer, who was not compelled to think ahead in much detail but could easily link on successive thoughts after the main idea had been established.

Any type of clause or phrase may be attached. This can result in an embarrassment in the classification, if Parry's distinction between "necessary" and "unperiodic" enjambement is rigorously adhered to, for a main clause, though virtually complete in meaning, may in some way signify that it is to be followed by a subordinate clause; by Parry's definition such a main clause, although it may have much more in common with simple main clauses, would have to be classified as "necessary" enjambement along with subordinate clauses which

<sup>52</sup> *Runovers* 144-45.

<sup>53</sup> *Enj.* 203.

<sup>54</sup> A list of some short and long similes, so extended, is given by G. P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer* (Cambridge 1953) 81-82; for such extension in the arming scenes see W. Arend, *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer* (= *Problemata* 7, Berlin 1933) and J. I. Armstrong, "The Arming Motif in the 'Iliad'," *AJP* 79 (1958) 337-54.

precede their main clause. Such main clauses, signifying that a subordinate clause is to follow and hence not technically in “unperiodic” enjambement, may be either “unreal” apodotes to be followed by a protasis, clauses containing a demonstrative pronoun which will be followed by exegesis, or clauses which require to be followed by an object-clause or complementary infinitive.<sup>55</sup> In such cases the overlapping of sense is slight, and the effect is quite different from that of splitting a clause (or still more a word-group) by enjambement.

Under this topic will be considered one of the most characteristic features of Homeric style, the runover word. A runover word is one connected in sense and construction with the preceding verse, standing as first word in its own verse, and followed by a strong pause in sense (which usually forms the A caesura, and is generally marked by punctuation in modern texts). Here the term includes cases where a runover word is followed by a similar part of speech in a parallel construction (e.g. ἔγχος / βριθύ, μέγα, στιβαρόν . . .) since the effect of the runover is not thus greatly altered; the term does not, however, include cases where an initial word is followed by an integral part of its own clause, since there no pause occurs and the emphatic isolation is lost (e.g. μῆνιν . . . / οὐλομένην, ἣ . . . is included, ἀρνύμενος ἣν τε ψυχὴν . . . is not).<sup>56</sup>

Virtually any part of speech may be used as a runover, and the word may stand in (by Parry’s definitions) “necessary” or “unperiodic” enjambement with the preceding verse. Naturally a runover verb is normally in “necessary” enjambement, a noun may or may not be so according to whether or not its sense has been in some way anticipated, and adjectives and adverbs (unless used predicatively) must be in “unperiodic” enjambement as they are not essential to the sense or structure of the sentence.<sup>57</sup> Here the various usages and effects of runover adjectives, nouns, and verbs will be considered in turn.

**2.31. Runover adjectives.** Long ago Giseke realized and commented on the usefulness of runover adjectives as a connecting link,

<sup>55</sup> “Unreal” apodotes, e.g. *Il.* 18.165, 21.544; pronoun followed by exegesis, *Il.* 10.111–2, 20.435–6; object-clause, *Il.* 1.18–19; complementary infinitive, *Il.* 1.22–23.

<sup>56</sup> Bassett, *Runovers*, occasionally speaks of a word as “in the runover position” when it is followed by some further part of its own clause.

<sup>57</sup> Except in the rare cases of distinguishing adjectives; see below, note 63.



but he also indicated that in many cases the sense of the adjective itself might add little to the effect of the passage and it might be merely a convenience for the poet:

Auch der Dichterling kann hinter *φάλλαγγες* ein *καρτεραί*, hinter *ἵπποι* ein *ὠκύποδες*, hinter *κυνέην* ein *ἵππουριν*, hinter *νηῶν* ein *ὠκυπόρων*, hinter *ἀσπίδα* ein *ταυρείην*, hinter *δοῦρε* ein *ὀξέα*, hinter *αἰγίδι* ein *χρυσείη*, hinter *ἔγχος* und *ξίφος* ein *χάλκεον*, hinter *μελίη* ein *δεινή* anhängen.<sup>58</sup>

He adds a long list of these “müßig” adjectives, which more sympathy and imagination on the part of the reader might greatly reduce. Bassett also refers to instances where the adjective itself is little more than a “filler, providing the epic fullness.”<sup>59</sup> Again a case can often be made, in the examples he gives, for attributing a little more value to the adjective than this, though naturally it is again usually a matter of subjective judgment.

Parry, however, here took a stand rather too far towards the other extreme, when he stated that an epithet in the verse following its noun was never formulaic but always “particularisée.”<sup>60</sup> A good list of instances refuting this (mainly of runover adjectives) is given by Bergson, whose own view is moderate and well-based.<sup>61</sup> In fact, the force of adjectives found in this position varies from the meaninglessness of *ἀμβροσίη* after *νύξ*, with no connexion whatever with the following phrase (*Il.* 18.268), to the very heavy weight laid on the runover participle *ἀχνύμενος* (*Il.* 1.103) or the distinguishing sense of the adjective in *ἀλλ’ ἄρα καὶ ἴς / ἐσθλή, ἐπεὶ . . .* (*Il.* 12.320-1). Midway between the extremes, and as an example of the subjectiveness of human judgment here, may be quoted *Il.* 22.133-4:

σείων Πηλιάδα μελίην κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον  
δεινὴν ἄμφι δὲ χαλκὸς ἐλάμπετο εἵκελος αὐγῇ. . .

<sup>58</sup> Giske (above, note 22) 38. La Roche (above, note 21) also gives a list of runovers followed by explanatory relative clauses. Recently the various linking-structures have been examined by J. B. Hainsworth, “Structure and Content in Epic Formulae; the Question of the Unique Expression,” *CQ* n.s. 14 (1964) 155-64.

<sup>59</sup> *Runovers* 134.

<sup>60</sup> *L'Ép. Tr.* 207.

<sup>61</sup> L. Bergson, *L'Épithète ornementale dans Éschyle, Sophocle et Euripide* (Lund 1956) 40-42.

Δεινὴν is included by Giseke in his list of useless runovers, dismissed by Bassett as "either merely crowded out of the previous verse, or . . . added partly to give a change in the rhythm," but is described by Bergson, in my opinion correctly, as "fortement accentué." It seems to me wise to think it possible that any literary effect that may be felt in this and other cases may have been felt by the poet himself and—since he is never *constrained* to use a runover adjective, as he may be an end-formula—may have been intentionally produced.

I intend here to discuss different ways in which runover adjectives are used, with the purpose both of showing more fully the difference in significance that occurs, and hence suggesting something of the power of emphasis and literary expression available through this means, and also of indicating the purely mechanical function of the device in linking further thoughts, or in padding out the verse to reach the A caesura.

**2.3II.** A runover adjective may be used with considerable or even great emphasis, which may be drawn both from its meaning and from its position. It was the main intention of Bassett's well-documented and very penetrating article<sup>62</sup> to show that neither the runover position nor any other in the Homeric verse gives special emphasis, and he shows indeed that in many instances runover words are certainly not emphatic. The fact remains, however, that the runover word is of necessity set off by its enjambement, by its isolation between the start of the verse and the pause that follows, and (most of all in the case of adjectives) by the fact that a runover is probably removed from its normal position in the sentence. An adjective does not often occur at the end of its clause in normal usage; still more rarely does it occur there separated from its noun, which is very commonly the case with runover adjectives. This dislocation of the natural order of thought by necessity throws some weight on a word in the runover position.

Only rarely, however, is a runover adjective used as an essential qualification of a previous idea, for this would bring about a harsh enjambement.<sup>63</sup> Usually it introduces a new or modifying idea,

<sup>62</sup> *Runovers*.

<sup>63</sup> I have noticed a few examples: ἐσθλή so used after ἴς (Il. 12.320-1) and φάτις (Od. 6.29-30), λυγρός after νόστον (Od. 1.326-7) and δαιδῆς (1.340-1), and the odd phrase θυμῶ / πρόφρονι (Il. 8.39-40 = 22.183-4), which is technically not a runover.

which is normally either further explained in the remainder of the verse or used as an introduction to a further new idea. Emphatic runover adjectives, followed by a further phrase of explanation, occur very frequently, from οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε onwards.

Perhaps the best way to illustrate the variations is to summarize the usages of νήπιος, which occurs mainly in this place and often has strong emphasis. Νήπιος here has naturally a strong sense, more emphatic than it has, for instance, in the common phrases νήπια τέκνα and νήπιον υἷόν. The commonest type of usage is that where it follows a phrase whose sense is already complete and is itself followed by a clause introduced by οὐδέ or (much less commonly) a relative clause, which explains and amplifies the particular type of "folly" in question. *Il.* 22.445 νηπίῃ, οὐδ' ἐνόησεν ὄ . . . may stand as an example, and (with relative pronoun) *Od.* 1.8-9 νήπιοι, οἳ κατὰ βοῦς . . . / ἦσθιον.<sup>64</sup>

Sometimes the exegetical clause is less important, and its link with νήπιος weaker in sense and grammar than in the cases above; the extreme case of this type is *Il.* 23.88 νήπιος, οὐκ ἐθέλων, ἀμφ' ἀστραγάλοισι χολωθείς, where the meaning of νήπιος is complemented but in no sense explained by the following words.<sup>65</sup>

Finally, there are the cases where νήπιος simply qualifies a preceding παῖς (or the like) with no more stress than in the normal phrase νήπια τέκνα, and the following clause follows the usual pattern in grammatical link but is altered in function. In two cases the following clause is parallel in meaning to νήπιος but is not exegetical of it: *Od.* 4.818, "my son—my young [son], knowing nothing of men's work or public assemblies," and *Il.* 16.8, "a girl—a young [girl], who runs beside her mother."<sup>66</sup> In two other cases, the form is maintained but the sense is still further changed; in *Od.* 11.449 Odysseus' son is not νήπιος because he now sits with the men, nor is a child νήπιος in *Od.* 6.301 because he can tell Alcinoüs' house from those of the other

<sup>64</sup> Similar are (divided according to the sense of the exegetical clause): *Il.* 20.264; *Il.* 9.440, 2.38, 20.466 = *Od.* 3.146; *Il.* 17.497, 12.113; *Il.* 2.873; 20.296; 18.311. A condensed form of the νήπιος + clause arrangement occurs twice, *Od.* 22.32 τὸ δὲ νήπιοι οὐκ ἐνόησαν, / . . .; cf. 22.370. This seems to be based on the regular / νήπιοι, οὐδ' ἐνόησεν . . .

<sup>65</sup> So too in *Il.* 12.127, 16.686.

<sup>66</sup> *Hymn to Mercury* 4.164 is similar.

Phaeacians.<sup>67</sup> From cases like these it is clear that the use of *νήπιος* in the runover position, followed by a linked clause, had become a kind of schematization, which was sometimes used for contexts to which it was not naturally suited.

A special case, not technically relevant here, arises where a similar kind of expegetical clause follows *νήπιος* but the adjective itself stands virtually or completely independent of the preceding clause; thus its connecting value disappears, but not its emphasis. The extreme instance is *Il.* 15.104, where it begins a direct speech.<sup>68</sup>

To show the powerful effect possible with a runover adjective a few of the more striking examples may be given. *Δεινός* is often used effectively at the beginning of the verse even when it is not a runover (e.g. *Il.* 4.420, 23.815), but it is stronger when in the runover position, as in *Il.* 22.133–4 (quoted above), or in the similar passage where Patroclus does not notice the approach of the terrible god (*Il.* 16.788–9), or where Priam kisses the hands of Achilles—*δαινὰς, ἀνδροφόνους, αἱ οἱ πολέας κτάνον υἱας* (*Il.* 24.478).<sup>69</sup> On one occasion emotional effect seems to be built up by careful reiteration of a runover adjective and expegetical line; [*νέκυν*]... / *γυμνόν· ἀτὰρ τά γε τεύχε' ἔχει κορυθαίολος* "*Εκτωρ*" is used first by Menelaus to Ajax in summoning him to help defend Patroclus' body (*Il.* 17.122), later (following a different line) by Menelaus to Antilochus as he sends him to Achilles with the news (17.693), and finally (again after a different line) by Antilochus himself in his brief tragic announcement to Achilles (18.21). There is one good instance of a normally formulaic adjective used in the runover position with strong significant sense, as well as with a link to the following phrase: *Il.* 21.463–4 *εἰ δὴ σοί γε βροτῶν ἔνεκα πτολεμίξω / δειλῶν, οἳ φύλλοισιν ἐοικότες*... (cf. *δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι* and other formulaic usages).<sup>70</sup>

<sup>67</sup> *Hymn to Mercury* 4.210 shows another type of usage, where the following clause contrasts with the runover adjective: "a child—a tiny [child], but he had a staff."

<sup>68</sup> So also Hesiod, *incertae sedis* fr. 18 Evelyn-White (234 EGF). Not so independent, but not in agreement with any one word, are *Il.* 8.177, 17.236, 5.406; and *Hymn to Aphrodite* 5.223.

<sup>69</sup> Mentioned by A. W. Gomme, "Homer and Recent Criticism," *More Essays in Greek History and Literature* (Oxford 1962) 13.

<sup>70</sup> Bassett took a different view: "And as for *δειλῶν*, a greater emphasis obviously falls on the 'unemphatically' placed *βροτῶν* (463): the adjective is merely an added idea, to introduce the famous simile. It is the connection of thought, rather than the need

Adverbs are sometimes used in the runover position with emphatic effect, and very often with an explanatory clause following: *Od.* 6.250 [*ῆσθε*] . . . / *ἀρπαλέως· δηρὸν γὰρ ἐδητύος ῆεν ἄπαστος*. Bassett said that only about one-sixth of adverb runovers are not followed by exegesis. It might perhaps be more accurate to say that exegesis normally follows except in the case of a few adverbs which frequently occur in this position.<sup>71</sup>

**2.312.** A runover word may be used in contrast with a following word or clause, and thus emphasize both itself and what follows. There are many cases like *τὸ πρίν· ἀτὰρ μὲν νῦν γε* . . . (*Od.* 4.32), *νῦν· ἀτὰρ ἠῶθεν* . . . (*Od.* 3.366), *πρῶτον· ἔπειτα δέ* . . . (*Il.* 11.176). Numbers are often involved: *οὐκ οἶην, ἄμα τῇ γε* . . . is common, and *πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί* . . . The opposing armies are occasionally contrasted in this way (e.g. *Il.* 16.69, 11.800), and the juxtaposition can be used effectively for other qualities, as in the mortal/immortal contrast in *Il.* 17.443-4.

**2.313.** Often a runover adjective is descriptive or supplemental in sense rather than emphatic, and leads into a further descriptive clause, a simile, or further descriptive adjectives. Adjectives equivalent to a proper name, and nouns in apposition to a noun, pronoun, or idea already sufficiently well understood, have much the same effect and may be included. This use of an unemphatic runover is common, and sometimes appears in cases where an unimportant adjective alone, without any linked idea, stands to fill the space before the A caesura.

The varying effects may be demonstrated by an account of a few of the many occurrences of the adjective *χάλκεον* in this position. It may be used for descriptive effect, and introduce further description: Achilles' armor is of bronze, and shines, and Hector delights in it (*Il.* 18.131); the house of Hephaestus is (besides other things) of bronze, since the smith-god made it himself (18.369-70); a jerkin is of bronze, and so has before this protected the wearer from harm (13.439-40);

for emphasis, which accounts for its position" (*Runovers* 131). Most of this is acceptable, but it is only part of the issue.

<sup>71</sup> Bassett's 22 examples (*Runovers* 139) of adverbs not followed by exegesis are poorly selected. Ten of the cases are of the adverb *καρπαλίμως*, which seems habitual and is, at all events, not easily expanded by exegesis; two are of *ἑσσυμένως*, of which the same might be said; and in some of the remaining ten a link can be found.

in the various arming scenes, it is worth mention that the sword is of bronze, even if the fact is rather obvious and not amplified (3.334 etc.). This is natural usage. The adjective seems, however, automatic and otiose in the midst of Hector's challenge to Achilles to ward off his javelin (22.286), and still more so when it intervenes as Athena plants Ares' javelin firmly back in the corner and states her opinion of him (15.127). There seems no reason for its insertion here other than habit—both the habit of using that adjective after lines mentioning a weapon, and the habit of beginning a new clause at the A caesura after a runover word.

Proper names, usually repeating a previously understood idea and often with a clause of associated idea following, are quite common in the runover position. Place-names so used have been examined by Bassett.<sup>72</sup> Personal names are sometimes used with considerable emotional effect, which can be well shown in the uses of *Πριαμίδης*. Achilles sets off after Polydorus, "Priam's son, whom his father did not allow to fight, since he was the youngest" (*Il.* 20.408–9), and Ajax leaps upon and kills Doryclus, "Priam's son, but illegitimate" (*Il.* 11.490).<sup>73</sup> The patronymic serves, however, only as a meaningless grammatical link in *Il.* 20.77, where Achilles strains to attack Hector, "Priam's son, whose blood . . ."; and it has not even this justification in 15.597, where it seems only to fill the gap between the previous verse (which occurs without the runover at 12.174) and a peculiarly arranged group of noun-epithet formulae. Perhaps an even clearer example of this usage as a simple "filler" is at *Il.* 12.438, where the patronymic merely pads out the verse to reach a schematized clause which is found again, after *κεῖται ἀνήρ*, at 16.558.

**2.314.** The superfluous use described above is very common with some adjectives. *Ἀθάνατος*, sometimes significant in sense (*Od.* 17.149), has not even linking value in at least three cases (*Il.* 4.64, 128, 12.9). *Ἀμφοτέρως* enjambs after *χείρας* in *Il.* 21.116 and *Od.* 24.398, and *ἄμφω* in *Il.* 14.496, with no linking or other value except that of

<sup>72</sup> *Runovers* 132.

<sup>73</sup> Actually the most pathetic passages are those in which Hector's name is introduced pleonastically as a runover or vocative; *Il.* 24.501, 742, 18.115 (the last perhaps also in order to reach a set phrase, as the rest of the verse is equal to 22.365).

filling the first few syllables of the line; after a similar phrase at the end of the line in *Od.* 5.374 and 9.417 the adjective is not used. "*Ἀνθρωπος* and *ἄνθρω* have little sense and simply support a relative clause at e.g. *Od.* 10.39 and 11.123; and even strong words like *ἄγριοι* and *μυρίοι* may only repeat an already stated idea and serve chiefly to link on further elaboration (*Od.* 1.199, 8.110). It is clear that the runover adjective construction itself, apart from any emphatic effect it might make possible, was found pleasant and convenient: a means of adding successive ideas which was easy both for structure and for comprehension.

**2.315.** A special form of the use of virtually meaningless descriptive adjectives occurs in a few instances where it seems that the runover adjective is used, after a noun at the end of the previous verse, in as formulaic and habitual a way as adjectives are in the regular noun-epithet combinations. The frequent use of *θεοῖσι* / *ἀθανάτοις* has been referred to above. Other cases are those of *ἰοδόκον*, used three times after *φαρέτρην* in closely similar passages; *ώκύποδες*, used after *ἵπποι* in a repeated couplet and another similarly constructed verse; and possibly *ἵππουριν*, used of a helmet-crest.<sup>74</sup> The latter word may be held to have some decorative significance; in the repeated arming passages which make up five of its six uses it is followed by the expansion *δεινὸν δὲ λόφος καθύπερθεν ἔνευεν*, and in the remaining instance, when Hector puts on his helmet again as he turns to leave his wife, the audience has not forgotten the lines where the crest, waving from the helmet-top, frightened his baby son.

There are several instances of a unique use of an adjective which is nevertheless obviously entirely ornamental: *Μενέλαος* / *διογενής* (*Il.* 23.293-4), "*Ἀρης* / *ρίνοτόρος* (*Il.* 21.391-2), *χαλκοβατὲς δῶ* / *ὑπερφεές* (*Od.* 13.4-5).<sup>75</sup> Sometimes the use of normally descriptive

<sup>74</sup> *Ἰοδόκον*, *Il.* 15.444, *Od.* 21.12, 60; *ώκύποδες*, *Il.* 5.296, 8.123 = 315; *ἵππουριν*, *Il.* 3.337 (= 11.42, 15.481, 16.138, *Od.* 22.124), *Il.* 6.495. Bergson (above, note 61) 41 mentions these and some others; he does not differentiate adjectives used in the runover position.

<sup>75</sup> In the last example, the adjective may have some effect, since Alcinoüs' palace is conspicuously magnificent, but its main purpose is to lead in to the rest of the couplet, which is similar to *Il.* 1.59-60 (see P. Chantraine, "Remarques sur l'emploi des formules dans le premier chant de l'Iliade," *REG* 45 [1932] 130).

adjectives such as *χάλκεον* and *χρύσειον* seems just as conventional and meaningless.<sup>76</sup>

**2.316.** Use of a runover adjective simply to fill the space at the beginning of the line and lead into the following phrase is most clearly shown in cases where parallel clauses, running from the A caesura on, are introduced by different runovers, suggesting strongly that the composer has been working towards that particular set clause. In *Od.* 8.569 = 13.179 the phrase *μέγα δ' ἡμιν ὄρος πόλει ἀμφικαλύψειν* is preceded by the essential infinitive *ραίσεισθαι*, for which are substituted the superfluous runovers *ἀνθρώπων* in *Od.* 13.152 and *ἄνθρωποι* in 13.158; the phrase *πρότερος γέγονει καὶ πλείονα ἤδη* is preceded by the essential subject *ἀλλὰ Ζεύς* in *Il.* 13.355, but by the colorless runover adjectives, *πολλόν, ἐπεὶ . . .* and *καλόν, ἐπεὶ . . .* at *Il.* 19.219 and 21.440. There are other more or less obvious examples, the most amateurish of which (if genuine) is the peculiar present participle *πιπτόντων* (*Il.* 10.200), preceding a phrase more regularly introduced by *κέκληται* in *Il.* 11.758.<sup>77</sup>

**2.32. Runover genitives.** A noun in the genitive, especially a personal name, may be used in the runover position, dependent on some noun or pronoun in the preceding verse, to give the same kind of effect in emphasis and link to the following clause as a runover adjective does.

Emphasis is clear in the obvious example, *Αἴαντος* in *Il.* 7.182–3. Just as strong an effect, with a strong link to the next clause, is seen in *Il.* 23.435 *Ἀτρεΐδew· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐκὼν μεθέηκεν ἐλαύνειν* and 20.303–4. I have not noticed cases of a purely superfluous use of such a genitive of a proper name, but there are several (in the *Odyssey* only) of *ἀνδρός* and *ἀνέρος* used only to support a following relative clause.

**2.33. Runover nouns.** Proper names, as Bassett indicates, do not usually occur in the runover position unless their sense has been in some way anticipated, and hence there seem to be no obvious cases of emphasis being gained by use of this position.<sup>78</sup> The same seems to

<sup>76</sup> *Χάλκεον* has been mentioned above; *χρύσειον*, e.g. *Il.* 14.344, *Od.* 8.431 (where the following clause is parallel to *Od.* 4.592, after a different runover).

<sup>77</sup> See also *Il.* 12.438 and 16.558; *Il.* 11.169 and 20.503; *Il.* 18.250 and *Od.* 24.452.

<sup>78</sup> Bassett, *Runovers* 122–30.



be the case with common nouns; the only case I have noticed where there is some emphasis—and it is perhaps technically not a runover noun—is *Od.* 15.54–5 τοῦ . . . μιννήσκειται ἥματα πάντα / ἀνδρὸς ξεινοδόκου, ὅς . . . There are, however, cases of nouns which merely repeat a previous thought and link on a following clause, as is so often the case with adjectives,<sup>79</sup> and of nouns which are even less necessary to anything but the metre.<sup>80</sup> The use of an unanticipated noun here, i.e. in “necessary” enjambement, seems not to have been found natural, and only appositional nouns, which can be added to an existing sentence in much the same way as adjectives,<sup>81</sup> occur with any frequency.

**2.34. Runover verbs.** Desire for emphasis leads to the use of some verbs here, particularly monosyllables such as νύξ’, βάλλ’, λάμπ’, κόπτ’ (and other forms of these verbs). Occasionally there is a link with an explanatory or contrasting clause, and twice I have noticed unnecessary “filler” verb-forms.<sup>82</sup> The usage of verbs here, finite, infinitive, and participial, is quite common (Bassett gives a full account) and seems to present no difficulties in sentence-construction.

**2.35. Summary: use of runover words.** A word in the runover position may be effective in various ways. As has been shown above, it may draw considerable emphasis from its position; in fact, this is the only way possible, within the conventions of Homeric verse, of emphasizing an adjective beyond its own natural force. As others have

<sup>79</sup> E.g. κτῆσιν, ὄσσην . . . picks up πάντα in *Il.* 18.512 = 22.121; van Leeuwen’s emendation (above, note 9, text and crit. app. *ad loc.*) οἴμην, τῆς . . . picks up αἰοιδόν in *Od.* 8.73–4; in *Od.* 14.203 παλλακίς, ἀλλὰ . . . repeats a thought already expressed and links on a contrasting idea. A different effect is produced in *Od.* 15.62, where after several verses the subject is repeated by the nominative runover ἥρως, which seems to mean “like a hero.”

<sup>80</sup> Bassett (*Runovers* 130) mentions the use of ἔγχος in *Il.* 3.360 (= 7.254) after it has already been used twice in preceding lines. Rather similar is the unnecessary use of the runover μνηστῆρες in *Od.* 1.151, after a formulaic verse which is used 21 times without the runover.

<sup>81</sup> There are, for example, a number of cases of runover proper names in apposition to a μιν in the preceding verse: e.g. *Il.* 21.249, *Od.* 1.194, 6.48.

<sup>82</sup> Explanatory: I have noticed only *Hymn to Demeter* 2.167–8; contrasting: *Il.* 16.171–2; “fillers”: ἔδμεναι (*Od.* 17.260) after a verse which six times has no runover; ἔστιν in *Od.* 17.159 (the odd prophecy of Theoclymenus).

stated before,<sup>83</sup> runovers are again important, from the poetical point of view, in bringing about variety in pause; this variety is immediately obvious in reading Homer, and instances of unusual deficiency of runover (as in the *Catalogue of Ships*<sup>84</sup>) or of excessive use of runover<sup>85</sup> are conspicuous by their monotony. I have not, however, succeeded in finding any significant recurrent patterns, and it may be that only the requirements of the immediate sense or construction decide whether or not a runover is used.

I have mentioned that the peculiar smoothness in the progression of thought in Homeric verse is partly due to the rarity of harsh enjambement. To some extent the runover words also contribute, partly by themselves adding a new idea, or qualifying a previous one, and partly by making possible a link in thought (and often in grammar) to the remainder of the verse in which they stand. This type of construction must have contributed both to facility of composition and to ease of comprehension, both of great importance in oral poetry. The relative rarity of a runover noun whose sense has not been anticipated may come about because it does not contribute to this easy progression to the same extent.

There are also traces of two special developments from the use of runover adjectives. The first is the use, in a few cases, of conventional or ornamental adjectives following a noun at the end of the preceding line in what is virtually a noun-epithet formula; the other, the use of a relative clause after a runover adjective not in the usual linked expegetical sense but with some other force (especially in the case of *νήπιος*). Both obviously arise because of the frequency of the normal uses, and show the force of analogy in forming the structure of verses.

### 3. ADJECTIVES BETWEEN THE A AND B CAESURAE

If a verse is continuing in enjambement from the preceding verse with no runover word, it frequently happens that the space between

<sup>83</sup> Bassett, *Runovers* esp. 129–30; *Poetry of Homer* (Berkeley 1938) esp. 148–49; Parry, *Enj.* 201, quoting Dionysius of Halicarnassus 26.274–75.

<sup>84</sup> This is perhaps only natural in consideration of the content; the remark does not apply to the “inserted” passages about Achilles etc. (mentioned by D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* [Berkeley 1959] 149–50).

<sup>85</sup> E.g. *Il.* 22.313–16; repeated use of enjambement after a pause at C (with no other

the A and B caesurae is filled by an adjective, and these occur in various usages which are worth classifying in order to show, where possible, the reason for the use of the adjective. In the majority of cases the adjective may be classed as formulaic and ornamental, and these may be divided according to their position relative to their noun, i.e. according to the way in which the verse in which they stand is constructed. Afterwards some of the cases in which an adjective with significant sense is used in this position deserve examination.

**3.I. Ornamental adjectives.** Cases where a purely ornamental adjective follows a runover adjective do not seem to occur; the descriptive adjectives *καλήν*, *χρυσείην* and the like are very common, but make some contribution to the sense. This leaves the following classes:

**3.II.** Cases where the adjective immediately follows its noun, i.e. there is a noun-epithet formula extending from the beginning of the verse to the B caesura. The usage is flexible, i.e. in most cases there are instances of the noun followed by its standard epithet (extending to the B caesura<sup>86</sup>), of the noun without the adjective with no pause after it, and of the noun standing alone as a runover, followed by a pause at the A caesura. The determining factor is naturally the length and preferred initial position of the phrases the poet desires to use in the remainder of the verse, which again is to some extent dependent on the case in which the noun is used; a nominative in this position normally ends its clause,<sup>87</sup> a dative is more likely to be followed by some essential part of its own sentence. Habitual usage probably played a part as well; one would hardly expect to find an undecorated *νηῶν* standing as runover word, though occasionally *ἔγχει* is so found.

A few of the clearer illustrations of this may be mentioned. The words *αἰχμή χαλκείη* are found almost invariably together—11 times, including two cases of the dative, against two where (for good reason) the adjective is not added;<sup>88</sup> *νηῶν ὠκυπόρων* five times together, *νηῶν*

(breaks), *Il.* 10.149–55, 13.161–66, 16.60–63, *Od.* 13.209–14 (the last three quoted by Bassett, *Buc.* 111).

<sup>86</sup> In one case (*Il.* 16.309) *ἔγχει* takes *ἄξυόεντι* instead of *χαλκείῳ* for the sake of the extra syllable, and *Ἐκτορα* twice takes *δῖον* (*Il.* 6.515, 15.15) in place of *Πριαμίδης*.

<sup>87</sup> A noun-epithet formula at the beginning of the verse does not normally begin its sentence; see above, §2.12.

<sup>88</sup> In *Il.* 17.600, *αἰχμή* is followed by the genitive of a personal name, in 20.399 by the more vivid *ἱεμένη*, perhaps to avoid the odd effect of the “bronze” helmet pierced

five times alone but integrated into its clause; ἔγχει χαλκείῳ seven times together, but ἔγχει 17 times alone enclosed within its clause, and twice alone as runover; and ἵπποι ἀερσιπόδες (and its oblique cases ἵππους ὠκύποδας etc.) only six times together, compared with nine where the noun stands as runover and a considerable number where it is enclosed within its clause.<sup>89</sup> Hector is the only major hero whose name is metrically tractable here, and Ἔκτωρ Πριάμίδης (all cases<sup>90</sup>) occurs 15 times, compared with 12 where the noun stands alone as runover, 15 where it is enclosed within the sentence, and four where it is followed by an adjective or phrase of different length.<sup>91</sup>

The figures cannot, I think, be pressed to give more information than that stated above; the essential fact is that the possibility exists of extending a noun, whether a runover or not, to reach the B instead of the A caesura, by the addition of a standard ornamental adjective, except in cases where the noun begins the sentence as well as the verse.

**3.12.** An ornamental adjective may be used to carry the line from the A to the B caesura even when the noun on which it depends is in the preceding verse. The reason for the insertion of such an adjective seems to be primarily structural, i.e. simply to carry the verse on to the next caesura, though there is naturally some decorative effect and perhaps, especially in the particular schematization to be described below, a pleasing fullness of expression.

The adjective may be placed in the middle of its clause, as in *Il.* 18.531–2 αὐτίκ' ἐφ' ἵππων / βάντες ἀερσιπόδων μετεκίαθον. More often, however, it is used in a particular schematization in which the sentence begins at the C caesura, the subject stands in that verse, the

in the next line by the “bronze” weapon. In the parallel lines *Il.* 12.184–5, however, the manuscripts mainly give the standard phrase, and it is not possible to decide what has happened. Scholars have noticed many examples of a standard formula abandoned if the context makes it unsuitable (e.g. Bergson [above, note 61] 33).

<sup>89</sup> It may be noted that *Il.* 24.697 ἵππους, ἡμίονοι δέ is an odd adaptation of the formulaic ἵππους θ' ἡμιόνους τε (*Il.* 23.260, 24.471).

<sup>90</sup> The genitive is unmetrical, and the vocative is ignored as the patronymic is never found after Ἔκτωρ and may for some reason have been purposely avoided. Other personal names are occasionally lengthened by an adjective in this position: Ὀδυσσεύς three times (*Iliad* only) by πολύμητις, others by ἄνακτα (and other cases); τανύπεπλος is found here more often than anywhere else.

<sup>91</sup> Ἔκτορα δῖον (see above, note 86); perhaps Ἔκτωρ τε Πριάμιο πάις (*Il.* 5.704, 18.154), but this seems to be a separate kind of bridging formula; see note 15 above.

verb stands at the beginning of the next verse, and the adjective concludes the sentence. *Il.* 12.50–1 οὐδέ οἱ ἵπποι / τόλμων ὠκύποδες may be given as example. After the B caesura there may be a new clause or another ornamental adjective to carry the verse on to the C caesura.<sup>92</sup>

There are two rather odd features in the instances of this schematization: significant adjectives are rare in it,<sup>93</sup> and *hapax legomena* seem more frequent than might be expected. The adjectives which I have observed to occur in the schematization are the following: five adjectives occur so more than once—ὠκύποδες three times,<sup>94</sup> ἐνπλόκαμος five times,<sup>95</sup> νηνεμῖη twice, and πορφύρεον and μακάρεσσι once each plus some slightly irregular variants;<sup>96</sup> seven times an adjective which occurs in this position in differently constructed sentences is found once in this schematization;<sup>97</sup> two adjectives which occur in other positions in the verse are found in this position once only, and in this schematization;<sup>98</sup> and five adjectives which have no obviously unusual appearance, and are clearly ornamental in usage, but only occur once in early epic—δινῆεις (*Il.* 21.125: modelled on the common verse-end δινῆεντα), ἀνέφελος (*Od.* 6.45), εὐπρυμνοί (*Il.* 4.248), ἐνπλείην (*Od.* 17.467), and πανδαμάτωρ (*Il.* 24.5 and the parallel phrase *Od.* 9.373).

<sup>92</sup> *Ἐνπλόκαμος* in this schematization is four times followed by the ornamental phrase δεινὴ θεός (*Od.* 7.41, 246, 255, 12.449). It may be mentioned that H. W. Prescott's remark (*CP* 7 [1912] 38) that in Homer a deferred adjective stands at the beginning of the verse, unless metrically impossible, is invalid, as many of the adjectives discussed here have the shape —υ—.

<sup>93</sup> I have noticed only *κακοεργός* (*Od.* 18.54); perhaps also *Il.* 11.604 ἴσος Ἄρηι (the phrase here starts from the fourth-foot caesura); and *ἀχνύμενοι* stands in this schematization once (*Od.* 11.4–5), but parallel verses (*Od.* 10.570, 11.466, 12.12) show that it is the whole verse which is standard.

<sup>94</sup> *Il.* 12.51, 16.368, *Od.* 23.245; *Il.* 10.569 might be added, though there the sentence begins at the B caesura.

<sup>95</sup> See above, note 92; the additional case is *Od.* 5.58.

<sup>96</sup> *Νηνεμῖη*, *Od.* 5.392, 12.169. *Πορφύρεω*, *Il.* 17.361; in *Od.* 20.151 the sentence begins at the beginning of the previous verse, and in *Od.* 2.427–8 there are similarities to the schematization. *Μακάρεσσι*, *Od.* 13.55; in 18.426 the verb at the start of the verse is in participial form but the structure is not dissimilar.

<sup>97</sup> *Ἀμαιμακέτην* (*Il.* 16.329; the word seems to have special association with the Chimaera: cf. *Il.* 6.179; *Theog.* 319, where it violates Hermann's Law and seems to be irregularly substituted for ἀκάματον); ἡριγένεια (*Od.* 4.195); χρυσείας (*Il.* 18.598); Διὸς θυγάτηρ (*Il.* 2.548; contrast its substantival use in 4.515); ἐν ἀργαλέω (*Od.* 12.161); Ἀτρεΐδης (*Il.* 24.688); ἀπειρεσίην (*Od.* 11.621).

<sup>98</sup> *Εὐνήτους* in *Il.* 18.596, and the odd use of ἀκάματον in *Il.* 15.598.

The number of instances, the number of uses of unique adjectives (which I think may suggest that the schematization appeared in works now lost<sup>99</sup>), and the almost invariably ornamental nature of the adjectives, seem sufficient to warrant considering the construction a regular schematization. Whether this is thought justifiable or not, at least it is clear that, when a sentence began at the C caesura and the verb fell at the beginning of the next verse, there was a strong tendency to add an ornamental adjective to the already complete sense of the clause. The reason may be, as in the cases of ornamental adjectives following a runover noun, simply to carry the verse on to the B caesura and enable the fresh start to be made there; or, more probably perhaps, because a clause which ran only from the C caesura in one verse to the A caesura in the next would be distastefully swift, short, and colorless.

This is supported by a similar use of an ornamental adjective in a slightly different schematization: with one of the examples listed above, *ἐνθα Καλυψὼ / ναίει ἐνπλόκαμος* (*Od.* 7.254–5), compare *ἐνθα δ' ἔναιε / Κίρκη ἐνπλόκαμος* (*Od.* 10.135–6) and *ἐνθα δ' ἔναιεν / Αἴολος Ἴπποτάδης* (*Od.* 10.1–2), both of which are followed by a complimentary phrase filling up the remainder of the verse. Circe's name could stand (with δέ) in the same construction as Calypso's, but the form actually used perhaps gives more emphasis for the first mention of her name.

**3.13.** An ornamental adjective is seldom used in this position preceding its noun. Even in the case of the main characters in the epics there seem to be no regular formulae in which an adjective here immediately precedes the name; in fact the only instances I have noticed are *διογενὴς Ὀδυσσεύς*, occurring twice in the *Odyssey* (15.485, 23.306) in this position instead of the more usual place at the start of the verse, and *ὁ τλήμων Ὀδυσσεύς*, found twice in *Il.* 10 (231, 498). These two phrases are, of course, not interchangeable but alternatives, with initial vowel or consonant, for the nominative case, but the rarity of their occurrence is remarkable.

There are, however, cases in which an adjective here stands in agreement with a noun which is at the end of the verse. Parry<sup>100</sup> drew

<sup>99</sup> I have noticed one instance, *καυχένας ἵππων / ἔκλυον ἰδρώοντας*, in *Homeri incertae sedis* fr. 1 (*EGF* p. 70–71).

<sup>100</sup> *L'Ép. Tr.* 95–96. There are examples at *Il.* 7.163 = 23.290, 11.177, 23.401, 812, *Od.* 8.3.

attention to a particular schematization exemplified in *Il.* 23.293 τῷ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Ἀτρεΐδης ὦρτο ξανθὸς Μενέλαος, of which there are a number of examples, and there are three cases of πολύμητις here preceding Ὀδυσσεύς at the end of the verse, and two of ἀντιθέοισι preceding Λυκίοισι.<sup>101</sup>

**3.2. Significant adjectives.** In the schematization described above, a few examples occurred of the use of a significant adjective or of a usually ornamental adjective with possibly significant sense.<sup>102</sup> Often a runover adjective is followed by another significant adjective agreeing with the same noun (δεινὰς, ἀνδροφόνους, *Il.* 24.479). Occasionally the two adjectives agree with different nouns and their juxtaposition gives emphasis to both: such are δύσμορος αἰνόμορον (*Il.* 22.481), ὄλβιος ἀφνειόν (*Od.* 17.420), ἡδὺν ἐν ἀργυρέῳ (*Od.* 10.357). The adjective is often preceded by another word dependent on it, the two forming a convenient descriptive phrase to fill the first half of the line (πάντοσε κυκλοτερές, ἰὼν ἐμπλείην, etc.). An exceptional case may be mentioned of an appositional noun used in this position much like an adjective, and with very heavy emphasis: ἀλλ' ἀνδρὸς θείοιο κάρη χαρίεν τε μέτωπον | ρύετ', Ἀχιλλῆος (*Il.* 16.798-9).

Sometimes a normally ornamental word draws sense from its context and takes on significance, as ἀνδροφόνους does in the phrase quoted above. Amongst adjectives occurring in this position, cases occur in *Il.* 17.476, where the usually colorless ἀθανάτων becomes important as Automedon suggests that only Alcimedon can handle the immortal horses of Achilles, now that Patroclus is dead; in *Od.* 13.260, πόδας ὠκύν attracts attention as it is only here removed from its usual position preceding Achilles' name at the end of the verse, and its meaning is elaborated in the following clause; in *Il.* 23.182-3 the isolated patronymic Πριαμίδην is either an unusually clumsily placed "filler" or, in my view more probably, an important addition to the sense of the sentence—"I will give Hector's body not to the flames but to the dogs, Priam's son though he be!" There are less important examples at *Il.* 21.189, where Αἰακίδης leads into the

<sup>101</sup> Respectively *Il.* 3.216, *Od.* 4.763, 19.585; and *Il.* 12.408, 16.421.

<sup>102</sup> Above, note 93.

genealogy of Aeacus, and perhaps ἀκάμαντα qualifying Helius' name in *Il.* 18.239, at the end of the long day of battle.

In sum, an ornamental adjective may be used here to follow a noun (in a very flexible usage), or a clause (particularly a certain schematized form), in order to carry the verse to the B caesura; or it may be used to fill in the verse between a sentence-beginning which runs from the beginning of the verse to the A caesura and a main part of the sentence (subject and verb) which fits between the B caesura and the end of the verse. It is not, however, used to precede and lengthen the common personal names, presumably because the combination would lead to the fourth-foot caesura, whereas the preferred noun-epithet combination (below, §4.32) concluded at the much more convenient C caesura. The position is occasionally used for an important word.

#### 4. AFTER THE B CAESURA

Most Homeric verses have a caesura at B, and usually some break in sense there. This break may be complete, i.e. the end of one sentence and the beginning of another; it may be strong, i.e. the beginning of a subordinate clause or the adding of a new phrase after the sense of the sentence is already virtually complete, as happens in "unperiodic" enjambement between verses; it may divide an ornamental from a significant part of the sentence; or it may, as in the case of "necessary" enjambement between verses, divide component essential parts of the sentence from each other.

Here some of the types of construction following the B caesura which present points of particular interest will be discussed. The simplest system of organization seems to be to follow the length of the phrase concerned; where relevant, the distinction between ornamental and significant use of formulaic expressions will be considered within each section.

**4.1. Complete phrase or clause between the B caesura and end of verse.** A phrase or clause of this length may consist of (1) a noun-epithet formula, (2) a noun-epithet formula enclosing some other word, (3) an appositional phrase, or (4) a complete clause or sentence.



**4.II.** A noun-epithet formula here may or may not be essential to the meaning of its sentence. Cases where the formula is essential are too familiar to need comment, but it may be pointed out that there are a number of cases where the standard epithet, for some reason unsuitable in a particular context, has been dropped in favor of a less offensive substitute. This indicates, I think, that the poet was not entirely insensible to the meaning of the adjective, and lends more weight to the view taken in this paper about the possibility of significant use of ornamental words.<sup>103</sup> There are, of course, a number of cases where a more or less unsuitable adjective has been allowed to remain. The length of the adjective naturally depends on the length of the noun in that grammatical case, and whether or not there is a caesura at C is accidental; where there is such a caesura (ποδώκεα Πηλείωνα) the adjective is detachable, and such cases will be considered later.

A noun-epithet formula not essential to the meaning may be inserted to add an additional thought, or to stress the effect of the adjective, or with little apparent effect other than to fill up the end of the verse. In the case of δαίφρονα Βελλεροφόντην (*Il.* 6.162) the effect of the repetition of the formula, and in particular the force of the adjective in the context, has been well expressed by Bassett, following the scholiast;<sup>104</sup> there is a similarly powerful use of βροτολογιῶ ἴσον *Ἀρηι* at *Il.* 20.46, and the fine adaptation of the traditional θεράποντες *Ἀρηος* at *Il.* 18.152, [Πάτροκλον] νέκυν, θεράποντ' *Ἀχιλλῆος*. Probably more often, however, the phrase is superfluous and without any additional meaning, as for instance γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων in *Od.* 11.386.<sup>105</sup>

Of a different type are cases where a noun-epithet formula which runs from the fourth-foot caesura to the end of the verse is joined

<sup>103</sup> See Bergson (above, note 61) 33; Parry, *L'Ép. Tr.* 235-36. There are also what seem to be pure and incomprehensible mistakes, such as κάρη ξανθὸς Μενέλαος (*Od.* 15.133) for βοῖν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος. Parry suggests (*Les Formules et la métrique d'Homère* [Paris 1928] 62) that the use of Ὀδυσσεύς ἰέρη ἴς as an alternative for the usual πολὺτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς in the Catalogue of Helen's Suitors (*Cat. of Women* fr. 68.21 Evelyn-White) shows an un-Homeric attention to the chronology of Odysseus' life, but I am not quite convinced.

<sup>104</sup> Bassett, *Runovers* 125.

<sup>105</sup> There are a surprising number of cases of obvious padding of this type in the *Hymn to Demeter* 2, e.g. 18, 32; 25; 315. By contrast, there is a harsh separation of a significant phrase, διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων, in *Theog.* 81-2, a type of structure I have not noticed in Homer.

on to the preceding sentence by conjunctions of two or three syllables in length; an example is *Il.* 1.611 *παρὰ δὲ χρυσόθρονος Ἥρη*. These are, of course, to be compared with the commoner cases where a phrase of this type begins a sentence and enjambs, which will be considered below. I have noticed few cases of this type outside the *Iliad*.<sup>106</sup> The usage is made possible by the existence of noun-epithet formulae which are normally used for a different purpose.

**4.12.** There are a number of examples of the space between the B caesura and the end of the verse filled by an ornamental adjective (running from the B to the C caesura), another word, and finally the noun. Since in most cases the final part is not found unaccompanied by the adjective, the whole is best considered a schematization.<sup>107</sup>

The commonest form is that of adjective + verb + noun, e.g. *ποδώκης εἶπετ' Ἀχιλλεύς* (*Il.* 18.234). I have noticed ten cases of this schematization; in most instances the particular phrase occurs only once, but in several the adjective and noun are found together without the verb. The adjective is always clearly ornamental, except in the sardonic words of Eurylochus (*Od.* 10.436), *σὺν δ' ὁ θρασὺς εἶπετ' Ὀδυσσεύς*.<sup>108</sup>

There are also a few cases of adjective + preposition + noun, e.g. *ποδώκεος ἄντ' Ἀχιλλῆος* (*Il.* 20.89). I have noticed only two other examples, plus two more in which the whole phrase fits between the fourth-foot caesura and the end of the verse.<sup>109</sup>

The number of examples is insufficient for very firm conclusions

<sup>106</sup> Other cases at *Il.* 2.477, 9.62, 15.5, 16.574, 22.211, 24.509, *Od.* 3.326. Also *Hymn to Demeter* 2.78.

<sup>107</sup> J. B. Hainsworth, "The Homeric Formula and the Problem of Its Transmission," *BICS* 9 (1962) 64, speaks of the division of a noun-epithet formula to allow the insertion of a dactylic word, giving as example *Il.* 15.674 *μεγαλήτορι ἦνδανε θυμῷ*.

<sup>108</sup> The other cases (square brackets indicate that the same noun and adjective are found elsewhere undivided): *Il.* 7.208, 15.451, [674], 16.166, 17.614, [22.471], 23.376, *Od.* 10.541 (= 12.142, 15.56, 20.91), 15.250. There are also cases in *Hymn to Aphrodite* 5.218, *Hymn to Apollo* 3.305, *Works and Days* 592. The view presented here is perhaps slightly strengthened by occurrence of cases where the same schematization is followed but with the word-break falling within the fifth foot instead of at the C caesura: *ἀθάνατος τέκετο Ζεὺς* (four times), *ἐνπλόκαμος τέλεισ' Ἡώς* (three times). Possibly based on the schematization are *Il.* 13.777 (with significant adjective), 20.320, 23.137, *Od.* 5.233.

<sup>109</sup> *Il.* 18.354, *Od.* 8.502. With these may be compared respectively the shorter forms in *Il.* 18.69 and *Od.* 24.409.

to be drawn, but seems to give some support to the view expressed above, i.e. that there is a feeling for a schematization of epithet, another word, and noun. The other possible views are, of course, that the phrase is simply built up from a separate ornamental adjective fitting between the B and C caesurae (of the type to be described below) prefixed to a concluding phrase from the C caesura on, or that it arises from the splitting of a noun-epithet (or rather, epithet-noun) formula in order to enclose an essential word. The first of these alternatives seems to me unlikely, because of the baldness of such an undecorated phrase; the second seems to be to some extent discounted by the lack of evidence, in some cases, for such undivided forms even where they are metrically acceptable.

**4.I3.** Appositional phrases in this position range from the purely ornamental 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες to expressions which, though they might appear generally serviceable, occur only once (ἀνάλκιδες αὐτοὶ ἑόντες, δαφοινεὸν αἵματι φωτῶν). Some are particularly effective and appropriate, almost certainly constructed for their context; two occur in close proximity in *Il.* 18, where Achilles, addressing the dead Patroclus, speaks of bringing to him the armour of Hector, μεγαθύμου σοῖο φονῆος (335), and of executing twelve Trojans at the pyre, σέθεν κταμένοιο χολωθείς (337; repeated from here in *Il.* 23.23). One cannot, of course, prove that such phrases are not traditional, but the possibility of their having been composed for one particular occurrence and intended for verbatim repetition in that context seems to me strong.

**4.I4.** Often a complete sentence or complete subordinate clause fills the space between the B caesura and the end of the verse, as has been noted by others;<sup>110</sup> there are several examples in the broken speech of Achilles, *Il.* 1.149-71. Occasionally the clause is inserted parenthetically, as in *Il.* 24.50 (the clause itself occurs again in *Il.* 21.201), and I have noticed one example of formulaic clauses with identical sense giving a choice of initial vowel or consonant, according to metrical requirement.<sup>111</sup>

<sup>110</sup> Parry, *Studies* (above, note 5) 129 (on *Il.* 1.5); J. A. Notopoulos, "The Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry," *AJP* 83 (1962) 355 note 15, and 356 note 52.

<sup>111</sup> *Πορὼν ἀπερείσια ἔδνα*, *Il.* 16.178, *Od.* 19.529; *ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα*, *Il.* 16.190, 22.472, *Od.* 11.282.

**4.2. Sentence or clause running from the B caesura and enjambling.** A sentence or clause of this type sometimes begins with a noun-epithet formula, sometimes by other means.

**4.21.** Not infrequently a noun-epithet formula running from the fourth-foot caesura to the end of the verse is used to begin a sentence, preceded by a word or words of two or three syllables. The joining words may be simply *ἀτάρ*, *παρὰ δέ*, *ἐπεί*, or a more important part of the sentence, such as *τὸν δέ*, *εἴ μοι*. Though the usage is fairly frequent<sup>112</sup> there are only a few examples of any one formula, and it seems that the normal end-of-verse formulae were simply used in this way when need arose, but hardly habitually. The enjambement which results is easy, since only the subject (or occasionally subject plus object) is positioned ahead of the verse-end.

In a few cases the form of a noun-epithet formula extending from the B caesura to the end of the verse allows the insertion of a particle, and the formula may then be used in the way mentioned above to begin a sentence: *ἄναξ δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων* / ... (*Od.* 8.77). I have noticed a few other cases, especially in the *Hymns*.<sup>113</sup>

**4.22.** Other ways of beginning a sentence at the B caesura are as varied as at the beginning of the verse. It may be mentioned, however, that a new sentence does not begin at the B caesura as often as might be expected, and there seems to have been some difficulty experienced in starting a sentence here. This had various results, amongst them perhaps the use of noun-epithet formulae (just mentioned), and the tendency to extend the sentence to the C caesura by means of an ornamental epithet, so that the new start can be made there. In *Il.* 1, for instance, of the 110 lines which enjamb, 40 begin at the beginning of the verse, 41 at the C caesura, 12 at the A caesura, and only 11 at the B caesura; the only pause at which fewer enjambling sentences start

<sup>112</sup> Parry mentions this initial use of end-formulae, and gives some examples (*L'Ép. Tr.* 65–66). I have noted 36 other cases, with no individual formula occurring more than five times and most occurring once only.

<sup>113</sup> Other instances are: *Il.* 11.772, *Od.* 3.436, 444. *Il.* 15.87, *Θέμιστι δὲ καλλιπαρήφω* is obviously formed after the analogy of other cases, since it will not scan without the particle and is hence not a noun-epithet formula. *Od.* 16.130 and 458 are of a similar type to the above cases but the particle is not required. Cases occur also in *Hymn to Aphrodite* 5.43 (= *Theog.* 550), 155, *Hymn to Hermes* 4.28, 416, Hesiod, *Shield* 27, *Cat. of Women* fr. 53.3 Evelyn-White.

is the fourth-foot caesura, where 6 such sentences begin. Other ways of counting the sentences which begin at the various pauses (by ignoring enjambement, or defining it differently) alter the figures but do not materially alter the proportions. Thus more sentences start at the C caesura than at the other mid-verse breaks put together, and amongst these others, the B caesura has little prominence.

**4.3. Adjectives between the B and C caesurae.** A sentence or clause which ends, or has a word-group which ends, at the B caesura, may be followed by a word-group or an ornamental adjective which continues the verse to the C caesura, where another break in sense occurs. About the word-groups, in which are included complete sentences or clauses (*σὺ δὲ φράσαι εἴ με σαώσεις*, *Il.* 1.83) nothing need be said, except perhaps that their existence emphasizes that the sense-units of the verse correspond to the metrical cola. The adjectives (mainly ornamental) used here are, however, numerous and merit a detailed analysis; for convenience all constructions in which such adjectives between the B and C caesurae occur will be considered here, irrespective of whether the main pause is at B or C.<sup>114</sup> Significant use of adjectives occurring in this position will be discussed separately.

**4.31.** The adjective may be part of a noun-epithet formula running from the B caesura to the end of the verse; the formula may or may not be essential to the meaning of its clause (above, §4.11). In this case the adjective may be invariably found with the remainder of the formula, or it may be used to lengthen (when required) a formula running from the C caesura to the verse-end. Examples seem unnecessary, since the usage is so common.

**4.32.** The adjective may follow a noun which runs from the A to the B caesura. The question arises if this is to be considered a noun-epithet formula extending from the A to the C caesura, or simply an *ad hoc* union of the noun with the common B-to-C "filler" adjective. Investigation suggests that there are examples of both.

<sup>114</sup> The use of adjectives in this position in the verse is pointed out by J. A. Russo, "A Closer Look at Homeric Formulas," *TAPA* 94 (1963) 240, 244. Adjectives with an additional syllable at the end, to fit a shorter noun, are less varied in construction and will not be discussed here; the major example of these is *βοὴν ἀγαθός*, used before the names of Menelaus and Diomedes 47 times, with individual uses only at *Il.* 13.123 (cf. 15.671), 15.249, 24.250, and the unique genitive *Il.* 17.102.

The best example of the noun-epithet formula running from the A to the C caesura is Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, where the adjective is particularly apt,<sup>115</sup> is used only for Odysseus,<sup>116</sup> and only in the genitive case. Κλυτοτέχνης is used only in this construction, with Hephaestus; ῥήξήνορα only so, with Achilles,<sup>117</sup> and ποτιπόρθιος only so, with Odysseus. Κορωνίσι is normally only found in this construction, after νηυσί or νήεσσι, and ὑψίζυγος after Κρονίδης, though each of these adjectives is used once separated from its noun (*Il.* 18.58=439; 11.543). The 45 occurrences of Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος and the five of Ὀδυσῆα πολύφρονα are in each case in identical verses, and it might be held that it is the whole verse which is the formula rather than the noun-epithet combination; since, however, the adjectives are seldom used in this position for other heroes it seems likely that there was a regular association between them and these particular names.<sup>118</sup> It should be noted that in all the above cases the noun is frequently found in the same position without the adjective.

In the above cases the adjective is more or less restricted to use with a particular noun. There are, however, many cases of nouns in this position which take one of the common stock of ornamental adjectives when occasion demands. Andromache and Nausicaa are λευκώλενος when necessary, and many different heroes share ἀρήιος, μεγάλητορα, δουρικλυτός, δαίφρονος.<sup>119</sup> The most interesting case is that of Idomeneus, who has his own special epithet for use (following his name) between the A and C caesurae, Κρητῶν ἀγός. It is used, however, only in two verses (one repeated five times), δουρικλυτός being elsewhere substituted; in a few, but only a few, of these other instances

<sup>115</sup> It is typical of Helen's tact that she substitutes μεγάλητορος as she addresses Odysseus' son (*Od.* 4.143).

<sup>116</sup> In *Il.* 4.421 the adjective is general in reference and significant in sense.

<sup>117</sup> Except when it is a proper name.

<sup>118</sup> Πεπνυμένος is used in this position occasionally with heroes in the *Iliad* who have names metrically equivalent to that of Telemachus, and once in the *Odyssey* for Laertes. Πολύφρονος is used three times with Hephaestus' name.

<sup>119</sup> For example, δουρικλυτός is used to fill up the verse before ἐγγύθεν ἐλθών after four different names in *Il.* 5.72, 11.396, 14.446, and *Od.* 17.71. Perhaps I should make it clear that, since the nominative form of some adjectives is not much used, I may quote an adjective by some other common case-form, and include further case-forms within the reference without explicitly stating the fact. Any other practice would be over-complicated for my purpose.

would *Κρητῶν ἀγός* be unsuitably tautological. It seems that a Homeric nod must be responsible for failure to use the proper formula.

In sum, a number of important and common nouns have their own particular adjective with which they can be combined if the immediate necessity requires, and the noun-epithet combination formed when the adjective is used is as traditional as the end-of-verse noun-epithet formulae. Other nouns take the usual "filler" adjectives when necessary, without much discrimination except on metrical grounds.

**4.33.** Occasionally an adjective in this position follows a noun which is not immediately adjacent to it in the verse, and the question arises if this is a habitual divided formula. The answer would seem to be negative. There are very few examples of regular usage; in the *Odyssey*, the phrase *αοιδὸς αἶειδε περικλυτός* occurs in a thrice-repeated verse and one other, and in the *Iliad*, *Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ' εὐτείχεον* occurs in a verse four times repeated.<sup>120</sup> In these cases it is the whole verse which is repeated rather than the noun-epithet combination, and there seems to be no evidence to suggest that a particular isolated adjective may be habitually used here to accompany a preceding separated noun. The evidence may be compared with that for the schematization of adjectives between the A and B caesurae described above (§3.12).

**4.34.** In many cases an ornamental adjective between the B and C caesurae is followed by another running from C to the end of the verse, thus providing a half-verse "filler," superfluous in sense. There are three examples in successive lines in *Il.* 7.228–30. In a number of examples the second adjective is found only (or mainly) in combination with the first, but the first may always be found followed by a pause at the C caesura or a necessary part of the verse.

Outstanding amongst those adjectives found only in combination with another is *ποικιλομήτην*, used only after *Ὀδυσῆα δαίφρονα*.<sup>121</sup> *Ἀστεροπητής* is always combined with a preceding *Ὀλύμπιος* (one

<sup>120</sup> *Od.* 8.83 (= 367, 521), 1.325; *Il.* 2.113 = 288 = 5.716 = 9.20. The latter is a shorter alternative for the usual formulae from the B caesura to the verse-end, *εὖ ναιόμενον* (or *εὐκτίμενον*) *πολλίεθρον*.

<sup>121</sup> Including *Od.* 3.163, where the phrase is extended by the insertion of *ἄνακτα*. The vocative of this adjective, in a different position, occurs in *Od.* 13.293 and in some of the *Hymns*.

exception<sup>122</sup>). *Πολύχαλκος*, though occurring occasionally elsewhere in the verse, as last word is found only in the two cases where it follows *πολύχρυσος*, which are both rather odd (see below) but suggest that the combination was traditional. *Βωτιανείρη* is more doubtful: although in its only appearance in Homer (*Il.* 1.155) it follows *ἐριβώλακι*, in the older *Hymns* a formula *ἐπὶ χθονὶ βωτιανείρη* appears.<sup>123</sup> Perhaps the slightly different case of *ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε* might be added, since the parts are, in this construction, inseparable, and also *κούρη Διὸς αἰγίοχοιο*, since the first part may stand alone but the second may not.

A few peculiar usages of this double-epithet combination may be included. *Δαίφρονος* is sometimes followed by *ἵπποδάμοιο*, sometimes not, in a schematized set of verses. *Πελώρια*, usually significant in sense, is twice followed by the probably significant *θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι*, but *πελώριος* in ornamental usage is combined with the equally ornamental *ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν*.<sup>124</sup> When need arises, various standard phrases (*ἄρχὸν Ἀχαιῶν* etc.) follow *ἀρήιος*, *ἀγανοῦ*, and the like, and the rather rare *θυμολέοντα* follows two different phrases. In one case the habit of this use produces an unfortunate paradox, when a predicative adjective is followed mechanically by the standard and quite unsuitable epithet: *Od.* 6.26 *εἴματα . . . κεῖται ἀκήδεα σιγαλόεντα*. Though there may be other cases of this kind of incongruity, I think its rarity is noteworthy and shows that some attention is paid to the meaning of the adjective. I have noticed two examples of two highly significant adjectives coupled in this construction, perhaps by analogy with the usage of ornamental adjectives here: *Il.* 11.390 *κωφὸν γὰρ βέλος ἀνδρὸς ἀνάλκιδος οὔτιδανοῖο*, and *Il.* 18.289, where the adjectives *πολύχρυσον πολύχαλκον* form the predicate ("men spoke of the city as rich in gold and bronze"). The only other occurrence of the latter two adjectives together is their bizarre application to Dolon (*Il.* 10.315); both examples suggest an unusual handling of a traditional phrase.

Thus there is evidence to suggest that a half-verse "filler" composed

<sup>122</sup> In *Il.* 7.443 (the only dative) a participle takes the place of the first adjective. In the *Odyssey*, in the only parallel occurrence (15.523), *αἰθέρι ναίων* (perhaps easier to understand) is substituted after *Ῥολύμπιος*.

<sup>123</sup> *Hymn to Apollo* 3.363, *Hymn to Aphrodite* 5.265; not in Hesiod.

<sup>124</sup> *Δαίφρονος*, *Il.* 2.23 = 60, 4.370, 8.152, 11.450, 18.18. *Πελώρια*, *Il.* 10.439, 18.83; *πελώριος*, *Il.* 3.229, 7.211.



of a regular pair of adjectives was found useful, and, since certain adjectives occur only thus, may even have brought about their survival. For convenience standard adjectives were also combined for a particular verse. There is always, however, a break between the two at the C caesura, and there are always instances of the first adjective standing alone followed by a pause or some essential part of its own sentence; this serves to emphasize the importance of the break at the C caesura, and of the various alternative constructions which may follow it.

**4.35.** Adjectives are very often used in this position as a “filler” before other types of verse-ending which start at the C caesura, such as formulaic but significant phrases, a new sentence or clause which begins at the C caesura, or a further essential part of the same sentence which fits conveniently within the last two feet of the line (often a verb). A glance at the Concordances under any of the standard ornamental adjectives will provide examples. Here I will give a few illustrations drawn from uses of the epithets *Διὺ φίλος* and *δαίφρονα*.

*Διὺ φίλος* is the *Iliad*’s “maid-of-all-work,” to borrow Henry’s term for the Virgilian *ingens*. It is found 17 times in the poem, always after the B caesura, but never in the *Odyssey*, the *Hymns*, or Hesiod; it is particularly strange that it is not found in the *Shield of Heracles* or the *Batrachomyomachia*. It is used, in the technique described in §4.31 above, to lengthen (when required) a formula which runs from the C caesura to the verse-end: *Il.* 2.628 *Διὺ φίλος ἱππότα Φυλεύς* (cf. [*Γερήνιος*] *ἱππότα Νέστωρ*), and the most interesting *Διὺ φίλε φαίδιμ’ Ἀχιλλεῦ* (*Il.* 22.216). The latter phrase seems to be created to replace the regular vocative formula of that length, *θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ’ Ἀχιλλεῦ*, on an occasion when it is a goddess who is speaking and the usual phrase might seem inappropriate. Four times it is attached to a preceding noun (as in §4.32 above) to pad out the verse to the C caesura, twice after *Ὀδυσῆα* where the usual *πολύφρονα* would cause hiatus (*Il.* 11.419, 473; and 1.86, 11.611). In five cases the epithet, separated from its noun, is inserted to lead up to the C caesura, in a regular schematization of particle+subject+verb+*Διὺ φίλος*+new sentence (e.g. *ἐνθ’ Ἐκτωρ εἰσῆλθε Διὺ φίλος, ἐν δ’ ἄρα χεῖρι . .*).<sup>125</sup>

<sup>125</sup> *Il.* 6.318 and 8.493, after which the next two verses are alike (with the latter compare *Il.* 8.542=18.310, where the “filler” is not required); 18.203, 24.472. In

Two other schematizations appear, that of subject + adverbial expression + Διὶ φίλος + verb (*Il.* 8.517, 9.168) and conjunction + subject + verb + Διὶ φίλος + object (*Il.* 10.49, 527). In the remaining cases the epithet is again obviously used as padding: *Il.* 1.74, where the vocative form is inserted parenthetically, as διοτρεφές often is (it would not scan here); and *Il.* 16.169, where the epithet is quite exceptionally placed in the verse following that in which its noun stands, its all-too-obvious purpose being to fill up the verse until the poet can begin again with the common phrase ἐν δὲ ἐκάστη.<sup>126</sup>

The same kinds of usages can be illustrated in the case of δαίφρονα, which 14 times fills up the line before a common verse-ending or a new enjambling sentence or clause. Here I will only mention two fresh schematized forms, a group of lines shaped as in *Il.* 13.418, Ἀντιλόχῳ δὲ μάλιστα δαίφρονι θυμὸν ὄρινεν,<sup>127</sup> and another like *Il.* 20.267, οὐδὲ τότε Αἰνείας δαίφρονος ὄβριμον ἔγχος.<sup>128</sup>

Two examples of peculiarities in the use of "filler" adjectives before a set phrase beginning at the C caesura may be noted here. In *Il.* 22.294 the common ending μακρὸν αὔσας is preceded by λευκάσπιδα in agreement with Deiphobus (accus.), whose name begins the verse; the adjective is *hapax legomenon* in Homer but perhaps belonged to Deiphobus in other epics (μεγαλήτορα would have done). In *Il.* 15.324 a gap before νυκτὸς ἀμολγῶ is bridged by the insertion of μελαίνης, possibly borrowed from a formula μελαίνης νυκτὸς which occurs in the *Hymn to Hermes* 4.67 and 290. I have noticed two cases—there must be more—where a similar first half of a verse diverges into different verse-endings by means of the use of a different adjective here, or the absence of the adjective altogether (*Il.* 2.169, cf. 11.473; and 2.392, cf. 10.549).

**4.36.** Naturally an adjective with sense essential for the meaning of the sentence often stands in this position, in cases where there is no

all these examples the epithet may perhaps have some significant effect (see §4.36 below). The fifth case, *Il.* 13.674, has no particle and is somewhat different from the others.

<sup>126</sup> The only other instances I have noticed of an adjective so widely separated from its noun are those of the oddly used epithet χρυσόθρονος in *Od.* 22.198 and 23.244.

<sup>127</sup> So *Il.* 14.459, 487; there is a shortened form in *Il.* 17.123, and a similar development around μῦθον ἐνίσπω in *Il.* 11.839.

<sup>128</sup> *Il.* 11.456; cf. *Od.* 15.519, *Hymn to Demeter* 2.233.

question of simple padding; two examples occur in successive lines in *Od.* 5.190–1. And sometimes this is the case with normally ornamental adjectives; ἀμύμονα, so often used as a “filler,” is once found with specific sense in *Od.* 8.246 οὐ γὰρ πυγμάχοι εἰμὲν ἀμύμονες οὐδὲ παλαισταί, and Achilles’ regular epithet πόδας ταχύς is once used, with an odd effect, for the speed with which Antilochus bears his message to his leader (*Il.* 18.2 Ἀντίλοχος δ’ Ἀχιλλῇ πόδας ταχύς ἄγγελος ἦλθε). Telemachus’ standard description πεπνυμένος retains enough power to stand forcefully in the rebuke πρόσθεν πεπνυμένε (*Il.* 23.570), and with distinguishing effect in phrases such as πεπνυμένος ἀνὴρ;<sup>129</sup> though it is used in formulaic phrases of a few other worthy people, it is never attributed to any of the suitors (many of whom have names metrically similar to that of Telemachus) except by the crafty lips of the young man himself (*Od.* 18.65).

It is this occasional use of ornamental adjectives with a significant sense, coupled with the occasional obvious avoidance of a particular adjective in an unsuitable context, which introduces the temptation to see some force in an adjective whose main use in a passage is admittedly for ornament or padding, when such stress on its meaning enriches the effect. In four of the schematized expressions mentioned above,<sup>130</sup> where Διὶ φίλος is used primarily to fill up the line, an insistence on the dignity conveyed by the word lends color and impressiveness to the situation: Achilles arises in his glory, and Athena casts a halo of light around his head; as Priam enters Achilles’ hut, he sees the hero sitting in state with lesser men bustling around him; the triumphant Hector, spear in hand, addresses the Trojans at the end of their day of victory; or as Hector enters Helen’s apartments at the start of the great human scenes of *Il.* 6, we are struck by the nobility of this Trojan prince. Odysseus is ταλασίφρονος as the maidservants appear in the hall in which he sits as a beggar, and διογενής (as well as πολύμητις) as he sends them away and himself (αὐτός) takes on the menial task of lighting the lamps; van Leeuwen comments, “At ipse heros humillimum hoc officium in se recepit.”<sup>131</sup> There seems also to be unusual pathetic force in the two similar expressions Πατρόκλοιο

<sup>129</sup> *Od.* 4.204; cf. *Il.* 9.58, *Od.* 3.20 = 328, 4.206.

<sup>130</sup> In §4.35; respectively *Il.* 18.203, 24.472, 8.493, 6.318.

<sup>131</sup> *Od.* 18.310–12; van Leeuwen (above, note 9) *ad loc.*

πεσόντος ἀμύμονος and Πατρόκλοιο θανόντος ἀμύμονος (*Il.* 17.10 and 379).

The adjective *πελώριος* is sometimes ornamental and sometimes significant, perhaps more often the latter. Bergson suggested that it is properly applied to Ajax, then transferred to others, such as Ares, Periphas, Orion, and Hades, and occasionally used for Achilles and Hector in a significant sense, as the personal choice of the poet.<sup>132</sup> Even when used of Ajax, however, the adjective seems of greater weight than the usual formulaic epithet, and is different in effect from the "fillers."<sup>133</sup> Only in the case of its use with Periphas (in two rather similar and adjacent verses) and when it precedes *ἔγχος* (two occurrences) does it seem conventional. On the other occasions on which it is used it seems to me always to have some strong, or even distinguishing, sense (as, for example, when it is used with *ἀνήρ*).

A few significant adjectives substitute on occasion for ornamental epithets; *πολύτροπος* and *Ἰθακήσιος* for Odysseus are well known examples, and probably *ἀνάλκιδος* (in place of *ἀμύμονος*) for Aegisthus.<sup>134</sup>

**4.4. Summary: use of adjectives between the B and C caesurae.** Adjectives in this position occur in different types of set formula, i.e. noun-epithet combinations filling the last half of the verse, noun-epithet combinations between the A and C caesurae, and in double-epithet combinations in the latter half of the verse. In some cases a particular adjective is reserved for a particular noun. The standard epithets, however, which fill this position are also treated as "fillers" which may be inserted when required to pad out the verse, either immediately following a noun or following one which stands earlier in the line and is separated by other words; they may be followed by various types of verse-endings, some involving a strong pause in sense at the C caesura. There are several set schematizations of verse structure (described above) in which these ornamental adjectives are included.

<sup>132</sup> Bergson (above, note 61) 34.

<sup>133</sup> In three of the four occurrences Bowra ("Style," in *Companion to Homer* [ed. Wace and Stubbings, London 1962] 31) considers the adjective to have special effect (*Il.* 3.229, 7.211, 17.360). In the remaining case (17.174) it is more conventional.

<sup>134</sup> Bergson (above, note 61) 29; Bowra (above, note 133) 31.

In cases where a new sentence or clause begins at the C caesura following an ornamental adjective, it is evident that the adjective was used because the poet prefers not to begin a new clause at the B caesura in the middle of the verse. This is the most obvious instance which suggests the normal explanation for such adjectives: that they are used not primarily for "epic fullness," nor even primarily because they are habitual with certain nouns, but because they were convenient for the poet in the structure of that particular verse. There are sufficient instances of nouns occurring without the epithet to show that its attachment was not essential, and the varied ways in which the adjectives are combined with nouns in different positions show that the unit of construction, the building-block, was the group of syllables between the caesurae.

The use of significant adjectives in this position shows that the position itself was not weakened in force by use of ornamental epithets here. Besides the adjectives which occur in this position, which can easily be divided into the categories of ornamental or significant, there is a large group of words or phrases found between these two caesurae which are not grammatically necessary to the sentence or particularly important in the contribution they make to its sense (*πολὸν χρόνον, διαμπερές*,<sup>135</sup> *τετυγμένον, περὶ χροί*), and it is naturally impossible to determine to what extent their presence is due to structural necessity rather than to the significance of their meaning. Again, however, they show the force of the usual structural breaks within the verse.

##### 5. AFTER THE C CAESURA

The C caesura is the most obvious of all breaks in the Homeric verse.<sup>136</sup> More new sentences or new phrases begin here than at any other place within the verse, including a fair number of cases where the break in sense at C is strong and would now be indicated by a

<sup>135</sup> One odd usage of this common word is worth mentioning because it illustrates what generally does *not* happen. In *Od.* 20.47 *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ θεός εἰμι, διαμπερές ἦ σε φυλάσσω*, the break in sense seems to come *before* the adverb instead of after it. This is the only case I have noticed of such a construction with a word or phrase which is found commonly between the B and C caesurae; either the phrasing is strange, or we should (harshly) punctuate after the adverb as usual.

<sup>136</sup> The most important article on the subject is still that of Bassett (*Buc.*).

paragraph-division. Cases of anaphora between the beginning of the verse and the C caesura are not uncommon.<sup>137</sup> The special nature of the constricted group of syllables between this caesura and the verse-end is indicated by the enormous number and variety of the ornamental adjectives which are found here, and often here only; and this characteristic feature of the formulaic style is closely linked with the apparently contrasting habit of filling this constricted position with an often unformulaic group of words which begin a new sentence. The link between the two techniques is the frequent occurrence of identical, or virtually identical, verses with alternative endings after the C caesura, and will be illustrated here.

Between the C caesura and the end of the verse the following categories of phrases may occur:

**5.1.** There may be an essential part of the sentence, with a break in words but not in sense at C. Many noun-epithet formulae are designed to fit this position, and may be used as essential parts of the sentence or when appositional and strictly superfluous to the sense (see next section). Very often a verb occurs in this position in the verse.

**5.2.** There may be an ornamental, conventional filler-phrase or word, occasionally with some possible significant sense behind the conventional use. Phrases and words found here in conventional usage have been divided into five classes and illustrated by Bassett,<sup>138</sup> and his classification may be adopted here:

(a) A word or clause joined to the preceding sentence by a coordinating conjunction: *πατέρ' ἔμμεναι ἡδὲ τεκέσθαι* (*Od.* 4.387).

(b) Appositional phrases: *ποιμένα λαῶν*.<sup>139</sup> Just as in the case of ornamental adjectives in other positions in the line, these conventional phrases can sometimes add considerably to the force of the line if given a certain amount of significant sense, and it must be considered

<sup>137</sup> Some are listed by Bassett, *Buc.* 112-14. Many can be added.

<sup>138</sup> *Buc.* 116-22.

<sup>139</sup> These are sometimes added superfluously as "fillers," widely separated from the noun with which they are in agreement. In *Il.* 1.472-3 the late placing and ineffectiveness of *κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν* lends weight to the doubts cast on the verse by Chantraine (above, note 75) 152; in the similar verse *Il.* 22.391 the construction is different. Still worse examples are *δῖα θεάων* in *Theog.* 376 and *Hymn to Aphrodite* 5.28.

possible that this was intended by the poet. *Ἐσθλὸν ἔόντα* twice seems to bear the sense "strong as he is" (*Il.* 20.312, 22.176); *ισόθεος φῶς* is most apt for Telemachus as he goes in to face the suitors, enheartened by Athena (*Od.* 1.324), or gets up ready to leave for town on the biggest day in his life (*Od.* 20.124); and again, it well describes the dignified Priam leaving the scene of the oath-taking (*Il.* 3.310). *Δία θεάων* seems a fitting reference to the goddess's power as she casts a halo around Achilles' head (*Il.* 18.205; notice the effect of *Διὶ φίλος* for Achilles two lines earlier), and so does *δῖα γυναικῶν* for the appearance of Penelope as she makes her immense impression on the suitors (*Od.* 18.208); in another way, the latter phrase is once used to hint at the contrast between her dignity and the insulting behavior she has suffered (*Od.* 23.302).

(c) Phrases containing a brief simile: *δαίμονι ἴσος*. By their nature these generally have some significance.

(d) Participles or participial phrases. Bassett has good remarks on some of these; they were noticed by Parry.<sup>140</sup>

(e) An adjective. Bassett gives a lengthy list of adjectives which so occur. The main characteristics of the group are their number, their frequent separation from the noun, the variety of their descriptive meanings, the number of compounds of certain roots, and the fact that many of them occur only once or twice in extant literature. The system has developed far beyond the requirements of pure metrical convenience and has become a superb descriptive instrument which deserves more detailed study than it has been given. In some contrast to ornamental adjectives and phrases in other parts of the verse, the conventional epithets here rarely, if ever, seem to have any direct relevance to the context; I have noticed only a few possible examples, and these are odd usages rather than employment of the adjective in the usual construction with significant effect.<sup>141</sup> The reason is presumably the much greater rigidity and conventionality of adjectives

<sup>140</sup> *Studies* (above, note 5) 131.

<sup>141</sup> The predicative use of *πολύχρυσον πολύχαλκον* has been mentioned above (§4.34). In *Od.* 11.11, *ποντοπορούσης* adds to the sense, "as she sailed"; whether its effect is weakened or (by contrast) strengthened by its similarity to the traditional *ποντοπόροιο*, I am not prepared to guess. There is possibly some distinguishing sense to the adjective in the formulaic *ἐπέεσσι . . . μελιχίοισι*, to which Bergson drew attention ([above, note 61] 21 and note 1). In only one case, however, is there any contrast between

here, as is shown by the high proportion found only here in the verse.<sup>142</sup>

One minor odd development in the use of one of these adjectives may be mentioned. Ἀσπιστάων often occurs separated from its noun, usually with στίχες or ἀγός intervening; this has led to an odd usage in two places (*Il.* 4.90 and 201, in parallel passages) where the place of the genitive noun ahead of ἀσπιστάων has been usurped by an intrusive κρατεραί. Κρατεραί στίχες is a combination not found elsewhere, and it may or may not be traditional; the insertion of the adjective here may be because in the context there is no suitable genitive noun available. So the unsupported traditional adjective has to rely upon an irregularly enjambling noun λαῶν in the next verse, whose proper function is really to introduce the following relative clause, as it does in e.g. *Od.* 2.234.

5.3. The verse may be completed by a new and complete clause or sentence. Many of these are standard expressions: οὐ τι μάλα δῆν, αἶψα δ' ἴκοντο, οὐδέ με πείσεις. Often, however, the sentence may be unique and appear unformulaic, and may carry considerable weight in the context. There is considerable emotional impact behind καὶ φόβου ἀρχήν (*Od.* 21.4, 24.169), ἀλλὰ κύνεσσιν (*Il.* 23.183), πένθος ἀέξων (*Od.* 24.231); and a fairly strong narrative sense in such phrases as εἴλετο δ' ἔγχος (*Il.* 10.24), and ἀλλὰ λυ' ἵππους (*Il.* 10.480). In spite of the frequent use of purely ornamental words in this place in the verse, the position had obviously not lost the possibility of bearing emphasis if desired, even when the phrase is short and does not enjamb.

5.4. A new sentence or clause may begin at the C caesura and go on to enjamb into the next verse. This usage is very common. Parry drew attention to "the numerous class of formulas made up of relative words, particularly pronouns and adverbs, which begin a clause of which the principal words will be found in the next line,"<sup>143</sup> and any grammatical part of the sentence may stand here; examples

μειλιχίους and another adjective (*Il.* 12.267, in what seems to be a non-formulaic expression), and the phrase itself is so traditional that the adjective can stand alone when ἐπέεσσι is omitted (*Il.* 6.214, 17.431). I would conclude that the meaning is something like "pleasantly" and the force is merely mildly honorific, like that of many formulaic adjectives.

<sup>142</sup> Marked by Bassett with an asterisk in his list (*Buc.* 119–20).

<sup>143</sup> Parry, *Studies* (above, note 5) 129.



seem unnecessary, as any few pages will give cases of this space filled with subject, object, indirect object, verb, etc. of an enjambling sentence, or any combinations of these parts of the grammatical structure. A classification does not seem to yield any profitable results at the moment. Exceptions to the usual limitations on enjambement occur somewhat more frequently in this kind of construction than in sentences beginning earlier in the line, as has been indicated above, §2.26, but perhaps not so frequently as might be expected in view of the constricted space available; for instance, cases of an adjective standing at the end of the line followed by the noun in the next line are quite rare.

Naturally the importance of the phrase which falls between C and the verse-end varies, as does the amount of enjambement of sense; the formulaic οἱ δὲ ἴδοντες contains virtually a complete thought; τεύχεα δ' Ἔκτωρ presents two main components of the thought and throws into emphasis the postponed third element, ἀπέδυσσε (*Il.* 18.82-3); οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δῆν offers little more than a negative, whereas ἦ τάχα χήρη (*Il.* 6.408) gives most of the thought before the phrase is completed, in the next verse, with σεῦ ἔσομαι. Not infrequently a single word (sometimes a name) followed by δέ fills this position. This usage seems, however, to be restricted (perhaps for metrical reasons); for although αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς was found useful 27 times in this position and αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεύς 17 times, the apparently parallel phrase Ἀτρείδης δέ is found only once here, and Πριαμίδης δέ not at all.<sup>144</sup> In only one case have I noticed a noun-epithet formula used here to begin a sentence, the intentionally abrupt μώνυχας ἵππους / ζεῦξον . . . (*Od.* 15.46-7). Perhaps the difficulty of inserting a particle would prevent wider use.

Occasionally sequences of verses with a strong break at C occur, with a strange effect, as though the poet had lost the hexameter rhythm and could not for a moment recover it; Bassett<sup>145</sup> lists some places where up to six successive verses have a pause at the C caesura and enjambement, and often a considerable number are scattered over a particular passage. These sequences and irregularities in frequency

<sup>144</sup> I have not seen occurrences of δέ in this construction listed, but have noticed the following (grouped according to the noun preceding): *Il.* 11.97, 12.185, 20.399 (and *Batr.* 228); *Il.* 15.140, 21.498, 23.791, *Od.* 2.244; *Od.* 4.615, 15.115; *Od.* 20.356; 24.354; 24.386 (also *Hymn to Hermes* 4.326, *Batr.* 200); *Il.* 13.162; 6.64; *Od.* 5.315; 18.119.

<sup>145</sup> *Buc.* 111. There is a similar series in *Theog.* 190-97.

make statistics untrustworthy, as does also the fact that subject-matter may affect the proportion, as in the *Catalogue of Ships*; but usually in Homer the proportion of enjambling lines after a strong pause at the C caesura seems to vary between 5 and 10 per cent. In the *Catalogue of Ships* it is only about 2.6 per cent, equalled only in the short (49 verses) *Hymn to Pan*; the highest proportion I have noticed, 12.5 per cent, occurs in the *Batrachomyomachia*.

5.5. A particularly interesting illustration of the way in which verses are put together is provided by the frequent examples of interchange of endings (from the C caesura to the verse-end) between verses which are otherwise substantially or completely the same. Bassett<sup>146</sup> mentions a few cases, such as the alternatives αἰγιόχοιο and αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἦρως in the similar verses *Il.* 10.154 and 11.66. A fuller demonstration is given by Hoekstra's beautiful diagram of the formulaic system set up around the name of Poseidon:<sup>147</sup> here the variations in the early part of the verse all conclude, between the B and C caesurae, with the various cases of γαιήοχος, and the verse is completed, according to need, by a formulaic adjective beginning with a consonant (κυανοχαῖτα), a formulaic adjective beginning with a vowel (ἐννοσίγαιος), a necessary part of the verse (e.g. ὠρσεν Ἀχαιοὺς), a co-ordinate phrase<sup>148</sup> (ἦδ' ἐριούνης), a complete sentence (ἦλθ' ἐριούνης), or an enjambling sentence (μηδὲ μεγέρης / . . .).

As a further example may be given the obviously standard phrase ἀμφὶ πυρὶ στῆσαι τρίποδα μέγαν (in which the final adjective is clearly added to bring the line to the C caesura). The phrase occurs four times in Homer, followed (to the end of the verse) three times by different new enjambling sentences starting at the C caesura (*Il.* 18.344, 22.443, 23.40) and once by the "filler" phrase ὅττι τάχιστα (*Od.* 8.434). No instance is found in Homer of the ornamental adjective agreeing with τρίποδα which would be expected to occur at the end of the line, though *Od.* 13.13 offers a useful co-ordinate phrase to end the verse, ἦδὲ λέβητα; but the missing adjective is provided in Hesiod,

<sup>146</sup> *Buc.* 121-22.

<sup>147</sup> A. Hoekstra, "Hésiode et la tradition orale," *Mnemosyne* 10 (1957) 210.

<sup>148</sup> Ἐριούνης is followed by Ἐρμείας is the next verse in these its only two occurrences in old epic, but may be a name or title rather than an adjective (above, §2.211 and note 28). Ἐριούνιος is used both substantively and as an adjective.

*Works and Days* 657, *τρίποδ' ὠτῶεντα* (the phrase confirming that the formula could be extended if desired by the use of *μέγαν*); and proof (if required) that this is not an isolated Hesiodic creation is afforded by *Il.* 23.264 and 513, where the same phrase is used, following *καί*, at the beginning of the verse. Thus it is purely by accident that the adjective does not occur in the final position in Homer.

The best way to see the wide possibilities of variation here is to look through the Concordances *s.v.* *Ἀχαιῶν*, observing the cases where virtually similar verses end with or without the epithet *χαλκοχιτώνων*.<sup>149</sup> In the poems in general, I have noticed the following cases:

(a) Alternation of an ornamental adjective and a new enjambling sentence or clause.<sup>150</sup>

(b) Alternation of an ornamental adjective and a new enjambling sentence or clause, where the space from the B to C caesurae is filled by another ornamental adjective.<sup>151</sup>

(c) Alternation of a superfluous co-ordinate phrase (of Bassett's type "A") and a new enjambling sentence or clause.<sup>152</sup>

(d) Alternation of a complete sentence (from the C caesura to the verse-end) and an enjambling sentence or clause.<sup>153</sup>

(e) Alternation of two enjambling clauses, one of which is a personal name followed by *δέ*.<sup>154</sup>

<sup>149</sup> Compare, for instance, *Il.* 2.163 with 2.179; 3.127 with 4.333; 12.352 with 14.354. There are eight cases of strong pause after *Ἀχαιῶν* and the beginning of a new sentence, in spite of the usual avoidance of a spondee preceding a heavy diaeresis here (see T. Stiffler, "Das Wernickesche Gesetz und die bukolische Dihärese," *Philologus* 79 [1924] 327-28).

<sup>150</sup> Some of the many examples: *Il.* 7.250 (etc.), cf. 5.281; *Il.* 9.683, cf. 14.97 (and with necessary noun-epithet formula, 14.106); *Il.* 2.45 (etc.), cf. 11.29 (and with noun and adjective, 5.738 etc.); *Il.* 1.316 (etc.), cf. 11.622, 24.12, *Od.* 6.94; *Il.* 5.815, cf. *Od.* 1.10, 20.61; *Od.* 13.252 (etc.), cf. 13.190, 300, 318, 356, 2.296, 17.240 (also with object and verb, *Od.* 5.382); *Il.* 24.474, cf. 24.574; *Od.* 24.544, cf. *Il.* 20.301; *Il.* 3.283, cf. 2.236; *Il.* 3.334 (etc.), cf. 11.29. Also *Il.* 17.473 (with significant adjective), cf. 18.132; *Od.* 17.550 (etc.) (ornamental noun-epithet formula), cf. 17.557.

<sup>151</sup> Examples: *Il.* 21.449, cf. 22.171; *Il.* 4.370 (etc.), cf. 18.18 (and many other cases of roughly similar verses formed around a proper name in the genitive + *νῆε* + *δαίφρονος*).

<sup>152</sup> Examples: *Il.* 15.700, cf. 13.89; perhaps *Il.* 17.735, cf. 746 (as *ἐκ πολέμοιο* is hardly essential to the sense).

<sup>153</sup> Examples: *Il.* 11.274 (= 400), cf. 5.327 (cf. 15.259, where a noun-epithet phrase stands here as necessary object of the sentence; *ὠκυπόροισιν* could stand in this verse); *Il.* 17.179 (= *Od.* 22.233), cf. *Il.* 11.314; *Il.* 1.246, cf. 11.633; *Il.* 1.356 (etc.), cf. 9.111.

<sup>154</sup> Examples: *Il.* 6.64, cf. 14.447; *Il.* 13.162, cf. 17.607.

(f) Two examples may be appended of cases where a similar thought is expressed in two alternative forms, one of which completes the whole verse, whereas the other runs only to the C caesura and allows the start of a new enjambling phrase there; in *Od.* 11.167 the verse ends ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἔχων ἀλάλημαι οἰζύν, but at 11.482 a phrase which begins similarly is abbreviated, and the verse runs ἀλλ' αἰὲν ἔχω κακά· σεῖο δ', Ἀχιλλεῦ, / . . . . In a similar way, *Il.* 11.370 conveys exactly the same thought as *Il.* 5.97, but by its economical form the former has room for the complimentary ποιμένι λαῶν, which could, if desired, be dropped to allow the start of an enjambling sentence.

**5.6. Summary: usage after the C caesura.** Any few pages of Homer will illustrate the frequency of the C caesura and the breaks in sense which occur at that point; the above remarks should have made clear the amazingly wide variety of the phrases or single words which occur within the constricted space between this caesura and the end of the verse. Conventional ways of filling the space—ornamental adjectives, complimentary phrases of greater or less significance—were developed and introduce a wide and colorful range of descriptive meanings; where the sentence continues over the break between words at the caesura to the end of the sentence, noun-epithet formulae and schematizations of (for example) verb and direct or indirect object appear;<sup>155</sup> but in many cases these possibilities of an easy, traditional way of ending the verse are not adopted (even when they have been used elsewhere after identical phrasing), and the poet prefers a strong pause in sense and the beginning of a new sentence or clause. Frequently, too, he creates apparently unique and original phrases within the limits of the four or five syllables available to him.

Furthermore, it must not be overlooked that, in addition to the skill demanded to compose these end-of-verse phrases, the following verse must also be adapted to accord with the grammatical structure of the whole sentence; for the words in the preceding verse are often not just a vague introduction consisting of a few particles and perhaps a negative, but include one or more essential—and even emphatic—parts of the sentence-structure. These, therefore, will not appear in the follow-

<sup>155</sup> See the remarks of Russo (above, note 114) 237, 245, on such phrases as τεῦχε κύνεσσιν, ἄλγε' ἔθηκε.

ing verse, which must be shaped to fit the metre, and to reach the next pause, without their inclusion. The technique and literary effects of this await further study, and may provide a criterion of the poet's skill.

It is natural to suppose that the development of ornamental adjectives to fit within this space at the end of the verse intensified the force of the break between words at C, and that the use of enjambling phrases to begin a sentence here arose either as alternatives for these epithets or for use in cases where, for some reason, the epithet was not available. Perhaps a beginning was made with the use of such relatively easy sentence-constructions as *αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοί* and *τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη*. This is probably unprovable, and in any case, by the time of the creation of the epics which we have, techniques which may have developed in sequence are merged together in the immensely wide range of the poet's craft.

## 6. GENERAL CONCLUSION

The results of this study seem to me to justify the following remarks.

The whole examination of the features of Homeric verse which have been discussed is based upon the divisions of the verse at the caesurae, in the manner most recently investigated by Porter and accepted by those most particularly concerned with oral poetry.<sup>156</sup> The fact that the features discussed can be so readily identified emphasizes how important these caesurae are for the structure of the sentence as well as the structure of the verse. The component parts from which so many verses are constructed fall between these breaks, even if there is no break in the sense of the sentence there; and it is at these points that breaks in the sense do occur.<sup>157</sup> This technique of composition, by component blocks falling between these caesurae, works against the occurrence of harsh enjambement—i.e. that in which parts of a sense-unit of the sentence (the subject or object, for instance) are divided by the verse-end—and brings about an easy sequence of thought. It gives the possibility of easily bridging the gap which may occur

<sup>156</sup> H. N. Porter (above, note 2); A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass. 1960) 142.

<sup>157</sup> There are even a few lines where the sense is broken at all the caesurae: *Il.* 1.158 (quoted above, §1), 1.185, 11.404, 18.306, Hesiod, *Works and Days* 268.

before the preferred position of the next word or formula, or before the preferred position for beginning the next sentence or clause, by means of padding the verse with the insertion of an ornamental adjective or some inconsequential phrase. In Homer, however, it is seldom so obvious that the poet is working towards the inclusion of a particular formula as it is, for instance, in *Works and Days* 99 αἰγιόχου βουλῇσι Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο. The development of the whole technique presumably results as directly from the circumstances of oral composition as does the development of formulae, and naturally assists the listener as well as the composer.

It must again be stressed, however, that operating against both ease of composition and ease of comprehension is the frequent use of sentences or clauses beginning at the C caesura, even when a formulaic ending is readily available and may even be used to complete a similar verse elsewhere. It is not that harsh enjambement is caused by such sentences—though it is slightly more frequent in these conditions—but that the limited space available before the end of the verse must have demanded extra skill on the part of the composer, just as the speed of the phrase and its lack of the customary decoration would seem to demand extra alertness from the listener. Perhaps this is a sophistication of the epic style associated with the zenith which epic reached at the time of Homer himself. Its effect is to intensify the variety of pause that naturally arises from the technique of composition described above, and to avoid any possible monotony for the hearer.

Any emphasis which falls upon a word seems to depend more upon the meaning of the word itself than on its position. Important ideas may be expressed in any place in the verse, and the constant use of purely ornamental words in (for example) the second half of the verse does not bar the use of strongly significant words and phrases from that position. The runover position, though sometimes used for colorless words, seems to add special force to words of significance by means of the isolation of words used here from both the preceding verse and that in which they stand. This position is the most free in the Homeric verse, and here the poet can insert a word, and link on a further thought, or omit it and begin a new sentence, with almost the unrestricted choice of a poet working without the constraints of the formulaic diction. Here he has greater play of word-choice,

and (as I have tried to show) controls something of the powerful effect which can be produced by freedom of word-position in other poetry.

The force of analogy is strong. This has already been pointed out, in particular by Parry in his list of "puns",<sup>158</sup> i.e. cases where words of similar sound but different meaning occupy the same position in verse and in formula. Here it has been shown that analogy can be responsible for alterations in the usual structural arrangement of adjective and noun (§2.213), and of genitive and noun on which it depends (§2.221). In these cases, as in Parry's, it is naturally the familiar *sound* of the word in its special position which leads to the use of the same word there under different structural circumstances, or the use of a word of similar but not identical sound. This attention to sound is, of course, what would be expected of a poet accustomed to composing without the aid of writing.

It has been suggested in many places in this paper that a significant sense can occasionally be attributed to ornamental adjectives and conventional phrases, and that this should be considered possibly intentional on the poet's part. This sympathetic approach is in fact similar to that demanded by the use of identical lines or expressions in very different circumstances, in all of which it may be effective in quite different ways; attention has been drawn to this by Calhoun and Bowra.<sup>159</sup> It is further supported by occasional cases where avoidance of the usual epithet, in circumstances where it would be inept, shows that the poet is not altogether heedless of the meaning of the word.

Has the above any bearing on the circumstances of composition or transmission of the poems? Does it afford any help in choosing between the theories that the poems were written down by Homer, or were dictated by him to a scribe, or were committed to memory by rhapsodes and written down at some later period?

The use of the constricted area between the C caesura and the end of the verse to begin a sentence, the use of runover words, and the

<sup>158</sup> *L'Ép. Tr.* 92. See also Bowra (above, note 133) 31-32.

<sup>159</sup> G. M. Calhoun, "Homeric Repetitions," *UCPCP* 12.1 (1933) 7-9; Bowra (above, note 133) 35.

occasional use of ornamental words and phrases with significant effect may be considered *individual* usages, where the craft of the particular poet may be seen more clearly than usual behind the conventional formulae. The skilful use and the frequency of these techniques, though not (I think) sufficient to distinguish one part of the poems from another, taken as a whole seem to indicate that the poet is a perfect master of the conventions of his diction and his verse-structure, master enough not only to use them with (generally) complete facility but also to give them occasionally an unwonted meaning and, very often, to dispense with (for example) the regular line-ending and substitute an original phrase. This implies, of course, that our poems were not composed extempore; I imagine no one would think they were, but sometimes a rather loose application of the term "oral poet" can give that impression. It also implies, I think, a careful design; the poet is composing a poem which is intended to be recited verbatim, not singing a song which another singer may repeat in substance but constantly refashion in the details of expression. This is one difference from the circumstances of composition of Southslavic epic.

The poet, therefore, must already have the conception of verbatim repetition of a poem. This, I feel, would in any case be expected, because of the occurrence of long repeated passages in the Homeric poems, and also from the existence, obviously from an early period, of catalogue-poetry after the manner of the *Catalogue of Ships* and much of Hesiod.<sup>160</sup> Here a large part of the intent of the verse seems to be to enable the memory of long lists of names, facts, and figures to be handed on unchanged. This is another important difference from the circumstances of composition in Southslavic culture, since catalogue-poetry of this nature does not seem to occur there.

These differences between Greek and Southslavic epic may vitiate the deduction from the experience of Southslavic that a creative oral poet cannot also be a memorizer. The skill with which the individual usages are exploited in Homer would incline me to think that these epics are not the first to include poetic devices which are intended for verbatim repetition, and that the idea of fixed versions of poems was

<sup>160</sup> See especially C. R. Beye, "Homeric Battle Narratives and Catalogues," *HSCP* 68 (1964) 345-73, who argues that "the *androktasiai* have evolved out of a form very much like the Catalogue [of Ships]" (p. 367).



perfectly familiar to the composer of our epics and not his own innovation.

This inclines me against the view that Homer was inspired to produce such exceptional poems by the introduction of writing. The question remains whether the fixed version of the epic was dictated to a scribe at the time of composition, or composed with the idea only of its verbatim repetition and transmission by memory. It might be thought that the individual characteristics of expression I have described weigh against its committal to memory, and certainly the style is more complicated than it need be simply to tell the story—more complicated even than it need be to convey the basic emotional effect of the scenes. To me however the admitted difficulty of committing the whole to memory by ear alone does not seem any greater than that of imagining eighth-century rhapsodes memorizing such long poems from whatever kind of document could have been produced at that time, and it would be my guess—since I am not convinced that anything more than guessing is possible at the moment—that writing down in order to preserve or stabilize a long-known version of a poem might be a more likely occurrence than any other circumstances of written recording. Further knowledge may perhaps be derived if differences can be determined between poems known to have been written down at the time of composition and those which may have been composed in other circumstances, and this must be done not only on the basis of formulaic analysis but also by investigation of the ways in which the structure of the sentence is arranged within the verse.