

RHETORIC AND REPTITION: THE FIGURA ETYMOLOGICA IN HOMERIC
EPIC

A Dissertation
Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
Of Cornell University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Todd Christopher Clary
August 2009

© 2009 Todd Christopher Clary

RHETORIC AND REPETITION: THE FIGURA ETYMOLOGICA IN HOMERIC
EPIC

Todd Clary, Ph.D.

Cornell University, 2009

The objective of this thesis is to provide the first thorough analysis of the most basic and redundant *figura etymologica*, defined as same-clause repetition of semantically equivalent noun and verb from the same root, in Homer, Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns*. Examples include: ἰδρῶ ἰδρῶν ‘to sweat sweat’, ῥόος ῥέει ‘the stream streams’, and θανάτῳ θνήσκειν ‘to die (by) death’. A core group of semantically and often derivationally identical idioms – ‘give gift’ and ‘live life’ to name but two – have subsisted throughout the history of Indo-European languages from the earliest extant documents to present day. Several observations to be developed in the course of the thesis suggest that Archaic Greek Epic preserves these persistent idioms in their oldest state, and is thus an intrinsically significant place to observe their distributions and idiosyncrasies.

Given that these *figurae etymologicae* occur roughly once every 75 lines in Homeric and Hesiodic hexameters, it ought to be surprising that they have never been the subject of systematic analysis until now. Despite, or perhaps because of its frequency recent studies of poetic etymologizing have offered only curt commentary on the *figura etymologica* en route to more recherché categories of wordplay, while earlier scholars were harshly critical, labeling both Homer and his audiences unsophisticated precisely because they reveled in the figures. In fact, once some fundamental distinctions among the phrases are coordinated with overall distributions in our texts, a very subtle

and sophisticated principle of selection, based on an acute awareness of the constructions' prolixity, emerges.

While there have been numerous studies of etymological figures in languages other than Ancient Greek, linguistic and stylistic methodologies have not as a rule been applied together. In this thesis, however, I have found the synthesis of comparative linguistic and stylistic analyses indispensable in the development of a three-dimensional conception of the figures. The general organization of the thesis is meant to facilitate this synthetic approach, and it is hoped that, at the end, the reader will be as convinced as I am that the epic poets approached each figure with a careful rhetorical strategy.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Todd Christopher Clary received a B.A. in English from the University of California, Santa Barbara in 1999, an M.A. in Classics from the same University in 2002, and a Ph.D. in Classics from Cornell University in 2009. He has been the recipient of numerous research and teaching fellowships at the University of California, Santa Barbara and Cornell University. During his studies at Cornell, he married Krystina Ellen Mize and had two sons: Caleb Russell Clary and Jackson Theodore Clary.

For Krystina, Caleb and Jackson

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I thank the members of my committee, Alan Nussbaum, Hayden Pelliccia, Michael Weiss, and Frederick Ahl, both for their help on this project, and guidance as teachers and scholarly examples throughout my time at Cornell. I would also take this opportunity to thank the Classics Department at Cornell for its ongoing support. Finally, this project would never have been possible without the support of my wife Krystina, to whom I owe the deepest debt of gratitude.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Biographical sketch	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgments	v
Table of contents	vi
Introduction: Terminology and select history of scholarship	1
I.0 The etymological figure	1
I.1 The <i>figura etymologica</i>	2
I.2 Etymologizing	7
I.3 Paronomasia/ <i>adnominatio</i> and wordplay	12
I.4 The internal and cognate accusative	14
I.5 Diachronic analysis of the cognate object debate	15
Chapter 1: General, cross-linguistic characteristics	30
1.1 Alliteration and assonance	30
1.1.1 Mutilation by sound law, preservation and renewal	34
1.2 Tautology and the negative tradition	49
1.2.1 Gradations of tautology and semantic detachment	52
1.2.2 Circularity and the <i>figura etymologica</i> in Plato	54
1.3 Methods of substitution and avoidance	58
1.3.1 Adverbial substitution	60
1.3.2 Periphrasis with nominal or verbal synonyms	61
1.3.3 Periphrasis with generic verbs	65
1.3.4 Formation of figures from periphrastic constructions	68
1.4 Selection of oblique cases to avoid externalization of the internal object	72

Chapter 2: Properties and grammatical categories of the specific case	
Structures	80
2.1 The etymological nominative	80
2.1.1 The etymological nominative and abstract nouns as deities in Homer	83
2.1.2 Meteorological phenomena and the numinous nominative	89
2.1.3 Θεὸς τίθησι	99
2.1.4 Other biologically 'inanimate' and neuter subjects	101
2.1.5 Biologically animate subjects	103
2.2 The etymological accusative	105
2.2.1 Internal etymological accusatives	105
2.2.2 The result accusative or accusative of the effected object	109
2.2.3 The external object accusative	111
2.2.4 The accusative with verbs of motion	112
2.2.5 The accusative of extent of space or time	113
2.2.6 Accusative <i>rei</i>	114
2.3 The etymological genitive	114
2.4 The etymological dative	117
2.4.1 The etymological dative/instrumental	119
2.4.2 The etymological dative/locative	121
2.4.3 The internal dative	122
2.5 The etymological vocative	123
2.6 Mixing bowls and drinking cups: syntactic transformations	124
Chapter 3: The Homeric provenance of etymological figures	128
3.1 The polyvalent stylistic profile of the figures	128

3.2 Contexts of entitlement	128
3.2.1. Military formulae	147
3.2.2 Sacral formulae	175
3.2.3. Legal and political formulae	183
3.3 Scenes and expression of everyday life	193
3.3.1 Tools, craftspeople, household implements, women	199
3.3.2 Herdsmen and farmers	214
3.4 People in the etymological nominative in the <i>Odyssey</i>	216
3.5 Contexts of eating/feasting and drinking	218
3.6. Figures of birth and lineage	220
Chapter 4: Tautological repetitions as components of epic hexameter	224
4.1 The figures as formulas	224
4.1.1 the intervention of a relative between noun and verb as a process of expansion:	247
4.2 The figures as mnemonic devices	254
4.3 Deployment of particular figures in epic hexameter	259
4.3.1 Adonics	260
4.3.2 Figures from the septhemimeral caesura	264
4.3.3 Figures from the trochaic caesura	266
4.3.4 Figures from the penthemimeral caesura	270
4.4 Line initial figures	271
4.5 Line internal figures	274
4.6 Analysis of less frequent, or less localized figures	275
4.7 minimal patterns	285
4.8 Major patterns	288
Chapter 5: Aversion to the perfect tenses and conversion to passive	292

5.1.0 Incidentalism	294
5.1.1 Intersections of verbal roots attesting both EAs and perfect tenses	297
5.2 Conversion to perfect tenses in Archaic Greek Epic	298
5.2.1 Possible conversions to passive within the Homeric schemata	298
5.2.2 Conversion to nominative with intransitive verbs within <i>figurae</i>	303
5.2.3 Conversions outside of the schemata	305
5.2.4 Post-Homeric conversions and the beginning of a transformation	306
5.3.1 The aftermath of a transformation and free occurrence of the perfect with cognate objects	314
5.3.2 The perfect aorist: straining against the constraint	319
5.4 Defining and motivating the incompatibility	321
5.4.1 Adjectives as adverbial modifiers	321
5.4.2 The perfect with adjunctive cases, etymological datives	324
5.4.3 Stativity and the cognate object	328
5.4.4 * <i>uesmḡ-ta ues-</i>	329
Appendices	332
Bibliography	350

Introduction

Terminology and select history of scholarship

I.0 The etymological figure:

In contemporary scholarship an etymological figure may involve the positioning of true or false cognates, be they proper names, nouns, adjectives, adverbs, verbs, or any combination thereof, in general proximity to each other. This study focuses on a limited subset of etymological figures in Archaic Greek Epic for a very specific reason. It concentrates only on the combination of a cognate noun and verb in the same clause because phrases of this sort involve a repetition of sound and sense more basic and blatant than other forms of etymological repetition. Present Day English houses a good number of such etymological figures as commonplace idioms, ‘give a gift’, ‘see a sight’, and ‘sing a song’ being but three out of many possible examples. Observance of colloquial usage of these phrases reveals that in the overwhelming majority of cases the intent of speakers in using them is not to call attention to cognate relationships between nouns and verbs, nor are the phrases themselves perceived to be excessively figurative. All evidence suggests that, in reference to well-established idioms like ἔπος εἶπεῖν or δῶρον διδόναι, this observation is also valid for Ancient Greek. Hence, to call them etymological figures is a bit of a misnomer. Nevertheless, since scholars have most often grouped them with *figurae etymologicae*, that is the label I have chosen to retain. But they have also gone by several other names, and, for purposes of clarity and synthesis, I have found it both necessary and illuminating to sort through overlapping terminology before proceeding to the main thesis. Hence, the following sections present a select history of scholarship and terminology pertaining to this subset of etymological figures in a roughly chronological

format. The goal of these sections, beyond clarification of terminology, is to mark the type of etymological repetition embodied by these basic phrases off from other types of etymologizing and wordplay, while at the same time setting them in a broader context of repetition figures and labels associated with repetition figures.

I.1 The *figura etymologica*:

The more or less strictly defined Latin collocation *figura etymologica* originated in nineteenth century German scholarship as a translation of the phrase σχῆμα ἐτυμολογίας, found in the Homeric commentaries of Eustathius.¹ The more common Eustathian label for the constructions under survey, however, is τρόπος ἐτυμολογικός or τρόπος ἐτυμολογίας, almost invariably coupled with the assertion that this manner of speaking is Ἀττικῶς, and often with further explanation: ἀπο γὰρ τοῦ δώσειν τὸ δῶρον, ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ εἶπειν τὸ ἔπος γίνεταί.² The standard designation for the *figurae etymologicae* in the Homeric Scholia is παρονομασία ἐτυμολογική, or less frequently just παρονομασία.³ More often than not, expressions noticed by Scholiasts as instances of etymological paronomasia and schematizing involve object-verb combinations otherwise quite rare in the Homeric corpus, in contexts featuring other repetition figures.⁴ The Eustathian ‘etymological *tropos*’ or ‘mannerism’, on the other hand, applied to various accusative

¹ At //4.323-4 in reference to αἰχμὰς αἰχμάσσοισι and γέρας γερόντων Eustathius says “εἰς ἐτυμολογίας πίπτει σχῆμα”.

² By calling it Attic he may mean that the τρόπος ἐτυμολογικός is particularly frequent in Attic as opposed to *Koine*, which inscriptional evidence verifies; but it does occur in early inscriptions in other dialects as well.

³ Eustathius also uses this designation. See below page 15.

⁴ For instance at //14.176 and 178 in reference to πλοκάμους ἔπλεξε and ἐάνον ἔσαθ’.

constructions whether they were stock idioms or seldom recurring figures;⁵ it also applied to figures with nouns in cases other than the accusative, and various other modes of repetition.⁶ Hence, the Eustathian distinction between the more specialized σχῆμα ἔτυμολογίας and generally applicable τρόπος ἔτυμολογικός hints at the validity of differentiating various repetition figures in terms of their rhetorical impact, and establishes a starting point for the stylistic analysis of the deployment of etymological *schemata* and *tropoi* in Homeric Epic I present in full in chapters three and four. The etymological figure, or schema applies to a more rare, and therefore more stylistically and rhetorically pronounced set of phrases than the more pedestrian etymological mannerism, or trope.

In nineteenth century studies of *figurae etymologicae* in Greek and Latin respectively, Lobeck (1837) and Landgraf (1881) each included repetition of cognate substantives and verbs within the same clauses without regard to case relationship/function. They also included segments in which one element of the figure was in a relative clause. In other words, they referenced the broader field of the *tropoi etymologici*, rather than the more restricted field of the σχῆμα ἔτυμολογίας. Landgraf also appended sections on adjectival and adverbial cognate phrases, purely verbal figures such as *videre videor*, and even nominal polyptoton.⁷ Thus, he defined the *figura etymologica* with a breadth approaching the contemporary definition of the

⁵ All the schemata mentioned so far, αἰχμὰς αἰχμάσσοισι, πλοκάμους ἔπλεξε, and ἐάνον ἔσαθ' occur only once in Homer, the τρόποι either many times, (ἔπος εἰπεῖν and δῶρον δίδοναι), seldom, (χοῆν χεισθαι), or once (ἱρεύουσ' ἱερήϊον).

⁶ For instance Eustathius so refers to the combination of nominative and cognate verb, αἰδοῦς ἄειδε at *Od.*1.325 and verb + phonetically related adjective at *Od.*1.48: Ὀδυσῆι δαίφρονι δαίεται ἦτορ.

⁷ He gave nominal and pronominal polyptoton further treatment more appropriately in "Substantivische Parataxen."

etymological figure. As a countercurrent to this generalizing trend, several more recent studies have limited the field of the *figura etymologica* to only those cases in which a verb takes as its direct object a noun from the same root. Some have even tried to limit its scope to nominal abstract-cognate verb combinations, despite the nebulous and transitory nature of the category 'abstract'.⁸ But Stech, in his 1967 article "Zur Gestalt der etymologischen Figur in verschiedenen Sprachen" deals mainly with repetition of cognate nouns in different cases (polyptoton), and in some circles even non-etymological phrases qualify as etymological figures:

*La figure étymologie est un procédé syntaxique par lequel on réunit dans une construction d'un type exceptionnel des mots apparentés soit par l' étymologie (vivre sa vie), soit au moins par le sens (dormez votre sommeil).*⁹

In my opinion this definition is too imprecise to be very useful. The combination of non-cognates (*dormez votre sommeil*) at the very least fails to achieve the repetition of sound native to the cognate phrases. Beyond that, even if a non-cognate noun and verb appear to be roughly synonymous, they do not as a rule approach the uniformity of meaning of words from the same root. In sum, phrases of the *dormez votre sommeil* type are not the same as *figurae etymologicae* such as *vivre sa vie*; the non-cognate phrases may be analyzed with the cognate ones in terms of their grammatical internality, but in

⁸ For restriction to the accusative see Gonda (273) "I will apply it (*figura etymologica*) only to those syntactic groups in which special uses of the accusative occur together with a verb deriving from the same root." He also noted there the difficulty of confining the category to *abstracta*, with references to scholars who have made such an attempt. Cf. Wills (243) "although the name *figura etymologica* has been used of numerous types of repetition, it particularly adheres to the combination of a verb and an abstract noun from the same stem."

⁹ Marouzeau (78).

terms of stylistics they do not achieve the same redundancy of sound and sense, and are therefore best treated separately.

In general, I think it is safe to say at this point, given that an etymological figure has been defined as just about any type of repetition of two or more words from the same root, and even an internal accusative with components derived from different roots, that the term needs clarification to be useful. Since traditional scholarship has made it very difficult to be precise, there is good reason to be extremely careful, and to some degree even innovative, in the adaptation of accepted terminology. This approach follows the precedent set by Wills in his 1996 study of repetition figures in Latin.¹⁰ In the course of this study it will be advantageous to mention traditional terms and make reference to past scholars, but there is no pressing need to survey them in full at the outset.¹¹ Even Wills' nice breakdown of the various repetitions examined in his book will not work for our purposes, since all the phrases integral to the present thesis occupy an unnamed subset in one of his categories, polyptoton.¹² He does further distinguish between nominal and verbal polyptoton, but, within verbal polyptoton, includes 1) *figurae etymologicae*, 2) figures that repeat different forms of the same verb, and 3) adverb + verb combinations.¹³ So we need at least to create the subcategory

¹⁰ Cf. Wills (9) "Anyone trying at present to describe a variety of types of repetition must inevitably christen many of them with new names."

¹¹ Surveys of the older literature are readily available in Landgraf, 1881, 5-8 and Raebel, 1 ff. in addition to the more modern references to Huttner, Frédéric and Lausberg given by Wills. For a concise history of the term polyptoton see Belardi. The standard work on nominal polyptoton in Archaic Greek is Gygli-Wyss.

¹² On page 11 Wills provides the following table:

	Identical form	Different form
Within unit	GEMINATION	POLYPTOTON
Across units	PARALLELISM	MODIFICATION

¹³ Ibid, 243-253. To provide examples, under verbal polyptoton Wills discusses not only *pugnam pugnare* but also *capta cepit*, as well as Homeric phrases such as ὀλλύντας τ'

noun-verb polyptoton. Further, within that subcategory it will be necessary to differentiate the various cases of nouns used in the same phrases as etymologically kindred verbs.¹⁴ For this purpose I have found it most convenient to utilize the following set of terms and abbreviations:¹⁵

EN = etymological nominative, e.g. ‘the singer sings’.

EA = etymological accusative, e.g. ‘give a gift’.

ED = etymological dative, e.g. ‘bind with/in bonds’.

EG = etymological genitive, e.g. ‘honor (with a due share) of honor’.

EF = etymological figures formed by nouns in the same phrases as verbs.

Within each case-category I include noun-verb combinations split by relative pronouns, but not those split by coordinating conjunctions. The reason for this is that separation by a relative does not significantly change the syntax of any of the case-units: ‘He gave a gift’ and ‘the gift which he gave’ are nearly interchangeable. Intervention by a coordinating conjunction or further separation of the cognates, on the other hand, lessens the circularity of the figure, in many cases makes the phonetic echo that calls attention to that circularity more distant, and thereby constitutes a different type of repetition. Just to be perfectly clear, no other types of repetition have been systematically integrated into this thesis. We are not dealing here with, for instance, repetition of nouns, as in ‘boys will be boys’, verbal repetition as in ‘it is what it is’, or any

ὄλλυμένων τε ‘slayers and slain’ (*Il.11.83*). Figures such as these concern us only as points of reference.

¹⁴ Fehling collected *Verb mit Akkusativ* (156-8), *Verb mit Dativ oder Genitiv*, *Verb und Subjekt* (158), and *Verb und präpositionale Verbindungen* (159).

¹⁵ This terminology is not entirely without precedent: Gaedicke had separate sections for ‘Der etymologische Accusativ’ (237 ff.) and ‘Der Accusativ des inhalts’ (156 ff.). Delbrück also used the term etymologische Accusativ (168). Further, the following section headings occur in Landgraf: *De ablativo etymologico* (24), and *De nominativo, dativo, locativo etymologico* (33).

other sort of repetitive colloquialism, poetic etymologizing etc. Rather, for the purposes of Archaic Greek Epic our survey primarily deals with *figurae etymologicae* in three cases of the noun: nominative (e.g. κήρυξ κηρύσσει ‘the herald heralds’), accusative (e.g. δῶρον δίδοναι ‘to give a gift’), and dative (e.g. δεσμῶ δεῖν ‘to fetter in a fetter’). The etymological genitive listed above occurs only twice in the Homeric corpus, and is therefore a bit of a false category.

1.2 Etymologizing:

The distinction between an etymology, in which a speaker or writer makes an explicit attempt to illuminate the true derivational history of a word, and an etymological figure, in which two words from the same root repeat for syntactic or stylistic reasons, was not made until quite late. The absence of this distinction resulted in the fact that, although we encounter a plethora of etymological figures in archaic literature, same phrase noun-verb polyptoton was not given a specific label in antiquity. In classical sources, the most frequent type of etymology was the repetition of two or more words linked specifically to call attention to their phonetic and semantic affinities.¹⁶ I cite an example from the *Cratylus* since, in this case, the etymologizing agenda is explicit:

τὰ δ’ “ἄστρα” ἕοικε τῆς ἀστραπῆς
ἐπωνυμίαν ἔχειν. ἢ δὲ “ἀστραπή,” ὅτι τὰ ὦπα ἀνα-
στρέφει, “ἀναστρωπή” ἂν εἴη, νῦν δὲ “ἀστραπή” καλ-
λωπισθεῖσα κέκληται.

¹⁶ Cf. Allen in Sikes, *h.Hom.* ed. 2 (Oxford 1936), Comm. 99 “From Homer, Hesiod, Euripides and Plato down to Zonaras the Greeks had but one principle of derivation, aural similarity of sound.”

The 'stars' seem to get their name from lightning.

But 'lightning', since it causes the eyes to turn upwards, should really be called 'the upturner', yet currently its name is 'lightning' for aesthetic reasons (Pl. *Crat.*409.c).

When Homeric Epic strives for overt etymology to a comparable degree we frequently see the same principles of assonance and semantic affinity at work. For instance, the Cyclops disparages Odysseus by pointing out that his 'name' (Οὐτίς) has affinities with an adjective meaning 'worthless' (οὔτιδανός):

καὶ δὲ κ' ἐμὸν κῆρ
λωφήσειε κακῶν, τά μοι **οὔτιδανός** πόρεν **Οὐτίς**.

And my heart would be
eased of the evils the good for nothing nobody has brought me
(*Od.*9.459-60).

In some passages the presentation of an EF shows the confluence of aural similarity and the pointing out of etymological relationship in much the same way as the passages just above:

σταθμοὶ δ' ἀργύρεοι ἐν χαλκῆφ **ἔστασαν** οὐδῶ,
ἀργύρεον δ' ἐφ' ὑπερθύριον, χρυσῆ δὲ κορώνη
Silver stanchions stood in a bronze threshold

The lintel above was silver and gold the handle (*Od.*7.89-90).

Here the semantic link between σταθμοὶ 'standing places, i.e. stables' and 'stand' is unobvious enough to merit explication, and the use of ἔστησι as a substitute for a simple verb of being suggests willful etymologizing via aural linking.

One cannot overstress, however, that most occurrences of idiomatic, etymological phrases are not instances of etymologizing. Would it not be

misguided to put the above, clearly overt and consciously etymologizing passage from the *Cratylus* on a par with the myriad times Plato wrote ὡς ἔπος εἶπεῖν?¹⁷ If questioned, Plato most likely would have made the etymological connection between ἔπος and εἶπεῖν, but just as a modern English speaker can say ‘give a gift’ without consciously seeking to highlight the cognate derivation of noun and verb, he often used the phrase as a simple idiom, rather than an etymologizing figure.

As we turn specifically now to the hundreds of cases of noun + verb polyptoton in Homer, note first that there has been a tendency to limit the parameters of etymologizing to passages involving proper names:

“In its early beginnings, however, the practice of etymologizing was mostly confined to proper names or comments on their significance, and many such cases are to be found in Homer.”¹⁸

Indeed, studies of Homeric etymologizing generally offer only passing and curt commentary on the EF itself en route to discussion of cases such as Χάρυβδις ἀναρροιβδεῖ in which a proper name repeats the sound of another word.¹⁹ But is it really plausible to make an absolute distinction between ‘etymologizing figures’ and ‘etymological figures’ based on the presence, or absence of a proper name in the phrase? Comments in Eustathius and the Homeric Scholia suggest not. In reference to τέμενος τάμον at //6.194 Eustathius attributes willful etymologizing to the poet: καὶ ὡς ὁ ποιητῆς ἐτυμολογεῖν βούλεται. The Scholia describe the same phrase as an allusion

¹⁷ I count at least 21 instances of this idiom in the *Laws* alone. The *TLG* lists the phrase 74 times in the Platonic corpus, including *dubia*.

¹⁸ Woodhead (7).

¹⁹ See Rank whose 147 page study deals primarily with names in Homer, and from which this example is drawn. Hecht, who focused on those etymologies he regarded as obvious, also speaks mostly of proper names. Recently, Tsitsibakou-Vasolos (2007) has focused on Pelopid etymologies in the *Iliad*.

to the etymology of τέμενος, ‘παρετυμολογεῖ,’ the active verb implying at least some intentionality on the part of the poet.²⁰ Also, several clearly conscious Homeric kennings coincide with the EA ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσι, a suggestive confluence of name and word etymologies:

Ἄστυάναξ, ὃν Τρῶες ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν·

οἷος γάρ σφιν ἔρυσσος πύλας καὶ τεῖχεα μακρά

Astyanax, whom the Trojans named that name

For he alone protected their gates and long walls (*Il.*22.506-7).

In general, schematizing and fashioning of *figurae* imply an active choice on the part of the artisan. But one must first separate oft-recurring commonplaces of poetic diction from non-recurring coinages or hapax *figurae etymologicae*.²¹ The former did not involve a conscious choice to ‘etymologize’ in the conventional language of epic. The substantive in these phrases generally supports an adjectival attribute, and thus performs a genuine syntactic service. The unidiomatic figures, on the other hand, especially those with denominative verbs attaching no attribute, are suggestive of a greater level of conscious fashioning than the stock idioms. Whether or not the

²⁰ For the definition of παρετυμολογεῖ as ‘allusion to the etymology of a word’ see LSJ sv. The Scholia here reads: ὅτι παρετυμολογεῖτὸ τέμενος ἀπὸ τοῦ τεμεῖν. See also Fehling (156).

²¹ It is also important to consider audience reaction. The most common combinations were most likely drawn from everyday speech, and probably attracted little, if any overt attention from listeners. I might add here a bit of a disclaimer: we have little choice but to take the surviving fragments of Archaic Greek Epic as a representative sampling. When I say ‘hapax’ I mean once-recurring in the extant corpus; status as an ‘oft-recurring commonplace’ pertains especially to figures such as δῶρον δίδοναι, ἔπος εἰπεῖν, and εἴματα ἔννυσθαι which occur over 30 times each just in Homer. While we ultimately cannot know that a given figure is ‘hapax’ or ‘commonplace’ in terms of the tens of thousands of lost hexameters, it is probable that the general opposition of coinage and commonplace would simply be further validated by exhumation of more texts. In other words, we might find another instance of a figure that appears to be a hapax now, but in so doing it is most likely that we would also find 10 more cases of δῶρον δίδοναι. The fragments of the *Cypria*, for instance, yield only εἴματα ἔννυσθαι (χ2: 4.1 and 7) and ἔθεντο θεαῖ (5.3).

generation of these repetitions represented a decision to etymologize in any contemporary sense is open to question. It does seem best, however, to set such phrases as πόλεμον πολεμίζειν (x2 in Homer) and τεῖχος τειχίζειν (once in Homer, once in the Hesiodic fragments) at least on a par with the likes of Χάρυβδις ἀναρροιβδεῖ and Ἄρπυιαι ἀνηρέψαντο in terms of conscious duplication of sound and sense. The fact that the former have not been traditionally included in studies of Homeric etymologizing, while the latter appear in all such studies has created a distinction that is arbitrary in some regards. One should note, since names per se lack semantics, or at least have optional semantic affiliations, that the name etymologies function to attribute definite semantics to them, and are in that sense explanatory and aetiological. The EF, on the other hand, in many cases serves to explain nothing. However, once the semantics of a name have been established by linkage to a verb, the etymologizing figure bears an extremely close resemblance to an etymological figure. Certain cases of the etymological nominative highlight this resemblance. For instance, the abstract noun 'blindness' in Ἄτη ἀᾶται becomes a name by virtue of personification and is therefore routinely included in studies on etymologizing. More pedestrian nominative phrases, on the other hand, such as πτωχὸς πτωχεύει or ὁδμὴ ὄζει, make scant appearance in such studies. For the most part I will not treat that aspect of Homeric study that goes under the name of 'etymologizing.' The reason for this is not to draw fast distinctions where lines of difference are blurry at best, but to focus on the neglected field: although the name 'etymologies' comprise a far smaller group they have received considerably more attention.²²

²² Not to say that the examination of them is exhausted. Interesting studies such as those of Lowenstam, Loudon and Tsitsibakou-Vasolos are still surfacing and still may surface. Wordplays involving proper names in Latin have also received a great deal of attention

I.3 Paronomasia/*adnominatio* and wordplay:

Paronomasia and its Latin translation *adnominatio* often function in scholarship as designations of polyptoton and the *figura etymologica*.²³ Schwyzer included under *partielle Iteration (Paronomasie)* the title of the Byzantine kings, βασιλεὺς βασιλέων βασιλεύων βασιλεῦσι ‘ruler of rulers ruling among rulers’, nominal and verbal polyptoton, the EA and ED.²⁴ As noted at the outset, the most common label for the EA in the Homeric Scholia is παρονομασία ἐτυμολογική. Hence, the scholiastic tradition implies that the EA is a subset of paronomasia, but that there are also instances of non-etymological paronomasia. Quintilian’s definition of *adnominatio* focused on the repetition of similar and in some cases contrastive sounds without necessitating an etymological, or even a semantic correlation.²⁵

*Tertium est genus figurarum quod aut similitudine aliqua vocum aut paribus aut contrariis convertit in se aures et animos excitat. Hinc est παρονομασία, quae dicitur adnominatio. (Inst.9.3.66).*²⁶

His examples include basic word repetition, *homo hostis, homo* (67), and nominal polyptoton, *omnium rerum...in omnibus rebus* (66), but also punning cases of *figurae non-etymologicae*, such as *amari iucundum est, si curetur ne quid insit amari* ‘It is good to be loved, if one takes care that there is no

starting with McCartney and not necessarily ending with O’Hara. Interestingly, even those who categorize various forms of the EF as ‘etymologizing’ still pass over it briefly en route to analysis of name etymologies, e.g. Tsitsibakou-Vasolos (35-36).

²³ Gonda (1959) treats the EA under *figura etymologica*, but the EN, ED and etymological instrumental under paronomasia. Reckendorf’s lists of paronomasia in Semitic languages include substantial sections on the EF in several cases of the noun, especially the EN (85-91), and EA (100 ff.). Raebel’s *De usu adnominatiois apud Romanorum poetas comicos* is peppered with etymological figures (27 ff.).

²⁴ (700).

²⁵ This is why the *O.L.D.* defines *adnominatio* as pun.

²⁶ “There is a third class of figures which appeals to the ear and arouses attention by some resemblance, equality, or contrast of sound. To this class belongs Paronomasia, which we call *adnominatio*” Text and translation by D.A. Russell, Loeb edition, Cambridge, MA, 2001.

bitterness in it' (70). The author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *adnominatio* as homonymous puns: *quos homines alea vincit, eos ferro statim vincit* 'men whom the die conquers, it binds at once with iron' (2.29); while Cicero points to cases in which the alteration of a letter results in wordplay, *dilegere oportet, quem velis diligere* 'one should choose whom you want to love' (ibid) and, citing Cato, *nobiliorem mobiliorem* (*de Orat.*2.63).

In his encyclopedic handbook on literary rhetoric Lausberg followed principles similar to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Cicero's:

The *annominatio* "paronomasia" is a (pseudo-) etymological play on the slightness of the phonetic echo on the one hand and the interesting range of meaning of the change on the other. The range of meaning can in such cases be raised to the level of paradox. The author expects the audience to see the etymology thus created between the two words to be their own (285).

Examination of this definition illuminates some important differences between paronomastic and etymological schemata. First, the EF is inherently tautological, and cannot involve any contrast, much less paradox, without overt negation of one of its elements. Such negation does not occur in Homer with any of the figures involving nominal abstracts, but ἀναίτιον αἰτιάσθαι, 'to blame the blameless man' (*Il.*13.775), serves to illustrate the point. Second, paronomastic figures assume audience perception of authorial intention, while we have seen that such an assumption regarding the EF can be dangerous. The EF at times involves a certain playfulness with words, but, even though nonce coinages like *dentes dentiant* 'teething teeth' (*Plaut.Mil.*34) consistently rank among *ludi verborum*, it does not necessarily involve 'wordplay', and in Homer it never results in any sort of pun. In the end, the various applications

of ‘paronomasia’ make it a hazardous term to use, but we might restrict its sense to refer to the few times in Homer where the EF is extended by attachment of an additional cognate: βουληφόρος...βουλὰς βουλεύει ‘the councilor...counsels councils’ (//.10.414-15, cf. 24.651-2). In this vein, it is interesting to take a closer look at Eustathius’ use of παρονμασία already mentioned on page one. Notice that he uses the term in direct reference to ἀγορὰς ἀγόρευον at //.2.788, but that the subjects of ἀγόρευον here are further qualified as ὀμηγερέες:²⁷

τὸ δὲ, ἀγορὰς ἀγόρευον, Ἄττικόν ἐστίν, ὡς καὶ τὸ βουλήν
βουλεύει καὶ λόγον λέγει καὶ ὅλως τὸ παρατιθέναι τοῖς ῥήμασι τὰ
ἐξ αὐτῶν ὀνόματα· καλεῖται δὲ τὸ σχῆμα παρονμασία.

In sum, ὀμηγερέες ἀγορὰς ἀγόρευον constitutes what I will call paronomastic amplification.

I.4 The internal and cognate accusative:

The internal accusative is a grammatical category in which a noun functions as the object of a verb with identical or at least very similar meaning. In such cases the action of the verb in essence creates the noun, which only exists as long as the verbal action continues.²⁸ This grammatical category has traditionally been treated as derived from and essentially identical to the *figura etymologica*/EA.²⁹ However, if there ever was a derivational direction from the EA to the internal accusative or vice versa this direction is impossible to determine: all the earliest Indo-European sources of significant volume attest both abundantly. Importantly, the EA is not necessarily a grammatical

²⁷ The whole phrase reads οἱ δ’ ἀγορὰς ἀγόρευον ἐπὶ Πριάμοιο θύρῃσι/ πάντες ὀμηγερέες ἡμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες.

²⁸ This is the standard definition given in the grammars. See Schwyzer-Delbrück (168), Leumann-Hoffmann-Szantyr (44), Krahe (62-3) and Mastronarde (122-3) et al.

²⁹ Ibid + Brugmann (1900:263, 1911:620 ff.).

category; rather the etymological relation between substantive and verb is paramount, and the repetition of sound and sense stylistically primal:

*Man behandelt die Inhaltsaccusative gewöhnlich zusammen mit den etymologischen Accusativen und gewinnt so ein bequemes Princip für ihre logische Anordnung. Aber historisch sind beide von einander zu trennen.*³⁰

In fact there are a good number of EAs in which the object is an effected, ongoing result of the verbal action, or simply external, and in the *Rig Veda* the ‘*etymologischen Objectsaccusative*’ is more frequent than the ‘*etymologischen Inhaltsaccusative*’.³¹ Objects in etymological phrases in Homer fall into various grammatical categories and will be treated on a case by case scenario.

Cognate accusative is a virtual synonym for internal accusative, perhaps, but not necessarily, with special reference to the etymological relationship between the substantive and verb. For example, under εἶπον in the LSJ we find the following comment: “c. acc. cogn. ἔπος, μῦθον, θεοπρόπιον, οὐνοματᾶ, etc.” Similarly, Cunliffe under εἶρομαι writes: “with cognate acc.: ἔπος ἄλλο ἐρέσθαι.”³² As a conflation of the EA and internal accusative the term lacks the specificity required for our purposes.

1.5. Diachronic analysis of the cognate object debate:

The term ‘cognate object’ has come to represent a narrow group of internal and etymological accusatives in English and various other languages, notably Latin, which are at the center of an ongoing debate in post-

³⁰ Gaedicke (157)

³¹ Ibid.

³² Cf. Smyth (1563-1568) who lists two types of cognate accusatives: 1) The substantive in the accusative is of the *same origin* as the verb 2) The substantive in the accusative is of *kindred meaning* as the verb.

Chomskyan linguistics popular enough to merit its own website.³³ The debate involves various attempts to fit sentences in which an otherwise intransitive verb may take a cognate, and only a cognate object (CO), into the principles of government and binding Chomsky set forth in 1981.³⁴ Basically, the CO presents an exception to his suggestion that intransitive verbs cannot have an argument with a θ -role.³⁵ In the first article-length treatment of the CO and the Chomskyan case-filter Jones distinguished a core group of ‘true cognate objects’ from other phrases “which resemble cognate object constructions, but which allow a wider range of direct complements” (89). He focused on three idioms as exemplifying the true cognate object construction:

- 1) die a gruesome death.
- 2) live an uneventful life.
- 3) sigh a weary sigh.³⁶

He contrasted these with similar phrases that take other complements: ‘dance a dance’, but also ‘dance a jig’, ‘dream a dream’, but also ‘dream a most peculiar thing’. Another distinguishing characteristic of the true cognate object is resistance to passivization:

* A painful death was died by John.

³³ See Csur  (1998).

³⁴ See 170-71 where Chomsky implies, mainly by omission, that only transitive verbs are capable of assigning objective case. He does make passing reference to CO constructions elsewhere: “Intransitive verbs generally assign no case, except under restricted conditions as in “he dreamt a dream” (1986, 74). This does not solve any questions within the CO debate, since, as we are about to see ‘dream a dream’ is not one of the ‘true COs’.

³⁵ For an overview of θ -criterion and the case filter see Chomsky (1981, esp. 34 ff.). Cf. Larjavaara, who sees the internal object category in French as a mostly empty distinction that “seems to have no other use than to justify the presence of an object with some verbs which most often do not have one”. This quote is actually from his English paraphrase of “*  Quoi Sert L’Objet Interne*” on Csur  (6).

³⁶ Ibid. These are also Zubizarreta’s examples. Others have used different idioms, Massam, for instance used ‘smile a smile’ (161), Moltmann used ‘scream a scream’, but both used ‘die a death’, the example par excellence within the discussion.

* A terrifying scream was screamed by John.³⁷

Further, Moltmann argues that “the predicative status of cognate objects might also be related to the impossibility of topicalization,” a characteristic they share with certain adverbials:³⁸

*A painful death, John died it.

*A shrill scream, John screamed it.

Cf. **slowly, John ate the cake.

The scholars involved in the cognate object debate also commonly take up the question of whether or not the CO can move away from the verb by the transformational process called WH-Movement. This involves forming a question or exclamation with interrogative or relative pronouns. Jones noticed that, while certain idioms of similar semantic content cannot undergo WH-Movement the CO can:

John kicked the bucket.

*What sort of bucket did John kick?

But:

What sort of a death did John die?

What a (gruesome) death John died! (92).

Massam, on the other hand, who argued that the constructions of the CO do in fact form thematic objects, remarks that they cannot be questioned as follows:

*What did he die? (164).

³⁷ These are Moltmann’s examples (301). The impossibility of Jones’ example, **An uneventful life was lived by Harry* is questionable. It is at least not valid cross-linguistically: Latin attests *vita vivitur* (Cypr.2. p. 578.21) and *aetas vivitur* (Ov.M.12.188); in Ennius we find the verb used impersonally, *praeter propter vitam vivitur* (Scen.259), which may have had something to do with authorizing the passive.

³⁸ Ibid.

At present there are two solutions to the CO debate. The first is to regard the noun phrase as an adjunct predicate/adverbial complement, and thereby alleviate the necessity of the cognate 'object' receiving a θ -role from its governing verb.³⁹ The second is to admit that the CO may take a patient θ -role and therefore function as a thematic object.⁴⁰ These two options involve fundamentally different notions of governance within the syntax of the phrase. The adverbial solution envisions modification of the verb by a noun phrase that, in essence, houses no argument, and thus creates a pseudo-object; reception of a patient θ -role, on the other hand, asserts for cognate objects the same rule of governance of object by verb as other argument housing noun phrases.

If we try to apply elements of the modern CO debate to the Homeric figures we find that very few of the accusative structures present 'true' cognate objects in the restricted sense. In fact, the expressions in Homer that most resemble the true CO constructions tend to feature the noun in the 'internal' dative: θανάτῳ θνήσκειν and ὀλέθρῳ ὀλλέσθαι 'die by a death'.⁴¹ The appearance of the dative in these phrases runs counter to Jones' argument that languages requiring a morphological expression of case select the accusative by default because of its semantic emptiness:

Although the choice of Accusative in (29) can be reconciled with the Inherent Case approach, the Caseless NP approach offers a more straightforward explanation. If the cognate objects in (29) remain caseless within the syntax but acquire a default-morphological Case-feature in PF, the

³⁹ Jones, Moltmann, Zubizarreta, Humphries et al. This is in fact a bit of a *communis opinio*.

⁴⁰ Massam.

⁴¹ For the designation of this category as 'internal' see Fehling, 158.

choice of a neutral Case form such as Accusative is precisely what we would expect (104).⁴²

This conception of default selection of the accusative fits into his argument that the CO noun phrase in English has no case according to a ‘Revised Case-Filter’:

Instead of trying to devise means of assigning Case to cognate objects and other adjunct NPs which never show overt Case morphology, we modify case theory so that such NPs are not required to be Case-marked (97-8).⁴³

As we have seen, Jones opposed this solution to the claim that “the Case-feature of cognate objects and adverbial NPs is inherent rather than structurally assigned” (95). Later, he presents the selection of accusative in overt case languages as a bit of a problem for adoption of an inherent case approach toward cognate objects:

The problem is that the Accusative Case in these languages does not appear to have any identifiable semantic function. To put it another way, if overt Case languages typically used one of the more ‘marked’ Cases (e.g. Genitive, Ablative, Dative etc.) to mark the cognate object, this would be strong evidence in favor of the Inherent Case approach (103-4).

⁴² NP = noun phrase, PF = phonetic form. The set of figures referred to in (29) are:

Arabic (a) Yajatahidu zijtihaada zaltamittiina
 he-studies studying [ACC] the ambitious [GEN]
 ‘He studies in an ambitious way’

German (b) Johann starb einen milden Tod.
 Johann died a peaceful death [ACC]

Latin (c) Faciam ut mei memineras dum vitam vivas
 I-will-make that me you-remember as long as life you-live
 ‘I will make you remember me as long as you live your life’

⁴³ He illustrates the Revised Case-filter (RCF) as follows: *NP [α θ -role, - α case] with α being “a variable over plus and minus values (the presence/absence of a Case-feature or θ -role) where NP has phonetic content.

This reasoning leads to the conclusion that the Homeric internal datives θανάτῳ (+ attribute) θνήσκειν, ὀλέθρῳ (+attribute) ὀλλέσθαι and for that matter πληγῇ (+attribute) πλήσσειν ‘strike a blow’ provide evidence for the Inherent Case Approach to the CO. In these phrases the noun is still internal and, given the prevalence of the internal accusative as a means of attaching an attribute, may still form in some sense “*nach Art des inneren Objekts.*”⁴⁴

However, if we are going to view these internal datives as alternatives to the internal accusative, we must then ask what motivates the selection of the dative. Why not simply render them in the accusative? It is difficult to account for the selection of the dative over the far more common accusative without postulating that in this isolated group the noun was perceived as somehow less of an object and more as an expression of manner. The English data examined by Massam and Jones supports this interpretation. Remember the differences in the admissibility of WH-movement:

What sort of death did John die?

but not

*What did he die?

The first, permissible question inquires as to the manner of death and is tantamount to asking

How did he die?

Viewed in this light it is better to construe the datives in the Homeric expressions as datives of manner or attendant circumstance, as classical grammarians have long recognized:

⁴⁴ Fehling (158).

Manner may be expressed by the adjective, as βιαίῳ θανάτῳ ἀποθνήσκειν *to die (by) a violent death* X.Hi.4.3 (= βίῳ).⁴⁵

Clearly the noun phrases in such expressions are quite closely related to manner adverbs, so that interpreting the grammar in this way may favor the argument that the CO functions primarily as an adjunct predicate participating, like other adverbial noun phrases, in modification of the verb.⁴⁶ Selection of case depends on the properties of the Greek dative and the semantic characteristics of the verb θνήσκειν.

Ancient Greek is not the only language that selects an oblique case within the field of the true cognate object. Biblical Latin shows an alternation between *mortem* and *morte mori*, but classical and post-classical Roman authors consistently select the internal ablative in the ‘die by a death’ expression, e.g. *ne simplici quidem morte moriebantur* (Sall.H.1.43.1).⁴⁷ This suggests replacement by *quo* rather than *quod*. The etymological idiom does not offer an opportunity to witness this motion, but in a semantic equivalent we find:

Quo leto censes me ut peream potissimum? (Plaut.Merc.483).

Uralic languages show a similar pattern of case selection. In his article on the *figura etymologica* in the Uralic family Fokos discussed the idioms ‘live (+ adjective) life’ and ‘die by (+ adjective) death’: Hungarian *életet élni* ‘*vitam vivere*’ and *halállal halni* ‘*morte mori*’.⁴⁸ He asserts that the expressions in the accusative, *életet élni* among them, formed independently within the Uralic

⁴⁵ Smyth (1527a).

⁴⁶ One of Jones’ examples of an Adjunct-predicate noun phrase is ‘this morning’ in ‘John arrived this morning’. He lists more examples on page 95.

⁴⁷ Cf. *moretur prius acerbissima morte* (Cic.Rab.Perd15.4), *mori sua morte* (Sen.Ep.69.6), *repentina morte perit* (Cic.Clu.174.1), *foeda morte perit* (Liv.42.28.11), *Magni morte perit* (Luc.10.519). For citations from biblical Latin see Müller, 31.

⁴⁸ 70-71. He quotes *morte morieris* from the Vulgate (Gen.2.17).

family.⁴⁹ He sees *halállal halni*, where the noun is in the instrumental, on the other hand, as a borrowing from Latin biblical language and quotes other ‘borrowings’ in different contexts. For instance he traces the Russian phrases, *smertiyu umrete, smertiyu da umret* ‘you will die by death, may you die by death’ back to θανάτῳ ἀποθνεῖσθε.⁵⁰ Whether or not the rendering of ‘die a death’ in oblique cases in these languages occurred under Greek and Latin influence, the logic of the construction, specifically the circumstances that lead ‘die death’ to be questioned as ‘how did he die’ but not ‘what did he die’ should not be dismissed out of hand as another influential factor. These idioms imply a natural mechanism in several overt case languages to render ‘die death’ with a noun in the ablative, dative or instrumental to express the manner or means of death.

Next, consistent selection of the accusative in the Greek and Latin expressions βίον ζῶειν and *vitam vivere* also finds corroboration in other languages. This necessitates making distinctions within the group of true cognate objects even in the restricted sense. The different aspectual, or actional characteristics of the verbs ‘live’ and ‘die’ cannot be ruled out as a determining factor in the selection of the case of the cognate noun.⁵¹ The verb ‘live’ has an inherently atelic nucleus, the verb ‘die’ an inherently telic one, requiring additional inflection to express duration. Differences in possible lines of questioning illustrate this:

⁴⁹ *Trotzdem kann natürlich von fremden Ursprung dieser Form der etym. Figur in den fiugr. Sprachen keine Rede sein; sie ist bei den verschiedensten Völkern naturgemässe Folge einer selbstverständlich Denk- und Anschauungsweise, und auch in anderen ural-altaischen Sprachen gebräuchlich* (71).

⁵⁰ 72; Cf. *Matth.* 15.4.

⁵¹ Actionality, as distinct from aspect, references inherent, rather than morphologically determined semantic characteristics of a verb’s relationship to categories such as ingressive, progressive/durative, egressive, telic and atelic. For a complete discussion of the conceptual history of the term with plenty of bibliography, see Napoli (32 ff.).

How long did he live?

*How long did he die?

How long was he dying for?

But one may also ask:

How did he live?

Divisions along actional and aspectual lines may, however, provide further evidence for setting the CO together with other adjunct-predicate noun phrases. Note that actional characteristics of verbs dictate admissibility and inadmissibility as follows:

Jill stayed several hours on the beach.⁵²

*Jill arrived several hours on the beach.

Further, application of a theory of aspectual governance of case selection may help to explain the following alternation in Sophocles *Elektra* between accusative with the present and dative with the aorist:

ζῶ βίον μοχθηρόν

‘I am living a wretched life’ (599)

μ’ αἰεὶ ζῶσαν ἀβλαβεῖ βίῳ

‘that I, always having lived by an unharmed life.’ (650).⁵³

The selective process illustrated here between present/progressive with the case that expressed duration and punctual aorist with the case that expressed point in time suggests a similarity with θανάτῳ θνήσκειν that surfaces under certain conditions. Cognate noun phrases driven by transitive verbs, such as

⁵² Another of Jones’ examples (95).

⁵³ At *Tr.* 168 we find the dative with the present infinitive: τὸ λοιπὸν ἤδη ζῆν ἀλυπτήτῳ βίῳ ‘for the future only then to live by a painless life.’ While the presence of ἤδη might confuse the issue somewhat this does seem to involve a use of the dative in a durative sense. Dobree deleted lines 166-8. The adjective ἀβλαβής is more common with an active sense. However, both the LSJ (sv) and Kells (135) argue for its passive use here.

δῶρον δίδοναι do not show this type of tense-sensitive alternation. Outside of the Cyclops episode the Homeric figures ‘live life’ and ‘die death’, though not numerous, violate neither the actional properties of the two verbs, nor the aspectual properties of the present and aorist:

ζῶεις δ’ ἀγαθὸν βίον ‘you are living a good life’ (*Od.*15.491).

ὣς **θάνων** οἰκτίστῳ **θανάτῳ** ‘so I died by a most pitiful death’ (*Od.*11.412).

ἦέ τις **ῶλετ’ ὀλέθρῳ** ἀδευκέι ἦς ἐπὶ νηὸς

Or did anyone die by a bitter death on their ship (*Od.*4.489).⁵⁴

In so far as we can draw conclusions from a small number of passages the selection of case here appears to be quite logical. This makes particularly aberrant the coincidence of accusative and aorist in the apodosis of a past contrafactual condition in *Odyssey* 9:

αὐτοῦ γάρ κε καὶ ἄμμες **ἀπωλόμεθ’** αἰπὺν **ὄλεθρον**

For right there we would have died a precipitous death (*Od.*9.303).⁵⁵

The two instances of φιλότητα/ι φιλεῖν in archaic epic, one in the accusative with the present, the other in the dative with the aorist, might be motivated by the same selection process as the ‘live life’ expressions in Sophocles.

ὄν περὶ κῆρι **φίλει** Ζεὺς τ’ αἰγίοχος καὶ Ἀπόλλων

παντοίην **φιλότητ’**. (*Od.*15.245-6).

Whom Aegis-bearing Zeus and Apollo love in their hearts

(with) every sort of love (*Od.*15.245-6).

Οὕτω Μαιάδος υἱὸν ἄναξ **ἐφίλησεν** Ἀπόλλων

⁵⁴ For more attestations of this expression in the dative with the aorist see below (24).

⁵⁵ All bets are off when ἀπόλλεσθαι moves from cognate to merely ‘internal’ expression where we find it construed with numerous accusatives. These other expressions might also have helped license the accusative in 9.303.

παντοίη φιλότητι,

So lord Apollo loved the son of Maia with every sort of love

(*h.Hom.4.573-5*).

The fact that ‘love every sort of love’ admits this alteration between accusative and internal dative along the lines of verbal aspect, while a host of other internal accusatives never feature the noun in the dative with the aorist, suggests that as an ‘object’ love was viewed more as an adjunct and less as an argument. Admittedly, the evidence is slight for this particular expression, but if we had the opposite alignment of case and tense, that is accusative with the aorist and dative with the present, we would have absolutely no recourse to explanation along the general lines of the argument.⁵⁶

In general, the predominance of the accusative in ‘live life’ and dative/ablative/instrumental in ‘die death’ expressions, not only in Greek, but in Latin, Uralic and Russian, underlines the need for an even more fine-grained semantic analysis of CO constructions beyond the distinction made in the debate between ‘true’ cognate objects and simply cognate objects. Even intransitive verbs that appear complementary, like ‘live’ and ‘die’ show different behavior in the ways they generate the CO. By now I hope to have shown that a historical examination of etymological constructions in overt case languages like Greek and Latin can help to deepen analysis of the cognate object in contemporary linguistics. In Greek both the accusative and dative expressions may omit the noun and leave the adjective on its own to function ‘adverbially’. Hence, attestations of the internal ablative/dative of manner suggest possible problems for Jones’ revised case filter, and favor the inherent case approach.

⁵⁶ It is possible that other factors motivate the alternation as well. For instance, the internal accusative may characterize the subjective experience of the lover, while the dative moves the experience out from the lover to the beloved.

This proves more problematic for arguments that the CO is an adjunct predicate and less problematic for Massam's argument that the CO acquiesces to verbal government via a patient theta role.

Another mode of examination may provide additional evidence. In Modern Greek the ED θανάτω (+ attribute) θνήσκειν is unidiomatic. Natural idiom favors either simple adverbial expression, πέθανε ειρηνικά 'died peacefully', or generic-verb periphrasis, είχε έναν ειρηνικό θάνατο 'had a peaceful death'.⁵⁷ Alternation with adverbials suggests that the CO functions as an adjunct predicate, but periphrasis is more difficult to fit into this adjunctive scenario. The phrases 'die a peaceful death', 'die peacefully' and 'have a peaceful death' are virtually interchangeable semantically, but if we try to make them interchangeable grammatically and syntactically we run into problems and must divide them as follows:

die a peaceful death = die peacefully

die a peaceful death = have a peaceful death

have a peaceful death ≠ *have peacefully.

The etymological phrase separates in two different ways, one highlighting modification of the verb by the attribute/adverbial adjunct, the other the governance of the noun by the verb. This is no mean point; CO constructions consistently show both types of alternation in every Indo-European language attesting them with any frequency. If the CO construction generates alternates showing motion in both directions we are left with the following hypothesis:

CO NP > verb

extractable as both:

⁵⁷ I owe this and all subsequent observations regarding Modern Greek to my friend and colleague, Yiannis Ziogas.

Adverb/adjunct pred. cognate verb

CO NP > periphrastic verb.

Given their tautology the dynamic within the phrases might be better represented, metaphorically speaking, in circular terms. This may seem a bit like an anti-conclusion, since it encompasses both sides of the debate, but it accounts for more of the facts. Further, it applies to many CO phrases in the restricted sense as far as the properties of each construction allow substitution by verbs of similar semantic content or generic-verb periphrasis:

sigh a deep > sigh > sigh > deeply / heave > a deep sigh, give > a deep sigh

live > a good life > live > well / have > a good life.

This theory of parallel/circular motion within the noun phrase also applies to the EA in the less restricted sense, the expressions that take a wider range of complements:

dream > a long dream > dream > for a long time / have > a long dream

The syntax of particular constructions, however, may make them resistant to such a breakdown. Within the group of internal datives, for instance, periphrasis cannot take place without moving the dative of manner into the accusative. Hence, we would need to add another step in the process:

died > by a peaceful death > died > peacefully (Mdrn. Grk. πέθανε ειρηνικά).

>> had > a peaceful death (Mdrn. Grk. είχε έναν ειρηνικό θάνατο)

Specifically applying a bit of Homeric data, it seems that the restriction on usage of the EA and internal ED with the perfect and pluperfect tenses further isolates the constructions both from full-fledged thematic objects and

neuter adjectives/adverbials.⁵⁸ This supports the hypothesis that they represent a distinct category with properties of both adverbials and thematic arguments, and makes Massam's conclusion that the CO receives a patient theta role from the verb a bit more attractive, not in so far as it portrays one type of motion, verb to noun, within the phrase, but because it at least acknowledges that we need to create a separate (sub)category to fit the CO into existing syntactic/grammatical frameworks.

The propensity to replace the EF with generic-verb periphrasis, often motivated by stylistic concerns,⁵⁸ sometimes results in transformation of intransitive verbs to transitive. Biese traced the evolution of the Latin verb *turbare* from transitive to intransitive by way of its use with the internal object. He outlined the following sequence in Plautus:

- 1) Intransitive: *visam ne nocte hac quipiam turbaverint* (*Capt.*127).
- 2) Transitive within the EF: *quantas turbas turbet* (*Bacch.*1076).
- 3) Use with (internal) pronouns: *quae filius turbavit* (*Bacch.*1091).
- 4) Attachment of external object with the pronoun: *quantas res turbo* (*Mil.*813).
- 5) One attestation with a personal pronoun: *me una turbat res* (*Ep.*312).⁵⁹

As far as processes of transitivization apply to a given CO construction, movement of the verb to an external, non-cognate object would involve at some level the perception of the substantive as a thematic argument. In the final analysis, the selection of the accusative in the majority of constructions is

⁵⁸ I discuss this point in more detail in Chapter 5.

⁵⁹ For more examples and further argumentation as to the progression within these and other phrases exhibiting intransitive > transitive movement of other verbs via the EA see Biese (13-17).

most likely due to the properties of that case as the direct object, not a result of its semantic emptiness. Selection of the dative or ablative in phrases where WH-movement requires a *quo* rather than a *quod* entails that the constructions followed a genuine rationale, and that there was, in the beginning, no default case. Later, in part merely because of the superior numbers of phrases that selected the accusative, it became the dominant case and began to impose itself on constructions that would have been more naturally rendered by an oblique case. In fact, we see glimpses of this process in the Homeric textual tradition: at *Od.*3.87 and 15.268 the scholiast would change the datives in ἀπώλετο λυγρῶ ὀλέθρῳ and ἀπέφθιτο λυγρῶ ὀλέθρῳ to λυγρὸν ὀλέθρον on the grounds that the accusative expressions are ‘more graceful’, αἱ χαριέστεραι.⁶⁰

⁶⁰ Some editors follow the scholiast’s advice despite the fact that there is more manuscript evidence for the dative. For instance, Allen prints λυγρὸν ὀλέθρον at *Od.*3.87 but λυγρῶ ὀλέθρῳ at 15.268.

Chapter 1

General, cross-linguistic characteristics

1.1 Alliteration and assonance:

In the older literature the coincidence of similar sounds was the defining characteristic of etymological figures. Thus, it comes as no surprise that the first term we run across in the scholarly tradition referring with any precision to the EF is παρόμοιον ‘employing assonance’ in Aelius Donatus (4th cent. CE).⁶¹ Later scholars did not lose sight of the importance of the phonetic echo. Landgraf, for instance, regarded the EF as a sub-category of alliteration:

Figuram etymologicam speciem quandam multiplicis et varii generis Alliterationis esse supra docuimus (5).

In many cases we see persistent repetition of one or two letters both within and surrounding the figure (alliteration):

τῶ τέκνα τέκη φιλότητι μιγείσα (*Od.*19.266).⁶²

κλισμῶ κεκλιμένη, λέππ’ ἠλάκατα στρωφῶσα (*Od.*17.97).

μείλιχα δῶρα δίδωσιν, ἐφ’ ἱμερτῶ δὲ προσώπῳ (*h.Hom.*10.2)

āvocāma kavāye médhyāya vāco vandāru vṛṣabhāya vṛṣṇe

(*RV.*5.1.12).⁶³

illa militia militatur multo magi’ quam (Plaut.*Per.*232)

Ballionem exballistabo (Plaut.*Pseud.*585).

I include this last example, obviously an *ad hoc* pseudo-etymological figure, to highlight the power of alliteration to generate such phrases. Neither *exballistare*, nor a simplex *ballistare*, are elsewhere attested. This underlines

⁶¹ *Art. Gramm.* 3.5.2. The designation of assonance as παρομοίωσις dates back to Aristotle *Rh.*1410a.

⁶² Cf. Watkins (33) who calls this a “striking phonetic echo”.

⁶³ “We have spoken laudatory speech to the sacrifice-honoring seer, the strong bull”..

the fact that the drive to create figures sometimes leads to the creation of innovative lexemes, or pseudo-words. This is an observable phenomenon across languages: in English Dr. Seuss coins a new noun for his phrase ‘the thinks you can think’ as if ‘think’, rather than ‘thought’ was the noun of the verb ‘think’. In Homer, Nestor, in playful banter with Agamemnon, who has just goaded him by lamenting that as an old man (γέρον, //4.313) he is ineffective in battle because old age (γῆρας, 315) has made his knees unable to follow his θυμός, coins a new pseudo-denominative from αἰχμή for use in αἰχμάς αἰχμάσσουσι (324). Hence, alliteration and the even more striking phonetic echoes discussed immediately below are often not simply by-products, but motivating factors in the creation of true and false etymological figures and, on occasion, lexemes/pseudo-words. Homeric πῆμα πάσχω offers a good example of a figure formed for its alliterative value:

φίλων ἄπο πῆματα πάσχει (*Od.*1.49).

πολυδέσμου πῆματα πάσχων (*Od.*5.33).

μηδέ τι μεσσηγύς γε κακὸν καὶ πῆμα πάθησι, (*Od.*7.195).

Although πῆμα πάσχω has had an illustrious career in the lists of etymological figures its validity as such is dubious at best. Πάσχω is the *-ske/o* present of **k^uend^h-*, hence **k^und^h-ske/o-* > **pat^hskō* > **pat^hsk^hō* > πάσχω, Aor. **e-k^und^h-* > ἐπαθ-. Derivation of πῆμα from **k^uend^h-* meets with serious difficulties: presumably we would have a neuter *-mḡ/-m(e)n-* stem with *t*-extension, but how would any form of the root end up as πῆ-? The deletion of the voiced aspirate, *d^h*, is impossible to motivate by sound law. We do not find the well-attested true cognate of πάσχω, πένθος < **k^uend^hos*, in an etymological

construction in archaic epic, while the phrase πῆμα/πήματα πάσχειν only surfaces once after Homer, also in a highly alliterative setting.⁶⁴

Πρ: οὐκ ἔχω σοφισμ' ὅτῳ
τῆς νῦν παρούσης πημονῆς ἀπαλλαγῶ.
Χο: πέπονθας αἰκὲς πῆμ'· ἀποσφαλεῖς φρενῶν
πλανᾶι

PR: I don't have a clever scheme by which
I might escape this suffering here now.

Cho: You have suffered shameful suffering; you are lead astray
by wandering of wits (*A.Pr.*470-3).

Sophocles uses a similar syntagm but with the denominative, πενθεῖν:

πενθεῖν πῆματ' εἰς πλεῖστον πόλεως (*OC.*739).

Herodotus constructs a real etymological figure from **k^uend^h*-, also with additional alliteration to emphasize pathos:⁶⁵

Ὅτάνης δὲ ὁ στρατηγὸς ἰδὼν πάθος μέγα Πέρσας πεπονθότας
(*Hdt.*3.147.1).

In addition to alliteration a majority of figures show a repetition of sound at the syllabic and/or disyllabic level (assonance).

Syllabic:

πολλὰ δ' ἐν ἀφνειοῦ πατρὸς κειμήλια κεῖται (*Il.*6.47).
βουλὰς βουλεύειν καθαρὰ χροῖ εἴματ' ἔχοντα. (*Od.*6.61).
ξεῖνους ξεινίζειν, ὅς τις κ' ἐμὰ δῶμαθ' ἵκηται." (*Od.*3.355).⁶⁶

⁶⁴ It is interesting, from a historical perspective, that this is the only Homeric EA of any frequency not well attested later, and the only phrase of any frequency in which the etymology is problematic.

⁶⁵ In Modern Greek one may say το πάθημα που ἐπάθε a phrase not without parallel in antiquity: χαῖρε παθῶν τὸ πάθημα (*Orph.Fr.*32f).

⁶⁶ Cf. Eustathius on this figure: "καὶ ὅλως ἢ συνεκφώνησις τοῦ ῥήματος καὶ τοῦ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὀνόματος".

Ἦ δ' ἔτεκε τρία τέκνα δαίφρονη Βελλεροφόντη (*Il.*6.196).

akṣair nā dīnyaḥ kṛṣīm it kṛṣasva (*RV.*10.34.13).⁶⁷

turbas turbet (*Pl.**Bacch.*1076).

disyllabic:

καὶ τότε ἄρ' ἄγγελον ἦκαν, ὃς ἀγγεῖλειε γυναικί. (*Od.*15.458).

ἄπρηκτον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι (*Il.*2.121).

σημά τέ οἱ χεύω καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερεΐξω (*Od.*2.222).

ἦέ τις ὤλετ' ὀλέθρῳ ἀδευκέϊ ἦς ἐπὶ νηὸς (*Od.*4.489).

gāyanti tvā gāyatriṇo 'The singers sing you' (*RV*1.10.1).

mirum atque inscitum somniavi somnium (*Pl.**Rud.*597).

In some cases one or both of the words repeat entirely:

αἰχμὰς δ' αἰχμάσσοισι νεώτεροι, οἳ περ ἐμεῖο (*Il.*4.324).

ἔργα διδάξαμεν ἐργάζεσθαι, (*Od.*22.422).

ἐπὶ δ' αἴγειον κνή τυρὸν/κνήστι χαλκείη (*Il.*11.639-40).

vayam uddhāram uddharāmahai (*ŚB.*13.3.4.2).⁶⁸

hau multo post luce lucebit (*Pl.**Curc.*182).

It is true as a generalization that the greater the degree of assonance the more artificial a figure is apt to be. The verbs in many of the phrases that repeat large sections of the noun in Homer are denominative, whereas most evidence suggests that the primary means of forming an EF involved formation from verbal root to abstract noun.⁶⁹ We should be careful, however,

⁶⁷ 'play no more with dice, plow your plowland.'

⁶⁸ 'Let us apportion for ourselves a special portion'

⁶⁹ Cf. Rosén, 108 "the derived form is in theory semantically empty: *donis donare* "to make presents"; *dona dare* "to give away." As the derived element duplicates the lexeme of the motivating word and is therefore devoid of *valeur*, ascribing semantic value to it as an entity morphologically motivated may create interpretational, although not necessarily translational, tautologies." A quick glance at the table of EAs in the appendices will confirm that the most common figures involve verb (not denominative) + verbal noun

not to assume that a figure with an artificial appearance is necessarily an *ad hoc* poetic creation. For instance, it is quite tempting to regard the Hesiodic EN κόκκυξ κοκκύζει as a nonce coinage. It follows the general patterns for the less idiomatic phrases and coinages. The verb is denominative and the figure makes up the largest part of a heavily spondaic line-beginning.⁷⁰ But in this case both noun and verb originate on the basis of an onomatopoeia inherent in the call of the bird itself.⁷¹ If Greek κόκκυξ, New High German *Kuckuck*, Sp. *cuco* and Fr. *coucou* are iconic rather than arbitrary formations it may be that the whole expression suggests itself on a different level than other coinages. That is not to say that it represents an embedded idiom, but merely to notice that it may lend itself to multiple spontaneous generations.

1.1.1 Mutilation by sound law, preservation and renewal:

It is inevitable that in some cases the operation of sound laws will mute the phonetic echo of an etymological idiom by changing the acoustic appearance of one, or both of its components. The muting of phonetic repetition can have two rather opposite effects. First, figures that no longer call attention to their semantic repetitiveness via assonance may survive in venues where they would otherwise be undesirable. Second, figures with two components that no longer bear much resemblance to each other may be reinvented to look more alike in milieus conducive to repetition of both sound and sense.

A mutilated figure in Pindaric narrative offers an example of the first process:

εἰ δέ νιν ἔχων τις οἶδεν τὸ μέλλον,

⁷⁰ ἦμος κόκκυξ κοκκύζει δρυὸς ἐν πετάλοισι (*Op.*486).

⁷¹ For an interesting analysis of the principles of onomatopoeia in the noun 'cuckoo' in several languages see Tsur, 2001. Cf. ὁ κόκκυξ εἶποι 'κοκκυ' (*Ar.Av.*505), "The Cuckoo which bewrayeth herself by cuckooing" (*W.D.tr.Comenius' Gate Lat. Unl.* §142.43).

ὅτι θανόντων μὲν ἐν-
 θάδ' αὐτίκ' ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες
ποινὰς ἔτεισαν—τὰ δ' ἐν τῷδε Διὸς ἀρχῷ
 ἀλιτρά κατὰ γᾶς δικάζει τις ἐχθρῷ
 λόγον φράσαις ἀνάγκᾳ·

But if, possessing this, a man knows the future,
 that upon death here helpless minds immediately
 pay penalties—that, in the reign of Zeus,
 someone under the earth judges transgressions
 revealing his verdict with loathsome necessity. (*O.2.55-60*).

Embedded in a gnomic statement, at such a serious moment in his narration, it is safer to assume that Pindar would have found a different way to express ‘pay a penalty’ if the elements of the phrase had retained their earlier form, **k^hoinas ek^heisan*, than to assume that he would have gone against his usual practice and repeated both sound and sense.⁷² The extreme rarity of etymological figures in Pindar, and Greek Lyric in general, was noted by Fehling, who cited only one, ἔπος εἶπεῖν.⁷³ Both elements of *ποινὰς ἔτεισαν* are from PIE **k^he/oj-*—but variation in the ablaut grade resulting in different outcomes of the labio-velar (**k^ho > πο-* but **k^he- > τε-*) allowed the figure to escape the aesthetic of Pindar, and the survey of Fehling.⁷⁴ In fact the

⁷² Cf. Gonda, 233, in reference to paronomasia, “Although the outward similarity might be obscured by the operation of sound laws- cf. e.g. in Greek Pind.*O.2.58* *ποινὰς τεῖσαι* ‘to pay penalties’- this double repetition of sound and sense may generally be considered characteristic of the ‘figure’ at issue”.

⁷³ 156. Pindar actually uses *ἔπος εἶπεῖν* three times, twice in narrative at *O.6.16*, *I.1.46*, and once in dialogue, in zeugma with *ἔργον* at *P.4.105*. It is, of course one of the most idiomatic figures.

⁷⁴ The lack of the EF in Choral Lyric becomes more striking when we consider that phonetic echoing of the non-tautological variety was a fundamental compositional tool of the Greek lyricists. Watkins (31) notes the “ECHOIC repetition” in Alcman’s Parthenion: *Δαμαρ[έ]τ’ ἐρατά τε Φιανθεμῖς ... damARETA T’ ERATA TE wianthemis*. In the same section he says

scholarly tradition generally misassigns, or simply does not notice the mutilated figures. It should be noted that in ancient literature variation in vowel quality did not amount to as severe a mutilation as change in consonants. This Pindaric example illustrates how advances in reconstructive linguistics can lead to a greater ability to recognize them.

In Homeric contexts where there is no particular reason to avoid the redundant figure we find a syntagm, also from **k^ue/oj-*, with semantics identical to ποινὰς ἔτεισαν rendered τιμὴν τίνειν:

τιμὴν δ' Ἀργείοις **ἀποτινέμεν** ἦν τιν' ἔοικεν,
 ἢ τε καὶ ἐσσομένοι μετ' ἀνθρώποισι πέληται,
 εἰ δ' ἂν ἐμοὶ **τιμὴν** Πριάμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες
τίνειν οὐκ ἐθέλωσιν Ἀλεξάνδροιο πεσόντος

And to pay to the Argives the payment that is fitting,
 such as will remain in the minds of future generations.

But if Priam and the sons of Priam are not willing
 to pay me the payment when Alexander falls (*//*.3.286-9, cf. 459).

This condition is spoken by Agamemnon, who is laying down the conditions for the duel between Menelaus and Paris. It is one of the not extremely numerous occasions in Homer for legalese, a venue that, as we will see later, was particularly conducive to the use of *figurae etymologicae*. The combination of τιμὴν with τίνειν is made more striking by the fact that τιμή, even in this restricted sense of 'recompense' (*LSJ* III), in Homer usually refers to recompense gained for meritorious or victorious action (τιμὴν ἀρνύμενοι,

"The use of the echo as a compositional device to enhance the perception of both performer and audience is characteristic of choral lyric, notably of its master, Pindar" (33). For but one example of Pindaric repetition cf. the reciprocal polyptoton in φιλέων φιλέοντ', ἄγων ἄγοντα προφρόνως (*P*.10.66).

εἵνεκα τιμῆς). Τιμή as payment for damage or loss, outside of the three cognate expressions, only occurs one other time.⁷⁵ Remember that compensatory ‘payment’, or ‘penalty’ is the standard meaning of ποινή. Note also the further polyptoton and alliteration in the phrase that separates τιμὴν and τίνειν, Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες. Homer attests ἀπετίλυτο ποινήν, on the other hand, in battle narrative, a context generally not conducive to use of the tautological EF.⁷⁶

But manipulating the meaning of a noun is not the most common way to reconstitute a figure. Usually, aurally mutilated phrasal elements instigate morphological re-formulation of one element, often resulting in a noun + denominative verb where there was simply noun + verb. For instance, the Homeric phrase βίον ζώειν, most likely a natural enough idiom, may be set beside later βίον βιώναι:⁷⁷

οὐ γάρ μοι ζώειν γε δοκεῖ βροτὸς οὐδὲ **βιώναι**
ἀνθρώποιο **βίον** ταλασίφρονος, ὅστις ἀπ’ οἴνου
θυμὸν ἐρητύσας πίνει ποτόν

For a man does not seem to me to be alive, nor to live
the life of a stout-hearted man, who, restraining
his spirit from wine, drinks a drink. (Panyasis, *Fr.*12.9-11).⁷⁸

⁷⁵ *Od.*22.57 τιμὴν ἄγειν.

⁷⁶ This point will be taken up at length in Chapter 3.

⁷⁷ For more attestations of the ‘live life’ expressions in Ancient Greek see La Roche (30), not in the section on the *figura etymologica*, but under “*Der inhalts-Accusativ des sinnverwandten Objects*”.

⁷⁸ Matthews (86) noted that Panyassis reveled in alliteration more than Homer. It is not entirely clear what sort of drink ποτόν refers to in opposition to wine. In Homer ποτόν usually refers to wine. When Odysseus gives the unmixed wine to the Cyclops to drink Polyphemus’ quaffing is emphasized by the same figure: ἡδὺ ποτόν πίνων (*Od.*9.354). In Attic, on the other hand, ποτόν may refer to drinking water.

ὄντινα τρόπον νῦν τε ζῆ καὶ ὄντινα τὸν παρεληλυθότα **βίον**
βεβίωκεν.

how he lives now and what life gone by he has lived. (Pl.La.188a).

Note that in both Panyasis and Plato the other verbal element of the figure typical in the expression ‘live a life’ from Homer through to New Comedy, ζῶειν, immediately precedes the denominative formation. The progression of this triple repetition serves to emphasize the processes of derivation and reinvention. Other manifestations of ‘live life’ in Greek select nouns assonant with ζῶειν:

ἀλλὰ **ζόην ἔζωον** τὴν αὐτὴν

‘but they were living the same sort of life’ (Hdt.4.112).

ἢ σμικρὸν οἶει ἐπιχειρεῖν πρᾶγμα διορίζεσθαι ὅλου
βίου διαγωγὴν, ἧ ἂν διαγόμενος ἕκαστος ἡμῶν λυσιτελε-
στάτην **ζωὴν ζώη**;

Or do you think it a trivial matter to delineate the leading of a whole life,
leading which each one of us might live a fulfilling life. (Pl.R.344e).

Once again Plato has put an element of the more common phrase, this time the noun, βίος, immediately before the more elaborate *figura*. Note also the duplication of tautologies achieved by inclusion of the relative ED διαγωγὴν ἧ διαγόμενος. The survival of these last Herdotean and Platonic figures in the Modern Greek idiom, ζω την ζωή, suggests the enduring appeal of the more phonetically repetitive formation in everyday speech.

The phrase ‘do work’ alternates in Homer as ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι /ἔρδειν/ρέζειν. While it is plausible to derive ἔρδειν and ρέζειν from PIE **uerg-*, they clearly have lost a great deal of their phonetic affinity with

ἔργον.⁷⁹ In the *Iliad* an ἔργον is usually a war-deed. The noun occurs with this meaning as an EA only with the phonetically mutated verb forms:

ῥέξαντας μέγα **ἔργον**, ὃ κε Τρώεσσι μελήσει.

having accomplished a great deed that will be a sorrow for the Trojans
(*Il.*10.282).

ἔργα δ' **ἔρεξ'** ὅσα φημι μελησέμεν Ἀργείοισι

He has performed deed that I say will be a sorrow for the Argives
(*Il.*10.51).

Several times in the *Odyssey* figures with the less assonant verb forms refer to the reckless actions of the suitors:

οἱ μέγα **ἔργον ἔρεξαν** ἀτασθαλίησι κακῆσι

They committed a monstrous act out of evil folly (*Od.*24.458).

Ῥέξαι/ἔρδειν ἔργον also references the evil actions of women three times: the transgression of one of Odysseus' female servants (*Od.*19.92), Helen's disastrous liaison with Paris (*Od.*23.222) and Epicaste's incestuous marriage to Oedipus (*Od.*11.272).

Expressions that utilize denominative ἐργάζεσθαι, on the other hand, focus on the household chores of women and slaves:

πεντήκοντά τοί εἰσιν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι γυναῖκες
δμωαί, τὰς μὲν τ' **ἔργα** διδάξαμεν **ἐργάζεσθαι**,
εἰρία τε ξαίνειν καὶ δουλοσύνην ἀνέχεσθαι

There are fifty women in your great hall,
servants whom we taught to labor at labors,
to card wool and endure a slavish lot. (*Od.*22.421-3).

⁷⁹ This derivation would involve two deverbative formations **uerĝ-ĵe/o-* > **uerzde/o-* > **uerde/o-* (ἔρδειν) and **ureĝ-ĵe/o-* > **hreze/o* (ῥέζειν).

ἔργα δ' Ἀθηναίη δέδαε κλυτὰ ἔργάζεσθαι.

Athena taught (the daughters of Pandareus) to labor at labors (*Od.*20.72).

With reference to this last example it is important also to detect a note of sarcasm heightened by the figure. We are lead to reflect that the household skills of Procne and Philomela, both in terms of weaving a tale of rape and mutilation into a cloth and cooking Itys, take on macabre dimensions in the context of their particular myth. Finally, in *Iliad* 24 Andromache bemoans the future of Astyanax now that Hector is dead. The poignance of her statement has much to do with the emphasis laid on the fact that her son will be performing tasks demeaning to his inherited nobility, essentially the tasks of a female domestic:

σὺ δ' αὖ τέκος ἦ ἐμοὶ αὐτῇ

ἔψεται, ἔνθά κεν **ἔργα** ἀεικέα **ἐργάζοιο**

ἀθλεύων πρὸ ἄνακτος ἀμειλίχου

But you, child will either follow along with me,

and there labor at shameful labors, toiling for a harsh lord (732-4).

By now we can see the basic differences in the way Homer uses the mutilated figures from **μερῆ*- versus the more noticeable denominatives. A simple deed, whether it takes place on or off the battlefield, finds expression with ἔρδειν or ῥέζειν, household tasks that have to do with fabrication, or simply menial labor find expression with ἐργάζεσθαι. The one attestation of the figure in the *Homeric Hymns* buttresses the association of the more overtly assonant form with women's work, and explicitly delineates the nature of some of the household chores:

ἵνα σφίσιν **ἐργάζωμαι**

πρόφρων οἶα γυναικὸς ἀφήλικος ἔργα τέτυκται·
 καί κεν παῖδα νεογνὸν ἐν ἀγκοίνησιν ἔχουσα (140)
 καλὰ τιθηνοίμην καὶ δώματα τηρήσαιμι
 καί κε λέχος στορέσαιμι μυχῶ θαλάμων εὐπήκτων
 δεσπόσουν καὶ κ' ἔργα διαθρήσαιμι γυναικός
 So that I (Demeter) might labor for them
 propitiously, whatever labors of an elderly woman are done:
 holding the new born child in my arms
 I could nurse him well, keep house, and make the master's bed
 in the penetralia of the well-built chamber
 or teach the women skilled labor (*h.Hom.2.138-143*).

Moving to Post-Homeric authors, we find clear favoritism for ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι. Hesiod actually composes an entire emphatic line varying just this one figure:

ὦδ' ἔρδειν, καὶ ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργῳ ἐργάζεσθαι.

So labor, and work work on top of work (*Op.382*).⁸⁰

The 'work' referenced here is clearly agricultural; it is interesting to compare Avestan *vareshnā verezeñti* 'they labor at their labors', which occurs several times in the *Nīrangestān*, always describing work in the fields. Along the lines of fabrication and production we should note the possibility that the ἔργα in these agricultural figures do not denote an internal abstract 'deed', but the fruit of labor, the fields and crops themselves. Next, in Herodotus the figure always features the denominative verb. Ἐργον ἐργάζεσθαι has taken over for ἔργον ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν to refer to odious actions:

⁸⁰ The vindictive injunction repeats with emphatic enjambment of the substantive at *Op.397-398*: ἐργάζεσθαι, νήπιε Πέρση/ἔργα.

ὦ κάκιστε ἀνδρῶν, ξεινίων τυχῶν **ἔργον** ἀνοσιώτατον **ἐργάσασθαι**.
Most base of men, enjoying hospitality you did a most unholy deed
(Hdt.2.115.4).

A passage from Herodotus four, on the other hand, illustrates usage of the figure strikingly reminiscent of the Homeric distributions of ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι. Here the Amazons juxtapose their lifestyle with that of Greek women:

Ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἂν δυναίμεθα οἰκέειν μετὰ τῶν ὑμετερέων γυναικῶν· οὐ γὰρ τὰ αὐτὰ νόμια ἡμῖν τε κάκεινῆσί ἐστι. Ἡμεῖς μὲν τοξεύομεν τε καὶ ἀκοντίζομεν καὶ ἵππαζόμεθα, ἔργα δὲ γυναικῆα οὐκ ἐμάθομεν· αἱ δὲ ὑμέτεραι γυναῖκες τούτων μὲν οὐδὲν τῶν ἡμεῖς κατελέξαμεν ποιέουσι, **ἔργα** δὲ γυναικῆα **ἐργάζονται** μένουσαι ἐν τῆσι ἀμάξεσι, οὔτ' ἐπὶ θήρην ἰοῦσαι οὔτε ἄλλη οὐδαμῆ.

We could not live in the same houses with your woman, for there are no similar customs between us. We practice archery and spearsmanship and ride horses and have never learned feminine choirs. We know that they do none of these things, but stay in the wagons and toil at their feminine toils, not one of them ever going out on the hunt. (114).

Overall, ἔργα ἐργάζεσθαι is quite common in *The Histories*, always in the recognizable form with the denominative verb.⁸¹ Finally, Plato connects ἔργον explicitly with the denominative and fabrication, describing the craft of the lyre-maker in the *Cratylus*:

⁸¹ Further passages include 3.25.6, 3.65.5, 7.153.4, 8.90.3, 8.116.1, 9.37.2, 9.45.3, 9.73.1, 9.75.1, 9.78.2, 6.138.4. There is one passage, 7.33.1 with a possible variant ἀθέμιστα [ἔργα] ἔρδεσκε. T = ἀθέμιτα ἔργα, Haiim Rosén prints ἀθέμιστα ἔρδεσκε based on ABC.

Τίς οὖν ὁ τῷ τοῦ λυροποιοῦ ἔργῳ χρησόμενος; ἄρ' οὐχ οὗτος ὃς ἐπίσταιτο ἂν ἐργαζομένῳ κάλλιστα ἐπιστατεῖν καὶ εἰργασμένον γνοίη εἶτ' εὖ εἴργασται εἴτε μή;

So who uses the product of a lyre-maker? Would this man be the one to know how to best oversee the producer and would know what was produced, whether it was produced well or not (390b)?

Another denominative expression, ἔργον ἐργωνεῖν 'contract work' appears in a fourth century inscription from the public buildings at Tegea:

εἰ δ' ἂν τις ἐργωνήσας ἔργον 'If someone, having contracted work'
(Rhodes and Osborne (henceforth R.O.) 60.37-8).

The sense one gets from the entire progression of phrases from **uerǵ-* is that the original internal accusative, 'do a deed', usually expressed as ἔργον ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν in Homeric language, was phonetically revitalized as ἔργα ἐργάζεσθαι, but only in the specific contexts of technical, household or farm work. Semantically this meant that the noun referred with increasing frequency to labors that produced goods, so that, in the end, the figure came to mean something more like 'produce products', a result accusative referencing the general, rather than the specific product.

In some cases when we find a semi-mutilated figure the tenor of its usage is questionable. The *Scutum* attests only one etymological figure, a rather difficult to recognize dative:

ἦμος δὲ χλοερῷ κυανόπτερος ἠχέτα τέττιξ
ὄζῳ ἐφεζόμενος θέρος ἀνθρώποισιν ἀείδειν
ἄρχεται,

At summertime when the louddark-winged cicada
begins his song for men,

sitting on a green **branch** (393-5).⁸²

The noun ὄζος and verb ἕζομαι derive from pre-forms **h₂o-sd-o-s* (cf. Lesb. ὕσδος, Hitt. *hasduer*, Goth. *asts*) and **sed-ǵ -e/o-* both from **sed-* / zero-grade *-sd-* ‘sit’. The muted phonetic echo of this figure most likely coincides with semantic detachment, since it is questionable that ὄζος at this point in its history had retained its association with **sed-* ‘sit’. Given a choice between counting this as a brief instance in the *Scutum* where an EF was deemed suitable, or considering it a *non-figura*, I would lean toward the latter.

Another Homeric figure with slightly muted assonance, τέμενος τάμον moves toward denominative expression with stronger phonetic repetition in later attestations:

[τὰ δὲ **τεμ]ένη** τὰ ἐξηρημένα ἐὰν καθά[περ ἔστ]
ι καὶ ἄλ]λα μὴ **τεμενίζειν**.

The sanctuaries already reserved are to be allowed,
But no one is to sanctify others. (*I.G.*1².45.11).⁸³

τεμένη τε τούτων ἐκάστοις **ἐτεμένισαν**

They sanctified a sanctuary for each of them (*Pl.Lg.*738c).

The denominative verb τεμενίζειν, standardly translated as ‘make a sacred precinct’, or ‘consecrate’, represents a duplication of the semantics of the nominal constituent interpretable, within the *figurae*, by ποιεῖν. It appears to have lost the sense of cutting out a tract of land (τέμνω) implicit in the Homeric passages:

καὶ μὲν οἱ Λύκιοι **τέμενος τάμον** ἕξοχον ἄλλων

The men of Lykia cut out a piece of land, surpassing others

⁸² As translated by A. Athanassakis, *Hesiod*, Baltimore and London, 1983.

⁸³ For the translation of ἐξηρημένα as ‘reserved’ rather than ‘dedicated’ as per LSJ. see Hicks-Hill (69).

(*Il.*6.194, cf.20.184).⁸⁴

On the only occasion in Homer of ἐδωδὴν ἔδουσιν the more overt phonetic repetition actually occurs in a relative clause echoing the less aurally accessible ἔσθειν:

νύμφη δ' ἐτίθει πάρα πᾶσαν ἐδωδὴν,
ἔσθειν καὶ πίνειν, οἷα βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ἔδουσιν·

And the nymph placed before them every sort of sustenance,
to eat and drink, that mortal men sustain themselves on (*Od.*5.196-97).

The same principles that operate in Homeric and post-Homeric Greek -- mutilation by sound law, manipulation of figures to make up for that mutilation, and willingness to use non-assonantal figures in otherwise unfriendly settings -- are observable in Latin. Take, for instance, the idiom *poc(u)lō bibit* < **peh₃-tlōd pi-ph₃-e-ti*. Note that the sound laws operating in this evolution are all quite predictable. The noun **peh₃-tlom* belongs to a group of *nomina instrumenti* routinely formed with the suffix *-*tlom*.⁸⁵ The third laryngeal would have colored *e* > *o* (**poh₃-tlom*) and eventually dropped with lengthening (**pōtlom* cf. Ved. *pātram*). In Latin the consonant cluster -*tl-* went to -*cl-* (*pōclom*) and later developed an anaptyctic vowel (*pōcolom* > *pōculum*). In the reduplicated present of **peh₃-* use of the zero grade of the root brought the 'p' into contact with the third laryngeal which caused voicing of the preceding consonant (*pi-ph₃-e/o-ti* > *pi-bh₃-e-ti*) already in PIE. So if we wanted to construct a PIE syntagm for this phrase it would have had the appearance **poh₃-tlōd pi-bh₃-e-ti* with some clear alliteration. It is not necessary to commit to this phrasal reconstruction, but it is also not that outlandish to assume that if PIE

⁸⁴ As translated by R. Lattimore, *The Iliad of Homer*, Chicago/London (1951).

⁸⁵ Olsen (1988) offers a good preliminary study of the group. For direct reference to *poculum* see 19 and 29. For a thorough analysis of the noun see Serbat (148).

possessed a noun meaning ‘drinking vessel’ and verb meaning ‘drink’ from the same root, that at some point some IE speaker found occasion to say ‘drink (from) a cup’.⁸⁶

At any rate, Latin attests the figure several times.⁸⁷ At Lucilius, 303 we find:

Cum pōclo bibō eōdem, amplector, labra labellis fictricis conpono, hoc est cum ψωλοκοποῦμαι.

When I drink from the same cup, I hug, I place lips on the lips of the molder, this is when ψωλοκοποῦμαι (turn priapic).⁸⁸

This playful and amorous context is not hostile to the EF; despite the muted alliteration of the consonants in *pōclo bibō* there is a conscious striving for, or reinvention of assonance. Note the repetition of *ō* and *o* throughout, and the added polyptoton: ‘lips on little lips’. The position of the mouth in pronunciation of the letter ‘o’ mimics its shape during the erotic activity described.⁸⁹ *Pōculō bibere* also occurs in Plautus in a context not uncondusive to an EF, in the *Casina* the slave Olympio speaks to the ancilla Pardalisca:⁹⁰

*inde foras tacitus profugiens exeo hoc ornatu quo vides,
ut senex hōc eōdem pōculō quō egō bibi biberet.*

Then I went fleeing quietly outside in this get up you see,
So that the old man might drink from this same cup I drank from
(932-33).

⁸⁶ Cf. Vedic, *pātram...pibatu* (RV.2.37.4), *pātram indrapānam* ‘a drinking vessel for Indra to drink’ (6.44.16), *pātram...pibā* (10.112.6), and *pātreṇa yad rudreṇā pibat* ‘with the cup which he drank with Rudra’ (10.136.7).

⁸⁷ In Latin **pibe/o- > bibe/o-* is an unremarkable assimilation.

⁸⁸ Under *psolocopumai* the *O.L.D.* says ‘to be affected with priapism’.

⁸⁹ Krenkel translated as though ψωλοκοποῦμαι = french-kissing (Zungenkusse), but the act described more likely involves the genitals.

⁹⁰ Plautine Latin is conducive to use of the EF in general, but slave talk in particular contains many of the most outlandish figures.

Once again there is artificially created/reinvention of assonance with *ō* by use of phrasing similar to that of Lucilius (*pōclo bibō eōdem* and *hōc eōdem pōculō*), and additional repetition in close proximity, this time verbal polyptoton (*bibi biberet*).⁹¹

Tautological etymological phrases are relatively rare in Latin poetry after Ennius and Lucilius, as Wills noticed in his sweeping survey.⁹² Horace attests only a few figures, although he often engages in nominal polyptoton.⁹³ It would most likely be a mistake to count the combination of *pocula* and *bibere* at *Ep.*1.2.23-4 as conscious polyptoton or use of an EF:

Circae pocula nosti;

quae si cum sociis stultus cupidusque bibisset

you know Circe's cups

which, if stupid and wanton with his comrades he had drunk⁹⁴

Likewise for the following:

Tristia cum multo pocula felle bibat

drinks wretched cups brimmed with bile (*Tib.*1.550).⁹⁵

⁹¹ Also note the inscription on Nestor's cup (535-520 BCE): Νέστώρος ε[ίμ]ι εὔποτερ[ον] ποτέριον. ἡὸς δ' ἄν τ' ὀδε πίεσι ποτερί[ο] (*CEG*, 454). Here, the cup speaks in the first person, and there is a clear striving for assonance of *o*, in this case simply mimicking the position of the mouth when drinking from this huge vessel.

⁹² "Besides the phrase *voce vocare*, later poets provide only a handful of internal accusatives or ablatives" (245). Here he has conflated the internal and etymological accusatives/ablatives. His statement actually does not apply to non-etymological internal accusatives or ablatives.

⁹³ For the *Odes* one may scan the lists of Huber to confirm (8-24), e.g. *carminibus carmina*, 4.8.11. The most noticeable noun-verb idiom, *ludum insolentem ludere*, 3.29.50 helps depict the fickleness of fortune; Cf. Porph. ad loc. "*veteribus usitatum elocutionis genus*". For more uses of *ludum ludere* see *Ter.Eu.*586-7, *Pl.Most.*1158, *Gellius* 18.13.4 et al. In the *Odes* we also find more subtle EA's with components separated by several lines: *carmina ...canto* 3.1.2...4, *regna...regit* 3.4.46...48 (the first of several objects), abl. *recines...carmine* 3.11...13. In the *Sermones* Wills, 245 noted *iure/ iurando* 2.3.179-80, by then a long-established legal formula.

⁹⁴ For the transfer from ablative 'drink from a cup' to the accusative, 'drink a cup' see below (2.6).

utque soporiferae biberem si pocula Lethes

and if I were drinking the cups of soporific Lethe (Ov. *Tr.*4.1.47).⁹⁶

In contexts where the idiom is sought after specifically for its repetition of both sound and sense more transparent verbal manifestations of **peh*₃-surface. For instance in the *Asinaria* in the mock legal *condiciones meretricis* which the parasite is to read through (*leges pellege*) we find, among other etymological figures:

tecum una postea aequae pocula potitet:

aps ted accipiat, tibi propinet, tu bibas

with you hereafter she must always drink equal cups receive

them from you, to you drink toasts, then drink (771-2).⁹⁷

Multiplication of Latin examples of mutilated and semantically detached figures (e.g. *officium facere, ingenio natus*) is beyond our scope here. These passages make it clear that the phonetic echo was a large part of the stylistic persona of the EF, and that mitigation of this echo altered the figures in the eyes of both Greek and Latin composers. We continually see the mutilated figures in genres and authors reluctant to use more obvious *figurae*, and

⁹⁵ Speaking of polyptoton in general Howe (1917:319) notes “Tibullus has only fourteen instances all told in the 1376 lines of his elegy”. None of the 14 passages he cites involve noun + verb polyptoton. Most are noun + noun or verb + verb. His study of repetitions does not include *pocula bibit*.

⁹⁶ Repetition in Latin poetry has been the subject of various studies, especially Poteat. Howe (1916) treated polyptoton in Ovid’s elegy; Brezeale expanded his study to hexameters. Huttner provided a full-length study of emphatic gemination in Roman elegy. The general impression one gets from these studies is that, while various forms of polyptoton were common in elegy the *figura etymologica* was quite rare.

⁹⁷ Cf. *propino magnum poculum* (*Curc.*359, et al.). *Poc(u)lum potare* is included in Rosén’s 1981 list of *figurae etymologicae* in Latin. As we would expect *pōclo bibō* does not appear among the ablative figures.

manipulation of at least one of the phrasal components, usually entailing the addition of a denominative verb, where schemata were desirable.

1.2 Tautology and the negative tradition:

Whereas alliteration and assonance are undeniably properties of all forms of polyptoton, tautology is specifically applicable to the EF proper. In one sense this makes it an interesting topic for stylistic analysis, but in another has opened it to general criticism. For instance, Josephus' term for the structure was περιττολογία 'over-talking', or 'wordiness':

τῶν ἀπτικκῶν ἐστὶν ἡ περιττολογία ὡς τὸ λέγω λόγον, γράφω γραφὴν καὶ τρέχω δρόμον (Synops.V.532 T III).

Further, there is a tendency to view expressions as completely insipid that do not at least use the repetitive substantive as a means of attaching an attribute/adjective to color the verbal action:

The repeated idea in the object should usually be intensified by a modifier; otherwise there is no purpose in repeating it." (Harper's English Grammar, Opdycke, 1941).

Terms that continually surface among nineteenth century scholars in their descriptions of etymological figures are "childish" "primitive" "awkward" and "clumsy."

Der erste Ursprung der etymologischen Figur fällt wohl in eine Zeit frühen, wenigentwickelten sprachlichen Lebens, sie ist aus einer gewissen kindlichen Unbeholfenheit und Verlegenheit erwachsen, denn aus überlegtem Sprachbewusstsein (Landgraf, 1888, 638 A).⁹⁸

⁹⁸ Cf. Weiske (22) who, citing δουλείαν δουλεύειν and πόλεμον πολεμεῖν says "Manifesta in his etiam est simplicitas antiquam redolens aetatem, qua homines nec auribus nec mente satis acute sentiebant". NB δουλείαν δουλεύειν, *mutatis litteris mutandis*, is still idiomatic in Modern Greek, although with a semantic shift from 'serve one's servitude' to 'work one's job'.

In the only article to date that has dealt systematically with the origins of the *figura etymologica* Havers used the assessment of the structure as primitive and unsophisticated to argue for its antiquity and existence in PIE. His argument is based on a Darwinian conception of linguistic evolution: the unsophisticated *figurae* recessed as languages evolved from primitive to enlightened. This scenario is subject to various problematic questions, but for now it suffices to remark that his depiction of straight-line recession in Greek starting from Homer fails to take into account the frequency of the EF in, among other places, fourth century Attic. In terms of aesthetics, Havers rescued Plautus from awkwardness by referencing his genre: the farcical nature of comedy made bawdy repetition acceptable. Homer, on the other hand, was left in a state of naive primitivism.

Moving away from negative assessment Gonda saw a different attitude toward stylistic repetition in the older Greek epics as opposed to classical writers. He still viewed the structures as 'primitive', but saw within that primitiveness a certain symmetry and attraction:

But the distinction which may be drawn between the classical style of writing and its immediate models on the one hand and Homer and Hesiod on the other suffices to show that there are, even in Greek, many reminiscences of a style, less typically 'Greek' and more akin to what may be considered to have been a narrative form of archaic and 'primitive' 'balanced' style (50).

Here we have some recognition that, in terms of the older traditions, the figures formed part of a stylistic not necessarily critiqueable by the standards of a modern literary aesthetic, but nonetheless possessing its own merits. Well

before Gonda, however, the stylistic and emotive value, as well as the variety and complexity of the constructions had been analyzed by Lobeck. Perhaps the most insightful observer of motivations behind etymological figures in Greek to date, he felt compelled to respond to a tradition that targeted the (–attribute) figures as a particularly stupid mode of pleonasm, while not counting the (+attribute) figures as pleonasm at all. After pointing out the similarity of βουλὰς βουλεύειν and ἀρίστην / βουλήν βουλεύειν he states his aim:

Sed universa causa melius cognoscetur, si huius constructionis gradus et dissimilitudines et vim et varietatem exposuero (503).

It almost goes without saying that the scholars who have engaged in negative assessments were applying their own aesthetic anachronistically.⁹⁹ We should also note that the various milieus that house the greatest number of etymological figures correspond broadly to the survival of oral traditions, and that tautology and repetition are a lively part of everyday spoken language with often very clear rhetorical purposes.¹⁰⁰ For poets and rhetoricians immersed in a culture of orality the fullness of sound quite often more than made up for the emptiness of sense. That said, it should be countered that Homer’s use of the figures also shows a sensitivity to their stylistic features marked by an often very careful selection process. The poet, or poets did not simply use the phrases according to whim. Rather, they adhered to an underlying aesthetic that determined the appropriateness of each figure for a given context or sub-genre. Whether in battle narrative or battle dialogue, the fanciful tales of the *Apologia* or a description of festivities in an ancient Greek οἶκος, the arming of a warrior for battle or the dressing of a woman for seduction, the figures do not

⁹⁹ Havers himself quoted Wilamowitz at Euripides *Her.*329 “und überhaupt ist die Furcht vor der Wiederholung eine ganz moderne stilistische Empfindung”

¹⁰⁰ This is the premise of Frédéric’s 1981 article “La tautologie dans le langage naturel”.

at all show the kind of uniform distribution that would suggest the application of a random or unsophisticated aesthetic.

1.2.1 Gradations of tautology and semantic detachment:

In a short section on the EF in Greek prose Denniston made a useful distinction between phrases with a specialized meaning beyond that of the verb alone, such as πολλὰς ἀρχὰς ἄρχειν ‘to hold many offices’, and those which are purely figurative, i.e. tautological, as in ἀπόδειξις ἀποδείξει ‘display a display’, an elaborate substitution for ἀπόδειξις ποιῆσθαι ‘make a display’.¹⁰¹ Once again examples of both types are numerous and extractable from various languages.¹⁰² For Latin Rosén discussed the oft-recurring expression, *ingenio natus* ‘born with talent’ as “an antiquated *figura etymologica* with a noun semantically detached from the verb *nasci*.”¹⁰³ In reference to Sanskrit Delbrück depicted semantic detachment from phrases originally involving an internal construction with a nominal abstract, to external constructions resulting from the concretization of that noun:

So hiess z.B. vittim vindate ursprünglich: “er findet sich Findung”, und vittim wäre deshalb als A. des Inhalts zu bezeichnen. Sobald aber vittim die concrete Bedeutung Besitz erhalten hat, so dass man sich darunter Land, Vieh u.s.w. vorstellt, so heisst es: er findet sich Land u.s.w., und es liegt der Objectsaccusativ vor (169).

¹⁰¹ 134. Cf. below: ‘formation of figures from periphrastic constructions’.

¹⁰² Biese noticed this phenomenon quite early, speaking of Latin figures without attributes such as *servitatem servire*: “*primo obtutu talis loquendi ratio nimis cumulata illeque accusativus plane ex abundantia additus videtur esse, sed his exemplis adcuratius inspectis videmus tamen, non esse verum pleonasmum statuendum in his locutionibus, quoniam vim ac notionem substantivi certis finibus restringi apparet, ita ut ‘servitus’ proprio sit significato “Slavendienst” i.e. officia munusve servi in erum et ‘vitam vivere’ praegnanter “Existenz haben”...vel “das Leben geniessen,” quod Epidici loco elucet V. 377: cogitarent postea vitam ut vixissent olim in adulescentia” (8),*

¹⁰³ 1981:111.

This is part of his unsuccessful attempt to connect the internal and etymological accusatives.¹⁰⁴ Ultimately the observance of one case of this kind does not mean that the same process of detachment should be applied to the entire group. A comparative study such as this may invite diachronic analysis by setting phrases such as Vedic *bhāráṃ bharati* ‘bears a burden’ next to the more specialized Greek match φορὸν φέρειν ‘pay a tribute/tax’.¹⁰⁵ But postulating an evolution from φορὸν φέρειν with an unattested meaning *‘bear a burden’ to the more specialized ‘pay tribute’ based on the occurrence of the syntagm in Vedic (or Germanic for that matter) makes the unprovable assumption that the construction was not independently generated in Greek after the noun came to mean ‘tribute’. The legal/political nature of φορὸν φέρειν makes such an assumption particularly problematic given the frequency of etymological figures in Ancient Greek legalese.

In regards to most of the Homeric etymological external objects this would involve assuming too much about the prehistory of a given expression. Even if we extend the field of observation from Homer to later Greek it is still difficult, in the majority of cases, to trace an evolution of an etymological object from internal abstract to external concrete within the history of usage in the *figurae*. There are certain phrases that admit analysis along the lines of concretization of the noun. For instance, the Homeric figure ἀγορὰς

¹⁰⁴ *Diese etymologischen A. bezeichnen wir als A. des Inhalts* (169). But see Gaedicke’s comments cited above (16-17).

¹⁰⁵ *Garbho bhāraṃ bharatyā cidasya ‘Der Neugeborne trägt die Bürde dieser (Welt)’* (RV.1.152.3), *bibharti bhāraṃ pṛthivī na bhūma ‘es trägt die Last wie die Erde das Land’* (RV.7.34.7), *ṣaḍbhārāṇ eko acarān bibharti ‘Sechs Lasten trägt der Eine ohne zu gehen’* (RV.3.56.2). The Vedic translations are, of course, from Geldner. The ‘ā’ in *bhāram* might be from the o-grade before a resonant via Brugmann’s law, but for an alternative view see Hajnal’s article. For a few Greek examples see (Ar.Av.191, X.An.5.5.7, Ath.2.1, Sym.4.32, IG 1².212.88).

ἀγορεύειν ‘address the assembly’ appears in Attic as ἐν τῷ ἀγορῷ ἀγορεύει ‘make an address in the assembly’ with the noun attaching to a locality. In general, however, we are faced with a much more rigid system that makes it necessary to evaluate the grammatical relationships of the components of each construction as synchronically as possible. Our main concern is to apply a synchronically determined degree of semantic detachment to stylistic analysis of the Homeric figures under the assumption that less tautological figures, such as ἱστὸν ἱστάναι ‘set up the mast’ are generally used in a more matter of fact fashion than completely circular ones, as πόλεμον πολεμίζειν.

1.2.2 Circularity and the *figura etymologica* in Plato:

The inherent tautology of noun-verb polyptoton made it attractive to philosophers and rhetoricians, and must be at least part of the reason that “Plato reveled in the *figura etymologicae*, particularly in the *Laws*, and his use of it is often rather affected.”¹⁰⁶ This is not the place to discuss Plato’s fondness for the figures at length, but a brief examination of just a few passages will show that their circularity made them indispensable as a dialectical tool. The *Minos*, in many ways a prelude to *Leges*, is a somewhat playful meditation on the adequacy, or inadequacy of tautological definitions for philosophical argumentation.¹⁰⁷ The departure point for the *Minos* is that etymological figures tend to provide superficial definitions of speech and sensory events, and that the degree to which law ‘νόμος’ should be defined as accepted things ‘τὰ νομιζόμενα’ is debatable. Socrates’ interrogation of his

¹⁰⁶ Denniston (134).

¹⁰⁷ For attribution of the *Minos* to Plato see Mulroy “despite being labeled as works of doubtful authenticity, the *Minos* and *Hipparchus* are remarkably artful and thought provoking. They are designed to be studied together with Plato’s *Laws* and illustrate the misleading disjunction with which the latter begins: who is responsible for laws, a god or a man” (115).

interlocutor is playful and pesky, and we can witness the EF facilitating tones reminiscent of Homeric rhetorical banter as it surfaces at various junctures:

ET. Τί οὖν ἄλλο **νόμος** εἶη ἄν, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἀλλ' ἢ τὰ **νομιζόμενα**;

ΣΩ. Ἡ καὶ **λόγος** σοι δοκεῖ εἶναι τὰ **λεγόμενα**, ἢ **ὄψις** τὰ **ὀρώμενα**, ἢ **ἀκοή** τὰ **ἀκουόμενα**; ἢ ἄλλο μὲν **λόγος**, ἄλλο δὲ τὰ **λεγόμενα**· καὶ ἄλλο μὲν **ὄψις**, ἄλλο δὲ τὰ **ὀρώμενα**· καὶ ἄλλο μὲν **ἀκοή**, ἄλλο δὲ τὰ **ἀκουόμενα**, καὶ ἄλλο δὲ **νόμος**, ἄλλο δὲ τὰ **νομιζόμενα**; οὕτως ἢ πῶς σοι δοκεῖ;

ET. Ἄλλο μοι νῦν ἐφάνη.

ΣΩ. Οὐκ ἄρα **νόμος** ἐστὶν τὰ **νομιζόμενα**. (5)

ET. Οὐ μοι δοκεῖ.

ΣΩ. Τί δῆτ' ἄν εἶη νόμος;

Friend: What else would law be, Socrates, but what is accepted?

Socrates: And so speech, in your view, is what is spoken, or sight what is seen, or hearing what is heard? Or is speech one thing, what is spoken another, sight one thing, what is seen another, hearing one thing, what is heard another—and so law one thing, what is accepted another? Is that so, or what is your view?

Friend: They are two different things, as it now seems to me.

Socrates: Law, then, is not what is accepted.

Friend: I don't think so.

Socrates: So what can law be? (Pl. *Minos*.313b-c).¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ This translation and the translation below are from Schofield in Cooper.

The friend then postulates that laws are the resolutions of cities. This proves inadequate since individual cities may enact unjust resolutions and laws cannot be unjust. Later in the dialogue Socrates defines the laws as those things accepted by Minos and established for citizens:

καίτοι δῆλον ὅτι ἃ ἐνόμιζεν καλὰ εἶναι, ταῦτα νόμιμα ἔθηκεν καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῦ πολίταις.

And indeed it is clear that what he accepted as admirable he laid down as accepted practice also for his own citizens. (320a).

Minos is explicitly connected with Zeus in his acceptance of laws and, by connecting passages in the *Minos* and *Laws*, it is possible to form a chain of acceptance of the laws highlighted by etymological and tautological figures. The law-establisher 'νομοθέτης' establishes the laws 'νόμους τιθέναι' in accordance with the manner in which the gods established them 'θέντων θεῶν'. Therefore, if the νόμος has been accepted 'νομιζόμενος' from the right parties, the tautological definition is useful. This etymological nexus and its underlying circularity stress conclusions as self-evident. Who better than the lawmaker to make laws (νομοθέτης νόμους τιθέναι), and who better than the gods in their role as establishers to establish them?

We cannot expect Homeric language to engage in such overt meditations on tautology-based definitions. However, it is possible to observe rhetoric in Homer that uses repetition figures to stress that the truth of a speaker's words is self-evident. In the following passage Nestor, in trying to convince Agamemnon that he made a mistake when he insulted Achilles and should consider making reparations, uses the EF in conjunction with verbal polyptoton to drive home his point:

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐρέω ὥς μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ἄριστα.

οὐ γάρ τις **νόον** ἄλλος ἀμείνονα τοῦδε **νοήσει**
οἶον ἐγὼ **νοέω** ἡμὲν πάλαι ἢ δ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν
ἐξ ἔτι τοῦ ὅτε διογενὲς Βρισηίδα κούρην
χωομένου Ἀχιλῆος ἔβης κλισίηθεν ἀπούρας
οὐ τι καθ' ἡμέτερόν γε **νόον**· μάλα γάρ τοι ἔγωγε
πόλλ' ἀπεμυθεόμην· σὺ δὲ σῶ μεγαλήτορι θυμῷ
εἴξας ἄνδρα φέριστον, ὃν ἀθάνατοί περ **ἔτισαν**,
ἠτίμησας,

So, I will say the things that seem best to me,
for nobody else will think of a better thought than the one
I have been thinking both long ago and still even now,
since, Zeus born one, you went to Achilles' dwelling and took
the maiden Briseis, and made him angry, not in accord with
my thought then. For I tried everything to dissuade you
but you, giving way to your proud heart, the mightiest man
whom the gods honor, dishonored. (*//*.9.103-111).

On the most basic level the quadruple repetition of νόος and νοέω here strongly emphasizes that Agamemnon must stop being guided by his heart (θυμός), and begin using his mind. The EA νόον νοῆσαι occurs nowhere else in archaic epic; the degree of separation of the noun and verb would have called attention to the construction and made it all the more affected.¹⁰⁹ In short, Agamemnon is meant to take note of it. The most prevalent definition of νόος is, of course, 'mind' or 'sense' in the abstract, while the regular verb found in the less common sense found here—a specific plan of action—is ἔχω.

¹⁰⁹ For a complete discussion of separation of the two components of an EF as a means of increasing emphasis see especially 249 ff.

Suppletion of the cognate verb for the regular, more periphrastic verb serves to further concretize and hence validate the act of thought, but it also underlines the redundancy of the whole phrase. Just to make sure that there is no question as to what he is aiming at, Nestor points out, this time via a much more distant repetition of νοέω and νόον, that Agamemnon's failure to 'think thought' has already had the very concrete consequence of angering Achilles. In a final display of verbal polyptoton (ἔτισαν, ἠτίμησας) he buttresses everything he has said on the will of the gods, and comes very close to accusing Agamemnon of sacrilege. By comparing this passage with the beginning of the *Minos* we can see that, for both Homer and Plato, the concretization of verbal processes accomplished by *figurae* within their tautological framework constituted a handy argumentative tool. In general, Plato's agenda in stressing the tautology of the EF is more overt than Homer's. What they have in common is a basic awareness of the rhetorical value of the structure, a value inseparable from its tautology.

1.3 Methods of substitution and avoidance:

In certain authors and specific genres the semantic and phonetic redundancy of the EF impels motion toward alternate expression. In other authors/genres etymological and non-etymological phrases appear as ongoing stylistic variants of each other. In Present Day English idiom we have both 'die gruesomely' and 'die a gruesome death'. In Homer we find ἔπος νημερτές ἔειπες and νημερτέα εἶπεν. Within the evolution of a given language the etymological idiom may become unidiomatic, as in the case of 'work work', an Old and Middle English idiom that competed for a long time but eventually lost

out to 'do work'.¹¹⁰ In some languages there is general avoidance of the EA in favor of its alternates; for instance, Gagnepain traced the '*singulièrement fréquent*' use of *figurae etymologicae* in Old Irish to '*complète régression*' in more modern Irish texts.¹¹¹ Further, Proinsias Mac Cana entertained the possibility that the periphrastic construction is the successor to the EA in Celtic languages.¹¹² These observations should be tempered by those of Rosén who argued, with reference to Irish, that the diminishing number of textualized figures may not reflect idiom:

We can not subscribe to an idea of an even, straight-line diminishing in the quantity of the *figura etymologica* construction, which is supposed to have happened concomitantly with the gradual increase of the totality of periphrasis in the same texts (67).

Rosén attributes the frequency of the EF in Old Irish to the glossarial nature of the texts themselves, but she includes within her inventory of *figurae etymologicae* "constructions with object-nouns which are of semantic affinity to the verbs, but do not constitute the verbal nouns of the verbs in question" (1991: 68). Thus, in Rosén's count the discrepancy in frequency between Old and Modern Irish texts is in part mitigated by the inclusion of non-etymological phrases such as *ith biadh* 'eat food'.

I will make a sharper distinction between etymological constructions that repeat both sound and sense, and combinations of nouns with synonymous but phonetically and etymologically distinct verbs. The latter may be semantically equivalent, but are stylistically quite different. The following

¹¹⁰ Old High German attests *wircan werc* (O.I.5.11, T.132.3). See Grimm (1898, 760). The latest attestation of 'work work' I have found is in the *Blickling Homilies*.

¹¹¹ See 91 and 185 respectively.

¹¹² 102⁷. By periphrastic these scholars point to cases in which a firmly established cognate idiom like 'drink a drink' gives way to expression with a generic verb: 'have a drink'.

paragraphs offer an introductory sketch of three basic modes of substitution/avoidance: 1) adverbial, 2) phrases with nominal or verbal synonyms and 3) periphrasis with generic verbs. These modes are by no means mutually exclusive, and often occur in close conjunction.

1.3.1 Adverbial substitution:

The empty noun of the internal EA often admits deletion with conversion of the attribute to adverb/adverbial neuter adjective. Identical line positioning within hexameters suggest that this is a formular variation, the substantive representing the variant deleted for the inclusion of more information: ^{tr}| ἔπος νημερτῆς ἔειπες (//.3.204) and ^{tr}| σὺ δ' οὐ νημερτῆς ἔειπες (*h.Hom.5.186*). This type of alternation only functions as a substitution when attachment of the attribute is the predominant *modus operandi* of a given phrase. Adverbial versus nominal alternations in non-attributival EAs are, of course, problematic: how would one render *χοῆν χεῖσθαι* adverbially? A prepositional phrase may also function as a substitute in much the same way as an adverbial: ^{tr}| ἔπος κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες· (//.15.206, *Od.8.141*), ^{tr}| ἐπεὶ κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες (//.9.59). There are many authors in which adverbial variation presents a stylistic alternate that has no problem co-existing with the EA. In other authors, however, it may constitute the preferred mode of expression to the complete exclusion of *figurae*. Caesar, for instance, never uses *acris pugna pugnata est*, but frequently attests *acriter pugnatum est*. Thucydides, although he uses *εἶπεῖν* with adverbial/demonstrative modifiers quite often, (φανερῶς, τοιαῦτα, τσσαῦτα εἶπεν, etc.) never uses *ἔπος εἶπεν*.¹¹³ Thus, we might consider the adverbial mode suppletive within

¹¹³ In fact *ἔπος* itself is quite rare in Thucydides. The singular is not attested and forms of the plural occur only 6 times. But, as will be noted below, his use of the standard Attic idiom *λόγον λέγω* is limited enough to suggest a predilection to eschew the EF.

the *corpora* of authors who consistently favor it against an established idiom, or in Homeric sub-genres that generally avoid the figures. While adverbial substitution is not the most common mechanism for elimination of an EF within the history of any language -- that distinction must be reserved for the various modes of periphrasis -- there are certain cases where the adverbial expression remains the only manner of conditioning the verb. As we have seen Modern Greek idiom permits adverbial attachment but not a cognate object with the verb to die.

1.3.2 Periphrasis with nominal or verbal synonyms:

Often a semantically equivalent, but aurally disparate word supplants, or alternates with either the noun or verb. Homer displays alternation of nominal and verbal synonyms in full with semantically equivalent phrases for ‘speak a word’:

Nominal substitution: ἔπος (+ attribute) ἔειπε, μῦθον (- attribute) ἔειπε.¹¹⁴

Verbal substitution: ἔπος τ' ἔφατ', ἔπος ἐρέεσθαι, ἔπεα πτερόεντα
προσηύδα, ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων.

Hence, we also find the non-idiomatic coinage with a denominative verb, μῦθον μυθεῖσθαι.

In the remainder of this section I contrast this free use and variation of the EF and its semantic equivalents, a license employed also by Herodotus and Plato in Greek and Plautus in Latin, with the unrepentive style of Greek and Latin authors, primarily historiographers, who clearly strove for a more somber and concise style, and therefore generally avoided the rhetorically charged circularities.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ μῦθον ἔειπε occurs more frequently.

¹¹⁵ Note that simply working in the genre of historiography alone is not limiting enough. We must primarily consider the style of a given author. The starkness and concision of

Thucydides, who, in the suppletive paradigm of λέγω (εἶπον, ἐρῶ), aside from the rather mutilated, passivized καλῶς λεχθέντες λόγοι (6.68.1), and semantically detached nominative, καὶ πολλὰ μὲν λόγια ἐλέγετο ‘and many prophecies were spoken’ (2.8.2) attests only non-etymological constructions of the internal sort:

ἐς τὸ κοινὸν τοιούτους δὴ **λόγους εἶπεν**

‘He spoke the following words to the common interest’ (4.58.1).

τοῦ καλῶς **εἰπόντος** μέμψασθαι **λόγον**

‘to criticize the argument of someone speaking well’ (3.37.4).

νῦν τοὺς **λόγους ἐροῦμεν** ‘we speak these words now’ (5.91.2).

τὸν τοῦ Ἀλκιβιάδου **λόγον** πρότερον **εἰρημένον**

‘the words spoken before by Alcibiades’ (8.52.1).

καὶ γὰρ ὁ μὴ **ῥηθεὶς λόγος** τοῖς ᾧδ’ ἔχουσιν αἰτίαν ἄν παράσχοι
ὡς, εἰ ἐλέχθεν, σωτήριος ἄν ᾦν

‘For the word not spoken would have caused us reproach on the grounds that, if spoken, it would have been our savior’ (3.53.3).

Note in this last example the distant repetition of λόγος in ἐλέχθεν juxtaposed with the non-cognate in the copulative phrase.

We find the same type of nominal and verbal variants in Plautus as in Homer:

dico unum ridiculum dictum ‘I am telling of one silly tale’ (*Capt.*482)¹¹⁶

unum verbum dixisti verissimum ‘you said one word most true’

(*Merc.*206)

Thucydides, Caesar and Tacitus offset the style of Herodotus as much as they do that of Homer.

¹¹⁶ As if there were any doubt that Plautus is reveling in figurative language here the line end *de dictis melioribus*.

*possum docta **dicta** et quamuis facunde **loqui***

I can speak learned words, and as charming as you like (*Tri.380*).

verba proloqui (*Pl.Amph.247, Ter.Andr.256*).¹¹⁷

Contrast this with Caesar, who, in the three lexical items, *dicere/dictum*, *verbum* and *loqui* only attests one internal-accusative:

*petierunt ut sibi liceret **verba sine periculo proloqui***

They asked to be allowed to speak words without peril (*BF.35.3*).

Like Thucydides, Tacitus is not completely adverse to the non-etymological internal accusative, although his concise style rarely admits even this level of redundancy.

***verba edicti** fuere pauca et sensu permodesto*

They had spoken few words, and with a modest sense (*Tac.A.1.7.4*).

A similar state of affairs may be outlined for ‘do a deed’ a well-attested lexical item in many languages often featuring an archaic EA beside other internal phrasal variants. In Homer we find ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι/ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν ‘work work’, but also ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι ‘ply work’, πονησάμενος ἔργα ‘labor work’, ἔργον τελέσειε ‘accomplish work’ and ὑπόσχηται...ἔργον ‘undertake work’. Once again Thucydides does not attest any form of ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι/ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν; but he often uses the denominative verb with adverbial demonstratives and adjectives:

τοιαῦτα εἰργάσαντο ‘they did such things’ (3.39.2)

πῶς οὐ δεινὰ εἰργασθε; ‘did you not act heinously?’ (3.66.2)

καὶ εἰ μὲν τούτων τι εἰργαστο ‘and if he had done any of this’ (6.29.1)

κοινῇ ἐργασαμένη ἡ Ἑλλάς ‘Hellas acting in common’ (1.3.1)

¹¹⁷ For further attestations of these and other related phrases see Müller (6-9).

ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ καθεστῶτι ἀγαθόν τι εἰργασμένοι εἰσὶν ‘Have they done anything good in the present war’ (3.52.4).

He also uses ἔργον with non-cognate verbs of similar semantic content:

ἐπράχθη δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἔργον ἀξιόλογον

‘but no deed was accomplished by them worthy of mention’ (1.17.1).

πραχθὲν τὸ ἔργον οὐκ ἀπείκῳτῳς καίπερ μέγα ὄν προυχώρησεν·

‘The feat was accomplished, not unlikely, even though it was an arduous one’ (8.68.4)

εἰπεῖν περὶ τῶν δρασάντων τὸ ἔργον

‘to speak of those who accomplished the deed (6.60.2).

To judge from our sources the Latin phrase *facinus facere* ‘do a deed’ was a well-established idiom.¹¹⁸ Sallust attests it numerous times, and the fact that it is the only EF possibly attested in a work at all associated with Caesar is evidence for its acceptability:

clamasse facinus se nefandum et scelus fecisse.

He had shouted that they had done a nefarious deed, even a crime (BH.16.4).¹¹⁹

Otherwise Caesar and pseudo-Caesar attest only non-etymological phrases:

tantum facinus committere audebant ‘they dared to submit such an action’ (BC.3.60.4)

facinus admittere ‘perpetrate an action’

(BG.3.9.3, 7.42.4, 38.8, BG.6.13.5)

nefandum crudelissimumque facinus sunt aggressi

¹¹⁸ See Landgraf (1881 17) and Müller (4-6).

¹¹⁹ Draeger (387) asserted that Caesar does not attest the EF. I do not know if he included the spurious *Spanish Wars* in his statement. In fact we might supply *fuisse* in the first clause “he shouted that it was a nefarious act and that they had committed a crime.”

‘They entered into a nefarious and extremely cruel deed’ (*BH.15.6*).

Facinus facere is likewise the only EF in Tacitus:

*Atque illi conscientia rebellionis et obsaepitis effugiis multa et clara
facinora fecere*

And they (the Britons), mindful of their rebellion and with all means of escape closed off, did many glorious deeds (*A.12.31.4*).¹²⁰

These correspondences establish two important patterns: 1) given the stylistic predilections of a particular writer one may predict with a reasonable degree of accuracy whether they will use etymological or simply internal phrases 2) The more idiomatic a phrase is the more likely it is to appear in *corpora* generally not conducive to the *figurae*.

1.3.3 Periphrasis with generic verbs:

The third way an etymological phrase may be subject to substitution involves the use of the noun with a more or less generic verb providing little or no additional semantic force. Such verbs are often of similar semantics cross-linguistically. Rosén includes the following types of verbs in outlining the processes of “auxiliary-verb periphrases” of the EA in the *Togail Troi*: ‘have’, ‘deliver’, ‘give’, ‘take’, ‘undertake’, ‘put/make’, verbs denoting beginning and completing, and verbs of attaining or obtaining (1991: 61). In Present Day English verbs of this sort often form more natural phrases than etymological ones. For instance it is more idiomatic to ‘have’ than to ‘drink a drink’, one may ‘give’ or ‘deliver’, but only marginally ‘speak a speech’. ‘Take a walk’ is unremarkable while ‘walk a walk’ is typically used only in the rhetorical phrase

¹²⁰ Adams noted that polyptoton in general is “found mainly in speeches in the Annals” (124).

‘don’t talk the talk if you can’t walk the walk’. The selection of generic verb can be dialectically idiosyncratic.¹²¹

Verbs in similar semantic categories as those Rosén noticed in Irish functioned as periphrases of the EA in Ancient Greek, and are observable within the Homeric corpus. We might compare our specific findings from Homer to Lobeck’s general list of verbs functioning as auxiliaries to the EF in Greek as a whole: τεύχειν, ποιεῖν, τελεῖν, ἄγειν, ἔχειν and χρῆσθαι (509). All of these verbs except χρῆσθαι function as alternates to the etymological accusative in Homer, although ἄγειν is quite marginal. I will treat the periphrastic alternates to each Homeric phrase exhaustively in more specific stylistic discussions. For now I offer only a preliminary sketch in order to highlight the cross-linguistic uniformity of the generic verbs in question.

Τεύχειν ‘accomplish’ appears as the passivized nominative equivalent to ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι/ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν in the perfect and pluperfect: ἔργα τέτυκται/τέτυκτο (x5 all Adonics). In Classical Greek ποιέω is, of course, the periphrastic verb par excellence. In Homer it is not as prevalent as such but we do find: ἀγορὴν ἀγέροντο/ ἀγορὴν ποιήσατο ‘assemble/make an assembly (x2). Τελεῖν alternates in the following phrases: δῶρα δίδωμι / δῶρα τέλεσσαν, ἔργον ἔρεξεν / ἔργον τελέσειε. Beside ἱρεύουσ’ ἱερήϊον, there is ἄγειν ἱερήϊον, but the regular phrase is, of course, ἱερὰ ῥέζον, and since ἱρεύουσ’ ἱερήϊον is a nonce coinage most likely formed from the more generic expressions, it is difficult to view use of the same noun with ἄγειν as

¹²¹ Wierzbicka, who offers an informative discussion of the principles that govern which generic verb will form a phrase with a given noun, noted “expressions like *have a read* or *a kick of the football* are usually rejected by native speakers of American English, but are very frequent in Australia” (756-7). In American English ‘take’ is a more prevalent verb in periphrasis, hence ‘take’ not ‘have a walk’.

periphrasis.¹²² As noted above, the phrases τιμὴν τίνειν and τιμὴν ἄγειν constitute the only uses of τιμή as a negative penalty, and both are, in different ways, substitutes for ποινήν τίνειν.

The participial correspondent of εἶματα εἶμαι within the Adonic is εἶματ' ἔχοντα; μάχην ἐμάχοντο may also be rendered μάχην...ἔχουσι; ἱερήϊον παρεῖχον or ἔσχον, are also common; δῶρα δίδωμι finds an alternate in δῶρα παρασχεῖν, and φίλει φιλότητα in παράσχη φιλότητα. In short, 'have' and its compound, 'provide', make as strong a showing as alternates to the EA in Homer as they do in Irish and English.

Beyond Lobeck's list Homer attests several other generic verbs alongside etymological accusatives. 'Put/Make', τίθησι is quite frequent: μάχην ἐμάχοντο/θήσονται... μάχην, ὄνομα ὀνομαίνω/τίθεσθ' ὄνομ' etc. The Hesiodic *Shield* attests only μάχην ἔθεντο. Latin manifestations of **d^heh₁*- 'do/make' are also quite frequent in periphrasis, e.g. *verba fecit*.¹²³ In connection with his arguments discussed above, Biese asserts that periphrasis is an important part of making intransitive transitive and uses *turbas turbet* (Plaut.*Bacch.*1076) and *turbam faciat* (Ter.*Eu.*615) in his argument.¹²⁴

The root **deh₃*- 'give' performs similar service in both Greek and Latin. In Homer we find the alternations ἀπετίλυτο ποινήν/ ποινήν δῶχ' and φίλει φιλότητ', φιλότητα δὸς. In Latin the standard phrase is, of course, *poenas dare* without an etymological equivalent, but the verb is used in clear

¹²² See just below .

¹²³ (Caes.*BH.*17.1 Tac.*A11.*35.2), *verbum facere* (Caes.*BH.*3.7), *facit verba* (*BF.*32.1, *BG2.*14.1) etc.

¹²⁴ Terence is in general much more reluctant to use the EF than Plautus.

periphrasis parallel to *pugnare et al.*¹²⁵ There is also frequent periphrasis combined with passivization/intransitivation involving the verbs ‘to be’ and ‘to be(come)’, εἶμί and γίγνομαι: πῆματα πάσχω/(μοι) πῆματα γενέσθαι. Compare this to alternations with intransitive verbs and neuter nouns such as κειμήλια κείται in the Adonic next to κειμήλιον ἔσται. These are but a few out of a plethora of possible examples and, in the end, this sort of periphrasis constitutes a study of its own.

1.3.4 Formation of figures from ‘periphrastic’ constructions:

Rather than looking at every coincidence of an EF and a phrase with a generic verb as a periphrasis of the *figura*, we should recognize the possibility of formation from periphrastic constructions. Figures formed in this direction will be particularly tautological since the verb that the cognate replaces is largely empty in the first place. Biese noticed several Plautine constructions, among them *pro benefactis quom mali messim metas* ‘in return for favors you harvest a harvest of trouble’, showing movement from a ‘periphrastic’ construction with *facio* to the etymological phrase.¹²⁶ Perhaps the clearest example in Homer is τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο (*Il.*7.449) a figure, and verb that occurs only once in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, in Poseidon’s indignant complaint to Zeus concerning the wall the Greeks had just built (τεῖχος ἔδειμαν at 436). The frequency of the collocation τεῖχος δέμω ‘build a wall’ (*Iliad* x5) and standard use of the verbal compound ἐύδητον ‘well-built’ to qualify τεῖχος suggests that this was the more idiomatic expression and that τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο was its rather artificial offshoot. This coincides with the observation that indignation and anger are cross-linguistic impellers of

¹²⁵ *priu’ quam istam pugnā pugnabo, ego etiam prius dabo aliam pugnā claram* (Plaut. *Ps.*524-5), *dabit hic pugnā* (Ter. *Eu.*899) and cf. O.L.D. s.v.

¹²⁶ *Epid.*718. For further examples see Biese, 8.

tautological repetition. Lobeck, citing, among other examples ὕβριν ὑβρίζειν at Eur.*Herc.*708, *Bacch.*247 and Seneca ‘*insanire hilarem insaniam*’, notes “*omnia autem proferuntur ab indignantibus iratisve*” (506).¹²⁷

As already noted ἰρεύουσ’ ἱερήϊον provides another example of a denominative coinage opposite several more generic and unremarkable expressions. The figure occurs only once, in *Odyssey* 14 when Eumaeus uses it to express his disgust with the suitors. He frames the figure with gemination of the word denoting the behavior he is reviling, wantonness.

κτῆματα δαρδάπτουσιν **ὑπέρβιον**, οὐδ’ ἔπι φειδώ.

ὅσσαι γὰρ νύκτες τε καὶ ἡμέραι ἐκ Διός εἰσιν,

οὐ ποθ’ ἐν **ἰρεύουσ’ ἱερήϊον**, οὐδὲ δὴ οἶω·

οἶνον δὲ φθινύθουσιν **ὑπέρβιον** ἐξαφύοντες

They devour our possessions wantonly, nor is there any sparing.

For, as many as are the nights and days of Zeus

I think that they never sacrifice even one sacrifice, or two,

but they waste wine, drawing it off wantonly (*Od.*14.92-5).

In the majority of cases in ancient Greek Epic it is not plausible to attempt to draw conclusions as to the relative primacy and derivational direction of an etymological phrase and its non-etymological equivalents. We may only observe their co-existence and perhaps entertain theories as to motivations for their selection in context. The goal of this section has been only to introduce modes of expression that produce alternatives to the *figurae*, and to assert that within certain authors and/or genres avoidance of the etymological repetition in favor of its substitutes is more or less predictable.

¹²⁷ Note also the intractable interpretational tautology posed by the denominative verbs.

This principle applies to Homer to the degree that we can differentiate tonally defined sub-genres within the corpus, both including and beyond making the basic distinction between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. It is remarkable that, excepting adverbial alternates, which truly are more succinct, the other types of alternation do little or nothing to alleviate the semantic emptiness of one phrasal element. Rather, it is the repetition of sound that the substitution of a synonym or periphrasis of equal semantic vacuity but aural variation alleviates.¹²⁸ At a fundamental level, phrases such as ‘have a drink’ and ‘drink a drink’ serve the same function in language. The persistence of the periphrastic constructions in milieus hostile to the *figura etymologica* underlines the fact that the combination of semantically equivalent noun and verb often performs a real syntactic service. Authors and languages that avoid the cognate constructions in favor of similar non-cognate ones are still utilizing the same basic structure. This is the reason that linguistic-based studies such as those of Rosén treat the internal phrases together, whether or not the substantive and verb are genuinely cognate. It is also part of the reason they include analysis of periphrases. At the level of stylistics, however, it is difficult to underestimate the differences between the *figurae etymologicae* and their semantically similar cousins.

In practice, linguistic and stylistic studies ought to connect on a basic level. Rosén compiled a very useful list of etymological accusatives and ablatives in Latin.¹²⁹ But there are real pitfalls to conducting a linguistic study from such a disembodied list without delineating more subtle levels of idiom and wordplayfulness. What are we to make of the fact that a large number of

¹²⁸ Even the scornful scholars have noticed this: *Nam aures eruditae varietatem sonorum in sermone poscunt, et priorum syllabarum iterationes respuunt* (Weiske: 22).

¹²⁹ 1981:101-3.

the listed figures appear only in Plautus? While there are some hapaxes in Plautus that may be considered valuable preservations, many etymological figures that pop up once in jocund contexts are most likely not among them. Ultimately, we ought to question at what level is it truly valid to analyze embedded idioms like *facinus facere* and playful coinages like *dolum dolare* together. By including lists of adjectives attached to certain phrases Rosén has at least given us a minimal sense of the frequency of each entry. But any investigation into typologies of the cognate object and any assertions as to its cross-linguistic *raison d'être* should start by making distinctions along stylistic lines. Imagine that a modern linguist examined the cognate object in Present Day English by first heaping together a bunch of phrases from Dr. Seuss, and other children's books.¹³⁰ Such a study would only be valid in so far as it took into account the genre it was working in against a backdrop of overall idiom. This is one of the advantages of combining stylistic and linguistic analysis, making fine distinctions between embedded idiom, nonce coinage, and genre-oriented categories, like legalese, in which the *figurae* are more at home. It is also a good reason to compose lists that leave no doubt as to the relative frequency of each construction in each corpus. One should then compare those lists to frequencies within the language of the particular author one has chosen to focus on, and, particularly in terms of developing typologies, but also in general terms, make comparisons with other languages.

¹³⁰ Cf. the Dr. Seuss title *Oh, the **Thinks** you can **Think***, or in the text itself "there are so many **thinks** that a **Thinker** can **think**". Note also how perceptions of frequency in English would be skewed by the opening of *Franklin and Harriet*: "Franklin could count by twos and button his shoes. He helped his little sister, Harriet, **zip zippers** and **button buttons**. He showed her how to play peekaboo and pat-a-cake. He read stories and **sang songs** to her".

1.4 Selection of oblique cases to avoid externalization of the internal object:

Scholars have shown a long-standing tendency to assume that almost any Indo-European verb could have taken an internal object.¹³¹ Aside from the fact that this does not mean that a given verb actually ever *did* take such an object, I contend that there is an underlying theoretical problem with this assumption. This problem stems from the fact that an etymologically related substantive in the accusative coupled with many transitive verbs results in a completely external object that behaves quite differently from a cognate object. For instance, if one were to try to form an internal object with a phrase such as ‘drill a drill’ the resulting construct would require two drills, one to do the drilling and the other to be drilled. The combination naturally construes as one drill boring into another, just as one would ‘drill a piece of wood’. It is possible for an inept speaker to mean simply ‘drill’ in emphatic fashion by saying ‘drill a drill’ as one would say ‘fight a fight’ to mean simply ‘fight’, but the phrase is imprecise and invites misconstrual. The persistent way to achieve more precision is to put the noun into the instrumental: ‘drill with a drill’. If one were to ask carpenters ‘what did you drill?’ the informative and expected answer would never be ‘my drill’, or even ‘my ®Makita’; rather they would supply some information about the material, such as wood or concrete they had used their

¹³¹Cf. Biese, 6 “*omni verbo et ei, quod appellatur intransitivum, et ei, quod transitivum nominatur, obiectum internum adtribui licet*”. More recently Melchert (251) “virtually any verb may take an ‘internal’ accusative, where the nominal object repeats the semantic content of the verb: cf. Grk. *spéndein spondén* ‘make a libation’. The nominal object may be an actual derivative of the verb (the *figura etymologica*) or merely a noun whose meaning is closely related to that of the verb (Eng. ‘run a race’)”. This is, by the way, a comment largely incidental to the main point of Melchert’s article. See below ‘mixing bowls’ where I agree with and perhaps provide additional evidence for his thesis.

drill to bore a hole into. If, on the other hand, one asked ‘what did you drill with?’ then ‘my ®Makita’ would be a perfectly reasonable answer.¹³²

This is most likely why many of the etymological phrases in Homer describing actions of carpentry, husbandry and technical fabrication feature the noun in the instrumental dative: τερέτρῳ τετρῆναι, τρυπάνῳ τρυπᾶν ‘drill with a drill’. This predilection is demonstrable in Greek outside of Epic as well: ἀργυρέῳ εὐλάκῳ εὐλαξεῖν ‘to plow with a silver plough-share’.¹³³ Sanskrit language describing mechanical procedures demonstrates similar tendencies: *khanan khanitreṇa* ‘digging with a spade (digging instrument)’ (Manu.2.218). Latin usage of the ablative, *terebra* ‘drill’ coincides with the instrumental dative in Homer, ‘*terebratur terebra foramen* ‘the hole is drilled with a drill’.¹³⁴ Further, Virgil’s rendering of Homeric τρυπάνῳ τρυπᾶν in reference to boring out Polyphemus’ eye stays true to the tendency to put the material drilled in the accusative and object used for drilling in the case that expresses instrument:

...et telo lumen terebramus acuto/ ingens

and we bored into his massive eye with the honed shaft (*Aen.3.635-6*).

Another Homeric figure featuring a cognate instrumental is ‘lock (the door) with the lock’: κληῖσαι κληῖδι (*Od.21.241*). In cases such as this, and for that matter also cases such as τερέτρῳ τετρῆναι etc., the verb appears to be a zero derived denominal. In an article on similar denominal verbs in English Clark and Clark included a small subsection for ‘locks’ under

¹³² Another example drawn from profane idiom is to ‘fertilize fertilizer’. One can fertilize a garden, or ‘fertilize with fertilizer’, but to ‘fertilize fertilizer’ is to provide independently existent fertilizer with additional, fertilizer-like substance.

¹³³ Th.5.16.2-3. (reported oracle of Delphi).

¹³⁴ Vitr.10.16.5; Col.4.29.15; Plin.*Nat.*7.198.

‘fasteners’, all in turn a subcategory of instrument verbs.¹³⁵ If many of the verbs in these figures are, in fact derived from instruments in the first place, the selection of dative, rather than accusative case may very well have been predetermined well before construction of the cognate phrase. Clark and Clark also listed denominals of “location verbs” (772), suggesting that the case selection of the figures discussed in the following section may be similarly motivated.

Homeric figures illustrate that the locative offers another means of alleviating the danger of externalization of the object, ἐν εὐνήϊ εὐνηθῆναι ‘bed in a bed’, ἐν δεσμῶ δεῖν ‘bind in bondage’. Once again Sanskrit is illustrative: *sádasi sīdati* ‘sits in a seat’ compared with Greek ὄζω ἐφέζεσθαι, ἔξετο δ’εἰνὶ θρόνῳ.¹³⁶ Latin attests the locative ablative: *sedibus optatis.....sidunt* ‘(doves) perch in welcome perches’ (Verg.A.6.203). Some technical language fits here: ἐν δ’ ἔθετ’ ἀκμοθέτῳ μέγαν ἄκμονα ‘he (Hephaestus) put the great anvil on the anvil-stand’ (Od.8.274).¹³⁷ Since such constructions are not so much avoidances of an externalized object, as simply the most natural way that a verb expresses its semantics in relation to noun cases, it would be mistaken to assert that it was within the natural proclivities of Indo-European to attach an internal accusative to a vast number of verbs when logical patterns of oblique case *figurae etymologicae* correspond within the daughter languages. If the Indo-European root **sed-* ‘sit’ attests etymological locatives in Greek, Latin and Sanskrit, this correspondence, which ultimately is based

¹³⁵ Clark and Clark (776). Their list of such verbs in English included: “latch, padlock, bar, lock, hasp (the door).”

¹³⁶ Gaedicke (132) compared *sádasi sīdati* and ἔξετο δ’εἰνὶ θρόνῳ under locative of the goal.

¹³⁷ Surely ἀκμόθετον τιθέναι would involve putting up the anvil-stand itself.

on the semantics of the verb, must have rendered illogical to some degree the formation of a cognate accusative from the same root.

The tendency of past scholars to focus primarily on the cognate accusatives without considering the datives and ablatives next to them has facilitated deprecatory assessments of ancient Greek case selection reminiscent of the negative assessments of the etymological figures themselves:

*Die griechische Ausdruckweise beruht auf einer durchaus einfachen und kindlichen Anschauung, während andere Sprachen, namentlich die Deutsche, sich auf eine verstandesmäßige Auffassung des in Wirklichkeit bestehenden Verhältnisses der Dinge gründen.*¹³⁸

When we observe that the dative figures in Homer ‘are based on a rational conception of the actual relationship of things in reality’ we find that the vast majority of the accusative figures do the same. The composer(s) of the Homeric corpus, when not borrowing a phrase directly from the spoken idiom of their time, nonetheless almost always used a framework presumably based in natural linguistic expression in their selection not only of the instrumental and locative datives, but also, as we have seen, in the more subtle distinction of internal dative versus internal accusative. This rationale is more perspicuous in Homer than in later Greek when the dominant accusative figures began to force themselves on would-be datives. For instance, in the *Iliad*, Odysseus threatens to send Thersites back to the ships πεπλήγων ἀγορήθεν ἀεικέσσι πληγῆσιν ‘having beaten (him) from the place of assembly with shameful beatings’ (2.264). Wh-movement verifies the

¹³⁸ Kühner-Gerth (303). This comment occurs in the section on “Akkusativ bei intransitiven und passiven Verben und Adjektiven” with specific reference to structures like ἀλγῶ τὴν κεφαλὴν, but immediately before the section on the internal accusative/*figura etymologica*.

sensibleness of this usage since asking “what was beaten” would lead us to Thersites (in this case a *quem*), while asking “how (he) was beaten” might reasonably be answered “with shameful beatings/shamefully”. In Aeschylus, on the other hand, Agamemnon exclaims πέπληγμαι καιρίαν πληγήν ‘I am struck with a mortal blow’ (1343).¹³⁹ In subsequent Attic we find that the ‘illogical’ accusative dominates other internal constructions, τύπτει πληγὰς (Ar. *Ra*.636, cf. Lex ap. Aeschin.1.139), πληγὰς μαστιγούσθω (Pl. *Lg*.914b) all with an attribute that was often left to stand on its own, e.g. τυπτόμενος πολλάς (Ar. *Nu*.972).

Defiance of case-logic does occur at times even in Homer. For example, active, middle, and passive manifestations of the idiom ‘clothe (in) clothing’, e.g. εἴματα ἔσσεν, εἴματα εἶμαι, and εἴματα ἔσθην all take the accusative, while comparative evidence suggests that the active forms should take the instrumental.¹⁴⁰ Stylistic considerations may, very rarely, drive a figure into an awkward case, for instance *Odyssey* 9, a book with a substantially different relationship to the *figura etymologica* than the rest of the Homeric corpus, attests two EAs found elsewhere only as EDs, ὄλεθρον ἀπόλλέσθαι, βέλος βαλλεῖν.

The danger of forming an external object when an internal one is intended is not always independent from the pre-existence of a phrase as an idiom embedded in a given language. The expression ‘give a gift’ in a language where the combination is unheard of might very well construe as ‘recycle a gift’, that is, to give something that already functioned as a gift at some time in the past. We can not separate the fact that the contemporary

¹³⁹ As translated with movement into the instrumental by Hugh Lloyd-Jones.

¹⁴⁰ In Vedic Causative verb forms feature the cognate instrumental, e.g.: *vástreṇeva vāsayā* ‘clothe as if with clothing’ (*RV*.1.140.1).

idiom ‘give gift’ means ‘give something’ from its long-standing status as a viable expression with internal syntax in every Germanic language. In Attic one may say ‘judge a judgement’ (δικήν δικάζειν) to mean ‘render a juridical decision’. This assumes an idiomatic sub-structure that does not exist in Present Day English where such a repetition might be more apt to entail re-evaluation of an already rendered verdict.

We should close this section with a caveat and partial vindication of the scholars quoted at the outset who asserted that PIE (Melchert), or Latin (Biese) could generate an internal accusative from any root. In the end, this assertion may possess a certain theoretical truth, although no evidence has surfaced to suggest that Homeric Greek permitted generation of cognate objects from ergative intransitives or unaccusatives.¹⁴¹ For example, while ‘sit a chair’ may never be chosen in favor of ‘sit in a chair’, we do find a collocation from a root ‘to sit’ that attaches an abstract substantive: Skt. *dīrghasatram āsate* lit’ ‘sit a long session’ with specialized meaning ‘to sit for a long time at a soma sacrifice’.¹⁴² The most important point here is not to debate whether any root could theoretically have generated an internal object in IE or its daughter languages, but to work from the earliest extant evidence to determine what sort of grammatical structure a given root actually did most naturally produce. Importantly, there is no evidence to suggest that PIE idiom worked in a fashion analogous to Hebrew, which “has a very productive process of cognate object

¹⁴¹ The statement that English permits unergative but not ergative intransitives to produce cognate objects and excludes unaccusatives has become standard (Humphries, 398). However, Butt’s list of unaccusatives, defined as intransitive verbs with inactive subjects, is as follows: Affected Argument -burn, fall, dry...; Inchoatives –melt, die, grow...; Existing and Happening –exist, happen, arise...; Involuntary Emission of Stimuli –shine, clink, stink.... Clearly the standard assertion depends on eliminating ‘die death’ as housing an object/argument structure (In Greek, of course, we find θνήσκω θανάτῳ).

¹⁴² From the *Brāhmanas*. The temporal translation is quoted from Gonda.

formation".¹⁴³ In general I would extend the assertion made by Rosén that the EF represents an unproductive class in Latin and Irish to Greek, but add the caveat that particular authors, such as Plautus, or Aristophanes, since they are clearly quite capable of coining just about any sort of whimsical construction, represent momentarily productive milieus generating the illusion that the EA in particular was more adaptable and widespread than overall attestation suggests in terms of actual literary and spoken idiom.

In this chapter it has been my intention to establish a cross-linguistic and cross-literary basis of comparison deriving from the fundamental properties of assonance and tautology inherent to all of the constructions. It also became necessary to note occasional deviations from these inherent properties resulting from sound change and/or semantic shift. It may be true that ancient Greek literature, juxtaposed with later literary traditions, displays a distinctly different attitude toward the repetition of sound and sense that defines the etymological figures. Nevertheless, I am not prepared to explain away this difference by dismissing Homer, Plato, or Attic in general as primitive or unsophisticated. The scholarly tradition to date has judged the (accusative) figures on the basis of a division into two groups, *figurae sine attributo* and *figurae cum attributo*, labeling the former as particularly pointless and stupid. Little or no attempt has been made to develop stylistic distinctions based on the degree to which a given phrase represents a natural idiom, or playful coinage. In the end, it may be necessary to admit that the ancient literature attesting the tautological figures extensively had a greater tolerance

¹⁴³ Mittwoch (81). There, she further states that Hebrew is "a language in which the equivalent of adverbial modification is often expressed by cognate objects." She gives examples of two constructions unacceptable in English: 1) with a transitive event verb (*hezinu hazana* 'fed a feeding'), and 2) with a passive verb *nivdeku bedika* ('were examined an examination').

for such stark repetition. However, this admission should be tempered by a more trenchant look into the stylistic properties of each expression in terms of how specific authors, in this case Homer, adapted the schemata to context along a continuum with polarities represented, on the one hand, by embedded idioms and, on the other, by nonce coinages. After situating the phrases along this continuum, and making careful observations as to their overall distribution, a rather sophisticated selection process emerges, a process based on emotive context, constructive idiosyncrasies of dialogue and narrative, sub-genre, and even gender.¹⁴⁴ Examination of this selection process will be the focus of chapters three and four.

¹⁴⁴ The figures adhere more readily to women as narratees.

Chapter 2

Properties and grammatical categories of the specific case structures

2.1 The etymological nominative:

We might expect figures with cognate nouns as subjects to be grammatically straightforward. The nominative shows neither the case syncretism of the dative, nor the same variety of specialized uses as the accusative. But sub-categorizations based on the distinct properties of substantives within the group create some important differences. Most fundamental is the division between animates and inanimates, creatures and things. Commonest in Homer are biologically animate substantives, usually humans, but possibly animals or birds as subjects of active verbs: κῆρυξ κηρύσσει ‘a herald heralds’, ἀοιδὸς/ ἀηδὼν ἀείδει ‘a singer, or songbird sings’, πτωχὸς πτωχεύει ‘a beggar begs’. Less frequently we find active verbs with concrete or abstract, non-personal, but not grammatically neuter subjects: ὄχευς ἔχει ‘a holder holds’, ὀσμὴ ὄζει ‘an odor is odorous’. The verb may also be in the middle with a biologically or grammatically animate or inanimate subject: γονὴ/ γενέθλη γίγνεται ‘a brood is born’, or κειμήλια κεῖται ‘stores lied stored’. What we do not find are grammatically neuter substantives as subjects of cognate verb forms from active paradigms.

Before moving on to more specific discussion of the EN we should note that fully documented conversion of the EA into a construction with the substantive moved into the nominative as the subject of a passive verb, although extremely common in later Greek and other IE languages, never occurs in Homer: πόλεμον πολεμεῖν > πόλεμος ἐπολεμεῖτο ‘war was waged’ (X.H.4.8.1), *vácaḥ vac-* > *vácas ucyate* ‘speech has been spoken’

(*RV.1.114.6*).¹⁴⁵ Some Homeric figures do co-occur with the passive, but the noun simply stays in the accusative:

ἄμφω χρυσεῖω, χρύσεια δὲ εἴματα ἔσθην

‘They both, golden, were clothed (in) golden clothes’ (*Il.18.517*).¹⁴⁶

The syntax of such phrases is facilitated by the great adaptability of the Greek accusative, and in fact may have had something to do with its development.

As far as the agentive construction of the etymological nominative goes previous studies have made a distinction between persons and abstractions as subjects of cognate verbs on the level of tautology. This has a direct effect on the degree to which the EN matches up with the EA. For instance, in a 1961 article entitled “Was tut der Wind, wenn er nicht weht?” Ammann asserted the pure tautology of the abstract subject in the phrase ‘the wind blows’, but denied that the personal subject in ‘the singer sings’ was tautologous:¹⁴⁷

**wēntos bedeutet also ‘wehend, der Wehende, der Weher’ und Der Wind weht heisst eigentlich gar nichts anderes als ‘Der Wehende weht’ oder ‘Der Weher weht’. Das scheint eine reine Tautologie zu sein, da Satzgegenstand und satzaussage ja dasselbe besagen (besonders deutlich in der Form ‘Der Wehende ist wehend’). Aber der Satz Der Sänger singt ist ganz ähnlich gebaut und doch nicht tautologisch (19).*

When a person appears as the etymological subject they are engaging in an action that has special reference to them as assigned at that time, but is obviously not the only action they may engage in. When the ‘herald heralds’

¹⁴⁵ The very existence of the passive in Homer has been a subject of debate. Cf. De Boel (38¹³), Kühner-Gerth (123), Wistrand (38). I hold with those who favor the passive.

¹⁴⁶ This figure appears on the shield of Achilles. The implied agent is Hephaestus.

¹⁴⁷ His article was actually based on a seminar he taught on the Phrase ‘der Wind weht’.

(κῆρυξ κηρύσσει), emphasis is laid upon the performance of his specific duty as herald, but a herald is capable of being the subject of other verbs involving very different activities, and his existence apart from the verbal action of heraldry is never in question. Abstract subjects, on the other hand, such as those in the phrases ὁδμῆ ὄζει or πνοιῆ πνέει are basically coexistent with the verbal action, and therefore may be called ‘internal subjects’ parallel in some sense to internal objects. This is why Rosén includes only this group in consideration of the *figura etymologica*:

The three kinds of semantically empty agents with such verbs,

∅	PRON.	COGNATE
priusquam lucet	lucet hoc	lumina lucent
ut plerumque evenit	hoc evenit	eventus evenit

demonstrate the analogy of this construction with the accusative *figura etymologica* and substantiate the status of such cognate nominalizations as internal subjects, as the comparable French expressions had been characterized.¹⁴⁸

The parallelism between the cognate/inner object and subject surely has validity at a fundamental level. However, it is important to point out that in poetry, as well as in the imaginations of children, the internal subject takes on properties the internal object does not. Importantly, the grammatical gender of internal subjects and objects distinguishes them. The three most frequently attested EAs in Homer, εἴματα ἔννυσθαι, ἔπος εἰπεῖν and δῶρον/δωτίνην δίδοναι, to which we might add ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι/ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν and πῆμα

¹⁴⁸ 1996:133. Here Rosén references Gougenheim’s 1945 chapter (130 ff.) “*La Construction avec Sujet des Verbes Exprimant des Phénomènes météorologiques*” that treats such French phrases as *il pleut* next to *la pluie pleut*, and Rabelais: *Il n’y pluyra pluye, n’y luyra lumiere, n’y ventera vent* ‘It will not rain there (rain), will not be alight (light), will not blow (wind).

πάσχειν, put together comprise a numerically overwhelming group of neuter internal accusatives. The fact that the vast majority of internal objects are grammatically neuter, while in Homer the internal subject does not appear in the neuter with active verb forms, provides a vital clue to the nature of the essential properties of the etymological nominative.¹⁴⁹

In general, placing the nominative as the agent of a verb expressing its own etymologically and therefore logically integral action imbues the subject with a heightened potency and has a tendency to personify, and sometimes even deify abstracts. As Gonda noted, specifically regarding the figure *uttudas tvot tudatu* 'let the up-thruster thrust you up',¹⁵⁰ the *Vedas* illustrate the tendency to deify abstracts on numerous occasions:

Like many other subjects of these paronomastic expressions the upthruster was a divine power of vague character and incidental occurrence, supposed to manifest every time when a special action takes place, one of the so-called 'Sondergotter' or 'Augenblicksgötter', spirits which preside over any specific activity in the moment it takes place and which were considered to be concerned only with that activity (237).

2.1.1 The etymological nominative and abstract nouns as deities in Homer:

As mentioned above I have for the most part kept discussion of name-etymologies out of this study. Nevertheless, a few figures are worth noticing here because they demonstrate the intersection of the abstract etymological

¹⁴⁹ The figures in Latin studied most closely by Rosén, namely *lumina lucent* (Enn.*Ann.*156) and *ventorum flamina flando* (Lucil.870-71 Marx), being grammatically neuter, obviously do not suggest the same state of affairs in Latin and Sanskrit as in Homer. Vedic has a few neuter subjects, *rocante rocanā divi* 'the lights shine in heaven' (*RV.*1.6.1) and as we will soon see many animates.

¹⁵⁰ (*AV.*3.25.1).

subject and occasional deity in Homer. In *Iliad* 19 as Agamemnon defends himself against accusations that he is the one who brought woes to the Achaeans by insulting Achilles, we witness the movement of ἄτην as abstract object to Ἄτη as deified subject:

ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ αἰτιός εἰμι,
ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς καὶ Μοῖρα καὶ ἠεροφοῖτις Ἐρινύς,
οἳ τέ μοι εἰν ἀγορῇ φρεσὶν ἔμβαλον ἄγριον ἄτην

I am not to blame

But Zeus and Fate and Fury who darts through air

They threw savage blindness into my brain in the assembly (*//*.86-8).

Here ἄτη in the accusative, pawn of other divine agencies, is a simple abstract. A few lines later she appears as a goddess in conjunction with being the daughter of Zeus and appearing in the first of a series of relative ENs:

θεὸς διὰ πάντα τελευτᾷ
πρέσβα Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἄτη, ἣ πάντας ἀᾶται,
οὐλομένη, τῇ μὲν θ' ἀπαλοὶ πόδες· οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' οὔδει
πίλναται, ἀλλ' ἄρα ἦ γε κατ' ἀνδρῶν κράατα βαίνει

The goddess did everything

august daughter of Zeus, Blindness, who blinds all,

destructive, and her feet are tender, for not to the ground

does she draw near, but rather she walks on men's' heads (*//*.19.92-

3).¹⁵¹

Note that personification of the abstract is made even more explicit by attachment of a genealogy and corporeal characteristics. Agamemnon goes on to explain how even Zeus, grievously blinded (πολλὸν ἀάσθη), was tricked

¹⁵¹ This passage is quoted to show Homer's skill at personification at *Pl.Smp*.195d.

by Hera and threw Blindness, who remains a goddess for the rest of the passage, out of Olympus:

αὐτίκα δ' εἶλ' Ἄτην κεφαλῆς λιπαροπλοκάμοιο
χώμενος φρεσὶν ἦσι, καὶ ὤμοσε καρτερόν ὄρκον
μή ποτ' ἐς Οὐλύμπόν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα
αὐτίς ἐλεύσεσθαι Ἄτην, ἣ πάντας ἀᾶται.

Right then he grabbed Blindness by the brilliant braids of her head
angry at heart, and he swore a mighty oath
that never again to Olympus and the starry sky
would come Blindness, who blinds all (//.19.126-29).

Near the end of his defense Agamemnon uses the figure one last time to justify his own willingness to make amends to Achilles:

οὐ δυνάμην λελαθέσθ' Ἄτης ἣ πρῶτον ἀᾶσθην

I could not be forgetful of Blindness by whom I was blinded (//.19.136).

This time the verb is passive and the relative in the dative, but Blindness is still most likely the agent.¹⁵² Contrast this with the one occurrence of ἄτη as an un-deified abstract in an etymological phrase:

Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἣ ρά τιν' ἤδη ὑπερμενέων βασιλῆων
τῆδ' ἄτη ἄσασας καί μιν μέγα κῦδος ἀπῆύρας

Zeus, father, already once you blinded with such blindness
one of the overzealous kings and robbed him of great glory (//.8.237).

Here Zeus is clearly the actor as subject of the verb and ἄτη is an instrumental dative. The movement away from agentive/nominative

¹⁵² Our texts consistently capitalize Ἄτη in this passage, but it is worth considering that the dative is instrumental, and that even in this manipulation of case and verbal voice we move slightly away from personification.

corresponds with an abstract, impersonal usage where the EN does not.¹⁵³ The abstract feminine ἄτη occurs x12 in the *Iliad* and x5 in the *Odyssey*. It operates as the subject of other verbs without personification or capitalization.¹⁵⁴

The second abstract in a relative EN appearing as the name of an occasional deity is Panic who appears as the subject of a causative verb:

οἶος δὲ βροτολοιγὸς Ἄρης πόλεμον δὲ μέτεισι,
τῷ δὲ **Φόβος** φίλος υἱὸς ἅμα κρατερὸς καὶ ἀταρβῆς
ἔσπετο, **ὅς τ' ἐφόβησε** ταλάφρονά περ πολεμιστήν·

And as Ares, doom of mortals goes out to war

and his own son Panic, both mighty and fearless

follows, who puts into a panic even a pugnacious warrior (*Il.*13.298-300).

This figure enhances a simile comparing Ares and Panic with Meriones and Idomeneus as they march out onto the battlefield.¹⁵⁵ The occurrence of the noun Φόβος as an internal but personified subject of an EN with the transitive active of φοβέω belies the fact that it is probably more natural as an internal object of an EA with the intransitive middle φοβέομαι. There is every possibility that the Homeric expression is a conversion of an internal accusative motivated by a stylistic desire for vivid personification:

ἀνδρεῖοι οὐκ αἰσχροὺς **φόβους φοβοῦνται**, ὅταν φοβῶνται,
οὐδὲ αἰσχρὰ θάρρη θαρροῦσιν

Real men do not fear shameful fears, when they fear,

¹⁵³ 3 other uses of Ἄτη as a goddess occur in quick succession at *Il.*9.504-12 where she is contrasted with more benevolent daughters of Zeus. Hesiod features Ἄτη in a list, *Th.*230.

¹⁵⁴ τὸν δ' ἄτη φρένας εἶλε (*Il.*16.805), ἄνδρ' ἄτη πικινὴ λάβη (*Il.*24.480).

¹⁵⁵ The naming and deification of Φόβος outside the etymological construction happens 4 other times in the *Iliad*, always closely associated with other Gods.

nor do they dare shameful acts of daring (Pl.*Prt.*360b, cf.E.*Tr.*1165-6).

φόβους πονηροὺς καὶ κενοὺς δεδοικέναι.

to have feared base and empty terrors (E.*Supp.*548, cf.Pl.*Smp.*198a).

καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν

jah ohtedun sis agis mikil

jah ohtedun agisa mikilamma

And they feared a great fear (Mark 4.41 with Gothic translation, and Luke 2.9 this time translated with an internal dative).¹⁵⁶

These and other passages provide evidence that both internal and etymological accusative constructions combining φόβον with φοβεῖσθαι or δεδοικέναι had quite a bit of currency after Homer. The personification and deification of Φόβος in the Iliadic passage does not depend on proving that the nominative expression was actively converted from an existing accusative idiom by Homer, but the possibility is interesting to contemplate. In any event, the abstract ‘panic’ would have been more logical as an object even if the figure itself were an innovation. The later attestations of the noun as the substantive element of an EA lend credence to the assertion that the Homeric nominative schema is quite artificial. Moving far afield, it is intriguing to note that even in modern contexts semantic equivalents to φόβον φοβεῖσθαι are more likely to pop up as accusatives:

So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have **to fear is fear** itself -- nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which

¹⁵⁶ This figure and its Gothic translation are discussed by Wolfe (211) who notes that “*ohtedun* is the weak preterite of the verb *ogan*, cognate with *agis*”. He cites this passage as an exception to his general hypothesis that Gothic avoids the EF in its translations of the Bible. It is therefore interesting to note the use of this mutilated figure in light of my previous assertion that mutilation authorizes use in venues otherwise hostile to such repetition of sound and sense. Gonda notes the varying ablaut grades (1959:241³²).

paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. (FDR, 1st inaugural address).

Roosevelt's phrase externalizes the cognate object, a process made possible, in large part, because 'fear fear' is not a modern English idiom. As an innovation it provides further evidence for verbs of fearing to naturally produce accusative *figurae*.

A final phrase worth mentioning in this section, not necessarily as an etymological figure, but rather as an alliterative figure of repetition with elemental forces/goddesses as subject, is ἄρπυιαι ἀνηρείψαντο/ Ἄρπυιαι ἀνῆρέψαντο 'the storm spirits snatched away'.¹⁵⁷ Szemerényi attempted to derive both ἀρπάζω and ἐρέπτομαι from IE *rep- via the supposition of a prothetic alpha.¹⁵⁸ Even if we admit this problematic connection, the further derivation of ἄρπυια as the feminine perfect participle of ἐρέπτομαι is difficult to say the least. Chantraine is doubtful even of the derivation of ἄρπυια from ἀρπάζω.¹⁵⁹ At any rate, the phrase Ἄρπυιαι ἀνῆρέψαντο has a history as an etymological figure and instance of etymologizing alongside Ἄτη ἅδται and Φόβος φοβεῖ.¹⁶⁰ The Ἄρπυιαι as either storm goddesses or abstract elementals viewed as potential subjects offer an appropriate segue to our next topic.

¹⁵⁷ *Od.* 1.241, 14.371, 20.77. The uncapitalized reading is that of Allen (Oxford edition), the capitalized that of von der Muehl (Teubner).

¹⁵⁸ 205: "ἀνηρείψαντο and ἀρπ-άζω are derived from IE *rep-. The Greek development is to be understood as follows. IE *rep- developed a prothetic vowel which, as is normally the case, was α-; then the early ἀρεπ- was, under certain conditions, assimilated to ἐρεπ- attested by ἐρέπτομαι". He does not discuss the presence of spiritus asper in one but not the other.

¹⁵⁹ See under ἀρπάζω "un rapport avec ἄρπυια, ἄρπυς est plus douteux et pourrait être dû à l'étymologie populaire."

¹⁶⁰ See for instance Fehling (158) where the phrase is listed as a *figura etymologica* and Rank (39-40) where it is discussed as an instance of etymologizing.

2.1.2 Meteorological phenomena and the numinous nominative:

In Present Day English, as in many modern languages, verbs describing meteorological phenomena take impersonal subjects: it's raining, it's snowing, or it's windy.¹⁶¹ Gendered pronouns would be singularly odd in such positions: *he's raining, or *she's snowing. If the noun 'rain' is used to describe the event we generally choose a non-cognate verb: rain is falling, snow is falling, or wind blows. Etymological figures in such expressions involve too overt a tautology and are generally awkward: †rain is raining, †snow is snowing. The phrase 'spring has sprung', at some level utilizing a pun to alleviate its bare repetitiveness, may be the most idiomatic figure of this type in current idiom. 'Thunder thunders' and 'dawn dawns' are a bit forced, but do not seem to be completely unidiomatic. Generally, however, as scientific-minded people we tend to keep our elements in the category of un-personified neuter abstracts.

As far as we can judge from extant sources, verbalizations of meteorological phenomena took fundamentally different forms in ancient times, and actually favored anthropomorphic expression with semi-personified animates in the subject-slot. While we must be careful to note that the poetic nature of these sources may or may not represent everyday idiom accurately, it is also true that virtuoso composers are not in the business of coining ridiculous phrases in serious contexts.¹⁶² There is also no reason to create an

¹⁶¹ Not all languages need a subject. Modern Greek, for instance may express the fact that 'it's raining' with a third person verb alone.

¹⁶² Much more will be said about this in Chapter 3; for now suffice to say that the ending of Joyce's somber short story "The Dead" would be severely impaired by the substitution of 'snow snowing' for 'snow falling' notwithstanding the passages emphasis on the alliteration of 's':

"His soul swooned slowly as he heard the snow falling faintly through the universe and faintly falling, like the descent of their last end, upon all the living and the dead."

unnecessary rift between poetic diction and audience reaction. It is possible that stylistic repetitions were more acceptable in special genres, but divorcing them completely from everyday speech would create the risk of absurdity at exactly the wrong moment.

Several ancient bodies of literature show the tendency to personify and deify abstract meteorological phenomena. The etymological nominative starts this apotheosis at the basic level of syntax. In the *Vedas* it is quite common to find the noun for a natural phenomenon coupled with a cognate verb. Most prominently the root **h₂ueh₁-* ‘blow’ generated the oft-recurring phrase *vāta-vā*.¹⁶³ Several passages quite clearly feature *vātaḥ* as an elemental deity:

śám no agnir jyótiranīko astu śám no mitrávaruṇāv asvínā

śám naḥ sukṛitām sukṛitāni santu śám na iṣiró abhí vātu vātaḥ

Let Agni, whose countenance is light, be lucky for us, let Mitra and Varuna, let the Ásvin be lucky for us, let the benefits of the benefactors be lucky for us, let lord Wind blow lucky for us. (*RV.7.35.4*).

At *Rig Veda* 10.137.2-3 variants of the figure repeat like an onomatopoeic mantra:

dvāv imau vātau vāta á sindhor á parāvātaḥ

dákṣam te anyá á vātu párānyó vātu yád rápaḥ

á vāta vāhi bheṣajām ví vāta vāhi yád rápaḥ

tvám hí viśvábheṣajo devānām dūtá íyase

These two winds blow here from the Sindhus in the distance;

let one blow power to you, the other blow sickness hence.

Wind, blow welfare here, Wind, blow sickness hence,

¹⁶³ See Grassmann’s entry for the verb, (1257), which finds expression with *vātaḥ* in about half of its attestations.

then you, the panacea, go forth as messenger of the gods. Variants of *vātaḥ vātu bheṣajam* ‘let Wind blow good health’ recur at *RV.1.89.4* and *10.186.1*. In all of these incantatory passages we see the Wind conjured as a personification of a potentially beneficial power in the Vedic universe having significant control over the well-being of men.

The Iranian tradition also shows a tendency to personify the Wind as an anthropomorphic entity. The description of the journey of the pious soul after death in the Avestan fragments of the *Hadhokht Nask* attests the same nominative syntagm twice in quick succession. The first thing the soul perceives after lying dormant for three days is a wind blowing sweeter than any wind in its previous experience:

7...ā dim **vātō upa.vāvō** saḍayeiti rapiθwitara hača naēma
rapiθwitaraēibyō hača naēmaēibyō hubaoiḍiš huḍaoiḍitarō anyaēibyō
vātaēibyō

It seems as if a wind were blowing from the region of the south, from the regions of the south, a sweet-scented wind, sweeter-scented than any other wind in the world.

8. āatəm **vātəm** naḥhaya uzgrəbayō saḍayeiti yō narš ašaonō urva:
‘kudaḍaēm **vātō vāiti**, yim yava vātəm naḥhābya hubaoiḍitəməm
jīgaurva?’

And it seems to the soul of the faithful one as if he were inhaling that wind with the nostrils, and he thinks: ‘Whence does that wind blow, the sweetest-scented wind I ever inhaled with my nostrils?’

9. aḥhadim **vātaya** frarənta saḍayeiti yā hava daēna kainīnō kəhrpa
srīraya xšōiθnyauruša.bāzvō amaya huraoḍayauzarštaya bərəzaitya

*erədvaššnyia sraotanvō āzātaya raēvasčiθraya panča.dasaya
raoḍaēšva kəhrpa avavatōsraya yaθa dāman sraēštāiš*

And it seems to him as if his own conscience were advancing to him in that wind, in the shape of a maiden fair, bright, white-armed, strong, tall-formed, high-standing, thick-breasted, beautiful of body, noble, of a glorious seed, of the size of a maid in her fifteenth year, as fair as the fairest things in the world (*H.2.7-9* translation after Darmesteter).

It is difficult to imagine a more clear case of personification than this. After being conjured as the nominative of two etymological figures the self's reflection appears as a maiden in the wind. Compare also the long excursus on the corporeal characteristics of this wind-maiden to the corporealization of Ἄτη above. In the third *Nask* the figure recurs several times to describe the wind that blows upon the wicked soul (3.25-32), although this time it is simply foul and not personified as a maiden.

Germanic languages also attest an EN from **h₂ueh₁-* from Gothic *waiwoun windos* onward.¹⁶⁴ As I have already mentioned, Amman noted that the occurrence of the noun in the masculine as an agentive subject often leads to a personification that generates the 'childish' question "*was tut der Wind, wenn er nicht Weht?*"¹⁶⁵ The logical answer to this question -- that there is no wind when it's not windy -- is unsatisfactory to the imagination. According to

¹⁶⁴ Hittite attests a verb, *ḫuwai-*, *ḫuya-* 'run, hurry, grow, spread (of vegetation)', which various scholars have tried to connect etymologically with the participial substantive, *ḫuwant-* 'wind' e.g. KUB VI 46 III 49, *ḫu-u-wa-an-te-es*. Regarding the connection of this verb and substantive Puhvel makes the following remark: "If there had been even a residual sense of 'blow' in *ḫuwai-* (instead 'blow' is *parai-*, q.v.), a figura etymologica **ḫuwanza ḫuwāi* would have been as idiomatically irresistible as *RV. 4.7.10, 10.142.4 vāto anuvāti* or OCS *vŭzěašę větri* (*Zogr. Matth.7:25-27*) or Goth. *waiwoun windos*." (1991, 422).

¹⁶⁵ His specific examples (17) of statements that generate children's' questions as to what the wind does when it's not windy are "*Hörst du, wie draussen der Wind weht?*" or "*Der Wind weht heute von Osten*."

Ammann, when answering the question for their children mothers are more likely to provide responses that acknowledge the personification in the child's mind by saying, for instance, that the wind sleeps when it is not blowing. The division of a natural event without visible agency, into the grammatical construct of active subject and verb creates an agent that is, in turn, given existence apart from the verbal action.¹⁶⁶ This whole process lends itself not only to the childrens' questions, but also to mythic and poetic expression. Personification via attributing agency in this way provides a link between the grammatical construct and the deification of **h₂ueh₁ntos*, historically just a thematized present participial appearing as subject in a completely tautological phrase.

Vergil's description of the winds trapped in a cavern in *Aeneid* 1 and Aeolus' bag of winds in the *Odyssey* show that the separate existence of winds was a commonplace in Ancient Epic. Homer does not attest a phrase to correspond exactly to Indo-Iranian *vāta-* *vā-* or Germanic *Wind weht*. Retention of the verbal aspects of the participle ἀέντος made it unsuitable as the substantival element of an EN. We do have what might be termed a 'near miss' with the participle in the genitive dependent on a syntagm that functions as the subject of διάημι in the onomatopoeic lines,

τοὺς/τὴν μὲν ἄρ' οὐτ' ἀνέμων διάη μένος ὑγρὸν ἀέντων

The wet force of the blowing winds could not blow through these/this (copse) (*Od.*5.478, 19.440).

But generally in Homer the subjects of meteorological phenomena are non-cognate gods or goddesses. For instance directional wind gods appear as subjects of ἄησι:

¹⁶⁶ See Ammann, 18.

Βορέης καὶ Ζέφυρος, τῷ τε Θρήκηθεν ἄητον

North and West, who blow from Thrace (*Il.*9.5).

Abstract words for wind also occur as subjects of the verb: οὔρος occurs as an agent at *Od.*3.176 (ὤρτο δ' ἐπὶ λιγύς οὔρος ἀήμεναι 'a shrill wind sprang up to blow'), but we soon learn that it was incited by Poseidon (183). Α πνοιή literally 'breath' becomes a favorable wind when it is the breath of Zephyr. This is the one wind Aeolus does not trap in the bag when he sends Odysseus homeward:

αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ πνοιὴν Ζεφύρου προέηκεν ἀῆναι

But for me he sent forth the breath of Zephyr to blow (*Od.*10.25).

The *Odyssey* (9.139) attests a noun from **h₂meh₁-* as subject of πνέω, ἐπιπνεύσωσιν ἀῆται 'winds breath' and at *Od.*4.567-8 Ocean sends winds of shrill breathing Zephyr to cool men:

ἀλλ' αἰεὶ Ζεφύροιο λιγὺ πνεΐοντος ἀήτας

Ἵκεανὸς ἀνίησιν ἀναψύχειν ἀνθρώπους·

Only once does Homeric language combine a word for wind and cognate verb in a true etymological nominative. But this one attestation shows an acute awareness of the construction's animating power in a strikingly literal manner:

Τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχὴ, κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλύς

αὐτίς δ' ἐμπνύνθη, περὶ δὲ πνοιὴ Βορέας

ζώγρει ἐπιπνεΐουσα κακῶς κεκαφηότα θυμόν

Then spirit left him, and mist had poured over his eyes.

But he gasped in again, and the breath of Boreas breathing

took him prisoner alive although he has hideously coughed up his life
(//.5.697-8).¹⁶⁷

This resurrection of Sarpedon occurs just after Tlepolemus' spear has been pulled from his thigh. The narrative has mentioned the intervention of Zeus at 662,¹⁶⁸ and highlights the fact by including that Sarpedon sits 'under Zeus' fair oak' (Διὸς περικαλλεῖ φηγῶ). The passage shows an artfulness leaving little doubt that the composer consciously strove for assonance and polyptoton. Alliteration of 'ps', 'pn' and 'p/ph' sounds mimic the gasping out and regaining of breath and life. The breath of the North wind breathing, lying at the center of the description, plays an active role highlighted by a possible double entendre in the use of ζώγρει (ζῶν ἀγρεῖν), which elsewhere in Greek always means to take a prisoner alive, and only here appears to mean also, 'revivify'.¹⁶⁹ Although in one sense Sarpedon is divinely incarnate after this episode, in another he is walking dead until he meets his ultimate demise at the hands of Patroclus.¹⁷⁰ The resuscitating *anima* of North Wind has taken him as a live prisoner for now, but he is breathing breaths not truly his own.

The only other elemental EN in Homer also features a non-cognate deity in the genitive alleviating the agentive role of the element itself:

περὶ δὲ ῥόος Ἰκεανοῖο/ ἀφρῶ μορμύρων ῥέειν

The stream of Ocean streamed round, roaring with foam (//.18.402-3).¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁷ This reading, in fact, goes against a long scholarly tradition. I have argued for it at length in a paper entitled "Fate, Jovian Omnipotence and the Walking Death of Sarpedon" presented in April, 2008 at the annual meeting of CAMWS.

¹⁶⁸ πατήρ δ' ἔτι λοιγὸν ἄμυνεν.

¹⁶⁹ The usual translation is 'bring back to life' and the LSJ has a separate entry just for this passage.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. the gloss of Hesch. κέκηφε· τέθνεκεν.

¹⁷¹ The context of this phrase, and correspondences in other languages are discussed in greater detail below .

Given this tendency to supplant the etymological agent with an adjoining non-cognate deity in the genitive it is not surprising that Homeric language often features familiar, anthropomorphic members of the Greek pantheon as the agentive subjects of meteorological phenomena. For instance, Hypnos describes Hera as causing the blasts of the winds to blow:

σὺ δέ οἱ κακὰ μήσαο θυμῷ
ὄρσασ' ἀργαλέων ἀνέμων ἐπὶ πόντον ἀήτας

But you (Hera) devised evils in your heart,
and roused blasts of baneful winds upon the sea (*Il.*14.253-4).

Sanskrit usage also shows the tendency to alternate the cognate nominative of the active element with a different deity. In the *Rig Veda* the EN and EA may alternate, with another deity filling the subject/agent slot. An example of this occurs in successive hymns, *RV.*5.83 and 84. The first is a hymn to Parjanya, or Indra in his capacity as the sender of rain:¹⁷²

ávarṣīr varṣám údu ṣú grbhāyā

‘you (Parjanya) rained rain, now check it well’ (83.10).

The following hymn, to *pṛthivi* closes with the rain as subject:

yát te abhrásya vidyúto divó várṣanti vṛṣṭáyaḥ

when the rains of your cloud rain from the brilliant sky (84.3).

As observed by Gonda the first arrangement finds correspondence in later literature:

yathā vai parjanyaḥ suvṛṣṭam varṣati evam yajño yajamānasya varṣati

¹⁷² The Etymology of *Parjanya* is debated; *-janya* could be either a reference to victor, *jetā*, generator, or impeller, *prajayitā* of water. The Unādi derivation actually makes a desperate and implausible attempt to construct an etymological figure out of the phrases by referring *Parjanya* back to *vṛṣ* with *p < v*, *guṇa* of *r* (ar) and *j < ṣ*.

‘then as Parjanya rains rain, so rain the sacrifices of the sacrificer’
(*T.S.1.6.10.5*).

But rain also occurs as subject in the *Atharvaveda*:

na varṣaṃ maitrāvaruṇaṃ brahmajyam abhi varṣati

The rain of Mitra and Varuna (Sun and Ocean) does not rain on the scholarly gathering (*5.19.15*).

In Homer, of course, as in later Greek, it is Zeus who rains.¹⁷³ In the PIE sense this would simply amount to the sky raining, but anthropomorphism probably obscured this elemental sense quite early.

Further meteorological phenomena involved in etymological nominatives in Vedic are *uṣas-* ‘dawn’ and *vidyut* ‘lightning’. In the *Rig Veda* *uṣas-* occurs frequently as the subject of *vas-*, *uṣ-*, e.g.

eṣó uṣā́ ápūrvyā vyúchatī priyā́ diváh

There the dawn, beloved of heaven, shines like never before (*1.46.1*). *Rig Veda* 1.48, a hymn to *Uṣas* in which the dawn is clearly a goddess, personified as the daughter of heaven (*duhitar diváh*), features the EN three times.¹⁷⁴ The same phrase occurs in the *Atharva Veda*: *śam uṣā́ no vyucchatu* ‘let dawn shine for us’ (*7.69.1*), and was clearly a part of Sanskrit poetic idiom from an early time. We find *vidyut* as subject of the prefixed, intensive stem of *dyut* ‘lightning flashes’ at *RV.6.3.8*: *vidyún ná dāvidyot* ‘(Agni flashes) like a flash of lightning flashes’.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷³ For Zeus raining in Homer cf. *Il.12.25-6*: ὤε δ’ ἄρα Ζεὺς / συνεχέει. In Modern Greek idiom the verb βρέχει alone suffices, and this option may be traced back to papyri (see Schwyzer, 621).

¹⁷⁴ In the 1st, 3rd and 8th verses. For further attestations cf. *RV.7.75.5*, multiple times again in 1.113. The phrase occurs with the noun in the plural at 7.72.4 (here invoked in the preceding verse as goddesses (*devīḥ*), etc. etc).

¹⁷⁵ Cf. 10.95.10, 10.99.2. At *Aeneid* 2.649 Jupiter is the impetus of lightning: *ex quo me diuum pater atque hominum rex/ fulminis adflavit ventis* ‘hence the father of gods and men blasted

Balto-Slavic attests nominative figures for snow, Lith. *sniegas snigo*, frost, Lith. *šaltis šalo* and thunder, Russ. *grom progromit*. E. Hofmann noted that figures of this type trend toward the accusative in German: *es schneit den Schnee* (97). As always there is no substitute for examination of each phrase language by language, but it is tempting to propose that the pattern with abstract meteorological phenomena in agentive roles as subjects of cognate verbs represents an older set of phrases upon which new constructions imposed themselves in various ways. In Homer, this imposition would have taken the form either of a personified non-cognate deity in the genitive or outright usurpation of the subject slot by a full-fledged member of the Greek pantheon. Elsewhere it involved movement of the abstract element to the accusative with retention of the etymological repetition and a separate god taking over as subject, as in Vedic, and finally, as in Germanic, a neuter pronoun took over as agent. Whether or not these processes are connected in any diachronic or cross-linguistic manner is anybody's guess, but only a select few of the meteorological ENs find any sort of correspondences at the level of syntagm or lexeme in IE languages, and it is telling that they appear to be older than the ENs featuring personal subjects, when, from a modern standpoint, personal subjects make more sense in this position.

As a final note on this topic it is important to add that featuring meteorological phenomena as subjects of paronomastic figures was not a practice restricted to Indo-European. From various Semitic sources Reckendorf includes the following combinations in his lists: 'streams stream', 'storms storm' 'the wind is windy' 'dawn dawns', 'rain rains', 'twilight twilights',

me with winds of lightning'. Cf. Servius (*ad loc.*) who has a discussion of the different types of lightning blasts.

‘fire (the burner) burns’, ‘cold cools’, lightning lightnings’ and ‘the passer (year) passes’.¹⁷⁶ Given the greater frequency of paronomasia in Semitic languages and the fact that the cognate object construction is actually productive there, it is not surprising that in this venue almost every element appears as subject to its own verb.

2.1.3 Θεὸς τίθησι:

Vedic attests an agent noun, **d^heh₁-te/or* as the name of a god, *Dhātar* several times as subject of phrases with the verb *dhā-* expressing the culmination of his sole activity:

dhātā́ gárbham dadhātu te ‘let Dhātar position your fetus’

(*RV.10.184.1=AV.5.25.5*).

dhātā dadhātu no rayim ‘let Dhātar position our material wealth’

(*AV.7.17.2*).

Knowing the properties of the EN, such a combination, in which a common verb of creation and distribution involves divine agency in a stylistic figure, should not surprise us. It might be advantageous to import that data to Homer where the most common figure with a subject of phonetic similarity to a verb is Θεὸς τίθησι, θεοὶ θέσαν.¹⁷⁷ Two facts problematize the evaluation of this schema as etymological. First, Θεὸς < **d^hh₁sos*, cognate with Latin *festus* and *fānum* < **fasnom* is difficult to derive with any degree of certainty from the same root as τίθησι, **d^heh₁*. Second, it is not possible to be certain that the two are ‘etymologized’ in Homer and Hesiod. The well-known passage of Herodotus which has the Pelasgians deriving the word Θεὸς from τίθησι

¹⁷⁶ For more figures and specific citations see Reckendorf, 77 ff.

¹⁷⁷ Note that, according to Pelliccia (78) “τίθημι ... has a pronounced partiality for divine subjects.” By his statistical analysis (79) τίθημι has divine subjects 30.2% of the time. This suggests that Θεὸς and τίθημι had a predisposition to occur as an EN.

shows that by his time there was not only a tendency to connect the functions of Gods with the semantic field of **d^heh₁-*, but to express that relationship in an overtly declared etymological nominative:

Ἔθουον δὲ πάντα πρότερον οἱ Πελασγοὶ θεοῖσι ἐπευχόμενοι, ὡς ἐγὼ ἐν Δωδώνῃ οἶδα ἀκούσας, ἐπωνυμίην δὲ οὐδ' οὔνομα ἐποιεῦντο οὐδενὶ αὐτῶν· οὐ γὰρ ἀκηκόεσάν κω.

Θεοὺς δὲ προσωνόμασάν σφεας ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιούτου ὅτι κόσμῳ **θέντες** τὰ πάντα πρήγματα καὶ πάσας νομὰς εἶχον.

In ancient times, as I know from what I was told at Dodona, the Pelasgians offered sacrifices of all kinds, and prayed to the gods, but without any distinction of name or title- for they had not yet heard of any such thing. They called the gods by the Greek word *theoi*- 'disposers'- because they had 'disposed' and arranged everything in due order, and assigned each thing to its proper division.¹⁷⁸

In the *Cratylus* Plato offers an alternate etymology, deriving θεὸς from θεῖν 'to run' since, at a time when deities were viewed exclusively as celestial bodies, they were always running across the sky.¹⁷⁹ It is quite likely that here, Plato, as often in the *Cratylus*, toys with a racier alternative to the 'standard' etymology offered by Herodotus or other sources. Elsewhere, in perhaps more conservative settings, Plato uses the figure θεὸς τίθησι, to buttress the necessity that people agree in the divine genesis and basis of laws:

¹⁷⁸ 2.52. As translated by Sélincourt. Inquiry into the origin of the Pelasgians as they are presented by Herodotus, is fraught with several notorious problems, and sheds no light on the origin of the figure. For a good outline of the problem of Pelasgian origin see McNeal's 1985 article.

¹⁷⁹ ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ γῆν καὶ ἄστρον καὶ οὐρανόν· ἅτε οὖν αὐτὰ ὀρῶντες πάντα ἀεὶ ἰόντα δρόμῳ καὶ θέοντα (397d).

μιᾶ δὲ φωνῇ καὶ ἕξ ἑνὸς στόματος πάντας συμφωνεῖν ὡς πάντα
καλῶς κείται **θέντων θεῶν**, καὶ ἐάν τις ἄλλως λέγῃ, μὴ ἀνέχεσθαι
τὸ παράπαν ἀκούοντας·

Everyone has to agree, with one heart and voice, that they are all
excellent and exist by divine fiat; if anyone says differently, the citizens
must absolutely refuse to listen to him (634e).¹⁸⁰

It is clear, then, that in post-Homeric Greek there was a popular etymology
connecting the actions of *theoi* with semantic aspects of **d^heh₁*. The recurring
Homeric formula, by featuring *theoi* repeatedly as the subjects of various
forms of τίθησι, illustrates the same tendency to connect the noun
semantically with the verb in an alliterative phrase. It thus fulfills sufficient
criteria for inclusion among *figurae etymologicae*. Whether or not it constitutes
an instance of popular ‘etymologizing’ at the time of the Epics remains in
question.

2.1.4 Other biologically ‘inanimate’ and neuter subjects:

The remaining inanimates featured in Homeric ENs roughly split into
two grammatical groups: neuters and non-neuters. Even undeified animates
may be semi-personified and display supernatural powers of agency
emphasized by the EN. At *Iliad* 18.470 after Hephaestus has ‘ordered them to
work’ (κέλευσε ἐργάζεσθαι), there is a depiction of the automatic action of
his bellows emphasized with an EN:

φῦσαι δ’ ἐν χοάνοισιν ἐείκοσι πᾶσαι ἐφύσων

‘All twenty bellows blew/bellowed on the melting-pots’.

¹⁸⁰ 634e, translated by T. Saunders in Cooper.

The *Scholia* assert that these bellows are ‘automata’, and the nominative in this passage may be juxtaposed with the more mundane use of the EA in Thucydides:

φύσας μεγάλας ἐσθέντες ἐς τὸ πρὸς ἑαυτῶν ἄκρον τῆς κεραίας
ἐφύσων

After inserting a huge pair of bellows into the end of the beam beside them, they made them blow/bellow (4.100.3-4).

Homer, as in the case of Φόβος φοβεῖ, has once again altered the expected construction to achieve vivid personification and supernatural agency.

Comparative evidence suggests that nouns from **steh*₂- ‘stand’ meaning ‘standing place’ were often neuter, hence Latin *stabulum* and Sanskrit *sthānam*. Post-Homeric Greek attests the ‘heteroclitic’ neuter plural σταθμά. Mycenaean *ta-to-mo* may attest a paradigm σταθμός/σταθμοί, but is too ambiguous to use as evidence. In Homer the gender of the singular, σταθμόν is similarly opaque. The plural, however, is clearly masculine: we have several attestations of σταθμούς. The sole Homeric occurrence of the nominative, singular or plural, σταθμοὶ occurs in an EN:

σταθμοὶ δ’ ἀργύρεοι ἐν χαλκῆφ **ἔστασαν** οὐδῶ,
ἀργύρεον δ’ ἐφ’ ὑπερθύριον, χρυσῆ δὲ κορώνη
Silver stanchions stood in a bronze threshold

The lintel above was silver and gold the handle (*Od.*7.89-90).

The strangeness of this figure mirrors the exotic and fantastical nature of the palace of Alcinous.¹⁸¹ In other supernatural settings, specifically the caves of Calypso and Polyphemus, ‘aromas are aromatic’ ὀδμῆ ὀδώδει.

¹⁸¹ But the phrase is too much for translators, who typically convert the EN to a more mundane expression, usually making passive and thus de-personalizing the stanchions. Cf. Lattimore

There are a few ENs with abstract subjects that may amount to conversions of EAs into the perfect tenses. These involve use with either passive, πόλις πεπόλιστο ‘the city had been built’, or intransitive verb forms, στήλη ἐστήκη ‘the stele has stood’, or -γνήτοι γεγάασιν ‘the brood has been born’.¹⁸² Beyond that there are some more mundane figures in which the power of the construction to emphasize the potency of the agent is undermined for paradoxical effect. These include ὄχευς ἔχει ‘the holders hold’ – but in fact they do not hold -- and neuter ἔρυμα ῥύεται ‘the protector protects’ – but Menelaus gets hit in the groin -- both in military contexts. In this last figure the neuter noun is only partly an antecedent to the middle verb, since it sits in apposition to a μίτρη and the relative subject is in fact ἧ. Other neuter abstracts with the middle are quite rare. The only one that occurs with any frequency is κειμήλια κεῖται. In the end, neuters were not terribly common or natural in the subject slot of an EN even when the verb was in the middle voice. As I noted above, no grammatically neuter nouns function as subjects of grammatically active verbs. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that such a combination was not permissible. Further, it is quite tempting to think of this possible restriction in conjunction with the Hittite ergative and Latin expression of personal agency with *a/ab* versus impersonal ‘agency/instrumentality with the prepositionless ablative.’¹⁸³

2.1.5 Biologically animate subjects:

The figures with ‘inanimate’ subjects form an interesting, and perhaps more antiquated subset, but do not constitute the majority of the ENs in Greek

“silver were the pillars set in the brazen threshold”, Murray “doorposts of silver were set in a threshold of bronze”, Fitzgerald “the posts and lintel were silver upon silver.”

¹⁸² For full discussion of these possible conversions see Chapter 5.

¹⁸³ In Hittite grammatically neuter nouns cannot appear as the subjects of transitive verbs. Instead they must be put into the ‘ergative’ case, developed specifically for this function,

epic. Many feature a person in the nominative engaging in an action to which they are especially appointed or skilled. To judge from inscriptional evidence phrases of this sort were especially common in Greek legal and political language. In Homer this trend is linked to a propensity to associate the construction with verbs of speech:

κῆρυξ κηρύσσει ‘the herald heralds’

ἄγγελος ἀγγεῖλει ‘the messenger reports’

ὄμηγερέες ἀγόρευον ‘gathered together they addressed the assembly’

βουληφόρος βουλεύει ‘the bringer of counsel councils’

Outside of speech-verbs the EN with a person as subject is quite rare in the *Iliad*. We find only the parsed compound ἡνίοχος (ἡνί) ἔχει ‘the rein-holder holds the reins’ and the semi-parsed compound ἀμαλλοδετήρ δεῖ ‘the sheaf-binder binds’.

The *Odyssey* displays much more variation and innovation, attesting several figures not in the *Iliad* and either rare or non-existent in Greek after Homer:

ᾄδῶς ἀεῖδει ‘the bard sings’

πρωχὸς πρωχεύει ‘the beggar begs’

οἰνοχόος χέει ‘the wine-pourer pours’

τοκεὺς τίκτει ‘the parent gives birth’

βώτηρ βόσκει ‘the cowherd herds’

βοῦς βόσκεται¹⁸⁴ ‘cattle graze’

μνηστήρ μνᾶται ‘the suitors court’

¹⁸⁴ Despite the connection of βοῦς with βόσκεται asserted by Pokorny, this etymology is problematic.

The root **ĝenh₁*- generated several figures sporadically dispersed throughout Homer Hesiod and the *Hymns*: γονή/ γενέθλη/-γνήτοι γίγνεται. We find ‘the woodcutter cuts (wood), ὕλοτόμος τέμνει, only in Hesiod, τροφὸς τρέφει ‘the nurse rears’ and the oxymoronic ἄδοτος δίδωσι ‘the non-giver gives’, only in the *Hymns*. Overall even the most frequently recurring ENs, whether their subjects are biologically animate, animated or deified are a much looser conglomerate than the core group of oft-attested accusative phrases. Hence, it is difficult, at best, to assert that any of them were idiomatic outside of very restricted venues.

2.2. The etymological accusative:

This section categorizes the etymological accusatives in Homer, Hesiod and the *Hymns* according to the grammatical relationship between the substantive and verb. Importantly, it is not possible to place all the accusative figures under one grammatical heading, despite their traditional association with the internal accusative, nor may one category be derived from the other.¹⁸⁵ Further, it is not plausible to restrict attachment of the EA or internal object to intransitive verbs, despite the tendencies of Grammarians to do just that.¹⁸⁶ Since I have already discussed the general characteristics of the EA/cognate object in some detail this section aims only at establishing a grammatical sketch.

2.2.1 Internal etymological accusatives:

¹⁸⁵ See Gaedicke’s comments quoted above (11).

¹⁸⁶ “...in dem sogenannten Akk. des Inhalts. Dieser steht bekanntlich bei intransitiven Verben” Hirt, 83. Cf. Rosèn (1981, 112) in reference to the Latin figures: “among the verbs that govern a cognate accusative...there are “transitive” as well as “intransitive” ones”. Commenting on Hirt’s statement Rosèn says “What should have been said is that whenever there is an accusative construed with an intransitive verb, it is an “accusative of the inner object”.

In fact, while not all the EAs in Homer involve an internal object, the majority most likely do. Determination of an object as internal rests mainly on the synonymy and synchronicity of the substantive with the action of its cognate verb. Some cases are relatively simple, as ‘fight a fight’ where it is clear that the noun has no existence either before the commencement of, or after the end of, the verbal action. Phrases in which the noun may temporarily attach to a non-abstract object are more complex. For instance one may ‘give a cup as a gift’ with the cup being an external object of ‘give’ further qualified by ‘gift’. But the cup is only a gift as long as it is associated with the verbal action of giving. The noun in ‘give a gift’ is therefore best categorized with the internal objects. Keeping these complexities in mind let us survey uses of the internal EA in Homer, the *Homeric Hymns* and Hesiod.

Speech acts:

ἔπος (+ attribute) εἶπεῖν ‘spoke a word’¹⁸⁷

μῦθον (– attribute) μυθεῖσθαι ‘explain the reason’

φήμην (– attribute) φάσθαι ‘utter an omen’

ὄαρους (+ attribute) ὀαρίζει ‘have a chat’ (*H.Hymn*).

ἀπειλήν (– attribute) ἀπειλεῖν ‘make a threat’¹⁸⁸

λώβην (+ attribute) λωβᾶσθαι ‘deliver an insult’

νεῖκος (– attribute) νεικέειν ‘have a quarrel’

βουλήν (± attribute) βουλεύειν ‘hold council’.

¹⁸⁷ There is one instance of this phrase without an attribute attached to the noun, but it is clearly a later formulaic variant of another phrase. See below (232).

¹⁸⁸ La Roche, 25 viewed this as result accusative but I wish to insist on more concreteness in terms of existence of the substantive beyond the terminus of the verbal action. Whether or not the momentary presence of the substantive may create a lasting impression is irrelevant: speech and speech act are contemporaneous. Cf. Escher: *bei ἔπος εἶπεῖν und ὄρκον ὀμνύμει lässt sich fragen, ob der acc. den inhalt oder das resultat bezeichne, jedenfalls aber dürfen sie nicht von einander getrennt werden, während nach La R. das erste zur ersten categorie, das zweite zur zweiten gehört; das ist inconsequent* (21).

ἀγορὰς (– attribute) ἀγορεύειν ‘address the assembly’
 (ἐκ)ονομακλήδην (adverbial) ὀνομάζειν ‘call by name’
 (-)κλήδην (adverbial) καλεῖν ‘call by name’
 ἐπὶ κλήσιν (adverbial) καλεῖν ‘give a nickname’

In as much as Odysseus’ ‘victory’ over Ajax was a triumph of superior oratory skills we may want to put the one occurrence of νίκην (– attribute) νικᾶν (*Od.*11.544-545) here.

Verbs denoting various types of speech acts, singing, praying, praising etc. show a tendency in several languages to generate internal objects. In Present day English ‘speak a word’ is admissible and ‘sing a song’ commonplace.¹⁸⁹ Gougenheim’s chapter on the internal object in French dedicates a section to “*Verbes de Parole*” (175-8). I have already cited examples of Latin ‘*dicta/verba dicere/loqui*’ etc. Also note *bonas preces precari* and Umbrian *teio subocau suboco* ‘pray prayers’. For Old Irish Huiginn lists several phrases of this sort, among them *in guide ron-gádsa* ‘the prayer that I have prayed’ (*Fél. Epil.*421) and *ni arindí bed n-aipert asind-robradsom* ‘not that it was as a saying that he said it’ (Ml. 50 b 8).¹⁹⁰ Balto-Slavic attests *zbor zborila* ‘speak a word’ and *pěsnju pěla* ‘sung a song’.¹⁹¹ In Vedic we find *árcāmārkām náre víśrutāya* ‘we sing a song to the celebrated lord’ (*RV.*1.62.1), *stuhí suṣṭutīm* ‘praise good praise’ (*RV.*8.96.12), and also several instances of *vacas vac-*, a nice lexical and morphological match for Homeric and Hesiodic, ἔπος εἶπεῖν. Later Greek commonly constructs verbs

¹⁸⁹ The fact that ἔπος εἶπεῖν is regularly rendered as ‘spoke a word’ in translations of Homer illustrates that it is a permissible phrase. In general the translators do not render figures that do not have English correspondences. ‘Sing a song’ is an old idiom, cf. Old High German, *Sang was gisungan* (see Grimm, 1898, 760).

¹⁹⁰ 124-5. Also *molad rundam-moldadsa* ‘the praise wherewith I have been praised’ (Ml. 88 a 17).

¹⁹¹ See E. Hofmann, 97.

of speech with an internal and/or etymological accusative. In Attic ὡς ἔπος εἶπεῖν was commonplace, as was λόγον λέγειν. Modern Greek idiom preserves λέω (ένα) λόγο, the aorist of which is εἶπα (ένα) λόγον. In examining our figures from Epic listed above we should notice a paucity of figures denoting what one might call ‘positive’ speech acts, (praying, praising and the like), against a predilection to form figures denoting ‘negative’ speech acts, (threatening, insulting, quarrelling etc.). Couple this with the observation that ἔπος εἶπεῖν is, in a few of its most stylistically charged upwellings, used in a confrontational manner, as in Agamemnon’s barely veiled threats to Chalcas at *Iliad* 1. 108 et al. and we can attribute this proclivity to the fruitfulness of emotive contexts of anger and indignation in generating the EF. Other internal constructions arranged by frequency:

δῶρον/δωτίνην (+ attribute) δίδοναι ‘give a gift’.

ἔργον (± attribute) ἐργάζεσθαι/ἔρδειν/ρέζειν ‘do a deed, work work.’

πῆμα (– attribute) πάσχειν ‘endure suffering’.

μάχην (– attribute) μάχεσθαι ‘engage in combat’.

κτέρεια (– attribute) κτερ(ε)ίζειν ‘give funerary honors’.

χύσιν/χοῆν (– attribute) χεῖσθαι ‘pour a libation’.

τιμὴν/ ποινὴν (– attribute) τίνειν ‘pay a penalty’.

πόλεμον (+ attribute) πολεμίζειν ‘fight a war’

ὄλεθρον (+ attribute) ἀπόλλεσθαι ‘die a death, meet one’s doom’

αἰχμὴν(+ attribute) αἰχμάζειν ‘wield a spear’

ιερχήϊον (+ attribute) ἱερεύσειν ‘perform a sacrifice’

φιλότητα (+ attribute) φιλεῖν ‘have love for’.

βίον (+ attribute) ζῶειν ‘live life’

ἰδρῶ (– attribute) ἰδρῶν ‘pour sweat’.

νόον (+ attribute) νοῆσαι ‘come up with a plan’.

κατὰ φρένα φράζεσθαι ‘consider in one’s mind’.

δίκην (± attribute) δικάζειν ‘render a verdict’ (Hes.).

μίγδην (adverbial) μεῖξαι ‘have sex’. (H.*Hymn*).

The substantives in most of these constructions are intangible and therefore very difficult to envision as anything but internal. Nevertheless, there are some noteworthy exceptions.¹⁹² In αἰχμήν αἰχμάζειν and ἰδρῶ ἰδρῶν the substantives, ‘spearpoint’ and ‘sweat’ are tangible. Both, as Homeric phrasal *Hapax legomena* and fanciful inventions of poetic language, should not be taken too seriously in terms of their grammar. At any rate, since they are denominative, the internality may be transferred to the verbs in so far as their syntactic existence mainly facilitates the addition of person and number to the nouns.¹⁹³ It is possible that the substantive of ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι, in Hesiod, where the expression may mean ‘work the fields’, has been semantically detached and therefore constitutes an external, or possibly a result accusative.

2.2.2. The result accusative or accusative of the effected object:

In this category a substantive is brought into existence by the action of the verb, as in the internal construction, but continues to exist after the verbal action stops: ‘strike a coin’ or ‘build a building’. Despite the fact that the *figura etymologica* is not typically associated with this grammatical category, several of the constructions fit best here.

¹⁹² Some apparent tangibles, like χοῖν are further cases where the noun has attached to another substance, in this case blood.

¹⁹³ La Roche classified both as internal (27). Landgraf puts the Apuleian phrase *sudorem desudare*, a grammatical match for ἰδρῶ ἰδρῶν, with the internal objects along with Plautine *vomitum pulmoneum vomere* ‘puke pulmonary puke’ (*Rud.*511) 1881, 22 in section 5 ‘*De obiecto interno cum attributo*’).

τέκνον (± attribute) τίκτειν ‘give birth to a child’.

τέμενος (+ attribute) τέμνειν ‘carve out an official domain’.

-γνήτω/ γόνον γείνασθαι ‘give birth to a child, bear young’.

τείχος (– attribute) τειχίζειν ‘build a wall’.

πλόκαμον (+ attribute) πλέκειν ‘braid a braid’.

φυτὸν (± attribute) φυτεύειν/ φύειν ‘cultivate crops’.

νήμα (– attribute) νείν ‘spin a spiderweb’ (Hes.).

νηὸν (+ attribute) ναίειν ‘build a temple’ (*Hymn*).

Importantly, the dividing lines between these categories are not meant to be inflexible, and there may be considerable overlap. Take, for instance, the figure τέκνον τίκτειν ‘give birth to a child’: I have categorized it with the result accusatives because a child has an existence after the birthing process. But to what degree is the existence of the child or person distinct from the notion that they are offspring? If they are distinct, then, in a sense, when they cease to be thought of in terms of the process of being born, they lose status as offspring. If this is the case then their existence as a τέκνον depends to some extent on considering them together with the verbal action of τίκτειν. Analyzing the figure in this way, we might just as well class it with the internals. In the end, interpreting these grammatical classes too rigidly is untenable. At the same time, it is necessary to delineate the general categories because there are functional and stylistic distinctions between the poles of internality and externality: to ‘set up a mast’ (ἴστων ἰστάναι), or ‘see someone’s body’ (εἶδος ἰδεῖν) are simply not the same as ‘set up that which is set up’ or ‘see that which is seen’ in the way that ‘speak a word’ is identical to ‘speak that which is spoken’ or ‘think a thought’ matches ‘think that which is thought’. Similarly, after its construction, a wall may be recognizable as such long after its builders

are dead and gone, so that analyzing *τείχος τειχίζειν* as a result accusative has some basis in reality.

2.2.3. The external object accusative:

This is of course the ‘regular’ function of the accusative: to indicate the direct object of a transitive verb. Once again, this grammatical category is not typically associated with the *figura etymologica*, but is nonetheless well-represented.

Several figures have to do with eating and drinking:

δαίτα/δαίτην (± attribute) δαίνυσθαι ‘partake of a feast’.

κρητήρα(– attribute)κιρνᾶσθαι ‘mix a bowl’.¹⁹⁴

εἶδαρ/ἔδωδῆν (± attribute) ἔδμεναι/ἔσθειν ‘eat food’.

οἶνον (± attribute) οἰνίζεσθαι/οἰνοχοεῦειν ‘provide wine, pour wine’.

ποτὸν (+ attribute) πίνειν ‘have a drink’.

Other figures:¹⁹⁵

ἰστὸν (± attribute) ἰστάναι ‘set up a mast, or loom’.

εἶδος (± attribute) ἰδεῖν ‘look upon one’s physical appearance’.

βέλος (– attribute) βαλλεῖν ‘hurl a projectile (generally a spear or arrow)’

Biologically animate objects:

ξεῖνον (± attribute) ξενίζειν ‘entertain a guest’

νομὸν (– attribute) νομεύειν ‘tend a herd’.

βοῦς (+ attribute) βουκολεῖν/ βόσκειν ‘tend cattle’.

¹⁹⁴ As outlined below this phrase is actually a grammatical non-sequitur/ellipse.

¹⁹⁵ These are the most striking cases of semantic detachment.

ἀναίτιον αἰτιάσθαι ‘blame one who is blameless’.¹⁹⁶

Prepositional:

στή παρὰ σταθμὸν ‘she stood by the stanchion’.

2.2.4 The accusative with verbs of motion:

According to localistic theory the accusative of the goal, or *terminus ad quem* and the allative-accusative (direction towards without implication of reaching the goal), represent the case’s most archaic usage and genetically preceded the semantically empty use of the accusative as the grammatical object.¹⁹⁷ De Boel, however, in his book on Homeric goal and object accusatives, has raised some valid questions to undermine projection of localistic theories onto PIE. He points out that there is no good evidence pointing to a stage of Indo-European when the accusative was not the case of the object, and that none of the localists have put forth a model outlining how PIE, or any other language for that matter, might have functioned without the grammatical category of direct object.¹⁹⁸ De Boel’s, in my eyes, valid objections to localistic theory are important in considering the age and possibility of inheritance of the EA, since, in Homer, verbs of motion were not generally used to create etymological objects. There are only two figures from **h₂ger-*: ἐς δ’ ἀγορὴν ἀγέροντο ‘they assembled into the place of assembly’ (x1, //18.245) and ὀμηγυρίσασθαι Ἀχαιοὺς/ εἰς ἀγορὴν ‘to assemble the

¹⁹⁶ This is really an adjectival substantive.

¹⁹⁷ This viewpoint is most often housed within a localistic theory of case origin: “From a *genetic* point of view all oblique cases and even the acc. go back to expressions of spatial relation. The grammatical cases like / the acc. and the gen. have secondary semantic functions that betray their etymological value. The acc. used with verbs of motion may well represent the original function of the respective form” (Kurylowicz, 201-2). For more bibliography and discussion of localistic theory see De Boel (13 ff.).

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

Achaians into the place of assembly' (*Od.*16.376-7). To this we may add a paradoxical figure from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*: ἐς δ' ἄδυτον κατέδυσε διὰ τριπόδων ἐριτίμων 'but he descended into the sanctuary (lit. he entered down into the place not to be entered) through the precious tripods' (3.443). The fact is that localities do not, as a rule, work as etymological objects without semantic detachment. If we were to subscribe to the most radical expression of localistic theory for PIE, we would be obliged to admit that the EA could not be inherited. It would have to post-date the extraction of the grammatical use of the accusative as object from the goal and allative uses. The validity of De Boel's objections makes this admission unnecessary.

2.2.5 The accusative of extent of space or time:

It is traditional to consider this a derived usage.¹⁹⁹ Derived or not we find no cognate objects in this category except for a few from verbs with a durative nucleus that may have this grammatical characteristic in addition to representing internal objects. The lone Homeric example here, ζώεις δ' ἀγαθὸν βίον 'you are living a good life' has already been discussed at length in the section on the cognate object debate. Another figure that does not occur in Homer as an EA, but is common as such elsewhere is 'sleep sleep'.²⁰⁰ Homer attests several internal, but not etymological constructions with this semantic. In both 'live life' and 'sleep sleep' combinations internality may be primary, durativity only implied: βίον ἀγαθὸν ζῶειν 'you live a good life'

¹⁹⁹ See De Boel, 13.

²⁰⁰ Cf. Ved. *svāpna suptvā* (*AV.*10.3.6), Lat. *sominum somniare* (Plaut.*Rud.*597), Lith. *sāpna sapnūti* 'dream a dream' (also Lith. *mėgą mėgōti* 'sleep sleep') and OHG. *slief slāf*. Dahl, for one, recognized the different 'aspectual potential' of the verbs 'sleep' and 'die': "the verbs *sleep* and *die* are quite different as regards the contexts in which they occur naturally. To take a standard illustration of this fact, *sleep* but not *die* can be used together with a durational adverbial like *for two hours*. The obvious semantic correlate of this distributional fact is that *die* is normally used of punctual events, whereas *sleep* is used of prolonged states" (26).

(*Od.*15.491) and εὔδησθα γλυκὺν ὕπνον ‘you sleep a sweet sleep’ (*Od.*8.445). At other times the durative actionality of the verb is consciously realized: ζῶειν ἡματα παντα ‘to live (through) all one’s days’ (*h.Hom.*5.221) and πάννουχον ὕπνον ἄωτεις; ‘Why do you slumber (through) an all night sleep?’ (*Il.*10.159). Setting these durative statements next to the punctual internal datives θανάτῳ θνήσκειν and ὀλέθρῳ ὀλλέσθαι vouches once again for a rational selection of case in the corpus.²⁰¹

2.2.6 Accusative *rei*:

The lexica classify one of the three most common EAs in Homer, εἶματα εἶμαι ‘I clothe myself (in) clothing’ as this type, along with the host of other accoutrement occurring with forms of ἔννῦμι, e.g. τεύχεα ἔσσε.²⁰² According to one theory this accusative, especially when coupled with the medio-passive, constitutes its own class, the so-called *Akkusativ des Bekleidungsgegenstandes* ‘accusative of the article of clothing’.²⁰³ This amounts to an admission that the grammar of the phrase defies categorization. Since it is the only EA that occurs with stative verb forms in Homer we will reserve full discussion of its complexities for chapter five, but note that εἶματα εἶμαι also occurs numerous times with a double accusative: κείνός σε χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε εἶματα ἔσσει.

2.3. The etymological genitive:

This is a bit of a default category. There are only two Homeric passages in which a genitive occurs in a copulative phrase with a cognate verb, and it is clear that in both instances the genitive arises through secondary processes.

²⁰¹ Herodotean usage backs up Homer: ἀποθανεῖν... θανάτῳ (7.170.1) πανωλεθρῆ ἀπολόμενοι (2.120.5).

²⁰² *Il.*18.451.

²⁰³ See Neu (211) in reference to Luvian and Hittite. There is also some speculation that this generated the ‘body’ and ‘body part’ accusative of respect, or Greek accusative.

The relative genitive in the line τιμῆς ἧς τέ μ' ἔοικε τετιμῆσθαι 'the honor with which it is right that I be honored'²⁰⁴ (*Il.*23.649) may either arise from attraction of the relative into the case of its antecedent, or may be considered a Homeric attestation of the genitive of price.²⁰⁵ Monro uses this very passage as an example of the genitive of price, which he relates closely to the genitive of exchange used in expressions like γόνυ γουνὸς ἀμείβων.²⁰⁶ Elsewhere he argues, against Kühner, that the attraction of the relative into the case of the antecedent does not occur in Homer, reclassifying Kühner's example, τῆς γάρ τοι γενεῆς ἧς Τρωί περ εὐρύσπα Ζεὺς/δῶχ' (*Il.*5.265-6) as partitive genitive 'the brood from which far-seeing Zeus gave'.²⁰⁷ In fact the accusative of the price is standard in this idiom with the active: τιμὴν ἀποτινέμεν ἢν τιν' ἔοικεν, (*Il.*3.459).²⁰⁸ In the final analysis it may be impossible to determine whether τιμῆς ἧς τέ μ' ἔοικε τετιμῆσθαι when compared to τιμὴν ἀποτινέμεν ἢν τιν' ἔοικεν offers an example of the attraction of the relative into the case of the antecedent, or represents a movement from the accusative to the genitive of price. It may even have arisen by means of a combination of these two processes.

A more important question for our purposes pertains to the case that underlies the ἧς. The fact that the EG is basically a non-category makes it tempting to postulate either τιμὴν τιμᾶν 'pay honor', or its passive counterpart τιμῆ τιμᾶσθαι 'honor be paid'. Hence, we might construe the sentence on the

²⁰⁴ This is Murray's Loeb translation. Cunliffe's translation also appears to take μ' as the subject of passive τετιμῆσθαι, 'the degree of honour in the measure of which I should be esteemed'.

²⁰⁵ τιμῆς is in the genitive because it is dependent on a verb of forgetting.

²⁰⁶ 148.

²⁰⁷ 246.

²⁰⁸ According to De Boel (112⁷) "the active τίνω 'pay' is constructed 8 times with the acc. of the price, and twice with the INSTR. The middle "to make someone pay for" does not occur with the price expressed".

model of //9.38 τοι δῶκε τετιμῆσθαι ‘he (Zeus) granted it to you to be honored’. This assumes an impersonal reading of ἔοικε well paralleled with the dative + infinitive. The relative in this scenario would best be construed as one of price on the pattern of the accusative pushed into the genitive by attraction and/or by the fact that the EA and perfect were mutually exclusive categories. This choice is made more attractive by the close model τιμὴν ἀποτινέμεν ἦν τιν’ ἔοικεν. We need only add a pronominal subject and change the cognate infinitive to perfect passive: *τιμὴν ἀποτινέμεν ἦν τινα μ’ ἔοικεν τετιμῆσθαι then change the antecedent and relative to genitive. The other option construes ἔοικε personally, making an underlying τιμὴ the subject of τετιμῆσθαι and translating ‘the honor that should be paid to me’. This reading is not as easy to parallel directly; other uses of τιμᾶσθαι feature animate subjects, e.g. ὡς κείνη περὶ κῆρι τετίμηται ‘so she (Arete) has been honored’ (*Od.*7.69). But grammar does not militate against it. It also fits the pattern of conversion into the perfect observable in later Greek, and perhaps glimpsed in Homer. The only other EG in Homer is at //22.345 μή με κύον γούνων γουνάζεο μὴ δὲ τοκῆων ‘do not, cur, supplicate me by knees or parents’. According to Cunliffe γουνάζομαι here “retains the genitival construction of a vb. of taking hold, and with the construction extended to something appealed to”. Leumann (1950), in his section on new word usages and denotations from syntactic ellipses, traces the two uses, λαβεῖν γούνων and λίσσεσθαι γούνων, from combinations overtly featuring both, λαβὼν ἐλίσσετο γούνων (*//.*6.45) to the variation γούνων γουνάζεο. But note that at //22.345, Achilles models his rejection of Hector’s obsecration closely on the supplication itself: λίσσομ’ ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς καὶ γούνων σῶν τε τοκῆων ‘I beg you by my life and your knees and parents’ (338). This suggests that γούνων

γουνάζεο is a bold coinage motivated by the repetition of sound and sense native to paronomasia. As noted previously, the tautological repetition embodied by the EF is often quite suitable to vituperative and sarcastic contexts. Lobeck noted that Demosthenes was more likely to use the EF when *aut cavillaretur aut ira effervesceret* (521). Hence, although the grammatical framework of this figure may be traced as above, the motivation for its generation, the final step from λαβῶν ἐλίσσετο γούνων, was purely stylistic.

2.4 The etymological dative:

The dative proper is largely personal, and denotes the person who is interested in or affected by the action;...the dative proper is not often used with things; when so used there is usually personification or semi-personification (Smyth, 1459).

One of the traditional observations applicable to the EA, that its substantive is generally not a person or a place, also pertains to the ED. Therefore, etymological phrases with a proper, personal dative are a virtual non-category in Homer and only a fledgling category in Hesiod, Vedic and elsewhere.²⁰⁹ Homer attests only one figure with a proper dative, and even here the personae are personified abstracts, Sleep and Death:

πέμπε δέ μιν πομποῖσιν ἄμα κραιπνοῖσι φέρεσθαι
 ὕπνω καὶ θανάτῳ διδυμάοσιν

Escort him (Sarpedon) to the swift escorts to be transported,
 to the twins, Sleep and Death (*//.16.671-2= //.16.681-2*).²¹⁰

²⁰⁹ Cf. Gonda (1959:242) “the etymologically cognate dative is a phenomenon of comparatively infrequent occurrence.” He cites *RV 6.9.7 amartyo ’vatūtaye nah* ‘May immortal (Agni) protect us as protection’. Here the dative is still an abstract.

²¹⁰ Cf. Smyth (1463), who explains that the dative proper may be used with words meaning to meet, approach, (1485) “with verbs of motion the dative of the person *to whom* is properly a dative of advantage or disadvantage” and perhaps most relevant here, (1475) with the example: ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν (*//.1.3*).

Hesiod attests either one, or two pure datives, depending on how one counts, in a consciously etymological gnome: δώτη μὲν τις ἔδωκεν, ἀδώτη δ' οὔτις ἔδωκεν 'one gives to the giver, but nobody gives to the ungiver' (*Op.*355).

Aside from these two isolated examples all the EDs in the older Greek epics are grammatically internal, instrumental or locative. Unlike the accusative constructions, the cognate dative substantives are generally not abstracts. Instead they are concrete objects and implements whose function mirrors the verbal action. Particularly with the instrumentals, the reiteration of noun and verb stresses the length and nature of the process, and may be used to great stylistic effect. In *Odyssey* nine, right at the moment when Odysseus and his men are putting out Polyphemus' eye, the following figure occurs:

οἱ μὲν μοχλὸν ἐλόντες ἐλάινον, ὄξυν ἐπ' ἄκρῳ,
ὀφθαλμῷ ἐνέρισαν· ἐγὼ δ' ἐφύπερθεν ἐρεισθεὶς
δίνεον, ὡς ὅτε τις **τρυπῶ** δόρυ νήιον ἀνήρ
τρυπάνῳ, οἱ δέ τ' ἔνερθεν ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι
ἀψάμενοι ἐκάτερθε, τὸ δὲ τρέχει ἐμμενὲς αἰεὶ.

My men, taking the olive-wood shaft, honed at the tip,
thrust it into his eye, while I, leaning on it from above,
twirled it, as when some man augers into a ship-timber
with an auger, and those below keep spinning the bit
with a strap, and it runs on incessantly (384-5).

Note the emphatic enjambment of τρυπάνῳ and linking alliteration throughout. In as much as the whole passage celebrates the triumph of technology over brute force, the figure vividly underscores the fact that similar repetitions of the dative are quite common in descriptions of technical fabrication. Often,

however, they have not so much to do with ‘industrial’ fabrication as with simple household implements and activities, like grating cheese.

2.4.1. The etymological dative/instrumental:

The coupling of a verb with an etymologically related instrumental is a common occurrence in many IE languages. In Vedic the instrumental *figura* sometimes overlaps with the accusative. Compare the figures in the following:

samānéna vo havíṣā juhomi

‘I libate to you with the same libate’ (*RV.10.191.3=AV.6.64.2*).

yuvám hótram ṛtuthá júhvate naréṣam jánāya vahathaḥ

‘you, to the man who is libating libation at the right time, give sustenance. (*RV.10.40.4*).

tapasā tapymānā ‘paining herself with penance’ (*AV.3.10.12*).

ágne tápas tapyāmahe úpa tapyāmahe tápaḥ śrutá ni śṛnvānto vayám

Agni, we do penance and further do penance, hearing the teachings (*AV.7.61.2*).

There are even paronomastic passages with case variation within the same copula:

yajnéna yajñám ayajantá deváḥ

The gods sacrifice/perform the sacrifice by sacrifice

(*RV.1.164.50=10.90.16*).²¹¹

²¹¹ For more examples of such case variation within the same EF in Vedic and Sanskrit in general, of which there are many, one may collate Gonda’s section on the instrumental (239 ff.) and his chapter on the *figura etymologica* (273 ff.).

Homer, on the other hand, if we exclude *Odyssey* 9, shows no variation of this sort. The instrumental figures never coincide with accusatives from the same root. In most instances this is most likely motivated by adherence to the logic of a given case, but, as noted above with reference to εἴματα ἔννυσθαι, the drive toward uniformity at times supercedes grammatical rationale. Fehling, although he made no attempt to classify the accusative figures, did provide some framework for categorization of the datives, dividing them into “*Dative nach Art des inneren Objekts*” and “*Instrumentale Dative*”; he covered the locatives under “*Verb und präpositionale Verbindungen*”.²¹²

προχόω (+ attribute) χεῖσθαι ‘to pour with a pitcher’.^{*213}

χέρνιβι (– attribute) νίψασθαι ‘to wash with hand-washing water’.*

βέλεσιν (– attribute) βαλλεῖν ‘hit with missiles’.²¹⁴

ππερύγεσσι (– attribute) ποτ/πέτεσθαι ‘fly with wings’.

ζωστήρι(ζώνη) (± attribute) ζώννυσθαι ‘to put on a belt’.

ἄτη (– attribute) ἀάσαι ‘to blind with blindness’.

κνήστι (+ attribute) κνήν ‘grate (cheese) with a cheese grater’.²¹⁵

κληῖδι (– attribute) κληῖσαι ‘to latch (a door) with a latch’.*

τερέτρω (– attribute) τετρήναι ‘to drill with a drill/gimlet’.

τροπάνω (– attribute) τροπᾶν ‘to drill with a drill/auger’*.

φωνῆ (+ attribute) φωνεῖν ‘to call with one’s voice’*.

ράβδοισι (+ attribute) ράψειν ‘to stitch with stitches’*.

²¹² 158-9. He seems not to have considered the possibility of prepositionless locatives.

²¹³ An asterisk indicates that the figure was not included in Fehling’s list. This figure and the next each occur 6 times, but in one three-line formula.

²¹⁴ For confirmation of this meaning see De Boel (128 ff.).

²¹⁵ Lattimore translates this figure as an instrumental ‘with a bronze grater’ (251) as do Fagles (317), Lombardo (682), and Wyatt (541), but, judging from archaeological evidence we cannot rule out a locative: ‘grate on a cheese grater’. For pictures of the graters that have been uncovered at Lefkandi and elsewhere see Ridgeway’s article.

We might include here the aberrant figure in a Hesiodic Fragment:

ὑπὲρ τῶν **ὀνομασάντων** ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς τῶν θεῶν **ὀνόμασιν**

On behalf of those naming themselves by the names of the gods (*Fr.15*).

The most frequent ED in Homer and Hesiod, δεσμῶ (+ attribute) δεῖν ‘to bind in/with chains’ is a bit problematic. Fehling lists it both under the instrumental and prepositional/locative headings. In Homer it occurs five times with ἐν/ ἐνὶ and twice with no preposition, in Hesiod twice with ἐν/ἐνὶ, twice without, and once in the *Hymns* without. This leaves us with a group of 7 definite locatives and 5 questionable cases classifiable either as prepositionless locatives or instrumentals. One may choose either option, but I prefer to bring the prepositionless figures in line with the expressions with ἐν/ἐνὶ and consider them all locative.

2.4.2 The etymological dative/locative:

ὀφθαλμοῖσι (± attribute) ὄψεσθαι ‘to see with the eyes’.²¹⁶

(ἐν) κρητῆρι (– attribute) κινᾶσθαι ‘mix in a mixing bowl’.

ἐνὶ φρεσὶ (± attribute) φρονεῖν/φράζεσθαι ‘consider in one’s mind’.

ἐν εὐνή (– attribute) εὐνηθῆναι lit. ‘to lie in the bed’ (of another) i.e. ‘adulterate.’

ἐν ἀκμοθέτῳ (– attribute) τιθέναι ‘to place on the anvil stand’.

κλισμῶ (– attribute) κλινέσθαι ‘to recline on a recliner’.

ὄζῳ (+ attribute) ἐφέζεσθαι ‘to sit on a branch’ (Hes.).

The underlying case of φόρμιγγι (+ attribute) φορμίζειν ‘play on/with the lyre’ (*h.Hom.3.182-3*) is impossible to determine.

²¹⁶ Although English, and Modern Greek idiom uses the instrumental, all evidence points to a locative in Homeric Greek. The etymological phrase does not appear with a preposition in Homer, but the present and aorist semantic equivalents do: ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἰδέσθαι (*Od.10.385*), ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώσα (*Od.8.459*).

2.4.3. The internal dative:

θανάτῳ (+ attribute) θνήσκειν ‘die a death’.

ὀλέθρῳ (+ attribute) ὀλλέσθαι ‘die a death’.

φιλότῃτι (+ attribute) φιλεῖν ‘have love for’ (*Hymn*).

Fehling lists πληγῇ (+ attribute) πλήσσειν with the internal datives, but we should entertain the possibility that it is actually an instrumental. The phrase occurs but once in the *Iliad* where Thersites is the accusative object:

αὐτὸν δὲ κλαίοντα θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας ἀφήσω

πεπλήγων ἀγορήθεν ἀεικέσσι πληγῇσιν.

(If I do not) send you yourself weeping to the swift ships

having beaten (you) from the assembly with shameful blows

(*Il.*2.264).²¹⁷

The verb occurs again immediately after this line:

Ὦς ἄρ’ ἔφη, σκήπτρῳ δὲ μετάφρενον ἠδὲ καὶ ὦμῳ

πλήξεν

So he spoke and beat his back and shoulders with the scepter (265-6).

If we construe σκήπτρῳ as an instrumental dative, it would make sense to construe πληγῇσιν just before it in the same way. In the case of an unspecified instrument one may use the internal instrument to color the verbal action with an adjective. But movement of this syntagm toward accusative expression in later Greek authors, coupled with observable cross-linguistic tendencies to form an internal EA with precisely the same semantics, make its internal object affinities undeniable.²¹⁸

²¹⁷ The instrumental translation is standard here. See L.S.J. sv.

²¹⁸ For movement of the phrase to accusative in post-Homeric Greek see above (106). For the idiom ‘strike a blow’ and its like in other languages cf. Goth. *háifst háifstjan* ‘fight a fight’ (I Tim.6.12), Mid. High German *gestochen wart ein stich* ‘stick a stick, prick a prick’, in a Dutch proverb *zijn slag slaan* ‘hit a good hit, score a blow’. Also in Celtic: O.Ir. *benaim bēimend*

2.5 Etymological vocative:

This is a very small category. The only vocative figure not involving a compound is Thetis' plaintiff address to Achilles at *Iliad* 1.414 τέκνον ἐμόν, τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ τεκοῦσα 'my child, why did I raise you, bearing you accursed'. The two other Homeric figures involve, once again, speech acts: ἀπποεπές, ἔειπες 'reckless in speech you spoke' (*Il.*8.209) ἀμαρτοεπές, ἔειπες 'erring in speech you spoke' (*Il.*13.824). Both fit the mold of innovations generated from the quite productive emotive context of rage and contempt. It is also irresistible, given the frequency of ἔπος εἰπεῖν, particularly ἔπος νημερτές ἔειπες, to postulate that the more regular idiom facilitated the coinages. The *Homeric Hymns* also show the propensity to feature compounds in the etymological vocative:

σχέτλιε ποικιλομήτα τί νῦν μητίσσαι ἄλλο

Wretch, intricate schemer, what else are you scheming now?

(*h.Hom.*3.322).

Χαῖρε Ποσειδάον γαιήοχε κυανοχαῖτα,

καὶ μάκαρ εὐμενὲς ἦτορ ἔχων πλώουσιν ἄρηγε

Greetings Poseidon, dark-haired supporter of earth,

Blessed one, with a kind heart come the aid of sailors (*h.Hom.*22.6-7).

The figure in the first passage obviously stems from the same emotive context, contempt, as the *Iliadic* compounds. The second, in which the repetition is

āgmara 'ich schlage fürchterliche Schläge' and *bāgim-se bāig* 'ich kämpfe den Kampf' (Brugmann, 1911, 40) Balto-Slavic: *plotki pletā* 'clap (a clap)'. In Vedic we find only an EA from **g^{wh}en-* with an externalized object *jaghānāñ ūpa jighnate* 'hit their backs, whip their behinds' (*RV.*6.75.13). Latin yields *pugnam pugnare* < *pugnus* 'fist', *militia militatur*, and later *bellum bellare*.

both phonetically and semantically much more distant, appears to be simply a very elevated form of address.

2.6 Mixing bowls and drinking cups: syntactic transformations:

I have noted on several occasions that the syntax of most of the etymological phrases in Homer remains fixed. In a few idioms having to do with eating and drinking, however, the case of the noun varies. This fact may be aligned with the ‘shift’ from an intra-Plautine variation between *poclud bibere* ‘drink from a cup’ and *poclam bibere* ‘drink a cup’, to later Latin’s exclusion of the former in favor of the latter. Vedic attests the phrase only with the cup in the accusative; whether this means that Sanskrit simply does not attest an earlier, non-elliptical idiom, or skipped to the final phrase without further ado, is not ascertainable. The Homeric epics allow us to trace a somewhat similar syntactic transformation via the phrase(s) (έν) κρητήρι κιννάσθαι > κρητήρα κιννάσθαι. In the *Iliad* and a few times in the *Odyssey* forms of κιννάσθαι occur with the cognate locative/dative (wine in the accusative):

οἶνον/ Ἀργείων οἱ ἄριστοι **ένι κρητήρι κέρωνται** (*Il.*4.260).

ή δέ τρίτη **κρητήρι** μελίφρονα **οἶνον ἐκίρνα** (*Od.*10.356).

έν δέ τε **οἶνον/ κρητήρσιν κερώντο** (*Od.*20.252-253).

Semantically equivalent, non-etymological phrases also feature the bowl in the locative dative:

οἱ μὲν οἶνον **ἐμισγον ένι κρητήρσιν** καὶ ὕδωρ (*Od.*1.110).²¹⁹

²¹⁹ Cf. *Od.*4.222, *Il.*3.669-270.

In an important intermediate syntactic step towards exclusion of the liquid altogether the wine becomes genitive while the bowl moves into the accusative:

τοῖς δ' ὁ γέρων ἐλθοῦσιν ἀνὰ **κρητῆρα κέρασσευ/ οἴνου**
(*Od.*3.390).²²⁰

τοῦ ὁ γέρων **κρητῆρα κέρασσατο**, πολλὰ δ' Ἀθήνη (*Od.*3.393).

ἐν δὲ κέρνατε τῷ **μελιάδεος** ὅττι τάχιστα **κράτῆρα** (*Alc.*367).

κινῆ κρητῆρα οἴνου (*Hdt.*4.66.1).

Finally, we see deletion of the liquid with only the bowl remaining as the elliptical direct object of 'mix':

Ποντόνοε, **κρητῆρα κερασάμενος** μέθυ νεῖμον (*Od.*7.179, 13.50).

τοῖσιν δὲ **κρητῆρα κέρασσατο** Μούλιος ἥρωε, (*Od.*18.423).

κρατῆράς τε κέρασαντες παρ' ἅπαν τὸ στράτευμα (*Th.*6.32.1).

κρατῆρας ἐγκινῆσιν, αἱ μυροπώλιδες

ἐστᾶσ' ἐφεξῆς· (*Ar.Ec.*841-42).

Another EA in the sphere of eating and drinking that seems to have generated a syntactic shift is δαῖτα/δαίτην δαίνυσθαι:

μοίρας δασάμενοι **δαίνυντ'** ἐρικυδέα **δαῖτα**. (*Od.*3.66=20.280).

The figure would then have presented the intermediate stage:

δαινύμαι δαῖτα γάμου, τάφου.²²¹

This facilitated more elliptical expressions:

δαίσειν δὲ γάμον μετὰ Μυρμιδόνεσσι

(you said) you would give (me) a wedding among the Myrmidons.

(*Il.*19.299).

²²⁰ There are numerous expressions with bowl in the accusative + a potable in the genitive: *Il.*1.470, 8.232, 9.170, *Od.*1.148, 2.431, 3.339, 21.271.

²²¹ See Schwyzer, 76.

ἦ τοι ὁ τὸν κτείνας δαίνυ τάφον Ἀργείοισιν

Indeed, after killing him provide a funeral for the Argives (*Od.*3.309).

In an article on the God-drinking formula in Hittite Melchert suggested that ellipses of this kind were particularly prevalent in sacrificial and ceremonial language:

New evidence confirms that the Hittite ritual expression ‘drink the god X’ means simply ‘drink to (the honor of) the god X’. The underlying indirect (divine name) is made the surface direct object by an optional syntactic transformation of Hittite which also applies to other structures in ritual contexts. Comparative evidence suggests, though it cannot prove, that a form of this rule existed in PIE (Melchert, 1).

The syntactic transformations we have outlined in Homer may also be somewhat ceremonial, or at the very least sympotic; but like the Hittite movements they also involve specific reference to potable liquids. This suggests that we also might view them at a more basic, grammatical level: ellipse of the liquid, either the content of a vessel (Greek, Latin, Vedic?), or liquid poured for a god (Hittite) could lead to a syntactic shift. This left a construction that, if taken in an overly literal fashion, constitutes a non sequitur. The intra-epic transformation of ‘mix in a bowl’ > ‘mix a bowl’ underlines the fact that such transformations may spontaneously occur, and makes projection into PIE problematic.

The primary concern of this chapter has been to outline the general characteristics of the individual case-forms of the *figura etymologica*, and to delineate the several grammatical constructions as they occur in Homer, Hesiod and the *Hymns*. It is important not to let these semantic and grammatical distinctions obscure the fact that, at the level of tautology and

assonance, most of the figures share essential properties. Taking a look at the use of the phrases across questions offers insight into this assertion. Within the framework of response, it does not much matter if the objects of ἔπος εἰπεῖν, δῶρον δίδοναι, or εἶδαρ ἔδμεναι display different properties under the grammarian's microscope. If someone asks you 'what did you eat for dinner' and you answer 'food', the object functions as deliberately unspecific whether or not it is internal or external. This similarity extends to all the case constructions. If someone asks 'who sang at the concert last night?' and the answer is 'the singers', or 'what did you stitch with?' is answered by 'stitches' the deliberate avoidance of requested specification is the same. The respondent is not being cooperative. Aside from those cases in which the substantive and verb are semantically detached, all the figures are fundamentally circular. This circularity constitutes the unity of cognate, same phrase, noun-verb polyptoton, what I have put under the heading of etymological figure, against other forms of polyptoton, and justifies their inclusion, to the exclusion of other types of repetition, in a single study.

Chapter 3

The Homeric Provenance of Etymological Figures

3.1 The polyvalent stylistic profile of the figures:

The fundamental assumption of this chapter is that, in terms of epic verbal art, the etymological figures under survey do not adhere to a uniform aesthetic. Just as there are idioms in Present Day English that may be used without giving their etymology or tautology much thought, as in ‘give a gift’, ‘sing a song’ etc., archaic Greek had its own deeply embedded idioms that made their way into epic diction: δῶρον διδόναι (x49), ἔπος εἰπεῖν (x34), εἶματα ἔννυσθαι (x37). The stylistic profile of these oft-repeated phrases would often have been very low. Other figures, usually occurring only once or twice in the corpus of Archaic Epic, assume a much higher profile. This discrepancy has a corollary in the scholarly tradition. Grammarians, both ancient and modern, regarded the σχῆμα ἐτυμολογικόν as a stylistic device, and studies such as Gonda’s, the title of which announces it as a stylistic endeavor, devote sizable chapters to paronomasia and etymological formulas. It is primarily the hammering cadence of the figures that gives even the most frequent stock phrases an aesthetic value:

Reciting these rythmical schemata and listening to them pleases ear and mind and calls up an intuitive aesthetic appreciation. In the course of time the ‘authors’ and reciters became conscious of the special properties and peculiarities of these schemata and discovering their mnemonic value, -a point of no mean interest- their appropriateness,

their inherent persuasiveness, may have more or less intentionally cultivated some of their characteristic features (Gonda, 1959:25).²²²

Several relatively recent linguistic studies, on the other hand, examine the figures in a way that calls into question any stylistic analysis. For instance, H. Rosén notes that, in Latin, figures in the nominative (e.g. *lux lucet*) are never interchangeable in terms of the case of their noun with figures in the accusative (e.g. *nomen nominare*). Ablative figures, on the other hand, (e.g. *luce lucet* and *nomine nominare*), often interchange with either accusatives or nominatives, but never both, while certain expressions are completely fixed in case (e.g. *fossam fodere*). Based on this observation she argues that the nouns have a logical basis for inclusion with the verb that goes beyond simply an optional adornment.

None of the manifestations of the figura etymologica should be evaluated as a stylistic phenomenon – unless the use of a specific collocation reflects a literary convention – since each of the three constructions has its own grammatical function or functions (1996:135).

To elaborate on Rosén’s point, note that since in Hindi the verb ‘to eat’ requires a complement, its most common object is its cognate noun:

mai~ khaanaa khaauu~gaa `I will eat (dinner/food)’.²²³

Given this circumstance, it would clearly be misguided to analyze the Hindi CO construction ‘eat food’ as a stylistic device unless context called attention to it in some other way.²²⁴

²²² Problems with assuming that the EF was a *necessary* mnemonic device will be raised in Chapter 4.

²²³ See Elena Bashir’s comment on Csuri “The verb khaanaa ‘to eat’ needs an object. You can’t say, as you can in English ‘I am eating.’ meaning ‘I am eating (a meal).’ The most common object encountered is *khaanaa* ‘food, meal’”

²²⁴ In Present Day English the idiom ‘give gift’ provides perhaps another example. There is more than a stylistic distinction between ‘give generously’ and ‘give a generous gift’. Both are

Reconciliation of the two apparently opposing assessments of Gonda and Rosén does not necessarily entail an adoption of an almost all inclusive definition of literary convention, despite the conventional nature of some of the milieus, such as Greek epic and Vedic hymns, in which the figures are numerous. Rather, we may recognize the grain of truth in Rosén's statement and use it as a common denominator for stylistic analysis: an author may use the etymological idioms that subsist in everyday speech, and consistently perform a syntactic function, with minimal stylistic impact. In the cases where the expression facilitates an adjective we might term this 'pure adjectival support;' in cases without an attribute 'pure emphasis.' Notice that emphasis itself may be considered stylistic and that even at this basic level our figures must be differentiated. Also note that I would be quite reluctant to assert that in Homeric verse even the most frequent idioms can be viewed as stylistic non-entities. On the other end of the spectrum, outdated, purely conventional expressions, or *ad hoc* coinages, are far more affected, draw much more attention to themselves, and therefore require very different aesthetic assessment.

Degree of tautology must also be factored into the equation. Phrases such as ἰστὸν ἰστάναι 'set up the mast', and ἀρχὴν ἄρχειν 'hold office,' in which divergent and specialized semantics have rendered the phrase untautological, represent a class distinct from purely redundant adornments where removal of the noun leaves one with the same meaning, such as (τεῖχος) τειχίζειν 'build a wall', or expressions in which the cognate verb

viable expressions but with different meaning. 'Give generously' is far more vague, and suggests general contributions in most cases, unless further specified to charity, while 'give a generous gift' generally denotes a singular act and a concrete present.

stands in for a more generic one ἀπόδειξιν ἀποδείξει instead of ἀπόδειξιν ποιῆσθαι ‘make a demonstration’.²²⁵ To adopt the terminology of Hofmann and Haffter etymological figures are ‘entitled’ to different degrees and for different reasons.²²⁶ The unstylistic figures Rosén speaks of are fully entitled, embedded idioms, and therefore come as near as possible to not being figures at all. Expressions that are clear coinages, such as Plautine *dentes dentiant* (*Mil.*34), and Aristophanic βάδον βαδίζειν (*Av.*42) are either entitled by context alone, or owe their humorous appeal to a lack of entitlement. In this case, genre is quite important, for unentitled figures will not generally occur in serious or somber contexts and genres that consistently strive to create such contexts.

In order to differentiate between figures in terms of their stylistic impact we might think in terms of an *entitlement continuum* ranging from ‘pure attributive support in *bona fide* idioms’ to ‘highly affected tautology involving (outdated) literary convention or coinage’. In the interests of providing a procedural model for sorting out the various figures in Homer, since scholarly precedents for study of the EF in Greek consist only of Fehling’s minimally explicated lists and Lobeck’s thirty seven page chapter covering all of ancient Greek,²²⁷ it will be helpful to adumbrate Haffter’s assertions with reference to

²²⁵ This last is Denniston’s example (134). He calls ἀρχὴν ἄρχειν “normal” while ἀπόδειξιν ἀποδείξει is a “genuine figure.”

²²⁶ Hofmann (1926:95) speaks of the vollberechtigtem Objekt ‘fully entitled object’, i.e. the cognate object used grammatically to support an attribute. Haffter adopts the term with due acknowledgement, 12.

²²⁷ Fehling includes a one and one half page section on the *figura etymologica* (51-2) under *blosse Wiederholungen*, which does not offer much more than a standard grammar, then has a five and one half page section on the EF itself mainly consisting of extremely useful lists. Lobeck’s *Dissertatio* has been most useful in its correct assertion that expressions of anger are particularly apt to generate highly affected figures (506).

Latin literature, not exhaustively and not in the order he presented them, but arranged according to this entitlement continuum.

At one pole of this continuum I place embedded idioms and stock phrases that, much like ‘sing a song’ or ‘give a gift’ in Present Day English, frequently have very little rhetorical impact. In other words, their aesthetic profile is extremely subtle, they strike a barely audible bass note on the stylistic register, and therefore, occupy the lower pole of our scale:

mediocriter vestitam veste lugubri

dressed modestly in a mourning dress (Ter.*Haut*.286).

Here, the etymological ablative effects pure verbal strengthening and adjectival support.²²⁸ It is doubtless no coincidence that Terence, who, compared to Plautus, avoids the EF, feels free to utilize an expression from **ues-*, a root that attests corresponding syntagma in several other IE languages which were either inherited, or formed independently at a very early stage.²²⁹ It is relevant to note here, however, that even a phrase such as this, in which the idiom has a clear grammatical function, also admits of stylistic analysis based on its alliteration.²³⁰ The same might be said of any number of times Homer uses an EA from **ues-* to qualify a character’s clothing: περὶ δ’ ἄμβροτα εἴματα ἔσσαν (*Od*.24.59). Also, note that once a figure becomes this idiomatic even manifestations without an attribute can be quite low profile, as in the following, relatively unaffected description of Telemachus putting on

²²⁸ Haffter (19): “*ganz im Dienste der Steigerungen der Rede stehen*” cf. Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*251.

²²⁹ As we know by now εἴματα ἔννυσθαι is commonplace in Homeric Greek. In addition, Vedic attests *vāstra-* *vas-* several times and Avestan *vastra-* *vah-*. Interestingly, the other dressing figure that occurs only once in Homer, ἐπὶ δὲ ἔσσαν, is quite closely matched by Avestan *vaste vanhanəm*.

²³⁰ *Ibid*, footnote 2.

his clothes in the morning: ὤρνυτ' ἄρ' ἐξ εὐνήφιν Ὀδυσσῆος φίλος υἱός, / εἵματα ἐσσάμενος (*Od.*2.2-3).

The next rung up in the continuum consists of figures that achieve a very low stylistic profile when they are in their proper niche:

*hostes autem omnes iudicati qui M. Antoni **sectam secuti sunt*** (Cic.*ad Brut.*1.3.4).

In this case the figure, 'they followed the following of Anthony' achieves a modest stylistic effect.²³¹ It is simply the use of an established political idiom in a politicizing context.²³² A good Homeric parallel is βουλὰς βουλευούσι παρήμενοι, ἧ θέμις ἐστί (*Il.*24.652). The main difference between figures on this second rung of the entitlement continuum and the first one is that they need a specific context to be comfortable. Pulled out of their politicizing context *sectam sequi* and βουλὰς βουλευούσι require more adaptation to context or genre than *vestita veste* or εἵματα ἔννυσθαι to be acceptable.

Next, we have figures of the second rung amplified by a further rhetorical or stylistic device:

ius iurandum** quod populus idem magna voce me vere **iurasse iuravit (Cic.*Ad Fam.*5.2.7).²³³

This usage exemplifies the amplification of a pre-existing juridical formula (*ius iurandum*), and illustrates that even an idiom which in certain contexts may have minimal rhetorical effect may, via paronomasia or other heightened forms of repetition, become an affected figure. There are similar heightenings of standard idioms in Plautus, e.g. *hau decorum facinus tuis factis facis*

²³¹ It is "stilistisch anspruchslos", Haffter (13).

²³² For attestations of this purely Latin collocation see *ibid* (13-14), Landgraf (21), Traina (40-41).

²³³ Haffter (14).

(*Aul.*220). For a Homeric example note the paronomastic expansion in the following lines:

Ἔκτωρ μὲν μετὰ τοῖσιν, ὅσοι **βουληφόροι** εἰσὶ,
βουλὰς βουλεύει θεοῦ παρὰ σήματι Ἴλου (*Il.*10-414-15).

The next category involves expressions taken out of their most natural context for stylistic reasons. *Nomen nominare*, in addition to having impressive correspondences in several I.E. languages, was an Old Latin idiom appropriate to contexts where some pathos was in order. We see it on the epitaph of a certain Claudia and twice in early tragedy:

nomen parentes nominarunt Claudiam (*C.I.L.* 1² 1211)²³⁴

quae nunc nominatur nomine Argo (*Enn. Trag.*208)

quis meum nominans nomen exciet (anonymous tragic frag. 97 R.).

But Plautus satirizes the figure in the *Asinaria* by moving it into the mock legal *condiciones meretricis* which the Parasite is to ‘read through’ (*leges pellege*, 747). Here, Diabolus’ mistress, when she throws dice, is not to say ‘you’ but must ‘name him by name:’ *Cum iaciat, ‘te’ ne dicat: nomen nominet* (780).²³⁵

In the case of Homer, of course, we do not have anything useful in Greek that predates the poems, but if we assume that ἔπος εἰπεῖν was a rather run of the mill expression at the time of the composition of the *Iliad*, Agammemnon’s caustic use of it to scold Calchas in book one can be seen as a low profile figure given higher profile by its arrangement in context:

μάντι κακῶν οὐ πῶ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον **εἶπας**·
αἰεὶ τοι τὰ κάκ’ ἐστὶ φίλα φρεσὶ μαντεύεσθαι,
ἐσθλὸν δ’ οὔτε τί πω **εἶπας ἔπος** οὔτ’ ἐτέλεσσας

²³⁴ Gonda calls this a ‘pompous’ figure.

²³⁵ For more discussion of the movement to bombast here see Haffter (21).

prophet of bane, never once have you said anything useful to me;
It is always in your mind to prophecy evil.

Not one time have you spoken an excellent word or made it come about
(106-8).²³⁶

That ἔπος εἶπεῖν was an established idiom well before the time of the composition of the *Iliad* is almost certain. In fact, Rüdiger Schmitt reconstructed a Proto-Indo-European syntagm ‘speak a word’ based on the exact match between ἔπος ἔειπε and Vedic *vácas avocam*:

*Schon gemein-indogermanisches Alter möchte ich für folgende
‘etymologische Figur’ annehmen: idg. * $\mu\epsilon k^w$ os $\mu\epsilon k^w$ ‘ein Wort / eine
Rede sprechen’ (264).²³⁷*

Ἔπος εἶπεῖν is attested 31 times in Homer and thrice in Hesiod. The Homeric instances occur primarily in dialogue. In narrative we find only one formula three times ἔπος δ’ ὀλοφυνδὸν ἔειπεν (at *Il.*5.683, 23.102, *Od.*19.362), and two occurrences of μετέειπεν ἔπος πάντεσσι πιφάυσκων (*Od.*22.131=247), a phrase that is rather more disjointed than the others, since the noun likely depends on πιφάυσκων.²³⁸ Hence, ἔπος εἶπεῖν primarily characterizes speakers. As such its predominant function is to affirm the sagacity or suitability of the speech spoken either by another or by the speaker themselves (x16):

²³⁶ The anomalous first aorist here (εἶπας) is actually a variant reading (Ar. 263a 354 729 A^m) for εἶπες (Did. 663 733 738 A B F^c). There is also manuscript evidence for metrically problematic ἔειπες and ἔειπας. Monro and Allen (OCT) print εἶπας, while West prints εἶπες and Latacz concurs.

²³⁷ Cf. Weiss (1994: 141), who notes that the labio-velar in εἶπον < **e- $\mu\epsilon\mu k^w$ om*, ought to have succumbed to the pre-Mycenaean ‘βουκόλος’ rule and rendered εἶκον, but was analogically retained, or restored because of the close association of the verb with the noun: «the etymological connection between εἶπον and ἔπος was never obscured. The Greeks, no doubt, felt the *figura etymologica* of the idiom ὡς ἔπος εἶπεῖν.»

²³⁸ Allen inserts a comma after μετέειπεν, and Murray translates accordingly: “(Agelaus) spoke among the suitors, and declared his word to all.”

τούτο **ἔπος** κατὰ μοῖραν **ἔειπες**· ‘you said this word properly’

(*Il.*15.206, *Od.*8.141 + its negation at 8.397, 21.278)

τόδ’ **εἰπέμεναι** πυκινὸν **ἔπος** ‘to say this shrewd word’ (*Il.*7.375, cf. 24.75, 744)

οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητον **ἔπος** ἔσσεται ὅττι κεν **εἴπω**· ‘nor will the word be dispensable, which I say’ (*Il.*2.361)

τούτο **ἔπος** νημερτὲς **ἔειπες**· ‘you said this word unerringly’ (*Il.*3.204)

οὐδ’ ἄλιον **ἔπος** ἔσσεται ὅττι κεν **εἴπη**· ‘nor will the word be vain, which he says’ (*Il.*24.92)

ἐπεὶ τόσα **εἶπες**, ὅσ’ ἂν πεπνυμένος ἀνὴρ / **εἴποι**· ‘since you say such things as a shrewd man says’ (*Od.*4.204-5)

οὐδέ τί πω παρὰ μοῖραν **ἔπος** νηκερδὲς **ἔειπες**· ‘nor did you say yet an unprofitable word unduly’ (*Od.*14.509)

εἴποιμι ἔπος, τό κε κέρδιον εἶη, ‘I would say the word that would be more profitable’ (*Od.*18.166)

κρῆνον νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ δειλῆ **ἔπος**, ὅττι κεν **εἴπω**· ‘fulfill now, for me, although a wretch, the word that I speak’ (*Od.*20.115)

ἔπος εἴπωμι τό μοι καταθύμιόν ἐστιν· ‘that I may speak the word which is on my mind’ (*Od.*22.392).

καὶ τοῦτ’ **ἔπος εἶπον** ἀπαντες· ‘and everyone said this word / agreed’ (*Hes.Fr.*211.6)

In all of these passages the figure is near the bottom of the entitlement continuum and the redundant noun functions in support of some sort of attribute, whether it be an adjective, demonstrative pronoun, relative, prepositional phrase, or combination of these. Most of the formulas that introduce these dialogues are what we might call neutral: they simply state

that the character is speaking, without explicitly specifying their emotional state (x11).²³⁹ Others characterize the speaker positively, that is they are rejoicing as they speak, or deliver their words with good intent (x3).²⁴⁰ In the case of Andromache's lament over Hector's corpse the figure heightens pathos (*Il.*24.744), and when Odysseus tells the suitors that Antinous' suggestion to put off the contest of the bow for another day is duly spoken (21.278), we are reminded that his words are insidious by their introduction: τοῖς δὲ δολοφρονέων μετέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς (274). Hence, of these sixteen expressions in which ἔπος εἰπεῖν constitutes an affirmation of the word spoken, the majority involve speakers whose emotive state is not particularly at issue, three involve words spoken with good intent and only two involve some deeper purpose (pathos and embittered subterfuge).

In addition, in several cases the tenor of the speech described by ἔπος εἰπεῖν is itself more or less neutral (7):

τόδ' ἠνώγεον εἰπεῖν ἔπος 'they bid (me) speak this word' (*Il.*7.394)

κῆρυξ, ὃς δὴ πρῶτος ἔπος σῆ μητρὶ ἔειπεν. (*Od.*16.469)

ὄφρα καθεζόμενος εἶπη ἔπος ἡδ' ἐπακούση 'so that he might sit, tell (his) tale and listen' (*Od.*19.98)

ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ξυνίει ἔπος, ὅττι κεν εἴπω· 'but come now, listen to the word that I speak' (*Od.*19.378)

²³⁹ For example, starting at the top of our list, at *Il.*5.205 Poseidon's dialogue with Iris is introduced simply by τὴν δ' αὔτε προσέειπε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων, and at *Od.*8.140 we find τὸν δ' αὔτ' Εὐρύαλος ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε. Other neutral introductions to the above figures occur at *Il.*24.66, 2.336 (in this case Nestor starts out with some insults, but by the time we get to the figure he has shifted his tone and is merely giving Agamemnon advice), 3.203, 24.89, *Od.*4.203, 14.507, 20.111, (introducing a prayer) and 22.390. The passage from the Hesiodic fragment also fits here.

²⁴⁰ See *Od.*8.385-6, 7.367 and 18.163 (although here Penelope's laughter is forced).

τοῦτ' ἄρα δεύτατον εἶπεν ἔπος 'this was last word he spoke'
(*Od.*23.342)²⁴¹

εἰπεῖν ἢ δ' ἐπακοῦσαι ἐμὸν ἔπος 'to speak and hear my word'
(*Od.*24.262)²⁴²

ρήϊδιον γὰρ ἔπος εἰπεῖν· βόε δὸς καὶ ἄμαξαν· 'for it is easy to say the word: give me oxen and a wagon' (*Hes. Op.*453).

The speech formulas that introduce all of these segments are 'neutral', except for *Od.*19.378. Here Eurycleia's words are actually introduced as doleful in one of the three in narrative instances of ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπεν, but by the time we get to the figure in her dialogue she has become more optimistic, since she is asserting to Penelope that the 'stranger' looks very much like Odysseus. In sum, ἔπος εἰπεῖν was used most often in dialogue in contexts not necessarily emotionally charged. Usually, there was some affirmation of the validity of the word spoken.

In contrast to this general distribution there are several occasions in which the idiom surfaces in expression of anger and bitterness. In *Odyssey* 23 Odysseus, after Penelope suggests that their bed be moved, says in perhaps feigned anger (ὀχθήσας ... προσεφώνεε) 'you spoke this soul-wracking word' (τοῦτο ἔπος θυμαλγὲς ἔειπες, *Od.*23.183, cf. 16.69). Here, the figure is in its usual line position. A negative adjective has simply replaced the more common affirmative ones. In the *Iliad* ἔπος εἰπεῖν occurs in contexts of anger three times: once at 20.250 in Aeneas' contemptuous goading of Achilles to fight, once at 1.543 when Hera is upset that Zeus has spoken to Thetis and

²⁴¹ This figure is actually in narrative, but the narrative describes Odysseus telling the tale of his adventures.

²⁴² Here the tone is one of light mockery, since Odysseus is posing as someone else to Laertes and asking for news about himself. The syntax of the phrase is also more disjointed than most.

addresses him with mocking words (κερτομίοισι), and once in Agamemnon's vilification of Chalcas cited above (116). In one Hesiodic occurrence we find the phrase in a proverbial setting dictating how one should exact revenge when wronged:

μή μιν πρότερος κακὸν ἔρξαι
μηδὲ ψεύδεσθαι γλώσσης χάριν· εἰ δέ σέ γ' ἄρχη
ἢ τι **ἔπος εἰπὼν** ἀποθύμιον ἠὲ καὶ ἔρξας,
δις τόσα τείνυσθαι μεμνημένος·

Do not do him wrong first,
and do not lie to please the tongue. But if he wrong you first,
either saying hateful word, or by deed,
remember to pay him back double. (*Op.*708-11).

The figure in Agamemnon's threat to Chalcas announces itself as more marked than the other upwellings of ἔπος εἰπεῖν in several ways, and hence, contributes to the threatening nature of the address. First, note the elaborate introduction:

τοῖσι δ' ἀνέστη
ἦρωσ Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
ἀχνύμενος· μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφιμέλαιναι
πίμπλαντ', ὅσσε δέ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετόωντι εἴκτην·
Κάλχαντα πρώτιστα κάκ' ὀσσόμενος προσέειπε·

Then rose up among them
the hero, son of Atreus, wide-ruling Agamemnon
deeply vexed, his heart filled black with great rage,
eyes flashing like fire, and with an evil glare at Chalcas first he spoke
(*Il.*1.101-5).

After this we must assume that Agamemnon is spitting out his words at Calchas. His tone is replicated in the alliteration alternating between ‘k’ and ‘p’ and ‘ph’ in the first three lines he utters culminating in the figure πω εἶπας ἔπος. The fact that the figure, which in almost all other cases attaches an attribute of some sort, but here stands bare, calls more attention to it. It as if the speaker (and poet) is revelling in and savoring the redundancy. Further, aside from being the only possible attestation of the first aorist in the expressions, the phrase has been moved from its usual position as an aorist indicative with noun first, followed by intervening material and augmented verb at line end. In short, here we have a very good example of a figure, the predominate occurrence of which is far more matter of fact, embellished to interact with its context. All the upwellings of ἔπος εἶπεῖν may now be placed on our continuum: at the low end are the majority of figures that simply and unemotionally portray a character commenting that a word has been said, usually with some sort of affirmation. Thence, we move up in stylistic register through several more emotionally charged contexts, whether this involves pathos, ironic insinuation, or anger, to the utterly embittered words of Agamemnon to Calchas. In this case, Homer has erected various metrical, alliterative and perhaps even morphological signposts to indicate that this is no ordinary use of the stock phrase.

Another example of an adapted figure in Homer involves expressions for pouring a libation. Twice χοῆν χεῖσθαι refers to an offering poured for the dead.²⁴³ Another funerary formula involves the adjectival perfect participle from χεῖσθαι, χυτήν:

ἀμφὶ πυρήν· εἶθαρ δὲ **χυτήν** ἐπὶ γαῖαν **ἔχευαν**

²⁴³ χοῆν χεῖσθαι πᾶσιν νεκύεσσιν, (*Od.*10.518, 11.26).

Around the pyre, then they piled up piled earth (*Il.*23.256).

τῷ κέ οἱ οὐδὲ θανόντι **χυτὴν** ἐπὶ γαῖαν **ἔχουσιν**

Nor did they pile up piled earth for the dead man (*Od.*3.258).

In Aeschylus *χύσιν χεῖσθαι* refers to libations poured to the dead. Electra considers in what manner she should pour offerings at Agamemnon's grave:

ἢ σῖγ' ἀτίμως, ὥσπερ οὖν ἀπώλετο

πατὴρ, τὰδ' **ἐκχέασα**, γάποτον **χύσιν**,

στείχω,

Or, in silence and shame, as he perished,

My father, after pouring these, a libation drunk by sod,

Do I return? (*Ch.*94-6).

This suggests that both *χοῆν* and *χύσιν χεῖσθαι* denoted poured offerings to the dead. Hence, the following passage from the *Odyssey*, in which the *χύσις* is a pile of leaves, can be seen as mock funereal:

ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσση λέκτρο, **χύσιν** δ' **ἐπεχέυατο** φύλλων.

Then he bedded down in the middle (of the thicket), and piled up a pile of leaves (*Od.*5.487).

Immediately after this Athena pours sleep over Odysseus' eyes (*ᾠδ.* δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνη / ὕπνον ἐπ' ὄμμασι χεῦ', 491-2) reminding us of the brotherhood of Ὑπνος and Θάνατος. A paradox arises since, by piling up his barrow, Odysseus creates a cocoon that protects his naked body from the elements and helps to save his life. Despite *LSJ* BI the use of the middle of *ἐπιχέω* here as 'pour for oneself' is odd, especially with the cognate idiom, which in all other instances in Homer and Aeschylus indicates, either in middle or active

voice, offerings poured for others.²⁴⁴ This further underlines Odysseus' life-saving action as, paradoxically, an auto-interment. It is as if he is pouring a libation at his own gravesite. In another, this time deeply pessimistic, self-burial passage Theognis plays upon the Homeric paradox:

Πάντων μὲν μὴ φῦναι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον'
μηδ' ἐσιδεῖν αὐγὰς ὀξέος ἠελίου,
'φύντα δ' ὅπως ὤκιστα πύλας Ἄϊδαο περῆσαι'
καὶ κεῖσθαι πολλὴν γῆν ἐπαμησάμενον

The best of all things for humankind is not to be born
and not to look upon the rays of the piercing sun.

But, if born, to reach the gates of Hades as quickly as possible,
and to lie dead having heaped much earth upon oneself. (1.424-7).

A key link between this and the passage from the *Odyssey* is the use of the middle ἐπαμάομαι here and at *Od.*5.482 (ἄφαρ δ' εὐνήν ἐπαμήσατο χερσὶ φίλησιν). In both passages the character is literally digging their own grave.

Another mode of expression the EF conveys, according to Haffter, is colloquializing bombast for comic effect:

si Parthi vos nihil calificiunt nos frigore frigescimus (Cic.*Ad Fam.*8.6.4).

This figure is clearly a coinage, and Haffter (12) saw it as evidence that the EF subsisted in everyday speech both at the level of specific, embedded expressions (*facinus facere* etc.), and as a matrix upon which new expressions might be coined. In Hesiod, as discussed in chapter one, we find the rather affected figure κόκκυξ κοκκύζει, which, because of its

²⁴⁴ A libation of leaves is also quite odd, a χοή being generally liquid. The χύσις of leaves calls to mind the poured earth (χυτὴν γαῖαν) of the pyre passages.

onomatopoetic replication of the sound of the bird it characterizes, may have suggested itself at a more basic level than pure coinage. Homer characterizes Hephaestus by having him construct an onomatopoetic figure, heavily accentuated by further alliteration, describing the stream of Ocean around the cave of the Nereids:

έν σπηϊ γλαφυρῶ· περι δὲ ῥόος Ὀκεανοῖο

ἀφρῶ μορμύρων ῥέεν ἄσπετος·

... in the smoothed out cave, and surrounding us the stream of Ocean streamed incessantly, murmuring with foam (*Il.*18.402-3).

The power of streams and rivers to conjure such collocations is demonstrable in several languages. The phrase ῥόος ῥέεν < *srou-os *sreu- forms a matching syntagm with Vedic *sravas srav-*:²⁴⁵

satyámugrasya bṛhatáḥ sám sravanti sam sraváḥ

sám yanti rasíno rásāḥ punānó bráhmaṇā hara índrāyendo pári srava

The common streams of true power stream together;

The fluids of the fluid coalesce. Among the ritual words intoned, o saffron one, flow (*RV*9.113.5).

In Latin we find a similar onomatopoetic expression from a different root:

UBEI **CONFLOUNT FLOUI** EDUS ET PORCERBA, IBI TERMINUS

STAT Where the two streams stream together, the Edus and Porcerba, there the boundary stands (*ILLRP* 517).²⁴⁶

The highest profile figures do not even suggest themselves at the level of onomatopoetics, or any other iconic level. They are coinages entitled solely by specific context and/or genre. At this level in Plautus we find, in addition to

²⁴⁵ If we follow Pokorny, *srava-* m. 'das Fleissen' (= gr. ῥόος) the match would be exact; but he does not explain why Brugmann's law did not operate on the 'o' of PIIR *srovos.

²⁴⁶ Compare Cic. *de Div.*1.35 *ut flumina in contrarias partes fluxerint.*

Ballionem exballistabo mentioned in Chapter 1, such zany concoctions as *opsonabo opsonium* ‘provide provisions’ (*Stich.*440), as Haffter points out (26), an elaboration of the more dignified idiom *opsonium curare*. Further, in an abusive exchange in the *Rudens*, when Charmides complains that he may be sick, the pimp, Labrax rails ‘*pulmoneum edepol nimi’ uelim uomitum uomas*’ ‘I really hope, by Pollux, that you puke a pulmonary puke’ (511). Many of the highest profile figures in Homer feature denominative verbs, such as αἰχμὰς δ’ αἰχμάσσοι (*Il.*4.324) coined by Nestor in playful banter with Agamemnon as described above, and τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο (*Il.*7.449) coined in bombastic indignation by Poseidon as a periphrasis of τεῖχος ἔδειμαν in narrative at 7.436.

To reiterate, Haffter identified five points on what I am calling the entitlement continuum (1,2,3,4, and 6 below). I have added an addition category (5). Arranged from lowest to highest stylistic profile the points on the continuum are as follows:

1. Oft recurring idioms as pure verbal strengtheners / adjectival supporters
2. Phrases entitled in genres or sub-genres, such as political formulas
3. Category 2 + paronomastic or other means of amplification
4. Phrases pulled out of their entitled context for comic or parodic effect
5. ‘Coinages’ suggesting themselves on an iconic level beyond pure spontaneity
6. Nonce coinages entitled specifically in their immediate context.

As we will see, this is just a rough, introductory delineation of an extremely complex spectrum. More subtle distinctions will emerge as we analyze the

stylistics of each figure throughout Homeric and Hesiodic poetry. Keep in mind also that the principles of semantic detachment and phonetic mutilation discussed in chapter one also have a direct influence on the stylistic profile of a figure, so that the analysis of the poetic register of each phrase is, in the end, a complex process of synthesizing data from various angles.

3.2 Contexts of entitlement:

In the older scholarly tradition we repeatedly find the statement that the EF is more at home in poetry than in prose. To provide but one example, in his study of the etymological figures of Latin, Landgraf begins with the following statement:

(quamquam (figura etymologica) latissime in prisca et Romanorum et Germanorum poesi patet, tamen prosae quoque orationi nec minus profano quam sacro sermoni ita insedit, ut nec ulla florentis linguae Latinae aetate prorsus evanuerit.

Hence, we see that, although Landgraf asserts that the EF is most prevalent in archaic poetry, he also acknowledges its presence in prose, oratory, profane and sacral speech, and basically throughout Latin. More recent scholars have reversed this assessment: both Wills, working primarily with Latin, and Fehling working with Greek, asserted that the EF is actually more common in prose than poetry (246 and 154 respectively).²⁴⁷ In the end, this contradiction arose from the fact that a broad distinction between prose and poetry in terms of the EF is too coarse. In Latin, while Caesar eschews the figures altogether, they are nonetheless more common in Livy and Cicero than in Virgil and Ovid.²⁴⁸

²⁴⁷ The significance of the EF in antique prose had been formerly noticed by E. Norden (1913:144-5).

²⁴⁸ This observation stems from a survey of the lists of Müller and Landgraf. Cf. Wills (244): "it is clear that many pairs (*pugnam pugnare, facinus facere, vitam vivere, occidione occidere*

Plautus uses them freely and flamboyantly, Terence sparingly and conservatively. In Greek, they are quite frequent in Homer and Hesiod, but almost non-existent in Lyric. In Greek prose, Thucydides is quite constrained in his usage, Plato and Herodotus quite liberal. In short, the prose-poetry distinction is non-existent; we need a more fine-grained set of criteria for determining entitled contexts. This study will show that even an author-by-author assessment is too blunt: there are entitled and unentitled contexts within the Homeric and Hesiodic *corpora*. Ultimately, there is no reason to believe that any ancient author's use of the figures is indiscriminate.²⁴⁹

It is safe to assume that if an author was striving for brevity such redundant phrases would have been off limits. This assertion is especially applicable to the figures used without attributes attached. A comment by Gaedicke, reinforces this observation:

It is assumed as a priori that the attributeless and unadorned etymological, internal accusative, which adds no new impetus to the character of the action, and only portrays that same emptiness with a certain recognizable irony, in times where one speaks only what is necessary, is not applicable.²⁵⁰

When we realize that there are times in Homeric poetry when the sober tone of the narrative does not allow excess verbiage, and other times when excess verbiage, for various reasons, is precisely what is desirable, we create the possibility that the presence of the EF, or lack thereof, can open a window into analyses of differing registers, or rhetorical postures, in epic diction.

etc.) are unexceptional in Livy and Cicero. In poetry, however, this stream dries up more quickly.”

²⁴⁹ See Wills (207-221) for remarks regarding the practices of individual Latin authors in the general use of polyptoton. Specific use of the EF is even more idiosyncratic.

²⁵⁰ This translated from German (157-8).

Unfortunately, in post-Parryan scholarship this is a perilous assertion in and of itself. The first step in delineating the epic contextual blocks or sub-genres conducive to the EF is to step outside of the poems themselves and observe where such figures are most comfortable in general terms. Most of the research that has been done along these lines is on Latin, and the most frequently cited observation is that, in Latin, the oldest attestations of such phrases were in legal, military and constitutional formulae.²⁵¹ Hence, I begin my analysis of the dispersion of the Homeric and Hesiodic figures by assessing the validity of this claim.

3.2.1. Military formulae:

A small group of figures that appear to represent military formulae have occupied a prominent position in sections on the internal accusative in Latin and Greek grammars for almost a century.²⁵² The Latin figures typically cited in these sections are Plautine *pugnam pugnare* and *militia militatur*.²⁵³ In the two early studies that treat etymological figures in Latin more extensively *pugnam pugnare* gets considerable attention along with *bellum bellare*, *proeliabantur proelium*, and *militare militiam*.²⁵⁴ Hence, to the casual observer, Latin, or more specifically Latin scholarship, would suggest a convincing and archaic military venue for at least the etymological accusative.²⁵⁵

²⁵¹ Leumann (38), “die älteste Belege sind juristische, militärische und staatsrechtliche Formeln.”

²⁵² This assertion was first made by J.B. Hofmann, Stolz-Schmalz (1928: 380) and repeated in Leumann as per above.

²⁵³ Further examples of Latin grammarians who cite these examples are Draeger (387), Woodcock (8-9), etc.

²⁵⁴ Landgraf (21), Müller (13-14).

²⁵⁵ This situation has repercussions for people working in other fields. For example, in his article on the cognate object Jones (103), citing Woodcock, felt it necessary to discuss the passivization of the CO *pugnam pugnare* > *pugnata pugna est*. In my view this is akin to feeling it necessary to account for the syntax of Dr. Seuss’ phrase “the thinks you can think.”

In his study of stylistic repetition in Sanskrit Gonda finds a curious correspondence between “fixed phrases of a highly technical character” in Vedic literature and the fact that “Latin examples concern juridical, political and military formulas.” He then lists the typical examples of the Latin grammars, suggesting that he is relying on them for the validity of the Latin venues. One should add here that Vedic, and post-Vedic Sanskrit literature does have a considerable number of etymological figures of martial quality. However, none of the roots that generate these figures correspond to generative roots in other I.E. languages, suggesting independent and isolated development. Some examples are *jayatu jétvāni* ‘let him win booty’ (*RV.6.47.26*), *yé sáhāṃsi sáhasā sáhante* ‘who by might won victories’ lit. conquered conquering by conquering (*RV.6.66.9*). The root **seǵʰ-*, Grk. ἔχω does in fact generate a few nominative expressions in Homer, but these are of an entirely different semantic nature and should not be connected with the Vedic paronomasia. Overall, the distribution of phrases involving cognate repetition in Sanskrit is much broader than in Latin and Homer, and the existence of martial phrases in Vedic ought not to be used as a basis for comparison.

It may be no coincidence that the Latin grammarians created a category of military formulae after the publication of Brugmann’s *Comparative Grammar of Indo-European Languages*. His *Paradebespiel* for the internal accusative both with and without an attribute is *einen (schweren) Kampf kämpfen*.²⁵⁶ Further, the three Homeric examples he lists are all of a military flavor: ἄλλοι δ’ ἀμφ’ ἄλλησι μάχην ἐμάχοντο νέεσσι, ἄπρηκτον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν

²⁵⁶ 1909:620-21. Other I.G. grammarians follow Brugmann, e.g. Hirt (1934:83).

and ἀπειλαί, τὰς Τρωσὶν ἀπείλεον.²⁵⁷ Greek grammarians also show a penchant for listing the military phrases.²⁵⁸ This preference may arise from the fact that the idiom ‘fight a fight’ is such a clear example of an internal accusative. The ‘fight’ is abstract, and cannot be argued to have any existence either before or after the verbal action.

I find it informative that Fehling, who collected the entire group of etymological *Wiederholungsfiguren* in pre-Gorgian Greek more exhaustively than any before him dropped the ‘military’ from the standard phrase of the Latin grammars when noting the correspondence between Roman and Greek mileus:

*Einige Belege weisen darauf hin, dass die figura etymologica einen besonderen Platz in der Sphäre der **offiziellen Rechts- und Verwaltungssprache** hatte. Das steht im Einklang mit den Verhältnissen im benachbarten Italischen (153).*

Most recently, Wills, who includes a section on ‘battle polyptoton’ in his book on allusive repetition, makes the following comment:

Despite the passages cited, it should be kept in mind how many opportunities for battle polyptoton are foregone by historians (and one might even say avoided by someone like Caesar who has fewer examples than most poets). The general absence of such forms from Caesar is significant and it may not be surprising that a more dramatic author like Livy is really the only Republican or Augustan historian to be accounted for (196).

²⁵⁷ Ibid (621). Brugmann’s examples from Latin and Old Irish also include ‘military’ idioms: Lat. *hoc bellum bellare*, Ir. *bāgim-se bāig*. Cf. Hirt (84) who does list non-military examples from Homer as well, e.g. βουλήν βουεύειν.

²⁵⁸ See Schwyzer (74), whose two Homeric examples are μάχην ἐμάχοντο and πόλεμον πολεμίζειν. Cf. Meillet-Vendryes (550-51).

Note here that within Will's battle section, while there are an abundance of noun + noun and verb + verb figures, there are no figures involving what he calls verb polyptoton, or *figura etymologica* proper.²⁵⁹ Thus, more recent scholarship hints at the questionability of a *bona fide* military provenance for the Latin and Greek figures, but we are still without a systematic analysis of Hofmann's assertion of such formulae in Latin and the prevalence of figures with an overtly martial appearance in the Greek and Indo-European grammars.

It has been remarked above that the earliest figures adduced from Latin to prove the existence of ancient 'military formulae' are Plautine. We have also noticed that the playful repetitiveness and at times absurd tautology invoked by such figures is so well-suited to his style as to cause the creation of entirely *ad hoc* phrases such as *Ballionem exballistabo* and *dentes dentiant*.²⁶⁰ Now, taking our Plautine examples with a grain of salt, let us examine more closely the individual passages used by Hofmann *et al.* to assert a martial venue for etymological phrases. At the start we should note that Haffter, in a remark directly in reference to Hofmann's postulation of 'sacral formulas' based on *vota vovi*, comments that in general Hofmann seems to have gone too far in his assignation of categories.²⁶¹

The first figure to be dealt with in a thorough manner is *pugnam pugnare*. We might remark first off that in both the nominal form, *pugnam*, and

²⁵⁹ Wills has a chapter (8) entitled Verb Polyptoton in which he does cite Plautus, *istam pugnam pugnabo*, saying that "the alliteration and etymological word play fit his aesthetic" (243).

²⁶⁰ Although McCartney (347) calls *Ballionem exballistabo* "an effective military figure", we should be careful not to think of it as anything but a dramatic invention facilitated by Greek βαλλεῖν. As noted above, the verb is a hapax from *ballista*.

²⁶¹ "Im übrigen scheint mir Hofmann in seinen Zuweisungen noch zu weit zu gehen" (32⁶).

verb, *pugnare*, we are dealing with internal Latin derivation, or back formation from *pugnus* ‘fist’, and that construction of even a proto-Italic, much less Indo-European syntagm is out of the question.²⁶² In early inscriptions the verb *pugnare* refers, at times, to a military engagement: MACEL[AMQUE OPIDOM P]UCNANDOD CEPET (*C.I.L.*1².25 260 B.C.E.). Later Inscriptions attest usage in reference to gladiatorial contests: CUMVE GLADIATORES IBEI PUGNABUNT (*C.I.L.*1².593.138 45 B.C.E.). The noun, *pugna*, however, is unattested before Plautus.

A close look at the context of *pugnam pugnabo* at *Pseudolus* 524 serves to undermine its validity as a serious military formula:

Ps. *priu’ quam istam pugnam pugnabo, ego etiam prius dabo aliam pugnam claram et commemorabilem.*

Simo. *quam pugnam?* Ps. *em ab hoc lenone uicino tuo per sycophantiam atque per doctos dolos tibicinam illam tuo’ quam gnatus deperit ea circumducam lepide lenonem.*

Ps: Before I fight this fight of yours, I will fight another fight, famous and to be Remembered.²⁶³

Simo: What kind of contest?

Ps. You’ll see. I will employ some skillful diplomacy and cunning tactics, to remove neatly from his grasp the singing girl who inspired a fatal passion in your Son’s heart.

²⁶² *Pugnus* > *pugnare* on the analogy of *cura* > *curare* types and subsequently *pugnare* > *pugna*. This derivational scenario is *communis opinio*, cf. Buck (1933:313).

²⁶³ This first part is thus (over)-translated by Rosén to emphasize the semantic equivalence of *pugnam pugnare* and *pugnam dare*.

Since, the *pugnam* mentioned before was tricking Simo out of money, and the *pugnam* referred to in the quote is tricking a pimp out of a flute-girl, what we have here in *pugnam pugnabo* is at best a parody of an etymological figure in a military formula. Add to this the fact that *pugna* can also refer to a boxing match, a meaning closer to its derivation from *pugnus*, or a gladiatorial contest, and it seems that we are quite far from having a securely attested military venue. Also note here the cross-linguistic tendency to express the striking of a blow, be it with a fist or other object, as a singular act, as evidence for an idiom of a very basic and colloquial nature. In other words, there is nothing in this passage to suggest the plurality involved in a military confrontation, or to cite as evidence for military *formulae*.

The active construction, *pugnam pugnare*, is attested elsewhere only once in a fragment of Lucilius (1339) *magnam pugnaumu' pugnam*, and once in Livy 6.42.5. Donatus, who refers to the phrase as ἀρχαισμός, says that in Lucilius the battle in question is a *pugna amatoria*.²⁶⁴ Otherwise the idiom is rendered in the passive.²⁶⁵ In the *Amphitruo* we find the passive construction used to refer to a military battle, albeit in Sosia's bombastic description of a battle he did not participate in, but missed breakfast for:

ipsusque Amphitruo regem Pterelam sua opruncauit manu.

*haec illist **pugnata pugna** usque a mani ad uesperum*

(hoc adeo hoc commemini magi' quia illo die inpransus fui)

Amphitryon himself, by his own hand, slaughtered king Pterela

this fight was fought there all the way from dawn to dusk

²⁶⁴ Krenkel compares *noctipugam* (Frg. 1246), although this *puga* is from Greek πυγή 'butt', and Plaut. *Ps.*524.

²⁶⁵ Diomedes Grammaticus (1.1.p 6) lists the construction in the passive.

(I clearly remember all the more because I went without breakfast that day) (252-4).

Apart from Plautus and Lucilius the phrase *pugnam pugnare* and its more common passive equivalent occur only sporadically in later prose. In his *Commentarii*, Caesar exhibits a studied avoidance of the figures in favor of adverbial expression:²⁶⁶

Ita ancipiti proelio diu atque acriter pugnatum est. (BG.1.26.1).²⁶⁷

Note the use of a synonym of *pugna* in the ablative (*proelio*), or alternatively, *vario certamine pugnatum est* (BC.1.46.4).²⁶⁸ This practice follows the general tendency of replacement of the etymologically related noun with an equally empty semantic equivalent noted by Rosén, and the specifically Latin tendency to move internal accusative expressions into the ablative noted by Landgraf. As for *pugnam* Caesar and pseudo-Caesar use it almost exclusively with verbs of motion and prepositions, e.g. *ad pugnam contendunt* (BH.40.4). So, even if we assert that *pugnam pugnare* was an idiom, we can not witness it undergoing replacement via a more general verb like *dare*, the regular replacement of *pugnare* in Terence.²⁶⁹

The fact that the *Commentarii* attest forms of *pugna* 71 times and forms of *pugnare* 126 times may suggest a conscious avoidance of combining them in the same phrase. An unconscious avoidance would be a more compelling

²⁶⁶ For the absence of such phrases in Caesar see Draeger (387) and Traina (42²). Whether or not Caesar's avoidance is due to an overall lack of the EF in military idiom, or is a sign of his own striving for an austere style is an open question.

²⁶⁷ This is but one of several such examples, the passive also occurs with *acerrime* (BH.11.2), *continenter* (BC.1.46.1), *comminus* (BG.1.52.4); *acriter* occurs multiple times with the active, e.g. *acriter pugnauerunt* (BG.5.15.3).

²⁶⁸ Livy also uses *proelio* and *certamine pugnare*. See Müller (13) for citations.

²⁶⁹ One might note here the frequent occurrence in Caesar of *bellum gerere/inferre* in conjunction with *bellum bellatum est* first attested in Livy (8.40.1, cf. 7.29.1) and speculate that in Livy's case the existence of an idiom with a noun + general verb of doing generated a literary figure.

suggestion that the expression *pugnam pugnare* simply did not exist in military idiom. At any rate, it is clear that the tautology of etymological phrases, combined with the fact that they call attention to their own redundancy by means of assonance, made them objectionable to Caesar. They must have lacked the austerity and *gravitas* the general, whom Aulus Gellius described as a *gravis auctor linguae latinae* (4.16.8), desired for his *Commentarii*.

Further prose attestations feature the passive construction *pugna pugnata (est)*. Note Cicero's use of the passive construction attaching the attribute *acerrima* to the etymological figure in contrast to Caesar's adverbial *acriter*.

*Cuius ex omnibus **pugnis**, quae sunt innumerabiles, uel **acerrima** mihi videtur illa, quae cum rege commissa est et summa contentione **pugnata**. (Mur.16).²⁷⁰*

It is important to consider the difference between Cicero's use of the phrase here, which separates and essentially masks its redundant elements, and Plautine usage which revels in the redundancy. In this connection Nepos is more Plautine than Ciceronian:

Hac pugna pugnata Romam profectus nullo resistente (Hann.5.1).

Other Latin authors clearly sought alternative phrases, often avoiding the ostentation of redundancy by avoiding assonance and replacing *pugnam* with another noun just as semantically empty, e.g. *pugnavit...proelia* (Hor.*Carm.*4.9.19-21) *proelium male pugnatum* (Sall.*J.*54.7).

In the end, there is no evidence that dictates against a supposition that Plautus, in fact, coined the etymological figure *pugnam pugnare*. There is no

²⁷⁰ Further attestations of the idiom in the passive construction always attach an attribute in the form of an adjective or pronoun: Livy *tam claram pugnam pugnata* (9.37.11, cf.40.52.6). For further examples see Landgraf (21).

epigraphical evidence for its existence in the numerous inscriptions concerning *res militares*. Although the formation from *pugnus* > *pugnare* evidently occurred quite early, the back formation from *pugnare* > *pugna* can not be proven to be pre-Plautine.

Hofmann's other example of a military formula from Plautus, *illa militia militatur* (Pl.*Per.* 232) occurs in a conversation between an *ancilla* and a *puer*, and the 'military service' referred to is clearly figurative.²⁷¹ The phrase finds no parallels outside of Plautus in the classical period and thus can not be used as an example of such phrases in real or literary military language.²⁷² Unlike the Latin juridical formulae (discussed below) 'military figures' do not find correspondence in extra-literary contexts, inscriptional or otherwise. The Plautine collocation *pugnam pugnare* is singularly bizarre; The bulk of the Latin literary examples we have suggest that the phrase made more sense in the passive.

It is generally safe to assume that the passive construction refers to a plurality of combatants and is thus equivalent to an active 3rd person, or possibly 1st person plural. This accords with the passages in which Homer uses etymological idioms meaning approximately *pugna pugmata est* or **pugnam pugnant, pugnant*. However, we should not put all of the Homeric passages reflecting this tendency on equal footing. For example, note the following passage.

“ὦ γέρον εἶθ' ὡς θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν
ὡς τοι γούναθ' ἔποιτο, βίη δέ τοι ἔμπεδος εἴη·
ἀλλά σε γῆρας τείρει ὁμοῖον· ὡς ὄφελέν τις

²⁷¹ See OLD sv.

²⁷² Müller notes parallels from the Vulgate, Apuleius etc. (14).

ἀνδρῶν ἄλλος ἔχειν, σὺ δὲ κουροτέρουσι μετεῖναι.”

Τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἔπειτα **Γερήνιος** ἵππότης Νέστωρ·

“Ἄτρεΐδῃ μάλα μὲν τοι ἐγὼν ἐθέλοιμι καὶ αὐτὸς

ὥς ἔμεν ὡς ὅτε δῖον Ἐρευθαλίωνα κατέκταν.

Ἄλλ' οὐ πῶς ἅμα πάντα θεοὶ δόσαν ἀνθρώποισιν·

εἰ τότε κοῦρος ἔα νῦν αὐτέ με **γῆρας** ὀπάζει.

Ἄλλὰ καὶ ὧς ἵππεῦσι μετέσσομαι ἠδὲ κελεύσω

βουλήν καὶ μύθοισι· τὸ γὰρ **γέρας** ἐστὶ **γερόντων**.²⁷³

Αἰχμὰς δ' **αἰχμάσσοισι** νεώτεροι, οἳ περ ἐμεῖο

ὀπλότεροι γεγάασι πεποιθασίν τε βίηφιν.

“Old man, I wish that, like the valor in your heart,

so your knees would follow and your strength were stalwart

but evil old age presses upon you; if only some other man had it

and you were among the youths”

Then Nestor the horseman from Gerania answered him.

“Son of Atreus, I wish I were as I was when I slew brilliant Ereuthalion.

But the gods do not give all things to men at the same time.

If I was a young man then, now old age attends me

but even so I will be among the horsemen and will urge them on

by counsel and words. For this is a privilege of old men.

Younger men will spear (with) spears, who were born later than I

and have confidence in their might. (//.4.313-325).

The first thing to notice about this passage is that, by the time we get to αἰχμὰς δ' αἰχμάσσοισι it is abundantly clear that Nestor is engaging in

²⁷³ For a remarkably similar creation in Skt. cf. *gurutvena jagadguroḥ* ‘respectability is of the world-fathers’ (Kāl.R.10.64).

etymologizing wordplay.²⁷⁴ He adduces the etymological figure γῆρας, γέρας γερόντων, which is, rather famously, a valid etymology up to this day, then concocts his own etymological accusative, αἰχμὰς αἰχμάσσοισι.²⁷⁵ It is not enough here, however, to note that etymology begets etymology without also noticing the juxtaposition of styles of etymologizing Nestor engages in. After a complex and learned nominal polyptoton etymologically connecting cognates that had, to some degree, semantically detached -- old age, old men and privilege – he constructs an infantile EA to mock the upstart, neoteric warriors, and emphasize brain over brawn. In fact, it is quite possible that αἰχμὰς αἰχμάσσοισι was as much an interpretational non sequitur to its ancient Greek audience as it is to us. Such concrete cognates as ‘spear or spearhead’ generally make more sense in the dative. This particular EA does not occur elsewhere in Greek.²⁷⁶ The noun αἰχμή ‘spear-tip’ is attested in Mycenaean (*ai-ka-sa-ma*), while the denominative verb is hapax in Homer. The first post-Homeric attestation of αἰχμάζειν distracts Nestor’s figure into manageable parts, while retaining the pejorative denotation of the verb. In Aeschylus’ *Persians* Atossa describes to the ghost of Darius the taunts that drove Xerxes to his folly:

ταῦτά τοι κακοῖς ὀμιλῶν ἀνδράσιν διδάσκειται
 θούριος Ξέρξης. λέγουσι δ’ ὡς σὺ μὲν μέγαν τέκνοισ

²⁷⁴ The speech of Nestor is itself more rife in etymological figures than the rest of the epic and the dialogue of any other character. Also, the phrase τὸ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ γερόντων seems to set up additional wordplay more than once, as evidenced by another line that follows the segment, this time spoken by Achilles, also featuring a rather oddly derived denominative: ὄφρ’ ἄλλην φράζωνται ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μῆτιν ἀμείνω (*Il.9.421-3*).

²⁷⁵ γῆρας and γέρας were originally strong and weak forms of the same acrostic paradigm which split in Greek and became two lexical items. PIE Nom-Acc. **gērh*₂-s, Gen. **gerh*₂-s-s.

²⁷⁶ There is a famous example of an EA from the same root, ἠχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν with its Gothic counterpart *ushanth hunth* ‘he took prisoners at spear point’ (*Ephes.4.8*, cf. Landgraf, 1881, 24), but neither its meaning nor formation bear much resemblance to the Homeric phrase.

πλοῦτον ἐκτήσω σὺν **αἰχμῆι**, τὸν δ' ἀνανδρίας ὕπο
ἔνδον **αἰχμάζειν**, πατρῶιον δ' ὄλβον οὐδὲν αὐξάνειν

Impetuous Xerxes, by associating with vile men, learned this.

For they were saying that, while you won great wealth for your children with your spear, he, because of cowardice, plays the spearman at home, and does not increase his father's estate (753-6).

The spondaic line beginning formula of accusative plural noun + denominative fits a recognizable pattern within the etymological accusative group. This pattern, in turn, fits into a wider group, suggesting that innovative figures had a tendency to take this position.²⁷⁷ 'Epic' futures in -αζω are not common, but the only way to form a future of a denominative in -αζω in the 3rd pl. with an initial long syllable without ending up with a cretic was by applying -σσ-.²⁷⁸ The form αἰχμάσσουσι has the advantage of exactly reduplicating the noun in its first two syllables (αἰχμάσ αἰχμάσ-σουσι) and, given the general principle that the greater the phonetic echo of a figure the more affected it is likely to be, it is safe to say that this is a nonce coinage motivated entirely by the specific dialogue in which it occurs. It would make about as much sense to assert its existence in the general military language of Greek as it would to put *Ballionem exballistabo* among real attestations of military formulae in Latin.

The next figure to consider occurs twice in the *Iliad* in almost identical formulae that vary only the attribute attached:

Αἰσχρὸν γὰρ τόδε γ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι
μὰψ οὔτω τοιόνδε τοσόνδε τε λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν
ἄπρηκτον **πόλεμον πολεμίζειν** ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι

²⁷⁷ For full discussion of this point see Chapter 4.

²⁷⁸ Although not all forms of this type are 3rd pl., cf. θαυμάσσεται.

ἀνδράσι παυροτέροισι, τέλος δ' οὐ πώ τι πέφανται·

For this is a shameful thing even for future generations to hear,
that so noble and so great an Achaean army so vainly warred
a fruitless war and fought against fewer men, but no end has yet
appeared. (*Il.*2.119-122).

As a phonetic figure *πόλεμον πολεμίζειν*, surrounded in this case by further alliterative echoing, conforms to the general observation that the two elements of more affected phrases consistently replicate large parts of each other, and that a majority of these types feature denominative verbs. The other instance of *πόλεμον πολεμίζειν* references the duel between Paris and Menelaus. The passage is not as alliterative, but the fact that the semantics of *πολεμίζειν* are perhaps less apt to refer to one on one combat may make its profile just as high.

ἀλλά σ' ἔγωγε

παύεσθαι κέλομαι, μηδὲ ξανθῷ Μενελάῳ

ἀντίβιον **πόλεμον πολεμίζειν** ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι

ἀφραδέως, μή πως τάχ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δουρὶ δαμήης.

But I urge you to stop,

do not fight a man to man fight against blonde Menelaus

and do battle witlessly, or soon you may be vanquished by his spear.

(*Il.*3.433-6).

The phrase *πόλεμον πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι* fits into a broader category of expressions, many of them adverbial, ending with *πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι*:

ἐν δὲ σθένος ὤρσεν ἐκάστῳ

καρδίῃ ἄλληκτον πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι

But she (Athena) roused the strength in the heart of each

to fight and do battle without stopping. (//.2.451-452=11.12, 14.152).

The adverbial expression always occurs in the general narrative, in reference to incitements for the men to fight. The other uses of the formula outside of the two with the etymological expression follow suit. The segment occurs once in dialogue without πόλεμον when Oilean Ajax says to Telamonion Ajax:

καὶ δ' ἔμοι αὐτῷ θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισι
μᾶλλον ἐφορμᾶται πολεμίζειν ἢ δὲ μάχεσθαι

And the heart in my own breast

incites me all the more to fight and do battle (//.13.73-4).²⁷⁹

Both of the uses of the expression with the etymological accusative, on the other hand, occur in dialogue, in bitterly ironic injunctions not to fight. First, at //.2.121, Agamemnon, in his test of the men, falsifies Zeus' deceptive dream, suggests retreating from Troy, and contemplates the shame of returning home without victory. Fenik noticed the humor, irony and reversals depicted in this scene:

At B 110 (ff.) Agamemnon had made the proposal for the first time, but there he did not receive the answer he expected. The *humorous irony* of the *peira* assumes an added dimension if we see in the army's behavior not only a contradiction of Agamemnon's own expectations, but also a *reversal* of the normal response to a typical question. (30, italics mine).

Second, at //.3.435 Helen sarcastically enjoins Paris not to fight Menelaus even though he has boasted many times before of being his better in strength of hand and spear.²⁸⁰ Hence, if πολεμίζειν ἢ δὲ μάχεσθαι is a military

²⁷⁹ For other instances of this line segment see //.3.67, 7.3.

²⁸⁰ σὴ τε βίη καὶ χερσὶ καὶ ἔγχεϊ φέρτερος εἶναι (//.3.431).

formula, πόλεμον πολεμίζειν ἢ δὲ μάχεσθαι is its antithesis, reserved for sardonic contexts. A final reinforcement of the antithetical nature of the phrase occurs when Achilles uses another etymological figure with πολεμίζειν, this time employing a compound adjective, in his injunction to Patroclus not to fight the Trojans once he has driven them from the ships:

μηδὲ σύ γ' ἄνευθεν ἐμεῖο λιλαίεσθαι **πολεμίζειν**

Τρωσὶ **φιλοπολέμοισιν**

Do not be eager, without me to war against

The war-loving Trojans (*//*.16.89-90).

In this case, however, Patroclus' eventual response to this injunction not to fight is typical: he ignores it and fights anyway. Further, Achilles' words are meant to be taken at face value, and there is no implicit disdain in them. Hence, this last example serves to illustrate the difference between the tautological EF, as I have defined it, and other forms of polyptoton, in terms of the nuances each engender. While πολεμίζειν Τρωσὶ φιλοπολέμοισιν creates an opposition that heightens the gravity of Achilles' prohibition, both occurrences of πόλεμον πολεμίζειν show an acute awareness of the phrases' vacuity, and seek to entitle that vacuity within specific contexts.

The best example of a military formula in Homer is the etymological accusative μάχην μάχεσθαι, always used in the 3rd plural imperfect without an attribute:

ἄλλοι δ' ἄμφ' ἄλλησι **μάχην ἐμάχοντο** πύλησιν. (*//*.12.175).

ἄλλοι δ' ἄμφ' ἄλλησι **μάχην ἐμάχοντο** νέεσσιν, (*//*.15.414).

ἢ δ' ὅσοι παρὰ νηυσὶ **μάχην ἐμάχοντο** θοῆσιν. (*//*.15.673).

στησάμενοι δ' **ἐμάχοντο μάχην** ποταμοῖο παρ' ὄχθας, (*//*.18.533).

στησάμενοι δ' **ἐμάχοντο μάχην** παρὰ νηυσὶ θοῆσι, (*Od*.9.54).

The root that gave rise to this expression, *mag^h-, meant ‘to have power’ or ‘be capable’ as in Vedic *mah-* ‘enable’, Goth. *mag*, OHG *magēn* ‘be strong’; in Greek it is connected to μῆχος ‘remedy’ or solution (Doric μάχος) and possibly μηχανή.²⁸¹ The meaning ‘do battle’ and the etymological figure are Greek innovations; the phrase finds no match outside of Greek. There are, however, a few interesting parallels in Sanskrit phrases with similar semantics, in the 3rd pl. (note also the further paronomasia):

śúrā iva prayúdhah̄ próta yuyudhuḥ̄ máryā iva suvṝdho vāṅṝdhuḥ̄

Forefighters, they (the Maruts) fought as heroes at spearpoint; as well-flourishing young heroes they have flourished. (*RV.5.59.5*).

Gaedicke noted the similar syntax of ἐμάχοντο μάχην and an etymological accusative from the *Brāhmanas*, *ājīm ājanta* ‘they were struggling the struggle, fighting the fight’ (*Çat.Br.2.4.3.4*), and Greek ἀγῶνα ἀγωνίζεται (247 and 244). The persistence of the 3rd pl. in ἐμάχοντο μάχην is particularly interesting in the passage from the *Odyssey*, which is embedded in a 1st person narrative, and is a bit jarring:

τότε δὴ ῥα κακὴ Διὸς αἴσα παρέστη
 ἡμῖν αἰνομόροισιν, ἴν’ ἄλγεα πολλὰ πάθοιμεν.
 στησάμενοι δ’ ἐμάχοντο μάχην παρὰ νηυσὶ θοῆσι,
 βάλλον δ’ ἀλλήλους χαλκῆρεσιν ἐγχείησιν.

Then an evil lot from Zeus stood upon us
 in our terrible fate, so that we would suffer many pains.
 In battle array they battled the battle by the swift ships,
 hurled at each other with bronze spears (*Od.9.52-5*).

²⁸¹ See LSJ under μῆχος, and LIV 379.

The rather sudden switch to 3rd person plural here is interesting given the predilection of the idiom itself to appear as such in the *Iliad*. It is as if the focus shifts for two lines to a general description of the battle between to Greeks and Ciconians, or perhaps focuses primarily on the Ciconians. Two lines later we switch back to 1st person plural (μένομεν, 57).

Overall, ἐμάχοντο μάχην is a rather distant way of relating the general battle. Directly following one of the attestations of the phrase, the poet himself steps back, and reflects in the first person:

ἄλλοι δ' ἀμφ' ἄλλησι **μάχην ἐμάχοντο** πύλησιν·

ἀργαλέον δέ με ταῦτα θεὸν ὥς πάντ' ἀγορεύσαι·

Different men were fighting the fight by different ships;

But hard would it be for me, as if a god, to relate all this (*//*.12.175-6).

In another instance the figure serves to focus the narrative from general to specific, plural to singular:

ἄλλοι δ' ἀμφ' ἄλλησι μάχην ἐμάχοντο νέεσσιν,

Ἕκτωρ δ' ἄντ' Αἴαντος εἰείσατο κυδαλίμοιο.

Various men were fighting their fight at various ships,

but Hector rushed straight for glorious Ajax (*//*.15.414-5).

Αἰχμὰς αἰχμάσσουσι (x1), πόλεμον πολεμίζειν (x2) and μάχην ἐμάχοντο (x5) together constitute all of the overtly military etymological accusatives. Needless to say 8 is not an impressive sampling of hundreds of figures. Further, given the contexts in which they occur, we can effectively remove πόλεμον πολεμίζειν and αἰχμὰς αἰχμάσσουσι from the military set. This leaves only one recurring formula persistently in the 3rd plural as the only military formula.

The remaining accusative expressions in martial contexts do not have semantics that make them appear native to battle descriptions, but have been adapted to such usage. I have already discussed the fact that the mutilated forms of figures from **uerǵ-* (ἔργον ῥέζειν) may refer to vicious acts of war in the *Doloneia*.²⁸²

The noun in the alliterative accusative figure πῆμα(τα) πάσχειν may refer to various sorts of suffering, but in a few passages the pains are those associated with war. The one time the expression appears in the *Iliad* Ares complains to Zeus of what might have been his fate if he had not fled from Diomedes on the battlefield:

αὐτοῦ **πήματ' ἔπασχον** ἐν αἰνῆσιν νεκάδεσσιν

There I would have suffered sufferings among the grisly corpses
(*Il*.5.886).

This passage clearly references the battlefield, but from a distance, as Ares has fled to Olympus. Zeus immediately castigates the war god for his pathetic tone and commands him to stop whining.²⁸³ In the *Odyssey* Telemachus uses the expression when he asks Menelaus if he has any news of Odysseus' whereabouts:

λίσσομαι, εἴ ποτέ τοί τι πατήρ ἐμός, ἐσθλὸς Ὀδυσσεύς

ἢ ἔπος ἢ ἐ τι ἔργον ὑποστάς ἐξετέλεσσε

δῆμψ ἐνι Τρώων, ὄθι **πάσχετε πῆματ'** Ἀχαιοί,

I beg you, if ever my father, excellent Odysseus,

fulfilled a promise for you, in word or deed,

²⁸² Tyrtaeus uses a similar phrase in a military context: **ἔρδων** δ' ὄβριμα **ἔργα** διδασκέσθω πολεμίζειν (11.27)

²⁸³ μή....μινύριζε (*Il*.5.889).

in the Trojans' land where you Achaeans suffered sufferings,
(*Od.*4.328-30).

It should be noted here that an etymologizing tone has been set earlier in Telemachus' speech when he uses an emphatic etymological dative.²⁸⁴ Further, Telemachus' words are bitter; he describes the destructive acts of the suitors and expresses a desire to hear news of the wretched death (λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον) of his father, so that the extremely fruitful emotive context of indignation and bitterness also motivates the figure. At best we have an idiom of general meaning, which, at any rate, may or may not have been felt to be etymological, adapted for reference to the pains of war.

It is worth remarking that the two times πῆματα πάσχειν refers to the sufferings of war are the only times it does not form an Adonic. The line-ending formula consistently refers to the woes of the wanderer and sailor: thrice in the alliterative phrase δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο πῆματα πάσχει 'Indeed, distant from dear ones he suffers sufferings' (*Od.*1.49)²⁸⁵ and twice in Odysseus' fictitious Cretan tale and Eumaius' reference to it: νῦν δεῦρο τόδ' ἴκω πῆματα πάσχων 'now I have come here thence suffering suffering' (*Od.*17.444cf.524).

Note the alliteration leading into the phrase as Zeus describes the manner of Odysseus' passage from Ogygia to Scheria:

ὥς κε νέηται
οὔτε θεῶν πομπῇ οὔτε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων·
ἀλλ' ὃ γ' ἐπὶ σχεδίδης πολυδέσμου πῆματα πάσχων
ἤματί κ' εἰκοστῷ Σχερίην ἐρίβωλον ἴκοιτο, (*Od.*5.31-4).

²⁸⁴ εἴ που ὄπωπας / ὄφθαλμοῖσι τεοῖσιν 'If ever you have seen with your own eyes' (*Od.*4.323-4). Note the enjambment of the schema over two lines.

²⁸⁵ The identical formula occurs with conjugation of the verb at *Od.*8.411 and *Od.*7.152.

Like many of the figures πῆμα(τα) πάσχειν always occurs in dialogue. It is an expressive phrase, often in highly alliterative contexts, used by Homeric characters to arouse pathos in an overly dramatic, or bitterly ironic manner. It is thus not surprising that it moved a few times into speech about war, but it is not a military formula.

The final etymological accusative that occurs in dialogue embedded in military narrative always uses an intervening relative and spans two lines. First, Poseidon, likening his voice to that of Thoas, goads Idomeneus to return to battle with a rhetorical question:

Ἴδομενεῦ Κρητῶν βουληφόρε ποῦ τοι **ἀπειλαὶ**
οἴχονται, **τὰς** Τρωσὶν **ἀπείλεον** υἴες Ἀχαιῶν;

“Idomeneus, counselor of the Cretans, where have the threats
Gone, which the sons of Achaeans threatened the Trojans?” (//.13.219-
20).

Next, Achilles, in another negative injunction this time designed to incite the men to battle, tells the Myrmidons not to forget the threats they threatened against the Trojans when they were waiting out his rage:

Μυρμιδόνες μή τίς μοι **ἀπειλάων** λελαθέσθω,
ᾧς ἐπὶ νηυσὶ θοῆσιν **ἀπειλεῖτε** Τρώεσσι (//.16.200-201).

From both these passages we may conclude that ἀπειλήν ἀπειλεῖν was a rhetorical figure used by Homeric characters in exhortations to do battle: The single occurrence of the idiom in narrative, in the *Odyssey*, might constitute an adaptation of the battle injunction:

οὐδ' ἐνοσίχθων
λήθετ' **ἀπειλάων**, τὰς ἀντιθέω Ὀδυσῆϊ

πρῶτον ἐπηπείλησε, Διὸς δ' ἐξείρετο βουλήν·

Nor did the earth-shaker

forget the threats which he had first threatened

against divine Odysseus, and he questioned the plan of Zeus

(*Od.*13.125-127).

Those are all of the etymological accusatives of an even marginally military nature. There is one etymological dative that directly describes battle action, βέλεσιν βαλλεῖν:

ὅσσοι δὴ βέλεσιν βεβλήσονται; οὐδέ τι οἶδε (*Il.*11.657).

ἢ βέλεσι βάλλωσι· σὺ δ' εἰσορόων ἀνέχεσθαι. (*Od.*16.277).

The figure from the *Iliad* involves a general description of the wounded, and the darts of the figure in the *Odyssey* are those of the suitors launched against Odysseus in disguise. The verb βαλλεῖν occurs with an etymological accusative in a non-military context when the Cyclops casts a stone at Odysseus' ship:

ὅς καὶ νῦν πόντονδε βαλὼν βέλος ἤγαγε νῆα (*Od.*9.495).

In general the semantics of βαλλεῖν are split along the lines of military and non-military contexts.²⁸⁶ Based on sheer numbers this lone representative of the ED occurring in battle narrative is not particularly impressive evidence for the construction's adaptability to military contexts.²⁸⁷

The remaining phrases that could be classified as martial formulae are etymological nominatives. The first occurs in a simile that compares

²⁸⁶ “The comparison between βάλλω “throw” and βάλλω “hit” is hampered by the fact that the former is used largely in a non-military sphere, while the latter is used nearly exclusively in a military context” (De Boel, 131).

²⁸⁷ It should be noted that non-tautological repetitions, such as ‘to hurl a dart and hit one’s target’ are quite common, e.g. οὐδ’ ἀλίωσε βέλος, βάλε δ’ Ἑκτορος ἠνιοχῆα (*Il.*16.737).

Idomeneus and Meriones to war and fear, Ares and Phobos, and, as discussed above, is best considered a literary creation:

τῷ δὲ **Φόβος** φίλος υἱὸς ἄμα κρατερὸς καὶ ἀταρβῆς
ἔσπετο, **ὅς** τ' **ἐφόβησε** ταλάφρονά περ πολεμιστήν·

His (Ares') son Panic, both mighty and fearless

follows, who puts into a panic even the stalwart warrior (*Il.* 13.299-300).

Two other etymological nominatives occur in one passage in *Iliad* 4, in which, with the help of Athena, Menelaus is wounded, rather than killed. One involves a rather unique figure, grammatically, a 'relative in apposition' to the main subject which is not an etymological figure:

αὐτὴ δ' αὖτ' ἴθυνεν ὄθι ζωστήρος **ὀχήες**
χρύσειοι **σύνεχον** καὶ διπλῶος ἦντετο θώρηξ.
Ἐν δ' ἔπεσε ζωστήρι ἀρηρότι πικρὸς οἴστος·
διὰ μὲν ἄρ ζωστήρος ἐλήλατο δαιδαλέοιο
καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πολυδαιδάλου ἠρήρειστο
μίτρης θ', ἣν ἐφόρει **ἔρυμα** χροὸς ἔρκος ἀκόντων,
ἣ οἱ πλεῖστον **ἔρυτο**· διὰ πρὸ δὲ εἶσατο καὶ τῆς.
Ἀκρότατον δ' ἄρ' οἴστος ἐπέγραψε χροῖα φωτός·
αὐτίκα δ' ἔρρεεν αἶμα κελαινεφὲς ἐξ ὠτειλῆς.

She (Athena) guided it straight to where the gilded holders
of the belt held together and the corselet fit together twofold.

The sharp arrow fell into the well-fit belt,

was driven through the fine wrought belt,

through the incredibly fine wrought corselet

and the chain mail apron which he wore, a defense of the skin, fence

against javelins, which defended him the most; but it drove through this.

At last the arrow scratched the very tip of the man's skin

And at once black-clouded blood flowed from the wound (*//*4.132-40).

Clearly this is one of the more repetitive passages we will find. It may be that there is some sardonicism intended. After all, Athena is helping Menelaus, but the result of her help is a wound in the groin. This paradox is mirrored by a switch in the meaning of ἴθουνεν from one that brings the aim of the shooter to fruition, to one of deflection to a spot more favorable for the person who gets shot:

Ὡς φάμενος προέηκε· βέλος δ' ἴθουνεν Ἀθήνη
ῥίνα παρ' ὀφθαλμόν, λευκοὺς δ' ἐπέρησεν ὀδόντας.

So speaking he made his cast, and Athena guided the spear
to his nose, next to the eye and it pierced his white teeth (*//*5.290-91).

The first figure in *Iliad* 4.132-40 finds a close echo later in the epic, but this time the victim, Hector's brother Polydorus, is not so lucky, since he is hit in the back, and the spear pierces all the way to the front. An image in reverse of the description of Menelaus' armor.²⁸⁸

τὸν βάλε μέσσον ἄκοντι ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεὺς
νῶτα παραίссοντος, ὅθι ζωστήρος ὀχῆες
χρῦσειοι **σύνεχον** καὶ διπλόος ἦντετο θώρηξ
ἀντικρὺ δὲ διέσχε παρ' ὀμφαλὸν ἔγχεος αἰχμή,
γνῦξ δ' ἔριπ' οἰμῶξας, νεφέλη δὲ μιν ἀμφεκάλυψε

²⁸⁸ Taking this ὅθι quite literally, Edwards (ad. loc.) puzzles over the position of the ὀχῆες here vs in the passage from book four, and goes so far as to speculate that either Menelaus, or more likely Polydorus has put his armor on backwards. Willcock attributes the discrepancy to carelessness in the use of formulae in one place or the other. I suggest that the proper place for the ὀχῆες are in the front, and that the description of where Polydorus has been hit merely takes some liberty with the designation of ὅθι. We might say 'he was hit on the back right where the navel is'. It does not mean that we are describing the navel as being on in the back.

κυανέη, προτὶ οἱ δ' ἔλαβ' ἔντερα χερσὶ λιασθεῖς.

Brilliant, swift-footed Achilles hit him with a javelin

in the middle of the back as he darted past, where the gilded holders of the belt held together and the corselet fit together twofold.

The spear-tip held its course clean through to the navel;

and he fell to his knees with a groan. Then a dark cloud

Enveloped him, and, slumping over, he clutched his guts towards him in his hands (*//*.20.413-15).

The same EN occurs in two other passages in close succession in *Iliad* 20, the second being an echo of the first. In this figure the ὀχῆες are double crossbars on the gates of the makeshift wall the Achaeans have constructed to defend the ships along the beach. Here the irony arises from the fact that the holders fail to hold:

δοιοὶ δ' ἔντοσθεν ὀχῆες

εἶχον ἐπημοιβοί, μία δὲ κληῖς ἐπαρήρει.

στῆ δὲ μάλ' ἐγγὺς ἰών, καὶ ἐρεισάμενος βάλε μέσσας

εὐ διαβάς, ἵνα μὴ οἱ ἀφαυρότερον βέλος εἴη,

ρῆξε δ' ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρους θαιρούς· πέσε δὲ λίθος εἴσω

βριθοσύνη, μέγα δ' ἀμφὶ πύλαι μύκον, οὐδ' ἄρ' ὀχῆες

ἔσχεθέτην, σανίδες δὲ διέτμαγεν ἄλλυδις ἄλλη.

Inside two intersected fasteners held fast (the gate), but a single bolt fit them together. He (Hector) came and stood quite close, set his feet and, pressing forward, he hit them in the middle and broke off both hinges. The stone fell inside with all its weight, the gates bellowed greatly all around, nor did the fasteners hold fast, but the timbers sundered this way and that (*//*.12.454-61).

Counting all of the figures discussed above in the most liberal manner, that is including examples such as the last one as two even though it is clearly but one echoed, and including the *ad hoc* phrases αἰχμὰς αἰχμάσσοισι and πόλεμον πολεμίζειν, we reach a total of 16 out of 347²⁸⁹ figures that can even tenuously count as military formulas. The fact of the matter is that many of the long battle narratives in the *Iliad* provide the longest gaps between such phrases. *Iliad* 21, the great *aristeia* of Achilles, consisting of 611 lines houses but one EF in dialogue, and this in Poseidon's indignant description of Apollo's unrequited servitude to Laomedon as a cowherd of cows (βοῦς βουκολέεσκες, 448). The book abounds in other sorts of etymologizing and polyptoton, but shows marked restraint in its use of the EF. Book 17, which describes the fight for the corpse of Patroclus for 761 lines, has no etymological accusatives or datives and only two etymological nominatives, one in an aside about a herald Apollo assumes the form of (324-5), and one in a simile comparing a warrior to a stele (434-5). Book 11 starts with 615 lines of battle containing only one figure in dialogue:

ζώγρει Ἄτρεος υἱέ, σὺ δ' ἄξια δέξαι ἄποινα·
πολλὰ δ' ἐν Ἀντιμάχοιο δόμοις **κειμήλια κείται**

take me alive, son of Atreus, and you will get a fit ransom;

for there are many stores stored in the house of Antimachus (131-2).

In fact, the only Iliadic use of κειμήλια κείται is in supplications such as this one, inserted as short dialogues in battle narrative (cf. 6.47) and meant to invoke pathos. In lieu of discussing all the battle narrative in which the EF fails to surface I refer the reader to the breakdown in the appendix. The marked

²⁸⁹ This is the total number of EFs in Homer. See Appendices.

absence of the etymological figures from several, highly formulaic themes is even more impressive than the overall numbers. They do not appear when the narrative describes, in quick succession, individual warriors fighting and killing; they do not appear in any of the great duels; and they are absent from arming scenes. Since my primary interest is in illustrating where the figures do appear I will not spend a great deal of time listing the themes where they are not. I treat the arming scenes in greater detail in the next chapter. Here I give but three examples of formulaic battle narrative devoid of the EF:

τόν ῥ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐτάροιο χολωσάμενος βάλε δουρὶ
κόρησιν· ἧ δ' ἐτέροιο διὰ κροτάφοιο πέρησεν
αἰχμὴ χαλκείη· τὸν δὲ σκότος ὅσσε κάλυψε,
δούπησεν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

Odysseus, angered because of his friend, hit him with his spear on the temple: through the other temple the bronze spear tip pierced; darkness covered his eyes and he hit the ground with a thud, armor clattering around him (*//.4.501-4*).

τόν ῥα κατ' ἀσπίδα δουρὶ βάλε κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων·
ἧ δ' οὐκ ἔγχος ἔρυτο, διὰ πρὸ δὲ εἴσατο χαλκός,
νειαίρη δ' ἐν γαστρὶ διὰ ζωστήρος ἔλασσε·
δούπησεν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

Mighty Agamemnon hit him on his shield with the spear; but it did not stave off spear, the bronze pressed through and drove past his belt into his lower belly and he hit the ground with a thud, armor clattering around him (*//.5.537-40*).

ὃ δὲ Σχεδίων μεγαθύμου Ἰφίτου υἱὸν
Φωκῆων ὄχ' ἄριστον, ὃς ἐν κλειτῷ Πανοπῆϊ

οἰκία ναιετάασκε πολέσσ' ἄνδρεσσιν ἀνάσσων,
τὸν βάλ' ὑπὸ κληῖδα μέσην· διὰ δ' ἀμπερὲς ἄκρη
αἰχμὴ χαλκεῖη παρὰ νείατον ὦμον ἀνέσχε· (310)
δούπησεν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

Αἴας δ' αὖ Φόρκυνα δαΐφρονα Φαίνοπος υἱὸν
Ἴπποθόω περιβάντα μέσην κατὰ γαστέρα τύψε·
ῥήξε δὲ θώρηκος γύαλον, διὰ δ' ἔντερα χαλκὸς
ἤφυσ'· ὃ δ' ἐν κονίησι πεσών ἔλε γαῖαν ἀγοστῷ.

Hector hit Schedius, the son of great-spirited Iphitus, far best of the Phocians, who had his home in glorious Panopeus and ruled over many men. Hector struck him beneath the middle of his collar bone, and clean through passed the sharp, bronze tip, coming out at the base of his shoulder, and he hit the ground with a thud, armor clattering around him.

But Ajax in turn struck battle-wise Phorcys, son of Phaenops, square in the belly as he stood over Hippothous; he broke the plate of corselet, the bronze let the entrails through, and, falling in the dust he clutched the earth with his hand. (*Il.*17.306-315).

One may check through every episode of this sort, of which there are a plethora, and find no *figurae etymologicae*. Another way of putting this is that the figures are absent from all the most gruesome scenes. Furthermore, it is clear that the Homeric poets could sustain long stretches of narrative without using the figures. Since their avoidance is systematic, rather than random, I conclude that the aesthetic qualities of the EF did not suit several of the more austere sub-categories of Homeric diction. In the case of 'military formulae' there is little reason to believe, based on both Latin and Greek evidence, that

the tautological schemata were native to martial diction in real or literary contexts at any early stage.

The lack of such figures in battle narration is the single biggest factor in accounting for the numerical discrepancy between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This is not to say that polyptoton of different types did not occur in battle scenes. Oppositional phrases featuring a verb in the active opposed to a form of the same verb in the passive are relatively common of in such contexts:²⁹⁰

ἔνθα δ' ἄμ' οἰμωγή τε καὶ εὐχολή πέλεν ἀνδρῶν
ὀλλύντων τε καὶ **ὀλλυμένων**, ῥέε δ' αἵματι γαῖα.

Then at the same time there was wailing and vaunting
of the slayers and the slain, and the sod streamed with blood (*//.8.64-5*).

ἑστάμεναι κρατερῶς, ἢ τ' ἔβλητ' ἢ τ' ἔβαλ' ἄλλον
to have stood mightily and either be shot or shoot another (*//.11.110*).

There are also noun + noun oppositional phrases such as οἰόθεν οἶος
ἀντίβιον μαχέσασθαι 'to fight one on one, face to face' (*//.7.39-40, cf.226*)
and several descriptions of the battle line either linked together or clashing:

φράξαντες δόρου δουρί, σάκος σάκεϊ προθελύμνω·
ἀσπίς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυιν, ἀνέρα δ' ἀνήρ·
hemming in spear with spear and shield with projecting shield;
shield pressed on shield, helmet on helmet, and man on man (*//.13.130-31*).

πεζοὶ μὲν πεζοὺς ὄλεκον φεύγοντας ἀνάγκη,
ἵππεῖς δ' ἵππηας· ὑπὸ δέ σφισιν ὤρτο κονίη

²⁹⁰ Verbal polyptoton of this sort, emphasizing parallelism or opposition is not limited to Greek, cf. Vedic *usāntam usānah* 'desiring the one who desires' (*RV.3.5.7*) here stressing reciprocity. In his presentation of polyptoton in Latin Wills includes sections on battle polyptoton (194-202) and amorous and fraternal polyptoton (202-6).

Foot-soldiers killed foot-soldiers fleeing involuntarily,
 horsemen horsemen, and the dust rose beneath them (//.11.150-51).
 Figures of this sort find striking parallels in Sanskrit, Latin, Irish and Baltic.²⁹¹
 There are also distributive figures portraying the way the battle lines were
 arranged:

κρίν' ἄνδρας κατὰ **φῦλα** κατὰ **φρήτρας** Ἀγάμεμνον,
 ὡς **φρήτρη φρήτρηφιν** ἀρήγη, **φῦλα** δὲ **φύλοις**.
 Separate the men by tribes, by clans, Agamemnon,
 So that clan may aid clan and tribe tribe (//.2.362-363).

The fact that other forms of polyptoton occur more freely in battle narrative
 further isolates the EF, and, as I have said the distinguishing factor is blatant
 circularity. In the final analysis, we must search outside of military language for
 the major provenances of our figures.

3.2.2 Sacral formulae

As noted above, scholarly tradition has generally asserted that, along
 with military language, archaic sacral diction attests significant numbers of
 etymological figures. The cross-linguistic evidence for this assertion is far
 more compelling than for the existence of military formulae. In Latin, although
 Haffter questioned Hoffmann's postulation of sacral formulae, we do find a
 number of relevant figures. Established idioms may enter into sacral diction:

Iunone rec. | matrona | Pisaurese | **dono dedrot**²⁹²

Iunoni reg(inae) matronae Pisaureses donum dederunt

Pisaurensian matrons gave a gift to queen Juno (Ernout, 75).²⁹³

²⁹¹ The best examples are cited by West (2007: 115-16).

²⁹² For a full discussion of the Italic idiom *donum do* see Euler's eponymous monograph.

²⁹³ Or 'the Pisaurensians gave a gift to queen Juno the matron.'

Dis-pater Veiovis Manes,

*Sive quo alio **nomine** fas est **nominare***

Father Dis, Veiovisian shades,

Or if it be permitted to name you by another name

This last is a formula cited by Macrobius (*Sat.*3.9.10, cf. Thulin, 56) as a chant (*carmen*) by which cities and armies were consecrated (*devoventur*) to be spoken only by dictators and generals. Several other figures stress sacral speech acts. Cato attests *Te bonas preces precor* 'I pray you good prayers' (*Agr.* 139), which Müller sees as an old prayer formula (17). This finds a parallel in Umbrian, on the tables of Iguvium:

*arsie tio **subocau suboco***

dei graboue

*arsier frite tio **subocau suboco***

dei graboue

In the formulation invoke thee an invoking

Jupiter Grabovius

In trust of the formulation I invoke thee an invoking

Jupiter Grabovius

(VI a 22-34, 8-11 as translated by Watkins, 215).

The same section of tables also attests *pihaclu pihafei* 'as purificatory offering to be purified' (27).²⁹⁴ Hence, just this small sampling suggests that the EF was quite at home in Umbrian sacral diction. Both Plautus and Cato attest *vota vovere* (*Amph.* 947, *Agr.*83) and the pseudo-etymological, perhaps originally

²⁹⁴ Plautus puts *piem pietatem* (*As.*506) into the mouth of a *meretrix*. Whether this is a nonce coinage or parody of an existing formula is difficult to ascertain.

legal formula, *praetor praeest* enters into sacral settings.²⁹⁵ This is not the place to list all of the figures in Latin sacral diction, but just this sampling should suffice to create the impression that the sacral formulae find far more validation than military formulae in Italic.

In the *Vedas* there are so many etymological figures in overtly sacral formulations that it would be cumbersome to list them all. Clearly, fixed idioms may be adapted for use in invocations:

āvocāma rāhūgaṇā agnāye mādhumad vācaḥ

We, the Rahuganas, spoke sweet speech to Agni (*RV.1.78.5*).

Others seem more particularized to sacral speech:

agnīm agniṃ hāvīmabhiḥ sādā havanta vís-pátim é

Agni, Agni they always invoke with invocations (*RV.1.12.2*)

The verb *yaj-* has sacrificial syntagms in both Vedic and Avestan:

yajñéna yajñám ayajanta devás ‘The gods sacrifice sacrifices with sacrifice’ (*RV.1.164.50=10.90.16*).

yō nā mazištəm yasnəm yazāite ‘who sacrifice the greatest sacrifice’ (*Yt.1.24*).

darəyəmcā yasnəm yazānō ‘even if he performs a long sacrifice’ (*Yt.10.138*).

It is also clear that certain phrases arose as specialized encapsulations of sacral processes. Hence, ‘to press that which is pressed’ (*somam su-*) always means ‘to prepare the sacrificial fluid’ and one of the most basic Sanskrit verbs, *kṛ-* ‘do’, when used as an EA (*karma kṛ-*) - could mean not simply ‘do a

²⁹⁵ In the *Carmen Marci*, Macrob.1.17.28: *his ludis faciendis praesit praetor*, cf. Livy.25.12.9ff, *praeerit praetor*.

deed' but 'perform sacrifice.'²⁹⁶ In short, there is no avoiding the impression that etymological figures were a staple of Indo-Iranian sacral diction from an early time, and remained so in increasingly specialized collocations.

Numerous other Indo-European languages attest etymological figures in sacral formulas. Obviously I cannot provide complete lists here, but note that in Old Hittite one finds both an EA, ^{DUG}*ispantuzi* [...] *sipanti* 'pour libation' (*KUB* XXIV 3 III 42 and XXX 1.2) in the ritual for the thundergod, and *ispanduit sipanti* 'libates with a libation-vessel' several times in ritual contexts.²⁹⁷ An inevitable comparison with ^{DUG}*ispantuzi sipanti* is post-Homeric Greek σπονδὰς σπένδειν (*Th.*8.57.2, et al.). Among the oldest figures in Germanic is Old High German *pluostar pluozit* 'sacrifice a sacrificial victim' (Grimm, 1898:760); For Old Irish I have already listed *in guide ron-gádsa* 'the prayer that I have prayed' (*Fél. Epil.*421). All of this leaves one with the impression that sacral diction had a distinct cross-linguistic propensity to incorporate and generate etymological figures.

The sacral language of Greek inscriptions buttresses this impression. First, there are several formulas of the semantics 'make sacrifice.' Here I will cite only θυσίας θύεσθαι:

τὰς **θυσίας θύεσθαι** ἰν Ἑλισσο[ν]τι 'the sacrifices shall be sacrificed at Helisson' (*SEG* 37.340, R.O.14.9, Helisson becomes a kome of Mantinea, early 4th cent. BC), cf. **θύη θύειν** ἐφι[στι]α (*IG* XII.v593, Ionic, last quarter of the 5th cent. BC, regulations limiting extravagance of burial rights).

²⁹⁶ See Gonda (275), who lists the paronomastic combination *akran karma karmakṛtaḥ* lit. 'the deed-doer does the deed', but technically 'the sacrificer performs the sacrifice' (*T.S.*1.8.3.3).

²⁹⁷ See Puhvel (1984:436-7) and Neu (1970: 12 and 38) where he says "In der hethitischen Magie spielen bekanntlich Farbbezeichnungen eine sehr wichtige Rolle."

Στεφάνειν στεφάνω ‘Crown (+attribute) with a crown’, or ‘garland with a garland’ is a widespread formula in dedicatory inscriptions:

καὶ **στεφανῶσαι** δάφνης **στεφάνω** ‘and crown him with a crown of laurel’ (R.O.46.8 and 10 c.360 BC).

στεφανῶσαι... χρυσῶι **στεφάνω** ‘crown with a golden crown’ (R.O.51.16-18, cf. R.O.64.24, R.O.72.35, R.O.77.14, R.O.89.30 etc., R.O.95.i.16, ii.34, iv.62-3 etc., 98.35-6, 100.191-3, 261-3).

στεφανῶσαι θαλλοῦ **στεφάνω** ‘crown with a crown of olive’ (R.O.89.40, 43, 332 Honors for Athenian Ephebes, R.O.94.22-3).

Another, highly specialized phrase describes an intricate sacrificial process:

ἔνδορα ἐνδέρεται ‘what is to wrapped in skin is wrapped in skin’ (R.O.62.A.47 and B.8, mid 4th cent. BC religious calendar of Cos).

Given the prevalence of the EF in sacral diction in all of these Indo-European and specifically Greek settings we might expect to find similar collocations in Homeric epic, but this is hardly the case. The fact of the matter is that the major sacrifice scenes are completely devoid of figures:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ’ εὖξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο,
αὔερυσαν μὲν πρῶτα καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν,
μηρούς τ’ ἐξέταμον κατὰ τε κνίση ἐκάλυψαν
δίπρυχα ποιήσαντες, ἐπ’ αὐτῶν δ’ ὠμοθέτησαν·
καίε δ’ ἐπὶ σχίζης ὁ γέρων, ἐπὶ δ’ αἴθοπα οἶνον
λειῖβε· νέοι δὲ παρ’ αὐτὸν ἔχον πεμπώβολα χερσίν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρε κᾶη καὶ σπλάγχνα πάσαντο,
μίστυλλον τ’ ἄρα τᾶλλα καὶ ἀμφ’ ὀβελοῖσιν ἔπειραν,
ῶπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαίτα,

δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἔδεύετο δαιτὸς εἴσης.

And when all had made prayer and flung down the scattering barley first they drew back the victim's heads and slaughtered them and skinned them, and cut away the meat from the thighs and wrapped them in fat, making a double fold, and laid shreds of flesh upon them. The old man burned these on a cleft stick and poured the gleaming wine over, while the young men with forks in their hands stood about him. but when they had burned the thigh pieces and tasted the vitals, they cut all the remainder into pieces and spitted them and roasted all carefully and took off the pieces.

Then after they had finished the work and readied the feast they feasted, nor was any man's hunger denied a fair portion.

(*Il.* 1.458-68).

Several observations make the lack of figures in this and similar passages more striking. First, many of the sacrifice passages involve praying (εὐξαντο) and εὐχὴν εὐχεσθαι is a moderately viable phrase in later Greek.²⁹⁸ Second, the process of skinning (ἔδειραν), cutting away the meat from the thighs and wrapping them in fat must have borne some similarity to the process encapsulated in the inscriptional formula ἔνδορα ἐνδέρεται. Instead of figures, we find highly specialized verbs without objects describing very complex processes: ὠμοθέτησαν = “to lay slices of raw flesh on the fat enclosing the sacrificial joints” (Cunliffe, sv.). Also, both the primary sacrificer, *hiereus* or *areter* (in this case Chryses) and his assistants (*mageiroi*) use numerous tools, and, as we will soon see, when the context is appropriate Homeric language is quick to form etymological datives emphasizing both an

²⁹⁸ Cf. D.19.130, Aeschin.3.18, *Inscr. Prien.*174.18 (2nd cent. BC).

implement and verbal activity. In another major sacrifice scene (*Od.*3.419-63) a bronze smith, Laertes, prepares a cow for sacrifice, and while the language in the passage flirts with figures the polyptoton is kept in separate clauses (see 425-6 and 432-3). When Eumaius sacrifices a pig in the *Odyssey* he libates wine:

ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἄργματα **θῦσε** θεοῖσ' αἰειγενέτησι,
σπείσας δ' αἶθοπα οἶνον Ὀδυσσῆϊ ππολιπόρθω
ἐν χεῖρεσσιν ἔθηκεν· ὁ δ' ἔζετο ἦ παρὰ μοίρη.

He spoke, and sacrificed the prime pieces to the gods who live forever
Then, having libated sparkling wine he put the cup in the hands
Of city-sacking Odysseus and sat down with his portion. (14.446-8).

In this context, according to my argument, Homeric narrative would never have portrayed Eumaius 'sacrificing a sacrifice' (θύος θύσε) or 'libating a libation' (σπονδῆν σπένδειν) of wine. When Eumaius expresses disdain for the suitors' failure to sacrifice, on the other hand, Homeric language shows that it was fully capable of exercising the option of constructing a figure of precisely the semantic 'sacrifice a sacrifice' ἱρεύουσ' ἱερήϊον in a properly entitled context.²⁹⁹ My conclusion is that compositional blocks depicting sacrifice show a studied avoidance of the EF; given the widespread proliferation of the EF in sacral diction virtually everywhere else we look, it is likely that the poets eschewed existing formulas in the interests of attaining a sober and concise stylistic.³⁰⁰

Sacrifice scenes in the *Homeric Hymns* also do not contain examples of the EF as I have defined it, but Hermes' sacrifice of two cows in his

²⁹⁹ For discussion of ἱρεύουσ' ἱερήϊον see above (73-4).

³⁰⁰ Other sacrifice scenes one may peruse in vain for figures are *Il.*2.402-431, 3.268-75, *Od.* 3.5-9.

eponymous hymn includes nominal polyptoton, a fact that, in my view distances the EF from other concatenations of cognates:

ὄφρα δὲ πῦρ ἀνέκαιε βίη κλυτοῦ Ἡφαίστοιο,
τόφρα δ' ὑποβρύχιας ἔλικας βοῦς ἔλκε θύραζε (115)
δοιὰς ἄγχι πυρός, δύναμις δέ οἱ ἔπλετο πολλή·
ἀμφοτέρας δ' ἐπὶ νῶτα χαμαὶ βάλε φυσιοώσας·
ἐγκλίνων δ' ἐκύλινδε δι' αἰῶνας τετορήσας,
ἔργω δ' ἔργον ὄπαζε ταμῶν κρέα πίονα δημῶ·
ῶππα δ' ἀμφ' ὀβελοῖσι πεπαρμένα δουρατέοισι, (120)
σάρκας ὁμοῦ καὶ νῶτα γεράσμια καὶ μέλαν αἶμα
ἐργμένον ἐν χολάδεσσι, τὰ δ' αὐτοῦ κεῖτ' ἐπὶ χώρης.
ρίνοὺς δ' ἐξετάνυσσε καταστυφέλω ἐνὶ πέτρῃ,
ὥς ἔτι νῦν τὰ μέτασσα πολυχρόνιοι πεφύασι (*h.Hom.4.114-24*).

The only figures that might fit in the sacral category in Homer are funereal. We find χοῆν χειῖσθαι πᾶσιν νεκύεσσιν twice in reference to Odysseus' poured offering to the dead in the *nekyyia*.³⁰¹ Also of note is κτέρεα κτερ(ε)ίζειν. The meaning of this phrase is rather condensed and the standard translation 'pay due funerary rites' fails to capture it fully. Since κτέρεα seems to derive from κτάομαι it refers to a practice of honor paid by burning a man's possessions with him on the pyre. *Κτέρος, the expected neuter singular of κτέρεα never occurs, instead there is a scantily attested κτέρας 'possession' or 'gift'.³⁰² This idiom features two formations of denominative verbs: κτερεῖζω the older formation with neuters in -ος and

³⁰¹ Vedic phrases from the same root have a more general, sacral provenance. See *RV.10.40.4* et al.

³⁰² (*Il.216, 24.235*, cf. in Simon. 107.9, *Trag. Adesp.* in *Gött.Nachr.*1922.27, A.R.4.1550). Nussbaum (70 note 63) suggests *κτερος > κτέρας by association with the almost synonymous γέρας.

κτηρίζω modelled on o-stems with –ίζω.³⁰³ The morphology alters as per the compatibility of the verb forms with the fixed, line-end formula. The whole phrase epitomizes an entire process, as does ἔνδορα ἐνδέρεται, and has the look of a *bona fide* ritual formula; Note that its end line position is entirely fixed in Homeric verse, and that, as will be argued in the next chapter, idioms are more likely to occur at the end of the line, coinages at the beginning.

ἐν πυρὶ κήαιεν καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρρα κτερίσαιεν (//.24.38).

σῆμά τέ οἱ χεύω καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρρα κτερεΐξω (Od.2.222).

σῆμά τέ οἱ χεύαι καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρρα κτερεΐξαι (Od.1.291).

ὄφρ' ἔταρον θάπτοι καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρρα κτερίσαιεν (Od.3.285).

All of these lines are in dialogue, so, to the extent that dialogue is a more privileged place for the EF than narrative, even this contextually idiomatic phrase must be at least moderately entitled.

3.2.3. Legal and political formulae

Unlike the military formulae, the traditional assertion that the EF proliferated in Old Latin legalese is verifiable in relevant inscriptions. Furthermore, this venue attests a significant number of phrases that do not include an attribute.³⁰⁴ An example of this occurs on the Twelve Tables: *si servos furtum faxit noxiamve noxit* 'If a slave commits a robbery or does harm' (12.12.2). Attestation of the same phrase in Livy illustrates movement of the legal formula into literature: *ob eam rem noxam nocuerunt* (9.10.9). *Servitutum servire* is an old juridical formula that finds ample expression in literature.³⁰⁵ It

³⁰³ Nussbaum's (70 note 64) examples for this analogy are ξένος : ξενίζω and τεῖχος : ἐτειχίσσαντο. The fact that all of these verbs occur in the etymological accusative construction could only facilitate such analogies.

³⁰⁴ See Gildersleeve (p.211) "The omission of the attribute is found most often in legal phraseology, proverbs and the like."

³⁰⁵ See Traina (37).

surfaces in the *Lex Cincia* with additional paronomasia: *Si quis a **seruis** quique pro **seruis seruitutem seruierunt** accipit isue duit*. Quintilian asserts that it is an old formula: *ut antiqui dixerunt, qui **seruitutem seruit***. (7.3.26); and it crops up again and again in Latin comedy and oratory:

*Quorum maiorum nemo **seruitutem seruiuit*** (Cic. *Top.*6.29, cf. *Pro Mur.*61).

*Equidem tam sum **seruos** quam tu, etsi ego domi liber fui, Tu usque a puero **seruitutem seruisti** in Alide* (Plaut. *Capt.*544, cf. *Capt.* 391, *Aul.* 592, *Mil.* 97, 482, 745, *Trin.*302, 304,).³⁰⁶

One might assume the same process of adaptation for the following Ennian figure:

***iudicavit** inclutum **iudicium** inter deas tris*

(Paris) made that famous judgment between three goddesses
(*Scen.*70).

At times the legal and sacral tend to overlap:

*praetor....**auspicat** **auspicium** prosperum*

The Praetor...takes a good auspice (Naev. *Carm.*40).

The figure *seruitutem servire* provides a good paradigm for what constitutes a *bona fide* legal formula: it boasts inscriptional attestation, verification in the grammatical tradition, and ample use in later literature.

³⁰⁶ Commenting on *Trin.*302 Landgraf (1881:15) says “*forma insequentem et ipsam priscam imitata est formulam.*” The passage from the *Aulularia* features a great deal of additional paronomasia, and is, in fact a quasi-proverbial rumination on what it means to ‘serve servitude as a servant’:

*nam qui ero ex sententia **seruire seruos** postulat
in erum matura, in se sera condecet capessere
sin dormitet, ita dormitet **seruom** sese ut cogitet.
Nam qui amanti ero **seruitutem seruit**, quasi ego **seruio**,
si erum uidet superare amorem, hoc **serui** esse officium reor,
retinere ad salutem, non enim quo incumbat eo impellere* (589-94).

Now, in the case of Homer, we should not expect to find a large number of political formulas, and indeed we do not; the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are not political texts. Given the proverbial nature of the *Works and Days* we might expect to find more there. In fact, the general impression that one gets from both Hesiod and Homer is that, given the opportunity, epic diction does recognize the appropriateness of the EF to legal and political contexts. Some epic phrases in this category find verification in later inscriptions. The collocation βουλήν βουλεύειν, which in Homer simply means ‘hold council,’ appears in Attic inscriptions so many times as to leave no doubt that this was a stock formula meaning ‘serve on the council.’ In Attic the council has become a decision making body in its own right and the figure has undergone a commensurate transformation to the etymological nominative, a construction that proliferates in Attic legalese to an astounding degree:

ταῦτα γίνηται, τοὺς **στ[ρατηγὸς** τοὺς αἶ]ει **στρατηγῶντας**
 ἐπιμ[έλεσθαι καὶ τή]ν **βουλήν** τὴν αἶει³⁰⁷ **βουλεύ[οσαν]**.
προσαναγ]ράψαι δὲ καὶ τόδε τὸ ψή[φισμα ἐς τὴν αὐ]τὴν στήλην
 τὸν **γραμμ[ατέα** τῆς **βουλής]** (*IG ii².12+*, *IG ii².43.34-5*).
 τὴν **βουλήν** τὴν αἶει **βουλεύ[σαν]** καὶ ἄλλ[ων Ἀθ]ηναίων τὸμ
 βουλόμενον τρόπῳ ὅτῳ ἂν ἐπίστῳ[ν]ται. **Γρά[ψαι** δὲ τὸ]ν
γραμματέα τῆς βουλής

‘and the council that is currently in office and any Athenian who wants,
 in any way they know. The scribe of the council is to inscribe’

(R.O.58.21-3, 352/1, Athens, Delphi and the Sacred *Orgas*, see also

³⁰⁷ Note the constant presence of αἶει in the inscriptions and in the following segment, which combines a paronomastic etymological nominative with the accusative expression:

ἐνθάδ’ ἐπέλθῃσιν **βουληφόρος**, οἳ τέ μοι αἶει
βουλὰς βουλεύουσι παρήμενοι, ἧ θέμις ἐστί· (*II.24.651-2*).

R.O.70.43-4, 343/2 and τῶν βουλευτῶν τῶν τῆς Βουλῆς ‘the councillors of the council’ R.O.79.11-12).

Homer attests this expression in the singular one time supporting an attribute (ἀρίστην), spoken by Nestor:

πολλῶν δ’ ἀγρομένων τῷ πείσει ὅς κεν ἀρίστην
βουλὴν βουλεύση· μάλα δὲ χρεὼ πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς
ἔσθλης καὶ πυκινῆς, ὅτι δῆϊοι ἐγγύθι νηῶν
καίουσιν πυρὰ πολλά·

When many are gathered together you will follow whoever counsels the best counsel, for all the Achaeans have great need of excellent and shrewd (counsel), since the enemy burns many fires near the ships (II.9.74-7).

The context here is rather serious: we are looking at a context-entitled idiom (category 2 above). The other instances of this political idiom all feature the noun in the plural and do not attach an attribute. They occur in dialogue and lend an air of authority to the speakers description of the assembly. Hesiod adapts the phrase to proverbial expression with variation of syntax: ἡ δὲ κακὴ **βουλή** τῷ **βουλεύσαντι** κακίστη ‘But bad counsel is the worst for the one who counseled it’ (Hes. *Op.*266).³⁰⁸

Another Homeric figure that finds corroboration in later inscriptions is the EN κῆρυξ κηρύσσει. It occurs in a Chian decree fixing the boundaries of the district, Lophitis (5th cent. B.C.):

τῶς δὲ **κῆρυκας** διαπέμψαντες ἐς τὰς χώρας **κη[ρ]υσσόντων**

³⁰⁸ Referring specifically to this Hesiodic aphorism Gonda (233) said “in solemn and ceremonious speech sound repetition and the often somewhat verbose character of these phrases may show to full advantage.”

Having sent heralds to the lands let them herald (Buck Ionic inscriptions #4.B5).

The structure and syntax of this inscriptional figure achieves some parallelism with the Homeric arrangements of the phrase:

αὐτὰρ ὃ **κηρύκεσσι** λιγυφθόγγοισι κέλευσε
κηρύσσειν ἀγορὴν δὲ κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοὺς·
οἳ μὲν **ἐκήρυσσον**, τοὶ δ' ἠγείροντο μάλ' ὦκα
But he (Agamemnon) ordered the clear-voiced heralds
to herald to the assembly the long-haired Achaeans;
they heralded them and they gathered quite quickly (*Il.2.50-53*).

This is the most common arrangement (*Il.2.442-444, Od.2.6-8*), with the two elements of the figure separated in much the same way the elements in the Chian decree separate. Given the persistent predilection of components of the EF to occur in close proximity this separation is quite striking. In both the inscription and the Homeric expressions the authority of the heralds is invested by a higher political entity, the third plural imperative (*κη[ρ]υσσόντων*) in the decree effectively amalgamates the action of the authorities and the heralds. When put into dialogue the Homeric formula also uses a third plural imperative:

Ἄλλ' ἄγε **κήρυκες** μὲν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων
λαὸν **κηρύσσοντες** ἀγειρόντων κατὰ νῆας,
But come, heralds of the bronze-clad Achaeans
Heralding the army assemble them along the ships (*Il.2.436-437*).

Finally, A Coan sacrificial calendar (mid. 4th cent. BC) also involves a third person imperative, this time singular:

ὁ δὲ [κῆρ]υξ κῆρυσσέτω ἐοτάζε[ν Ζην]ὸς Πολιέως ἐνιαύτα ὠραῖα
ἐορτάν

Let the herald herald (order) to feast the yearly, seasonal feast of Zeus
Polios (Buck, #108.36-7).

Whether the similarities of the Homeric and inscriptional attestations of κῆρυξ κηρύσσει arose because of derivation from a common pool of political language, or whether the inscriptional phrases are molded on Homeric precedents is an interesting, but unanswerable, question. What is important for our purposes is that the Homeric expression, even if it was a coinage of epic diction, adhered to a context-dictated aesthetic which entitled it to take place where it does. The same processes must have entitled ἀγορὰς ἀγόρευον (*Il.*2.788) and ἐς δ' ἀγορὴν ἀγέροντο (*Il.*18.245).

The etymological accusative τιμὴν τίνειν occurs three times in *Iliad* 3 referring to the payment the Trojans will owe the Greeks if Paris falls to Menelaus in single combat. The first two occurrences are in quick succession, in a highly ritualized setting, spoken by Agammemnon as he lays down the terms of the duel over sacrificial lambs.³⁰⁹ I have already discussed how the semantically odd τιμὴν τίνειν shows a striving for a recognizable figure against more regular ποινήν τίνειν (29-31 above), but note that the figures are not entitled until the scene moves from its sacral to its quasi-legal, treaty portions.

There is much evidence to suggest that δίκην δικάζειν became a legal idiom in various dialects. An inscription delineating rewards for informers from Thasos (411-409 BC) attests τριηκόσιοι κρινόντων δίκην δικάσαντες twice

³⁰⁹ He cuts the lambs' head hair and holds it in his hand. (273-5). He also begins his speech by invoking Zeus and Helios (276-7).

(M.L.83.3-4 and 11-12), and in Phocian, from Stiris we find δικά[ζ]ειν τὰς δίκας (Buck, #56.15, 180 BC). Herodotus constructs a paradoxical paronomasia using the figure:³¹⁰

τοῦ τὸν πατέρα Σισάμνην βασιλεὺς Καμβύσης γενόμενον
τῶν βασιλῆϊων **δικαστέων**, ὅτι ἐπὶ χρήμασι **δίκην ἄδικον**
ἐδίκασε, σφάξας ἀπέδειρε

His (Otanēs') father, Sisamnes, who was one of the royal judges, King Cambyses slaughtered and flayed since he rendered an unjust verdict for a bribe (Hdt.5.25.1 and the identical phrase at 7.194.1).

Given the probability that δίκην δικάζειν was a juridical formula at this time it is surprising that the phrase only appears once in the *Works and Days* in a context which has the dual motivating factor of expressing disdain:

ἤδη μὲν γὰρ κλῆρον ἐδασσάμεθ', ἄλλα τε πολλὰ
ἀρπάζων ἐφόρεις μέγα κυδαίνων βασιλῆας
δωροφάγους, οἱ τήνδε **δίκην** ἐθέλουσι **δικάσσαι**.
νήπιοι, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν ὅσῳ πλέον ἤμισυ παντὸς

For already had we divided our shares, but you (Perses)
keep snatching up and taking more, fawning all over the lords,
gift-gobblers, who want to judge cases, infants who do not
know how much more half is then whole (*Op.*37-40).³¹¹

On the shield of Achilles we see the legalistic meaning of νεῖκος νεικεῖν 'dispute a case' in successive clauses: ἔνθα δὲ **νεῖκος** / ὠρώρει, δύο δ' ἄνδρες **ἐνεῖκεον** εἵνεκα ποινῆς 'a dispute arose and two men disputed over

³¹⁰ The same figure also appears in more mundane fashion in the *Histories* at 3.31.3 and 6.139.2.

³¹¹ The only other instance of the phrase in Archaic epic is in a Hesiodic fragment: μηδὲ **δίκην** **δικάσεις**, πρὶν ἄμφω μῦθον ἀκούσεις (338).

the price' (*Il.*18.497-8). But the same-clause upwelling of the expression dismisses any formal legalistic reference and is entitled by scorn in a caustic riposte spoken by Aeneas to Achilles that mocks its own verbosity:

στρεπτή δὲ γλῶσσ' ἐστὶ βροτῶν, πολέες δ' ἔνι μῦθοι
παντοῖοι, ἐπέων δὲ πολὺς νομὸς ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα.

ὅπποῖόν κ' εἶπησθα ἔπος, τοῖόν κ' ἐπακούσαιοις.

ἀλλὰ τί ἢ ἔριδας καὶ **νεῖκεα** νῶϊν ἀνάγκη

νεικεῖν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐναντίον ὡς τε γυναῖκας,

αἳ τε χολωσάμεναι ἔριδος πέρι θυμοβόροιο

νεικεῦσ' ἀλλήλησι μέσῃν ἐς ἄγυιαν ἰοῦσαι

πόλλ' ἔτεά τε καὶ οὐκί· χόλος δέ τε καὶ τὰ κελεύει.

Mortals' tongues are twisted, and on them many tales
of every sort; the field of words is vast on this side and that
whatever utterance you utter such you could also hear;
but what need for us to quarrel strifes and quarrels
against each other like women who, embittered by
some soul-wasting strife go out into the middle
of the road and quarrel against each other, words true
and false which anger compels them to say (*Il.*20.251-2).

This passage is a nice illustration of several points. First, it shows an acute awareness of the prolixity of hapax *figurae* (**νεῖκεα νεικεῖν**) and even stock idioms (**εἶπησθα ἔπος**). It also shows how powerful contempt is as a motivating factor in the use of otherwise ridiculous nonce coinages. The existence of **νεῖκος νεικεῖν** as any sort of idiom in legal or colloquial contexts is seriously to be doubted.

Unlike νεῖκος νεικεῖν, ἐγγύη ἐγγυᾶται seems at least to be a variant of a real legal phrase. There is inscriptional attestation of the EN:

οἱ δ' ἐγγυηταὶ ἐγγυάσθω[σ]α[ν] πῆ[α]ν τὸ τοῦ μισθώματο[ς] καὶ τῶν ἐπέργων ἀπάντων [ἀπ]ό[τεισ]μα, εἰὰ μὲν βούληται ἔχεν ὁ μισθωσάμε[ο]ς

'the sureties must insure the whole payment of the rent and of all required additional work, if the lessee wishes to retain possession'
(R.O.59.14-16 mid 4th cent. BC, Lease of sacred land Arcesine, Amorgus).

Andocides (1.73) renders the figure in the accusative with an active verb and Plato follows suit on more than one occasion (*Lg.*953e and *Phd.*115d). Homer situates the figure in a quasi-legal setting in the song of Demodocus. Ares and Aphrodite are hanging in Hephaestus' invisible net, having just been caught in adultery. All the gods, especially Hermes and Apollo, are quite amused, except for Poseidon, who offers to ensure payment of Ares' ransom should the war god default. Hephaestus replies that this would not suit Poseidon's dignity:

μή με, Ποσειδάων γαίηοχε, ταῦτα κέλευε· (350)

δειλαί τοι δειλῶν γε καὶ ἐγγύαι ἐγγυάσθαι.

πῶς ἂν ἐγὼ σε δέοιμι μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν,

εἴ κεν Ἄρης οἴχοιτο χρέος καὶ δεσμὸν ἀλύξας

Do not, Poseidon, supporter of the earth, bid me do this;

wretched is the insurance that insures wretches

how could I put you in bonds among the immortal gods

if Ares should depart evading both debt and bond? (*Od.*8.351).

The legal phrase, transported into this light and slightly satirical setting, is highly reminiscent of the movement of the pompous sacral and funereal Latin

figure *nomen/nomine nominare* into the mock-legal *condiciones mereticis* in the *Asinaria*. It is also amplified by further polyptoton (δειλαί δειλῶν) somewhat like Cicero's *ius iurandum ... iurasse iuravit*.

Finally, Odysseus constructs a quasi-legal EA in the *nekyuia* when citing the reason for the anger of the shade of Ajax:

οἷη δ' Αἴαντος ψυχὴ Τελαμωνιάδαο
νόσφιν ἀφεστήκει, κεχολωμένη εἵνεκα **νίκης**,
τήν μιν ἐγὼ **νίκησα** δικαζόμενος παρὰ νηυσὶ
τεύχεσιν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλλῆος·

The shade of Ajax, son of Telamon, alone stood far off,
wroth at the victory which I won from him deliberating by the ships
for the armor of Achilles (*Od.*11.543-546).

In Attic legalese etymological nominatives proliferated. Virtually every office found a corresponding figure. In a financial decree from 434-3 B.C.E. we find a nominative expression curiously similar to Latin/Oscan CENSORES CENSUERUNT.³¹²

λογισάσθων δὲ ἡ-[οἱ **λ**]ογισταὶ ἡοὶ τριάκοντα ἡοῖπερ νῦν τὰ
ὀφελόμενα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀκρ-[ιβῶ]ς

The assessors are to assess, the thirty who accurately (assess) the
debts to the gods. (*IG* i².91, *IG* i².324.1).

Presiders preside: πρυτανείας δευτέ[ρας πρυ]τανευόσας (*IG* i².324.4, 8, *IG* i².302.18, 304.27,); witnesses bear witness: Μαρτυρῶν δὲ τῶς μάρτυρας (*R.O.* 5.3.75-6, Athenian phratry decree from Declea, 396/5 BC). There is also ample inscriptional attestation for accusative figures. To cite just a few examples we find: χρήματα/χρήμασι χρῆσθαι 'take

³¹² Cf. Or. Vat. c. 15. *ut legati ex eius ordinis auctoritate legarentur*.

possession of possessions' (*SIG* 47.23, 25, *IG* i².91.33 etc.) and τ]ῶ **φόρο** ἐγίγνετο ὄν τοῖς Παν[αθ]ε[ναί]οις] ἐτετάχατο **φέρειν** (*SIG* 75 430 BC.); ἠοπόσ]αι πόλες **φόρον φέρουσι** Ἀθ]εναί]οις (*IG* i².65.5-6). In fact, etymological and paronomastic figures make up the bulk of whole sections of inscriptions:

ἀναγράψαι ἐν σ[τή]λι λιθίνῃ τὸν **γραμματέα** τῆς βολῆς τὸν νῦν **γραμμα]τεύοντα** 'the inscriber of the council, the one inscribing now is to inscribe on a stone stele (*IG* ii².12+).

Hence, we can only conclude that the EF in all of its case forms was native to Greek legalese, and it is no surprise that Homeric language attests several political and legal formulas.

3.3 Scenes and expression of everyday life

Although Homeric diction participates, to a degree, in the etymologically figurative language of later Greek legalese, we should note that the primary politicizing structure found in Attic, the etymological nominative, is largely absent from Homer in this connection. As observed above, the *Iliad* shows little tendency to construct ENs with personal subjects. It is in the *Odyssey* that these structures make their first real appearance, but they never feature, as subjects, upper echelon characters exercising their power. This fact separates Homer from later Greek. By the time of the Byzantine empire extremely ornate paronomasia was evidently taken quite seriously, as we are left to assume by the formal title of the kings themselves represented on the flag and other official documents as four betas, or fire steels offsetting the cross: βασιλεὺς βασιλέων βασιλεύων βασιλεῦσι 'ruler of rulers ruling among rulers.' This figure appears ridiculously pompous to us and, according to my argument, would not have been in accord with Homeric aesthetics. Archaic epic never

constructs ENs featuring elite males. Despite the fact that both noun and verb are quite common in all of these would be schemata at this early stage we do not find †βασιλεὺς βασιλεύει, †ἄναξ ἀνάσσει or †πολεμιστὴς πολεμίζει. Comparative evidence suggests that ENs expressing the power of high level officials and kings were apt to arise *sua sponte* in strikingly similar collocations. Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων itself was a standard translation of the title of the Persian kings and echoed phrases found in Babylonian texts and Old Persian inscriptions, e.g. *ā'yāramna xšāyaθ'ya vazraka xšāyaθ'ya xšāyaθ'yānām* 'Ariaramnes the great king, king of kings.'³¹³ Vedic attests *Adhirājo rājasu rājayātai* 'may he rule as over-ruler among rulers' (AV.6.98.1) from the same root as the Plautine mockery *non ego nunc parasitus sum sed regum rex regalior* 'I am not now a parasite but a rather regal ruler of rulers' (Capt. 825). Homeric abstinence from forming such figures for its human elite carries over to the gods. Zeus is persistently the 'ruler of gods and men' but never '†the ruler ruling gods and men.' At the same time, we should temper this observation with Nilsson's assertion that the depiction of the anthropomorphic Olympian family gave the poets an opportunity to highlight domestic life of the Greek nobility and family interactions otherwise absent from the depictions of camp life in the *Iliad*.³¹⁴ The fact of the matter is that, in certain passages etymological figures proliferate in depictions of divinities in the *Iliad*. Further, the specific divinities that instigate their proliferation as narratees shed light on the distribution of figures among the human narratees of both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

³¹³ For more attestations of the Semitic figures see Štech (145).

³¹⁴ See Nilsson (1923/4:368) "Die vielberufenen olympischen Szenen ersetzen gewissermaßen die fehlenden Schilderungen aus dem häuslichen Leben in der Adelherrschaft, die weder im Lagerleben noch auf Ithaka einen Platz finden konnten wegen abnormen Verhältnisse."

The most striking and sudden upwelling of high profile *figurae etymologicae* in an Iliadic sequence otherwise hostile to their usage occurs in book 14. This book (522 lines) begins with the battle by the Achaean ships raging (150 + lines with no figures even in dialogue). The narrative then moves to the seduction of Zeus by Hera. All of the etymological figures in the book, except for Hera's use of δῶρα δέ τοι δώσω in promising a bribe to Hypnos (238), occur in a span of 6 lines in Hera's 'make-up' scene:

τῷ ῥ' ἦ γε χρῶα καλὸν ἀλειψαμένη ἰδὲ χαίτας
 πεξαμένη χερσὶ **πλοκάμους ἔπλεξε** φαεινοῦς
 καλοῦς ἀμβροσίους ἐκ κράατος ἀθανάτιο.
 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ἀμβρόσιον **ἔανὸν ἔσαθ'**, ὄν οἱ Ἀθήνη
 ἔξυσ' ἀσκήσασα, τίθει δ' ἐνὶ δαίδαλα πολλά·
 χρυσεῖης δ' ἐνετῆσι κατὰ στήθος περονᾶτο.
ζώσατο δὲ **ζώνη** ἑκατὸν θυσάνοις ἀραρυίη,

With this (oil) she anointed her lovely skin,
 then combed her hair and braided radiant braids by hand,
 lovely and ambrosial down from her immortal head.
 Then she dressed herself in an ambrosial dress
 which Athena worked smooth and put many adornments on,
 with golden brooches she pinned it to her breast
 and sashed herself in a sash fit with one hundred tassels. (//.14.175-181).

Πλοκάμους ἔπλεξε, ἔανὸν ἔσαθ', and ζώσατο δὲ ζώνη are all high profile figures. Placed in quick succession they elicit added attention. Apollonius references this Homeric scene when he describes Aphrodite getting herself ready for the day:

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐς χαλκεῶνα καὶ ἄκμονας ἦρι βεβήκει,
νήσοιο Πλαγκτῆς εὐρύν μυχόν, ᾧ ἔνι πάντα
δαίδαλα χάλκευεν ῥιπῆ πυρός· ἡ δ' ἄρα μούνη
ἦστο δόμῳ δινωτὸν ἀνὰ θρόνον ἄντα θυράων,
λευκοῖσιν δ' ἐκάτερθε κόμας ἐπειμένη ὤμοις
κόσμηι χρυσεῖη διὰ κερκίδι, μέλλε δὲ μακροῦς
πλέξασθαι πλοκάμους· τὰς δὲ προπάροιθεν ἰδοῦσα
ἔσχεθεν εἴσω τέ σφε κάλει, καὶ ἀπὸ θρόνου ὦρτο
εἴσε τ' ἐνὶ κλισμοῖσιν· ἀτὰρ μετέπειτα καὶ αὐτὴ
ἶζανεν, ἀψήκτους δὲ χεροῖν ἀνεδήσατο χαίτας.
τοῖα δὲ μειδιῶσα προσέννεπεν αἰμυλίοισιν·

But he (Hephaestus) had gone early to his forge and anvils
to a broad cavern in a floating island where with the blast of flame
he wrought all manner of curious work; and she all alone was sitting
within, on an inlaid seat facing the door. And her white shoulders
on each side were covered with the mantle of her hair and she was
parting it with a golden comb and about to braid it into long braids;
but when she saw the goddesses before her, she stayed and called
them within, and rose from her seat and placed them on couches. Then
she herself sat down, and with her hands gathered up the locks still
uncombed. And smiling, she addressed them with crafty words
(A.R.Arg.3.41-51).

These being the only occurrences of 'braid braids' in both Homer and
Apollonius respectively, what we have here is a figural footnote.³¹⁵ The

³¹⁵ Figural footnoting, or allusion via repetition is the central premise of Wills' excellent and useful book. What he has done for Latin has never been done for Greek. Since the storehouse

Apollonian scene is famous for its ‘everyday’ flavor, a flavor it has in common with the Homeric passage.³¹⁶

I see no satirization of Hera in these lines. If anything the schematized lingering upon the plaiting of braids, the fine dress and the sash has an erotic, tantalizing effect. The passage suggests that etymological figures were entitled by the desire to depict an event from the ordinary lives of the Greek aristocracy, a woman getting ready for a special occasion.

In another case involving Hera, however, the inappropriateness of the queen of the gods engaging in everyday action features a high profile figure that satirizes this everyday context on one level, and Hera herself on another. ‘Sweat sweat’ is an EA that surfaces in various languages and contexts. The upwelling of the figure in Vedic occurs in an agricultural context, that is, in its properly entitled mode conveying the real sweat of real workers:

kīnāreva svédam āsiṣvidānā

the ploughman sweating sweat (*RV.10.106.10*).

In other languages the same semantics are used to enhance dramatic effect:

switzet den tôtsweiz

he sweats the sweat of death (*Martina 231.38 MHG.*).

et n'ai je pas sué la sueur de les nuits?

And have I not sweat the sweat in the nights (*Verlaine, Sagesse.2.4.1*).

Apuleius uses *sudare sudorem* for comic effect, although Celsus attests the syntagm in the ablative in a more matter of fact setting:

of Greek *figurae* is so much more vast than in Latin, the collection and examination of figural footnotes in Greek literature represents a currently untapped line of work-intensive inquiry.

³¹⁶ Commenting on the Apollonian passage, Fraenkel notes the familiar color, 331; Hunter, 102, ventures that “the image of Aphrodite doing her hair may be indebted to art, as well as the Homeric Hera.” Later in the same note he remarks: “an interest in the poetic description of ordinary activities is one of the many features which Hellenistic poetry shares with Euripides.”

vinulentum sudorem in balneo desudare

to sweat out a wine laden sweat in the bath house (Apul.*Apol.*59).

sudare... frigido sudore 'to sweat with a cold sweat (Cel.2.4.5).

Hence, it is quite possible that the parallel Homeric figure, ἰδρῶ ἰδρῶν, could have been used matter of factly, to depict a real worker sweating at his labor, for instance. But, by putting the figure into the mouth of an indignant and petulant Hera as she complains to her husband about Paris' escape from his duel with Menelaus, Homer makes the goddess comically demean herself.

αἰνότατε Κρονίδη ποῖον τὸν μῦθον ἔειπες· (25)

πῶς ἐθέλεις ἄλιον θεῖναι πόνον ἢδ' ἀτέλεστον,

ἰδρῶ θ' ὄν ἴδρωσα μόγῳ, καμέτην δέ μοι ἵπποι

λαὸν ἀγειρούση, Πριάμῳ κακὰ τοιό τε παισίν.

ἔρδ'· ἀτὰρ οὐ τοι πάντες ἐπαινέομεν θεοὶ ἄλλοι.

Most dread son of Cronos what a word did you speak?

How can you willingly make vain and useless my labor,

and the sweat that I sweated in toil, my horses grew tired

as I mustered the army, a bane for Priam and his sons?

Do it, but all of us other gods are not in agreement (*Il.*4.26-27).³¹⁷

Here, ἰδρῶ θ' ὄν ἴδρωσα meets all the criteria for high profile figures. The phonetic echo of the noun is complete in the denominative verb, the segment constitutes a heavily spondaic line beginning, and the figure itself occurs only here in epic. The proposal that Hera is rejecting consists of resolution of the entire Trojan war, restoration of Helen to Menelaus, and circumvention of the

³¹⁷ Pallas is similarly brought down to earth at the beginning of Callimachus five, where it is asserted that the goddess did not bath before washing the dust and sweat from her steeds (5.5-12). Bulloch, commenting on line 11, notes that Callimachus uses ἰδρῶ the 'Homeric accusative' as opposed to Attic ἰδρῶτα. The ongoing connection with horses is interesting, particularly given that the Vedic figure also involves plowing, in a Hymn to the *Ashvins*.

fall of Troy. Hence, the sweat that she has sweated is meant to contrapose all the sorrow and blood commensurate with the continuance of war and destruction of the city. In short, we are not intended to join in her self-pity. The failure of her rhetoric is signaled by improper adaptation of tautology. In general terms the ostentatious figure is motivated on various levels: first, it has a basic context of entitlement as suggested by the comparative evidence, second, as we have seen so often it is uttered in anger by an indignant speaker, but in this case the pathos the speaker intends to elicit becomes ridiculous in context.

3.3.1 tools and craftspeople, household implements and women

As I have noted, the scene in which Hera prepares for the seduction of Zeus has clear parallels with an Apollonian passage famous for its prosaic tone. Notice as well that the Apollonian tableau begins with Hephaestus' early morning departure to his anvils, a theme that recurs in both *Iliad* 18 and *Odyssey* 8.³¹⁸ *Iliad* 18 progresses for four hundred lines with no remarkable figures. There is only one idiom, δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα (84) and one political formula, ἀγορὴν ἀγέροντο (245). The last third of the book moves to the presentation of Hephaestus and forging of the shield, and etymological figures proliferate: there are eight in a span of just over two hundred lines, including three hapax etymological nominatives and one dative that occurs only one other time. First, in his initial conversation with Thetis, Hephaestus is characterized by the construction ῥόος ῥέεν, a rather affected (5 on my scale as discussed above) figure emphasized by surrounding alliteration. This

³¹⁸ Hunter (102) says that in the Apollonian passage “echoes of *Od.* 8 arouse expectations that Aphrodite will be found in an embarrassing position.” Given the echo of Hera’s preparation for seduction, we might be meant to assume that Aphrodite is making preparations for Ares’ arrival when Hera and Athena interrupt her.

occurs in conjunction with a description of several items he crafted while in the cave of the Nereids:

ἦσι παρ' εἰνάετες χάλκευον δαίδαλα πολλά,
πόρπας τε γναμπάς θ' ἔλικας κάλυκας τε καὶ ὄρμους
ἐν σπηϊ̄ γλαφυρῶ· περὶ δὲ ῥόος ἾΩκεανοῖο
ἀφρῶ μορμύρων ῥέεν ἄσπετος·

With them I worked nine years as a smith, and wrought many intricate things; pins that bend back, curved clasps, cups, necklaces, working there in the hollow of the cave, and the stream of Ocean around us streamed on forever with its foam and its murmur (//.18.400-3).

From what we know of archaic blacksmiths they were the perfect people to characterize with colloquial bombast:

There was a blacksmith in every little town or *komé*. The forge where he 'sat' was a meeting place for all the idlers and talkers who came there to exchange news. Hesiod advises the serious and industrious man to pass by without stopping.³¹⁹ The simple equipment was the same as that which Hephaestus disposes of in the work-shop he has built on Olympus (Mireaux, 153-4).

When we actually enter the workshop of Hephaestus his preparations involve two very striking figures:

Ἦς εἰπὼν τὴν μὲν λίπεν αὐτοῦ, βῆ δ' ἐπὶ φύσας·
τὰς δ' ἐς πῦρ ἔτρεψε κέλευσέ τε ἐργάζεσθαι.
φῦσαι δ' ἐν χοάνοισιν ἐείκοσι πᾶσαι **ἐφύσων** (470)
παντοίην εὐπρηστον αὐτμὴν ἐξανιεῖσαι,
ἄλλοτε μὲν σπεύδοντι παρέμμεναι, ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε,

³¹⁹ *Op.*493.

ὅπως Ἥφαιστος τ' ἐθέλοι καὶ ἔργον ἄνοιτο.

χαλκὸν δ' ἐν πυρὶ βάλλεν ἀτειρέα κασσίτερόν τε
καὶ χρυσὸν τιμῆντα καὶ ἄργυρον· αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα (475)

θῆκεν ἐν ἀκμοθέτῳ μέγαν ἄκμονα, γέντο δὲ χειρὶ
ῥαιστήρα κρατερήν, ἐτέρηφι δὲ γέντο πυράγρην.

So he spoke, and left her there, and went to his bellows.

He turned these toward the fire and gave them their orders for working.

And the bellows, all twenty of them, blew on the crucibles,

From all directions blasting forth wind to blow the flames high

Now as he hurried to be at this place and now at another,

wherever Hephaistos might wish them to blow, and the work went

forward. He cast on the fire bronze, which is weariless, and tin with it,

and valuable gold, and silver, and thereafter set upon

the anvil-stand the great anvil, and gripped in one hand

the ponderous hammer, while in the other he grasped the pincers

(*Il.*18.468-77).

The figure φῦσαι ἐφύσων occurs only here. The nominative (cf. *Th.*4.100.3-4:

φύσας μεγάλας ... **ἐφύσων**) emphasizes the automatic nature of these

bellows.³²⁰ We find ἀκμοθέτῳ τιθέναι one other time in the *Odyssey*, also

with Hephaestus as the subject: (ἐν δ' ἔθρετ' ἀκμοθέτῳ μέγαν ἄκμονα,

κόππε δὲ δεσμούς, *Od.*8.274). Taken together they characterize the narratee

as appropriate for deliverance of a certain amount of prolixity, and emphasize

the technical nature of the blacksmith's preparations. Remember that

Hephaestus is, in general, a comical god. At the end of *Iliad* 1 he limpingly

³²⁰ For more discussion see above (108-9).

takes on the role of a wine-server (οἴνοχόει, 598),³²¹ a role elsewhere characterized by the high profile figure οἶνον οἴνοχοεῦντες ἐνὶ χρυσεῖς δεπάεσσιν (*Od.*3.472), and all the other gods laugh. In Sappho, the converted ΕΑ κράτηρ ἐκέκρατ' applies to Hermes when he pours wine (ὠινοχόαισε) for the gods (*Fr.*141).

The figures describing the artisan setting up for work are reflected in the product of his labor. The 130-line description of the shield features four figures, strictly speaking, five if we count a slightly more distant polyptoton. In fact, the distribution of figures on the shield serves as a partial microcosm for the general distribution of figures in the *Iliad*. First, in the initial representation of Orion's position in the cosmos, the standard naming formula ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν (487) occurs in its appropriate context and regularized line position. Second, there is one well-established idiom emphasized by paronomastic amplification in the description of Ares and Athena leading the defenders of a besieged city out to battle:

οἱ δ' ἴσαν· ἦρχε δ' ἄρά σφιν Ἄρης καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη
ἄμφω χρυσεῖω, χρύσεια δὲ εἴματα ἔσθην,
καλῶ καὶ μεγάλω σὺν τεύχεσιν, ὥς τε θεῶ περ
ἀμφὶς ἀριζήλω· λαοὶ δ' ὑπολίζονες ἦσαν.

They were going out, and Ares and Pallas Athena led them,
both gold and clothed in golden clothes
beautiful and tall in their armor, brilliant beyond the rest,
as befits gods, the men were smaller below them (*Il.*18.516-19).

Ares and Athena as warrior are not deities to whom affected circularities normally adhere, and in this case the figure, in its normal place in the Adonic,

³²¹ The verbal compound is used despite the fact that he is actually pouring nectar.

and linked to the preceding adjectival polyptoton by repetition of the diphthong, 'εἶ', achieves an amplification of pure verbal strengthening justified by the text itself. The figure stands out from its surrounding diction just as the deities stand out amongst the human combatants. But there is, in addition, something distinctly odd about its application. The Adonic formula εἶματα εἶμαι etc. does have a 'warrior' variant, e.g. τεύχεα ἔσσε, but nowhere else does everyday clothing (εἶματα) overlap with armor as it seems to here. Within the oddness of the application of εἶματα εἶμαι to warriors and armor there may very well be a focalization of Hephaestus as blacksmith: his everyday clothes are the equivalent of a heroes' armor. It is as if the banal is intruding upon a martial context. The primary focalizee has been superimposed upon the secondary ones via his art. Later in the same episode ἐμάχοντο μάχην (533) occurs in its usual capacity, describing a battle scene at a distance. This may serve to illustrate only that contexts conducive to high profile figures tend to elicit stock phrases as well.

The only truly anomalous figures on the shield occur in a description of a harvest.

Ἐν δ' ἐτίθει τέμενος βασιλῆϊον· ἔνθα δ' ἔριθοι (550)

ἤμων ὀξειάς δρεπάνας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες.

δράγματα δ' ἄλλα μετ' ὄγμον ἐπήτριμα πίπτον ἔραζε,

ἄλλα δ' **ἀμαλλοδετήρες** ἐν ἔλλεδανοῖσι **δέοντο**.

τρεις δ' ἄρ' ἀμαλλοδετήρες ἐφέστασαν· αὐτὰρ ὀπισθε

παῖδες **δραγμαεύοντες** ἐν ἀγκαλίδεσσι φέροντες (555)

ἀσπερχές παρέχον· βασιλεὺς δ' ἐν τοῖσι σιωπῇ

σκήπτρον ἔχων ἐστήκει ἐπ' ὄγμου γηθόσυνος κῆρ.

He made on it the precinct of a king, where the laborers

were reaping, with the sharp harvest hooks in their hands.

Of the cut swathes some fell along the lines of reaping, one after another, while the sheaf-binders caught up others and bound them with ropes. There were three sheaf-binders who stood by, and behind them children, picking up the cut swathes and carrying them in their arms provided a constant supply; by them the king in silence,

holding his staff, stood near the line of reapers, happily (*Il.* 18.550-55).

Note that, according to Mireaux “even in the city states where the owners took a direct part in the cultivation of their land, the bulk of agricultural work was carried out by the class of servants and laborers who made up the mass of the rural population” (126). Hence, the construction of ‘sheaf-binders binding’ does not violate the general thesis that Homeric diction would not have attached such a construction to elite males, but felt free to attach them to other, more working class people. The same phrase EN, ἀμαλλοδετήρες δέοντο, is framed by a more distant repetition, δράγματα δραγμαεύοντες, in turn framed by the presence of a βασιλεύς, who, standing in silence holding his scepter, neither participates in the work of his subjects, nor is characterized by the same verbosity as they are. The rapid movement from one level of diction to another is striking.

As if there were any doubt the EF adhered specifically to Hephaestus in his anthropomorphic capacity as a smith, an unnamed, presumably human bronze-smith makes a brief appearance in *Iliad* 12 in the description of Sarpedon’s shield; the description of his work features an etymological figure unparalleled in epic diction:

ἦν ἄρα χαλκεὺς
ἤλασεν, ἔντοσθεν δὲ βοείας **ῥάψε** θαμειὰς

χρυσείης **ράβδοισι** διηνεκέσιν περὶ κύκλον

Which the bronze-smith

hammered out, for him, and on the inward side had **stitched** ox-hides
in close folds with golden **stitches** clean round the circles (*Il.*12.295-7).

Ship sailing, shipbuilding and carpentry represent other areas in which the EF tends to surface. The standard formulas for setting sail in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* involve the semantically detached, and hence not too terribly high profile figure ἰστὸν ἰσάναι: οἱ δ' **ἰστὸν στήσαντ'** ἀνά θ' ἰστιά λευκὰ πέτασσαν 'they stood up the mast and unfurled the white sails' (*Il.*1.480). The phonetic echo in the figure itself is most often amplified by further echoing in ἰστιά, the word for sail, giving such lines what Havelock called a 'nursery rhyme' quality, or what Tsitsibakou-Vasalos has called a «hammering acoustic effect ... most frequently used to introduce briefly but solidly new themes.»³²² For our purposes it is important to qualify that the figure generally occurs in the third plural, and that it refers to the actions of the common sailor. The one exception is when Odysseus must set sail from Kalypso's island alone.

Less frequent figures surface in descriptions of ship construction and carpentry. When Odysseus describes how he and his men twirled the stake into Polyphemus' eye he compares their drilling to that of a shipwright:

οἱ μὲν μοχλὸν ἐλόντες ἐλάϊνον, ὄξυν ἐπ' ἄκρω,
ὄφθαλμῷ ἐνέρισαν· ἐγὼ δ' ἐφύπερθεν ἐρεισθεῖς
δίνεον, ὡς ὅτε τις **τρυπᾶ** δόρυ νήϊον ἀνήρ
τρυπάνω, οἱ δέ **τ'** ἔνερθεν ὑποσσείουσιν ἰμάντι
ἀψάμενοι ἐκάτερθε, τὸ δὲ **τρέχει** ἐμμενὲς αἰεὶ·

³²² See Havelock (82-3), quote from Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (36). Other lines with the same formula + echoing in ἰστιά occur at *Od.*9.77, 10.506 and 12.402; other passages where the formula occurs without this echo are *Il.*23.852 and *Od.*15.289-290 = 2.424-425.

They seized the beam of olive, sharp at the end, and leaned on it
into the eye, while I from above, leaning my weight on it,
twirled it, like a man **augers** into a ship timber
with an **auger**, and his men from underneath, grasping
the strap on either side whirl it, and it bites resolutely deeper(*Od.*9.382-
6).

Here, the repetition of the verbal action in the semantically and etymological related implement drives home the length of the gruesome process, as does the ongoing alliteration in tau, rho and τρ immediately after the *figura*. The phrase **τρυπή τρυπάνω**, another one of those hapax figurae in which the phonetic echo of one element is complete within the other, has a very marked stylistic effect. It is entitled not only by virtue of its description of a technical process, but by the vengeance and spite that motivates that process. In a more mundane setting, Odysseus describes in great detail the construction of his bed out of an oak tree:

καὶ τότε ἔπειτ' ἀπέκοψα κόμην τανυφύλλου ἐλαίης,
κορμόν δ' ἐκ ρίζης προταμῶν ἀμφέξεσα χαλκῶ
εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως καὶ ἐπὶ στάθμην ἴθυνα,
ἐρμῖν' ἀσκήσας, **τέτρηνα** δὲ πάντα **τερέτρῳ**

Then, I cut off the foliage from the long-leafed olive,
and, hewing the trunk from the root, I smoothed it with an adze
well and skillfully, and trued it to the line, thus fashioning
the bedpost, and **gimleted** it all with a **gimlet** (*Od.*23.195-8).

Here, the figure may not have quite as strong an emotive circumstance for entitlement as in the Cyclops passage, but Odysseus does begin this description in anger at his wife's suggestion that their bed be moved, and

there must be a certain amount of indignation even in the minute technicalities of construction. He starts the dialogue by using the stock phrase in, perhaps mock, anger I have already discussed, but will repeat here: ὦ γυναῖ, ἦ μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος θυμαλγῆς ἔειπες· ‘My wife, this is an extremely grievous word you just said’ (*Od.*23.183). In *Odyssey* five τέρετρα ... τέτρηνεν occurs in successive phrases in a much more matter of fact description of the construction of the raft that will take Odysseus off Ogygia:

τόφρα δ' ἔνεικε **τέρετρα** Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων·

τέτρηνεν δ' ἄρα πάντα καὶ ἤρμοσεν ἀλλήλοισι

Meanwhile Kalypso, brilliant goddess, brought him **gimlets**

and he **gimleted** all the planks and fit them together (*Od.*5.246-7).

The discrepancy in the degrees of rhetorical entitlement required to motivate the connected tautologies ‘auger with an auger’ and ‘gimlet with a gimlet’ versus less connected repetition ‘she brought gimlets and he gimleted’ underscores, once again, the difference that syntactic alleviation of the prolixity of the EF can make. Hesiod attests one EN connecting the action of woodcutters with building and ship construction:

ύλοτόμον τε **ταμείν** θαλαμήια δοῦρα

νήια τε ξύλα πολλά, τά τ' ἄρμενα νηυσὶ πέλονται

And the woodcutter should cut planks for building a chamber,

and many ship timbers, which are fit for ships (*Hes.**Op.*807-8).

Moving now into the depiction of everyday events in the Homeric household, the first thing to notice is that the emergence of servants and their activities, especially servant women, created context for rather ornate figures in and of itself. I have already discussed in some detail the distribution of

mutilated forms of EAs from **merǵ-* (ῥέξαντας ἔργον = deeds of warriors) against forms that achieve full phonetic echoing in the denominative verb (ἔργα ἐργάζεσθαι = household labors of serving women).³²³ Another example is a recurring formula in the *Odyssey* that describes a handmaid's (ἀμφίπολος) preparation of a washbasin:

χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος **προχόω ἐπέχευε** φέρουσα
καλῆ χρυσεῖη, ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος,
νίψασθαι· παρὰ δὲ ξεστὴν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν.

A maidservant brought hand-washing water for them and poured it from a splendid and golden pitcher, holding it above a silver basin for them to wash, and she pulled a polished table before them (*Od.*1.136-8 = 4.52-4, 7.172-4, 10.368-9, 15.135-7, 17.91-3).

In her eponymous *Hymn*, Aphrodite, who is fibbing to Anchises about being a mortal, explains that she knows his language because of her Trojan wet nurse, and highlights the activity, and perhaps the social standing, of the wet nurse with an EN:

Τρῳὰς γὰρ μεγάρῳ με **τροφὸς τρέφεν**, ἢ δὲ διὰ πρό
σμικρὴν παῖδ' ἀτίταλλε φίλης παρὰ μητρὸς ἐλοῦσα.

For a Trojan wet nurse nursed me in the hall, who took me from my mother and reared me when I was a small child (*h.Hom.*5.114-15).

Perhaps the most striking figure in this category occurs in *Iliad* 11. This is a mostly grim and serious book, 848 lines of battle scenes. There are 4

³²³ The goddess Athena, who in her martial capacity does not elicit figurae, is several times involved in this EA since it is she who teaches women to 'work works'.

Etymological figures in the book and only one in narrative, this when the action has moved from the battle to the dwelling of Nestor:

ἄλλος μὲν μογέων ἀποκινήσασκε τραπέζης
πλεῖον ἔόν, Νέστωρ δ' ὁ γέρων ἀμογητὶ ἄειρεν.
ἐν τῷ ρά σφι **κύκησε** γυνὴ εἴκυῖα θεῆσιν
οἴνω Πραμνείῳ, ἐπὶ δ' αἴγειον **κνή** τυρὸν
κνήστι χαλκείῃ, ἐπὶ δ' ἄλφιστα λευκὰ πάλυνε, (640)
πινόμεναι δ' ἐκέλευσεν, ἐπεὶ ῥ' ὤπλισσε **κυκείῳ** (//.11.628-41).

Another man with great effort could lift it (Nestor's cup) from the table,
But Nestor, aged as he was, lifted it without strain.

In this the woman, like the immortals, **mixed them a potion**
with Pramneian wine, **grated** goat's-milk cheese into it
with a bronze **grater**, and scattered with her hand white barley into it
when she got the **potion** ready, she told them to drink it.

Once again, κνή κνήστι meets the criteria for high profile figures. Also note the framing of one same phrase schema within another more distant echo. We have seen his framing structure (A1 B1 B2 A2) more than once now.³²⁴ It gives the impression of conscious fashioning along the lines of formulaic expression, and suggests that the construction of ornate schemata in conjunction with narratees of a certain status was an implied mannerism of epic composition. The narratee in this passage is Hekamede, the Trojan serving woman of Nestor. The stylistically charged figure κνή κνήστι, framed by the more distant echo κύκησε κυκείῳ, underscores the fact that here we have a respite from the battle-narrative and an imposition of a kitchen utensil and the

³²⁴ I refer to δράγματα (A1) ἀμαλλοδετήρες (B1) δέοντο (B2) δραγμαεύοντες (A2) and χέρνιβα (A1) προχόψ (B1) ἐπέχευε (B2) νίψασθαι (A2).

commensurate activity of a household serving woman upon the more austere diction of the book as a whole.

Given that the proper place for a cheese grater is in the kitchen or dining room, it came as some surprise in the 1990's when bronze cheese graters were uncovered, along with weapons, in the cremation burial sites of three warriors. Two articles attempting to explain the presence of these graters, one by David Ridgway and one by Martin West, surfaced shortly thereafter. Both articles tried to connect the passage from the *Iliad* with the graves at Lefkandi. Ridgway's premise was that both the graves and *Iliad* showed that, although later evidence suggests prevalence of cheese graters among other kitchen utensils, at this early stage the bronze graters were considered battle accoutrement.³²⁵ He even goes so far as to suggest that in *Odyssey* ten when Circe mixes a potion almost identical to Hekamede's the lack of cheese graters is due to lack of battle context:

We are not told that Circe used a grater: is this simply the luck of the poetic draw, or would it have been out of place for her to possess a utensil associated in the audience's mind with the field of battle rather than the kitchen? (328-9).

The unfortunate assumption here is that Homer actually brings the bronze cheese grater into battle narrative, an assumption predicated on the notion that a book of the *Iliad* cannot change its tone and offer a prosaic scene in the midst of the war. If high profile etymological figures such as κνή κνήστι did

³²⁵ As evidence that later graters took their proper place in the kitchen Ridgway cites Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae* iv.169b-c where a cheese-grater (*turoknestin*) features in a list of other kitchen utensils. He also notes several appearances of cheese graters in kitchen contexts in Aristophanes. In the *Wasps* (938 ff.) a *turoknestis* testifies as a witness in a trial. Cf. *Birds* 1579, *Lysistrata* 231 and further references in Ridgway (340).

act as not exactly subtle signposts for shifts from somber to not so somber and elevated to everyday narrative, as I have argued, then the appearance of the cheese grater would have let the audience know that the poet was not dealing with a martial implement. In effect, a problem best kept in the Lefkandi graves has been foisted on Homer, who would be more aptly listed with the other literary evidence that cheese graters were a domestic implement, used by domestics. The ultimate implications of the imposition of the Lefkandi find were realized by West, who, arguing for the primacy of the gravesites, made the Iliadic implement a Euboean intercalation:

My thesis is that Nestor's huge goblet was an older element in the tradition, going back to Mycenaean poetry, and that a Euboean poet of the ninth century was the first to fortify its content with grated cheese, following a custom of his own day (191).

In the end, the bronze cheese grater might have been the property of the elite male whose belongings were packed for a military campaign, but the discussion that has surfaced regarding this passage in book 11 has neglected to account for the fact that the person who actually uses the implement is a serving woman, and the place she uses it is not on the battlefield but in the closest thing that the Greek warriors at Troy had to an οἶκος.

Through the whole scene in Nestor's dwelling Machaon, the Achaean healer, has an arrow in his arm. In the beginning of book 14 Nestor describes how Hekamede will wash his wound:

εἰς ὃ κε **θερμὰ λοετρά** ἐϋπλόκαμος Ἐκαμήδη
θερμήνη καὶ **λούση** ἄπο βρότον αἱματόεντα·

until Hekamede of the fine braids warms warm washwater
and washes off the bloody gore (//.14.6-7).

Polyptoton featuring a verb and cognate adjective are relatively rare, but when they do occur they embrace a redundancy that makes them closer than other classes of repetition to the EF. Here the profile of θερμὰ θερμήνῃ is amplified by added echoing across a coordinating conjunction, λοετρὰ λούσῃ. Hence, in both her appearances Hekamede is characterized by prolixity.

The division of etymological figures among men is generally clear. They do not characterize elite males, but non-elite workers and craftsmen. The only real exception to this is Odysseus when he works as a shipbuilder or carpenter. The overall situation with women, however, is quite different. There is no indication of any reservation in highlighting the activities of women of the elite classes with affected figures. As we have seen, three etymological accusatives in rapid succession characterize Hera. Also, a number of EFs adhere specifically to Penelope. The consummate activity exemplifying Penelope's wife is, of course, weaving. The process of her weaving is emphasized by another manifestation of ἰστὸν ἰστάναι, semantically detached in much the same way as the sailing figure 'set up a mast:'

στησαμένη μέγαν **ἰστὸν** ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ὕφαινε,
 setting up a great loom/web in the hall she wove (*Od.*2.94=24.129, cf.
 19.139).

In the *Works and Days* two figures link the weaving of a woman with the web spinning of a spider in a proverbial expression:

ἡ δὲ δωδεκάτη τῆς ἐνδεκάτης μέγ' ἀμείνων·
 τῇ γάρ τοι **νῆ νήματ'** ἀερσιπότητος ἀράχνης
 ἤματος ἐκ πλείου, ὅτε ἴδρις σωρὸν ἀμάται·
 τῇ δ' **ἰστὸν στήσαιτο** γυνὴ προβάλοιτό τε ἔργον (*Hes. Op.*776-779).
 The twelfth is far better than the eleventh

for on that day the gossamer-borne spider weaves its web
in full day, and the Wise One (ant) gathers her pile;
on that day a woman should set up her loom and set to her work.

The recurring etymological formula ‘stood by the stanchion’ applies mainly to Penelope – always in the company of ἀμφίπολοι, who are also ‘standing by’ -- once to Nausicaa:

κλίμακα δ' ὑψηλὴν κατεβήσετο οἴῳ δόμοιο,
οὐκ οἴη, ἅμα τῆ γε καὶ ἀμφίπολοι δὴ ἔποντο.
ἣ δ' ὅτε δὴ μνηστήρας ἀφίκετο δῖα γυναικῶν,
στή ῥα παρὰ **σταθμὸν** τέγεος πύκα ποιητοῖο,
ἅντα παρειάων σχομένη λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα·
ἀμφίπολος δ' ἄρα οἱ κεδνὴ ἐκάτερθε **παρέστη**

She descended the high staircase that was built in her palace,
not all alone, since two handmaids went to attend her.

When she, goddess among women, came near the suitors,
she stood by the stanchion that supported the roof with its joinery
holding her shining veil in front of her cheeks, to shield them,
and a devoted attendant was stationed on either side of her (*Od.*1.332-
5 line 333 =16.415, 18.209, 21.64 and 8.457 of Nausicaa).

Note that the depiction of Penelope here is not patronizing or derogatory. This point is enhanced by the presence of the elevated, and highly formulaic diction just before the figure, δῖα γυναικῶν, which has corollaries among warriors (δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς) and goddesses (δῖα θεάων).

Although generally people in Homer sit in a *klismos* (ἔζετο δ' ἐν κλισμῷ, *Il.*24.597, *Od.*4.136, cf. *Il.*8.436, 9.200, 11.622, *Od.*17.90), when she is working with her distaff Penelope leans, or reclines, on one while she sits:

μήτηρ δ' αντίον ἴζε παρὰ σταθμὸν μεγάρου
κλισμῶ κεκλιμένη, λέπτ' ἠλάκατα στρωφῶσα.

His mother sat opposite, beside the pillar supporting
the hall, **reclining** on a **recliner** and turning fine yarn on a distaff
(*Od.*17.96-7).

3.3.2 Herdsmen and farmers

Philoetius the cowherd, elsewhere a recipient of a rather ornate and famous introductory formula (βοῶν ἐπιβουκόλος ἀνήρ) becomes the focus of a high profile figure that seals the doom of the suitors when Odysseus is preparing his onslaught:

σοὶ δέ, Φιλοίτιε δῖε, θύρας ἐπιτέλλομαι αὐλῆς
κληῖσαι κληῖδι, θοῶς δ' ἐπὶ δεσμὸν ἰήλαι.

I bid you, noble Philoetius, to bolt the gates of the courtyard
with the bolt, and quickly tie on the cord (*Od.*21.240-1).

In a rather caustic context describing their unrequited servitude to Laomedon Poseidon chides Apollo, who is not generally characterized by affected redundancies, to remember that he slavishly worked as a cowherd in Troy by using a figure with only one other occurrence in epic:

ἦτοι ἐγὼ Τρώεσσι πόλιν πέρι τείχος ἔδειμα
εὐρύ τε καὶ μάλα καλόν, ἴν' ἄρρηκτος πόλις εἴη·
Φοῖβε σὺ δ' εἰλίποδας ἔλικας **βοῦς βουκολέεσκες**
Ἰδῆς ἐν κνημοῖσι πολυπύχου ὑληέσσης.

I built the Trojans a wall around their city, broad and quite fine,
so that the city would be impregnable
and, Phoebus, you cowherded the sleek cows of rolling gait
in the foothills of wooded, many-valled Ida. (*//.*21.448).

Note that this is one of only two figures in *Iliad* 21 (611 lines), a book primarily dedicated to the *aristeia* of Achilles. In the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* the same figure takes on a more matter of fact tone, since it is not doubly motivated by angry injunction.

Ἀγχίσεω δ' ἄρα οἱ γλυκὺν ἴμερον ἔμβαλε θυμῷ,
ὃς τότ' ἐν ἀκροπόλοις ὄρεσιν πολυπιδάκου Ἰδῆς
βουκολέεσκεν βοῦς δέμας ἀθανάτοισιν ἐοικώς

He (Zeus) threw sweet desire for Anchises into her heart,
who then, like the immortals in appearance, cowherded cows
in the mountains of many-springed Ida (*h.Hom.5.55*).

As I have said on several occasions, *Odyssey* nine bears a distinctly different relationship to the *figura etymologica* than any other book in Homer. In this book Odysseus, as (secondary) narrator, strives for figural creativity even when rendering idiomatic phrases. When he reports that he asked Polyphemus to give him a gift he does not settle for unremarkable δῶρον δίδοναι, but replaces the standard noun with δωτίνην, itself quite rare. In *Odyssey* nine figures that elsewhere appear with the noun in the dative (βέλεσιν βαλλεῖν, ὀλέθρῳ ὀλλέσθαι) appear in the accusative. Also, there are several other figures that surface only in this book. I have already noted the highly effective figural hapax τρυπάνῳ τρυπᾶν, and would add ποτὸν πίνειν (354). In addition there are two phrases that fit into the agricultural category:

οὔτε **φυτεύουσιν** χερσὶν **φυτὸν** οὔτ' ἀρόωσιν

They (Cyclopes) do not plant plants by hands or plows (*Od.9.108*).

ἀλλ' ἐνόμειε **νομὸν** κάτα πίονα μῆλα

But he (Polyphemus) was out herding his herd among the rich flocks
(*Od.*9.217).

These figures find no correspondence elsewhere in the *Odyssey* or *Iliad*, but similar formations occur in the *Hymns*. The first of these compounds the agricultural figure with one that looks like it is drawn from an erotic context, but, applied to cows is difficult to imagine to have had anything but a slightly comic effect.

ἡμεῖς δ' αὖτ' ὄρεός τε καὶ ἵπποβότου πεδίοιο
βουσι **νομοῦς** ἑκάεργε **νομεύσομεν** ἀγραύλοισιν.
ἔνθεν ἄλις τέξουσι βόες ταύροισι **μιγεῖσαι**
μίγδην θηλείας τε καὶ ἄρσενας·

We, for our part, far shooter, in the horse-nourishing foothills
will herd the herds of roving cows where the cows, copulating
their copulations with the bulls will bear females and males (4.492-4).

οὐδὲ τρύγην οἴσεις, οὐτ' ἄρ **φυτὰ** μυρία **φύσεις**
and you (Delos) will never bear the vintage, nor will you sprout
numerous sprouts (3.55).

We might also note that cows themselves merit a pseudo-etymological figure, βούς βόσκειται, and that this intersects with a few other phrases from βόσκειν, βώτηρ βόσκει and βούς βόσκειν.

3.4 People in the etymological nominative in the *Odyssey*

As remarked above, personal subjects of the EN in the *Iliad* are quite rare. In the *Odyssey*, however, several structures emerge that are illuminating in terms of what type of people the poet(s) felt it appropriate to characterize in this manner. The general, overarching observation here is that the poet of the *Odyssey* did not characterize 'the best of the Achaeans' via such figures, while

he felt free to so depict lower echelon public servants. A nice example of this is πτωχὸς πτωχεύει ‘the beggar begs’. This figure occurs twice, once in a proverbial expression that Odysseus imparts to Telemachus:

πτωχῶ βέλτερόν ἐστι κατὰ πόλιν ἢ ἐ κατ’ ἀγρούς
δαίτα **πτωχεύειν**· δώσει δέ μοι ὅς κ’ ἐθέλησιν.

It is better for a beggar, in the city rather than in the fields
to beg for food. But whoever wishes will give to me (*Od.*17.18-19).

The other instance of this figure introduces Irus:

ἦλθε δ’ ἐπὶ **πτωχὸς** πανδήμιος, ὃς κατὰ ἄστῳ
πτωχεύεσκ’ Ἰθάκης, μετὰ δ’ ἔπρεπε γαστέρι μάργη

There came now a public beggar, who used to beg in the town
of Ithaca, notorious for his voracious gut (*Od.*18.1-2).

Remember that Hesiod lists the beggar next to the potter, builder and poet (ἄοιδός) in a list of demiurges (*Op.*24-5). In this line of argument I want to stress that it is not my conclusion that Homer is necessarily constructing these figures to express contempt for public workers. The construction is, at times, clearly a vehicle of contempt, as when Athena scorns the suitors.³²⁶

φράζεω ὅπως **μνηστῆρσιν** ἀναιδέσσι χεῖρας ἐφήσεις,
οἳ δὴ τοι τρίετες μέγαρον κάτα κοιρανέουσι,
μνώμενοι ἀντιθέην ἄλοχον καὶ ἔδνα διδόντες·

Consider how you might get your hands on the shameless
wooers, who now for three years have been lording it in your hall

³²⁶ Another figure featuring a household item that scorns the suitors is ὦ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δὴ κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς ἐν **εὐνή** ἤθελον **εὐνηθῆναι** ἀνάγκιδες αὐτοὶ ἐόντες. (*Od.*4.333-4=17.123-5).

wooing your divine wife and offering wedding presents (*Od.*13.376-8).³²⁷

But we should temper these derogative figures with the observation that the poet of the *Odyssey* characterized the singers of song themselves with a nominative repetition. Both Phemius and Demodocus are so characterized on several occasions:

μοῦσ' ἄρ' **ᾄδων** ἀνήκεν **ᾄδέμεναι** κλέα ἀνδρῶν,

The muse bid the singer to sing the famous deeds of men (*Od.*8.73, cf. 8.83 = 367, 87 and 52).

τοῖσι δ' **ᾄδὸς ᾄειδε** περικλυτός, οἱ δὲ σιωπῇ

ἦατ' ἀκούοντες· ὁ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον **ᾄειδε**

For them the glorious singer sang, and they, in silence

sat listening; but he sang of return (*Od.*1.325-9, cf. *Od.*17.358, 385, 518-520, 330-331, 345-346).

That Phemius is a servant, singing for the suitors only under compulsion, is allegedly what saves him from slaughter. Whether the ᾄδὸς was a slave, or a demiurge occupying some higher rank in the social hierarchy, the proliferation of this figure does not upset the general thesis that elite males were not the recipients of such prolixity. Even if Demodocus and Phemius are viewed as free artisans they still do not rank with 'the best of the Achaeans.' The figure does, however, underscore that prolix repetitions were capable of expressing a certain fondness for the persona characterized, and that they need not be looked at en masse as pejorative.

3.5 Contexts of eating/feasting and drinking

³²⁷ Variations of the same formula occur with similar contempt at *Od.*18.275-7 and 20.287-90.

All the instances of ἐνὶ κρητῆρι κέρωνται and κρητῆρα κέρασσεν have been cited. The fact that this is the only figure to surface in Lesbian lyric may have something to do with the alleviation of redundancy created by semantic detachment, and possibly the appropriateness of the figure for a sympotic setting. Other figures having to do with wine in Homer are less embedded and more verbose, as in **οἶνον οἶνοχοεῦντες** ἐνὶ χρυσεῖς δεπάεσσιν ‘wine-pouring wine in golden cups’ (*Od.*3.472) and **οἶνον** δὲ μελίφρονα **οἰνίζεσθε** ‘provide sweet-hearted wine’ (*Il.*8.506, 546).

Unspecified object constructions with verbs meaning ‘eat,’ as in ‘eat food’ are cross-linguistically commonplace. Homeric language had a formal and less formal variation on this semantic. At the basic level we find figures from **h₁ed-*:

γαίης Λωτοφάγων, οἳ τ’ ἄνθινον **εἶδαρ ἔδουσι**.

the land of the lotus-eaters, who eat flowery food (*Od.*9.84).

ἄνερες, οὐδέ θ’ ἄλεσσι μεμιγμένον **εἶδαρ ἔδουσι**.

men, nor do they eat food mixed with salt (*Od.*11.123=23.270).

Ἑρμείας, νύμφη δ’ ἐτίθει πάρα πᾶσαν **ἔδωδῆν,**

ἔσθειν καὶ πίνειν, οἷα βροτοὶ ἄνδρες **ἔδουσι**.

Hermes, and the nymph put down all the sustenance

to eat and drink, upon which mortal men sustain themselves (*Od.*5.195-96).

Actually a bit more common in Homer, however, is more ceremonial δαῖτα/δαίτην δαίνυσθαι ‘feast a feast’, often in highly ornate, alliterative lines:

μοίρας δασσάμενοι **δαίνυντ’** ἐρικυδέα **δαῖτα**.

After dividing portions they feasted a glorious feast (*Od.*3.66=20.280).

Overall, the impression is that contexts of eating and drinking entitled select

figurae.

3.6. Figures of birth and lineage

There is little to no scholarship in this category, but in several corners of Indo-European, Greek, Latin and Sanskrit genealogical passages and roots meaning to be born and to give birth generated highly alliterative etymological nominatives, accusatives and ablatives. In Vedic, the root **ĝenh*₁- produced etymological nominatives with the agent noun **ĝenh*₁-*tor*:

mā jānitā tvā jajāna ‘the progenitor has engendered me’ (*RV.10.28.6*).

janitúr yó jajāna ‘of the progenitor who engendered’ (*RV.4.17.12*).

The same root is coupled with the feminine agent noun with the Devi suffix:

Jānitrī (tvā) ajījanat ‘the genetrix engendered you’ (*RV.10.134.1*).

Vedic also attests several derivatives forming etymological accusatives from **ĝenh*₁-. For instance the compound noun *prajā́m* as the object of the causative in paronomastic amplification:

á naḥ prajā́m janayatu prajā́patir ‘Prajāpatir, (Lit. lord of progeny) engender progeny for us’ (*RV.10.85.43*).

Latin examples are abundant and here I list only a few out of many:

progeniem genui (*CIL*1²,15).³²⁸

me...summo genere gnatum (*Pl.Capt.319*).

neminem bono esse genere natum (*Cic.Mur.15*).

uno partu duos pepelit simul (*Pl.Am.1138*).

et nati natorum et qui nascentur ab illis (*Virg.Aen.3.98*).

Repetitiveness, with or without tautology, is characteristic of presentations of genealogies:

³²⁸ Cf. Gonda (1959:233), under paronomasia, who adds: “In solemn and ceremonious speech sound repetition and the often somewhat verbose character of these phrases may show to full advantage: e.g. in pompous Latin epitaphs”.

ἢ **τέκε** Πειρίθοον θεόφιν μήστωρ' ἀτάλαντον·
 οὐδ' ὅτε περ Δανάης καλλισφύρου Ἀκρισιώνης,
 ἢ **τέκε** Περσῆα πάντων ἀριδείκετον ἀνδρῶν· (320)
 οὐδ' ὅτε Φοίνικος κούρης τηλεκλειτοῖο,
 ἢ **τέκε** μοι Μίνων τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Ῥαδάμανθον·
 οὐδ' ὅτε περ Σεμέλης οὐδ' Ἀλκμήνης ἐνὶ Θήβῃ,
 ἢ ῥ' Ἡρακλῆα κρατερόφρονα **γείνατο** παῖδα·
 ἢ δὲ Διώνυσον Σεμέλη **τέκε** χάρμα βροτοῖσιν·
 She bore Peirithous, like to the gods in counsel;
 nor of fair-ankled Danae, daughter of Acrisius
 who bore Perseus, brilliant among all men;
 nor the daughter of far-famed Phoenix
 who bore me Minos and divine Rhadamanthys;
 nor of Semele, nor Alcmene in Thebes,
 and she gave birth to Hercules, son stout of spirit,
 and Semele bore Dionysus, joy of mortals (*//.14.318-25*).

The repetitiveness of genealogical language licensed etymological figures in the same venue. In Hesiod and Homer we find a variety of figures from two roots, **ǵenh₁-* and **teḱ-* including nominatives (γενέθλη / γονή γένετο, τοκῆες τέκον) accusatives (τέκνον τίκτειν, γόνον γείνατο, γνήτω γείνασθαι) and even a vocative τέκνον, τίκτω. This variety of expression is unique among semantic representations of the *figurae*, and bespeaks a general and widespread license. Many of these phrases occur as pure verbal strengthening:

Ἦ δ' **ἔτεκε** τρία **τέκνα** δαίφρονι Βελλεροφόντῃ
 She bore three children to sagacious Bellerophon (*//.6.196*).

Ῥεΐη δὲ δμηθεΐσα Κρόνω **τέκε** φαΐδιμα **τέκνα**,

Rea, overwhelmed by Kronos, bore brilliant children (*Th.*453).

But at other times the birth-figures highlight pathos, as in Thetis' question to Achilles:

τέκνον ἐμόν, τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ τεκοῦσα

My child, why did I raise you, bearing you accursed (*Il.*1.414).

In the prophecy scene in *Iliad* 2, when the mother sparrow and her young are eaten by a serpent, whatever pathos we feel for the bird is heightened by a figure: ὀκτώ, ἀτὰρ μήτηρ ἐνάτη ἦν ἢ **τέκε τέκνα** (*Il.*2.313=327). In fact, there is such a strong tradition in scholarship to assert that the *figura etymologica* itself is inherently pathetic, that Wills, speaking of repetition in general, responded against it:

To say that repetition gives a sad or pathetic tone to Horace's *Odes* 2.14.1 *Eheu fugaces, Posthume, Posthume*, would be to mistake the index for what it points to, since we have a contrary effect from the similar structure of Plautus' *Trin.* 1180 *o pater, pater mi, salve*. As an index, repetition emphasizes the tone which the words would have if unrepeated (7).³²⁹

When it comes to the genealogical figures their emotive context is either neutral or pathetic. Hence, the semantics of some figures push them toward a certain index.

To sum up this chapter, we have seen that the distribution of figures in Homer is not random, and in the process called into question some of the

³²⁹ Wills' note on this subject is also informative: "The vague recognition of the appropriateness of repetition for pathos (already, e.g. *Rhet. Her.* 4.38, *conduplicatio est cum ratione amplificationis aut commiserationis eiusdem unius aut plurium uerborum iteratio*, or *Macr. Sat.* 4.6.23 (*nascitur pathos et de repetitione*) has unfortunately shaped the general attitude towards these figures as inherently pathetic."

statements traditionally made about the *figura etymologica*. First, the figures are not generally used in serious martial contexts without some degree of paradox or distance. Second, they have been weeded out of sacral language in Homeric formulae. Third, while the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* do not abound in political context, the figures do surface when such contexts present themselves, but with the notable difference that upper echelon officials do not appear as the subject of cognate verbs as they do so persistently in Attic. Next, we have seen that a very large number of the most high profile figures characterize working class individuals engaged in mundane activities. We have also observed certain other prevalent tendencies running crosswise through these overall distributions. Most markedly, expressions of scorn and anger, both of the lighthearted and the truly caustic variety, serve to buttress the use of many of the most blatant repetitions.

The overall ramifications for the study of Homeric diction and the rhetorical presentation of characters are significant: it is not as uniform as some post-Parryan scholarship has wanted to make it. Homer's use of the figures reveals a subtleness that was lost on most of the scholars who have commented on them. In sum, there is an often clear rhetorical strategy in the use of the *figura etymologica*, especially in its more affected manifestations, that dictates what sort of personae the figures adhere to. This strategy is often pivotal in creating at times quite sudden dividing lines within the narrative presentation of a scene.

Chapter 4

Tautological repetitions as components of epic hexameter

4.1 The figures as formulas:

This chapter is in one sense a continuation of the last. It continues the stylistic analysis of the figures, but acknowledges that in order to discern more subtle degrees of nuance, especially within the frequently attested figures, it is necessary to synthesize examination of context and tone with an awareness of metrical and syntactic norms and irregularities. In terms of making a contribution to formulaic theory my scope will be as limited as it can be. I make no pretense of having arrived at one definition of what constitutes a formula in archaic hexameters, or makes a given phrase or line segment formulaic, nor do I wish to engage the Homeric question.³³⁰ My first aim is to note the several ways in which the various etymological phrases under survey position themselves in epic hexameter. As we will see, this process leads to generalizations with interesting ramifications for stylistic and rhetorical analysis. For one, figures at the lowest end of our entitlement continuum (1) quite often take up end line positions, although they are frequent enough to also enjoy a good deal of mobility. Figures at the highest end (6), on the other hand, position themselves primarily at line beginnings. Furthermore, low-end figures typically attach an attribute and form expansive dactylic segments, while high-end figures do not attach attributes and frequently form thick, spondaic segments. Hence, to complement the stylistic analysis, we can add that, not only do the likes of (+attribute) δῶρα δίδωμι and (+attribute) εἶματα

³³⁰ Those interested in oral traditions might start from Foley's tomes dedicated to bibliography on the subject. A brief introduction to the nature and history of the Homeric question may be found in Parry (x ff.).

εἶμαι represent ‘pure verbal strengthening and adjectival support’, but that the idioms, comfortably placed in common verse positions, as in ^{bd} | δῶρα δίδωμι and ^{bd} | εἶματα εἶμαι, represent the bottom of the bottom of the stylistic continuum. In these cases, they simply finish off lines, in rhythmic, but nonetheless quite predictable and unremarkable fashion. On the other end of the continuum, metrical analysis enables us to add the verse position and scansion of such anomalies as τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο ^{tr} | and ξείνους ξεινίζειν, ⁵ | to the list of other factors that make these phrases stylistically supercharged. Further analysis of the metrical placements of all the figures will reveal additional nuances within this general dichotomy, but, before we get ahead of ourselves, let us take a look at the metrical placements themselves.

As I just said, I do not mean to make any big contribution to formulaic or oral theory. The line positions of the figures are the same whether or not one sees ‘Homer’ as the consummate oral poet masterfully culminating a long tradition, a little-gifted patch worker, or a group of literate recensionists working in Athens at the time of Peisistratus. Nevertheless, since questions of formularity are bound to arise from the alignment of prosodically and semantically similar line segments, I will begin by outlining a few of the most influential definitions of the (Homeric) formula and noting how the figures fit, or do not fit, into those definitions before analyzing the localizations of the individual phrases.

Recurring etymological figures often take up identical line positions and constitute ‘formulas’ according to any and all of the definitions put forth by Parryan and post-Parryan scholarship. A rough division of these formulaic figures separates them into three groups, line ending, line beginning and line

internal in order of frequency. Here are but a few preliminary examples of each:

Line ending:

- ^{bd} | δῶρα δίδωμι. (*Od.*20.342)
^{bd} | δῶρα διδοῦσιν· (*Od.*18.279)
^{bd} | δῶρα διδώσειν." (*Od.*24.314)³³¹
^{bd} | δῶρα διδοίτε, (*Od.*11.357)
^{bd} | δῶρα διδοῦναι (*Il.*24.425)
^{bd} | δῶρον ἔδωκαν· (*Il.*23.745)
^{bd} | δῶρα ἔδωκεν. (*Hes. Th.*399)
^{bd} | δῶρον ἔδωκεν (*Hes. Fr.*141.3).

Line beginning:

- βουλὰς βουλεύειν ⁵ | (*Od.*6.61 cf. *Il.*10.147=327)
βουλὰς βουλεύει ⁵ | (*Il.*10.415)
βουλήν βουλεύση ⁵ | (*Il.*9.75).

Line internal:

- ἄλλοι δ' ἀμφ' ἄλλησι ^{tr} | **μάχην ἐμάχοντο** πύλησιν·(*Il.*12.175).
ἄλλοι δ' ἀμφ' ἄλλησι ^{tr} | **μάχην ἐμάχοντο** νέεσσιν, (*Il.*15.414).
ἦδ' ὅσοι παρὰ νηυσὶ ^{tr} | **μάχην ἐμάχοντο** θοῆσιν·(*Il.*15.673).
εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ **θῆκε θεά**, ⁷ | γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη· (*Od.*5.427)
ἐν δέ οἱ ἄσκον **ἔθηκε θεὰ** ⁷ | μέλανος οἴνοιο (*Od.*5.265)
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ καὶ τῷ **θῆκε θεὸς** ⁷ | κακόν, ὅττι οἱ οὔ τι (*Il.*24.538)

³³¹ Here, pressure to conform to the Adonic appears to have produced a *Streckform* (διδώσειν). The only other time we see this long form of the future is also within a connected figure (δῶρα διδώσομεν, ^{bd} |). The forms might be the regular future, e.g. δώσω extended by analogy to the reduplicated present to enable configuration of the phrase in its most common form. There is, however, an intriguing match in the Vedic desiderative participle, *dīdāsata* < **di-deh₃-s-*. *RV.*10.151.2, enticing us to at least acknowledge the possibility of a preservation.

έν στήθεσσι **τιθεῖσι θεοί.** ⁷ | μέγα μὲν κλέος αὐτῆ (Od.2.125).

τοῖον ἄρ' ὄρκον **ἔθεντο θεοί** ⁷ | Στυγὸς ἄφθιτον ὕδωρ (Hes.Th.805)

έν στήθεσσι **ἔθηκε θεὰ** ⁷ | μελίγηρυν ἀοιδήν. (h.Hom.3.519).

These repeated expressions clearly conform to Parry's seminal designation of the Homeric formula as "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea."³³² They also satisfy structural definitions of the formula. For instance, Russo posited the line ending metrical and syntactical structure (^{bd} | noun + verb), to which (^{bd} | δῶρα δίδωμι) obviously conforms, as a formula regardless of the meaning of the segment.³³³ Gregory Nagy, analyzing the formula from a less structural standpoint, adduced the following definition: "the formula is a fixed phrase conditioned by the traditional themes of oral poetry."³³⁴ The figures above fit this description according to the paradigmatic definition of 'theme', or 'typical scene' put forth by Parry and Lord.³³⁵ For example, βουλὰς βουλεύειν commonly introduces council scenes; ^{bd} | δῶρα δίδωμι and its metrical variants generally appear in contexts of guest-friendship, or *xenia*. Further, neither Kiparsky's definition of the formulas as "ready made surface structures" (1976:83), nor Watkins' as "the verbal and grammatical device for encoding and transmitting a given theme or interaction of themes" (17) preclude any of the schemata listed so far.

The formulaic patterning exhibited by the examples above, δῶρον δίδοναι, βουλὰς βουλεύειν, μάχην μάχεσθαι, and θεὸς τίθησι extends to

³³² Parry (xxxii, 13 and 272).

³³³ See Russo (221) who counts ἄλγε' ἔθηκεν, μῦθον ἔειπεν, and ἀνδρὶ μάχεσθαι as representatives of the same end-line formula.

³³⁴ 1976:251. His assertion that "meter is diachronically generated by formula rather than vice versa" shows that his stance is far from structural. Construction of a phrase of a certain meaning, or theme creates structure, and not vice versa.

³³⁵ Chapter 5 of *The Singer of Tales* deals specifically with the themes.

many of the more common figures. Hence, it follows that a large number of the figures are formulaic. The next step is to define more precisely what type of formula they constitute. We may begin by noting the basic distinction between fixed and flexible formula made by Hainsworth and discussed further by Kiparsky.³³⁶ Fixed formulas, like ^{bd} | θούριδος ἀλκῆς, which occurs 22 times always in this same position and invariably in the genitive, appear in only one shape, while flexible formulas can be inflected, expanded, and split by other words.³³⁷ The basic fact that all of the etymological figures that occur with any frequency conjugate would dictate, then, that they are at least slightly flexible formulas.

Further examination of the metrical placements of δῶρον δίδοναι will show that it, and by extension the other oft-repeated EFs, are best classed not just as moderately flexible, but as extremely flexible formulae. When we are dealing with a figure that regularly attaches an attribute/adjective, such as δῶρον δίδοναι, the formula is more expansive:

⁵ | καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδοῦσιν· (*Od.*18.279)

⁵ | ἦδ' ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδώσειν." (*Od.*24.314)

⁵ | καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδοῖτε, (*Od.*11.357)

⁵ | καὶ ἐν αἰσιμα δῶρα διδοῦναι (*Il.*24.425)

⁵ | ποτὶ δ' ἄσπετα δῶρα δίδωμι. (*Od.*20.342).

These segments are all of the same metrical shape and the essential idea could be defined as 'give gifts of a certain quality.' The adjective + noun +

³³⁶ Kiparsky (82) credits Hainsworth with separation of formulas into two classes: fixed and flexible. Hainsworth has an entire chapter on "The Flexible Formula" (110-28).

³³⁷ The line ending phrases πόντια μήτηρ, θούριδος ἀλκῆς and αἰπυς (-υν) ὄλεθρος (-ον) represent what Hainsworth calls 'monolithic formulae' (119). Kiparsky picks out θούριδος ἀλκῆς, since it does not decline, as a completely fixed formula, of which he says: "there is little doubt that the expression was formulaic in only that shape (in other forms it was of course no doubt perfectly grammatical and usable, but had no formulaic status)" (82).

verb sequence invariably makes three line-ending feet of the same shape. We might then say, based on any of the definitions cited above, that δῶρόν δίδοναι presents an Adonic formula expandable by attachment of its third component in this particular order: adjective + noun + verb of this specific shape $\text{---} \text{---} \text{---} | \text{---} \text{---} \text{---} | \text{---} \text{x}$. It will become evident that δῶρόν δίδοναι is not the only phrase to attest a sizable group that fits such a uniform pattern. The composers would have been free to qualify these formulas in whatever way context called for by using the etymological figure as their basis and simply varying the adjective. ‘Give gifts’ is not the best example of this potential for diversified qualification since the quality of the gifts is never negative; but in the case of εἴματα ἔννυσθαι we see a shift, in the final books of the *Odyssey*, from clothing described elsewhere only with positive attributes (ἄμβροτα, χαρίεντα, χρύσεια, καλά, ἐπήρατα and θυώδεα καὶ λούσσα) to clothing that is wretched and filthy (κακὰ and λυγρὰ).³³⁸

In the process of expansion note that phrases of very similar semantic content may occupy slightly different metrical segments:

^{tr} | περισσὰ δὲ δῶρα ἔδωκεν (Hes. *Th.*400, *Fr.*10.61)

In a few passages, the standard adjectival attribute may be supplanted by information of a different sort, as in the dative recipient of the gift:

^{tr} | Θόαντι δὲ δῶρον ἔδωκαν· (//.23.745)

Whether or not these last two segments represent the same formula as those above begins to depend on our definition of formulae. Both are of a slightly different metrical structure, while this last one shows variant syntax. If one desired to be quite strict in rendering Parry’s “same metrical conditions” as ‘in

³³⁸ There is an irony implicit in the clothing being superficially wretched and filthy, while in fact these are the same καλά εἴματα given to Odysseus by the Phaeacians.

identical line positions' the objection might be raised that segments beginning at the penthemimeral and trochaic caesura represent different formulae, but both Nagy and Watkins caution against taking the Parryan phrase in this way.³³⁹ Stretching the notion of "same metrical conditions" to include segments of equal length and cadence regardless of line position, while still retaining the "essential idea" corollary, would enable us to put line initial manifestations of δῶρόν δίδοναι in the same family of formulas as the end line figures, and establish the fact that the formula is mobile in addition to being flexible. Compare the adjective + noun + verb end line segments above with the following line beginnings:

ἄξια δῶρα δίδωσι ^{tr} | (*Il.*9.261)

μείλιχα δῶρα δίδωσιν ^{tr} | (*h.Hom.*10.2)

ἄμβροτα δῶρα δίδου ⁵ | (*Od.*18.191)

μυρία δῶρα διδοῦς ⁵ | (*Il.*9.699)

Also compare lines in which figures occupy slightly different line positions among the μάχην μάχεσθαι and θεὸς τίθησι formulas:

στησάμενοι δ' **ἐμάχοντο μάχην** ⁷ | ποταμοῖο παρ' ὄχθας, (*Il.*18.533)

στησάμενοι δ' **ἐμάχοντο μάχην** ⁷ | παρὰ νηυσὶ θεοῖσι (*Od.*9.54)

θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι **θεοὶ θέσαν** ^{bd} | εἵνεκα κούρης (*Il.*9.636)

τὸν μὲν ἀρίζηλον **θῆκεν θεὸς** ^{bd} | ὅς περ ἔφηνε (*Il.*2.318)

"μαῖα φίλη, μάργην σε **θεοὶ θέσαν**, ^{bd} | οἳ τε δύνανται (*Od.*23.11)

γῆμεν· ἄφαρ δ' ἀνάπυστα **θεοὶ θέσαν** ἀνθρώποισιν. (*Od.*11.274)

οὐλομένων; τὰ δὲ πῆμα **θεοὶ θέσαν** Ἀργείοισι, (*Od.*11.555).³⁴⁰

³³⁹ Nagy (1974:8²⁴) says that Parry's "description is suitable as a working definition, provided that the phrase 'under the same metrical conditions' is not understood 'in the same position within the line'." Cf. Watkins (17).

³⁴⁰ Only one time in Homer does θεὸς τίθησι fall in a significantly different position: οἶον δὴ τάχ' ἔμελλε **θεὰ** καὶ καρτερὸς ἀνήρ

But expansions of some figures stretch the definition of ‘identical metrical conditions’ beyond its breaking point. In the case of δῶρόν δίδοναι, a few anomalous manifestations of the line initial sequence illustrate this. One breaks the line boundary and represents the sole instance where a participle takes the place of the adjectival attribute, by all accounts an innovative expression:

μάψ ἔνεκ’ ἀλλοτρίων ἀχέων, ⁷ | κεχαρισμένα δ’ αἰεὶ

δῶρα θεοῖσι **δίδωσι** ^{tr} | τοῖ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχουσιν; (*Il.20.298-9*).

The other is perhaps less bold:

τούς οἱ δῶρον ἔδωκεν ἔχειν· ⁷ | (*h.Hom.5.212*).

Expansions such as these would seem to require that in order to group all of the instances of ‘give gift’ in one formulaic family we need to favor thematic rather than structural conceptions of the formula.

In both the line ending and line beginning segments the substantive and verb may be split by an adjective. In the line ending formula this split occurs when the verb form cannot anchor an Adonic. It shifts from the end to the beginning of the chain: attribute + noun + verb >> verb + attribute + noun. The specific metrical length of the segment is slightly less regular in these instances.

⁷ | δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα, (*Il.16.381*³⁴¹, 867, 18.84, 24.278, 534)

⁵ | ἔδοσαν δέ οἱ ἄσπετα δῶρα, (*Od.13.135*)

^{tr} | δίδον περικαλλέα δῶρα (*h.Hom.2.327*)

θησέμεναι· πρότεροι γὰρ ἀεικέα μηχανόωντο. (*Od.20.393-4*).

To which add: τῆς δ’ ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτα **θεοὶ** προπάροιθεν **ἔθηκαν** (*Hes.Op.288*).

³⁴¹ Omitted in most manuscripts.

In one case, ⁵ | δῶσω δέ τοι ἀγλαὰ δῶρα, (*Od.*4.589) the noun + verb sequence would have resulted in a cretic (†δῶρα δῶσω).³⁴² This may also account for another line initial segment where the noun and verb are separate:

δῶρα δέ τοι δῶσω ^{tr} | καλὸν θρόνον ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ (*Il.*14.238).

In the *Hymns* we find adjectives placed between noun and verb in line-beginning phrases:

δῶρον ἀγαυὸν ἔδωκε ^{tr} | (*h.Hom.*4.442)

δῶσω τ' ἀγλαὰ δῶρα ^{tr} | (*h.Hom.*4.462).

This last being the only member of the δῶρόν δίδοναι family, except for one relative expression, where the verb begins a line.

Outside of these patterns there remain only a few lines where the noun and verb are further apart:

δῶρόν τοι καὶ ἐγώ, τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο **δίδωμι**, (*Od.*15.125)

δῶρα δ' ἄγ' ἀλλήλοισι περικλυτὰ **δώμεν** ἄμφω, (*Il.*7.299)

δῶρα μὲν οὐκέτ' ὄνοστα **διδοῖς** Ἀχιλλῆϊ ἄνακτι. (*Il.*9.164).

There is only one strictly line internal instance of δῶρόν δίδοναι:

χαίρετ'· ἀτὰρ καὶ **δῶρα διδώσομεν**, ^{bd} | ὡς τὸ πάρος περ
(*Od.*13.358).

In sum, if we count every phrase featuring (attribute) + δῶρόν + δίδοναι as the same 'ready made surface structure' or 'verbal and grammatical device for encoding and transmitting a given theme or interaction of themes' we must also say that this 'formula' is so flexible and mobile that it defies any all-inclusive structural classification, despite showing certain dominant shapes and localizations. If one were to insist on a structural

³⁴² Not that this is entirely fatal. Note the forms mentioned above, like διδώσειν, that have been stretched to accommodate regular positioning within the line.

analysis, on the other hand, it would be tempting to posit that the idiom in its most prevalent metrical position and classic noun + verb shape (^{bd} | δῶρα δίδωμι) constitutes a generative basis inherently expansive by virtue of the figure's natural propensity to attach an attribute. From this basis the poets could move the idiom around and adapt the various forms of its conjugation to the end-line segment, and also to line-initial segments until the 'formula' itself was structurally opaque. I am aware of how hazardous it has become to speak in the active voice of the Homeric composers 'splitting' formulas and 'moving' idioms around. Particularly in synchronic terms, it is far safer, and in most cases more accurate, to view the majority of mobile and flexible formulas merely as coexistent variations of an essential unit, the generative base of which, if it ever existed, is ultimately unknown to us, and may very well have been unknown to the poets themselves. I wish, however, to make a special case for the 'splitting' of δῶρα δίδωμι and by extension several of the other cognate idioms.

A fundamental difference between the idiomatic *figurae etymologicae* and other formulas in Homeric *Dichtersprache*, like ornamental epithet-name formulas, is that there is evidence that suggests the former's subsistence in real spoken Greek at the time of Homer.³⁴³ It is quite possible that they did not just exist in Epic as an element of poetic verbal artifice, but had synchronic

³⁴³ The evidence for δῶρον δίδοναι is 1) existence of the same idiom, from the same root in Modern Greek; 2) extremely frequent literary and inscriptional (in widely disparate dialects) attestation from ancient sources up to the present day; 3) attestation in authors like Thucydides who do not, as a practice, use the EF, suggestive of a deeper level of acceptability; 4) comparative evidence suggesting either an extremely compelling typology or inheritance of the 'give gift' syntagm: Lat. *donum dare*, Ven. *donom doto*, Osc.-Umb. *dunum dede(d)*, OIr. *dán dorada*, Ved. *dātraṃ dadāti*, later Skt. *dānam dā-*, Aves. *dāθrdm daḍāiti*, Welsh *dall dawn* all from **deh₃*. In Germanic the expression is similarly well-attested, but from a different root, **g^heb^h*- which originally meant 'take' cf. Gabel 'fork' lit. 'instrument for taking' (note that in Hittite the 'give' root **deh₃*. means take and that 'give and 'take' are but different aspects of the same modality) NHG *Gabe geben*, Eng. *gibt gyve*.

corollaries in the actual language of the poets and their audience. There is no reason to believe that these corollaries would not have acted as a basis of comparison for the upwellings of the same phrases in Epic. Obviously, we have no direct evidence from which to make assertions about spoken Greek at the time of Homer. In fact, the ‘regular’ structure that I am about to reconstruct for δῶρα δίδωμι, and by extension the EF as a general phenomenon, rests on literary evidence, and said literary evidence is all that is really needed to support the observations I will make in the course of this Chapter. However, the widely disparate nature of some of the literary evidence makes an ongoing basis in *Umgangssprache*, or at least organic syntax, perhaps the most plausible source for the continuing regularity in the extant expressions of the figures.³⁴⁴

In as much as scholarship on Homeric, and for that matter Indo-European poetic language has focused primarily on diction that distinguishes *Dichtersprache* from *Umgangssprache*,³⁴⁵ it is interesting to note the possibility that the most frequent EFs were actually quite pedestrian. Theories of formulaics, geared primarily to account for the existence of different options for expressions like δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς and ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, would definitely not be the ones best equipped to deal with phrases that had their own form of expression in everyday speech, deviation from which could very well have been felt by listeners and heard by composers.

³⁴⁴ Authors of cross-linguistic studies have primarily viewed the EF as an element of *Dichtersprache* (Schmitt, 261 ff., Euler 1982:25), but Hofmann includes a substantial section on the EF in *Lateinische Umgangssprache* (sec. 88 pgs.94-5), and Haffter, as we saw last chapter, makes the assumption at several junctures that the EF subsisted in everyday speech.

³⁴⁵ Cf. West (2007:3) “From 1853 onwards Kuhn, Theodor Benfey, and others began to identify parallel poetic phrases in different branches of the Indo-European tradition, especially in Greek and Indic: phrases composed of words that corresponded etymologically in the different languages, and expressing concepts such as would not have had a place in ordinary everyday speech but only in an elevated formal type of discourse, in poetry or high rhetoric.”

The assertion of a standard basis for the EF in everyday speech, deviance from which results in a more marked phrase, is to some degree scientific: the hypothesis stands up to tests in living languages. In Present Day English the basic structure of the ‘give gift’ and ‘sing songs’ idioms is verb + attribute + noun, e.g. ‘I gave generous gifts’, ‘I sang my favorite song’, any deviance from this pattern makes the phrase either more marked or unintelligible.³⁴⁶ For instance, ‘generous gifts I gave’ sounds poetic and would not normally be encountered in everyday speech, ‘gifts I gave generous’ is simply flawed syntax. In Modern Greek, perhaps a more pointed example because it admits a far greater degree of inflection than English, inversion of the components of the spoken idiom δίνω (ένα) δώρο is permissible, but calls more attention to the phrase. Obviously, the reasons for these facts are not particular to the cognate idiom. Rather, they trace right back to the most basic structural norms of English and Modern Greek syntax. Keeping this in mind, let us attempt to reconstruct the most basic pattern for the ancient expression δῶρα δίδωμι.

First, evidence both outside of and within Greek suggests that the noun and verb lined up directly adjacent to each other, and, in the main, occurred in that order (noun + verb). Euler’s monograph on Old Italic *dōnom dō* is quite helpful in this regard. Here, we see that in Venetic attestations the noun and verb are always connected, although in this particular case it is more common for the verb to precede the noun (*doto dono.m x7, dono.m doto x1*).³⁴⁷ In Old Latin, Umbrian and Oscan we have the same connected noun-verb order that

³⁴⁶ Available evidence suggests that this syntactical order goes back quite some time: cf. *The kyng gef is men grete giftes* (R. Glouc. (Rolls) 2600, 1297 CE); *gyuen þair giftes overall* (*Fairf.* 1340 CE). Cf. OHG *Sang was gisungen* (Ludw. Grimm, 760), which shows the standard word order in the passive, against the active in MHG *singe ich minen Sanc* (*HMS.* 2.239^a).

³⁴⁷ See Euler (1982:8-9), where he gives complete inscriptional citations.

predominates in Homer: Oscan *dunum deded* (Euler, 11); Umbrian *dunum dede* (Euler, 12); Old Latin *donom dedi[t]*, *dono dat*, *donum datum* (Euler, 15-16). This is just a sampling of possible examples, but note that outside of Venetic, every occurrence of the figure Euler lists has this configuration, and that most of them anchor their admittedly fragmentary phrases. The arrangement and placement of *dōnom dō* in the following inscriptions is thus typical of early Latin, and probably early Italic in general.

C. PLACENTIUS HER F. MARTE **DONU DEDE** (*CIL*² I.62).

IUNONE RE MATRONA PISAVESE **DONO DEDROT** (*CIL*² I.173).

Plautus attests the idiom *dono dare* no less than 21 times. Of these, 10 are in connected noun + verb constructions at line end, e.g.:

quae uoluit, quae postulauit; {te} quoque {ei} dono dedi (*Mil.* 1205)

hanc tibi noctem honoris caussa gratiis dono dabo (*As.* 194)

venire illaec posse credo dona quae ei dono dedi (*Tru.* 544).³⁴⁸

In four others the noun and verb, which is still at line end, are briefly interrupted by intervening matter, e.g. *dono postilla datast* (*Poe.* 467).³⁴⁹ In three the noun and verb are still connected, but the verb comes first (*dedisse dono*, *Am.* 761, cf. *As.* 752, *Mi.* 1148), 3 have verb + noun order with words in between (*Men.* 689, *Mi.* 120, *Poe.* 169), and there is one instance of interrupted noun + verb line internally (*ea caussa equidem illam emi dono quam darem matri meae*, *Mer.* 400). If we start from the supposition, as inscriptional evidence suggests, that *dōno(m) dō* was, by the time of Plautus, a familiar idiom predominantly appearing in that order, and often closing out clauses and sentences, we see first that the majority distribution of Plautine

³⁴⁸ The other connected end line instances of the phrase in Plautus occur at *Am.* 538, 790, *Mi.* *Arg.* I.4, *St.* 665, *Tru.* 279, 802 and 804.

³⁴⁹ Cf. *Am.* 418 (This a questionable reading. Lindsay deletes the noun), 534 and *Ci.* 133.

dono dare corroborates this noun + verb arrangement and anchor position. The other arrangements and positionings of the phrase show that comedic ‘formula’ also enjoyed a certain degree of flexibility and mobility.

The instances of δῶρα δίδωμι in Archaic Greek Epic are not completely dissimilar to the situation in Plautus. The idiom, not including the relatives analyzed below, occurs 22 times in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, 5 times in Hesiod, and 4 times in the Hymns. 17 of these 31 occurrences feature noun + verb in the connected arrangement, in seven others only an adjectival attribute separates the noun and verb. Unlike Plautus, the Homeric phrases are our oldest evidence for the idiom in Greek, so we cannot hope to pre-establish the form of its expression.³⁵⁰ The best we can do is look at subsequent attestations. The sheer number of instances of δῶρα δίδωμι in inscriptional and literary Greek makes a complete listing of them here impractical. I present only a representative sampling meant to confirm the observation that the noun and verb generally were either connected or composed quite close to each other.

An Inscription from Lycia ends a substantial section with the line: ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖς κεχαριμμένα δῶρα δ[έδωκας] (*SEG* 28.1245.17, beginning of the 4th cent. B.C.). The reconstructed perfect active here is, as will be argued in the next chapter, a Homeric impossibility, but note that the whole hexameter, which begins with an epic lengthening of the alpha in ἀθανάτοισι, and contains the same perfect participle as the metrically marked Iliadic segment noted above (⁷ | κεχαρισμένα δ’ αἰεὶ **δῶρα** θεοῖσι **δίδωσι** ^{tr} |) ends in a plausibly reconstructed Adonic EF and is clearly striving to be

³⁵⁰ Euler, (1982:23), notes the lack of the idiom in Mycenaean against *do-ra-qe pe-re* (δῶρα τε φέρει?) (PY Tn 316, 2v 2v. 5v. 8.)

Homeric. Admittedly, the fact that the author of this line was replicating Homeric diction means that the positioning of the cognate phrase is not so much independent evidence for the prevalence of this arrangement as it is a testament to the staying power of the Homeric formula itself. There is less derivative inscriptional evidence, however, that supports the end line connection of noun and verb. On a 2nd cent. BC statue of Memnon line 2 reads αὐδήεντι θεῶ μουσικὰ δῶρα διδούς (*Ep.Gr.* 1000) to which Kaibel compares κτήσεος ἐξ ὀσίης ψυχικὰ δῶρα διδούς (*Ep.Gr.* 815.4). Other inscriptions support the direct proximity of noun and verb, but are more ambiguous as to their order.³⁵¹ Also note that the arrangement is by no means restricted to the cognate syntagm: ἰέρια τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος δῶρον ἔθηκεν (*SEG* 27.351).

Moving now into the evidence of literary Greek, Herodotus attests δῶρα δίδωμι in the following arrangements: δῶρα ἔδωκε (1.53.2), δῶρα δώσω (8.5.2), δῶρα δώσειν (1.84.1), δῶρον δοθῆναι (3.42.1), διδοῖ δῶρον (4.172.2), διδόντες τὰ δῶρα (3.21.1), δώσω οἱ δῶρα (7.8.81), δῶρα ταῦτα τοι διδοῖ (3.21.1), and with broadest separation δῶρα οἱ ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος ἐδίδου (3.160.2). In Xenophon we find: ἄλλα δῶρα ἔδωκεν (*Cyr.* 8.5.17); δῶρα δόντες (*An.* 4.7.27); δῶρα δοῦς (*An.* 7.7.8); πολλὰ δῶρα δόντες (*Cyr.* 7.4.9); πολλὰ δὲ δῶρα διαδοῦναι (*Cyr.* 1.4.26); δῶρων ὦν ἐδίδοσαν (*Cyr.* 7.2.23); δῶρα πᾶσι διέδωκεν (*Cyr.* 8.7.1); δῶρά γε ἦν διδῶσιν (*Cyr.* 2.1.13); δῶρον ἐκ βασιλέως ἐδόθη (*HG.* 3.1.6); δῶρα ἀμέμπως

³⁵¹ Cf. δῶρα οὐκ ἔδωκα οὐδὲ δώσω (*SEG* 29.1130 bis. 49-50, 1st half of 2nd cent. BC) δῶρον ἔδωκεν θεῶ (*SEG* 36.590.4, 181 AD), but cf. γράψας τῷ διδόντι δῶρον (*SEG* 31.696, early 5th cent. BC); with a dative intervening: Μογέα δίδοτι ταῖ γυναικὶ δῶρον (*CEG* 446, ca.450-30 BC, black figured cantharus); and ματρὶ δὲ δῶκ[ε] / δῶρον (Peek, #946.34-4, 1st, 2nd cent. BCE). Much later there is also end line δωρήσατο δῶρον# (*SEG* 43.911.10).

έδίδου (*HG.3.1.13*); with verb + noun order πολλά καὶ καλὰ ἔδωκε δῶρα (*Cyr. 8.4.26*); and once across a coordinating conjunction τε τὸ ἔκπωμα δέδωκας καὶ Χρυσάντῳ τὸ δῶρον (*Cyr.8.4.27*). Further examples could be adduced *ad nauseum*, but they would only strengthen the impression that the two elements of δῶρα δίδωμι were most often directly adjacent to each other, that, if they were separated, it was usually not by more than one or two words, and that the most common order was noun verb. These facts are, of course, not restricted to just this, or any cognate idiom. They derive from the general syntax of Greek, as the arrangement of *dōnom dō* derives from the syntax of Italic. But in the case of the EF, where phonetic echoing was at issue, there may have been an extra incentive to keep the assonant elements close together.

The strength of the generality that the nominal and verbal elements of δῶρον διδόναι were most often connected, would not mean much in this study if the Homeric instances of the figure in which the noun and verb are separated did not show a marked stylistic difference from the connected phrases. In fact, Homeric usage makes it quite clear that separation of δῶρον and διδόναι occurred at junctures where additional emphasis was required of the basic *Ausdruckverstärkung*.

Very few of the Homeric uses of δῶρον διδόναι involve the actual giving of a gift in the present tense, with the act and object of giving witnessed first hand by the audience. The figures with the verb in the aorist simply mention that an item already in someone's possession had once been a gift. One formula (**δόσαν** ἀγλαὰ **δῶρα**) references the horses that the gods gave to Peleus, (*Il.16.381, 867*), a team of mules the Mysians gave Priam (*Il.24.278*), the armor of Achilles stripped by Hector off the body of Patroclus

(*Il.*18.84), and the generally good lot that came out of Zeus' urn for Peleus (*Il.*24.534). The first three of these occur in narrative in explanatory, rather matter of fact statements. The last two are spoken by Achilles, and while there might be some bitterness of tone, they are nonetheless, momentary digressions from the main thrust of the dialogue and the giving of gifts is not showcased at length. Elsewhere, one end line figure refers to a mixing bowl the Sidonians gave to Thoas (Θόαντι δὲ δῶρον ἔδωκαν, *Il.*23.745). This bowl is the prize for the footrace, and the substitution of the dative for an adjectival attribute serves to very quickly lay emphasis on Thoas as a recipient, long ago, of this bowl as gift, but once again the whole segment is but a short introduction to the main action: the race itself. Next a slightly separated end line figure describes everything the Phaeacians gave Odysseus (ἔδοσαν δὲ οἱ ἄσπετα δῶρα, *Od.*13.135). Even the little bit of separation here results in additional emphasis, since Poseidon is speaking in indignation that Odysseus has not only made it home, but also acquired great wealth in the process. The remaining Adonic figures refer to unspecified (*Il.*24.425, *Od.*11.357) and often fictitious (*Od.*18.279, 20.342, 24.314) gifts. Two figures involve gifts that are enumerated, but subsequently refused, as when Hera offers Hypnos a bribe for putting Zeus to sleep (*Il.*14.238),³⁵² and when Menelaus offers Telemachos a team of horses, a chariot and a cup.

This last case (δώσω δὲ τοι ἀγλαὰ δῶρα, *Od.*4.589), is most likely meant by Homer to portray Menelaus as being somewhat emphatic, the noun and verb are separated as in the figure put in the mouth of an indignant Poseidon above, and noun + verb order similarly inverted. The Horses and

³⁵² Δῶρα δὲ τοι δώσω καλὸν θρόνον ἄφθιτον αἰεὶ. He refuses the throne, but acquiesces later when she offers him the Grace Pasithea.

chariot, however, prove to be bombastic gifts, and are rejected by Telemachus, who, in figurative response says that he would prefer something he can put in his storeroom: **δῶρον** δ', ὅτι κέ μοι **δώης**, κειμήλιον ἔστω (*Od.*4.600). Note that he changes the plural δῶρα to a single δῶρον. Menelaus, not one to be verbally outdone, responds in even more elaborate terms:

δώρων δ', ὅσσ' ἐν ἐμῷ οἴκῳ **κειμήλια** **κεῖται**,

δώσω, ὃ κάλλιστον καὶ τιμηέστατόν ἐστι.

δώσω τοι κρητῆρα τετυγμένον·

Of the gifts which in my house lie stored in the storeroom

I will give the most beautiful and valuable,

I will give you a wrought mixing bowl (*Od.*4.613-15).

Menelaus may have been corrected as to the appropriateness of the gifts he offered, but he will not be outdone in terms of figurative expression. He has now separated his initial figure, which Telemachus extended from the trochaic to the spondee caesura, all the way across a line boundary. He has also managed to sandwich one figure within another by putting κειμήλια κεῖται, which in fact represents an escalation of Telemachus' more periphrastic κειμήλιον ἔστω, between the two elements of δῶρων ... δώσω. In general terms, the two are engaging in an exchange of figures as they talk about an exchange of gifts, and the fact that Telemachus picks up on Menelaus' original figure may be a clue that it was more noticeable than other instances of δῶρα δίδωμι which pass by without remark.

In *Iliad* nine the gifts that Agamemnon offers Achilles are referred to by δῶρα δίδωμι three times. In two of these instances the arrangement of the figure is unremarkable. Once, Diomedes wishes that Agamemnon had never

offered the gifts (μυρία **δῶρα διδούς**, 699). At line 261 Odysseus urges Achilles to relent, since Agamemnon's gifts are suitable ἄξια **δῶρα δίδωσι** μεταλλήξαντι χόλοιο. He subsequently enumerates the gifts, which had already been listed once in this book. At line 164, on the other hand, just after Agamemnon himself has listed the gifts, Nestor expresses his approval of them by means of a more remarkable arrangement of the figure:

δῶρα μὲν οὐκέτ' ὄνοστὰ **διδοῖς** Ἀχιλῆϊ ἄνακτι·

Gifts no longer to be scorned you are giving to lord Achilles (*//*.9.164).

An elevation of the figure here is not surprising, since the gifts that have just been enumerated are without parallel in Epic. In fact, it is more surprising that Odysseus did not refer to them later with a similarly inflated arrangement, rather, he says, in the regular way, simply that they are suitable. The 'appropriateness' of Agamemnon's gifts has been subject to opposing views. Many have considered his offer impeccable according to the value system of Epic. But, as noted recently by B. Sammons, scholars who approach Homer from an anthropological perspective have questioned this view:

Their argument is essentially that Agamemnon's offer of splendid gifts in compensation to Achilles fails precisely by being too generous, so that it amounts to a kind of gift attack, or "potlatch" tactic, whereby the offer of material compensation becomes so splendid as to publicly subject Achilles to Agamemnon, because excessive gifts necessarily belittle the recipient and aggrandize the donor (Sammons 2008:364).

Sammons does not wholly embrace this view, nor do I. But we do not need to see the gifts as an intentional potlatch tactic to motivate the sensibleness of downplaying them as book nine progresses. Agamemnon may offer them with good intent, and Nestor wholeheartedly approve, but in the course of events

others develop different views, and a figural progression in which the gifts are first inflated (Nestor), then regularized (Odysseus), and finally degraded (Diomedes), can be made sense of if we see in the differing views of scholars, a plurality of assessments within the *Iliad* itself.

There are only two figures within the δῶρόν διδόναι group where the noun and verb are further separated than in Nestor's comment above, and these constitute the only two times when the figure immediately involves a depiction of actual gift-giving that we witness firsthand in the present. First, In *Iliad* 7, after Hector and Ajax have battled until nightfall, Hector proposes that they stop fighting and exchange gifts:

δῶρα δ' ἄγ' ἀλλήλοισι περικλυτὰ δώομεν ἄμφω,

gifts!, come now, to each other, glorious ones let us both give (*//.7.299*).

Immediately thereafter the gifts are described and exchanged:

ᾠς ἄρα φωνήσας δῶκε ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον

σὺν κολεῶ τε φέρων καὶ ἐϋτμήτῳ τελαμῶνι·

Αἴας δὲ ζωστήρα δίδου φοίνικι φαεινόν.

Having said that, (Hector) presented a silver-studded sword,
with its sheath, bringing it there also with its well-cut strap.

But Ajax presented a waist belt radiant in crimson (*//.7.303-5*).

The greatest degree of separation in the group, however, occurs in *Odyssey* 15, when Helen gives Telemachus an elegant gown intended to be his future bride's wedding dress. Before the actual exchange the gift itself is elaborately introduced:

Ἑλένη δὲ παρίστατο φωριαμοῖσιν,

ἐνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι παμποίκιοι, οὐς κάμεν αὐτή.

τῶν ἔν' ἀειραμένη Ἑλένη φέρε, δῖα γυναικῶν,

ὄς κάλλιστος ἔην ποικίλμασιν ἠδὲ μέγιστος,
ἀστὴρ δ' ὡς ἀπέλαμπεν· ἔκειτο δὲ νείατος ἄλλων.

Helen stood by the storage chests
where there were gowns of every intricacy, which she had made
herself. Lifting up one of them, Helen, goddess among women, carried
forth the one that was the most beautiful in its fine embroidery, and the
fullest; like a star it shone, and was stored there under the others
(*Od.*15.104-8).

The diction of Helen herself, when she offers the gown to Telemachus, is no
less elaborate:

Ἑλένη δὲ παρίστατο καλλιπάρηος
πέπλον ἔχουσ' ἐν χερσίν, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε·
δῶρόν τοι καὶ ἐγώ, τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο **δίδωμι**,
μνήμ' Ἑλένης χειρῶν, πολυηράτου ἐς γάμου ὥρην,
σῆ ἀλόχῳ φορέειν· τεῖος δὲ φίλῃ παρὰ μητρὶ
κεῖσθαι ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ. σὺ δέ μοι χαίρων ἀφίκοιο
οἶκον ἐϋκτίμενον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.”
ὥς εἰποῦσ' ἐν χερσὶ τίθει, ὃ δ' ἐδέξατο χαίρων.

Helen stood close, the flush of beauty on her cheeks;
holding the gown in her hands, she spoke these words and addressed
him by name: “a gift to you, I also for my part, dear child, this gown,
give, remembrance of Helen’s hands, for the time of your lovely, lovely
wedding for your own wife to wear. May you fare well and reach
your fine home and fatherland.” So speaking,
she placed it in his hands, and he quite gladly received it. (*Od.*123-30).

I have deliberately translated line 125 with disjointed syntax to underline its uniqueness among the idiomatic *figurae*, a uniqueness which, in this case, derives entirely from the splitting of the phrase and discombobulation of the standard attribute + noun + verb word order: the demonstrative pronoun has taken emphatic position in the final, Adonic segment by supplanting the cognate noun. In sum, the arrangement of the figure and formula has in every way been molded to lay emphasis on the handing over of this lovely present.

Now that we have at least glimpsed the context of all the cases of δῶρόν δίδοναι – at least the ones not split by a relative pronoun -- a surprisingly precise continuum arises within the broader entitlement continuum I delineated in Chapter 3. In short, we can add decimal points to our system. At the very low end of the scale (1.0) are the metrically standard phrases that merely provide the additional and to some degree extraneous information that an item was a gift at some point in its past.³⁵³ Also down at this level are the several general statements about gift giving and reports of unspecified gifts with the noun + verb arrangement in the Adonic. Here I would also put the line beginning, but nonetheless standardly configured lines that first downplay, then denigrate the perhaps overly extravagant nature of Agamemnon's offer to Achilles. Moving just a bit up the scale (say 1.2) we have phrases where the adjective, noun and verb have been slightly more separated. I include here Poseidon's indignant complaint to Zeus, and Menelaus' overly ambitious offer to Telemachus. Note that I do not mean to imply that metrical placement and syntax are the only means by which a figure might be slightly elevated on the

³⁵³ Here I have in mind specifically Θόαντι δὲ δῶρον ἔδωκαν· and all five instances of the δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα formula.

scale. For instance, I would put the description of the physical attributes that Athena gives Penelope at least on this level:

ἄμβροτα δῶρα δίδου, ἵνα μιν θησαΐατ' Ἀχαιοί.

She gave her immortal gifts, so the Achaeans would be in awe of her
(*Od.*18.191).

In this case the phrase has additional impact not because of its meter or syntax, but because of the uniqueness of the adjective ἄμβροτα. This is the only time this particular adjective is used with the figure. Now, moving up the scale of stylistic impact and noun-verb separation still further (1.5) we have Nestor's declaration that Agamemnon's gifts should no longer be scorned. Finally, at the top end of this sub-continuum we have the two times the idiom actually involves an outright exchange of gifts: Hector-Ajax (1.8) and Helen-Telemachos (1.9). Note that the structures at the low end of the sub-scale meet with the greatest number and most exact structural parallels outside of Homer.³⁵⁴ While those at the high end are always in the minority as far as parallels go. As the above analysis shows these facts hold true not just for Greek outside of Homer, but for Italic as well. Plato also achieves emphasis by sandwiching material into the space between δῶρόν and δίδοναι in an extended figure highlighting the etymological relationship between traitorous graft (προδίδωμι) and the type of giftgiving that amounts to extortion:

οἳ τὸ δίκαιον οὐκ ἄν ποτε προδοίεν ἔνεκα δῶρων παρὰ ἀδίκων
ἀνδρῶν ἀνοσίως διδομένων

who would never betray justice for the gifts by unjust men sacrilegiously
given (*Lg.*907a).

³⁵⁴ cf. δῶρον ἔδωκαν, *Il.*23.745, δῶρα ἔδωκεν, *Hes. Th.*400, *Fr.*10.61, *Hdt.*1.53.2, *Xen. Cyr.* 8.5.17 and the majority of purely structural parallels listed above.

For pure visual effect I include the following presentation of lines of increasing separation and emphasis meant to represent the gap between 1.0 and 1.9 on the stylistic continuum:

ἄξια δῶρα δίδωσι
 δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα
 μυρία δῶρα διδούς
 ἄσπετα δῶρα δίδωμι.
 ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδοῦσιν·
 δώσω δέ τοι ἀγλαὰ δῶρα
 ἔδοσαν δέ οἱ ἄσπετα δῶρα
 δῶρα μὲν οὐκέτ' ὄνοστα διδοῖς
 δῶρα δ' ἄγ' ἀλλήλοισι περικλυτὰ δώομεν
 δῶρόν τοι καὶ ἐγώ, τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο δίδωμι

4.1.1 The intervention of a relative between noun and verb as a process of expansion:

Separation of the nominal and verbal components of an EF by a relative often results in different line placements. Specifically, the cognate noun and verb may be more widely separated, although we also see patterns reminiscent of the non-relative figures. The noun may come earlier in the line while the relative + verb makes up the Adonic as in this rather proverbial line:

ἀλλ' ὃ γε σιγῇ δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι, ^{bd} | ὅτι διδοῖεν

But let him keep in silence the gifts of the gods, which they give
(*Od.*18.142).

The noun + relative + verb may comprise a line initial segment of a shape similar to the adjective + noun + verb sequences in Hector's unspecified and scorned mention of gifts Achilles will get if he spares his life. As the metrical

nature of this phrase is similar to other, lower-end structures (but not the lowest), so is the basic circumstance (scorned) of the gifts:

δῶρα τά τοι δώσουσι ^{tr} | πατήρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ, (*Il.22.341*).

cf. ἄξια δῶρα δίδωσι ^{tr} | (*Il.9.261*)

But the relative is likely to extend this configuration, either by inclusion of the adjectival attribute in addition to the relative (proverbial in the description of Zeus' urn):

δώρων οἶα δίδωσι κακῶν, ⁷ | ἕτερος δὲ ἐάων· (*Il.24.528*).³⁵⁵

Or by inclusion of a dative recipient (a gift refused by Athena as Mentēs):

δώρον δ' ὅττι κέ μοι **δοῦναι** ⁷ | φίλον ἦτορ ἀνώγη (*Od.1.316*).

δώρον δ' ὅττι κέ μοι **δοίης**, ⁷ | κειμήλιον ἔστω· (*Od.4.600*).³⁵⁶

Alternatively, the relative may bring about a caesura in the midst of the figure:

πομπή καὶ φίλα **δῶρα**, ^{tr} | τά οἱ **δίδομεν** φιλέοντες. (*Od.8.545*).

But, for the most part, composition with a relative enables separation. This occurs to a degree shown also by the non-relative phrases:

δῶρα τά οἱ ξεῖνος Λακεδαίμονι **δῶκε** τυχήσας (*Od.21.13*)

ὥς τοι **δῶρ'** ἀποπέμψω, ^{tr} | ἄ τοι Μενέλαος **ἔδωκε**. (*Od.17.76*).

But frequently the relatives show wider separation than the non-relatives.

While the noun and verb of the non-relative cases of δῶρόν διδόναι always occur in the same line, in a significant number of the relative phrases they appear in successive lines:³⁵⁷

δῶρα ἐμήs παρὰ νηὸς ἐνεικέμεν, **ὅσσ'** Ἀχιλῆϊ

³⁵⁵ Delay of the adjective (κακῶν) here must facilitate some extra emphasis.

³⁵⁶ This figure has already been discussed above as a short extension of Menelaus' figure.

³⁵⁷ There is one Hesiodic fragment where the figure splits over two lines without the aid of a relative:

μνάτο· πλεῖστα δὲ **δῶρα** μετὰ ξανθὸν Μενέλαον
μνηστήρων **ἐδίδου**· μάλα δ' ἤθελε ὄν κατὰ θυμόν (*Hes.Fr.204.41-2*).

χθιζὸν ὑπέστημεν **δώσειν**, ἀγέμεν τε γυναῖκας. (*Il.*19.194-5)
δώρων δ' ὅσσ' ἐν ἐμῷ οἴκῳ κειμήλια κείται,
δώσω ὃ κάλλιστον καὶ τιμηέστατόν ἐστιν. (*Od.*4.613-4=15.113-14).³⁵⁸

ἐξέφερεν θαλάμοιο, τίθει δ' ἐνὶ κάλλιμα **δῶρα**,
ἐσθῆτα χρυσόν τε, **τά** οἱ Φαίηκες **ἔδωκαν**. (*Od.*8.439-40).
νηὶ δ' ἐνὶ πρύμνῃ ἐξαίνυτο κάλλιμα **δῶρα**,
ἐσθῆτα χρυσόν τε, **τά** οἱ Μενέλαος **ἔδωκε**. (*Od.*15.206-7).

The figure from *Iliad* nineteen, which involves the furthest separation of noun and verb within the δῶρόν διδόναι group, occurs in a rather matter of fact manner when Agamemnon orders Odysseus to fetch the gifts he promised Achilles. It creates the impression that distant separation by means of an intervening relative does not necessitate the same degree of emphasis as a similar degree of separation among the non-relatives. The figures from *Odyssey* eight and fifteen occur in narrative and facilitate the same impression. As discussed above, however, the figure from *Odyssey* 4 is spoken by Menelaus in a very affected setting, while its doublet in fifteen occurs at the actual giving of the mixing bowl. In short, the relative phrases are a much more heterogeneous group in terms of stylistic profile. It is also quite difficult to apply one structural definition of the formula to the relative figures.

The overall impression is that intervention of a relative made distancing of the noun and verb unremarkable in terms of both style and meter. In general, whether or not we want to look at all the cases of δῶρόν διδόναι as a formula, set of analogous formulas, or a family of formulas is, to my mind, not as important as the observation that δῶρόν διδόναι itself, and by

³⁵⁸ Discussed in detail above.

extension all of the frequently recurring figures, constituted a useful and adaptable building block within the traditional diction of Epic. In the cases of the non-relative phrases we have seen that there was a basic structure primarily localized at the end of the line, but also possible at the line beginning, and that the disruption of this structure facilitated the stylistic agenda of specific passages and books. On the other hand, several of the relative clauses that house the cognate verb, and hence create the figure are thematically quite static. It would be difficult to argue that such expansions as $^{tr} | \tau\acute{\alpha} \text{ οἱ Φαίηκες ἔδωκαν}$ and $^{bd} | \tau\acute{\alpha} \text{ οἱ Φαίηκες ἔδωκαν}$, since we already know who gave the gifts, are not, at least to some degree, motivated by metrical convenience.

It has become apparent by now that it is easiest to favor thematic definitions of the formula to motivate inclusion of a particular figure in one formulaic family. But structural definitions also have interesting and at times formulaically unifying implications for the figures. The line beginning expression ($\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu^5 |$), since this phrase never attaches an attribute when the noun is in the plural, does not regularly expand in the same way as (+ attribute) figures.³⁵⁹ It can optionally expand with additional descriptive material relevant to the verbal action:

$\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\iota \text{ παρήμενοι }^{bd} |$ (*//*.24.652)

$\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\zeta\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omicron\varsigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu^{bd} |$ (*//*.23.78)

But, for the most part, it makes up a simple noun-verb pattern at the onset of the line.

$\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu^5 |$ καθαρὰ χροῖ εἶματ' ἔχοντα. (*Od.*6.61)

³⁵⁹ The one time the noun is in the singular it does attach an attribute and spans two lines: ἀρίστην / βουλήν βουλεύση⁵ | (*//*.9.75).

βουλὰς βουλεύειν, ⁵ | ἢ φευγέμεν ἢ ἐ μάχεσθαι. (*Il.*10.147=327).³⁶⁰

According to a structural/syntactic view, phrases such as this one, attributeless etymological accusatives plus denominative verbs in heavily spondaic line beginnings, might constitute a formula. This would enable us to connect, perhaps genetically, recurring set phrases with nonce coinages:

βουλὰς βουλεύουσι ^{tr} | >>
αἰχμὰς δ' αἰχμάσσουσι ^{tr} | (*Il.*4.324)
τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο ^{tr} | (*Il.*7.449)
οἶνον οἰνοχοεῦντες ^{tr} | (*Od.*3.472)
βουλὰς βουλεύειν ⁵ | >>
μῦθον μυθείσθην ⁵ | (*Od.*3.140)
ξεῖνους ξεινίζειν, ⁵ | (*Od.*3.355).

By lifting metrical constraints on 'same formula' a bit we could assert that one formulaic template has asserted itself in all of the above segments. If we were willing to stretch this structural/syntactic model further, the next step would be to include in this category other once or twice occurring figures of any case in the first parts of lines, whether they be heavily spondaic and denominative or not, as based on kindred formulaic templates and compositional strategies:

ζώσατο δὲ ζώνη ⁵ | (*Il.*14.181)
δαίτην δαινυμένους ⁵ | (*Od.*7.50)
δοίης δωτίνην ⁵ | (*Od.*9.268)
ἦδὺ ποτὸν πίνων ⁵ | (*Od.*9.354).
κλισμῶ κεκλιμένη ⁵ | (*Od.*17.97)
θῆκεν ἐν ἀκμοθέτῳ ⁵ | (*Il.*18.476)

³⁶⁰ The lone Hesiodic instance of this phrase is positionally and syntactically innovative and non-formulaic: ἡ δὲ κακὴ **βουλή** τῷ **βουλεύσαντι** κακίστη. (*Op.*266).

ἐν δ' ἔθετ' ἀκμοθέτῳ ⁵ | (*Od.*8.274)
 τῆδ' ἄτη ἄσασ ⁵ | (*Il.*8.237)
 μηδὲ δίκην δικάσης, ⁵ | (*Hes.Fr.*338)³⁶¹
 ὄζῳ ἐφεζόμενος ⁵ | (*Hes.Sc.*394)
 τῆ γάρ τοι νῆ νήματ' ^{tr} | (*Hes.Op.*777)
 οἷ δ' ἀγορὰς ἀγόρευον ^{tr} | (*Il.*2.788)
 ἐς δ' ἀγορὴν ἀγέροντο ^{tr} | (*Il.*18.245)
 φήμην τίς μοι φάσθω ^{tr} | (*Od.*20.100)
 ἦ βέλεσι βάλλωσι ^{tr} | (*Od.*16.277)
 ἀμφὶ δὲ νηὸν ἔνασσαν ^{tr} | (*h.Hom.*3.298)
 κληῖσαι κληῖδι ^{3.5} | (*Od.*21.241)
 ὡς θάνον οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ ⁷ | (*Od.*11.412)
 ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο πόλις ⁷ | (*Il.*20.217)
 ἰδρῶ θ' ὄν ἴδρωσα μόγῳ, ⁷ | (*Il.*4.27).
 βόσκοντ' Ἡελίοιο βόες ⁷ | (*Od.*12.128)³⁶²
 ἦμος κόκκυξ κοκκύζει ⁷ | (*Hes.Op.*486)
 ὄσσοι δὴ βέλεσιν βεβλήαται ^{bd} | (*Il.*11.657).
 οὔτε φυτεύουσιν χερσὶν φυτὸν ^{bd} | (*Od.*9.108)³⁶³
 οὔ ποθ' ἐν ἱρεύουσ' ἱερήϊον ^{bd} | (*Od.*14.94)
 ἀπρηκτον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν ^{bd} | ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι (*Il.*2.121)

³⁶¹ This phrase occurs one other time in Hesiod: δωροφάγους, οἳ τήνδε **δίκην** ἐθέλουσι **δικάσαι**. (*Op.*39).

³⁶² This EN is most likely pseudo-etymological. Its other Homeric instance is a bit more spread out: **βοσκέσκονθ'** ἔλικες καλαὶ **βόες** εὐρυμέτωποι (*Od.*12.355). In the *Hymns* it occurs over two lines:

ἔνθα θεῶν μακάρων **βόες** ἄμβροτοι αὐλιν ἔχεσκον
βοσκόμεναι λειμῶνας ἀκηρασίους ἐρατεινούς. (*h.Hom.*4.71-2).

³⁶³ While this denominative figure occurs only once in Epic the *Hymns* attest a non-denominative phrase from the same root: οὐδὲ τρύγην οἴσεις, οὔτ' ἄρ **φυτὰ** μυρία **φύσεις** (3.55).

ἀντίβιον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν^{bd} | ἡδὲ μάχεσθαι (//.3.435).³⁶⁴

All of these cognate phrasal segments could be grouped under the same heading by virtue of their position at the beginning of the line, the fact that they occur only once or twice, and that they do not generally attach an attribute.³⁶⁵ If we insist on this basis that they represent the same formula we are straying pretty far from conventional definitions, but the observation remains that if composers of ancient Epic wished to coin a new etymological phrase, or incorporate an idiom not elsewhere part of poetic diction into hexameter it is very likely that they would do so at the beginning of the line, and would not be doing so in order to support an attribute. More often than not the noun would be denominative and the segment loaded with spondees.³⁶⁶

It is clear that the etymological figures *en masse* constituted, in the eyes of epic composers, a tangible component helpful in the crafting of their verses regardless of how the figures fit into the greater framework of formulaic theory. If, however, we are tempted to posit, as a structural formulaic family, a template whereby cognate noun, optional attribute and cognate verb combine in any order to form a line segment, we should also observe that, while there are some prevalent patterns in the placements of the figures, there are also a significant number of anomalies and that, ultimately, no single structural model will apply to all of them. Rather than try to unite all of the EFs in one formulaic family, it should suffice to have outlined, using δῶρόν δίδοναι as a paradigmatic sample, the various ways one may look at the figures in terms of

³⁶⁴ This might be complicated by the fact that πολεμίζειν ἡδὲ μάχεσθαι is itself a fixed formula (//.x8).

³⁶⁵ The obvious exception is (+attribute) πόλεμον πολεμίζειν.

³⁶⁶ I should make clear that this is not universally the case. For example, the *Iliad* twice attests³ | οἶνον δὲ μελίφρονα οἰνίζεσθε (8.506,546). There is also the concurrent tendency, discussed in more detail below, for affected/coined figures to split their noun and verb over two lines.

different definitions of the formula. Ultimately, I want to make it clear that by noting, for instance, that the EF often localizes in the Adonic in phrases of somewhat striking acoustic similarity (^{bd} | εἶματα εἶται, ^{bd} | πῆματα πάσχει), I am neither confirming, nor denying the possibility that all of these figures together represent one structural ‘formula’. At the same time, at the level of syntax, available evidence suggests that the EF had a usual, familiar mode of expression, and that deviation from that mode called additional attention to the phrase.

4.2 The figures as mnemonic devices:

It is often asserted that the *schema etymologias* served as a mnemonic device within the Homeric oral tradition:

“The repetition of sounds produced by means of the alliteration and concatenation of cognates has an immediate effect on memorization.... Besides mere sounds, compositional blocks such as lists, and catalogues within the epics, typical scenes, that is, action sequences, such as contests, meals, journeys, etc. similes and rings, among others, prompt the singer’s memory” (Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, 36).³⁶⁷

The assertion of ‘mnemonic devices’ is not without its problems in its application to oral poetics, and does not apply uniformly to both the spontaneously composing singer and rhapsode reciting from memory. A.B. Lord’s study of Slavic traditions led him to adduce the following caveat in relation to the formulae as ‘necessary’ compositional tools:

For while I have stressed their usefulness and necessity in composition as essential considerations in studying formulas and the whole

³⁶⁷ For another formulation of this idea of the ‘rhythmical schemata’ as mnemonic devices see Gonda, 1959, 25.

formulaic style, it may well be that these characteristics belong to the preservation and development of that style and of the formula rather than to their origins (65).

In this vein, we should keep in mind that the EF was not a necessary component of epic verse, but an optional, if convenient tool subject to a careful selection process.³⁶⁸ Examination of the proliferation, or absence of etymological figures in a few closely related compositional themes, or blocks, will illustrate my point. First, none of the figures ever appear in an arming scene, one of the primary ‘themes’ discussed by Lord. The arming of Paris serves as a good example of this:³⁶⁹

κνημίδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμησιν ἔθηκε
καλάς, ἀργυρέοισιν ἐπισφυρίοις ἀραρυίας·
δεύτερον αὖ θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσι ἐδυνεν
οἶο κασιγνήτοιο Λυκάονος· ἤρμοσε δ’ αὐτῷ.
ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρ’ ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον
χάλκεον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε·
κρατὶ δ’ ἐπ’ ἰφθίμῳ κυνέην εὐτυκτον ἔθηκεν
ἵππουριν· δεινὸν δὲ λόφος καθύπερθεν ἔνευεν·
εἶλετο δ’ ἄλκιμον ἔγχος, ὃ οἱ παλάμηφιν ἀρήρει (//.3.330-38).

Note that nominal polyptoton (κνημίδας κνήμησιν), though still not abundant, is not wholly absent from the arming scenes.³⁷⁰ The absence of the EF in

³⁶⁸ I limit the frame of reference here to only those etymological figures included in this study, the instances of noun-verb, same phrase polyptoton. Under more expansive definitions the statement would be far more difficult to support. See 1.1.

³⁶⁹ Chapter 5 of *The Singer of Tales* deals specifically with the themes. For discussion of the Homeric arming scenes see 89 ff.

³⁷⁰ Descriptions of the arming of Patroclus (//.131-44), Agamemnon and Achilles are similarly devoid of the EF. Κνημίδας κνήμησιν begins all these scenes. The arming of Achilles features verbal polyptoton in a simile: ὡς δ’ ὅτ’ ἂν ἐκ πόντοιο σέλας ναύτησι φανήη / **καιομένοιο** πυρός, τό τε **καίεται** ὑψόθ’ ὄρεσφι. (//.19.375-6).

arming scenes most likely falls in line with the overarching observation that the figures were eschewed in deference to the extra-sober tone of battle narrative. In scenes where a Homeric character puts on everyday clothes, on the other hand, εἴματα ἔννυσθαι is nearly ubiquitous, and when Hera dresses for the seduction of Zeus ornate and studied etymological figures emerge in quick succession.³⁷¹ Another highly formulaic ‘theme’ in which the EF is conspicuously absent is that of sacrifice. This absence is made more remarkable by the fact that sacrificial contexts were such a rich environment for the EF both in later Greek and in other Indo-European traditions.³⁷²

Other themes consistently feature one or more etymological figures and, in fact, some of the more lengthy, repeated segments amalgamate multiple repetitions. The council theme generally commences with a separated, paronomastic figure portraying the processes of summoning and gathering:³⁷³

αὐτὰρ ὃ **κηρύκεσσι** λιγυφθόγγοισι κέλευσε
κηρύσσειν ἀγορῆν δὲ κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιοῦς·
οἱ μὲν **ἐκήρυσσον**, τοὶ δ' **ἠγείροντο** μάλ' ὦκα (*Il.*2.50-53).³⁷⁴

This three line ‘formula’ repeats with little variation, in introductory passages, at *Il.*2.442-444 and *Od.*2.6-8. *Iliad* 2.442-444 repeats a less paronomastic but still separated imperatival figure a few lines before:

³⁷¹ This passage and its figures, πλοκάμους ἔπλεξε, ἐάνον ἔσαθ' and ζώσατο δὲ ζώνη are cited in full and discussed above (204-5).

³⁷² For full discussion of this point, examples of typical Homeric sacrifice scenes, and comparison with other Indo-European sacral diction see (185 ff).

³⁷³ For perception of κήρυξ κηρύσσει as a ‘separated’ figure and comparison with separated structures in Sanskrit see Gonda. Parallels for the separation of κήρυξ and κηρύσσει in Greek inscriptions, a syntactic fact that must have been influential in its deployment in hexameter, see above (161-2).

³⁷⁴ Cf. Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (36) speaking of the EF: “This technique is marked by a hammering acoustic effect and is most frequently used for its capacity to introduce briefly but solidly new themes, whose expeditious movement and succession it mediates.”

Ἄλλ' ἄγε **κήρυκες** μὲν Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων

λαὸν **κηρύσσοντες** ἀγειρόντων κατὰ νῆας, (*Il.*2.436-437).³⁷⁵

The interlocking figure in the three line formula, ἀγορὴν ἡγείροντο, although its two components occur across coordinating conjunctions, is still compositionally significant. Elsewhere, several figures from **h₂ger-* introduce the assembly theme with or without further repetition and/or paronomasia. They depict the movement of people to the assembly or place of assembly, of their own accord or summoned:

ἐς δ' **ἀγορὴν ἀγέροντο** ^{tr} | πάρος δόρποιο μέδεσθαι.

They assembled into the assembly place before thinking of dinner (*Il.*18.245)

ἀλλ' ἄγετε, πρὶν κείνον **ὀμηγυρίσασθαι** Ἀχαιοὺς
εἰς **ἀγορὴν**.

But come now, before he calls an assembly of the Achaeans, into the place of assembly (*Od.*16.376-6).

In one instance, a figure from **h₂ger-* functions in a manner similar to recurring βουλὰς βουλευεῖν, that is as a general description of the assembly-proceedings:

οἱ δ' **ἀγορὰς ἀγόρευον** ^{tr} | ἐπὶ Πριάμοιο θύρῃσι

πάντες **ὀμηγερέες** ἡμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες

‘But they were holding councils (counseling councils) at the gates of Priam all assembled together both young and old (*Il.*2.788).

³⁷⁵ The other occurrence of κήρυξ κηρύσσει this time not introducing a council, nonetheless shows the same separation, not to mention additional etymologizing in γέροντι γήρασκε:

κήρυκι Ἠπυτίδῃ, ὅς οἱ παρὰ πατρὶ γέροντι
κηρύσσων γήρασκε φίλα φρεσὶ μήδεα εἰδώς. (*Il.*17.322-5).

Also of significance here is the tight-knit polyptoton ostensibly across a coordinating conjunction in οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὀμηγερέες τε γέγοντο (*Il.*1.57, et al.). Taken together the three figures, κῆρυξ κηρύσσει, ἀγορὴν ἀγέ(ι)ρεσθαι/ ἀγορεύειν /ὀμηγυρίσασθαι and βουλὰς βουλεύειν represent a pliable stock of phrases the poet(s) used to transition into or briefly describe council scenes.

Scenes in which people wash themselves, or servants wash them, are also packed with polyptoton and apt to include etymological figures. Note the interlocking figures in this oft-repeated segment:

χέρνιβα δ' ἀμφίπολος **προχόω** **ἐπέχευε** φέρουσα
καλῆ χρυσεῖη, ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος,
νίψασθαι· παρὰ δὲ ξεστήν ἐτάνυσσε τράπεζαν.

(*Od.*1.136-8=4.52-4, 7.172-4,10.368-9, 15.135-7, 17.91-3).

For but one example of polyptoton across a coordinating conjunction note the following line:

οἱ δ' ἀπε**λυμαίνοντο** καὶ εἰς ἄλα **λύματα** βάλλον (*Il.*1.314).

Examination of just these few 'themes' shows that the poets were perfectly capable of composing with or without the aid of etymological figures, and that they did not *rely* on them as a mnemonic device. This is not to say that the figures were not convenient and useful for the purposes of composition within the themes they developed in, nor to say that they did not aid in memory at some point in the epic tradition. The absence of figures in some compositional themes, set against their frequency in others, suggests that distinct themes developed independently of each other according to an underlying aesthetic. This notion coincides with Lord's general view of the theme based on the practices of Slavic singers:

Although the themes lead naturally from one to another to form a song which exists as a whole in the singer's mind with Aristotelian beginning, middle, and end, the units within this whole, the themes, have a semi-independent life of their own (Lord 1960:94).

The context-determined, selective occurrence of the EF in well-developed compositional blocks shows that, while it is not completely incorrect to say that the figures were utilized as mnemonic devices, it is also important to note that they were not a crutch without which the composer of epic would stumble.

4.3 Deployment of particular figures in epic hexameter:

In this section I have been divided between two ways of organizing the material. The first involves simply observing how each figure in isolation positions itself in the hexameter. The second entails making some attempt to organize the phrases in a way that emphasizes the most prominent positions of the EF *en masse*. Rather than choosing between these two manners of organization I have tried to combine them. For instance, when I discuss a figure that most markedly localizes as an Adonic I include the rest of the attestations of that particular idiom in the same discussion. Hence, anyone interested in observing the behavior of one phrase needs search no further than a particular section. On the other hand, I have made some attempt to group figures that localize near the end of the line together, and to make further sub-groupings along the lines of more specific end line segments. Although it might be more impressive in terms of stressing that, for instance, a large number of figures comprise Adonics to see them all in a row, it would have been confusing to have several different discussions of an idiom simply because it occurs in different line positions. Also, the figures that are not

particularly localized, although there are only a few, would have been scattered all over the chapter.

4.3.1 Adonics (πήμα πάσχειν, εἴματα ἔννυσθαι, εἶδαρ ἔδμεναι):³⁷⁶

The most common place to find a noun and verb in an etymological figure in Homer is at or near the end of the line. In many cases the cognate noun and verb, in that order, comprise an Adonic, but segments of longer length also occur in significant numbers. For non-attribute figures the space from diaeresis to line end is often all that is needed. Note the impressive localization of pseudo-etymological πήμα πάσχειν:

ἔρχεσθ', ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθεν ἐπ' ἀγροῦ ^{bd} | **πήματα πάσχειν** (*Od.*1.190)

δοῖεν, ἐπεὶ δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο ^{bd} | **πήματα πάσχεις**." (*Od.*8.411)

θᾶσσον, ἐπεὶ δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο ^{bd} | **πήματα πάσχω**." (*Od.*7.152)

ἀλλ' ὃ γ' ἐπὶ σχεδῆς πολυδέσμου ^{bd} | **πήματα πάσχων** (*Od.*5.33)

ἔνθεν δὴ νῦν δεῦρο τόδ' ἴκετο ^{bd} | **πήματα πάσχων**, (*Od.*17.524)

ἔνθεν δὴ νῦν δεῦρο τόδ' ἴκω ^{bd} | **πήματα πάσχων**." (*Od.*17.444)

ἦ ἀλὸς ἦ ἐπὶ γῆς ἀλγήσετε ^{bd} | **πήμα παθόντες**.' (*Od.*12.27)

μηδέ τι μεσσηγύς γε κακὸν καὶ ^{bd} | **πήμα πάθησι**, (*Od.*7.195).

This figure occurs only twice elsewhere. Once in the second person plural, when the verb form cannot end the line: δῆμῳ ἔνι Τρώων, ὅθι πάσχετε πήματ' Ἀχαιοί, (*Od.*4.330), and the only *Iliadic* manifestation: αὐτοῦ πήματ' ἔπασχον ἐν αἰνῆσιν νεκάδεσσι, (*Il.*5.886). These are also the only times, within the figure, that the final alpha of πήματα elides. It is clear from juxtapositions like ^{bd} | πήματα πάσχων and ^{bd} | πήμα πάθησι that the alternation between singular and plural, pain and pains, depends more on the metrical shape of the following verb than any contextual or semantic

³⁷⁶ For δῶρον δίδοναι in Adonics see above.

distinction. All ten instances of the phrase are in dialogue. The Adonic segments make general reference either to the sufferings of Odysseus (x6), Odysseus and his men (x1), or Laertes (x1). Perhaps most interesting is that the two times that they refer specifically to the miseries of the Greeks at Troy are the only two metrically anomalous figures. Note that the sole Iliadic upwelling, πήματ' ἔπασχον, would fit at line end.

In a whole host of phrases the line-anchoring figure/Adonic, expands via attachment of an adjective or other attribute-type element or elements. I have already noted such a tendency in δῶρόν δίδοναι. Another striking example of this is ^{bd} | εἴματα εἶμαι:

³ | τὰ δὲ λυγρὰ περὶ χροῖ **εἴματα ἔστο**. (*Od.*17.338, *Od.*17.203, 24.157)

³ | καὶ τοῖα περὶ χροῖ **εἴματα ἔστο**. (*Il.*23.67)

³ | χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε **εἴματα ἔσσαν/ ἔσσει** (*Od.*10.542, 14.320, *Od.*15.338)

⁵ | κακὰ δὲ χροῖ **εἴματα εἶμαι** (*Od.*19.72, *Od.*23.115)

⁵ | κακὰ δὲ χροῖ **εἴματα εἶται**. (*Od.*11.191)

⁵ | περὶ δ' ἄμβροτα **εἴματα ἔσσαν/ ἔσσον/ ἔσσε**. (*Od.*24.59, *h.Hom.*6.6, *Il.*16.670, 680)

⁵ | καὶ ἄμβροτα **εἴματα ἔσσαν**, (*Od.*7.265)

⁵ | χαρίεντα δὲ **εἴματα ἔσσε**. (*Il.*5.905)

⁵ | χρύσεια δὲ **εἴματα ἔσθην**, (*Il.*18.517)

εἰπέ μοι ὅπποῖ' ^{2nd foot tr} | ἄσσα περὶ χροῖ **εἴματα ἔστο**, (*Od.*19.218).

The present participle of εἶμαι, εἰμένος, does not occur with εἴματα as its object. Instead, we continually find periphrasis with ἔχειν always in the Adonic this time with elision of the noun's final alpha.

καθαρὰ χροῖ εἵματ' ἔχοντα (*Od.*6.61)

νεόπλυτα εἵματ' ἔχοντες (*Od.*6.64)

κακὰ χροῖ εἵματ' ἔχοντα (*Od.*14.506, 23.95, 24.156)

καλὰ περὶ χροῖ εἵματ' ἔχοντι (*Od.*16.210)

Less frequently εἵματα ἔννυσθαι appears in line initial segments, particularly when the verb is aorist. The noun + verb sequence maintains the same metrical shape, with the exception that the final syllable of the verb now scans short (attribute optional):

ἀμφὶ δὲ εἵματα ἔσσα^{tr} | καὶ ὤμοσα καρτερόν ὄρκον (*Od.*4.253).

ἀμφὶ δὲ εἵματα ἔσσαθ'^{tr} | ἅ οἱ πόρε παρθένος ἀδμῆς, (*Od.*6.228).

ἀμφὶ δὲ εἵματα ἔσσαν^{bd} ἐπήρατα, | θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι. (*Od.*8.366).

λυγρὰ δὲ εἵματα ἔσσε^{bd} περὶ χροῖ, | μή ἐ συβώτης (*Od.*16.457).

When the verb appears as ἀμφιέννυμι the root final and ending initial sigmas of the aorist and future simplify. Otherwise the form would have contained a cretic and been unusable. Εἵματα ἀμφιέννυσθαι is mainly line initial:

εἵματά τ' ἀμφιέσσα^{tr} | θυώδεα καὶ λούσσα. (*Od.*5.264)

εἵματα δ' ἀμφιέσαιμι^{tr} | ποσὶν θ' ὑποδήματα δοῖν. (*Od.*18.361)

εἵματά τ' ἀμφιέσω⁵ | πέμψω δὲ τοι οὔρον ὀπισθεν, (*Od.*5.167)

But the compound also appears the only time the figure spans two lines:

αὐτὰρ ἐμὲ χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε εἵματ' ἐκείνη

καλὰ μάλ' ἀμφιέσσα, ποσὶν δ' ὑποδήματα δοῦσα (*Od.*15.368-369).

The aorist middle participial figure also appears line initially:

εἵματα ἐσσάμενος,⁵ | περὶ δὲ ξίφος ὄξυ θέτ' ὤμω, (*Od.*2.3, 4.308,
20.125)

εἵματα ἐσσαμένη⁵ | τηλαυγέα δῖα Σελήνη (*h.Hom.*32.8).

In cases where the figure splits across the better part of a line the verb begins the line and the noun makes up the fifth foot. Most of the Homeric instances of this boil down to one formula in which the figure frames more specific items of clothing, cloak and tunic:

ἔσσω μιν χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε, **εἴματα** καλά, (*Od.*16.79, 17.550, 21.339)

ἔσσαι με χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε, **εἴματα** καλά· (*Od.*14.154)

ἔσσας με χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε **εἴματα** πέμψαι (*Od.*14.396)

ἔσσαμένη δ' εὖ πάντα περὶ χροῖ **εἴματα** καλά (*h.Hom.*5.64).

The *Hymns* attest the only instance of the idiom that features a verbal formant with the innovated present stem in –υμι in a position not exactly paralleled in Homer:

νήδυμον, αὐτὴ δὲ χροῖ **ἔννυτο εἴματα** καλά (*h.Hom.*5.171).

In terms of emphasis in context εἴματα εἶμαι is far more uniform than δῶρόν δίδοναι. It appears quite frequently in narrative as a simple description of a person having gotten dressed, separation of noun and verb is quite rare, but, occurring in only one rather pedestrian formula, does not upset this general usage. The only figures in the group that are amplified do so by inclusion of additional polyptoton, as in the depiction of Ares and Athena on the shield, or by inclusion of loaded adjectives, as in the ironic descriptions of Odysseus' sordid clothes.

The line placement displayed by ^{bd} | πῆματα πάσχειν and ^{bd} | εἴματα εἶμαι also adheres to ^{bd} | εἶδαρ ἔδμεναι:

γαίης Λωτοφάγων, ⁵ | οἷ τ' ἄνθινον **εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν**. (*Od.*9.84).

άνερες, οὐδέ θ' ἄλεσσι μεμιγμένον **εἶδαρ ἔδουσιν**·
(*Od.*11.123=23.270).

δηρὸν μὲν ζῶουσι καὶ ἄμβροτον εἶδαρ ἔδουσι (h.Hom.5.260).

The other figures from *h₁ed- span two lines. In one the noun and verb connect across the line barrier:

λύσας ἐξ ὀχέων, παρὰ δ' ἄμβρόσιον βάλεν **εἶδαρ**

ἔδμεναι· ἀμφὶ δὲ ποσσὶ πέδας ἔβαλε χρυσείας (Il.13.35-6).

Here, since the infinitive could not fit into an Adonic, and would have formed a cretic without correption of the final syllable, an adjustment was necessary. A final figure from *h₁ed- has three elements. The first two, ἔδωδῆν and ἔσθειν connect across the line barrier in a way reminiscent of the arrangement just above, but the figure then expands into a relative clause featuring the more recognizable verbal cognate.

Ἑρμείας, νύμφη δ' ἐτίθει πάρα πᾶσαν **ἔδωδῆν**,

ἔσθειν καὶ πίνειν, **οἶα** βροτοὶ ἄνδρες **ἔδουσιν**· (Od.5.195-196).

4.3.2 Figures from the septhemimeral caesura (κειμήλια κεῖται, κτέρρα κτερ(ε)ίζειν, et al.):

Other than the instances of δῶρον δίδοναι noted above (e.g. ⁷ | δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα), only two figures of any recurrence localize in this position. Neither one ever attaches an adjectival attribute, but each expands by other means.

πολλὰ δ' ἐν ἀφνειοῦ πατρὸς ⁷ | **κειμήλια κεῖται** (Il.6.47)

πολλὰ δ' ἐν Ἀντιμάχοιο δόμοις ⁷ | **κειμήλια κεῖται** (Il.11-132)

δώρων δ' ὅσσ' ἐν ἐμῷ οἴκῳ ⁷ | **κειμήλια κεῖται**, (Od.4.614=15.113)

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἴκανον ὄθι ⁷ | **κειμήλια κεῖτο**, (Od.15.101).

The one alternate pattern for this figure adds a genitive at the end of the line, pushing the cognate phrase to the penthemimeral caesura:

⁵ | **κειμήλια κεῖτο** ἄνακτος (Od.14.326, 19.295, 21.9).

If the noun is in the singular, κειμήλιον κείται/χείτο being unmetrical, we find instead forms of εἰμί:

⁷ | κειμήλιον ἔστω (*Il.*23.618, *Od.*4.600)

τιμῆεν, μάλα καλόν, ὄ τοι κειμήλιον ἔσται (*Od.*1.312).

In the case of the relatively fixed, line ending formula κτέρεα κτερ(ε)ίζειν verbal morphology adapts to metrical conditions. The verb takes the oldest traceable shape of denominatives from neuters in –ος, –εος when metrically possible:³⁷⁷

σῆμά τέ οἱ χεύω⁵ | καὶ ἐπὶ **κτέρεα κτερείξω** (*Od.*2.222)

σῆμά τέ οἱ χεύαι⁵ | καὶ ἐπὶ **κτέρεα κτερείξαι** (*Od.*1.291).

But when the composer wished to use a form of the verb with a disyllabic ending the old formant –εἴξε/ο- was untenable, and we find a newer formant in –ίζω (alternate forms of the aorist optative 3rd plural):

ἐν πυρὶ κήαιεν⁵ | καὶ ἐπὶ **κτέρεα κτερίσαιεν**. (*Il.*24.38)

ὄφρ' ἔταρον θάπποι⁵ | καὶ ἐπὶ **κτέρεα κτερίσαιεν**. (*Od.*3.285).

I do not mean to assert that the innovative forms in –ίζω arose specifically for the purposes of this etymological formula. While the idea is intriguing, the *Iliad* attests the futures κτερῖω (18.334) and κτερῖοῦσι (11.455, 22.336) without the cognate noun, and to impose a relative chronology on these forms would be problematic at best. It is possible that the innovative forms were already viable at the time of the composition of *Iliad* 24 and *Odyssey* 3, and were simply selected because they made the line-ending phrase usable. It is also possible that the innovative forms were innovated for use in the etymological formula, then used independently elsewhere.

³⁷⁷ For the relative chronology of denominatives from nouns in –ος, –εος see Nussbaum (70 note 63).

A few figures that only occur once also fill the post-penthemimeral slot:

Φοῖβε σὺ δ' εἰλίποδας ἔλικας ⁷ | **βοῦς βουκολέεσκες** (*Il.21.448*).

ἐγκλιδὸν ἐζομένη πυκινούσ ⁷ | **όάρους όαρίζει**. (*h.Hom.23.3*).

4.3.3 Figures from the trochaic caesura (ἐπίκλησιν καλεῖν, ἀνάτιον αἰτιάσθαι, ὀφθαλμοῖσι ὄψεσθαι, ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ὀλέθρῳ (ἀπ)ολλέσθαι):

Four out of the five times we find ἐπίκλησιν καλεῖν in Homer, as well as the only Hesiodic instance occur in this position:

ὄν τε κύν' Ὀρίωνος ^{tr} | **ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσι**. (*Il.22.29*).

Ἄστυάναξ, ὄν Τρῶες ^{tr} | **ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν**. (*Il.22.506*).

Ἄρκτον θ', ἦν καὶ ἅμαξαν ^{tr} | **ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν**, (*Od.5.273*, *Il.18.487*).

Τοὺς δὲ πατήρ Τιτηήνας ^{tr} | **ἐπίκλησιν καλέεσκε** (*Hes.Th.207*).

The one exception spans successive lines:

δίου Ἀρηιθέου, τὸν **ἐπίκλησιν** κορυνήτην

ἄνδρες **κίκλησκον** καλλίζωνοί τε γυναῖκες (*Il.7.138-139*).

The conjugation of ἀνάτιον αἰτιάσθαι (present infinitive, 2nd and 3rd sg. optative) invariably fills this slot:

Ἔκτορ ἐπεὶ τοι θυμὸς ^{tr} | **ἀνάτιον αἰτιάσθαι**, (*Il.13.775*).

οὐκ ἄν μιν νῦν, τέκνον, ^{tr} | **ἀνάτιον αἰτιόω**. (*Od.20.135*).

δεινὸς ἀνήρ· τάχα κεν καὶ ^{tr} | **ἀνάτιον αἰτιόωτο**. (*Il.11.654*).

When the verb form is future ὀφθαλμοῖσι ὄψεσθαι fits in this position:

εἰ δέ κε νοστήσω καὶ **ἐσόψομαι ὀφθαλμοῖσι** (*Il.5.212*).

εἰ γάρ σ' αἰρήσει καὶ **ἐσόψεται ὀφθαλμοῖσιν** (*Il.24.206*).

In the perfect the phrase connects two lines: εἷ που ὄπωπας / ὀφθαλμοῖσι τεοῖσιν (*Od.3.93-4=4.323-4*). In a very contrived line with another polyptotonic figure 'ensure sureties' takes this position:

δειλαί τοι δειλῶν γε καὶ ἔγγυαι ἔγγυάασθαι. (*Od.*8.351).

The most common EF that takes up the space from the trochaic caesura to line end, this time with the addition of an attribute, is ἔπος εἶπεῖν. When used in the etymological expression with the augmented, uncontracted aorist indicative, the noun ἔπος, always in the singular, localizes without exception in this position, although the strength or existence of said caesura is debatable in some cases.³⁷⁸ This leads to a sequence of the following pattern: $\bar{\text{u}} | - \bar{\text{u}} \bar{\text{u}} | - \bar{\text{u}} \bar{\text{u}} | - \text{x}$ with the possible substitution of a spondee in the 4th, but not in the 5th foot, before the verb.³⁷⁹ Note that in all of these cases the word's second syllable is long by position, hence, for purposes of the inner metric, shaped $\bar{\text{u}} -$, and that this is the most common position for words of this shape.³⁸⁰ In several instances the phrase makes up a clearly demarcated hemistich from trochaic caesura to line end:

δάκρυα δ' ἔκβαλε θερμά, ^{tr} | ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπεν·

(*Od.*19.362).

Σαρπηδῶν Διὸς υἱός, ^{tr} | ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπε (*Il.*5.683)

χερσί τε συμπλατάγησεν, ^{tr} | ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδνὸν ἔειπεν (*Il.*23.102)

οὐδέ τί πω παρὰ μοῖραν ^{tr} | ἔπος νηκερδὲς ἔειπες (*Od.*14.509).

The same pattern, ἔπος + adjective (or prepositional phrase) + ἔειπε(ς) also occurs in lines admitting different segmentation, invariably involving a pause early in the line. In the majority of cases this *pausa* is post-vocative:

³⁷⁸ The only possible 'exception' involves a compounded form of the verb and disjointed syntax: τοῖς δ' Ἀγέλεως μετέειπεν, ἔπος πάντεσσι πιφάσκειν. (*Od.*22.131, 247).

³⁷⁹ This pattern coincides with one of the more common 'noun-epithet formulae of gods and heroes in the nominative case'. See Parry, 1971 p. 39 column 3: πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς etc.

³⁸⁰ O'neil (140). For definition of 'inner metric' see *ibid* (1 note 2).

ὦ γυναῖ | ἦ μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος ⁷ | νημερτές ἔειπες (*Il.3.204*)³⁸¹
 ὦ γυναῖ, | ἦ μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος ⁷ | θυμαλγές ἔειπες (*Od.23.183*)
 Εὔμαι', | ἦ μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος ⁷ | θυμαλγές ἔειπες (*Od.16.69*)
 Ἰρι θεὰ ³ | μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος ⁷ | κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες (*Il.15.206*)
 Λαοδάμα, ³ | μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος ⁷ | κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες (*Od.8.141*)
 κῆρυξ, | ὅς δὴ πρῶτος ἔπος σῆ μητρὶ ἔειπεν (*Od.16.469*)
 λίσσομ', | ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο ἔπος κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπε (*Od.21.278*)
 καὶ δῶρω, ³ | ἐπεὶ οὐ τι ἔπος κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπεν (*Od.8.397*).

While all of the attestations of ἔπος εἶπεῖν in which the verb is of the shape _ _ x, fit this pattern, when the verb takes on a different shape the elements of the idiom switch position and its placement varies. In most of these instances the verb immediately precedes the noun or noun + adjective phrase and the phrase gravitates toward the middle of the line often before the diaeresis, but also in other positions.

καὶ δὲ τόδ' ἠνώγεον εἶπεῖν ἔπος ^{bd} | αἶ κ' ἐθέλητε (*Il.7.394*)
 ἐσθλὸν δ' οὔτε τί πω εἶπας ἔπος ^{bd} | οὔτ' ἐτέλεσσας· (*Il.1.108*)
 πρόφρων τέτληκας εἶπεῖν ἔπος ^{bd} | ὅττι νοήσης. (*Il.1.543*)
 ὄφρα καθεζόμενος εἶπη ἔπος ^{bd} | ἠδ' ἐπακούση (*Od.19.98*)
 ὄφρα τί οἱ εἶπω πυκινὸν ἔπος, ^{bd} | ὥς κεν Ἀχιλλεὺς (*Il.24.75*)
 οὐδέ τί μοι εἶπες πυκινὸν ἔπος, ^{bd} | οὔ τέ κεν αἰεὶ (*Il.24.744*)
 καὶ δὲ τόδ' εἰπέμεναι πυκινὸν ἔπος, ^{bd} | αἶ κ' ἐθέλωσι (*Il.7.375*)
 τοῦτ' ἄρα δεύτατον εἶπεν ἔπος, ὅτε οἱ γλυκὺς ὕπνος (*Od.23.342*)
 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἕκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν· (*Od.21.248*)
 εὐχόμενος δ' ἄρα εἶπεν, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἕκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν (*Od.7.330*)

³⁸¹ Whether or not there was truly a pause at the septemimeral point here is, in my opinion, difficult to say, and for all we know may have varied from singer to singer and recitation to recitation.

παιδὶ δέ κεν **εἵποιμι ἔπος**, τό κε κέρδιον εἶη, (*Od.*18.166)

ὀπποῖόν κ' **εἶπησθα ἔπος**, τοῖόν κ' ἐπακούσαις. (*Il.*20.250)

In one case the verb and noun are more widely separated:

εἰπεῖν ἦδ' ἐπακούσαι ἐμὸν **ἔπος**,^{bd} | ὡς ἐρέεινον (*Od.*24.262).

In one anomalous expression the noun precedes the verb:

ὄφρα **ἔπος εἶπωμι**^{tr} | (*Od.*22.392).

Here the present subjunctive 1st sg. εἶπωμι, a Homeric hapax beside the regular form, εἶπω, looks very much like a stretch-form. In fact, when compared to another phrase the whole line beginning, ὄφρα ἔπος εἶπωμι looks like an extension because of the line's semantic equivalence with a more frequent and regular set of lines:

ὄφρ' εἶπω³ | τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει

so that I might say what the heart in my chest bids me (*Il.*7.68, 349, 369, 8.6, 19.102, *Od.*7.187, et al. + a host of similar expressions).³⁸²

ὄφρα ἔπος εἶπωμι^{tr} | τό μοι καταθύμιόν ἐστιν

so that I might speak the speech that is in my heart (*Od.*22.392).

The four times ἔπος εἰπεῖν occurs across a relative the verb phrase fills a fixed slot and the noun placement varies slightly:

κήδεσιν. ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ξυνίει **ἔπος**,^{bd} | ὅττι κεν **εἶπω**. (*Od.*19.378)

κρήνον νῦν καὶ ἐμοὶ δειλῆ **ἔπος**,^{bd} | ὅττι κεν **εἶπω**. (*Od.*20.115)

οὐ τοι ἀπόβλητον **ἔπος** ἔσσεται^{bd} | ὅττι κεν **εἶπω**. (*Il.*2.361)

εἶμι μὲν, οὐδ' ἄλιον **ἔπος** ἔσσεται^{bd} | ὅττι κεν **εἶπη** (*Il.*24.92).

Here the relative phrase, aside from adding emphasis, helps to fill out the line.³⁸³ The Hesiodic occurrences of the syntagm fit none of the Homeric patterns.

³⁸² Cf. *Hes. fr.*75.14.

ρήϊδιον γὰρ ἔπος εἶπειν· “βόε δὸς καὶ ἄμαξαν (*Op.*453)

ἢ τι ἔπος εἰπὼν ἀποθύμιον ἠὲ καὶ ἔρξας (*Op.*710)

ἱμερόεν] τα γ[ά]μον, καὶ τοῦτ' ἔπος εἶπον ἀπάντες (*Fr.*211.6).³⁸⁴

The prevalence of the connected arrangement in the attestations of this idiom supports the general claim that the separation of the elements of an EF was remarkable. They also buttress the impression that inversion of adjective + noun + verb word order was not particularly anomalous. In Plato ὡς ἔπος εἶπειν is standard, but on occasion one may find ὡς εἶπειν ἔπος (*Lg.*967c).

The phrase ὀλέθρῳ ἀπολλέσθαι, although not that frequent, nonetheless occupies the space from trochaic caesura to line end regardless of the case of the noun:

πευθόμεθ', ἦχι ἕκαστος ^{tr} | ἀπώλετο λυγρῷ ὀλέθρῳ (*Od.*3.87)

αὐτοῦ γάρ κε καὶ ἄμμες ^{tr} | ἀπωλόμεθ' αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον (*Od.*9.303).

With the simplex verb, ὀλέθρῳ ὀλλέσθαι occurs only once in a very different position:

ἦέ τις ὤλετ' ὀλέθρῳ ἀδευκέι ^{bd} | ἦς ἐπὶ νηὸς (*Od.*4.489)

This is positionally closer to ὡς θάνον οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ· ⁷ | περὶ δ' ἄλλοι ἐταῖροι (*Od.*11.412).

4.3.4 Figures from the penthemimeral caesura:

The only phrase found in this position with any regularity is ⁵ | **δαίνυντ'** ἐρικυδέα **δαῖτα**. (*Il.*24.802, *Od.*3.66=20.280, *Od.*13.26). Against this recurring phrase there are two line initial segments (noted above) and one that spreads across two lines:

³⁸³ Cf. Hainsworth (1964:158): “the relative clause, which is sometimes replaced by a different kind of subordinate clause, is usually an explanation of the epithet and often uses the *figura etymologica*.”

³⁸⁴ The figure does not occur in the *Homeric Hymns*.

Τηλέμαχος τεμένεα νέμεται καὶ **δαΐτας** εἴσας

δαίνυται, ἄς ἐπέοικε δικασπόλον ἄνδρ' ἀλεγύνειν· (*Od.*11.185-186).

The phrases starting at the penthemimeral caesura all occur in narrative in simple descriptions of people feasting. Interestingly, the two line initial figures, and the figure split over two lines with enjambment of the verb, are all in dialogue.

4.4 Line initial figures:

In addition to the impressive number of hapax or near hapax line initial figures listed above there are a few more frequently attested phrases that localize at the beginning of lines. When it means 'set up the mast of a ship' **ἰστὸν ἰστάναι** takes up the space to the penthemimeral caesura; it a flexible formula since the number of the noun and morphology of the verb may vary, but it is not mobile:

οἱ δ' **ἰστὸν στήσαντ'**⁵ | ἀνά θ' ἰστία λευκὰ πέτασαν, (*Il.*1.480)

ἰστὸν δ' ἔστησεν⁵ | νηὸς κυανοπρώροιο (*Il.*23.852)

ἰστοὺς στησάμενοι⁵ | ἀνά θ' ἰστία λεύκ' ἐρύσαντες (*Od.*9.77)

ἰστὸν στησάμενοι⁵ | ἀνά θ' ἰστία λεύκ' ἐρύσαντες. (*Od.*12.402)

ἰστὸν δὲ στήσας,⁵ | ἀνά θ' ἰστία λευκὰ πετάσας (*Od.*10.506).

The only exception occurs when the phrase attaches an attribute:

ἰστὸν δ' εἰλάτινον κοίλης ἔντοσθε μεσόδμης

στήσαν ἀείραντες (*Od.*15.289-290=2.424-425).

Παρὰ σταθμὸν ἰστάναι appears on five different occasions in equivalent lines, also taking up the space from line onset to penthemimeral caesura:

στή ῥα παρὰ **σταθμὸν**⁵ | τέγεος πύκα ποιητοῖο, (*Od.*1.333=8.457, 16.415, 18.209, 21.64).

When ἰστόν ἰσάναι means ‘set up a loom’ both attribute and non-attribute versions end at the trochaic caesura:

στησαμένη μέγαν **ἰστόν** ^{tr} | ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ὕφαινε, (*Od.*2.94=24.129)

στησαμένη μέγαν **ἰστόν**, ^{tr} | ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ὕφαίνειν, (*Od.*19.139)

τῆ δ' **ἰστόν** **στήσαιτο** ^{tr} | γυνὴ προβάλοιτό τε ἔργον. (*Hes.Op.*779).

It is interesting that the mobility of the formula coincides with its semantic diversity. When the ἰστόν is a mast the phrase stops at the penthemimeral caesura, only when it is a loom is there expansion to the trochaic caesura.

The various combinations of ἔργον and ἔργα with ἐργάζεσθαι, ἔρδειν and ῥέζειν are not uniformly deployed, but the ἔρδειν and ῥέζειν figures are predominantly line beginning:

ἔρδειν ἔργα βίαια ^{tr} | κακορραφήσι νόοιο· (*Od.*2.236).

οἱ μέγα **ἔργον ἔρεξαν** ^{tr} | ἀτασθαλίησι κακῆσι, (*Od.*24.458)

ῥέξαντας μέγα **ἔργον**, ^{tr} | ὅ κε Τρῶεσσι μελήσει. (*Il.*10.282)

ἦ μέγα **ἔργον ἔρεξεν** ^{tr} | αἰδρεΐησι νόοιο (*Od.*11.272)

ἔρδουσα μέγα **ἔργον**, ⁵ | ὃ σῆ κεφαλῆ ἀναμάξεις· (*Od.*19.92)

ἔργα δ' **ἔρεξ'** ὅσα φημὶ μελησέμεν Ἀργείοισι (*Il.*10.51).

In the only Homeric anomalies the verb and noun phrase split:

τὴν δ' ἦ τοι **ῥέξαι** θεὸς ὠρορεν **ἔργον** ἀεικές· (*Od.*23.222)

θυνότων ἄμυδις· θηεῦντο δὲ μέρμερα **ἔργα**

ὅσσ' ἄνδρες **ῥέξαντες** ἔβαν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας. (*Il.*10.524-25).

Hesiod connects the phrase across lines:

φάσκε δὲ τιταίνοντας ἀτασθαλίη μέγα **ῥέξαι**

ἔργον, τοῖο δ' ἔπειτα τίσιν μετόπισθεν ἔσεσθαι. (*Hes.Th.*209-210).

In the denominative phrases, on the other hand, the verb is line final except in one case:

δμωαί, τὰς μὲν τ' ἔργα διδάξαμεν ἐργάζεσθαι, (*Od.22.422*)
 ἔψαι, ἔνθά κεν ἔργα ἀεικέα ἐργάζοιο (*Il.24.733*)
 ᾧδ' ἔρδειν, καὶ ἔργον ἐπ' ἔργω ἐργάζεσθαι (*Hes.Op.382*)
 ἔργα δ' Ἀθηναίη δέδαε κλυτὰ ἐργάζεσθαι. (*Od.20.72*)
 ἀνέρος ἠδὲ γυναικός, ἵνα σφίσιν ἐργάζωμαι
 πρόφρων οἶα γυναικὸς ἀφήλικος ἔργα τέτυκται. (*h.Hom.2.139-140*).

The position of the verb in these lines, far from being a surprise, is in fact nearly obligatory for words of an inner metrical structure of spondee + spondee. According to Oneil's tables (23, page 147) words of this shape occur overwhelmingly in position 12: *Iliad* 96.5%, *Odyssey* 96.3% and Hesiod 90.2%. The one exceptional placement in Hesiod features a form of the denominative with a different inner metric:

οὐδ' ἐπιμετρήσω· ἐργάζεω, νήπιε Πέρση,
 ἔργα τά τ' ἀνθρώποισι θεοὶ διετεκμήραντο (*Op.397-8*).

Above we saw how the Homeric nicknaming formula, ἐπίκλησιν καλεῖν localizes at the end of lines. In Homeric figures that mean 'call to, or summon by name,' on the other hand, either with simply κλήδην or ἐξονομακλήδην, the nominal elements hover around the beginning of lines:

ἐξονομακλήδην ὀνομάζων^{bd} | ἄνδρα ἕκαστον (*Il.22.415*)
 κλήδην εἰς ἀγορὴν κικλήσκειν^{bd} | ἄνδρα ἕκαστον, (*Il.9.11*)
 ὑψόσ' ἀειρομένων· ἐμὲ δὲ φθέγγοντο καλεῦντες
 ἐξονομακλήδην,⁵ | τότε γ' ὕστατον, ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ (*Od.12.249-250*)
 ἐκ δ' ὀνομακλήδην Δαναῶν ὀνόμαζες ἀρίστους, (*Od.4.278*).

The same cannot be said for similar phrases in Hesiod:

καὶ οἱ τοῦτ' ὀνόμην' ὄνομ' ἔμμεναι, οὔνεκα νύμφη (*Hes.Fr.235.2*)

Εὐβοϊαν δὲ βοός μιν **ἐπώνυμον ὠνόμασε** Ζεὺς (Hes.*Fr.*296).

4.5 Line internal figures

Aside from θεὸς τίθησι and μάχην μάχεσθαι the most numerically impressive localization of a figure line internally involves the unaugmented forms of εἶπεῖν ἔπος, etc. already discussed. Otherwise, only a few seldom found figures are exclusively line internal. The locatival dative ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φρονεῖν/φράζεσθαι is interesting because even though its two manifestations have quite different verbal formants the phrase itself nonetheless occupies the same line position:

ὄφρ' ἄλλην³ | **φράζονται ἐνὶ φρεσὶ**^{bd} | μῆτιν ἀμείνω (*Il.*9.423)

οὐκ ὄπιδα³ | **φρονέοντες ἐνὶ φρεσὶν**^{bd} | οὐδ' ἐλεητύν. (*Od.*14.82).

The prepositional EA from the same root positions itself a bit differently, although the noun is still right before the diaeresis:

φράζεσθαι δὴ ἔπειτα κατὰ **φρένα**^{bd} | καὶ κατὰ θυμὸν (*Od.*1.294).

A few other figures that occur only once in Homeric language take line internal position, often, but not always, before the diaeresis:

ἐνδουκέως,³ | **ζώεις** δ' ἀγαθὸν **βίον**^{bd} | αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γε (*Od.*15.491)

ὄς καὶ νῦν πόντονδε **βαλὼν βέλος**^{bd} | ἤγαγε νῆα (*Od.*9.495)³⁸⁵

Τρωὰς γὰρ μεγάρῳ με **τροφὸς τρέφεν**,^{bd} | ἢ δὲ διὰ πρόδ

(*h.Hom.*5.114)

καὶ μὲν οἱ Λύκιοι⁵ | **τέμενος τάμον**^{bd} | ἔξοχον ἄλλων (*Il.*6.194)

ἦ νύ τί τοι Τρῶες⁵ | **τέμενος τάμον**^{bd} | ἔξοχον ἄλλων (*Il.*20.184)

εὐρομεν, ἀλλ' **ἐνόμειε νομὸν**⁷ | κάτα πίονα μῆλα (*Od.*9.217)

βαλλέμεν, **ύλοτόμον** τε **ταμείν**⁷ | θαλαμήια δοῦρα (Hes.*Op.*807)

ἀμφ' αὐτῷ δὲ χοῆν χειῖσθαι⁷ | πᾶσιν νεκύεσσιν, (*Od.*10.518, 11.26)

³⁸⁵ Βελός βαλλεῖν is hapax in the accusative. The datives deploy line initially.

In some cases the EF is line internal but together with its attribute the phrase ends the line:

έν δ' ἄρα μέσση λέκτο, ^{tr} | **χύσιν δ' ἐπεχεύατο** φύλλων. (*Od.*5.487)

πεξαμένη χερσὶ ⁵ | **πλοκάμους ἔπλεξε** φαεινοῦς (*Il.*14.176).

4.6 Analysis of less frequent, or less localized figures:

There are a few well-attested figures without a clear preference for a particular position in the line. Κρητῆρα κινρᾶσθαι looks like it might localize a bit in the *Odyssey*. We have four line internal occurrences in roughly the same place (noun in the elliptical accusative):

τοῦ ὁ γέρων ³ | **κρητῆρα κεράσσατο**, ^{bd} | πολλὰ δ' Ἀθήνη (*Od.*3.393)

τοῖσιν δὲ ³ | **κρητῆρα κεράσσατο** ^{bd} | Μούλιος ἦρωσ, (*Od.*18.423)

"Ποντόνοε, ³ | **κρητῆρα κερασσάμενος** μέθυ νεῖμον (*Od.*7.179, 13.50).

against only one line ending placement:

τοῖς δ' ὁ γέρων ἐλθοῦσιν ἀνὰ **κρητῆρα κέρασσαν** (*Od.*3.390).

But if we include the locative phrases in this formulaic family the picture becomes more muddled:

Ἀργείων οἱ ἄριστοι ἐνὶ **κρητῆρι κέρωνται**. (*Il.*4.260)

ἦ δὲ τρίτη **κρητῆρι** μελίφρονα οἶνον **ἐκίρνα** (*Od.*10.356).

κρητῆρσιν κερώντο· ^{tr} | κύπελλα δὲ νεῖμε συβώτης. (*Od.*20.253)

The Homeric instances of τέκνον τίκτειν do not present a terribly uniform metrical grouping, but if we combine them with the figures from the *Hymns* and Hesiod certain patterns do emerge. First, only three (two of these in a repeated line) of the seven occurrences in Homer make up the end of lines, but if we add data from the *Hymns* the line end segment starts to look more like a tendency:

ὀκτώ, ἀτὰρ μήτηρ ἐνάτη ἦν ἢ **τέκε τέκνα**. (*Il.2.313=327*)
 σοὶ δ' ἄλοχόν τε φίλην σπέσθαι καὶ **τέκνα τεκέσθαι**. (*Od.22.324*)
 δοῖεν κουριδίους ἄνδρας καὶ **τέκνα τεκέσθαι** (*h.Hom.2.136*)
 κουριδίην ἄλοχον, σοὶ δ' ἀγλαὰ **τέκνα τεκεῖσθαι**. (*h.Hom.5.126-7*).

Further, if we assume a flexible formula that adapts to its verb form, as in the case of δῶρον δίδοναι which predominantly formed an Adonic when the verb shape fit at the end of the line, but shifted otherwise (ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδοῦσιν# but δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα) the one Homeric instance of ἡ δὲ Πύλου βασιλεῦε, ^{tr}| **τέκεν** δέ οἱ ἀγλαὰ **τέκνα**, (*Od.11.285*) also looks more like a trend in light of data from elsewhere in Epic:

χαῖρε μάκαιρ' ὦ Λητοῖ, ^{tr}| ἐπεὶ **τέκες** ἀγλαὰ **τέκνα** (*h.Hom.3.14*)
 αὐτοκασιγνήτην, ⁵| ἢ οἱ **τέκε** κάλλιμα **τέκνα** (*h.Hom.31.5*)
 ἦ δ' ὑποκουσαμένη ⁵| **τέκετο** κρατερόφρονα **τέκνα**. (*Hes.Th.308*)
 ῥεῖη δὲ δμηθεῖσα Κρόνῳ ⁷| **τέκε** φαίδιμα **τέκνα**, (*Hes.Th.453*)
^{tr}| **τ]έκοντό** τε κύδιμα **τέκνα** (*Hes.Fr.10(a).30*)³⁸⁶

We also see movement of this 'formula' to the front of the line (once again keeping in mind δώσω τ' ἀγλαὰ δῶρα ^{tr}| and δῶρα δέ τοι δώσω ⁵|):

τέξεις ἀγλαὰ **τέκνα**, ^{tr}| ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀποφώλιοι εὖναι (*Od.11.249*)
 [**τέξεις** ἀγλαὰ **τέκ]να**, ^{tr}| ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀποφώ[λιοι εὖναι (*Hes.Fr.31.2*)
 Ἡ δ' **ἔτεκε** τρία **τέκνα** ^{tr}| δαίφρονη Βελλεροφόντη (*Il.6.196*).

We are then left with a few more problematic/less structurally formulaic placements:

κουριδίον, τῷ **τέκνα τέκη** φιλότητι μιγεῖσα, (*Od.19.266*).
τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες ἐοικότα **τέκνα** γονεῦσιν. (*Hes.Op.235*).
 ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ, ὅτε τ' ἄτριχος οὔρεσι **τίκτει**

³⁸⁶ One cannot know where to put]. ἴν' ἀγλαὰ **τέκνα τ[εκ-** (*Hes.Fr.31.4*).

γ[αίη]ς ἐν κευθμῶνι τρίτῳ ἔτει τρία **τέκνα**. (Hes.Fr.204.129-30).

Non-relative instances of ἀοιδὸς ἀεῖδει do recur several times in a fixed phrase with περικλυτός that takes up the space before the diaeresis:

τοῖσι δ' **ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε** περικλυτός, ^{bd} | οἱ δὲ σιωπῆ (Od.1.325-9)

ταῦτ' ἄρ' **ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε** περικλυτός· ^{bd} | αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεύς

(Od.8.83=367,521).

To which we might compare μοῦσ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνήκεν ἀειδέμεναι ^{bd} | κλέα ἀνδρῶν, (Od.8.73). But other upwellings of the phrase, both relative and non-relative, show considerable variation in their prosodic deployment. On several occasions the figure at least remains in the same line:

ἦ τοι ὅτε λήξειεν ^{tr} | **ἀείδων** θεῖος **ἀοιδός**, (Od.8.87)³⁸⁷

ἦσθιε δ' ἦος **ἀοιδός** ^{tr} | ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν **ἄειδεν**. (Od.17.358)

ἦ καὶ θέσπιν **ἀοιδόν**, ^{tr} | ὅ κεν τέρπησιν **ἀείδων**; (Od.17.385).³⁸⁸

But quite a few times it spans two lines:

Τερπιάδης δ' ἔτ' **ἀοιδὸς** ἀλύσκανε κῆρα μέλαιναν,

Φήμιος, **ὅς** ῥ' **ἦειδε** μετὰ μνηστῆρσιν ἀνάγκη. (Od.22.330-331)

αὐτῷ τοι μετόπισθ' ἄχος ἔσσεται, εἴ κεν **ἀοιδόν**

πέφνης, **ὅς** τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν **ἀείδω**. (Od.22.345-346)

Πηνειόν· σὲ δ' **ἀοιδὸς** ἔχων φόρμιγγα λίγειαν

ἦδυεπῆς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν **ἀεῖδει**. (h.Hom.21.3-4).

ἴληθ' εἶραφιῶτα γυναιμανές· οἱ δέ σ' **ἀοιδοὶ**

³⁸⁷ Note that θεῖος ἀοιδός is itself formulaic in this position, on occasion in the accusative (Od. X2), but especially in the nominative (X8).

³⁸⁸ Hainsworth postulated that in the case of θέσπιν ἀοιδόν "It falls in the 2nd and 3rd feet, and the shift from the normal position at the verse-end has caused the poet to hesitate between θεῖον ἀοιδόν and θέσπιν ἀοιδήν" (1968, 121). This observation throws into greater relief the absence of typologically prevalent 'sing a song' in favor of 'the singer sings' in the *Odyssey*. It may support speculation that 'sing a song' was simply not a Greek idiom and may have even been awkward or outlandish.

ἄδομεν ἀρχόμενοι λήγοντές τ', οὐδέ πη ἔστι
σεῖ' ἐπιληθομένω ἱερῆς μεμνήσθαι **ἀοιδῆς**. (*h.Hom.1.17-9*)
ὡς δ' ὅτ' **ἀοιδὸν** ἀνήρ ποτιδέρκεται, **ὄς** τε θεῶν ἔξ
ἀείδει δεδαῶς ἔπε' ἱμερόεντα βροτοῖσι,
τοῦ δ' ἄμοτον μεμάασιν ἀκουέμεν, ὀππὸτ' **ἀείδη**. (*Od.17.518-520*).

As I have indicated with the bold print in these last two passages the aural tone struck by the figure reverberates with paronomasia in a third line. The 'songbird sings' phrase has its own configuration in successive lines:

ὡς δ' ὅτε Πανδαρέου κούρη, χλωρηῖς **ἠηδῶν**,
καλὸν **ἀείδησιν** ἔαρος νέον ἰσταμένοιο, (*Od.19.518-19*).

The most frequent ED in Homer and Hesiod, δεσμῶ δεῖν shows little to no patterning in its line location. Thrice it forms an end line segment:

παῖδες Ἀλωῆος, ⁵ | **δῆσαν** κρατερῶ ἐνὶ **δεσμῶ**. (*Il.5.386*)³⁸⁹
Κόττω τ' ἠδὲ Γύη, ⁵ | **δῆσεν** κρατερῶ ἐνὶ **δεσμῶ** (*Hes.Th.618*)
σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε ^{tr} | **δέον** θυμαλγέϊ **δεσμῶ** (*Od.22.189*).

Twice it begins lines:

πλείοσί μ' ἐν **δεσμοῖσι δέον** ⁷ | μᾶλλον τε πίεζον (*Od.12.196*)
δεσμῶ ἐν ἀργαλέω **δέδετο**, ⁷ | κρατέρ' ἄλγεα πάσχων (*Od.15.232*).

Three times its components split over the greater parts of one line:

ἠέ με **δῆσαντες** λίπετ' αὐτόθι νηλεῖ **δεσμῶ**, (*Il.10.443*)
πέμψαν καὶ **δεσμοῖσιν** ἐν ἀργαλέοισιν **ἔδησαν** (*Hes.Th.718*)
εἶναι, καὶ **δεσμοῖς** ἔθελον **δεῖν** ἀργαλέοισι (*h.Hom.7.12-3*)³⁹⁰

Twice it occurs across the line-boundary:

οἶον ἔμ' ἠνώγει ὅτ' ἀκουέμεν· ἀλλά με **δεσμῶ**

³⁸⁹ Again with paronomastic reverberation in the next line: χαλκῆω δ' ἐν κεράμω **δέδετο** τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας.

³⁹⁰ Echoed in the next line τὸν δ' οὐκ ἴσχανε **δεσμά**, λύγοι δ' ἀπὸ τηλόσ' ἐπιππον.

δήσατ' ἐν ἀργαλέω, ὄφρ' ἔμπεδον αὐτόθι μίμνω (*Od.*12.160-161)

ἐλθῶν ἐξείπη, ὁ δ' οἴσάμενος **καταδήση**

δεσμῶ ἐν ἀργαλέω, ὑμῖν δ' ἐπιφράσσετ' ὄλεθρον. (*Od.*15.443-444).

And twice it splits more widely in separate lines:

δήσε δ' ἀλυκτοπέδησι Προμηθεά ποικιλόβουλον

δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέοισι μέσον διὰ κίον' ἐλάσσας· (*Hes. Th.*521-2)³⁹¹

σὺν δὲ πόδας χεῖράς τε **δέει** γλῶσσάν τε νόον τε

δεσμοῖς ἀφράστοισι, φιλεῖ δέ ἐ μαλθακὸς ὕπνος (*Hes. Fr.*239.4-5).

In the strictly *Iliadic* EN ὀχεὺς (συν) ἔχει the noun is always line-final and the verb closely follows in the next line. When the ὀχῆες are 'belt buckles' the cognate noun and verb sandwich an attribute in a once-repeated segment:

^{tr} | ὄθι ζωστήρος **ὀχῆες** / χρύσειοι **σύνεχον** (*Il.*4.132-3, 20.414-15).

When they are 'gate hinges' the noun and verb connect across the line boundary twice in one narrative sequence, but the verbs are of different configuration. The first phrase has two attributes, so the segment is longer, the second merely negates the first, but has a more elaborate, dual verb form:

δικλίδας ὑψηλάς· ⁵ | δοιοὶ δ' ἔντοσθεν **ὀχῆες**

εἶχον ἐπημοιβοί, ⁵ | μία δὲ κληῖς ἐπαρήρει. (*Il.*12.454-5)

βριθοσύνη, μέγα δ' ἀμφὶ πύλαι μύκον, ^{bd} | οὐδ' ἄρ' **ὀχῆες**

έσχεθέτην, ³ | σανίδες δὲ διέτμαγεν ἄλλυδις ἄλλη (*Il.*12.460-61).

While 'pay a penalty' in one guise takes only one end-line position, ἀπετίλυτο ποινήν# at *Il.*16.398 and ἀπετίσατο ποινήν# *Od.*23.312, its more

³⁹¹ Here δήσε is immediately echoed in ἀλυκτοπέδησι so that by the time we get to δεσμοῖς we are at the third part of the aural schema that frames and mingles alliteration in ἀλυκτοπέδησι Προμηθεά ποικιλόβουλον. In other words, the interwoven figures and assonance are as cunning and intricate (ποικίλος) as Prometheus' council, and as tightly interlocking as the chains that bind him.

affected semantic equivalent, τιμὴν τίνειν or ἀποτίνειν repeats in *Iliad* 3 with no regularity in the verse position.

τιμὴν δ' Ἀργείοις **ἀποτίνεμεν**^{bd} | ἦν τιν' ἔοικεν, (*Il.*3.286)

Εἰ δ' ἂν ἐμοὶ **τιμὴν** Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες

τίνειν οὐκ ἐθέλωσιν Ἀλεξάνδροιο πεσόντος, (*Il.*3.288-9)

ἔκδοτε, καὶ **τιμὴν ἀποτίνεμεν**^{bd} | ἦν τιν' ἔοικεν, (*Il.*3.459).

There are numerous figures, generally ones in which the noun and verb are separated by a relative, that always occur spaced apart in successive lines, though many of these only appear once anyway. The majority either are denominatives or look like denominatives. We see this configuration with verbs in –εω. The most common is ἀπειλήν ἀπειλεῖν (always in the plural, always with an intervening relative):³⁹²

Ἴδομενεὺ Κρητῶν βουληφόρε ποῦ τοι **ἀπειλαὶ**

οἴχονται, τὰς Τρωσὶν **ἀπείλεον** υἴες Ἀχαιῶν; (*Il.*13.219-20)

Μυρμιδόνες μή τίς μοι **ἀπειλάων** λελαθέσθω,

ἄς ἐπὶ νηυσὶ θοῆσιν **ἀπειλεῖτε** Τρώεσσι (*Il.*16.200-201)

λήθητ' **ἀπειλάων**, τὰς ἀντιθέω Ὀδυσῆϊ

πρῶτον **ἐπηπείλησε**, Διὸς δ' ἐξείρετο βουλήν (*Od.*13.126-127)

Others are found only once or twice:

ὄν περὶ κῆρι **φίλει** Ζεὺς τ' αἰγίοχος καὶ Ἀπόλλων

παντοίην **φιλότητ'**· οὐδ' ἴκετο γήραος οὐδόν (*Od.*15.245-6)

Οὕτω Μαιάδος υἷον ἄναξ **ἐφίλησεν** Ἀπόλλων

παντοίη **φιλότητι**, χάριν δ' ἐπέθηκε Κρονίων. (*h.Hom.*4.574-5)

ἀλλὰ τί ἦ ἔριδας καὶ **νείκεα** νῶϊν ἀνάγκη

³⁹² Whether derivational direction here is deverbal or denominative is ultimately unknown. Cf. Chantraine (1999) under ἀπειλέω: “*Dérivation inverse de ἀπειλέω; il semble moins probable que ἀπειλέω soit un dénominatif de ἀπειλή.*”

νικεῖν ἀλλήλοισιν ἐναντίον ὡς τε γυναῖκας, (*Il.*20.251-2)
 τῷ δὲ **Φόβος** φίλος υἱὸς ἅμα κρατερός καὶ ἀταρβῆς
 ἔσπετο, **ὄς τ' ἐφόβησε** ταλάφρονά περ πολεμιστήν· (*Il.*13.299-
 300)³⁹³

Some in –αω, -αομαι:

ἄλλης μὲν **λώβης** τε καὶ αἴσχεος οὐκ ἐπιδευεῖς
 ἦν ἐμὲ **λωβήσασθε** κακαὶ κύνες, οὐδέ τι θυμῷ· (*Il.*13.622-23).
 νόσφιν ἀφεστήκει, κεχολωμένη εἵνεκα **νίκης**,
τήν μιν ἐγὼ **νίκησα** δικαζόμενος παρὰ νηυσὶ (*Od.*11.544-545)
 οἴνω Πραμνεῖω, ἐπὶ δ' αἴγειον **κνή** τυρὸν
κνήστι χαλκείῃ, ἐπὶ δ' ἄλφιτα λευκὰ πάλυνε, (*Il.*11.639-40)
 "ὦ πόποι, ἦ μάλα δὴ κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς ἐν **εὐνή**
 ἤθελον **εὐνηθῆναι** ἀνάλκιδες αὐτοὶ ἐόντες. (*Od.*4.333-4=17.123-5)
 δίνεον, ὡς ὅτε τις **τρυπῶ** δόρου νήιον ἀνήρ
τρυπάνω, οἱ δέ τ' ἔνερθεν ὑποσσεῖουσιν ἱμάντι (*Od.*9.384-5)

-ιζω and -ευω

πωχῶ βέλτερόν ἐστι κατὰ πτόλιν ἢ ἐ κατ' ἀγρούς
 δαίτα **πωχεύειν**· δώσει δέ μοι ὄς κ' ἐθέλησιν. (*Od.*17.18-19)
 ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ **πωχός** πανδήμιος, **ὄς** κατὰ ἄστῃ
πωχεύεσκ' Ἰθάκης, μετὰ δ' ἔπρεπε γαστέρι μάργῃ (*Od.*18.1-2)
 εἶσι δὲ **φορμίζων** Λητοῦς ἐρικυδέος υἱὸς
φόρμιγγι γλαφυρῇ πρὸς Πυθῶ πετρήεσσαν (*h.Hom.*3.182-3)
φήμη δ' οὔτις πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται, **ἦν** τινα πολλοὶ
 λαοὶ **φημίξωσι**· θεὸς νύ τις ἐστί καὶ αὐτή. (*Hes.Op.*763-4)³⁹⁴

³⁹³ Here, of course, the inherited form is causative.

³⁹⁴ I put this figure here, rather than with Homeric φήμην τίς μοι φάσθω¹⁷ | because both its denominative formation and its deployment in the hexameter mark it off as distinct.

πόστον δὴ ἔτος ἐστίν, ὅτε **ξείνισσας** ἐκεῖνον
σὸν **ξεῖνον** δύστηνον, ἐμὸν παῖδ', εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε (*Od.*24.288-9).

Others include the meteorological nominatives *et alia*:

αὐτίς δ' ἐμπνύνθη, περὶ δὲ **πνοιή** Βορέας
ζώγρει **ἐπιπνείουσα** κακῶς κεκαφηότα θυμόν (*Il.*5.697-8)
ἐν σπηϊ γλαφυρῶ· περὶ δὲ **ρόος** Ὀκεανοῖο
ἀφρῶ μορμύρων **ρέεν** ἄσπετος· οὐδέ τις ἄλλος (*Il.*18.402-3)
μίτρης θ', ἦν ἐφόρει **ἔρυμα** χροὸς ἔρκος ἀκόντων,
ἦ οἱ πλεῖστον **ἔρυτο**· διὰ πρὸ δὲ εἶσατο καὶ τῆς. (*Il.*4.137-8)
παρ δὲ **ζωστήρ** κείτο παναίολος, ᾧ ῥ' ὁ γεραιὸς
ζώννουθ' ὅτ' ἐς πόλεμον φθισήνορα θωρήσσοιτο (*Il.*10.77-8)
ἀλλ' ὥς τε **στήλη** μένει ἔμπεδον, ἦ τ' ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
ἀνέρος **ἐστήκη** τεθνηότος ἢ ἐ γυναικός (*Il.*17.434-5, cf. 13.437-8).
ἤλασεν, ἔντοσθεν δὲ βοείας **ράψε** θαμειὰς
χρυσείης **ράβδοισι** διηνεκέσιν περὶ κύκλον (*Il.*12.296-7)

The Homeric figure *μνηστήρ μνᾶται*, splits up over three and even four lines, always with an intervening relative

φράζευ ὅπως **μνηστήρσιν** ἀναιδέσι χεῖρας ἐφήσεις,
οἷ δὴ τοι τρίετες μέγαρον κάτα κοιρανέουσι,
μνώμενοι ἀντιθέην ἄλοχον καὶ ἔδνα διδόντες· (*Od.*13.376-8)
μνηστήρων οὐχ ἦδε δίκη τὸ πάροιθε τέτυκτο·
οἷ τ' ἀγαθὴν τε γυναῖκα καὶ ἀφνειοῖο θύγατρα
μνηστεύειν ἐθέλωσι καὶ ἀλλήλοισ ἐρίσωσιν (*Od.*18.275-7)
ἦν δὲ τις ἐν **μνηστήρσιν** ἀνὴρ ἀθεμίστια εἰδῶς,
Κτήσιππος δ' ὄνομ' ἔσκε, Σάμη δ' ἐνὶ οἰκίᾳ ναῖεν·
ὅς δὴ τοι κτεάτεσσι πεποιθῶς θεσπεσίοισι

μνάσκει Ὀδυσσῆος δὴν οἰχομένοιο δάμαρτα. (*Od.*20.287-90).

All of these phrases are stylistically quite high profile, and it is difficult to avoid the impression that their often delayed phonetic echo, and/or expansion across line boundaries, increased the impact they had in context, despite the fact that the relative made the distance between noun and verb plausible. The two deployments of ξείνον ξενίζειν present a paradigmatic example of the two modes of constructing highly affected EFs: Heavily sponadaic line onset (ξείνους ξενίζειν, ⁵ |) and line-crossing ὅτε **ξείνισσας** ἐκεῖνον / σὸν **ξείνον** δύστηνον.

As I remarked in reference to ἔπος, ^{bd} | ὅτι κεν εἶπω, and could also have noted when discussing such arrangements as μήτηρ ἐνάτη ἦν ^{bd} | ἣ τέκε τέκνα, or δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι, ^{bd} | ὅτι διδοῖεν the verb housing segment of a relative EF often looks very much like a line filling device. In a few cases this is the most frequent arrangement. When Ἄτη is the goddess we find the relative cognate phrase following in the same position with the verb either active or passive and the relative nominative or dative:

πρέσβα Διὸς θυγάτηρ **Ἄτη**, ⁷ | ἣ πάντας **ἀάται** (*//.*19.90)

αὔτις ἐλεύσεσθαι **Ἄτην**, ⁷ | ἣ πάντας **ἀάται** (*//.*19.129)

οὐ δυνάμην λελαθέσθ' **Ἄτης** ⁷ | ἣ πρῶτον **ἀάσθην** (*//.*19.136).

In studies on Homeric etymologizing the relative phrase is said to exist mainly for that purpose, but we should also add the desire to personify to the equation. The only time 'blindness' occurs unpersonified as an instrumental dative the phrase is line initial:

τῆδ' **ἄτη** **ἄσας** καί μιν μέγα κῦδος ἀπηύρας; (*//.*8.237).

Figures involving γίγνομαι generally show no localization. In one case we see the standard noun + verb order in a connected phrase:

παίδων ἐν μεγάροισι ^{tr} | **γονὴ γένετο** κρειόντων (*Il.*24.540)

But two other instances of schemata from γίγνομαι show wider degrees of separation:

τῶν οἱ ἔξ **ἐγένοντο** ἐνὶ μεγάροισι **γενέθλη** (*Il.*5.270)

ἱμερόεντα **γόνον** περὶ πάντων Οὐραניῶνων,

γείνατο, αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς φιλότητι μιγεῖσα. (*Hes. Th.*919-920)

Three others show this propensity to expand into a relative clause. Either on the same or successive lines:

αὐτοκασι**γνήτω**, **τῷ** μοι μία **γείνατο** μήτηρ. (*Il.*3.238).

σοῖς τε κασι**γνήτοις** οἷ τοι ὁμόθεν **γεγάσιν**. (*h.Hom.*5.131-5).

Ἵορτυγίην Λαιστ[ρ]υ[γον]ίην τε **γενέθλην**

ὄς τε Ποσειδάωνος ἐρισθ[ε]νέος **γένεθ'** υἱός (*Hes. Fr.*150.26-7).

The lack of metrical uniformity in the figures of birth and lineage from *ḡenh₁*-mirrors the variety of their nominal components, and gives added weight to the impression that these expressions were molded on and licensed by more general proclivities for repetitious language in genealogical language.

The two occurrences of τοκεὺς τίκτει are similarly ununiform:

Ἀρήτη δ' ὄνομ' ἐστὶν ἐπώνυμον, ἐκ δὲ **τοκῆων**

τῶν αὐτῶν **οἷ** περ **τέκον** Ἀλκίνοον βασιλῆα. (*Od.*7.54-55)

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πᾶσι τίθενται, ἐπεὶ κε **τέκωσι**, **τοκῆες**. (*Od.*8.554).

We see one instance each of the line expanding relative and successive line arrangement with ἄγγελος ἀγγεῖλει:

καὶ τότε ἄρ' **ἄγγελον** ἦκαν, **ὄς ἀγγεῖλειε** γυναικί. (*Od.*15.458).

Ἔκτορος· οὐ γάρ οἱ τις ἐτήτυμος **ἄγγελος** ἐλθὼν

ἤγγειλ' ὅτι ρά οἱ πόσις ἔκτοθι μίμνε πυλάων, (*Il.*22.438-9).

4.7 Minimal patterns:

By now we have come quite far from the regularity and localization that characterized many of the oft-recurring staples of Homeric language like εἶματα ἔννυσθαι, δῶρον δίδοναι or θεὸς τίθησι. In order to return to the impression that the etymological figures show a great deal of regularity in their placement within hexameters, we will need to compile the information that has been laid out in this chapter into a cohesive whole. But before we proceed to analysis of major patterns, note that there are some minimal patterns that emerge if we line up isolated occurrences of various phrases. Sometimes one element of a figure begins a line while the other member either finishes it or occurs in a segment that finishes it. One might point to hints of this line-framing pattern in the major idioms and compare the positions of some less frequent or hapax phrases:

δῶρόν τοι καὶ ἐγώ, τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο **δίδωμι**, (*Od.*15.125)

ἔσσω μιν χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε, **εἶματα** καλά, (*Od.*16.79, 17.550, 21.339)

ἔσσαι με χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε, **εἶματα** καλά· (*Od.*14.154)

ἔσσας με χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε **εἶματα** πέμψαι (*Od.*14.396)

ἔσσαμένη δ' εὖ πάντα περὶ χροῖ εἶματα καλά (*h.Hom.*5.64)

εἶδος ἀκιδνοτέρη μέγεθος τ' εἰσάντα **ιδέσθαι**· (*Od.*5.217)

εἶδός τε μέγεθος τε ἀμείνονα θῆκεν **ιδέσθαι** (*Od.*24.374)³⁹⁵

φῦσαι δ' ἐν χοάνοισιν ἐείκοσι πᾶσαι **ἐφύσων** (*Il.*18.470)

πεπλήγων ἀγορήθεν ἀεικέσσι **πληγῆσιν**. (*Il.*2.264)

σταθμοὶ δ' ἀργύρεοι ἐν χαλκῆφ **ἔστασαν** οὐδῶ (*Od.*7.89)

³⁹⁵ The two other appearances of this figure fit divergent patterns:

εἶδος οὐ τι **ιδών**,⁵ | ἀλλ' ἄλλων μῦθον ἀκούων. (*Hes.Fr.*199.32-3).
οὐ τότε γ' ᾧδ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀγασσάμεθ' | **εἶδος** **ιδόντες** (*Il.*3.224).

χεῦ', **ὄδμη** δ' ἠδεῖα ἀπὸ κρητῆρος **ὀδώδει** (*Od.*9.210-11).

The other instance of ὄδμη ὄζε in the *Odyssey* features noun and verb at the end of successive lines:

πῦρ μὲν ἐπ' ἐσχαρόφιν μέγα καίετο, τηλόσε δ' **ὄδμη**
κέδρου τ' εὐκεάτοιο θύου τ' ἀνὰ νῆσον **ὀδώδει** (*Od.*5.59-60).

This is another pattern not entirely without parallel among more frequent figures:

ἐξέφερεν θαλάμοιο, τίθει δ' ἐνὶ κάλλιμα **δῶρα**,
ἐσθῆτα χρυσόν τε, τά οἱ Φαίηκες **ἔδωκαν**. (*Od.*8.439-40).
νηὶ δ' ἐνὶ πρύμνῃ ἐξαίνυτο κάλλιμα **δῶρα**,
ἐσθῆτα χρυσόν τε, τά οἱ Μενέλαος **ἔδωκε**. (*Od.*15.206-7).
αὐτῷ τοι μετόπισθ' ἄχος ἔσσεται, εἴ κεν **ἄοιδόν**
πέφνης, **ὄς** τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν **ἀείδω**. (*Od.*22.345-346)
ῶρηι ἐν εἰαρινῇι, ὅτε τ' ἄτριχος οὔρεσι **τίκτει**
γ|α|ῖ|η|ς ἐν κευθμῶνι τρίτῳι ἔτει τρία **τέκνα**. (*Hes.Fr.*204.129-30)
'Ερμείας, νύμφη δ' ἐτίθει πάρα πᾶσαν **ἔδωδῆν**,
ἔσθειν καὶ πίνειν, **οἶα** βροτοὶ ἄνδρες **ἔδουσιν**. (*Od.*5.195-196).

We might imagine that the delayed echo in this arrangement had an acoustic effect not unlike rhyme in English verse, as in the heroic couplets of Alexander Pope, or the sonnets of Robert Frost.³⁹⁶ A similarly delayed echo may occur in successive line beginnings, but less frequently than at line end:

³⁹⁶ Compare Pope's opening of the epistle, *Essay On Man*:
Awake, my St. John! Leave all meaner things
To low ambition, and the pride of kings.

And the first quatrain of Frost's *Into My Own*:

One of my wishes is that those dark trees,
So old and firm they scarcely show the breeze,
Were not, as 'twere, the merest mask of gloom,
But stretched away unto the edge of doom.

δώρων δ' ὅσσ' ἐν ἐμῷ οἴκῳ κειμήλια κείται,
δώσω ὃ κάλλιστον καὶ τιμηέστατόν ἐστιν· (*Od.*4.613-4=15.113-14)
δῆσε δ' ἀλυκτοπέδησι Προμηθεά ποικιλόβουλον
δεσμοῖς ἀργαλέοισι μέσον διὰ κίον' ἐλάσσας· (*Hes. Th.*521-2)
κήρυκι Ἴηπυτίδῃ, ὅς οἱ παρὰ πατρὶ γέροντι
κηρύσσων γήρασκε φίλα φρεσὶ μήδεα εἰδώς· (*Il.*17.322-5).

In some cases already cited (ἀοῖδοι#... ἀοιδῆς#, #μνηστήρων... #μνηστεύειν) the line ending and line beginning acoustic hammers fall over three lines. It is, of course, very rare that Homeric syntax sustains a same-phrase figure over such a prosodic space without a coordinating conjunction. Hence, within all of our figures the echo over three lines only occurs in the cases of μνηστήρ μνᾶται and, with paronomastic and polyptotic extension into a third line, κήρυξ κηρύσσει and ἀοῖδοὶ ἀεῖδει. But if we wanted to open up a very large can of worms such arrangements could be compared to a myriad of other syntactically more loosely connected echoes, e.g:

κείνος δ' οὐ ποτε πάμπαν ἀτάσθαλον ἄνδρα **ἔώργει**·
 ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ὑμέτερος θυμὸς καὶ ἀεικέα **ἔργα**
 φαίνεται, οὐδέ τις ἐστι χάρις μετόπισθ' **εὐεργέων**(*Od.*4.693-5).

Another minimal pattern, perhaps barely perceptible in the flurry of figures, but nonetheless worth commenting on briefly, features a connected noun-verb phrase right across the line boundary. A sizable group of these may be excerpted from above: ῥέξαι / ἔργον, ὄπωπας / ὀφθαλμοῖσι, ἀοῖδοὶ / ἄδομεν, δεσμῶ / δῆσατ', ὀχήγες / εἶχον, εἶδαρ / ἔδμεναι. Two figures only appear in this position:

ἐνθεν ἄλις τέξουσι βόες ταύροισι **μιγεῖσαι**
μίγδην θηλείας τε καὶ ἄρσενας· οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ (*h.Hom.*4.493-4)

ἴφθιμον Μελάνιππον. ὃ δ' ὄφρα μὲν εἰλίποδας **βοῦς**

βόσκ' ἐν Περκώτῃ δῆϊων ἀπὸ νόσφιν ἐόντων (*//*.15.547-8).

4.8 Major patterns:

At this point we have seen the prosodic placement of virtually all the figures and are in a position to make some general observations.³⁹⁷ First, the oft-recurring idioms of poetic diction constitute formulaic building blocks with a primary structure attribute + noun + verb + in connected phrases.

Rearrangement of the order of the elements is generally less remarkable than separation of the unit. The accusative figures of this type tend to gravitate toward the Adonic segment to which they are either perfectly suited (^{bd} | εἶματα εἶμαι, ^{bd} | δῶρα δίδωμι, ^{bd} | εἶδαρ ἔδμεναι), suited with some variation (^{bd} | πῆματα πάσχειν vs. ^{bd} | πῆμα πάθησι etc.), or morphologically adapted to fill this slot (^{bd} | δῶρα διδώσειν). Aberrations from this norm often involve parts of the conjugation of the figure that would not fit in the Adonic, either because the verb form simply will not fit there (⁷ | δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα), or because the noun + verb sequence would not have fit there (^{†bd} | ἔπος εἶπειν, ἔπος ἔειπεν).³⁹⁸ Expanding our survey further into the line than the diaeresis, we can include within this class of figures in which the connected noun + verb constitute the entirety of an end line segment to several other expressions either with syntactic variation (⁷ | κειμήλια κεῖται, ⁷ | κειμήλιον ἔστω, ^{tr} | ἐπὶ κλησιν καλέουσι, ^{tr} | ἐπὶ κλησιν καλέεσκε), or morphological variation (⁵ | καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρρα κτερεῖξω vs. ⁵ | καὶ ἐπὶ κτέρρα κτερίσαιεν, ^{tr} | ἀναίτιον αἰτιάσθαι vs. ^{tr} | ἀναίτιον αἰτιόω).

³⁹⁷ I have omitted a few that fit no pattern and only occur once, e.g. οὐ γὰρ τις **νόον** ἄλλος ἀμείνονα τοῦδε **νοήσει** (*//*.9.104); ἄλλα δ' **ἀμαλλοδετήρες** ἐν ἔλλεδανοῖσι **δέοντο** (*//*.18.553).

³⁹⁸ I assume the presence of the initial di-gamma for the purposes of versification of these forms.

However, although we might call the various end line positions something of a norm for many of the most frequently attested idioms, it is important to note that several recurring figures that do not conform to this norm nonetheless show their own particular pattern of localization. This localization may be line initial, as in all of the semantically varied and detached figures from **steh₂*: ἰστὸν δ' ἔστησεν ⁵ | 'he set up the mast', στή ῥα παρὰ σταθμὸν ⁵ | 'she stood by the stanchion' and στησαμένη μέγαν ἰστὸν ^{tr} | 'setting up a loom'. The localization may also be line internal (θῆκε θεά, ⁷ |, ^{tr} | μάχην ἐμάχοντο).

The predominantly end line localization of recurring phrases contrasts sharply with the placement of infrequent schemata. As the lists above show the majority of these take up line beginning positions. Only one line beginning denominative expression occurs with any frequency (βουλὰς βουλευεῖν ⁵ | X5), but attributeless noun phrase + denominative verb at the onset of lines appears to be a somewhat productive structural formulaic template. In as much as this template is for the most part heavily spondaic it must have put a great deal of emphasis on the innovated expression. The highly affected context of *Odyssey* 9 shows these principles at work by converting the most frequent EA, δῶρον διδόναι into an attributeless, spondaic and innovative line beginning phrase featuring unidiomatic δωτίνην:

εἴ τι πόροις **ξεινήιον** ἤε καὶ ἄλλως
δοίης δωτίνην, ἥ τε **ξεινῶν** θέμις ἐστίν.
ἀλλ' αἰδεῖο, φέριστε, θεοῦς· **ικέται** δέ τοί εἶμεν,
Ζεὺς δ' ἐπατιμήτωρ **ικετάων** τε **ξεινῶν** τε,
ξεινίος, ὃς **ξεινοῖσιν** ἄμ' αἰδοίοισιν ὀπηδεῖ.

If you might provide us some entertainment, or otherwise

present us a present, which is the right of guests.

But respect the gods, good man, for we are suppliants to you
and Zeus is avenger of suppliants and guests

Zeus of guests, who walks with revered guests (*Od.*9.267-271).

The polyptoton in this passage constitutes a veritable flood of repetition. Note also that *δοίης δωτίνην* inverts the semi-usual noun + verb word order of idiomatic figures, and strips the figure of its nearly ubiquitous attribute by supplanting it with an adverb. Couple this with the fact that *Odyssey* 9 engages wordplay more than other books of Homer and we can see that this context called for a figure of substantially higher profile than a low profile stock phrase in predictable position like ^{bd} | *δῶρα δίδωμι*, or even a split formula like Helen's demonstrative **δῶρόν** τοι καὶ ἐγώ, τέκνον φίλε, τοῦτο **δίδωμι**. Remember that Odysseus is reporting this dialogue to the Phaeacians (the secondary narrator reporting his own speech) presumably with some residual ire, and that the 'present' he eventually is granted by Polyphemos is, maliciously enough, that he will be eaten last.

To bring forth but one more of many possible examples, observe the placement of the bombastic and almost incomprehensibly tautological *τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο* ^{tr} | (*Il.*7.449) used by Poseidon to express indignation, against the phrase in narrative that it echoes, ^{bd} | *τεῖχος ἔδειμαν* at 436. This sequence presents a striking display of a normal and unremarkable expression in the Adonic moved to the front of the line and expressed figuratively to achieve rhetorical emphasis.

In the end, the careful analysis of the deployment of the EF in Homeric hexameters, particularly the juxtaposition of predominantly end line idioms and innovative phrases at the onset of lines, has unearthed several nuances of

Homeric compositional technique. The fact that irregular figures gravitate toward the onset of lines has metrical corollaries not just in the hexameter of Greek Epic, but in almost every meter in every language one can think. In Homeric poetry various factors served to make dactyls more desirable than spondees later in the line. In addition to the well-known prevalence of dactyls, in the 5th foot, there was also a predilection not to compose spondees at the end of the 4th foot before a diaeresis (Hermann's bridge). But, while there may have been metrical motivations for coining the spondaic denominative figures at the beginning of lines, there is no reason to believe that this did conform to the poets' aesthetic preference. Rather, this position would likely have showcased the figure and put a premium on ingenuity.

Chapter 5

5. Aversion to the perfect tenses and conversion to passive:³⁹⁹

This chapter starts from two observations: first, that Homeric Greek is the most faithful preserver of the original *naktostative*⁴⁰⁰ aspect of the PIE perfect, and second, that, -- out of 295 occurrences involving every other tense -- the accusative + verb *figura etymologica* does not co-occur with inherited perfect or pluperfect verb forms in Homer, Hesiod or the *Hymns*. The first observation is prevalent enough among Indo-Europeanists to be considered *communis opinio*,⁴⁰¹ the second has emerged from the new statistical analysis in the tables A5.1-3 presented in the Appendix. Here, I operate under the assumption that the accomplished state denoted by the perfect originally adhered only to grammatical subjects, and that the so-called *resultative*⁴⁰² perfect, whereby stativity could be transferred to grammatical objects, was, for the most part, a post-Homeric development.⁴⁰³ Based partly on this

³⁹⁹ A shortened version of this chapter entitled “Restrictions on the Use of the *Figura Etymologica* in Ancient Greek Epic” has already been published in *Proceedings of the 19th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Journal of Indo-European Monograph Series, No. 54*, 113-36. I thank the organizers of and participants in that conference, as well as the editors of the Journal, for useful feedback regarding the ultimate form and content of the article and chapter.

⁴⁰⁰ For prior use of the convenient term ‘*naktostative*’ see Gotō, 169 who defines it as *Erreichter Zustand*, accomplished, or achieved stativity.

⁴⁰¹ “The IE perfect (whence the perfect active of Greek and Indo-Iranian) originally denoted the state resulting from the accomplishment of an action, or process. This value is still faithfully preserved in Homeric Greek” (Jasonoff, 14) cf. Chantraine (1927: 8), Lyonnet, 40, et al.

⁴⁰² The term ‘*resultative*’ has some unfortunate overlaps in current linguistic terminology. Kiparsky’s definition of ‘*resultative*’ perfects in English does not preclude the subject being the primary focus of *naktostativity*. For instance he interprets “the convict has escaped now” as a *resultative* perfect. Nevertheless, I have chosen, for the most part, to retain the term ‘*resultative*’ because of its prevalence in the classical literature on the topic. If I slip on occasion and speak of an ‘*objective*’, rather than a *resultative* perfect I ask forgiveness for the equivocation.

⁴⁰³ Schmidt, (5), Kümmel (65) et al. For beginnings of the *resultative* perfect in Homer see Lyonnet’s article. For a general discussion of the *resultative* perfect and its proliferation in Attic see Chantraine (1927: 118 ff.). In 1903 Brugmann asserted that PIE possessed two types of perfects, one expressing only the state of the subject, the other capable of transferring that state onto an object. For the latter he cited Vedic *somaṁ suṣuma*, Homeric perfect participle

assumption, and partly on what evidence is available to us within the Epic *figurae*, I propose that, at the earliest stage, an etymological argument could only take the subject-slot in conjunction with the perfect or pluperfect. Such arguments might combine with either passive or intransitive verbs, but in terms of conversion of an accusative construction behind both lies the fact that they could not have achieved their state by their own agency.

Recent discussions of the cognate object (CO) have classified the construction in two, juxtaposed manners. Majority opinion among post-Chomskyan linguists casts the CO noun phrase as an adjunct predicate, modifying verbal action like any other adverb or adverbial phrase and not governed, as most objects are, by reception of a θ -role.⁴⁰⁴ In this scenario the CO is an object in name only. Diane Massam, on the other hand, asserted that the CO functions as a special sort of object governed by verbs via what she called a ‘patient θ -role’.⁴⁰⁵ Since it is demonstrable in Homeric Greek that the perfect could take either adverbial/adjectival complements or external objects, but could never occur with a CO, I find both conclusions problematic. If the CO was truly an adjunct, and Homer attests syntactic combinations such as, πολλὰ ἔοργε, it would be difficult to motivate a restriction against forming a phrase like †πολλὰ ἔργα ἔοργε.⁴⁰⁶ On the other hand, if external objects could freely take θ -roles from verbs in the perfect, as in τεθνᾶσιν, τιμῆν

πεπληγώς and pluperfect indicative βεβλήκει (§ 738 and § 746). By the time of the *Vedas*, however, it is clear that the Indo-Iranian perfect had undergone several innovations that made it a less accurate indicator of the original properties of the PIE perfect than Homeric Greek. Thus, there is nothing that militates against seeing the objective stativity exemplified by phrases such as *somaṃ suṣuma* as representing an independent, post-PIE development.

⁴⁰⁴ Jones, Moltmann, Zubizarreta, Humphries et al.

⁴⁰⁵ This is basically a quick synopsis of the articles discussed already in the Introduction above (12 ff.).

⁴⁰⁶ The dagger, here and hereafter, indicates the impossibility of the phrase at the time of Homer.

λελόγγασι ‘the dead, those who have achieved honor’ (*Od.*11.304), but Homer seems to be at pains not to say τιμὴν τετιμῆσθαι,⁴⁰⁷ what point is there in not making a categorical distinction between the principles of government binding cognate versus non-cognate objects to verbs?

5.1.0 Incidentalism:

Before proceeding to the main analyses I would like to address a natural and perhaps inevitable question: is it possible that the CO’s failure to occur with the perfect tenses is mere coincidence? Various facts point to the lack of intersection not being due to chance. I have included a compilation of Schlacter’s meticulous count of tenses in Homer (table A6.3) to show that we cannot simply cite the rarity of the perfect tenses against aorist, or present forms to account for the gap; the future is far less frequent than the perfect and pluperfect, and yet readily incorporates the etymological accusative (EA). Further, it would be an extra coincidence that, of the six Greek tenses, the two that share the same essential properties both lack expression with the EA. We would be compelled to admit coincidence if, for instance, the pluperfect and future attested no EAs but the perfect did. Another argument against coincidence is the traceable mechanism for perfect expression I have already mentioned: conversion into the nominative as subject of a passive or intransitive verb:

accusative + active verb in any non-perfect tense (do a deed) >>
nominative + verb in a ‘passive’ perfect tense (a deed has been done)
or >> nominative + verb in the intransitive perfect (a stele has stood/stands).

⁴⁰⁷ For a description of the pains he took to avoid τιμὴν τετιμῆσθαι see below (99-101).

But perhaps the most convincing argument for postulating a grammatical restriction, rather than attributing the gap to coincidence, is that the morphological and semantic characteristics of the perfect tenses and the fundamental properties of the *figura etymologica* would have made combining the two an enticing proposition for the epic poets. Alliteration and assonance are driving forces behind formation of etymological figures, while the perfect, because of its reduplication, comes ready-made with its own phonetic echo. Also, the perfect is traditionally described as an intensive category, and the stylistic bottom-line of etymological figures is that they represent an emphatic form of repetition, or *ausdruckverstärkung*. Intersections of the perfect with nominative and dative *figurae etymologicae* demonstrate that the epic poets were aware of this situation and took advantage of it. Note the extension of alliteration and assonance in the following phrases (these are but two of many possible examples):

κλισμῶ κεκλιμένη, λέπτ' ἠλάκατα στρωφῶσα.

‘reclined against a recliner, spinning fine threads’ (*Od.*17.97)

ὄδμη δ' ἠδεῖα ἀπὸ κρητήρος ὀδώδει

‘the sweet aroma from the bowl was aromatic’ (*Od.*9.210).

In Classical Greek, after the “resultative” perfect helped to authorize use with every type of object, we see the confluence of phonetic echoing and intensity often utilized to good effect within the accusative figures:

Μῶν οὖν οὐ μυρίαί μὲν ἐπὶ μυρίαῖς ἡμῖν γεγόνασι

πόλεις ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τοῦ πλήθους

λόγον οὐκ ἐλάττους ἐφθαρμένοι; **πεπολιτευμένοι δ' αὖ πάσας**

πολιτείας πολλάκις ἐκασταχοῦ;

Surely, then, thousands upon thousands of cities have come into existence in this span of time, and an equally great number, certainly no less, have met destruction? Have they not governed themselves in turn by every form of government everywhere? (Pl.Lg.676c).

Note that the repetitiveness of πεπολιτευμένοι πολιτείας is mirrored by the preceding polyptoton in μυρίαί μὲν ἐπὶ μυρίαίς; both emphatic questions have verbs in the perfect (γεγόνασι and πεπολιτευμένοι), and, taken together with its subject, the figure actually constitutes an extended paronomastic construction: πόλεις πολιτείας πεπολιτευμένοι. The passage and schema are both highly affected and suggestive of conscious fashioning for rhetorical emphasis.

One last reason to see the lack of EAs with the perfect in Archaic Epic as not simply coincidental is that the repetition of sound and sense generally endemic to etymological figures marks them out as a specific set, and makes it more plausible that a grammatical restriction would apply, within the syntax of a particular case, to the entire group. The fact that all of the accusative figures produced a phonetic echo, and that the vast majority were completely tautological, seems to have taken precedent over the grammatical heterogeneity of the category in the application of the restriction against use with perfect. We would then postulate that a numerically overwhelming group of EAs, consisting both of those featuring internal objects and perhaps those with effected, or result-type objects, were syntactically incompatible with the perfect tenses, while the smaller group of phrases that incorporate external objects, since the perfect could occur with other external arguments, were analogically included in the restriction. In other words, I regard internal and effected constructions like ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι/ ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν and τέκνον

τίκτειν as genuinely incompatible with the perfect tenses, while phrases in which semantic detachment has produced an external object, such as εἶδος ἰδεῖν are not genuinely incompatible. We could motivate the lack of occurrence of εἶδος with any forms within the perfect paradigm of οἶδα/εἰδέναί along the same lines as the internal constructions if it meant merely ‘see a sight’, or ‘see that which is seen.’ Since, however, the phrase must mean ‘look upon someone’s physical appearance,’ with the syntagm having achieved some degree of externality, and since there is no good reason to believe that there would have been a restriction against forming a figure with the meaning ‘to have come to know one’s appearance’ (†εἶδος εἰδέναί), we are left to postulate either an analogical extension of the perfect-restriction to external object phrases, or admit a certain amount of incidentalism. Admission of some element of chance does not invalidate the general theory. In fact, in reference to some figures, like στή ῥα παρὰ σταθμὸν ‘stood by the stanchion’, since the prepositional phrase is locative, and the perfect and pluperfect both occur with the locative dative, it may be entirely coincidental that the poets never began a line ἐστήκει ῥα παρὰ σταθμὸν.

5.1.1 Intersections of verbal roots attesting both EAs and perfect tenses:

Whatever the reason for the lack of co-occurrence of the EA with the perfect tenses, it is not because there is no overlap between verbs appearing in the two categories. The following roots generate both:

**deh*₃- δῶρον δίδοναι / pf. δέδοται⁴⁰⁸

**steh*₂- ἰστὸν ἰσάναί (στή παρὰ σταθμὸν) / pf. ἔστηκε, plupf.

ἐστήκει

⁴⁰⁸ This perfect is a Homeric hapax at //5.428: οὐ τοι τέκνον ἐμὸν δέδοται πολεμήϊα ἔργα.

**uerġ*- ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι/ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν / pf. ἔοργας, plupf.εωργει
 **k^uend^h*- πῆμα πάσχειν / pf. πέπονθα, plupf. ἐπεπονθει
 **kleh₁*- ἐπίκλησιν/κλήδην καλεῖν / pf. κέκλημαι, plupf. κεκλήατο
 **teġ*- τέκνον τίκτειν / pf. τέτοκα (τετοκυίης Hes.*Op*.591)
 **h₁ed*- εἶδαρ/ἔδωδὴν ἔδμεναι/ἔσθειν / pf.pass. ἐδήδοται, ἐδήδαται.
 **ġ^heu*- χύσιν/χοὴν χειῖσθαι / pf. κέχυται, plupf. κέχυτο
 **k^uej*- τιμὴν/ ποινήν τίνειν / pf. τετίμηται
 **ueid*- εἶδος ἰδεῖν / pf. οἶδα, plupf. ἦδεα
 **temh₁*- τέμενος τέμνειν / pf.pass. τετμημένον
 **h₂ger*- ἐς ἀγορὴν ἀγέ(ι)ρεσθαι / plupf. ἀγηγέρατο
 **b^hu*- φυτὸν φύειν/ φυτεύειν / pf. πεφύκασι πεφουασι plupf.πεφουκει
 **ġ^uelh₂*- βέλος βαλλεῖν / pf. βέβληαι, plupf. βέβλετο
 **ġenh₁*- γνήτω γείνασθαι / pf. γέγονε, plupf. γέγονει
 **meġk*- μίγδην μεῖξαι (Hymns) / pf. μέμιγμαι, plupf. ἐμέμικτο
 **dueH*- ἄδυτον δῦναι (Hymns) / pf. δέδυκε

5.2. Conversion to perfect tenses in Archaic Greek Epic:

5.2.1 Possible conversions to passive within the Homeric schemata:

As outlined above, Homeric and post-Homeric evidence suggests that, in order to render an accusatorial figure in the perfect or pluperfect the noun would be put into the nominative and the verb changed to passive or intransitive. In the Archaic Epics, however, the passive construction has not yet become the regular correspondent of the active, and we are left with only a few possible conversions.⁴⁰⁹ In his list of etymological figures

⁴⁰⁹ Gonda, in order to account for the relative paucity of passive constructions in the *Rig Veda* versus later Sanskrit literature, asserts that “the passive was not yet the regular correspondent of the active construction” (1959:281). The fact that the *Rig Veda* does show some full conversions (*vácaḥ vac-* > *vácas ucyate* ‘speech has been spoken’ (*RV*.1.114.6)), while Homer shows none, puts the Greek structures at a more undeveloped, or more pristine phase.

featuring *verb mit akkusativ* (156-7), Fehling lists two constructions that are intriguing in this connection: πεπόλιστο πόλις and τιμὴν τετιμήσθαι. The only possible assumption behind listing the first of these figures with the accusatives is that it represents a conversion from an active construction, that is *πολιν πολιζειν >> πεπόλιστο πόλις. The problem with this assumption is that the active phrase itself never occurs. Further, the passive figure only pops up once in Homer:

Δάρδανον αὖ πρῶτον τέκετο νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς,
κτίσσε δὲ Δαρδανίην, ἐπεὶ οὐ πῶ Ἴλιος ἱρὴ
ἐν πεδίῳ **πεπόλιστο πόλις** μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
Cloud-gathering Zeus sired Dardanus first,
and he founded Dardania, since not yet had mighty Ilium,
city of mortal men been built in the plain (*Il.*20.215-17).

The linking alliteration before and after the *figura* in this passage, as well as the continuance of repetitive phraseology started by the stress on the eponymy of Dardania, are suggestive of nonce coinage, not modeling on a never-attested *πολιν πολιζειν. The active of the denominative verb, πολιζειν only occurs one time in the Homer, as τεῖχος... τὸ...πολίσομεν (*Il.*7.449-53), again with reference to Troy. It also surfaces once in an inscription from Philae:

καὶ πάτρης γλυκερῆς Πτολεμαῖδος, ἣν ἐπόλισσεν
Σωτήρ, sc. τὴν πόλιν, πάτρην?
And from the sweet homeland Ptolemai, which Soter founded,
(*Ep.Gr.*982).

The perfect passive, on the other hand, is more common, and is the only form occurring in a cognate construction after Homer. In Hesiod we find Δωδώνη

πεπόλισται (*Fr.240.5*), while Herodotus attests *πολιζειν* 4 times in the etymological figure, noun in the nominative and verb in the perfect passive always specifying the name of the city, as the Homeric figure referred to the city, Troy, and generally with further alliteration outside of the schema:

Βουδῖνοι δέ, ἔθνος ἐὸν μέγα καὶ πολλόν, γλαυκόν τε πᾶν
ἰσχυρῶς ἐστί καὶ πυρρόν. Πόλις δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖσι πεπόλισται
Ξυλίνη, οὔνομα δὲ τῇ πόλι ἐστὶ Γελωνός·

The Budini, a tribe both great and numerous, all have eyes extremely bright and reddish. A wooden settlement among them has been settled, and the name of this settlement is Gelonus (*Hdt.4.108.1*)

τῶν ἐσχάτη πεπόλισται πρὸς ἐσπέρης πόλις τῇ οὔνομά ἐστι
Μεσαμβρία

Furthest from them a settlement towards sunset has been settled, its name is Mesambria (*Hdt.7.108.2*).⁴¹⁰

Given that all of the above schemata occur with the noun in the nominative, it seems probable that Homeric *πεπόλιστο πόλις* represents an expression coined in the passive and presenting no active counterpart, and that its Herodotean equivalent *πεπόλισται πόλις* simply followed this precedent. Nevertheless, the logic of the phrase follows the general principles of the perfect tenses as expressing only the subject state; it may not demonstrate a conversion, but still suggests a predilection for nominative + perfect instead of accusative + perfect, for ‘the city had (was in the state of having) been built’, rather than ‘they had (were in the state of having) built the city’.

⁴¹⁰ The other two passages are *ποταμὸν Χοάσπην, ἐόντα καὶ τοῦτον νηυσιπέρητον, ἐπ’ ᾧ Σοῦσα πόλις πεπόλισται*. (*5.52.6*) and *Σάλη τε Σαμοθρηκική πεπόλισται πόλις καὶ Ζώνη* (*7.59.2*).

The other EA listed by Fehling with a verb in the perfect, τιμῆν τετιμῆσθαι, if we were to take the verb as a middle governing the accusative, would appear to violate the restriction. The actual attestation, however, is considerably more enigmatic:

τοῦτο δ' ἐγὼ πρόφρων δέχομαι, χαίρει δέ μοι ἦτορ,
ὥς μευ ἀεὶ μέμνησαι ἐνηέος, οὐδέ σε λήθω,
τιμῆς ἧς τέ μ' ἔοικε **τετιμῆσθαι** μετ' Ἀχαιοῖς

I (Nestor) accept this from you gratefully, and my heart is happy that you have remembered me and my kindness, that I am not forgotten for the honour that should be my honour among the Achaeans (Il.23.647-9).⁴¹¹

As discussed at length above (99-101) the accusative of price is standard in similar idioms. Further, explaining the selection of the genitive case for the relative here as motivated by either attraction to the antecedent, or genitive of price is implausible, and does not explain the change from accusative of price in closely related phrases. In sum, it is quite likely that the genitive is masking a violation of the restriction.

The fact that the verb τιμᾶν 'honor' pushes for innovative expression in the perfect is not a phenomenon isolated to Epic. Indeed, both Wackernagel and Chantraine saw in Pindar's use of τιμᾶν the earliest attestation of the "resultative" perfect:

ἴστε μάν
Αἴαντος ἀλκάν, φοίνιον τὰν ὀψία
ἐν νυκτὶ ταμῶν περὶ ᾧ φασγάνῳ μομφὰν ἔχει
παίδεσσιν Ἑλλάνων ὅσοι Τροίανδ' ἔβαν.

⁴¹¹ As translated by Lattimore, Chicago, 1951.

ἀλλ' Ὀμηρός τοι **τετίμακεν** δι' ἀνθρώπων, ὅς αὐτοῦ
πᾶσαν ὀρθώσας ἀρετὰν κατὰ ῥάβδον ἔφρασεν
θεσπεσίων ἐπέων λοιποῖς ἀθύρειν.

Indeed you know

the prowess of Ajax, which, slicing bloody around his sword
late in the night, he holds out as a reproach
to the sons of the Hellenes who went to Troy.
But Homer has done him honor among men,
who, setting straight all his valor, by his wand of
divine words, told of it to delight men to come. (*I.4.37*).

McKay, who is quite a bit more sceptical regarding early attestations of the “resultative” perfect, interprets *τετίμακεν* as emphasizing not the state of honor bestowed by Homer on Ajax, but the state of honor Homer achieved by honoring Ajax. He comes to the conclusion that “Ajax is in fact incidental to the power of Homer. The state expressed by *τετίμακεν* is that of the subject, not the object” (10). In general, McKay goes to great lengths to discount the early examples of “resultative” perfects adduced by Chantraine, even resorting, at one point (8), to postulating scribal error to account for inscriptional ἀνατέθηκεν, commonly cited as the earliest (320 BC) inscriptional evidence of the resultative perfect.⁴¹² In the end, many of McKay’s readings seem more metaphorical than grammatical. In the Pindaric passage it is difficult not to agree with Wackernagel and Chantraine and admit that, at least on the basic level of syntax, Ajax is the recipient of honor. We would then conclude, combining the Homeric and Pindaric passages, that the semantics of τιμᾶν

⁴¹² *IG.2.2* pp. 302 ff.). Cf. Wackernagel, 8, Chantraine, 6.

made it a particularly good candidate for innovative usage in the perfect transferring stativity to the object, and, in reference to the Homeric phrase, perhaps incorporating the etymological object into the subject state of the verb.

5.2.2 Conversion to nominative with intransitive verbs within *figurae*:

In this category there is one case where we can actually witness the transformation within Archaic Epic: we have seen that active figures from **ǵenh₁-*, while not terribly common, are represented in more than one formulation:

αὐτοκασιγνήτω, τῷ μοι μία γείνατο μήτηρ

My (Helen's) brothers whom one mother bore (*//*.3.238)

ἱμερόεντα γόνον περὶ πάντων Οὐρανιώνων,

γείνατο, αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς φιλότητι μιγεῖσα

She (Leto) bore a brood more lovely than all other the children of

Ouranos, having mingled in love with aegis-bearing Zeus (*Hes. Th.*919-920).⁴¹³

Compare especially *//*.3.238 to the following appearance of the nominative figure linked to an intransitive form of γίγνομαι:

σοῖς τε κασιγνήτοις οἷ τοι ὁμόθεν γεγάασιν·

And to your brothers, who are born from the same womb

(*h.Hom.*5.135).

Another case involves the root **steh₂-*. While Homer does not attest the EA στήλην ἰστάναι, in Attic inscriptions it is standard:

⁴¹³ Cf. Θήβη ἐν ἑπταπύλῳ διδυμάονε γείνατο παῖδε, / οὐ καθ' ὁμὰ φρονέοντε· κασιγνήτω γε μὲν ἤστην· (*Hes.Sc.*49-50).

καὶ ἔστησε τὴν στήλην ‘and he set up the *stèle*’ (R.O.5.1.3, Athenian phratry decree from Declea, 396/5 BC, cf. R.O.20.24-5, 29.9, R.O.37.84, R.O.44.43, R.O.89.35, 90.36).

We might juxtapose this standard phrase with a few passages from the *Iliad*:

ἀλλ’ ὥς τε **στήλη** μένει ἔμπεδον, ἢ τ’ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
ἀνέρος **ἔστήκη** τεθνηότος ἢ ἐ γυναικός

But they (the horses of Patroclus) remained fixed like a stele which at the tomb of a dead man or woman has stationed itself (*Il.*17.434-5).

The appearance of the intransitive here, given the prevalence of the active phrase in inscriptions, suggests a conversion conducive to expression with the perfect: στήλην ἰστάναι >> στήλη ἔστήκη. The passage above and the one below are closely modeled on each other, putting the noun and verb in the perfect in the same slots, but to very different effect:

ἀλλ’ ὥς τε **στήλην** ἢ δένδρεον ὑψιπέτηλον
ἀτρέμας **ἔσταότα στήθος** μέσον οὔτασε δουρὶ

But as he (Alcathous) stood fixed, like a stele or a high-leaved tree, he (Idomeneus) wounded him with a spear in the middle of his chest (*Il.*13.437-8).

The fact that both these standing stele occur in similes likened, in one case to horses, in another to a warrior may in part make up for the fact that, since stele do not stand themselves up, the phrase may have sounded a bit odd.

The stylistically marked nature of the figures, combined with the inscriptional evidence for the normal formulation taking the shape of an accusative construction tempt one to take στήλη ἔστήκη as a poetically charged conversion of a set phrase στήλην ἰστάναι.

5.2.3 Conversions outside of the schemata:

A few expressions, followed along semantic, rather than etymological lines, provide additional evidence for conversion to subject + perfect and pluperfect. The frequent phrase ἔπος εἶπεῖν ‘speak speech’ is, of course, defective, with only the reduplicated aorist forming an etymological accusative. Expressions with the equivalent semantic ‘speak speech’, however, do occur with pluperfect, medio-passive forms of εἶρω:

οὐ πῶ πᾶν εἶρητο ἔπος, ὅτε

‘not yet had the whole speech been spoken, when’ (*Il.*10.540, *Od.*16.11).

Also the syntagm ‘work work’, which appears in various, more or less mutilated forms (ἔργον/ἔργα + ἐργάζεσθαι/ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν), corresponds in meaning to a phrase in which the noun is coupled with the perfect medio-passive form of τεύχω:

ἴδωμ’ ὄντιν’ ἔργα τέτυκται

‘let me see what deeds have been done’ (*Il.*22.450, cf. 24.354).

The verb τεύχω is quite commonly used as an auxiliary to the the etymological verb in the *figurae* from Homer to Classical Greek.⁴¹⁴ In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* the perfect option appears in a relative phrase governed by a cognate main verb:

ἵνα σφίσιν ἐργάζωμαι

πρόφρων οἶα γυναικὸς ἀφήλικος ἔργα τέτυκται·

So that I (Demeter) might labor for them

propitiously, whatever labors of an elderly woman are done (139-140).

⁴¹⁴ It heads Lobeck’s general list of verbs functioning as auxiliaries to the *figura etymologica* in Greek as a whole: τεύχειν, ποιεῖν, τελεῖν, ἄγειν, ἔχειν and χρῆσθαι (509).

Another verb commonly used as an auxiliary to the etymological option in the figures, τελεῖν attests perfect and pluperfect forms with ἔργον as subject:

μέγα ἔργον ὑπερφιάλως τετέλεσται

‘A heinous act has been committed outrageously’ (*Od.*16.346).

τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον

The deed has been accomplished (*Il.*7.465, 19.242, *Od.*22.479).

5.2.4 Post-Homeric conversions and the beginning of a transformation:

It would be ideal to be able to track the interaction of the perfect and pluperfect with the cognate object in the time between Homer and Attic, unfortunately, the *figura etymologica* went mainly underground, or at least fails to occur with any frequency in extant texts, for a substantial period after Archaic Epic. The little bit of evidence we do have from Archilochus and Lesbian poetry, however, shows no deviance from the Homeric state of affairs. In fact, it suggests that interactions between cognate objects and perfect tenses were the same in Greek of the seventh century B.C.E. Archilochus (Fl. 648, -solar eclipse-) attests a Greek coinage that shows patterning similar to πεπόλιστο πόλις:

ἐν δορὶ μὲν μοι **μάζα μεμαγμένη**

‘In my spear is my kneaded barley-bread’ (*Fr.*2).⁴¹⁵

Alcaeus (b. 620 B.C.E.) attests the somewhat common Homeric figure κρητήρα κιννάσθαι ‘mix a bowl’ with the present imperative and the noun in the accusative:

ἐν δὲ κέρνατε τῷ μελιάδεος ὅττι τάχιστα **κράτηρα**

mix a bowl of honey-sweet (wine) as quickly as possible (*Alc.*367).

⁴¹⁵ cf. *Hdt.*1.200, μάζαν μαξάμενος for attestation of the same figure as an EA.

Sappho (b. 612 BC), on the other hand, renders the same idiom in the pluperfect by bringing the noun into the nominative:

κῆ δ' ἀμβροσίας μὲν
κράτηρ ἐκέκρατ'
Ἕρμαις δ' ἔλων ὄλπιν θεοῖσ' ὀινοχόαισε

There a bowl of ambrosia had been mixed, and Hermes, taking the jug, poured wine for the gods (*Fr.141*).

Even if we admit that the resultative perfect was a possibility for Pindar, since he almost never uses the *figura etymologica*, he does not help us much.

The next author whose use of the perfect with the EF is at all instructive is Aeschylus. It is clear that by his time the Attic dialect was developing a slightly different attitude toward combining the CO and perfect. Still, in most cases we do find the old-style Homeric conversion into the passive with the perfect. Aeschylus uses *χοῆν/ χύσιν χεῖσθαι* in the middle and active with the present infinitive and present and aorist participle:

δεύτερον δὲ χρῆ χοὰς
γῆι τε καὶ φθιτοῖς χέασθαι
Second, you must pour
libations to the earth and the dead (*Pers.219-20*).

τί φῶ χέουσα τάσδε κηδείους χοάς;
What do I say while pouring these funereal libations (*Aesch.Ch.87*).

τάδ' **ἐκχέασα**, γάποτον **χύσιν**,
στείχω

after pouring this, a libation drunk by earth do I go? (*Aesch.Ch.97-68*).

The one time he renders the phrase in the perfect he puts the CO in the nominative in a genitival noun clause:

ἴετε δάκρυ καναχῆς ὀλόμενον
ὀλομένωι δεσπότηι
πρὸς ῥεῦμα τόδε κεδνῶν κακῶν τ'
ἀπότροπον, ἄγος ἀπεύχεται
κεχυμένων χοᾶν.

Shed an echoing tear lost for the lost lord,
against this flood of cares and evils unstoppable, abominable curse
of the libations that have been poured (Aesch.Ch.152-6).

Another Aeschylean phrase that follows the method hinted at in Homer involves the more common syntagm, ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι:

τοιγάρ σφιν ἔργον ἐστὶν ἐξεργασμένον
μέγιστον

For indeed a most heinous deed has been done by him (*Pers.*759-60).

The following expression, cited by Chantraine (125) as an early use of the resultative/objective perfect, on the other hand, admits adjectival/adverbial attachment with the perfect middle in a manner not inconsistent with Homeric usage:

ἦ πολλά γ' ἐν δόμοισιν εἴργασται κακά,

She has perpetrated many evils in the house (*A.Fr.*311).

Taking εἴργασται as a resultative perfect in this passage is problematic.

Remember that, according to Chantraine, the Homeric perfect, outside of a few innovative cases like βέβληκα, which has an older counterpart in βέβλημαι, expressed only the state of the subject.⁴¹⁶ How are we to differentiate, then, between the perfect in the Aeschylean phrase above and

⁴¹⁶ *L'aspect du parfait grec dans les plus anciens textes est donc bien défini. Il signifie essentiellement l'état du sujet. Il n'y a dans tous les poèmes homériques qu'un exemple sûr du parfait résultatif et il est manifestement récent.* (1927, 16 cf.121).

the series of Homeric line-ending expressions combining an active perfect from **merǵ-* with substantive adjective/adverbials?

Ἕκτωρ Πριάμίδης, καὶ δὴ κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργε

Hector son of Priam, and in fact he has done many evils (*Il.*8.356)⁴¹⁷

κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὃ τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ ὃ τε πολλὰ ἐοργῶς

He dies alike, both the lazy man and he who has worked much

(*Il.*9.320)

This last line constitutes a famous example of *naktostativity* with present temporal reference since *πολλὰ ἐοργῶς* is basically equated with an adjective (*ἀεργός*).

ὦ πόποι ἦ δὴ μυρὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐσθλὰ ἔοργε ...

vûn δὲ τόδε μέγ' ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξε

Well now, surely Odysseus has done countless excellent things

but now he did this thing far the best among the Argives (*Il.*2.272 and

74).

These lines are often used to show the difference between the present perfect and aorist.

Also compare the following passage from the *Odyssey*:

τολμήεις μοι θυμός, ἐπεὶ κακὰ πολλὰ πέπονθα

My heart is enduring, since I have suffered many evils (*Od.*17.284).

According to Chantraine the accusatives in such combinations do not constitute any sort of objectification of subjective stativity:

Dans une formule comme celle de ρ 284 κακὰ πολλὰ πέπονθα,

l'accusatif ne fait que définir et circonscrire l'idée verbale, il n'ajoute pas

la notion d'une réalisation (6).

⁴¹⁷ The segment *καὶ δὴ κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργε* repeats at *Il.*5.175 and 16.424.

Indeed, it may be better to view all of the neuter substantives in these phrases, including those in Aeschylus, as modifiers of the verbal action and the subject state, rather than objects to which the stativity denoted by the perfect has been transferred. It is true that, when the adjectives are twofold, as in κακὰ πολλὰ εἴργασται or κακὰ πολλὰ πέπονθα, there is more of a tendency to interpret the adjectives as substantives incorporated into the subject state; but it is not clear if this tendency is fundamentally an interpretation of syntax, or simply a means of circumventing translational difficulties. Ancient Greek may have been perfectly able to say ‘I have (am in the state of having) suffered much badly,’ or ‘she has (is in the state of having) done much evilly’, even though such translations appear awkward to us. Citing *Iliad* 2.272 (μυρία Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐσθλὰ ἔοργε), McKay noticed the possible conflation, problematic though it is, of present and past temporal reference:

If the theory that the development of a resultative perfect led to the aoristic use of the perfect is unsatisfactory, what kind of change, if any, did take place? I suggest that it was along the lines of an increasingly conscious implication of the past and present time relationship in the essential state of the perfect. Odysseus is a man of many achievements, and being such a man has now excelled himself. Past action is certainly implied, but we cannot be certain that Homer intended μυρία to imply repeated action and so give some prominence to the past actions themselves (11-12).

I would counter that in the two lines ἔοργε and ἔρεξεν, μυρία and τόδε contrast emphatically, and actually may serve to distance the temporal references of the perfect and aorist.

Turning back to Aeschylus, elsewhere in his plays we find combinations of the EA with perfects that would have been foreign to Homer. For example, the first utterance we hear from Agamemnon as he is being butchered in his bath shows a curious combination of passivity in the perfect incorporating the cognate object:

Ag. ὦμοι **πέπληγμαι** καιρίαν **πληγὴν** ἔσω.

Cho. σῆγα· τίς πληγὴν ἀυτεῖ καιρίως οὐτασμένος;

Ag. ὦμοι μάλ' αὐθις δευτέραν πεπληγμένος.

Cho. **τοῦργον εἰργάσθαι** δοκεῖ μοι βασιλέως οἰμώγμασιν

Ag. Alack! I am struck deep a fatal blow

Cho. Silence, who shouts 'a blow', fatally wounded

Ag. Alack! Struck again a second one

Cho. The deed is done, as it seems to me by the cries of the king
(1343-46).

The repetition in the schema πέπληγμαι πληγὴν plays out in the two stichomythic lines that follow. This is obviously a climactic moment in the play, and an excellent place for innovative and even slightly off-kilter syntax and anakoluthon. Almost as if to signal a return to normalcy within the construction of perfect schemata, the Chorus begins its speech with the expectable, passive conversion of an idiomatic figure, τοῦργον εἰργάσθαι.

The phrase πέπληγμαι πληγὴν has a semantic corollary in *Iliad*:

πεπλήγων ἀγορήθεν ἀεικέσσι πληγῆσιν

Having beaten (Thersites) from the place of assembly with shameful beatings (2.264)

The perfect participle πεπληγώς is a variant reading here for the reduplicated aorist πεπλήγων.⁴¹⁸ If we read πεπληγώς, and follow the interpretation of Fehling, who listed πληγῆ (+ attribute) πλήσσειν with the internal datives, we would then have a unique combination in Archaic Epic of an internal argument with the perfect. It may be no coincidence that πεπληγώς has often been singled out, along with βεβλήκει, as an early instance of the resultative/objective perfect, and that both mean hit, or beat.⁴¹⁹ However, it is also possible to construe πληγῆσιν in the Homeric phrase as instrumental, and, since cognate instrumental/dative adjuncts do occur with the perfect, the phrase might not be so remarkable. On the other hand, if Chantraine is correct in interpreting perfect forms such as πεπληγώς, πεπληγυῖα, βεβλήκει, and κεκοπώς as relatively recent formations analogical to similar aorists,⁴²⁰ we might postulate a change in the relationship of the perfect tenses to the CO by proximation with the aorist, the tense that attests by far the greatest number of etymological accusatives in Epic (See Appendix A5.1 and 3). We should also note that all of these possible resultative perfects mean essentially the same thing ‘have hit’, and that, as Chantraine asserted, passives such as βεβλήαται etc. might have facilitated evolution of the active. At any rate, the attachment of the cognate object, πληγῆν to perfect passive πέπληγμαi would appear to operate somewhere between a resultative perfect and conversion to passive. That is, somewhere between ‘I have struck a blow’ and ‘a blow has been struck.’ Whether it represents a bold coinage and anakoluthon or not, it indicates a significant movement toward compatibility of the perfect and

⁴¹⁸ The participle appears twice. At *Il.* 2.264 the standard reading has become πεπλήγων based on Scholia B. At *Il.* 22.497 editors prefer πεπληγώς.

⁴¹⁹ see Lyonnet (41 ff.).

⁴²⁰ See 1927:15-16 and 121.

etymological object either as an intentional half-violation of the perfect restriction, or as a sign that Greek syntax at that time was moving toward free use of the cognate accusative and perfect.

Depending on one's beliefs as to the authenticity of the *Prometheus Bound*, either Aeschylus, or some later and lesser tragedian attests the Homeric phrase πῆμα πάσχειν⁴²¹ in a fully active construction with the perfect:

Πρ: οὐκ ἔχω σοφισμ' ὅτι
τῆς νῦν παρούσης πημονῆς ἀπαλλαγῶ.
Χο: πέπονθας αἰκὲς πῆμ'· ἀποσφαλεῖς φρενῶν
πλανᾶι

PR: I don't have a clever scheme by which
I might escape this suffering here now.

Cho: You have suffered shameful suffering; you are lead astray
by wandering of wits (470-3).

Since available data suggests that such a combination would not have been permissible at the time of Archaic Epic, it must be admitted, because of πληγὴν πέπληγμαι, that by the time of the *Agamemnon* (458 B.C.E.) some sort of transformation in the way the CO related to the perfect either had occurred, or was occurring, and that, because of πέπονθας πῆμα, by the time of the *Prometheus Bound* (after 457) a substantial change had taken place. Also note that the adjective that the CO construction supports, ἀεικής, is the same as the possibly innovative phrase in Homer (πεπλήγως/ν ἀεικέσσι πληγῆσιν) itself almost uncannily reminiscent of πέπληγμαι πληγὴν. This

⁴²¹ Remember that this is a (pseudo)-etymological schemata, since there is no plausible way to derive πῆμα from *k^hend^h-. It appears once in the *Iliad*, with the imperfect, and ten times in the *Odyssey*, 8 times with the present and 2 with the aorist. Its inclusion in the restriction does not need to be motivated by etymology, since it is clearly an internal object, and the restriction seems to have applied to all internal objects.

suggests that both shame and honor were concepts capable of attaching themselves as states to individuals, and hence pushing against the restriction against CO expression with the perfect. In general terms, Aeschylus appears to be making further inroads along lines already established by Homer.

5.3.1 The aftermath of a transformation and free occurrence of the perfect with cognate objects:

The combination πέπονθας πῆμα looks forward to Herodotus, who attests numerous etymological accusatives with the perfect, and several resultative perfects:⁴²²

Ὀτάνης δὲ ὁ στρατηγὸς ἰδὼν πάθος μέγα Πέρσας πεπονθότας

The general, Otanes, after seeing the Persians suffering great suffering (Hdt.3.147.1).

ὁ δὲ βουλευσάμενος αἰσchrῶς, εἴ οἱ ἡ τύχη ἐπίσποιτο, εὔρημα εὔρηκε, ἦσσαν δὲ οὐδέν οἱ κακῶς βεβούλευται.

But the one who has planned shamefully, if luck favors him, has found his windfall, but nonetheless has he planned evilly (7.10.82).

One oft-cited example of a perfect stressing the state of the object in Herodotus has, once again to do with honor:

βασιλεὺς ἐκάστῳ τιμὴν ἐδεδώκεε

The king had given honor to each (8.67.2).

But we also find many similar phrases in the passive, showing the persistence of the older method of conversion:

λέγουσι καί σφι τιμὰς ἄλλας δεδόσθαι

They say also that other honors have been granted to them (4.35.2).

⁴²² Chantraine's lengthy list of 'resultative' perfects in Attic includes several examples from Herodotus (124- ff.) and Kiel gives the category its own section (29-41).

By the time we get to Plato, Xenophon and Aristotle the rules governing perfect usage with cognate objects have changed substantially and we see unmitigated combination of the two:

τῶν πολιτῶν ὅποσοι τέλος ἔχοιεν τοῦ βίου, κατὰ σώματα ἢ κατὰ ψυχὰς **ἔργα ἐξαιργασμένοι** καλὰ καὶ ἐπίπονα καὶ τοῖς νόμοις εὐπειθεῖς γεγονότες, ἐγκωμίων αὐτοὺς τυγχάνειν πρέπον ἂν εἴη.
As many citizens as might attain the goal of life, have by their bodies and souls done good and laborious deeds, and have been compliant to the laws, these shall be considered as suitable to attain praise
(Pl.Lg.801e).

This is perhaps the most important Platonic example because ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι / ἔρδειν / ῥέζειν is a prominent idiom in Archaic Epic (x15), which, as we have seen, shows both passivation in conjunction with the perfect and frequent use of adverbs, sometime in multiples (κακὰ πολλὰ), with ἔοργε etc. Elsewhere Plato attests the perfect with cognate objects that are either non-existent in Homer (μηχανὰς μηχανάομαι), or very rare (βίον ζῶειν, *Od.* X1):

(τέχναι) δίκαι καὶ στάσεις λεγόμεναι, λόγοις ἔργοις τε **μεμηχανημένοι** πάσας **μηχανὰς** εἰς τὸ κακουργεῖν
'(Arts) being called lawsuits and factions, by words and deeds having devised every device for wrong doing' (Pl.Lg.679e).

ὄντινα τρόπον νῦν τε ζῆ καὶ ὄντινα τὸν παρεληλυθότα **βίον**
βεβίωκεν

How he lives now and what life gone by he has lived. (Pl.La.188a).

Xenophon is also free to construct cogante objects with the perfect:

Ἄρα ἐννοεῖτε, ἄνδρες, ὅτι ὁ νῦν ἀγών ἐστὶν οὐ μόνον περὶ τῆς τήμερον **νίκης**, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῆς πρόσθεν ἣν **νενικήκατε** καὶ περὶ πάσης εὐδαιμονίας;

I am sure you remember, men, that this present battle is not only for today's victory, but also for the one before which you have won and for your happiness (X.Cyr.7.1.10).

It is interesting to compare Xenophon's use of the perfect here to the same schema's one occurrence in the *Odyssey*, where there is a marked movement from perfects to aorist:

νόσφιν ἀφεστήκει, κεχολωμένη εἵνεκα **νίκης**,

τήν μιν ἐγὼ **νίκησα** δικαζόμενος παρὰ νηυσὶ

He (the shade of Ajax) stood far of, angered because of the victory, which I won pleading my case by the ships. (*Od.*11.544-545).

Finally, Aristotle combines an analogue to the Homeric figure πόλεμον πολεμίζειν with the –κα perfect:

λέγω δ' οἶον πῶς ἂν δυναίμεθα συμβουλεύειν Ἀθηναίοις εἰ πολεμητέον ἢ μὴ πολεμητέον, μὴ ἔχοντες τίς ἢ δύναμις αὐτῶν, πότερον ναυτικὴ ἢ πεζικὴ ἢ ἄμφω, καὶ αὕτη πόσις, καὶ πρόσσοδοι τίνες ἢ φίλοι καὶ ἐχθροί, εἶτα τίνας **πολέμους πεπολεμήκασι** καὶ πῶς, καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ τοιαῦτα

But, I say, how would we be able to counsel the Athenians as to whether they should go to war or not go to war, not knowing their strength, whether it is naval or infantry or both, how great it is, and what their sources of revenue are, their friends and enemies, and what's more what wars they have waged, and how and everything like that (*Arist.Rh*1396a11).

These passages leave little doubt that in Classical Attic use of the perfect and cognate object was categorically different than the use, or lack thereof in Archaic Epic. Further, if we exclude the *Prometheus*, we can further state that Aeschylus, although πληγὴν πέπληγμαι represents a momentary, and perhaps innovative exception, largely preserves the conversational mode of nominative + perfect. This pinpoints the alleviation of the restriction to sometime not too long after 460 B.C.E.

Since there is no reason to believe that the cognate object construction changed in any way, we must seek motivation for lifting the restriction with the active perfect and pluperfect within the transformation of those tenses that scholars have generally defined along two, perhaps complementary, lines: 1) the potential to denote the state of the object and 2) proximation to the aorist. In fact, all of the grammarians who have examined the evolution of the Greek perfect see the transference from only subject stativity to potential object stativity as a necessary step in the tense's proximation to the aorist. Even McKay, who is the most skeptical when it comes to analyzing perfects as resultative/objective, does not argue against the change altogether; rather, he places it much later than Wackernagel and Chantraine, and consequently argues that its emergence took place within a shorter time period (17).

If we start with the perfect denoting the state of the subject, and later find it denoting the state of the object, we must allow that a great change has taken place, a change detrimental to the perfect aspect, for aspect, whether it denotes process, action or state, is naturally more concerned with the subject than the object. It is arguable that the

development of transitive perfects produced a change in the balance of the inner meaning of the perfect (McKay, 9).

In the conclusion of his article McKay suggests that we may want to push the dates for a fundamental change in the perfect all the way to the second century A.D. (17). This is a major shift from Chantraine, who traces the rise of the resultative/objective perfect from Pindar. Both characterize the shift as happening along two integrally related fronts: proximation to the aorist and objectification of stativity. Chantraine points out that the rise in –κα perfects, most likely analogous to –κα aorists, roughly corresponds to the advent of resultative perfects (121). Now, since the aorist is the tense used most frequently with the EA in Archaic Epic, any change that made the perfect more aoristic would also have facilitated combination with the cognate object. On the other hand, whenever the perfect came to the point where it could denote the object-state, it most likely would also have been capable of incorporating a CO into the subject state. In other words, both changes, taken separately or in conjunction, would have opened the perfect tenses to composition with the EA. But, in as much as the movement from κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργε and κακὰ πολλὰ εἴργασται to καλὰ ἔργα ἐξειργασμένοι appears to be more subtle than the creation of a morphologically innovative paradigm (ἔδεδώκεε etc.), there is not much reason to assume, outside of the innovative semantics of verbs of striking (πεπληγώς, πεπληγυῖα, βεβλήκει, and κεκοπώς) and honoring (Pindaric τετίμακεν) perhaps mirrored by equally innovative internal combinations with the perfect (Homeric *varia lectio* πεπλήγω(ς) πληγῆσιν, Aeschylean πληγὴν πέπληγμαί and Homeric τιμῆς ἦς/ῆν ἔοικε τετιμῆσθαι), that the rise of the resultative perfect preceded the possibility of combining a perfect with a cognate object. Still, though it may not be necessary to put one

before the other, we should note that many of the confluences cited from Attic prose do involve EAs and –κα perfects (βίον βεβίωκεν, πολέμους πεπολεμήκασι, νίκης ἦν νενικήκατε). For all we know, the perfect and CO may have been used together first, and this may have facilitated the rise of objectification, or the two may have arisen together in a symbiotic relationship. Whatever the relative chronology of perfect use with the CO and rise of the objective/resultative usage, we must also factor in the observation that, at some point, the perfect seems to have acquired aoristic tendencies. However, the data presented here regarding the shift in availability of the CO construction with the perfect strongly favors Chantraine’s temporal location of the rise of the resultative perfect to Pindar, and argues strongly, perhaps even conclusively against McKay’s attempt to view the phenomenon as having happened centuries later.

5.3.2 The perfect aorist; straining against the constraint:

As discussed at some length above (117 ff.) in one manifestation of ἔπος εἶπεῖν, a *varia lectio* we do not find the regular, thematic, reduplicated aorist, but rather a newly made ‘first’ aorist. Here Agamemnon delivers a thinly veiled threat to Calchas:

ἐσθλὸν δ’ οὔτε τί πω εἶπας ἔπος οὔτ’ ἐτέλεσσας

But nothing excellent have you said, nor ever accomplished (*Il.*1.108).

Translations are, of course, not conclusive, but it is interesting as a preliminary remark to note that Lattimore renders this phrase in the present perfect, and that other translators follow suit.⁴²³ The ‘first’ aorist of εἶπεῖν occurs elsewhere in Homer twice, as a variant reading at *Il.*24.379, ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα γέρον κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπες/ἔειπας and at *Od.*3.427, εἶπατε δ’

⁴²³ Cf. Murray-Wyatt, and more loosely, Fagles and Lombardo.

εἴσω/δμωῆσιν. In these last two phrases the reference is straightforwardly aoristic. By contrast, in Agamemnon's curse, where the aorist ending in -ας occurs with the cognate noun, it appears to have the force of a present perfect.

In fact, there are numerous passages in which οὐ πω is used with the perfect and pluperfect amplifying either stativity, or the present perfect:

οὐ γάρ πω τέθνηκεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ δῖος Ὀρέστης.

For brilliant Orestes has not yet died/ is not yet dead upon earth
(*Od.*11.461).⁴²⁴

ἀλλ' οὐ πω τοιόνδε τοσόνδ' τε λαὸν ὄπωπα

But I have never seen such a host as this one (*Il.*2.799).

Later in *Iliad* 1 Hera uses a phrase reminiscent of Agamemnon's castigation of Chalcas when she pesters Zeus about his visit with Thetis:

οὐδέ τί πώ μοι

πρόφρων τέτληκας εἰπεῖν ἔπος ὅτι νοήσης

Never yet once have you willingly suffered to speak

a word you thought (*Il.*1.542-3).

By comparison with οὐδέ τί πώ ... τέτληκας | εἰπεῖν ἔπος | the earlier phrase, οὔτε τί πω | εἶπας ἔπος | seems very much like a present perfect.

Note also that -ας, outside of the paradigm of the sigmatic aorist, would have been more familiar as a perfect ending. In the end, the two passages taken together give the impression of maneuvering around the restriction against perfect usage within the confines of an oft-attested idiom. They also hint at movement of the aorist into the sphere of the perfect.

⁴²⁴ This is Berrettoni's example, he also refers to *Od.*1.196, a virtual repetition with Odysseus for Orestes, and points out that ἔτι αἰεὶ may also be used with the perfect.

5.4. Defining and motivating the incompatibility:

I hope to have established by now that the relationship of cognate objects to the perfect tenses was substantially different in Archaic Epic than in Classical Attic, and that this difference most likely arose via a proximation of the perfect to the aorist commensurate with the development of resultative perfects. What remains is to take a closer look at Homeric usage itself in order to set the CO restriction off against other types of complements and adjuncts possible with verbs in the perfect. Next, I will move toward delineating the reasons why syntactical constructions like ‘I have suffered sufferings’, or ‘I have done deeds’ were non-sequiturs at a time when the perfect tenses could only reference the state of the subject.

5.4.1 Adjectives as adverbial modifiers

For most adjectives Homeric language lacked an overt adverbial marker, preferring instead the neuter singular or plural.⁴²⁵ Cognate expressions in which the noun supports an adjectival attribute often alternate with neuter singular and plural adverbials with very little difference in meaning.

Compare the following segments:

^{tr} | ἔπος νημερτῆς ἔειπες (*Il.3.204*)

^{tr} | θεὰ νημερτέα εἶπεν, (*Od.5.300*).

^{tr} | ὅπως νημερτέα εἶπη (*Od.3.19*).

^{tr} | σὺ δ’ οὐ νημερτῆς ἔειπες (*h.Hom.5.186*).

A small number of etymological accusatives commonly appear in grammars and lexica as adverbs or absolutes. These occur mostly in Homer with reference to names and nicknames, as in *ονομακλήδην*, *ἐπίκλησιν*,

⁴²⁵ Cf. Monro (129) “This construction (neuter as adverbial) is very common in Homer, and may almost be said to be the usual Homeric mode of forming an Adverb. It has been already observed that Adverbs in –ως are comparatively rare in Homer.”

ἐξονομακλήδην, but we must also include μίγδην from one of the *Hymns*. In Homer ονομακλήδην and ἐπίκλησιν are only used as etymological accusatives to the verbs ὀνομάζειν and καλεῖν, while in the *Homeric Hymn to Mercury* we find μιγεῖσαι/μίγδην. All of the passages need not be cited here but note the extreme alliteration in the following two lines:

δίου Ἀρηϊθόου, τὸν ἐπίκλησιν κορυνήτην
 ἄνδρες κίκλησκον καλλίζωνοί τε γυναῖκες
 of brilliant Areithous, whom men and fair-belted
 women call (by) the nickname, mace-man (*Il.*7.138-139).

It should not escape our notice that the classification of each of these accusatives as adverbial is most likely a convenience of translation, rather than a reflection of their underlying syntax. They are simply internal accusatives we have no translational equivalent for.⁴²⁶ The possibility that, if there had been no restriction, the poets might have combined forms of the middle perfect κέκλημαι or pluperfect κεκλήατο etc. with one or all of these accusatives is suggested by the occurrence of verbal polyptoton in κέκλεθ' ὀμοκλήσας 'had called calling (them) together' (*Il.*20.3685) and buttressed by the fact that the perfect does occur, with alliteration, in naming formulas not completely dissimilar to ἐπίκλησιν καλεῖν: καὶ οὔνεκα σὴ παράκοιτις / κέκλημαι 'and for this reason I am called your wife' (*Il.*4.60-1 = 18.366); καὶ Ἄλησιου ἔνθα κολώνη / κέκληται 'and the place is called the hill of Alesium' (*Il.*11.757-8); ἧ τε καταίτυξ / κέκληται 'and this (helmet) is called the skullcap' (*Il.*10.258-9).⁴²⁷ If ἐπίκλησιν had truly been an adverb, there would

⁴²⁶ Note that *nomen* in Latin *nomen nominare* is not classed as an adverb, but as an internal accusative.

⁴²⁷ For more examples see *Il.*2.260, 3.138, 14.268, *Od.*6.244, all stressing the state of the subject.

have been no reason not to add it to such expressions. On the other hand, if the cognate accusative had been permissible with the perfect $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\eta\mu\alpha\iota$ ‘I am called the name’ would have been permissible along the same lines as Aeschylean $\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\eta\nu$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\mu\alpha\iota$ ‘I am struck a blow’. Obviously, arguing that the lack of any variant of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\eta\mu\alpha\iota$ provides evidence for a restriction against use with the perfect is an argument *ex silentio*, and hence cannot be conclusive. I merely wish to add this observation to an ever-increasing list of “coincidences” that facilitate the impression that the empty spots in the tense/etymological accusative columns of the table of tenses finds corroborating gaps elsewhere in Homeric usage.

Turning back now to the discussion of adverbial modification, it became evident above that neuter adjectives can and often do combine with the perfect, and in some cases verbs that attest substantial numbers of EAs also admit adverbial complements. I invite comparison of the following passages to further illustrate this point:

ἔργα δ' ἔρεξ' ὅσα φημὶ μελησέμεν Ἄργείοισι

deeds he did which I say will be a source of sorrow for the Argives
(//.10.51).

λάϊνον ἔσσο χιτῶνα κακῶν ἔνεχ' ὅσσα ἔοργας.

You will put on a stone cloak for the evils you have done (//.3.57).⁴²⁸

Since I have included relatives in the etymological phrases counted in the tables, I assume that even across a relative the noun $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha$ could not have combined with cognate perfects. Rather, we would find a passive construction like the one cited above: $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ $\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\iota$. Juxtaposition of the

⁴²⁸ For further uses of $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\alpha$ and $\omicron\iota\acute{\alpha}$ with $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ cf. //.21.399 and 22.347.

following line-endings is of some interest in terms of adverbial versus nominal arguments in formulas:

ἔργα ἀεικέα ἐργάζοιο (*Il.*24.733)

κακὰ πολλὰ ἔοργε (*Il.*8.356)

κακὰ πολλὰ πέπονθα (*Od.*17.284).

κακὸν καὶ πῆμα πάθησι, (*Od.*7.195).

Importantly, Homer is not adverse to etymologizing ἔργα and pluperfect forms of ἔρδω, he just never put them together in the same clause: as discussed in the preceding chapter ἐώργει, ἔργα and εὐεργέων occur in successive line endings at *Od.*4.693-5.

So, the only conclusion that available evidence presents is that, in Archaic Greek, the cognate objects were treated differently than adverbial adjectives. As I said at the outset of this chapter this runs against the grain of most modern linguists' categorization of the CO in English, who follow Jones in grouping the construction with various other adjunct predicates. Of course, we could always argue that Jones' observations apply only to English, but in as much as he cites Arabic and German, and includes an analysis of overt case languages like Latin, the fact that the most preservative group of cognate objects in Indo-European languages, that is those in Homer, behave like arguments and not adjuncts may problematize his theory. We would then lean toward the conclusion of Massam, who asserted that the CO constituted a thematic object.

5.4.2 The perfect with adjunctive cases, etymological datives:

Any restriction against use of the perfect and pluperfect with the etymological accusative ought also apply to the internal dative formed,

according to scholarly tradition, on the model of the accusative.⁴²⁹ Therefore it should come as no surprise that the internal dative does not occur with the perfect tenses except for in the one problematic example we have already examined, πεπλήγων πληγῆσιν, where the participle either is, or has been remodeled, to look like a reduplicated aorist. Of specific interest here are two semantically similar figures θανάτῳ θνήσκειν and ὀλέθρῳ ὀλλέσθαι, this last with an accusative parallel ὄλεθρον ἀπόλλέσθαι, all meaning ‘die a death’, and all occurring as support for an adjectival attribute. One reason this particular group is worthy of mention in this context is that these idioms, along with their complement βίον ζῶειν ‘live a (good etc.) life’, are the Homeric semantic equivalents to modern English, German and even Latin idioms which form the core of the ‘cognate object’ debate.⁴³⁰ Also, although the phrases do not make up a numerically impressive group in Homer, there is evidence for their existence as idioms in later/wider Greek, and impressive correspondence in other languages, Indo-European and non-Indo-European as well.⁴³¹ Thus, ‘die death’ and ‘live life’, despite their spotty occurrence in Homer, were possibly influential idioms and, according to modern linguistic analysis, ‘true cognate objects’. As such they would have resisted passivization and would not have been available for use in the perfect or pluperfect in any form.

Add to this observation the fact that the perfects of ὄλλυμαι and θνήσκω, ὄλωλα ‘I have perished/ am done for’ and τέθνηκα ‘I am dead’ are both classic examples of the original IE *‘naktostativ’* perfect as preserved in

⁴²⁹ Or at least in a manner highly reminiscent of the EA; cf. Fehling (158) who lists this category under the heading “Dative nach Art des inneren Objekts”.

⁴³⁰ ‘Die a death’ is, in fact the only idiom used by every single scholar engaged in the discussion, including Jones, Zubizarreta, Moltmann and Massam.

⁴³¹ See the discussion in the Introduction, pages (20 ff.) above.

Homer.⁴³² The various forms of τέθνηκα, quite numerous in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, are occasionally modified by temporal adverbs, αὐτίκα τεθναίην, ἤδη τέθνηκε, occasionally by prepositional phrases, κατὰ πάμπαν/τεθνάμεν, but never a neuter adjective that looks like the alternate to a nominal construction as in ἔπος νημερτὲς ἔειπες and νημερτὲς ἔειπες.

In contrast to the internal dative other uses of the etymological dative, some instrumental, some locative, occur with the perfect a number of times. These cases, since their relationship to the verb was more oblique/adjunctive, were not in danger of being construed as entering into the accomplished state of the subject, and, just as they could be readily passivized with no case change, could be brought unchanged into use with the perfect and pluperfect.

The idiom ‘to see with/in one’s eyes’, for instance, inflects in various tenses, including the perfect, in a series of phrases of differing etymological / non-etymological relationships but identical semantic value (cognate combinations in bold):⁴³³

Fut: **ἐσόψομαι ὀφθαλμοῖσι** (*Il.*5.212, 24.206).

Pres: ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώμαι (*Il.*13.99 et al.).

Impf: ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρώντο (*Od.*15.452).

Aor: ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἴδωμαι (*Il.*1.587 et al.).

Perf. **ὄπωπας/ὀφθαλμοῖσι** (*Od.*3.93-4, 4.323-4).⁴³⁴

Note that with an instrumental dative conversion to medio-passive perfect does not entail any change in the case of the cognate dative: βέλεσι βάλλωσι ‘they hit with missiles’ (*Od.*16.277), >> ὅσσοι δὴ βέλεσιν βεβλήσονται ‘as

⁴³² For use of these forms as *Paradebiespielen* see e.g. Chantraine, 4, Jasanoff, 14.

⁴³³ The idioms in the aorist occasionally occur with the preposition ἐν, whether this means that the phrase should always be construed as locative, or may be instrumental when used without ἐν is open for question.

⁴³⁴ To this we might add another, very similar perfect expression, ὀφθαλμοῖσιν δεδορκῶς.

many as have been struck with missiles' (*Il.*11.657). The locative dative also admits use in the medio-passive perfect without change in the case of the cognate adjunct: με δεσμῶ/δήσατ' ἐν ἀργαλέῳ 'they fettered me in a painful fetter' (*Od.*12.160-161) >> δεσμῶ ἐν ἀργαλέῳ δέδετο 'he (Melampus) had been fettered in painful fetters' (*Od.*15.232). I have already cited κλισμῶ κεκλιμένη. Hence, it is clear that the dative, as an adjunct case, enjoyed unrestricted use with the perfect. The number of etymological datives (61) and uses with the perfect tenses (6) is not out of proportion to Schlacter's overall count of perfects and pluperfects against present and aorist. This throws into greater relief the fact that the EA, attested about four times as much, never coincides with perfect tenses.

If we consider the proportional breakdown of etymological nominative, accusative and dative with the Homeric tenses, none of the proportions are surprising except for perhaps the relative paucity of ENs in the perfect and pluperfect (Appendix A5.1 and 2): 3 in 75, or 1 in 25, when the overall ratio of perfect and pluperfects against other tenses is 1 in 13 is not exactly what we would expect from the subject case in conjunction with the tense that expressed the subject state. However, this proportional discrepancy can be mostly dismissed by noticing that the five most common ENs, pseudo-etymological θεὸς τίθησι, ἀοιδὸς/ἀηδὼν ἀείδει, κειμήλια κεῖται, κῆρυξ κηρύσσει and ὄχευς ἔχει feature verbs that have no perfect or pluperfect. In fact, if we count only the ENs with verbs that have a perfect tense we get a ratio of about 1 in 3, which is actually quite high. Hence, the ratio of ENs from verbs that have perfects contrasts sharply with the ratio of EAs from verbs with perfects listed above (258-9).

5.4.3 Stativity and the cognate object:

In the article to which I have already referred several times Diane Massam (175) noted that, in English at least, stativity and the CO are not compatible:

Stative verbs, at both stage and predicate level... are also disallowed in CO constructions. These verbs do not have the actor role necessary for CO constructions since it is only actors which can be subjects of the derived causative affecting verbs, and perhaps because it is only events (and not states) which may be in a MEANS clause

The impossible constructions she cites here are:

- a. *Lancelot was happy a happy(ness).
- b. *Guinevere was tall a tall(ness).
- c. *The lamp stood a stand(ing) (in the corner).

A fundamental point in her argument is that verbs in CO constructions 'cause' or bring into existence a verbal noun, and thus require an agent that is capable of producing a concretization of their own action. This why abstract, or inanimate nouns are primarily possible with the perfect as cognate subjects, but only with the additional oddity that the abstract is personified, or, if you will, agentified. Further, in the internal constructions, the terminus of the verbal action necessitates the end of the existence of the verbal noun. If we recall Chantaine's assertion about adjectival adjuncts -- that they may modify verbal action without being joined with it -- we must assume that the etymological accusative could not modify the subject state without joining with it. Further, in order to make sense of the restriction, we must postulate factors that blocked the CO from entering into the subject state. Recognition that external objects occur with the perfect tenses without entering into a co-existent state with the

subject may lead us in the right direction. The restriction subsists in the fact that the internal object operates in a liminal area between adverbial modification of the perfected state and the government of external objects by transitive perfects. It must both modify and be governed. As a modifier it need not enter into the subject state, but, as both modifier and grammatical object created and sustained by the verbal action, it would have had to join that state. But, lest we think the problem solved solely by referencing stativity, note that in several instances one of the most frequent etymological objects in Homer actually does combine with stative verb forms.

5.4.4 **uesmḡ-ta ues-*:

The only verb that generates an EA in any stative construction in Homer is **ues-* ‘wear’. According to Chantraine (1999: 350) based on the accentuation of the participle εἰμένος, the finite forms εἶται and ἔστο were synchronically perfects and pluperfects. Historically, however, they are stative presents and imperfects (Narten, 238-9). The stative syntagm always occurs in the Adonic, seven times in the *Odyssey*, once in the *Iliad*:

ἦ ὅτι δὴ ῥυπόω, ⁵ | κακὰ δὲ χροῖ ^{bd} | **εἶματα εἶμαι** (*Od.*19.72, cf. 23.115, *Od.*11.191).

σκηπτόμενος· ³ | τὰ δὲ λυγρὰ περὶ χροῖ ^{bd} | **εἶματα ἔστο** (*Od.*17.338, cf. *Od.*17.203=24.157, *Od.*19.218, *Il.*23.67).

The meaning and ablaut of the present tense forms in Hittite, and Indo-Iranian that correspond to εἶμαι, etc. point to an original PIE present denoting not the process of getting dressed, but the state of being dressed. The stative syntagm εἶματα εἶμαι ‘I have clothed myself (in) clothing’ = ‘I am dressed’, finds correspondence in Vedic: *vāstrāṇy árijuna vāsānā* ‘clothed (in) white clothing’ (*RV.*3.39.2, cf.1.152.1 et al). It is quite possible that the Homeric

phrase represents an EA composed before reinterpretation of εἶμαι etc. as perfect. At any rate, none of the forms would have looked like reduplicated perfects, and the conclusion we might draw from the presence of the syntagm is that there was no categorical restriction against present statives attaching a CO. We should, however, note that another recurring syntagm in the Adonic with a stative present in Homer behaved more like the perfect in relation to the CO by featuring the inanimate, cognate noun as subject: κειμήλια κεῖται (*Il.*6.47, 11.132, *Od.*4.614=15.113), κειμήλια κεῖτο (*Od.*14.326, 15.101, 19.295, 21.9) and κειμήλια ... ἔκτητο, (*Hes.Fr.*200.4-6). The syntax of the nouns meaning 'clothing' in all of the languages attesting cognate accusatives from **ues-* are problematic enough to have generated a voluminous bibliography. I need not go into all the complexities of the phrases here, since, being a stative present, it does not explicitly violate the restriction I am primarily concerned with.

In the end, if we are inclined to give full force to the present stative CO construction **uesmḡ-ta ues-*, then we are compelled to seek motivation for the restriction by referencing not just stativity, but accomplished or naktostativity. If stativity itself is not terribly conducive to expression with the CO, we would then assume, given one recurring stative idiom and no naktostative idioms, that the perfect was categorically incompatible with the internal, etymological accusative because of the former's existence as a derived morphological category designated specifically to denote naktostativity. It seems that an object which owed both its inception and continuing existence to the action of its cognate verb, could not both be involved through the duration of the verbal process until its achievement and, at the end of that process, join the subject in an ongoing state. In general terms of categorizing cognate objects, I am

afraid that I have left the constructions in more nebulous territory than both constituents within the modern linguistic debate have been willing to. Given the Homeric data, however, I see little plausibility in equating the EA either with adverbial adjuncts, or thematic objects/full-fledged θ -role receptors.

The realization that the etymological accusative admits no co-occurrence with the perfect should lead to a re-assessment of the relationship between objects and the perfect tenses in our earliest Greek sources. As yet, I have found no evidence that would lead me to believe that any sort of internal object, cognate or non-cognate could become the argument of a verb in a perfect tense. If this turns out to be true -- upon an investigation of all the perfects in Archaic Epic et al.--⁴³⁵ then we can situate the core of the restriction against use with the EA, which as we know by now actually encompasses the entire spectrum of objects from internal to external, squarely within the core group of both internal and etymological objects. Granted, the internal ED does not represent a numerically impressive group, but if internality was at the core of the restriction then lack of such expressive and formulaically attractive combinations as $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$ and $\tau\acute{\omicron}\lambda\omega\lambda\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\theta\rho\omega$ makes sense. In the case of $\theta\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\omega$ the fact that the perfect is the most prevalent form of the verb in Homer makes this observation more pertinent.⁴³⁶ Indeed, the potential resonance of these and a host of other possible formulas with the accusative ($\tau\acute{\pi}\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\nu\theta\alpha$ etc.) represent an opportunity that the poets would not have missed out on but for a very compelling syntactic restriction, an opportunity that Attic tragedians and prose writers capitalized on as soon as, perhaps even slightly before, the inception of the grammatical possibility.

⁴³⁵ This is part of one of my upcoming projects: "Grammatical Internality and the Perfect Tenses in Ancient Greek."

⁴³⁶ See Napoli's table (143).

APPENDICES

A1. Etymological figures with same-phrase substantives and verbs in Homer:

A1.1 Etymological nominatives:

Idiom	Iliad	Odyssey	Total
θεὸς τίθησι	3	10	13
ἄοιδός/ ἀηδῶν αἰεῖδει	0	8	8
κειμήλια κεῖται	2	6	8
κῆρυξ κηρύσσει	4	1	5
ὄχευς ἔχει	4	0	4
βοῦς βόσκεται	0	3	3
γονή/ γενέθλη γίγνεται	2	0	2
ὄδμη ὄζει	0	2	2
σταθμός/ στήλη ἴστησι	1	1	2
ῥόος ῥέει	1	0	1
πρωχός πρωχεύει	0	1	1
ὄινοχόος χέει	0	1	1
ἄγγελος ἀγγεῖλει	1	0	1
τοκεὺς τίκτει	0	1	1
πνοιὴ πνέει	1	0	1
φῦσα φυσᾷ	1	0	1
ὄμηγερέες ἀγόρευον	1	0	1
ἐγγύη ἐγγυᾶται	0	1	1

πόλις πολίζεται	1	0	1
βώτηρ βόσκει	0	1	1
ήνιοχος (ήνι') έχει	1	0	1
άμαλλοδετήρ δει	1	0	1
total	24	36	60

A1.1.1 Relative etymological nominatives:

Idiom	Iliad	Odyssey	Total
αοιδός αείδει	0	4	4
πτωχός πτωχεύει	0	1	1
ἄγγελος ἀγγείλει	0	1	1
βουληφόρος βουλεύει	1	0	1
τοκεύς τίκτει	0	1	1
μνηστήρ μνάται	0	3	3
Ἴατη ἀάται	2	0	2
ἔρυμα ρύεται	1	0	1
Φόβος φοβείν	1	0	1
Total	5	10	15
combined total	29	46	75

A1.2 Etymological vocatives:

Idiom	Iliad	Odyssey	Total
τέκνον, τίκτω	1	0	1
ἀπποεπές, ἔειπες·	1	0	1

ἀμαρτοεπές, ἔειπες·	1	0	1
---------------------	---	---	---

A1.3 Etymological accusatives:

Idiom	Iliad	Odyssey	Total
εἶματα/ἐάνον ἔννυσθαι	6	28	34
ἔπος εἰπεῖν	11	15	26
δῶρον/δωτίνην δίδοναι	14	10	24
ἰστὸν/σταθμὸν ἰσάναι	2	13	15
ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι/ἔρδειν/ῥέζειν	3	7	10
†πῆμα πάσχειν	1	10	11
ἐπὶ κλησιν/κλήδην καλεῖν	5	2	7
τέκνον τίκτειν	3	4	7
βουλὴν βουλεύειν	6	1	7
δαῖτα/δαίτην δαίνυσθαι	1	5	6
μάχην μάχεσθαι	4	1	5
κρητῆρα κερνᾶσθαι	0	5	5
κτέρεα κτερ(ε)ίζειν	1	3	4
εἶδαρ/ἔδωδὴν ἔδμεναι/ἔσθειν	0	4	4
ἀναίτιον αἰτιάσθαι	2	1	3
χύσιν/χοὴν χεῖσθαι	0	3	3
τιμὴν τίνειν	3	0	3
οἶνον οἰνίζεσθαι/οἰνοχοεύειν	1	2	3
εἶδος ἰδεῖν	1	2	3

†(έκ)ονομακλήδην ὀνομάζειν	1	1	2
πόλεμον πολεμίζειν	2	0	2
ξεῖνον ξενίζειν	0	2	2
τέμενος τέμνειν	2	0	2
ἀγορὴν ἀγέ(ι)ρεσθαι/ἀγορεύειν/ὀμηγυρίζεσθαι	2	1	3
ὄλεθρον ἀπόλλεσθαι	0	1	1
αἰχμὴν αἰχμάζειν	1	0	1
ἱερήϊον ἱερεύσειν	0	1	1
νόον νοῆσαι	1	0	1
φυτὸν φυτεύειν	0	1	1
νομὸν νομεύειν	0	1	1
νεῖκος νεικέϊν	1	0	1
μῦθον μυθεῖσθαι	0	1	1
τείχος τειχίζειν	1	0	1
πλόκαμον πλέκειν	1	0	1
φιλότητα φιλεῖν	0	1	1
βίον ζώειν	0	1	1
φήμην φάσθαι	0	1	1
ποτὸν πίνειν	0	1	1
βοῦς βουκολεῖν	1	0	1
βοῦς βόσκειν	1	0	1
βέλος βαλλεῖν	0	1	1
κατὰ φρένα φράζεσθαι	0	1	1
Total	78	131	213

A1.3.1 Relative etymological accusatives:

Idiom	Iliad	Odyssey	Total
ἔπος εἶπεῖν	2	3	5
δῶρον δίδοναι	3	11	14
ἔργον ῥέζειν	1	0	1
ἀπειλήν ἀπειλεῖν	2	1	3
-γνήτω γείνασθαι	1	0	1
ἰδρῶ ἰδρῶν	1	0	1
νίκην νικᾶν	0	1	1
λώβην λωβάσθαι	1	0	1
total	11	14	25
Combined total	89	143	232

A1.4 Etymological genitives:

Idiom	Iliad	Odyssey	Total
γούνων γουνάζομαι	1	0	1

A1.4.1 Relative etymological genitive:

τιμῆς τετιμῆσθαι	1	0	1
------------------	---	---	---

A1.5 Etymological datives:

Idiom	Iliad	Odyssey	Total
(ἐν) ⁴³⁷ δεσμῶ δεῖν	2	5	7

⁴³⁷ Parentheses indicate that the figure occurs both with and without the preposition, in this case ἐν.

προχῶ χειῖσθαι	0	6 (1)	6
χέρνιβι νίψασθαι	0	6(1)	6
ὀφθαλμοῖσι ὄψεσθαι	2	3	5
(έν) κρητήρι κιννάσθαι	1	2	3
ένι φρεσὶ φρονεῖν/φράζεσθαι	2	1	3
βέλεσιν βαλλεῖν	1	1	2
ππερύγεσσι ποτ/πέτεσθαι	1	1	2
έν εύνῃ εύνηθῆναι	0	2(1)	2
πομποῖσι πέμπειν	2	0	2
πληγῇ πλήσσειν	1	0	1
κνήστι κνήν	1	0	1
θανάτω θνήσκειν	0	1	1
ζώνη ζώννυσθαι ⁴³⁸	1	0	1
ἄτη ἀάσαι	1	0	1
ὀλέθρῳ ὀλλέσθαι	0	1	1
ἀκμοθέτῳ τιθέναι	0	1	1
κλισμῶ κλινέσθαι	0	1	1
κληῖδι κληῖσαι	0	1	1
τερέτρῳ τετρῆναι	0	1	1
τρυπάνῳ τρυπᾶν	0	1	1
φωνῇ φωνεῖν	0	1	1
ράβδοισι ράψειν	1	0	1

⁴³⁸ The vulgate reading, ζώνην would make this an etymological accusative, but the relative below seems to support the dative.

total	16	34	50
-------	----	----	----

A1.5.1 Relative etymological datives:

Idiom	Iliad	Odyssey	Total
ζωστήρι ζώννυσθαι	1	0	1
ἄτη ἀάσαι	1	0	1
Combined total	18	33	51
Overall combined total	140	224	364

A2. Etymological figures with same-phrase substantives and verbs in Hesiod:

A2.1 Etymological nominatives:

Idiom	Theogony	Works and Days	Shield	Fragments	Total
θεὸς τίθησι	1	1	0	0	2
κόκκυξ κοκκύζει	0	1	0	0	1
ὑλοτόμος τεμνεῖν	0	1	0	0	1
γενέθλη γίγνεται ⁴³⁹	0	0	0	1	1
total	1	3	0	1	5

⁴³⁹ This is the only relative etymological nominative in Hesiod.

A2.2 Etymological accusatives:

Idiom	Theogony	Works and Days	Shield	Fragments	Total
ἔπος εἰπεῖν	0	2	0	1	3
δῶρον δίδοναι	1	1	0	5	6
ἔργον ἐργάζομαι/ῥέζειν	1	2	0	0	3
τέκνον τίκτειν	2	1	0	4	7
ἰστὸν ἰσάναί	0	1	0	0	1
ἐπίκλησιν καλεῖν	1	0	0	0	1
βουλήν βουλεύειν	0	1	0	0	1
ἐπώνυμον/ὄνομα ὀνομαίνω/ὀνομάζειν	0	0	0	2	2
φήμην φάσθαι ⁴⁴⁰	0	1	0	0	1
γόνον γείνασθαι	1	0	0	0	1
δίκην δικάζειν	0	1	0	1	2
νήμα νεῖν	0	1	0	0	1
τειχος τειχίζειν	0	0	0	1	1
εἶδος ἰδεῖν	0	0	0	1	1
total	6	11	0	15	32

⁴⁴⁰ Relative.

A2.3 Etymological datives:

Idiom	Theogony	Works and Days	The Shield	Fragments	Total
δεσμῶ δεῖν	3	0	0	1	4
(ἀ)δῶτη δίδοναι	0	2(1)	0	0	2(1)
ὄζω ἐφέζεσθαι	0	0	1	0	1
ὀνόμασιν ὀνομάζειν	0	0	0	1	1
totals	3	2	1	2	8
Overall combined total	10	16	1	18	45

A3 Etymological figures with same-phrase substantives and verbs in the *Homeric Hymns*:

A3.1 Etymological nominatives:

Idiom	Shorter hymns	Demeter (2)	Apollo (3,21)	Hermes (4)	Aphrodite (5,6,10)	total
θεὸς τίθησι ⁴⁴¹	0	0	2	0	0	2
ᾄοιδὸς ἀεῖδει	1 ⁴⁴²	0	1	0	0	2
ὁδμὴ ὄζει	0	1	0	0	0	1
βόες βόσκνται	0	0	0	1	0	1

⁴⁴¹ For this 'etymology' cf. Hdt.2.52, but Pl.*Cra*.397d. derives it from θεῖν. θεὸς < *d^h₁so_s, cognate with Latin *festus* and *fānum* < *fasnom is difficult to derive from the same root as τίθησι, *d^h₁eh₁.

⁴⁴² #1 to Dionysus.

-γνήτοι γίγνεται ⁴⁴³	0	0	0	0	1	1
τροφὸς τρέφει	0	0	0	0	1	1
ἄδοτος δίδωσι	0	0	0	1	0	1
total	1	1	3	2	2	9

A3.2 Etymological vocatives:

Idiom	Shorter hymns	Demeter (2)	Apollo (3,21)	Hermes (4)	Aphrodite (5,6,10)	Total
Γαίῳχε ἔχων	1 ⁴⁴⁴	0	0	0	0	1
ποικιλομήτα μητίσαι	0	0	1	0	0	1

A3.3 Etymological accusatives:

Idiom	Shorter hymns	Demeter (2)	Apollo (3,21)	Hermes (4)	Aphrodite (5,6,10)	total
εἶματα ἔννυσθαι	1 ⁴⁴⁵	0	0	0	3	4
δῶρον δίδοναι	0	1	0	2	2	5
ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι	0	1	0	0	0	1
Τέκνον τίκτειν	1 ⁴⁴⁶	1	1	0	1	4

⁴⁴³ Relative.

⁴⁴⁴ #22 to Poseidon.

⁴⁴⁵ #32 to Selene.

⁴⁴⁶ #31 to Helios subject is Calliope.

εἶδαρ ἔδμεναι	0	0	0	0	1	1
νομὸν νομεύειν	0	0	0	1	0	1
εἶδος ἰδεῖν	0	0	1	0	0	1
βοῦς βουκολεῖν	0	0	0	0	1	1
φυτὸν φύειν	0	0	1	0	0	1
μίγδην μεῖξαι	0	0	0	1	0	1
ἄρους ἄριζειν	1 ⁴⁴⁷	0	0	0	0	1
νηὸν ναίειν	0	0	1	0	0	1
ἄδυτον δῦναι	0	0	1	0	0	1
total	3	3	5	4	8	23

A3.4 Etymological datives:

Idiom	Shorter hymns	Demeter (2)	Apollo (3,21)	Hermes (4)	Aphrodite (5,6,10)	total
δεσμῶ δεῖν	1 ⁴⁴⁸	0	0	0	0	1
Φιλότητι φιλεῖν	0	0	0	1	0	1
φόρμιγγι φορμίζειν	0	0	1	0	0	1
total	1	0	1	1	0	3
Overall combined total	6	4	10	7	10	37

⁴⁴⁷ #23 to Zeus.

⁴⁴⁸ #7 to Dionysus.

A4. Book by book count of etymological phrases:

Iliad: (Total: 122/15,693 = 1/128.631)

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. 4/611 = 1/152.75. | 13. 6/837 = 1/139.5 |
| 2. 11/877 = 1/79.727 | 14. 4/522 = 1/130.5 |
| 3. 8/461 = 1/57.625 | 15. 4/746 = 1/186.5 |
| 4. 5/544 = 1/108.8 | 16. 7/867 = 1/123.857 |
| 5. 7/909 = 1/129.857 | 17. 2/761 = 1/380.5 |
| 6. 3/529 = 1/176.333 | 18. 7/617 = 1/88.142 |
| 7. 5/482 = 1/96.4 | 19. 4/424 = 1/106 |
| 8. 4/565 = 1/141.25 | 20. 7/503 = 1/71.857 |
| 9. 9/713 = 1/79.222 | 21. 1/611 = 1/611 |
| 10. 8/579 = 1/72.375 | 22. 6/515 = 85.833 |
| 11. 4/848 = 1/212 | 23. 7/897 = 1/128.142 |
| 12. 3/471 = 1/157 | 24. 14/804 = 1/57.428 |

Odyssey: (Total: 227/12,110 = 1/53.584)

- | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. 8/444 = 1/55.5 | 13. 6/440 = 1/73.333 |
| 2. 8/434 = 1/54.25 | 14. 8/533 = 1/66.625 |
| 3. 10/497 = 1/49.7 | 15. 15/557 = 1/37.133 |
| 4. 15/847 = 1/56.466 | 16. 6/481 = 1/80.166 |
| 5. 10/493 = 1/49.3 | 17. 14/606 = 1/43.285 |
| 6. 2/331 = 1/165.5 | 18. 10/428 = 1/42.8 |
| 7. 11/347 = 1/31.545 | 19. 11/604 = 1/54.909 |
| 8. 14/586 = 1/41.857 | 20. 11/394 = 1/39.4 |
| 9. 12/566 = 1/47.166 | 21. 8/434 = 1/54.25 |
| 10. 6/574 = 1/95.666 | 22. 8/501 = 1/62.625 |
| 11. 13/640 = 1/49.23 | 23. 7/372 = 1/53.142 |
| 12. 7/453 = 1/64.714 | 24. 7/548 = 1/78.285 |

Iliad Breakdowns:

Battle narrative proper = 13/4339, 1/333.77 Battle dialogue = 12/1923,
1/160.25

Duels = 0/215, arming scenes = 0/162 duel dialogue = 2/110

Total battle narrative = 13/4716, 1/362.77 total battle dialogue = 14/2033,
1/145.214

Total battle scenes = 27/6749, 1/249.96.

Iliad without battle scenes = 95/8944 = 1/94.147

A5.1 Table of Tense Usage with Etymological Phrases (Homer):

	Fut.	Pres.	Impfct.	Aor.	Perf.	Plperf.	Total
EN	1	28	18	21	3	1	75
EA	18	70⁴⁴⁹	26	124	0	0	238
ED	2	8	6	31	5	1	53
EG	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
EF	21	107	50	175	11	7	364

A5.2 Table of Tense Usage with Etymological Phrases (Hesiod, Hymns).⁴⁵⁰

	Fut.	Pres.	Impfct.	Aor.	Perf.	Plperf.	Total
EN	1	5	1	6	1	0	14
EA	3	12	5	35	0	0	55
ED	0	4	0	5	0	0	9
EF	4	21	6	46	1	0	78

A6 Alphabetical index of line numbers in which the etymological figures occur:

Homer

Etymological nominative:

ἄγγελος ἀγγεῖλει: *Il.*22.438-9, *Od.*15.458.

ἄοιδος/ ἀηδῶν ἀεῖδει: *Od.*1.325-9, 8.73, 8.83=367, 521, 8.87, 17.358, 17.385, 17.518-19, 19.518-19, 22.330-331, 22.345-346.

ἄτη ἀταί: *Il.*19.90-91, 128-30.

βοῦς βόσκει: *Od.*12.128, 12.355.

βῶτωρ βόσκει: *Od.*14.102

γονή / γενέθλη γίγνεται: *Il.*5.269-70, 24.539-40.

ἐγγύη ἐγγυᾶται: *Od.*8.351.

⁴⁴⁹ 3 of these presents and 5 of the imperfects, all from **ues-* 'wear' are historically presents, but reanalyzed at some point in Greek as perfects and pluperfects.

⁴⁵⁰ The count from Hesiod includes the fragments. In this case a few of the figures are to be bracketed.

ἔρυμα ρύεται: *Il.*4.137-8.
ἠνίοχος (ἠνί') ἔχει: *Il.*8.119-21
θεὸς τίθησι: *Il.*2.318-19, 9.636, 24.538, *Od.*2.125, 5.265, 5.427, 11.274, 11.555, 15.234, 18.158=21.1, 20.393-4, 23.11.
κειμήλια κείται: *Il.*6.47, 11-132, *Od.*4.614=15.113, 14.326, 15.101, 19.295, 21.9.
κῆρυξ κηρύσσει: *Il.*2.50-52, 2.436-437, 2.442-444, 17.322-5, *Od.*2.6-8.
μνηστήρ μνάται: *Od.*13.376-8, 18.275-7, 20.287-90.
ὄδμη ὄξε: *Od.*5.59-60, 9.210.
ὀινοχόος χέει: *Od.*9.10.
ὀμηγερέες ἀγόρευον: *Il.*2.788-789.
ὄχευς ἔχει: *Il.*4.132-3, 12.454-5, 460-61, 20.414-15.
πνοιὴ πνέει: *Il.*5.697-8.
πόλις πολίζεται: *Il.*20.217.
πρωχὸς πρωχεύει: *Od.*17.18-19, 18.1-2.
ῥόος ῥέει: *Il.*18.402-3
σταθμὸς ἔστη: *Od.*7.89-90.
στήλη ἐστήκη: *Il.*17.434-5.
τοκεὺς τίκτει: *Od.*7.54-55, 8.553-554.
Φόβος φοβεῖ: *Il.*13.299-300
φύσα φυσᾷ: *Il.*18.470.

Etymological vocative

τέκνον, τίκτω: *Il.*1.414.
ἀπποεπές, ἔειπερ· *Il.*8.209.
ἀμαρτοεπές, ἔειπερ· *Il.*13.824.

Etymological accusative:

ἀγορὴν ἀγέ(ι)ρεσθαι: *Il.*18.245.
ἀγορὴν ἀγορεύειν: *Il.*2.788.
αἰχμὴν αἰχμάζειν: *Il.*4.324.
ἀναίτιον αἰτιάσθαι: *Il.*11.654, 13.775, *Od.*20.135.
ἀπειλὴν ἀπειλεῖν: *Il.*13.219-20, 16.200-201, *Od.*13.126-127.
βέλος βαλλεῖν: *Od.*9.495.
βίον ζώειν: *Od.*15.491.
βουλὴν βουλεύειν: *Il.*9.75, 10.147=327, 10.415, 23.78, 24.652, *Od.*6.61.
βοῦς βουκολεῖν: *Il.*21.448.
βοῦς βόσκειν: *Il.*15.547-8.
-γνήτω γείνασθαι: *Il.*3.238.
δαίτα δαίνυσθαι: *Il.*24.802, *Od.*3.66=20.280, 13.26.
δαίτην δαίνυσθαι: *Od.*7.50, 11.185-186.
δῶρον διδόναι: *Il.* 7.299, 9.164, 261, 699, 14.238, 16.381=867, 18.84, 19.194-5, 20.299, 22.341, 23.745, 24.278, 425, 528, 534, *Od.*1.316, 4.589,

600, 613-4=15.113-14, 8.439-40, 545, 11.357, 13.135, 358, 15.125, 15.206-7, 17.76, 18.142, 191, 279, 20.342, 21.13, 24.314.

δωτίνην διδόναι: *Od.9.268.*

ἐάνον ἔννυσθαι: *//.14.178.*

ἔδωδὴν ἔσθειν: *Od.5.195-196.*

εἶδαρ ἔδμεναι: *//.13.35-6, Od.9.84, Od.11.123=23.270.*

εἶδος ἰδεῖν: *//.3.224, Od.5.217, 24.374.*

εἶματα ἔννυσθαι: *//.5.905, 16.670, 680, 18.517, 23.67. Od. 2.3, 4.253, 308, 5.167, 264, 6.228, 7.265, 8.366, 10.542, 11.191, 14.154, 320, 396, 15.338, 368-369, 16.79, 457 17.203, 338, 550, 18.361, 19.72, 218, 20.125, 21.339, 23.115, 24.59, 24.157, 21.339*

ἐπίκλησιν καλεῖν: *//.7.138-139, 18.487, 22.29, 506. Od.5.273.*

ἔπος εἶπειν: *//.1.108, 543, 2.361, 3.204, 5.683, 7.375, 394, 15.206, 20.115, 250, 23.102, 24.75, 92, 744. Od.4.204-5, 8.141, 397, 14.509, 16.69, 469, 18.166, 19.98, 362, 378, 20.115, 21.278, 22.131=247, 392, 23.183, 342, 24.262.*

ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι: *//.24.733, Od.20.72, 22.422.*

ἔργον ἔρδειν: *Od.2.236, 19.92.*

ἔργον ῥέζειν: *//.10.51, 282, 524-25. Od.11.272, 23.222, 24.458.*

ἰδρῶ ἰδρῶν: *//.4.27.*

ἰερήϊον ἱερεύσειν: *Od.14.94.*

ἰστὸν ἰστάναι: *//.1.480, 23.852. Od.2.94=24.129, 9.77, 10.506, 12.402, 15.289-290=2.424-425, 19.139.*

κλήδην καλεῖν: *//.9.11.*

κρητῆρα κερνάσθαι: *Od.3.390, 393, Od.7.179, 13.50, 18.423.*

κτέρεα κτερ(ε)ίζειν: *//.24.38, Od.1.291, 2.222, 3.285.*

λώβην λωβᾶσθαι: *//.13.622-23.*

μάχην μάχεσθαι: *//.12.175, 15.414, 15.673, 18.533, Od.9.54,*

μῦθον μυθεῖσθαι: *Od.3.140*

νεῖκος νεικέϊν: *//.20.251-2.*

νίκην νικᾶν: *Od.11.544-545.*

νομὸν νομεύειν: *Od.9.217.*

νόον νοῆσαι: *//.9.104.*

ξεῖνον ξενίζειν: *Od.3.355, 7.190, 24.288-9.*

οἶνον οἰνίζεσθαι: *//.8.506, 546.*

οἶνον οἰνοχοεύειν: *Od.3.472.*

ὄλεθρον ἀπόλλεσθαι: *Od.9.303.*

(ἐκ)ονομακλήδην ὀνομάζειν: *//.22.415. Od. 4.278, 12.249-250.*

πῆμα πάσχειν: *//.5.886. Od.1.49, 190, 4.330, 5.33, 7.152, 195, 8.411, 12.27, 17.444, 524.*

πλόκαμον πλέκειν: *//.14.176.*

ποινήν τίνειν: *//.16.398, Od.23.312.*

πόλεμον πολεμίζειν: *//.2.121, 3.435.*

ποτόν πίνειν: *Od.*9.354.
σταθμόν ἰστάναι: *Od.*1.333=8.457, 16.415, 18.209, 21.64.
τειχος τειχίζειν: *Il.*7.449.
τέμενος τέμνειν: *Il.*6.194, 20.184.
τέκνον τίκτειν: *Il.*2.313=327, 6.196, *Od.*11.249, 285, 19.266, 22.324
τιμήν τίνειν: *Il.*3.286, 288-9, 459.
φήμην φάσθαι: *Od.*20.100.
φιλότητα φιλεῖν: *Od.*15.245-6.
κατὰ φρένα φράζεσθαι: *Od.*1.294.
φυτόν φυτεύειν: *Od.*9.108.
χοήν χεισθαι: *Od.*10.518, 11.26,
χύσιν χεισθαι: *Od.*5.487.

Etymological genitive:

γούνων γουνάζομαι: *Il.*22.345,
τιμῆς τετιμῆσθαι: *Il.*23.649.

Etymological dative:

ἀκμοθέτῳ τιθέναι: *Od.*8.274.
ἄτη ἀάσαι: *Il.*8.237,
βέλεσιν βαλλεῖν: *Il.*11.657, *Od.*16.277.
δεσμῷ δεῖν: *Il.*5.386-7, 10.443, *Od.*12.160-161, 12.196, 15.232, 443-444,
22.189.
εὐνήν εὐνηθῆναι: *Od.*4.333-4=17.123-5.
ζώνη ζώννυσθαι: *Il.*14.181.
ζωστήρι ζώννυσθαι: *Il.*10.77-8.
θανάτῳ θνήσκειν: *Od.*11.412.
κληῖδι κληῖσαι: *Od.*17.97.
κλισμῷ κλινέσθαι: *Od.*17.97.
κνήστι κνήν: *Il.*11.639-40.
κρητήρι κερνάσθαι: *Il.*4.260, *Od.*10.356, 20.253.
ὀλέθρῳ ὀλλέσθαι: *Od.*3.87, 4.489.
ὀφθαλμοῖσι ὄψεσθαι: *Il.*5.212, 24.206, *Od.*3.93-4 = 4.323-4.
πομποῖσι πέμπειν: *Il.*16.671-2= *Il.*16.681-2.
πληγῇ πλήσσειν: *Il.*2.264.
προχῶ χεισθαι: *Od.*1.136-8=4.52-4, 7.172-4, 10.368-9, 15.135-7, 17.91-3.
περύγεσσι ποτ/πέτεσθαι: *Il.*2.462, *Od.*2.148-9.
ράβδοισι ράψειν: *Il.*12.297.
τερέτρῳ τετρῆναι: *Od.*23.198.
τρυπάνῳ τρυπᾶν: *Od.*9.384-5.
φρεσὶ φρονεῖν/φράζεσθαι: *Il.*9.421-3, *Od.*14.81-2.
φωνῇ φωνεῖν: *Od.*19.545.
χέρνιβι νίψασθαι: *Od.*1.136-8=4.52-4, 7.172-4, 10.368-9, 15.135-7, 17.91-3.

Hesiod

Etymological nominative

γενέθλη γίγνεται: *Fr.150.26-7*

θεός τίθησι: *Th.805, Op.288.*

κόκκυξ κοκκύζει: *Op.486.*

ύλοτόμος τεμνεῖν: *Op.807*

Etymological accusative

βουλήν βουλεύειν: *Op.266.*

γόνον γείνασθαι: *Th.919-920.*

δίκην δικάζειν: *Op.39, Fr.338.*

δῶρον δίδοναι: *Th.399, Op.82, Fr.10.61, 141.3, 204.41-2, 204.54.*

εἶδος ἰδεῖν: *Fr.199.33.*

ἐπίκλησιν καλεῖν: *Th.207.*

ἔπος εἰπεῖν: *Op.453, Op.710, Fr.211.6.*

ἐπώνυμον ὀνομάζειν: *.Fr.296.*

ἔργον ἐργάζομαι: *Op.382, 397-398.*

ἔργον ῥέζειν: *Th.209-210.*

ἰστὸν ἰσάναι: *Op.779.*

νῆμα νεῖν: *Op.777.*

ὄνομα ὀνομαίνω: *Fr.235.2.*

τείχος τειχίζειν: *Fr.182.*

τέκνον τίκτειν: *Th.308, 453, Op.235, Fr.10(a).30, 31.2, 31.4, 204.129-30.*

φήμην φάσθαι: *Op.763-4.*

Etymological Dative

δεσμῶ δεῖν: *Th.521-2, 617-8, 717-8, Fr.239.4-5.*

(ἀ)δῶτη δίδοναι: *Op.355.*

ὄζω ἐφέζεσθαι: *Sc.394.*

ὀνόμασιν ὀνομάζειν: *Fr.15.*

Homeric Hymns

Etymological nominative

ἄδοτος δίδωσι: 4.573

ἄοιδὸς ἀεῖδει: 1.17-8, 21.3-4.

βόες βόσκνται: 4.71-2.

-γνήτοι γίγνεται: 5.135.

θεός τίθησι: 3.137, 519.

ὀδμή ὄζει: 2.13.

τροφὸς τρέφει: 5.114.

Etymological vocative

Γαίῳχε ἔχων: 22.6-7.
ποικιλομήτα μητίσσαι: 3.322.

Etymological accusative

ἄδυτον δύναι: .3.443.
βοῦς βουκολεῖν: 5.55
δῶρον δίδοναι: 2.327, 4.442, 462, 5.212, 10.2,
εἶδαρ ἔδμεναι: 5.260.
εἶδος ἰδεῖν: 3.198.
εἶματα ἔννυσθαι: 5.64, 171-2, .6.6, 32.8.
ἔργον ἐργάζεσθαι: 2.139-140.
μίγδην μεῖξαι: 4.493-4.
νηὸν ναίειν: 3.298.
νομὸν νομεύειν: 4.492.
ὄαρους ὀαρίζειν: 23.3
τέκνον τίκτειν: 2.136, 3.14, 5.127, 31.5.
φυτὸν φύειν: 3.55.

Etymological dative

δεσμῶ δεῖν: 7.12.
φιλότητι φιλεῖν: 4.574-5.
φόρμιγγι φορμίζειν: 3.182-3.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ammann, H. 1961. "Was tut der Wind, wenn er nicht weht? Sprache als Führerin und Verführerin." In: H.A. *Nachgelassene Schriften zur vergleichenden und allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft (IBK 12)*. Innsbruck, 17-26.
- Austin, P. 1982. "Transitivity and Cognate Objects in Australian Languages" *Syntax and Semantics* 15, 37-26.
- Belardi, W. 1971. "Per la storia della nozione di 'poliptoto' nell'antichità." *QUCC* 12, 122-144.
- Brenabé, A. 1987. *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta pars I*. Leipzig.
- Berrettoni, P. 1972. "L'uso del perfetto nel greco omerico." *Studi E Saggi Linguistici* 12, 25-170.
- Berrettoni, P. 1972. "Su alcune caratteristiche del piuccheperfetto in Omero." *Studi E Saggi Linguistici* 12, 171-182.
- Biese, A. 1878. *De obiecto interno apud Plautum et Terentium atque de transitu verbalium notionum*. diss. Kiel.
- Bourgeois, P. and Clark, B. 2001. *Franklin and Harriet*. New York.
- Breazeale, E. 1917. "Polyptoton in the Hexameters of Ovid, Lucretius, and Vergil." *Studies in Philology University of North Carolina* 14, 306-318.
- Brugmann, K. 1900. *Greiche Grammatik*. Munich.
- Brugmann, K. 1911. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, vol.2.2. Strassburg.
- Buck, C.D. 1933. *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago.
- Buck, C.D. 1998. *The Greek Dialects²*. London.

- Bulloch, A.W. 1985. *Callimachus: The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge.
- Butt, M. 2006. *Theories of Case*. Cambridge.
- Campanile, E. 1982. "Review of *dōnum dō*." *Kratylos* 27, 182-83.
- Chantraine, P. 1999. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque²*. Paris.
- Chantraine, P. 1927. *Histoire du parfait grec*. Paris.
- Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of Language*. New York.
- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht.
- Clark, E.V, Clark, H.H. 1979. "When Nouns Surface as Verbs" *Language* 55.4, 767-811.
- Csuri, P. 1998. "Cognate Object Summary: references." *Linguist List*
<http://www.linguistlist.org/issues/9/9-1757.html>
- Cunliffe, R.J. 1963. *A Lexicon of the Homeric Dialect*. Norman.
- Darmesteter, J. 1898. *Sacred Books of the East*. American Edition.
- De Boel, G. 1988. *Goal Accusative and Object Accusative in Homer*. Brussels.
- Delbrück, B. 1888. *Altindische Syntax*. Halle.
- Denniston, J.D. 1965. *Greek Prose Style*. Oxford.
- Draeger, A. 1881. *Historische Syntax der Lateinischen Sprache*. Leipzig.
- Escher, E. 1876. *Der Accusative bei Sophocles*. Zurich.
- Euler, W. 1982. *Dōnom dō: eine figura etymologica der Sprachen Altitaliens*. Innsbruck.
- Euler, W. 1979. *Indoiranisch-griechische Gemeinsamkeiten der Nominalbildung und deren indogermanische Grundlagen*. Innsbruck.
- Fehling, D. 1969. *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*. Berlin.
- Fenick, B. 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad. Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description*. Wiesbaden.

- Fokos, D. 1932. "Die etymologischen Figuren der finnisch-ugrischen Sprachen" *Ungarische Jahrbucher* 12, 70-89.
- Foley, J.M. 1985. *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research*. New York.
- Fränkel, H. 1968. *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*. Munich.
- Frédéric, M. 1981. "La tautologie dans le langue naturel" *Travaux de Linguistique et de Litterature* 19, 313-326.
- Gaedicke, C. 1880. *Der accusativ im Veda*. Breslau.
- Gagnepain, J. *La syntaxe du nom verbal dans les langues celtique: I Irlandais* (= *Collection linguistique* 61), Paris 1963.
- Geldner, K.F. 2003. *Der Rig-Veda: Aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt und mit einem laufenden Kommetar versehen*. Cambridge Mass./London.
- Gonda, J. 1959. *Stylistic Repetition in the Veda*. Amsterdam.
- Gotō, T. 1997. Überlegungen zum urindogermanischen "Stativ" In *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy*, ed. E. Crespo and J. L. G. Ramón. Madrid/Wiesbaden.
- Gougenheim, G. 1970. *Etudes de Grammaire et de vocabulaire francais. Reunies sur l'initiative de ses collegues et amis pour son soixante-dixieme anniversaire*. Paris.
- Grassman, H. 1955. *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda*. Wiesbaden.
- Grimm, J. 1854. *Deutsche Rechts-alterthümer*. Göttingen.
- Grimm, J. 1898. *Deutsche Grammatik*. Göttingen.
- Gygli-Wyss, B. 1966. *Das nominale Polyptoton im alteren Griechisch*. Göttingen.
- Haffter, H. 1974. *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache*. Berlin.
- Hainsworth, J.B. 1964. "Structure and Content in Epic Formulae." *CQ* 58, 155-64.

- Hainsworth, J.B. 1968. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford.
- Hajnal, I. 1994. "Das Brugmansche Gesetz in diachroner Sicht und seine Gültigkeit innerhalb der arischen a-Stämme" *Historische Sprachforschung* 107, 194-221.
- Hansen, P.A. 1983. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, Vol. 12. Berlin.
- Havelock, E. A. 1963. *Preface to Plato*. Cambridge.
- Havers, W. 1936. "Zum Ursprung der sogenannten etymologischen Figuren" *Festschrift für Max Deutschbein*. Leipzig.
- Hecht, R. 1882. *De etymologiis apud poetas graecos obviis*. Alberta.
- Hesiod 1970, 1983, 1990. *Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum, Fragmenta Selecta*. Ed. F. Solmsen, Oxford.
- Hesiod trans. A. Athanassakis 1983. *Theogony, Works and Days, Shield*. Baltimore/London.
- Hicks, E.L. and Hill, G.F. 1901. *A Manual of Greek Inscriptions*. Oxford.
- Hirt, H. 1934. *Indogermanische Grammatik VI*. Heidelberg.
- Hoffmann, J.B. 1926. *Lateinische umgangssprache*. Heidelberg.
- Hofmann, E. 1930. *Ausdruckverstärkung*. Göttingen.
- Homer, trans. R.Fagles 1990. *The Iliad*. New York.
- Homer, trans. R. Lattimore 1951. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago/London.
- Homer, trans. S. Lombardo 1997. *Iliad: Homer*. Indianapolis/Cambridge.
- Homer 1902 eds. David B. Monro et Thomas W. Allen. *Homeri: Opera*. Oxford: Clarendon Press [1978 reprint].
- Homer, trans. A.T. Murray, Revised by W.F. Wyatt 1999. *Homer: Iliad*. Cambridge Mass. Loeb Classical Libray.
- Howe, G. 1916. "A Type of Verbal Repetition in Ovid's Elegy" *Studies in Philology University of North Carolina* 13, 81-91.

- Howe, G. 1917. "Polypoton in Tibullus and Propertius" *Studies in Philology University of North Carolina* 14, 319-20.
- Huber, G. 1970. *Wortwiederholung in den Oden des Horaz*. Zürich.
- Hudson-Williams, T. 1910. *The Elegies of Theognis*. London.
- Humphries, R.L. 1999. "Valency Changing Alternations" in K. Brown and J. Miller ed. *Concise Encyclopedia of Grammatical Categories*. Amsterdam.
- Hunter, R.L. 1989. *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautika Book III*. Cambridge.
- Huttner, E. 1965. *Kunstformen der emphatischen Geminatio*. Bayreuth.
- Jasanoff, J.H. 1978. *Stative and Middle in Indo-European*. Innsbruck.
- Jones, M.A. 1988. "Cognate Objects and the Case-filter" *Journal of Linguistics* 24, 89-110.
- Keil, F. 1963. "Untersuchungen zum Perfektgebrauch Herodots" *Glotta* 41, 10-51.
- Kiparsky, P. 1976. "Oral Poetry: Some Linguistic and Typological Considerations." In *Oral Literature and the Formula*. Ed. B.A. Stolz and R. S. Shannon, Ann Arbor, 73-125.
- Krahe, H. 1972. *Grundzüge der vergleichenden Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Innsbruck.
- Krenkel, W. 1970. *Lucilius Satiren*. Leiden.
- Kühner, R.- Gerth, B. 1978. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* 2.1. Hanover.
- Kümmel, M. 2000. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen: eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden.
- La Roche, J. 1861. *Homerische Studien der Accusativ im Homer*. Wien.

- Landgraf, G. 1881. "De figures etymologicis linguae Latinae" *Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis*.
- Landgraf, G. 1888. "Substantivische Parataxen" *ALL* 5 161-191.
- Lapp, F. 1965. *De Callimachi Cyrenaei tropis et figures*. Bonn.
- Larjavaara, M. 1997. "À Quoi Sert L'Objet Interne?" *Travaux de Linguistique* 35, 79-88.
- Latacz, J. 2000. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar I*. Leipzig.
- Lausberg, H. 1998. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*. Leiden.
- Lejeune, M. 1947. *Traité de phonétique grecque*. Paris.
- Leumann, M. 1950. *Homerische Wörter*. Basel.
- Leumann, M. - Hoffmann, J.B. – Szantyr, A. 1972. *Lateinische Grammatik vol. 2.2, Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Munich.
- Lobeck, Chr. August 1837. *Paralipomena grammaticae graecae*. Lipsiae.
- Louden, B. 1995. "Categories of Homeric Wordplay" *TAPhA* 125, 27-46.
- Lowenstam, S. 1993. *The Scepter and the Spear*. Lanham.
- Lubotsky, A. 1997. *A ṚgVedic Word Concordance, part I and II*. New Haven.
- Lyonnet, S. 1934-5. "Parfaits et Plu-Que-Parfaits Résultatifs chez Homère" *BSL* 35. 39-50.
- Marouzeau, J. 1933. *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique*. Paris.
- Massam, D. 1990. "Cognate Objects as Thematic Objects" *Revue canadienne de Linguistique* 35.2, 161-190.
- Mastrorarde, D.L. 1993. *Introduction to Attic Greek*. Berkeley/Los Angeles.
- Matthews, V. 1974. "Panyassis of Halikarnassos" *Mnemosyne Supp.* 133.
- McCartney, E.S. 1918-1919. "Puns and Plays on Proper Names" *CJ* 14, 343-358.

- McKay, K.L. 1965. "The Use of the Ancient Greek Perfect down to the Second Century A.D." *B.I.C.S.* 12, 1-21.
- McNeal, R.A. 1985. "How did Pelasgians Become Hellenes? Herodotus I.56-58" *Illinois Classical Studies* 10, 11-21.
- Meillet, A., Vendryes, J. 1966. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. Paris.
- Melchert, C. 1981. "God-Drinking: A Syntactic Transformation in Hittite" *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 9, 245-254.
- Mireaux, E. trans. I. Sells 1959. *Daily Life in the Time of Homer*. London.
- Moltmann, F. 1990. "Nominal and Clausal Event Predicates" *Papers from the Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistics Society* 25, 301-14.
- Monro, D.B. 1992. *Homeric Grammar*². Oxford.
- Müller, C.F.W. 1908. *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen sprache. Supplement. Syntax des nominativs und akkusativs im lateinischen*. Leipzig.
- Mulroy, D. 2007. "The Subtle Artistry of the *Minos* and *Hipparchus*" *TAPhA* 137.1, 115-131.
- Nagy, G. 1974. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic meter*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Napoli, M. 2006. *Aspect and Actionality in Homeric Greek: a contrastive analysis*. Milan.
- Narten, J. 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden.
- Neu, E. 1970. *Ein althethitisches Gewitterritual*. Wiesbaden.
- Neu, E. 1968. *Interpretation der hethitischen mediopassiven Verbalformen*. Wiesbaden.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1923/4. "Götter und Psychologie bei Homer." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 22, 363-392. Leipzig/Berlin.

- Norden, E. 1913. *Agnostos Theos; Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig.
- Nussbaum, A. 1986. *Head and Horn in Indo-European*. Berlin.
- O'Hara, J. J. 1996. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor.
- Óhúiginn, R. 1983. "On the Old Irish Figura Etymologica" *Eriu* 34, 123-133.
- Olsen, B. 1988. *Proto-Indo-European instrument noun suffix *-tlom and its variants*. Copenhagen.
- O'Neil, E. 1942. "The localization of the metrical word-types in the Greek hexameter" *YCS* 8, 105-178.
- Parry, A. 1989. *The Language of Achilles and Other Papers*. Oxford.
- Parry, M. 1971. *The Making Of Homeric Verse*. Oxford.
- Pelliccia, H. 1993. "Aeschylus, *Eumenides*, 64-88 and the *Ex Cathedra* Language of Apollo" *HSCP* 95, 65-105.
- Plato 1997. *Complete Works*. Ed. J.M. Cooper. Indianapolis/Cambridge.
- Pokorny, J. 1959. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern/Munich
- Poteat, H. 1912. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: with Special Reference to the Metrical Treatment of Repeated Words*. New York.
- Proinsias Mac Cana 1973. "On Celtic word order and the Welsh 'abnormal' Sentence" *Eriu* 24, 90 ff.
- Puhvel J. 1984. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vol. 1 and 2. Berlin/New York.
- Puhvel J. 1991. *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*, vol.3. Berlin/New York.
- Quennell, Marjorie and C.H.B. and Batsford, B.T. 1929. *Everyday Things in Homeric Greece*. London.

- Raebel, O. 1882. *De usu adnominationis apud Romanorum poetas comicos*. Halis.
- Rank, L.P. 1952. *Etymologiseering en verwante verschijnselen bij Homerus*. Assen.
- Reckendorf, H. 1909. *Über paronomasie in den semitischen Sprachen; ein Beitrag zur allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft*. Giessen.
- Rhodes, P.J. and Osborne, R. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404-323 BC*. Oxford.
- Ridgway, D. 1997 "Nestor's Cup and the Etruscans" *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 16(3), 325-344.
- Rosén, H. 1981. *Studies in the Syntax of the Verbal Noun in Early Latin*. Munich.
- Rosén, H. 1996. "Eam vitam vivere quae est sola vita nominanda' Reflections on cognate complements" in *On Latin: Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honour of Harm Pinkster*. Amsterdam.
- Rosén, H. 1991. "Periphrasis and Figura Etymologica in Some Sources of Middle Irish" *Zeitschrift für keltische Philologie* 43, 53-83.
- Russo, J.A. 1976. "Is "Oral" or "Aural" Composition the Cause of Homer's Formulaic Style?" In *Oral Literature and the Formula*. Ed. B.A. Stolz and R. S. Shannon, Ann Arbor, 31-54.
- Russo, J.A. 1966. "The Structural Formula in Homeric Verse." *YCS* 20, 219-40.
- Sammons, B. 2008. "Gift, List & Story in *Iliad* 9.115-61." *CJ* 103.4, 353-379.
- Schindler, J. 1975. "Zum Ablaut der neutralen s-Stämme des indogermanischen" in *Flexion und Wortbildung* ed Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden.

- Schlacter, L. 1907-8. "Untersuchungen über den Gebrauch der Tempora und Moda bei einzelnen griechischen Schriftstellern- bei Homer" *Indogermanische Forschungen* 22, 202-242.
- Schmidt, K.H. 1964. "Das perfektum in indogermanischen Sprachen Wandel einer Verbalkategorie" *Glotta* 42, 1-18.
- Schwyzer, E. and Debrunner, A. 1975. Griechische Grammatik, vol. 2, *Syntax und syntaktische Stylistik*. Munich.
- Senn, A. 1957-1966. *Handbuch der litauischen Sprache*. Heidelberg.
- Serbat, G. 1975. *Les Dérivés Nominaux Latins a Suffixe Mediatif*. Paris.
- Smythe, H.W. 1920. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge Mass.
- Stanford, W.B. 1972. *Ambiguity in Greek literature*. New York.
- Stech, S. 1967. "Zur Gestalt der etymologischen Figur in verschiedenen Sprachen" *ZVS* 81, 134-152.
- Stolz, F. and Schmalz, J.H. 1928. *Lateinische Grammatik vol.2.2, Laut- und Formenlehre, Syntax und Stylistik*. Munich.
- Szemerényi, O. 1964. *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the Nature of the Indo-European Accent*. Naples.
- Tebben, J.R. 1977. *Homer-Konkordanz: A Computer Concordance to the Homeric Hymns*. Hildesheim/New York.
- Tebben, J.R. 1994. *Concordantia Homerica pars I vols. 1-2 Odyssea*. Zürich/New York.
- Tebben, J.R. 1998. *Concordantia Homerica pars II vols. 1-3 Ilias*. Zürich/New York.
- Thulin, C.O. 1906. *Italische sakrale Poesie und Prosa; eine metrische Untersuchung*. Berlin.

- Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, E. 2007. *Ancient Poetic Etymology: The Pelopids*. Stuttgart.
- Traina, A. 1955. *Esgesi e sintassi; studi di sintassi latina*. Padova.
- Tsur, R. "Onomatopoeia: Cuckoo-language and Tick-Tocking. The Constraints Semiotic Systems" 2001 available at <http://www.trismegistos.com/IconicityIn Language/Articles/Tsur/>
- Wackernagel, J. 1969. *Kleine Schriften*. Göttingen.
- Watkins, C. 1995. *How to Kill a Dragon: aspects of Indo-European poetics*. New York.
- Weiske, B. 1807. *Pleonasmi Graeci*. Lipsiae.
- Weiss, M. 1994. "Life everlasting" *Münchener Studien Zur Sprachwissenschaft* 131-156.
- Weiss, M. forthcoming. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*.
- West, M.L. 1998. "Grated Cheese fit for heroes." *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 118, 190-91.
- West, M.L. 2007. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1982. "Why can you Have a Drink When you can't Have an Eat?" *Language* 58, 753-799.
- Willcock, M.M. 1984. *The Iliad of Homer, Books XII-XXIV*. New York.
- Wills, J. 1996. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford.
- Wistrand, E. 1941 *Über das passivum*. Göteborg.
- Wolfe, B.N. 2006. "Figurae Etymologicae in Gothic" *Oxford Working Papers in Linguistics Philology and Phonetics* 7, 207-214.
- Woodhead, W.D. 1928. *Etymologizing in Greek literature from Homer to Philo Judaeus*. Toronto.

Zubizarreta, M.L. 1987. *Levels of Representation in the Lexicon and in the Syntax*. Dordrecht.