

MODULARITY AND THE SPECTRUM OF FORMULARITY IN THE
HOMERIC CORPUS

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

Aaron Phillip Tate

May 2010

© 2010 Aaron Phillip Tate

MODULARITY AND THE SPECTRUM OF FORMULARITY IN THE HOMERIC CORPUS

Aaron Phillip Tate, Ph.D.

Cornell University 2010

Since the work of Milman Parry, the analysis of Homeric language has devoted considerable effort to analyzing conceptions and applications of “the formula.” Defined by Parry as “a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea,” the formula was often connected to theories of origin and composition. In this study, however, I have identified five parameters for the analysis of that formularity, without relying on any single definition of the term. The parameters are metrical position, metrical size, metrical shape, lexical content, and syntactic behavior. They are to be applied to individual verse segments, defined as verse units constrained by regularly occurring caesurae and verse-end. Any segment may be compared by means of the parameters, without adducing a concept of the formula, much less a hypothesis of origin. When samples are subjected to this method, a number of features emerge. First, verse segments turn out to have internal syntactic schemata localized within them, which generate and regulate morphological content internal to that segment. Abstract syntactic patterns can generate surface outputs that are related syntactically but with no lexical item in common; we call this a template. Multiple templates can localize within the same segment, sometimes interacting with one another, for which a term is needed. I have suggested

‘module.’ Finally, these localized templates and modules can combine with adjacent verse segments to form higher level syntactic schemata, which themselves can behave independently of their smaller, constitutive templates and modules. This ability for segments to maintain internal syntactic regularity, while simultaneously binding with adjacent segments to create larger syntactic units, and even whole blocks of verses, is further justification for the term ‘module’—verse segments in this poetry behave in a modular fashion, since internally stable segments can freely combine with each other in order to create a flexible, idiomatic language. The conclusion to be drawn is that we have in the Homeric corpus a *spectrum of formularity*, with no single isolable item at its core, and that the parametric method can be profitably used for literary and linguistic analysis.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Mr. Tate received a B.A. in Philosophy from Northwestern University in 1994, spent the academic year of 1999-2000 as a Fulbright researcher at the *Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku* in Zagreb, Croatia, and received an M.A. in Classics from the University of Missouri in 2001. In the time leading to doctoral work at Cornell, he pursued additional language instruction at the University of Chicago (Hyde Park, Illinois), the International School of Mongolian Studies (Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia), and the University of Zagreb (Zagreb, Croatia). He has conducted fieldwork recording and interviewing epic and lyric singers in Bosnia and Herzegovina, China, Croatia, and Mongolia.

For my parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with gratitude and warmth that I thank the Cornell University Department of Classics, including its faculty, staff (Linda Brown, Katrina Neff, and Sue Payne), and students, for all that they provided during my time in the department. I could not have imagined, or asked for, more. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to my committee, and it is my great pleasure to acknowledge them here. To Hayden Pelliccia, I give heartfelt thanks for years of brilliant instruction, critical acumen, and blood-quickenning inspiration. To Michael Weiss I heed a special debt of gratitude, not only for uncommon intelligence and kindness, but for two summers spent teaching me Hittite and a third comparative Slavic. Jeff Rusten provided constant encouragement and expertise, and to him I will always be particularly grateful for the interest and care he gave to my dissertation. Above all, I would like to thank Alan J. Nussbaum, whose patience and wisdom came with remarkable generosity, and whose skill and decency as a teacher are as immense as a person could ever hope to find. Each of my committee members taught me more than they will likely ever realize, and I will always regard them with a touch of awe and an enormous measure of gratitude. Others whose ideas, support, and advice are present here in ways they may not recognize, but present all the same, include Bamó Qubumo, Vibeke Børdahl, E. Wayles Browne, Joško Čaleta, John Miles Foley, Chao Gejin, Tanja Perić-Polonijo, and Pietro Pucci. All of them, in their own ways, taught me something essential about epic as well as life, and I thank them for memories that I will carry with me to the end. To my cousin, Janet Selby, I owe countless years of

support and warm conversation; it is an honor and pleasure to thank her here. The greatest acknowledgement of all, however, is reserved for the two people whose extraordinary love, support, and friendship exceed the realm of words to such a degree that I know not how to begin to thank them: my parents, Nancy and Phil Tate. To the two of you, I owe the world and so much more.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| Biographical Sketch | iii |
| Dedication | iv |
| Acknowledgments | v |
| Table of Contents | vi |
| | |
| Chapter One: Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter Two: The Method | 64 |
| Chapter Three: Theoretical Basis | 121 |
| Chapter Four: Review of Scholarship | 162 |
| Appendix: Modularity and the Verb | 196 |
| Bibliography: | 208 |

CHAPTER ONE

To say that formular or oral-formulaic studies of Homeric diction have neglected the role played by syntax in the behavior of Homeric diction would be to understate matters significantly. Though Düntzer, Ellendt, and Witte broached the question of syntax, especially in relation to the role played by the bucolic diaeresis, hepthemimeral caesura, and third foot caesurae in the creation of particular linguistic forms, it was not until Milman Parry that an analysis attempted to provide a comprehensive framework for explaining verse segments, and the caesurae that constrained them, as the result of a *tradition* of composition. Parry was clear in identifying those particular scholars' work as fundamental to his own investigation, and also made clear that he considered their work to be an unfinished undertaking—"unfinished" because they had isolated the "special" nature of Homeric language's metrical constraints without having provided an explanation for what that verse actually "was," or how it came to be: "The theory of Witte, even with the further work done on it by Meister," Parry writes, "is unfinished: they have logically proved that the language of Homer is the work of the Homeric verse, but they have not at all shown how the verse in this case could have such power . . . [T]o say that the Homeric language was the work of the Homeric verse thus implies a poetry which is, at least to our way of thinking, of *a very special kind*, so that while the theory may be proved it cannot really be understood until we know just what this poetry *was*" (emphasis mine).¹

¹ Parry 1971: 329.

Parry's stated desideratum both to explain the "special" nature of Homeric language and to provide an account of what the poetry actually "was" exemplifies a longstanding tendency in Homeric criticism to combine two separable levels of explanation: (1) the analytic level addressing the outwardly observable *formal* features or parameters of the Homeric poetic language itself (e.g., the metrical, dictional, and linguistic aspects comprising its 'special' kind or status), and (2) the explanation for the *origin* of that form, namely, the mechanisms or causes by which that language arose in the first place (in Parry's words, what the language actually "was"). One might call this a mixture of the descriptive level of formal analysis on the one hand, upon which analytic method operates, and the purely speculative level on the other, for which hypothetical accounts relying on theories of performance, tradition, authorial excellence, editorial intervention, oral composition, and the like have been offered since the beginning of modern scholarship (and earlier). It is the intrusion of the latter level into the former that causes, as we will see, interminable problems for the analysis of Homeric diction; for the moment, we would like also to point out that Parry himself was prone to the same blending, or contamination, of method and speculation, as demonstrated by the fact that he called for a single explanation to answer both questions.

Among the many reasons why Homeric language appears to be peculiar, of course, is the fundamental fact that it is impossible to discuss linguistic matters within the corpus without immediately encountering considerations of diction as well. In fact, as is well known, the two aspects are co-constitutive, and inseparable, in this corpus, no matter what

one's conception of its origin may be. Unlike the case with later Greek poetry, considerations of diction do not count merely as one among other formal criteria to be added to the discussion of Homeric verse, but are in fact constitutive of the linguistic status of the corpus as such. For this reason, the study of diction in the Homeric poems has never been simply one among many possible topics for analysis, but has always been a fundamental part of *any* linguistic analysis. Another way of making the point is to remind readers that the language of Homer shows a complexity along two axes simultaneously: (1) historical Greek grammar, and (2) developments internal to the Homeric language itself, according to prosodic rules that obtained within that poetic tradition or technique. As a result of this peculiar situation, whereby linguistic history and corpus-internal diction influence each other reciprocally and inextricably, analytic tasks of a very special kind arise. An appropriate response to those special tasks, this study will argue, is to develop a formal method for describing the Homeric language in terms of its formal prosodic structure (i.e., an appropriate method for characterizing the first level), but to do so in a way that allows for the diagnosis of questions concerning Greek grammar and historical Greek linguistics *without* appealing to external hypotheses of origin or tradition (i.e., various hypotheses regarding written or oral composition, or, the second level).

In pursuit of that task, our immediate point of departure will be the question of syntactic productivity and its role within Homeric diction, since one feature that has been consistently avoided, if not entirely neglected, in the history of Homeric scholarship is that of syntax and its analogical effects upon and within Homeric diction. In fact, as this study

will show, considerations of a syntactic nature in Homeric studies, especially in the 20th century, have repeatedly veered from the possibility of a systematic analysis in pursuit of another analytic allure, namely, the temptation to speculate on the meaning of syntactic patterning for some version of the oral hypothesis. The frequency with which this occurs in the secondary literature is easy to underestimate until one looks at the writings on the formula from the 1960s to the 1980s generally, or, more specifically, from the period surrounding work on the structural formula (associated especially with Russo)—especially when considered from the methodological perspective that we have established and set forth in what follows. To make the point, we refer to what Mark Edwards had to say, in a well regarded survey of Homeric scholarship written for the journal *Oral Tradition* in 1986, when he summarized work done on the question of analogy and structural formulae from the time of Parry until the article’s writing. In a two-page section entitled “Analogy, ‘Schematizations,’ and ‘Structural Formulae,’” Edwards surveys the period in which syntactic formulae, or structural formulae as the phenomenon is typically named, began to emerge as serious proposals for the explanation of certain conspicuous dictional features. What Edwards correctly concludes, without any controversy whatsoever, is that the period of work on the structural formula was always understood, by proponents and opponents alike, *in relation to questions of oral composition*, rather than as a task to be undertaken in itself, on its own terms:

O’Neill (see section 2) showed that words occur in the hexameter at preferred positions according to their metrical shape; Russo points

out that certain grammatical types, of certain metrical shapes, also have preferred positions. He gives an analysis of *Iliad* 1.1-7 along these lines (214ff), finding (for example) nouns shaped – u followed by a verb shaped u — — at the verse-end (*alge' etheke, muthon eeipen*), and reversed, verb — u followed by noun u — (*teuche kunessin*). In another article (1966) he analyzes further passages (using the term “structural formula” for this kind of system), and, finding such patterns more common in Homer than in Apollonius, *suggests that they are an indication of oral composition*. An appendix lists a number of structural formulae according to their position in the verse. (Edwards 1986:202) (parentheses are in the original; emphasis mine)

The passage is taken from the same section in which Edwards accurately characterizes Parry’s conclusion that analogy was a fundamental mechanism in Homeric diction’s operation. This is not an insignificant point, and it is one to which we will return. By now the importance of O’Neill’s study is well known too, and hardly needs comment—in fact, when considered together with Parry’s emphasis on analogy, O’Neill’s work provides the starting point for a methodological breakthrough that never quite took place (we have attempted to do so in this study). What is most striking, however, about Edwards’ account is the fact that his summary of research on structural formulae, analogy, and metrical word-type localization culminated in a discussion of that work’s value for adjudicating oral composition, instead of proposing a method or an inventory of features that would include structural formulae and related phenomena in a fully formed account.

Edwards continues his discussion, and exemplifies again, in the very next paragraph, the fact that support as well as opposition to the

structural formula was presented in terms of oral composition proofs rather than internal methodological propriety. Edwards writes:

Hainsworth 1964 and Minton 1965 perceive the value of Russo's emphasis that "phrases of a given metrical value and internal shape, expressing a more or less constant syntactic relationship within themselves, tend to have a very limited placement in the hexameter line" (Minton 1965:243), *but express doubt that this is a mark of oral composition*. Their reservations were confirmed by Packard 1976. (Russo 1986:202-203) (references in the original; emphasis mine)

The quotation is illustrative of a number of tendencies legible elsewhere in modern studies of Homeric diction. First, there is the standard recognition that Russo's study possessed a certain value. Namely, in Edwards' formulation of it, Russo arrived at the insight that certain "phrases" with a metrical identity, internal shape, and a "constant syntactic relationship within themselves" were not to be accepted (e.g., by Hainsworth and Minton, in this instance) as belonging to Homeric diction, given the caveat that the distribution of structural formulæ within the hexameter line is restricted to certain positions, i.e., "very limited." But rather than inquire further into the meaning, mechanisms, and implications of this insight, Edwards skips over such questions and moves immediately to the question that the authors themselves (Russo, Hainsworth, Minton) had formulated as the most pressing concern: whether or not these features reveal a "mark of oral composition." The suspicion on the part of Hainsworth and Minton, according to Edwards' summary—namely, that structural formulae did not betray marks of oral composition—was likewise thought, we are further told, by Packard, to

show no evidence of oral composition either. Apart from these not uninteresting debates, a larger question looms. Why did such scholars, including Edwards, not inquire further into the formal parameters defining the phenomena under discussion, viz., the definition of the structural formula in terms of internal syntax, verse placement, and metrical size, or, observable tendencies for structural formulae to conjoin with each other, or, the meaning of these “constant syntactic relationships” for an understanding of the diction itself, prior to the formulation of an answer to the oral hypothesis? As we will see, these are questions that will return again and again, and to which provisional answers will always seem to be that analysts in a post-Parry environment avoided the analysis of syntax from a formal point of view, as a phenomenon to be studied on its own terms, but chose instead to approach Homeric syntax as a feature that might provide insight into a more general conception of the compositional process and origin of Homeric poetry (oral or written, one or many, and so on). This is an example, we would argue, of the speculative level intruding upon the formal.

A central argument of this dissertation is that this tendency to break off from the question of the analogical role of syntactic patterning in preference for speculative questions concerning oral composition has led directly to methodological mistakes — mistakes that can be both demonstrated and corrected, with much gain in our understanding of Homeric diction as an outcome of the correction. The task that we are proposing then is to provide a method for defining, comparing, and analyzing specific metrically constrained instances of Homeric diction, in which one can observe how syntactic patterning participates in the

behavior of hexametrically regulated verse segment and their relatives — and to do so without reliance on premises related to oral or written hypotheses. This is not to say that we are opposed in any way to the oral hypothesis, or to considering the many versions of it offered heretofore; instead, what we have in mind is to take that hypothesis so seriously as to refuse to adduce it a priori: our conviction is that methodological procedure obligates us to ascertain the best possible account of Homeric repetition and formularity *before* bringing the results to bear on any such analysis for speculative hypotheses or theories of origin. In other words, it is precisely out of respect for the oral hypothesis, and for the Homeric facts themselves, that we refuse to engage questions of oral or written composition until we have completed a more comprehensive, and dogma-free (it is hoped), analysis of syntactic patterns and their constitutive role in Homeric diction.

Let us now return to Parry, and let us begin where he himself began: the two dissertations. It can be easily demonstrated that Parry's first dissertation was highly aware of the operation of syntax in the use of formulae, at least to the extent that his analysis suggested that the syntax internal to verse segments was essential for the functioning, development, and inflection of related verse segments. After all, his category of "formula system" practically implies as much already, no matter how little attention was paid by subsequent investigators to the implications of Parry's category. He also presented ample evidence for formulae that deserved to be grouped under syntactic headings. The vast majority of the portion of the study entitled "The Epithet and the Formula I: Usage of the

Fixed Epithet,” in fact, is devoted to exactly this category.² But Parry did not isolate the role of syntax as a question to be examined in itself, nor did he study the role played by syntax on a segment-by-segment basis throughout the corpus, for the simple reason that Parry’s goals were significantly different than ours today. At the time of Parry’s writings, the task at hand, as his own words in the following quote clearly attest, was to define a method for demonstrating the ‘traditionality’ of the Homeric epic language (and later, its connection to oral tradition), and more importantly, to apply the method in order to sort out the contributions made by the original poet, Homer, from the contributions made by a pre-existing, or later (depending on one’s model for the text’s production), tradition:

It is this problem and this problem alone, to discover why Homer chose certain words, certain forms, certain constructions to express his thought, that I shall deal with in this volume. *But in our attempt to learn which part of Homer’s diction is traditional and which part original*, I shall make use of the same method which has been used to prove that Homer’s language is a traditional language (emphasis mine).³

As the quote demonstrates, Parry, at least at this stage, believed it possible to separate the contributions of the individual poet from the diction made available to him by the tradition, a task that most scholars today would consider—correctly, in my opinion—ill-conceived (though there are numerous instances, of course, where historical-linguistic peculiarities and intra-epic innovations are demonstrable). Parry’s

² Parry 1971: 37-79.

³ Parry 1971: 6.

findings, which he explained at length in the two dissertations written under Meillet, did however point to a series of questions, some of which included the role of syntax, to be pursued in multiple directions, one of which Parry hoped would eventually lead to the investigation and comparison of Homeric Greek formulaic language to Serbo-Croatian oral epic versification. Parry did not live to accomplish the task. Viewed from today's philological vantage point, after many decades of work on oral-formulaic diction in various languages and traditions, one may say with a degree of confidence that the role played by syntax in the operation of Homeric Greek epic diction has not been given a comprehensive methodological or philological analysis. As a result, we have at our disposal little resembling an account of the ways in which syntactic structures internal to repeated verse segments helped analogically to generate diction in ancient Greek Homeric epic—to say nothing of other Greek poetic genres or a comparison with South Slavic epic.⁴ We draw attention to this state of affairs in order to show that (1) the question of the role of syntax in the analogical production of Homeric diction is present from the beginning in Parry's own work, but that (2) Parry did not himself identify the necessity of separating this question from more general questions, including speculative ones related to compositional process and its relation to language, tradition, and composition, and, finally (3) that the role of syntax in Homeric composition *does* have its place in the

⁴ Regarding the South Slavic epic traditions, full account of the prosodological similarities and differences (at the level of verse, but also composition) between the Greek and Slavic traditions would be essential if one were to begin to offer insights about formulaic styles, techniques, and surface outputs for the two traditions (to say nothing of other living oral epic poetries).

context of a discussion addressing compositional technique and idiomatic mastery among singers in living oral epic traditions, once the methods and assumptions have been clarified and subjected to methodological scrutiny.

It hardly bears repeating that responses to Parry's work have always tended to provoke responses addressing the oral aspect of his claims rather than to attempt to explore other, more restricted, corpus-internal questions. One such question, we would argue, is the possibility that abstract syntactic patterns internal to line segments contributed to the production of new semantic outputs and formula-like units of diction, and even to linguistic peculiarities and innovations (especially morphological ones) that occurred nowhere outside of the poems themselves. When one pursues this syntactic line of inquiry with methodological rigor, it becomes possible to comprehend the analogical role played by isolable syntactic structures within the epic hexameter segmentations and verses.

Once this part of the dictional puzzle has been restored, it becomes possible to consider the hexameter not merely from the point of view of a 'theory of the formula' underlying a corpus of poetry, but as a communicative poetic idiom in which a *spectrum of formulaicity* more accurately characterizes the linguistic and metrical facts. But in order to reach this point, and to put ourselves in a position to take these insights and apply them to an actual reading of a passage or an analysis of a group of verses, we will also need to remove a number of obstacles from the history of oral formulaic studies. Before we do that, and in order to make clear the goals of our study, we would like first point to a number of questions that remain open—as a result of the neglect of syntax's generative force in the development and maintenance of epic diction: do

we have yet a comprehensive descriptive account of Homeric diction considered under all of its aspects? Do we really understand, and have exhaustive evidence for the different ways in which syntactic analogy operated in the creation of new expressions? Can we really conclude that the definition of the formula, and the nature of Homeric formularity, has been thoroughly investigated, if we have not yet grasped the extent and reach of syntactic patterning within that formularity? Unfortunately, the answers to each of these questions today remains: no.

This is not to say that the role of syntax has not appeared in the secondary literature, because it has, of course. Discussions of syntax in relation to Homeric language almost always include references to Joseph Russo's work on the 'structural' formula, as we have already seen in Edwards' article quoted above.⁵ Unfortunately Russo's work suffers from an incompleteness in the handling of evidence as well as a zeal to shift the discussion to oral composition and oral poetics, with the result that he jumps to claims regarding the question of segment-internal syntax without ever actually arriving at a secure methodology for analyzing the structural syntactic phenomena he claims to have identified.

Not long after Russo's work on the structural formula appeared, Michael Nagler attempted to show that there were verse segments in Homeric poetry whose relatedness existed only and exclusively on the phonic or auditory plane.⁶ This thesis, and the peculiar presentation of evidence necessary for making it, represents yet another example of a commentator claiming to have identified a dimension of formularity that

⁵ See Russo 1966 and Edwards 1986.

⁶ See Nagler 1967 and 1974.

eluded Parry's purview. In Nagler's case, however, the claim can be shown without a tremendous amount of effort to be incomplete. Nagler's wish to discuss theoretical aspects of formularity without first properly evaluating the evidence that he himself adduces is reminiscent of Russo, in that both seem to have been more interested in addressing the putative nature of formularity and orality, or in addressing questions of oral composition, than in producing a comprehensive methodology for empirically testable results—all of this is examined in the final chapter of this study.

To turn to more recent work, Edzard Visser's work, as well as Bakker and Fabricotti's extension of it in terms of "core" and "peripheral" formular elements did in fact exhibit an awareness of syntax in Homeric formularity. But rather than provide an explanation or method for discussing syntactic behavior, Bakker and Fabricotti's revision of Visser explored one aspect by which the poet subtracted or added certain peripheral elements to a syntactic and semantic core.⁷ Though valuable, Bakker and Fabricotti's analysis does not attempt a comprehensive account of the syntax internal to Homeric verse segments, so will remain of peripheral importance to our study.

Verse Segments, Method, and Modularity

Throughout this study, Homeric verse will be treated as a phenomenon metrically divisible into fundamental units or *segments*, as defined by the major caesurae familiar to scholars since the work of O'Neill and Porter (debates surrounding the second foot caesurae will be

⁷ See Bakker and Fabbricotti 1991.

postponed for further study, for the reason that we devote the majority of our time to analyzing more robustly attested, and clearly defined, segments appearing at easily specifiable segment boundaries such as the bucolic diaeresis, hepthemimeral caesura, and mid-line caesurae). What I attempt to show is that the mode of composition responsible for Homeric verse, whatever its technique, provenance, or status at the time of the transcriptions might have been, was a particular mode of composition that can be most accurately described not as ‘formular’ or ‘oral formulaic’ but as *modular*; the method required for analyzing that diction, then, will need to account for, and explain, that modularity. What is meant by the syntagm ‘modular’ or ‘modular diction’ will require explanation, discussion, and extensive samples, of course. But as we will see, the formula will in fact turn out, from the vantage point of the methodology that we have developed, to be a kind of surface manifestation, or a surface instantiation, of modularity, i.e., to be a particularly visible aspect of one end of a *spectrum of formularity* ranging from the familiar examples of noun-epithet formulae at one end of the spectrum, to the more abstract, syntactically defined schematizations with little common lexical content at the other end. After establishing this point, the goal will be to provide an uncontroversial descriptive method for discussing and comparing all of the relevant features and behaviors of Homeric units of diction across this spectrum in a way that makes all such phenomena isolable and comparable.

The term modular, as will become clearer as the discussion proceeds, has been adopted in order to indicate the basic claim that composers (be they singers, editors, writers, or whoever) who used

Homeric epic diction must have composed not by means of individual words or individual formulae, but by means of *caesurae-bound verse segments*, and that these verse segments often combined with other verse segments to form larger, more syntactically extended or schematized, verse segmental units. Of crucial importance, furthermore, to see is that these verse segments contained, in addition to phraseology that has been called by scholars ‘formulaic,’ generative syntactic structures whose outputs can be isolated and identified—and some of which can be shown without controversy to have been influential enough to produce linguistic anomalies or innovations occurring nowhere else in the Greek language. What is more, these abstract syntactic structures, by virtue of the fact that they are abstract structures often devoid of semantic content, will allow for substitutions within various parts of their structure, substitutions which often lead to the establishment of new or extended abstract patterns as well as syntactically regulated verse segments. As a result of this situation, many of these abstract syntactic structures, or ‘templates’ as I will call sometimes them (following the usage and conception articulated by Alan Nussbaum)⁸ tend to cluster within particular verse segments (e.g., verse *position*) and for this reason have come to possess a particular *moraic size* and *metrical shape* in their particular verse positions (in addition to their syntactic content). As a result, these verse segments are able to harbor many different syntactic templates occurring in that selfsame particular verse position (though of course some are also ‘mobile,’ that is, following Hainsworth, can be shifted to other verse

⁸ The concept and term “template” have been adopted directly from Alan J. Nussbaum’s lectures on Homeric linguistics at Cornell University.

positions, usually with some morphological or phonological adjustment). To repeat, these syntactic templates can be shown to regulate morphological inputs, sometimes creating robustly attested variant syntactic patterns in certain segments, and can even be shown to generate morphological anomalies (e.g., the creation of medio-passive forms for verbs that do not otherwise have them). When numerous templates turn out to inhabit the same segment with demonstrable frequency, we will choose to refer to such segments as ‘modules.’ Modules can also join in myriad ways with other modules (i.e., other segments with multiple templates localized within), by combining with an adjacent module to form a new module of a larger moraic size and shape, or by joining entire verses to produce blocks of lines in which a minimal number of segment-internal words are inflected, or by expanding leftward in order to accommodate larger syntactic constructions.

In order to exemplify what is meant by all of this, let us first begin with an example of the use of the term verse ‘segment.’ The segment is merely an abstract measure of the moraic shapes created by the existence of regularly occurring caesurae in Homeric verse. If we characterize the Homeric line in the following way, we can demarcate places in the verse where a number of possible segments may begin, end, or conjoin with each other:

– ∪∪ – ∪∪ – ⁵ ∪ | ^{tr} ∪ – ⁷ ∪∪ || – ∪∪ – x

Within this framework there are many different ways of dividing the line according to the phraseology of Homeric poetry. One example of an isolable segment would be the piece of diction stretching from verse-initial position (#) to the midline penthemimeral caesura (⁵|):

– ∪∪ – ∪∪ – ⁵ |

Another example would be a segment with the same beginning point of verse-initial position (#), but reaching to the trochaic caesura (^{tr}|):

– ∪∪ – ∪∪ – ∪ ^{tr} |

As is well known, both of these segments regularly occur in Homeric verse, since line breaks at the penthemimeral or trochaic caesurae occur in the vast majority of lines in the Homeric corpus. There are more segments, of course, especially in the second hemistich. For example, we could delineate other regularly occurring segments in Homeric verse, such as the following:

|| – ∪∪ – x #

⁷ | ∪∪ || – ∪∪ – x #

^{tr} | ∪ – ⁷ | ∪∪ || – ∪∪ – x #

⁵ | ∪ ∪ – ⁷ | ∪∪ || – ∪∪ – x #

All of these segments are well attested in Homeric poetry. However, at this stage of the analysis, such examples are nothing more than sequences of moraicallly long and short syllables situated between regularly occurring caesurae and diaereses. There is obviously no syntactic or dictional content that can be extracted, implied, or predicted from them. It is precisely for this reason that we use the term ‘segment’ to describe them, while reserving other terms for segments with actual attested patterns (e.g., syntactic, and lexical) internal to them.

The next step in delineating the nomenclature is to illustrate what is meant by our adoption of the term ‘template,’ which is used in order to provide a more thorough account of the *behavior* of diction occurring in the segments just given. The concept of a template can only be

demonstrated by way of example, since, by definition it is an abstract syntactic pattern in which its outputs have not a single word in common.

Consider this example:

| | |
|---|------------|
| Σπερχόμενος δ' ὁ γεραιὸς ἔοῦ ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου | Il. 24.322 |
| Εὐρύλοχος δ' ἐτάροισι κακῆς ἐξήρχετο βουλῆς· | Od. 12.339 |

In the two lines here given, the segment from the trochaic caesura to verse-end shows a hemistich with identical grammatical structure (in terms of syntax and inflection), but contains no word in common. The single feature present in both, at least at a purely descriptive level, is an abstract syntactic pattern, or schema. This syntactic schema is what we call a template.

Templates, however, rarely appear in such clear examples: usually they do, in fact, have one or more words in common. Consider the following list of adonic segments in the corpus. In this case we see vivid evidence for an internal syntax governing the segment reaching from bucolic diaresis to verse-end. Most of the following examples of the line-final adonic-shaped segment begin with a two-syllable οὐδέ and are followed by a pronoun in the accusative case, which is itself the object of a subsequent segment-final verb in the first, second, or third person singular inflection. Without question, what we have here is a related set of line-final segments, or what we will refer to throughout our study as a correspondence set. What binds the examples as a correspondence set, however, is shared syntax—with only a minimally shared lexical content. In other words, these examples would not meet standard definitions of the ‘formula’ as given in the secondary literature, since, as we will show,

although there is a certain syntactic schema, there is also a divergence that bespeaks the freedom engendered by syntactic substitution according to an abstract scheme. First, a group of segments from the *Iliad* with inflected forms of the line-final segment indicating “escaping the notice of,” and obeying a form of the following syntactic core: || οὐδέ + acc pronoun + λήθ— # (text boxes indicate examples in which substitution begins to occur, thus demonstrating that we are looking at a syntactic pattern, not a frozen, unmodifiable verse segment):

| | |
|---|------------|
| δαιμονίη αἰεὶ ἴ μὲν οἴεαι οὐδέ σε λήθω, | Il. 1.561 |
| ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι ἴ παρίστασαι, οὐδέ σε λήθω | Il. 10.279 |
| ὥς μεν αἰεὶ μέμνησαι ἴ ἐνθέος, οὐδέ σε λήθω, | Il. 23.648 |
| καὶ δέ σε γινώσκω ἴ Πρίαμε φρεσίν, οὐδέ με λήθεις, | Il. 24.563 |
| αἰεὶ τέρμ' ὀρόων στρέφει ἐγγύθεν, οὐδέ ἐ λήθει | Il. 23.323 |

In the last two verses of the list, there is variation according to a syntactic pattern. In fact, there can be little doubt but that a syntactic core unifies the five adonic-shaped segments, especially since two of them (Il. 23.648 and Il. 23.323) occur in proximity in the same book. If these verses were all that we had before us to consider, we might well conclude that what we were seeing was an inflectable segment, of the kind discussed by Witte. To understand the segment better, however, let us expand the correspondence set to include further examples of lexical substitution, since we find the same segment, altered by tense, with further segment-internal syntactic variations and substitutions. Again, text boxes indicate places of syntactic substitution:

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| σῆμα δέ τοι ἔρέω ⁵ ἢ μάλ' ἀριφραδές, οὐδέ σε λήσει. | Il. 23.326, Od. 11.126 |
| ἄλλος δ' οὐ τις σεῖό ⁵ ἢ ποθ' ἄφεται, οὐδέ σε λήσει, | Hy. to Ap. 53 |
| “καὶ λίην τοι ἐγὼ γε ⁵ ἢ παρέσσομαι, οὐδέ με λήσεις, | Od. 13.393 |
| στεινωπῶ ⁵ ἐν ὀδῶ ⁵ ἢ παραδύμεναι, οὐδέ με λήσει. | Il. 23.416 |

The problem in referring to this group as a correspondence set, at this point, is that the set is not yet complete: there are far more examples of the syntactic pattern attested, with lexical variation according to the same schema. First, we have a verb indicating a notion of ‘covering’ or ‘concealing,’ in the future tense:

| | |
|--|---------------|
| πέυθομαι, ἢ θέμις ἐστί, ⁵ ἢ δαήσεται, οὐδέ σε κεύσω. | Od. 3.187 |
| σῆμα δέ μοι τόδ' ἔειπεν ἢ ἀριφραδές, οὐδέ σε κεύσω. | Od. 23.273 |
| ἀλλὰ τόδε τρομέω ⁵ ἢ Λητοῖ ἔπος, οὐδέ σε κεύσω. | Hy. to Ap. 66 |

And when we look further, we find further lexical substitution in the choice of verb, as well as its inflection. The following group of verses are related and so must be added to the correspondence set:

| | |
|---|------------|
| οἷόν σ' οὐδ' ὁμόσας ⁵ ἢ περ ἐπήγαγον οὐδέ σε πείθω. | Od. 14.392 |
| κλέπτε νόω, ἐπεὶ οὐ ⁵ ἢ παρελεύσεαι οὐδέ με πείσεις. | Il. 1.132 |
| μὴ με κάθιζ' Ἐλένη ⁵ ἢ φιλέουσα περ· οὐδέ με πείσεις. | Il. 6.360 |
| οὐχ ἔδος ἐστὶ γεραιῆ ⁵ ἢ διοτρεφές, οὐδέ με πείσεις. | Il. 11.648 |
| μὴ δέ μ' ἔρυκε μάχης ⁵ ἢ φιλέουσα περ· οὐδέ με πείσεις. | Il. 18.126 |
| ὄρνις ἐνὶ μεγάροισι ἢ κακὸς πέλευ· οὐδέ με πείσεις. | Il. 24.219 |
| πειρᾶ ἔμεῖο γεραιῆ ⁵ ἢ νεωτέρου, οὐδέ με πείσεις, | Il. 24.433 |
| ἀλλὰ τὰ γ' οὐ κατὰ κόσμον, ἢ οἴομαι, οὐδέ με πείσεις, | Od. 14.363 |
| μὴ μευ πειράτω εὖ ⁵ ἢ εἰδότος· οὐδέ με πείσει. | Il. 9.345 |

What we have seen thus far looks to be a basic syntactic pattern, and one which, given certain lexical substitutions, has given rise to new groups of

segments clustered around a particular semantic item (e.g., οὐδέ and a verb with the meaning ‘persuade’ or ‘escape the notice of’ and so on). However, though substitution is a common way for a segment to receive new variations, there is also the possibility of using a segment to construct a longer syntactic pattern (‘longer’ than mere segment itself, that is), which can also maintain the role as a regulator of semantic input, though now across more than one adjacent segment. In order to see what is meant by this, let us look at an example of our already established pattern in order to see how it has been adapted for use in a syntactic construction accommodating indirect statement: our same construction of οὐδέ followed immediately by a pronoun and finite verb (located in the adonic-shaped verse-final segment), can be seen here in combination with complementary infinitives that follow in various verse positions in the immediately subsequent verses (the infinitives have been underlined):

ἦέ μὲν ἦέ σε δουρὶ κιχήσομαι, || οὐδέ σέ φημι
 δηρὸν ἐμῆς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἀλύξειν αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον. Π. 10.370

ποικίλον, ζῆ ἐνὶ πάντα τετεύχεται· || οὐδέ σέ φημι
 ἄπρηκτόν γε νέεσθαι, ὅ τι φρεσὶ σῆσι μενοινᾶς. Π. 14.220

ἴδμεναι, οὐδὲ δαῖναι ἐμὸν νόον· || οὐδέ σέ φημι
 δὴν ἄκλαυτον ἔσεσθαι, ἐπεὶ κ’ ἐὺ πάντα πύθηται. Od 4.493

ἦ τοὺς λυσόμενος δεῦρ’ ἔρχεαι; || οὐδέ σέ φημι
 αὐτὸν νοστήσειν, μενέεις δὲ σύ γ’ ἔνθα περ ἄλλοι. Od. 10.284

These four examples, however, are not simply modifications of the already well embedded “οὐδέ + pronoun + finite verb” construction, since

there is also well attested segmental-internal substitution within the segment, viz., the segment || οὐδέ + pronoun + φημι # segment shows further variation:

ὅς μ' ἔβαλε φθάμενος καὶ ἐπεύχεται, || οὐδέ μὲ φησι Π. 5.119
 δηρὸν ἔτ' ὄψεσθαι λαμπρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο.

ὄρνυσθε Τρῶες μεγάθυμοι κέντορες ἵππων·
 βέβληται γὰρ ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν, || οὐδέ ἐ φημι Π. 5.103
 δῆθ' ἀνσχήσεσθαι κρατερὸν βέλος, εἰ ἔτεόν με

στῆτ' ἐλελιχθέντες καὶ ἀμύνετε νηλεῆς ἦμαρ
 Αἴανθ', ὅς βελέεσσι βιάζεται, || οὐδέ ἐ φημι Π. 11.589
 φεύξεσθ' ἐκ πολέμοιο δυσσηχέος· ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἄντην

χάλκεα μαρμαίροντα· τὰ μὲν κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ
 αὐτὸς ἔχων μοισιν ἀγάλλεται, || οὐδέ ἐ φημι Π. 18.132
 δηρὸν ἐπαγλαῖεῖσθαι, ἐπεὶ φόνος ἐγγύθεν αὐτῷ.

οἷος κείνου θυμὸς ὑπέρβιος, οὗ σε μεθήσει,
 ἀλλ' αὐτὸς καλέων δεῦρ' εἴσεται, || οὐδέ ἐ φημι Od. 15.213
 ἄψ ἰέναι κενεόν· μάλα γὰρ κεχολώσεται ἔμπης.”

At this point, we can begin to see that what we have is a spectrum of lexical, and now syntactic, variation, occurring thanks to substitutions and flexible expansions of a basic syntactic pattern—in other words, we are not looking at a formula, structural or otherwise. What is more, the highly malleable segment segment, || οὐδέ + pronoun + verb #, gives rise not only to numerous lexical variations but to *recombination* with adjacent segments, as the example of indirect statement shows.

But we are not finished yet. In order to show further flexibility in

segmentally-based syntactic patterning, consider three more variations, which are now made by way of substitution within the indirect statement construction. First, instead of nesting the accusative pronoun inside of the segment, it was possible to substitute an adverb and then to postpone the accusative subject until the next line:

ἴομεν· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἡγήσομαι, || οὐδ' ἔτι φημι Il. 14.374
 Ἑκτορα Πριαμίδην μενέειν μάλα περ μεμαῶτα.

In a similar fashion, it was possible to create still further variation, by way of further substitution:

εἰ δ' ἄγ' ἐγὼν αὐτὸς δικάσω, καί || μ' οὐ τινά φημι Il. 23.579
 ἄλλον ἐπιπλήξειν Δαναῶν· ἰθεῖα γὰρ ἔσται.

And in the next case, we find an instance in which the οὐδέ has been substituted for, or replaced by, ἔνθα, though the indirect statement construction, with the infinitive in the immediately following line, is still operative (which is a way of saying that the syntactic pattern can tolerate even the replacement of its most identifiable lexical item):

πατρὸς ἐμοῦ πρὸς δῶμα δαΐφρονος, || ἔνθα σέ φημι Od. 6.256
 πάντων Φαιήκων εἰδησέμεν, ὅσοι ἄριστοι.

When we ask what it is that binds all of these examples, the answer is clear: an abstract syntactic pattern, scheme, or structure. We only use the word 'template,' however, as a kind of shorthand, since technically speaking, a syntactic 'template' in its purest sense, as we have defined it,

would comprise a collection of segments grouped as a correspondence set in which the segments showed the same syntax but had *no words in common*. Here, however, the segments under comparison do share a minimal lexical item in common, at least in the majority of examples: οὐδέ. And they do also obviously share an abstract syntactic description, as well as allow for variations built from that stable pattern or abstract description. The underlying syntactic structure which accounts for the behavior of the particular line segments here compared, then, can be described as: (1) οὐδέ localized at the bucolic diaresis, followed by (2) an accusative pronoun and (3) a finite verb. Now, as we just said, since οὐδέ occurs in every example (or nearly), we would not say that we have here perfect evidence for an abstract template, since the proof for a purely syntactic template would require that the segments compared have no words in common, but *only* an abstract syntactic description—this, after all, is what a template means, even in everyday speech. However, what we do find evidence for, despite the presence of οὐδέ in virtually every example, is a wide range of variation among internal accusatives and line-final verb forms, and even in terms of constructions that can be extended to the next line on the basis of the core adonic-shaped segment: there is clear flexibility, and substitutability, according to a syntactic schema. In the context of our insistence on ‘modularity’ as the best terminological denomination for what we have here, an additional point to be drawn from the correspondence set is to emphasize that at the *endpoints* of the segment we find stability (namely, the segmental shape, size, and position are stable, and absolutely regular), yet *within* the segment itself we find diversity (lexical substitution operates according to a syntactic

framework). This is the first indication that we are in the presence of a phenomenon that is not merely to be described as the effect of regular word-breaks or caesurae, or merely ‘formulaic’ in the sense given by the secondary literature on Homeric language, but as segments between caesurae that have internal syntactic patterns. But there is still more to say, and more to add to the correspondence set that we are developing.

If we were to take the last batch of aforementioned examples, and to replace the accusative subject with τί, we would discover a new, though not unrelated, syntactic pattern within the same line-final adonic segment. Consider these verses. Again, text boxes have been used in order to indicate when a new item in the pattern appears in the correspondence set, and complementary infinitives have been underlined:

ἡμεῖς δὲ μεμαῶτες ἄμ’ ἐψόμεθ’, || οὐδέ τί φημι Π. 13.785, Od. 23.127
ἀλκῆς δευήσεσθαι, ὅση δύναμίς γε πάρεστι.”

αἰεὶ μὲν Τρώεσσ’ ἐπιμίτοιοι, || οὐδέ τί φημι Π. 10.548
μιμνάζειν παρὰ νηυσὶ γέρων περ ἑὼν πολεμιστῆς·

ἡμεῖς δ’ ἐμμεμαῶτες ἄμ’ ἐψόμεθ’, || οὐδέ τί φημι Π. 13.785
ἀλκῆς δευήσεσθαι, ὅση δύναμις γε πάρεστι.

οἷα Ζεὺς κακὰ ἔργα πιφάσκεται· || οὐδέ τί φημι Π. 15.97
πᾶσιν ὁμῶς θυμὸν κεχαρησέμεν, οὔτε βροτοῖσιν

These verses, then, with the || οὐδέ τί φημι # segment clearly attested, show a direct relation to the segments that we saw just above, yet could not be said, under any circumstances, to show identical syntax. What has happened instead is that the substitution of τί for a personal pronoun in

the accusative case has created a slightly different but related syntactic pattern, which can be further varied by still more lexical (and syntactic) substitution. Consider the following verses, which have show a different verb in the segment-final position:

ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἴ ἀκούομεν || οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν· Π. 2.486
οἱ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν·

δυσμενέες δ' ἄνδρες ἴ σχεδὸν εἶαται· || οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν Π. 10.100
μή πως καὶ διὰ νύκτα μενοιμήσωσι μάχεσθαι.

κείνου, ὅπως δὴ δηρὸν ἴ ἀποίχεται, || οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν, Od. 4.109
ζῶει ὅ γ' ἦ τέθνηκεν. ὀδύρονται νύ που αὐτὸν

Now we can show that this syntactic pattern, too, is a stable template capable of regulating further substitution in the verse-final verb position:

ἦτοι Ἀθηναίῃ ἴ ἀκέων ἦν || οὐδέ τι εἶπε Π. 4.22, 8.459
σκυζομένη Διὶ πατρί, χόλος δέ μιν ἄγριος ἦρει·

ὅσοι δὴ βέλεσιν ἴ βεβλήαται; || οὐδέ τι οἶδε Π. 11.657
πένθεος, ὅσον ὄρωρε κατὰ στρατόν· οἱ γὰρ ἄριστοι

Ἐκτωρ δ' οὐκ ἐπέπυστο Διὶ φίλος, || οὐδέ τι ἦδη Π. 13.674
ὅττι ῥά οἱ νηῶν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ δηϊόωντο

μαίνεται ἐκπάγλως ἴ πῆσυνος Διί, || οὐδέ τι τίει Π. 9.238
ἀνέρας οὐδὲ θεούς· κρατερὴ δέ ἐ λύσσα δέδυκεν.

Τρῶα δὲ πένθος ἄλαστον ἔχε φρένας, || οὐδέ τι ἦδει Hy. Aphr. 207
ὄππη οἱ φίλον υἷὸν ἀνήρπασε θέσπις ἄελλα·

This particular instantiation was particularly useful to the composer, as seen by its five examples:

ὡς ἦλθον, φίλε τέκνον, ἴ' ἀπευθής, || οὐδέ τι οἶδα
κεῖνων, οἳ τ' ἐσάωθεν Ἀχαιῶν οἳ τ' ἀπόλοντο. Od. 3.184

Ἐτρεΐδη, τί με ταῦτα ἴ' διεΐρααι; || οὐδέ τι οἶδα,
ζῶει ὅ γ' ἦ τέθνηκε· κακὸν δ' ἀνεμῶλια βάζειν.' Il. 11.463

καί σφρας ὠΐσθην τοὺς ἔμμεναι, || οὐδέ τι οἶδα.”
ὡς φάτο, μεΐδησεν δ' ἱερὴ ἴς Τηλεμάχοιο Od. 16.475

οὕτω τοι τόδε σῆμα πιφαύσκομαι· || οὐδέ τι οἶδα,
ἦ μοι ἔτ' ἔμπεδόν ἐστι, γύναι, λέχος, ἦέ τις ἦδη Od. 23.202

οὕτω δεῦρ' ἰκόμην ἀλαλημένη, || οὐδέ τι οἶδα
ἦ τις δὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ οἳ τινες ἐγγεγάασιν Hy. Dem. 133

Would we not agree that these segments still bear a very real relation to the collection of verses given immediately before them, in which we saw οὐδέ + accusative pronoun + a finite verb? If so, then what dictional explanation will accommodate both the stability and the variation? To suggest that one structural formula, or even a single template, regulates all segments in the correspondence set would seem to miss the fact of syntactic replacement and variation developing as a result of replacement. In any case, clearly there is a relation, and one would be hard pressed to deny but that these segments comprise a methodologically justified group, sample, or correspondence set. But there is more. Keeping in mind the syntactic patterning that we have seen thus far, now compare this small group of segments, which seem also without question to be related to

what we have encountered:

ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἀχιλλῆα πόδας ταχύν· || οὐδέ μιν οἶω
νῦν ἶέναι μάλα περ κεχολωμένον Ἔκτορι δῖω· Π. 17.709

ὄν τέκομεν σύ τ' ἐγώ τε δυσάμμοροι, || οὐδέ μιν οἶω
ἦβην ἴξεσθαι· πρὶν γὰρ πόλις ἦδε κατ' ἄκρης Π. 24.727

ἀλλὰ μάλα στιχὸς εἶμι διαμπερές, || οὐδέ τιν' οἶω
Τρώων χαιρήσειν, ὅς τις σχεδὸν ἔγχεος ἔλθη. Π. 20.362

Λῆμνον ἐς ἠγαθήην πεπερημένος· || οὐδέ μιν ἔσχε
πόντος ἀλὸς πολιῆς, ὃ πολέας ἀέκοντας ἐρύκει. Π. 21.58

πρὸς ῥόον αἴσσοτος ἀν' ἰθύν, || οὐδέ μιν ἴσχευ
εὐρύ ῥέων ποταμός· μέγα γὰρ σθένος ἔμβαλ' Ἀθήνη. Π. 21.303

And these as well:

αἰεὶ δ' ἀργαλέω ἔχετ' ἄσθματι, κὰδ δέ οἱ ἰδρώς
πάντοθεν ἐκ μελέων πολὺς ἔρρεεν, || οὐδέ πη εἶχεν
ἀμπνεῦσαι· πάντη δὲ κακὸν κακῶ ἐστήρικτο. Π. 16.110

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ ποτὶ μακρὸν ἐρινεὸν ὑψὸς' ἀερθεῖς,
τῶ προσφῦς ἐχόμεν ὡς νυκτερίς· || οὐδέ πη εἶχον
οὔτε στηρεῖσαι ποσὶν ἔμπεδον οὔτ' ἐπιβῆναι· Od. 12.433

ἀλλ' ἦτοι κλέψαι μὲν ἐάσομεν, || οὐδέ πη ἔστι,
λάθρη Ἀχιλλῆος θρασὺν Ἔκτορα· ἦ γὰρ οἱ αἰεὶ Π. 24.71

Now, if we were to admit that all of the aforementioned verses bear a relation, and can be considered to belong together in some manner, we

would nevertheless *not* claim that the syntactic patterns in the examples given are identical or that they are governed by one ‘formula.’ We would also not want to argue that we are seeing the effects of a single structural formula. Yet the ‘formulaic-ness’ of our collection of lines still seems to call for explanation. And in fact, there is still more. If we were to substitute τις and to replace the segment-final verb, and make use of a complementary infinitive, then we would arrive at this group of verses:

ἐξ ἐδέων σφοῦ πατρὸς ἐναντίον· || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
μεῖναι ἐπερχόμενον, ἀλλ’ ἀντίοι ἔσταν ἅπαντες. Π. 1.534

οἱ δὲ μάλ’ ἐτρόμεον καὶ ἐδείδισαν, || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ θυμὸς ἀνῆκε πολυτλήμων πολεμίζειν Π. 7.151

οἶνον δ’ ἐκ δεπάων χαμάδις χέον, || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
πρὶν πιεῖν πρὶν λείψαι ὑπερμενεί Κρονίωνι. Π. 7.480

ἔνθ’ ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ἀκὴν ἔσαν, || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
Τηλέμαχον μύθοισιν ἀμείψασθαι χαλεποῖσιν· Od. 2.82

φύζαν ἐμοῖσ’ ἐτάροισι κακὴν βάλεν, || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
μεῖναι ἐναντῆβιον· περὶ γὰρ κακὰ πάντοθεν ἔστη. Od. 14.269

φύζαν ἐμοῖσ’ ἐτάροισι κακὴν βάλεν, || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
στήναι ἐναντῆβιον· περὶ γὰρ κακὰ πάντοθεν ἔστη. Od. 17.438

σταίησαν, τῶν δὲ τράπετο χρώς, || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
πρόσσω αἴξας περὶ νεκροῦ δηριάσθαι. Π. 17.733

ὀρθῶν δ’ ἐσταότων ἀγορὴ γένητ’, || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
ἔξεσθαι· πάντας γὰρ ἔχε τρόμος, οὔνεκ’ Ἀχιλλεύς Π. 18.246

Μυρμιδόνας δ' ἄρα πάντας ἔλε τρόμος, || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
ἄντην εἰσιδέειν, ἀλλ' ἔτρεσαν. αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεύς

Il. 19.14

αἱ δὲ μάλ' ἐτρόμεον καὶ ἐδεΐδισαν, || οὐδέ τις ἔτλη
Φοῖβον δέξασθαι καὶ πιστότερη περ ἑοῦσα

Hy. Ap. 47

It was also possible to inflect the verb according to person, and to substitute a personal pronoun inside the segment:

ῶχεθ' ἄμ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἐς Ἴλιον· || οὐδέ μοι ἔτλης,
πρὶν ἐλθεῖν μνηστῆρας ἀγήνορας ἐς τόδε δῶμα,

Od. 17.104

It was also possible to replace the pronoun with an adverb:

τρὶς περὶ ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμου δῖον, || οὐδέ ποτ' ἔτλην
μεῖναι ἐπερχόμενον· νῦν αὐτέ με θυμὸς ἀνῆκε

Il. 22.251

Further lexical substitution was also possible. For example:

οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐννημαρ κέατ' ἐν φόνῳ, || οὐδέ τις ῆεν
κατθάψαι, λαοὺς δὲ λίθους ποῆησε Κρονίων·

Il. 24.610

and:

ρίμφα δ' ἄρ' αὐτὸς ἔλαυνε κατὰ στρατόν, || οὐδέ τις ἔγνω.
'Ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ πόρον ἴξον ἑϋρρεῖος ποταμοῖο

Il. 24.691

Once we accept that these examples suggest a similar but undeniably related syntax to those that preceded, we come to an important point,

namely, that the presence of multiple syntactic patterns in the same verse segment, and with the same metrical size and shape, tells us something about the diction of this poetry. The segment here under consideration (bucolic diaeresis to verse end), based on what we have seen, contains a clear set of syntactic patterns, perhaps even aggregates of syntactic patterns. These patterns are both regular in terms of metrical size, shape, and location in the verse, yet show internal flexibility as well as the ability to combine with adjacent segments. It is for this reason, then, that we characterize the segment as a *module*, i.e., as a segment of hexameter verse that houses multiple syntactic templates, many of which may be related but whose history in the diction is impossible to adjudicate, at least chronologically. What we have in mind here is the everyday usage of the term “modular,” namely, a situation in which stable units with internal flexibility nevertheless can freely combine with other stable units in order to render new configurations.

Before going further, we have still more verses to consider in order complete our preliminary analysis of the verse-final adonic-shaped οὐδέ + verb construction. In order to add a slightly more complicated example, consider the following verses, which seem to integrate different items (τί, σε, line-final χρῆ, etc.) from the earlier segments:

ἀφραΐνεις Μενέλαε ἴ διοτρεφές, || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ
ταύτης ἀφροσύνης· ἀνὰ δὲ σχέο κηδόμενος περ Π. 7.109

ἀλλ' Ἀχιλεῦ δάμασον ἴ θυμὸν μέγαν· || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ
νηλεές ἦτορ ἔχειν· στρεπτοὶ δέ τε καὶ θεοὶ αὐτοῖ Π. 9.496

Ἄτρεΐδη ἦρωϊ ἴ φέρων χάριν· || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ Π. 9.613

τὸν φιλέειν, ἵνα μὴ μοι ἀπέχθῃαι φιλέοντι.

ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ πρόφερε κρατερόν μένος· || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ
ἑστάμεναι μέλεον σὺν τεύχεσιν, ἀλλὰ λυ' ἵππους Π. 10.479

Ἐκτορ τίπτε μάχης ἴ ἀποπαύεαι; || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ. Π. 16.721
αἴθ' ὅσον ἦσσω εἰμί, τόσον σέο φέρτερος εἶην

Ξάνθε τί μοι θάνατον ἴ μαντεύεαι; || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ. Π. 19.420
εὔ νυ τὸ οἶδα καὶ αὐτὸς ὅ μοι μόρος ἐνθάδ' ὀλέσθαι

Ἀτρεΐδη, τί με ταῦτα ἴ διείρεαι; || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ Od. 4.492
ἴδμεναι, οὐδέ δαῆναι ἐμὸν νόον· οὐδέ σέ φημι

Ἥρη μὴ χαλέπαινε ἴ παρ' ἐκ νόον· || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ. Π. 20.133
οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγ' ἐθέλοιμι θεοὺς ἔριδι ξυνελάσσαι

ἀλλ' αἰεὶ μύθοις ἴ λαβρεύεαι· || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ Π. 23.478
λαβραγόρην ἔμεναι· πάρα γὰρ καὶ ἀμενονες ἄλλοι.

κτείνης ἠὲ δόλω ἴ ἢ ἀμφαδόν· || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ Od. 1.296
νηπιάας ὀχέειν, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι τηλίκος ἐσσί.

ἀλλὰ μέν' αὖθ' ἐπὶ σοῖσι ἴ καθήμενος· || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ Od. 2.369
πόντον ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον κακὰ πάσχειν οὐδ' ἀλάλησθαι.”

ἢ τινά που δόλον ἄλλον ἴ οἶεαι; || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ Od. 10.380
δειδόμεν· ἦδη γὰρ τοι ἀπώμοσα καρτερόν ὄρκον.’

ἔστι δὲ τερπομένοισιν ἴ ἀκουέμεν· || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ, Od. 15.393
πρὶν ὥρη, καταλέχθαι· ἀνίη καὶ πολὺς ὕπνος

“μαῖα, τίη δὲ σὺ τὰς ἴ μυθήσεται; || οὐδέ τί σε χρῆ. Od. 19.500
εὔ νυ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ φράσομαι καὶ εἴσομ' ἐκάστην.

οὐδὸς δ' ἀμφοτέρους ἴ ὅδε χεῖσεται, || οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ
ἀλλοτρίων φθονέειν· δοκέεις δέ μοι εἶναι ἀλήτης

Od. 18.17

Consider now two verses that prove that the segment was in fact a syntactic pattern capable of segment-internal substitution:

νῦν δ' ἦτοι μὲν ἐγὼ ἴ παύω χόλον, || οὐδέ τί με χρὴ
ἀσκελέως αἰεὶ μενεαινέμεν· ἀλλ' ἄγε θᾶσσον

Il. 19.67

μνησαμένω· μάλα δ' εἰμι πολύστονος· || οὐδέ τί με χρὴ
οἴκω ἐν ἀλλοτρίω γοόωντά τε μυρόμενόν τε

Od. 19.118

With these examples it becomes clear why we are no longer able to speak of a simple structural formula or even a 'template.' What we find instead is a series of related but non-identical syntactic patterns localized in the same verse position, with the same size, slightly different moraic shapes, similar semantic content (οὐδέ + τί + pronoun + verb), and similar but not identical syntax. We would not speak of a single formula, or even of a Parryan formula system. Yet these segments, e.g., the entire list that we have considered so far, are clearly related. What relates them is a syntactic unity by which a phrase beginning with οὐδέ after the bucolic diaeresis (and continuing with content that is replaceable according to a syntactic scheme of substitution) allows for a range of variation, and therefore allows for the creation of a whole number of useful segments for Homeric composition. Though at first glance, it may appear that we are looking at frozen phrases grouped in the same verse position, careful inspection shows that there are further patterns and sub-patterns created by means of substituting and varying items in the syntactic schema. In

this way, not only are variations available as the result of segment-internal substitution and alteration, but recombinations with other segments, such as the indirect statement construction (once it has been built from the already existing οὐδέ + pronoun + verb segment), become possible in order to complete a local passage's sense.

In order for us to pursue this last point, namely, the ability of segments to recombine or integrate with each other, we will select a group of lines from the last sample and then see how certain whole-line syntactic patterns emerge from the given segmental possibilities. From the list just given, we can take four conspicuous examples showing syntactic integrity across more than the mere adonic-shaped verse-final segment—the phenomenon is analogous to the indirect statement construction spanning two verses, but occupies only a whole line. This example, as we will see, reveals further undeniable evidence of a higher level of syntactic organization, namely, evidence for a whole-line syntactic construction built from smaller subunits. The correspondence on a segment by segment basis is clear:

| | |
|---|------------|
| Ἐκτορ τίπτε μάχης ἴ ἀποπαύει; οὐδέ τί σε χρή. | Il. 16.721 |
| Ζάνθε τί μοι θάνατον ἴ μαντεύει; οὐδέ τί σε χρή. | Il. 19.420 |
| μαῖα, τίη δὲ σὺ τὰς ἴ μυθήσεται; οὐδέ τί σε χρή. | Od. 19.500 |
| Ἄτρεΐδη, τί με ταῦτα ἴ διείρει; οὐδέ τί σε χρή. | Od. 4.492 |

The four examples show evidence of a shared syntax throughout the verse, even though the line-final segment begins a new thought. They also begin to show something approaching a whole-verse patterning. This phenomenon might be unremarkable if it were not possible to show that it permeates the corpus.

When we were to return to the earlier lines comprising the first part of our correspondence set, and look further at them in light of the integrating or binding phenomenon we have just observed, we discover that a similar whole-line syntactic pattern can be extracted from those examples as well. Consider, for example, this correspondence:

| | |
|---|------------|
| <u>μή με κάθιζ'</u> Ἑλένη <u>φιλέουσά περ</u> · <u>οὔδέ με πείσεις</u> · | Il. 6.360 |
| <u>μή δέ μ' ἔρυκε μάχης</u> <u>φιλέουσά περ</u> · <u>οὔδέ με πείσεις</u> . | Il. 18.126 |

Separated by twelve books of the *Iliad*, the whole-line integrity is impressive, and by comparing them we can begin to see that the term 'modular' captures something that formula, segment, and even template fail to signify: whole verses built from smaller, self-substantial segments. As we just saw, the line final syntactic pattern || οὔδέ + acc. pronoun + line-final finite verb # is a well-attested syntactic pattern, with examples spread throughout the corpus; and it is certainly present here. The mid-line segment | φιλέουσά περ· || also occurs in both segments and is bound as a self-contained syntactic unit between the masculine caesura and bucolic diaeresis. In the first hemistich of the line, however, we also find a segment fitting between verse-opening and the penthemimeral caesura with the minimal syntactic structure of μή + an accusative pronominal object + a second person singular imperative. Each of these segments, here situated side by side, are attested independently throughout the corpus. Yet we see that in these two cases, both verses *also* possess a whole-line integrity, that is, a kind of dictional identity that stretches across the entire line. This local cosmos of dictional phenomena, then, is exactly what we mean to indicate by means of the

term ‘modular’: separate pieces of diction, each well-attested as syntactic units, each localized at a particular position in the line, and each possessing determinate moraic size and shape, yet nevertheless also combining with the other in order to comprise a whole-line syntactic structure that becomes inflectable and usable as a single piece of whole-line diction. The only palpable difference between the two lines, in fact is the meaning of the imperative and the presence or absence of an expressed subject, a direct object in the genitive, and the case of the pronoun.

The ability for verse segments, or ‘modules’ as we are now calling them, to combine with other modules in other verse positions, usually adjacent to each other, in order to produce modules of larger moraic sizes and shapes, is a hallmark of modular diction. These new recombinant segments can then also create or yield higher level syntactic patterns and templates into which particular grammatical items may be substituted. In a word, *although built from smaller segments, segments can become productive syntactic schemata themselves*. Or, to put it another way, modular combinations can coalesce in order to produce what are commonly known in the secondary literature as inflected half-lines and inflected whole lines, or in some cases, entire blocks of inflected lines. We provide exhaustive lists of these phenomena in the next two chapters and in the Appendix.

In the Homeric corpus, as we will show, this ability for verse segments to maintain their own segment-internal syntax while readily combining with adjacent modules is a feature that makes possible a diction whose behavior is different, and more precisely accounted for,

than what is predicted or described by any extant formulaic model. One outcome of our analysis therefore is that we can now better understand how such a highly flexible, and metrically constrained, linguistic *idiom* with analogically productive force was built from smaller units and subunits each with their own well-attested segment-internal usages of syntax, lexicon, and phraseology. When we come to investigate the adonic-shaped verse segment reaching from the bucolic diaeresis to line-end, for example, we will see that although the boundaries defining the segments at their endpoints are rigidly fixed, the language inside of the module was not only *not* fixed but in fact was readily available for analogical refashioning—and ‘available’ to such a degree that innovations occurred there which occurred nowhere else in the Greek language. (What we have seen until now has been merely substitution, integration, and recombination, not yet morphological innovation.)

The first question that will arise in response to the account that we are proposing is the obvious one: What is new in this description of Homeric diction? How is an account of ‘modular’ diction to be differentiated from the myriad models and discussions of formularity preceding it? What does the discussion of modular diction contribute, if anything, to the analysis of Homeric verse? What problems does it solve? What insights does it provide? How is ‘modularity’ anything more than an empty and inconsequential redescription of dictional facts already known?

Our study can answer all of these questions. First, our analysis of modularity provides the most comprehensive account to date of Homeric dictional behavior, ‘comprehensive’ because it predicts and explains not

only surface outputs at the lexical level (the ‘formula’), but other productive or generative features as well (syntax in particular). Rather than develop yet another theory that fuses this or that particular scholar’s variation on the theory of the formula or the oral hypothesis with an interpretation of the Homeric linguistic facts, our account of dictional modularity attempts to provide a purely *formal* description of the dictional facts first, in a purely schematic fashion, with no concern whatsoever for oral or written hypotheses. This point cannot be stressed enough. What we are attempting to provide is an account of Homeric diction that makes no use of formula definitions and that refuses the importation of any version of the oral hypothesis—but instead, comprises a description *from the point of view of verse segments themselves, according to all of the linguistically meaningful parameters that define them*. In order to show this, we have chosen to begin with the hexameter verse and its constitutive units, e.g., its caesurae-bound verse segments, as the basic kernels or units for analysis. To be sure, we could have chosen any unit of analysis with which to begin, be it the syllable or word or phrase, but to do so would have produced utterly irrelevant results, of course, since the linguistic units that comprise the verse are those defined by caesurae placement, not by metrical feet or individual words, as has long been recognized. The task then in what follows will be to take a particular verse segment (e.g., from bucolic diaeresis to verse end) and to describe it under as many of the relevant linguistic and metrical parameters as possible, and in so doing to discover comparable verse segments whose behavior may turn out to be mutually and reciprocally influential in the same position, as well as in adjacent verses. From that point forward,

then, and on the basis of the correspondence sets of verse segments yielded by such an approach, our further comparison, and analysis, will proceed.

The view to which the account of modular diction will be opposed, and to which we will make occasional reference, is what we will characterize for the time being as the “hexameter as container” conception of Homeric verse. On this view, the Greek hexameter is merely an abstract metrical matrix of possibilities with identifiable caesurae into which individual words from the Greek language must be fitted in order to fill out each verse. From this perspective, syntactic similarities are merely accidents resulting from the limited availability of syntactic patterns and grammatical forms that can occur under metrical constraints and limitations; or in other words, this conception does not account for syntactic productivity and the centrality of syntax to the creation of new expressions and analogically-produced content within verse segments. It is by refining and developing this basic, but incomplete, conception of ‘Homeric hexameter as fixed container’ that we will answer decisively the question as to whether or not our account offers anything new (it does).

The Structural Formula Reconsidered

What this brief sketch of modular diction already makes clear is just how far beyond the notion of a mere clustering of structural formulae our method attempts to go. There is, to be sure, much in common between Russo’s ideas and the more fully formed version that appears in our formulation of modular diction, and for that reason we will repeatedly return to his suggestions, both in order to do justice to their contribution but also to develop them further. Discussion in the secondary literature

after Russo’s first proposals for a structural formula often occasioned criticisms whose lines of argument seem rather quaint by today’s lights: the notion of a structural formula was often said to be “too general” to be used to produce accurate tests for orality. It is important to note in passing, however, that in later work, though he still adhered to the importance of the “essential idea,” Parry himself came quite close to arguing for something approximating the structural formula, though his focus was never so narrow as to reduce formulae and formula systems to one structural type. In his essay, “Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making,” published in 1930 in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Parry devotes the fifth section to the analysis to “The Formula in Homer.” Here he is basically collecting instances of formulaic occurrences according to grammatically similar patterns. The following is an example of how close Parry comes to what Russo would later call “structural formula”:

...there are more general types of formulas, and one could make no greater mistake than to limit the formulaic element to what is underlined. Γινώσκω σε θεὰ in E 815 is like Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ in A1, because in both cases one has a complete clause of the same length, followed by the vocative θεὰ. ... πολλὰς δ’ ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς in A3 is an accusative phrase of the same length as πολλὰς δὲ δρυὺς ἀζαλέας, (Il.11.494). ... τεῦχε κύνεσσιν is like δῶκεν ἐταίρω (Il.17.698, 23.612). Often one finds the same verse pattern where the words are different:

A10 νοῦσον ἀνά στρατὸν ὄρσε κακὴν, ὀλέκοντο δεῖλαοί,
 A 20 παῖδα δ’ ἐμοὶ λύσαιτε φίλην, τὰ δ’ ἄποινα δέχεσθαι,
 a 23 Αἰθίοπας, τοὶ διχθὰ δεδαΐαται, ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν,

When we compare the two verses here cited by Parry in light of the method sketched above, we immediately begin to see the limits of Parry's conception: he does not differentiate each phrase's placement according to verse segment, and he does not differentiate between the essential features of a segment's size, shape, position, lexicon, and syntax within the verse. The two pairs of lines do indeed show grammatical and syntactical similarities, but one would be hard pressed to identify by what criteria an exact correspondence or comparison between either of the two would be made. This is why we insist on adhering to the unit of the verse segment first and foremost—as well as the crucial criteria of verse-segmental size, shape, position, lexicon, and syntax—in order to put the analyst in the position of being able to identify exactly which piece of diction will be compared, and according to what parameters the comparison will be made. Once we commit to a method whereby any analysis or comparison of verse segments within the corpus must be described according to comprehensive criteria, we suddenly open a vantage point by which Homeric diction, including many scholarly analyses and previous presentations of it, can be profitably analyzed. Whether one chooses to reconsider Parry's groundbreaking and methodical analyses, or to re-investigate moments from the post-Parry period of scholarship (Russo, Nagler, Hainsworth, et al.), or to undertake new investigations of the diction for our own literary or literary-theoretical purposes, the method that we propose promises to provide a

⁹ Parry 1971: 313.

lens, or analytical filter, for looking at vast numbers of verse segments in order to learn what their structures and systems reveal in comparison, instead of what they reveal about this or that theory of the formula.

With this in mind, let us return to the initial objections made against Russo's structural formula, in order to bring the discussion full circle from Edwards' summary back to Russo and Parry and, finally, to our own work. J.B. Hainsworth voiced the standard objection to the structural formula when he wrote:

The vice of the extension of the term 'formula' to cover structural features in the epic diction is that unless it is hedged about by more conditions than are visible in the practice of present-day Homeric scholarship the statement that the epics are nine-tenths formulae is likely to be vacuously, and so uselessly, true.¹⁰

It is important to note that Hainsworth was replying to Lord, who argued in somewhat ambiguous fashion that "verse patterns" with no shared lexical items in common did indeed constitute a degree of formularity. Hainsworth's objection does not address the structural formula directly, however, but opposes it for the reason that it offers nothing by way of proving *orality*; if structural formulae are to be found in written poetry too (and no doubt they are), then the phenomenon is inadmissible to any theory of Homeric formularity or orality, says Hainsworth. From the point of view of our study, however, Hainsworth has allowed himself to travel a road to irrelevancy: if there are structural or syntactic formulae or patterns in the poetry, then why not include them in the analysis and why

¹⁰ Hainsworth 1964: 157.

not produce an inventory of them—and only then on that basis evaluate the results in order to see what they tell us (if anything) about formularity?

To take another example of a misunderstanding of the importance of the structural formula, William Minton, offering objections similar to those of Hainsworth's at almost exactly the same historical moment, writes that Lord and Notopoulos' propensity to see syntax¹¹ as belonging to formularity results in a "new proposal" that "would divest the formula of any direct association with meaning and isolate it as a purely structural, metrical-grammatical unit."¹² This "purely structural, metrical-grammatical" dimension is, of course, precisely one of the fundamental aspects that must be included, we are arguing, in any description of Homeric diction, if that description is to possess explanatory power. Minton, however, objects to the consideration on the grounds that any such formula will not be able to serve adequately as a "test for oral composition," and he furthermore concludes that the notion should be refused on those grounds, or at least resisted:

But to call such an abstract, 'structural' pattern a formula, or even a shadow of one, is dangerous. It invites the assumption, which in fact underlies much of its presentation in Russo's study, that such patterns can be used as a test for oral composition, and gives a stamp of approval to earlier appeals to structure made for just this purpose."¹³

¹¹ Lord's proposal for "verse patterns" was of a very general nature and squares with what we are arguing in this dissertation, while Notopoulos' analyses were methodologically unsound and far too haphazard to merit extensive discussion. See Lord 1960; and Notopoulos 1960.

¹² Minton 243: 1965.

¹³ Minton 1965: 244.

Once again, the criticism of the structural formula has been offered for the reason that it might lead to false conclusions regarding the nature of *oral* composition. When one reads the quote from the remove of a generation of oral-formulaic analysis, however, the question that comes to mind is something more like this: why worry about the relevance of the structural formula for formula tests? Why analyze the structural formula in terms of *orality*? Or put more succinctly, why not ask about the relevance of the structural formula for our understanding of Homeric diction itself? Minton continues:

Unfortunately this view [the structural formula] is entirely false. For just as the metrical phenomena of preferred word and phrase distribution were observed by O'Neill and Porter to apply to all hexameter poetry, from Homer to (at least) Callimachus, so too it appears do these grammatical and syntactic 'preferences.' In any case, an analysis of the first 1000 lines of Book 1 of the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius reveals a distribution of metrical-grammatical word and phrase units that is close to, in some cases almost identical with those indicated for Homer here. If Homer were to be adjudged an oral poet solely on the basis for these structural formulae, Apollonius would have to be placed by his side.¹⁴

Minton's point that abstract syntactic patterns can be found with equal frequency in Homer and Apollonius in fact misses the point: the existence of these patterns, if not pressed into service as proof of oral composition, nevertheless *still exist* and for that reason require, even call out for, analysis. The fact that they can be found in both Homer and

¹⁴ Minton 1965: 245.

Apollonius, furthermore, is a notable observation, and far from serving as proof that the concept of the structural formula is irrelevant or incorrect, the presence of structural formulae in both authors in fact renews our interest in knowing what exactly these patterns were doing in both Homer and Apollonius in the first place; and whether they were functionally and descriptively similar or different; and how in actuality they behaved and interacted (if at all) from the perspective of the diction of the two corpora. But this is not Minton's interest, as he makes clear:

The metrical-grammatical approach to the constitution and placement of word-groups and individual words in oral poetry is a *valuable additional tool to have*. It cannot establish the oral characters of a poem and should never be associated with the terms 'formula' and 'formulaic.' But it can enhance our appreciation of the poet's art by showing how he has placed a word group in an unusual position (Μῆνιν ἄειδε) or reversed its expected order (διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε) or employed a non-formulaic phrase of exceptional word placement and meter (οἰωνοῖσ' ἰ τε πᾶσι) to create a particular effect." (emphasis mine)¹⁵

And so for Minton the syntactic component of dictional analysis has no value in itself, and sheds no light on orality, but might, in fact, turn out to be a "valuable tool" for enhancing "our appreciation of the poet's art" by showing how certain word placements are "unusual." Minton concludes, after referring to his comparison between the opening of the *Iliad* and his 1000 lines of Apollonius, with this admission: "a complete comparison of all word and phrase types by part of speech and perhaps syntactic function might reveal a residue of usages of possible value in testing the oral

¹⁵ Minton 1965: 253.

character of a poem. If such do exist and can be satisfactorily defined, we should know more about them.”¹⁶ Although we see here that Minton admits ultimately the need for a complete investigation of “word and phrase types,” he still only begrudgingly allows that “*perhaps*” (my emphasis) an account of syntax would be essential to the purpose. In conclusion we would like to underline the fact that he still discusses such matters in terms of the “value in testing the oral character of a poem.”

With Minton’s objections we come face to face with one of the fundamentals of the entire oral formulaic chapter in the history of scholarship: the centrality of the formula as the single unit or item to be used for analysis and theorization. Time and time again we find scholars objecting to the structural formula for the reason that it does not square with a theory of the formula or with a way of proving oral composition. Minton’s own words state the point categorically, namely, that the structural formula “cannot establish the oral characters of a poem and should never be associated with the terms ‘formula’ and ‘formulaic.’”

But let us now call into question the premise underpinning this objection, and let us pose it in rather bald terms: by what interpretive right is the formula to be considered the bedrock linguistic phenomenon underlying the entirety of Homeric diction, no matter how that diction’s origin is to be understood? On what grounds are we to accept that the formula itself is the single, sole, and comprehensive unit by which all of Homeric diction is to be adequately comprehended? To argue that an appropriate theory of the formula is the ultimate goal of oral-formulaic analysis, or to conclude that the failure to achieve such a theory marks a

¹⁶ Minton 1965: 253.

failure in grasping the compositional nature and origin of the poems, produces a methodological confusion that must be questioned, criticized, and revised. Once we have done so, we will see that formulaicity in fact belongs to a *continuum* or *spectrum*, and does not rely upon or require or even make sense when understood as the result of the behavior of one single linguistico-metrical phenomenon known as a formula.

Let us conclude our introduction with one of the most recent attempts to interpret and categorize work on the formula, Matthew Clark's *Out of Line: Homeric Composition Beyond the Hexameter*.¹⁷ Though the monograph is a study of Homeric enjambment, Clark gathers the history of research on formulaic studies under four headings in his introduction, and then uses these four categories as theories in order to see what his own studies of enjambment yield for the cogency and interpretation of the four views. Clark writes:

It will be useful to give a summary account of the various *concepts* of formulaic composition which have been proposed since Parry's original definition, and which will in some measure be tested by the examples which are examined throughout this study. These concepts may be represented by four models, which I will call (1) set-phrase, (2) chain-and-choice, (3) deep-structure, and (4) word-by-word. (emphasis mine)¹⁸

Without traversing a lengthy discussion of each of Clark's four categories, which he refers to as "concepts," let us try to encapsulate each of them in

¹⁷ Clark 1997.

¹⁸ Clark 1997: 5.

summary form, and let us say a few words about the methodological coherence of his presentation.

The first “concept” of formulaic composition, Clark writes, is the “set-phrase” model. This is the view that he attributes to the early work of Milman Parry, whereby any proper name, or proper name-plus-epithet, or proper name-plus-epithet-and-adjective, constitutes a “set unit” of meaning that is deployed in linear sequence by the composer in the composition of the line. Or as Clark puts it, “the epithet in a name-epithet formula carries no meaning of its own; therefore it can function simply as a device to accommodate the name to the metrical context ... however words are stored, and whatever the mental relationship between the signifier and the signified may be, formulas like ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἄγαμέμνων are handled just as if they were single words, and therefore they do not cause any new theoretical complication.”¹⁹ This characterization will be recognizable to most as a kind of ‘hard Parryan’ interpretation, and as such, will not be particularly useful for the discussion of hypothetical models of composition process, apart from the obvious value of providing a category under which to place this view (which is Clark’s purpose after all). While the conception is recognizable enough, Clark’s presentation of it remains quite vague on what its formal parameters or definition might be.

The second conception of formulaic composition, according to Clark, is the “chain-and-choice” model. On this view, common whole line formulae of the sort used in speech introductions and responses are to be seen as “a chain of three positions, and the element which in any given

¹⁹ Clark 1997: 6.

instance appears at any position is chosen from a set of elements of a particular kind, such as objects or subjects or verbs. Formulas shorter than the whole line can also be described by chain-and-choice analysis; name-epithet pairs may be grouped into families according to the same principle ... Even some individual words, particularly in an inflecting language, can be analyzed as a chain of choices: roots and affixes.”²⁰

Clark appends at least one objection to this view at the outset: “The chain-and-choice model explains how some formulas at least are composed and how they can be grouped into families, but the formula can no longer be seen as a unitary whole, as it was in the set-phrase model. The chain-and-choice model is entirely linear—the chain must always consist of the same words in direct succession and in the same order—and thus it cannot account for the many formulaic variations which are found in the text.”²¹

Again, not unlike his characterization of the “set-phrase model,” Clark’s account here is not particularly specific, or rigorous, in terms of its parameters or definition. That being said, what interests us about Clark’s hypothetical second model is the confusion of formal and compositional elements. On the one hand, he is talking about formal considerations: there are three verse positions, “elements” are chosen from a pre-established stock of material (e.g., subjects and verbs), and there is the suggestion of formula-families. On the other hand, all decisions as to how to analyze the material in the three formalized slots derives from a conception of composition by which the poet is to be understood as executing “choices” from the linear “chains” of options. At a very

²⁰ Clark 1997: 9.

²¹ Clark 1997: 9.

general level, this account may well be minimally ‘true,’ which is to say, there do seem to have been formal divisions in the hexameter, and there do seem to have been choices made as to what would fit there. But to say so without further specification as to the relation between the divisions or the modes of combination and recombination seems not to rise above the level of description, and meanwhile raises the question as to what the “chain-and-choice” model really means in terms of both compositionial process (e.g., the poet) and analytic method. Again, we find a mixture of the formal and the speculative planes of analysis.

Clark’s third concept of formulaic composition is the “deep-structure model,” which amounts in essence to Michael Nagler’s account of formularity whereby the theory and reality of the formula rest ultimately on some sort of “preverbal Gestalt” (or big, grand collection of them) locked inside the composer’s mind; and these preverbal formations allow the production of various surface manifestations, at the level of individual formulaic variations, in the poetry’s formular outputs (we remark in passing that no attempt was ever made to explain how “preverbal Gestalts” were generated, distributed, or disseminated across a tradition of composers). Since this model is not one that allows much to be said of it, for the simple reason that its entire explanatory armature rests on an unknowable, un-analyzeable, and wholly unreachable domain contained or related in some fashion to psycho-linguistic phenomena, there is not much for us to say about it either. A more explicit criticism of Nagler’s model is given in the last chapter of our study.

Clark’s fourth category is the “Word-by-Word Model,” which he explicitly associates with the work of Visser: “The model proposed by

Edzard Visser bypasses the formula *per se* and deals with verse construction through the deployment of single words ... Visser's method is based on the successive placement of single words in the line rather than in formulaic associations. The theory does, however, grant the existence of 'lexical solidarities,' which amount to formulaic associations, and thus it can explain why particular formulaic collocations are found repeatedly in the text: the process of generation will regularly give the same results each time it is called in use."²² Clark might have also mentioned Russo's account of the structural formula in this connection, since, as has never been recognized, his model also imported elements of a "word-by-word" account of the formula, since so many of the examples given in the appendix to Russo's article amounted to structural formulae whose reality was in fact only single words (e.g., participles) in the same position of the verse but with no syntactic relation to the words in the remainder of the segment (all of which is discussed and shown in the final chapter of our study). Indeed, no theory or account of the segment was even attempted by Russo, and for this reason, and others, we would remark from the outset that any account of Homeric diction that relies exclusively on the single word as the analytical unit is extremely problematic, since it eliminates syntactic considerations.

That each of Clark's four "concepts" of oral formulaic composition remain open to debate and discussion almost goes without saying. Leaving aside the question of whether or not his characterizations of the four models in actuality merit the word "concept" or not, we would first point out that no critical perspective, interpretive standard, or formal

²² Clark 1997: 9.

criteria have been offered, much less established, for what it is that his four conceptions claim to address: there is no theory of meter, no account of segmental division, no historical linguistic orientation, and no exhaustive specification of terms. Instead Clark merely asserts from the outside, without further ado, that these are the four “concepts.”

Furthermore, it is not entirely clear whether he is talking about methods of *analysis* of formularity, or if he is proposing *compositional* models to describe, explain, and account for actual compositional process. Again, this is an example of the contamination of the formal with the speculative, an interference that allows utterly subjective presuppositions to intrude and the formal perspective to become distorted. In essence, and no doubt the result of the heterogeneous material that Clark is attempting to corral into a semi-theoretical and semi-historical framework, he has proposed four vague models for interpreting ‘formularity.’ Still, this attempt is useful, and not without significant interest, since his models do, very much, intersect with issues that we raised above. What our study proposes, then, quite to the contrary of the four models elaborated by Clark, is (1) to renounce any fixed conception or definition of the formula from the beginning, and (2) to postpone any reflection on the nature of Homeric composition until we have (3) secured a descriptive method whereby any verse segment in the corpus, regardless of its formularity or non-formularity, can be analyzed and compared to any other potentially relevant verse segment. The latter we undertake for the purpose of producing correspondence sets from which to obtain reliable and demonstrable data regarding corpus-internal features concerning the behavior of Homeric diction and phraseology. Only when these aspects

have been carefully handled and methodically presented, will it be possible to move forward in a discussion of larger issues concerning the nature of Homeric formulaicity and its relation to questions of analysis, interpretation, and compositional process.

CHAPTER TWO

The Method: Five Parameters for Analyzing Homeric Verse

In order adequately to characterize any segment from a formal and descriptive point of view, we must first define what makes a segment a segment in the first place. There are a number of criteria by which one might choose to analyze a unit of Homeric diction, and the most frequent approach in a post-Parry environment has been to propose a definition of the formula first, then next to ask if various samples from the diction have reached that threshold of formularity. From the point of view of method, however, this approach remains highly questionable, since it allows for the intrusion of any number of unnecessarily subjective premises on the part of the analyst. For the purposes of methodological completeness, we suggest that rather than start by first deciding upon a definition of the formula in the abstract, or by proposing different conceptions for its scope and application, we begin instead by considering each segment according to its most meaningful linguistic parameters within the context of well attested features in the hexametrically-constrained diction. What follows then is the articulation of just such a method for describing each segment's linguistic and phraseological characteristics as they appear within the matrix of Homeric diction, in order to provide stable categories and parameters for potentially isolating and comparing any two or more segments in the corpus. Nomenclature and symbols for metrical analysis are as follows:

$\overset{3}{|}$ = trithemimeral caesura

- $\overset{5}{|}$ = penthemimeral caesura
- $\overset{tr}{|}$ = trochaic caesura
- $\overset{7}{|}$ = hepthemimeral caesura
- \parallel = bucolic diaeresis
- $\#$ = verse end

The segments of the hexameter to which I will refer depend on these divisions:

— ∪ ∪ — ∪ $\overset{3}{|}$ ∪ — $\overset{5}{|}$ ∪ $\overset{tr}{|}$ ∪ — $\overset{7}{|}$ ∪ ∪ \parallel — ∪ ∪ — x

Method and Terminology: the Five Parameters

To begin, we have identified five criteria that characterize every single segment's possible description. From this point forward, when we discuss a segment's behavior, we will do so with reference to each of the five parameters. An extended discussion of each, with numerous examples, follows. First, the five parameters:

- (1) metrical size or length of the segment
- (2) moraic shape of the segment
- (3) metrical position of the segment within the hexameter line
- (4) lexical content of the segment
- (5) internal syntax of the segment

Let us first make clear through examples and further discussion what is meant by each of the parameters and why they are analytically meaningful.

(1) Metrical size or length of the segment. This is the moraic length of the bounded expression (e.g., bounded by caesurae, diaeresis, or verse-end). A schematic example of an adonic-shaped segment positioned after the bucolic diaeresis would be:

| | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|---|
| Metrical ‘size’ in the abstract: | | # |
| An actual example from the poetry: | Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη | # |

Metrical size will of course vary. Here are further examples of variations in metrical size, including segments beginning from the trochaic caesura to line-end, and from the hepthemimeral caesura to line-end, alongside the already mentioned adonic-shaped segment at line-end:

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| | Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη # | |
| | γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη # | |
| | θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη # | |

More examples of segments with variations in size, each occurring for the god Apollo:

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| | Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων # | |
| | Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων # | |
| | ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων # | |
| | ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων # | |
| | ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων # | |

Since metrical size is only one parameter, it will of course interact, and vary, in relation to other parameters. To see how this is so, and what effects can be registered as a result, is one aspect of our task at this point. Take, for instance, the example of two hemistichs with identical syntax but with differences in metrical size, a phenomenon that illumines the way in which Homeric diction actually operates, but that also sheds light on the flexibility, and interaction, of segments. In this case, the hemistichs under comparison begin at the trochaic ($\bar{\text{I}}$) and penthemimeral ($\bar{\text{I}}$) caesurae respectively, even though the position of the grammatical items, and the syntax (approximately), are similar. One key difference in the two segments, then, is the variation in segmental size or length: the first example fits from trochaic caesura to line-end, the second from penthemimeral caesura to line-end. Compare:

Εὐρύλοχος δ' ἑτάροισι $\bar{\text{I}}$ κακῆς $\bar{\text{I}}$ ἔξιρχετο βουλῆς Od. 12.339

with:

βάλλομεν· οὐδ' ὁ γέρων $\bar{\text{I}}$ δολῆς $\bar{\text{I}}$ ἐπελήθετο τέχνης Od. 4.455

We see here an example of two hemistichs with similar syntax but different segmental length. The next example shows that the *inflection* of a hemistich-sized verse segment can alter the length of that same segment once it's been inflected. Metrical size here has clearly *expanded*, or lengthened, as the direct result of the inflection of a verse segment from the singular (ζεῦξον, ἄγων) into the plural (ζεύξαθ', ἄγοντες):

ζεῦξον ὑφ' ἄρματ' ἄγων, $\bar{\text{I}}$ ᾄφρα πρήσσωμεν ὄδοιο. Od. 15.47

as compared with this verse (notice also the similarity in the second half of the verses too):

ζεύξαθ' ὑφ' ἄρματ' ἄγοντες, ἴ' ἵνα πρήσσησιν ὄδοϊο. Od. 4.476

(2) Moraic shape of the segment. ‘Shape’ refers to the precise sequence of long and short syllables within the segment. There are instances in the line, after all, in which the actual shape or sequence of moraic longs and shorts have meaning and consequences—one need only think of Hermann’s Bridge. That is to say, metrical analysts will remember that spondaic substitution in the fourth foot can lead to segments with the same metrical size but different metrical shapes, a factor not insignificant when interpreting certain phenomena (e.g. segments occurring before the bucolic diaeresis, questions of interpreting Hermann’s Bridge, the avoidance of spondaic lines, and so forth). Leaving this position aside for the moment, let us return to the verse-final adonic-shaped segment in order to see what kind of variation appears there, with the same or similar syntax. Examples in which segmental shape varies internally within the same segment would include:

|| – ∪ ∪ – x #
 || μητίετα Ζεὺς #

differs in metrical shape from:

|| – ∪ ∪ – x #

|| δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. #

which differs in metrical shape from:

|| – ∪∪ – x #

|| δῖ' Ἀφροδίτη #

which differs in metrical shape again from:

|| – ∪∪ – x #

|| φαίδιμος Ἑκτώρ #

As the examples show, there is a wide variety of moraic shapes available inside of the segment. These varying shapes will help us to characterize any segment in the corpus.

Now, for the segment reaching from hephthemimeral caesura to verse end, examples of different metrical shapes within the same segment can be found here as well. Consider these two segments, both of which show typical noun-epithet syntax and are in the same metrical position, yet have a distinct difference in metrical shape:

∫ – – ∪ ∪ – x #

∫ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων #

∫ ∪ ∪ – ∪ ∪ – x #

∫ κρατερὸς Διομήδης #

These examples are only the beginning of the variety that one finds for this parameter in the Homeric corpus.

(3) Metrical position in the verse. The metrical position of the segment within the verse, in relation to caesurae and verse-ends, is one of the most important parameters for discussion of hexametric diction. In the following three examples, we can see that the phrase *δούλιον ἦμαρ*, for example—semantically important to the poems to be sure—is attested in three different verse positions:

| | |
|--|------------|
| χήτει τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν <u>δούλιον ἦμαρ</u> . # | Il. 6.463 |
| ἀνέρος, εὔτ' ἄν μιν ἴ κατὰ <u>δούλιον</u> ἦμαρ ἔλθῃσιν. # | Od. 17.323 |
| αὐτίκαί <u>δούλιον ἦμαρ</u> ἴ ἐμοὶ περιμηχανόωντο. # | Od. 14.340 |

Metrical variations in which the same piece of diction appears in different metrical positions is common in the Homeric hexameter, and such variations provide the basis for Hainsworth's identification of "mobility" as one important aspect of the hexameter's flexibility.²³ As Hainsworth pointed out, and as has been well known since the work of Witte, Ellendt, Düntzer, and others, frequent are the examples in which a phrase appearing to localize in one particular metrical position can nevertheless shift to adjacent verse positions in order to accommodate alterations in the grammar and segment-behaviors surrounding them. Often, it is quite easy to observe the factors in the line causing the movement. Consider, for example, the segment *οὐρανὸν εὐρύον* in the following sample of three verses—the appearance of a verse-final verb in the same segment, in the

²³ Hainsworth 1968: 46-57.

third and fourth examples, appears to shift the phrase οὐρανὸν εὐρύν leftward into a new metrical position entirely, thereby altering the construction of the line (from the point of view of composition) and raising questions about the reality of the bucolic diaeresis (from the point of view of method and analytic description). First, the segment οὐρανὸν εὐρύν localized in the verse-final adonic-shaped position:

Ἄτρεΐδης δ' ᾤμωξεν | ἰδῶν εἰς || οὐρανὸν εὐρύν Π. 3.364
 φαῖνεθ' ὁμοῦ νεφέεσσιν | ἰῶν εἰς || οὐρανὸν εὐρύν Π. 5.867

And now the same segment apparently shifted leftward by the insertion of a verse-final finite verb²⁴:

ὡς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰῶν | εἰς οὐρανὸν || εὐρύν ἵκηται Π. 21.522

Examples in which segments have shifted or moved from one position to another are not particularly difficult to find, though as is often the case, the examination of segmental mobility sheds light not only on the parameter that we are calling “metrical position” but on other parameters as well (which is a way of repeating what we said above, namely, that the five parameters interact with one another). For example, consider the following three verses. In the first two, we have a good example of an inflected line segment that reaches from the trochaic caesura to verse-end:

²⁴ Compare also, for supporting evidence of mobility, this verse, which is different semantically, obviously, but still probably related:

ὡς Τρώων ἀλαλητὸς | ἀνά στρατὸν || εὐρύν ὀρώρει Π. 4.436

ῥΗ ῥα, καὶ ἄντιλόχοιο ῥ Νοήμονι || δῶκεν ἑταίρω Π. 23.612
 βῆ δὲ θέειν, τὰ δὲ τεύχε' ῥ ἀμύμονι || δῶκεν ἑταίρω Π. 17.698

But the segment can occur in the first hemistich as well, though this time it has been inflected to include a dative plural object. As a result, the segment no longer retains the same metrical size, shape or position—though the syntax (granted that the dative object has changed from singular to plural) and lexical content have survived the shift in position:

δῶκεν ἑταίροισιν ῥ κατάγειν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας. Π. 5.26

Metrical position is meaningful not only in relation to questions of mobility, of course. It is one of the fundamental criteria by which we are able to talk about a verse segment at all, though we must always keep in mind that position interacts with other parameters (e.g., internal syntax may change while the position remains the same, or, internal syntax may remain the same while the position changes, as we just saw in *Il.* 5.26).

(4) The lexical content of the metrical segment. This parameter, the parameter of lexical content, is meant to indicate, or to refer to, the actual words that appear in the segment. This parameter is obviously one of the most important for the history of formula studies, since it is the one that has received the most attention since Parry. For example, Parry's distinction between "generalizing" and "distinctive" epithets can be comprehended under this aspect. Classic noun-epithet bi-forms can be placed here, too, as examples of meaningful variation (or not) within the lexical content of the segment. For example, consider these segments, in which the alternation between adjectives, at the lexical level, is that which

alone comprises the meaningful difference in the identities of the segments (in conjunction with phonological differences too, of course), as evidence for segments in which lexical content remains partially stable, yet partially variable (depending on the substitution of the epithets):

|| δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # || - ∪ ∪ - x # 60x

is differentiated from its bi-form only by one lexical difference, while the other parameters that we have been discussing remain the same (size, shape, position, syntax):

|| ἐσθλὸς Ὀδυσσεύς # || - ∪ ∪ - x # 3x

Two more examples, of which the same can be said. First:

|| δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. # || - ∪ ∪ - x # 34x

which is differentiated only by the lexical content of the adjective in the other half of the pair:

|| ὦκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς. # || - ∪ ∪ - x # 5x

To insist on such points may not seem analytically meaningful at first, though as we will see, they certainly are—one way of making the point is to remind the reader that formula studies almost always treat the formula itself as the single, core, kernel of analysis, and that these formulae

usually have a semantic similarity or identity. We will have many occasions to refer to this parameter throughout. For the moment, though, we can also widen the purview of the segment under discussion in order to include whole-line prosody, for the purpose of producing examples in which lexical variation occurs only in specific segments located at specific metrical positions within whole-line verses (e.g., within verses that are otherwise highly stable). For example, compare these two examples (and note that they are separated by no fewer than one hundred verses, in the same book of the *Iliad*):

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---------------|------------|
| ὥς κραιπνῶς μεμαῦα ῥ' διέπτατο | | πότνια ῥ' Ἥρη | Il. 15.83 |
| ὥς κραιπνῶς μεμαῦα ῥ' διέπτατο | | ὠκέα ῥ' Ἴρις, | Il. 15.172 |

The difference between the two lines is *only* lexical, since the size, shape, position, syntax, and lexicon—apart from our segment in text-boxes—are the same throughout. The phenomenon is actually quite common in Homeric poetry, once you begin to look for it. For example, compare these two verses (again, in the same book, in rather close proximity):

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---------------|-----------|
| παρ δὲ Διὶ Κρονίῳνι ῥ' καθέζετο | | θυμὸν ἀχέϋων, | Il. 5.869 |
| παρ δὲ Διὶ Κρονίῳνι ῥ' καθέζετο | | κύδει γαίῳν. | Il. 5.906 |

Though the syntax internal to the verse-final adonic-shaped segment is not quite identical, it is very similar. And apart from the lexical content of the segment, the rest of the verse is identical for all parameters. From the next book of the *Iliad*, we have further examples, this time with identical syntax both segment-internally in verse-opening position, but also across the two verses as wholes:

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|------------|--|----|---------|--|--------------|----------|
| Νέστωρ δ' | Ἀργείοισιν | | τ' | ἐκέλετο | | μακρὸν αὖσας | Π. 6.66 |
| Ἔκτωρ δέ | Τρῶεσσιν | | τ' | ἐκέλετο | | μακρὸν αὖσας | Π. 6.110 |

Such examples are extremely striking, and suggestive. Again, as we have seen repeatedly, the question of whole-line prosody emerges once again in its relation to the ways in which segments combine to yield larger, overarching syntactic patterns *across* segments. Further examples, and quite revealing ones at that ('revealing,' that is, with regard to variation and stability within the category of lexical content), begin to appear throughout the corpus. One example would be:

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------|----------|--|----|----------|--|-------|----------|-----------|
| Ἔκτορι γάρ | οἱ θυμὸς | | τ' | ἐβούλετο | | κῦδος | ὀρέξαι. | Π.12.174 |
| χάζετ', ἐπεὶ | οἱ θυμὸς | | τ' | ἐέλεπετο | | κῦδος | ἄρέσθαι. | Π. 12.407 |

At this point we begin to see that segments combine quite readily to create larger syntactic patterns or templates. It is for this reason, I would like to point out, that we adopted the term modular over and beyond any account of formulaic or templatic. In other words, perfectly well attested segments of sub-whole-line length are able to interact throughout the poetry according to their own segmental behavior, yet *also* can combine with adjacent segments to give rise to longer syntactic patterns spanning multiple segments.

Once we see how larger templates, built from adjacent segments or templates, begin to arise, we must also take care to notice that larger syntactic patterns of this kind, once they have entered the corpus as stable patterns, will *also* allow for additional substitution, which will only

mutate them further again. The following examples, and hundreds more like them, begin to demonstrate the mechanisms by which identical, or virtually identical, verses can soon start to diverge by way of incremental changes to individual words inside regulated syntactic patterns:

| | |
|---|------------|
| θώρηκος γύαλον, ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτατο πικρὸς οἴστος. | Il. 13.587 |
| πολλὸν ἀποπλαγχθεὶς ἐκάς ἔπτατο πικρὸς οἴστος. | Il. 13.592 |

At this point, the comparison of verses under the category of ‘lexical content’ could be expanded in any number of directions, but for the purpose of maintaining our methodological focus, we will turn now to syntax in order to complete the methodological presentation.

(5) The internal syntax of the segment. This is the syntactic description of the segment. It is also the feature that the history of Homeric studies has most neglected, as we have mentioned throughout. But before considering complex examples in which internal syntax can be shown unquestionably to affect the morphological structure of verse-internal word shapes, we must first consider more straightforward instances. The following two noun-epithet collocation used for Homeric heroes is a classic collocation but also indicative of a key feature that comes to light through syntactic analysis. The central point in the following example is to see that the syntax of the segments is the same, even though the lexical content is not:

| | | |
|-----------------|-----|------------------------|
| ὤκῳς Ἀχιλλεύς # | – ∪ | ∪ – x # nominative sg. |
| δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # | – ∪ | ∪ – x # nominative sg. |

In the next chapter we devote more space to the theoretical implications of comparisons such as this one, but for the time being we will point out that the two segments are clearly related, and that they are identical according to four of the five parameters (segmental size, shape, position, and syntax are all identical, in other words). The *only* variation is at the level of lexical content.

Now, to look at a more complicated example, let us take two verses from Russo’s 1966 article, “The Structural Formula in Homeric Verse,”²⁵ in which Russo broaches the question of the existence (and interpretation, ultimately) of abstract syntactic templates. One will immediately notice that the two hemistichs, not unlike the last example, share similar syntax while having not a single word in common (apart from the particle δ’):

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--|---------------|--|-----------------|---|-----------|
| οἱ δ’ ἰστὸν στήσαντ’ | | ἀνά θ’ ἰστίᾱ | | λευκὰ πέτασσαν, | # | Il. 1.480 |
| ὑποῦ ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις, | | ὑπὸ δ’ ἔρματα | | μακρὰ τάνυσσαν | # | Il. 1.486 |

This phenomenon, in which similar or identical internal syntax but no word in common occurs within corresponding segments, is far more common in Homeric poetry than has been previously acknowledged—including by Russo himself, who failed to develop his own insights in a systematic manner. In such cases we use the term ‘template’ in order to describe the syntactic unity that both hemistichs share. But before going on to discuss cases of multi-tiered syntactic patterning in which evidence for mutual, analogical influence can be demonstrated, let us step back for a moment in order to point out instances in which the inflection of a single

²⁵ Russo 1966.

word coincides with a complete segment, as in this particular example occurring in the verse-final adonic position:

| | |
|---|------------|
| καρπαλίμως ἔρχεσθαι ἐγὼ δ' ὁδὸν ἡγεμονεύσω. | Od. 6.261 |
| ὦ Κίρκη, τίς γὰρ ταύτην ὁδὸν ἡγεμονεύσει; | Od. 10.501 |
| τῶν μὲν ἄρ' Ἴδομενεὺς δουρὶ κλυτὸς ἡγεμόνευε | Il. 2.650 |

Or this instance, in which the subject of the phrase remains the same while the verb in line-final position is inflected:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| κρηῆναι δὲ καὶ ἄλλω ^{tr} ἴ' ὅτ' ἄν τινα θυμὸς ἀνώγη | Il. 9.101 |
| ἔστηχ', ὥς περ ἐμοί, ἴ' πιέειν ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνώγοι | Il. 4.263 |
| οἴκαδε νοστήσαντ', ἴ' ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ θυμὸς ἀνώγει | Il. 18.90 |

Examples such as these, which show inflection of segments, were pointed out long ago by Witte.²⁶ What interests us more, however, are examples such as the following one, in which two hemistichs show virtually identical syntax but have not a single word in common:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| τὸν δ' ἐς Ἀχαιῶν νῆας ^{tr} ἴ' εὐσκαρθμοι φέρων ἵπποι. | Il. 13.31 |
| ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο, ἴ' πολύκλητοι δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες. | Il. 4.438 |

Examples, like this one, in which syntactic identity governs the length of a hemistich, demonstrate the existence of what we are calling a template. In order better to grasp the reality and surface manifestation of this phenomenon, we would like to point to examples such as the following—notice that the last example in the following set is of a different metrical size and shape than the three others:

²⁶ Witte 1909-1913.

| | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| χρυσείην εὐτυκτον, ἴ | έοῦ ἴ δ' ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου, | Il.13.26 |
| Σπερχόμενος δ' ὁ γεραιὸς ἴ | έοῦ ἴ ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου, | Il. 24.322 |
| Εὐρύλοχος δ' ἐτάροισι ἴ | κακῆς ἴ ἐξήρχετο βουλῆς | Od. 12.339 |
| βάλλομεν· οὐδ' ὁ γέρων ἴ | δολίης ἴ ἐπελήθετο τέχνης, | Od. 4.455 |

As is well known but too little studied, Homeric diction is capable of producing verse-clusters in which entire blocks of diction repeat, but in which only one word, or a few individual words, are inflected. In the following clusters we have instances of both lexical and syntactic identity across a block of four successive verses. We would suggest that examples such as these are further evidence for abstract syntactic patterns underlying entire clusters of segments. We note this time that the corresponding blocks are separated by the distance of nearly two books of the *Odyssey*:

ἦ δ' ἐλελίχθη πᾶσα Διὸς πληγεῖσα κεραυνῶ,
ἐν δὲ θεεῖου πλητὸ· πέσον δ' ἐκ νηὸς ἑτάροι. Od. 12.417
οἱ δὲ κορώνησιν ἴκελοι περὶ νῆα μέλαιναν
κύμασιν ἐμφορέοντο, θεὸς δ' ἀποαίνυτο νόστον

ἦ δ' ἐλελίχθη πᾶσα Διὸς πληγεῖσα κεραυνῶ,
ἐν δὲ θεεῖου πλητὸ· πέσον δ' ἐκ νηὸς ἅπαντες. Od. 14.307
οἱ δὲ κορώνησιν ἴκελοι περὶ νῆα μέλαιναν
κύμασιν ἐμφορέοντο· θεὸς δ' ἀποαίνυτο νόστον

A quite intricate example, by which syntactic identity could not possibly be explained as an accident, would be the following:

δοῦπησεν δὲ πεσῶν, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῶ.
Ἰδομενεὺς δ' ἄρα Φαῖστον ἴ ἐνήρατο || Μήονος υἱὸν Il. 5.42-4

Βώρου, ὅς ἐκ Τάρνης ἐριβώλακος εἰληλούθει.

ἤριπε δὲ πρηνῆς, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

Μηριόνης δὲ Φέρεκλον ἴ' ἐνήρατο || τέκτονος υἱὸν
Ἀρμονίδεω, ὅς χερσὶν ἐπίστατο δαίδαλα πάντα

Il. 5.58-60

Now, for an example of a syntactic template occurring in the same passage:

αὐτὸν δ' ἐνθάδ' ἔχουσα δολοφρονέουσα κελεύεις

ἐς θάλαμόν τ' ἰέναι καὶ ἴ' σῆς ἐπιβήμεναι εὐνῆς,

Od. 10.340

ὄφρα με γυμνωθέντα κακὸν καὶ ἀνήνορα θήης.

οὐδ' ἂν ἐγὼ γ' ἐθέλοιμι ἴ' τεῆς ἐπιβήμεναι εὐνῆς,

Od. 10.342

εἰ μή μοι τλαίης γε, θεά, μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμόσσαι,

Another example, again from the same book, but showing undeniable regulation by way of syntactic patterning here:

ὄφρα ἰδῆ γλαυκῶπις ὅτ' ἂν ἴ' πατρὶ μάχηται.

Ἴηρη δ' οὐ τι τόσον νεμεσίζομαι οὐδὲ χολοῦμαι

Il. 8.407

αἰεὶ γὰρ μοι ἔωθεν ἐνικλᾶν ὅττι κεν εἴπω.

ὄφρα ἰδῆς γλαυκῶπι ὅτ' ἂν ἴ' πατρὶ μάχηται.

Ἴηρη δ' οὐ τι τόσον νεμεσίζεται οὐδὲ χολοῦται

Il. 8.421

αἰεὶ γὰρ οἱ ἔωθεν ἐνικλᾶν ὅττι κεν εἴπη.

There are countless other examples which will further demonstrate why the category of syntax is essential to the analysis of Homeric versification—so many that one wonders where even to begin, and how to justify where to begin. In any case, in order to continue the analysis, let us consider the following pair, in which the whole-line syntax is clearly stable, yet which tolerates a verse-internal substitution of two words

(τανύπεπλος for μύθοισιν, or vice versa) in the same metrical position. Three points worth making about the substitution would be: (1) the substituted word occupies the same metrical position, (2) has *different* metrical shapes, and (3) has *different* syntax (one is a dative plural, the other a nominative singular) — within an otherwise uniform, identical pair of verses:

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|--|---|----------|--|---------------|-----------|
| Τὸν δ' Ἑλένη | μύθοισιν | ἤ | ἀμείβετο | | διὰ γυναικῶν· | Il. 3.171 |
| Τὸν δ' Ἑλένη | τανύπεπλος | ἤ | ἀμείβετο | | διὰ γυναικῶν· | Il. 3.228 |

Examples such as this one are important, because they demonstrate how forceful the role of syntax can be: the whole line has a kind of overarching syntactic pattern, yet one grammatical item internal to that pattern can tolerate substitution by means of two items which nevertheless differ from each other in syntax, shape, and lexicon. This mutual interaction, and concomitant variation, within an overarching syntactic frame, is precisely why we must leave the jargon and conceptual inefficiency of ‘formulaic’ analysis behind and admit that a better calibrated account would accommodate these and other related kinds of multi-tiered features.

Still further evidence of a group of verses within which a clear syntactic pattern governs an entire sequence of segments in a highly structured manner (though, again, we note: in close proximity, less than 150 verses apart), would be the following two blocks from Book 15 of the *Iliad*:

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|--|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| μή μ' οὐδὲ κρατερός περ ἔων ἐπιόντα ταλάσῃ | | | | | | |
| μείναι , | ἐπεὶ | εὐ | φημί | ἤ | βίη | πολὺ φέρτερος εἶναι |
| καὶ γενεῇ πρότερος· | | | | ἢ | τοῦ | δ' οὐκ ὄθεται φίλον ἦτορ |

Il. 15.166

ἐνθάδ' ἐλεύσεσθαι· σὲ δ' ὑπεξαλέασθαι ἄνωγε
 χεῖρας, ἐπεὶ σέο φησὶ βίη πολὺ φέρτερος εἶναι Π. 15.181
 καὶ γενεῇ πρότερος· σὸν δ' οὐκ ὄθεται φίλον ἦτορ

We see here yet another example of a syntactic structure over the course of three verses that incontrovertibly regulates the inflection of certain units in the lines.

From the point of view of method, modular diction produces what we have been referring to as a spectrum of formularity. This can be seen most clearly in cases where the content within the category of lexical content is varied to such a degree, according to a syntactic pattern, that the lexical output verges on showing few or no words in common. In some cases a semantic husk been substituted so many times that only the syntactic shell remains, and this phenomenon constitutes one extreme end of the spectrum: no lexical content in common, only the abstract syntactic form. Consider this example, in which a line-initial nominative plural is located before a third person plural verb medio-passive in form. Note that all instances have the same metrical position, size, and syntax, though vary according to lexical content and moraic shape:

| | | | |
|-----------|------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| ἀθάνατοι | φράζονται | ἔπεγναμψεν γὰρ ἅπαντας | Π. 2.14, 2.31, 2.68 |
| Τρῶες | ὀρίνονται | ἐπιμίξῃ ἵπποι τε καὶ αὐτοί | Π. 11.525 |
| πομπῆες | γίνονται | ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης | Od. 4.362 |
| μνηστῆρες | φράζονται | ὃ μὴ τελέσειε Κρονίων· | Od. 4.699 |
| τρίζουσαι | ποτέονται | ἐπεὶ κέ τις ἀποπέσησιν | Od. 24.7 |
| Ἀργεῖοι | φεύξονται | ἐπ' εὐρέα νῶτα θαλάσσης, | Π. 2.159 |
| μάρτυροι | ἔσονται | καὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἀρμονιάων· | Π. 22.255 |
| πᾶσαι | μωμήσονται | ἔχω δ' ἄχε' ἄκριτα θυμῷ. | Π. 3.412 |

As we have come to expect, further variation can appear through substitution:

αἰόλαι εὐλαὶ ἔδονται, ἴ ἔπει κε κύνες κορέσωνται Π. 22.509

In some cases, as we have seen, the syntactic pattern will persist even when the choice between penthemimeral or trochaic caesura varies, though we hasten to add that this prosodological option of ending at the midline caesura with either a long or a short vowel looks more and more like a metrical option created precisely for segmental flexibility:

| | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|
| ἄνδρες | ἔσέρχονται, | ἴ ἄλλ' ἀθανάτων ὁδός ἐστιν. | Od. 13.112 |
| οἱ ῥ' ἐλεφαίρονται, | ἴ ἔπε' ἀκράαντα φέροντες· | | Od. 19.565 |
| ὄρκια | ἔσσουνται, | ἴ πρὶν γ' ἢ ἕτερόν γε πεσόντα | Il. 22.266 |
| ψυχαὶ | ἔλεύσονται, | ἴ νεκύων κατατεθνηώτων. | Od. 10.530 |
| ὄλβιοι | ἔσσουνται, | ἴ τὰ δέ τοι νημερτέα εἴρω.' | Od. 11.137 |
| ὄλβιοι | ἔσσουνται, | ἴ τὰ δέ μοι φάτο πάντα τελεῖσθαι.” | Od. 23.284 |

These examples from the first hemistich, though they show a variation in segment-internal shape and size, suggest nevertheless the existence a template with the size, position, and syntax:

nom pl + 3rd pl m-p ἴ

and:

nom pl + 3rd pl m-p ἴ

A similar example, again filling the first hemistich up to the trochaic caesura, would be:

| | | | | | |
|----|-------------|------------|---|--------------------------|-----------|
| οἷ | τέ σε | πεφρίκασι | ἴ | λέονθ' ὡς μηκάδες αἶγες. | Π. 11.383 |
| οἷ | σε πόλιν δ' | οἴσουσι | ἴ | κονίοντες πεδίοιο. | Π. 13.820 |
| οἷ | με μέγα | πλάζουσι | ἴ | καὶ οὐκ εἰῶσ' ἐθέλοντα | Π. 2.132 |
| ἦν | γὰρ δὴ με | σαῶσι | ἴ | θεοὶ καὶ οἴκαδ' ἴκωμαι, | Π. 9.393 |
| οἷ | κέ με | τιμήσουσι, | ἴ | μάλιστα δὲ μητίετα Ζεὺς. | Π. 1.175 |

In the following series of verses, we do not yet have evidence of a template, but we do see how one syntactic schema can give rise to new ones by means of substitution.

| | | | | |
|----------|--------------|---|-------------------------|------------|
| ἴκετο δ' | ἔς Μαραθῶνα | ἴ | καὶ εὐρυάγυιαν Ἀθήνην, | Od. 7.80 |
| ἴκετο δ' | ἔς Πείραιον, | ἴ | ὅ μιν πρόφρων ὑπέδεκτο. | Od. 20.372 |

and now without the preposition:

| | | | | |
|----------|----------------|---|-----------------------|----------|
| ἴκετο δ' | αἰπὺν Ὀλυμπον, | ἴ | ὀμηγέρεσσι δ' ἐπῆλθεν | Π. 15.84 |
|----------|----------------|---|-----------------------|----------|

Though the segment is of a different size, surely we would also consider this segment related:

| | | | | |
|----------|------------|---|----------------------------|-----------|
| ἴκετο δ' | εἰς Αἰγᾶς, | ἴ | ὅθι οἱ κλυτὰ δώματ' ἔασιν. | Od. 5.381 |
|----------|------------|---|----------------------------|-----------|

When taken together, examples such as these four illustrate how an internal syntax in the segment allows for the substitution of various words within the segment. To take another example, let us consider: the verb ἔζετο followed by the preposition ἐν + different objects:

| | | | |
|-------|----------------|--------------------------|------------|
| ἔζετο | δ' εἰνὶ θρόνῳ· | τῷ δ' ἀΐξαντε πετέσθην. | Il. 15.150 |
| ἔζετο | δ' ἐν κλισμῶ | πολυδαιδάλῳ ἔνθεν ἀνέστη | Il. 24.597 |
| ἔζετο | δ' ἐν κλισμῶ, | ὑπὸ δὲ θρῆνυς ποσὶν ἦεν. | Od. 4.136 |
| ἔζετο | δ' ἐν λέκτρῳ, | μαλακὸν δ' ἔκδυε χιτῶνα· | Od. 1.437 |

Identical in size and also sharing a line-initial word, but clearly a different segment from the point of view of syntax, are the following, in which participles have replaced the prepositional phrase.

| | | | |
|----------|--------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| ἔζετο δ' | ὀρθωθεῖς, | μαλακὸν δ' ἔνδυε χιτῶνα | Il. 2.42 |
| ἔζετο δ' | ὀρθωθεῖς, | καὶ σφραγὸς πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν· | Il. 23.235 |
| ἔζετο | γὰρ προΐδων, | τὸ δ' ὑπέρπτατο χάλκεον ἔγχος, | Il. 22.275 |

What this example shows is that modular diction produces a *spectrum* of formularity. Often, as in the example just presented, one or more words remain throughout the template's surface outputs. The template is the abstracted syntactic pattern itself, and so in cases where one key lexical item remains, because the syntactic pattern yields various surface outputs, we speak of a *spectrum*—not lexical formularity of the kind identified by Parry, and not purely abstracted 'templates' either; rather, something in between. Note that the first set occurs in a segment reaching from verse-opening to the penthemimeral caesura:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| οἱ δὲ | πανημέριοι | μολπῇ θεὸν ἰλάσκοντο | Il. 1.472 |
| οἱ δὲ | πανημέριοι | σεῖον ζυγὸν ἀμφὶς ἔχοντες. | Od. 3.486, 15.184 |
| οἱ δὲ | χολωσάμενοι | Καδμεῖοι κέντορες ἵππων | Il. 4.391 |
| οἱ δὲ | συναγρόμενοι | Πυλίων ἡγήτορες ἄνδρες | Il. 11.687 |
| οἱ δὲ | παριστάμενοι | προσεφώνεον ἕκ τ' ἐρέοντο, | Od. 10.109 |
| οἱ δὲ | διαστάντες | σφέας αὐτοὺς ἀρτύναντες | Il. 12.86 |
| οἱ δὲ καὶ | ἀχνύμενοί | περ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἠδὺ γέλασαν· | Il. 2.270 |
| οἱ δὲ κ' | ἀγασσάμενοι | χαλκοκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ | Il. 7.41 |

and now from verse-opening to the trochaic caesura:

| | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Οἱ δὲ μέγα φρονέοντες | ἔπι πτολέμοιο γεφύρας | Π. 8.553 |
| οἱ δὲ μέγα ἰάχοντες | ἔπέδραμον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν | Π. 14.421 |
| οἱ δὲ βοῆς αἰόντες | ἄμ' ἠοῖ φαινομένηφι | Od. 14.266, 17.435 |

| | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|----------|
| Οἱ δὲ Πύλον τ' ἐνέμοντο | καὶ Ἀρήνην ἐρατεινὴν | Π. 2.591 |
| Οἱ δὲ Φεράς ἐνέμοντο | παραὶ Βοιβηΐδα λίμνην | Π. 2.711 |
| Οἱ δὲ Ζέλειαν ἐναιον | ὑπαὶ πόδα νεΐατον Ἴδης | Π. 2.824 |
| Οἱ δὲ Μυκήνας εἶχον | εὐκτίμενον πτολίεθρον | Π. 2.569 |

| | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| οἱ δὲ γάμον τεύξουσιν | καὶ ἄρτυνέουσιν ἔεδνα | Od. 1.277, 2.196 |
| οἱ δὲ τε τὰς ὀλέκουσιν | ἔπάλμενοι, οὐδέ τις ἀλκή | Od. 22.305 |
| οἱ δὲ γάμον σπεύδουσιν | ἐγὼ δὲ δόλους τολυπεύω. | Od. 19.137 |

These examples illustrate well what we mean by the term modularity. They each contain a certain degree of syntactic regularity, but are internally flexible, segmentally speaking. Yet as modules with stable metrical position and length, they also combine well with other half-line segments to produce the Homeric diction that we know so well. Formally stable, internally flexible, and freely combinatorial—such is what we mean to capture by the term modular.

Before we conclude this section, we must consider an example in which the syntax actually produces a morphological anomaly—in this case, a medio-passive verb form that appears nowhere else in Greek, and which is the sole creation of a syntactic analogy in the particular localized segment. The following verse contains the word, ἐντανύεσθαι, a *hapax*. The creation would have been said in the early days of formula analysis,

no doubt, to have been a creation *metri causa*. This explanation, however, is incomplete, since the innovation can be shown with the precision that our method offers to have been created on a syntactic analogy. First the anomalous instance of ἐντανύεσθαι:

μνηστήρεσσιν ἄεθλον ἄαατον· οὐ γὰρ οἴω
 ῥηϊδίως τόδε τόξον ἴ εὕξοον || ἐντανύεσθαι. Od 21.92
 οὐ γάρ τις μέτα τοῖος ἀνήρ ἐν τοῖσδεσι πᾶσιν,

The explanation is easily obtained, since the segment belongs to a correspondence set of other, inflected versions of the same hemistich reaching from the trochaic caesura to verse-end. To have made an anomalous medio-passive infinitive in this metrical position is not surprising based on these verses:

ἤ πολλὸν χεῖρονες ἄνδρες ἀμύμονος ἀνδρὸς ἄκοιτιν
 μνῶνται, οὐδέ τι τόξον ἴ εὕξοον || ἐντανύουσιν. Od 21.326
 ἀλλ' ἄλλος τις πτωχὸς ἀνὴρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθῶν

ὥς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ὑπερφιάλως νεμέσησαν,
 δεῖσαντες μὴ τόξον ἴ εὕξοον || ἐντανύσειεν. Od 21.286
 Ἄντίνοος δ' ἐνένιπεν ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·

We have, then, clear evidence here that the syntax of the segment is sufficiently robust to generate an inflection of the hemistich in which a morphological anomaly is actually created for the first time, for the purpose of fulfilling the semantic function of the verse and passage *in the particular segment*. In this instance, and others like it, we may say that the preference for lexical content, verse position, size, and shape, and

even the syntactic pattern itself, were all ranked higher than obedience to the standard morphology of the Greek language. Examples such as this one provide the nail in the coffin of the argument by which syntactic similarities are said to be accidental. As the example shows, clearly internal syntax can be productive. For this reason, coming to terms with the modes and means of syntactic productivity, to say nothing of its effects on other diction in the corpus, will be obligatory for any serious formular, or modular—as we are now calling it—analysis.

Segments, Templates, and Modules

Now that we have defined the five parameters to be used in our discussion of verse segments, it is necessary to say a word about the terms that we will use. In the first chapter, the terms ‘template’ and ‘module’ were introduced as supplements to the term ‘segment.’ When a syntactic pattern occurs localized in one particular verse position, and when the verses in the correspondence set share no words in common in the same segment, but show a clear underlying syntactic pattern, we speak of a ‘template.’ We have already cited the example given by Russo in his article on the structural formula as one such template, but it is worth considering the verse pair again in order to see what is meant, precisely, by the term, now from our methodological point of view. The verses:

οἱ δ' ἰστὸν στήσαντ' ἰ ἀνά θ' ἰστίαι || λευκὰ πέτασσαν, # Il. 1.480
 ὑποῦ ἐπὶ ψαμάθοις, ἰ ὑπὸ δ' ἔρματα || μακρὰ τάνυσσαν # Il. 1.486

As can be seen, though no lexical item is the same, a single syntactic pattern governs the hemistich from penthemimeral caesura to line-end in

both verses. And as we have also already mentioned in the introduction, examples such as these, in which no lexical item in common is shared, can be found far less frequently throughout the corpus than examples in which one (or more) word(s) in common persist(s) across the verses being compared. The skeptic may ask why it would matter that syntactic patterning can be identified and studied across groups of verses throughout the corpus, and may furthermore ask what this syntactic patterning shows regarding the behavior of Homeric versification. In response to those who doubt that syntax plays a productive role in Homeric diction—regulating lexical inputs and outputs to such a degree that morphology is disturbed or even created—we would cite the example that we saw above, of ἐντανύεσθαι. Another way to respond would be to remind the skeptic that there are good examples of templates that occur also in spoken speech, and that some of these templates have found their way into the epic language. One example would be the prepositional phrase. The prepositional phrase, by definition, is a syntactic structure by which words can be placed and replaced, or substituted, according to a grammatical obligation whereby the object takes on the appropriate case determined by the preposition. What else is a prepositional phrase, after all, if not a kind of grammatical template, by definition? The following example, then, of a prepositional phrase localized in a specific metrical position, namely verse-end, with identical metrical size and shape, and with the same syntax throughout, is virtual proof that syntactic structures can have active, generative, productive force in the poetic diction as well as in the spoken language (where idiomatic templates are frequent, of course). After all, since the prepositional phrase is, in its own way,

already a template, its appearance in the poetry already suggests a dictional situation whereby a definite syntactic pattern regulates, in a very precise way, semantic inputs in a specific segment. For example, from the verse-final adonic metrical position:

|| – ∪ ∪ – x #

- || εἶνεκα κούρης # (6x: Il.1.298, 1.336, 2.377, 9.637, 19.58, Od. 8.319)
- || εἶνεκα ποινης # (2x: Il. 3.290, 18.498)
- || εἶνεκα νύμφης # (1x: Il. 9.560)
- || εἶνεκα πατρός # (1x: Od. 4.672)
- || εἶνεκα σεῖο # (3x: Il. 6.525, Od. 6.156, *Aphr.* 248)
- || εἶνεκα πομπῆς # (1x: Od. 8.33)
- || εἶνεκα δώρων # (2x: Od. 11.521, Od. 15.247)
- || εἶνεκα νίκης # (1x: Od. 11.544)
- || εἶνεκα τευχέων # (1x: Od. 11.554)
- || εἶνεκα τιμῆς # (1x: Od. 14.70, 14.117)
- || εἶνεκα λυγρῆς # (1x: Od. 17.473)

What will prove the reality of syntactic productivity ultimately, however, are those instances, known since the time of Ellendt, Dünzer, and Witte, in which an abstract syntact pattern actually generates morphological anomalies—one of which we already saw above. If such anomalies can be shown to be the effect of syntactic patterns or schemata rather than the outcome of a shadowy category of ‘metrical necessity,’ then we will have proved that syntax possesses a productive role within the diction and therefore must be understood as operating in combination with lexical and segmental requirements, rather than appearing to be merely a surface result of localization preferences (which is the view taken by the ‘hexameter as container’ explanation). To see this, then, is to grasp that

the nature of Homeric diction is not merely formula-based, but in fact modular, and that the modular nature of Homeric diction gives rise to a spectrum of formular behavior rather than a mere surface appearance of formulaic sequences (cf. Matthew Clark's characterizations of the history of formula studies). By looking more closely at a number of examples both already cited and yet to be adduced in what follows, we can begin to see further evidence for precisely the kinds of morphological adjustments that prove that the role of syntax, in combination with verse architecture and compositional semantics, played an active role in the analogical creation of new diction, in addition to allowing the poet or singer or editor to produce the verses needed for the composition or re-composition of the poem.

The Five Parameters and Examples of Application

For the purpose of looking more closely at the application of the five metrical parameters that we have presented, let us examine the behavior of an adonic-shaped noun phrase, *νηλεὲς ἦμαρ*, in order to see what our method yields in terms of specific dictional behavior and also to see what the method shows concerning more general questions of formularity, syntactic analogy, mobility, modularity, spectra of formularity, and related matters. We begin by listing all examples of *νηλεὲς ἦμαρ* found in the Homeric corpus. This will comprise our initial correspondence set for analysis and comparison. Text-boxes have been used to illustrate co-present syntactic and lexical patterns also at work in the line, i.e., phraseological phenomena which are adjacent to, and in interaction with, the segment ||*νηλεὲς ἦμαρ* #:

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|-----------|--|--------------|------------|
| ἀίσσων ᾧ ἔγχει | ἴ | ἀμύνετο | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Il. 11.484 |
| στῆτ' ἐλελιχθέντες καὶ | ἴ | ἀμύνετε | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ | Il. 11.588 |
| τῷ ῥα καὶ ἐν σταδίῃ μὲν | ἴ | ἀμύνετο | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Il. 13.514 |
| νῶϊν δὲ ζωοῖσιν | ἴ | ἀμύνετε | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Il. 17.511 |
| καὶ τῷ μὲν φάος ἦλθεν, | ἴ | ἄμυνε δὲ | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Il. 17.615 |
| ἄστεϊ καὶ τεκέεσσιν | ἴ | ἀμύνων | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Od. 8.525 |
| τῶν μνησαὶ καὶ ἄμυνον | ἴ | ᾽Ολύμπιε | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Il. 15.375 |
| οἶον δὴ καὶ ὄδ' ἦλθε | ἴ | φυγῶν ὑπο | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ | Il. 21.57 |
| εἶδετ', ἐγὼ δ' ἄν ἔπειτα | ἴ | φυγῶν ὑπο | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ | Od. 9.17 |

Our first general question is: what kind of repetition or formularity do we have here? What is the best description of the precise state of affairs in terms of diction? What mechanisms are at work, if any? Are we dealing with evidence of a structural formula, a formula type, or something else?

When we begin from the first criterion that we specified, namely, metrical size, we notice that all of our occurrences of *νηλεὲς ἦμαρ* do indeed have the same metrical size, the same moraic shape, and the same metrical position in the line (which is not always the case: identical segments can be distended by various phenomena in order to create longer pieces of diction, while others can be moved into different metrical positions). These features, in the instance of the specific segment || *νηλεὲς ἦμαρ* #, can be characterized. Metrical position (bucolic diaeresis to verse-end), metrical size (an adonic-long segment) and metrical shape (an adonic-shaped segment) allow for a single representation:

$$\begin{aligned} &|| - \cup \cup - x \# \\ &|| \text{νηλεὲς ἦμαρ} \# \end{aligned}$$

As for the other two criteria, lexicon, and syntax, both allow for a simple description. The phrase's lexical content does not vary and its syntax remains the same in all examples. This seems to present a straightforward case of a stable segment localized at verse-end, in the adonic-shaped position. However, the value of a method that makes space for what we are calling modularity is the ability to analyze and explain the segment in relation to the behavior of adjacent segments. The reason for this is actually quite simple: in Homeric poetry, segments do not exist in isolation from neighboring segments or behave in isolation from adjacent pieces of diction, as we shall now see.

First, when we look at the second criterion, metrical shape, and its behavior within the correspondence set just given, we find a number of things that suddenly emerge. For example, when we compare the inflected form ἀμύνων in Od. 8.525 to other forms of the same verb appearing in the same adjacent segment (adjacent to || νηλεὲς ἦμαρ #, that is), we notice a meaningful variation in metrical shape: the expected moraic shape for this particular segment $\overset{tr}{\bar{\bar{}}}\bar{\bar{}} - \overset{?}{\bar{\bar{}}}\bar{\bar{}} ||$, which occurs in the segment slotted between the trochaic and bucolic diaeresis, has here been modified by the occurrence of a naturally long syllable in the second half of the fourth foot, i.e., just before the bucolic diaeresis, vs. the typical shape. First, the regular shape:

$$\overset{tr}{\bar{\bar{}}}\bar{\bar{}} - \overset{?}{\bar{\bar{}}}\bar{\bar{}} ||$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \overset{tr}{\bar{\bar{}}}\bar{\bar{}} \text{ ἀμύνετο } || \\ \overset{tr}{\bar{\bar{}}}\bar{\bar{}} \text{ ἀμύνετε } || \end{array}$$

ῥ̄ ἄμυνε δὲ ||

in these verses, for example:

| | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------|
| τὼ ῥα καὶ ἐν σταδίῃ μὲν | ῥ̄ ἄμύνετο | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ, | Il. 13.514 |
| νῶϊν δὲ ζωοῖσιν | ῥ̄ ἄμύνετε | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ· | Il. 17.511 |
| καὶ τῷ μὲν φάος ἦλθεν, | ῥ̄ ἄμυνε δὲ | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ, | Il. 17.615 |

now in comparison with the modified shape, ῥ̄ ὦ – ῥ̄ – ||, attested here as:

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| ῥ̄ ὦ – ῥ̄ – | |
| ῥ̄ ἄμύνων | Od. 8.525 |

in this particular verse:

| | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|
| ἄσπεϊ καὶ τεκέεσσιν | ῥ̄ ἄμύνων | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ· | Od. 8.525 |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|

This difference in metrical shape is, in fact, important and noteworthy, since long vowels in the second half of the fourth foot are a rare phenomenon. They are so rare, in fact, that the occurrence of different kinds of long vowels (e.g. by nature or by position) in the second half of the fourth foot can be ranked: naturally long syllables are rare, while syllables long by position are more rare. And so, when studying dictional phenomena, and especially syllabic length as it relates to specific verse positions (e.g., the fourth or fifth foot), considerations of metrical shape do come into play, and for this reason must be accounted for by method. What we conclude in a preliminary fashion, then, from this set of verses,

is the fact that the segment was sufficiently useful, and robust enough syntactically speaking, to allow the composer or tradition to inflect the word in such a way as to produce a long vowel before the bucolic diaeresis, because the preference for using that particular word in the passage ranked higher than the preference for having two short syllables in the second half of the fourth foot. In other words, the syntactic pattern of the segment, and the composer's need for that particular word in that particular position of the line, outweighed the standard Homeric preference to place a certain metrical shape in that position.

To continue with this segment for a moment, let us look at an example in which the relevance of metrical shape appears to have observable consequences for lexical substitutions occurring in specific segments in relation to alterations in adjacent segments. Every reader of Homer is familiar with famous passage in Book 6 of the *Iliad* in which Hector speaks with, and separates from, his wife Andromache. The line that interests us in particular occurs is:

ὥς ποτέ τις ἑρέει· σοὶ δ' αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος
 χήτει τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν || δούλιον ἦμαρ. Π. 6.463
 ἀλλά με τεθνηῶτα χυτὴ κατὰ γαῖα καλύπτοι

What we have in this verse from the celebrated passage is a deliberate substitution of the phrase δούλιον ἦμαρ for the usual phrase, νηλεὲς ἦμαρ, which, as we just saw above, occurs in every other instance (apart from two exceptions) with some form of the verb ἀμύνω. When we arrange the relevant verses with this in mind, we find this set:

αἰσῶν ᾧ ἔγχει | ἀμύνετο || νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. Π. 11.484

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|-----------|
| στῆτ' ἐλελιχθέντες ἰ καὶ ἀμύνετε | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ | Π. 11.588 |
| τῶ ρα καὶ ἐν σταδίῃ μὲν ἰ ἀμύνετο | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Π. 13.514 |
| νῶϊν δὲ ζωοῖσιν ἰ ἀμύνετε | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Π. 17.511 |
| καὶ τῷ μὲν φάος ἦλθεν, ἰ ἀμυνε δὲ | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Π. 17.615 |
| ἄστεϊ καὶ τεκέεσσιν ἰ ἀμύνων | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Od. 8.525 |
| τῶν μνησαὶ καὶ ἄμυνον ἰ Ὀλύμπιε | | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. | Π. 15.375 |

But now, from *Iliad* Book VI, we have:

χῆτεϊ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν || δούλιον ἦμαρ. Π. 6.463

The example of δούλιον ἦμαρ in Π. 6.463 shows that a significant form of the verb, namely, an infinitive with a long vowel in the second half of the fourth foot, has been produced in order to accommodate the word δούλιον:

χῆτεϊ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν || δούλιον ἦμαρ. Π. 6.463

The only other examples of the segment δούλιον ἦμαρ occur in these two instances:

αὐτκα δούλιον ἦμαρ ἰ ἐμοὶ περιμηχανόωντο. Π. 14.340
ἀνέρος, εὔτ' ἄν μιν ἰ κατὰ δούλιον || ἦμαρ ἔλησιν. Od. 17.323

On the basis of these lines, we can see that the preference for the use of the word δούλιον required a different form of the infinitive than typically appears in the same position. In other words, the passage required ἀμύνειν || rather than the usual shape, ἀμυνέμεν || (the Aeolic infinitive) in the same position. The form of the infinitive that typically appears in

this position is the Aeolic infinitive ἀμυνέμεν || :

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------|
| νηυσὶν καιομένησιν | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> · | ἀλλ' ἐπὶ δώρων | Π. 9.602 |
| οἱ κείνω ἐρίσαντες | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> | οὐκ ἐθέλουσι | Π. 13.109 |
| ἡμεῖς ὀτρυνώμεθ' | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> | ἀλλήλοισιν. | Π. 14.369 |
| ἀθανάτων Δαναοῖσιν | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> | ἐνθάδ' ἐάσω | Π. 15.73 |
| νηυσί τε καὶ κλισίησιν | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> · | οὐδὲ μὲν Ἔκτωρ | Π. 15.688 |
| τειρομένοις ἐτάροισιν | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> · | ἔνθεν ἀπῆλθεν | Π. 17.703 |
| Τρωῆσιν· τῶ καὶ οἱ | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> | ὤρσεν ἐταίρους. | Π. 17.273 |
| τειρομένοις ἐτάροισιν | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> | αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον. | Π. 18.129 |
| ἡμεῖς δ' οὐ νύ τι τοῖοι | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> · | ἧ καὶ ἔπειτα | Od. 2.60 |
| ποῖοί κ' εἴτ' Ὀδυσῆϊ | ^{tr} <u>ἀμυνέμεν</u> · | εἴ ποθεν ἔλθοι | Od. 21.195 |

But in order to avoid creating a final vowel that would be long by position before δούλιον, the poet was forced to use a word with a long vowel in the position before the bucolic diaeresis, instead of the usual ἀμυνέμεν:

χίπτει τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν || δούλιον ἦμαρ. Π. 6.463

And so we can now see that the segment from the trochaic caesura to the bucolic diaeresis, acting in conjunction with the verse-final adonic phrases, has led to the modification of a metrical shape, which proves the semantic and poetic importance of the word δούλιον in this particular passage: the substitution of the word for the otherwise perfectly regular νηλεὲς highlights the importance of the word δούλιον in the particular passage, since νηλεὲς is metrically equivalent and would have fit perfectly well.

To return to νηλεὲς ἦμαρ, it is now time to consider this segment in relation to the third parameter, namely, metrical position. Here, our example is easily defined: the only occurrence of νηλεὲς ἦμαρ occurs in

the adonic-shaped verse-final position after the bucolic diaeresis. But the typically occurring words adjacent to it can still be moved by semantic and narrative needs. Consider, for example, the following verse from the correspondence set, and let us pay special attention to the way in which the verb ἄμυνον has moved leftward in order to allow the appearance of the vocative singular in the same metrical position as the one usually reserved, in this particular group of segments anyway, for a form of the verb ἀμύνε-/ἀμύνεμεν/etc.:

τῶν μνησῶν καὶ ἄμυνον ἴ Ὀλύμπιε || νηλεὲς ἦμαρ, Π. 15.375

As we have seen, all other occurrences of verses with νηλεὲς ἦμαρ, together with a form of the verb ἀμύνειν/ἀμύνεμεν, place the verb in the position between trochaic caesura and bucolic diaeresis. But in this line, the verb form has moved leftward (Hainsworth touched on this aspect of flexibility in his discussion of “separation.”²⁷) One may reasonably conclude that the placement of the vocative Ὀλύμπιε was important enough to displace the otherwise well established positioning of the verb in the mid-line segment. Thus even in instances in which the segment under question appears in the same position throughout the corpus (e.g., || νηλεὲς ἦμαρ #) , the category of metrical position remains a meaningful parameter for both dictional analysis and semantic interpretation, and so still must be consulted (especially in relation to adjacent diction) in order to grasp the metrical and phraseological behavior of the correspondence set in question—that is to say, in order to grasp the wider behavior,

²⁷ Hainsworth 1968: 90-109

context, and motivation of the individual lines under consideration.

One last example of the relevance of metrical position for our method merits consideration at this point. Let us take the aforementioned verse, in which δούλιον seems to have replaced νηλεές in order to emphasize Hector’s reference to a day of slavery yet to come—here we have the one substitution, as was just discussed, as well as two more examples in which the noun phrase has ‘moved’ (these three verses comprise all occurrences of this collocation in the corpus). To recall the correspondence set:

| | |
|--|------------|
| χήτει τοιοῦδ’ ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἦμαρ. | Il. 6.463 |
| αὐτίκα δούλιον ἦμαρ ἐμοὶ περιμηχανόωντο. | Od. 14.340 |
| ἀνέρος, εὔτ’ ἄν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἦμαρ ἔλησιν. | Od. 17.323 |

Even a cursory glance at the three verses is revealing. First, in Od. 14.340 we have an example of a verb (περιμηχανόωντο) filling out the entire position from hepthemimeral caesura to line end—not such a common thing in Homeric diction, and worth noticing. Second, in Od. 17.323, we are faced with the question as to whether a bucolic diaeresis can be assigned to the verse at all. As happens frequently in the analysis of Homeric versification, what looks to have occurred here is that the line-final placement of a particular verb form moved the phrase δούλιον ἦμαρ leftward—in this case all the way to the penthemimeral caesura:

| | |
|--|------------|
| ἀνέρος, εὔτ’ ἄν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἦμαρ ἔλησιν. | Od. 17.323 |
|--|------------|

Now let us turn to the parameter of lexical content, the fourth

category in our method. The lexical content of all of our instances of νηλεές ἦμαρ, is, of course, identical. However, as we just saw, lexicon can still play a crucially important role in the analysis of the diction (e.g., the substitution of δούλιον for νηλεές), especially for purposes of segmental comparison, even when the segment in question shows no variation. When we reconsider the verse Il. 6.463 (χήτει τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν || δούλιον ἦμαρ), we can see that in terms of a formulaic, or better yet modular, comparison, we must consider not only instances of νηλεές ἦμαρ but of clearly related verses with variations in lexical content related to it—in this case the substitution of δούλιον in what looks to have been an otherwise fairly stable, albeit inflectable, segment. If we were to wish to learn more about δούλιον ἦμαρ in relation to the question of lexicon and mobility of diction, then we would need to look at lexically related items, in order to confirm or deny that analogous patterns of mobility held for lexically similar items, too. To take the first example, we will start with a lexically related but non-identical adonic segment, the phrase μόρσιμον ἦμαρ. This phrase shows similar possibilities for metrical position, namely, that the verse-final adonic has been shifted leftward, again by a finite verb, just as we saw above with δούλιον ἦμαρ. Compare:

ἔσσεσθ'· ἤδη γάρ οἱ ἐπὶ ὀρνυε || μόρσιμον ἦμαρ Il. 15.61

and:

εἰς Ἄϊδαο δόμους, πρὶν μόρσιμον || ἦμαρ ἐπέλθη Od. 10.175

The patterning is so similar to what we saw for both δούλιον ἦμαρ and νηλεὲς ἦμαρ that we are tempted to conclude that what we have before us is a template. But let us look first at other lexically related items, before drawing conclusions.

A similar combination of stability-plus-mobile-variation holds for another lexically related item in the same verse-final position, αἴσιμον ἦμαρ. First, the verses with stable localization:

| | |
|---|------------|
| πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Πάτροκλον ἐπισπεῖν <u>αἴσιμον ἦμαρ</u> | Il. 21.100 |
| ἔλκε δὲ μέσσα λαβῶν· ῥέπε δ' Ἑκτορος <u>αἴσιμον ἦμαρ</u> , | Il. 22.212 |
| πέϊσσονται· δὴ γὰρ σφι παρίσταται <u>αἴσιμον ἦμαρ</u> . | Od. 16.280 |
| ὅς τῃ γ' ἀντιάσειε, φέρεσκέ μιν <u>αἴσιμον ἦμαρ</u> | H. Ap. 356 |

Now notice that mobility can occur when a genitive plural Ἀχαιῶν is placed in verse-final position:

| | |
|--|----------|
| ἔλκε δὲ μέσσα λαβῶν· ῥέπε δ' <u>αἴσιμον</u> ἦμαρ Ἀχαιῶν . | Il. 8.72 |
|--|----------|

Again it looks as if we have evidence for a hexametric tendency to allow for lexical substitution in the verse-final position of the line—though interesting to note in this regard is the fact that the intruding word causing the displacement is not a verb but a noun in the genitive plural. We are not then in the presence of a single syntactic template, but what looks to be templates co-occurring in the same verse-final position. In other words, what we have here looks like modularity.

The parameter of lexical content has value for analyzing our

correspondence set in a further way. Above we saw two verses clearly related both to each other and to the correspondence set as a whole, which nevertheless called out for further consideration. The verses are:

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| οἷον δὴ καὶ ὄδ' ἦλθε | φυγῶν ὑπο | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ | Il. 21.57 |
| εἶδετ', ἐγὼ δ' ἄν' ἔπειτα | φυγῶν ὑπο | νηλεὲς ἦμαρ | Od. 9.17 |

The segment | φυγῶν ὑπο || appears here in the same position in which we typically find an inflected form of the verb ἀμύνειν. The verse-opening hemistich in both examples is considerably different from the other, while the second hemistich is identical. The impression is that a whole line hemistich of the shape | φυγῶν ὑπο || νηλεὲς ἦμαρ has been created and now can operate independently of its constitutive sub-segments. This would be further evidence for what we are calling modularity, since there is observable identity and flexibility within smaller segments, yet at the same time larger hemistich segments seem now to behave if they were self-substantial half-line segments independent of their segmental constituents. This slightly more complex behavior, now observable at the level of hemistichs built from shorter segments, would not have become visible to us, interestingly enough, had we confined the analysis merely to the segment νηλεὲς ἦμαρ. And so, yet again, even while the lexical content of the segment that attracted our attention (νηλεὲς ἦμαρ) remains stable initially, one must look beyond it to the neighborhood of adjacent diction—and semantically related forms with similar metrical size, shape, and position—in order to see what other significant and interactive influences are operating on the segment as well as on the verse as a whole.

This brings us conveniently to our final parameter: the internal syntax of the segment. The syntax internal to verse segments, in many ways the focal point of our study, is one of the most frequently neglected parameters in the study of Homeric versification. Russo’s structural formula attempted to address the question, but as we already saw in the first chapter, there occur in the Homeric corpus groups of segments that would be impossible to reduce to one single structure or structural formula. What we often find instead, upon closer scrutiny, is multiple syntactic patterns that are mutually interactive with each other *within the same segment*—virtually overlaying one another—as if there were a spectrum of substitution whereby replacement of one grammatical item had led to the development of more structural formulae in the same segment. As for our segment at hand, νηλεές ἦμαρ, the syntactic description is: the collocation of adjective and noun, in the accusative case, in the verse-final adonic position. We see this in:

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|----------|--|---------------|------------|
| αἴσσων ᾧ ἔγχει | † | ἀμύνετο | | νηλεές ἦμαρ. | Il. 11.484 |
| στῆτ' ἐλελιχθέντες καὶ | † | ἀμύνετε | | νηλεές ἦμαρ | Il. 11.588 |
| τῷ ῥα καὶ ἐν σταδίῃ μὲν | † | ἀμύνετο | | νηλεές ἦμαρ. | Il. 13.514 |
| νῶϊν δὲ ζωοῖσιν | † | ἀμύνετε | | νηλεές ἦμαρ. | Il. 17.511 |
| καὶ τῷ μὲν φάος ἦλθεν, | † | ἀμυνε δὲ | | νηλεές ἦμαρ, | Il. 17.615 |
| ἄστεϊ καὶ τεκέεσσιν | † | ἀμύνων | | νηλεές ἦμαρ. | Od. 8.525 |
| τῶν μνησαὶ καὶ ἄμυνον | † | Ὀλύμπιε | | νηλεές ἦμαρ, | Il. 15.375 |
| χίτηϊ τοιοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς | † | ἀμύνειν | | δούλιον ἦμαρ. | Il. 6.463 |

It would strain credulity to argue that there is no relation between the verses, or to suggest that the similarity is merely accidental. For one thing, two different pairs here occur in proximity to each other (Il. 11.484

and 11.588; II. 17.511 and 17.615). This lends plausibility to the notion that there was a local influence internal to the passage itself acting upon the diction, here, and in general elsewhere. Second, the concepts presented by the conceptions “warding off” and “pitiless day” naturally belong together, and so would naturally occur in an expression, as one can imagine, used in a poetry so attentive to destruction, pity, and warding off. Third, the fact that forms of the verb for “warding off” and “pitiless day” occur together six times in the same hemistich, in a segment of the same length, with a seventh example showing mobile ‘splitting,’ suggests that we have an expression whose existence in the corpus is best understood as a half-line composed of smaller modular segments, rather than as a ‘chain’ or linear sequence of inflectable choices (*contra* Clark’s “chain-and-choice” model). But these segments, as we have seen, are at the same time involved symbiotically with other segments whose syntactic patterning is virtually identical even when the lexical items have changed. What we have, then, instead of a linear chain of atomic-formula choices, is a new, higher level, inflectable verse segment, whose meaningful identity exists precisely *as a hemistich*, not as an accidental accumulation of sub-units segments.

It is precisely for this reason that we have adopted the word *modular* to describe such behavior: the smaller units, which seem to show syntactic stability internal to their segments and for that reason already begin to look like templates, have also combined with adjacent segments in order to produce larger pieces of diction with their own inflectional tendencies, i.e., larger inflectable half-line expressions, which themselves become available for use throughout the corpus as independent hemistichs

(and can become models for other kinds of analogical remaking and reconfiguration as well). Furthermore, as we have already seen, these new half-line segments can combine not only to form whole-lines and pairs of whole-lines, but entire *blocks* of verses in which the same items internal to the blocks are inflected.

A module, as I am attempting to describe it, is a regularly occurring verse segment bounded by caesurae or line-end on both ends of the segment, within which a multiplicity of abstract syntactic patterns can be localized. A module accommodates different syntactic patterns or templates, which themselves possess productive or analogical dictional force and produce a spectrum of formular-looking outputs. To characterize a verse segment as a module, then, is to assign an analytic name to segments having: (1) identical metrical position as well as definitive moraic shape and size (which is the very definition of a segment, after all), (2) multiple syntactic templates internal to the segment, and (3) the ability to (a) expand leftward or rightward and (b) to integrate or combine with adjacent segments.

The syntactic patterns in (2), when sufficiently well attested, make possible an inventory of templates. Furthermore, templates do not simply describe syntactic patterns but can be shown to regulate the lexical and grammatical material filling out those patterns—an essential point for our analysis and for the understanding of Homeric versification in general. Any number of templates can, then, in theory, be localized within a particular position in the verse—and so when we find a segment that shows evidence of multiple templates, we use the word ‘module’ in order to distinguish this cluster of templates from a mere verse segment.

Consider this collection of verses, as a mere starting point—where would one template end and a new one begin? Though the answer to that question is difficult, would we not agree that the relative clause, localized after the bucolic diaeresis, was an operative syntactic pattern available to Homeric composers, no matter what their methods and techniques may have been? Compare the following collection of segments, which do not even begin to approximate the actual collection we could produce for the segment, were we to expand the set to include other forms of the relative pronoun:

| | |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| ὅς περ ἔφηνε· | Il. 2.318 |
| ὅς κέ σε πέφνη | Od. 11.135 |
| ὅς κ' ἐμὲ κήδη· | Il. 9.615 |
| ὅς κέ σε θεΐνη. | Od. 18.63 |
| ὅς κέ με πέφνη | Od. 23.282 |
| ὅς κε λάχρισιν· | Il. 7.171 |
| ὅς κεν ἴδηται | Il. 14.416, 17.93, 17.100, 18.467 |
| ὅς κε λίπηται | Il. 19.235 |
| ὅς κε φύγησι | Il. 19.72 |
| ὅς κε θάνησι | Il. 19.228 |
| ὅς κ' ἰθύνοι | Il. 24.149, 24.178 |
| ὅς κεν ὀπυΐη, | Od. 15.21 |
| ὅς κ' ἐθέλησι, | Od. 17.11 |
| ὅς κ' ἐθέλησιν. | Od. 17.19 |
| ὅς κ' ἐθέλησι. | Od. 17.559 |
| ὅς κε γένηται. | Od. 24.29 |
| ὅς κεν ἔχησι | Od. 4.756 |
| ὅς κε φιλήση | Od. 4.29 |
| ὅς κεν ἀρίστην | Il. 9.74 |
| ὅς κεν ἐκείνων | Od. 19.322 |
| ὅς κεν ἐμῆς γε | Od. 19.27 |
| ὅς κέ σευ ἄντα | Il. 16.621 |
| ὄν κ' ἐθέλησθα, | Il. 10.235 |
| ὄν κ' ἐθέλησι. | Il. 10.22 |
| ἦν κ' ἐθέλησθα | Il. 21.484 |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| ᾧ κ' ἐθέλησθα, | Π. 24.335 |
| ᾧ κ' ἐθέλησι | Od. 2.128 |
| ἄσσο' ἐθέλησθα | Π. 1.554 |
| ὅς σε παρέλθοι | Od. 13.291 |
| ὅς μιν ἔμελλε | Π. 21.47 |
| ὅς μιν ἀνώγει | Π. 5.509 |
| ὅς οἱ ὀπήδει· | Π. 2.184 |
| ὅς λοιγὸν ἀμύνει. | Π. 15.603 (However, this is part of a larger system) |
| ὅς περ ἔδωκεν, | Π. 9.367 |
| ὅς πρὶν ἐτύχθη | Od. 4.212 |
| ὅς καταθήσει. | Od. 16.45 |
| ὅς μοι ἔπεισιν, | Π. 13.482 |
| ὅς μοι ἀνέστη· | Π. 23.635 |
| ὅς οἱ ἔμελλε | Π. 24.85 |
| ἦδ' ὅς ἔπεφνε. | Od. 23.84 |
| ὅς τις ὑπάρξει. | Od. 24.286 |
| ὅς ῥ' ἐφύλασσε | Π. 15.461 |
| ὅς ῥ' ἔβαλέν περ | Π. 4.524 |
| ὅς κ' ἐπιδευής. | Π. 5.481 |
| οὐδ' ὅς ἀλύξαι | Π. 22.201 |
| ὅς περὶ πάντων | 2.831, identical at 11.329 |
| ὅς μέγα πάντων | Π. 1.78, Π. 10.32 |
| ὅς μέγα πᾶσιν | Π. 1.283 |
| ὅς ῥα πυλάων | Od. 12.445 |
| ὅς ῥα τόθ' ἵππων | Π. 6.18 |
| ὅς ῥα Σκαμάνδρου | Π. 5.77 |
| ὅς ῥα Χίμαιραν | Π. 16.328 |
| ὅς ῥ' ἐνὶ Παισῶ | Π. 5.612 |
| ὅς δέ κεν ὕμεων | Π. 15.494 |
| ὅς τε μεσήεις | Π. 12.269 |
| ὅς τε δίδωσιν | Od. 1.348 |
| ὅς τε πεφεύγοι | Π. 21.609 |
| ὅς τ' ἐπιδευής | Π. 12.299 |
| ὅς τέ νυ λαῶν | Π. 2.365 |
| ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλων | Π. 9.553 |
| ὅς τε καθ' ὕλην | Π. 10.184 |
| ὅς τε μέγιστος | Π. 15.37 (identical: Od. 5.185, Apollo 5.185), Hymns exx |
| ὅς τ' ἐπὶ πολλήν | Π. 15.80 |
| ὅς τε καὶ οὐκί. | Π. 15.137 |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| ὅς τ' ἐπὶ νεβρῶ | Π. 15.579 |
| ὅς τ' ἐνὶ πάτρῃ | Π. 24.480 |
| ὅς τέ οἱ αὐτῶ | Π. 24.292 |
| ὅς τε σοὶ αὐτῶ | Π. 24.310 |
| οἷ τε σοὶ αὐτῶ | Π. 9.521 |
| ὅς τέ μιν αὐτὴν | Π. 24.729 |
| ὅς τε θαλάσσης | Od. 1.52, Od. 4.385, <i>Theogony</i> 931 |
| ὅς τε μέγιστος | Π. 15.37, Od. 5.185 |
| ὅς τε μάλιστα | Π. 5.5, Od. 13.93, |
| ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλους | Od. 13.213, Od. 21.293 |
| οἷ τε καὶ ἄλλους | Od. 16.227, 20.187 |
| ὅς τε καὶ ἄλλων | Π. 9.553 |
| ὅς τε θεῶν ἔξ | Od. 17.518 |
| ὅς τε θεουδῆς | Od. 19.109 |
| ὅς τέ μεν αἰεὶ | Od. 22.357 |
| ὅς τε καὶ οὐκί. | Π. 15.137 |
| ὅς ῥά τε πάσης | Od. 15.411 |
| ὅς ῥά τε τέχνη | Π. 3.61 |
| ὅς ῥά τε ἔργων | Π. 17.549 |
| ὅς ῥά τε πάντων | Od. 15.319 |
| ὅς τις ἄριστος | Π. 7.50, 11.179, 16.76, 18.289, 19.528, 24.215 (Od. 20.335 mobile) |
| ὅς τις ἀφήη | Π. 17.631 |
| ὅς τις ἐθείρη· | Π. 21.347 |
| ὅς τις ὄδ' ἐστί· | Π. 3.192 |
| ὅς τις ὀπιῖοι.” | Od. 2.336, 16.386 |
| ὅς τις ἀμάρτη. | Od. 13.214 |
| ὅς τις ἄριστος. | Π. 7.50, Od. 11.179, Od 16.76, 18.289, 19.528, 24.215 |
| ὅς τις ἐκείνου | Od. 14.163 |
| ὅς τις ἐμοίγε | Od. 15.359 |
| ὅς τις Ἀχαιῶν | Π. 23.285 |
| ὅς σάφα θυμῶ | Π. 12.28 |
| ὅς σε πάρος γε | Π. 13.465 |
| ὅς τὸ πάρος γε | Π. 17.587s |
| ὅς σε πάρος περ | Π. 15.256 |
| ὅς τοι ἀκοίτης. | Π. 15.91 |
| ὅς Διὸς ἱρεὺς | Π. 16.604 |
| ὅς μέγ' ἄριστος | Π. 16.271, 17.164, Od. 22.29 |
| ὅς οἱ ἀπάντων | Π. 27.583 |
| ὅς ῥα ἄνακτα | Π. 23.517 |

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| ὅς μάλα πολλά | Od. 1.1 |
| ὅς ποτ' ἐν ὑμῖν | Od. 2.46 |
| ὅς ῥα τὰ μῆλα | Od. 9.187 |
| ὅς ῥ' Ὀδυσῆϊ | Od. 24.445 |
| ὅς κατὰ ἄστν | Od. 18.1 |
| ὅς μ' ἐπὶ βουσίην | Od. 20.209 |
| ὅς μέγ' ἄριστος | Od. 16.271, 17.164, 22.29 |

The list demonstrates why the terms segment and template are insufficient for characterizing the diversity of syntactic patterns available in the segment. What we have here is a series of templates, some of which blur into each other to such a degree that it becomes impossible to determine where one begins and the other ends. Or, perhaps if it were indeed possible, the divisions would become, at some point, almost arbitrary, and therefore of diminishing utility from a methodological point of view. However, lest we be accused of making an assertion without providing evidence, let us look at the possibilities available to the composer who wished to begin a relative clause after the bucolic diaeresis in nothing more than the the following manner: || οἱ δὲ ... # :

| | |
|---|------------|
| αἰὲν ἀποκτείνων ἰ τὸν ὀπίστατον· οἱ δὲ φέβοντο. | Il. 8.342 |
| ἰᾶτ' Εὐρύπυλον ἰ βεβλημένον· οἱ δὲ μάχοντο | Il. 12.2 |
| οἱ μὲν ἀφροσῶσιν ἰ σὺν τεύχεσιν, οἱ δὲ μάχονται | Il. 13.738 |
| πολλοὶ δ' Ἀργείων ἰ οἱ μὲν δάμεν, οἱ δὲ λίποντο, | Il. 12.14 |
| θρώσκων ἄλλοτ' ἐπ' ἄλλον ἰ ἀμείβεται, οἱ δὲ πέτονται | Il. 15.684 |
| ἐξεῖης πάντεσσι ἰ παρῆστασαι· οἱ δὲ διδοῦσι | Od. 17.450 |
| εἰ δ' ἄγε τοὺς ἂν ἐγὼ ἰ ἐπιόσομαι οἱ δὲ πιθέσθων. | Il. 9.167 |
| οὐδ' εἴα κλαίειν ἰ Πρίαμος μέγας· οἱ δὲ σιωπῆ | Il. 7.427 |
| τοῖσι δ' ἀοιδὸς ἰ ἄειδε ἰ περικλυτός, οἱ δὲ σιωπῆ | Od. 1.235 |
| τῶν ἔν γέ σφιν ἰ ἄειδε ἰ παρήμενος, οἱ δὲ σιωπῆ | Od. 1.339 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| ἀργαλέον Τρώων ἰ καὶ Ἀχαιῶν· οἱ δὲ λύκοι ὥς | Π. 4.471 |
| ἴσας δ' ὑσμενη ἰ κεφαλὰς ἔχεν, οἱ δὲ λύκοι ὥς | Π. 11.72 |
| πάντας ἀνὰ κλισίᾳ ἰ σὺν τεύχεσιν· οἱ δὲ λύκοι ὥς | Π. 16.156 |
| μὰψ ἀτὰρ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἰ ἔμοι δ' ἄχος, οἱ δὲ ἔκηλοι | Π. 5.759 |
| ἦκε δ' ἐπ' Ἀργεῖοισι ἰ κακὸν βέλος· οἱ δὲ νυ λαοὶ | Π. 1.382 |
| | |
| ὄτρυνον Δαναοὺς ἰ πολεμιζέμεν· οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ | Π. 5.520 |
| φραζώμεσθ' ὥς κεν ἰ καταπαύσομεν· οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ | Od. 2.168 |
| ἐξ ἡμέων γὰρ φασι ἰ κάκ' ἔμμεναι· οἱ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ | Od. 1.33 |
| | |
| πάντη τ' εἰλυφῶν ἰ ἄνεμος φέρει, οἱ δὲ τε θάμνοι | Π. 11.156 |
| κείρει τ' εἰσελθῶν ἰ βαθὺ λήϊον· οἱ δὲ τε παῖδες | Π. 11.560 |
| δικτύῳ ἐξέρυσαν ἰ πολυωπῶ· οἱ δὲ τε πάντες | Od. 22.386 |
| | |
| ἔγκατα καὶ μέλαν αἶμα ἰ λαφύσσετον· οἱ δὲ νομῆες | Π. 18.583 |
| μάστι δ' αἰὲν ἔλαννε ἰ κατωμαδόν· οἱ δὲ οἱ ἵπποι | Π. 23.500 |
| | |
| ἐσχατιῇ πολέμοιο ἰ δυσηχέος· οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι | Π. 11.524 |
| Πάτροκλος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἰ ἔχεν ποδός· οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι | Π. 16.763 |
| ἦσται ὀδυρόμενος ἰ ἔταρον φίλον· οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι | Π. 19.345 |
| ἦμενος, ἔνθ' ὀρόων ἰ φρένα τέρψομαι· οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι | Π. 20.23 |
| ἔνθ' ὅ γε τέρπετο δαιτὶ ἰ παρήμενος· οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι | Od. 1.26 |
| τάμνων δέρμα βόειον ἰ εὐχροές· οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι | Od. 14.24 |
| | |
| ἦκε σέλας μετὰ λαὸν ἰ Ἀχαιῶν· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες | Π. 8.76 |
| ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι ἰ Διὸς δόμῳ· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες | Π. 15.85 |
| ποιμένος ἀφραδίῃσι ἰ διέτμαγεν· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες | Π. 16.354 |
| δεξιὸς ἀίξας ἰ διὰ ἄστεος· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες | Π. 24.320 |
| αὐτοὺς δ' εἰσηγον ἰ θεῖον δόμον· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες | Od. 4.43 |
| δεξιὸς ἦιξε πρόσθ' ἰ ἵππων· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες | Od. 15.164 |
| Τρώων ἰπποδάμων ἰ καὶ Ἀχαιῶν· οἱ δὲ μένοντες | Π. 4.333 |
| κήρυκες δ' ἄρα λαὸν ἰ ἐρήτυον· οἱ δὲ γέροντες | Π. 18.503 |
| | |
| ὣς ἔφατ' Εὐρύπυλος ἰ βεβλημένος· οἱ δὲ παρ' αὐτὸν | Π. 11.592 |
| αὐτῆκα δ' οἱ μὲν τεῖχος ἰ ὑπέρβασαν, οἱ δὲ κατ' αὐτὰς | Π. 12.469 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| κεκλόμενος Τρώεσσι ἴρ κατὰ στίχας· οἱ δὲ σὺν αὐτῷ | Il. 15.353 |
| ἀλλὰ θεὸς μορφήν ἵ ἔπεισι στέφει· οἱ δὲ τ' ἐς αὐτὸν | Od. 8.170 |
| ἀμφ' αὐτῷ χυμένη ἵ λίγα κωκύει· οἱ δὲ τ' ὄπισθε | Od. 8.527 |
| μειλιχίῳσ' ἐπέεσσι ἴρ παραυδῶν· οἱ δὲ τοι οὔ τι | Od. 16.279 |
| τῶν δ' αἱ μὲν λεπτάς ἵ ὀθόνας ἔχον· οἱ δὲ χιτῶνας | Il. 18.595 |
| καὶ ρ' αἱ μὲν καλὰς ἵ στεφάνας ἔχον· οἱ δὲ μαχαῖρας | Il. 18.597 |
| νώμησεν δ' ἄρα πᾶσιν ἴρ ἐπισταδόν· οἱ δὲ θεοῖσιν | Od. 13.54 |
| νώμησεν δ' ἄρα πᾶσιν ἵ ἐπισταδόν· οἱ δὲ θεοῖσι | Od. 18.425 |
| ὥς Δαναοὶ Τρώεσσιν ἴρ ἐπέχραον· οἱ δὲ φόβοιο | Il. 16.356 |
| αἶματι φοινικόεσσαι ἴρ ἀνέδραμον· οἱ δὲ μάλ' αἰεὶ | Il. 23.717 |

What these verses show, in combination with the long list immediately preceding, is the fact that syntactic formularity comprises a *spectrum*—not a collection of templates or schemata, and certainly not a list of atomic-formulaic kernels.

A few last points to make before concluding the chapter. Modules are not, as we are defining them, to be understood merely as confined to single verse segments, since adjacent segments also often combine to make larger, longer modules: whole-line dictional units, which are often inflectable, can justifiably be described as whole-line modules built from shorter modules. A pedestrian example, but one all the more useful for the reason of its commonality, is provided by the following collection of verse segments—consider the ways in which whole-line verses of address and response are formed on the basis of interchangeable segments, a situation already noticed by Parry:

Verse-initial segment ἵ + ἵ verb of address ἵ + ἵ nom. subject #

Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος |⁵
 Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδῶν |⁵
 Τὴν δὲ μέγ' ὀχθήσας |⁵
 τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος |⁵
 Τὴν δὲ βαρὺ στενάχων |⁵

|⁵ μετέφη |⁷
 |⁵ προσέφη |⁷

|⁷ πόδας ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύς·
 |⁷ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων·
 |⁷ νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς·

|⁷ κρατερὸς Διομήδης·
 |⁷ κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ·

|⁷ Τελαμώνιος Αἴας·
 |⁷ πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς·
 |⁷ Τελαμώνιος Αἴας·
 |⁷ Πρίαμος θεοειδής·
 |⁷ ξανθὸς Μενέλαος·
 |⁷ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων·

The recognition that Homeric verse technique provided modular flexibility of the sort observed here has consequences for our understanding of Homeric poetry in general. The division according to verse segments with internal syntax, which we now refer to as modules, results in an account of the hexameter by which various sorts of insights begin to take shape. One, as it happens, concerns the relationship between the bucolic diaeresis and hepthemimeral caesurae in the second hemistich. The choice between the two becomes partially analogous to the alternation between segments ending at the penthemimeral and trochaic caesurae in the third foot: segments fitting between the hepthemimeral caesura and line-end, and between the bucolic diaeresis

and line-end, often show comparable syntactic patterns whose primary difference is not syntactic but dictional size and shape—certain pieces otherwise similar in lexical and syntactic content are made to fit from hepthemimeral caesura to verse-end, while others are formed to fit from bucolic diaeresis to verse-end—just as syntactic patterns internal to segments ending at the penthemimeral caesura sometimes have alternating optional segments with similar syntax but reaching to the trochaic caesura. In other words, from the modular point of view, the segment reaching from hepthemimeral caesura to verse-end contains modules in some instances which are comparable in syntactic shape and linguistic character to the segment reaching from the bucolic diaeresis to line-end, and these alternations in metrical size can sometimes be interpreted as a bi-forms of each other. For example, there are instances in which the segment fitting between the hepthemimeral caesura and verse-end can be expanded all the way to the trochaic caesura if necessary, producing yet further segmental possibilities for syntactic construction. An example would be:

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| ἀλλ' ἔκ τοι ἐρέω, ἴ τὸ δὲ καὶ ἴ <u>τελέεσθαι οἴω</u> . | Π. 1.204 |
| ἀθάνατοι βάλλουσι ἢ καὶ ὡς ἴ <u>τελέεσθαι οἴω</u> , | Od. 1.201, Od. 15.173 |
| “ὦ γέρον, οὗ πω τοῦτο ἢ ἔπος ἴ <u>τελέεσθαι οἴω</u> · | Od. 3.226 |
| ὦδε γὰρ ἡμέτερόν γε ἴ νόον ἴ <u>τελέεσθαι οἴω</u> · | Od. 22.215 |
| πᾶσι δὲ σημαίνειν, ἴ ἅ τιν' οὐ ἴ <u>πείσεσθαι οἴω</u> · | Π. 1.289 |
| σήμαιν'· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγ' ἴ ἔτι σοὶ ἴ <u>πείσεσθαι οἴω</u> . | Π. 1.296 |
| καὶ μιν γουνάσομαι ἴ καὶ μιν ἴ <u>πείσεσθαι οἴω</u> . | Π. 1.427 |
| ἵππεῦσι· στεῖνος γάρ, ἴ ὅθι ἴ <u>τρῶσεσθαι οἴω</u> . | Π. 12.66 |
| δηρὸν ἐμῆς καὶ σῆς ἴ ἔριδος ἴ <u>μνήσεσθαι οἴω</u> . | Π. 19.64 |
| ἐκφύγομεν, καὶ που ἴ <u>τῶνδε</u> ἴ <u>μνήσεσθαι οἴω</u> . | Od. 12.212 |
| Ἐκτορα καὶ μεμαῶτα ἢ <u>μάχης</u> ἴ <u>σχήσεσθαι οἴω</u> . | Π. 9.655 |
| μίμνει, ὄν οὐκέτι πάγχυ ἢ <u>μάχης</u> ἴ <u>σχήσεσθαι οἴω</u> . | Π. 13.747 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| <u>Ἔκτορα Πριαμίδην ἤ μένεος ἤ σχήσεσθαι οἴω,</u> | Il. 17.503 |
| ἄλλ' οὐ τοι τόδε κέρδος ἐγών ἤ ἔσσεσθαι οἴω | Il. 16.311 |
| ὄψεται· οὐ γάρ μιν πρόσθεν ἤ παύσεσθαι οἴω | Od. 17.7 |

which are now expandable leftward, where necessary, from the hepthemimeral all the way to the trochaic caesura:

| | |
|---|------------|
| ἄνδρ' ὀρόω, τάχα δ' ἄμμε ἤ διαρραΐσεσθαι οἴω. | Il. 24.355 |
| οὐ γὰρ ἀναιμωτί γε ἤ διακρινέεσθαι οἴω | Od. 18.149 |
| πάντως οὐκέτι νῶϊ ἤ διακρινέεσθαι οἴω | Od. 20.80 |
| ἡσυχίως καὶ ἔπειτα ἤ διακρινέεσθαι οἴω. | Herm. 438 |
| αὔριον· οὐ μὲν γάρ τί ἤ σ' ὑποστρέψεσθαι οἴω | Od. 18.23 |
| ἑστάμεν· οὐ μὲν γάρ τιν' ἤ ἀναιρήσεσθαι οἴω, | Od. 21.261 |
| ἔσσουνται· τῶ καί μιν ἤ ἐπαυρήσεσθαι οἴω. | Il. 6.353 |

To summarize: our method divides the hexameter according to verse segments. These verse segments bind repeating syntactic patterns whose generative, productive, and regulatory effects are real and demonstrable. The numerous syntactic patterns and their output can be separated and subdivided, and when individual syntactic patterns emerge from such comparisons (using correspondence sets), we use the term ‘template’ to describe the abstract syntactic schema. When we discover a segment with multiple templates localized within it, each of which shows numerous instantiations and all of which seem to be bound by the same dictional endpoints (e.g., caesurae, diatareses, line-end, etc), we call the segment a ‘module.’ Some modules swell to create moraicly longer modules, while others join seamlessly with adjacent modules to form half-line and whole-line unities; and sometimes form even blocks of verse-groups that are then inflected *as* entire blocks, as we saw earlier in the

chapter. If our method and presentation of evidence are correct, then we are no longer within the realm of traditional formula studies, but have opened a new view onto Homeric diction.

CHAPTER THREE

The Theoretical Basis for the Modular Account of Homeric Diction

Now that we have presented the method, it is time to return to the theoretical basis for the claims concerning segmental behavior, internal syntax, and the spectrum of formularity. In what follows we start from the basic linguistic and dictional facts of the noun-epithet collocation, in its localized position behind the bucolic diaeresis, and next move through a series of dictional phenomena (inflection, mobility, and others) in order to demonstrate that formular behavior is not merely “flexible” but in fact a graduated spectrum ranging from highly literal repetitions of phrase-formulae to abstract repetitions of syntactic structures with little or no commonality at the level of lexicon. In doing so we will attempt to demonstrate, from the ground up, the accuracy of the following: (1) formularity cannot be reduced to the sole atomic unit of the semantically-based phrase-formula, but instead constitutes, and more precisely reflects, a spectrum created by the presence of multiple syntactic patterns internal to the same and adjacently coinjoined segment (2) the reality of internal syntax within line segments constitutes a genuinely productive force in the creation of morphological innovations (3) the modular, rather than atomic, account of the spectrum of formularity solves a number of methodological and linguistic problems in the theory and comprehension of Homeric versification.

Noun-Epithet Formulae and Templates

The first example of formulaicity in the analysis of Homeric diction is the noun-epithet doublet, which existed in order to facilitate a verse-final adonic-shaped segment, in the nominative case, following a consonant-final or vowel-final word at the bucolic diaeresis. While we would point out that even these examples imply an underlying abstract syntax, we will refrain from saying more on the matter until later in the discussion. The following examples are taken from Parry's analysis:

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------|---------|-----|
| δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 60x |
| ἐσθλὸς Ὀδυσσεύς # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 3x |
| δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 34x |
| ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύς. # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 5x |
| φαίδιμος Ἴεκτωρ # | - ~ ~ | - x # | 29x |
| ὄβριμος Ἴεκτωρ # | - ~ ~ | - x # | 4x |

Next in our inventory of formulaic phenomena is the existence, already observed by Witte, of verse segments that behave as if inflected—inflections which form paradigms not unlike noun declensions.²⁸ In this instance, however, the paradigms have come into existence in order to accommodate their placement not only according to grammar but also according to verse architecture (a key point). For example, in the verse-final adonic position, the word for charioteer shows the following paradigm, which is based on different stem forms and which shows heterogenous morphology, quite clearly the result of verse-architectural constraints:

²⁸ See Witte 1912, in particular Section VII.

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| - υ υ - χ # | |
| ἥνιοχῆες # | nom. pl. |
| ἥνιοχῆα # | acc. sg. |
| ἥνίοχόν τε # | acc. sg. + post positive connective |
| ἥνιόχοιο # | gen. sg. |

The evidence for which can be seen in:

| | |
|---|------------|
| ἄψ ἐπιμισγομένων· ὑπὸ δ' ἔστρεφον <u>ἥνιοχῆες</u> . | Il. 5.505 |
| ἀλλ' Ἄρχεπτόλεμον θρασὺν Ἑκτορος <u>ἥνιοχῆα</u> | Il. 8.312 |
| αὐτὰρ ὃ Μηριόναο ὀπάονά θ' <u>ἥνίοχόν τε</u> | Il. 17.610 |
| Ἑκτορα δ' αἰνὸν ἄχος πύκασε φρένας <u>ἥνιόχοιο</u> . | Il. 8.124 |

What the example demonstrates is that within Homeric verse, narrative requirements (e.g., inflecting the final word in the line according to the grammatical necessities of the particular verse) are obligated to work in tandem with verse-architectural constraints (e.g., morphology is fitted out to fill the segment between bucolic diaeresis and line-end). Here, in the adonic segment, for example, we see that the word for 'charioteer,' in order to fit the adonic segment, must adopt morphology from a number of different sources (ἥνιοχῆες and ἥνιοχῆα imply an *-eus nominative for the word which by all appearances never in fact existed).

In other words, in this example, in order for our lexical item to function in this particular position in the verse, the morphology of the word has been adjusted according to metrical shape (or, in other words, has adopted case endings deriving from heterogeneous sources, i.e., from an -eus nominal paradigm as well as the -oio genitive, rather than from a homogeneous nominal paradigm attested within the history of Greek) in

order to obey the demands of Homeric grammar, syntax, and verse architecture. From the analyst’s point of view, once we have accepted that a lexical item occurring within the same verse position will allow for manipulations of morphology on the basis of verse-architectural constraints in the manner seen here, we have run headlong into the fact of a syntactic pressure sufficiently forceful to override the morphological regularities of the Greek language. To put it another way, we could imagine the opposite situation, i.e., a case in which the impossibility of forming new metrical shapes would forbid the word from occurring in the position and thereby forbid the possibility of using the form in the verse. But this does not happen—exactly the opposite occurs: the syntactic patterns remain, while the morphology of the language is forced to adapt.

We must also remember that the ‘inflection’ of the word for ‘charioteer’ is still more extensive than its localized behavior in line-final position: the word occurs in other verse positions with other shapes, including a nominative singular ἡνίοχος that is based on a different stem-shape than the one we just saw in line-final position. For example:

| | | |
|------------|---|----------|
| — ∪ ∪ χ | 5 | |
| ἡνίοχος | 5 | nom. sg. |
| ἡνίοχον | 5 | acc. sg. |
| ἡνίοχῳ | 5 | dat. sg. |
| ἡνίοχόν τε | 5 | acc. sg. |

The evidence for which can be seen in these verses:

| | |
|---|------------|
| ὣς ἔφαθ', ἡνίοχος δ' ἵμασεν καλλίτριχας ἵππους | II. 11.280 |
| κεῖσθαι, ὃ δ' ἡνίοχον μέθεπε θρασύν· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτι δὴν | II. 8.126 |
| μᾶλλον ὑφ' ἡνίοχῳ εἰωθότι καμπύλον ἄρμα | II. 5.231 |

ἔστασαν ἡνίοχόν τε ἴ και ἄρματα ποικίλ' ἔχοντες· Π 13.537, 14.431

An interesting phenomenon that we note here is the existence of two forms of an accusative singular occurring just before the mid-line caesura: ἡνίοχον ἴ and ἡνίοχόν τε ἴ. The existence of both, precisely in the verse position that allows for a certain metrical option—the segment seems to be able to end at either the penthemimeral caesura or the trochaic—suggests that the frequency of use of the word ‘charioteer’ created a flexibility whereby the accusative singular, in the midline inflection, was doubly accommodated in its frequent usage by means of two separate shapes.

Instances in which words show heterogeneous inflectional paradigms in order to accommodate verse position and grammar simultaneously are familiar to every student of Homeric diction. Adducing them here, or merely providing lists of examples, would contribute nothing new to the study of diction were not this phenomenon related, and explained, in terms of a series of other dictional phenomena whose totality has never been fully appreciated. What is essential about the phenomenon of segment inflection for our study, then, is the fact that the inclusion of such paradigms in a grammar of Homeric formularity points directly to the feature of verse architecture. The consideration of verse architecture, furthermore, comes very quickly to suggest that when dealing with metrically constrained units—or segments—composers were not merely working with kernel-shaped core-and-peripheral lexicon-based formulas but were working with fully formed linguistic *expressions*—‘expressions’ not dissimilar from expressions known to speakers of a

language; and ‘expressions’ whose preferred localization within certain positions of the hexameter led to their manipulation, adaptation, and development according to the exigencies of the particular passages in which they occurred.

Let us now turn to another well-known instance of a line-final adonic segment with inflectional variants, though one in which the paradigm does not include merely one word (e.g., ‘charioteer’) but the collocation of adjective and noun, the latter of which is regularly *replaced by a different word*. The example was pointed out long ago by Witte:²⁹

| | | |
|------------------|---|----------|
| - ˘ ˘ - χ # | πατρίς ἄρουρα | nom. sg. |
|------------------|---|----------|

| | | |
|---|-----------------|----------|
| - ˘˘ - χ # | πατρίδα γαῖαν # | acc. sg. |
| πατρίδος αἴης # | | gen. sg. |
| πατρίδι γαῶη # | | dat. sg. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|----------|
| ̄ φυσίζοος | αἶα | # | nom. sg. |
|------------|---|---|----------|

The evidence for the paradigm can be seen in these verses:

| | |
|--|------------|
| γαίης; ποῦ δέ νύ οἱ γενεή καὶ <u>πατρίς ἄρουρα</u> | Od. 1.407 |
| τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ἤδη ἀνεφαίνετο <u>πατρίς ἄρουρα</u> | Od. 10.29 |
| ἀνδρῶν; ποῦ δέ νύ οἱ γενεή καὶ <u>πατρίς ἄρουρα</u> | Od. 20.193 |
| φεύγωμεν σὺν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς <u>πατρίδα γαῖαν</u> . | Il. 2.140 |

²⁹ Witte 1912: 112-113.

| | |
|--|------------|
| έν Τροίη ἀπόλοντο φίλης ἀπό <u>πατρίδος αἴης</u> | Π. 2.162 |
| αὐτίκαί γάρ μνήσονται Ἀχαιοὶ <u>πατρίδος αἴης</u> | Π. 4.172 |
| ὥς ἄρ' ἐμέλλετε τῆλε φίλων καὶ <u>πατρίδος αἴης</u> | Π. 11.817 |
| έν Λακεδαίμονι αὖθι φίλην έν <u>πατρίδι γαίη.</u> | Π. 3.244 |
| δῶκεν ἀεικίσσασθαι ἐῆ έν <u>πατρίδι γαίη.</u> | Π. 22.404 |
| χαῖρε, ξεῖν', ἴνα καί ποτ' ἐών έν <u>πατρίδι γαίη</u> | Od. 8.461 |
| ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ιδέσθαι ἐών έν <u>πατρίδι γαίη.</u> | Od. 14.143 |
| ὥς ἦ τοι Ὀδυσσεὺς ἤδη έν <u>πατρίδι γαίη.</u> | Od. 17.157 |
| ἄνδρα ποτ' ἐξείνισσα φίλην έν <u>πατρίδι γαίη</u> | Od. 24.266 |

A nominative option even exists for the segment localized after the hephthemimeral caesura:

| | |
|--|------------|
| Ὡς φάτο, <u>τοὺς</u> δ' ἤδη <u>κάτεχεν</u> ἰ <u>φυσίζοος αἶα</u> | Π. 3.243 |
| <u>τοὺς</u> ἄμφω ζωοὺς <u>κατέχει</u> ἰ <u>φυσίζοος αἶα</u> | Od. 11.301 |

Just as was the case with our word for ‘charioteer,’ so too in this example the full inflectional paradigm for the noun phrase occurs not merely in one verse position, but in many. In addition to the verse-final adonic and post-hephthemimeral placements, a collocation occurs localized also in a mid-line position. Note that in this instance, which is a genitive singular, the form γαίης has returned in place of αἴης, which was the odd form used in line-final position, in the adonic-initial segment, in order to avoid making a long by position. And so we have now:

γαίης ἰ ἄπο πατρίδος gen. sg.

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| έν Φυλάκη <u>γαίης</u> ἰ ἄπο πατρίδος ἄνδρα κατακτὰς | Π. 13.696, 15.335 |
| κλαίοντας, <u>γαίης</u> ἰ ἄπο πατρίδος. αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γε | Od. 10.49 |

In comparison to the form of the word in the formulaic collocation we saw above:

ἐν Τροίῃ ἀπόλοντο φίλης ἀπὸ || πατρίδος αἴης

Il. 2.162

The existence of inflectable pieces of diction such as these, whose segmental boundaries correspond with well attested caesurae, and whose internal segmental syntax is strong enough to regulate the substitution of lexical items appearing inside of them, points well beyond the existence of a diction that is derived entirely from lexicon-based formulae of the classic formulaic type, and already begins to point to a multi-tiered set of constraints. If inflectable segments vary both (a) vertically, i.e., by using lexical substitution to fill out segmental paradigms, and (b) horizontally, according to verse position (where variant segments with varying lexical substitution are needed), then have we not begun to move closer to a conception of the formula whereby the phenomenon is no longer very formula-looking at all? Are we not in the presence of something that looks much more like a multi-level interaction, with both vertical and horizontal flexibility accommodated, and even made possible, by syntactic schemas? And aren't we now speaking of a *spectrum of formularity* rather than a merely atomic account, where the spectrum shows at one end a lexical fixity but at another end a syntactic one? The answer is clear. In the example just given, where an entirely new word was used (whether inherited or created will not be discussed here) in order to replace another word in the same inflected expression (e.g., αἴης for γαἴης in the segment inflected into the genitive singular), we find

incontrovertible evidence of both syntactic and verse-architectural pressures causing morphological change and even lexical substitution, according to a number of interactive parameters and influences.

To apply the method adopted in the second chapter, we would say regarding the segments under consideration that they have the same metrical size (adonic), occasionally a different metrical shape (πατρὶς ἄρουρα has three, rather than two, syllables in its verse-final word), functionally identical lexical content, but different syntax. However, the *overarching* syntactic story is one not of difference but of relation, since the inflectability of the segment, fitted out as it is with different words in order to make possible the inflected segment, has arisen *first and foremost in order to satisfy different narrative needs, in strict observation of verse-architectural constraints*. While this is important evidence for our own account of modularity, it needs also to be pointed out that earlier researchers also signaled their awareness of inflectability within a formulaic context. Parry, for one, referred to the category of the “formula system” in order to cover phenomena such as the examples just given, while Hainsworth referred to similar behavior as formulaic flexibility. What is important for our account, however, is that we have identified here further evidence of formulaic behavior that has moved from the strictly literal phrase-formula with phonologically useful bi-forms to a new level by which segments show variation not merely in order to fit properly behind the vowel quantity preceding it in the immediately adjacent segment but for additional reasons and pressures as well. This latter variation accommodates (like the Greek language itself), in fact, the narrative exigencies of the composer’s linguistic needs: if the segment

needs to make a genitive, as it does in this example, an entirely different word (αἴης) is substituted in order to account for differing requirements of syntax, as accorded by the meaning of the line.

The next example of formulaic inflection involves yet another form of linguistic abstraction: the creation of aberrant morphology, in this instance the application of a nonstandard case ending, in order to make possible the creation of a new segment. This now-famous example was already noticed by Witte long ago in his pathbreaking studies. What we have here, in essence, is the creation of a rather bizarre accusative singular under the influence of the metrical size, shape, and syntax internal to the verse-final segment: the creation of εὐρέα, in the line-final adonic collocation: || εὐρέα πόντον #. The word is no mere local ‘mistake,’ since it occurs three times in the corpus, and since it furthermore makes possible yet another collocation in the same position: || εὐρέα κόλπον #. First, both examples of the line-final adonic:

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|----------------|--|---------------|------------|
| ἤγαγε Σιδονίηθεν ἐπιπλῶς | | - ~ ~ - x # | | εὐρέα πόντον, | Il. 6.291 |
| μηνὶ δ' ἐν οὐλῷ πάντα περήσαμεν | | | | εὐρέα πόντον, | Od. 24.118 |

The mutation of a perfectly good, and historically old, u-stem adjective into an innovative accusative singular ending in -έα is surprising, to say the least. But it is not a *hapax*, and it ought not be considered merely an error, since it too is well embedded in the poems.

First of all, the expected form, εὐρὺν, is very well attested in the corpus, both embedded in formulae and also in the line-final adonic position. Consider these verses:

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|--|---------------|-----------|
| ἢ πολὺ λῶϊόν ἐστι | κατὰ στρατὸν | | εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν | Π. 1.229 |
| καὶ τότε ἔπειτ' ἀνάγοντο | μετὰ στρατὸν | | εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν | Π. 1.478 |
| αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἴκοντο | κατὰ στρατὸν | | εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν, | Π. 1.484 |
| ἡμεῖς δ' ἀθρόοι ὧδε | κατὰ στρατὸν | | εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν | Π. 2.439 |
| βὰν δ' ἰέναι καθ' ὄμιλον | ἀνὰ στρατὸν | | εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν. | Π. 4.209 |
| Ταλθύβιος δέ μοι ὦκα | κατὰ στρατὸν | | εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν | Π. 19.196 |
| κεῖσ' ἰέναι ἐπὶ νῆας | ἔσω στρατὸν | | εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν. | Π. 24.199 |

And the same segment, shifted leftward after verse-final insertion of a verb:

ὧς Τρώων ἀλαλητὸς ἀνὰ στρατὸν || εὐρὺν ὀρώρει Π. 4.436

Yet another example in which the entire segment ἀνὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν has shifted leftward, without altering its structure, in order to accommodate, apparently, a new phrase appearing in verse-final position:

πάντη ἀνὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν || ἄμμι δὲ μάντις Π. 1.384

compared to:

βὰν δ' ἰέναι καθ' ὄμιλον ἀνὰ στρατὸν || εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν. Π. 4.209

The word εὐρὺν is also firmly embedded in the following segment (note the modular substitutions available between the trochaic caesura and bucolic diaeresis):

Ἀτρεΐδης δ' ὤμωξεν ἰδῶν εἰς || οὐρανὸν εὐρύν Π. 3.364

| | | |
|------------------------|--|------------|
| φαίνεθ' ὁμοῦ νεφέεσσιν | ^{tr} ἰῶν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν | Il. 5.867 |
| ᾧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν | ^{tr} ἰδῶν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν· | Il. 7.178 |
| ᾧδε δέ τις εἶπεσκεν | ^{tr} ἰδῶν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν· | Il. 7.201 |
| εὐξάμενος δ' ἄρα εἶπεν | ^{tr} ἰδῶν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν· | Il. 19.257 |
| Πηλείδης δ' ᾤμωξεν | ^{tr} ἰδῶν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν· | Il. 21.272 |

Here again, in this list of corresponding verse segments, we find evidence for the possibility of shifting line segments by the means of re-positioning a verb, and even an adverb, into the adonic-shaped segment in verse-final position, thus seamlessly (in this case, certainly not in all cases) shifting the well embedded piece of diction leftward:

| | | |
|-------------------|---|------------|
| ὡς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς | ἰῶν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν ἴκηται | Il. 21.522 |
| ἔζεσθην, Τρώων δέ | ^{tr} πρὸς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν ἄερθεν | Il. 8.74 |

For the sake of completeness, we must mention that there is also the example of εὐρύν attested in the following segment, which is extremely common in the poems:

| | | |
|--------------------|--|----------|
| ἀθανάτοισιν ἔδωκε, | ^{tr} <u>τοὶ οὐρανὸν () εὐρύν ἔχουσιν;</u> | Od. 1.67 |
|--------------------|--|----------|

Given the frequency of the occurrence of εὐρύν in the poems, it is surprising to find an utterly novel form of this accusative singular (εὐρέα), which has no reality in the Greek language outside of the Homeric poems (or in the pre-history of Greek, for that matter), deployed here on more than one occasion, and in more than one position. First, the two instances in the verse-final adonic:

ἤγαγε Σιδονίηθεν ἐπιπλῶς || εὐρέα πόντον, Π. 6.291
 μηνὶ δ' ἐν οὐλῶ πάντα περήσαμεν || εὐρέα πόντον, Od. 24.118

Though a linguistic innovation internal to the Homeric poems—and indeed, internal to *this segment*—the model for this mutation of a u-stem adjective, as Witte himself already pointed out, is well known. It was the dative singular, εὐρέϊ, which was a genuine form in both Homeric language and Greek generally, with a perfect match in Sanskrit. More importantly—and here is the essential point for our investigation—the dative singular εὐρέϊ occurs in exactly the same verse position, with exactly the same metrical shape and size, as the innovative form εὐρέα. And so we are methodologically justified in concluding that this new accusative singular was built from the dative singular in order to be placed in an accusative phrase and in order to avoid a spondaic line, which the presence of εὐρὺν would have caused. First the evidence for the dative singular:

ἀλλ' ἔτι που ζῶος κατερύκεται || εὐρέϊ πόντω, Od. 1.197
 ὦκα δ' ἐφοπλίσσαντες ἐνήσομεν || εὐρέϊ πόντω. Od. 2.295
 εἷς δ' ἔτι που ζῶος κατερύκεται || εὐρέϊ πόντω. Od. 4.498
 ὅς τις ἔτι ζῶος κατερύκεται || εὐρέϊ πόντω Od. 4.552
 ἤωθεν δ' ἀναβάντες ἐνήσομεν || εὐρέϊ πόντω' Od. 12.293
 ἡμεῖς δ' αἴψ' ἀναβάντες ἐνήκαμεν || εὐρέϊ πόντω Od. 12.401

seems to have provided the model for the creation of:

ἤγαγε Σιδονίηθεν ἐπιπλῶς || εὐρέα πόντον Π. 6.291
 μηνὶ δ' ἐν οὐλῶ πάντα περήσαμεν || εὐρέα πόντον Od. 24.118

With this example we arrive at another fairly reliable conclusion about the

way in which Homeric diction functions in order to create new forms. The creation of εὐρέα in the phrase εὐρέα ποντον was made on the basis of a local model—in fact, *segmentally* local model—in which a binding structure joining adjective and noun had remained intact *even as the segment was inflected*, first into the dative case, and next into an accusative singular case. In the accusative singular inflection, the requirement to inflect *the entire segment* was potent enough to create an *entirely new adjectival inflection* for an otherwise perfectly well functioning u-stem with tens upon tens of examples already attested in the poems. How successful was that innovation? Successful enough to allow for it to be used in another collocation:

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---------------------|------------|
| ὕμεις μὲν νῦν δῦτε θαλάσσης | | <u>εὐρέα κόλπον</u> | Il. 18.140 |
| οἴσει δινήεις εἶσω ἄλως | | <u>εὐρέα κόλπον</u> | Il. 21.125 |
| τόφρα δ' ἄρ' ἢ γ' ὑποδῦσα θαλάσσης | | <u>εὐρέα κόλπον</u> | Il. 4.435 |

Apparently the explanation for not using the well attested εὐρὺν in the fifth foot here is the avoidance of a spondaic line. If so, this is yet another example in which metrical shape has imposed itself in the behavior and creation of new diction—if the explanation is correct, then metrical shape here in the fifth foot, in this instance anyway, ranks higher as a preference than morphological fidelity to the already existing forms available in the Greek language, though it was helped, of course, by the syntactic pressures provided by the inflection of the segment as a single piece of diction.

Yet another example, which appears initially to be a case of a verse-final verb displacing the phrase εὐρέα πόντον leftward, is:

ἡμάτια Θρήκηθεν ἐπ' εὐρέα || πόντον ἄγουσι

Π. 9.72

Whether or not this leftward shifting is really the explanation is in fact more complicated, since there is a well attested, and grammatically regular, occurrence of εὐρέα in the same position, in what looks to be a well embedded segment:

Ἄργεῖοι φεύξονται ἐπ' εὐρέα || νῶτα θαλάσσης, Π. 2.159
φεύγειν ὀρμήσονται ἐπ' εὐρέα || νῶτα θαλάσσης. Π. 8.511

If we were to attempt to decide the question of whether or not the phrase ἐπ' εὐρέα || πόντοον ἄγουσι # was the result of a leftward shift of || εὐρέα πόντον #, or was based in part on the already existing segment ἐπ' εὐρέα || νῶτα θαλάσσης, we would need to widen our investigation to include other phenomena and many more verses. We will leave the task aside for now.

Noun-Epithet Formulae and Modular Diction

Let us now circle back to the most influential articulation of formulaic analysis, Milman Parry's analysis of noun-epithet formulae. In order to see what our method yields when applied to the same segments by which he made his initial breakthrough—the same correspondence sets, let us say—we will start with a simple example: the segment that occurs in the verse-final position from bucolic diaeresis to line-end in which noun-epithet collocations occur for heroes and gods. By considering the variety of segmental shapes, sizes, meanings, and

syntactic arrangements that exist for this particular segment, we will again see how our method allows for a more precise characterization of the segment's multiformity, behavior in the poetry, and, ultimately, modularity. First, let us begin with the examples given in Parry's classic list concerning the noun-epithet formulae for heroes and gods in the first dissertation (Parry, 1972:39), which comprises the following correspondence set for heroes and gods:

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 60x |
| ἐσθλὸς Ὀδυσσεύς # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 3x |
| Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 33x |
| [ὄβριμοπάτρη] # | - ~ ~ - x # | | 3x (in gen 3x) |
| δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 34x |
| ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύς. # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 5x |
| πότνια Ἥρη # | - ~ ~ | - x # | 11x |
| φαίδιμος Ἑκτώρ # | - ~ ~ | - x # | 29x |
| ὄβριμος Ἑκτώρ # | - ~ ~ | - x # | 4x |
| ἵππότης Νέστωρ # | - ~ ~ | - x # | 1x |
| χάλκεος Ἄρης # | - ~ ~ | - x # | 5x |
| ὄβριμος Ἄρης # | - ~ ~ | - x # | 5x |
| μητίετα Ζεὺς # | - ~ ~ - | x # | 18x |
| εὐρύσπαστος Ζεὺς # | - ~ ~ - | x # | 14x |

When we compare the segments in this way, we are able to differentiate among our methodology's key features: size, shape, position, lexical content, and syntax. Doing so, furthermore, allows us to see how the

phraseology intersects and interacts with the same and adjacent segments. First, each of the segments has the same dictional *size* (e.g., bucolic diaeresis to verse-end) and the same verse *position* (located behind the bucolic diaeresis and reaching to verse-end). However, the segments do vary among themselves according to segment-internal shape:

| | | | |
|------------------|---------|---------|-----|
| δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # | - ~ | ~ - x # | 60x |
| φαίδιμος Ἔκτωρ # | - ~ ~ | - x # | 29x |
| μητίετα Ζεὺς # | - ~ ~ - | x # | 18x |

They also vary according to lexical content, of course. The same three segments again, now from the the lexical perspective:

| | | | | |
|------------------|---------|---------|----------|-----|
| δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # | - ~ | ~ - x # | Nom. Sg. | 60x |
| φαίδιμος Ἔκτωρ # | - ~ ~ | - x # | Nom. Sg. | 29x |
| μητίετα Ζεὺς # | - ~ ~ - | x # | Nom. Sg. | 18x |

While variation in shape is often less consequential than variation in lexicon, shape does in some instances (especially in the final syllable of the segment before the bucolic diaeresis, and in the fifth foot, as we just saw) have some effect on diction and therefore on our dictional analysis. As for the criterion of lexical content and how we are to characterize it in for the examples just given, obviously there are divergences: certain adjectives are shared while others are substituted. For example, many proper names (in this list) maintain the same verse position and internal syntax throughout, even when adnominal adjectives are substituted in place of each other. That is to say, certain proper nouns (e.g., Ὀδυσσεύς and Ἀχιλλεύς) share the same epithets, e.g., δῖος (an example of Parry's

generalizing epithet), while other proper nouns occur with what Parry called “distinctive” epithets (i.e., epithets reserved for individual heroes). Lastly, for the examples given above in Parry’s list, regarding syntax, we find something quite common in Homeric poetry: a line-final subject preceded by an adnominal adjective, both of which are in the nominative case in all examples. To connect this with the variation in segmental shape mentioned above, we can now see that the syntactic pattern ‘epithet+noun’ is distributed *across different segmental shapes*—which is notable, since it shows that the syntactic and grammatical identity of the segment remains intact even when different shapes within the segment are present; and it is distributed across different lexical outputs, also.

To summarize, we can say that each segment in the above correspondence set agrees in segmental size, position, and syntax, shows minor variation in segment-internal shape, yet diverges widely at the level of lexical content (the latter of which is precisely the feature whose presence is necessary in order to qualify as formulaic on most views). *The theoretical point is to see that we have evidence here for an abstract syntactic template*, whose syntactic description would be: adnominal adjectival epithet + proper noun governing the behavior of noun-epithet formations, localized in the line-final segment. Whether or not that template has actual, demonstrable productive force from the dictional point of view, or is merely a correspondence at the descriptive level of analysis, is a question that will require further evidence to answer.

But before moving on to answer the question as to syntax’s possible productive force, let us pause for a moment to consider the implications of Parry’s arrangement of epithet-noun collocations for our method of

analysis. It can now be seen that Parry’s method already contained, in kernel form, the basic points of our modular account. And since he began with noun-epithet formulae, we will too, both to connect our analysis back to his but also to shed reciprocal light on his and our own method. The first question that we would like to answer is whether *from the purely descriptive point of view* two segments with identical proper nouns but divergent epithets are to be adjudged related or not—and by ‘related,’ we mean dictionally, linguistically, and syntactically related, *not* merely accidentally related:

| | | | |
|------------------|-----|---------|-----|
| ὤκῦς Ἀχιλλεύς # | – ∪ | ∪ – x # | 5x |
| δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. # | – ∪ | ∪ – x # | 34x |

The answer is that indeed the two segments are related, since the two provide phonological options for joining the line-final subject “X-adj + Achilles” to the preceding segment, depending on whether that preceding segment’s word-final phonology necessitated a vowel-initial or consonant-initial word following it. Such an option is essential to the very possibility of Homeric diction, as has long been recognized. But given the ubiquity of such pairs, what is the analyst to say then about examples where the differences derive not from optional epithets but from two different proper names with the same epithet? For example:

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----|---------|-----|
| δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς # | – ∪ | ∪ – x # | 34x |
| δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # | – ∪ | ∪ – x # | 60x |

Here we have an example of what Parry called the “generalizing” epithet: δῖος was available for use with a large number of proper names in order to fill out the verse—this too allowed for the possibility of a flexible diction. Again, we see a kind of syntactic unity governing the segment, namely, the application of a general epithet to a proper name. The point is made clearer by the following list, where we begin to see not only its ‘generalizing’ flexibility, but the ability to inflect in feminine singular and masculine plural:

- || - ˘ ˘ - χ #
- || δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. #
- || δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς #
- || δῖος Ὀρέστης #
- || δῖος ὑφορβός, # / δῖον ὑφορβόν. #
- || δῖος Ἀλάστωρ #
- || δῖος Ἀγήνωρ #
- || δῖος Ἐχέφρων. #
- || δῖος Ἐπειός #
- || δῖος Ἐπειγέυς, #
- || δῖα Καλυψώ, #
- || δῖοι Ἀχαιοὶ #
- || δῖα γυναικῶν #
- || δῖα θεάων #
- || - ˘˘ - χ #
- || δῖ Ἀφροδίτη #
- || δῖ Ἄντεια #

The evidence from the list reveals the degree to which the verse-final segment made use of a form of the adjective δῖος/ δῖοι/ δῖα/ δῖ[α] in producing line-final subjects. But what are we to do about instances where neither the epithet nor the proper noun is shared? Are we not

obliged to conclude that this pair must also be considered related, or subject to an overarching formal unity which one might describe as a syntactic one defined as “epithet+noun”? Compare, for example:

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----|---------|-----|
| ὤκῦς Ἄχιλλεύς # | – ∪ | ∪ – x # | 5x |
| δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # | – ∪ | ∪ – x # | 60x |

Does the fact that the name ‘Odysseus’ occurs with δῖος here instead of the name Ἄχιλλεύς entail that the two segments are no longer related? No, far from it. What matters for us is the fact that the only difference, from the point of view of the method outlined above, occurs at the level of lexicon.³⁰ Otherwise the two segments agree in segmental size, shape, metrical position, and syntax. But they *share not a word in common at the level of lexical output*. Of course, the phrase “share not a word in common” is somewhat imprecise, since the words do share a number of grammatical features: both segments have an adjective and a proper noun in the nominative case, both are in the singular, and so on; and the fact of this grammatical similarity is precisely the point. From the perspective of method, then—which must remain unconcerned with formula definitions, a point we have made repeatedly—we can say that we have here incipient evidence for the claim that the line-final segment itself allows for the substitution of both epithets and heroes’ names, a substitutability that would only be possible were there a kind of supervening grammatical or syntactical unity to bind them in their local metrical environment. This is a theoretical point to be made once again regarding the descriptive state of

³⁰ (ὤκῦς Ἄχιλλεύς without πόδας only occurs six times in the Homeric corpus, viz. Il. 19.295, 21.211, 22.188, 22.229, 23.218, 24.621.)

affairs: the presence of an abstract internal syntax governs the segment's distribution of epithets and nouns.

Let us look now at more examples of epithet+noun combinations occurring in the same verse position. We would like to pose the question of dictional relation yet again. In order to take further examples of the same phenomenon, let us ask if we are to believe that the segments:

|| ὄβριμος Ἴεκτωρ # || - ∪ ∪ - x #

and:

|| φαίδιμος Ἴεκτωρ # || - ∪ ∪ - x #

have nothing in common with:

|| ὄβριμος ἼΑρης # || - ∪ ∪ - x #
 || χάλκεος ἼΑρης # || - ∪ ∪ - x #

apart from the fact that the pairs have identical size, position, and syntax segment-internally? Are we really to think, looking back over these four examples, that they do not belong to a larger, more encompassing, syntactic pattern localized in line-final position? We would also want to compare:

|| ἱππότα Νέστωρ # || - ∪ ∪ - x #
 || πότνια ἼΗρη # || - ∪ ∪ - x #

The question is well worth asking, since according to traditional formulaic conceptions, the four pairs of segments would certainly not be considered formulaic. To these examples we can now add segments that agree in metrical position and syntax, but that diverge slightly in terms of metrical *shape*. Compare the shape:

|| - ~ ~ - x #:
 || Παλλάς Ἀθήνη #

to the segments already mentioned:

|| - ~ ~ - x #
 || φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ #
 || πότνια Ἥρη #

and now add further examples with identical shape, such as:

|| - ~ ~ - x #
 || νήδυμος ὕπνος, # Π. 2.2, 10.91, 14.242,
 354, 4.793, 12.311,
 12.366,

with yet another shape with identical syntax and position is well attested in Homer:

|| - ~ ~ - x #
 || Παλλάς Ἀθήνη #
 || Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων #

|| δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. #
 || θεῖος ὄνειρος. #

Il. 2.22

Obeying the same syntax and in the same segmental position, there are other shapes:

|| - ∪ ∪ - x #

|| μητίετα Ζεύς # 34x
 || εὐρύοπα Ζεύς # 5x

It is possible to reverse the word order, but to keep the same line position, shape, and syntax as segments mentioned above:

|| - ∪ ∪ - x #

|| Ἄρτεμις ἀγνή #
 || Ἄσιος ἥρωος # (1x)

Still more variation in terms of shape:

|| - ∪ ∪ - x #

|| Γλαῦκος ἀμύμων #
 || Μοῦσα λίγεια. # (1x in *Odyssey*, elsewhere in *Hymns*, mobilely)
 || Μοῖρα κραταιή. # (several times in Homer, also in Hesiod)
 || Ἴρος ἀλήτης. # (1x)

Or, if one prefers, the segment may be characterized by the application of the same epithet to heroes who have names with identical metrical size, shape, and placement:

|| - υ υ - χ #

|| ἰππότα Τυδεύς· #
|| ἰππότα Οἰνεύς #
|| ἰππότα Πηλεύς, #
|| ἰππότα Φυλεύς, #
|| ἰππότα Νέστωρ· #

There are further examples where the epithets themselves may be inflected according to gender and number, a situation which once again suggests an internal syntax constitutive of the segment:

|| - υ υ - χ #

|| δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς· #
|| δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς #
|| δῖος Ὀρέστης #
|| δῖος ὑφορβός, # / δῖον ὑφορβόν· # (mobile also)
|| δῖα Καλυψώ, #
|| δῖοι Ἀχαιοὶ #

And with elision before a following vowel-initial name, the same general epithet appears in its monosyllabic form:

|| - υ υ - χ #

|| δῖ Ἀφροδίτη #
|| δῖ Ἄντεια # (hapax *Iliad* 6.160)

And still more examples, some of which begin to show inflection in the dative and accusative cases:

|| - υ υ - χ #

|| πότνια Κίρκη. #
|| πότνια νύμφη #
|| πότνια Ἥρη, #
|| πότνια μήτηρ #
|| πότνι' Ἐνυώ #

|| - υ υ - χ #

|| φαίδιμος Αἴας #
|| φαίδιμος Ἑκτωρ. #

|| - υ υ - χ #

|| φαίδιμος υἱός / || φαίδιμον υἱόν. #
|| Φαίδιμος ἦρως #
|| φαίδιμα γυῖα #
|| φαιδίμω μω, #
|| φαίδιμα τέκνα, # (Hesiod)
|| φαίδιμος Ἄτλας # (Hesiod frag)

|| - υ υ - χ #

|| φαίδιμ' Ἀχιλλεῦ #
|| φαίδιμ' Ὀδυσσεῦ. #

|| - υ υ - χ #

|| Γλαῦκος ἀμύμων #
|| Τεῦκρος ἀμύμων; #

Examples with inflection of various kinds:

|| - υ υ - χ #

|| Ἑκτορα δῖον #
|| Νέστορα δῖον #
|| Μέντορα δῖον #
|| Μέμνονα δῖον. #
|| κοίρανε λαῶν #
|| ποιμένα λαῶν # / ποιμένι λαῶν, #
|| ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν, #
|| αἰθέρι ναίων #

|| - ∪ ∪ - χ #
 || φῦλα γυναικῶν. # / || φῦλα Γιγάντων. #
 || φέρτατ' Ἀχαιῶν #
 || ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν. # (also mobile in one instance)
 || δῖα θεάων #
 || δῶτορ ἑάων #
 || κύδει γαίωv #
 || πόντια θηρῶv # (hapax)

For the purposes of methodological completeness, we would like also to point out that the segment reaching from the heptemimeral caesura to line-end also shows comparable phenomena for nominative, and inflected, epithet+noun segments:

⁷
 | - - ∪ ∪ - χ #
⁷
 | κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων #
⁷
 | κρείων Ἐλεφήνωρ #
⁷
 | κρείων Ἐτεωνεύς, #
⁷
 | κρείων Εὔμηλος. #
⁷
 | κρείων Ἐλικάων #
⁷
 | κρείων Ἀγαπήνωρ #
⁷
 | κρείων ἐνοσίχθων. #
⁷
 | κρειῶν ἐρατίζων #

⁷
 | ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - χ #
⁷
 | κρατερὸς Διομήδης #
⁷
 | κρατερὸς Λυκομήδης, #
⁷
 | κρατερὸς Λυκόοργος #
⁷
 | κρατερὸς Μεγαπένθης #
⁷
 | κρατερὸς Πολυποίτης #
⁷
 | κρατερὸς τ' Ἐφιάλτης #
⁷
 | κρατερὸς Διώρης #

⁷
 | ∪ ∪ - ∪ ∪ - χ #
⁷
 | Μενέλαος ἀμύμων, #
⁷
 | Κλυτόνηος ἀμύμων. #

The existence of correspondence sets such as these does not yet in itself prove the reality of analogical, or syntactically productive influence. For that kind of proof, we rely upon the kind of evidence we observed when we saw an entirely new adjectival inflection, || εὐρέα ποντον #, created in order to inflect a particular Homeric segment. And so let us also recall the example of the prepositional phrase. The prepositional phrase is, in a way, *already a syntactic template embedded in spoken language*—once it appears in Homeric diction, it behaves in the same way: the preposition requires that an object occur in a particular grammatical case and in a particular position in the line appropriate to it. After all, substitution of the prepositional object according to the syntactic schema is what defines the phrase as a prepositional phrase in the first place. What the example of || εἴνεκα + noun in the gen. # showed, then, was the reality of a grammatical or syntactic template, already embedded in the language itself, now localized at a particular point in the verse. This is yet one more piece of evidence to suggest that the template defined as “ || adnominal epithet + noun # ” is a piece of dictional morphology equally as idiomatic and equally well embedded in the hexametrically constrained poetic language as the prepositional phrase is in the spoken language. If prepositional phrases work in this way, then is it not thinkable that other caesura-bound segments might too? To return to noun-epithet formulae in verse-final position, consider these examples:

| | |
|---|------------|
| τῆς γενεῆς ἔκλεπεν ἴ ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγχίσης | Il. 5.268 |
| καί νύ κεν ἔνθ' ἀπόλοιτο ἴ ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Αἰνεΐας, | Il. 5.311 |
| θεύσεσθαι· τοὺς δ' αὖθι ἴ ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Αὐγείας | Il. 11.701 |

ξεῖνος γάρ οἱ ἔδωκεν ἴ ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Εἰάφητης Π. 15.532
 ὤρτο πολὺ πρῶτος μὲν ἴ ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Εἰᾶμηλος Π. 23.288

These examples suggest that the hemistich ‘ ἴ ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν + proper name in the genitive case’ functions not entirely differently than the prepositional phrase. In addition to well attested segments for Diomedes and Menelaos, further substitution can occur with proper names and even verbs:

ὄψε δὲ δὴ μετέειπε ἴ βοήν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης Π. 9.696
 τὸν πρότερος προσέειπε ἴ βοήν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος Π. 10.36
 καὶ τότε ἄρ’ Αἴας εἶπε ἴ βοήν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον Π. 17.23

Thus far, these examples show only inflection of a hemistich. Not only is the subject of the hemistich able to be replaced by other proper names (a completely normal occurrence), but it is possible even to substitute a noun and then inflect it as well:

Ἔκτορα δὲ φράσσαντο ἴ βοήν ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἑταίρους Π. 15.671

and:

Πάμμονά τ’ Ἀντίφονόν τε ἴ βοήν ἀγαθὸν τε Πολίτην Π. 24.250

What is more, as we have seen, it was also possible to substitute a segment-final verb, or to insert a verb inside the segment, or to add a verb and inflect still another term inside the segment. All three of which happen here, in respective order:

| | |
|---|------------|
| Ἔκτωρ δὴ παρὰ νηυσὶ ἴβροῖν ἀγαθὸς πολεμίζει | Il. 13.123 |
| οὓς ἑτάρους ὀλέκοντα ἴβροῖν ἀγαθὸς βάλεν Αἴας | Il. 15.249 |
| εἰ δέ που Αἴαντός γε ἴβροῖν ἀγαθοῖο πυθοίμην, | Il. 17.102 |

When looking at this correspondence set in particular, it becomes clear as to why it is preferable in specific instances to speak of modules and not templates: while the boundaries of the segment are absolutely fixed and the lexical content of the segment more or less stable, there is far too much variety here in the substitution of words and phrases to allow the analyst to be comfortable with a reduction of the heterogeneity down to merely one or two, or even three, grammatical schemata or templates.

In this last set of examples, then, we have moved beyond the mere substitution of one proper name in connection with a generalizing epithet. We have witnessed instead far more variety, and undeniable evidence for binding structures as well as syntactically productive schemata. All of the segments begin at the trochaic caesura, of course, because they have each been built by substituting a word or phrase within, and according to, the “βροῖν ἀγαθὸς X (nom or gen)” template. The final slot may be filled by Διομήδης or Μενέλαος, or as in the latter example, the entire segment can be inflected in the accusative: βροῖν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον. Once that inflection has occurred, it takes only one further substitution to inflect the line in the accusative with two direct objects: ἴβροῖν ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἑταίρους. Further substitutions become possible, including the insertion of the verbs πολεμίζει (Il. 13.123), βάλεν (Il. 15.249), and πυθοίμην (Il. 17.102). The latter example even saw an inflection of the adjective ἀγαθὸς into the genitive case. Lest there be any doubt as to

just how well attested this hemistich is throughout the corpus, compare all occurrences:

| | |
|---|------------|
| τῶν αὐθ' ἡγεμόνευε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης | Π. 2.563 |
| σὺμπάντων δ' ἡγεῖτο ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 2.567 |
| αὐτόματος δέ οἱ ἦλθε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος· | Π. 2.408 |
| τῶν οἱ ἀδελφεὸς ἦρχε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος | Π. 2.586 |
| τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος· | Π. 3.96 |
| ἽΟφρα τοὶ ἀμφεπέποντο ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον· | Π. 4.220 |
| ἽΑδρηστον δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος | Π. 6.37 |
| τὸν πρότερος προσέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος· | Π. 10.36 |
| Τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος· | Π. 10.60 |
| ἽΑτρεΐδην δ' ἄχος εἶλε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον· | Π. 13.58 |
| ἽΑτρεΐδης δ' ἄρα χεῖρα ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος | Π. 13.59 |
| ἽΑντῆλοχον δ' ὄτρυνε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος· | Π. 15.568 |
| καὶ τότε ἄρ' Αἴας εἶπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον· | Π. 17.23 |
| ἽὩς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος, | Π. 17.246 |
| Τὴν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος· | Π. 17.560 |
| καὶ τότε ἄρ' Αἴας εἶπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον· | Π. 17.65 |
| ἽὩς ἔφατ', οὐδ' ἀπίθησε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος, | Π. 17.656 |
| ὥς ἀπὸ Πατρόκλοιο ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος | Π. 17.665 |
| αὐτῆμαρ δέ οἱ ἦλθε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος, | Od. 3.31 |
| ρῦντ' ἄρ' ἐξ εὐνήφι ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος | Od. 4.307 |
| ὥς φάτο, μεΐδησεν δὲ ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος, | Od. 4.60 |
| ἀλλ' ὄτρυνε τάχιστα ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον | Od. 15.14 |
| ἀγχίμολον δὲ σφ' ἦλθε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος, | Od. 15.57 |
| τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος· | Od. 15.67 |
| αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος, | Od. 15.92 |
| τὸν πῦρ κῆαι ἄνωγε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος | Od. 15. 97 |
| εἶρετο δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος, | Od. 17.120 |
| δὴ τότε ἔπειτ' ἠρᾶτο ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 5.114 |
| τάων ἄς ἐπέτελλε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης, | Π. 5.320 |
| τῆ δ' ἐπὶ μακρὸν ἄυσε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 5.347 |
| Αἰνεΐα δ' ἐπόρουσε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης, | Π. 5.432 |
| Τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν ῥίγησε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 5.596 |
| δεύτερος αὐθ' ὤρματο ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης | Π. 5.855 |
| ἽΑξυλον δ' ἄρ' ἔπεφνε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης | Π. 6.12 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| τὸν πρότερος προσέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 6.122 |
| “ὣς φάτο, γήθησεν δὲ ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 6.212 |
| ὄψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 7.399 |
| εἰ μὴ ἄρ’ ὄξυ νόησε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 8.91 |
| Τὸν δ’ ἠμείβετ’ ἔπειτα ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 8.145 |
| ὄψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 9.31 |
| ὄψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 9.696 |
| τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 10.219 |
| τοῖς δ’ αὖτις μετέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 10.241 |
| Δεύτερος αὖτ’ ἠῤῥατο ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 10.283 |
| τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν ῥίγησε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης, | Π. 11.345 |
| “Ἐκτωρ δὴ παρὰ νηυσὶ ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς <u>πολεμίζει</u> | Π. 13.123 |
| Τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης· | Π. 14.109 |
| οὓς ἐτάρους ὀλέκοντα ἴ βοὴν ἀγαθὸς <u>βάλεν Αἴας</u> | Π. 15.249 |
| “Ἐκτορα δὲ φράσαντο ἴ βοὴν <u>ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἐταίρους,</u> | Π. 15.671 |
| εἰ δέ που Αἴαντός γε ἴ βοὴν <u>ἀγαθοῖο πυθοίμην,</u> | Π. 17.102 |
| Πάμμονά τ’ Ἀντίφονόν τε ἴ βοὴν <u>ἀγαθὸν τε Πολίτην</u> | Π. 24.250 |

The same phenomenon is well attested at the hepthemimeral caesura as well. There are countless examples with Agamemnon. One of the least complex would be:

τοῖσιν δ’ εὐχόμενος μετέφη ἴ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων Π.2.411

But of course there are further substitutions that occur with regularity:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| τὸν δὲ πεσόντα ποδῶν ἔλαβε ἴ <u>κρείων</u> <u>Ἐλεφήνωρ</u> | Π. 4.463 |
| Τὴν δὲ μέγ’ ὀχθήσας προσέφη ἴ <u>κρείων</u> <u>ἔνοσίχθων</u> · | Π. 8.208 |
| εἰ μὴ σφωε πατὴρ εὐρὺ ἴ <u>κρείων</u> <u>ἔνοσίχθων</u> | Π. 11.751 |
| Οὐδ’ ἀλαοσκοπιὴν εἶχε ἴ <u>κρείων</u> <u>ἔνοσίχθων</u> · | Π. 13.10 |
| τὴν Ἀντηνορίδης εἶχε ἴ <u>κρείων</u> <u>ἑλικάων</u> | Π. 3.123 |
| στῆσαν· ὁ δὲ προμολῶν ἴδετο ἴ <u>κρείων</u> <u>Ἐτεωνεύς,</u> | Od. 4.22 |
| Ἀντιλόχου· μετὰ τὸν δ’ ἔλαχε ἴ <u>κρείων</u> <u>Εὐμηλος</u> · | Π. 23.354 |
| τῶν ἦρχ’ Ἀγκαῖοιο πάϊς ἴ <u>κρείων</u> <u>Ἀγαπήνωρ</u> | Π. 2.609 |

These are easily enough understood against the background of this:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| ἦρως Ἀτρείδης εὐρύ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων | Il. 1.102 |
| Τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων | Il. 1.130 |
| ἦ γάρ μ' Ἀτρείδης εὐρύ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων | Il. 1.355 |

The hepthemimeral caesura shows other examples:

| | |
|---|------------|
| ἄν δ' ἄρα Τυδείδης ὦρτο, κρατερὸς Διομήδης | Il. 23.812 |
| οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ Δρύαντος υἱὸς κρατερὸς Λυκόοργος | Il. 6.130 |
| Αἴαν σφῶϊ μὲν αὖθι, σὺ καὶ κρατερὸς Λυκομήδης | Il. 12.366 |
| ὅς οἱ τηλύγετος γένετο κρατερὸς Μεγαπένθης | Od. 4.11 |
| θῆκ' αὐτοῦ προπάραιθε φέρων κρατερὸς Μεγαπένθης. | Od. 15.122 |
| Ἔνθ' αὖ Πειριθόου υἱὸς κρατερὸς Πολυποίτης | Il. 12.182 |
| τοὺς δ' αὖτ' ἐξ ἄντρον προσέφη κρατερὸς Πολύφημος | Od. 9.407 |
| τὸν δ' ἐπιμασσάμενος προσέφη κρατερὸς Πολύφημος | Od. 9.446 |
| καὶ τῆνι σ' ἐξαπάτησε δόλω κρατερὸς Πολυδέγμων | Dem. 404 |
| χώρησεν, τῆ δ' ἔκθορ' ἀναξ κρατερὸς Πολυδέγμων | Dem. 430 |

These are easily enough understood as syntactic substitutions based on:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| ὣς φάτο, τὸν δ' οὐ τι προσέφη κρατερὸς Διομήδης | Il. 4.401 |
| Τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη κρατερὸς Διομήδης. | Il. 4.411 |
| ὥς μεμαῶς Τρώεσσι μίγη κρατερὸς Διομήδης. | Il. 5.143 |

Segmental Expansion, Horizontal Inflection, and Modular Diction in Noun-Epithet Formulae

Let us look now at Parry's same list of "noun-epithet formulae of gods and heroes in the nominative case, principal types" in order to see a different phenomenon: segmental *expansion*. As we will see, what we are calling segmental 'expansion' will turn out to be, in essence, a

subcategory of segmental *inflection*, in the sense analyzed above: just as the segment can inflect in a vertical manner internal to the segment, in Homeric poetry the segment can also inflect (i.e., expand) *horizontally* to accommodate other segmental lengths needed for making differently sized pieces of diction (especially in the nominative case). When we look at all of the instances from Parry’s list, for example, it turns out that *the longer segments are built directly from the shorter segments*—or the reverse, the shorter segments are built from reduction of the longer segments (whichever may be the case, and it is probably impossible to know). First the segments from bucolic diaeresis and hepthemimeral caesura to line-end:

| | | |
|---|------------------------|-------------------|
| | <u>δῖος</u> Ὀδυσσεύς # | 60 x |
| | ἔσθλος Ὀδυσσεύς # | 3 ³¹ x |
| ∩ | πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς # | 81x |
| ∩ | πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς # | 4x |

And now the segment from trochaic caesura to line-end, which looks to be an expansion of the segment || δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # by one word, πολύτλας:

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ∩ | πολύτλας () <u>δῖος</u> Ὀδυσσεύς # | 38x |
|---|--------------------------------------|-----|

The segment between trochaic caesura and line-end contains the already well-attested bucolic segment || δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς # inside of it. This

³¹ N.B.: ἔσθλος Ὀδυσσεύς is not a context-free occurrence. It only occurs three times in the *Odyssey*, clustered within the *Telemachia*, all in the same speech whereby Telemachus asks someone if they have seen ἔσθλος Ὀδυσσεύς.

phenomenon turns out to be regular for well-attested noun-epithet formulae. Consider the next god on Parry's table, 'Αθήνη, where a segment at the trochaic caesura contains the hepthemimerally localized segment within itself. Parry's examples:

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Παλλάς 'Αθήνη # | 33x |
| [ὄβριμοπάτρη] # | 3x (but inflected in gen, also 3x = review segments) |
| ⌈ γλαυκῶπις 'Αθήνη # | 26x |
| ⌈ θεὰ γλαυκῶπις 'Αθήνη # | (51x) (built by adding θεὰ to hepth.) |
| ⌈ 'Αλαλκομενηῖς 'Αθήνη # | (2x) |
| # Παλλάς 'Αθηναίη ⌋ | (8x) |

The segment ⌈ θεὰ γλαυκῶπις 'Αθήνη #, which occurs 51 times in the corpus, contains the well-attested segment reaching from hepthemimeral caesura to line-end, ⌈ γλαυκῶπις 'Αθήνη #, within it. This is another example of segmental inflection, in that it allows the nominative case of the subject to take on still further metrical *sizes*, in order to allow further flexibility in forming subjects within the matrix of the diction. Seeing this also provides an insight into the way that this diction works on a syntactic, and ultimately modular, basis (we say 'modular' because the well-established line-final segments localized between the hepthemimeral caesura and bucolic diaeresis are expanded into the longer, hemistich-length segments). The findings for *Ἀπόλλων*, which has only one adonic segment, are as follows:³²

³² Though Parry does not mention it, the following segment is also attested in the Homeric Hymns and in Hesiod: # [Φοῖβος ἄκερσεκόμης] ⌋

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων # | (33x) |
| Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων # | (2x) |
| ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων # | (6x) |
| κλυτότοξος Ἀπόλλων.” # | (1x) |
| τῚ ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων # | (5x) |
| τῚ ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων # | (3x) |

In this case we see that both segments localized after the trochaic caesura contain segments attested from the hephthemimeral caesura to line-end.

For Ἀχιλλεύς we have the following system:

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς # | (34x) |
| ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύς· # | (5x) |
| πόδας ὠκύς Ἀχιλλεύ # | (31x) (built from the preceding ex.) |
| μέγαθυμος Ἀχιλλεύς # | (1x) |
| τῚ ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς· # | (many x) (built from <i>dios Achill.</i>) |

The segment localized behind the trochaic caesura contains the segment || δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς#, localized after the bucolic diaeresis.

As for Ζεὺς, we have the following segments:

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| μητίετα Ζεὺς # | 34x |
| εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς # | 5x |
| νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς # | 30x |
| Ζεὺς τερπικέραunos # | 4x |
| στεροπηγερέτα Ζεὺς # | 1x |
| τῚ Ὀλύμπιος εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς # | 1x (also in Hesiod) |
| τῚ βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς # | 1x (not mentioned in Parry) |
| τῚ πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε # | |
| # Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης | 5x (in Hymns and Hesiod as well) |

As for Ἥρη, the adonic segment occurs 11 times:

| | | |
|----|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| | <u>πότνια</u> Ἦρη # | 11x (cf πότνια μήτηρ) |
| 7 | <u>λευκώλενος</u> Ἦρη # | 3x |
| tr | βοῶπις <u>πότνια</u> Ἦρη # | 11x |
| tr | θεὰ <u>λευκώλενος</u> Ἦρη # | 19x |

As for Ἔκτωρ, we have

| | | |
|----|----------------------------------|-----|
| | ὄβριμος Ἔκτωρ # | 29x |
| | φαίδιμος Ἔκτωρ # | 4x |
| 7 | <u>κορυθαίολος</u> Ἔκτωρ # | 25x |
| tr | μέγας <u>κορυθαίολος</u> Ἔκτωρ # | 12x |
| # | Ἔκτωρ Πριαμίδης | 6x |

There are only two segments for Νέστωρ, though the longer segment seems to have been built from the adonic-shaped one:

| | | |
|--|------------------------|----|
| | <u>ἱππότα</u> Νέστωρ # | 1x |
|--|------------------------|----|

and built from it:

| | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----|
| 7 | Γερήνιος <u>ἱππότα</u> Νέστωρ # | 1x |
|---|---------------------------------|----|

The next god, Ἄρης, has a slightly more developed system. Here it is:

| | | |
|----|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | χάλκεος Ἄρης # | 5x |
| | <u>ὄβριμος</u> Ἄρης # | 5x |
| 7 | χρυσήνιος Ἄρης # | 1x |
| tr | βριήπυος <u>ὄβριμος</u> Ἄρης # | 1x |
| tr | Ἄρης ἄτος πολέμοιο # | 3x |
| tr | μένος <u>ὄβριμος</u> Ἄρης # | (not mentioned by Parry) |

The system for Διομήδης:

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| [Τυδέος υἱὸς #] | 8x (inflected in the acc. sg. too) |
| ⁷ κρατερὸς Διομήδης # | 12x |
| ⁷ <u>ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης</u> # | 1x |
| ^{tr} βοῆν <u>ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης</u> # | 21x |

The last hero on Parry's chart is Ἄγαμέμνων.

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| ⁷ κρείων Ἄγαμέμνων # | 26x |
| ^{tr} ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἄγαμέμνων # | 37x |
| # ἥρωες Ἀτρείδης ⁵ | (Parry says 3, but there are more) |

In these examples of noun-epithet-based segment construction we discern yet another fundamental principle governing Homeric diction: the possibility of segmental expansion, which amounts to a kind of horizontal inflection, for the purpose of increasing the size of the segment. This modular flexibility then allows for the efficient creation of segments that will fit when localized behind both the (1) hepthemimeral caesura and (2) bucolic diaeresis, as well as within (3) trochaic-caesura-to-line-end segments.

CHAPTER FOUR

Review of Scholarship From the Perspective of Modular Diction

As we have mentioned, discussions of segmental syntax in the Homeric corpus will need to consider proposals made by Joseph Russo concerning the reality of a “structural formula” and its relation to composition and analysis. In the appendix to his well known article, “The Structural formula in Homeric Verse,” Russo gives examples of words and syntagms that comprise, according to him, structural formulae.³³ He arranges the evidence according to line segments in some instances, but more often according to individual words (a questionable procedure, as we will see). We will begin by looking at his categories, which we have taken directly from the appendix to the article. We will next test the validity of his claims regarding structural formularity according to the insights that we have secured in our own study heretofore, and we will then take the differences between Russo’s claims and our own as points of departure for describing more precisely the nature of Homeric verse, both its analysis and composition. The latter we do in an effort to bring a number of concluding thoughts to this study, and the study to a sensible ending point.

We begin with Russo’s first instance of a structural formula. His first example, taken from his sizeable appendix of structural formulae at the end of the article, is as follows:

³³ Russo 1966.

“A. Single long words used before the A or B caesura
1. – ≈ – (participle)

ούλομένην
χωομένω
έστάμεναι
τειρομένους
σπεΐσαντες
έσβάντες
είσορόων
καγχαλόων”

The first question concerns Russo’s definition. From the point of view that we established above, whereby five parameters need to be considered when evaluating the formulaic behavior of any lexical item, “Single long words before the A or B caesura” does not provide the analytic specificity that we need for an analysis of line segments possessing internal syntax. Russo has essentially identified metrical position, and two possibilities for metrical size (before the A or B caesura), as the parameters for his evidence. To denote the metrical position as a localization before the A or B caesura is, indeed a starting point for a definition, though an incomplete one, since segments behave differently when reaching to the penthemimeral and trochaic caesura. What is more, if we were to grant that “single words” can be filed under the category of a structural formula, then we would need to know more about that single word’s behavior in relation to adjacent words, and probably need a further theory of formularity in addition.

The first word in Russo’s list is a familiar one, ούλομένην. If we consider all occurrences of the participle, both in the inflected form given by Russo in his appendix, but also in its other inflections, we find fifteen

examples from the two poems and *Hymns*. Although the arrangement of the evidence will vary depending on one’s interpretive priorities, when we begin with the inflected word in verse-initial position, we find four examples in a segment from verse-opening to the trochaic caesura:

| | |
|--|------------|
| οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ ἴ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε, | Il. 1.2 |
| οὐλομένην, ἣ τ' αἰὲν ἴ' ἀήσυλα ἔργα μέμηλεν. | Il. 5.876 |
| οὐλομένην, ἣ πολλὰ ἴ' κάκ' ἀνθρώποισι δίδωσι· | Od. 17.287 |
| οὐλομένης, ἣ πολλὰ ἴ' κάκ' ἀνθρώποισι δίδωσιν. | Od. 17.474 |

In each case the word is enjambed and followed directly by a relative pronoun. The word οὐλομένην can also be inflected into other cases, as it is in the fourth example above, οὐλομένης. When we compare the two verses side by side, we find what looks to be an inflected verse segment, and we note that the two verses appear in the same book of the *Odyssey* (less than two hundred lines apart, incidentally):

| | |
|---|------------|
| <u>οὐλομένην, ἣ πολλὰ ἴ' κάκ' ἀνθρώποισι δίδωσι·</u> | Od. 17.287 |
| <u>οὐλομένης, ἣ πολλὰ ἴ' κάκ' ἀνθρώποισι δίδωσιν.</u> | Od. 17.474 |

The question for us, however, is whether we can extract something approximating a “structural formula” from the attested evidence of this word οὐλομένην. From what we have seen above, it looks as if the enjambed participle, when followed by a relative clause and with the verb occurring in the second hemistich in line-final position, may indeed have constituted a vague sort of prosodic syntactic structure available to the poet—to buttress this claim, we observe that in the four examples we have a direct object and an indirect object in the second hemistich as well.

Perhaps, then, we are dealing with a whole-line segment? There is one major obstacle, however. The syntactic patternings in all instances are by no means identical, as the four examples show. Still more problematic is the fact that other examples complicate the picture. Consider these verses:

| | |
|--|------------|
| <u>ούλόμεν'</u> αἴθ' φελλες ἴ' ἀεικελίου στρατοῦ ἄλλου | Il. 14.84 |
| <u>ούλομένων;</u> τὰ δὲ πῆμα ἴ' θεοὶ θέσαν Ἀργείοισι· | Od. 11.555 |
| <u>ούλόμεν'</u> , εἰ δὴ ποῦ τις ἴ' ἐπουράνιος θεός ἐστι· | Od. 17.484 |
| <u>ούλομένης</u> ἐμέθεν, τῆς ἴ' τε Ζεὺς ὄλβον ἀπηύρα. | Od. 18.273 |
| <u>ούλόμενον</u> καματηρόν, ἴ' ὅ τε στυγέουσι θεοὶ περ. | Aphr. 246 |

In these examples, if we look only at the segment reaching to the trochaic caesura, we do indeed find that each segment is the same size. And so we do have a potential correspondence set. Complicating the picture significantly, however, is the occurrence of the participle at the masculine caesura (= ἴ') in the following manner:

| | |
|--|------------|
| φάρμακον <u>ούλόμενον,</u> ἴ' τό σφιν πόρε πότνια Κίρκη· | Od. 10.394 |
| ἔκτα σὺν <u>ούλομένη]</u> ἴ' ἀλόχῳ οἰκόνδε καλέσσας, | Od. 11.410 |
| ἀλλ' ἔνεκ' <u>ούλομένης]</u> ἴ' γαστρὸς κακὰ κήδε' ἔχουσιν | Od. 15.344 |

Again, since in these three examples the participle occurs in the same metrical position (before the penthemimeral caesura), and since the three segments are the same size, we have here at least a candidate for a structural formula. However, the syntax of each of the three examples is different; and more importantly, to set up a syntactic template for this segment would require conceptualizing the segment as a segment reaching from verse-opening to the penthemimeral caesura, and not the

trochaic caesura, as we saw above, which would mean that we are looking at two different segments and two different template candidates (at the very least), not one ‘structural formula.’

When the internal syntax of the segments diverges so significantly, how can we justify explaining the participle’s usage as the result of a single structural formula? We cannot. There is quite clearly no single syntactic schema that undergirds the participle’s appearance in the verse-initial hemistich, or even in the verse’s opening position. The presence of a mere participle in the same position in only three lines of the entire corpus can hardly merit classification as a structural formula, at least without further criteria or constraints, since doing so would amount to granting formulaic status to single words, and single words very weakly attested to begin with. Furthermore, how would one begin to separate the occurrence here from the prosodological fact that participles with that particular shape will tend to occur there by the nature of the structure of the hexameter, given O’Neill’s findings and the word-type metrical localizations that can be predicted from them?

Regarding the possibility of segmental correspondence at the grammatical level in the three verses, the closest we come is the partial agreement in Od. 11.410 and Od. 15.344, where in both instances a verse-opening word is followed by a prepositional phrase and an inflected form of οὐλομέν—. Still, if we were to call this agreement anything at all, we would have to characterize the segmental correspondence as one in which an opening word, a prepositional phrase, and an inflected form of οὐλομέν- occur together. This would be a kind of sub-subset of any structural formula spanning the corpus for all occurrences of οὐλομέν-

participles, to say nothing of the larger question of *the abstract syntactic patterns governing participles position as a whole occurring in that metrical* — which is where the real proof for something definitively structural would be seen. The following examples constitute all remaining participles made from this verb in the corpus. Note that though the two examples occur separated by twenty books, and are in fact the same hemistich segment in line-final position³⁴:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| λάθρη, ἀνωϊστί, δόλω <u>οὐλομένης</u> ἀλόχοιο. | Od. 4.92 |
| Αἰγίσθου ὑπὸ χερσὶ καὶ <u>οὐλομένης</u> ἀλόχοιο.” | Od. 24.97 |

When we take all of these instances together as a correspondence set, there is no question but that the segmental behavior of οὐλομένην/οὐλομένης/etc in the Homeric corpus points to a number of interesting phenomena. However, the presence of the word itself in the opening hemistich is nowhere close to being sufficient for warranting a classification of the word, or the segments in which it occurs, as a single structural formula.

As for the next item in Russo’s list, *χωομένω*, we will pass over it for the time being, for the simple reason that to study the occurrence of medio-passive participles located at the trochaic caesura would require the investigation of lists of hundreds upon hundreds of examples from the Homeric corpus. To consult such lists would yield diminishing returns for the purpose of putting Russo’s method to the test.

The next word in Russo's list, then, is ἐστάμεναι. Does this word point to a structural formula? Here is the evidence for segments built from verse-opening to the penthemimeral caesura:

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|
| <u>ἐστάμεναι</u> | κρατερῶς, | ἤ τ' ἔβλητ' ἤ τ' ἔβαλ' ἄλλον. | Π. 11.410 |
| <u>ἐστάμεναι</u> | κρατερῶς, | μηδὲ τρωπᾶσθε φόβον δέ. | Π. 15.666 |
| αὐτῷ θ' <u>ἐστάμεναι</u> | | κρατερῶς καὶ ἀνωγέμεν ἄλλους· | Π. 13.56 |
| <u>ἐστάμεναι</u> | μέλεον | σὺν τεύχεσιν, ἀλλὰ λυ' ἵππους· | Π. 10.480 |

and reaching to the trochaic caesura:

| | | | |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| <u>ἐστάμεναι</u> | <u>περὶ τοῖχον</u> | ἔϋσταθέος μεγάροιο, | Π. 18.374 |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------|

Given the paucity, and heterogeneity, of the evidence for this particular structural formula candidate, the suggestion that this word might attain the threshold of such a denomination remains mysterious. It clearly is not a formula at all, much less a structural one. In four of five examples it does occur in verse-initial position, but one is of a different length (reaching to the trochaic caesura). Furthermore, there is no consideration taken, or analysis made, or discursive explanation given, as to what the other words surrounding out supposedly structural formula are doing. The example and its analysis look to be incomplete.

Russo's next candidate for a structural formula is the word τειρομένους. This, too, is an odd suggestion for a structural formula, since it occurs no more than three times in the corpus:

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------|-----------------------------|----------|
| <u>τειρομένους</u> | ἐρύεσθαι | ὑπὸ Τρώων ὀρυμαγδοῦ. | Π. 9.248 |
| <u>τειρομένους</u> | ἐλέαιρε | κατὰ στρατόν, οἷ σε θεὸν ὦς | Π. 9.302 |

τειρομένους δ' ἐπὶ νηυσὶν ἴδων ἔλεησεν Ἀχαιοῦς.

Il. 15.44

While the three occurrences do show the same verse position, namely verse-initially, and while all three examples are at least in a segment with the same metrical size and shape, there is no consideration given to the syntax of the three. This absence is fatal for the claim that we have here a structural formula, since the third example seems to be unrelated to the first two, while the first two seem to be related to each other only distantly.

The next word in Russo's appendix is σπείσαντες. It is in cases such as these that our methodological insistence on the categories of size, shape, position, syntax, and lexicon bears fruit, since the word can be *prima facie* shown not to be a structural formula at all, on account of its distribution across too wide a range of metrical positions and sizes:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <u>σπείσαντες</u> παρὰ νῆας ἴσαν πάλιν· ἦρχε δ' Ὀδυσσεύς. | Il. 9.657 |
| <u>σπείσαντες</u> κοῖτιοιο μεδώμεθα· τοῖο γὰρ ὥρη. | Od. 3.334 |
| καὶ τότε δὴ <u>σπείσαντες</u> ἔβαν κλισίην δὲ ἕκαστος, | Il. 9.712 |
| πέμπετέ με <u>σπείσαντες</u> ἀπήμονα, ἥχαίρετε δ' αὐτοῖ | Od. 13.39 |

And to the penthemimeral caesura:

| | |
|---|------------|
| ὄφρα <u>σπείσαντες</u> κατακείομεν ἥ οἴκαδ' ἰόντες· | Od. 18.419 |
| ὄφρα <u>σπείσαντες</u> καταθειόμεν ἥ ἀγκύλα τόξα· | Od. 21.264 |

The first four examples show segments ending at the trochaic caesura, two of which are verse-initial, two of which are segment-final. The next two examples are in fact the same segment, and built only to extend to the

masculine caesura, with similarly shaped verbs following in the identical position, i.e., located before the bucolic diaeresis. Again, we see evidence of interesting segmental behavior, and we have a glimpse at how Homeric diction actually functioned, but find nothing justifying the claim that σπεΐσαντες itself constitutes a structural formula: there is too much variety in its metrical position, and too much variation in the segment-internal words that surround it. The segments would be better analyzed by the modular methods advocated in our opening chapters.

Somewhat surprisingly, Russo also lists the word ἐσβάντες as a structural formula. We say ‘surprisingly,’ because the word is attested only once in the Homeric corpus, in the following passage:

αὐτοὶ δ' ἰδρῶ πολλὸν ἀπενίζοντο θαλάσση
 ἐσβάντες κνήμας τε ἴδ' ἰδὲ λόφον ἀμφὶ τε μηρούς. Π. 10.573
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σφιν κῦμα θαλάσσης ἰδρῶ πολλὸν

While we do not deny that a surface output of only one occurrence may still in some cases merit classification, under certain conditions, as formular—given the right specifications and methodology—this example surely proves nothing.

The last word on Russo’s opening list is καγχαλόων. It occurs only twice in the poems of Homer:

τεύχεσι παμφαίνων ὥς τ' ἠλέκτωρ ἐβεβήκει
 καγχαλόων, ταχέες ἴδ' ἰδὲ πόδες φέρον· ἥ αἴψα δ' ἔπειτα Π. 6.514

and:

ὣς εἰπὼν τάφροιο διήλασε μώνυχας ἵππους
καρχαλόων· ἅμα δ' ἄλλοι ἴσαν χαίροντες Ἀχαιο Π. 10.565

Though both examples have the same metrical position, and both are enjambed, what explanation would one need to adopt in order to claim that these two instances constitute a *formula*? A formula compared to what? In view of what criteria? On what basis? Again, the claim turns out to be incomplete, at best. Both occurrences are in segments of different length, neither show a binding syntax, and neither seem to have related material in adjacent segments. This seems then not to be a structural formula.

Russo's next category of candidates for structural formulae is the "adverb" in the first hemistich. Here is his list (the second in the appendix), which he provides at the conclusion of his article:

2. – ≈ – (adverb)
καρπαλίμως (also in Hesiod and the Hymns)
ἀσπασίως (also in Hesiod)
ῥηιδίως
νωλεμέως (in Tyrtaeus, in same position)
σμερδαλέον (in Hymns and Hesiod)
ἀντίβιον (ἀντιβίην)
κ.τ.λ.

At first glance, the suggestion that a single word, in this case an adverb, may count as a formula, would indeed be controversial, and in need of a supplementary argument. The complete evidence for his first word, καρπαλίμως, is the following. First we give the segments built to extend to the penthemimeral caesura, next we give them for the trochaic caesura:

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἀνέδυσ' ἰ πολίῃς ἀλὸς ἠύτ' ὀμίχλη, | Π. 1.359 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς, τὴν δ' εἰς ἰ ὄρμον προέρεσσαν ἐρετμοῖς. | Π. 1.435, Od.15.497 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς πρὸ νεῶν ἰ ἐχέμεν λαόν τε καὶ ἵππους | Π. 9.708 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἵππων ἰ ἐπεβήσεται· κόψε δ' Ὀδυσσεύς | Π. 10.513 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς, ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἰ ἱερῆιον οὐδὲ βοεῖην | Π. 22.159 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς, ἀπὸ δὲ ἰ χλαῖναν βάλε φοινικόεσσαν, | Od. 14.500 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἀνόρουσ' ἰ ὑπὸ χάρματος· αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' αὐτὸς | Dem. 371 |

Now, in a different metrical position:

| | |
|--|------------------|
| χαίρων <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς, ἰ εἰ καὶ μάλα τηλόθεν ἐσσί. | Od. 6.312, 7.194 |
| τόφρα δὲ <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς ἰ ἐξίκετο νηῦς εὐεργῆς | Od. 12.166 |
| ἔνθεν <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς ἰ προσέβης πρὸς δειράδα θύων, | Hy. Apollo 281 |
| ὥς ἄρα <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς ἰ ἰήσατο θεοῦρον Ἔρρα. | Π. 5.904 |

Now in a segment reaching to the trochaic caesura:

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς ἄρνάς τε ἴ φέρειν Πρίαμόν τε καλέσσαι· | Π. 3.117 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἴκανε ἴ θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν, | Π. 2.17, 2.168 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἴκανε ἴ θεῶν ἔδος αἰπὺν Ὀλυμπον, | Π. 5.868 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς, οἶνον δὲ ἴ μελίφρονα οἰνίζεσθε | Π. 8.506 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς, οἶνον δὲ ἴ μελίφρονα οἰνίζοντο, | Π. 8.546 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς· εἰ δ' ἄμμε ἴ παραφθαίησι πόδεσσι, | Π. 10.346 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἠἴξε ἴ διὰ δρυμὰ πυκνὰ καὶ ὕλην | Π. 11.118 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς κλισίηθεν ἴ ἀνείλετο χάλκεον ἔγχος, | Π. 13.296 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἀπίοντος ἴ ἀκόντισε δουρὶ φαεινῶ. | Π. 14.461 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς μάλιστα ἴ καὶ ἠνία λάζετο χερσίν, | Π. 17.482, 24.441 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἴκετ' ἴ Ἄργος ἴ Ἀχαιικόν, ἔνθ' ἄρα ἦδη | Π. 19.115 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς; τότε δ' οὐ τι ἴ μετατροπαλίζεο φεύγων. | Π. 20.190 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς, μὴ σφῶν ἴ ἐλεγχείην καταχεύη | Π. 23.408 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς· ὁ δ' ἔπειτα ἴ μετ' ἴχνια βαῖνε θεοῖο. | Od. 2.406, 3.30, 5.193, 7.38 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς μοι, τέκνα ἴ φίλα, κρηήνατ' ἐέλδωρ, | Od. 3.418 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἔζευξαν ἴ ὑφ' ἄρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους. | Od. 3.478 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς ἔρχεσθαι ἴ ἐγὼ δ' ὄδον ἠγεμονεύσω. | Od. 6.261 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς δ' ἔμπληντο ἴ βροτῶν ἀγοραῖτε καὶ ἔδραι | Od. 8.16 |
| <u>καρπαλίμω</u> ς ἐπέτοντο ἴ κονίοντες πεδίοιο. | Od. 8.122 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| <u>καρπαλίμως</u> κατὰ ἄστυ· ἴφιλοι δ' ἅμα πάντες ἔποντο | Il. 24.327 |
| <u>καρπαλίμως</u> ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἴεβήσετο δώματος εἴσω. | Od. 7.135 |
| <u>καρπαλίμως</u> δ' εἰς ἄντρον ἴαφικόμεθ', οὐδέ μιν ἔνδον | Od. 9.216 |
| <u>καρπαλίμως</u> ἐπὶ νῆα ἴθοῖν ἐρίφους τε καὶ ἄρνας | Od. 9.226 |
| <u>καρπαλίμως</u> παρὰ νηὸς ἴανήϊον ἐς περιωπήν, | Od. 10.146 |
| <u>καρπαλίμως</u> δὲ τὰ μῆλα ἴτανάυποδα, πῖονα δημῶ, | Od. 9.464 |
| <u>καρπαλίμως</u> χαίροντα ἴφίλως χαίροντες ἔπεμπον | Od. 19.461 |

The diversity of examples here shows that there is no single structural formula associated with this particular adverb. It does of course tend to follow certain verse positions, but this is much more the result of metrical word-type localization, rather than the result of a structural, or syntactic-structural, force. And so now for Russo's next example, ἀσπασίως:

| | |
|--|------------|
| φημί μιν <u>ἀσπασίως</u> ἴγόνυ κάμψειν, αἴ κε φύγησι | Il. 7.118 |
| γνώσεται· <u>ἀσπασίως</u> ἴγὰρ ἀφίξεται Ἴλιον ἱρήν | Il. 18.270 |
| κείμην <u>ἀσπασίως</u> , ἴφάε δὲ χρυσόθρονος Ἡώς. | Od. 14.502 |
| δέξαντ' <u>ἀσπασίως</u> , ἴπερὶ δ' ἄμβροτα εἶματα ἔσσαν, | Aphr. 6 |

These four examples at least show the word appearing in segments of the same size (verse-opening to penthemimeral caesura). But there is no syntactic pattern organizing them, and one would be hard pressed to extract an actual structural formula regulating the output of the segment. Furthermore, the word appears in another series of examples, with a different metrical position, in the first hemistich:

| | |
|---|------------|
| <u>ἀσπασίως</u> φεύγοντες ἴάνεπνεον Ἔκτορα δῖον. | Il. 11.327 |
| <u>ἀσπασίως</u> Πάτροκλον ἴύπ' ἐκ βελέων ἐρύσαντες | Il. 18.232 |
| <u>ἀσπασίως</u> δ' ἐς πόντον ἴέπηρεφέας φύγε πέτρας | Od. 10.131 |
| <u>ἀσπασίως</u> αὐτῶν ἴγόνυ κάμψειν, ὅς κε φύγησι | Il. 19.72 |
| <u>ἀσπασίως</u> δ' ἄρα τῶ ἴκατέδου φάος ἠελίοιο | Od. 13.33 |
| <u>ἀσπασίως</u> γάρ κ' ἄλλος ἴάνηρ ἀλαλήμενος ἐλθῶν | Od. 13.333 |

And so again, the example of a single adverb, ἀσπασίως, does not look like a particularly propitious candidate for attribution to the category of structural formula.

Unfortunately, after a certain amount of inspection, it becomes clear that Russo's one word adverbs do not, under rigorous consideration, turn out to be very convincing examples of structural formulae. For the purpose of comprehensiveness, however, let us look at the remaining examples in his list. Again, we find diversity for the adverb νωλεμέως:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <u>νωλεμέως</u> πόλεμον δέ ἴ κέλευε δὲ οἷσιν ἕκαστος | Π. 4.428 |
| <u>νωλεμέως</u> , αὐτὸς δὲ ἴ πάλιν τρέπεν ὅσσε φαίνω | Π. 13.3 |
| <u>νωλεμέως</u> ἔταροι δὲ ἴ κατέκταθεν οὖς σὺ μεταλλάξ. | Π. 13.780 |
| <u>νωλεμέως</u> κρατερῆσι, ἴ σάωσε δὲ πάντας Ἀχαιοῦς· | Π. 4.288 |
| <u>νωλεμέως</u> κτείνοντο ἴ σύες ὡς ἀργιόδοντες, | Π. 11.413 |
| <u>νωλεμέως</u> · ἀτὰρ αὐτὸς ἴ ἐλίσσετο ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα. | Π. 20.24 |
| <u>νωλεμέως</u> ἐχέμεν, ἴ κρατερὴν δ' ἀποθέσθαι ἐνιπὴν. | Π. 5.492 |
| <u>νωλεμέως</u> στρεφθεῖς ἴ ἐχόμεν τετληότι θυμῶ. | Π. 9.435 |
| <u>νωλεμέως</u> δ' ἐχόμεν, ἴ ὄφρ' ἐξεμέσειεν ὀπίσσω | Π. 12.437 |

It occurs only in verse-initial position, yes, but can it be said to constitute a structural formula? Not according to the parameters that we have adopted, since, as we can see, there is extraordinary syntactic diversity associated with this adverb in this segment.

The next example is σμερδαλέος. Notice that it too is inflected in a number of instances:

| | |
|--|----------|
| <u>σμερδαλέος</u> , τὸν ῥ' αὐτὸς ἴ Ὀλύμπιος ἦκε φόως δέ, | Π. 2.309 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησαν ἴ ἀϋσάντων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν, | Π. 2.334 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβιζε ἴ ποδῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἵππων. | Π. 2.466 |

| | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δ' ἐβόησεν ἴ' ἐποτρύνων Ἰουδοῖα· | Π. 8.92 |
| <u>σμερδαλέω</u> , τὸν ἔεστο ἴ' περὶ χροῖ, δοιὰ δὲ χερσὶ | Π. 12.464 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβιζε ἴ' τιτυσκομένων καθ' ὄμιλον | Π. 13.498 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κροτάφοισι ἴ' τινάσσετο μαρναμένοιο | Π. 15.609 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε ἴ' περὶ κροτάφοισι πεσόντος. | Π. 15.648 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησαν ἴ' ἀϋσάντων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν. | Π. 16.277 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δ' ὤμωξεν· ἴ' ἄκουσε δὲ πότνια μήτηρ | Π. 18.35 |
| <u>σμερδαλέω</u> δὲ λέοντε ἴ' δὴ ἐν πρώτῃσι βόεσσι | Π. 18.579 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δ' ἵπποισιν ἴ' ἐκέκλετο πατὴρ ἑοῖο· | Π. 19.399 |
| <u>σμερδαλέ'</u> εὐρώεντα, ἴ' τὰ τε στυγέουσι θεοὶ περ· | Π. 20.65 |
| <u>σμερδαλέω</u> μέγα δ' ἀμφὶ ἴ' σάκος μύκε δουρὸς ἀκωκῆ. | Π. 20.260 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβιζεν· ἴ' ὑπαιθα δὲ τοῖο λιασθεὶς | Π. 21.255 |
| <u>σμερδαλέην</u> , ἦν οὐδὲ ἴ' Διὸς δάμνησι κεραυνός· | Π. 21.401 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε· ἴ' πάλιν δ' ἀπὸ χαλκὸς ὄρουσε | Π. 21.593 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δὲ δέδορκεν ἴ' ἐλισσόμενος περὶ χειρῆ· | Π. 22.95 |
| <u>σμερδαλέος</u> δ' αὐτῆσι ἴ' φάνη κεκακωμένος ἄλμη, | Od. 6.137 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δ' ἐβόησε ἴ' γέγωνέ τε πᾶσι θεοῖσι· | Od. 8.305 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δὲ μέγ' ὤμωξεν, περὶ δ' ἴαχε πέτρῃ, | Od. 9.395 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβιζε· ἴ' θεὰ δ' ἐλέαιρε καὶ αὐτή. | Od. 10.399 |
| <u>σμερδαλέος</u> δὲ οἱ ἀμφὶ ἴ' περὶ στήθεσσι ἀορτῆρ | Od. 11.609 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε· ἴ' γέλασσε δὲ Πηνελόπεια, | Od. 17.542 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε, ἴ' γέλασσε δὲ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων | Hermes 420 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε· ἴ' θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδεν | Hermes 54 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε, ἴ' θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄεισεν. | Hermes 502 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δ' ἐβόησε ἴ' πολὺτλας δῖος Ἰουδοσεύς, | Od. 24.537 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων· ἴ' ὃ δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χερσὶ | Π. 5.302, 8.321, 20.285 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων· ἴ' ὃ δ' ἀμαρτὴ δῖος Ἰουδοσεύς | Od 22.81 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων, ἴ' τρις δ' ἐννέα φῶτας ἔπεφνεν. | Π. 16.785 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων, ἴ' ὤρσεν δ' ἥρωας Ἀχαιοῦς. | Π. 19.41 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων, ἴ' πρῶτον δ' ἔλεν Ἰφιδίωνα | Π. 20.382 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων· ἴ' τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων | Π. 20.443 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> ἰάχησεν, ἴ' ἐκινήθη δ' ἄρα πόντος | Aphr. 11 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> κτυπέων· ἴ' τοὺς δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἦρει· | Π. 7.479 |
| <u>σμερδαλέω</u> κεκάλυφθ'· ἴ' ὃ δ' ἄρ' ἀσπίδος ὀμφαλὸν οὔτα, | Π. 13.192 |
| <u>σμερδαλέη</u> κεφαλῆ, ἴ' ἐν δὲ τρίστοιχοι ὀδόντες, | Od. 12.91 |

When we look at the list, examples do emerge for segments with syntactic and lexical formularity. The first would be:

| | |
|--|------------|
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησαν ἄϋσάντων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν, | Il. 2.334 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβιζε ποδῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἵππων. | Il. 2.466 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβιζε τιτυσκομένων καθ' ὄμιλον | Il. 13.498 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε περὶ κροτάφοισι πεσόντος. | Il. 15.648 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησαν ἄϋσάντων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν. | Il. 16.277 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβιζεν· ὑπαιθα δὲ τοῖο λιασθεῖς | Il. 21.255 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε· πάλιν δ' ἀπὸ χαλκὸς ὄρουσε | Il. 21.593 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβιζε· θεὰ δ' ἐλέαιρε καὶ αὐτή. | Od. 10.399 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε· γέλασσε δὲ Πηνελόπεια, | Od. 17.542 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε· γέλασσε δὲ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων | Herm. 420 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε· θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδεν | Hermes 54 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> κονάβησε· θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄεισεν. | Hermes 502 |

To which we would add the following, given the match in syntax, metrical position, metrical shape, and metrical size:

| | |
|---|------------|
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δ' ἐβόησεν ἐποτρύνων Ὀδυσῆα· | Il. 8.92 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δ' ἐβόησε γέγωνέ τε πᾶσι θεοῖσι· | Od. 8.305 |
| <u>σμερδαλέον</u> δ' ἐβόησε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, | Od. 24.537 |

A second correspondence set that emerges from the list is the following, a segment that reaches to the penthemimeral caesura:

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων· ὃ δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ | Il. 5.302, 8.321, 20.285 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων· ὃ δ' ἄμαρτῆ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς | Od 22.81 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων· τρὶς δ' ἐννέα φῶτας ἔπεφνεν. | Il. 16.785 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων· ὦρσεν δ' ἥρωας Ἀχαιοῦς. | Il. 19.41 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων· πρῶτον δ' ἔλεν Ἴφιτίωνα | Il. 20.382 |
| <u>σμερδαλέα</u> ἰάχων· τὸν δ' ἐξήρπαξεν Ἀπόλλων | Il. 20.443 |

with which this line belongs:

σμερδαλέα κτυπέων· ἵ τούς δὲ χλωρόν δέος ἦρει· Π. 7.479

Both of the previous correspondence sets, in some fashion, point towards this line from the *Hymns*:

σμερδαλέον ἰάχησεν, ἴ ἐκινήθη δ' ἄρα πόντος Minerva 11

While these correspondences are interesting and no doubt merit further study, we can eliminate the possibility that the word itself comprises a single structural formula. Again, there is too much diversity. And it looks as if there are a number of modules, manifest on the surface as phrase-formulae, present here, to say nothing of grammatical relatives or connections to more abstract templates. The next step in the analysis of these lines would be to undertake a full modular investigation, in order to see how many different kinds of schemata occupy this segment size, shape, and position, and then to see how they interact with the verses before and after them, especially in light of the typically enjambed metrical position.

The last example from Russo's list, ἀντίβιον, occurs only three times in the Homeric corpus, and is clearly not a structural formula:

ἀντίβιον μαχέσασθαι ἴ ἐν αἰνῇ δηϊοτήτι. Π. 3.20, 7.40, 7.51
ἀντίβιον πόλεμον ἵ πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι Π. 3.435
εἰ μὲν δὴ ἀντίβιον ἴ σὺν τεύχεσι πειρηθείης, Π. 11.386

We see here diversity, and no evidence of a structural syntactic pattern.

Russo's next list in the appendix provides one word adjectives. Given what we have just seen, we might expect one-word examples of adjectives not to comprise examples of structural formulae. Our suspicions are confirmed. In some instances, words from the list occur only one or two times in the entire corpus. First, the list:

3. – ≈ – (adjective)

ἀντίθεος (only one out of a handful of *Iliad* examples is line initial)
ὠμοφάγοι (5x in Homer, only once line-initial, one ex. in the *Hymns*)
ἀμφοτέρω (erratic, metrical-positionally speaking, in Homer)
ἐννύχιοι (only one occurrence in Homer)
παννύχιοι (extremely diverse in terms of metrical position)
ἠδυεπής (once in the *Iliad*, once in the *Hymns*)
ὠκύποδες (extremely diverse in terms of metrical position)
κήδιστοί (once in the *Iliad*, once in the *Odyssey*)
ἔχθιστος (only 4x in all of Homer, at various metrical positions)

Now, let us consider them individually. The first example is quite far from a structural formula, as all of its attested appearances show:

ἀντίθεος Τελαμωνιάδης μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπε· Π. 9.623

and:

στάς πρόσθεν νέκυος· τοῦ δ' ἀντίθεος Θρασυμήδης Π. 16.321
Ἴλιός τ' Ἀσσάρακός τε καὶ ἀντίθεος Γανυμήδης, Π. 20.232
Περσεύς τ' Ἄρητός τε καὶ ἀντίθεος Θρασυμήδης. Od. 3.414
Λαοδάμας θ' Ἄλιός τε καὶ ἀντίθεος Κλυτόνης. Od. 8.119
Νέστωρ δ' ἀντίθεος καὶ ἐγὼ νικάσκομεν οἴω. Od. 11.512

Regarding the next item in the list, we discover a similar story. There are only three examples in the Homeric corpus, and they clearly show that no structural formula is in evidence for the segment:

| | |
|---|--------------|
| <u>ὠμοφάγοι</u> μιν θῶες ἴρ' ἐν οὔρεσι δαρδάπτουσιν | Il. 11.479 |
| <u>ὠμοφάγοι</u> , τοῖσιν τε ἴρ' ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν ἄσπετος ἀλκή, | Il. 16.157 |
| <u>ὠμοφάγοι</u> φοιτῶσι ἴρ' κατὰ σκιδόεντας ἐναύλους, | H. Aphr. 124 |

His fourth item in the list occurs only once in Homer:

| | |
|--|------------|
| <u>ἐννύχιοι</u> προτὶ ἄστυ· ἴρ' γεγήθει δὲ φρένα Νηλεΐς, | Il. 11.683 |
|--|------------|

His fifth item on the list, παννύχιοι, appears in a wide range of metrical positions:

| | |
|---|------------|
| εἶδον <u>παννύχιοι</u> , Δία δ' οὐκ ἔχε νήδυμος ὕπνος, | Il. 2.2 |
| <u>παννύχιοι</u> μὲν ἔπειτα κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ | Il. 7.476 |
| ὥς κεν <u>παννύχιοι</u> μέσφ' ἠοῦς ἠριγενεΐης | Il. 8.508 |
| εἶατο <u>παννύχιοι</u> , πυρὰ δὲ σφισι καΐετο πολλά. | Il. 8.554 |
| εἶδον <u>παννύχιοι</u> μαλακῶ δεδμημένοι ὕπνω· | Il. 10.2 |
| <u>παννύχιοι</u> Πάτροκλον ἀνεστενάχοντο γοῶντες. | Il. 18.315 |
| <u>παννύχιοι</u> μὲν ἔπειτα πόδας ταχύν ἀμφ' Ἀχιλῆα | Il. 18.354 |
| <u>παννύχιοι</u> δ' ἄρα τοί γε πυρῆς ἄμυδις φλόγ' ἔβαλλον | Il. 23.217 |
| εἶδον <u>παννύχιοι</u> μαλακῶ δεδμημένοι ὕπνω· | Il. 24.678 |

Still another example from his list appears only once in the *Iliad*, and once in the *Hymns*. How could this possibly be a structural formula?

| | |
|---|-------------|
| <u>ἠδυεπῆς</u> ἀνόρουσε λιγύς Πυλίων ἀγορητής, | Il. 1.248 |
| <u>ἠδυεπῆς</u> πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν αἰεῖδει | H. to Ap. 4 |

For the remaining adjectives in his list, we find a similar story:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| <u>ώκύποδες</u> τοῦ δ' αὖθι λύθη ψυχὴ τε μένος τε. | Π. 5.296 |
| <u>ώκύποδες</u> τοῦ δ' αὖθι λύθη ψυχὴ τε μένος τε. | Π. 8.123 |
| <u>ώκύποδες</u> τοῦ δ' αὖθι λύθη ψυχὴ τε μένος τε. | Π. 8.315 |
| ἔστασαν <u>ώκύποδες</u> μελιηδέα πυρὸν ἔδοντες· | Π. 10.569 |
| τόλμων <u>ώκύποδες</u> , μάλα δὲ χρεμέτιζον ἐπ' ἄκρω | Π. 12.51 |
| ἔκφερον <u>ώκύποδες</u> σὺν τεύχεσι, λεῖπε δὲ λαὸν | Π. 16.368 |
| <u>ώκύποδες</u> φέρον ἄρμα· πατήρ δέ οἱ ἄγχι παραστάς | Π. 23.304 |

And only two occurrences:

| | |
|---|----------|
| <u>κήδιστοί</u> τ' ἔμεναι καὶ φίλτατοι ὅσοι Ἀχαιοί | Π. 9.642 |
| <u>κήδιστοι</u> τελέθουσι μεθ' αἵμα τε καὶ γένος αὐτῶν. | Π. 8.583 |

Last of all:

| | |
|---|----------|
| <u>ἔχθιστος</u> δέ μοί ἐσσι διοτρεφέων βασιλῆων· | Π. 1.176 |
| <u>ἔχθιστος</u> δ' Ἀχιλῆϊ μάλιστ' ἦν ἠδ' Ὀδυσῆϊ· | Π. 2.220 |
| <u>ἔχθιστος</u> δέ μοί ἐσσι θεῶν οἱ Ὀλυμπον ἔχουσιν· | Π. 5.890 |
| τοῦνεκα καί τε βροτοῖσι θεῶν <u>ἔχθιστος</u> ἀπάντων· | Π. 9.159 |

At this point, Russo's evidence appears to look a collection of adjectives that tend to appear in the same slot in accordance with metrical word-type localization, rather than the effects of underlying generative and regulative syntactic schmata or true structural formularity.

Russo's next list concerns the verb. Here is his list of verbs that putatively comprise structural formulae, complete with my comments on their frequency, which I've added in parentheses:

4. – ≈ – (verb)

δούπησεν (22 occurrences, all in line-initial position, still too diverse)

βέβληται (only 5x this form in Homer, all in line-initial position)

βεβλήκει (12x this form in Homer, all line-initial)

πέπτανται (only 1x in Homer, line initial)

ἐκφερέμεν (only 1x in Homer, line-initial)

As further evidence, he provides only:

B. Verb forms used before the B caesura

1. ∘ – ∘ V 5 1/2 (12)

νόησε

νοῆσαι

ἕτερπεν (Note: there is only one occurrence of this verb in this position)

ἔχεσκε (2x in this pos, 2x line-final)

ἔρυτο

ὄφελλεν (2x in Homer total – one here, one line-final)

κ.τ.λ.

Likewise, Russo specifies verbs with the following shape. Whether he intends the totality of them to comprise a structural formula, or each of them individually, is not entirely clear. But if the former were the case, then one would want to address the question of different tenses, and if the second were the case, then there is simply too much diversity to merit an account based on one, single structural formula:

2. ∘ – V 5 1/2 (1 1/2)

ἐστὶ

ἦρχε

ᾤσε

ἴζε

ἴκεν

δαῖεν
βῆσαν
βαῖνον

The same can be said for these remaining verb lists:

3. ≈ – ∪ V 5 1/2
ώρμαινε
ἴκοντο
ἐπέοικε
καλέουσι
δώσουσι
ἐθέλησι

And:

4. ≈ – V 5
πρῆσεν
στήσαντ'
ἔβαλον
ἐθέλω (-ει)
ἀγέμεν
κρατέειν
προΐει
κ.τ.λ.

When we come to the list of what he calls “noun-combinations,” we find a number of suggestive correspondences, but no account of how they belong together or according to what criteria; and no account of syntax is given at all. One must conclude, then, that no matter the amount of interest legitimately piqued by the list of “noun-combinations,” the evidence nevertheless proves nothing, at least not in the form in which it was presented:

C. Noun-combinations lasting to the B caesura

1. – ∪ | ∪ –
ἀνδρὶ φίλω
πατρὶ φίλω
μητρὶ φίλῃ
μητέρ' ἐμήν
πατρίδ' ἐμήν
ἔγχος ἐμόν
τέκνον ἐμόν,
χεῖρα ἐήν
χεῖρας ἐμάς,
κ.τ.λ.

2.
Ἰλίου αἰπεινῆς·
πέτραι τ' ἠλίβατοι
ἠχῆ θεσπεσίῃ
νῆας εὐσσέλμους
ἀνέρε κυδαλίμω
ἰὸς χαλκοβαρῆς,
Τρωαὶ εὐπλόκαμοι
ἔγχεϊ χαλκείῳ
κ.τ.λ.

3.
νησὶν ἔπι γλαφυρῆσιν
νῆας ἔπι γλαφυράς / νῆας ἀνὰ γλαφυράς, (3x)
μῶ ἐνὶ στιβαρῶ
χειρὸς ἄπο στιβαρῆς
εὐνῆ ἐνὶ μαλακῆ·
ποσσοὶ δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσι
δώρῳ ἔπι μεγάλῳ;
σκήπτρου ὑπὸ χρυσοῦ
κ.τ.λ.

4.
πέτρῃ ὑπὸ γλαφυρῆ (only one occurrence in Homer)
χώρῳ ἐν οἰοπόλῳ,
φάτνη ἐφ' ἰππεΐῃ
χῶρον ἀν' ὑλήεντα

νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην / νύκτα δι' ὀρφναίην, χερσὶν ὑφ' ἡμετέρησιν
κ.τ.λ.

One could make a similar critique of all of Russo's evidence, both that which we have listed here, and that which continues in the appendix to his article. Russo does, however, go on to consider something called "phrase-patterns," though he does so without providing a definition. The difference in scope, rigor, and definition between his approach and the one advocated by our methodology ought to be apparent by this point. And so let us turn to a related, and similarly influential, analysis in the history of Homeric formula studies.

Michael Nagler, in his 1967 article "Towards a Generative View of the Oral Formula," but also in his book *Spontaneity and Tradition* (1974), argued that there is a phonic level (related to deep structural patterns and units) that affects formulaic relations internal to Homeric versification. The influence of the book remains significant to this day, or is at least cited frequently enough—as we saw above, Matthew Clark devoted one of his four 'concepts' of oral formulaic composition exclusively to Nagler's views. Interesting for our study is the fact that Nagler begins his discussion with a critique of Russo:

If one goes as far as Russo, for example, in saying that metrical-grammatical patterns such as verb in $\sim - \simeq$ (12) || or noun at $\sim -$ (7) for single words are "in themselves formulaic" (p.240) irrespective of their dictional content, the suggestion is likely to be considered hopelessly broad; what, exactly, is the relationship of this "formulaicness" to the word-for-word inevitability of the noun-epithet combination or the imposing rigidity and thrift of the schematized "formula systems" which we, somewhat unfairly, consider the salient features of Parry's work? And similar problems

arise with the question of diction: for example with Ruijgh's contention that the occurrence of a lexical item such as *nu* is formulaic in certain metrical positions, as well as other criteria.³⁵

Nagler's questions are similar to the ones that we posed in relation to our five parameters of formulaic analysis. The claim that Russo's notion of the structural formula was "hopelessly broad" repeats what was said of Parry by Hainsworth and Hoekstra. Hoekstra, in his 1965 book on modifications of formulaic prototypes, wrote, in reference to Parry, that general verse patterns showing only syntactic features in common "are much too vague . . . They can be shown to exist even in the *Hymns of Callimachus* and they are apparently inherent in the hexameter itself, whether formulaic or non-formulaic, whether oral or written."³⁶ We too have argued the concept of "verse patterns," without further characterization, is too broad to be analytically useful. When recharacterized according to the five parameters proposed by our method, these verse patterns can, however, be studied in precise ways.

The history of formulaic studies has been kind to Nagler's work. His examples, however, seem not to have been subjected to extensive scrutiny. In order to do this, and to see how his claims connect with the analysis of modularity, I have begun by reproducing Nagler's well known list of the correspondences that supposedly show evidence for an "an open-ended family" of formulae based upon purely sonic—and only partially lexical, in some cases not at all—resemblances. The fundamental point to grasp when comparing items in the list, we would

³⁵ Nagler 1967: 271.

³⁶ Hoekstra 1965: 12.

suggest, is the fact that Nagler selected these word groups occurring at verse-end in order to show that they were related by means of the phonological resemblance of *verse-final words* alone, even when the words had nothing in common. He does this, it is important to note, without considering the behavior of the rest of the segment.

Nagler concluded on the basis of this list that similarities such as the ones seen at verse-end are to be explained by the deep structure of formulaic “allomorphs,” that is to say, of preverbal gestalts, which live inside the singers, performers, poets, audience members, or whoever it was that produced the poems. To start with, here is Nagler’s list:³⁷

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1. | πίονι δήμῳ | (9 times) |
| 2. | τίετο δήμῳ | (6 times) |
| 3. | ἴκετο δῆμον, | (Od. 15.238) |
| 4. | παντί τε δήμῳ, | (twice, cf. Od. 8.157) |
| 5. | τῶδ’ ἐνὶ δήμῳ. | (Od. 2.317) |
| 6. | φαῖν’ ἐνὶ δήμῳ· | (Il. 18.295) |
| 7. | Τρώων ἐνὶ δήμῳ, | (Od. 1.237) |
| 8. | ἄλλοδαπῶ ἐνὶ δήμῳ | (Il. 19.324) |
| 9. | ἄλλογνώτῳ ἐνὶ δήμῳ. | (Od. 2.366) |
| 10. | ἄλλων ἐξίκετο δῆμον | (Il. 24.481) |

According to Nagler, we have in these ten examples a correspondence set

³⁷ Nagler writes, “With the conceptual framework in question, a group such as the *pioni demoi* phrases would be considered not a closed “system” but an open-ended “family,” and each phrase in the group would be considered an allomorph, *not of any other existing phrase*, but of some central Gestalt—for want of a better term—which is the real mental template underlying the production of all such phrases. The Gestalt itself, in our case, would seem to exist on a preverbal level of the poet’s mind, since we have found it impossible to define other than as a comprehensive list of all the allomorphs which happen to exist in an extended corpus.” (Nagler 1967: 267; 1974: 7)

whose relatedness, and possible formularity, must be explained. In other words, there is a relation governing all of the examples: the unifying feature is the verse-final occurrence of some sort of inflected form of δῆμῳ, etc. That the relation between the ten segments, Nagler furthermore argues, cannot be described as formulaic, according to Parryan parameters, is his next point. Why, he asks? Because there is no binding ‘essential idea,’ and no binding anything-else for that matter, except for *phonic* or *audible* similarities. His conclusion is that there must be some sort of deep structural ur-form or ‘pre-verbal template’ that allows for each of these forms to be generated for all of the surface-level variety that we see in the ten examples.

That would indeed be very instructive, if his examples were in fact representative of actual dictional units. But they are not. When we consider the entire verse of each example, a different picture emerges. Let us turn now to each of the examples, in order to see how the verse-end similarities are artifacts of longer, more sizeable, half-line long segmental behavior.

Beginning with the first example from the list, when we look at the corpus, we notice that πτόνι δῆμῳ belongs to a wider segmental system. First, we will separate his examples according to their position in the corpus. The first two examples, taken from Book 16 of the *Iliad*, belong not to a line-end noun-epithet situation, *but to a larger segment reaching from the trochaic caesura to verse-end*, identical in both occurrences, but with different initial segments from verse-initial to trochaic caesura.

- | | | | |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------|------------|
| 1.1. θεῖω ἀναρπάξας | ‡ | <u>Λυκίης ἐν πτόνι δῆμῳ,</u> | Il. 16.437 |
| 1.2. κλυθι ἄναξ ὅς που | ‡ | <u>Λυκίης ἐν πτόνι δῆμῳ</u> | Il. 16.514 |

According to our methodology, this segment can be classified without controversy as a phrase-formula from the penthemimeral caesura to line-end. Were we to investigate the line to see if it contained smaller segments and constituted an active dictional module, we would no doubt need to expand our analysis to include other verses possibly related. The first point to make is that when Nagler says in the above list that his example of πτόνι δήμῳ occurs ‘nine times’ (see #1 on Nagler’s list above), he already misrepresents the situation, since our first instance of πτόνι δήμῳ is not an independent example of a formula but in fact a segment embedded in a half-line piece of dictation already with its own identity and behavior, i.e., a half-line segment that can combine and recombine with entirely different half-lines, as it has done in the two examples given above.

The next two examples from Nagler’s list of the same two-word unit πτόνι δήμῳ occurring in verse-final position, also from the same book, belong to *still longer* segments, both of which are identical and *also* contain Λυκίης, though now with the adjective εὐρείης added, and the preposition, ἐν, moved to a new metrical position:

- | | | | | |
|------|--------------------|---|---------------------|------------|
| 1.3. | θήσουσ’ ἐν Λυκίης | ‡ | εὐρείης πτόνι δήμῳ, | Il. 16.673 |
| 1.4. | κάτθεσαν ἐν Λυκίης | ‡ | εὐρείης πτόνι δήμῳ. | Il. 16.683 |

It now begins to look as if these four examples comprise their own segmental grouping, since there seems to be expansion by means of inserting ‡ εὐρείης into the following segments:

- 1.1. θείω ἀναρπάξας | Λυκίης ἐν πτόνι δήμῳ, Π. 16.437
 1.2. κλυθι ἄναξ ὅς που | Λυκίης ἐν πτόνι δήμῳ Π. 16.514

In any case, they are not four equally independent examples of πτόνι δήμῳ, and they do not require an allomorphic mechanism to generate them—they belong to longer metrical segments whose syntactic description is something else entirely. In other words, to repeat, the four examples cited here belong to their own dictional microsystem, which is longer in dictional length than what Nagler gives as the example. One might even ask if Nagler’s citation of πτόνι δήμῳ constitutes any kind of independent dictional, or formulaic, unit at all, and on what basis.

Now, when we consider the next two examples of πτόνι δήμῳ extant in the corpus (remembering that we are still investigating only the first entry in Nagler’s list), we find that the adjective-noun unit is shared by yet another formula:

- 1.5. πρὶν γ’ ὅτε Φαιήκων | ἀνδρῶν ἐν πτόνι δήμῳ Od. 13.322
 1.6-7. ἀγχοῦ, Θεσπρωτῶν | ἀνδρῶν ἐν πτόνι δήμῳ, Od. 17.526, 19.271

Please note that, though we have only underlined the final four words of the formula, a genitive plural proper noun also belongs with the genitive plural ἀνδρῶν. In other words, this is a formulaic line-segment that belongs together, not further independent examples of unrelated sonic resemblances. In fact, the last two examples belong to a more complicated network of diction. Compare:

προπροκυλινδόμενος· στεῦται δ’ Ὀδυσῆος ἀκοῦσαι
ἀγχοῦ, Θεσπρωτῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν πτόνι δήμῳ, Od. 17.526
ζωοῦ· πολλὰ δ’ ἄγει κειμήλια ὄνδε δόμονδε.

And:

ὡς ἤδη Ὀδυσῆος ἐγὼ περὶ νόστου ἄκουσα
ἀγχοῦ, Θεσπρωτῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐν πτόνι δῆμῳ, Od. 19.271
ζωοῦ· αὐτὰρ ἄγει κειμήλια πολλὰ καὶ ἐσθλά,

As we can see from these two examples, both of which have verses with πτόνι δῆμῳ in verse-final position, the correspondences between the two passages seem to belong to a larger modular framework—larger than the mere sonic resemblance of the line final πτόνι δῆμῳ, that is. The next example is as follows:

1.8. Τμώλω ὑπο νιφόεντι ὕδης ἐν πτόνι δῆμῳ· II. 20.385

The ninth example, as was mentioned above, does not constitute an example that we would weight equally, since it is a different word (“fat”), and, as would be expected, has a different syntax than the previous examples:

1.9. ὕμμ’ ἐπὶ μηρί’ ἔκθε, καλύψας πτόνι δημῶ, Od. 17.241

Finally, not mentioned by Nagler, there is a further example similar to his examples 1.1, 1.2, and 1.8, in Hesiod’s *Theogony*:

1.10. νεῖῶ ἐνι τριπόλῳ, Κρήτης ἐν πτόνι δῆμῳ, Theog. 971

So much for the example comprising entry #1 on his list. We have now

shown that *πίονι δήμω* in line-final position belongs to other repeated segments and is not itself a freely occurring two-word dictional unit that belongs to one of ten different listed examples whose similarity can only be explained by pre-verbal gestalts — *πίονι δήμω* in line-final position actually participates, and is embedded, in a number of repeated line segments throughout the early epic corpus.

Now, for Nagler's *τίετο δήμω*, which is example #2 in his list given above. He writes that:

τίετο certainly sounds enough like *πίονι* for the resemblance to be called formulaic on subjective grounds, but the former is a different part of speech and stands again in a different syntactic relationship to the final word of the verse from the adjective, epithet or not. *πίονι δήμω* and *τίετο δήμω* therefore confront one with a strong resemblance not accounted for by even the broad (or 'soft-Parryan') concept of the structural formula. Only the most fundamental criterion for formulaic resemblance remains common to all the present examples — that of the metrical pattern itself; that is, the repeated metrical unit (colon?) in the same position and with the same internal distribution of word end.³⁸

But this is problematic, on almost every point. First of all, the line-final segment *τίετο δήμω* does not freely occur, but instead belongs to a line segment stretching from trochaic caesura to verse-end:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| ἀρητήρ ἐτέτυκτο, <u>θεὸς δ' ὧς τίετο δήμω,</u> | Il. 5.78 |
| Ἄργεῶν ἦνασσε, <u>θεὸς δ' ὧς τίετο δήμω.</u> | Il. 10.33 |
| Αἰνεΐαν θ', ὃς Τρωσὶ <u>θεὸς ὧς τίετο δήμω.</u> | Il. 11.58 |

³⁸ Cf. Russo 1966: 239 and Hainsworth 1968: 59 (and *passim*) with Nagler 1974: 7.

| | |
|---|------------|
| Αἰτωλοῖσιν ἀνασσε, <u>θεὸς δ' ὡς τίετο δῆμω</u> . | Il. 13.218 |
| Ἰδαίου ἐτέτυκτο, <u>θεὸς δ' ὡς τίετο δῆμω</u> . | Il. 16.605 |
| ὄς τότ' ἐνὶ Κρήτεσσι <u>θεὸς ὡς τίετο δῆμω</u> | Od. 14.205 |

For this reason, Nagler's claim that "πίονι δῆμω and τίετο δῆμω therefore confront one with a strong resemblance not accounted for by even the broad (or 'soft-Parryan') concept of the structural formula" is misleading, since both πίονι δῆμω and τίετο δῆμω belong to entirely different line segments and require absolutely no explanation—'soft Parryan' or other—in order to explain the fact that they have similar words in similar positions at the end of the line. They bear a resemblance to each other, to be sure, but their resemblance is merely the surface effect, or artifact, that has resulted from the fact that the longer segments to which they belong happen to have similar words in verse-final position.

When we consider example #3 from Nagler's list (ἴκετο δῆμον *Odyssey* 15.238), we find a similar problem with the analysis. The first thing to notice is that the verse is more closely related to example #10 (ἄλλων ἐξίκετο δῆμον, *Il* 24.481) than Nagler admits: he lists only ἴκετο δῆμον as the relevant segment for comparison, yet example #10 shows the existence of a corresponding genitive ἄλλων—which we have in both examples, and which is dependent on δῆμον in both instances:

| | |
|---|------------|
| 3. ἠγάγετο πρὸς δώμαθ'· ὁ δ' <u>ἄλλων ἴκετο δῆμον</u> , | Od. 15.238 |
|---|------------|

beside:

| | |
|---|------------|
| 10. φῶτα κατακτείνας <u>ἄλλων ἐξίκετο δῆμον</u> | Il. 24.481 |
|---|------------|

Though the verb in example #10 is prefixed, the two segments show ἄλλων placed just before the adonic segment || ἴκετο δῆμον in example #3 and the hephthemimeral in example #10 ἴ ἐξίκετο δῆμον. These are the only two examples of this verb followed by this object in the Homeric corpus, which is suggestive. To argue that both of the examples are (1) separate instances that justify being taken as separate items on the list, and (2) in a primary formulaic relation to πῖονι δήμῳ, rather than to each other, is difficult to maintain upon further scrutiny. Compare the following verse-final examples of || ἴκετο followed by a direct object:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Τυδείδης ὑπ' ἐμεῖο φοβούμενος ἴκετο νῆας. | Il. 8.149 |
| τάμνων δένδρεα μακρά, ἄδος τέ μιν ἴκετο θυμόν, | Il. 11.88 |
| αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἤβης ἐρικυδέος ἴκετο μέτρον, | Il. 11.225 |
| ἔνθεν ὑπεκπροφυγῶν πατρώϊον ἴκετο δῶμα. | Il. 21.44 |
| οὐδ' ὀλίγον· σὺ δὲ τοῦτον, ἐπεὶ τεὸν ἴκετο δῶμα, | Od. 3.368 |
| ὃς νέον Ἀλκινόοιο δαΐφρονος ἴκετο δῶμα | Od. 8.13 |
| ἀλλ' ἦ τοι τὸν ξεῖνον, ἐπεὶ τεὸν ἴκετο δῶμα, | Od. 16.78 |
| Τηλεμάχῳ μελέμεν· τοῦ γὰρ φίλον ἴκετο δῶμα.” | Od. 18.421 |
| ξείνων τηλεδαπῶν φιλίων ἐμόν ἴκετο δῶμα, | Od. 9.351 |
| εἰ νόστησ' Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ ὑπότροπος ἴκετο δῶμα· | Od. 20.332 |
| ξείνων τηλεδαπῶν φιλίων ἐμόν ἴκετο δῶμα· | Od. 24.268 |
| τὴν δ' ἄχος αἰνότερον καὶ κύντερον ἴκετο θυμόν. | H. to Dem. 90 |
| πρὶν γ' ὅτε δὴ Κελεοῖο δαΐφρονος ἴκετο δῶμα, | H. to Dem. 96 |
| ἔπλητ', ἔνθεν ἔπειτα περίρρυτον ἴκετο Κύπρον. | Theog. 193 |

and:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Οὐλύμπον δὲ δῖωκε, θεῶν δ' ἴ ἐξίκετο θώκους. | Il. 8.439 |
|--|-----------|

and:

φῶτα κατακτείνας ἄλλων ἴξικετο δῆμον
γαίης ἡμετέρης, ἄλλων δ' ἴαφικώμεθα δῆμον.

Il. 24.481
Od. 16.382

In light of these examples, it is clear that Nagler's examples #3 (ἴκετο δῆμον) and #10 (ἄλλων ἴξικετο δῆμον) belong not only to each other but to a much more pervasive system where ἴκετο is followed by a direct object with the shape $\sim \#$. This furthermore suggests the possibility that a template comprising a 'verb followed by a direct object occupying the same position' may also be part of the system here.

On the basis of what we have seen in the above examples, we can only conclude that Nagler's analysis, which was influential during the 1970s and 1980s, does not in fact show what he claims that it shows. Again, like Russo's appendix, the collected materials are highly suggestive and often extremely interesting. However, both require more precise analytical parameters, and methods, in order to discover what is going on from a purely diction-internal point of view, apart from considerations of hypothetical compositional process or oral formulaic poetics. Nothing in Nagler's evidence, for example, proves that the visible formulaic resemblances here must be pushed in the direction of an "open-ended family" or a "preverbal gestalt" that provides the only underlying solution. Surprising though the investigation of his actual examples may be, it is useful not only for removing a minor obfuscation in the history of the secondary literature but for clarifying ways of proceeding with formulaic, templatic, and modular analysis in the future.

APPENDIX

Modularity and the Verb

Here we list collections of verses, according to metrical position, with approximate relations to the syntactic patterns that organize them. Not all examples, of course, will follow the pattern exactly or precisely. Related lines have been added for purposes of reference and comparison.

Hepthemimeral + verb + nominative:

| | |
|---|------------|
| έν καθαρῶ, ὅθι δὴ νεκύων ἴ <u>διεφαίνετο χῶρος</u> | Π. 10.199 |
| έν καθαρῶ ὅθι δὴ νεκύων ἴ <u>διεφαίνετο χῶρος.</u> | Π. 8.491 |
| ῶ πέπον ἦ μὲν σοί γε πατήρ ἴ <u>ἐπετέλλετο Πηλεὺς</u> | Π. 9.252 |
| ἦ ῥά νύ τοι μεγάλων δῶρων ἴ <u>ἐπεμαίετο θυμὸς</u> | Π. 10.401 |
| χείλει ἐφεσταότες· ἀπὸ γὰρ ἴ <u>δειδίσσετο τάφρος</u> | Π. 12.52 |
| δὴ ῥά τότε ῶμωξεν καὶ ῶ ἴ <u>πεπλήγετο μηρῶ</u> | Π. 12.162 |
| τρίγληνα μορόεντα· χάρις ἴ <u>δ' ἀπελάμπετο πολλή.</u> | Π. 14.183 |
| “Ὡς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ Ἄρης θαλερῶ ἴ <u>πεπλήγετο μηρῶ</u> | Π. 15.113 |
| πολλὰ μὲν ἄρ μάστιγι θοῆ ἴ <u>ἐπεμαίετο θείνων,</u> | Π. 17.430 |
| ἠνιόχοιο πόθω· θαλερῆ ἴ <u>δ' ἐμαίετο χαίτη</u> | Π. 17.439 |
| ῶμωξέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ῶ ἴ <u>πεπλήγετο μηρῶ</u> | Π. 15.397 |
| ἄψασθαι, χλωρός περ ἐών, ἴ <u>διεφαίνετο δ' αἰνῶς,</u> | Od. 9.379 |
| οἴκαδ' ἐλαυνομένην; καὶ δὴ ἴ <u>προῦφαίνετο πᾶσα.”</u> | Od. 13.169 |
| ῶμωξέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ῶ ἴ <u>πεπλήγετο μηρῶ</u> | Od. 13.198 |
| έννεα νῆας στεῖλα, θοῶς ἴ <u>δ' ἐσαγείρετο λαός.</u> | Od. 14.248 |
| τρίγληνα μορόεντα, χάρις ἴ <u>δ' ἀπελάμπετο πολλή·</u> | Od. 18.298 |
| ῥέξας μηρί' ἔκαιον· ὁ δ' οὐκ ἴ <u>ἐμπάζετο ἱρῶν,</u> | Od. 9.553 |
| ὡς ἄρ' ἔφαν μνηστῆρες, ὁ δ' οὐκ ἴ <u>ἐμπάζετο μύθων.</u> | Od. 17.488 |
| ὡς ἄρ' ἔφαν, Ἴρω δὲ κακῶς ἴ <u>ὠρίνετο θυμός.</u> | Od. 18.75 |
| ἀμφαγαπαζόμεναι· τοῦ δ' οὐ ἴ <u>μειλίσσετο θυμός·</u> | Dem. 290 |
| “Ὡς φάτο λισσομένη· τῆς δ' οὐκ ἴ <u>ἐπεπείθετο θυμός.</u> | Dem. 324 |
| βότρυνες· ἀμφ' ἰστόν δὲ μέλας ἴ <u>εἰλίσσετο κισσός</u> | Diony. 40 |

Hepthemimeral + verb + accusative:

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Ἄργείους καὶ νῆας, ἐπεὶ Διὸς ἴ <u>ἐτράπετο φρήν.</u> | Π. 10.45 |
| τοὺς ὅ γε συγκαλέσας πυκινὴν ἴ <u>ἀρτύνετο βουλήν.</u> | Π. 10.302 |
| ἔγχος· ὁ δὲ φρεσὶν ἦσι χάρη καὶ ἴ <u>ἔέλπετο νίκην.</u> | Π. 13.609 |
| ἦμενον, οὐδ' ἔτι κείτο, νέον ἴ <u>δ' ἔσαγεῖρετο θυμόν,</u> | Π. 15.240 |
| εἷ μιν ἀριστεύοντα βαλὼν ἴ <u>ἐξείλετο θυμόν.</u> | Π. 15.460 |
| ὅς τε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἄνδρα φοβεῖ ἴ <u>καὶ ἀφείλετο νίκην</u> | Π. 16.689 |
| ὅς τε καὶ ἄλκιμον ἄνδρα φοβεῖ ἴ <u>καὶ ἀφείλετο νίκην</u> | Π. 17.177 |
| ἴζε δ' ἄρ' ἐν μέσσοισι, Διὸς ἴ <u>δ' ἐξεῖρετο βουλήν.</u> | Π. 20.15 |
| πυκνὰ μάλα στενάχοντα· μόγις ἴ <u>δ' ἔσαγεῖρετο θυμόν.</u> | Π. 21.417 |
| φῶτα κατακτείνας ἄλλων ἴ <u>ἐξίκετο δῆμον</u> | Π. 24.481 |
| τηκεδόνι στυγερῆ μελέων ἴ <u>ἐξεῖλετο θυμόν.</u> | Od. 11.201 |
| ἰππόθεν ἐξέμεναι, ξίφειος ἴ <u>δ' ἐπεμαίετο κώπην</u> | Od. 11.531 |
| πρῶτον ἐπηπείλησε, Διὸς ἴ <u>δ' ἐξεῖρετο βουλήν.</u> | Od. 13.127 |
| ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κείνος ἔρυκε, Διὸς ἴ <u>δ' ὠπίζετο μῆνιν</u> | Od. 14.283 |
| κῆρυξ γάρ οἱ ἔειπε Μένδων, ἴ <u>ὅς ἐπέυθετο βουλάς.</u> | Od. 16.412, 4.677 |
| τειρόμενος πάντων οἴων ἴ <u>ἐπεμαίετο νῶτα</u> | Od. 9.441 |
| τῶν μὲν τ' ἠέλιος φαέθων ἴ <u>ἐξεῖλετο θυμόν.</u> | Od. 22.388 |
| δακρυόφιν πίμπλαντο, γόον ἴ <u>δ' ὠίετο θυμός.</u> | Od. 20.349 |
| ἔσφαζον, πολλὸς δὲ πίθων ἴ <u>ἠφύσσετο οἶνος·</u> | Od. 23.305 |
| θυμῷ χωομένης, στερεῶς ἴ <u>δ' ἠναίνετο μύθους.</u> | Dem. 330 |
| ἀμφαγαπαζόμεναι, ἀχέων ἴ <u>δ' ἀπεπαύετο θυμός.</u> | Dem. 436 |
| αὐτῷ ἐφεζομένη πυκινὰς ἴ <u>φραζέσκετο βουλάς·</u> | Apollo 436 |
| σὺν δ' ἐφόρει ξύλα πολλά, πυρὸς ἴ <u>δ' ἐπεμαίετο τέχνην.</u> | Herm. 108 |
| ὥς ἔφατ' Ἀντίνοος· ὁ δ' ἄρ' οὐκ ἴ <u>ἐμπάζετο μύθων.</u> | Od. 20.275 |
| Οὐλύμπων δὲ δίκωκε, θεῶν ἴ <u>δ' ἐξίκετο θώκους.</u> | Π. 8.439 |

Hepthemimeral + verb + genitive:

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Ἄδρηστος δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα λαβῶν ἴ <u>ἐλίσσετο γούνων·</u> | Π. 6.45 |
| αὐτὰρ ὁ τῆ ἐτέρῃ μὲν ἐλῶν ἴ <u>ἐλλίσσετο γούνων,</u> | Π. 21.71 |
| χρυσείην εὐτυκτον, ἐοῦ ἴ <u>δ' ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου,</u> | Π. 8.44, 13.26 |
| Σπερχόμενος δ' ὁ γεραῖος ἐοῦ ἴ <u>ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου,</u> | Π. 24.322 |
| ἐν χεῖρεσσ' Ὀδυσῆϊ τίθει, ἴ <u>ἐπεβήσετο δ' ἵππων·</u> | Π. 10.529 |
| μητέρ' ἐμήν· ἠ δ' αἰὲν ἐμὲ ἴ <u>λισσέσκετο γούνων</u> | Π. 9.451 |
| ὥς φάν· ὁ δ' ὑπόροφον θάλαμον ἴ <u>κατεβήσετο πατρός,</u> | Od. 2.337 |
| βάλλομεν· οὐδ' ὁ γέρων δολίης ἴ <u>ἐπελήθετο τέχνης,</u> | Od. 4.455 |
| Εὐρύλοχος δ' ἐτάροισι κακῆς ἴ <u>ἐξήρχετο βουλής·</u> | Od. 12.339 |

αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' ἀμφοτέρησι λαβῶν ἴ ἐλλίσσετο γούνων

Od. 10.264

Hepthemimeral + verb + dative:

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| νεΐατον ἐς κενεῶνα ὅθι ἴ <u>ζωννύσκετο μήτρη</u> : | Π. 5.857 |
| νεΐκει ὄνειδίζων, μέγα δὲ ἴ <u>στεναχίζετο θυμῶ</u> : | Π. 7.95 |
| Ἄτρεΐδην προσέειπε καὶ ἴ <u>ἐξερεεΐνετο μύθῳ</u> : | Π. 10.81 |
| Αἰνεῖαν θ', ὅς Τρωσὶ θεὸς ἴ <u>ὥς τίετο δήμῳ</u> , | Π. 11.58 |
| Ἵως φάτο, κώκυσεν δὲ γυνή ἴ <u>καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Π. 24.200 |
| Ἵως φάτο, γήθησεν δ' ὁ γέρων, ἴ <u>καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Π. 24.424 |
| Ἵως ἔφατ', ἔδεισεν δ' ὁ γέρων ἴ <u>καὶ ἐπέιθετο μύθῳ</u> . | Π. 24.571 |
| ὅς τότ' ἐνὶ Κρήτεσσι θεὸς ἴ <u>ὥς τίετο δήμῳ</u> | Od. 14.205 |
| τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε γυνή ἴ <u>καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Od. 15.434 |
| τοῖς δ' αὖτις μετέειπε γυνή ἴ <u>καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Od. 15.439 |
| τὸν δ' αὖ διογενῆς Ὀδυσσεύς ἴ <u>ἠμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Od. 15.485 |
| πάντα δ' ἔσαν νεόδαρτα· δόλον ἴ <u>δ' ἐπεμήδετο πατρί</u> . | Od. 4.437 |
| πατρί φίλῳ· ὁ δὲ πάντα νόει ἴ <u>καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Od. 6.67 |
| ὥς ἐφάμην, ὁ δὲ μ' οἰμῶξας ἴ <u>ἠμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Od. 11.59 |
| δέρτρον ἔσω δύνοντες· ὁ δ' οὐκ ἴ <u>ἀπαμύνετο χερσὶ</u> . | Od. 11.579 |
| ὅς κείνον τελαμῶνα ἐῆ ἴ <u>ἐγκάτθετο τέχνῃ</u> . | Od. 11.614 |
| αὐτίκα δ' Εὐρύλοχος στυγερῶ ἴ <u>μ' ἠμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Od. 12.278 |
| ἦνδανε κηρύκων καὶ σφιν ἴ <u>παρεγίνετο δαιτί</u> : | Od. 17.173 |
| ῥεῖα λαθῶν Εὐμαιον, ἄφαρ ἴ <u>δ' ἐρεεΐνετο μύθῳ</u> : | Od. 17.305 |
| ὥς ἐφάμην, ὁ δὲ μ' οἰμῶξας ἴ <u>ἠμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Od. 9.506 |
| ὥς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ φίλῳ ἴ <u>ἐπεπέιθετο πατρί</u> , | Od. 19.14 |
| ὥς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ φίλῳ ἴ <u>ἐπεπέιθετο πατρί</u> , | Od. 22.108, 2.393 |
| τὴν δ' ἄτην οὐ πρόσθεν ἔῳ ἴ <u>ἐγκάτθετο θυμῶ</u> | Od. 23.223 |
| ὥς ἄρ' ἔφη Ἑκάτη· τὴν δ' οὐκ ἴ <u>ἠμείβετο μύθῳ</u> | Dem. 59 |
| Ἵως φάτο, τὴν δ' Ὑπεριονίδης ἴ <u>ἠμείβετο μύθῳ</u> : | Dem. 74 |
| κυάνεος ῥαδινοῖσι θεᾶς ἴ <u>ἐλελίζετο ποσσίν</u> . | Dem. 183 |
| παῖδ' ἀνὰ χερσὶν ἐλοῦσα ἔῳ ἴ <u>ἐγκάτθετο κόλπῳ</u> , | Dem. 286 |

Bucolic Diaeresis + verb + nominative:

| | |
|---|----------|
| ἀλλ' ἀλαπαδνὸς ἔην, παῦρος δὲ οἱ <u>εἶπετο λαός</u> . | Π. 2.675 |
| υἱὸς Πειριθόιοιο τὸν ἀθάνατος <u>τέκετο Ζεὺς</u> : | Π. 2.741 |
| ἐς δ' ὄχεα φλόγεα ποσὶ βήσετο, <u>λάζετο δ' ἔγχος</u> | Π. 5.745 |
| ἔνθ' αὖτε Γλαύκῳ Κρονίδης φρένας <u>ἐξέλετο Ζεὺς</u> , | Π. 6.234 |
| ἔγχος ἔχ' ἐνδεκάπηχ'· πάροιθε δὲ <u>λάμπετο δουρὸς</u> | Π. 6.319 |
| ἀμβρατός ἐστι πόλις καὶ ἐπίδρομον <u>ἔπλετο τεῖχος</u> . | Π. 6.434 |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Νέστωρ, οἱ καὶ πρόσθεν ἀρίστη <u>φαίνετο βουλή</u> · | Π. 7.325 |
| Ἔκτορος ἀντικρύ, βαλέειν δέ ἐ <u>ἴετο θυμός</u> · | Π. 8.301, 310 |
| ἔς δ' ὄχεα φλόγεα ποσὶ βήσετο, <u>λάζετο δ' ἔγχος</u> | Π. 8.389 |
| ἔγχος ἔχ' ἑνδεκάπηχ'· πάροιθε δὲ <u>λάμπετο δουρός</u> | Π. 8.494 |
| Νέστωρ, οἱ καὶ πρόσθεν ἀρίστη <u>φαίνετο βουλή</u> · | Π. 9.94 |
| ἦδε δέ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη <u>φαίνετο βουλή</u> | Π. 10.17 |
| νησοῖν ἔπι γλαφυρῆσιν ἐλαυνέμεν· <u>ἦχθετο γὰρ κῆρ</u> · | Π. 11.274, 400 |
| ἦκε κακὸν Δαναοῖσι, μίνυνθα δὲ <u>χάζετο δουρός</u> · | Π. 11.539 |
| ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ Πυλίων καὶ Ἐπειῶν <u>ἔπλετο νεῖκος</u> , | Π. 11.737 |
| τείχεος ἔντοσθεν, μέγα δὲ σφισι <u>φαίνετο ἔργον</u> · | Π. 12.416 |
| τρὶς μὲν ὀρέξατ' ἰών, τὸ δὲ τέτρατον <u>ἴκετο τέκμωρ</u> | Π. 13.20 |
| λάθρη ὑπεξαναδύς πολιῆς ἀλός· <u>ἦχθετο γὰρ ῥα</u> | Π. 13.352 |
| Ἰδομενεὺς δ' οὐ λῆγε μένος μέγα, <u>ἴετο δ' αἰεὶ</u> | Π. 13.424 |
| ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ κροτάφοισι φαινή <u>σεῖετο πήληξ</u> · | Π. 13.805 |
| ἦδε δέ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη <u>φαίνετο βουλή</u> | Π. 14.161 |
| βήτην, ἀκροτάτη δὲ ποδῶν ὑπο <u>σεῖετο ὕλη</u> · | Π. 14.285 |
| ὄσση ἄρα Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν <u>ἔπλετο φωνή</u> | Π. 14.400 |
| Ζάνθου δινήεντος, ὃν ἀθάνατος <u>τέκετο Ζεὺς</u> , | Π. 14.434 |
| χλωροὶ ὑπαὶ δαίους πεφοβημένοι· <u>ἔγρετο δὲ Ζεὺς</u> | Π. 15.4 |
| τρεῖς γάρ τ' ἐκ Κρόνου εἰμὲν ἀδελφοὶ οὓς <u>τέκετο Ῥέα</u> | Π. 15.187 |
| πήληξ βαλλομένη καναχὴν ἔχε, <u>βάλλετο δ' αἰεὶ</u> | Π. 16.105 |
| τοῖο μὲν Αὐτομέδων δουρικλυτὸς <u>εὔρετο τέκμωρ</u> · | Π. 16.472 |
| ἦκε δ' ἐρείσάμενος, οὐδὲ δὴν <u>χάζετο φωτός</u> , | Π. 16.736 |
| δούρατ' ἀνασχόμενοι· μάλα δὲ σφισιν <u>ἔλπετο θυμὸς</u> | Π. 17.234 |
| εἴλκεον ἀμφότεροι· μάλα δὲ σφισιν <u>ἔλπετο θυμὸς</u> | Π. 17.395 |
| ἦϊσαν ἀμφότεροι· μάλα δὲ σφισιν <u>ἔλπετο θυμὸς</u> | Π. 17.495 |
| δακρυόφι πλησθεν, θαλερὴ δὲ οἱ <u>ἔσχετο φωνή</u> · | Π. 17.696 |
| τέκνον τί κλαίεις; τί δὲ σε φρένας <u>ἴκετο πένθος</u> ; | Π. 18.73 |
| γάστρην μὲν τρίποδος πῦρ ἄμφεπε, <u>θέρμετο δ' ὕδωρ</u> · | Π. 18.348 |
| ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀσάμην καὶ μευ φρένας <u>ἔξέλετο Ζεὺς</u> , | Π. 19.137 |
| χρῦσειοὶ σύνεχον καὶ διπλόος <u>ἦντετο θώρηξ</u> · | Π. 20.415 |
| Ζάνθου δινήεντος, ὃν ἀθάνατος <u>τέκετο Ζεὺς</u> , | Π. 21.2 |
| Ἵως ἄρα φωνήσας πάλιν ἐτράπετ'· <u>αἶδετο γὰρ ῥα</u> | Π. 21.468 |
| οὐδ' Ἀγαμέμνονι πάμπαν ἐήνδανε· <u>βούλετο γὰρ ῥα</u> | Od. 3.143 |
| αὐτῷ δ' οὐ πω φαωνετ' ἐναντίη· <u>αἶδετο γὰρ ῥα</u> | Od. 6.329 |
| πρόσθε μὲν ἵππηες, μετὰ δὲ νέφος <u>εἶπετο πεζῶν</u> | Π. 23.133 |
| δακρυόφι πλησθεν, θαλερὴ δὲ οἱ <u>ἔσχετο φωνή</u> · | Π. 23.397 |
| κυάνεον, τοῦ δ' οὐ τι μελάντερον <u>ἔπλετο ἔσθος</u> · | Π. 24.94 |
| Ζάνθου δινήεντος, ὃν ἀθάνατος <u>τέκετο Ζεὺς</u> | Π. 24.693 |
| οὐδὲ γυνή· πάντα γὰρ ἀσχετον <u>ἴκετο πένθος</u> · | Π. 24.708 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| τοῖσι δὲ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἤρχετο μύθων· | Od. 1.367 |
| φεῦγον, ἐπεὶ γίνωσκον, ὃ δὴ κακὰ μῆδετο δαίμων. | Od. 3.166 |
| δακρυόφιν πλησθεν, θαλερὴ δέ οἱ ἔσχετο φωνή. | Od. 4.705 |
| ἦλθον γὰρ καὶ κεῖσε, πολὺς δέ μοι ἔσπετο λαός. | Od. 6.164 |
| τοῖσιν δ' Ἀρήτη λευκώλενος ἤρχετο μύθων· | Od. 7.233 |
| οὐδὲ Ποσειδάωνα γέλωσ ἔχε, λίσσετο δ' αἰεὶ | Od. 8.344 |
| γάστρην μὲν τρίποδος πῦρ ἄμφεπε, θέρμετο δ' ὕδωρ· | Od. 8.437 |
| ἦδε δέ μοι κατὰ θυμὸν ἄρωστη φαίνετο βουλή· | Od. 9.318 |
| ἦδε δέ μοι κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή· | Od. 9.424 |
| ἀλλ' ἤμην ἀλλοφρονέων, κακὰ δ' ὄσσετο θυμός. | Od. 10.374 |
| ἦδε δέ μοι κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή· | Od. 11.230 |
| τοῖσιν δ' Ἀρήτη λευκώλενος ἤρχετο μύθων· | Od. 11.335 |
| καὶ τότε δὴ γίνωσκον, ὃ δὴ κακὰ μῆδετο δαίμων, | Od. 12.295 |
| ὀπταλέα τε καὶ ὤμά· βοῶν δ' ὥς γίνετο φωνή. | Od. 12.396 |
| τοῖσι δὲ Νεστορίδης Πεισίστρατος ἤρχετο μύθων· | Od. 15.166 |
| δακρυόφιν πλησθεν, θαλερὴ δέ οἱ ἔσχετο φωνή. | Od. 19.472 |
| τοῖσι δὲ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἤρχετο μύθων· | Od. 15.502 |
| ἦ οὐκ οἶσθ' ὅτε δεῦρο πατήρ τεός ἴκετο φεύγων, | Od. 16.424 |
| ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῆ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος. | Od. 17.57 |
| ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῆ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος· | Od. 19.29 |
| τῆς δ' ἄρ' ἀκουούσης ῥέε δάκρυα, τήκετο δὲ χρώς. | Od. 19.04 |
| ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῆ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος, | Od. 21.386 |
| “ἦ τις θηητῆρ καὶ ἐπῖκλοπος ἔπλετο τόξων· | Od. 21.397 |
| ὥς ἄρ' ἐφώνησεν, τῆ δ' ἄπτερος ἔπλετο μῦθος, | Od. 22.398 |
| ὤλεσε τηλοῦ νόστον Ἀχαιίδος, ὤλετο δ' αὐτός.” | Od. 23.68 |
| λυγρὴν, ἐξ ἧς πρῶτα καὶ ἡμέας ἴκετο πένθος. | Od. 23.224 |
| Νέστωρ, οὗ καὶ πρόσθεν ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή | Od. 24.52 |
| αὐτὸς δὲ πρῶτιστα περὶ χροῖ δύσετο χαλκόν· | Od. 22.113 |
| μακρὰ τινάσσοντας· μέγα δ' αὐτῶι φαίνετο ἔργον. | Od. 22.149 |
| τόσσον ἔπ' ὠδίνουσα ἔκηβόλον ἴκετο Λητώ, | Apollo 45 |
| οὐλα λαβῶν ἐπέθηκεν ἐπηετανά· λάμπετο δὲ φλόξ | Herm. 113 |
| δοιὰς ἄγχι πυρός, δύναμις δέ οἱ ἔπλετο πολλή· | Herm. 117 |
| γηρύετ' ἀμβολάδην, ἐρατὴ δέ οἱ ἔσπετο φωνή, | Herm. 426 |
| ἦδε δέ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή· | Aphr. 235 |
| “ὣς εἰπὼν ἰστόν τε καὶ ἰστίον ἔλκετο νηός. | Diony. 32 |

Bucolic Diaeresis + verb + accusative:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Περγάμου ἑκκατιδῶν, Τρώεσσι δὲ βούλετο νίκην· | Il. 7.21 |
| τοῖς ὁ γέρων πάμπρωτος ὑφαίνειν ἤρχετο μῆτιν | Il. 7.324 |

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Τυδείδης ὑπ' ἐμεῖο φοβούμενος <u>ἴκετο νῆας.</u> | Π. 8.149 |
| τοῖς ὁ γέρων πάμπρωτος ὑφαίνειν <u>ἤρχετο μῆτιν</u> | Π. 9.93 |
| εἶατο παννύχιοι, πυρὰ δέ σφισι <u>καίετο πολλά.</u> | Π. 8.554 |
| τῶν τότε καί ῥα ἄνακτος ἐναντίον <u>εἶλετο τόξον</u> | Π. 9.559 |
| πολλὰς ἐκ κεφαλῆς προθελύμνους <u>ἔλκετο χαίτας</u> | Π. 10.15 |
| αἴθωνος μεγάλοιο ποδηνεκές, <u>εἶλετο δ' ἔγχος.</u> | Π. 10.24, 178 |
| τάμνων δένδρεα μακρά, ἄδος τέ μιν <u>ἴκετο θυμόν,</u> | Π. 11.88 |
| αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ῥ' ἤβης ἐρικυδέος <u>ἴκετο μέτρον,</u> | Π. 11.225 |
| Ζεὺς μὲν ῥα Τρώεσσι καὶ Ἔκτορι <u>βούλετο νῆκην</u> | Π. 13.347 |
| ἄλτ' ἐπὶ Πεισάνδρῳ· ὁ δ' ὑπ' ἀσπίδος <u>εἶλετο καλήν</u> | Π. 13.611 |
| εἶος ὁ τῶ πολέμιζε μένων, ἔτι δ' <u>ἔλπετο νίκην,</u> | Π. 15.539 |
| Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, Τρώεσσι δὲ <u>βούλετο νίκην·</u> | Π. 16.121 |
| πρόσσω ἰέμενοι, ἐπὶ δ' Ἔκτορι <u>κέκλετο θυμός·</u> | Π. 16.382 |
| ἐς δίφρον δ' ἀναβάς φύγαδ' ἔτραπε, <u>κέκλετο δ' ἄλλους</u> | Π. 16.657 |
| σκαίῃ ἔγχος ἔχων· ἐτέρηφι δὲ <u>λάζετο πέτρον</u> | Π. 16.734 |
| ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ τὸ <u>ἔλπετο πάμπαν</u> | Π. 17.406 |
| στάσκε μέγα ἰάχων· ὀπίσω δ' οὐ <u>χάζετο πάμπαν.</u> | Π. 18.160 |
| Πουλυδάμαντι δ' ἄρ' οὐ τις ὅς ἐσθλήν <u>φράζετο βουλήν.</u> | Π. 18.313 |
| φάσγανον οἶον ἔχων, κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ <u>μήδετο ἔργα,</u> | Π. 21.19 |
| ἔνθεν ὑπεκπροφυγῶν πατρώϊον <u>ἴκετο δῶμα.</u> | Π. 21.44 |
| χαλκῶ δηϊόων· κακὰ δὲ φρεσὶ <u>μήδετο ἔργα·</u> | Π. 23.176 |
| Ἥ ῥα, καὶ Ἔκτορα δῖον ἀεικέα <u>μήδετο ἔργα.</u> | Π. 22.395, 23.24 |
| θαρσύνων ἔπεσιν, μέγα δ' αὐτῶ <u>βούλετο νίκην.</u> | Π. 23.682 |
| καὶ τότε δὴ Ζεὺς λυγρὸν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ <u>μήδετο νόστον</u> | Od. 3.132 |
| οἴκαδε ἰέμενοι· Ζεὺς δ' οὐ πῶ <u>μήδετο νόστον,</u> | Od. 3.160 |
| οὐδ' ὀλίγον· σὺ δὲ τοῦτον, ἐπεὶ τεὸν <u>ἴκετο δῶμα,</u> | Od. 3.368 |
| ἂν δ' ἄρα Τηλέμαχος περικαλλέα <u>βήσετο δίφρον·</u> | Od. 3.481 |
| υἱέει δὲ Σπάρτηθεν Ἀλέκτορος <u>ἤγετο κούρην,</u> | Od. 4.10 |
| ὥς φάθ', ὁ δὲ μεγάροιο διέσσυτο, <u>κέκλετο δ' ἄλλους</u> | Od. 4.37 |
| οὐδ' ὁ γ' ἀληθέα εἶπε, πάλιν δ' ὁ γε <u>λάζετο μῦθον,</u> | Od. 13.254 |
| ἄλλον ἐποτρύνειεν, ἐπεὶ ἐο <u>κῆδετο λήην·</u> | Od. 14.461 |
| ἠγάγετο πρὸς δῶμαθ'· ὁ δ' ἄλλων <u>ἴκετο δῆμον,</u> | Od. 15.238 |
| ἀλλ' ἦ τοι τὸν ξεῖνον, ἐπεὶ τεὸν <u>ἴκετο δῶμα,</u> | Od. 16.78 |
| Αἴγισθος δολόμητις ἄγων, ὑπὸ δ' <u>ἔσχετο μισθὸν</u> | Od. 4.525 |
| καὶ τότε Ὀδυσσῆϊ μεγαλήτορι <u>μήδετο πομπήν·</u> | Od. 5.233 |
| ὅς νέον Ἀλκινόοιο δαίφρονος <u>ἴκετο δῶμα</u> | Od. 8.13 |
| καὶ τότε πῦρ ἀνέκαιε καὶ εἴσιδεν, <u>εἶρετο δ' ἡμεας·</u> | Od. 9.251 |
| ἔνθα μὲν οὔτε βοῶν οὔτ' ἀνδρῶν <u>φαίνετο ἔργα,</u> | Od. 10.98 |
| ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἀμφ' μοισιν ἀεικέα <u>βάλλετο πήρην,</u> | Od. 17.197 |
| ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἀμφ' μοισιν ἀεικέα <u>βάλλετο πήρην,</u> | Od. 18.108 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Τηλεμάχῳ μελέμεν· τοῦ γὰρ φίλον <u>ἴκετο δῶμα.</u> ” | Od. 18.421 |
| προσφύε’ ἐξ αὐτῆς, ὅθ’ ἐπὶ μέγα <u>βάλλετο κῶας.</u> | Od. 19.8 |
| ξείνων τηλεδαπῶν φιλίων ἐμόν <u>ἴκετο δῶμα,</u> | Od. 19.51 |
| λικριφὶς αἶξας, οὐδ’ ὀστέον <u>ἴκετο φωτός.</u> | Od. 19.51 |
| σίτου δ’ οὐκέτ’ ἔφη πεινήμεναι· <u>εἶρετο γὰρ μιν.</u> | Od. 20.137 |
| εἰ νόστησ’ Ὀδυσσεὺς καὶ ὑπότροπος <u>ἴκετο δῶμα·</u> | Od. 20.332 |
| ξείνων τηλεδαπῶν φιλίων ἐμόν <u>ἴκετο δῶμα·</u> | Od. 24.26 |
| τὴν δ’ ἄχος αἰνότερον καὶ κύντερον <u>ἴκετο θυμόν.</u> | Dem. 90 |
| πρὶν γ’ ὅτε δὴ Κελεοῖο δαίφρονος <u>ἴκετο δῶμα,</u> | Dem. 96 |
| κίδνατο, πολλὰ δὲ μῆλα ταναύποδα <u>βόσκετο ποθην.</u> | Herm. 232 |
| ἦϊσαν· ἡ δ’ ὀρώσα μετὰ φρεσὶ <u>τέρπετο θυμόν</u> | Aphr. 72 |

Bucolic Diaeresis + verb + genitive:

| | |
|---|------------|
| ζῶν ἔτ’ ἀσπαίροντα, ἴ και οὔ πω <u>λήθετο χάρμης,</u> | Il. 12.203 |
| αὐτίκ’ ἐπεὶ τ’ ἐνόησεν· ὅμως δ’ οὐ <u>λήθετο χάρμης,</u> | Il. 12.393 |
| ἡελίου ὀξεῖα, νέφος δ’ οὐ <u>φαίνετο πάσης</u> | Il. 17.372 |
| τῆσι δὲ Ναυσικάα λευκώλενος <u>ἦρχετο μολπῆς.</u> | Od. 6.101 |
| ἴχνη ἀποστρέψας· δολίης δ’ οὐ <u>λήθετο τέχνης</u> | Herm. 76 |
| θάρσος ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θῆκε καὶ ἐκ δέος <u>εἶλετο γυίων.</u> | Od. 6.140 |
| ὄφρα μοι ἐκ κάματον θυμοφθόρον <u>εἶλετο γυίων.</u> | Od. 10.363 |
| βόμβησαν δ’ ἄρα πάντα κατὰ ρόον· <u>ἔσχετο δ’ αὐτοῦ</u> | Od. 12.204 |

Bucolic Diaeresis + verb + dative:

| | |
|---|------------|
| πὰρ δέ οἱ ἴρις ἔβαινε καὶ ἠνία <u>λάζετο χερσὶ,</u> | Il. 5.365 |
| ἀρητήρ ἐτέτυκτο, θεὸς δ’ ὧς <u>τίετο δήμῳ,</u> | Il. 5.78 |
| πάλλων δ’ ὀξέα δοῦρα κατὰ στρατόν <u>ῶχετο πάντη</u> | Il. 6.104 |
| Ἰλίου εὐρῶσιν, ἐπεὶ ὧς φίλον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῷ</u> | Il. 7.31 |
| τῶν δ’ Ἐλενος Πριάμοιο φίλος παῖς <u>σύνθετο θυμῷ</u> | Il. 7.44 |
| Ἄργεῶν ἠνασσε, θεὸς δ’ ὧς <u>τίετο δήμῳ.</u> | Il. 10.33 |
| νηας ἔπι γλαφυράς· τῆ γὰρ φίλον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῷ.</u> | Il. 10.531 |
| πάλλων δ’ ὀξέα δοῦρα κατὰ στρατόν <u>ῶχετο πάντη</u> | Il. 11.212 |
| νηας ἔπι γλαφυράς· τῆ γὰρ φίλον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῷ</u> | Il. 11.520 |
| Αἰτωλοῖσιν ἄνασσε, θεὸς δ’ ὧς <u>τίετο δήμῳ·</u> | Il. 13.218 |
| αἰὲν ἔχ’ ἠνίοχος θεράπων· ὃ δὲ <u>ἴετο θυμῷ</u> | Il. 13.386 |
| ἦμενον εἰσεῖδε, στυγερός δέ οἱ <u>ἔπλετο θυμῷ.</u> | Il. 14.158 |
| ἀλλ’ εἰ δὴ ρ’ ἐθέλεις καίτοι φίλον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῷ.</u> | Il. 14.337 |
| Ἰδαίου ἐτέτυκτο, θεὸς δ’ ὧς <u>τίετο δήμῳ.</u> | Il. 16.605 |
| ἀλλὰ κατ’ αὐτοὺς αἰὲν ὄρα καὶ <u>φράζετο θυμῷ,</u> | Il. 16.646 |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| τείχει ὑπο Τρώων· τό μιν οὐ ποτε <u>ἔλπετο θυμῶ</u> | Π. 17.404 |
| καρπαλίμως μάστιγα καὶ ἠνία <u>λάζετο χερσίν,</u> | Π. 17.482 |
| τρέσσε δὲ παπτήνας, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι <u>ἔλπετο θυμῶ</u> | Π. 17.603 |
| Τῶν δ' ἅπαν ἐπλήσθη πεδίον καὶ <u>λάμπετο χαλκῶ</u> | Π. 20.156 |
| Ἦ ρ' ὁ γέρων, πολιάς δ' ἄρ' ἀνὰ τρίχας <u>ἔλκετο χερσὶ</u> | Π. 22.77 |
| εἰ δέ μιν οἰκτίρεις καίτοι φίλος <u>ἔπλετο θυμῶ</u> | Π. 23.548 |
| καρπαλίμως μάστιγα καὶ ἠνία <u>λάζετο χερσίν,</u> | Π. 24.441 |
| παιδὸς γὰρ μῦθον πεπνυμένον <u>ἔνθετο θυμῶ.</u> | Od. 1.361 |
| Τηλεμάχῳ εἰκυῖα κατὰ πτόλιν <u>ῶχετο πάντη,</u> | Od. 2.383 |
| ἐκτελέσας μέγα ἔργον, ὃ οὐ ποτε <u>ἔλπετο θυμῶ.</u> | Od. 3.275 |
| ἐς δίφρον τ' ἀνέβαινε καὶ ἠνία <u>λάζετο χερσὶ,</u> | Od. 3.483 |
| πατροκασιγνήτῳ, ὅς τοι κότον <u>ἔνθετο θυμῶ,</u> | Od. 13.342 |
| αἰδέομαι· περὶ γὰρ μ' ἐφίλει καὶ <u>κῆδετο θυμῶ·</u> | Od. 14.146 |
| ἦ κ' ἀτέλεστ' εἶη, ὥς οἱ φίλον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῶ.</u> | Od. 8.571 |
| λήσειν ἐννοσίγαιον, ὃ τοι κότον <u>ἔνθετο θυμῶ,</u> | Od. 11.102 |
| ἔρξον ὅπως ἐθέλεις καίτοι φίλον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῶ.</u> " | Od. 13.145 |
| Δουλίχιόνδ' ἰέναι, ὅθι μοι φίλον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῶ·</u> | Od. 14.397 |
| τὴν δ' αὖτε προσέειπεν ἀνὴρ, ὅς <u>μίσγετο λάθρη·</u> | Od. 15.430. |
| ὅττι μάλιστ' ἐθέλεις καίτοι φίλον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῶ,</u> | Od. 18.113 |
| νευστάζων κεφαλῇ· δὴ γὰρ κακὸν <u>ᾔσοσετο θυμῶ.</u> | Od. 18.154 |
| “Κτήσιππ', ἦ μάλα τοι τόδε κέρδιον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῶ·</u> | Od. 20.304 |
| παιδὸς γὰρ μῦθον πεπνυμένον <u>ἔνθετο θυμῶ.</u> | Od. 21.355 |
| ὄσσα δ' ἄρ' ἄγγελος ᾤκα κατὰ πτόλιν <u>ῶχετο πάντη</u> | Od. 24.413 |
| πάσσατ' ἀκηχεμένη, οὐδὲ χροῶ <u>βάλλετο λουτροῖς.</u> | Dem. 50 |
| ἦγαγες· οὕτω που τῶ σῶ φίλον <u>ἔπλετο θυμῶ·</u> | Apollo 527 |

Line-final segments with verb ending in -ato localized before the bucolic diaeresis and followed by a line-end nominative subject (mostly) of the verb. First, from trochaic caesura to line-end:

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Θερσίτης· τῶ δ' ᾤκα <u>παρίστατο</u> <u>δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,</u> | Π. 2.244 |
| κυκλός', ὃ δ' ἐν μέσσοισι <u>παρίστατο</u> <u>ισόθεος φῶς,</u> | Π. 4.212 |
| Τεῦκρε πέπον δὴ νῶϊν <u>ἀπέκτατο</u> <u>πιστὸς ἑταῖρος</u> | Π. 15.438 |
| τεύχειν· ἔξοχα γὰρ μιν <u>ἐφίλατο</u> <u>Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη·</u> | Π. 5.61 |
| ἦ μάλα σ' οὐ βέλος ὠκὺ <u>δαμάσσατο</u> <u>πικρὸς οἰστός·</u> | Π. 5.278 |
| ταῦτ' ἄρα οἱ φρονέοντι <u>παρίστατο</u> <u>Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων</u> | Π. 16.716 |
| ᾠς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι <u>ἐπέπτατο</u> <u>δεξιὸς ὄρνις</u> | Π. 13.830 |
| ὥς κραιπνῶς μεμαῖα <u>διέπτατο</u> <u>πότνια Ἥρη·</u> | Π. 15.84 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| ὡς κραιπνῶς μεμαυῖα <u>διέπτατο</u> ὠκέα Ἴρις, | Π. 15.173 |
| καὶ τὸν μὲν μετὰ χερσὶν <u>ἐρύσατο</u> Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων | Π. 5.344 |
| Ἵως εἰπὼν οἱ παίδος <u>ὀρέξατο</u> φαίδιμος Ἐκτωρ· | Π. 6.466 |
| ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ βασιλῆα <u>κιχήσατο</u> Τυδέος υἱός, | Π. 10.494 |
| ἦλθε κακόν· νῦν αὐτέ <u>σ' ἐρύσατο</u> Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων | Π. 11.363 |
| δούπησεν δὲ πεσών· ὃ <u>δ' ἐπέυξατο</u> δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς· | Π. 11.449 |
| Πάτροκλος δὲ θύρησιν <u>ἐφίστατο</u> ἰσόθεος φῶς. | Π. 11.644 |
| Τεῦκρε πέπον δὴ νῶϊν <u>ἀπέκτατο</u> πιστὸς ἑταῖρος | Π. 15.438 |
| Ἀτρεΐδης, εἰ μὴ οἱ <u>ἀγάσσατο</u> Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, | Π. 17.72 |
| τῷ δὲ βαρὺ στενάχοντι <u>παρωστατο</u> πότνια μήτηρ, | Π. 18.70 |
| μύρονθ' ἢ δ' ἐν τοῖσι <u>παρίστατο</u> δῖα θεάων, | Π. 19.6 |
| Ἵως οἱ μὲν ῥ' ἐκάτερθε <u>καθήατο</u> μητιόωντες | Π. 20.153 |
| ἦλθε κακόν· νῦν αὐτέ <u>σ' ἐρύσατο</u> Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, | Π. 20.450 |
| εἰ μὴ Τυδέος υἱῖ <u>κοτέσσατο</u> Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, | Π. 23.284 |
| Εὐρύαλος δὲ οἱ οἶος <u>ἀνίστατο</u> ἰσόθεος φῶς | Π. 23.678 |
| ὡς κείνῳ ἀναφανδὰ <u>παρίστατο</u> Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη· — | Od. 3.222 |
| τῷ δὲ Βρισηῖς <u>παρελέξατο</u> καλλιπάρης. | Π. 24.676 |
| θῆκαν, ἐπεὶ σέ γε τοῖον <u>ἐγείνατο</u> Πηνελόπεια. | Od. 1.224 |
| τοῖσιν δ' ἀμφοτέροισιν <u>ἀγάσσατο</u> θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ. | Od. 4.658 |
| καὶ τότε ἔπειτ' ἄνεμος μὲν <u>ἐπαύσατο</u> ἠδὲ γαλήνη | Od. 5.391 |
| ὡς Ὀδυσῆ' ἀσπαστὸν <u>ἔείσατο</u> γαῖα καὶ ὕλη, | Od. 5.398 |
| ἶξε νέων, τῆ δὴ οἱ <u>ἔείσατο</u> χῶρος ἄριστος, | Od. 5.442 |
| ἔς ποταμόν, τῆ δὴ μοι <u>ἔείσατο</u> χῶρος ἄριστος, | Od. 7.281 |
| αὐτίκ' ἔπειτ' ἄνεμος μὲν <u>ἐπαύσατο</u> ἠδὲ γαλήνη | Od. 12.169 |
| ἀργύρεον· Ἐλένη δὲ <u>παρίστατο</u> καλλιπάρης | Od. 15.123 |
| ὡς ἄρα οἱ εἰπόντι <u>ἐπέπτατο</u> δεξιὸς ὄρνις, | Od. 15.160 |
| Τηλέμαχος δ' εὐνήθεν <u>ἀνίστατο</u> , ἰσόθεος φῶς, | Od. 20.125 |
| οὐκ ἔβαλες τὸν ξεῖνον· <u>ἀλεύατο</u> γὰρ βέλος αὐτός | Od. 20.305 |
| Λειώδης δὲ πρῶτος <u>ἀνίστατο</u> , Ἥνοπος υἱός, | Od. 21.144 |
| οὐ γὰρ τοι σέ γε τοῖον <u>ἐγείνατο</u> πότνια μήτηρ, | Od. 21.172 |
| κωρύκῃ· αὐτίκα γὰρ μοι <u>οἶσατο</u> θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ | Od. 9.213 |
| Ἀντινόου, τὸν πρῶτον <u>ἐνήρατο</u> δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς· | Od. 24.424 |
| ἐπεὶ δὴ μνηστῆρας <u>ἔτείσατο</u> δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, | Od. 24.482 |
| ἔς λιμέν', ἢ δ' ἀμάθοισιν <u>ἐχρωψατο</u> ποντοπόρος νηῦς | Apollo 439 |
| φοινὸν ἀποπνεῖουσ', ὃ δ' <u>ἐπηύξατο</u> Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων· | Apollo 362 |

Now, from the penthemimeral caesura to line-end:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| θῶρηκος γύαλον· <u>διὰ δ' ἔπτατο</u> πικρὸς οἶστος, | Π. 5.99 |
| θῶρηκος γύαλον, <u>ἀπὸ δ' ἔπτατο</u> πικρὸς οἶστος. | Π. 13.588 |

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| πολλὸν ἀποπλαγχθεὶς ἵ ἐκάς ἔπτατο πικρὸς οἴστος. | Π. 13.593 |
| τοῖσι δ' Ἐρευθαλίῳν ἵ πρόμος ἴστατο ἰσόθεος φῶς | Π. 7.136 |
| Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν ἀγορὴν ἵ ποιήσατο <u>τερπικέραυτος</u> | Π. 8.2 |
| Τρώων αὐτ' ἀγορὴν ἵ ποιήσατο φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ | Π. 8.489 |
| πένθει δ' ἀτλήτω ἵ <u>βεβολήατο</u> πάντες ἄριστοι. | Π. 9.3 |
| ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας ἵ ἠγήσατο <u>κυανοχαΐτης</u> | Π. 20.144 |
| Λαοδαμείη μὲν ἵ <u>παρελέξατο</u> μητίετα Ζεὺς, | Π. 6.198 |
| Ἄψ δ' ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ ἵ <u>τέτατο</u> κρατερὴ ὑσμίνη | Π. 17.544 |
| ἦγον· ἀτὰρ σὲ Ζεὺς ἵ ἔρρυσάτο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι. | Π. 20.194 |
| δούπησεν δὲ πεσῶν, ἵ ὃ δ' ἐπέυξατο <u>διὸς Ἀχιλλεύς</u> · | Π. 20.388 |
| καὶ τὸ μὲν ἄντα ἰδῶν ἵ ἠλεύατο φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ· | Π. 22.274 |
| λυγρόν, ὃν ἐκ Τροίης ἵ ἐπετείλατο <u>Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη</u> . | Od. 1.327 |
| καὶ δμῶων, οὓς μοι ἵ <u>λήϊσατο</u> <u>διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς</u> ·” | Od. 1.398 |
| ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας ἵ ἠγήσατο <u>Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη</u> | Od. 2.405, 3.29 |
| ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας ἵ ἠγήσατο <u>Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη</u> | Od. 7.37 |
| ὣς γὰρ οἱ χρεῖων ἵ <u>μυθήσατο</u> <u>Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων</u> | Od. 8.79 |
| αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἐδρέων. ἵ ἀνὰ δ' ἴστατο <u>διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς</u> , | Od. 13.56 |
| τῆμος δὴ νήσῳ ἵ <u>προσεπίλνατο</u> <u>ποντοπόρος νηῦς</u> . | Od. 13.95 |
| κήδετο οἰκῆων, ἵ οὓς <u>κθήσατο</u> <u>διὸς Ὀδυσσεύς</u> . | Od. 14.4 |
| ὣς εἰπὼν κλισίηνδ' ἵ ἠγήσατο <u>διὸς ὑφορβός</u> , | Od. 14.48 |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakker, E.J., and F. Fabbricotti. 1991. "Peripheral and nuclear semantics in Homeric diction. The case of dative expressions for spear," *Mnemosyne* 44:63-84.
- Bakker, E. J., and Nina van den Houten. 1992. "Aspects of Synonymy in Homeric Diction: An Investigation of Dative Expressions for 'Spear,'" *Classical Philology*, vol. 87, No. 1: 1-13.
- Barnes, Harry R. 1986. "The Colometric Structure of Homeric Hexameter," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 27:125-50.
- Bassett, Samuel E. 1919. "The Theory of the Homeric Caesura According to the Extant Remains of the Ancient Doctrine," *American Journal of Philology* 40:343-72.
- Clark, Matthew. 1997. *Out of Line: Homeric Composition Beyond the Hexameter*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Düntzer, Heinrich. 1872. *Homerische Abhandlungen*, Leipzig, 507-92.
- Edwards, Mark W. 1966. "Some Features of Homeric Craftsmanship." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, vol. 97:115-179.
- _____. 1986. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part I," *Oral Tradition* 1:171-230.
- _____. 1986. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part II," *Oral Tradition* 3:11-60.
- Ellendt, J.-E. 1861. "Über den Einfluss des Metrums auf Wortbildung und Wortverbindung," Königsberg 1861 (*Drei homerische Abhandlungen*, Leipzig 1864).

- Fränkel, Eduard. 1932. "Kolon und Satz: Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes, II." *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*: 319-54.
- Fränkel, Hermann. 1926. "Der kallimachische und der homerische Hexameter." *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (phil.-hist. Klasse):197-229.
- Fry, Donald K., Jr. 1967. "Old English Formulas and Systems," *English Studies* 48:193-204.
- Hainsworth, J.B. 1964. "Structure and Content in Epic Formulae: The Question of the Unique Expression," *Classical Quarterly*, 14: 155-164.
- _____. 1968. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1976. "Phrase-Clusters in Homer." In *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to Leonard R. Palmer on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday, June 5, 1976*, ed. by A. M. Davies and W. Meid, 83-86. *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft*, no. 16. Vienna: Ernst Becvar.
- Ingalls, Wayne B. 1970. "The Structure of the Homeric Hexameter: A Review," *Phoenix* 24:1-12.
- _____. 1972. "Another Dimension of the Homeric Formula." *Phoenix* 26: 111-22.
- _____. 1976. "The Analogical Formula in Homer." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 106:211-26.
- Lord, Albert Bates. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- _____. 1968. "Homer as Oral Poet," *HSCP* 72:1-46
- Meillet, Antoine. 1923. *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs*.
Paris.
- Minton, William W. 1965. "The Fallacy of the Structural Formula,"
Transactions of the American Philological Association 96:241-53.
- _____. "The Frequency and Structuring of Traditional Formulas in
Hesiod's Theogony," *HSCP* 79:25-54.
- Nagler, Michael. 1967. "Towards a Generative View of the Oral
Formula," *Transactions of the American Philological
Association* 98:269-311.
- _____. 1974. *Sponaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of
Homer*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California
Press.
- Notopoulos, James A. 1949. "Parataxis in Homer: A New Approach to
Homeric Literary Criticism," *Transactions of the American
Philological Association* 80:1-23.
- _____. 1950. "The Generic and Oral Composition in Homer"
Transactions of the American Philological Association 81:28-36
- _____. 1964. "Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry." *HSCP* 68: 1-77.
- O'Neill, Eugene, Jr. 1942. "The Localization of Metrical Word-Types in
the Greek Hexameter." *Yale Classical Studies* 8:103-78.
- Parry, Milman. 1971. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected
Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. by Adam Parry. Oxford
Clarendon Press.
- Porter, Howard N. 1949. "Repetition in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite."
American Journal of Philology, vol. 70, No. 3:249-272

- Russo, Joseph A. 1963. "A Closer Look at Homeric Formulas,"
Transactions of the American Philological Association 94:235-
247.
- _____. 1966. "The Structural Formula in Homeric Verse." *Yale
Classical Studies* 20:217-240.
- _____. 1968. "Homer Against His Tradition." *Arion* 7:275-95.
- Witte, Kurt. 1909-1913. "Zur homerischen Sprache." *Glotta* 1-4.
- _____. 1913. "Homeros B) Sprache," in *Pauly-Wissowa*, pp. 2213-2247.
Stuttgart.