HOMERIC DISCOURSE AND ENJAMBEMENT: A COGNITIVE APPROACH

EGBERT J. BAKKER

University of Leiden

1. Introduction

The discussion of enjambement in Homer has since Milman Parry's (1929)[1] seminal article been a recurrent topic in the study of Homer as 'oral poetry.' The tendency in Homer for sentence end to coincide with verse end was made by Parry into a basis on which Homer could be differentiated from the unequivocally literate hexameter poets Apollonius of Rhodes and Virgil. The difference in versification between Homer and the later poets was explained by Parry in terms of the oral compositional technique of which the Homeric style is the product or at least a strong reflex.

Most authors agree that in Homer the end of the verse coincides more frequently with the end of a linguistic unit ('sentence') than in Apollonius or Virgil or any literate poet.[2] Yet on the other hand they have to concede that Homer does indeed contain many cases where the 'sense' is not completed by the end of the verse and where we have to admit, accordingly, a case of what Parry called 'necessary enjambement.' A popular and, indeed, attractive maneuver is to attribute such stylistic subtleties (by oral standards) to the sophistication that we have to recognize in Homeric poetry anyway. But in doing so, we implicitly apply to Homer the same standards as to literate poets, which reduces 'orality' to a mere limiting factor (from an aesthetic point of view), from which Homer's genius could free itself so well. Moreover, we imply that the concepts with which Parry worked ('complete thought,' 'idea,' and especially 'sentence') are self-evident and uncontroversial in oral poetry studies, which they are not.[3]

In this article I intend to do something that should be done, in my opinion, *before* we attribute anything to Homer's literary or stylistic genius. This is the appreciation of Homer's style as primarily an oral style. Of course, there is

---

[1] I will cite from the collected writings (A. Parry, ed. [1971]).

[2] See Lord (1960: 54; 284), M. W. Edwards (1966), Kirk (1966), G. P. Edwards (1971: 93–99). The strong coincidence of metrical and linguistic units (on which see also Visser [1987: 31–32]) was formulated by Peabody (1975: 4; 141–43) in terms of the 'enjambment test for orality.' According to the enjambement test, independence of the linguistic expression of verse end should not, or very seldom, occur in an oral style.

[3] One piece of criticism of Parry's statistics (Clayman & Van Nortwick [1977]), for example, was apparently motivated by a different conception of 'sentence' from that of Parry. The critique has been sufficiently refuted (Barnes [1979]), but the confusion remains.

nothing controversial, even something trivial, in calling Homeric style 'oral.'
But still I believe that many scholars who have studied Homer in terms of 'oral
poetry' have not gone far enough, in that they kept applying, whether or not
implicitly, the linguistic standards of written language to Homer. In this article
I will accept the ultimate linguistic and cognitive consequences of what it
means to speak about oral poetry. To do this, I will resort to modern linguistic
research on orality outside the sphere of Homeric philology or even oral poetry.

The second purpose of the article is the reexamination of 'enjambement' in
Homer in the light of the linguistic properties of oral language use. By adopting
a functional linguistic and discourse-oriented point of view, I shall try to show
that even in cases where there is enjambement by all standards used hitherto, the
end of the line is still a clear boundary between linguistic units, so that it is
preferable to suppress the term 'enjambement' altogether. This second purpose
amounts to providing a linguistic and cognitive basis to Edwards's (1966: 122–
37) justified attempts to look for a 'break in sense' even in the 'harshest' cases
of enjambement.[4]

2. The production of oral narrative

Many of the scholars who have worked on Homeric style, whether or not in
connection with enjambement, have noticed the kind of feature of that style that
can be dealt with in terms of 'adding' (Parry), 'cumulation' (Kirk) or some such
characterization.[5] The cumulative nature of the Homeric style is intimately
connected with the less harsh of the two types of enjambement which Parry dis-
tinguished and which he called 'unperiodic' (after Dionysius of Halicarnassus):[6]
verse end in Homer frequently falls between a clause and a phrase which is in
some way in apposition to it, either a participial or a prepositional or some
other expanding phrase, for example:

(1)   Ἦ, καὶ Πείσανδρον μὲν ἀφ' ἵππων ὦσε χαμᾶζε,
        δουρὶ βαλὼν πρὸς στῆθος. (Λ 143–44).

The participial phrase is a non-essential extension of the preceding clause, so
that the enjambement it creates is considered not to be very strong. But
'cumulation' also applies, as I shall argue, to many of the cases of Parry's sec-
ond kind of enjambement ('necessary' enjambement), in which verse end falls
between constituents that seem to belong closely together, for example:

(2)   Αἴας δὲ Κλεόβουλον Ὀϊλιάδης ἐπορούσας
        ζωὸν ἕλε, βλαφθέντα κατὰ κλόνον. (Π 330–31).

---

[4] Edwards (1966: 122–23): "actual overlapping of sense seldom occurs; one
whole component unit of the sentence and the sense has normally been ex-
pressed, 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 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."

[5] See also Chantraine's 'construction appositionelle' (Chantraine [1953: 12ff.]).

[6] Kirk (1966) uses the term 'progressive,' which is more in line with the linear
additive organization of the discourse than Parry's primarily stylistic term.

In this example, the linguistic break between ζωὸν ἕλε and βλαφθέντα is similar to that which coincides with verse end in (1), while the verse end in (2) seems to separate essential parts of one and the same clause (subject + object and verb) from one another.

'Cumulation' in Homer has been discussed mainly in stylistic terms. This reflects the dominantly literary approach, in which the Homeric text is seen as *static*, a finished product. When we take orality seriously, however, we have to look at Homer as a *dynamic*, ongoing process. Recent research in oral language use makes this new perspective possible; it allows us to deal with Homeric discourse in a cognitive framework, in which we approach linguistic expressions from the point of view of the cognitive processes of the narrator, not from the point of view of the standards applied by a reader.

In a series of articles, the linguist Wallace Chafe (1980, 1982, 1985, 1987, 1989) has elaborated the point that speakers normally do not produce their utterances in an uninterrupted flow of words and sentences. Instead, spoken language is produced in a series of 'spurts of vocalization' (Chafe 1987: 1). These *idea units* (or *intonation units*), as Chafe calls them, have the following properties (1985: 106): (1) they have a single coherent intonation contour, often with a falling pitch at the end effecting a sense of closure; (2) they are often preceded and followed by hesitation phenomena; (3) they may be complete, independent clauses, consisting of a verb and (a) noun phrase(s), but they may also be chunks of information that are syntactically dependent on other units; (4) they are relatively short, about seven words, but often less.

Chafe hypothesizes that what he calls the *fragmented* nature of informal speech, appearing in the concatenation of idea units, reflects the cognitive limitations of the human organism. Active consciousness, or the amount of information that a person can focus on at any one time, is severely limited, as experimental data on short-time memory suggests (Miller [1956]). As a result, the total amount of information of which a story consists can be processed by an oral story-teller only in small chunks at a time, and this would seem to be reflected in the fragmented linear organization of the discourse in idea units.

One of the consequences of Chafe's findings, as well as of related research in conversation analysis, is that the concept of 'sentence' loses much of its importance when we are dealing with ongoing language production. When what we call the typical sentence-final falling intonation can occur at the end of any idea (intonation) unit, even when the syntax has not been brought to completion, it is not so clear anymore what a sentence is. If sentences have any function at all in ongoing speech and narrative, it is a function that is independent of the cognitive constraints that result in the linear organization in idea units (Chafe [1987: 46–47]). This appears from the fact that sentences in a text are very uneven in length and may also vary in length from speaker to speaker. Instead of being related to the productive aspect of texts, sentences may be seen as the result of a speaker's decisions as to the *presentation* of a narrative; they are thus a matter of rhetoric, or style, rather than of the cognitive activation of idea units in the speaker's mind.

As a major component of the rhetorical articulation of texts, sentences tend to be more prominent in writing than in speech. Contrary to speaking (and

hearing), writing (and reading) are activities that are less determined by cognitive constraints. A writer is very often in a more leisurely position than an oral narrator; consequently, the text he produces has a more edited, *integrated* quality. Sentences in formal written texts are presented as integral wholes, and the way a writer begins a sentence is often indissolubly linked with how he envisages the completion of what he has begun. Thus the *fragmentation* of speechcan be opposed to the *integration* of writing.[7]

An example of the edited, integrated nature of writing as opposed to the fragmented nature of speech is a sentence like "And then she went faster in that class than in the beginning class." In Chafe's (1989: 4) data, this sentence was orally produced as a succession of three idea units:

(3)   a. ...and then she...went faster.
        b. ...in that class,
        c. ...you know than in the...beginning class.

The speaker realized the first idea unit as a complete clause, with the appropriate sentence-final falling pitch (indicated by a full stop in the transcription). The second idea unit was added, as an afterthought after a full pause, to the first, its non-falling pitch signalling that more was to follow; the third unit, finally, brought the utterance to its end, being connected to the second one by the typically English idea unit linking device "*you know.*"

The typically fragmented organization of ongoing speech in idea units has its own syntax, which differs considerably from formal educated written language, where the emphasis is more on the text produced than on the production itself. Two aspects of the syntax of ongoing speech are relevant for my purpose: (1) the devices used for the linking of idea units and (2) the loosely connected status of noun phrases and adverbial phrases with respect to the clause to which they belong. In section 5 below I shall explain what I mean by the second aspect; we will now deal with the first one.

Idea units with clausal properties (i.e. with a verb and [a] noun phrase[s]) may be connected to each other by a number of linkage markers, of which *and* in English is the most neutral and the most frequent (Schiffrin [1987: 150]; Chafe [1989: 10–11]). In a grammar describing formal, 'perfect' sentences, *and* may be described as a coordinating conjunction linking clauses that are situated on the same syntactic level, thereby yielding complex sentences.[8] In the grammar of spoken language, on the other hand, *and* serves as a linking device

---

[7] Notice that the distinction between integration and fragmentation is related to but by no means identical with that between writing and speech. Writing tends to be more integrated than speech, but it has its less formal varieties. Likewise, speech is typically fragmented, but it has many genres, ranging from informal to formal (see now Martin [1989: 11]). Especially oral poetry may be highly premeditated and 'rehearsed.' In work currently in preparation (Bakker: in prep. A) I address the tension between conscious design ('rhetoric') on the one hand and orality ('cognition') on the other in Homeric poetry. In the present article I am exclusively concerned with 'cognition.'

[8] On the level of (logical) semantics, *and* signals that when the one of the component clauses is 'true,' the other is true too. This is what in propositional logic appears as the logical relation 'conjunction' (&), see Allwood et al. (1977: 32), McCawley (1981: 16).

between two clausal idea units, ranging in function from an empty space-filler between two vocalizations[9] to a continuative (progressive) connective signalling that the following idea unit is more than just a rewording of the previous one (Chafe [1989: 11]). In narrative the relation between two idea units linked by *and* is most often a temporal one, but this is not due to *and* itself: as a maximally neutral element, the particle just signals that there is a relation of some kind, without further specifying it.

The application to the Homeric style of the concept of the fragmentation of oral narrative into idea units has, I think, an immediate appeal. And the abandonment of the syntactic concept of 'sentence' in favor of the idea unit has important consequences for the discussion of enjambement. The fact that many citations from Homerists can be given whose wording closely resembles that of Chafe[10] may suggest that the theory of oral narrative production is a statement in theoretical terms of what classicists have always felt intuitively about the adding and cumulative style of the Homeric poems. In the remainder of this paper I shall try to work out this statement. In section 3 below I address the phenomenon of clause linkage in Homer in terms of idea units. Sections 4 and 5 deal with enjambement in Homer within the cognitive framework of oral narrative production. This discussion ignores to some extent the technicalities of the production of the verse; these will be dealt with cursorily in section 6.

3. Clause linkage and idea units in Homer

One of the features of the Homeric style that most clearly agrees with modern data on oral narrative is the linkage of short syntactic cola by δέ. The occurrence of connective particles like δέ is a constitutive part of Parry's definition of 'sentence," the concept which underlies all the discussions of enjambement in Homer: what δέ introduces is, for Parry, a new sentence.[11] It seems preferable, however, to describe δέ (in Homer, that is) as a linkage marker between clausal idea units, signalling that there is some, as yet unspecified, relation between two linked units.[12] What δέ connects are not so much units that are a factor in the rhetorical articulation of texts, as the successive ideas on which the narrator focusses while unfolding the story. The units linked by δέ are quite short and often more than one of them go into one line:

(4)   δῦ δὲ χιτῶν' ἕλε δὲ σκῆπτρον παχύ, βῆ δὲ θύραζε (Σ 416)

---

[9] In Beaman (1984: 57), *and* in spoken discourse is denied the status of coordinator on these grounds.

[10] For example, Parry's (1971: 253) definition of 'unperiodic' enjambement: "...the sentence, at the verse end, already gives a complete thought, although it goes on in the next sentence, *adding free ideas by new word groups*" (emphasis mine), or Kirk (1976: 152): "...any simple and paratactic narrative is cumulative; each new piece of information, as the story proceeds, can be envisaged as being heaped upon its predecessor."

[11] Parry (1971: 253): "I define the sentence as any independent clause or group of clauses introduced by a co-ordinate conjunction or by asyndeton."

[12] It should be noted that the function of δέ in later Greek (e.g. in cultivated Attic prose) is quite different: in breaking up the text into meaningful units, it does serve a rhetorical, text-structuring purpose (which I discuss in Bakker [in prep. B]).

Furthermore, the fact that they are on the whole of equal length, as is shown in
the following passage, strongly suggests that they are connected with the flow
of ideas in the narrative rather than with conscious presentation. In other words,
their length is cognitively determined, not rhetorically or stylistically:

(5)   Ἕκτωρ δ' ἐξ ὀχέων σὺν τεύχεσιν ἆλτο χαμᾶζε,
       πάλλων δ' ὀξέα δοῦρα κατὰ στρατὸν ᾤχετο πάντη,
       ὀτρύνων μαχέσασθαι, ἔγειρε δὲ φύλοπιν αἰνήν.
       οἱ δ' ἐλελίχθησαν καὶ ἐναντίοι ἔσταν Ἀχαιῶν,
       Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἑτέρωθεν ἐκαρτύναντο φάλαγγας.
       ἀρτύνθη δὲ μάχη, στὰν δ' ἀντίοι· ἐν δ' Ἀγαμέμνων
       πρῶτος ὄρουσ', ἔθελεν δὲ πολὺ προμάχεσθαι ἀπάντων.
                                        (Λ 211–17).

Most often, the units linked by δέ are short narrative cola, between which a
temporal (sequential) relation exists. But the relation need not be a temporal
one. As a maximally neutral linking device, δέ in Homer simply marks the
progression of one idea to another,[13] also in cases where English *and* in a (non-
oral!) translation is impossible:

(6)   ἦ ῥά νύ μοί τι πίθοιο, κασίγνητος δέ τοί εἰμι. (Η 48)[14]

The minimal condition for the use of δέ seems to be that the second of two
units linked has to be more than just a rephrasing of what is stated in the first:
δέ is a progression marker.[15] When the second of two coordinated word groups
is a restatement of the first, and both express one and the same mental image,
καί or τε have to be used, instead of δέ:

(7)   ὄφρα μὲν ἠὼς ἦν καὶ ἀέξετο ἱερὸν ἦμαρ (Λ 84)[16]
       στῆ δὲ γνὺξ ἐριπὼν καὶ ἐρείσατο χειρὶ παχείῃ Λ 355).

(8)   δύσετό τ' ἠέλιος σκιόωντό τε πᾶσαι ἀγυιαί (β 388)[17]
       οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο (Α 37)

These examples consist of two different statements of one and the same idea.
Consequently, I would analyze them as one idea unit, which may be introduced
in the normal way by δέ.[18]

---

[13] See also the treatment of δέ in Ruijgh (1971: 128), who uses the term
'transitive' to characterize the transition from one 'fact' (as he calls it) to
another. Compare Apollonius Dyscolus' characterization of δέ as a σύνδεσμος
μεταβατικός.

[14] Cases like this one have been treated by the ancient grammarians under the
heading "ὁ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ γάρ," because a causal relation between the two clauses
seems to obtain. This may be true, but the relation is not therefore actually
expressed by δέ.

[15] See also Chafe (1989: 11).

[16] Compare the equivalent case εἰς ὅ κε νῆας ἐϋσσέλμους ἀφίκη(τ)αι / δύῃ τ'
ἠέλιος καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἱερὸν ἔλθῃ (Λ 194, 209).

[17] When the second member of the linked pair contains new information, δὲ is
used instead of τε: δύσετο δ' ἠέλιος, τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον Ἀχαιῶν (Η 465).
Notice, however, that the vulg. has τε.

[18] See also Ruijgh (1971: 131), who analyzes καί as coordinating clausal con-
stituents within the scope of units linked by δέ. Ruijgh's terminology and

4. Homeric enjambement and the idea unit

Units linked by δέ in Homeric Greek (like those linked by *and* in oral English narrative) have clausal properties, that is, they consist of minimally a verb, very often accompanied by subject and/or object constituents. Such basic clauses[19] have by their very nature a sense of completeness. This is why Parry does not speak of enjambement when verse end falls between two clauses linked by δέ.[20] Instead, he uses 'enjambement' for those situations where a verse opens with a non-clausal phrase which is in some way syntactically related to what precedes in the verse before. The enjambement is 'unperiodic' or 'necessary' according to the degree of grammatical closure that is reached at the end of the preceding verse.[21]

Now in an analysis in terms of idea units this conception is quite drastically altered. In this analysis we are not thinking anymore in terms of a complex sentence that occupies more metrical space than just one line. Approaching the problem from the cognitive, text-productive side, we have to think in terms of a mental picture and its verbalization. The narrator focusses on the various aspects of this picture, thereby producing a series of idea units. The grammatical and semantic relatedness of these units reflects the coherence of the mental picture. The written, edited correlate of such a series of idea units is the sentence, but the fact that *Homer* is *materially* a written text with sentence articulation (appearing in punctuation in our modern printed text) should not induce us to think that it is conceived in the way written texts are. The non-integrated, fragmented quality of the Homeric style is highly indicative of oral narrative, and the term 'enjambement,' even in its softened, 'unperiodic' sense, should be suppressed as long as the end of the verse can be reasonably shown to fall between two idea units. To get an idea of what I have in mind, consider the following passage:

(9)   αὐτὰρ ᾿Αλέξανδρος, ῾Ελένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο,
       Τυδεΐδῃ ἔπι τόξα τιταίνετο, ποιμένι λαῶν,
       στήλῃ κεκλιμένος ἀνδροκμήτῳ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
       ῎Ιλου Δαρδανίδαο, παλαιοῦ δημογέροντος. (Λ 369–72).

conceptual framework are different from mine, but the two accounts, as far as Homeric Greek is concerned, are essentially the same.

[19] Cf. Dik's (1978: 15) term 'nuclear predication' ("by 'nuclear predication' we mean the application of a predicate to an appropriate number of terms functioning as arguments of that predicate").

[20] However, he speaks of necessary enjambement when the clause introduced by δέ is, syntactically, the main clause of the subordinate clause in the preceding verse (as in A 57–58: οἱ δ᾽ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ᾽ ἐγένοντο / τοῖσι δ᾽ ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς ᾿Αχιλλεύς). This practice, however, amounts to a misjudgment of subordination (and hence of apodotic δέ) in Homer: the 'main clause' (τοῖσι δ᾽ ἀνιστάμενος κτλ.) that allegedly completes the thought begun by the preceding subclause, is in reality a fresh clausal unit which is appended to what precedes in the normal way by δέ.

[21] Of course, the distinction is to some extent subjective. See also Kirk (1976: 150).

This passage can be effectively analyzed as a succession of 8 idea units, 2 per line, unfolding a coherent mental image, rather than as an extended sentence occupying 4 lines. The first unit is a mere name (αὐτὰρ Ἀλέξανδρος). The name, standing on its own, functions as what may be called a *topic-shifting device* which directs the attention of the narrator and the hearer from one warrior in the battle to another: it mentions the participant in the narrative about whom the poet is going to say something. Owing to the force of αὐτάρ, the unit effects a boundary in the discourse.[22] In functional linguistic terms, we may call it a *theme*.[23] More on 'themes' in the Homeric fragmented style will be said in section 5 below.

The second unit, Ἑλένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο, is added to the first as a qualifying phrase in apposition. From the point of view of the production of the verse, however, the function of the unit is to optionally extend the name Ἀλέξανδρος to the end of the line. This is the first instance we encounter of the interaction of the production of idea units with the production of the verse. In this case the former is in service of the latter.

The first unit of the next line (Τυδεΐδη ἔπι τόξα τιταίνετο) is the clausal element of the whole. By all standards used hitherto, this line is a case of necessary enjambement, since the alleged subject of the clause (Ἀλέξανδρος), is expressed in a line in which the verb does not occur.[24] However, in my opinion the thematic constituent Ἀλέξανδρος is not a necessary constituent at all: being a syntactically detached constituent, it stands outside the clause proper, and Τυδεΐδη ἔπι τόξα τιταίνετο is perfectly complete without it. Thus, line 369–70 should not be read as "Alexandros aimed his bow" but as "Alexandros, (...), *he* aimed his bow." Consequently, there is no enjambement here. In section 5 I shall say more about the special status of noun phrases like Ἀλέξανδρος in Homeric discourse and its consequences for the study of enjambement.

Line 370 is rounded off with the appositional phrase ποιμένι λαῶν. This expression belongs to the stereotyped phrases with which the space between the bucolic diaeresis and the end of the line may be filled. The function of these phrases is to enable the poet to reach under all circumstances and in an easy way the end of the line when the end of a unit has, metrically, a dactylic closure and falls at the bucolic diaeresis. An other example is δουρὶ φαεινῷ (ὀξέϊ δουρί) with verbs of killing or wounding (see Visser 1987: 80–82; Bakker &

---

[22] Notice, incidentally, that in later Greek this is precisely a major function of δέ: whenever a transition from one clause to another is connected with a shift from one topic in a narrative to another, δέ, and not καί, is the connective particle. See further Bakker (in prep. B).

[23] Theme constituents are noun phrases or adverbial elements (subclauses or participles) that are syntactically detached and placed before their main clauses. Nominal 'themes' effect, in introducing a new referent into the discourse, a topic shift; adverbial themes effect, in marking an incision between two action sequences in a story, a paragraph break. See further Bakker (forthc.).

[24] Kirk (1976: 150) addresses a similar case: ὤ μοι ἐγών, ὅ τέ μοι Σαρπηδόνα, φίλτατον ἀνδρῶν, / μοῖρ᾽ ὑπὸ Πατρόκλοιο Μενοιτιάδαο δαμῆναι. Like the case under investigation here, the first verse ends with an apposed phrase (φίλτατον ἀνδρῶν) between which and the following line a pause (in sense as well as in sound) is conceivable, while the syntax of the sentence goes on.

Fabbricotti: fc.).[25] The cognitive load connected with these standardized, verse-closing units is so low that we might consider comparing them, not to Chafe's idea units themselves, but to the vocalization/hesitation phenomena *between* them (like *you know* in English). The point of this idea is that when the poet is producing ποιμένι λαῶν or some such expression, he is already planning what comes after.

The next two lines are instances of Parry's unperiodic enjambement. From the point of view of sentential syntax, they contain the typically Homeric extensions of the basic clause: 'circumstantial modifiers' in the form of participial and prepositional phrases. Grammatically, the sentence could stop before or after any of them, and this is why the enjambement is 'unperiodic' (or 'progressive'). In the analysis in terms of idea units, however, the two lines are not so much an extension of a sentence already begun, as additions to the mental picture: while shooting at Diomedes, Paris is seeking cover behind the gravestone on the tomb of Troy's founder Ilos. The completion of the picture is vocalized in four idea units on which the narrator focusses successively.

The first of these units (στήλῃ κεκλιμένος) is a participial phrase of a type that is very frequent in the first half of the verse (see also ex. (1) above);[26] it may be characterized as an afterthought to the preceding clausal unit, expressing the circumstances under which the action reported took place. The following unit (ἀνδροκμήτῳ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ) is a prepositional phrase of a common formulaic type[27] that specifies the place where the gravestone stands on which Paris leans. The third and fourth units ("Ιλου Δαρδανίδαο, παλαιοῦ δημογέροντος) continue the associative chain,[28] by mentioning the person to whom the tomb belongs and by providing a verse-filling apposition such as Ελένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο in l. 369, respectively.

---

[25] Sometimes the stereotyped closing unit is as complete clause: πῖπτε δὲ λαός, ὦρτο δ' ἀϋτή.
[26] The well known placing of middle choriambic participles in 'runover' position at the beginning of the verse, a usage with obvious 'versifying' relevance, is a special case of this type. It is one of Russo's (1963: 242) more convincing examples of the 'structural formula.'
[27] This type consists of the following structure: adjective (or noun) + preposition + noun (or adjective). The expressions have in common that the dative singular ending of the adjective/noun before the preposition stands in hiatus (see Bakker 1988). Examples are: ἐϋσσέλμῳ ἐνὶ νηί//, εὐξέστῳ ἐνὶ δίφρῳ//, μάχῃ ἐνὶ κυδιανείρῃ//, ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ / etc. It is interesting to note that prepositional expressions in the first half of the verse consistently display a different structure: noun + preposition + adjective, whereby the (dative or genitive) ending of the noun suffers correption (e.g. πέτρῃ ἐφ' ὑψηλῇ, νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῳ, γαίῃ ἐν ἀλλοδαπῇ). Note that this verse-initial type has the same rhythmical pattern as νῆας ἐπὶ γλαφυράς and similar expressions in which correption does not occur. An example of both types in one line is Hes. *WD* 599, χώρῳ ἐν εὐαεῖ καὶ ἐϋτροχάλῳ ἐν ἀλωῇ.
[28] Note that the tomb of Ilus is in the peripheral consciousness of the narrator, since it is mentioned some time before (l. 166: παρ' "Ιλου σῆμα παλαιοῦ Δαρδανίδαο).

Thus instead of being one complex integrated sentence,[29] the passage discussed falls apart in eight successive idea units, which together vocalize the various aspects of one coherent mental picture:

(10)   a. But Alexandros,
        b. the husband of Helen of the fair hair,
        c. to Tudeides his bow he aimed,
        d. the herdsman of the soldiers.
        e. leaning on the gravestone,
        f. on the man-made tomb,
        g. (that) of Ilus the son of Dardanus,
        h. the elder of the people.

Of these, the units b. and d. play most clearly a verse-technical role; in requiring little cognitive energy, they might, as I suggested above, be compared to the hesitation/vocalization phenomena between significant idea units in oral speech or narrative. These phenomena (often simply a pause) fill the space in which the speaker/narrator plans ahead for the subsequent discourse. To speak of 'enjambement' in this case is useless in so far as the narrator is not designing a sentence but deploying a mental picture.

5. Left-and right-dislocation

In Parry's terms, the 'enjambement' in the passage discussed in the previous section is 'unperiodic'[30] in the sense that the sentence in question could have come to an end before the enjambing verse. In this section I discuss cases where two seemingly essential constituents of one and the same 'sentence' fall in two different verses. These are cases of what Parry called 'necessary' enjambement.

Informal oral discourse tends to have simple and small constituents as the direct complements (subject, object[s]) of a verb in a clause. Very often, these complements are as simple as unstressed personal or demonstrative pronouns. The reason of this tendency is twofold: (i) highly complex noun phrases may diminish the ease of processing of utterances, and hence impair an effective communication; (ii) oral discourse tends to be *context-bound* in that it is contracted between people who share a great deal of situational knowledge: there is often no need to use full names or noun phrases, as the addressee understands anyway who or what is meant by the speaker, even when a pronoun is used.

Equally often, however, simple pronominal reference is not sufficient (or is not considered sufficient by the speaker). A full noun phrase has to be used in those cases, but the crucial feature of oral discourse in this respect is that this constituent is not made a part of the structure of the clause in question. Instead,

---

[29] For example, the one in Rieu's translation (p. 207): "But now Paris, the husband of Helen of the lovely hair, drew a bow on Tydeides the great captain, leaning for cover against the columns on the mound which men of a bygone age had made for their chieftain, Ilus son of Dardanus." Notice especially the integrated quality of the translation of the last two verses ("leaning for cover..."): here the difference with Homer's fragmented units is greatest.
[30] Except for the 'necessary' enjambement between ll. 369 and 370.

it is placed either before or after it; this is called '*left-dislocation*' and '*right-dislocation*' respectively. The L/R-dislocated element is 'represented' in the clause by an unstressed (as in English) or even bound (clitic) pronoun. This strategy is entirely in line with the fragmented nature of the speech process as opposed to the integrated nature of edited writing: in planned written discourse, the most complex noun phrases may function as the direct complement of the verb, forming complex, integrated clauses. In unplanned speech, the L/R-dislocated element may be seen as a separate idea unit, uttered before or after the concomitant clausal one.

Left-dislocated noun phrases that are uttered, as separate idea units, before the clausal unit to which they properly belong, are called *themes*.[31] An example of a L-dislocated theme was αὐτὰρ Ἀλέξανδρος in ex. (9) above. The basic function of themes is to specify the 'domain' (universe of discourse) within which (or the entity about which) the subsequent clause(s) say(s) something (see Dik [1978: 132]). In continuous narration, a theme effects what may be called a topic switch, as we have seen in the previous section, while in conversation a speaker may utter a theme constituent to establish the leading topic of the subsequent conversation. Often, s/he pauses after the theme, before going on, to give the addressee the opportunity to express or deny his or her familiarity with the topic.[32] An example is

(11)   A. That student of yours that came to my office yesterday.
        B. Hm.
        A. She's going to do a paper on oral narrative production.

Right-dislocation occurs when a speaker, for some reason or other, wants to add, by way of afterthought, the identity of one of the referents of the preceding clausal unit. Like left-dislocation, it is a typical feature of oral fragmented ('loose') style.[33] In being explanatory, rather than referent-establishing, R-dislocated constituents are less *discontinuous* than L-dislocated ones, i.e. they do not effect a break in the discourse.[34] Some examples,

(12)   He's a nice fellow, your brother.
        I want to buy it, that house.
        He gave it to him, the book.

Now my claim is that L- and R-dislocation occurs in Greek, too, in spite of the fact that this does not overtly appear from our texts. Ancient Greek does not, like modern Western languages, possess unstressed and/or clitic pronominal elements which function as 'substitutes' for the displaced constituent. However,

---

[31] Linguistic usage is highly inconsistent here. Very often the term 'topic' is used for L-dislocation.

[32] The identity of referents is very often something that is negotiated between a speaker and an addressee. See the study of L-dislocation in these terms in Geluykens (1987: ch. 5).

[33] Linguistic terminology is still more diffuse than for left-dislocated constituents. I have found 'R-dislocated topic,' 'afterthought topic,' 'antitopic' (Chafe [1985: 115]), and 'tail' (Dik [1978: 19, 153–56]).

[34] For discussion of 'themes' and other linguistic devices in terms of (discourse) continuity, see Givón (1983).

Greek can express subject agreement, by the inflected morphology of the verb.[35]
This means that an expression like Σωκράτης εἶπε is principally ambiguous
between the readings "Socrates said" and "Socrates, he said." Likewise, εἶπε
Σωκράτης would allow of the reading "He said, Socrates."[36] In the case of
objects, Greek does not possess an overt means to express unstressed objects in
a clause, that are understood in the context of utterance; instead, it uses 'zero-
realization,' as in

(13)   δῶκε δ' Ἐρευθαλίωνι φίλῳ θεράποντι φορῆναι
         ("He gave it [sc. the armor] to his squire Ereuthalion to wear"),
                                                              (Η 149).[37]

But this means that when the object is overtly expressed by a full noun phrase,
it may be read as a case of R-dislocation (*δῶκε δ' Ἐρευθαλίωνι τεύχεα,
"he gave it to E., the armor").

     Now Homeric Greek sometimes allows us to 'prove' the dislocated status
of a nominal constituent. In the case of L-dislocation this may be done on the
basis of the place of an enclitic particle, and in the case of R-dislocation on the
basis of the occurrence of a 'redundant' pronoun in the clause.

     In a recent paper, Ruijgh (1988) addresses the place of enclitics in the
Homeric phrase in a reexamination of Wackernagel's Law. He argues that what
are seeming exceptions to the Law (viz. enclitics that do not occupy the second
but a later position in the clause) are in fact no exceptions at all, because the
preceding words are left-dislocated. Ruijgh cites, among other examples:

(14)   ἤτοι ὅ γ' ὣς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἕζετο. (Α 68),

which, on account of the place of ἄρ', has to be read as "But he, having spoken
thus, he sat down." In other words, ὅ γ' is a theme constituent (to which a
participial phrase is attached); the clause proper starts with κατ'. Another
example is:

(15)   καὶ τοὺς μὲν λίπεν αὖθι ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
         στήθεσι παμφαίνοντας, ἐπεὶ περίδυσε χιτῶνας·
         αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ ῥ' Ἰσόν τε καὶ Ἄντιφον ἐξεναρίζων
                                                  (Λ 99–101).[38]

---

[35] Ruijgh (in personal communication) suggested that it is in fact possible to
analyze the personal ending on the verb as pronominal subject. The athematic
ending -μι would then be the missing nominative to μου, μοι, με.

[36] See also Ruijgh (1979: 71).

[37] See also Λ 109: Ἄντιφον αὖ παρὰ οὓς ἔλασε ξίφει, ἐκ δ' ἔβαλ' ἵππων,
where the object (Antiphus) is unexpressed in the second unit. An extreme
example of the phenomenon is Β 102–8. The σκῆπτρον (introduced in 101), the
leading topic of this passage, is object in this passage 6 times, but never
expressed.

[38] Note that this passage is a good example of the fact that Homeric Greek often
uses αὐτάρ with the same function as δέ in later Greek: in this passage, it is
correlated with μέν in l. 99.

It is not very clear what ῥ' does in 1. 101,[39] but even in the minimal case in which it serves merely to avoid hiatus, it cannot be placed randomly in the clause: it has to abide the law of the placement of enclitics. So in this example it indicates that ὁ is L-dislocated and does not belong to the clause proper. But we can go a step further, I think: whatever is the function of ῥ', semantic or merely prosodic, it is clear that the particle is used for a purpose other than to indicate the L-dislocated status of the preceding constituent. Consequently, we have to take into consideration the thematic, L-dislocated status of a noun phrase *even when* ἄρα (or any other enclitic)[40] in its seemingly deviant position is absent.[41]

The 'proof' of the existence of R-dislocation in Homeric discourse may be made on the basis of cases like this:

(16)   αὐτὰρ ὁ βοῦν ἱέρευσεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων (B 402).

The demonstrative pronoun is often considered to be 'pleonastic' (e.g. Visser [1987: 118]), on the grounds that the subject of the sentence is expressed anyway in the same verse. I believe that this analysis is incorrect and that the alleged subject is in reality a R-dislocated constituent which is loosely attached to the clause. And I want to extend this analysis even to cases where the 'pleonastic' pronoun is absent, for example,

(17)   ἦ καὶ ὀνειροπόλον, καὶ γάρ τ' ὄναρ ἐκ Διός ἐστιν
         ὅς κ' εἴποι ὅ τι τόσσον ἐχώσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (A 64).

The phrase Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων may be read as a R-dislocated element: Achilles is speaking in context, and for him there is no doubt that Apollo is the god who sent the plague; so he refers to him as 'he,' but adds his name to avoid all misunderstanding. In cases like this, the R-dislocation is not visible in our texts, but in oral narration it must have been made apparent by means of intonation. This is of course a different way of saying that a R- (just as a L-) dislocated constituent is a separate idea (intonation) unit.[42]

Now the relevance of these insights for the study of enjambement is obvious: whenever a seemingly necessary constituent is separated from the rest of its clause by a verse boundary (thus constituting a case of what Parry calls 'necessary enjambement'), we have to reckon with the possibility that it is a case of L- or R-dislocation, which would rob the term 'enjambement' of all its application. Sometimes the L-dislocated status of a constituent just before the verse end is proved by an enclitic, in the same way as in (14)–(15) above. Consider the following example (cited by Ruijgh 1988):

---

[39] Notice that there are variant readings here: either ῥ' is omitted or Βήρισόν τε is read (which presupposes ἐξενάριξε instead of ἐξεναρίξων). Apparently the position of ῥ' caused trouble already in Antiquity.

[40] For example οὖν: οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν, ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο (A 57), where οἱ δ' is the theme.

[41] Compare, for example, with (15): αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ σὺν δουρὶ μετ' ἀντίθεον Πολύδωρον (Υ 407).

[42] Notice that R-dislocation does not apply without more ado to all nominatives placed at the end of a clausal unit. For instance, in the case of τὸν ἠΰκομος τέκε Λητώ (A 36) R-dislocation does not seem to be an appropriate concept.

(18)   πρόσθεν Μυρμιδόνων πολεμιζέμεν. αὐτὰρ ᾿Αχιλλεύς
        βῆ ῥ᾽ ἴμεν ἐς κλισίην, χηλοῦ δ᾽ ἀπὸ πῶμ᾽ ἀνέῳγε (Π 220–21).

The left-dislocated theme constituent αὐτὰρ ᾿Αχιλλεύς is a good example of a
topic switch effected by αὐτάρ: the attention of the narrator switches from
Patroclus and the Myrmidons and their preparations for battle to Achilles. This
switch, which creates a major boundary in the discourse, warrants a separate
nominal idea unit which introduces the topic (person) with whom the subse-
quent discourse will be concerned.

        Sometimes the L-dislocated constituent is more than a simple noun phrase.
Consider the following examples; in both cases the L-dislocation is, again,
proved by the position of ἄρα:

(19)   ἔνθα δ᾽ ἀνὴρ ἕλεν ἄνδρα κεδασθείσης ὑσμίνης
        ἡγεμόνων. πρῶτος δὲ Μενοιτίου ἄλκιμος υἱός
        αὐτίκ᾽ ἄρα στρεφθέντος ᾿Αρηϊλύκου βάλε μηρόν (Π 306–8).

(20)   ὣς οἱ μὲν κλαίοντες ἐέρχατο, τοῖσι δὲ Κίρκη
        πάρ᾽ ῥ᾽ ἄκυλον βάλανόν τ᾽ ἔβαλεν καρπόν τε κρανείης
                                                          (κ 241–42).

Ex. (19) is treated by Kirk (1976: 168) as an instance of 'integral' (a subdivi-
sion of 'necessary') enjambement in a discussion of Π 306–50. This passage is
considered by Kirk to be extremely complex from the point of view of the
interaction of verse and "sentence."[43] However, when one gets used to seeing
Homer's style as fragmented and full of the concomitant L- and R-dislocations,
the passage is not so exceptional anymore. In l. 307–8 in any case (= ex. [19]),
the alleged enjambement is actually a theme constituent before the verse-end,
whose predicative extension (πρῶτος) provides the link with the preceding dis-
course. Ex. (20) is cited by Ruijgh (1988). Here the theme constituent is not a
simple noun phrase indicating topic switch; rather, the domain within which the
following clause is meant to make sense is a relation between two
persons/entities which play a role in this clause. Thus the 'enjambement' in
(20) boils down to a verse end which happens to fall between two idea units:

(21)   a. And to them Circe,
        b. acorns she threw.

        The phenomenon of L-dislocation before the end of the verse is not limited
to cases where the second word of the following verse is an enclitic or
postpositive particle. We may say that just as in the case of (14) and (15), the
particle ἄρα has not been added merely to mark the L-dislocation.

---

[43] "This passage, in which internal stops and integral enjambements and the
overrunning of verse-end are rife, in which the simplicity of the verse as the
primary rhythmical unit is suppressed or transcended (however one happens to
look at it), lies at the opposite extreme of heavily cumulative passages in which
one verse leads to the next either with a new sentence or with progressive
enjambement." (1976: 168).

Consequently, there may be L-dislocation too when the particle is absent. Here are some examples from Kirk's passage Π 306–50 (cf. also ex. (2) above):[44]

(22)   Φυλεΐδης δ' Ἄμφικλον ἐφορμηθέντα δοκεύσας
         ἔφθη ὀρεξάμενος πρυμνὸν σκέλος, ἔνθα πάχιστος
         μυῶν ἀνθρώπου πέλεται. (Π 313–15, cf. 321–22).

(23)   ἤριπε δὲ προπάροιθε. Μάρις δ' αὐτοσχεδὰ δουρί
         'Αντιλόχῳ ἐπόρουσε κασιγνήτοιο χολωθείς. (Π 319–20).

(24)   Μηριόνης δ' 'Ακάμαντα κιχεὶς ποσὶ καρπαλίμοισι
         νύξ' ἵππων ἐπιβησόμενον κατὰ δεξιὸν ὦμον. (Π 342–43).

In all three cases the enjambement ('integral' according to Kirk) is in reality a complex theme constituent ending at the end of the line. In (23) the complexity lies in the fact that descriptive detail is added to the theme ("And Maris, nearby with his spear"). In the other two cases, (22) and (24), the complex L-dislocated constituent introduces two warriors at once and specifies, by means of a participial phrase, the relation between them. This creates a suitable context ('frame'), so that the subsequent clause can do without nominal reference and can leave the object unexpressed (see ex. (13) above).[45] This yields a pair of idea units in each case:

(25)   a. And Phyleides, of Amphiclus dodging the onrush,
         b. he hit him first high in his thigh.[46]

(26)   a. And Meriones, overtaking Acamas with swift feet,
         b. he struck him in the right shoulder as he mounted his chariot.

When a name or noun phrase at the *beginning* of the line seems to belong to the clause in the line before, we have to consider R-dislocation, analogously to the treatment in terms of L-dislocation of noun phrases at the end of a line. Often, there is an overt index of this phenomenon, in the form of the 'redundant' pronoun ὁ see (16) above). The passage under consideration contains two instances:

[44] In all, there are 12 cases of L-dislocation 'enjambing' into the next line in Kirk's passage (ll. 307, 313, 319, 321, 323, 326, 330, 333, 337, 342, 345, 349). This means that Kirk's figure of 'integral' enjambement in the passage drops from 22 to 10 when the L-dislocation-cases are subtracted from the total.

[45] It is interesting to note that this relation between the complex theme and the subsequent clause (each theme specifying the relation between a new pair of warriors in the fight) resembles the discourse structure which Beye (1964) discovered to be the common property of both epic catalogue entries and ἀνδροκτασίαι, the so-called 'ABC-scheme': a bare statement of fact (the A-part, e.g. a killing, i.e. a relation between two warriors) is followed by a further description (C); the two parts are often separated by an anecdote (B) about one of the persons mentioned in A. In the examples under study the theme, expressing the 'killing-entry' in the list, resembles the A-part and the clausal element proper, which provides more detail, the C-part.

[46] Notice that the second 'enjambement' in (22), equally 'integral' in Kirk's classification, can be analyzed as case of R-dislocation: "where it is thickest, the muscle of a man" (πέλεται in l. 315 is redundant).

(27) Νεστορίδαι δ᾽ ὁ μὲν οὔτασ᾽ Ἀτύμνιον ὀξέϊ δουρί
      Ἀντίλοχος, λαπάρης δὲ διήλασε χάλκεον ἔγχος. (Π 317–8).

(28)   ὁ δ᾽ ὑπ᾽ οὔατος αὐχένα θεῖνε
      Πηνέλεως. (Π 339–40).

In (27) the first line opens with the theme constituent Νεστορίδαι δ᾽ ("And as for the sons of Nestor") which specifies the two victors of the following lines;[47] this is followed by a unit naming the exploit of one of the two ("the one, he wounded Atymnius"),[48] to which is added his name, as an explicatory afterthought. In (28), Peneleos is already present on the scene as a participant in the action (cf. 1. 335 Πηνέλεως δὲ Λύκων τε συνέδραμον). The action of Lycon is described first, so that ὁ δ᾽ marks a switch to the other participant on the scene, whose name in l. 340 in R-dislocated position is no more than an optional reminder that is, apart from its function for the versification, highly characteristic of oral discourse.[49]

According to Kirk's table (1976: 177) the 'enjambement' in (27) and (28) belongs to the milder types ('periodic' and 'progressive' resp.),[50] no doubt on account of the presence of ὁ in the clause before. However, the presence or absence of this element does not make any difference for the 'degree' of enjambement in question, as the name at the beginning of the next line may be R-dislocated anyway. Consider the following examples, which in Kirk's typology would be 'harsher' cases of enjambement (viz. the 'integral' type):

(29) οὕνεκα τὸν Χρύσην ἠτίμασεν ἀρητῆρα
      Ἀτρεΐδης. (A 11–12).

(30) ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ᾽ ὕστατον ἐξενάριξεν
      Ἕκτωρ Πριαμίδης, ὅτε οἱ Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδωκεν; (Λ 299–300).

In (29), in uttering ἠτίμασεν, the poet has Agamemnon in mind, the king to whom Apollo's anger is directed, and this can be easily deduced from the context. But to avoid all misunderstanding, the poet adds Ἀτρεΐδης, by way of R-dislocation. The same applies to (30). In the context it is perfectly clear who is the subject of ἐξενάριξεν, as the narrative at this point is solely concerned with the beginning of the glory of Hector; but the poet adds Hector's name, in the form of a typically oral, slightly redundant R-dislocation. On account of this analysis, in which the name at the beginning of the verse is an elucidation of the clause before, not a part of it, it is highly preferable not to speak of

---

[47] Notice that in traditional grammar, this constituent would be described as the subject, followed by two partial appositions.

[48] Note that μὲν has here the function it has also in post-Homeric Greek, viz. to signal that more is to come: closure (and hence coherence) of the chunk of discourse in question is attained only when a following δέ is reached.

[49] Other, equivalent examples: αὐτὰρ ὁ μήνιε νηυσὶ παρήμενος ὠκυπόροισι / διογενὴς Πηλῆος υἱός, πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (A 488–89), ὁ δ᾽ ἅμα πρότερος καὶ ἀρείων / ἥρως Πρωτεσίλαος ἀρήϊος (B 707–8).

[50] I cannot see why (27) and (28) should belong to different types in any typology.

'enjambement' anymore, as the verse end neatly coincides with the end of an idea unit.

6. Versification and the order of constituents

I conclude this article with a short discussion of a class of instances of 'necessary enjambement' which has not so much to be discussed in terms of L/R-dislocation and fragmented oral discourse as in terms of versification, the distribution of words and phrases in the metrical space of the dactylic hexameter.

Up to this point I have discussed Homer's style in terms of fragmentation as the crucial feature of oral discourse. The leading thought was that the Homeric poet, in beginning a stretch of discourse, does not yet know how he is to end it, as the text he produces is a dynamic process rather than a fixed product. This is what underlies 'cumulation' as one of the characteristics of Homeric poetry. But there is also a real sense in which the Homeric style is 'integrative': in an important respect, the way the poet begins an utterance is often determined by what will have to be the end of it. The dominating force here is meter: the exigencies of the verse often put constraints upon the preferred narrative expression, in that the order of constituents in a unit has to be reversed just to fit a given expression into the hexameter. This yields a number of characteristic cases of 'necessary enjambement'. Consider the following example:

(31)   τόν ῥ' υἱὸς Τελαμῶνος ὑπ' οὔατος ἔγχεϊ μακρῷ
         νύξ', ἐκ δ' ἔσπασεν ἔγχος. (N 177–78).

At first sight, the enjambement here is similar to ex. (24) above in that both have an enjambing predicate in the second line (νύξ'). However, there is an important difference. In (24), νύξ' opens what may be called a clause that makes sense within the context of its theme. In (31), on the other hand, νύξ' stands quite alone, because a new clausal unit (ἐκ δ' ἔσπασεν ἔγχος) immediately follows. Moreover, the foregoing expression cannot be called a thematic constituent, because it lacks the crucial property of L-dislocated elements: it does not introduce (a) new participant(s) in the discourse. In fact, with its anaphoric pronoun (τόν) as object, which refers back to l. 171, it may be treated as the C-part of Beye's (1964) ABC-scheme (see also note 45), in which specific information is expressed about a killing.[51] Thus, instead of opening the clausal unit following a theme, νύξ' in (31) is an essential part of the preceding clause, viz. its verb.

Now it is important to notice that if νύξ' had be placed before the modifiers ὑπ' οὔατος ἔγχεϊ μακρῷ instead of after it (as in *τόν ῥ' υἱὸς Τελαμῶνος νύξεν, ὑπ' οὔατος ἔγχεϊ μακρῷ), it would have been easy to conceive of the expression as a succession of three idea units:

(32)   a. Him the son of Telamon stabbed,
         b. under the ear,
         c. with his long spear.

---

[51] See also Visser (1987: 48–49 for this discourse structure. The ABC-scheme is part of Visser's typology of 'killing scenes,' the discourse type to which he limits his valuable discussion of Homeric versification.

And if νύξ' had stood at the end of the verse and ὑπ' οὔατος ἔγχεϊ μακρῷ at the beginning of the next verse, there would have been, in sentential terms, an unequivocal case of unperiodic enjambement. However, this is not the case and νύξ' is separated from its clause by the two modifiers. The reason for this is to be found in the realization, not of the cognitive idea units, but of the verse. After having filled the first half of the verse with the terms referring to the victim and the victor, the poet may in principle proceed in linear fashion with the predicate of the clause, but he prefers not to do so, because he has a ready way to fill the second part: adonic sequences meaning "with the spear" are placed frequently after the bucolic diaeresis,[52] and the remaining metrical space between the trochaic caesura and the bucolic diaeresis (‿ — ‿ ‿) can be conveniently filled by a phrase specifying where the victim was wounded. As a consequence of these localizations, the verb νύξ' has to be postponed. Its position at the beginning of the verse does not indicate any emphasis specifically intended by the poet: νύξ' is dislocated for purely metrical reasons. The following examples are similar:

(33)   τὸν δ' ἰθὺς μεμαῶτα μετώπιον ὀξέϊ δουρὶ
        νύξ', οὐδὲ στεφάνη δόρυ οἱ σχέθε χαλκοβάρεια. (Λ 95–6).

(34)   δουρὶ κατὰ πρότμησιν ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ὀμφαλοέσσης
        νύξεν· ὁ δ' ἐν κονίῃσι πεσὼν ἕλε γαῖαν ἀγοστῷ. (Λ 424–25).

(35)   αὐτοὶ δὲ πρυλέες σὺν τεύχεσιν θωρηχθέντες
        ῥώοντ'· ἄσβεστος δὲ βοὴ γένετ' ἠῶθι πρό. (Λ 49–50).

The second half of the verse in Λ 95 (ex. [33]) is similar to that in (31): adonic expression for "with the spear" preceded by a modifier specifying the place of wounding. In (34), the spear has already been mentioned in the first half of the verse, so that the second half can be filled by a prepositional phrase specifying the place of wounding. In (35), finally, the participial phrase σὺν τεύχεσιν θωρηχθέντες is to such an extent a ready-made phrase filling the post-caesural part of the verse that it pushes the predicate ahead to the following line. In all three cases the (traditional) pattern of versification is such that there is no room for the predicate in the second half of the verse.

7. Summary and conclusion

In the above sections I have tried to lay a linguistic basis for the discussion of Homeric style in terms of orality. This is necessary in so far as many treatments of Homeric style still deal with their subject in terms that do not differ significantly from the treatment of written literature, even when they do subscribe to the oral poetry approach. Of course, Homer has many features that call for a 'literate' approach; but this should not make us insensitive to the

---

[52] Beside ἔγχεϊ μακρῷ there are δουρὶ φαεινῷ, ὀξέϊ δουρὶ, νηλέϊ χαλκῷ and ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ. For the role of these expressions in the versification see Visser (1987: 81–2) and especially Bakker & Fabbricotti (fc.).

massive evidence in the Homeric text reflecting orality, or perhaps even pointing to an oral origin.

The oral basis consists in abandoning, along the lines of Chafe, the concept of 'sentence' in favor of an approach in terms of 'idea units' reflecting the cognitive processes of the narrator. An oral story does not consist of a series of sentences whose length is determined by the narrator's judgments as to the best presentation of the story. Rather, an oral story consists of the narrator's focussing on small pieces of the information of which the story consists (one at a time) and vocalizing these 'foci of consciousness' in a series of idea units. Of course, in Homer this process is a great deal more complicated, because of the exigencies posed by the verse, but I believe that the principle basically applies.

This approach yields a suitable framework for the discussion of 'enjambement'. Many instances of what in sentential syntax has to be called 'enjambement' turn out in the cognitive approach to be no enjambement at all, because of the fragmented organization of oral discourse in idea units: whenever the end of the verse can be reasonably shown to fall between two such units, it is preferable not to speak of enjambement. This is not to say, however, that in the oral-cognitive approach every case of 'enjambement' ceases to be enjambement. There simply remain cases of verse end falling between constituents between which a strong cohesion obtains (Edwards [1966] cites such cases). The oral linguistic approach which I have advocated cannot make those cases disappear, but it does allow us to see them in the appropriate light, in which they appear still more remarkable than they did. This is another way of saying that we cannot properly appreciate Homer's genius and originality, before we have appreciated the oral basis from which this genius had to start.

References

Allwood, J., Anderson, L.-G., Dahl, O. 1977. *Logic in Linguistics*, Cambridge: C.U.P.

Bakker, E. J. 1988. "Long Diphthongs and Hiatus in Early Greek Epic: Phonology and the Role of Epic Diction," *Mnem.* 40, 1–25.

—. Forthcoming. "Narrative Structure and Indirect Discourse. Temporal Subclauses in a Herodotean Short Story," forthcoming in *Journal of Pragmatics.*

—. In prep. A. "Homeric Poetry: from Cognition to Rhetoric. Linguistic Evidence for Orality in the *Iliad*."

—. In prep. B. "Clause Combining in Ancient Greek. Δέ as a Discourse-organizational Particle."

Bakker, E. J. & Fabbricotti, F. Forthcoming. "Peripheral and Nuclear Semantics in Homeric Diction: the Case of Dative Expressions for 'Spear'," forthcoming in *Mnemosyne.*

Barnes, H. R. 1979. "Enjambement and Oral Composition," *TAPA* 109, 1–10.

Beaman, K. 1984. "Coordination and Subordination Revisited: Syntactic Complexity in Spoken and Written Narrative Discourse," in: D. Tannen (ed.), *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse*, Norwood, N.J: Ablex, pp. 45–80.

Beye, C. R. 1964. "Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues," *HSCP* 68, 345–73.

Chafe, W. L. 1980. "The Deployment of Consciousness in the Production of a Narrative," in: W. L. Chafe (ed.), *The Pear Stories. Cognitive, Cultural and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*, Norwood, N.J: Ablex, pp.9–50.

—. 1982. "Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing, and Oral Literature," in: D. Tannen (ed.), *Spoken and Written Language. Exploring Orality and Literacy*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 35–53.

—. 1985. "Linguistic Differences Produced by Differences between Speaking and Writing," in: D. R. Olson, N. Torrance & A. Hildyard (eds.), *Literacy, Language and Learning. The Nature and Consequences of Reading and Writing*, Cambridge: C.U.P., pp. 105–23.

—. 1987. "Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow," in: R. S. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

—. 1989. "Linking Intonation Units in Spoken English," in: J. Haiman and S. A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 21–57.

Chantraine, P. 1953. *Grammaire homérique*, ii *Syntaxe*, Paris: Klincksieck.

Clayman, D. L. & Van Nortwick, T. 1977. "Enjambement in Greek Hexameter Poetry," *TAPA* 107, 85–92.

Dik, S. C. 1978. *Functional Grammar*, Dordrecht: Foris.

Edwards, G. P. 1971. *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Edwards, M. W. 1966. "Some Features of Homeric Craftmanship," *TAPA* 97, 115–79.

Geluykens, R. 1987. *Left-dislocation in English discourse*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Univ. of Antwerp.

Givón, T. 1983. "Topic Continuity in Discourse: An Introduction," in: T. Givón, ed., *Topic Continuity in Discourse. A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 1–41.

Kirk, G. S. 1966. "Studies in Some Technical Aspects of Homeric Style ii. Verse Structure and Sentence Structure in Homer," *YCS* 20, 105–51 (reprinted in: *Homer and the Oral Tradition*, Cambridge 1976, pp. 146–82; references are to this text).

Lord, A. B. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press.

McCawley, J. D. 1981. *Everything that Linguists Have Always Wanted to Know about Logic, but were Afraid to Ask*, Chicago: Univ. of Chigaco Press.

Miller, G. A. 1956. "The Magical Number Seven, Plus or Minus Two," *Psychological Review* 63, 81–97.

Parry, M. 1929. "The Distinctive Character of Enjambement in Homeric Verse," *TAPA* 60, 200–220 (reprinted in A. Parry [ed.], *The Making of Homeric Verse. The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* [Oxford 1971] pp. 251–65).

Peabody, B. 1975. *The Winged Word*, Albany: State Univ. of New York Press.

Ruijgh, C. J. 1971. *Autour de τε épique. Études sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.

—. 1979. Review of Ch. H. Kahn, *The Verb 'Be' in Ancient Greek, Lingua* 48, 43–83.

—. 1988. "La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d' après la loi de Wackernagel," paper read at the Ernst Risch Colloquium in Basle.

Russo, J. A. 1963. "A Closer Look at Homeric Formulas," *TAPA* 94, 235–47.

Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse Markers*, Cambridge: C.U.P.

Visser, E. 1987. *Homerische Versifikationstechnik. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.