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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION TO ENJAMBMENT

Enjambment is a poetic phenomenon whereby a syntactic unit is broken across two lines.¹

The separation of constituents that are within the same phrase creates suspense for the listener/reader. Numerous poets throughout the centuries are known for using this tool, including T.S. Eliot, Shakespeare, and Homer. Consider the following examples:


April is the cruelest month, breeding
Lilacs out of the dead land, mixing
Memory and desire, stirring
Dull roots with spring rain.²

2. Shakespeare, *The Winter’s Tale* I.1-4

If you shall chance, Camillo, to visit Bohemia, on
the like occasion whereon my services are now on
foot, you shall see, as I have said, great
difference betwixt our Bohemia and your Sicilia.³

The separation of the verbs ‘breeding’, ‘mixing’, ‘stirring’ from their direct objects
parsing of the sentence. Readers are left in suspense until they hit upon the next line. The same
goes for Shakespeare’s *The Winter’s Tale*. In lines 1-3 it is the separation of the prepositional
phrases ‘on the like occasion’ and ‘on foot’ that is responsible for the excitement. In line 3-4, the
noun phrase ‘great difference’ is split producing the enjambment effect.

---

¹ Orthographically, the term appears as enjambment throughout this paper, except in the case of article titles and
quotes, where the authors’ spelling is preserved (enjambment/enjambement).
² All T.S. Eliot taken from *T.S. Eliot: The Critical Heritage* edited by Michael Grant (see References for details).
³ All Shakespeare taken from *The Winter’s Tale* edited by J.H.P. Pafford (see References for details).
Meter

There is an important distinction to be made between the written compositions of the poet, T.S. Eliot, and the performance pieces of the playwright, Shakespeare. T.S. Eliot wrote poems that were published in books and journals. For a reader, the visual break produced by the enjambment is palpable. However, it is not as easy for the listener to pick up on. *The Waste Land* is a modernist poem without a consistent use of meter or rhyme. Moreover, it includes heteroglossic monologues and dialogues (Crews 1998: 24-25). As a result, there is no regular distinctive metrical marking at the end of a line for the listener.

On the other hand, as a playwright, Shakespeare created performance pieces for an audience. For this reason, one might expect the enjambment to be more audibly discernible. This is not necessarily the case. As in many of his plays, Shakespeare wrote *The Winter’s Tale* in both blank verse and prose (Pafford 1963:1xxxii). The play opens with prose (see example 2). As a result, the enjambment is largely lost on the listener because it also lacks line distinction. Moreover, even when characters speak in iambic pentameter, the effect of the enjambment is soft because the meter is identical from beginning to end (unstressed and stressed syllables in succession). Here again there is no distinctive metrical marker to indicate the end of a line. Therefore, the occurrence of enjambment is less audibly detectable. Consider the following illustration of the repetitious nature of blank verse:

3. Shakespeare, *The Winter’s Tale* IV.1.11-12

```
̆    ́       ̆       ́         ̆     ́     ̆       ́
Or what is now receiv’d. I witness to
̆          ̆         ́           ̆      ́      ̆      ́     ̆     ́
The times that brought them in; so shall I do
```

Unlike in T.S. Eliot and Shakespeare, meter assists the listener in detecting enjambment in
Homer. The dactylic hexameter in the oral compositions of Homer, indicate the end of a line and the beginning of the next consistently. The audience expects a line to end with a spondaic foot (see example 4). A pause in speech occurs after the final foot, creating the sharp distinction between each line.

4. Hom. Il. I.609-610

Zeũς δὲ πρὸς δὲν λέχος ἦτ’ Οὐλύμπος ἀστεροπητής,

Even if the line ends with a short vowel, there is a natural lengthening that occurs at the end of the line and it is therefore treated like a regular spondee. Consequently, the final syllable is often marked with an x since the length of the vowel is neutralized.

5. Hom. Il. I.42

τίσειαν Δαναοῖ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοὶ βέλεσσιν.

As a result of this pattern, the listener/reader is made well aware of the end of a line. This poses no issue if the end of a phrase coincides with the end of a line such as in example 5. When enjambment occurs, however, the phrase is interrupted by the pause. The listener/reader then immediately becomes aware of the unusual break in syntax, and a significant sense of suspense is created. Although there is not a consistent definition or even recognition of enjambment in Homeric poetry, most scholars would agree that the first two lines of Homer’s Iliad as seen in example 6 exemplify the phenomenon.
Sing, goddess, the anger of Peleus’ son Achilleus
and its devastation, which put pains thousandfold upon the
Achaians.

Syntax

In addition to the meter, word order plays a complex and significant role in the perception
of Homeric enjambment. The word order of Ancient Greek can vary greatly both in prose and
poetry (Fortson 2010:262). Although there are a variety of word orders, there are notable patterns
and constraints. First, there is a tendency towards verb-final sentences (Denniston 2002: 43).
Second, there are also postpositional conjunctions and particles such as γάρ ‘for’ and μέν
‘indeed’. These are just a few examples of word order patterns in Greek. As expected, poetry has
even greater syntactic flexibility than prose (Fortson 2010:262).

As is the case in I.1-2 of the Iliad in example 6, enjambment often does not happen where
one line ends and another begins. Here, the noun Μῆληλ “anger” in line 1 is modified by the
adjective οὐλομένην “destructive” in line 2. This creates an additional challenge because it is
necessary to figure out in what ways the constituents are understood when they are separated
under these conditions. For now, consider the following examples of prose from the beginning
of Herodotus’ Histories.


4 All Greek passages are from D.B. Monro’s edition of Homer’s Iliad unless otherwise noted.
5 All English translations are from the Iliad of Homer by Richmond Lattimore, who relied upon Monro’s text. The
English is provided for conceptual purposes only. Lattimore often changes the arrangement of words which impacts
the existence and/or nature of the enjambment. In order to understand the classifications of enjambment, note the
syntax in the Greek and not the English translation.
6 The research presented in Chapters 3 and 4 illustrates that it is possible to interpret these lines as not showing
enjambment. Nevertheless, the example was chosen here because it is the first potential instance of enjambment in
the Iliad and thus a natural starting point for the analysis.
a. …ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά…

Great and also wondrous deeds

b. …τούτους γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρυθῆς καλεομένης θαλάσσης ἀπικομένους ἐπὶ τήν θάλασσαν…

for those ones from the Red Sea having come to this sea

In example 7a, the noun ἔργα “deeds” and adjectives μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά “great and also wondrous” are closely situated. However, only a couple of sentences later the pronoun τούτους and the adjective ἀπικομένους are separated by the prepositional phrase ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑρυθῆς καλεομένης θαλάσσης ‘from the Red Sea’. Since prose is continuous, readers are not as impacted by the separation as they are when enjambment occurs in poetry. For, not only are the constituents separated by other phrases in the Homeric hexameter, but there is a natural break that occurs at the end of every metrical line that adds more distance between a noun and its subsequent adjective. Therefore, the apparent enjambment in the first two lines of the Iliad results in a dramatically delayed description of the anger of Achilles with a more powerful effect than if the two lines were simply written together in prose style such as, Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληθάδεω Αχιλῆος οὐλομένην, ἥ μυρί’ Ἀχιωΐς ἄλγε’ ἔθηκε.

Early Scholarship on Homeric Enjambment: Milman Parry

Enjambment has been recognized as a salient feature of Homeric Greek and is addressed by many scholars in combination with other topics in poetics including meter and oral theory. In 1929, Milman Parry conducted the first systematic analysis of Homeric enjambment. In his article, “The Distinctive Character of Enjambement in Homeric Verse”, Parry categorizes the different degrees of enjambment and argues that the frequency of enjambment types correlates with the oral or written nature of a composition. He concludes that the pattern of enjambment in Homer is indicative of an oral composition (Parry 1929: 203, 219).
Parry uses three main components for the identification of enjambment (see example 16).

First, if the end of a sentence coincides with the end of a line, there is no enjambment (Parry 1929: 203). Consider the following:

8. Hom. I. I.7-8

Ἀτρείδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρόν καὶ δίος Ἀχιλλεῦς.
Τίς τ` ἀρ σφω θεών ἐριδι ξυνήκε μάχεσθαι;

Atreus’ son the lord of men and brilliant Achilleus.
What god was it then set them together in bitter collision?

Second, if a complete thought coincides with the end of a line but the sentence carries on to the next line, it is “unperiodic” enjambment (Parry 1929: 203). For example:

9. Hom. I. I.5-6

οἰωνοῖς τε πᾶσι, Διὸς δ` ἐτελείετο βουλὴ,
ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἑρίσαντε

…of all birds, and the will of Zeus was accomplished since that time when first there stood in division of conflict

Parry further categorizes unperiodic enjambment into four groups. The first group includes dependent clauses (e.g. example 9), participial phrases, and genitive absolutes. Example 10 demonstrates a participial phrase:


Ἀτρείδης· ὃ γὰρ ἤλθε θοάς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
λυσόμενός τε θύγατρα φέρων τ` ἀπερείσι ἄποινα,

…Atreus’ son…
when he came beside the fast ships of the Achaians to ransom back his daughter, carrying gifts beyond count…

Example 11 illustrates Parry’s enjambment with a genitive absolute:

---

7 This term comes from Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ essay On Literary Composition. See reference page for a full citation of Stephen Usher’s translation.
11. Hom. I.46-47

ἔκλαγξαν δ’ ἄρ’ ὀίστοι ἐπ’ ὅμων χωμένοιο,
αὐτοῦ κινηθέντος· δ’ δ’ ἦτε νυκτὶ ἑοικός.

…and the shafts clashed on the shoulders of the god walking angrily. He came as night comes down and knelt then

The second group involves an adjective being introduced in the following line separated from the noun it modifies, as is the case in example 6. Post-nominal adjectives of this sort are discussed in detail in Chapter 4. The third group includes a following line that is adverbial as illustrated in example 12 where the preposition ἄνα ‘on’ is closely linked to the action at hand (Parry 1929: 206).


στέμματ’ ἐχων ἐν χειριν ἐκθόλου Ἀπόλλωνος
χρυσέω ἄνα σκήπτρῳ, καὶ λίσσετο πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς,
in his hands wound on a staff of gold the ribbons of Apollo who strikes from afar, and supplicated all the Achaians,

The fourth type of unperiodic enjambment has a coordinating conjunction that introduces a phrase in the following line, which preserves the same structure as the preceding line (Parry 1929: 206-207). Example 13 demonstrates this:

13. Hom. I.4-5

هةρώων, αὐτοῦς δ’ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κῦνεσιν
οἰωνοῖς τε πᾶσι, Διός δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή,
of heroes, but gave their bodies to be the delicate feasting of dogs, of all birds, and the will of Zeus was accomplished

The final type of enjambment Parry calls “necessary” enjambment and occurs when a thought is interrupted by the end of a line (Parry 1929: 203). Consider the following:

14. Hom. I.3-4
πολλὰς δ’ ἐφθήμους ψυχὰς Ἀτίδ σπειράσειν
ήρωων, αὐτοῖς δὲ ἑλώριοι τεῦχε κύνεσσιν

hurled in their multitudes to the house of Hades strong souls
of heroes, but gave their bodies to be the delicate feasting
of dogs...

Although a phrase is not interrupted by the line break, the thought would not be complete
without ἥρωων ‘heroes’ in line 4. Example 15, however, illustrates the type of necessary
enjambment that interrupts the noun phrase πάντων Ἄργείων ‘of all Argives’ (Parry 1929: 217).

15. Hom. II. I.78-79

ἠ γὰρ ὅλοιμα ἄνδρα χολωσέμεν, ὡς μέγα πάντων
Ἀργείων κρατέει καὶ οἱ πείθονται Ἀχαιοὶ,

since I believe I shall make a man angry who holds great kingship
over the men of Argos, and all the Achaians obey him.

Parry compared the frequency of enjambment types in selections of the Odyssey and the
Iliad to sections of Apollonius of Rhodes’ Argonautica and Virgil’s Aeneid. He found that the
Iliad and Odyssey had more unperiodic enjambment, and the Argonautica and the Aeneid had
more necessary enjambment. Parry concludes that there is a general tendency for no enjambment
in Homer, and where there is enjambment, it will likely be unperiodic. Therefore, lack of
enjambment supplemented by more unperiodic enjambment than necessary enjambment is the
criterion for an oral composition (Parry 1929: 215). Although Parry provides an important and
innovative study of enjambment, there are a number of problems with his methods and
conclusions that other scholars later address.

Responses to Parry’s Research

Over nearly five decades, many scholars have modeled their approaches to enjambment on
Parry’s analysis, making changes in identification and terminology along the way, including G.S.

---

8 In 1975, Berkley Peabody echoed Parry’s findings by applying a similar analysis to Hesiod. For more information,
see references.
Kirk and Carolyn Higbie. Most have concluded that there is in fact a connection between enjambment and oral composition. Dee Lesser Clayman and van Nortwick, however, attempt to discredit his findings in their article, “Enjambement in Greek Hexameter Poetry” (Clayman 1977: 85-92). Nevertheless, most scholars have discounted their study (the reasons for this will be addressed later in this chapter). 9

There is a great interest among scholars to consider enjambment as another pattern in the Homeric formula. The core issue is that there are incongruent definitions of enjambment that have arisen from the development of multiple systems for classifying the phenomena including those by Parry, Kirk, and Higbie. The table in example 16 is a breakdown of the different terms used for the categories of enjambment (Higbie 1990: 29). 10 The reception of their work will be presented later in this chapter.

16. Enjambment Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parry</th>
<th>Kirk</th>
<th>Higbie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unperiodic</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td>adding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>periodic</td>
<td>clausal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>integral</td>
<td>necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>violent</td>
<td>violent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1966, G.S. Kirk revised Parry’s analysis of Homeric enjambment by renaming and adding categories. 11 Kirk argues that the term “unperiodic” is negative and suggests instead that it be called “progressive” enjambment. Since he recognized that Parry had defined two different types of “necessary” enjambment, Kirk split this category and named each type “periodic” and

---

9 This includes G.S. Kirk, Harry R. Barnes, and Carolyn Higbie.
10 This chart is taken directly from Higbie 1990: 29. Other scholars are not included because they did not significantly change the terminology.
11 See Kirk 1976: 148 for a chart that outlines the differences between his model and Parry’s. All references to Kirk’s research come from chapter 7 in Kirk’s *Homer and the Oral tradition*, “Verse-structure and sentence-structure”, which is a revised version of the article of the same name first published in 1966 as part of the Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 97:115-79.
“integral”. Periodic enjambment includes cases where one could find punctuation that is not a final stop, such as when a subordinate clause precedes the main clause. Integral enjambment refers to the carrying on of one thought into the next line without a chance of punctuation.

Furthermore, Kirk adds the category of “violent” enjambment, which occurs when the interruption happens between two very closely linked words such as Parry’s “necessary” enjambment demonstrated by example 10. Kirk states, however, that violent enjambment is rare and therefore insignificant for his purposes (Kirk 1976:147-150). He sets out to expand the statistical database and states that “no startling or particularly concrete results can be expected from this kind of inquiry; rather, at best, a heightened understanding of the complexity of Homeric style, of its relation to oral procedures of the interaction between rhythm and meaning” (Kirk 1976: 147). Based on the data and observations of Homeric enjambment and related features12 in Book XVI of the Iliad, Kirk concludes that there is not a clear correspondence between structure and style, and that Homer contains a complex variety of features without obvious preference (Kirk 1976: 171-172). Although Kirk provides an additional perspective to the study of enjambment, his work does not yield many answers.

In their 1977 article, “Enjambement in Greek Hexameter Poetry”, Dee Lesser Clayman and Thomas van Nortwick criticize Parry’s approach without much acknowledgement of G.S. Kirk’s contributions to the topic. They state that Parry’s selections were not as random as they could have been. They go on to point out how he used a limited amount of poetry from only two periods. In addition, they attacked his characterization of Homer and Apollonius as the representatives of oral versus literate Greek hexameter as a whole. Calling into question the statistical significance of Parry’s work, Clayman and van Nortwick suggest that chance may have skewed the results (Clayman 1977: 85-92).

---

In an effort to support their argument, Clayman and van Nortwick conducted their own statistical survey of enjambment, including larger selections of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Argonautica* as well as data from the following texts: the *Homeric Hymns*, *Theogony*, *Works and Days*, *Shield*, *Phaenomena*, Callimachus’ *Hymns*, and Theocritus’ *Idylls* (Clayman 1977: 88).\(^{13}\)

The data from Clayman and van Nortwick suggest fewer instances of unperiodic enjambment and more necessary enjambment in Homer. Also interesting is that they found more statistically significant examples of necessary enjambment in *Argonautica* than Parry had. As a result, Clayman and van Nortwick argue that Parry’s claim for a connection between unperiodic enjambment and oral composition is unfounded. Based on their data, there is no significant difference between the amount of unperiodic enjambment in a comparison between the *Iliad* and *Argonautica*. In fact, it appears that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have less unperiodic enjambment than most of the other works. Therefore, they conclude that the frequency of enjambment does not reveal anything about the oral composition of a poem (Clayman 1977: 89-91).

While attacking Parry, Clayman and van Nortwick made an important observation about enjambment and style. They explain that the style of an author and the topic significantly influences the use of enjambment. Clayman and van Nortwick note that Homer’s preference for fronting verbs in the Hymn to Demeter may account for the number of necessary enjambments. In addition, the amount of unperiodic enjambment in Hesiod’s *Theogony* may be due to the lists present in the catalogues of gods. They use this as further evidence that there cannot be a consistent pattern of enjambment in oral composition (Clayman 1977: 91). While interesting, their methods and conclusions also raise serious issues.

Harry R. Barnes, in his 1979 article, “Enjambment and Oral Composition”, gave credit to Clayman and van Nortwick for pointing out the problems in Parry’s analysis but also criticized

\(^{13}\) For a table of results see Clayman 1977: 88.
their approach. Clayman and van Nortwick share with Parry the opinion that no enjambment occurs when a sentence ends in one line and a new sentence begins in the next line. Barnes states, however, that Clayman and van Nortwick do not agree with Parry on the definition of a sentence (Barnes 1979: 2). Parry considers a sentence, “any independent clause or group of clauses introduced by a coordinate conjunction or by asyndeton” (Parry 1929:203). Since punctuation is inconsistent from text to text, it is not taken into consideration.

According to Barnes, however, it appears that Clayman and van Nortwick relied on the final stop punctuation to indicate the ending of a sentence (Barnes 1979: 2). This alone could account for the significant difference in the results. As Barnes notes, thirty-nine lines have a final stop in the OCT edition of Il.1-100 and have no enjambment according to Clayman and van Nortwick. Considering Parry’s definition of enjambment, there would be eight additional lines and therefore eight more instances of no enjambment (Barnes 1979: 3).

Barnes goes on to explain other issues in the study conducted by Clayman and van Nortwick, including basic miscalculations. Though Clayman and van Nortwick bring up a correspondence between style and enjambment, Barnes points out that they neglect to survey poems that would be more appropriate for comparison. For example, Clayman and van Nortwick claim that the Idylls of Theocritus have fewer instances of unperiodic enjambment (28.1%) and necessary enjambment (29.5%) while the majority of lines (42.4%) show no enjambment (Clayman 1977: 88). Barnes argues that it is not appropriate to compare the Idylls to Homeric epic because the styles are so different. He states that this is mainly due to the stichic dialogue and interrupting refrains that are present in the Idylls. Therefore, Barnes did a study of Theocritus’ Epyllia, which is more similar in style. His results demonstrate that there is more
unperiodic enjambment in *Epyllia* than the *Idylls*, supporting Parry’s claims (Barnes 1979:3-4).  

Barnes surveys a larger portion of the *Iliad* and his results again call into question the conclusions made by Clayman and van Nortwick. He sums up his findings in the following way: “Earlier hexameter, which displays a high degree of formulaic content, is characterized by a high percentage of verses with no enjambment, and a low percentage of verses with necessary enjambement” (Barnes 1979: 9). Therefore, Barnes and Parry are in complete agreement with correlation between enjambment and oral composition.

More recently, Carolyn Higbie developed yet another system for categorizing enjambment in *Measure and Music: Enjambment and Sentence Structure in the Iliad* (Higbie 1990: 29). She renames Parry’s “unperiodic” and Kirk’s “progressive” enjambment as “adding” enjambment. Parry’s “necessary” and Kirk’s “periodic” becomes Higbie’s “clausal” enjambment. Kirk’s “integral” enjambment is Higbie’s “necessary” enjambment. Finally, Higbie maintains Kirk’s classification of “violent” enjambment but broadens its scope (Higbie 1990: 29, 78).

Since Higbie is mostly in agreement with Parry, for the purposes of this paper, it is not necessary to go through her work in detail. It is enough to quote her saying, “a low frequency of necessary enjambment is consistent with oral composition but does not require it” (Higbie 1990: 81). She adds that enjambment is only one element that should be considered in the determination of an oral composition. Although she supports Parry for the most part, Higbie does not make any arguments for the oral nature of the *Iliad*, stating that her analysis did not involve any comparisons and therefore lacks the necessary information to do so (Higbie 1990: 81).

---

14 For a table of this comparison see Barnes 1979: 4.
15 Barnes finds fewer examples of necessary enjambment. See the table in Barnes 1979: 5.
16 In the early twentieth century, other scholars did significant research on related topics in Homeric enjambment, but their findings are not essential for the purposes of this paper. Here are a few examples: Samuel Eliot Basset *The Poetry of Homer*, Albert B. Lord “Homer and Huso III: Enjambment in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song”, and Elizabeth Lyding “Homeric Enjambment”. See references for full citations.
17 For data see tables in Higbie 1990: 82-86.
The existence of so many categories of enjambment that vary by term and definition itself calls for a reevaluation of Homeric enjambment as a whole. The subjective nature of these approaches prevents scholars from coming to an agreement. The cases of enjambment previously described as “necessary” or “violent” are most relevant because they illustrate the breaking of closely connected constituents. \(^{18}\) The purpose of this paper, however, is to do away with categorizing enjambment by the degree to which it affects the reader. By focusing strictly on the split of syntactic constituents, this research redefines enjambment while opening the door for further discussion of Greek word order and the illustration thereof.

I will show that there is an objective way to define Homeric enjambment with a systematic assessment of affected phrase types. By categorizing the occurrences of enjambment by the type of phrase that is split (determiner, noun, verb, adjective, or prepositional phrase), patterns emerge that have previously not been discussed in the framework of modern syntactic theory. The methods of generative syntax illustrate how these patterns have linguistic and literary implications.

\(^{18}\) See example 16.
CHAPTER 2
ENJAMBMENT AND THE HOMERIC FORMULA

Many scholars consider enjambment part of the Homeric formula. The lists of the components that make up the Homeric formula vary greatly depending on the scholars’ scope.¹⁹

A general requirement for an element of poetry to be considered formulaic is that it must have a recognizable pattern and occur frequently. To date, a complete list of what constitutes the formula is a challenge to create (Russo 1997:239-242). An example of a pattern that is part of the Homeric formula is the presence of repeated phrases. While there are *hapax legomena* throughout Homer, there are also numerous stock phrases that are regularly used. The repetition of such phrases as ποιμένα λαόν “shepherd of men” is widely accepted as formulaic. Metrically, the phrase fits perfectly at the end of a line because ποιμένα is dactylic while λαόν is spondaic, as demonstrated in example 17.

17. Hom. Il. I.263

- - -| - -
οἶνον Πειρίθοον τε Δρύαντά τε ποιμένα λαόν

men like Peirithoös, and Dryas, shepherd of the people

Although such repeated phrases and metrical patterns are accepted as formulaic, it is reasonable to question Homeric enjambment in general as formulaic. Parry, though he used the presence of enjambment as evidence for oral poetry, admits that it is not widely used by Homer (Parry 1929: 215). In addition, Egbert Bakker states, “even in cases where there is enjambment by all standards used hitherto, the end of the line is still a clear boundary between linguistic

¹⁹ There are so-called “soft Parryists” who have broadened the understanding of the formula and “hard Parryists” who do not wish to expand the formula beyond the scope that Parry acknowledged. See Nagler 1967: 269-274.
units, so that it is preferable to suppress the term ‘enjambement’ altogether” (Bakker 1990: 2). Bakker takes a new linguistic approach to the topic that questions the interpretation and prominence of the phenomenon in Homer. His analysis breathes new life into the subject and significantly diminishes the number of examples of Homeric enjambment previously acknowledged.

Bakker claims that prior research lacks an understanding of the difference between syntactic units in oral versus written compositions (Bakker 1990: 2). He points out that the linguistics of written language has been mistakenly applied to the understanding of Homeric enjambment. The *Iliad* is now widely acknowledged as an oral composition. Therefore, Bakker, unlike Parry, has the benefit of not needing to use enjambment as proof of its oral origins.

**Enjambment and Oral Theory**

Consider the findings by the linguist Wallace Chafe, who has done research on natural interruption in speech. These interrupted units are marked by intonation and hesitation, they tend to be short, and can occur in the midst of a syntactic unit (Bakker 1990: 3). Bakker calls these interrupted stretches “idea units”. He claims that they have their own syntax separate from that of written work because the focus is on the process of production. A speaker is not editing his speech for the listener as a writer would for the reader (Bakker 1990: 4).

In connecting his research to the big picture of Homeric formulae, Bakker discusses Homer’s use of the connective particle ὅε. According to Parry, ὅε introduces a new sentence (Parry 1929: 203). Bakker, however, considers the particle in Homeric Greek a “linkage marker between clausal idea units” (Bakker 1990: 5). Research done by Jared Klein demonstrates that Homeric ὅε functions as both a connective particle and a sentential conjunction (Klein 1992: 11). This discrepancy in the understanding of ὅε on the parts of Parry and Bakker requires further
consideration. Bakker claims that the function of δέ as a connector of idea units is demonstrated in the following line:

18. Hom. Il. XVIII.416


δο δε χιτων’ ἔλε δὲ σκηπτρον παχό, βῆ δὲ θύραζε

and took up a heavy stick in his hand, and went to the doorway

Since the idea units are connected, conceptually they are understood as related. Bakker calls the particle a “progressive marker” and explains that the elements which it connects can be understood as whole idea units (Bakker 1990: 6). Nevertheless, he does state that each part introduced by the particle δέ has clausal properties and therefore has a type of completion (Bakker 1990: 7). Parry and Bakker both do not consider it enjambment when one line is linked to another that begins with δέ, but for different reasons. For Bakker, it is the separation of idea units on a smaller scale, for Parry it is the larger and often longer sentential understanding.

The greatest difference between Parry and Bakker’s analyses is that Bakker’s idea units are shorter and more frequent. Thus, there will naturally be even less of a chance for enjambment to occur. Consider this passage:

19. Hom. Il. XI.369-372


Βακκερ interprets this passage as a series of idea units:

20. a. But Alexandros,
   b. the husband of Helen of the fair hair
   c. to Tudeides his bow he aimed,
   d. the herdsman of the soldiers.
   e. leaning on the gravestone,

20 Bakker 1990: 5.
f. on the man-made tomb,
g. (that) of Ilus the son of Dardanus,
h. the elder of the people.22

While Parry would consider lines 371-372 an example of unperiodic enjambment, Bakker states that “to speak of ‘enjambment’ in this case is useless insofar as the narrator is not designing a sentence but deploying a mental picture” (Bakker 1990: 10). This explanation is directly reflective of oral theory in that the speaker is not orchestrating a sentence structure to control interpretation but rather producing a series of images.

Bakker also discusses how the patterns of oral discourse, namely left and right dislocation (L-dislocation and R-dislocation), mislead Parry into identifying cases of necessary enjambment. The following is an example of R-dislocation:

οὖνεκα τὸν Χρύσην ἠτίμασεν ἠρητήρα
Ἄτρείδη·

since Atreus’ son had dishonoured Chryses, priest of Apollo.

Although Ἄτρείδη is right-dislocated in the Greek, Lattimore takes the liberty to front “Atreus’ son” and as such does not preserve the effect.23 Therefore, it is important to focus on the arrangement in Greek. Bakker states, “when a name or noun phrase at the beginning of the line seems to belong to the clause in the line before, we have to consider R-dislocation, analogously to the treatment in terms of L-dislocation of noun phrases at the end of a line” (Bakker 1990: 15). In example 21, however, the right-dislocation does not result in enjambment.

On the other hand, consider the L-dislocation in the following lines.
22. Hom. I. XVI.342-343

22 Bakker 1990: 10.
23 For consistency, Lattimore’s translation is used in the English translation provided with each example. However, the prose and the syntactic trees will remain true to the Greek as it appears. The Greek in all the passages with associated syntactic trees is parsed in Appendix 1 and listed by example number.
Meriones on his light feet overtaking Akamas stabbed him in the right shoulder as he climbed up behind his horses.

According to G.S. Kirk, this is an example of integral enjambment, the carrying on of one thought into the next line without a chance of punctuation. However, Bakker does not consider this enjambment in any fashion because the participial phrase κιχείς and the case usage of the two nouns Μηριόνης and Άκαμαντα define the relationship between them. Namely, Μηριόνης is the subject and Άκαμαντα is the direct object. Therefore, there is no need for a nominal reference in the next line (Bakker 1990: 15). The thought could be interrupted at the end of line 342. As a result, Bakker argues that many such cases of so-called enjambment can be discounted.

Ultimately, Bakker claims that in many of the lines where so-called enjambment occurs, the constituents are not split if one understands the groupings as idea units. Bakker has discussed other aspects of his theory elsewhere including a breakdown of the meter presented in his book, *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* as well as a discussion of intonation in *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics.*

**Challenges to Bakker’s Interpretation**

In the article, “Homeric Enjambment and Orality”, Rainer Friedrich refutes some of Bakker’s claims. Friedrich suggests that Bakker has an eccentric approach and that the text does not support such an analysis. Friedrich states that “if Bakker is right and the Homeric sentence does not exist, then his oral-cognitive reading must always succeed in removing enjambment” (Friedrich 2000: 12). He believes that the first lines of the *Odyssey* expose the problem with Bakker’s approach:

---

24 See references.

άνδρα μοι ἔγνησε Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, δός μᾶλα πολλὰ
πλάγχθη...  

Friedrich interprets these lines in the manner of Bakker as:

24. a. Of the man to me sing, Muse,
   b. him of many turns,
   c. who very far/
   d. he was driven astray

Friedrich claims that δός μᾶλα πολλὰ and πλάγχθη cannot be understood as separate idea units. He provides a number of other examples citing the same issue. Since Bakker agrees that there are still cases of enjambment, Friedrich states “with this disarming concession he might hope to get away in the belief of having neutralized a large number of those bothersome enjambments and thus relieved oral theory of much of the burden of contrary evidence” (Friedrich 2000: 13). He goes on to identify two issues with Bakker’s approach: applying “informal” discourse analysis and dismissing the Homeric sentence (Friedrich 2000: 13-14). On the other hand, Friedrich also criticizes the use of statistics in the study of poetics. While he offers no conclusions about the relationship between enjambment and oral composition, Friedrich raises some interesting issues.  

With so many different systems of categorizing the types of enjambment, a standard approach does not exist. All studies are full of nuances and tend to raise more questions than they answer. Although Bakker provides a well-reasoned perspective, issues remain. In his conclusion to “Homeric Discourse and Enjambment: A Cognitive Approach”, Bakker states,

---

26 Notably, his comments on informal versus formal discourse analysis deserve further investigation. However, that is beyond the scope of this paper.
27 M. W. Edwards also developed a system for categorizing enjambment using different terms for various degrees of enjambment. His analysis is not provided in this paper because it would only serve to demonstrate the existence of many systems, a point sufficiently illustrated by discussions of the systems developed by Parry, Kirk, and Higbie. For more information on his work see references. For a chart that compares all systems see Friedrich 2000: 4.
“This is not to say, however, that in the oral-cognitive approach every case of ‘enjambement’ ceases to be enjambement” (Bakker 1990: 19).28

I believe that the application of modern syntactic theories such as X-bar and Minimalism to the study of enjambment can further illuminate the phenomenon. By providing tree-structures for the sentences and phrases, it is possible to visualize the relationships between constituents as well as phrases and phases of the sentence. The benefit of such an analysis is that it provides an objective perspective based on accepted linguistic theory and free from subjective categorizations. The challenge in developing a fresh examination of Homeric enjambment is deciding on a definition of enjambment that does not add to complexities of the systems that have been developed in the past (e.g. Parry, Kirk, Higbie, etc.). At the same time, it is essential where possible to take into account the elements of oral theory as presented by Egbert Bakker. While this generative approach redefines and classifies the elements of enjambment from a different perspective, inadvertently, it largely supports Bakker’s findings.

---

28 For examples of real enjambment according to Bakker, see Edwards 1966.
CHAPTER 3
A GENERATIVE APPROACH

In an effort to discover patterns of enjambment from an objective perspective, my research begins by enumerating the occurrences of enjambment in Books I-V of the Iliad without regard to previous categorizations. I am not concerned with the degree of impact on the hearer. Therefore, I do not separate “necessary” from “violent” enjambment for example. Instead, this research considers the types of phrases affected and the patterns of occurrence. The approach will be largely based on Government and Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981, 1982, 1986) with X-bar Theory as its phrase structure system, but more recent Minimalist ideas (Chomsky 1995, 2001) will be appealed to as well.

Out of the 3,402 lines in my data base, 74 of them can potentially be interpreted as enjambed. These specific examples are presented in Chapter 4. Beforehand, it is necessary to define what is and what is not enjambment in terms of phrase and phase boundaries. A Complementizer Phrase (CP) encompasses the entire sentence. To consider the splitting of this phrase as enjambment would be to say that nearly every sentence in the Iliad is enjambed. The next level down is the Tense Phrase (TP). Again, this would be too large a scope to reveal anything. The structural complexity and the size of the separated pieces matter. Therefore, it is necessary to identify enjambment based on splits within such levels as verb phrase (VP), determiner phrase (DP), noun phrase (NP), adjective phrase (AP), and prepositional phrase (PP).

Simply put, enjambment occurs when the split happens in the middle of a phrase. When the break occurs at the boundary of a phrase it is not enjambment with the exception of specific
adjunct clauses. For example, when the break takes place within an NP that splits the N from its adjunct AP/APS, even though AP is kept intact, it is a case of enjambment. An AP does not have the phase-defining autonomy that more complex, clause-type phrases such as DP have (Chomsky 2001). Splitting it from the N it modifies can potentially be considered enjambment as generally demonstrated by example 25. Examples of such cases in Greek will be analyzed later in this chapter.

25. General X-bar illustration of an AP split from its N

```
DP
 /  \
 |   |
D   

D NP
   /  |
  |  N
  |  |
      AP
      /  |
     N   
    /  |
   N   |
```

An NP is also not phase-defining and therefore a split between an NP and the D that it complements would be considered enjambment as well.

26. General X-bar illustration of an NP split from its D

```
DP
 /  \
 |   |
D   

D NP
   /  |
  |  N
  |  |
      /
     N   
    /  |
   N   |
```

If we assume the VP-internal subject hypothesis (Carnie 2007: 258), one might also consider the splitting of the subject DP from the predicate VP enjambment. However, the split-off DP can have the complexity and thus autonomy of a phase, given the DP-hypothesis (Abney 1987). This means that, unlike in the case of an AP that is separated from its N or an NP that is
separated from its D, a subject DP that is separated from its V does not result in a dangling modifier. Therefore, a DP split from its V is not enjambment. While example 27 provides a general analysis of this split, the complexity of this relationship and the movement of the phrases are discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.

27. General X-bar illustration of a subject DP split from its tensed predicate

Phrase Definitions

This section provides examples of non-enjambment and enjambment in the *Iliad*, beginning with the determiner phrase. A DP is enjambed when the D and the NP it modifies are separated by the end of a line as generally illustrated in example 26. Throughout Books I-V of the *Iliad*, there are no straightforward examples of enjambed DPs.\(^29\)


'Ως ἀφατ', ἔδεισεν δ' ὁ γέρων καὶ ἐπείθετο μύθῳ.

So he spoke, and the old man in terror obeyed him

If this line were enjambed (without regard to meter) it might appear as it does in unattested example 29. Thus, the noun γέρων “old man” is separated from its modifying determiner “the”, resulting in enjambment. Theories for why certain types of enjambment seem to be avoided are

\(^{29}\) There are quantifying adjectives that act like determiners and as such the split between the adjective and the noun can be interpreted as enjambment of the DP. See Chapter 4 example 52.
addressed in Chapter 5. Those issues are separate from the application of modern syntactic theory and therefore will not be discussed in detail in this chapter. Nevertheless, it is important to note that what is not allowed can often be as significant as what is allowed in Homeric poetry.

29. * Unattested Arrangement of Hom. Il. I.33

...Ως ἔφατ’, ἐδείσεν δ’ ὁ γέρων καὶ ἐπείθετο μύθῳ... 

A noun phrase is enjambed when a noun and certain modifiers are broken by the end of a line. When a noun and a relative pronoun are separated, it is not enjambment. This is because a relative pronoun marks a relative clause and therefore a new CP. In Minimalist terms, this is a phase boundary as demonstrated by example 30.

30. Hom. Il. I.174-175

λίσσομαι ἐνεκ’ ἐμεῖν’ μένειν’ πάρ’ ἐμοῖγε καὶ ἄλλοι οἱ κέ με τιμήσουσι, μάλιστα δὲ μετίετα Ζεὺς.

...I will (not) entreat (you) to stay here for my sake. There are others with me who will do me honour, and above all Zeus of the councils.

30 A detailed discussion of enjambled noun phrases can be found in Chapter 4.
In the case of a split in the environment of a partitive genitive, the split occurs at the (adjunct) DP phase boundary.\textsuperscript{31} As a result, example 31 is not an instance of enjambment.

31. Hom. \textit{Il.} I.118-119

αὐτάρ ἐμοὶ γέρας αὐτίχ’ ἐτομάσατ’ ὀφρα μὴ οἶος Ἀργείων ἀγέραστος ἢω, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ ἔοικε·

Find me then some prize that shall be my own, lest I only among the Argives go without, since that were unfitting;

When a DP that is in apposition with another DP is present on a separate line, it is also not considered enjambment. The two nouns in apposition are two separate determiner phrases.

Therefore, the apposition occurs at a phase boundary. There is also a noticeable intonation break when apposition occurs. This understanding is illustrated in example 32.\textsuperscript{32}


κάρτιστοι μὲν ἔσαν καὶ καρτίστοις ἐμάχοντο, Φησίν ὀρεσκόσι, καὶ ἐκπάγλως ἀπόλεσαν.

\textsuperscript{31} This greatly simplifies the structure of partitive genitives. For more information on partitive and possessive structures see “The Structure of DPs: Some Principles, Parameters and Problems” by Giuseppe Longobardi (full citation in References section).

\textsuperscript{32} The complex syntax of apposition is simplified here. For more information, see \textit{The Syntax of Apposition} by Charles F. Meyer (full citation in References section).
the strongest, and they fought against the strongest, the beast men living within the mountains, and terribly they destroyed them.

The following is another example of such a phrase; however, it has an NP modified by two APs. Nevertheless, the AP that appears on the second line is also appositional. Example 33 brings up the topic of identification of enjambment in the environment of post-nominal adjectives. A detailed discussion of this can be found in Chapter 4.

33. Hom. *Iliad*. IV.63-64

σοι μὲν ἐγώ, σοὶ δὲ ἔμοι· ἐπὶ δὲ ἔχονται θεοὶ ἄλλοι

ἀθάνατοι· σοὶ δὲ θάσσον Ἀθηναίη ἐπιτείλαι

I to you, you to me, and so the rest of the immortal gods will follow. Now in speed give orders to Athene

In the account proposed here, separation of the subject DP (the external argument) from the V is not considered enjambment. More specifically, when the subject is a pronoun the inflected nature of the verb makes the pronoun an emphatic addition and not an element intrinsic to the
understanding of the sentence. Therefore, if a subject pronoun appears on a separate line, this is not a case of enjambment. In fact, the pronoun is assigned its role as an Agent while part of the vP before moving to pick up its case in the spec of the TP as illustrated in example 34.

The separation of a nominal, whether it is the subject or direct object, from the verb with which it is associated is not enjambment. The subject DP, as demonstrated below, starts inside the vP. The vP is a phase precisely because it has all of the V’s arguments inside of it. The departure of the subject DP does represent the splitting up a phase, but crucially, the DP itself can be considered phase-defining, so we are not left with a dangling modifier that cannot stand on its own. Therefore, it is not enjambment.

34. Hom. Il. I.173-174

φεῦγε μάλʾ, εἴ τοι θυμὸς ἐπέσυνται, σοῦ δὲ ἐγὼνει λίσομαι εἶνεκ´ ἐμείῳ μένειν· πάρ ἐμοῖγε καὶ ἄλλοι

‘Run away by all means if your heart drives you. I will not entreat you to stay here for my sake. There are others with me
Just as a split between the subject DP and the V is not enjambment, a split between the direct object DP and the V is not enjambment. Example 34 demonstrates both at once. While the subject DP ἔγο “I” is the external argument of the verb, the direct object DP σ’ “you” is its internal argument. Nevertheless, in both cases the split occurs at the boundary of a DP, which is potentially phase-defining, and therefore this is not in enjambment. Certain PPs within a VP are internal arguments and can be considered phase-defining (Lee-Schoenfeld 2007). Additionally, AdvPs and other PPs are adjuncts in a VP (Carnie 2007: 170). Adjuncts can be adjoined to a variety of places throughout a sentence (Carnie 2007: 44). Although these AdvPs and PPs may not be phase-defining, as adjuncts they can be interpreted appositionally. Thus, it can be concluded that when a split occurs between a V and an internal argument or adjunct, there is no enjambment.

Many of the verb phrases encountered in the text are associated with infinitival complements that appear on a separate line. The Greek infinitive is partially inflected only for tense and voice and as such is a non-finite verb. Example 35 demonstrates an object-control construction. The complement clause is a CP because there is no cross-clausal case assignment. In this case, ἀιδέσωμαι “respect” and δέχωμαι “take” are deponent verbs that appear mediopassive in form but are active in translation. Lattimore’s translation “that the priest be respected and shining ransom be taken” does not accurately reflect the deponent nature of the verbs.

35. Hom. II. I.22-23

Ἐνθ’ ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ἐπευθήμησαν Ἀχαιοὶ ἀιδέσωμαι θερήμα καὶ ἀγιαὶ δέχθαι ἀποινα

---

33 See the unpublished paper “Infinitive Constructions in Ancient Greek” listed in References. It demonstrates the case assignment rules which govern the direct object and subjects of such constructions. The subject of the embedded clause is coindexed with the object of the main clause. There is no expressed subject of the infinitive, rather the PRO form is coindexed with the accusative object of the main clause. For a copy of that work, contact me directly.

34 The word order of the DP and main verb is simplified because it is not essential for understanding the relationship between the main clause and the embedded clause.
Then all the rest of the Achaians cried out in favour that the priest be respected and the shining ransom be taken;

The unexpressed indirect object of the main verb ἐπευφήμησαν “shout assent” is the subject of the infinitive in the complement clause (Agamemnon). Since the break occurs at the CP boundary, there is no enjambment.

In the first five books of the Iliad, there are also no examples of enjambed prepositional phrases. An enjambed prepositional phrase would occur if there was a preposition on one line and its object on a separate line. A PP is an example of one of the few phrases whose head always needs a complement. In some instances, the preposition serves more as a case marker and is therefore very closely linked to its NP complement. For the sake of demonstration, consider the following example of an unenjambed prepositional phrase:


Σμινθεῖο εἰ ποτὲ τοι χαρίεντ’ ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεψα,

Evidence on how an infinitive construction is a non-finite clause and therefore belongs in a separate CP can be found in Carnie 2007: 203.
Smintheus, if ever it pleased your heart that I built your temple,
if ever it pleased you that I burned all the rich thigh pieces

If this line were enjambed, it would appear as in the unattested example 38.\footnote{This unattested construction does not take into account meter or other issues, it is simply meant to demonstrate the split of a prepositional phrase.}


…Σιμνθεύ εἰ ποτέ τοι χαρέντ’ ἐπί νηὼν ἔρεψα, ἤ εἰ δὴ ποτέ…

Although the split occurs at a phrase boundary, the relationship between the P and the DP must be considered enjambment. Unlike a V, which can be intransitive and therefore be complete without a complement, a P must always have a complement. This is why a P split from its DP complement, but not a V split from its complement, ought to be considered enjambment.

Ultimately, this analysis disqualifies all the subgroups of Parry’s “unperiodic” enjambment from being considered enjambment (see examples 9-13). Therefore, it is expected that the number of enjambment examples in Homer will be even fewer than what Parry suggests. Thus, this research begins to align with Bakker’s conclusions. What is left to analyze are the cases of Parry’s “necessary” enjambment (see examples 14-15). Even with the narrowed definition of enjambment that has been presented here, it is possible that what Parry calls “necessary” enjambment could be considered real enjambment (see example 25). However, that is not always the case. These types of phrases will be explored in Chapter 4.
Survey of Enjambed Phrases

After defining the parameters of the phrases and the situations in which they are enjamed, it is now possible to survey their presence in enjamed sentences. Every enjamed sentence affects one phrase. The goal is to answer the following series of questions: How many examples of enjambment occur in Books I-V of the Iliad overall? What is the distribution of enjambment among the phrase types? What is the significance of these patterns?

By comparing the frequency of enjambment among the phrases, big picture patterns emerge that are more linguistically revealing than subjective categorizations that have emotive value. Examples 38-42 illustrate the frequency of enjambment in Books I-V of the Iliad. It is clear that, given the syntactic definitions of enjambment within the different phrases as explained throughout this chapter, only NPs are enjamed. Since these 72 lines make up only about 2% of the first five books of the Iliad, it appears that Homeric enjambment occurs infrequently. Moreover, many of the lines listed could potentially be disqualified. Therefore, the number of enjamed lines may be decreased further. The next chapter offers a full discussion of the results with a particular focus on the comparison between post-nominal and pre-nominal APs.

38. Enjambment in Book I of the Iliad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase Type</th>
<th>Cases of Enjambment</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1, 78, 98, 113, 118, 133, 135, 152, 240, 243, 245, 247, 283, 357, 380, 382, 409, 525, 575, 608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Enjambment in Book II of the Iliad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase Type</th>
<th>Cases of Enjambment</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>93, 96, 137, 217, 293, 301, 414, 417, 577, 597, 599, 618, 625, 665, 781, 816, 817, 838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Enjambment in Book III of the Iliad
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase Type</th>
<th>Cases of Enjambment</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>150, 278, 334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Enjambment in Book IV of the *Iliad*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase Type</th>
<th>Cases of Enjambment</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63, 90, 125, 132, 146, 201, 210, 281, 315, 420, 447, 450, 457, 463, 480, 525, 532</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42. Enjambment in Book V of the *Iliad*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase Type</th>
<th>Cases of Enjambment</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>188, 193, 295, 331, 483, 507, 524, 534, 544, 730, 738, 743, 745, 822, 860</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF ENJAMBED PHRASES

Noun Phrases

As the tables at the end of Chapter 3 indicate, it appears that only NPs are affected by enjambment. The fact that there are often two nominals within a sentence (subject and direct object) contributes to the existence of more NPs (inside of DPs) in general than other types of constituents. Therefore, the frequency of nominals as a whole suggests that enjambment would likely affect them more than any other phrase type.

An NP that is split by enjambment can be identified when a modifier and a noun appear on two separate lines (see example 25). That is, an AP and the N that it modifies are separated. The most common arrangement of this type is a noun on one line followed by an adjective on the next line. This post-nominal type of enjambment is illustrated in example 6. In Parry’s terms, this is a type of “necessary” enjambment. However, Bakker does not consider this enjambment because the idea units are complete on each line (see Chapter 2). This research concurs with Bakker’s conclusions, however, for reasons outside of oral theory. All splits between an N and its post-nominal AP could be considered examples of apposition. Therefore, as discussed in Chapter 3, these would not be cases of enjambment (see example 32).

There are, however, examples of real enjambment that survive the scrutiny of generative syntax. But, even some of these instances have a level of predictability that softens the impact of the enjambment on the listener. Since there appears to be a distinction between post-positional and pre-positional adjectives in potentially enjambed NPs, this analysis is split into two sections:
Post-nominal Adjectives and Other Cases.

Post-nominal Adjectives

Of the seventy-two examples of apparent enjambment, forty-six (64%) of them include post-nominal adjectives. While not true of pre-nominal adjectives, it is possible to view post-nominal adjectives as appositional. Therefore, the number of enjambed lines in Books I-V of the *Iliad* decreases to twenty-six (about .8%), thus further supporting Bakker’s view of enjambment in Homer. The following analysis demonstrates how the apparent split between an N and its post-positional AP can be interpreted as an example of non-enjambing apposition.

Bakker would not consider example 6 a case of enjambment because of the post-nominal positioning of the adjective. The post-nominal adjective οὐλομένην “destructive” in the following line appears to be modifying the preceding noun Μῆνιν “anger”. The first line, however, has a complete concept “Sing, goddess, the anger of Peleus’ son Achilleus”. The prosodic break that occurs at the end of the line aligns with the complete thought presented in the first line. The following οὐλομένην “destructive” in the next line adds another idea unit to the mental picture that is being formed. As two separate idea units, the apparent split of Μῆνιν and οὐλομένην ought not to be considered enjambment according to Bakker’s logic based on oral theory. The following analysis demonstrates that there is a way to support this conclusion through generative syntax.

Consider first how it is possible to interpret the relationship between “anger” and “destructive” in a manner contrary to Bakker:


Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηλημάδων Ἀχιλῆος
οὐλομένην, ὡ μυρί’ Ἀχαιοῖς ἀλγε’ ἔθηκε,

Sing, goddess, the anger of Peleus’ son Achilleus
and its devastation, which put pains thousandfold upon the Achaians,

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{NP} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{Mῆνιν} \\
\text{anger} \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{οὐλομένην} \\
\text{destructive}
\end{array}
\]

On the other hand, when the entire sentence is taken into account, a different picture emerges. Example 44 illustrates how the fronting of the head noun Μῆνιν “anger” makes it appear as though there is internal enjambment of the NP. The challenge is to explain how the head of a phrase was fronted without having the entire phrase fronted.

There is another phenomenon to consider and that is scrambling (example 45). Scrambling typically describes short and local movements that do not occur across clauses. In this case, the possessor DP (Πηληκίάδεω Ἀχιλῆος “Achilles son of Peleus”) vacates the specifier position of the main DP. Likewise, the AP (οὐλομένην “destructive”) vacates the DP. This allows for remnant movement. The head Μῆνιν “anger” is left in the DP. As a result, the entire DP (containing at this stage only the expressed head N) is free to move to the specifier position of the CP. Since the entire phrase is moving together, it is no longer in violation of the structure preserving constraint that disallows heads to move into specifier position. However, the details of scrambling are hotly debated. It is unclear where the possessor DP or the AP would go. Nevertheless, this explanation would disqualify the sentence as an example of enjambment since the split would then be occurring at the phase boundary of a DP.

44. Hom. II. I.1-2

---

37 Some scholars suggest additional phrases but this is beyond the scope of this paper. For more information see Grewendorf and Sternefeld 1990.
Mήνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Αχιλῆος
οὐλομένην, ἢ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἐθήκε.

Sing, goddess, the anger of Peleus’ son Achilleus
and its devastation, which put pains thousandfold upon the
Achaians,


Mήνιν ἄειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Αχιλῆος
οὐλομένην, ἢ μυρί' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἐθήκε.

Sing, goddess, the anger of Peleus’ son Achilleus
and its devastation, which put pains thousandfold upon the
Achaians,
This tree demonstrates how, if scrambling is taken into account, the line can no longer be interpreted as enjambment. This illustration also brings up issues of the word order that will not be addressed in detail in this paper. As mentioned previously, Greek is generally considered to be an SOV language. In SOV, all verbal constituents are expected to be right-headed. However, Greek verbal constituents are both right and left-headed depending on the word order of the sentence. Perhaps Greek is both right and left-headed because it allows for a variety of word
orders.\textsuperscript{38}

There is, however, yet another way to interpret this sentence that involves apposition and ellipsis. The AP οὐλομένην “destructive” may be a substantive AP that modifies an elided N. Therefore, it stands in apposition with the N Μῆλη “anger”. The N is unexpressed in the second line because it is identical to the N in the first line (Μῆλη).

46. Apposition and Ellipsis in Hom. Il. I.1-2

This interpretation would mean that the enjambment splits off a phase-defining DP. With this, the line can no longer be considered enjambed.\textsuperscript{39} Furthermore, this interpretation is supported by prosodic patterns. In The Prosody of Greek Speech, A.M. Devine and Laurence D. Stephens state, “Grammatical pauses occur between prosodic units, generally of the rank of the phrase or higher” (Devine 1994: 432). In addition, there is final lengthening. The final syllable in the final word of a prosodic unit is relatively lengthened (Devine 1994: 146). If the end of a

\textsuperscript{38} This issue is not thoroughly addressed here and deserves further exploration in future research.

\textsuperscript{39} Scrambling of the possessor DP would still occur then, but this does not result in enjambment.
prosodic unit (e.g. DP) aligns with the end of a line such as in example 46, there is a substantially developed and perceptible thought. Therefore, prosodic evidence, discourse analysis, and this syntactic research converge to reach the same conclusion. That is, lines I.1-2 of the *Iliad* do not demonstrate real enjambment. Examples 47 further illustrate this with two APs modifying the same N. In this case, both APs appear in the second line.


πρίν γ’ ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλω δόμεναι ἐλικώπιδα κούρην
ἀπριάτην ἀνάποινον, ἀγενθ’ ἱερὴν ἐκατόμβην

until we give the glancing-eyed girl back to her father
without price, without ransom, and lead also a blessed hecatomb

These APs could also be interpreted as appositional. Since all post-nominal APs can be interpreted as part of an appositional DP, the separation of an N from a post-positional AP cannot be considered real enjambment. It is best understood as the separation between an N and a DP. Since DP is phase-defining, this boundary break cannot be considered enjambment. Thus, the number of cases of enjambment dwindles significantly.

**Pre-nominal Adjectives**

If a prosodic unit such as an NP is interrupted by a break in the prosody brought on by the end of the line where the AP is pre-positional, the concept is temporarily stranded and potentially
incomprehensible until the next line is recited. Example 48 illustrates this with the phrase “nine heralds shouting”. This tree treats “nine” as an adjunct AP which, when split from the N it modifies, results in a dangling modifier and thus constitutes a case of enjambment occurring between the N “heralds” and the AP.

48. Hom. II. II.96-97

λαὸν ἱζόντων, ὡμαδός δ’ ἦν· ἐννέα δὲ σφεας
κήρυκες βοῶντες ἐρήτουν, εἰ ποτ’ ἀυτῆς

as the people took their positions and there was tumult. Nine heralds shouting set about putting them in order, to make them cease their...

In contrast, example 49 illustrates how “nine heralds” could exemplify enjambment of the
DP instead of the NP. The adjective “nine” is a determiner-like adjective. Examples of
determiner-like adjectives are quantifiers like “some”, “few”, “nine” as opposed to qualifiers like
“important” or “big”. Determiner-like adjectives are called Quantifier Phrases (QPs). Since Qs
cannot co-occur with Determiners, it is possible to treat the Q as a D. Therefore, the underlying
structure becomes the DP “nine heralds” and this results in enjambment.

49. Hom. II. II.96-97

λαὸν ἵζόντων, ὀμαδὸς δ᾽ ἦν· ἐννέα δὲ σφεας
κήρυκες βοῶντες ἔρητον, εἴ ποτ᾽ ἀὑτῆς

as the people took their positions and there was tumult. Nine heralds
shouting set about putting them in order …

There is also one case in which two APs are broken by the end of the line and followed by
the NP. This is a clear case of NP enjambment.

50. Hom. II. V.524-525

ἀπρέμας, ὄφρ᾽ εὑδησι μένος Βορέας καὶ ἄλλων
ζαξρειών ἀνέμων, οἱ τε νέφεα σκιόντα

motionless, when the strength of the north wind sleeps, and of the other
tearing winds, which…
The adjective here also could be interpreted as a determiner. In that case, it is DP enjambment.

51. Hom. II. V.524-525

ἀτρέμας, ὃδ' εὗδησι μένος Βορέα καὶ ἄλλων ζαχρειῶν ἄνέμων, οἵ τε νέφεα σκιόειντα

motionless, when the strength of the north wind sleeps, and the other tearing winds, which…

Example 52 illustrates NP enjambment in which the AP qualifies but does not quantify the N. Therefore, it cannot be interpreted as DP enjambment.

52. Hom. II. II.625-626

Οἱ δ' ἐκ Δοῦληκίου Ἐχινάων θ' ἱεράων νήσων, αἱ ναίουσι πέρην ἄλος Ἡλιδός ἀντα,

They who came from Doulichion and the sacred Echinai, islands, where men live across the water from Elis,
Examples 48-52 are clear-cut instances of enjambment. The concepts are incomplete and the prosodic breaks slice through the syntactic constituents in a blunt manner. There are eleven examples of this type of NP or DP enjambment in the data base presented here. That is the extent of the real enjambment found in the first five books of the *Iliad*. In other words, only about .3% of the lines have real enjambment. There are, however, nine additional examples that are similar. The difference is that they involve stock phrases that result in the enjambment of a DP. One such example is 53.

53. Hom. *Il.* I.78-79

\[ \text{ἦ γὰρ ὃδοις ἄνδρα χολωσέμεν, ὡς μέγα πάντων Ἀργείων κρατέει καὶ οἱ πείθονται Ἀχαῖοι·} \]

since I believe I shall make a man angry who holds great kingship over the men of Argos, and all the Achaians obey him.

As mentioned at the beginning of Chapter 2, stock phrases are widely used throughout the *Iliad*. A number of cases of enjambment involve the term λαοί “men” in the following line.⁴⁰

As Bakker points out, these phrase are expected (Bakker 1990: 8-9). Therefore, the listener would not be held in suspense by the enjambment of such a phrase. The nominal provided in the first line is most informative. Whether it is ἄριστοι “best” or ἀσπιστάων “warrior”, the addition of λαοί “men” in the following line would not be necessary to the meaning of the phrase. Not

---

⁴⁰ cf. ἄριστοι λαοί “best men” II.577, 817 and ἀσπιστάων λαῶν “of warrior men” at IV.90, 201. Other instances of similar stock phrases that were not enjambed include, I.263, II.85, II.105, and II.191, among many others.
only is a form of λαοί commonly placed after an adjective, but the inflection of the preceding adjective would clue the listener in to the gender of the noun. Therefore, λαοί “men” adds little to the meaning of the phrase. Consider ἄριστοι λαοί “the best men” in example 54 that results in the enjambment of an NP.

54. Hom. II. II.817-818

Πριμιδής· ἄμα τῷ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι λαοὶ θωρήσαντο μεμαότες ἐγχείησι.

Priam’s son; and with him far the best and the bravest fighting men were armed and eager to fight with the spear’s edge.

In summary, this research supports the claim that enjambment is an infrequent occurrence in Homer. Furthermore, it seems that only DPs and NPs are subject to enjambment. The nature of enjambment is complex and takes an intimate knowledge of syntactic constituents and oral theory to interpret. Initially, what appear to be examples of enjambed structures may be disqualified when taking into consideration phrase boundaries, phase boundaries, ellipsis, apposition, and the position of APs in an NP. It remains to be determined if the amount of enjambment increases further on in the Iliad or in other works of Homer. Without that knowledge, it is difficult to conclude to what degree Homeric enjambment is prevalent.

41 Although genitive plural endings and the like are ambiguous because they appear the same no matter what gender, context and familiarity with the phrase would make the phrase unambiguous even if the noun λαοί “men” was not present.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

There are many benefits to an approach to the problem of enjambment based on generative syntax. For example, the objective nature of a purely syntactic interpretation does away with the overlapping terminology found in previous studies. Additionally, applying modern syntactic theory to Homeric enjambment involves syntactic trees that provide visual representation of the constituents. As a result, the presence of enjambment or lack thereof is clearly discernible. There are 72 potential examples of enjambment in the first 3,402 lines of the *Iliad*. Upon further analysis, only 11 of those examples qualify as real enjambment (i.e. succeed in interrupting a phrase without any indication of what is to come next).

To provide new insight, this research relies on testable criteria well established by syntactic theories such as the X-bar phrase structure system and Minimalism, the latest stage of Chomsky’s Principles and Parameters framework. For example, using generative syntax to illustrate Homeric enjambment reveals the significance of phrase and phase boundaries in the conception of syntactic units. First of all, if a split occurs within a phrase, it could be enjambment (e.g. DP in example 49). Second, if the split occurs at the boundary of a phrase then it is enjambment only if the phrase is not phase-defining (e.g. AP in example 53). Third, if the split occurs at a phase boundary it may or may not be enjambment depending on whether or not the head requires a complement (e.g. PP in example 37). Furthermore, it seems that pre-nominal adjectives are more likely to produce enjambment than post-nominal adjectives. Crucially, this study also offers new evidence supporting existing claims that Homeric enjambment occurs
infrarequently.

Generally speaking, this falls in line with the findings of Bakker, but arrives at them by different reasoning. This generative approach differs most from the cognitive approach of Bakker when considering the distinction between idea units and syntactic constituents. Often, the generative approach and the cognitive approach both eliminate the possibility of considering a line enjambed, but for different reasons. Consider example 55:

55. Hom. Il. XI.371-372

στήλη κεκλιμένος ἀνδροκμήτω ἐπὶ τῶμῳ
Ἄλω Δαρδανίδαο, παλαιοὶ δημογέροντος.\(^\text{42}\)

leaning against the column, work of men’s hand, on the gravemound of Ilos, Dardanos’ son, an elder of the folk in the old days.

Although Parry would consider line 371 an example of unperiodic enjambment, I agree with Bakker that this is not enjambment. While Bakker is concerned with the conceptual idea units, what I see is a complete prepositional phrase ἐπὶ τῶμῳ and a complete phase-defining determiner phrase “Ἄλω Δαρδανίδαο “of Ilos, Dardanos’ son”. Since the split off phrase is phase defining, there is no enjambment. Although our reasoning differs, it is not a coincidence that both Bakker and I disqualify line 371 from being considered enjambment. The degree of overlap between the concept of idea units and demonstrable syntactic units deserves further consideration. Conversely, by focusing on the constituents of different phrase types, the importance of the idea units as defined by Bakker is largely marginalized. This consequence is one drawback in the generative approach.

Another drawback is that a purely syntactic analysis of this sort does not take into account the elements that are beyond scientific illustration. For example, a DP split from its VP does not provide a complete picture for the listener and perhaps this is something that must be taken into

account. Without the ability to test the perceptibility of Homeric enjambment among native speakers, however, the possibility of scientifically exploring the degree of impact is limited.

In addition, there are potential literary explanations for word order. For example, the motivation for fronting the noun Мῆληλ “anger” in example 6 could be the fact that it is a key word in the sentence. Anger is the motivating factor for Achilles’ actions throughout the Iliad. Another reason that these violations occur could be because epic poetry allows such flexibility in syntax. It is not easy and sometimes it is impossible to incorporate these literary interpretations into a strictly syntactic analysis based on cross-linguistic theories.

Although this generative approach cannot account for aspects beyond demonstrable syntax, it offers an objective and fresh insight into the study of Homeric enjambment. While Parry, Bakker, and others have acknowledged that enjambment in Homer is rare, this research offers linguistic evidence in the framework of modern syntactic theory in a way that was previously unexplored. Concerning the few examples of Homeric enjambment that he acknowledges, Bakker states, “they appear still more remarkable than they did” (Bakker 1990: 19). I could not agree more. For that reason, however, unlike Bakker, I am not ready yet to erase the term enjambment from discussions of Homeric discourse.

A complete survey of enjambment in Homer and the works of other authors such as Hesiod could confirm the initial results provided here and identify more patterns. Moreover, what is not enjambed is as interesting as what is. Another question to inquire about is why enjambment is avoided in certain phrases. For example, consider prepositional phrases. One reason why prepositional phrases are not enjammed may be because prepositions are generally not suited to fit the meter at the end of a line. They often have just one short syllable. This does not pose an issue itself, as it would simply require the previous word to end with a long syllable -
something which is not difficult to find (dative, genitive, etc.). At a glance it seems that short single-syllable particles such as τε “and” as well as περ “however” are used at the end of lines, but only sparingly. It is therefore possible that the avoidance of enjambment is motivated by prosody not syntax in these cases.

There is also a need for more research on the application of modern syntactic theory in Ancient Greek overall. This would include a study of nominal determination in Greek that takes into account cross-linguistic discourse. Furthermore, there are numerous other aspects of Greek grammar that the X-bar system and more recent Minimalist ideas could shine light on. These include some issues that have been raised here such as the headedness of Greek verbal constituents. Fronting, scrambling, and remnant movement could also be explored in a similar way. Thus, this research on generative syntax and Homeric enjambment is an example of how modern syntactic theory can provide further evidence and breathe new life into common topics of Greek literature.
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APPENDIX: GREEK PARSING

29. * Hom. II. I.33

...\'Ως ἔφατ', ἔδεισεν δ' ὃ
... the pron. nom s. m.

γέρων ...
old man n. nom s. m.

30. Hom. II. I.174-175

λίσσομαι εἶνεκ' ἕμεο μένειν' πάρ' ἐμοίγε καὶ ἄλλοι
...others n. nom. pl. m.

οἱ κέ με τιμήσουσι...
who pron. nom. pl. m. ptcl. me pron. 1st acc. sg. honor v. 3rd pl. fut. act. indic.

31. Hom. II. I.118-119

αὐτάρ ἐμοὶ γέρας αὐτίχ' ἐτοιμάσατ' ὁφρα μή ὁῖς
...alone adj. nom. s. m.

Ἄργείον ἀγέραστος...
Argives n. gen. pl. m. without honor adj. nom. s. m.

32. Hom. II. I.267-268

κάρτιστοι μὲν ἔσαν καὶ καρτίστοις ἐμάχοντο,
...strongest adj. dat. pl. m. they fought 3rd pl. impf. mid. indic.

Φησίν ὁρεσκόουσι...
beast men n. dat. pl. m. living within the mountains adj. dat. pl. m.

33. Hom. II. IV.63-64

σοί μὲν ἑγώ, σὺ δ' ἐμοί- ἐπὶ δ' ἔψονταί θεοὶ
...gods n. nom. pl. m. other adj. nom. pl. m.

ἄθανατοι...
immortal adj. nom. pl. m.
34. Hom. II. I.173-174

φεῦγε μάλ’, εἰ τοι θυμός ἐπέστησαι, οὐδὲ σ’ ἔγωγε
you pron. 2nd acc. s. I pron. 1st nom. s. (ptcl)

λίσσομαι... entreat 1st sg. pres. mid. indic

35. Hom. II. I.22-23

Ἐνθ’ ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ἐπευφήμησαν Ἀχαῖοι
...other adj. nom. pl. m. ptcl. all adj. nom. pl. m. cried out 3rd pl. aor. act. indic. Achaians n. nom. pl. m.

αἰδεῖθαί θ’ ἱερή... to respect v. pres. mid. inf. both ptcl. priest n. acc. s. m.


...Σμινθεὶ εἰ ποτέ τοι χαρίεντ’ ἐπὶ
...upon prep.

νηόν...

temple n. acc. s. m.

43. Hom. II. I.1-2

Μῆνιν ἀείδε, θεά. Πηληῆδεω Ἀχιλῆς
anger n. acc. s. f. sing v. 2nd s. imper goddess n. voc. s. f. son of Peleus adj. gen. s. m. Achilles gen. s. m.

οὐλομένην, ἡ μυρί’ Ἀχαιοῖς ἀλγε’
destructive ppl. acc. s. f. which rel. nom. s. f. countless adj. acc. p. neut. Achaean n. dat. p. m. pains n. acc p. neut.

ἐθηκε,
placed v. 3 s. aor. act. ind.

47. Hom. II. I.1.98-99

πρὶν γ’ ἀπὸ πατρὶ φίλῳ δόμεναι ἐλικώπιδα κούρην
...girl n. acc. s. f.

ἀπριάτην ἀνάποινον... without price adj. acc. s. f. without ransom adj. acc. s. f.

48. Hom. II. II.96-97

λαὸν ἵζοντων, ὄμαδος δ’ ἥν ἔννεα δὲ σφαις
...nine adj. nom. pl. m. and ptcl. them pron. 3rd pl. acc.

κήρυκες βοῶντες...

heralds n. nom pl. m. shouting adj. nom. pl. m.
50. Hom. II. V.524-525

ἀτρέμας, δφρ’ εὐδησὶ μένος Βορέαο καὶ ἄλλων
...other adj. gen. pl. m.

ζαχρειῶν ἀνέμων...
motionless adj. gen. pl. m. winds n. gen. pl. m.

52. Hom. II. II.625-626

Οἱ ὁ̣ ἐκ Δουλιχίου Ἑχινάων θ’ ἵεράων
...Echinal adj. gen. pl. f. and ptcl. (post-positional) sacred adj. gen. pl. f.

νήσσων...
islands n. gen. pl. f.

53. Hom. II. I.78-79

ἡ γὰρ ὤνται ἄνδρα χολοσέμεν, ὡς μέγα πάντων
...all adj. gen. pl. m.

Ἄργείων
Argives n. gen pl. m.

54. Hom. II. II.817-818

Πριαμίδης- ἀμα τῷ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι
...best adj. nom. pl. m.

λαοί ...
men n. nom. pl. m.

55. Hom. II. XI.371-372

στήλη κεκλιμένος ἄνδροκμήτω ἐπὶ τύμβῳ
...upon prep. tomb n. dat. s. m.

‘Πλοῦ Δαρδανίδαο...
Ilos n. gen. s. m. son of Dardanos n. gen. s. m.