PROBLEMS IN THE HOMERIC HEXAMETER

by

A. G. TSOPANAKIS

[ΛΕΥΚΗ ΣΕΛΙΔΑ]

PROBLEMS IN THE HOMERIC HEXAMETER

by

A. G. TSOPANAKIS

ἡ μὲν γὰρ πεζὴ λέξις οὐδενὸς οὔτε ὀνόματος οὔτε ῥήματος βιάζεται τοὺς χρόνους οὔτε μετατίθησιν, ἀλλ' οἵας παρείληφεν τῇ φύσει τὰς συλλαβὰς τάς τε μακρὰς καὶ τὰς βραχείας, τοιαύτας φυλάττει· ἡ δὲ μουσικὴ τε καὶ ῥυθμικὴ μεταβάλλουσιν αὐτοὺς μειοῦσαι καὶ παραύξουσαι, ὥστε πολλάκις εἰς τἀναντία μεταχωρεῖν· οὐ γὰρ ταῖς συλλαβαῖς ἀπευθύνουσι τοὺς χρόνους, ἀλλὰ τοῖς χρόνοις τὰς συλλαβάς.

(*Dion. Hal., De comp. 11 [64]*)

For more than 150 years there has been a constant interest in and inquiry about the dactylic hexameter[1], conducted by various eminent scholars, by whom many of its problems have been interpreted and solved. Yet we continue to be unable to explain certain common irregularities, such as the metrical hiatus—in which a final naked long vowel or diphthong preserves its long value, or a final naked short is not elided before the initial vowel of a word—, or the short vowel *(brevis in longo)* instead of one that should be long by position. The different theories and conjectures, based at times upon etymology, at times upon analogy or upon other aspects of historical Grammar, did shed some light on a few cases but they did not bring the problem on the whole any closer to its solution. The most radical effort for the interpretation of these irregulatities was made by MILMAN PARRY in his study «*Les formules et la métrique d' Homère*» (Paris 1928), in which the eminent American scholar, so prematurely lost, tried to apply to the hexameter as well his theory about formulas and their role in the composition of the homeric verse and of the epic poem (*L' épithète traditionnelle chez Homère. Paris* 1928). Until his death (†1935), PARRY had been mainly occu-

[1] S. The survey of EUGENE O' NEILL, Jr, <The Localization of metrical Word-types in the Greek Hexameter>, *Yale Class. Studies* 8, 1942, 160-178, and the references to even earlier treatises.

pied with the advancement of his theory of the *oral composition* of the epics, and this is the reason why, although he had grasped the problem rightly *by detaching it from the area of historical Grammar and connecting it with the internal conditions of the construction of the epic verse and the epic poems*, he had not the time to study it thoroughly; neither has any colleague or pupil of his made any approach in this direction. It was another American scholar—also of short life—who tried to approach the problem of the hexameter from another point of view: the metrical types of the individual words, and their frequency in various poets and periods; this was Eugene O' Neill Jr, who with his ‹The localization of Metrical Word-types in the Greek Hexameter: Homer, Hesiod and the Alexandrians›, *Yale Classical Studies* 8, 1942, 103-178, initiated another series of hexameter - studies[1]; among them we mention Howard N. Porter's ‹The Early Greek Hexameter›, *Yale Classical Studies* 12, 1951, 1-63, and the doctoral dissertation (not published yet) of his pupil Joseph A. Russo, *Word-Localization and the Formulaic Nature of the Homeric Hexameter: A Study of Homeric Language* (*Diss. Yale* 1962).

In Eugene O' Neill Jr's study, 48.431 words occurring in 7.152 hexametric verses of epic poets belonging to different periods (*Iliad*, *Odyssey*, *Hesiod*, *Aratus*, *Callimachus*, *Apollonius*, *Theocritus*) have been examined and classified according to their metrical form, frequency, and distribution in the different feet of the verse, with no consideration to metrical irregularities. Eugene O' Neill Jr's treatise is a fundamental contribution to the study of the hexameter, the significant results of which must be constantly taken into account. Since O' Neill Jr has irrefutably demonstrated that each word tends to occupy a particular place in the verse according to its individual metrical form, not only in the Homeric poems but in the later epic poets as well, it is obvious that the main problem of the poet is to successfully accomodate at the same time very different and often dissimilar facts, such as the meaning he wants to convey to his audience, the construction of the speech according to the laws of the Greek language, his artistic intention, and the metrical forms of the individual words. Thus, the formula becomes only a part—and a secondary one—of this complexity, and must conform itself to the iron laws of the individual metrical forms. Whenever the construction of the phrase causes a change in the grammatical or the metrical form, the formula is dissolved and another accomoda-

[1] S. also an earlier metrical study of E. O' Neill, Jr, ‹The importance of Final Syllables in Greek Verse›. *TAPA* 70, 1939, 256-294.

tion is sought and found according to the new metrical type of the word: Ἀχιλεύς or Ἀχιλλεύς, Ἀχιλῆ', Ἀχιλῆα, or Ἀχιλλῆα etc. belong to different metrical word-types, occupy different places in the verse, and are accompanied by different epitheta.

On this basis, I have been studying for some years the mechanism of the hiatus of a naked long vowel or diphthong, which is taken as long before a word with initial vowel *(long in hiatus)*. This usually happens in the thesis[1], but there are also frequent cases of it in the arsis. I have also studied—because I came to the conclusion that both cases belong to the same phenomenon—the presence of a short vowel instead of one long by position[2]. This too occurs almost exclusively in the thesis, but there are a few cases of it in the arsis as well. I will call the first: *chasmodic long*, the second: *pseudo-long*[3]. I have begun with the collection of all the words in which these two irregularities occur (in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*), and proceeded to their classification not according to their grammatical but to their metrical form. The material has already been arranged, and I hope to be able to publish it soon together with the general remarks that arise from such an orientation of the inquiry. Of course, if such a position is correct, much more work will follow. In the present paper I will try to give an example of the kind of investigation on which my research is based[4].

***

The epic poet—like all prosody poets—in his effort to draw out

---

[1] Thesis=θέσις, *ictus*, the long syllable with the accent.

[2] *Parry, Form.* p. 4 speaks of «la nature générale des ces causes» (=difficulties in versification) and of «ces causes doivent être les mêmes que celles qu' ont provoqué l' emploi de la syllabe finale brève au temps fort»; but his explanation («le poète trouvait plus facile d' exposer sa pensée par des mots entraînant des irrégularités métriques que d' en chercher d' autres») shows how differently did he see the problem.

[3] I did not examine the third case of hiatus, that is the preservation of the final short vowel before a word with initial vowel, which should be called *chasmodic short*.

[4] For the collection and classification of the material I have used for several years funds from the modest account of the Department of Classics of the University of Thessaloniki; for the study of the literature I have spent six months in the U.S.A (Yale University) on a research grant from the Fulbright Commission in Greece. I wish to express my gratitude to the University of Thessaloniki and to the Fulbright Commission as well for their generous help. My appreciation also goes to the University of Yale (Department of Classics, and The Sterling Memorial Library) for their assistance.

of the Greek words the adequate metrical types for the juxtaposition of the dactyls and spondees he needed, had to pay attention not only to the basic body and the basic metrical type of each word, but mostly to their last syllable. This was due to the fact that the last syllable of the word could be shortened or preserve its prosodic value, as long as the poet took care to juxtapose a word beginning with a vowel or with one or more consonants. In syllables other than the last his personal interference made no sensible difference except where the etymology of the word or other minor factors did allow it (τόσσος-τόσος, Ὄλυμπος-Οὐλύμποιο, πόλις-πτολίεθρον, ποταμοῖο-ποταμοῦ etc). The last syllable, however, was indeed an Achilles' heel of the poet's, because it was mostly there that he could easily preserve, alter—or fail in his attempt to alter—the prosodic value of the vowel or diphthong. It was of the utmost importance that he had the possibility to shorten a naked long syllable, to elide a naked short, or to lengthen the naked or covered short[1]. This did mean that he could use the same words with a different metrical value, or that he could make words of unfitting prosody suitable for the hexameter through a slight adaptation or elision of their last syllable (⏑⏑⏑,–⏑⏑⏑,–⏑– etc). But this did also mean that he should always be concerned about the initial syllable of the next word; the slightest confusion in this respect could disturb this sensitive balance. In the case of a naked long last syllable, the poet had to juxtapose a word with initial consonant, if this last syllable was to keep its long value; otherwise, he would have a long syllable in hiatus (*chasmodic long*). But he could also turn this syllable into a short one—if he needed it in the arsis—by juxtaposing a word with initial vowel. A final short syllable, on the other hand, could be naked or covered by a final consonant. In the first case the poet could: *a*) use the short naked syllable as short by adjoining a word with a simple initial consonant; *b*) elide the final vowel, if ne did not need it, by adjoining a word with initial vowel; *c*) use the naked short syllable as long by position by adjoining a word with two initial consonants or a double one (ζ, ξ, ψ). The irregularities occur in *b*, when the short vowel of the last syllable is not elided (*chasmodic short*), and in *c*, when the poet fails to make the final vowel long by position; in this case, we have a *pseudo-long*. When the last short vowel was covered by a final consonant, the poet could use it only in two ways; *a*) as short, by adjoining a word with initial vowel, and *b*) as long, by

[1] Or to add a -ν ephelcysticon.

adjoining a word with initial consonant(s); failing to do this, he again had a *pseudo-long* as a result.

This means that there are types of words that can only and invariably be used as long by nature or position in their last syllable (ἀνθρώπων, ἀνθρώπους, ἄψ), and others which can be used not only as they are but also with different metrical value, if the poet is skillful enough to find the right word that is to follow (ἄγε͞ι, ἄγῃ, ἄγοι͞, or ἄγε͡ι, ἄγ͡ῃ, ἄγοι͞, ἄγε͞, or ἄγε͡). From another point of view, there are also word-types which only by this procedure could be fitted into the dactylic hexameter (cretic–◡–, as a dactyl: *M* 127 νήπιοῐ ἐν δὲ..., *N* 139 ἀσπέτῳ ὄμβρῳ; with elision as –◡: *Λ* 288 οἴχετ' ἀνήρ; 1st paeon –◡◡◡; with elision: *X* 471 ἠγάγεθ' Ἕκτωρ; as a choriamb: *H* 390 ἠγάγετο͞ Τροίηνδ'; tribrach◡◡◡; with elision: *B* 659 τὴν ἄγετ' ἐξ; as an anapaest: *I* 165 ἀλλ' ἄγετε͞ κλητούς; antispast ◡– –◡; with elision: *Ξ* 132 ἀφεστᾶσ' οὐδὲ μάχονται; with the last syllable long: *B* 380 Τρωσὶν ἀνάβλησῐς κακοῦ, etc.

To add difficulty to difficulty, we may state that there are certain metrical forms, which by their own constitution are particularly liable to suffer the irregularity more often than the others; such are the forms – –◡ (palimbacchee), ◡––◡ (antispast) etc.

But this fact also means that all these metrical word-types with the last syllable naked long, or naked short and covered short are «potentially» (*δυνάμει*, according to Aristoteles) provided with a metrical flexibility in their last syllable, and consequently with an instability as well; this instability and flexibility does make the poet's task easier, but also more complicated, especially if he is composing orally: For instance, the long monosyllable with a naked vowel or diphthong may be used either as long or as short; the short monosyllable may be elided (γε, τε etc› γ', τ') may be used as short (γε͡, τε͡), or as long by position (γε͞, τε͞). The same is true of disyllables of every metrical type, of which I shall give some examples, and of trisyllables, or polysyllabic words, which are not treated here.

All these conditions and premises result in the creation of new metrically equivalent word-pairs which we would never suspect to be existing; These are the pairs of the same word, whose syllables except for the last one are and remain metrically identical, while the last becomes metrically indifferent and variable (ὁδοῦ: ◡– and ◡◡; ὁδὸν: ◡◡ and ◡–), because its prosody depends on the following word. Consequently, the borders between all metrical types which differ in quantity only in their last syllable are abolished; the short monosyllable may acquire the same value as the long and vice versa; the spon-

dee may become –⏑ and vice versa; the dibrach (⏑⏑) may become ⏑– and vice versa; the tribrach must become anapaest etc. But the borders are abolished also between thesis and arsis for some metrical types, so that these types cannot be invariably used in the thesis or the arsis, but they depend on the metrical type they acquire «in action» (*ἐνεργείᾳ*) at a given moment. This versatility of certain metrical types and their ability to shift between arsis and thesis may also help to analyse the nature of certain peculiarities and rare instances of chasmodic long and pseudo-long in the arsis.

We give here an example of the metrical possibilities of monosyllabic and disyllabic words(excepting elision and -ν ephelcysticon): the former can be used *a*) both in the arsis and in the thesis as long or long by position: N 8 *οὐ γάρ*, *N* 7 *ἐς* Τροίην δ' *οὐ πάμπαν*, *b*) *N* 8 *ὃν κατά*, *N* 51 ἕξου-$\overset{2}{\text{σ}}$ῑν *γὰρ πάντας*; in the arsis only, if they are or become short: *N* 129 Τρῶ̄ᾱ́ς *τ̆ε̆ κ̆αὶ*; disyllabic words may be used *a*) with a dibrach (pyrrhic) rhythm, and so form the entire arsis of a dactyl (⏑⏑; or ⏑– which becomes also ⏑⏑): *N* 16 δαμναμένους, *Διὶ δ̄ὲ̄* κρατερῶς, *N* 89 ὑπὲκ *κακ̆οῦ*; *b*) with an iambic rhythm, occupying the place of the second short element of a preceding dactylic foot and the thesis of the following (types: ⏑–, or ⏑⏑⟩⏑–): *N* 14 *πόλῑς καὶ N* 26 *ἑοῦ* δ'; *c*) with a spondeic rhythm in the arsis of the preceding and the thesis of the following foot, or in the thesis and the arsis of the same foot (types: – –́, –⏑⟩– –́, or –́ – and –⏑⟩–́–): *N* 46 Αἴαντε *πρώτ$\overset{2}{\text{ω}}$* προσέφη, *N* 13 *ἔνθ$\overset{3}{\bar{\text{ε}}}$ν* γάρ, N 56 $\overset{1}{\bar{\text{α}}}$*ὐτὼ* τ', *N* 39 *Τρ$\overset{1}{\text{ῶ}}$ες* δὲ; *d*) and with a trochaic rhythm in the thesis and the first short element of a dactylic foot (types: –⏑ and – –⟩–⏑): *N* 19 *π$\overset{1}{\bar{\text{ο}}}$σσὶν* ὑπ', *N* 39 φλογὶ *ἶσ̆οι* ἀολλέες.

As an illustration of the multitude and variety of the problems arising from the mutability of the last syllable, we give the numbers concerning the nature and the transformation of the last syllable, taken from the first 100 verses of chant 13 (ν) of the *Odyssey*, and of chant 14 (Ξ) of the *Iliad*; there was no special reason for the choice of these particular chants. The results are impressive.

Leaving out the last word of the verse, because its last syllabe does not interest our research, we have the following picture:

		ν 1-100		Ξ 1-100		Total	
long	⊣ (covered long)	58	147	100	172	158	319
	— (naked long)	89		72		161	
	⏑ (shortened long)	20	109	27	99	47	208
	◡ (short naked or covered)	253	423	235	384	488	
	⏒ (short which becomes long by position)	100		96		196	
	['] (short which has been elided)	70		53		123	
	◡' (original penult left last short after elision)	18		15		33	
	—' (original penult left last long after elision)	8		16		24	
	Total	616		614		1230	

We have, therefore, 1230 last syllables; out of these 366 (167 and 199 respectively) are long by nature, out of which 158 (58 and 100) are covered long, that is unalterably long, the only ones which the poet may dispose of without any regard to the beginning of the next word (here we include a few cases with a syllable permanently long by position: ἐξ, ἀψ, etc.), while 208 (109 and 99) end with a naked long vowel or diphthong, out of which 47 (20 and 27) became short by position. Out of the total number (807) of short syllables (423 and 384 respectively) we will subtract 123 (70 and 53) because their final vowel suffered elision, so there are left 688 short syllables (357 and 331). Finally, out of these, 488 (253 and 235) remained short, while the other 196 (100 and 96) became long by position. We should also add a small number of syllables short, long, and long by position which resulted from the elision suffered by words of more than one syllable (ὄφρ', ἐπ', ἄμ', αὖτ' etc), and these are 24 (8 and 16) long or long by position, and 33 (18 and 15) short.

If we now total these numbers we will realize that the poet is sure only of his covered longs (158), while with all others (1173) he must take care of the beginning of the following word; the quantitative proportion of these numbers is 13,5%: 86,5%.

Yet, much stranger things happen if we look at these numbers from a different angle: if we add to the total number of the short last syllables (488) the naked long used as short (before initial vowel, in the arsis) (47) as well as the more-than-one-syllable elided words whose original penult (now last syllable) is short (33), we get a defi-

nitive total number of 568 last syllables used one way or another as short. If, on the other hand, to those long by nature (319) we add the long by position (196) as well as those long or long by position resulting from the elision of more-than-one-syllable words (24), we will get a total of 529 final syllables used as long. And this, on the one hand, constitutes another proof of the violent mutations that take place in the prosody of the last syllable, while, on the other, it gives us a quantitative proportion of about 48% for the long and 52% for the short final syllables, which leads us right up to the limits of the penthemimere and the tritotrochaic caesurae; and this is probably the reason of the numerical relationship between them.

Again, there is another point of view which is also of great importance to our investigation: of how many syllables do the respective words of the same verses consist? It is interesting to know that the same 100 verses of *ν* contain 1299, those of *Ξ* 1264 (again not counting the syllables of the last word of the verse); that makes a total of 2563 syllables, out of which 1230 have been used as final syllables, that is a proportion of about 48% to a mere 52% non-final syllables. This means that the poet must be careful with almost every other syllable, because it is—although certainly in a disorderly fashion and with exception of the 13,5% of the covered long—a final one, which he ought take care of. This flexibility—as we have said—does not present only difficulties: it also facilitates the task of the poet to obtain the adequate metrical units, but as the numbers have shown the alleviation is far lesser than the care he must take. In spite of all that, the poet managed to fail only in five chasmodic longs and in two pseudo-longs in the 100 verses of the *ν*, and in only two of each case in the 100 verses of the *Ξ* (*ν* 3, 10, 25, 51, 65, 80, 97, *Ξ* 11, 55, 69, 78).

But, apart from the considerations about the final syllable of words and the influence of the initial vowel or consonant(s) of the next word upon it, we must also take into account some other factors equally important and unpredictable, such as the metrical word-type in which the irregularity occurs, and the metrical word-types which immediately precede or follow it; the grammatical category to which each word belongs, their frequency, position or importance in the speech, and other similar factors, through which the general behaviour of the words in the epic verse is influenced; especially the kind of irregularity each word is apt to suffer itself, or cause to the preceding word, as we will try to show by a thorough examination of the adverb *δοι*.

One may ask whether such an amount of complexities and intri-

cacies does not risk to frustrate the effort to subjugate them under definite rules and render the whole problem unintelligible. However from the study of the material and its rational classification certain concise elements gradually emerge, allowing us to detect the mechanism of the meter as well as that of the irregularity and the latter's own anatomy. In doing so, the mechanism of the Greek language must be taken into consideration, and more so that of the epic, which although unquestionably based on the wealth of traditional material, yet was capable of transforming and renewing this material, of contracting it or enlarging and enriching it, most of the times with success. The poet is always felt behind this formidable effort, always engaged in solving the difficulties which arise mostly, as we tried to emphasize, at the point of contact of two words; and this is the point where the poet is most likely to fail in his effort to select the fitting word for the correct metrical construction of the verse, especially if we admit, as we should, *that the meaning of the verse is his foremost preoccupation.* If this point of view is correct, then the presence of the irregularity may be considered also as a fact in favor of the theory of *oral composition.* Mistakes of this kind may be more easily avoided if the poet can try a certain form and replace it at his leisure. But this is a point that cannot be discussed further now. Here we can note that the search for the adequate and metrically regular forms of expression, leads to the formation of the formulaic expression (*formula*), while the effort of the poet to modify it or to connect it with new associations may create the favorable conditions for the occurence of irregularities; and this is exactly the point which has been examined and to a great extent correctly interpreted by the study of M. PARRY, which we mentioned at the beginning. But the single word with its own metrical pattern and with the mercurial behaviour of its last syllable exists before the formulaic expression[1].

***

We will examine now a pyrrhic (⏑⏑) metrical form, the adverb

[1] PARRY did also notice the importance of the last syllable (op. cit. 6 «Si, comme nous avons le droit de le supposer, il s' agit de facteurs de la versification déterminant non seulement l' hiatus mais encore toute irrégularité métrique à la fin du mot, nous aurons trouvé que la question de l' hiatus dans Homère doit être posée d' une façon différente qu' elle ne l' a été jusqu' ici. Là où on n' a vu ordinairement qu' un problème particulier, nous en verrons un qui s' étend à toute la question de la liaison des mots dans l' hexamètre), but he limited it to the formulaic expression and did not single out the individual metrical patterns of the words.

ὅθι, a word beginning and ending with a short vowel. According to what has been said before, such a word may: *a*) fill up the entire arsis, or part of the arsis (as first or second short element, provided that it has suffered elision) of a dactylic foot, and *b*) in iambic form (⏑–) occupy the place of the second short element of a dactyl and the thesis of the next foot, if its last syllable becomes long by position. The eventual irregularities may occur in ὅθι itself in both cases: in the first case (entire arsis), the elision of the last short syllable of ὅθι will not take place, although a word beginning with an initial vowel may follow (this case will not be considered here)[1]; in the second, although the poet must use it with an iambic value he does not manage to make its last syllable long by position, and in this way a *pseudo-long* appears. But because ὅθι also begins with a vowel, it may cause irregularities in the last syllable of the preceding word, if the poet does not take care of the fact; the eventual irregularities here will appear only if ὅθι is to be used in the entire arsis (or, with elision, as the first short element of the arsis) of a dactyl whose thesis must coincide with the last syllable of the preceding word. If this syllable consists of a naked long (vowel or diphthong), the appearance of a *chasmodic long* is inevitable; if, on the other hand, the same consists of a short vowel, naked or covered by only one consonant, the irregularity of the *pseudo-long* is also inevitable.

From the syntactical point of view ὅθι introduces an adverbial relative clause, which serves as an elucidation to an adverb of place or an equivalent adverbial locution, stated or implied by the context, frequently—though not always—immediately preceding the ὅθι-clause. In the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Hymns* it introduces such clauses in 106 verses (54:49:3, respectively), which with regard to the position and the grammatical form of the adverb or the adverbial locution extend in one or more verses (see below). Hence, the place, the extent and the structure of the relative ὅθι-clause are influenced by the position in which the local adverb or the corresponding adverbial locution is placed. The most advanced localization of ὅθι towards the beginning of the verse is in the arsis of the first foot (*Y* 320 ἴξε δ' ὅθ' Αἰνείας), while the most advanced towards the end is in the arsis of the fourth (*ν* 82 Τηλέπυλον Λαιστρυγονίην, ὅθι ποιμένα ποιμήν), one instance of each case only.

We will examine first the position and the relationship of ὅθι with

---

[1] There is only one such case: *ξ* 73 ὅθι ἕθνεα ἔρχατο χοίρων (probably correct: Fέθνεα? s. Knös, *De digammo homerico* p. 175).

the adverbial locution, and the different forms of the latter:

a) Both in the same verse:

ω 304 εἰμὶ μὲν ἐξ Ἀλύβαντος, ὅθι κλυτὰ δώματα ναίω·
B 722 Λήμνῳ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, ὅθι μιν λίπον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν.

b) The adverbial locution or part of it depends on the preceding verse (enjambement):

β 337/38..., ὃ δ' ὑψόροφον θάλαμον κατεβήσετο πατρός,
εὐρύν, ὅθι νητὸς χρυσὸς καὶ χαλκὸς ἔκειτο.
ζ 41/2 ἡ μὲν ἄρ ὣς εἰποῦσ' ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
Οὔλυμπόνδ', ὅθι φασὶ θεῶν ἕδος...
ξ 140/41 οὐδ' εἴ κεν πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος αὖτις ἵκωμαι
οἶκον, ὅθι πρῶτον γενόμην...
I 381/82 οὐδ' ὅσ' ἐς Ὀρχομενὸν ποτινίσσεται, οὐδ' ὅσα Θήβας
Αἰγυπτίας, ὅθι πλεῖστα δόμοις ἐν κτήματα κεῖται.

(cf also δ 126/27 ...δς ἔναι' ἐνὶ Θήβῃς, /Αἰγυπτίῃς, ὅθι...).

Ξ 283/84 Ἶδην δ' ἱκέσθην πολυπίδακα, μητέρα θηρῶν,
Λεκτόν, ὅθι πρῶτον λιπέτην ἅλα.....

c) Part of the relative clause extends into the next verse (enjambement):

κ 82/83 Τηλέπυλον Λαιστρυγονίην, ὅθι ποιμένα ποιμὴν/ἠπύει εἰσελάων..
X 154/55 καλοὶ λαῖνεοι, ὅθι εἵματα σιγαλόεντα/πλύνεσκον Τρώων ἄλοχοι.

d) In a few instances the adverb of place or the adverbial locution to which ὅθι would apply are omitted:

ξ 532/33 βῆ δ' ἴμεναι κείων, ὅθι περ κύνες ἀργιόδοντες/..εὗδον.
Y 320 ἶξε δ' ὅθ' Αἰνείας ἠδ' ὁ κλυτὸς ἦεν Ἀχιλλεύς.

The localization of ὅθι in the whole arsis or, with an iambic type, in the arsis and the thesis depends, naturally, upon the kind and the metrical form of the local adverb or the locution replacing it, to which ὅθι will be joined. The metrical forms of the preceding word will influence not only the position and the metrical type of ὅθι, but also the metrical form of the words that will follow it and vice versa. But we will discuss this later. Now we must inquire into the numerical distribution and position of ὅθι in the various parts of the verse, and into its use in the arsis and the thesis:

1) *Disyllabic*;

a) in the arsis: 61 times ($\overset{2}{—}$+ὅθι:20 times; $\overset{3}{—}$+ὅθι:40 times; $\overset{4}{—}$+ὅθι: once);

b) in the arsis and the thesis (iambic): 32 times (ὅθῐ̄:4 times; ὅθῐ̄: once; ὅθῐ̄:27 times);

2) *Monosyllabic* (ὅθ'); only in the arsis:

a) as first short element of an arsis: 7 times ($\overset{2}{—}$+ὅθ': once [*B* 572]; $\overset{3}{—}$+ὅθ':6 times);

b) as second short element of an arsis: 6 times ($\overset{1}{—}\smile$+ὅθ': once [*Y* 320]; $\overset{3}{—}\smile$+ὅθ': 5 times).

We see thus that: a) The use of ὅθι in the arsis amounts to the 74/106 of the total, while its iambic use to the other 32/106. This shows clearly: *α*) that it was much easier for the poet to place before ὅθι a local adverb or a corresponding expression ending in a long sullable, or that it was more difficult for him to transform the short last syllable of ὅθι into long by position, that is to place after it words beginning with two consonants; *b*) that the most frequent use of ὅθι with a dibrach rhythm is after the penthemimere caesura, and less than half as much after the trihemimere, while it appears only once after the hepthemimere; in this verse (*κ* 82) the relative clause introduced by ὅθι remains incomplete, because after it there is room only for the object and subject of the relative clause, while the verb and other complements must be transferred to the next verse; *c*) that, vice versa, the most frequent iambic use of ὅθι (27 times) happens in the fourth thesis ($\smile\overset{4}{—}$), that is after the tritotrochaic caesura; much less frequently (4 times) in the second thesis ($\smile\overset{2}{—}$), that is after the first trochaic caesura, and only once (*Λ* 148) in the third thesis ($\smile\overset{3}{—}$), that is after the second trochaic caesura; never naturally in the fifth thesis ($\smile\overset{5}{—}$), that is after the fourth trochaic caesura, or Hermann's bridge, a fact which is in agreement with the relative frequency of the trochaic caesurae.

The most formulaic, or apparently formulaic relative clauses with ὅθι are: *γ* 100 ~ *δ* 243 ~ 330 ὅθι πάσχετε πήματ' Ἀχαιοὶ with variant in *γ* 220 ὅθι πάσχομεν ἄλγε' Ἀχαιοὶ (where ἄλγε' instead of πήματ' because of πάσχομεν, which ends with a consonant); *δ* 627 ~ *ϱ* 169 ἐν τυκτῷ δαπέδῳ, ὅθι περ πάρος ὕβριν ἔχοντες; *Θ* 491 ~*K* 199 ἐν καθαρῷ, ὅθι δὴ νεκύων διεφαίνετο χῶρος, which are only a repetition of the same verse, but hardly a formulaic expression; *ε* 238 ~ 241 ὅθι δένδρεα μακρὰ πεφύκει; *ν* 275 ~ *ο* 298 ~ *ω* 431 ὅθι κρατέουσιν Ἐπειοί; *ζ* 210 ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας ἔστ' ἀνέμοιο ~ *μ* 336 ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας ἦν ἀνέμοιο; *Δ* 516 ὅθι μεθιέντας ἴδοιτο ~ *N* 229 ὅθι μεθιέντα ἴδηαι; *γ* 326 ~ *Δ* 210 ὅθι ξανθὸς Μενέλαος ~ *δ* 564 ὅθι ξανθὸς Ῥαδάμανθυς; *δ* 127 ~ *I* 382 ὅθι πλεῖστα δόμοις ἐν κτήματα κεῖται.

But even in these cases we cannot fail to notice the poet's ability and ease with which he adjusts—often surmounting unforseen difficulties—the grammatical, logical, and metrical forms (πάσχετε πήματα ~ πάσχομεν ἄλγε'; ἔστ' ~ ἦν etc) to meet any new situation: *ε* 381 ἵκετο

δ' εἰς Αἰγάς, ὅθι οἱ κλυτὰ δώματ' ἔασιν ~ χ 109 βῆ δ' ἴμεναι θάλαμόνδ', ὅθι οἱ κλυτὰ τεύχεα κεῖτο ~ θ 277 βῆ δ' ἴμεν εἰς θάλαμον, ὅθι οἱ φίλα δέμνι' ἔκειτο ~ ξ 291 Φοινίκην, ὅθι τοῦ γε δόμοι καὶ κτήματ' ἔκειτο ~ *I* 382 Αἰγυπτίας, ὅθι πλεῖστα δόμοις ἐν κτήματα κεῖται ~ δ 127 Αἰγυπτίης, ὅθι πλεῖστα δόμοις ἐν κτήματα κεῖται ~ β 338 θάλαμον... /εὐρύν, ὅθι νητὸς χρυσὸς καὶ χαλκὸς ἔκειτο; *Y* 391 Γυγαίῃ, ὅθι τοι τέμενος πατρώιόν ἐστιν ~ Ψ 148 ἐς πηγάς, ὅθι τοι τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις.

From the point of view of «speech», that is the content and the syntactical construction of the relative clauses, we notice that these do not belong to any special category but that according to their extent they manage in most cases to complete the meaning in the same verse; there are nominal clauses (Ψ 148 ἐς πηγάς, ὅθι τοι τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις), clauses with ἐστὶ (ε 345 ὅθι τοι μοῖρ' ἐστιν ἁλύξαι), with transitive or intransitive verbs (*A* 723 ὅθι μείναμεν Ἠῶ δῖαν, ξ 73 ὅθι ἔθνεα ἔρχατο χοίρων, ε 241 ὅθι δένδρεα μακρὰ πεφύκει), with two verbs, two subjects (ξ 141 ὅθι πρῶτον γενόμην καὶ μ' ἔτρεφον αὐτοί, β 338 ὅθι νητὸς χρυσὸς καὶ χαλκὸς ἔκειτο) etc.

A) *Irregularities before* ὅθι

The frequency of ὅθι and ὅθ' in the arsis of different feet (ὅθ' only as first short element of the arsis) is, as we have said, 61 and 7 respectively=68 times; 59 times out of these, we have before it a long vowel or diphthong either covered or naked, and a long by position or a pseudo-long in the remaining nine; 36 out of the 59, do not present hiatus, while 23 end in a *chasmodic long*. If we subtract the repetitions of the same form with chasmodic long (ἐν καθαρῷ, ὅθι 3 times, ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθι 3 times, ἐν τυκτῷ δαπέδῳ, ὅθι twice; total 5), as well as the repetitions without hiatus (δήμῳ ἐνὶ Τρώων, ὅθι 5 times, ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατιήν, ὅθι ~ ἐπ' ἐσχατιῆς, ὅθι twice, Φαιήκων, ὅθι twice; total 6), the proportion goes down to the total number of 31: 17 respectively= 48 verses with ὅθι in the arsis, in which case the chasmodic long consists in the 34,5% of this number (but only in the 16% of the total); on the other hand, the 9 times out of 68, where the poet uses or must use a vowel long by position before ὅθι, consist in only about the 13,3% of this number (or about 15,3% of the 59, if we subtract the repetitions we mentioned), or about the 8,5% of the total. This clearly indicates that the creation of a syllable long by position not merely before a word with initial vowel but in the stringent special conditions of having an adverbial (local) locution followed by ὅθι, is not an easy task; and this can happen not only with ὅθι, but also in other similar or analogous cases. This difficulty is dramatically underlined by the fact that in five verses out of these nine, the

poet was unable to create the long by position syllable he needed, and so he left the word before ὅθι with a pseudo-long.

1) *Chasmodic long*;

a) In the second thesis ($\overset{2}{\text{—}}$+ὅθι; no examples in the *Odyssey*); in the *Iliad*: *B* 861 ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθι περ Τρῶας... *Σ* 521 ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθι τ' ἀρδμὸς *Δ* 41 τὴν ἐθέλω, ὅθι τοι..., *Θ* 491 ~*K* 199 ἐν καθαρῷ, ὅθι δὴ νεκύων διεφαίνετο χῶρος, *Ψ* 61 ἐν καθαρῷ, ὅθι κύματ'..., *Y* 391 Τυγαίῃ, ὅθι τοι..., *Ω* 615 ἐν Σιπύλῳ, ὅθι φασί.

b) in the third thesis ($\overset{3}{\text{—}}$+ὅθι): *α* 50 νήσῳ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ, ὅθι τ' ὀμφαλός..., *δ* 627 ~*ρ* 169 ἐν τυκτῷ δαπέδῳ, ὅθι περ πάρος ὕβριν ἔχοντες, *ξ* 397 Δουλίχιόνδ' ἰέναι, ὅθι μοι φίλον..., *τ* 188 στῆσε δ' ἐν Ἀμνισῷ, ὅθι τε σπέος..., *B* 722 Λήμνῳ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, ὅθι μιν λίπον..., *E* 446 Περγάμῳ ἐν ἱερῇ, ὅθι οἱ νηός γ'.., *K* 568 φάτνῃ ἐφ' ἱππείῃ, ὅθι περ, *Σ* 263 μίμνειν ἐν πεδίῳ, ὅθι περ Τρῶες..., *X* 154 καλοὶ λαῖνεοι, ὅθι εἵματα..; ($\overset{3}{\text{—}}$+ὅθ'): *ζ* 210 λούσατέ τ' ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας, *H* 143 στεινωπῷ ἐν ὁδῷ, ὅθ' ἄρ οὐ..., *P* 54 χώρῳ ἐν οἰοπόλῳ, ὅθ' ἅλις...

2) *Pseudo-long*:

a) in the third thesis ($\overset{3}{\smile}$+ὅθι); only in the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*: *θ* 277 βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμόν, ὅθι οἱ φίλα..., *ο* 175 ἐλθὼν ἐξ ὄρεος, ὅθι οἱ γενεή..., *π* 471 ἤδη ὑπὲρ πόλιος, ὅθι θ' Ἑρμαιος..., *Hy. Ven.* 1, 157 ἐς λέχος εὐστρωτόν, ὅθι περ πάρος ἔσκεν ἄνακτι; ($\overset{3}{\smile}$+ὅθ'): *μ* 336 χεῖρας νιψάμενός, ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας...

B. *Irregularities in the last syllable of ὅθι*;

We have already noticed that ὅθι is used with iambic rhythm 32 times, four times out of which its last syllable occupies the thesis of the second foot, once the thesis of the third, and in the remaining 27 it occupies the thesis of the fourth foot ($\smile\overset{4}{\text{—}}$); that is, ὅθι introduces here the second hemistich after the tritotrochaic caesura. It is interesting to notice here that ὅθι, being a relative adverb, is used as a conjunctive particle in the beginning of the sentence, and cannot be separated from the words which follow it so as to form the pause of the penthemimere caesura, neither can it be joined (unless exceptionally) to a trochaic word in the second foot ($\overset{2}{\text{—}}\smile$+ὅθῑ$\overset{3}{}$), because of the trochaic bridge which exists also in this position (for Hermann's bridge see p. 348). Thus we understand its presence after the caesura of the first trochee, and mostly after the caesura of the third trochee. Consequently, every time the movement of the first hemistich stops at the (third) trochee, and a sentence introduced by ὅθι follows, this word must take an iambic form, so that its final syllable covers the thesis of (mainly) the fourth foot.

The irregularity in this point will result from the inability of the poet to place after ὅθι a word beginning with two consonants. In most of the cases the poet is successful; we have, however, the following exceptions:

a) in the second thesis ($\overset{1}{—}\smile+\overset{2}{\text{ὅθῑ}}$): *β* 338 εὐρύν, ὅθῑ νητός..

b) in the fourth thesis ($\overset{3}{—}\smile+\overset{4}{\text{ὅθῑ}}$); *ο* 101 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἵκανον, ὅθῑ κειμήλια κεῖτο, *Δ* 516 ~ *N* 229 ὅθι μεθιέντα ἴδοιτο (~ ἴδηαι).

Though we may omit case *a*), in which the initial *ν*- of νητὸς may have a double-consonant value, we cannot say probably the same for case *b*), which we are going to discuss later on[1].

If we examine first the grammatical forms with irregularity before ὅθι, we see that, with the exception of the forms ἐθέλω, λαΐνεοι, νιψάμενος, all others are adverbial locutions with prepositions, mostly in the dative of nouns and adjectives of the first and second declension (ἐπὶ... Γυγαίῃ, ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, εἰν ἱερῇ, ἐν καθαρῷ, ἐν ποταμῷ, ἐν Σιπύλῳ), and rarely in other cases (*Hy. Ven.* 1, 157 ἐς..εὔστρωτον; ἐς θάλαμον) or in the third declension (ἐξ ὄρεος, ὑπὲρ πόλιος). This rarity of certain cases and of names of the third declension is understandable, since their endings are mostly short; the same is true of the short-ending forms (accusative) of the second declension. Whenever the poet was forced by the meaning of his speech to use nouns of the third declension (ὄρεος, πόλιος), or short-ending forms of the second (θάλαμον) before ὅθι, he did not manage to make the short last syllable long by position. This observation could possibly become a serious factor in the understanding of the irregularity, since, as we have already noticed, the clauses introduced by ὅθι are in some way or other connected with a local adverb or adverbial locution. Consequently, it would be very difficult, almost impossible, even to the most skilful poet to place before ὅθι adverbs or adverbial locutions which would always end in a covered long syllable or a long by position and at the same time express the exact meaning he wanted to convey. Under the circumstances of his broader narration and of the narrower context, he needed only ἐν Γυγαίῃ, ἐν Σιπύλῳ, ἐν ποταμῷ etc., and for these words and expressions the Greek language offered no other grammatical or lexical alternatives, which would better fit the metrical necessities of the hexameter. Wherever the poet was able to use other verbs and along with them other adverbial forms or metrically easier nominal cases and forms, he did it succesfully: *δ* 126/27 ἐν Θήβῃς/Αἰγυ-

[1] Unfortunately, neither the etymology of κειμήλιον nor of μετὰ helps us (may be κF-?, or μhετά?).

πτίης, ὅθι, *I* 381/82 Θήβας Αἰγυπτίας, ὅθι, *ξ* 290/91 ἱκόμεσθα/Φοινίκην, ὅθι, *B* 783 εἰν Ἀρίμοις, ὅθι, *Ψ* 148 ἐς πηγάς, ὅθι, *γ* 100, 220, *δ* 243, 330 δήμῳ ἐνὶ Τρώων, ὅθι (ἐν Τρώων δήμῳ is metrically equivalent, but it would lead to a chasmodic long), *δ* 517, *ω* 150 ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατιήν, ὅθι, *ε* 238 νήσου ἐπ' ἐσχατιῆς, ὅθι, *ε* 381 ἵκετο δ' εἰς Αἰγάς, ὅθι, *ν* 160 βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἐς Σχερίην, ὅθι, *ξ* 73 βῆ δ' ἴμεν ἐς συφεούς, ὅθι, *ϱ* 523 Κρήτῃ ναιετάων, ὅθι (here also ναιετάων Κρήτῃ, is metrically equivalent but it leads to chasmodic long, inverting at the same time the natural sequence of a spondee [or dactyl] +a choriamb), *Z* 516 στρέψεσθ' ἐκ χώρης, ὅθι, *K* 325/26 ὅφρ' ἂν ἵκωμαι/νῆ' Ἀγαμεμνονέην, ὅθι, *Λ* 358 τῆλε διὰ προμάχων, ὅθι etc. (cf also *Θ* 83, *Λ* 723, *κ* 81/2, *μ* 2/3, *τ* 58), where we see the rich and skilful use of adequate forms ending in covered long vowels and diphthongs. But we see also that wherever the grammatically more convenient forms did not suit him, he managed to skilfully vary the sentence without betraying the meaning: *ε* 241 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ δεῖξ', ὅθι, *ε* 359 γαῖαν ἐγὼν ἰδόμην, ὅθι, *ξ* 353 ἔνθ' ἀναβάς, ὅθι, *ξ* 532 βῆ δ' ἴμεναι κείων, ὅθι, *τ* 210/11 βωμὸς δ' ἐφύπερθε τέτυκτο/ νυμφάων, ὅθι, *B* 572 καὶ Σικυῶν', ὅθ', *K* 504 ἢ ὅ γε δίφρον ἑλών, ὅθι, M 22 καὶ Σιμόεις, ὅθι.

The conditions are reversed when the poet must use ὅθι in iambic form. In this case, the preceding word must end with a short syllable and its penult must be long; consequently, it is here that we may expect grammatical and metrical forms precluded by the use of ὅθι as the whole arsis of a dactyl: *β* 337/38 ὁ δ' ὑψόροφον θάλαμον κατεβήσετο πατρὸς/εὐρύν, ὅθῑ, *ξ* 140/41... αὖτις ἵκωμαι/οἶκον, ὅθῑ, *Ξ* 283/84 Ἴδην δ' ἱκέσθην,.., /Λεκτόν, ὅθῑ, *γ* 326 ἐς Λακεδαίμονα δῖαν, ὅθῑ, *ν* 275 ἢ εἰς Ἤλιδα δῖαν, ὅθῑ, *ο* 298 ἠδὲ παρ' Ἤλιδα δῖαν, ὅθῑ, *ω* 431 ἢ καὶ ἐς Ἤλιδα δῖαν, ὅθῑ, *ι* 301 οὐτάμεναι πρὸς στῆθος, ὅθῑ, *E* 8 ὦρσε δέ μιν κατὰ μέσσον, ὅθῑ, *Θ* 325 αὐερύοντα παρ' ὦμον, ὅθῑ, *N* 229 ὀτρύνεις δὲ καὶ ἄλλον, ὅθῑ, *Π* 284/85.. ἀκόντισε δουρὶ φαεινῷ/ἀντικρὺς κατὰ μέσσον, ὅθῑ, *Ψ* 205/6..εἶμι γὰρ αὖτις ἐπ' ὠκεανοῖο ῥέεθρα,/Αἰθιόπων ἐς γαῖαν, ὅθῑ, *Δ* 516 ἐρχομένη καθ' ὅμῑλον, ὅθῑ, *ο* 404 Ὀρτυγίης καθύπερθεν, ὅθῑ, *ω* 304 εἰμὶ μὲν ἐξ Ἀλύβαντος, ὅθῑ, *E* 856/57..ἐπέρεισε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη/νείατον εἰς κενεῶνα, ὅθῑ.

There are rare instances of other grammatical forms (nominal or verbal) before ὅθι, which obey to the same metrical requirements but which are not adverbs or adverbial locutions of place: *E* 847/48 αὐτόθ' ἔασε/κεῖσθαι, ὅθῑ, *Λ* 148/49 τοὺς μὲν ἔᾱσ', ὁ δ' ὅθῑ... κλονέοντο/ (τῇ ῥ' ἐνόρουσ'), *ι* 50 ἀνδράσι μάρνασθαι, καὶ ὅθῑ, *M* 66... στεῖνος γάρ, ὅθῑ, *λ* 190 ἀλλ' ὅ γε χεῖμα μὲν εὖδει, ὅθῑ, *δ* 564 πέμψουσιν, ὅθῑ, *ο* 101, *Γ* 145, *Δ* 210, *E* 780, *K* 526, *Σ* 520, *Ψ* 138 ἵκᾱνον, ὅθῑ, *Δ* 132 ἴθῡνεν, ὅθῑ, *Y* 414 παραΐσσοντος, ὅθῑ.

We will classify now according to their metrical form the words which do precede and follow ὅθι; this classification will show the mechanism of the disposition of ὅθι.

I) ὅθι *in the arsis.*

A) In the second arsis;

a) metrical forms before ὅθι:

1) choriamb ($-\breve{}\breve{}\overset{2}{-}$+ὅθι): *α* 425 Τηλέμαχος δ' ὅθι, *δ* 127 Αἰγυπτίης, ὅθι, *I* 382 Αἰγυπτίᾱς, ὅθι, *Hy.* 6, 3 εἰναλίης ὅθι

2) anapaest ($\breve{}\breve{}\overset{2}{-}$+ὅθι): *ξ* 353 (ἐνθ') ἀναβᾱ́ς, ὅθι, *B* 783 (εἰν) Ἀρίμοις, ὅθι, *B* 861, *Σ* 521 (ἐν) ποταμῷ, ὅθι, *Δ* 41 (τὴν) ἐθέλω, ὅθι, *Θ* 491, *K* 199, *Ψ* 61 (ἐν) καθαρῷ, ὅθι, *M* 22 (καὶ) Σιμόεις, ὅθι, *Ω* 615 (ἐν) Σιπύλῳ, ὅθι.

3) molossus ($--\overset{2}{-}$+ὅθι): *ζ* 42 Οὔλυμπόνδ', ὅθι, *ξ* 291 Φοινίκην, ὅθι, *ϱ* 211 νυμφάων, ὅθι, *Y* 391 Γυγαίη, ὅθι.

4) spondee ($-\overset{2}{-}$+ὅθι): *Ψ* 148 (ἐς) πηγᾱ́ς, ὅθι :

b) metrical forms after ὅθι:

1) one long monosyllable after ὅθι (ὅθι+$-$): *α* 425 ὅθι οἱ, *ξ* 353 ὅθι τεῖ, *Δ* 41, *Υ* 391, *Ψ* 148 ὅθι τοι, *Θ* 491, *K* 199 ὅθι δή.

2) a trochaic word (ὅθι+$-\breve{}$): *δ* 127, *I* 382 ὅθι πλεῖστᾰ́, *ζ* 42, *B* 783, *Ω* 615 ὅθι φᾰ́σί, *ξ* 291 ὅθι τοῦ γε, *ϱ* 211 ὅθι πάντες, *B* 861 ὅθι Τρῶας, *M* 22 ὅθι πολλά, *Σ* 521 ὅθι τ' ἀρδμός, *Ψ* 61 ὅθι κῡ́ματ'

We notice here that, after ὅθι, the poet had to stop at the penthemimeral caesura (case IA, b1) or at that of the third trochee (IA, b2); consequently, in the first case one long monosyllabic word was sufficient, whereas in the second he needed a dissyllabic word of the form $-\breve{}$.

B) ὅθι in the third arsis;

a) metrical forms before ὅθι:

1) $\breve{}\breve{}-\breve{}\breve{}\overset{3}{-}$+ὅθι: *K* 326 (νῆ') Ἀγαμεμνονέην, ὅθι

2) choriamb ($-\breve{}\breve{}\overset{3}{-}$+ὅθι): *α* 50 ἀμφιρύτῃ, ὅθι, *δ* 517, *ω* 150 ἐσχατιήν, ὅθι, *ε* 238 ἐσχατιῇς, ὅθι, *θ* 80, *B* 722 ἠγαθέῃ, ὅθι, *ϱ* 523 ναιετάων, ὅθι, *X* 154 λαΐνεοι, ὅθι

3) anapaest ($\breve{}\breve{}\overset{3}{-}$+ὅθι): *δ* 627, *ϱ* 169 δαπέδῳ, ὅθι, *ε* 359 ἰδόμην, ὅθι, *ν* 160 (ἐς) Σχερίην, ὅθι, *ξ* 73 (ἐς)συφεούς, ὅθι, *ξ* 397 ἰέναι, ὅθι, *χ* 109 θάλαμόνδ', ὅθι, *E* 446 (εἰν) ἱερῇ, ὅθι, *Θ* 83 (κὰκ) κορυφήν, ὅθι, *Λ* 358 (διὰ) προμάχων, ὅθι, *Σ* 263 (ἐν) πεδίῳ, ὅθι.

4) pseudo-anapaest ($\breve{}\breve{}\overset{3}{\breve{}}$+ὅθι; result: *pseudo-long*); *θ* 277 (ἐς) θάλαμον, ὅθι, *ο* 175 (ἐξ) ὄρεος, ὅθι, *π* 471 (ὑπὲρ) πόλιος, ὅθι.

5) molossus $--\overset{3}{-}$+ὅθι): *ε* 345, *ζ* 35 Φαιήκων, ὅθι, *μ* 3 Αἰαίην, ὅθι, *τ* 188 (ἐν) Ἀμνισῷ, ὅθι, *τ* 411 Παρνησόνδ', ὅθι, *Λ* 723 Ἀρήνης, ὅθι, *K* 568 ἱππείῃ, ὅθι

6) palimbacchee=pseudomolossus ($- - \overset{3}{\smile} +$ δθι; result :*pseudo-long*): *H. Ven.* 1, 157 εὔστρωτον, δθι

7) spondee ($- \overset{3}{—} +$ δθι): γ 100, 220, δ 243, 330 Τρώων, δθι, ε 381 (εἰς) Αἰγάς, δθι, ξ 532 κείων, δθι, *Z* 516 (ἐκ) χώρης, δθι.

8) ($\smile - | - | \,) \overset{3}{—} +$ δθι: ε 241 (ἐπεὶ δὴ) δεῖξ', δθι.

9) iambic ($\smile \overset{3}{—} +$ δθι): *K* 504 ἑλών, δθι, *Hy. Cer.* 384 ἄγων, δθι.

b) metrical forms after δθι:

1) δθι+one long monosyllable (δθι$+\overset{4}{—}$): δ 627, ρ 169 δθι περ (πάρος), ε 345 δθι τοι (μοῖρ'), ε 359 δθι μοί (φατο), ε 381 δθι οἱ (κλυτά), ζ 35 δθι τοι (γένος), θ 277 δθι οἱ (φίλα), ξ 397 δθι μοι (φίλον), ο 175 δθι οἱ (γενεή), τ 188 δθι τε (σπέος), τ 411 δθι πού (μοι), χ 109 δθι οἱ (κλυτά), *B* 722 δθι μιν (λίπον), *E* 446 δθι οἱ (νηός γ'), *Z* 516 δθι ᾗ (ἀάριζε), *Θ* 83 δθι τε (πρῶτα), *K* 326 δθι που (μέλλουσιν), *K* 568 δθι περ (Διομήδεος), *Λ* 358 δθι οἱ (καταείσατο), *Σ* 263 δθι περ (Τρῶες).

2) δθι+dactyl (δθι$+\overset{4}{—}\smile\smile$): α 50 δθι τ' ὀμφαλός, γ 100, δ 243, 330 δθι πάσχετε, γ 220 δθι πάσχομεν, δ 517, ε 241, ω 150 δθι δώματα, ε 238 δθι δένδρεα, ξ 73 δθι ἔθνεα, *K* 504 δθι ποικίλα, *Λ* 723 δθι μείναμεν, *X* 154 δθι εἵματα.

3) palimbachee=molossus (δθι$+\overset{4}{—}\overset{5}{\smile}$): ν 160 δθι Φαίηκες, π 471 δθι θ' Ἑρμαιος (λόφος), ρ 523 δθι Μίνωος.

What we should notice here, is that since δθι introduces the second hemistich after the penthemimere, the words before it are of the same metrical form as in case IA; there are however, some differences in the metrical forms following it, as we will see below.

C) δθι in the fourth arsis;

a) metrical forms before δθι:

1) $- - \smile\smile \overset{4}{—} +$ δθι: κ 82 Λαιστρυγονίην, δθι

b) metrical forms after δθι:

1) δθι$+\overset{5}{—}\smile\smile$: κ 82 δθι ποιμένα

D) δθ' as first short element of the third arsis;

a) metrical forms before δθ':

1) iambic ($\smile \overset{3}{—} +$ δθ'): *H* 143 (ἐν) ὁδῷ, δθ'

2) anapaest ($\smile\smile \overset{3}{—} +$ δθ'): ζ 210 (ἐν) ποταμῷ, δθ'

3) spondee ($- \overset{3}{—} +$ δθ'): τ 58 (ἐξ) αὐτῆς, δθ'

4) choriamb ($- \smile\smile \overset{3}{—} +$ δθ'): θ 80 ἠγαθέῃ, δθ'

5) pseudo-choriamb=first paeon: ($- \smile\smile \overset{3}{\smile} +$ δθ'; result: *pseudo-long*) μ 336 νιψάμενος, δθ'.

b) metrical forms after δθ':

1) iambic (δθ'$+ \smile \overset{4}{—}$): ζ 210, μ 336 δθ' ἐπὶ (σκέπας), τ 58 δθ' ἐπὶ (μέ-

γα), *H* 143 ὅθ' ἄρ' οὐ (κορύνη), *P* 54 ὅθ' ἅλις^{4} (ἀναβέβροχεν) with *pseudo-long* (?) in the last syllable of ἅλις

2) bacchee (ὅθ'+⏑^{4}—): *θ* 80 ὅθ' ὑπέρβη

E) "Οθ' as the second short element of a dactylic foot presents no particular interest. It always occurs after the third (once in the first: *Y* 320 ἶξε δ', ὅθ') feminine caesura and is followed by a word beginning with a long vowel; hence, no possibility of irregularity.

II) ὅθι *in iambic use* (⏑—);

A) ὅθῑ=⏑^{2};

a) metrical forms before ὅθῑ:

1) $\overset{1}{—}$⏑+ὅθῑ: *β* 338 εὐρύν, ὅθῑ, *ξ* 141 οἶκον, ὅθῑ, *E* 848 κεῖσθαι, ὅθῑ, *Ξ* 284 Λεκτόν, ὅθῑ.

b) metrical forms after ὅθῑ:

1) ὅθῑ+—^{3}: *β* 338 ὅθῑ νητῶς, *ξ* 141, *Ξ* 284 ὅθῑ πρῶτον.

B) ὅθῑ=⏑^{3};

a) metrical forms before ὅθῑ:

1) (⏑^{2}|) ⏑+ὅθῑ^{3}: *Λ* 148 (τοὺς μὲν ἔᾱσ'), ὁ δ' ὅθῑ.

b) metrical forms after ὅθῑ:

1) ὅθῑ+—^{4}: *Λ* 148 ὅθῑ πλεῖσται

C) ὅθῑ=⏑^{4};

a) metrical forms before ὅθῑ:

1) a short monosyllable + ὅθῑ: *ι* 50 (μάρναθαι) καὶ ὅθῑ, *M* 66 (στεῖνος) γάρ, ὅθῑ.

2) trochaic $\overset{3}{—}$⏑+ὅθῑ: *γ* 326, *ν* 275, *ο* 298, *ω* 431 δῖαν, ὅθῑ, *ι* 301 (πρὸς) στῆθος, ὅθῑ, *λ* 190 εὖδει, ὅθῑ *E* 8, *Π* 285 (κατὰ) μέσσον, ὅθῑ, *Θ* 325 (παρ') ὦμον, ὅθῑ, *N* 229 ἄλλον, ὅθῑ, *Ψ* 206 (ἐς) γαῖαν, ὅθῑ.

3) amphibrach ⏑$\overset{3}{—}$⏑+ὅθῑ: *Δ* 516 (καθ) ὅμῑλον, ὅθῑ.

4) palimbachee —$\overset{3}{—}$⏑+ὅθῑ: *δ* 564 πέμψουσιν, ὅθῑ, *ο* 101, *Γ* 145, *Δ* 210, *E* 780, *K* 526, *Σ* 520, *Ψ* 138 ἱκᾱνον, ὅθῑ, *Δ* 132 ἴθῡνεν, ὅθῑ.

5) third-paeon ⏑⏑$\overset{3}{—}$⏑+ὅθι: *ο* 404 καθύπερθεν, ὅθῑ, *ω* 304 (ἐξ) Ἀλύβαντος, ὅθῑ, *E* 857 (ἐς) κενεῶνα, ὅθῑ.

6) ⏑——$\overset{3}{—}$⏑+ ὅθι: *Y* 414 παραΐσσοντος, ὅθῑ.

b) metrical forms after ὅθῑ:

1) ὅθῑ^{4}+a long monosyllable: *ι* 50 ὅθῑ χρή.

ὅθῑ^{4}+⏑⏑: *ι* 301 ὅθῑ φρένες, *ο* 404 ὅθῑ τροπαί, *K* 526 ὅθῑ σκοπόν, *Σ* 520, *Ψ* 138 ὅθῑ σφισι(ν).

3) ὅθῑ+—^{5}: *γ* 326, *δ* 564, *Δ* 210 ὅθῑ ξανθῶς, *λ* 190 ὅθῑ δμῶ$\overset{5}{ε}$ς (with *pseudo-long* in the last syllable of δμῶες), *Γ* 145 ὅθῑ Σκαιαί, *E* 8, 780, *Π* 285 ὅθῑ πλεῖστοι, *Θ* 325 ὅθῑ κληῖς, *Ψ* 206 ὅθῑ ῥέζουσ'.

4) ὅθῑ+—$\overset{5}{—}$⏑: *M* 66 ὅθῑ τρώσεσθαι, *Y* 414 ὅθῑ ζωστῆρος.

5) ὅθῑ+—$\overset{5}{—}$⏑⏑: *o* 101 ὅθῑ κειμήλια, *E* 857 ὅθῑ ζωννύσκετο.

6) ὅθῑ+⏑⏑$\overset{5}{—}$⏑: *ν* 275, *o* 298, *ω* 431 ὅθῑ κρατέουσιν, *Δ* 516, *N* 229 ὅθῑ μεθιέντα.

In examining the words following ὅθι in cases IB and C, we notice that the poet needs a dactyl after it, in order to arrive at the bucolic diaeresis. He achieves this either by using entire dactylic words (11 times) or by a trick: he first puts a monosyllabic, enclitic, word—long or long by position—next to which he attaches disyllabic words of pyrrhic rhythm (⏑⏑), or other polyssyllabic words with two consecutive short initial syllables (⏑⏑, ⏑⏑—⏑, ⏑⏑—⏑⏑) etc: οἱ γενεή τε, ᾗ ὀάριζε, περ Διομήδεος, οἱ καταείσατο); In this case, he overlaps the limits of the bucolic diaeresis and reaches the caesura of the fifth trochee or the diaeresis of the fifth foot. But there are also three cases in which apparently a dactylic form could not be obtained; in these we meet instead three-syllable words of palimbaccheic form which are used as molossic (IB, b3), because their last syllable must form the thesis of the fifth foot; accordingly, the fourth foot becomes a spondee. We find a variation of the same expedient in cases where a long monosyllable is followed by a disyllabic word of trochaic form (—⏑), which must be used as a spondee (οἱ νηός γ', τε̄ πρῶτᾱ), because what we have said of the former case applies here too. In *K* 326 που μέλλουσιν, the problem of the molossus is solved in a different way (που+μέλλου-σιν), where the (short) last syllable reaches the fifth trochaic caesura. With τοι μοῖρ' and πού μοι, we have also a spondee in the fourth foot.

In case ID (ὅθ'), it is obvious that one more short syllable after ὅθ' is needed in order to complete the arsis. This condition is met through the use of a disyllabic, iambic or potentially iambic word or a combination of monosyllabic words (ἐπί, ἅλις, ἄρ, οὐ), whose last syllable will form the thesis of the fourth foot.

In the iambic use of ὅθῑ, the metrical forms before it are of course different; they must end in a short syllable; hence in IIA, B, C, we find words of only one short syllable, disyllables of trochaic rhythm (—⏑: 11), trisyllabic words of amphibrachic or palimbaccheic rhythm (⏑—⏑, ——⏑) etc. After it, the foot founded by the last syllable of ὅθῑ can be completed by two short monosyllables, by one long monosyllable, or by a disyllable of spondeic form up to the next caesura of the first hemistich or the bucolic diaeresis of the second, depending on the position of ὅθῑ in the verse.

Summing up our analysis we can say: *a*) that the localization of ὅθι in the whole arsis of a dactyl is the result of the arrangement of words of certain metrical forms, which end or are intented to end in a long (or long by position) syllable before it, that is in one of the masculine caesurae; *b*) that the irregularities in this case are due to the initial vowel of ὅθι, and, correspondingly, to the fact that the preceding word ends in a naked long syllable or in one insufficiently protected short; *c*) that the irregularities take place in the last syllable of the preceding word, and they are the result of the inherent difficulty to combine a fitting metrical type before ὅθι with the necessary grammatical form so as to ensure the last syllable of this form the long or long by position value according to the known metrical rules; *d*) that the iambic use of ὅθῐ̄ results from the arrangement of words of certain metrical forms, which end in one short syllable before ὅθι, that is in one of the possible feminine caesurae; *e*) that the irregularity in this case takes place in the last syllable of ὅθι, and results from the difficulty to ensure its last syllable the long by position value by placing next to it the fitting grammatical and metrical forms, which must begin by two consonants; *f*) that the use of the grammatical and metrical forms which have caused the irregularity, and their frequency in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* may help us to understand the mechanism of the irregularity.

*

Let us classify now all the words presenting irregularity before ὅθι, according to their grammatical and metrical form:

I) *Chasmodic long or pseudo-long before* ὅθι; *α*) adverbial form; *β*) verbal or other nominal form:

a) molossus: *α*) *Y* 390/91 ἐπὶ λίμνῃ / Γυγαίη², ὅθι, *τ* 188 στῆσε δ' ἐν Ἀμνισῷ³, ὅθι, *K* 568 φάτνῃ ἐφ' ἱππείῃ³, ὅθι (total of molossi before ὅθι: 11+2 palimbacchei used as molossi without irregularity: *ζ* 42 Οὐλυμπόνδ' *τ* 411 Παρνησόνδ')

a$_1$) pseudo-molossus (=palimbacchee): *Hy. Ven.* 1, 157 ἐς λέχος εὐστρωτόν³, ὅθι (*pseudo-long*)

b) anapaest: *α*) *B* 861, *Σ* 521 (ἐν) ποταμῷ², ὅθι, *ζ* 210 ἐν ποταμῷ³, ὅθι, *Θ* 491, *K* 199, *Ψ* 61 (ἐν) καθαρῷ², ὅθι, *Ω* 615 (ἐν) Σιπύλῳ², ὅθι, *E* 446 (εἰν) ἱερῇ³, ὅθι, *Σ* 263 (ἐν) πεδίῳ³, ὅθι, *δ* 627, *ϱ* 169 (ἐν τυκτῷ) δαπέδῳ³,

ὅθι. *β*) Verbal forms: *ξ* 397 ἰέναι, ὅθι, *Δ* 41 (τὴν) ἐθέλω, ὅθι.

b$_1$) pseudo-anapaest (=tribrach: ⏑⏑⏑: *pseudo-long*): *a*) *θ* 277 (ἐς) θάλαμον : ὅθι, *o* 175 (ἐξ) ὄρεος, ὅθι, *π* 471 (ὑπὲρ) πόλιος, ὅθι. Total of anapaests before ὅθι: 18+3 pseudo-anapaests; tribrachs used as anapaests correctly: one (*χ* 109 θάλαμόνδ', ὅθι)[1]

c) choriamb: –⏑⏑– : *a*) *α* 50 (ἐν) ἀμφιρύτῃ, ὅθι, *θ* 80, *B* 722 (ἐν) ἠγαθέῃ, ὅθι, *P* 54 (ἐν) οἰοπόλῳ, ὅθι. *β*) Nominal form without preposition: *X* 154 λαΐνεοι, ὅθι.

c$_1$) pseudo-choriamb (=1st paeon: –⏑⏑): *β*) Verbal form (participle): *μ* 336 νιψάμενος, ὅθ'. Total of choriambs before ὅθι: 10, to which we may add *K* 326 (νῆ') Ἀγαμεμνονέην, ὅθι, and *κ* 82 (Τηλέπυλον) Λαιστρυγονίην, ὅθι (taking into account only the last four syllables of each word); first paeon used correctly as a choriamb; one: *α* 425 Τηλέμαχος δ' ὅθι.

d) iambic rhythm (⏑–: *α*) *H* 143 (ἐν) ὁδῷ, ὅθι. Total of words of the same metrical form; two: (*K* 504 ἑλών, ὅθι).

e) The spondeic metrical words (– –) present no irregularity before ὅθι (total: 6); neither does the only verse with ⏑– | –⏑ | –: *ε* 241 ἐπεὶ δὴ δεῖξ' ὅθι; but I do not know whether this is due to pure chance. We notice only that their last syllable consists of a (covered) vowel or diphthong, long by nature and never by one long by position.

II) *Pseudo-long in the last syllable of ὅθι*

From the grammatical and metrical point of view, the forms which have caused the irregularity of the *pseudo-long* in the last syllable of ὅθι are κειμήλια (*o* 101 ὅθι κειμήλια κεῖτο) and μεθιέντα (*Δ* 516 ὅθι μεθιέντα ἴδοιτο, *N* 229 ὅθι μεθιέντα ἴδηαι); κειμήλια is the subject of κεῖτο, and metrically an ionic major (––⏑⏑), very convenient to fill the arsis of the fourth foot (spondee), and the whole fifth dactyl; μεθιέντα is an attributive participle to the object of ἴδοιτο (τινά), and ἴδηαι (ἄλλον); its metrical form (third paeon: ⏑⏑–⏑) is also very convenient to fill the dactylic arsis of the fourth foot and part of the fifth foot (up to the caesura of the fifth trochee). According to the tables of Eug. O' Neill, Jr (p. 145) the metrical form of ionic major is found *only* in the 8th (*Iliad* 63,8%, *Odyssey* 68,4%) and the 10th place (*Il.* 36,2%, *Od.* 31,6%), that is mostly in the bucolic diaeresis, and se-

1) Counted with the total.

condly in the diaeresis of the fifth foot, as in our case; the metrical form of the third paeon is found mostly (*Il.* 56,9%, *Od.* 62,5%) in the 5 ½ place (that is in the third trochaic caesura) and secondly (*Il.* 39,5%, *Od.* 33,1%) in the 9 ½ place (that is in the fifth trochaic caesura), as in our case (O' Neill, Jr, o.c.p. 143).

The external factors, which facilitated the irregularity in the last syllable of ὅθι are the following: *a*) that in all three verses, the first hemistich ends in the caesura of the third trochee (*o* 101 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἵκᾱνον, *Δ* 516 ἐρχομένη καθ' ὅμῑλον, *N* 229 ὀτρύνεις δὲ καὶ ἄλλον); *b*) that in all three verses the word before ὅθι is metrically an amphibrach (⏑–⏑; in *N* 229 καὶ ἄλλον may be considered as such). If we look into the tables of O' Neill (p. 142) we see that the amphibrachic metrical forms occupy mainly the 5 ½ place, that is the third trochaic caesura, at the extraordinary percentage of 75,8% in the *Il.* and 82,4% in the *Od.*;[1] *c*) that the words κειμήλια and μεθιέντα conform also with the tables of O' Neill Jr. as to their localization after ὅθι.

Let us now look into the behaviour of ἵκᾱνον and the other amphibrachic forms of the same verb (ἵκᾱνε, ἵκᾱνεν), which are most likely to behave in the same way. First of all there is a v.l. in *o* 101: ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἵκᾱν' (sc. Odysseus), ὅθι οἱ κειμήλια κεῖτο, which eliminates the anomaly by reversing the position and the use of ὅθι from iambic to pyrrhic (⏑⏑) through the mutation of the preceding word from ⏑–⏑ to ⏑–; thus, a new situation has been created after ὅθι, repaired fittingly by the use of a monosyllabic long after it (s. above in IA, b1): notwithstanding this v.l. we will consider the details of the irregularity. The hemistich ἀλλ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἵκᾱνον appears to be very common and formulaic, but it would be astonishing if such an expresion as: *to arrive*, *he arrived*, *they arrived*, were rare or non formulaic in the speech, especially within the movement of the battle. If we look, however, into the examples of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, we will notice the different frequency and the not very rigorous formalization of the forms of ἱκάνω (and not only of these) in the epics. M. Parry and his followers have rendered great services to the study of the epics by illustrating their

1) We must notice, though, that for this metrical type as well as for ⏑, –⏑, ⏑⏑–⏑, the tables of O' Neill, Jr. are somewhat misleading, because he does consider the *syllaba anceps* at the end of the verse as long (s. op. c. 113); consequently, such forms as ἵκανεν, ὅμιλον are considered as ⏑–$\overset{6}{⏑}$ for the last part of the verse. We must, therefore, also take into account Table 29 (p. 151), where the percentage of the natural quantities in position 12 (final syllable) is considered; the percentage of amphibrachs is 40,6% in the *Il.* and 42% in the *Od.*

formulaic nature, but we must not ignore the fact that life as expressed by language is not infinite but very limited, especially the kind of life in which the epic moves (battles, deaths, woundings, angers, armaments, sacrifices, ships, gifts, conversations, questions and answers, prayers, dinners etc); in my opinion, the most remarkable fact was not that the poet had to repeat himself from time to time, but that he managed to handle the linquistic wealth at his disposal with such a fine sense of variation and renewal, that only recently and through the learned efforts of such scolars as DÜNTZER, MEISTER, and especially PARRY, did we come to its full realization. I suppose that after this stage, a more sober inquiry will follow[1].

Thus, the most formulaic expressions with ἱκάνω in amphibrachic form are: *o* 101, *Δ* 210, *E* 780 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ρ' ἵκᾱνον, *K* 526, *Σ* 520 οἵ δ' ὅτε δὴ ρ' ἵκᾱνον *B* 17, 168, *E* 868 καρπαλίμως δ' ἵκᾱνε, *Z* 370, 497 αἶψα δ' ἔπειθ' ἵκᾱνε, and (with interposition of the adverbial accus.): *Z* 297 αἵ δ' ὅτε νηὸν ἵκανον, *Ψ* 138 οἱ δ' ὅτε χῶρον ἵκᾱνον, *Ψ* 214 αἶψα δὲ πόντον ἵκᾱνεν, out of 15 verses with ἵκᾱνε in the *Iliad*, 6 in the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*, out of 8 with ἵκᾱνεν in the *Iliad*, 10 in the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*, out of 10 with ἵκᾱνον in the *Iliad*, 4 in the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*[2]; that is, a total of 13 (=7, if we subtract the repetitions) more or less (rather less than more) formulaic expressions out of 49 hemistichs, in which these amphibrachic forms of ἱκάνω have b en used.

The most interesting fact, which I think supports the view that it is the metrical form and the meaning of the word which compel it to occupy a special position in the verse, and around which the rest is organized, is that ἵκᾱνε, ἵκᾱνεν, ἵκᾱνον in amphibrachic form are the central words in the first hemistich—in the feminine caesura of the third foot—11 times in the *Iliad* and 5 in the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns* (for ἵκᾱνε), twice and once respectively for ἵκᾱνεν, and 8 and 3 respectively for ἵκᾱνον, that is a total of 30 times out of the 49. Out of these 30

---

1) S. W. WHALON, <The Homeric Epithets>, *Yale Class. Stud.* 17, 1961, 97-142; It is evident that I do not share the enthusiasm of such eminent scholars as A. B. LORD, *The Singer of Tales p.* 214, about the alleged formulaic character of such expressions as φαρὶν ἐκαβαλλίκευσεν, γοργὸν ἐκ., εὐθὺς ἐκ. etc. (in *Dig. Acr.*), or of G. S. KIRK, *The Songs of Homer* p. 67 (Τρώεσσι δέ; ὣς φατο etc.); this does not, of course, affect my opinion about the excellent quality of both books.

2) According to the *Index Homericus* of A. GEHRING, and the *Concordances* of PENDERGAST - MARZULLO for the *Iliad* and DUNBAR - MARZULLO for the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*.

times ὅθι appears with regular iambic rhythm (last syllable long by position: ⏑–) after ἵκανον 6 times:

Δ 210 / *E* 780 } ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ρ' ἵκᾱνον { ὅθῑ ξανθὸς Μενέλαος / ὅθῑ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι

Γ 145 αἶψα δ' ἔπειθ' ἵκᾱνον, ὅθῑ Σκαιαὶ πύλαι ἦσαν

K 526 / *Σ* 520 } οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ ρ' ἵκᾱνον { ὅθῑ σκοπὸν Ἕκτορος ἔκταν / ὅθῑ σφίσιν εἶκε λοχῆσαι

Ψ 138 οἱ δ' ὅτε χῶρον ἵκᾱνον, ὅθῑ σφίσι πέφραδ' Ἀχιλλεύς,

and only once (*o* 101) with pseudo-long; this may be due to the meaning the poet had to express in the second hemistich with the word κειμήλια, which owing to its metrical form (– –⏑⏑) tends to occupy the arsis of the third foot up to the bucolic diaeresis, or the arsis of the fourth foot up to the fifth diaeresis[1], as in our case. The presence and localization of κειμήλια - κειμήλιον in the epics is as follows: κειμήλια 11 times in the *Odyssey*, 5 times in the *Iliad*; κειμήλιον 3 times in the *Odyssey*, once in the *Iliad*: total 20. Out of these, κειμήλια is found in the third arsis and up to the bucolic diaeresis 7 times in the *Odyssey* and only twice in the *Iliad*, κειμήλιον in the same place once in the *Odyssey*,—total 10; the rest (κειμήλια 4 times in the *Odyssey* and 3 in the *Iliad*, κειμήλιον twice in the *Odyssey*, once in the *Iliad*) cover the arsis of the fourth foot up to the fifth diaeresis. The percentage here is 50% to 50% for each localization, but the difference is reduced by the repetitions: κειμήλια κεῖται (*δ* 613, *o* 113, *Z* 47, *Λ* 132), κειμήλια κεῖτο (*o* 101), κειμήλια καλὰ (*κ* 40, *Σ* 290), κειμήλιον ἔσται (*α* 312), κειμήλιον ἔστω (*δ* 600, *Ψ* 618). We must notice also that the v. *o* 113 δώρων δ' ὅσσ' ἐν ἐμῷ οἴκῳ κειμήλια κεῖται, lies only 12 verses further down from the *o* 101, and very often this kind of neighbourhood brings about anomalies (cf. M. Parry, *Form.* 14).

Of the remaining two verses with irregularity in the last syllable of ὅθι, we will try to examine first the verse *Δ* 516 ἐρχομένη καθ' ὅμιλον, ὅθι μεθιέντα(ς) ἴδοιτο. The first hemistich is to be found also in *Δ* 445 ἐρχομένη καθ' ὅμῑλον, ὀφέλλουσα στόνον ἀνδρῶν, not very far from the other; ὅμῑλον has the same rhythm as ἵκᾱνον, and recurs 43 times in the *Iliad* (38 if we subtract the repetitions), 11 in the *Odyssey* (9 without the repetitions); ὅμῑλος is found twice in the *Iliad*, 3 times in the *Odyssey*. Out of the total of 52 verses, ὅμῑλος-ὅμῑλον are localized

---

1) S. E. O' Neill, Jr, *o.c.* p. 145: *Il.* 70,1%, *Od.* 63,2% for the former place, *Il.* 29,9%, *Od.* 35,5% for the latter.

in the second trochee ($\smile\overset{2}{—}\smile$) twice; in the third trochee 22 times; in the fifth trochee 3 times; in the last foot 25 times. We remind the reader that Table 29 of O' Neill Jr. (p. 151) shows a percentage of 40,6% in the *Iliad* and 42,0% in the *Odyssey* for the localization of the amphibrachic form in the last foot of the verse.

Μεθιέντα, on the other hand, belongs to the word-type $\smile\smile—\smile$ (third paeon), which occupies more frequently the arsis of the second foot up to the third trochaic caesura (59,9% *Iliad*, 62,5% *Odyssey*), and the arsis of the fourth foot up to the fifth trochaic caesura (39,5% *Il.*, 33,1%); the word occurs in the *Iliad* only in the forms μεθιέντα (4 times) and μεθιέντας (once), and occupies twice the first (*Δ* 240 οὓς τινας αὖ μεθιέντας ἴδοις στυγεροῦ πολέμοιο, *Z* 330 εἴ τινά που μεθιέντα ἴδοις στυγεροῦ πολέμοιο), and three times the second of the above mentioned places (*Δ* 516 ἐρχομένη καθ' ὅμιλον, ὅθι μεθιέντα [v.l. μεθιέντας] ἵδοιτο, *N* 229 ὀτρύνεις δὲ καὶ ἄλλον, ὅθι μεθιέντα ἴδηαι, *M* 268 νείκεον, ὄντινα πάγχυ μάχης μεθιέντα ἴδοιεν)[1]. We also see here that the special use of the word places it three times out of five in the arsis of the fourth foot up to the fifth trochee. In this case as in the case of κειμήλια the interpolation of ὅθι after the feminine caesura of the third trochee was the cause of the irregularity, because ὅθι in this position should, as we have pointed out, be used in iambic form; this has been succesfully achieved in most of the cases—especially with words of the type $—\overset{5}{—}$, $\smile\smile$, $—\overset{5}{—}\smile$, three times with κρατέουσιν ($\smile\smile\overset{5}{—}\smile$), once with ζωννύσκετο ($—\overset{5}{—}\smile\smile$)—, but it was impossible with κειμήλια and μεθιέντα. We may add here that the frequent and correct use of a spondeic word after ὅθῐ (ξανθός, πρῶτος, ῥέζουσ') has caused also another irregularity at the v. *λ* 190 ὅθι δμῶ$\overset{5}{\breve{\text{ε}}}$ς ἐνὶ οἴκῳ where δμῶες needed to be followed by a word with initial consonant; but in his effort to avoid successfully the *pseudo-long* in the last syllable of ὅθι the poet could not avoid another, which belongs to a different category of word-types ($—\smile$), and is due probably to the very frequent use of ἐνὶ οἴκῳ (οἴκῳ 54 times in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*, 36 times out of which ἐνὶ οἴκῳ at the end of the verse)[2].

---

1) S. also μεθέηκα ($\smile\smile\overset{3}{—}\smile$) *P* 639, μεθίησι ($\smile\smile\overset{5}{—}\smile$) *N* 234, μεθέηκεν ($\smile\smile\overset{5}{—}\smile$) *Ψ* 434, μεθέηκε ($\smile\smile\overset{6}{—}\smile$) *Ω* 48, without irregularity in the last syllable of the preceding words.

2) Parry, o.c. 16 «l' expression δμῶες ἐνὶ οἴκῳ doit être rapprochée de celle qui tombe à cette position (fin du vers) en π 140 δμώων ἐνὶ οἴκῳ».

*

Let us turn now to the irregularities which take place before ὅθι. I do not intend to make a thorough examination of all the words with chasmodic long or pseudo-long, because such an investigation would lead us very far; I will rather try to give an example of each word-type[1], so as to show the relationship of ὅθι with the words preceding it and to illustrate the method further.

1) *Molossic word-types;*

Y 391 Τυγαίῃ, ὅθι τοι τέμενος πατρώιόν ἐστιν.

Τυγαίη occurs once more in the *Iliad* (probably not as personal name): *B* 865 υἱὲ Ταλαιμένεος, τὼ Τυγαίῃ τέκε λίμνη (catalogue of the Trojans)[2]; the dative in the first verse depends on v. 390 γενεὴ δέ τοι ἔστ' ἐπὶ λίμνῃ / 391 Τυγαίῃ. Owing to the rarity of the word, we do not expect to draw any help from its use in the epics. We must, therefore, examine the localization of the molossic word-types in the hexameter as well as that of the other words after ὅθι. The tables of O' Neill, Jr. (o.c. p. 144) give the following picture: *Iliad* 49,4%, *Odyssey* 50,3% for the 3rd place ($=\overset{1}{-}-\overset{2}{-}$: first foot and second thesis), 34,7% and 31,8% respectively for the fifth place ($\overset{2}{-}-\overset{3}{-}$: penthemimere caesura), with minor numbers for the other places. The word τέμενος recurs 9 times in the *Iliad*, 3 times in the *Odyssey*, and once in the *Hymns* (*Ven.* 59), of course always in anapaestic form ($\smile\smile\overset{2}{-}$: once; $\smile\smile\overset{3}{-}$: twice; $\smile\smile\overset{4}{-}$: 10 times). The various forms of πατρώιος (πατρώια, πατρώιον, πατρώιοι, πατρωΐῃ etc.) used always as major ionics, recur 24 times in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (*Il.* 8, *Od.* 16), out of which 16 times in the bucolic diaeresis ($-\overset{4}{\smile\smile}$: i.e. after the penthemimere caesura), and 8 times in the fifth diaeresis ($-\overset{5}{\smile\smile}$);the combination τέμενος πατρώιον is found *only* in the verse *Y* 391. The localization of the anapaests (s. O' Neill, Jr., o.c. p. 141) is as follows: Iliad 13,9%, Odyssey 13,5% for the third place ($\smile\smile\overset{2}{-}$); 41% and 34% respectively for the fifth place ($\smile\smile\overset{3}{-}$); 33,8% and 39,8% respectively for the seventh place ($\smile\smile\overset{4}{-}$); 9,4% and 10,7% respectively for the ninth place ($\smile\smile\overset{5}{-}$); 1,9% and 2% respectively for the eleventh place ($\smile\smile\overset{6}{-}$). The interpolation of ὅθι τοι after the molossic form of the beginning of the verse has displaced the anapaest to the next position; the same has happened in *Ψ* 148 (ἐς πηγὰς ὅθι τοι τέμενος βωμός τε θυήεις).

2) *Anapaestic word-types:* ἐν ποταμῷ;

---

1) I will leave out the type $\smile-$ for another occasion.

2) Cf the app. crit. in the edition of T. W. Allen; in *Herod.* 8,136 however: *Ἀλεξάνδρου.. ἀδελφεὴν Τυγαίην.*

The anapaests can occupy theoretically all the dactylic arses and the successive theses; yet, they have a different frequency in the various feet, as we have seen from the tables of O' NEILL Jr. (s. above). The frequency of the anapaestic forms of the substantive ποταμὸς is the following: ποταμοὶ 8 times (*Od.*—*Hy.* 4; *Il.* 4), ποταμὸν 18 times (*Od.*—*Hy.* 8; *Il.* 10), ποταμοῦ 13 times(*Od.*—*Hy.* 5; *Il.* 8), ποταμῷ 15 times(*Od.*—*Hy.* 5; *Il.* 10) ποταμῶν 12 times (*Od.*—*Hy.* 7; *Il.* 5), ποταμὸς 12 times (only in the *Il.*), ποταμοὺς once (in the *Il.*), ποταμώ once (in the *Il.*); total 80.

The localization of these forms shows the following picture:

a) ποταμοί, ποταμόν, ποταμοῦ, ποταμῷ in $\smile\smile\overset{2}{—}$: 13 times (*Od.*—*Hy.* 5; *Il.* 8; irregularities: *chasmodic long* in *B* 861 ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθι περ Τρῶας κεράιζε καὶ ἄλλους; *Σ* 521 ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθι τ' ἀρδμὸς ἔην πάντεσσι βοτοῖσον, *λ* 238 ἢ ποταμοῦ ἠράσσατ');

b) ποταμόν, ποταμός, ποταμοῦ, ποταμῷ, ποταμῶν in $\smile\smile\overset{3}{—}$: 30 times (*Od.*—*Hy.* 16; *Il.* 14; *chasmodic long* in *ζ* 210 λούσατέ τ' ἐν ποταμῷ, δθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας ἔστ'ἀνέμοιο; *pseudo-long* in *ε* 460 καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐς ποταμὸν ἁλιμυρήεντα μεθῆκεν);

c) ποταμοί, ποταμόν, ποταμός, ποταμοῦ, ποταμούς, ποταμῷ, ποταμῶν in $\smile\smile\overset{4}{—}$: 29 times (*Od.*—*Hy* 10; *Il.* 19; *chasmodic long*: *E* 598 στήῃ ἐπ' ὠκυρόῳ ποταμῷ ἅλαδε προρέοντι; *Θ* 490 νόσφι νεῶν ἀγαγών, ποταμῷ ἔπι δινήεντι; *B* 659 τὴν ἄγετ' ἐξ Ἐφύρης, / *O* 531 ἤγαγεν ἐξ Ἐφύρης, / *B* 839; *M* 97 αἴθωνες, μεγάλοι, } ποταμοῦ ἄπο Σελλήεντος; probably correct: *Φ* 282 ἐρχθέντ' ἐν μεγάλῳ ποταμῷ ὡς παῖδα συφορβόν[1]);

d) ποταμός, ποταμώ, ποταμῶν in $\smile\smile\overset{6}{—}$: 8 times (*Od.*—*Hy.* 2; *Il.* 6).

We shall now examine the irregularties:

a) The localization of ἐν ποταμῷ in the arsis of the first and the thesis of the second foot is due to enjambement (*B* 860/61 ἀλλ' ἐδάμη ὑπὸ χερσὶ ποδώκεος Αἰακίδαο, / ἐν ποταμῷ; *Σ* 520/21 οἱ δ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἵκανον, ὅθι σφίσιν εἶκε λοχῆσαι, / ἐν ποταμῷ); in *λ* 238 ἢ ποταμοῦ ἠράσσατ' the whole relative sentence depends on the preceding verse also (φῆ δὲ Κρηθῆος γυνὴ ἔμμεναι Αἰολίδαο), where ποταμοῦ is the object of ἠράσσατ', which owing to its palimbaccheeic form occupies mostly the third trochaic caesura (O' NEILL, Jr., o.c. p. 143), and is found only in this verse. The sentence introduced by ὅθι in *B* 861 is based, therefore, metrically on κεράιζε ($\smile\smile\overset{5}{—}\smile$), which occurs only here, and could occupy the arsis of the second foot up to the third caesura (s. above p. 362); on the other hand, the indispensable presence of ὅθι (+τοι s. above p, 353, IA, b1) after ποταμῷ

1. Cf. V. KNÖS, *De digammo hom.* p. 167; M. PARRY, *Les form.* p. 52-55.

has already pushed κεράιζε into the place it occupies now, and has accomodated the other words, Τρῶας etc, accordingly. In Σ 521 (ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθι τ' ἀρδμὸς ἔην πάντεσσι βοτοῖσι) the adverbial expression ἐν π., which constitutes again an enjambement, serves in this case as an apposition to the preceding ὅθι-clause: Σ 520 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ῥ' ἵκανον ὅθι σφίσιν εἶκε λοχῆσαι, to which the new ὅθι-clause (Σ 521 ἐν π., ὅθι τ' ἀρδμὸς ἔην πάντεσσι βοτοῖσι), is in its turn the necessary explanation. We have little help from the word ἀρδμός, because it occurs once more in the *Odyssey* (ν 247 παντοίη, ἐν δ' ἀρδμοὶ ἐπηετανοὶ παρέασιν), but, naturally enough, this one also occupies the third trochaic caesura.

b) The localization of ποταμῷ in the arsis of the second and the thesis of the third foot in ζ 210 (λούσατέ τ' ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας ἔστ' ἀνέμοιο) is due to the presence of the verb λούσατε, which owing to its dactylic form occupies the first dactyl (cf. O' Neill, Jr., o.c. p. 142; first dactyl: *Il.* 25,7%, *Od.* 33,8%; second dactyl: *Il.* 9,6%. *Od.* 7,1%, fourth dactyl: *Il.* 29,4%, *Od.* 27,6%; fifth dactyl *Il.* 35,3% *Od.* 31,5%). The word σκέπας occurs only in the Odyssey : ε 443∼ η 282 λεῖος πετράων, καὶ ἐπὶ σκέπας ἦν ἀνέμοιο, ζ 210 λούσατέ τ' ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας ἔστ' ἀνέμοιο, ζ 212 καδ δ' ἄρ' Ὀδυσσῆ' εἶσαν ἐπὶ σκέπας, ὡς ἐκέλευσεν. In the first three verses σκέπας seems to be the subject of ἐπ'-ἔστ(ι) or ἐπ'-ἦν (ἀνέμοιο depends on σκέπας), while in the last, ἐπὶ σκέπας is a local adverbial expression to καθεῖσαν; we notice, however, that in all four verses ἐπὶ σκέπας occupies the second hemistich after the third trochaic caesura (with ἔστ'∼ἦν-ἀνέμοιο, or with ὡς ἐκέλευσεν which is metrically equivalent; they fill the verse after the bucolic diaeresis); the presence of ὅθ' before ἐπὶ σκέπας adds another short element at the beginning of the second hemistich, and this means that the first hemistich stops at the penthemimere caesura, where a covered long syllable was needed, as we have explained. Instead, there is ἐν ποταμῷ with its *chasmodic long*, and νιψάμενος with its *pseudo-long* (s. below). Is ἐπὶ σκέπας ἔστ' ἀνέμοιο a formulaic expression? I rather doubt that such a rare contingency—for an epic poem—as «to seek shelter from the wind», might have entered beforehand into the metrical preoccupations of the aedes and imposed on them the trouble of memorizing such an insignificancy; I would rather see this case as a clear example of the adaptation to the metre of a common sentence of every-day life; beyond that, we see rather clearly that every word or expression tends to occupy a certain place in the verse according not only to its metrical

type but also to its meaning. Looking into the tables of O' NEILL, Jr. (p. 143), we see that the word-type ⏑—⏑⏑ (=ἐπὶ σκέπας) occupies at an amazing percentage of *Il.* 95,3% *Od.* 95,6% the position after the trochaic caesura up to the bucolic diaeresis, that is the same in which our ἐπὶ σκέπας is localized.

c) The *pseudo-long* in ε 460 (ποταμὸν ἁλιμυρήεντα μεθῆκεν)is due to the anapaest which was expected of ποταμὸν if a word beginning with a consonant was to follow afterwards; instead, we find a formidable six-syllable vowel-beginning rare adjective of a very rare metrical type (⏑⏑——$\overset{5}{—}$⏑), which could fit *only* in this place (s. the tables of O' NEILL. Jr., p. 150 «rare types», where there are only two instances, both from the *Iliad*). The adjective ἁλιμυρήεντα is perhaps a creation of the poet —if it is not traditional[1]—, and is found once more with a different metrical type—and, naturally enough, in a different place (⏑⏑——$\overset{6}{—}$—)but with the same substantive: Φ 190 ποταμῶν ἁλιμυρηέντων. This also is the place where such a metrical type could be localized (s. O' NEILL, Jr., p. 150 «rare types», with two examples from the *Iliad*, one from the *Odyssey*, 4 from *Hesiod*, 10 from *Aratus*, 6 from *Callimach*, 2 from *Apollonius*, all in the same place).

d) The *chasmodic long* in the fourth thesis (*E* 598 ποταμῷ ἄλαδε προρέοντι, Θ 490 ποταμῷ ἔπι δινήεντι, *B* 659 *O* ~531 ~*B* 839 ~*M* 97 ποταμοῦ ἄπο Σελλήεντος is due to the transposition of the anapaest ποταμῷ after the verb (—⏑) and the qualifying adjective with preposition (⏑+—⏑⏑—) in *E* 598: στήῃ ἐπ' ὠκυρόῳ ποταμῷ; in *B* 839~*M*97 after two adjectives: (ἵπποι) αἴθωνες, μεγάλοι, ποταμοῦ ἄπο); in Θ 490 νόσφι νεῶν ἀγαγών, ποταμῷ ἔπι, *B* 659 ~ *O* 531 τὴν ἄγετ' ἐξ Ἐφύρης, ποταμοῦ ἄπο..; ἐπὶ...ποταμῷ, ποταμῷ ἔπι, ποταμοῦ ἄπο stand as local specifications of a wider local adverb. The case *E* 598 (interposition of ὠκυρόῳ between ἐπὶ and ποταμῷ) illustrates clearly the difficulties in the use of a pyrrhic preposition with initial and final vowel (⏑⏑: ἐπί, ἀπὸ), introducing the genitive or dative of an anapaestic word with a simple initial consonant. The difference is also evident in the cases of παρ ποταμὸν or ποταμὸν πάρα, in which the difficulties are overcome. Under these conditions the inversion ποταμῷ ἔπι or ποταμοῦ ἄπο with the unavoidable chasmodic long was a minor evil. The final words δινήεντι, Σελλήεντος have also contributed by their metrical type

1. S. M. PARRY, *L'épithète traditionelle dans Homère* p. 55 «la rareté de telle autre (expression) n'indique pas nécessairement qu'elle soit originale et non traditionnelle».

(– – – ⏑) to the localization of ποταμῷ ἔπι, ποταμοῦ ἄπο; δινήεντα, δινήεντι, δινήεντος occur 12 times in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*, out of which 10 at the end of the verse; Σελλήεντος only in the *Iliad* and only in the above mentioned verses, where in all probability we have a formulaic expression. The word - type – – – ⏑ (= – – – ⏑ for the last foot) occupies almost exclusively (*Il.* 96,5%, *Od.* 96,3%; cf. O' Neill, Jr., o.c. 147) the last part of the verse.

3) *Pseudo-anapaestic forms*;

a) θ 277 βῆ ρ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμόνδε, ὅθι οἱ φίλα δέμνι' ἔκειτο.

For the mechanism of this kind of irregularity s. ποταμὸν ἁλιμυρήεντα (above). The frequency and distribution of the various anapaestic or potentially anapaestic forms of θάλαμός in the various parts of the verse is as follows:

⏑⏑^{2}	⏑⏑^{3}	⏑⏑^{4}	⏑⏑^{5}
ἐς θάλαμον (*Od.* 5)	ἐς θάλαμον (*Od.* 8; *Il.*3)	εἰς...θάλαμον (*Il.* 1) θάλαμον (*Od.*2; *Il.* 2)	
ἐκ θαλάμου (*Od.* 1; *Il.*1)	ἐκ θαλάμου (*Od.* 1)	θαλάμου (*Od.* 2)	θαλάμων (*Od.* 1)
ἐκ θαλάμων (*Od.* 1)	ἐκ θαλάμων (*Il.* 1)	ἐκτὸς...θαλάμου (*Od.* 1)	
ἐς θαλάμους (*Od.* 1;)	ἐν θαλάμῳ (*Od.* 1; *Il.* 5)	θάλαμοι (*Il.* 2)	
(καὶ) θαλάμους (*Il.* 1)	[θάλαμόνδε (*Od.* 3)]		[θάλαμόνδε] (*Od.*1)

Total 40: ⏑⏑^{2}=10 ⏑⏑^{3}(⏑)=19 ⏑⏑^{4}=10 ⏑⏑^{5}=1

Chasmodic long:
⏑⏑^{2}: χ 140 ἐκ θαλάμου· ἔνδον γάρ, ὀΐομαι, οὐδέ πῃ ἄλλῃ
⏑⏑^{3}: Ζ 336 ἦμην ἐν θαλάμῳ, ἔθελον δ' ἄχεϊ προτραπέσθαι
ϱ 506 ἠμένη ἐν θαλάμῳ· ὁ δ' ἐδείπνει δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.

Pseudo-long: ⏑⏑^{3}⏑: θ 277 βῆ ρ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμον, ὅθι οἱ φίλα δέμνι' ἔκειτο.

If we look into these 40 cases of anapaestic forms of θάλαμος we notice that 30 of them, that is 75% (except: θάλαμον 4 times, θαλάμους once, θαλάμου twice, θαλάμων once, θάλαμοι twice), are accompanied by a preposition: ἐς θάλαμον 17 times, ἐκ θαλάμου 3 times, ἐκτὸς θαλάμου once, ἐκ θαλάμων 2 times, ἐς θαλάμους once, ἐν θαλάμῳ 6 times; that, again, very few of them end in a covered long (θαλάμους twice, θαλάμων 3 times), and that, consequently, the rest which end in naked long or an insufficiently covered short vowel are

exposed to the danger of a next word with initial vowel or a simple consonant. Perhaps we might also add that owing to the fact that Greek relative pronouns and particles begin with ὁ-, the poet does not have many alternatives to complete a local adverbial expression with a relative clause beginning with a consonant. This may be the reason why after such an adverbial expression—or a simple dative or genitive—we frequently see an abrupt stop or change of construction, the result of which is not always very successful, at least for the protection of the naked vowel or diphthong: χ 140 ἐκ θαλάμου· ἔνδον γάρ;...ϱ 506 ἠμένη ἐν θαλάμῳ. ὁ δ' ἐδείπνει...; Ζ 336 ἤμην ἐν θαλάμῳ, ἔθελον δ'....

As for v. θ 277 βῆ ϱ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμόν, ὅθι οἱ (φίλα δέμνι'ἐ)κειτο, we may compare χ 109 βῆ δ' ἴμεναι θάλαμόνδ', ὅθι οἱ [κλυτὰ τεύχεα] κεῖτο, where the problem is fittingly solved[1]; we find ἐς θάλαμον or simply θάλαμον followed by a consonant in 20 out of the 40 times.

b) ο 175 ἐλθὼν ἐξ ὄρεος, ὅθι οἱ γενεή τε τόκος τε

We have noticed before (s. above, p. 351) that the grammatical forms of the third declension are metrically difficult to deal with, because they end mostly in a short syllable (exception: gen. plur. -ων); this difficulty is more marked in nouns of two short syllables (πόλις, ὄρος etc), which may in other cases extend to three or more syllables of tribrach and other metrical types ὄρεος, ὄρεϊ, ὄρεσιν, ὄρεα, ὄρεσσι, πολίεσσι). We limit our investigation to the tribrach types, which must acquire an anapaestic form so that they fit in the hexameter. Here are the anapaestic and potentially anapaestic grammatical forms of ὄρος in Homer:

⏑⏑–^{2}	⏑⏑–^{3}	⏑⏑–^{4}	⏑⏑–^{5}
(ἐξ) ὀρέων 2		ὀρέων 14	ὀρέων 1
		(κατ' Ἰδαίων ὀ.6)	
ὄρεος 4	ὀρέων 8 (ὑψη-	(ἀπ' Ἰδαίων ὀ.3)	ὄρεος 2
	λῶν ὀ. 4)	(ἐκ)..ὄρεος 1	
	ὄρεος 2	ὄρεϊ 1	
	(ἐξ) ὄρεος 5	ὄρεσιν 1	ὄρεσι 1
			ὄρεα 5 (ὀ.νιφόεν-
			τα 1; ὄ.σκιόεντα 4),

Total 47: ⏑⏑–^{2}:6 ⏑⏑–^{3}=15 ⏑⏑–^{4}=17 ⏑⏑–^{5}=9

1) There is a v. l. ἐς θάλαμόν δ' in *W* (Vratislav. 28); s. A. Ludwich, *Hom. Carm.* app. crit. in v.; this is metrically, but not grammatically, sound (pleonastic δ'); However, there is no serious reason why we could not introduce the reading βῆ δ' ἴμεναι θάλαμόν δ' of χ 109.

Pseudo-long: *o* 175 ἐλθὼν ἐξ ὄρεος, ὄθι οἱ γενεή τε τόκος τε

We see that gen. plur. ὀρέων occurs in 25 out of the 47 times, and mostly in typical expressions (ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων, ἀπ' Ἰδαίων ὀρέων), a sharp difference from the treatment of θάλαμον, which is found mostly in the singular (33:7); this may be due to the fact that the poet did speak mostly of a definite θάλαμος at a time, and not of θάλαμοι in general and in the plural (especially in the *Odyssey*, where the word mostly occurs: *Od.* 25 times + 4 θάλαμόνδε : *Il.* 15); and also to the fact that, on the contrary, he could speak of ὄρεα in general and in a genuine plural, not of a definite ὄρος. Notwithstanding this, tribrach forms of ὄρος are not so rare (22 out of 47, against 21 out of 40 for θάλαμος). But even from them the poet used mostly the gen. ὄρεος (14 times), because it was much easier for him to join after it a word with a simple initial consonant (as it was the case with θάλαμον: 21 times). On the contrary, he rarely used the tribrach forms ending in a naked vowel, because he needed after them a word with two initial consonants; hence the formulaic expression ὄρεᾱ σκιόεντα 4 times, and the variant ὄρεᾱ νιφόεντα (once, and correctly).

The irregularity after ἐλθὼν ἐξ ὄρεος is due to the fact that the poet thought of giving a birth-place and a family to the eagle (*o* 161 αἰετὸς ἀργὴν χῆνα φέρων ὀνύχεσσι...), which appeared at the moment of the departure of Telemachus from Sparta. Hence the necessity to begin the second hemistich with the local adverbial clause introduced by ὄθι, after which a long syllable was indispensable according to what has been said before. The anapaestic forms of γενεὴ (γενεή, γενεῇ, γενεῇ, γενεήν, γενεῆς) occur 49 times (*Il.* 34; *Od.* and *Hy.* 15), and they are variously localized (⏑⏑–^{2}: 4 times, ⏑⏑–^{3}: 24 times, ⏑⏑–^{4}: 14 times, ⏑⏑–^{6}: 7 times) owing to the mobility of the anapaest (s. above p. 363-4). The combination γενεή τε τόκος τε occurs twice in the *Iliad* (*H* 128 πάντων Ἀργείων ἐρέων γενεήν τε τόκον τε; *O* 141 πάντων ἀνθρώπων ῥῦσθαι γενεήν τε τόκον τε), and in the verse we discuss, in the *Odyssey*; τόκος alone is found only once in the *Iliad* (*T* 119 Ἀλκμήνης δ' ἀπέπαυσε τόκον...) and in *Hy. Ap.* 116 (δὴ τότε τὴν τόκος εἶλε) with a slight variation of meaning; the gen. τόκοιο twice (*Il. P* 5... οὐ πρὶν εἰδυῖα τόκοιο; *Hy. Cer.* 101... ἥ τε τόκοιο); γενεή τε τόκος τε looks like a formulaic expression, but it is remarkable that it occurs only three times out of 49 verses with γενεή.

4) *Choriambic word-types*;

B 722 Λήμνῳ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, ὄθι μιν λίπον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν

The adj. ἠγάθεος in its choriambic or potentially choriambic

(–◡◡◡) forms occurs 13 times (*Il.* 5, *Od.* 5, *Hy.* 3).

ἠγαθέη: *Hy. Ap.* 37 Λέσβος τ' ἠγαθέη, Μάκαρος ἕδος Αἰολίωνος.

ἠγαθέῃ: *A* 252 ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέῃ, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσεν
B 722 Λήμνῳ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, ὅθι μιν λίπον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν (*chasm. long*)
δ 599 ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέῃ, σὺ δέ με χρόνον ἐνθάδ' ἐρύκεις
Θ 80 Πυθοῖ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, ὅθ' ὑπέρβη λάινον οὐδὸν (*chasm. long*)
Hy 24, 2 Πυθοῖ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, ἱερὸν δόμον ἀμφιπολεύεις (*chasm. long*).

ἠγαθέην: *Φ* 58 Λῆμνον ἐς ἠγαθέην πεπερημένος...
Φ 79 Λῆμνον ἐς ἠγαθέην, ἑκατόμβοιον δέ τοι ἦλφον
β 308 ἐς Πύλον ἠγαθέην μετ' ἀγαυοῦ πατρὸς ἀκουήν
δ 702 ε 20 ἐς Πύλον ἠγαθέην, ἠδ' ἐς Λακεδαίμονα δῖαν
ξ 180 ἐς Πύλον ἠγαθέην· τὸν δὲ μνηστῆρες ἀγαυοὶ
Hy. Merc. 216 ἐς Πύλον ἠγαθέην, διζήμενος εἰλίποδας βοῦς.

ἠγάθεον: *Z* 133 σεῦε κατ' ἠγάθεον Νυσήιον.

The choriambic forms are localized according to the tables of O'Neill Jr. (o.c. p. 144) mostly in the first hemistich ($\overset{1}{—}\smile\smile\overset{2}{—}$: *Il.* 42,2% - *Od.* 37,3%; $\overset{2}{—}\smile\smile\overset{3}{—}$: *Il.* 37,6% - *Od.* 48,6%) with minor percentages in the middle of the verse ($\overset{3}{—}\smile\smile\overset{4}{—}$: *Il.* 2,3% - *Od.* 0) and the second hemistich ($\overset{4}{—}\smile\smile\overset{5}{—}$: *Il.* 10,4% - *Od.* 9,0%; $\overset{5}{—}\smile\smile\overset{6}{—}$: *Il*, 7,5% - *Od.* 5,1%). Their localization in the second dactyl up to the penthemimere caesura presupposes the presence of a dactyl or a spondee before them; this is the case with the forms of ἠγάθεος, which are all localized in this place and are preceded by spondeic or dactylic forms of four place-names: Λέσβος τ' ἠγ. once; ἐν Πύλῳ ἠ. twice, ἐς Πύλον ἠ. 4 times; Λήμνῳ ἐν ἠ. once, Λῆμνον ἐς ἠ. twice; Πυθοῖ ἐν ἠ. twice)[1]. I will not discuss here whether ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέῃ or Λήμνῳ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ etc. is a formulaic expression[2]; I notice only that we find two more cases of irregularity with Πυθοῖ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, with ὅθ' (= ὅτε?) in *θ* 80[3], and with ἱερὸν in *Hy.* 24, 2, and these two also in the dative. In all, out of the 6 pontentially chasmodic forms of ἠγαθέη-ῃ (+one potentially pseudo-long: ἠγάθεον; s. p. 370 n. 1), the poet managed to cover the final long vowel or diphthong only in 3 cases, and this does once more underline the dif-

1) In *Z* 133 (σεῦε, κατ' ἠγάθεον Νυσήιον) the poet has placed the verb (completing the dactyl with κατ') at the beginning of the verse, because Νυσήιον did not fit there; by this arrangement he avoided also the potential pseudo-long of ἠγάθεον.

2) Λέσβος etc occurs 7 times in *Il.*, *Od.* and *Hy.*, out of which only once with ἠγ.; Λῆμνος etc 12 times, out of which 3 with ἠγ.; Πυθοῖ, Πυθῶ etc 8 times, out of which 2 with ἠγ.; Πύλος etc 51 times, out of which 6 with ἠγ.

3) Considered as ὅθι in the *Index Homericus* of Gehring.

ficulty of connecting a relative adverb with initial vowel after an adverbial expression of place, as it is the case of ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέῃ, Λήμνῳ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ etc, and as we have pointed out before.

5) *Pseudo-choriambic word-types* (–◡◡◡):

μ 336 χεῖρας νιψάμενός, ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας ἦν ἀνέμοιο;

νιψάμενος-νιψάμενοι in correct choriambic use occur in three more verses (Ω 305 νιψάμενος δὲ κύπελλον ἐδέξατο ἦς ἀλόχοιο, β 261 χεῖρας νιψάμενος πολιῆς ἁλὸς εὔχετ' Ἀθήνῃ, κ 184 χεῖρας νιψάμενοι τεύχοντ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα). In Ω 305 the choriamb comes first, while in the other two verses we find a spondee before it, as we have remarked in the preceding case. The clause ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας ἦν ἀνέμοιο is not connected to an adverbial locution of place or to a local adverb, the presence of which, though, could not always be metrically successful, as we have seen in ζ 210 and in other cases (s. above). M. Parry (Form. p. 34) cites the three verses with χεῖρας νιψάμενος (-οι) together with ζ 210, implying that the second hemistich of this verse (ὅθ' ἐπὶ σκέπας ἔστ' ἀνέμοιο) as a formulaic expression of the second hemistich, has been joined to another formulaic expression of the first hemistich, leaving as a result the pseudo-long in λουσάμενος (μ 336).

But a little further (op. c. p. 38-40) Parry says that «il serait plus utile d' orienter la recherche dans un autre sens, c' est-à-dire vers l' étude des *types*—(his italics)—de formules et du jeu de l' analogie qui en a déterminé l' existence. Par example on peut signaler le fait que, sur les 175 cas de syllabe finale brève devant la penthémimère que cite Knös, cette coupe est précédée 24 fois d' un participe en -όμενος, -όμενον, -άμενος, -άμενον, soit au nominatif, soit à l' accusatif: μαχησόμενος (A153), ἀπερχόμενον (A535) (other examples follow). Une étude de ces 24 cas montre qu' il s' agit.. de l' un des deux artifices de versification suivants: 1) Le poète développe sa phrase...en ajoutant au commencement du vers suivant soit un participe, soit une expression participiale...». This is a good observation,[1] but if we look into the metrical form of these participles we realize that all are choriambic or potentially choriambic (–◡◡◡) in their last four syllables - if they happen to have more than four. The first 200 verses of *M* of the Iliad, for instance, present 26 such verses with a choriamb at the penthemimere caesura, and many of these choriambs or potential choriambs *happen to be* participles, ending mostly—but not only—in -ομενος -αμενος :*M* 2 ἰᾶτ' Εὐρύπυλον, 20 Ῥῆσός θ' Ἑπτάπορός (τε),

1) S. also K. Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache* p. 41.

31 αὖτις δ' ἠιόνᾱ, 39 Ἕκτορα *δειδιότᾱς*, 51 τόλμων ὠκύποδᾱς, 52 χείλει *ἐφεσταότᾱς*, 60 δὴ τότε Πουλυδάμᾱς, 63 ἡ δὲ μάλ' ἀργαλέη, 68 Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, 80 ὃς φάτο Πουλυδάμας, 90 τεῖχος *ῥηξάμενοι*, 91 καί σφι Κεβριόνης, 96 163 Ἄσιος Ὑρτακίδης, 110 ἀλλ' οὐχ Ὑρτακίδης, 121 εὗρ' *ἐπικεκλιμένας*, 122 ἀλλ' *ἀναπεπταμένας*, 129 τὸν μὲν Πειρίθοου (υἷα), 136 μίμνον *ἐπερχόμενῶν*, 138 ὑψόσ' *ἀνασχόμενοι*, 152 ἄντην *βαλλομένων*, 155 βάλλον *ἀμυνόμενοι*, 156 νηῶν τ' ὠκυπόρων, 166 σχήσειν ἡμέτερόν (γε), 182 ἔνθ' αὖ Πειριθόου (υἱός), 192 πλῆξ' αὐτοσχεδίην, 194 πάντας ἐπασσυτέρους; and it is not the fact that they are participles that does or does not cause the eventual irregularity, but the mere fact that they are potential choriambs (or choriambs with a naked final long); and, again, it is not due to the fact that they are at the penthemimere caesura that we find them sometimes with a pseudolong (or chasmodic long), but to the fact that, being choriambs or potential choriambs, they tend to occupy mostly this place, if they happen to be preceded by a dactyl or a spondee (or even by a minor metrical unit, if they have more than four syllables), as is frequently the case (s. p. 370). Consequently the penthemimere caesura must be considered as a mere point of contact, one out of more junctures that exist in the hexameter, at which one of the irregularities may occur, depending on the metrical types of the words.

It seems then to me that χεῖρας νιψάμενος is not necessarily a formulaic expression but an ordinary phrase of everyday life, and we have said the same of ἐπὶ σκέπας ἔστ' ἀνέμοιο(s. above p. 365). I would rather say that the poet often avoided it, although he had many occasions to use it (see the forms of νίζω). In *Ω* 305, in his effort to accomodate more words in the same verse (probably also because the preceding verse ended with χερσὶν ἔχουσα), the poet did not have any difficulty in leaving out χεῖρας. In the other verses, χεῖρας stands regularly before a potential choriamb, as we have pointed out above; χεῖρας, χεῖρες, with spondeic or trochaic value, χείρεσσ' only with spondeic, often occur at the beginning of the verse with words or combinations of words (of mostly choriambic or molossic metrical type) that fill the first hemistich up to the penthemimere or tritotrochaic caesura (*ε* 454 χεῖράς τε στιβαράς, *κ* 376 χεῖρας ἰάλλοντᾱ, *π* 16 χεῖράς τ' ἀμφοτέρας, *π* 242 χεῖράς τ' αἰχμητήν, *σ* 100 χεῖρας ἀνασχόμενοι, *Z* 58 χεῖράς θ' ἡμετέρας, *Z* 233 χεῖράς τ' ἀλλήλων, *Θ* 347, *O* 369 χεῖρας ἀνίσχοντᾱς, *Λ* 146 χεῖρας ἀπὸ ξίφεῖ, *Σ* 317, *Ψ* 18 χεῖρας ἐπ' ἀνδροφόνους, *M* 382 χείρεσσ' ἀμφοτέρῃσι, *Π* 704 χείρεσσ' ἀθανάτῃσι etc), and I see no difference in χεῖρας νιψάμενος. In other words, it was in the poet's intention to transform a potential choriamb into a real one by joining after it a word with initial conso-

nant, as he successfully did with the other examples I have given here, and as we have seen in the examples with ἠγαθέη (s. above p. 370). But he failed in his intention not because he unsuccesfully joined two formulaic hemistichs, but because he thought of completing the meaning—and the verse—by giving a specification of the place and because he did not have at his disposal any adverbs or adverbial locutions with initial consonant, as we have pointed out before.

6) *Palimbaccheic word-types*;

Hy. Ven. 1, 157 ἐς λέχος εὔστρωτόν, ὅθι περ πάρος ἔσκεν ἄνακτι.

This case resembles the preceding as to the construction of the first hemistich with a dactyl (or a spondee) + a choriamb or a molossus, and as to the necessity of introducing an adverbial specification of place in the second hemistich. Here the difficulty is aggravated by the metrical form of εὔστρωτον (palimbacchee – – ⏑ = potential molossus: – – –), which along with the antispast is one of the most prone to the irregularity of the pseudo-long (s. above p. 341)[1]. We only notice here that we do not know from the tables of O' Neill Jr how many times this metrical form has been successfully used as a molossus, but only the frequency of molossi (49,4% *Il.*, 50,3% *Od.* in place $3 = \overset{1}{–} – \overset{2}{–}$; 34,7% and 31,8% respectively in place $5 = \overset{2}{–} – \overset{3}{–}$, as in the our case); but I can give the total numbers of pseudo-longs of this metrical form; these are 73 (*Il.* 48, *Od.* 20, *Hy.* 5, with a few repetitions), out of which 18 (13; 4; 1 respectively) may show only apparent irregularity, because they are followed by a word with initial *F* or *ϱ, λ, μ, ν*. Their distribution in the verse is as follows: $– – \overset{2}{⏑} = 20$ (*Il.* 10; *Od.* 10); $– – \overset{3}{⏑} = 31$ (21; 6; 4); $– – \overset{5}{⏑} = 1$ (*Il.*); $– – \overset{6}{⏑} = 3$ (*Il.*). Total 55.

*

Summing up our exposition we may say:

a) that the individual, real or potential metrical form of the word is the first to be singled out and examined;

b) that the meaning of the word as well as its use and construction in the epic verse are the antagonistic factors which, though subordinated to the law of the individual metrical form as a whole, may nevertheless impose some minor infringements on it;

c) that the metrical forms which precede or follow that in which

1) S. also E. Hermann, ‹Die Behandlung der antispastischen Wörter im homerischen Epos›, *IF* 25, 1909, 285-288.

the irregularity occurs, must also be taken into consideration; their position in the verse too may facilitate the irregularity;

d) that the irregularity is the unsuccessful result of the constant effort to transform or preserve the metrical value of the last syllable of the words; but it reflects at the same time the difficulties of the composition of the verse and the limitations of human ability;

e) that the formulaic expression and its transformation is one of the factors in the irregularity, but this too is subordinated to the metrical laws of the individual words which constitute it;

f) that the enjambement is an important factor in the irregularity, because it breaks the limits of the *isometry* (i.e. one verse — one meaning), and expands into part of the next verse; in this context we may speak of irregularities after the various caesurae—not especially of the penthemimere, hepthemimere, and tritotrochaic—, because the poet is frequently compelled at this point to break the sense or to introduce a new clause.

g) that the analogy is a minor factor in the creation of the irregularity; the reminiscence and slight transformation of neighbouring verses or phrases is more than that apt to produce it, but this could in effect be considered as another form—although a loose one—of the formulaic expression. Within the analogy itself, we may discern also the movement of the same word towards the same place because of its meaning and of its metrical form.

*

Most of the observations and details I have expounded above, constitute very common knowledge to all scholars acquainted with the epic; but I am hopeful that by calling special attention to the most important of them, or by combining some others, I have given a clearer view of the relationship, transformation and movement of the metrical forms and, perhaps, an anatomy of the irregularity. It remains to be seen whether this consitutes also a step towards its explanation.