# THE SYNTAX AND DISCOURSE FUNCTION OF PREPOSED TEMPORAL ἐπεί-CLAUSES IN HOMERIC GREEK

JUDITH PRAIS

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

# Declaration

I, Judith Prais, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

Signed ____________________________

Date __________________2017________

**The word count of this thesis, including footnotes but excluding the appendices and bibliography is:**

**_______99,987_____ words**

# Abstract

The interplay in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* between preposed temporal ἐπεί-clauses and preceding text is investigated. It is demonstrated that the metrical and compositional conditions of the poems influence lexical and grammatical form, distorting or restricting the semantics of some words while prescribing a limited set of phrasal patterns from which to form subordinate clauses. By combining in a single investigation observations on the syntax and discourse function of ἐπεί-clauses, a distinction can be drawn between components which are predominantly necessary for metrical or information purposes (such as αὐτάρ and personal pronouns) and those which facilitate the organisation of the text (such as the antiphonal relationship of imperfect and aorist accounts of events).

Following an introduction to the syntax of ἐπεί-clauses, Chapter 3 argues that out of metrical necessity the typical antithetical meaning of αὐτάρ weakened to a progressive meaning when juxtaposed to ἐπεί. In Chapter 4 instances of left-dislocation of noun phrases before a preposed ἐπεί-clause are considered. It is suggested that this dislocation is determined by the discourse processing challenges posed by subordination and does not perform the role of organising discourse on a broader textual basis.

Chapter 5 surveys the discourse function of the ἐπεί-clauses with the observation made that those clauses which start books bear a subtly different relationship to preceding text when compared with book-internal clauses. In Chapter 6 a range of preposed clauses are examined; they are shown to relate back to preceding text through recapitulation or through expectancy. Chapter 7 considers the discourse function of ἐπεί-clauses which, in their relationship to a preceding account of the commencement of that event, emphasise thorough completion. The wording of the ἐπεί-clause is considered in Chapter 8, with the observation made that ἐπεί-clauses which denote completion are lexically and/or phrasally distinctive.

## Acknowledgements

I should like to express my deep thanks to my supervisors Dr Daniel Abondolo and Professor Stephen Colvin for encouraging and helping me to carry out this study. I am indebted to many other persons who have offered guidance on detailed aspects of the work. In particular, I should like to thank my examiners, Professor Ahuvia Kahane and Professor Andreas Willi whose contributions much enhanced the quality of this study, as well as Professor Giorgios Giannakis and Professor Hans Heinrich Hock who both kindly offered valuable bibliographic suggestions at a conference organised by Dr Nikolaos Lavidas and Dr Leonid Kulikov in Thessaloniki.

The generosity of a number of scholars in sharing drafts or final forms of their studies on related areas and in corresponding with me in connection therewith was gratefully received. Notably, Dr Dagmar Muchnová, Dr Nicolas Bertrand and Professor Robert Carlson were gracious in their quick responses to my queries.

The kindness and forbearance of my friends was sorely tested and they were not found wanting: Shazia Bhatti, Sharon Laitner, Katharina Lewis, Seetal Modi and David Taylor were friends indeed.

This thesis is dedicated with love and gratitude to my mother and to the memory of my father, who both bestowed on me a natural and nurtured love of languages of the Eastern Mediterranean.

# Table of Contents

**Declaration** 3

**Abstract** 5

**Acknowledgements** 7

**Table of Contents** 8

**List of Tables** 14

**Abbreviations and Defined Terms** 16

**Chapter 1 Introduction** 18

1.1 Ancient subordination 18
1.2 Scope and structure of the study 18
1.3 Existing studies on ἐπεί 19
1.4 Existing studies on temporal subordination in Greek outside of ἐπεί 22
1.5 Textual editions, research materials and tools 22
1.6 Variae lectiones 23
1.7 Defined terms 23

**Chapter 2 Syntax: Overview** 24

2.1 Statistics on ἐπεί 24
2.2 Position of the ἐπεί-clause in the sentence 24
2.3 Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses and Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses 25
  2.3.1 Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses 25
  2.3.2 Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses 27
2.4 The semantics of ἐπεί 28
  2.4.1 The semantics of other temporal subordinators 29
  2.4.2 Difference between the semantics of the temporal subordinators in Homer and fifth-century Greek 29
2.5 Distinguishing temporal preposed ἐπεί-Clauses from causal preposed ἐπεί-clauses 30
2.6 Etymology of ἐπεί 32
2.7 The cross-linguistic syntax of subordinate clauses 33
2.8 The syntax of temporal ἐπεί-clauses 34
2.9 Subordinating morphemes and supporting particles 34
2.10 Special verb forms in Homeric temporal subordination 35
2.11 Word Order within the ἐπεί-Clause 35
2.12 Syntactic peculiarities of ἐπεί-clauses 36

2.13 A note on the aorist in the temporal ἐπεί-clauses 36

**Chapter 3 Syntax: Coordination of the Subordinate Clause 38**

3.1 Introduction 38
3.2 Epic formula 39
3.3 Poetic licence: Convenience – necessity continuum 42
3.4 The syntagm αὐτὰρ ἐπεί 45
3.5 A re-examination of the semantics of αὐτάρ in Homer 48
  3.5.1 The predominance of an antithetical meaning 48
  3.5.2 The infrequency of a progressive meaning 49
3.6 The progressive sense of αὐτάρ in the majority of ἐπεί-clauses 50
3.7 The progressive sense of αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί at book beginnings 51
3.8 The antithetical sense of αὐτάρ in Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses 52
3.9 ἀλλ’ ὅτε: A model solution to metrical difficulties before a subordinator 55
3.10 The use of conjunctions with their prototypical semantics before ἐπεί 57
  3.10.1 The eliminative sense of ἀλλά with ἐπεί 57
  3.10.2 The relative and local sense of ἔνθα with ἐπεί 59
  3.10.3 The immediacy of αὐτίκα with ἐπεί 60
3.11 A Note on the absence of Homeric *ἐπεὶ δέ 60
  3.11.1 Other Subordinators not coordinated with δέ 61
  3.11.2 ἦμος and comparative and quantitative subordinators coordinate with δέ 62
  3.11.3 Relationship with apodotic δέ 62
  3.11.4 δέ marking narrative focus in the subordinate clause 63
  3.11.5 A word of caution regarding the Homeric data 64
3.12 Conclusion 65

**Chapter 4 Syntax: Left-Dislocation before the Subordinate Clause 66**

4.1 Introduction 66
4.2 Cross-linguistic accounts of the syntax of left-dislocation 67
4.3 Investigations of left-dislocation in Greek 68
4.4 Recognising left-dislocation in Greek 69
  4.4.1 Criteria for left-dislocation: Before an independent clause 69
  4.4.2 Criteria for left-dislocation: Before a preposed subordinate clause 71
  4.4.3 Relationship of a left-dislocated noun phrase to the following clause complex 73

4.5 Left-dislocated nominative pronouns 73

4.5.1 A note on the hierarchy of constituents 74

4.5.2 Introduction 75

4.5.3 The syntax and topical continuity of sentences with left-dislocated nominative pronouns 75

4.5.4 Referencing function of the left-dislocated pronouns 77

4.5.5 Continuous topic referencing 80

4.5.6 Reynen’s view on the function of the subordinate clauses with left-dislocated pronouns 80

4.6 Left-dislocated nominative proper nouns 82

4.6.1 The syntax and topical continuity of sentences with left-dislocated proper nouns 83

4.6.2 Referencing function of the left-dislocated proper nouns 84

4.6.3 Hexametric interference with word order and lexical choices 85

4.7 Left-dislocated oblique case nouns and pronouns 88

4.7.1 Previous studies 88

4.7.2 Left-dislocated oblique case pronouns which perform no discourse function 88

4.7.3 Left-dislocated oblique case pronouns which cohere the discourse 90

4.8 Left-dislocated subject and object 92

4.9 Existing studies on the function of left-dislocation 93

4.9.1 Left-dislocation in general linguistics 94

4.9.2 Left-dislocation in Greek 96

4.9.3 Left-dislocation before a subordinate clause in Greek 97

4.10 The discourse simplifying function of left-dislocation before subordinate clauses 98

4.10.1 Summary of positive evidence from ἐπεί 99

4.10.2 Negative evidence from ἐπεί 99

4.10.3 Evidence from other subordinators 100

4.10.4 Discourse simplifying left dislocation as an alternative to cataphora 101

4.10.5 Cataphora in Homer 102

4.11 Prolepsis before a Complement Clause 102

4.12 Conclusion 103

**Chapter 5 Discourse Function: Overview 105**

5.1 Discourse analysis and subordination 105

5.2 Discourse analysis and temporal subordination in Ancient Greek 106

5.3 Discourse function of Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses in Homer 107
5.4 Discourse function of Postposed Subordinate Clauses and Suppletion 108
5.5 Discourse function of Parenthetical and Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses 109
5.6 Preposed Temporal Subordination with ὡς and ὅτε 112
  5.6.1 ὡς-clauses 112
  5.6.2 ὅτε-clauses 113
5.7 Discourse Function of Preposed Temporal ἐπεί -Clauses in fifth-century Greek 113
5.8 Book divisions marked by an ἐπεί-clause 114
  5.8.1 Limited range of techniques for starting books 115
  5.8.2 The unique discourse function of certain book-initial ἐπεί-clauses 117
  5.8.3 Detailed discussion of book-initial ἐπεί-clauses 118
  5.8.4 Other αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses identified by *LfrgE* as bearing broad narratival linking 122
  5.8.5 Reassessing the division into books 123

**Chapter 6 Discourse Function: Cohesion 124**
6.1 Introduction 124
6.2 Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses 125
  6.2.1 Previous studies in general linguistics and Greek 125
  6.2.2 Discussion of the data 126
  6.2.3 ἄρα in independent clauses 128
6.3 Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses 129
  6.3.1 Previous studies in general linguistics and Greek 129
  6.3.2 Discussion of the data: Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses 131
  6.3.3 Discussion of the data: ἐπεί-clauses of listening 134
  6.3.4 Discussion of the data: ἐπεί-clauses of solicited seeing 137
  6.3.5 Discussion of the data: ἐπεί-clauses of unsolicited seeing 138
6.4 Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses 140
  6.4.1 Existing observations on Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses 140
  6.4.2 Similar Homeric constructions 140
  6.4.3 Correspondent constructions in later Greek 141
  6.4.4 Imperfective aspect 142
  6.4.5 Discussion of the data: Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses 143
  6.4.6 Correspondent preposed clauses with ὅτε and ἦμος 146

**Chapter 7 Discourse Function: Completion 148**

7.1 Introduction 148

7.2 Cross-linguistic analyses of subordination used to complete an event 149

  7.2.1 Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses 150

  7.2.2 Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses 152

  7.2.3 Cross-linguistic observations on Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses 152

7.3 Existing Accounts of constructions in fifth-century Greek or Homeric Greek which resemble the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses 153

  7.3.1 Constructions in Herodotus 153

  7.3.2 Participial chaining in Homer 154

  7.3.3 Sucession of subordinate clauses 157

7.4 Previous analyses of the discourse function of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses in Homer 157

  7.4.1 The function of the individual ἐπεί-clauses 157

  7.4.2 The association with type scenes 158

  7.4.3 Verbal aspect 159

7.5 The components of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses 160

  7.5.1 Preparation of the event 160

  7.5.2 Duration of Completive Events 163

  7.5.3 First account with imperfective aspect 166

7.6 Textual relations of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses 169

  7.6.1 Relationship to the preceding text 169

  7.6.2 Relationship to the following text 173

7.7 Discussion of the data: dinner preparations and consumption 175

  7.7.1 Introduction 175

  7.7.2 Event preparation 177

  7.7.3 Analysis of the ἐπεί-clauses 177

  7.7.4 Slaughtering the victim 178

  7.7.5 Preparing a fire for roasting 179

  7.7.6 Burning the thigh pieces 179

  7.7.7 Roasting the outer meats 182

  7.7.8 Full preparation of a meal 185

  7.7.9 Consumption of dinner 190

7.8 Conclusion 200

**Chapter 8 Discourse Function: the lexical and phrasal patterns of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses 202**

8.1 Introduction 202

8.2 Existing observations on the phrasal shape of ἐπεί-clauses 202

8.3 Completive function of distinctive wording 203

8.4 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed through doublets 204

8.4.1 Homeric doublets 204

8.4.2 Discussion of the data: marking completion 206

8.4.3 Verbal Doublets 207

8.4.4 Nominal Doublets 215

8.4.5 Limitations on the productivity of doublets marking completiveness 220

8.5 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses with phasal verbs 221

8.6 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with an inflection of πᾶν 222

8.7 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with a verb which is placed first in the clause 225

8.7.1 Possible Semantic Significance to Verb First 225

8.7.2 Note of Caution on Word Order 226

8.8 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses: no pattern 227

8.9 Observations on the wording of ἐπεί-clauses which are not Completive ἐπεί-Clauses 227

8.10 Conclusion 228

**Chapter 9 Conclusion 230**

**Appendix 1 Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses 232**

**Appendix 2 Preposed non-temporal ἐπεί-clauses 240**

**Appendix 3 Discussion of all Completive ἐπεί-Clauses other than those connected with dining 242**

**Bibliography 279**

# List of Tables

**Table 2.1.** Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses 26

**Table 2.2.** Tense and Mood sequences associated with non-temporal ἐπεί-Clauses 32

**Table 3.1.** Antithetical αὐτάρ in the first six books of the *Iliad* 48

**Table 3.2.** Progressive αὐτάρ in the first six books of the *Iliad* 50

**Table 3.3.** Temporal ἐπεί-clauses prefaced by ἀλλά 58

**Table 4.1.** Nominative pronouns before the ἐπεί-clauses 75

**Table 4.2.** Nominative pronouns before the ἐπεί-clauses with remote resumptive referencing force 79

**Table 4.3.** Comparison of ἐπεί-clauses with initial αὐτάρ or with a left-dislocated pronoun 81

**Table 4.4.** ἐπεί-clauses preceded by left-dislocation of a proper noun 82

**Table 4.5** ἐπεί-clauses with the proper noun after the subordinator 85

**Table 4.6.** Oblique case pronouns before the ἐπεί-clauses 88

**Table 4.7.** Oblique case nouns whose left-dislocation coheres the text 90

**Table 4.8.** ἐπεί-clauses with left-dislocated subject and oblique case noun 92

**Table 5.1.** Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses 110

**Table 5.2.** Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses 111

**Table 6.1.** Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses 126

**Table 6.2.** Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses 131

**Table 6.3.** Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses: sequential ἐπεί-clauses in respect of listening 134

**Table 6.4.** Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses: Seeing 137

**Table 6.5.** Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses (other than those of seeing) 143

**Table 6.6.** Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses of seeing 145

**Table 7.1.** Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clause 178

**Table 7.2.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses denoting burning the thigh pieces 179

**Table 7.3.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses denoting roasting of outer meats 182

**Table 8.4.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses denoting meal preparation. 185

**Table 8.5.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses denoting dining. 190

**Table 9.1.** Parry’s Table of “Formulaic” αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses 203

**Table 9.2.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with Verbal Doublets 207

**Table 9.3.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with Nominal Doublets 215

**Table 9.4.** Instances of Homeric Conjunct Hyperbaton identified by Devine and Stephens 1999 218

**Table 9.5.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with phasal verbs denoting completion 221

**Table 9.6.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with an inflection of πᾶν 222

**Table 9.7.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses with the verb placed first 225

**Table 10.1.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which are or form part of recognised type scenes 243

**Table 10.2.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which do not form part of recognised type scenes 270

## Abbreviations and Defined Terms

“**Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses**” are Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which are juxtaposed to a preceding account of the inception of the Completive Event. They are discussed in Chapter 7.

“**Completive ἐπεί-Clauses**” form the subject of investigation of Chapter 7 and are ἐπεί-clauses which cohere back to an earlier account of the same event as that described in the ἐπεί-clause itself. The earlier account of the event typically denotes the event as being only commenced but not completed.

“**Completive Events**” are events which are the subject of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.

“**Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses**” are temporal ἐπεί-clauses which are classified as a group on the basis that they mark out the start of a second time period as well as simultaneously concluding an earlier time period which is referred to in preceding text and which is typically marked by μέν. They are set out at Table 6.5 and Table 6.6.

“**Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses of Seeing**” are a sub-set of Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses, consisting of clauses which denote seeing. They are set out at Table 6.6 and are discussed in Section 6.4.

“**Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses**” are Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which cohere back to an earlier account of the same event as that described in the ἐπεί-clause itself. In the first account of the event not all stages of the event are mentioned or not all participants are mentioned. They are discussed in Chapter 7.

“**Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses**” are temporal ἐπεί-clauses which describe events which are expected based on preceding text. They are discussed in Section 6.3.

“**Kühner-Gerth**” refers to the second part of the Greek grammar of Raphael Kühner which was revised by Bernhard Gerth and is referred to in the bibliography as “Kühner, R. and Gerth, B. 1898” and “Kühner, R. and Gerth, B. 1904”.

“***LfrgE***” is *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* referred to in the bibliography as “Snell and Mett 1955-2010”.

“**Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses**” are temporal ἐπεί-clauses which are classified as parenthetical based on their syntactic properties, being embedded within a single main clause and do not form part of the list of preposed clauses set at out at Appendix 1.They are set out at **Table 2.1** and again at **Table 5.1**.

“**Pronominal ἐπεί-Clauses**” are ἐπεί-clauses which are preceded by a nominative demonstrative pronoun followed by δ’, most frequently the masculine plural οἱ. They are set out at **Table 4.1**.

“**Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses**” are temporal ἐπεί-clauses which are classified as preposed based on their syntactic properties, but follow a forward or backward linking correlative particle. They form part of the list of preposed clauses set at out at Appendix 1 and are set out at **Table 5.2**.

“**Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses**” are temporal ἐπεί-clauses in the past tense which are identified and classified as such based on the methodology set out in Chapter 2. They are set out at Appendix 1.

“**Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses**” are Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which respond to a preceding account of the inception of the Completive Event but follow after a break in the narrative. They are discussed in Chapter 7.

“**Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses**” are temporal ἐπεί-clauses which recapitulate an event which had been stated earlier before a digression. They are discussed in Section 6.2.

“**Schwyzer-Debrunner**” refers to the second part of the Greek grammar of Eduard Schwyzer which was completed and edited by Albert Debrunner and is referred to in the bibliography as “Schwyzer, E. and Debrunner, A. 1950”.

# Chapter 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Ancient subordination

It is widely held that “early language is inclined to avoid subordinate clauses... Auditors with acoustic, but with no visualising capacity, are likely to lose the thread of a lengthy sentence, unless it is presented to them in co-ordinate clauses”.[1] Some scholars of orality and literacy see a preference for coordinate constructions over subordinate as deriving from the convenience of the speaker. But whether it is to spare an audience the cognitive challenge of processing complex text or to make allowance for pressures on the speaker/performer, the consensus is that subordinate clauses are either absent or to some extent avoided in oral text.

Yet the Homeric poems, which are generally regarded as having their origins in oral composition, are replete with subordinate clauses. Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses, stand at around two hundred and twenty occurrences across the two poems and alone account for an average of nearly five temporal clauses per Homeric book. Kühner-Gerth indeed recognised this state of affairs in stating that “in den Homerischen Gesängen finden wir die hypotaktische Satzverbindung schon bis zu hoher Vollendung ausgebildet”.[2]

If we examine the syntax and discourse function of the Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses a number of features distinguish the clauses from what is generally noted of preposed subordinate clauses. Some features, in particular the left-dislocation of a noun before the subordinate clause, seem to extend across to fifth-century Greek and seem unlikely to be a product of oral performance. Other features, such as the recurrent use of the antithetical subordinator αὐτάρ in contexts where an antithetical meaning is not required, or the heavy use of ἐπεί-clauses to denote completion of an event begun earlier in the narrative, seem likely to be linked to the oral composition of verse.

## 1.2 Scope and structure of the study

Subordinate clauses which are preposed to their main clause are thought to perform greater discourse organisation work (such as cohering text or creating a frame of reference for events in subsequent text) than postposed clauses, with the latter being understood as simply supplementing or qualifying the event of their preceding main clause. With a view to obtaining the clearest understanding of what sort of discourse function subordinate clauses in Homeric poetry might perform, the object of study has therefore been limited to *preposed* subordinate clauses. Some comparisons with, and observations on, postposed clauses are offered in the overview of syntax at Chapter 2 and the overview of discourse function at Chapter 5.

---

[1] Chaytor 1945: 142. Similarly, Haiman and Thompson 1988: x summarised that “grammatical coordination and subordination arise as universal discourse structures become conventionalised, primarily in written registers.” Ong 1982: 37-38 identified an “additive rather than subordinative” style as characteristic of oral thought and expression.

[2] Kühner-Gerth 1904: 229.

As a subordinator, ἐπεί can bear temporal meaning or causal meaning. The causal meaning is often broken down into, or recategorised as, an inferential, motivating or concessive meaning. The syntax, semantics and discourse function of causal ἐπεί have been studied in some detail by scholars such as Stahl, Kraus and Muchnová. As the less explored meaning, we concentrate on the temporal uses of ἐπεί.

This thesis addresses the syntax and discourse function of ἐπεί-clauses which are in the past tense indicative. There are approximately thirty preposed ἐπεί-clauses which are in the subjunctive form and one which is in the future indicative, which all relate to future events and appear to bear temporal meaning;[3] due to their quantity these clauses could not be accommodated in this study.

Chapters 2, 3 and 4 relate to syntax, whilst chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 relate to the discourse function of Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses; a list of these clauses can be found in Appendix 1.

## 1.3 Existing studies on ἐπεί

There are five monographs on ἐπεί: Zycha 1885, Reynen 1957, Bolling 1959, Kraus 1970 and Muchnová 2011 (which incorporated the findings a handful of earlier articles by Muchnová on ἐπεί-see below). These studies have concentrated on the non-temporal use(s) of ἐπεί, with little consideration of the temporal uses. The reader is encouraged to consult Muchnová's recent five page review of monographs on ἐπεί and on works on subordination in Greek which include sections on ἐπεί.[4] Muchnová's account dwells at some length on details of analysis of non-temporal uses.[5]

First, the thirty four page article of Josef Zycha, published in 1885, offered a review of ἐπεί across a broad range of ancient Greek literature. The study outlined a basic division between causal and temporal uses. As noted by Muchnová, a large chunk of the study is dedicated to considering the etymology and possible evolution of the different uses that we find in the historical texts. Zycha's principal innovation was in offering various statistics on different uses and phrases. This achievement has been largely superseded by the ease today with which this information can be obtained from computerised databases. It is, however, an invaluable resource for anyone setting out on the path to study ἐπεί - an immediate impression can be formed on the subordinator’s use in authors as varied as Euripides, Plato and Thucydides.

---

[3] Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 659 notes that only a temporal interpretation is possible where a subjunctive is employed in the ἐπεί clause.

[4] Muchnová 2011: 22-26.

[5] Muchnová 2011 looks at Nilsson 1907 in some detail (pages 23, 91-99) and cites this study a number of times across her work. Nilsson published a study on "Causalsätze" in Greek, which considered causal uses of ἐπεί in depth. He was particularly interested in identifying clauses which seemed to be independent, without any following or preceding main clause.

Reynen 1957 was the first of three studies by Reynen on Homeric οὖν. That first study looked at οὖν following ἐπεί. The second and third studies, published a year later, considered respectively οὖν following ὡς and οὖν in all other environments. The first forty three pages of the 1957 study are dedicated to temporal instances of ἐπεὶ οὖν. Reynen described the relationship that these clauses bore to the preceding and following text. (Reynen’s publications were written in German, but when he is cited here we quote him in translation for ease of comprehension.) Reynen’s study is the only existing in-depth investigation into the function of temporal ἐπεί-clauses. He ascribed the discourse function of these clauses to οὖν rather than to ἐπεί.

It is argued that ὡς and ἐπεί-clauses with οὖν had a strong anaphoric relationship to the preceding text which could be contrasted with those which had a mere ὡς / ἐπεί and those which were prefaced with αὐτάρ. Reynen summarised his findings on the meaning of οὖν, particularly as found in ἐπεὶ οὖν as “οὖν barely needs to affirm the ἐπεί-clause [*because the contents are so anticipated by the preceding text*] - to the extent that it even points beyond it to the following text... [*For some instances*] we should content ourselves with the most common translations, such as “therefore” or “now”. But we could even add to the “now” a “once”. “Now once” would present the situation (to which with it the transition is carried out) as simply obvious and at the same time present the preceding events as background and simultaneously depart from it, in a way which is sharper than when “now” is used by itself.”[6]

Reynen’s analysis that ἐπεί-clauses (albeit in Reynen’s account, only those with οὖν) bind tightly to preceding text accords with our own readings; in the chapters on discourse function, Reynen’s interpretation is often noted as supporting our analysis. But the findings in this thesis depart from Reynen’s analysis by asserting that irrespective of whether or not οὖν follows ἐπεί, temporal ἐπεί-clauses link back to preceding text.

By concentrating on οὖν, Reynen’s assessment of the full semantics of ἐπεί was somewhat compromised. As discussed in Section 4.5.6, Reynen did not recognise the driving force of pronominal referencing in many of the ἐπεί-clauses which for metrical reasons triggered and/or permitted the use of οὖν, with the result that meaning is attributed by Reynen to οὖν where its inclusion appears rather to be for metrical convenience. Furthermore, by not acknowledging the extent to which either of οὖν or δή is frequently associated with a temporal subordinator, Reynen may have been conferring more semantic significance on the association of οὖν with ἐπεί than is justifiable once the broader patterns of temporal subordinators and particles are taken into account. The association of particles with subordinators is discussed briefly at Section 2.9.

---

[6] Reynen 1957: 8-10.

Bolling's twenty page study on the syntax of ἐπεί in Homer was published in 1959. It was severely descriptive, with the citations gathered in a "mechanical fashion".[7] Bolling divided the study into sections on the indicative, on the subjunctive and on the optative. He further divided the section on the indicative into five sections which included (i) where the ἐπεί-clause precedes the main clause, (ii) where it follows the main clause, and (iii) where it is "encased in its accompaniment".

The 1970 study by Kraus examines instances of ἐπεί which were traditionally considered "concessive" (in particular by Stahl 1907). The study argues that certain instances, such as *Odyssey* 1.37 ἐπεὶ πρό οἱ εἴπομεν ἡμεῖς should better be viewed as bearing a causal meaning rather than a concessive meaning. Kraus illustrates that the ἐπεί-clause explains why a word or phrase was used in the preceding clause – in the case of *Odyssey* 1.37 the ἐπεί-clause explains why it was that Agamemnon knew of the fate that awaited him, as recounted in the preceding clause.[8] While Kraus's study did not extent to temporal instances of ἐπεί, the finding that so-called concessive ἐπεί-clauses relate back to earlier text is consistent with the findings in this thesis regarding the anaphoric referencing of temporal ἐπεί.

Between 1991 and 2009 Dagmar Muchnová published six articles on ἐπεί. Her principal interest was in non-causal uses of ἐπεί. The corpus was mostly the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* with some interest in Xenophon's writings. In 2011 Muchnová published a full book presenting the fruits of new research and incorporating the findings and ideas established in previous articles; in her words, the text of the book represents "un stade postérieur de notre reflexion, et contient des développements et des idées inédits".[9]

Three large chapters occupy the majority of Muchnová's 2011 study, with three brief introductory chapters setting the scene. In Muchnová's third chapter she examines preposed ἐπεί-clauses in Xenophon. She concluded that there were no certain criteria for distinguishing between temporal and causal uses of these preposed clauses, but that all should be categorised as having "circumstantial semantics". She suggested that the preposed instances presented a continuum of uses from causal at one extreme to temporal at the other, with the majority occupying the centre and with a smaller group at the extreme of temporality.

Muchnová's fourth and fifth chapters are dedicated to postposed ἐπεί and "autonomous" clauses respectively. The corpus for the fourth chapter is the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, with one page appendices on Xenophon and Sophocles. The corpus for the fifth chapter is a range of writers including Aeschylus, Aristohpanes, Euripides, Herodotus, Homer, Plato and Sophocles. She finds that the postposed and autonomous clauses support a preceding illocutionary act of the speaker. She does not pretend that it is a comprehensive account of all Homeric postposed ἐπεί-clauses. As with Kraus's earlier study, the finding that autonomous ἐπεί-clauses relate back to earlier text is consistent with the findings in this thesis regarding the anaphoric referencing of temporal ἐπεί and is invaluable for refining the semantic profile of ἐπεί in its different functions to a backward linking subordinator.

---

[7] See Muchnová 2011: 24 for an alternative summary of this study. A four page appendix to Bolling's article by Knebel 1959 examined some of the non-temporal instances in Homer and suggested that they are not necessarily subordinate clauses, but, rather, stand as independent clauses.

[8] Kraus 1907: 147.

[9] Muchnová 2011: 11.

## 1.4 Existing studies on temporal subordination in Greek outside of ἐπεί

There is little detailed literature on Greek temporal subordination. Rijksbaron produced a study in 1976 of clauses on temporal conjunctions in Herodotus, focusing on ἐπεί and ὡς. The study considered the preposed and postposed subordinate clauses, whether with causal or temporal function. Some differences in function between preposed and postposed clauses were noted, and the tendency for ὡς to mark circumstantial clauses was noted. Rijksbaron did not consider the broader discourse function of the clauses.

More recently, Buijs attempted a comparison between the discourse function of participles and of temporal subordinate clauses in Xenophon. Muchnová provides a review of this work.[10] We mention his study in more detail in Section 5.2.

## 1.5 Textual editions, research materials and tools

The *Iliad* is cited from West 1998-2000, except that the convention of an *iota subscript* instead of an *iota adscript* is followed (and to that extent is based on van Thiel 2010). The text of the *Odyssey* is cited from von der Mühll 1962. Where there is a difference in the preferred reading of a single formula between the two cited editions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, we follow the reading of West 1998-2000 in our discussions of such a formula.

The critical apparatus of West 1998-2000 and von der Mühll 1962 were consulted as was the apparatus of van Thiel 2010 and van Thiel 1991 in respect of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* respectively as well as that of the major edition of the *Iliad* of Allen 1931 and the earlier critical edition of *Odyssey* of Allen 1917-1919.

The concordances of Tebben 1994 and Tebben 1998, which are to the editions of van Thiel 1991 and van Thiel 1996 respectively, were used for identifying the set of ἐπεί-clauses which form the subject of investigation set out herein. Those concordances were also referred to when considering phrasal patterns as were the concordances of Prendergast 1983 and Dunbar 1962. The *Chicago Homer Database* at http://homer.library.northwestern.edu/ (whose Homeric texts are derived from Monro and Allen 1920 in the case of the *Iliad* and Murray 1919 in the case of the *Odyssey*) has been an indispensable resource for generating information on repeated phrases of two or more words filtered by a range of different parameters, serving to save time and, thanks to its mechanical basis, to insure against human error.

---

[10] Muchnová 2011: 25-26.

## 1.6 Variae lectiones

There are a small number of significant variant readings across the Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses, once divergences in treatment of *nu-ephelkustikon*, elision and the augment are discounted. West 1998-2000 reads *Iliad* 11.459 with a ὅπως-clause where van Thiel 2010 reads the line with an ἐπεί-clause. At Section 6.3.4 we explore some of the metrical, contextual and semantic conditions that may have given rise to the alternative readings of *Iliad* 11.459.

The manuscript reading of *Odyssey* 3.130 as αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Πριάμοιο πόλιν διεπέρσαμεν αἰπήν / βῆμεν δ' ἐν νήεσσι, θεὸς δ' ἐκέδασσεν Ἀχαιούς is to be favoured over a possible *varia lectio* based on, among others, Strabo. This is discussed at Section 3.8.

## 1.7 Defined terms

The theories advanced in the different chapters are to some extent interdependent without necessarily developing in a linear fashion. For example, in Chapter 4 it is observed that pronouns which precede ἐπεί, and form what we term there “Pronominal ἐπεί-Clauses”, are typically necessary for information referencing; in Chapter 3 the argument that αὐτάρ is typically combined with ἐπεί out of metrical necessity relies for part of its support on that observation that Pronominal ἐπεί-Clauses are not themselves an available option unless information referencing requires it.

In view of the interconnectedness of the argumentation, terms which are defined in full in one chapter are sometimes usefully employed in chapters which precede their definition. For ease of intelligibility a condensed definitions list has therefore been included prior to this chapter and can be referred to wherever a capitalised term is used.

# Chapter 2 Syntax: Overview

## 2.1 Statistics on ἐπεί

ἐπεί is the most highly attested subordinating conjunction in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. According to the Tebben concordances, with which the Chicago Homer Database agrees, there are 747 occurrences of ἐπεί, 47 of ἐπήν, and one of ἐπειδάν.[11] Zycha cited 29 attestations of ἐπεὶ κε in Homer, a combination which Muchnová did not isolate for her statistics.[12] Bolling noted two instances of ἐπεί τ’ / ἐπείτ’ in postposed clauses.[13] ἐπει δή, which is often found as one orthographic word in later Greek, is treated as two words in all editions of the Homeric poems consulted.[14] ἐπείπερ and ἐπειδήπερ are not attested until later Greek.[15]

ἐπεί is prominent in the *Homeric Hymns*, Hesiod’s *Theogony* and *Works and Days* and in a full range of Classical Greek prose and poetry.[16] In Modern Greek only ἐπειδή remains,[17] and is used with textually high frequency as a causal conjunction.[18]

## 2.2 Position of the ἐπεί-clause in the sentence

ἐπεί-clauses can precede a main clause, be situated within a main clause, or follow the main clause.[19] The syntax (and function) of a parenthetical subordinate clause is little discussed in general linguistics. Typically, only the preposed and postposed positions are conceived of for subordinate clauses.[20] But handbooks on Modern English recognise the existence of three positions for a subordinate clause: Quirk et al., for example, classifies subordinate clauses into “initial, medial or final”, illustrating the medial clause with *we shall leave, if you agree, tonight*.[21] In the following section it is noted that a limited number of temporal ἐπεί-clauses are attested in parenthetical position within the sentence.

---

[11] Muchnová 2011: 31 notes that the TLG Database produces a statistic of 745 occurrences of ἐπεί, in comparison with the 747 occurrences generated by the Perseus site (which is based on the same texts as those of the Chicago Homer Database). See Chantraine 1963:§381 on ἐπειδάν of *Iliad* 13.285.

[12] Zycha 1885: 110.

[13] *Iliad* 11.87 and 11.562. See Bolling 1959: 22.

[14] So that Muchnová 2011: 29 gives zero for the number of instances of ἐπειδή in Homer.

[15] Zycha 1885: 100-101.

[16] See Zycha 1885: 84 for some statistics of ἐπεί in such works. By contrast with the steadily high use of ἐπεί, the use of the subordinator ὅτε dips in classical Greek, with Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 649 noting that “bei Hdt. [treten] ὅτε und ὁπ(π)ότε zurück.” Not surprisingly, then, the study on adverbial subordination in Herodotus of Rijksbaron 1976b does not cover ὅτε at all.

[17] There is no entry for ἐπεί in the dictionary of Babiniotis 2012, but rather an entry solely for ἐπειδή, which cites the etymology of ἐπειδή as being ἐπεί + δή.

[18] See Kitis 2000 *passim* and Kitis 2006 *passim*. Similarly, Babiniotis offers a dictionary definition for ἐπειδή of διότι, γιατί, για τον λόγο ότι.

[19] ὅτε can also precede or follow its main clause. In chapter 6 of Rijksbaron 1976b it is noted that in Herodotus ὡς carries temporal meaning only when it preceds its main clause; the same appears to apply to Homeric Greek, as suggested by our observations on postposed expressions of sighting as set out in Section 5.4. Not all languages allow their subordinate clauses (or all types of them) to stand both in pre-position and post-position. See Diessel 2001 for an account of which languages display which patterns and the distribution preferences of adverbs between the two options. In languages in which flexibility is permitted, the theoretical preservation of unchanged meaning despite switching of position is considered a principal criterion for distinguishing coordinated clauses from subordinate clauses (see Verstrate 2007: 162-267).

[20] For example, Chafe 1984: 437 simply states “an adverbial clause may come before its main clause, or it may come after.” See similarly Thompson et al. 2007: 295ff and Diessel 2001, 2005 and 2008. In

It has been noted in general linguistics that there is a degree of iconic relationship between the temporality denoted by a temporal subordinator and the ordering of the subordinate clause and main clause. Based on a large corpus of English data: “adverbial clauses marked by *after* precede the main clause significantly more often than adverbial clauses marked by *before*: an average of 54 percent of all after-clauses precede the main clause, but only an average of 11.5 percent of all before-clauses are preposed.”[22] It is perhaps then not surprising that postposed *temporal* ἐπεί, whose basic temporal function is to denote anteriority, is found less frequently than its preposed counterpart. In fact, based on a survey of all the postposed ἐπεί-clauses, a *temporal* postposed ἐπεί-clause in past tense narrative occurs on average just once every two or three books.[23] The first four instances to occur are at *Iliad* 2.16, 5.510, 11.100 and 11.323.

However, the general inclination of ἐπεί, when both causal and temporal uses are counted, is for it to be postposed: the statistical distribution of preposed and postposed ἐπεί-clauses is a ratio of approximately 1:2.[24] Bolling listed many of the instances of the postposed clauses but did not note any particular lexical patterns, simply describing these as where “the ἐπεί constituent comes second”.[25]

## 2.3 Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses and Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses

### 2.3.1 Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses

There are seven temporal ἐπεί-clauses which appear to be parenthetical, being neither preposed nor postposed to a main clause. Six of the parenthetical temporal ἐπεί-clauses fall into a single lexical group denoting seeing and have already been noted by Reynen as being parenthetical, although the basis for that classification was not articulated by him.[26] These clauses, which we

---

his 2005 study Diessel (page 452) expressly excludes from his study “adverbial clauses that interrupt the main clause (e.g. *My favourite word, when I was twelve, was paradox).*”

[21] Quirk et al. 1972: 792.

[22] Diessel 2005: 463.

[23] Muchnová 2003: 107 describes postposted temporal ἐπεί in Homer as “exceptionelle”. Nilsson 1907: 24ff. had earlier summarised simply that ἐπεί is used temporally when in a preposed clause and causally when in a postposed clause.

[24] Ford 1993: 27 found a somewhat similar ratio of 48:135 of preposed to postposed clauses in a study of temporal, conditional and causal clauses in conversational English.

[25] Bolling 1959: 21.

[26] Reynen 1958: 68 n.2 describes the six instances as where the “ἐπεί-Satz schiebt sich in den Hauptsatz ein”. Reynen also included *Iliad* 11.459 in the list of parenthetical clauses, regarding whose variant readings see the discussion in Section 6.3.4; even if that line is indeed to be read with ἐπεί, it cannot

can term “Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses”, are set out at **Table 2.1** below. A number of parenthetical ἐπεί-clauses which are not temporal have been noted in earlier studies.[27]

**Table 2.1.** Parenthetical Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 8.397 | Ζεὺς δὲ πατὴρ Ἴδηθεν ἐπεὶ ἴδε, χώσατ’ ἄρ’ αἰνῶς |
| 2. | *Iliad* 9.195 | ὣς δ’ αὔτως Πάτροκλος, ἐπεὶ ἴδε φῶτας, ἀνέστη |
| 3. | *Iliad* 16.427 | Πάτροκλος δ' ἑτέρωθεν, ἐπεὶ ἴδεν, ἔκθορε δίφρου |
| 4. | *Iliad* 17.59-60 | τοῖον Πάνθου υἱὸν ἐϋμμελίην Εὔφορβον<br>Ἀτρεΐδης Μενέλαος ἐπεὶ κτάνε τεύχε' ἐσύλα |
| 5. | *Iliad* 22.236-237 | ὃς ἔτλης ἐμέ' εἵνεκ', ἐπεὶ ἴδες ὀφθαλμοῖσιν,<br>τείχεος ἐξελθεῖν, ἄλλοι δ' ἔντοσθε μένουσιν |
| 6. | *Odyssey* 10.414-415 | μητέρας: ὣς ἐμὲ κεῖνοι, ἐπεὶ ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι,<br>δακρυόεντες ἔχυντο: δόκησε δ' ἄρα σφίσι θυμὸς |
| 7. | *Odyssey* 23.214 | οὕνεκά σ' οὐ τὸ πρῶτον, ἐπεὶ ἴδον, ὧδ' ἀγάπησα |

There are four identifiable characteristics to these parenthetical clauses, the first three of which can be described as diagnostic criteria as they are syntactic bases for recognising the clauses as arenthetical. The fourth characteristic indicates the type of structural environment in which the parenthetical clauses are used.

1. **Shared grammatical subject**. The subject of the main clause is the same as that of the subordinate clause. There is no restatement (neither by way of changed grammatical case nor by way of reiterating synonym) of the grammatical subject in the subordinate clause or in the portion of the main clause which follows the subordinate clause.
2. **Object elision**. In all sentences except for *Iliad* 9.195 the direct object of the verb (ἴδε/ κτάνε) is missing. Omitting the object of εἶδον is aberrant: in seventy one of the first seventy five transitive occurrences of that verb in the *Iliad* the verb governs either a direct object, a complement clause (*Iliad* 1.537 ἰδοῦσ' ὅτι), a prepositional phrase (*Iliad* 2.271 ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον), or an adverbial expression (*Iliad* 2.269 ἀχρεῖον ἰδὼν). Omitting the object of κτείνω is similarly unusual.
3. **Absence of intonation pause**. The four subordinate clauses which display only one type of lexical formulaism, namely the late placed ἐπεὶ ἴδε, depart from the preposed ἐπεί-clauses

---

easily be seen as parenthetical – the reiterating synonym of πάντες in the main clause at line 460 as well as the coincidence of line end with subordinate clause end speak against such a classification. Muchnová 2011: 71-74 also classified six instances of temporal ἐπεί in Xenophon’s *Hellenica* as parenthetical. The examples cited by Muchnová include *Hellenica* 1.5.10.2 καὶ ὁ μὲν Λύσανδρος, ἐπεὶ αὐτῷ τὸ ναυτικὸν συνετέτακτο, ἀνελκύσας τὰς ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ οὔσας ναῦς ἐνενήκοντα ἡσυχίαν ἦγεν.

[27] See Nilsson 1907: 17 and Muchnová 2011: 96-97, 141 who both identified the non-temporal ἐπεί-clauses of *Iliad* 1.515 ἢ ἀπόειπ', ἐπεὶ οὔ τοι ἔπι δέος, ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῶ and *Odyssey* 8.205–206 as parenthetical.

in their brevity: in these cases the intonation pause marked by a new metrical line is absent, as the verb of the main clause is on the same line as the subordinate clause.[28] Commencing the main clause on the same line as the subordinate clause is rare for ἐπεί-clauses, occurring otherwise only at *Iliad* 21.383 and *Odyssey* 10.237. In respect of the two parenthetical clauses which include the longer subordinate clause ending in ὀφθαλμοῖσι,[29] the additional words which precede the subordinator (beyond the nominative subject) are necessarily or probably governed by the main clause: for example, ὣς δ' αὔτως of *Iliad* 9.195 can relate only to ἀνέστη of the main clause.

4. **Dependent or anaphoric relationship.** The Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses occur only within sentences which are linked to broader stretches of text by way of dependent or correlative particles or nouns. The demonstrative correlative ὥς of *Iliad* 9.195 and *Odyssey* 10.414 and τοῖον of *Iliad* 17.59 refer to statements of the preceding text, in the first case to the springing up of Achilles and in the latter two cases to extended similes. The initial relative pronoun of *Iliad* 22.236 similarly points backwards as does the causal conjunction of *Odyssey* 23.214. The line-initial proper nouns of *Iliad* 8.397 and *Iliad* 16.427 both contrast with proper nouns of the preceding lines, albeit without an anticipatory μέν. This relationship with the surrounding text distinguishes the parenthetical clauses from the majority of preposed ἐπεί-clauses, as discussed in further detail in Section 5.5.

### 2.3.2 Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses

There are a further six ἐπεί-clauses which do not satisfy the criteria for classification as parenthetical, being more naturally classified as preposed clauses. They are set out at **Table 5.2**.

We nevertheless term these six clauses “Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses” because their correlative relationship to preceding text (characteristic number (4) above) recalls that of the Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses and because their discourse function, which is explored at Section 5.5, similarly resembles that of Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses. The correlative relationship of these six clauses is considered at Section 3.10.1 and Section 4.5.5 in respect of the backward referencing of ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἐπεί, Section 4.7.3 in respect of the backward referencing to a preceding μέν, and Section 4.8 in respect of the forward referencing with μέν.

---

[28] On the other hand, we have a particularly pertinent exampleof a ὡς clause of seeing at *Iliad* 23.202-203 τοὶ δ' ὡς ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι // πάντες ἀνήϊξαν which should be treated as a preposed clause rather than a parenthetical clause. There both the metrical break and the reiterating synonym πάντες indicate that the pronoun does not directly govern the main clause. In this regard, see also Ruijgh 1990: 230 on the role of the new metrical line in marking an intonational pause.

[29] *Iliad* 22.236-237, and *Odyssey* 10.414-415.

## 2.4 The semantics of ἐπεί

The semantics of ἐπεί have long been considered to consist of two features, typically those of causality and temporality. The presence of a degree of polysemy with ἐπεί is suggested equally for its use in Homer and in later writers. Chantraine, in his *Dictionnaire Etymologique*, notes ἐπεί as a "conjonction de sens temporal et causal, "après que, comme, parce que".[30] The various studies of Muchnová, in particular those of 2003 and 2011, explore these two different meanings of ἐπεί in Homer and Xenophon and consider to what extent they can both be found in a single use and, at the other extreme, can be found alone at either end of a hypothesised continuum.[31] Zycha noted a proportion of 333 causal uses to 271 temporal uses in Homer.[32]

The temporal meaning of Homeric ἐπεί is recognised as marking anteriority and not simultaneity.[33] Our study of preposed temporal ἐπεί indeed finds no instance of simultaneity introduced by ἐπεί, which perhaps correlates with the close to zero attestations of imperfect verbs in the temporal ἐπεί-clause. It is evident, however, that simultaneity can be marked by ἐπεί in later Greek, in, for example, the Greek of Herodotus or Xenophon.[34]

The causal meaning of Homeric ἐπεί has attracted a number of different accounts and classifications, often with sub-divisions of the causal meaning for different instances. Pfudel identified certain instances of ἐπεί in Homer as "motivating expressions", as they served to justify the statement of the main clause.[35] Stahl later wrote of a "konzessive Kausalsatz" where the clause marks out a preceding reason as ineffective, so that ἐπεί means "obwohl, während, während doch".[36] He also wrote of a free-standing ἐπεί which relates to no main clause, but functions rather as “eine Erwiderung auf eine vorhergehende Rede einleitet”. He gave a number of examples, including *Odyssey* 6.187 ξεῖν’, ἐπεὶ οὔτε κακῷ οὔτ’ ἄφρονι φωτὶ ἔοικας.[37]

---

[30] Chantraine 1968-1980: 356. See also Kitis 2000: 129 and Kortmann 1997: 215 and *passim* for observations that the Indo-European languages have evolved away from polysemous adverbial subordinators as attested in the classical languages towards monosemous subordinators in the modern languages.

[31] Indeed there is a suggestion that the temporal semantics of ἐπεί often carry a "circumstantial" nuance, combining a temporal and causal meaning. But the research for this thesis find that a circumstantial nuance does not seem applicable to the Homeric data. According to Muchnová 2011: 56-57, an ἐπεί-clause with these semantics would be acceptable as an answer to the question both as to when and as to how. See also Rijksbaron 1976b: 75 Rikjsbaron 2002: 77.

[32] Giving a total of 604 attestations rather than the 735 that the Chicago Homer Database produces.

[33] Zycha 1885: 84-85 states "ἐπεί ist eine Conjunction der Vorzeitigkeit". Chantraine 1963: 255 suggests that the subordinator denotes "après que". Kühner-Gerth 1904: 445 simply describes ἐπεί's temporal function as specifying what precedes the event stated in the main clause. Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 659 offers "nachdem" after as the fundamental meaning of ἐπεί. Ruijgh 1971: 502-503, §412 distinguished ὅτε from ἐπεί by noting that ἐπεί appears to denote anteriority.

[34] Riemann and Goelzer 1897: §550 designate temporal ἐπεί as meaning "après que", but also as meaning "lorsque". Similarly, Humbert 1960: §346 states that "ἐπεί, qui signifie à la fois "lorsque" et "après que" appartient à la fois à la simultanéité (indéterminée) et à la postériorité. See also Rijksbaron 1976b: 75 and Muchnová 2011: 39-41.

[35] See Pfudel 1871: 4. Rijksbaron 1976b: 2, 80 revived this concept in connection with certain instances in Herodotus. I am grateful to Muchnová 2011: 91 for drawing my attention to Pfudel's work.

[36] See Stahl 1907: 519ff.

In addition to providing a thorough review of earlier accounts of non-temporal uses of ἐπεί,[38] Muchnová offered a detailed and well substantiated account of postposed non-temporal uses of ἐπεί which she classified as having *justifying force* and being associated with speech acts. This was intended to replace the earlier concept of “motivating expressions” which had been introduced by Pfudel.

### 2.4.1 The semantics of other temporal subordinators

In his grammar of the Homeric dialect Chantraine dedicates a chapter to temporal clauses and the subordinator; there he notes ὅτε as “particularly frequent”, εὗτε meaning “as” and offering around thirty examples, ἦμος as signifying “at the moment when” and being more frequent in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, ὡς and ὅπως as meaning “as” and used particularly with verbs of perception, ἡνίκα as occurring only once although being more widespread in later Greek, ὁσσάκι as meaning “as often as”, the phrase ἐξ οὗ as meaning “from the time when”. [39]

Chantraine also notes a number of subordinators with a durative sense meaning “while, or until the time when” and with an anterior sense “before”. In Section 5.6 we look at the types of events that preposed ὡς- and ὅτε-clauses describe and note they do not link back to preceding text.

### 2.4.2 Difference between the semantics of the temporal subordinators in Homer and fifth-century Greek

It is evident that the subordinators are used differently in fifth-century Greek from the way that they are used in Homer. For example, ἐπεί and ὡς seem to predominate in Herodotus, with ὅτε occurring only occasionally**.** Other authors show different patterns with a greater prominence given to ὅτε. [40]

---

[37] Stahl 1907: 224.

[38] Muchnová 2011: 90-105. Based on the criteria set out below, as adapted from Rijksbaron, the last example should be given a temporal meaning.

[39] Chantraine 1963: 254-265.

[40] Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 649. There are differing views on how the subordinators are distinguished from each other in fifth-century Greek. See in particular Rijksbaron 1976b: 139ff. and Sicking 1996: 39-41.

## 2.5 Distinguishing temporal preposed ἐπεί-Clauses from causal preposed ἐπεί-clauses

There are 261 preposed ἐπεί-clauses. There are five basic lexical patterns which a preposed ἐπεί-clause follows.[41] Subject to certain exceptions,[42] a preposed ἐπεί-clause is not found outside of these patterns. The patterns are as follows:

5. αὐτάρ ἐπεί as set out in Appendix 1 together with the instances at (2) below ;
6. a noun or pronoun + δ’ ἐπεί as set out in Appendix 1 together with the instances at (1) above;
7. a vocative noun + ἐπεί as set out in Part 1 of Appendix 2;
8. νῦν δ’ ἐπεί as set out in Part 2 of Appendix 2; and
9. ἀλλ’ ἐπεί as set out in Part 3 of Appendix 2.

Where a subordinator such as ἐπεί carries causal and temporal meaning, the traditional parameters for determining which meaning a particular subordinate clause carries are: (i) the tense of the subordinate clause and main clause, and (ii) the mood of the subordinate clause and main clause. Rijksbaron formulated the following rule, based on Herodotean syntax, regarding preposed indicative clauses:

> *“The tense appears to be a decisive factor. There are the following options:*
>
> 1. *indicative imperfect or indicative aorist in the ἐπεί-clause, past tense in the main clause; or*
> 2. *indicative present or indicative aorist in the ἐπεί-clause, non-past tense in the main clause.*
>
> *“With (1) the interpretation is temporal (when / after), with (2) inferential (now that).”*[43]

Notwithstanding the formulation of rules to distinguish between causal and temporal meaning, Zycha suggested that sometimes the two meanings can be found in the one use, such as at *Iliad* 11.744-745 στῆν ῥα μετὰ προμάχοισιν: ἀτὰρ μεγάθυμοι Ἐπειοὶ / ἔτρεσαν ἄλλυδις ἄλλος, ἐπεὶ ἴδον ἄνδρα πεσόντα or *Iliad* 9.434-436 εἰ μὲν δὴ νόστόν γε μετὰ φρεσὶ φαίδιμ’ Ἀχιλλεῦ / βάλλεαι .. / ... ἐπεὶ χόλος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ.[44] Chantraine similarly noted that sometimes the two meanings could be found in the one use: “le contact entre le sense temporal et le sens causal s’observe parfois bien”. He cited *Odyssey* 23.52-53 ἀλλ’ ἕπευ, ὄφρα σφῶϊν ἐϋφροσύνης ἐπιβῆτον / ἀμφοτέρω φίλον ἦτορ, ἐπεὶ κακὰ πολλὰ πέποσθε.[45]

---

[41] The limited nature of this range has not previously been recognised by scholars who have examined ἐπεί. Bolling 1959 noted all five groups but distributed them across different sub-headings, so that it is not possible to deduce that these five groups represent the preposed ἐπεί-clauses.

[42] For example, *Iliad* 6.504 ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἐπεί, 6.474 αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ὃν φίλον υἱὸν ἐπεὶ κύσε, 8.269 παπτήνας, ἐπεὶ ἄρ τιν' ὀϊστεύσας. The wording of the various exceptions are the subject of Chapters 3 and 4.

[43] Rijksbaron 1976b: 72. See a similar formulation by Most 1986: 266-267.

[44] See Zycha 1885: 83.

The Homeric instances of ambiguous meaning of ἐπεί, as illustrated by the examples above, tend to be where the ἐπεί-clause describes perception or a predicative expression and, most importantly, where the ἐπεί-clause is postposed. The first of the three examples above consists of past tense indicative in the main clause (ἔτρεσαν) and past tense indicative in the subordinate clause (ἴδον). In Section 5.4 it is observed that there appears to be an element of suppletion in the function that ἐπεί performs when its clause is postposed; *postposed* ἐπεί-clauses govern verb groups (notably of perception) which are only exceptionally to be found in *preposed* ἐπεί-clauses – where a nuance of anticipated perception is desired - and are more typically found with *preposed* ὡς clauses. Verbs of perception create a circumstance or reason against which the events of the main clause are to be understood, so that where ἐπεί-clauses are postposed and describe perception a natural reading is causal. The same cannot be said of preposed ἐπεί-clauses which, as set out in Chapters 5 to 8, link back to earlier text rather than forward to the main clause. As regards the predicative expressions of the latter two examples (χόλος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ and κακὰ πολλὰ πέποσθε) these verb classes are not found in preposed ἐπεί-clauses where their tense is shared with that of the main clause.

Rijksbaron’s formulation can be applied eliminatively and of great benefit to the Homeric data. If we take Rijksbaron’s second limb according to which a temporal (or “inferential”, as he termed it) meaning is precluded wherever we have indicative present or indicative aorist in the ἐπεί-clause, non-past tense in the main clause, we can automatically exclude all preposed ἐπεί-clauses which follow the latter three lexical patterns, save only for the ἀλλ' ἐπεί-clause of *Iliad* 22.258 where the verb of the subordinate clause is in the aorist subjunctive and where ἀλλ' answers to οὐ γὰρ ἐγώ of line 256.

Below we tabulate the tense and mood patterns for each of the third, fourth and fifth lexical patterns. As noted since at least Stahl,[46] the ἐπεί-clauses of the third lexical pattern, i.e. those of the form vocative noun + ἐπεί, do not always have an obvious main clause: of those clauses, for the purposes of the table we excluded *Iliad* 13.68 and 14.65 and *Odyssey* 3.108, 4,204 and 6.187 since a syntactically suitable main clause (even irrespective of context) was not evident. At least three of the ἐπεί-clauses of the fifth lexical pattern, i.e. those of the form νῦν δ’ ἐπεί, are also considered to have no evident main clause.[47]

---

[45] Chantraine 1963: 287. Chantraine also cited *Iliad* 3.59-60 Ἕκτορ ἐπεί με κατ’ αἶσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ’ ὑπὲρ αἶσαν // αἰεί τοι κραδίη πέλεκυς ὥς ἐστιν ἀτειρὴς which is surprising sincer the past tense of the ἐπεί-clause does not sit well with a temporal reading, given the past tense of the following text.

[46] Stahl 1907: 224.

[47] Bolling 1960: 25 noted this in respect of *Iliad* 9.356, 18.101 and 18.333.

**Table 2.2.** Tense and Mood sequences associated with non-temporal ἐπεί-Clauses

| **ἐπεί-clause** | **Main clause** | **Example** |
|---|---|---|
| aorist indicative | present indicative | vocative + ἐπεί *Odyssey* 5.408, 13.4<br>ἀλλ’ ἐπεί *Iliad* 9.119, 19.137<br>νῦν δ’ ἐπεί *Iliad* 22.104, *Odyssey* 23.225 |
| | subjunctive | vocative + ἐπεί *Iliad* 7.288, 22.379<br>νῦν δ’ ἐπεί *Iliad* 9.344 |
| | imperative | vocative + ἐπεί *Iliad* 3.59, *Odyssey* 2.96, 3.211, 14.386, 17.174, 19.141, 24.131 and 24.400<br>νῦν δ’ ἐπεί *Odyssey* 23.354<br>ἀλλ’ ἐπεί *Odyssey* 19.485, 23.260 |
| | modal verb in aorist ὄφελλεν | vocative + ἐπεί *Iliad* 1.352 |
| | future indicative | vocative + ἐπεί *Iliad* 6.333<br>ἀλλ’ ἐπεί *Odyssey* 14.467, 17.226, 18.362, 22.71 |
| present indicative | present indicative | vocative + ἐπεί *Odyssey* 15.260 |
| | optative | νῦν δ’ ἐπεί *Iliad* 23.150 |
| | subjunctive | ἀλλ’ ἐπεί *Odyssey* 5.137 |
| | imperative | Vocative + ἐπεί *Odyssey* 8.236, 13.228, 15.390, 16.91, 17.185 |
| | future indicative | vocative + ἐπεί *Odyssey* 14.149<br>νῦν δ’ ἐπεί *Odyssey* 6.191 |
| | modal verb in aorist μέλλεν | vocative + ἐπεί *Odyssey* 1.231 |
| perfect indicative | imperative | vocative + ἐπεί *Iliad* 6.77<br>νῦν δ’ ἐπεί *Odyssey* 15.346 |
| | present / copula | vocative + ἐπεί *Iliad* 6.382 |
| | future indicative | vocative + ἐπεί *Odyssey* 20.227 |
| predicative expression in the form of elided copula | present tense | vocative + ἐπεί *Iliad* 13.775 |
| future indicative of copula | predicative expression in the form of elided copula | ἀλλ’ ἐπεί *Odyssey* 2.278 |

## 2.6 Etymology of ἐπεί

It has long been suggested that ἐπεί is originally formed of two elements. Zycha noted that the twelfth-century *Etymologicon Magnum* recorded against the entry for ἐπεί: ἐκ τῆς ἐπὶ προθέσεως καὶ τοῦ εἰ συνάπτικοῦ συνδέσμου.[48] Zycha also noted that nineteenth-century interpretations of this etymology are divided on how to treat the second element εἰ: whether (i) as the conditional particle (which some argued had temporal meaning) or (ii) as the relative pronoun.

While Curtius suggested that the conditional/temporal particle should be read into the second part of ἐπεί,[49] Lange dismissed this, noting that a temporal meaning to εἰ is not found in Homer. Furthermore, Lange found a typological model for reading a relative pronoun into -εἰ in the Homeric ἐξ οὗ and εἰς ὅ and similarly in the German *nachdem, indem, seitdem*.[50] Various formulations along these and other lines can be observed. Stahl added the possibility that ἐπί forms a dative/locative form ἐπεί by analogy with ἐκεί.[51]

## 2.7 The cross-linguistic syntax of subordinate clauses

Studies on the typology of subordinate clauses in the languages of the world have identified a number of syntactic features which distinguish subordinate clauses from main clauses.[52] In her cross-linguistic textbook on subordination Cristofaro suggested two basic tests for identifying subordination: (i) the form of the verb, regarding which Cristofaro observed that “it may be the case that tense, aspect, mood distinctions are expressed in the dependent clause, but not in the same ways as in independent clauses. … It encompasses forms such as those of dependent moods and subjunctives”[53]; and (ii) the coding of participants, including whether the subordinate clause includes any overt expression of the arguments.[54]

A few years later Thompson et al. observed that adverbial clauses tend to be “in some sense ‘less subordinate’ than the prototypes [of complement clauses and relative clauses] on the continuum” and identified three devices typically found for marking adverbial clauses: (i) subordinating morphemes; (ii) special verb forms; and (iii) word order.[55] Thus, Thompson et al.

---

[48] Zycha 1885: 86, citing the 1848 Thomas Gaisford Edition of the *Etymologicon Magnum*, page 356.

[49] Curtius 1863: 182.

[50] Lange 1863: 315.

[51] Stahl 1907: 224.

[52] Thompson et al. 2007: 238 summarised that the term “subordination” is used to extend far beyond adverbial temporal clauses to cover “three types of subordinate clauses: those which function as noun phrases (called complements), those which function as modifiers of nouns (called relative clauses), and those which function as modifiers of verb phrases or entire clauses (called adverbial clauses).” An alternative and widespread way of categorising subordination is between finite and non-finite clauses (see the discussion in Cristofaro 2003: 53-54). In finite subordination a verb form is found in the “subordinate clause” and is marked for all the parameters which the verb in a main clause would typically be marked for: person, number, tense and mood, as is the case with our ἐπεί-clauses. In non-finite subordination, as for example with participles, the subordinate verbal element in the clause is a participle which does not conjugate for person or mood.

[53] Cristofaro 2003: 2, 67.

[54] *Idem*, 75-82.

[55] Thompson et al. 2007: 238. Cristofaro (2003: 51) on the other hand states that “variation in word order has been empirically proven to have little relevance for clause linkage strategies used within the

implicitly discounted the possibility of coding of participants as relevant to adverbial clauses. Indeed we find that Homeric Greek does not code the participants of subordinate clauses differently from those of independent clauses.

## 2.8 The syntax of temporal ἐπεί-clauses

Within the parameters of Cristofaro and of Thompson et al., Homeric temporal clauses are largely similar to the subordination structures of European languages today. Below we set out the details according to the three headings identified by Thompson et al. Only the first matter of subordinating morphemes throws up anything of particular interest, namely the use of particles with the subordinators. Regrettably this matter is too large for this thesis, deserving its own dedicated study.

After we look at the three typologically recognised markers of subordination, we outline two ways, previously not examined, in which some or all of the temporal ἐπεί-clauses differ from independent clauses, namely the restrictions on how ἐπεί-clauses are coordinated to the preceding sentence and the phenomenon of left-dislocation before the subordinator. These form the subject of Chapters 3 and 4 respectively.

## 2.9 Subordinating morphemes and supporting particles

ἐπεί marks out the clauses as subordinate clauses. But it often seems to draw on the support of a particle: the tendency of one of δή[56] and οὖν[57] to follow ἐπεί-clauses is well known. [58] A glance at Appendix 1 will show where δή and οὖν are found in the ἐπεί-clauses. The consensus, both of linguists and of literary commentators,[59] is that these particles offer a meaning of inevitability or expectedness to the events of the subordinate clause.

---

domain of subordienation. One notable exception is the well-known case of German ... Another case in point is provided by Barasano.”

[56] See Chantraine 1963: 255, Kühner-Gerth 1904: 129, Wackernagel 1916: 31-32, Schwzyer-Debrunner 1950: 659, Bakker 1993: 75-76, and Sicking 1996: 41. All scholars attribute a cohering function to δή.

[57] Denniston 1954: 416-417 suggests that it is οὖν of ἐπεὶ οὖν which is doing the work of referring “to something already described or foreshadowed”, noting that there are 33 instances with this type of “backward reference”; he offers a similar analysis of ὡς οὖν. Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 586 notes as one phenomenon ἐπεὶ οὖν and ὡς οὖν. As with δή, these two studies suggest that οὖν carries a cohering and/or affirming function in respect of preceding text.

[58] οὖν and δή are combined in the temporal subordinate clause at *Odyssey* 15.361 ὄφρα μὲν οὖν δὴ κείνη ἔην, and in the causal subordinate clause at *Odyssey* 17.226 ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δὴ ἔργα κάκ' ἔμμαθεν, οὐκ ἐθελήσει which recurs at *Odyssey* 18.362 . The use of one or both of these particles may be linked to the direct speech context of this narrative.

[59] The reading of contextually tailored meaning into δή spans the commentaries of the nineteenth to twenty first centuries. For example, at *Iliad* 24.443 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πύργους τε νεῶν καὶ τάφρον ἵκοντο, the commentary of Leaf and Bayfield 1898: 592 says “δή: at last”. Similarly, Graziosi and Haubold 2010: 110 asserts in regard of δή at *Iliad* 6.121 οἳ δ' ὅτε δὴ σχεδὸν ἦσαν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἰόντες that “the particle highlights the confrontation”. Regarding οὖν de Jong 2012: 185 states that οὖν of *Iliad* 11.641-2 πινέμεναι δ' ἐκέλευσεν, ἐπεί ῥ' ὥπλισσε κυκειῶ. // τὼ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν πίνοντ' ἀφέτην πολυκαγκέα δίψαν illustrates how οὖν functions, namely that “the particle οὖν in Homer is usually combined with ἐπεί or ὡς, and is resumptive”.

Yet the *communis opinio* disregards the widespread and contextually indiscriminate association of these two particles with temporal clauses. A full investigation into the matter should take into account the ὅτε-clauses which are almost always followed by δή[60] and the ὡς-clauses which are almost always followed by οὖν. [61]

## 2.10 Special verb forms in Homeric temporal subordination

Within the past tense, one-time events in ἐπεί-clauses show no distinction in Homeric Greek with regard to tense, aspect or mood when compared with the way that they would be expressed in independent clauses. But when an event is to be understood as having occurred repeatedly or iteratively, then we do indeed observe that the *irrealis* mood, the optative, is used in the ἐπεί-clause where the indicative would be used if the event were described in an independent clause.

Thus, at *Iliad* 24.14-15 ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν ὑφ’ ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους / Ἕκτορα δ’ ἕλκεσθαι δησάσκετο δίφρου ὄπισθεν we can note that the aorist optative is used to denote iterative action in the past tense.[62] The main clauses present a σκ- indicative form in the first case and an imperfect followed by σκ- indicatives in the second.

This structure has been adequately observed, with a particularly good summary in Schwyzer-Debrunner.[63] Schwyzer-Debrunner notes that the use of the aorist optative in subordinate clauses extends to other temporal clauses including those introduced by ὄφρα and extends also to relative clauses and conditional clauses. They further note that the use is seen also in fifth-century Greek but that after Homer the main clauses prefer the imperfect indicative rather than the σκ- aorist.[64]

## 2.11 Word Order within the ἐπεί-Clause

Homeric temporal ἐπεί-clauses display no change in word order within the ἐπεί-clause from that seen in independent clauses.[65] It is suggested in Chapter 8 that the word order of the ἐπεί-clause is adapted according to the emphasis in the clause, typically as it relates to the preceding text, but that this is not syntactically associated with the subordinate status of the clause.

---

[60] On approximately 146 instances out of approximately 164 occurrences of temporal preposed ὅτε.

[61] Approximately 43 out of 46 ὡς-clauses.

[62] See Chantraine 1963: 224-225 and Zycha 1885: 104. Bolling 1959: 37 also notes *Iliad* 8.268-272 where an optative βεβλήκοι is read instead of βεβλήκει in some manuscripts. Zycha (*loc. cit.*) also notes *Odyssey* 24.254 which is better categorised as a postposed clause.

[63] Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 335-336.

[64] As noted by Blass et al. 1896: §367 the iterative sense is expressed in the subordinate clauses of Hellenistic Greek by ἄν followed by the aorist imperfect indicative.

[65] Kühner-Gerth 1904: 598 observed that “bei den Adverbialsätzen der Zeit und der Bedingung lässt sich, da sie schon in der gewöhnlichen Stellung dem Hauptsatze voranzugehen pflegen, die Inversion nicht anwenden”.

## 2.12 Syntactic peculiarities of ἐπεί-clauses

Notwithstanding the enumeration in the previous section on how temporal ἐπεί-clauses conform to the inventory of characteristics of subordination, the syntax of Homeric temporal ἐπεί-clauses present three distinctive features, which are not generally identified as specific to subordination:

1. *Coordination of the ἐπεί-clause with an antithetical conjunction.* This is the subject of Chapter 3 and seems to be a feature specific to the Homeric context. Metrical pressure, combined with performance pressure, has produced a default combination of ἐπεί with the antithetical conjunction αὐτάρ. Less likely to be unique to Homeric Greek, but rather a property of early Greek, is the possible evidence that coordination with the topic-marking conjunction δέ was not possible.
2. *Left-dislocation of an express subject where it is the topic of the ἐπεί-clause and the main clause*. This is the subject of Chapter 4. Left-dislocation is a feature which is evident in fifth-century Greek as well. We suggest that left-dislocation may be an alternative to subject cataphora between a preposed subordinate clause and its following main clause, a phenomenon which is well known in English.
3. *Phrasing to mark completion, most notably through linguistic parallelism.* This is the subject of Chapter 8. This third characteristic straddles the divide between syntax and discourse function.

## 2.13 A note on the aorist in the temporal ἐπεί-clauses

Zycha noted that a Homeric temporal ἐπεί-clause presents almost exclusively with an aorist verb.[66] We have likewise found that the aorist is selected with the temporal ἐπεί-clauses. Other uses of Homeric ἐπεί only seldom display the imperfect (e.g. *Iliad* 2.171, 5.536).[67]

The use of the aorist in ἐπεί-clauses is generally explained as marking relative anteriority of the event of the ἐπεί-clause as opposed to simultaneity, both in Zycha's monograph on ἐπεί[68] and in numerous grammatical handbooks and monographs in respect of adverbial constructions and paratactic sequences.[69] Indeed the natural interpretation of all of the events recounted in our ἐπεί-clauses is that they occurred before the events of the main clause and subsequent clauses.

---

[66] Zycha 1885: 85. Zycha identified *Iliad* 21.201 and 24.50 as exceptions. But ἀπηύρα of those two citations has subsequently been assessed as a root aorist (see Risch 1964: §86b). See also Ruijgh who noted the exceptional imperfects of *Iliad* 11.267 ἐπεί ... ἐτέρσετο etc. and *Odyssey* 17.28 ἐπεί ῥ' ἵκανε. It is not possible to distinguish these two ἐπεί-clauses from the other ἐπεί-clauses, but we can note that the text of both is seen elsewhere in parataxis (see *Iliad* 18.848 and *Iliad* 6.370 and 6.497), which may suggest that the text was not conceived for an ἐπεί-clause.

[67] Exclusive use of the aorist with temporal ἐπεί is not continued in later Greek. Zycha offered statistics on verbal aspect with ἐπεί in later Greek, which illustrate a weakening of the aorist bias.

[68] Zycha 1885: 103. Bolling 1959 does not comment on this.

[69] Chantraine 1963: §271 cites *Iliad* 1.606, 2.513 and *Odyssey* 18.5 and the ἐπεί instance of *Iliad* 1.484. See also Monro 1891: §76, Kühner-Gerth 1898: 154, Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 298 and Napoli 2003: 83. See Hettrich 1976 in particular page 18 where he contrasted a hypothetical but unattested

As far as the use of the aorist in respect of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses is concerned, additional observations on the use of the aorist can be made, in particular as it relates to the execution of the relevant event in relation to preceding text. We note in Chapter 7 that the aorist is likely to be the unmarked stem for the particular verbs used, so that the only nuance of the aorist of such verbs is the execution of the particular event in the past. However, in Chapter 8 we illustrate that Completive ἐπεί-Clauses employ a variety of lexical and phrasal devices which appear to be used to convey not only the occurrence of the event(s) in the past, but also the thorough completion of those event(s).

---

ὅτε ἐδειπνοῦμεν διελεγόμεθα “während wir assen, unterhielten wir uns”, with ὅτε ἐδειπνήσαμεν διελεγόμεθα “nachdem wir gegessen hatten, unterhielten wir uns”. See also Dry 1983: 38 on English.

# Chapter 3 Syntax: Coordination of the Subordinate Clause

## 3.1 Introduction

The line-initial phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεί occurs 173 times.[70] The first instance with αὐτὰρ ἐπεί is found at *Iliad* 1.458 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ηὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο with four occurring shortly thereafter: *Iliad* 1.464, 1.467, 1.469 and 1.484. The remaining fifty temporal ἐπεί-clauses typically start with a pronoun + δέ + ἐπεί construction, a sequence which is the subject of the following chapter.

Aside from the non-Attic-Ionic αὐτάρ, there are a limited number of particles with which a temporal ἐπεί-clause is linked to preceding text in Homer: ἀλλά (three times), ἔνθα (once) and αὐτίκα (once). The basic premiss of the oral-formulaic theory is invaluable for understanding why αὐτάρ is consistently selected to combine with ἐπεί: only one combination (typically a noun-epithet formula, but here a coordinator + subordinator) is typically selected for repeat use from a range of metrically possible options. The phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεί was indeed recognised by Milman Parry as an instance of an epic formula.

The oral-formulaic theory does not, however, readily address the question of implications on the semantics of the supporting element of a formula. With regard to αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, we argue that there are significant syntactic and compositional constraints on the poet which combine to distort the semantics of αὐτάρ. In this regard we note that a similar distortion of ἀλλά of the highly recurrent ἀλλ’ ὅτε is thought to have occurred. It is proposed in this chapter that a continuum from metrical convenience to metrical necessity be considered as a useful tool for approaching the question of the implication of oral formulas for semantics, where the semantics of αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί should be considered as an instance which is at the metrical necessity end of the continuum.

On a separate but related note, while there are no instances of an asyndetic temporal ἐπεί-clause, there are also no instances of an ἐπεί-clause coordinated with δέ. We suggest that this is unlikely to be wholly attributable to metrical exigency given that on a small number of occasions (i) ἐπεί is placed in a position within the hexameter which would, from the metrical perspective, have allowed a following δέ, or (ii) ἐπεί starts a clause in the middle of the metrical line, suggesting that the failure in such instances to be coordinated with δέ is not only attributable to ἐπεί’s preference for a line initial position. We suggest that the boundary and topic marking characteristics of δέ may not be suited to coordinating an ἐπεί-clause.

---

[70] Of the 173 occurrences, nine are with κε followed by the subjunctive and two are in direct speech and have non-temporal meaning: *Iliad* 6.349 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάδε γ' ὧδε θεοὶ κακὰ τεκμήραντο and *Iliad* 24.547. There are ninety four different αὐτὰρ ἐπεί clauses to analyse once formulatic repetitions are removed from the total.

## 3.2 Epic formula

Parry observed a pattern of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί followed directly by the verb in the indicative[71] which concluded at the trochaic caesura.[72] Parry viewed the pattern as an optimal combination of metrical and semantic needs, stating that “it is clear that the poet, or poets, who used them, felt the exact device [...] for fitting into the verse verb-forms of certain moods and measures.”

Ruijgh combined Bowra’s observations[73] on the Cypriot attestations of the form *autar* with Parry’s observations on the formulaic nature of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί to support his theory of an earliest “Achaean” layer to the poems (namely of an Arcado-Cyprian layer). He noted that αὐτὰρ ἐπεί was established by scholars as a formulaic phrase but that it also displayed an Achaean form, which marked this out as a very productive formulaic phrase from the Achaean stage of composition, a formula which “sert à construire les phrases les plus traditionnelles de l’épopée.”[74]

The inclusion of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί within the ambit of oral formulas does justice to the high frequency of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί as well as to the infrequency with which any particle other than αὐτάρ combines with ἐπεί. However, the impact on the meaning of αὐτάρ when used in the formula was not considered by Parry or Ruijgh. Without ado, Parry interpreted αὐτάρ as carrying adversative or contrasting force, describing ἐπεί-clauses with αὐτὰρ ἐπεί as denoting “but when he (we, they) had done so and so”. It was only in subsequent decades, in works such as Visser 1988 that the suitability of formulas, or the components of formulas, to individual contexts was examined. But before we can consider how αὐτάρ in particular is affected by its regular combination ἐπεί, we need to assess (and ultimately discount) a recent suggestion of Joshua T. Katz that the formula αὐτὰρ ἐπεί represents a Proto-Indo-European inherited and sacral collocation.

---

[71] Beyond a verb which finishes at the trochaic caesura, there are many other recurrent and less recurrent ways of continuing the text from αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, including the six times occurring αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα, to an extent that suggests that a verb finishing at the trochaic caesura is not itself part of the formulaic pattern.

[72] Parry 1930: 85-86 formulated three sub-classes of the αὐτὰρ ἐπεί formula with the indicative: first, where “to αὐτὰρ ἐπεί was added an indicative verb form of the measure ∪ ∪-∪ , beginning with a single consonant; also another type in which to αὐτὰρ ἐπεί was joined first ῥ’, one form of that helpful and many-shaped particle, then an indicative verb-form beginning with a vowel or diphthong and measured ∪ ∪-∪; thirdly, there was a type where αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, lengthened by the addition of the syllable δή allowed the use of verb forms of the valuable-∪.” Parry added a fourth sub-class for subjunctive clauses which started with αὐτὰρ ἐπήν.

[73] See footnote 96.

[74] Ruijgh 1957: 35-43. See also Hainsworth 1968: 100 and Peabody 1975: 80 on an “αὐτὰρ ἐπεί series” in Hesiod. Durante 1976: 55-56 in turn suggested that αὐτὰρ ἐπεί reflected part of an Aeolic layer to the poems, based on a Boeotian instance of αὐτάρ. He observed that Friedländer’s collection of Greek verse inscriptions contained an epigram from Boeotia dating from between 650 and 625 which included the word αὐτάρ (Friedländer 1948: §37). However, as in fact observed by Friedländer, this inscription is hexametric and is linguistically homericising, with only “a slight local touch” being the use of Boeotian δίδοι; we cannot, then, rely on this Boeotian inscription to provide useful evidence of the Boeotian dialect and, more particularly, of αὐτάρ.

In a monograph on ταρ and the phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεί,[75] Katz suggested that the Homeric combination of αὐτάρ with ἐπεί reflects an underlying close relationship between -ταρ and ἐπ-, where ταρ is to be understood as a unitary particle.[76] In addition to the noted recurrence of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, evidence for the relationship is adduced, among other things, from the occurrence of (i) αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα, line initially (*Iliad* 4.442 etc.) and line finally (*Iliad* 3.273 etc.); (ii) αὐτὰρ ἐπί where ἐπί is prepositional; (iii) αὐτὰρ ἐπί- where ἐπί is preverbal; and (iv) αὐτὰρ ὄπισθεν which Katz notes is relevant if the view is correct that Greek *opi*- is an ablauting variant of *epi*- as Mycenaean evidence might suggest.[77] From Katz's citation of a Luwian text with a possible sequence of -*tar* -*epi*: *pā=tar āppa zaštanz(a) aštummantanz(a)=ta atuwalaḫit niš dādduwar* (inscription KUB 9.31 ii 25-26, CTH 757.B (NS)) *But do not come back with evil to these gates*, we are also to understand that there is an "Indo-European poetic inheritance" underpinning the combination.[78]

As far as investigating the function of αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί is concerned, the corollary to Katz's theory is that the phrase represents an inherited collocation, and as a constituent of a collocation, αὐτάρ would be subject to collocational restrictions of its semantics. According to Katz, the semantic restrictions can be seen in the types of events introduced by αὐτὰρ ἐπεί and can also be seen elsewhere in Homer where there is an occurrence of etymological or non-etymological ταρ and ἐπ-. Specifically, Katz notes the high occurrence of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί with "verbs that pertain to the intersection of ritual and dining", such as at Odyssey 12.359 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' εὔξαντο καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν. Katz hypothesises in conclusion that the particle ταρ is of a sacral nature.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεί is indeed often found with descriptions of ritual acts, as explored in Chapter 7 and Chapter 8. But Katz's reasoning that αὐτάρ is selected to link the ἐπεί-clauses because of a historic and continuing propensity for ταρ to link to ἐπ in sacral contexts would need to benefit from further refinement of the substantiating arguments before we can rely on it. Of particular concern is Katz's principal reasoning for why αὐτάρ should be understood as containing the particle ταρ when it is traditionally understood as being derived from αὐτ-άρ.[79]

---

[75] *Idem*, 65-79.

[76] As Katz notes, it is disputed as to whether Homeric ταρ should be read as one particle or as τ' ἄρ.

[77] *Idem*, 75-76. Katz identified the fourth group as being an instance of additional proof of the common origins of *epi*- and *opi*- given the evidence of the preceding group for there being a pattern of autar epi-. But it is far from clear that groups (ii), (iii) and (iv) cited by Katz are by themselves a significant group. These are three groups where αὐτάρ precedes the prepositions ἐπί or ὄπισθεν. But closer inspection of αὐτάρ reveals that αὐτάρ has a predilection for prepositions, and not just those which start with *ep*-/*op*-: if we look forward to Table 3.1, the distribution of αὐτάρ before a preposition is as follows: before ὕπερθε (*Iliad* 2.218, and 5.724), ὑπό (*Iliad* 2.465), ἐπ' (*Iliad* 5.729) and ἐν (*Iliad* 6.243).

[78] For comparative work on the Luwian particle –*tar* and Greek ταρ see Watkins 1995: 150-151.

[79] See *LfrgE* 1978: 1564 on the etymology of αὐτάρ: "meist als Zusammenrückung aus αὖτε u. ἄρ(α) erklärt".

In support of deriving αὐτάρ from αὖ + ταρ, Katz noted that Parry had identified eighteen instances of the extended combination αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ', to which Katz added *Odyssey* 2.407.[80] Katz suggested that the attested instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί with ῥ' were significant as they would be cases of "particle doubling" if αὐτάρ contained ἄρα. It was further observed that particle doubling is a "rare phenomenon at all stages of Greek (as well as in related languages)", so we must conclude that in fact αὐτάρ does not contain ἄρα and must therefore contain a different particle, namely ταρ. Katz discounted any metrical necessity from the equation, observing that αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' is a formula whose consequent greater age would mean that the supposed particle doubling in the phrase would have been more obvious at the time of inception and therefore avoided.

However Katz had not heeded the position of ῥ' in αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ', namely its *prima facie* placement outside the Wackernagel position of second in the clause.[81] By reference to instances other than αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ', such late positioning of ἄρα has been argued to be evidence of a clause boundary, with the material which appears before the word directly preceding ἄρα being "left-dislocated" or acting as a "theme".[82] The same argument should be applied to our instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ': αὐτάρ is left-dislocated and does not form a syntactic part of the clause which starts ἐπεί. On this basis, if αὐτάρ were derived from αὐτ-άρ, αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' would not present an instance of particle doubling as the two occurrences of ἄρα fall on either side of a clausal boundary.

The equating of αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί with that of αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα and αὐτὰρ ἐπί is at least partially specious. αὐτάρ in the latter two cases generally responds to a preceding μέν and is performing its regular antithetical function, while, as we argue later in the chapter, the majority of occurrences of αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί do not perform any correlative antithetical function. Furthermore, Katz does not observe (because it is indeed not the case, as a cursory glance at a concordance proves) that any of the instances of αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα or αὐτὰρ ἐπί are in sacral contexts, unlike his observations for αὐτὰρ ἐπεί.

We can agree with Katz that αὐτάρ forms a particularly productive bond with ἐπεί, and that the combination is often found in sacral contexts, but it is not overwhelmingly obvious that this bond is attributable to any Homeric or inherited linking of -tar with –ep. The reason why ἐπεί (whether linked by αὐτάρ or anything else) is often found in sacral contexts and why it is often coordinated by αὐτάρ must be sought elsewhere.

---

[80] In fact, a further eighteen instances occur, which can be identified by looking at Appendix 1.

[81] See Wackernagel 1892 in which the observation was made that certain clitics in a number of Indo-European languages, including Greek, tend to take second position in the sentence.

[82] For example, in respect of *Iliad* 16.220-221 and *Odyssey* 8.55-56. Ruijgh 1990: 229-231 argued that αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεύς and αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα of each of the respective instances are "themes" and not part of the clause proper, which is why enjambed βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν and βάν ῥ' ἴμεν can follow respectively with their superficially late placed ῥ'. Bakker 1990: 12 developed Ruijgh's point and interpreted *Iliad* 11.101 αὐτὰρ ὃ βῆ ῥ' ῏Ισόν (where the sentence is on one line) as consisting of a left-dislocated αὐτὰρ ὃ.

It rests to us then to consider afresh the semantics of αὐτάρ when combined with ἐπεί. In order to do this, we need to ask why the formula is so productive, and indeed why a formula developed in the first place. It may be that not all formulas are equal: in this sense the circumstances that trigger the genesis of one formula and the way in which that formula is used in the text may vary from one formula to another more than is currently acknowledged. The poet may have less control over this formula with ἐπεί, less choice to choose other options, than with other formulas such as the various noun-epithet formulas.

## 3.3 Poetic licence: Convenience – necessity continuum

When considering the circumstances giving rise to the use of a particular formula, it may be beneficial to posit a continuum from metrical convenience at one end to metrical necessity at the other.[83] We can then hypothesise that the extent, or rate, at which the components of the individual use of a formula are semantically in harmony with the context may decrease as we move along the continuum from convenience to necessity.

ἐπεί of preposed temporal clauses appears to create significant metrical challenges such that we would position its combination with αὐτάρ at the "metrical necessity" end of the continuum. To date, the metrical accommodation that αὐτάρ provides for ἐπεί has been recognised only in outline and only by a couple of scholars. Bolling stated that ἐπεί presented a "metrical difficulty" which he viewed as being met by "prefixing a connective", namely αὐτάρ.[84] Similarly, in her paper on Homeric ἐπεί, which was principally on non-temporal uses, Muchnová also saw the metrical value of αὐτάρ being placed before ἐπεί, "qui pour des raisons métriques ne peut pas être mis en tête absolue du vers".[85] However, the details of the metrical difficulties should be enumerated so that we can understand whether the use of αὐτάρ is a matter of convenience or rather one of necessity.

There are three conditions which combine to influence ἐπεί's position in the metrical line. First, it appears that - subject to the exception of the permissibility of the left-dislocation of certain noun phrases, as discussed in the following chapter - there is a syntactic requirement in classical and Homeric Greek to begin a clause which is governed by ἐπεί with the subordinator:[86] in addition to the typological evidence for a clause initial position of the subordinator,[87] the regular presence of the postpositives δή, οὖν and ῥ' after ἐπεί mark out ἐπεί as the beginning of the clause.

---

[83] While these two terms signify quite different things, they have in practice often been used interchangeably.

[84] Bolling 1959: 19-20.

[85] Muchnová 2003: 107. See similarly Muchnová 2011: 146.

[86] This has not hitherto been articulated with any substantiation. In his study of the colon in Greek discourse, Scheppers 2011: 72-73 asserted that "words marking grammatical subordination" are one of three types of word classes which are bound to take the first position in the clause.

Secondly, there is a strong preference within the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* for the beginning of preposed subordinate clauses to coincide with the beginning of the metrical line. Parry noted that "nearly one half of [Homer's] verses finish where the sentence ends,[88] implying that nearly half of Homer's verses start with the beginning of the clause. The tendency for preposed subordinate clauses to commence the metrical line is in fact far higher than 50% of occurrences: if we exclude ἐπεί, but consider the temporal subordinators εὖτε, ὅτε, ὡς, ἦμος, ἕως and ὄφρα we find a 99% affiliation to the beginning of the line.[89]

The reason why preposed subordinate clauses gravitate to the beginning of the line may be connected with the "enjambement" that will arise across any sentence which consists of a subordinate clause and main clause where that sentence extends beyond one metrical line (which is the case with almost all sentences which start with an ἐπεί-clause); even where the main clause starts at the beginning of the following line, there is a weak enjambement between it and the preceding line which contains the subordinate clause.[90] If the ἐπεί-clause did not start at the head of the line (as we indeed see in seven instances with ἐπεί),[91] and was furthermore followed by a subordinate clause which was partially or entirely on the following line, there would be two enjambements in one sentence.

Thirdly, although there are six instances in which ἐπεί is attested in the first syllable of the line (a preposed temporal instance at *Iliad* 23.2, two postposed temporal uses at *Odyssey* 4.13 and 8.452 and three preposed causal uses at *Iliad* 22.379, *Odyssey* 21.25 and 24.482), the short first vowel of ἐπεί in general precludes ἐπεί from occupying the *arsis* of the initial foot of the metrical line. As far as the line initial instance at *Iliad* 23.2 is concerned, we note in Section 5.8 that the discourse function of this ἐπεί-clause belongs to a distinct song-commencement marking group, which is likely to belong to a relatively younger layer of the poems, when each poem was divided into twenty four songs. The predominant view of other studies regarding most , if not all, of the six instances is that this line initial ἐπεί represents a distinct treatment of ἐπεί which is not generally present in the poems.[92] It seems likely that the six instances of line initial ἐπεί represent an evolution in the syllabic quantity of Homeric ἐπεί which was not accessible when the poems were initially composed. The remaining 739 occurrences of ἐπεί in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* occur where the first syllable of ἐπεί is to be read with a short vowel.[93]

---

[87] Thompson et al. 2007: 238 noted that a cross-linguistic survey reveals that subordinators may stand at the beginning or end of the clause that they modify. Dryer 2013 online, however, suggested that there are eight languages in the world where the adverbial subordinator appears inside the clause.

[88] Parry 1929: 205.

[89] The only exceptions are *Iliad* 18.67 ῥήγνυτο: ταὶ δ' ὅτε δὴ Τροίην ἐρίβωλον ἵκοντο, *Iliad* 23.202 with a ὡς-clause and *Odyssey* 12.439 with an ἦμος-clause.

[90] Parry 1929: 216 noted the case of "necessary enjambement" (where the clause requires additional words from the following line in order to be completed – here, because a ἐπεί-clause requires a main clause) following *Iliad* 1.57-58 οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο, // τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς, which he described as being enjambement "following a word group". Kirk 1976: 147-148, in turn, described this as where "a subordinate clause [...] fills one verse and is succeeded by the main clause in the next", suggesting that "we should normally expect to find weak punctuation, marking some degree of pause, at the point of enjambment".

[91] The three ἐπεί-clauses which are preceded by the masculine singular demonstrative pronoun at *Iliad* 21.26, *Odyssey* 11.98 and 21.297, the ἐπεί-clause which is governed by a relative pronoun at *Odyssey* 14.175, and three of the ἐπεί-clauses which are preceded by left-dislocated proper nouns at *Iliad* 8.269ff., 23.1ff. and *Odyssey* 21.404ff.

In conclusion, we have a conundrum whereby the syntax and compositional structure of Homer’s Greek requires ἐπεί of a preposed clause to start the metrical line, but ἐπεί itself is not syllabically suited to starting the metrical line. Prefixing a particle to ἐπεί, which is the solution generally adopted to address the conundrum, will be a response to a metrical necessity and not an act of mere metrical convenience. (In the following chapter we demonstrate that Pronominal ἐπεί-Clauses, whereby a pronoun precedes ἐπεί, are specific to contexts in which the information requirements determine the inclusion of a pronoun.)

Of the range of particles available in Homeric Greek, only certain of the particles are metrically possible, and within that sub-group αὐτάρ gives the greatest flexibility as to what can follow ἐπεί. Of the particles listed out in Monro’s *Homeric Grammar*[94] which can take first position in a clause, καί is not metrically suited due to the hiatus that would have occurred before ἐπεί. Of the remaining sub-group, ἀλλ’ before ἐπεί would have required the word which followed ἐπεί to start with a vowel in order to enable correption of -πεί (see for example *Odyssey* 5.137 ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὔ πως ἔστι where ἀλλ' has semantic force, responding eliminatively to the negative of the preceding line), which contrasts with the flexible freedom afforded by αὐτὰρ ἐπεί which can be followed by a long or short syllable which starts with either a single consonant or a consonant cluster. Similarly, ἠδ’ ἐπεί would have required the word which followed ἐπεί to start with a vowel. If we compare the syllabic conditions of ἐπεί to those of ὅτε, we can observe that αὐτάρ before ὅτε imposes severe restrictions on what can follow ὅτε: a long syllabled vowel if there is elision to ὅτ’ or else a consonant cluster – in fact only a long syllabled vowel is attested on the five occasions where αὐτὰρ ὅτε occurs, see for example *Iliad* 10.14 αὐτὰρ ὅτ' ἐς νῆάς (note that αὐτὰρ ὅτ' on these five occasions is an antithetical response to a preceding ἤτοι ὅτε). ἀλλ' before ἀλλ' ὅτε on the other hand permits any single consonant to follow which must however introduce a long syllable; the relative restrictions on what can follow ἀλλ' ὅτε when compared with αὐτὰρ ἐπεί may explain the great success of ἀλλ’ ὅτε δή (105 out of 111 occurrences of ἀλλ' ὅτε) relative to αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δή (38 out of 173 occurrences of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί).

---

[92] While Wackernagel 1916: 31-32 asserted (without further substantiation) that ἐπεί’s status in these instances as creating a stikhos akephalos indicated that a long initial vowel in ἐπεί was present and was of great antiquity, Shipp 1972: 40-41 discussed the six occasions of line initial ἐπεί and suggested that they were all “late”, save for *Iliad* 22.379. Wyatt 1969: 219-220 suggested that line initial ἐπεί may be concealing *ἐππεί, by analogy with the attested and etymologically sound variation between ὅττι and ὅτι. See Chantraine 1958: 103 for a list of various instances of *stikhos akephalos* among which only *Iliad* 23.2 is mentioned

[93] A further metrical oddity seen with ἐπεί which has not been mentioned by others is that a short and closed syllable which precedes a line-internal ἐπεί must sometimes be read as long. This is so at *Iliad* 1.153, 7.31, 12.270, 13.309, 17.147, 20.368, 22.513, 23.603, Odyssey 1.226, 10.170, and 16.89. There is no evident connection between this metrical anomaly and that of the long initial vowel.

[94] Monro 1891: 299-335.

### 3.4 The syntagm αὐτὰρ ἐπεί

αὐτάρ occurs approximately 770 times in Homer.[95] 173 of those occurrences occur juxtaposed to a following ἐπεί: 72 times in the *Iliad* and 101 times in the *Odyssey*. αὐτάρ is “common in the Epic, [but] hardly occurs elsewhere”, found only in some Cypriot inscriptions and in later epicising texts.[96] Bolling offered citations for the full set of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί attestations in Homer.[97]

Surveys of αὐτάρ are few in number but divergent in approach: Denniston’s brief account (which appears to form the basis for the relevant section in Schwyzer-Debrunner)[98] and the fulsome entry in *LfrgE* both map out a larger group of uses where the meaning is designated as progressive and a smaller group where it is adversative. On the other hand, the relevant sections of Bonifazi’s monograph on particles which begin with *au* are interested in demonstrating how αὐτάρ consistently marks a new subject or shift in focus. So whereas Denniston and *LfrgE* position the prevalent meaning or function of αὐτάρ at the left extreme of a progressive-adversative continuum and allow a minority further along the continuum reaching in some instances to the adversative extreme, Bonifazi positions the function of αὐτάρ somewhere in the middle of the continuum.

All three accounts integrate the use of αὐτάρ in αὐτὰρ ἐπεί into the proposed schemata for αὐτάρ. But, as noted in the following section, studies which focus on ἐπεί in Homer recognise that there is a particular metrical usefulness to αὐτάρ before ἐπεί, a recognition which contributes to an inference that we argue should be drawn, that αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί should be treated separately and that its function may not be representative of, or indeed accord with, the semantics generally attested with αὐτάρ.

---

[95] By reference to the Chicago Homer Database. Dunkel 1988: 54 and *LfrgE* give the figure as 359 occurrences in the *Iliad* and 409 in the *Odyssey*.

[96] Bowra 1934: 58. Bowra cited two certain and two possible instances of Cypriot autar, where in all instances the word is followed by me/mi (the first person accusative pronoun). Bowra suggested that in all four cases “the contrast is between the goddess, to whom the dedication is made and whose name is given in the first line, and the man (au-ta-ra me/mi) who makes the dedication whose name is given afterwards.” Bowra suggested that this antithetical meaning is similar to that seen in Homer. See also Egetmeyer 2011: 551 for a recent confirmation of these four Cypriot attestations (*ICL* 235.3 and 242.2 and then with less orthographic certainty ICL 245.2 and 236.2). Egetmeyer describes the function of autar (spelled in the Cypriot syllabic script as au-ta-ra) as “utilisé comme charnière paratactique pour lier à ce qui précède une phrase suivante avec un nouveau sujet”, but this does not do justice to the antithetical relations.

[97] Bolling 1959: 19-20.

[98] Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 559.

It is our impression that the respective studies of Denniston and *LfrgE* which favour a large progressive group are driven to posit a predominating weak meaning of progressiveness for αὐτάρ so as to accommodate the prevailing non-antithetical context of αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί. Bonifazi's overall interpretation on the other hand seems better in accordance with the data yet strains the interpretation to force αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί into the description of a particle which marks a contrast with preceding text.

Denniston's account of αὐτάρ extends to one page and sixteen citations. Denniston divided the use of αὐτάρ into a "commoner use" of the particle which denotes a "weakly adversative or purely progressive" meaning and into a less frequent use which denotes a "strongly adversative" meaning.

Instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, of which four were cited, namely *Iliad* 1.458, 464, 467, 469, are placed in the weakly adversative/purely progressive group, with the phrase described as "often mark[ing] the successive stages of a narrative". [99] These are all ἐπεί-clauses of prayer and dining, where, indeed, sequential stages of a stylised dining scene are recounted, often with a degree of repetition. The distinction (which we note below that *LfrgE* draws) between αὐτάρ of these instances and of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί where a contrast is marked with an earlier time period is not mentioned by Denniston.

Of the other examples of αὐτάρ cited by Denniston, it is unclear what criteria are used to distinguish a weakly adversative/progressive use from a strongly adversative one. The citations brought by Denniston for the former group cluster around αὐτάρ juxtaposed to a preposition,[100] and for the latter group an antithetical relationship marked by μέν recurs although the text reproduced in the citations sometimes omits the correlative phrase with μέν.[101] Our principal concern with such a division is that, as set out in Section 3.6, an antithetical relationship typically also exists between αὐτάρ + preposition and preceding text.

*LfrgE* offers two principal classifications for all Homeric instances of αὐτάρ: the majority are deemed to be *weiterführend* with a minority classified as *adversativ*. αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί is distributed across the two groups, with most instances falling in the *weiterführend* group. Within the *weiterführend* group, *LfrgE* sub-categorises certain instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί where αὐτάρ is described as losing its antithetical function and instead marking a new start or linking back to the main events; these instances coincide partially with book beginnings and are discussed below in the section on book beginnings. The *adversativ* group is home to all of the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses, save only *Odyssey* 15.366, and 22.119., which are placed in the *weiterführend* group.

---

[99] Denniston 1954: 51-55.

[100] *Iliad* 2.218 αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε, 2.465 αὐτὰρ ὑπό, and 6.243 αὐτὰρ ἐν. Also cited are *Odyssey* 9.335 and 21.290

[101] *Iliad* 1.118, 1.333, 19.63 and *Odyssey* 4.259.

In her study on certain particles used in Homer which begin with *au* (αὐτάρ; αὖτε; αὖ; αὖτις; αὐτίκα; αὐτοῦ), Bonifazi, like Denniston and *LfrgE*, placed αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί within a schema of how αὐτάρ is used in Homer. Bonifazi used filmic terms to argue that αὐτάρ is a "discourse marker primarily involved with the beginning of new narrative sections". She distributed the function of αὐτάρ as operating across absolute focus/zooming in, mid shot/close-up shifts and long shot shifts, with αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί being situated within the long shot shifts. In contrast to the predominantly progressive function attributed to αὐτάρ by Denniston and *LfrgE* Bonifazi's study instead asserted that αὐτάρ marks a change in the narrative view point.

But Bonifazi's suggestion of a change in focus being performed by αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί seems somewhat strained. Bonifazi examined two instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, namely at *Iliad* 9.211.-212 πῦρ δὲ Μενοιτιάδης δαῖεν μέγα ἰσόθεος φώς. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλὸξ ἐμαράνθη and the "analogous well-known formula relating to shared meals αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο".

In respect of αὐτάρ at *Iliad* 9.211 Bonifazi argued that "the two images [of the fire beginning to blaze up and then of the final flames], as well as their respective temporal moments, do belong to two different shots. It is exactly like a movie, when a shot darkens and fades out, and a new one, concerning the same visual content, fades in. Two different shots focus on different actions and different events (in this case the fire just beginning to blaze up and the final flames before the embers are ready to barbecue the meat)."[102]

Bonifazi argues that although the main clause describes the same Patroclus as is in the ἐπεί-clause, and furthermore describes that same Patroclus as putting the meat on the embers of the same fire as that of the ἐπεί-clause, the clause nevertheless captures the scene with a different shot. Our principal concern with this argument of a different perspective of the same scene is that this theory cannot adequately address those many instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses in close succession such as those which lead up to most occurrences of αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο where, to adopt Bonifazi's cinematic metaphor, the audience would be left dizzy from such rapid changes of "shot".

In addition to the apparent awkwardness of attributing a discourse organising force to αὐτάρ of certain of the instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, Bonifazi has sometimes favoured recognising the macro organisation of discourse associated with αὐτάρ at the expense of the local level. Yet it is clear that αὐτάρ often operates at the very local level of organisation, where items are linked one to the next. As Richardson says, "whereas modern narrative is accustomed to switching the scene with the same disregard for continuity as the theater's curtains and blackouts, Homer usually manages to keep some logical connection between the scenes even where he makes a clean break from one to the other. Frequently the logical connection is parallelism, or at least correspondence of actions, usually with the implication of simultaneity. The parallelism is often emphasized by particles, especially μέν / δέ or μέν / αὐτάρ."[103]

---

[102] Bonifazi 2008: 50.

A further recurrent point of concern is an egregious omission which is common to all accounts of αὐτάρ: the absence of any statement on the limited number of classes of the word which directly follows αὐτάρ. This omission is particularly troubling in the case of *LfrgE* given the detail of that account. As will be noted below in our own account of αὐτάρ, subject to very few exceptions and based on a study of the first six books of the Iliad, αὐτάρ is followed only by (1) a pronoun or proper noun, (2) a preposition, (3) ἔπειτα, or (4) ἐπεί. In the first three classes, that word is almost unfailingly mirrored by a preceding pronoun/proper noun, preposition or temporal particle or expression respectively, which is often, although by no means always, marked with μέν.

## 3.5 A re-examination of the semantics of αὐτάρ in Homer

### 3.5.1 The predominance of an antithetical meaning

If we consider all the instances of αὐτάρ in the first six books of the *Iliad* they divide easily into two groups: those which mark an antithetical contrast with a preceding clause or constituent thereof and a much smaller group which seem to mark pure progression. In the following table we set out first those which mark antithesis.

**Table 3.1.** Antithetical αὐτάρ in the first six books of the *Iliad*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Juxtaposed to a following proper noun or pronoun which contrasts with a preceding express subject which is sometimes marked by μέν | |
| | *Iliad* 1.118 | αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ γέρας αὐτίχ' ἑτοιμάσατ' ὄφρα μὴ οἶος |
| | *Iliad* 1.127 | ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν τήνδε θεῷ πρόες: αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ |
| | See also *Iliad* 1.133, 1.282, 1.333, 1.348, 1.430, 1.488, 1.597, 2.50, 2.103, 2.105, 2.107, 2.224, 2.402, 2.517, 2.599, 2.631, 2.667, 2.844, 2.848, 2.856, 3.18,[104] 3.69, 3.81, 3.118, 3.136, 3.253, 3.290, 3.328, 3.379, 4.116, 4.231, 4.329, 4.385, 4.514, 5.142, 5.308, 5.327, 5.398, 5.449, 5.585, 5.620, 5.733, 5.806, 5.844, 5.849,[105] 6.155, 6.157, 6.171, 6.214 and 6.402. | |
| 2. | Line initial or line-penultimate-final and juxtaposed to a following ἔπειτα which answers a preceding temporal expression sometimes marked by μέν | |
| | *Iliad* 1.50-151 | οὐρῆας μὲν πρῶτον ... / αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' αὐτοῖσι βέλος ἐχεπευκὲς ἐφιεὶς |
| | See also *Iliad* 2.406, 3.315, 3.335, 4.424, 4.442, 5.459 and 5.884. | |
| 3. | Line-penultimate-final and juxtaposed to a preposition, with contrast to a preceding prepositional expression, e.g. *outside... , but inside...* | |

---

[103] Richardson 1999: 437.

[104] In this instance the subject continues from the preceeding lines, but there is nevertheless an answer to preceding Τρωσὶν μέν, as if to contrast the masses and the individual.

[105] Here the subject of the preceding contrasting clause is identical, but the objects of the action are different: ἤτοι ὃ μὲν Περίφαντα ... // ... // αὐτὰρ ὃ βῆ ῥ' ἰθὺς Διομήδεος.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | *Iliad* 2.218 | κυρτὼ ἐπὶ στῆθος συνοχωκότε: αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε |
| | See also 2.465, 5.724, 5.729 and 6.243. | |
| 4. | Heading a Correspondent ἐπεί-Clause | |
| | *Iliad* 1.605 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατέδυ λαμπρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο |

It is instructive to note that where there is no express preceding μέν which contrasts with αὐτάρ, we nevertheless have topical positioning of a preceding noun, pronoun or temporal phrase: *Iliad* 1.133: ἦ ἐθέλεις ὄφρ' αὐτὸς ἔχῃς γέρας, αὐτὰρ ἔμ' αὔτως, 1.282 Ἀτρεΐδη σὺ δὲ παῦε τεὸν μένος: αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε, and 1.348 ἣ δ' ἀέκουσ' ἅμα τοῖσι γυνὴ κίεν: αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς.

The first sub-group above shows the same use of αὐτάρ as noted by Bowra in the Cypriot inscriptions. Denniston cites a couple of such instances in his “strongly adversative” group.[106] We do not find these uses of αὐτάρ adversative as much as we find them contrastive; the impulse of the narrative continues without a break when αὐτάρ is used, as it draws out parallel similarities rather than differences in a sequence of events. Bowra does not cite any examples from the second group above with ἔπειτα, but cites three from the third group, placing them all in the second of his two groups, namely as “weakly adversative, or purely progressive”. But Bowra does not isolate these instances before prepositions into their own group; perhaps if he had recognised a pattern there he would have been more inclined to place them in the “strongly adversative group”. The adversative meaning of αὐτάρ in the group of Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses, of which there is only one representative in the first six books of the *Iliad*, was not mentioned by Denniston. This meaning seems adversative rather than contrastive – indeed in Section 6.4.6 we note that ἀλλά before ἀλλ' ὅτε also marks out a new time period which contrasts with that set in the preceding text.

Of these occurrences, a prepositional correlation is twice supported with μέν: *Odyssey* 14.473, 476 ἡμεῖς μὲν περὶ ἄστυ … αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε χιὼν and *Odyssey* 20.2 κὰμ μὲν ἀδέψητον βοέην στόρεσ', αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε and is supported one further time by μέν where ὕπερθε is used to refer to the gods above compared to the mortals on the battlefield: *Iliad* 7.99, 101 ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν … / ἥμενοι αὖθι … / αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε. The other instances present a preposition of location in the immediately preceding text but without μέν: *Iliad* 5.722, 724 ἀμφ' ὀχέεσφι … αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε, 12.398 διαμπερές, αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε, 12.496-497 πρυμνὸς παχύς, αὐτὰρ ὕπερθεν / ὀξὺς ἔην, 13.682 θῖν' ἔφ' ἁλὸς πολιῆς εἰρυμέναι: αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε, 24.797 ἐς κοίλην κάπετον θέσαν, αὐτὰρ ὕπερθε, *Odyssey* 24.225 ἐπὶ χερσὶ βάτων ἕνεκ': αὐτὰρ ὕπερθεν.

### 3.5.2 The infrequency of a progressive meaning

The attestations of αὐτάρ without any apparent contrastive relationship to a preceding element or clause are few. Outside of the formulaic αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα and αὐτὰρ ἐπεί only three instances are found in the first six books, as listed in the first sub-group of the following table. They show no particular unity, prefacing a noun in the genitive, a nominative adjective and a nominative noun in order of occurrence.

---

[106] Denniston 1954: 55.

**Table 3.2.** Progressive αὐτάρ in the first six books of the *Iliad*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Juxtaposed to a noun or adjective and with no evident contrast | |
| *Iliad* 4.542 | χειρὸς ἑλοῦσ’, αὐτὰρ βελέων ἀπερύκοι ἐρωήν: |
| See also *Iliad* 5.204 and 5.399. | |
| 2. Juxtaposed to a following line-final ἔπειτα which marks sequential events | |
| *Iliad* 3.273-274 | ἀρνῶν ἐκ κεφαλέων τάμνε τρίχας: αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα<br>κήρυκες Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν νεῖμαν ἀρίστοις. |
| 3. Followed by ἐπεί, with no evident contrast | |
| *Iliad* 1.458 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ηὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο |
| See also *Iliad* 1.464, 1.467, 1.469, 1.484, 2.317, 2.421, 2.427, 2.430, 2.432, 3.1, 4.124, 4.217, 6.83, 6.178, 6.349. | |

As can be seen from the above table, the only well attested use of αὐτάρ with a progressive sense is with ἐπεί. In Section 3.3 we noted the metrical difficulties faced by ἐπεί in preposed temporal clauses in appearing in the text unless it is supported by a preceding conjunction. αὐτάρ performs this supporting role in what must simply be recognised as a case of poetic licence. It is possible that the four other occurrences of progressive αὐτάρ listed in the table are using αὐτάρ with a weakened semantic sense developed by the frequent use of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί. But it seems more likely that these uses are modelled on the device itself of using antithetical αὐτάρ for a neutral coordinating function where metrically beneficial.

## 3.6 The progressive sense of *αὐτάρ* in the majority of *ἐπεί*-clauses

In **Table 3.2** we indicated that in the overwhelming majority of cases when αὐτάρ is followed by ἐπεί it bears no contrast to preceding text. We can illustrate this with four examples, starting with a Completive ἐπεί-Clause at random, such as that found in the passage starting at *Iliad* 7.200. *The Greeks prayed to the gods for a favourable outcome of Ajax's duel with Hector while Ajax armed himself*. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα περὶ χροῒ ἕσσατο τεύχη (line 207), *Ajax strode out to meet his foe*. There is no change to the trajectory of the events to allow for an adversative sense to αὐτάρ in this instance. Similarly, with the Completive ἐπεί-Clause in the passage at *Iliad* 9.89ff. *Agamemnon invites the Achaeans chieftains to his shelter and serves them dinner*. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο (line 92), *Agamemnon addresses them*.

We can also consider a Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clause: at *Odyssey* 8.15ff. *Aliconous summons a meeting of the Phaeacians who quickly fill the meeting place and gaze in wonder at*

*Odysseus, the subject of the meeting* ... αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο (line 24), *Alcinous speaks to them.* The events flow with no surprise, change or even antithesis of events.

In addition, if we take an Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clause, such as that found in the passage starting at *Iliad* 4.213ff., we again see that the ἐπεί-clause and main clause both present events that continue the path of the preceding lines. *Machaon, an Achaean surgeon, starts to treat wounded Menelaus. He pulls the offending arrow out of the wound and opens up the armour there to take direct care of the wound.* αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ἴδεν ἕλκος ὅθ' ἔμπεσε πικρὸς ὀϊστός, *he sucked the blood out and put medicine on the wound*.

## 3.7 The progressive sense of αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί at book beginnings

αὐτὰρ ἐπεί starts four books, namely *Iliad* 3, 15, *Odyssey* 11, and 12. The phrase also occurs at Odysseus's song resumption at *Odyssey* 11.385. Alongside these five instances αὐτὰρ ὁ starts *Odyssey* 14, 19, 20 and 22.[107] Contrary to what has been hinted at by some scholars there is, however, no common function between the two sets of book-initial αὐτάρ.[108]

αὐτάρ of book-initial αὐτὰρ ἐπεί and of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί of *Odyssey* 11.385 is incidental, being employed *metri causa*: it marks no antithetical relationship to any temporal expression, subject or particle in the preceding text. The ἐπεί-clause at *Iliad* 3.1, for example, summarises the marshalling of the Trojan and Achaean armies and their respective allies and the main clause turns to their encounter on the battlefield, while the text of *Iliad* 2 from line 449 to the end of that book attends to the constitution of the two camps and their assumption of position. In addition *Odyssey* 11 concludes with a fair wind carrying Odysseus and his comrades in a ship across the river Ocean, while *Odyssey* 12.1 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ποταμοῖο λίπεν ῥόον Ὠκεανοῖο continues that theme and brings us in the main clause to an arrival of the ship at the island of Aeaea.

*LfrgE* attributes to αὐτάρ of *Iliad* 3, 15 and *Odyssey* 11.385 the function of linking episodes of greater range and of marking a new start.[109] However, such linking and marking is the product of the anaphoric function of ἐπεί rather than of αὐτάρ. This linking and marking is also found with book-initial Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεί of *Iliad* 13.1 (where there is no αὐτάρ) and is not dissimilar to the function performed by book-initial ὥς of nine Homeric books (which, it should be noted, is not supported by αὐτάρ), as discussed further in Section 5.8.[110] But in its observation that αὐτάρ "*verliert hier seine eigentliche gegenüberstellende Funktion*", *LfrgE* indeed recognised that this αὐτάρ lacks its normal (antithetical) meaning.

---

[107] Bonifazi 2008: 48 n.39 observes that αὐτάρ heads seven Homeric books, unaccountably omitting *Odyssey* 19.

[108] Bonifazi *ibid* 48-49 conflates the function of the two sets of αὐτάρ, suggesting in her analysis of instances of certain αὐτάρs which include those which start books that αὐτάρ "is primarily "involved with the beginning of new narrative sections … it typically establishes a new setting, that is, a series of related actions that do not share with the previous setting either the time, or the place, or both time and place." Under the rubric of narrative beginnings, Bonifazi placed a seemingly diverse group of αὐτάρ occurrences. αὐτὰρ ἐπεί and αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα are placed in the group, including instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί which mark no change in place but merely (in Bonifazi's account) a "temporal gap". Skafte Jensen 1999: 20 listed out all the particles which start the Homeric books and included as separate items αὐτὰρ ἐπεί and αὐτάρ (where it is followed by ὁ), stating that "a song is regularly connected with the preceding one by means of a particle".

[109] *LfrgE* 1978: 1570 places the three αὐτάρ's of *Iliad* 3.1, 15.1 and *Odyssey* 11.385 into a group of their own together with four other occurrences of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, namely *Odyssey* 4.233, 12.260, and 12.391 and one instance of αὐτὰρ Ἀθηναίη at *Odyssey* 24.472.

αὐτάρ of book-initial αὐτὰρ ὁ, on the other hand, marks a contrast with the subject of the end of the preceding book.[111] In the case of *Odyssey* 14.1, αὐτὰρ ὁ answers to ἡ μέν of the final line of *Odyssey* 13. In the case of the other three instances at *Odyssey* 19.1, 20.1 and 22.1, the book-initial αὐτὰρ ὁ changes the scene and subject (always to Odysseus) from that which is at the end of the preceding book. The change is not one of mere turn-taking within the same scene, to the extent that a proper noun is required in addition to αὐτὰρ ὁ, for example *Odyssey* 18.427-19.1 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ' ἔπιόν θ' ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός, / βάν ῥ' ἴμεναι κείοντες ἑὰ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἕκαστος. / αὐτὰρ ὁ ἐν μεγάρῳ ὑπελείπετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς. This use of αὐτάρ is emphatically antithetical[112] unlike the space-filling αὐτάρ of book-initial αὐτὰρ ἐπεί.

### 3.8 The antithetical sense of *αὐτάρ* in Correspondent *ἐπεί*-Clauses

In **Table 3.1** we noted only one instance in the first six books of the *Iliad*, namely at *Iliad* 1.605, where αὐτάρ bears antithetical meaning before ἐπεί. We examine this construction in Section 6.4 where we note that this type of ἐπεί-clause (a Correspondent ἐπεί-Clause) answers to a preceding time period which is most typically marked by μέν The response to the particle μέν is to be found at the beginning of a second time frame in the form of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, and indeed in other instances a preceding time period which is marked by μέν is answered by ἀλλ' ὅτε, νῦν δέ or ἦμος δ'. For example:

*Iliad* 12.10-13, 17 ὄφρα μὲν Ἕκτωρ ζωὸς ἔην καὶ μήνι' Ἀχιλλεὺς

---

[110] Skafte Jensen 1999: 20 notes that ὥς starts nine books of Homer: *Iliad* 7, 9, 12, 14, 18, 20, 22, 23, *Odyssey* 6, 7, and 13). In its analysis of the Iliadic book-initial αὐτὰρ ἐπεί's, *LfrgE* itself recognises that the cohering function which it (falsely in our view) attributes to αὐτάρ – as part of a "resumierendes Bindeglied" – is similarly executed by ὥς, such as at *Iliad* 23.1 ὣς οἳ μὲν στενάχοντο. Skafte Jensen (*ibid* 18) noted that the book-initial passages introduced by ὥς (where between one and eight lines are introduced) "sum up the events of the previous song, or the general situation or both… and contain no new information".

[111] Olson 1995: 230, 234 viewed a book-break falling between a clause marked with μέν and its correspondent clause as sub-optimal. Jensen 1999: 18 simply described this break as "exceptional". But Nagy 1996: 161 n.30 and 2000 took a polar position, arguing that this very separation of the μέν-clause and its correspondent clause was a marker of a new book/song, such a division being, Nagy suggested, "traditional rhapsodic practice". In support of this view he noted that *Iliad* 18.356 Ζεὺς δ' Ἥρην προσέειπε κασιγνήτην ἄλοχόν τε is recorded by Plutarch as being the point at which a rhapsode at a wedding began his performance a line, which he notes, is, in our vulgate text corresponding to παννύχιοι μέν of line 354. See also Richardson 1990: 115 and 1999: 437 where a similar view to Nagy is taken.

[112] This antithetical function is typical for αὐτάρ of αὐτὰρ ὁ, both book initially and internally. See for example *Iliad* 1.331, 333 τὼ μέν ... αὐτὰρ ὁ, 2.48, 50 ἠὼς μέν ... αὐτὰρ ὁ.

> καὶ Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος ἀπόρθητος πόλις ἔπλε,
> τόφρα δὲ καὶ μέγα τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν ἔμπεδον ἦεν.
> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μὲν Τρώων θάνον ὅσσοι ἄριστοι / ... /
> δὴ τότε μητιόωντο Ποσειδάων καὶ Ἀπόλλων

ἐπεί-clauses are found answering a preceding temporal subordinator (or phrase) + μέν at *Iliad* 1.601-606, 12.10, 13-17, 13.314-317, 15.277-280, 15.318-22, 15.547-549, and 20.41-49, and at *Odyssey* 3.126-131, 15.361-368, and 22.116-122. On three occasions the ἐπεί-clauses are preceded by a temporal expression which is not marked by μέν: *Iliad* 11.264-268, 13.172-175, 15.392-397 and *Odyssey* 13.314-319. There is in fact an asymmetry present here, since, as we will set out below, every occasion of a temporal subordinate clause or temporal expression + μέν is answered by a second temporal subordinate clause or, more rarely, by a temporal expression which is not a subordinate clause, but not all temporal subordinate clauses which are followed by an answering second temporal subordinate clause are marked with μέν. This asymmetry may at least partly explain why the μέν ... αὐτὰρ ἐπεί relationship is largely overlooked.

Indeed, a number of studies have not recognised where the correlative relationship of the particles lies. In a surprising oversight, *LfrgE* misses the correlative relationship between μέν and a following αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, ἀλλ' ὅτε etc., instead identifying a link back to preceding temporal expressions.[113] Furthermore, although some scholars have recognised the relationship between μέν at the beginning of a first subordinate clause with an adversative particle at the beginning of a second subordinate clause, and not with δέ in the first main clause (which is seen in the example cited above),[114] other scholars have read the correspondences carelessly, and have suggested that an intervening "apodotic δέ", rather than a following αὐτάρ, is triggered by – and answers to – a preceding μέν. [115]

A brief account is therefore merited of the evidence in favour of recognising that where αὐτὰρ ἐπεί is preceded by a temporal expression + μέν, (i) αὐτάρ functions as a correlative to μέν, and (ii) an intervening apodotic δέ should be ignored when identifying the correlative relationships and indeed for the phrasing of the paragraph. For these purposes we can consider a sample of three temporal words which are sometimes, but not exclusively, answered by a temporal subordinator in a clause following the clause in which the initial temporal word is found.

---

[113] See *LfrgE* 1978: 1576 where the adversative relationship is described simply as being with a preceding ὄφρα, ἦος, τόφρα, τῆος with no mention of μέν. The *LfrgE idem*, 1579 separately and briefly notes a correlative relationship between μέν and αὐτάρ which it records as occurring 187 times in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

[114] See Monro 1891: 307 §334.4, following Nieberding 1882: 4, although illustrated largely by conditional ἐπεί-clauses (Iliad 2.188, 9.508 etc.) with only Odyssey 9.56 with ἦμος δ’ representing temporal ἐπεί-clauses. Bakker 1993: 301-302 also correctly interprets this structure in one example from Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War* 3, 98, 1 on which see further in Section 6.4.3.

[115] See in particular Chantraine 1963:§515: "Parfois un μέν dans la subordonnée répond au δέ de la principale: [...] I 550 ὄφρα μὲν οὖν Μελέαγρος ἀρηΐφιλος πολέμιζε, / τόφρα δὲ Κουρήτεσσι κακῶς ἦν." Chantraine here cites an instance which is in fact followed by ἀλλ' ὅτε at line 553. See also Lahmeyer 1879: 13 and Leumann 1949: 87.

First, every instance of ὄφρα μέν or ὄφρ' ἂν μέν κεν is answered by a subsequent time period introduced by either νῦν δέ (*Iliad* 5.791, 18.261 and *Odyssey* 20.333), ἦμος δ' (*Iliad* 8.68, 11.86, 16.779, and *Odyssey* 9.58), ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ (*Iliad* 9.553) or αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ/ἐπὴν (*Iliad* 11.191, 11.206, 12.13, 15.320, 15.549, *Odyssey* 5.363, 6.262, 15.366, and 22.119). When ὄφρα is not followed by μέν it is typically not answered by a subsequent time period. But whether or not ὄφρα is followed by μέν, an apodotic δέ is not unusual in the main clause following ὄφρα: *Iliad* 4.220, 221 ὄφρα τοὶ ἀμφεπένοντο βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον, / τόφρα δ' ἐπὶ Τρώων στίχες ἤλυθον ἀσπιστάων.[116]

Secondly, of the forty seven occurrences of ἕως / εἵως in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, eleven are directly followed by μέν. These eleven occurrences are followed by a second time frame introduced by either αὐτὰρ ἐπεί (*Iliad* 12.141, 15.277, 15.390, 20.41 and *Odyssey* 3.126), ἀλλ' ὅτε (*Iliad* 13.143, 17.727, 730, *Odyssey* 2.148 and 12.327) or νῦν δ' ὅτε (*Odyssey* 19.532). As with ὄφρα above, whether or not ἕως / εἵως is followed by μέν, an apodotic δέ is not unusual in the main clause following ἕως / εἵως: *Iliad* 1.193, 194 ἕως ὃ ταῦθ' ὥρμαινε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν, / ἕλκετο δ' ἐκ κολεοῖο μέγα ξίφος, ἦλθε δ' Ἀθήνη.[117]

Finally, we can consider the temporal particle τότε which is not a subordinator. Of the two hundred and eighty seven Homeric occurrences of τότε, a mere ten are followed by μέν. Nine of these occurrences are followed by a second time frame introduced by either particle ἦμος δ' (see *Odyssey* 9.161, 9.306 etc.) or by αὐτὰρ ἐπεί (on one occasion, at *Iliad* 1.601). The tenth occasion of *Iliad* 21.40-43 καὶ τότε μέν is answered by a locatival change: κεῖθεν δέ.

The above observations on the consistent correlation between a first temporal clause + μέν and the text that follows, informs our view on a *varia lectio* at *Odyssey* 3.130-131. This passage reads in the edition of von der Mühll 1962 (and indeed in van Thiel 1991 and Allen 1917) as αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Πριάμοιο πόλιν διεπέρσαμεν αἰπήν / βῆμεν δ' ἐν νήεσσι, θεὸς δ' ἐκέδασσεν Ἀχαιούς. But the *apparatus criticus* of Allen 1917 notes a possible *varia lectio* at line 130 based on Strabo and a plus verse following line 130 based on the military historian Polyaenus of the second century CE, so that the passage would read as: ἦ γὰρ καί Πριάμοιο πόλιν διεπέρσαμεν αἰπήν / βουλῇ καὶ μύθοισι καὶ ἠπεροπηίδι τέχνῃ / βῆμεν δ' ἐν νήεσσι, θεὸς δ' ἐκέδασσεν Ἀχαιούς. However, the correlative phrase εἷος μέν of the preceding line 126 ἔνθ' ἦ τοι εἷος μὲν ἐγὼ καὶ δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς, which is not answered by any correlative expression before line 130, makes it improbable from the perspective of internal consistency and based in particular on what has been noted in this section that the variant reading ἦ γὰρ καί should be preferred over the *vulgate* reading.[118]

---

[116] See Lahmeyer 1879: 5 for a full list of instances of apodotic δέ which follow ὄφρα.

[117] See Lahmeyer 1879: 4-5 for a full list of instances of apodotic δέ which follow ἕως / εἵως.

We can now return to the question of the semantics of αὐτάρ in the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses. Since αὐτάρ of these αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses answers the preceding μέν it most certainly has antithetical force. That αὐτάρ is serving not merely as a space filler is further supported by the fact that all ἐπεί-clauses which answer an earlier time period with μέν always start with αὐτάρ – there is no alternating with an initial noun phrase.[119] However, we lack positive evidence of a choice of αὐτάρ over δέ, for example, since neither a metrically suitable proper noun nor a pronoun could, from a referential and contextual perspective, have been used for any of the attested instances: a Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause would have been unsuitable. We cannot form an unequivocal view that αὐτάρ is, or indeed the full phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεί was selected over δέ because it would answer μέν. But on the other hand it is clear that αὐτάρ is performing the role of answering to μέν, inasmuch as an asyndetic ἐπεί would not have sufficed in the context of these Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses.

## 3.9 ἀλλ’ ὅτε: A model solution to metrical difficulties before a subordinator

The likelihood that the progressive sense of αὐτάρ in αὐτάρ ἐπεί is a metrically driven departure from its natural adversative meaning finds support in a parallel process that may have occurred with ἀλλά in ἀλλ’ ὅτε (δή).

ἀλλ’ ὅτε is the typical way of starting a ὅτε-clause in Homer. In a five page monograph published in 1952 Moorhouse noted that it is generally held that ἀλλά has adversative meaning but sometimes simply denotes progression. Moorhouse suggested that in Homer the instances of progression can be pinpointed to two recurrent sequences: ἀλλ’ ὅτε (δή) and ἀλλά ... μέν ... δέ.

Moorhouse identified a few instances of ἀλλ’ ὅτε (δή) where an adversative meaning was allowable or essential: *Iliad* 8.23, 11.714 and *Odyssey* 5.400. To illustrate the adversative nature of the particle, Moorhouse paraphrased the first example as “Zeus tells the other gods that they could not pull him by a rope from heaven: ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ ἐγὼ πρόφρων ἐθέλοιμι ἐρύσσαι, / αὐτῇ κεν γαίῃ ἐρύσαιμ' αὐτῇ τε θαλάσσῃ.”[120]

---

[118] Fish 2007 cites column 34 of *Papyrus Herculaneum* number 1507 as further evidence in support of both *variae lectiones*, as that column appears to cite a line from the *Odyssey* of σῇι γὰρ καὶ Πριάμοιο πόλιν διεπέρσαμεν αἰπήν / βουλῇ. Fish appears to recognise that such a reading would interfere with the syntax of the lines when he notes on page 78 of his monograph that line 132 which starts with καὶ τότε δή would need to be read as responding to εἰνάετες γάρ σφιν κακὰ ῥάπτομεν ... // ... μόγις δ' ἐτέλεσσε Κρονίων of lines 118-119 in order for the variant readings to be acceptable; but Fish’s suggestion does not address the matter of the unanswered εἷος μέν.

[119] The δ' which follows initial noun phrases relates to the noun phrase and not to the temporal subordinator, and so it cannot be said that an initial noun phrase such as οἱ δ' could theoretically have been employed here.

[120] Moorhouse 1952: 100.

Moorhouse also cited some instances where “the traditional ‘but when’ makes nonsense”, and where a progressive sense should be understood by the particle: *Iliad* 3.264, 23.816 and *Odyssey* 3.388. Moorhouse paraphrased the sense of the third example as “Nestor led his guests and relatives to his house. ἀλλ' ὅτε δῶμαθ' ἵκοντο ... / ἑξείης ἕζοντο... The story is simply continued, with no trace of adversation.”

Moorhouse drew on Leumann’s findings which were published in 1950 into the idiosyncrasies of the Homeric lexicon to offer a fresh insight into the semantics of ἀλλά: the meaning of words in Homer may be distorted due to the poetic process of composition and performance. Moorhouse noted that ἀλλά of the three times occurring ὅτε-clause of *Odyssey* 5.400 ἀλλ' ὅτε τόσσον ἀπῆν ὅσσον τε γέγωνε βοήσας, 9.473 and 12.181 is “probably adversative” in the first two instances but not adversative at 12.181. He suggested that this would be an example where a cross-over point might occur from the adversative sense and the progressive sense, although not necessarily the actual instance. He also noted that “the metrical convenience of “ἀλλ’ in that position must also have been a factor in maintaining” a progressive meaning. He summarised that “a formula ἀλλ’ ὅτε (δή) was thus obtained which simply meant “when”.[121]

He suggests that ἀλλά may be one of those words which are a product of “the peculiar nature of the Greek Epic language itself” and “are sometimes used in Homer in a strict sense inappropriately, being taken from one context ... where they were at home, and misapplied elsewhere.” Moorhouse offered a similar, although less detailed, analysis of the sequence ἀλλά ... μέν ... δέ which is found with adversative force at, for example, *Odyssey* 3.359-360 ἀλλ' οὗτος μὲν νῦν σοὶ ἅμ' ἕψεται, ὄφρα κεν εὕδῃ / σοῖσιν ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν: ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ νῆα μέλαιναν but on other occasions such as at *Odyssey* 11.275 and 20.83 is found without an adversative relationship.

Moorhouse even suggested an overlap in use between ἀλλ’ ὅτε-clauses and αὐτάρ ἐπεί-clauses. He noted that the passages at *Iliad* 3.209-22, 6.172-200 and 10.338-365 contain four ἀλλ’ ὅτε-clauses in quick succession, some of which are adversative and some of which are progressive. He compared them to the sequences of αὐτάρ ἐπεί-clauses found at *Iliad* 1.458ff., 2.421ff., 9.212ff., and *Odyssey* 3.447ff. The fact that both subordinators sometimes place preposed subordinate clauses close to each other does not, however, seem particularly relevant to the question of the function of the meaning of ἀλλά. We note in Section 7.3.3 that it seems to be the case that Greek does not mind, perhaps even celebrates, the juxtaposition or near juxtaposition of subordinate clauses.

Moorhouse was not alone in seeing a link between ἀλλ’ ὅτε and αὐτάρ ἐπεί. Bolling drew an analogy between the two phrases, but without illustrating the absence of an adversative nuance with ἀλλ’ of ἀλλ’ ὅτε: the “forces that cause similar examples of ὅτε to move toward the verse head [namely, the tendency for verse end and sense end to coincide and similarly verse beginning and sense beginning, meaning that a subordinator tends to be at the beginning of a verse] have a similar effect on ἐπεί. The same device for meeting the metrical difficulty – prefixing a connective [in the case of ὅτε with ἀλλ’] – is largely used.”[122]

---

[121] Moorhouse 1952: 104.

Bolling’s understanding of the metrical role of both ἀλλ’ and αὐτάρ chimes best with the conclusions that we would suggest be drawn from the outline above of ἀλλά offered by Moorhouse and of αὐτάρ offered here. It is not necessary to look for instances of ἀλλ’ ὅτε or αὐτὰρ ἐπεί which are adversative in their textual relations – although they clearly exist – in order to explain why the adversative conjunctions are used with simple progressive meaning. Both ὅτε and ἐπεί would be more or less entirely excluded from the poems if they did not have the support a coordinating particle – the fact that the coordinating particle happens to bear an adversative meaning had to be overlooked in favour of including these subordinators which are used so very frequently in the poems.

## 3.10 The use of conjunctions with their prototypical semantics before ἐπεί

### 3.10.1 The eliminative sense of ἀλλά with ἐπεί

The phrase ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεί is found with two past tense subordinate clauses and one future tense subordinate clause, as set out in the table below. ἀλλά provides here a contrastive/eliminative meaning which is not found with αὐτάρ. (The shorter combination ἀλλ’ ἐπεί is reserved for the ten non-temporal ἐπεί-clauses, as set out in Part 3 of Appendix 2. Other than at *Odyssey* 22.70-72 ὦ φίλοι, οὐ γὰρ σχήσει ἀνὴρ ὅδε χεῖρας … / ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἔλλαβε τόξον … / οὐδοῦ ἄπο ξεστοῦ τοξάσσεται, there is no eliminative function performed by ἀλλ’ with these ten instances.)

---

[122] Bolling 1959: 19.

**Table 3.3.** Temporal ἐπεί-clauses prefaced by ἀλλά

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 6.503-505 | οὐδὲ Πάρις δήθυνεν ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι δόμοισιν<br>ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεὶ κατέδυ κλυτὰ τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ,<br>σεύατ’ ἔπειτ’ ἀνὰ ἄστυ ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι πεποιθώς |
| | See similarly *Iliad* 24.12-15 and *Iliad* 22.256-259 which is future tense (with subjunctive in the ἐπεί-clause) | |

A single instance of ἀλλ’ ἐπεί was noted by Muchnová in Xenophon’s *Hellenica* at 2.4.19.1 καὶ οὐκ ἐψεύσατο, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεὶ ἀνέλαβον τὰ ὅπλα.[123] She noted that ἀλλά there (i) marks the affirmative refutation of the preceding negative clause, and (ii) is to be read with the main clause and not the ἐπεί-clause, so that (in my words) the construction reads as “he did not do event *x*, but rather (once he had done *y*) he did event *z*.[124]

The eliminative (also termed “affirmative”) use of the adversative conjunction is well recognised cross-linguistically, including in Ancient Greek.[125] ἀλλά of *Iliad* 6.504 performs much the same function in the Homeric instances as it appears to perform in the example by Muchnová. The event described in the text preceding the ἐπεί-clause is a negative synonym of the event described in the main clause: not lingering in the palace *versus* rushing out to the city. The event described between the negative and positive accounts, namely the putting on of armour in the ἐπεί-clause, can be ignored for the purposes of the *negative* + ἀλλά + *positive* construction: *Paris did not delay, but hurried out*. The other two instances similarly consist of a negative statement preceding the ἐπεί-clause followed by a positive formulation in the main clause.

It is generally held that αὐτάρ does not perform the above described eliminative function,[126] and indeed there is no instance of an αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clause which responds eliminatively to a preceding negative clause. It is then no surprise that the phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεί is not use in these instances.

However, it is not necessarily the case that the poet consciously or deliberately rejected the phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεί in favour of this alternative construction ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεί. And indeed for two reasons it seems reasonable to conclude that we do not have here any intentional modification of the αὐτὰρ ἐπεί phrase; rather, the composition of ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεί starts from a different model. First, the phrasal relations indicate that a different formulaic pattern influenced the phrasing and may have been the sole model to which the poet was working. As suggested in

---

[123] Muchnová 2007: 70. Muchnová does not cite any non-temporal instances of ἐπεί with ἀλλά. On the other hand, she notes another temporal instance of ἐπεί with a particle, namely μέντοι.

[124] *Ibid.* 70-71.

[125] Quirk et al. 1972: §9.54 observe that “but” may be employed to mark a contrast through “a restatement in affirmative terms of what has been said negatively ... in a first conjoin”. See Denniston 1954: 1 on the use of ἀλλά: “eliminative, substituting the true for the false... the clause to which it is opposed is negative.”

[126] See *LfrgE* 1978: 1576.

Section 4.5.5, there is recurrent phrasal pattern of οὐδέ / οὐ + nominative proper noun ... ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ which seems to have given rise to the phrase ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεί rather than ἀλλ’ ἐπεί. There is certainly no competing pattern of οὐδέ / οὐ ... αὐτάρ.

Second, it appears that the discourse function of these sandwiched ἐπεί-clauses with ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεί is not identical to straight sequential ἐπεί-clauses with αὐτὰρ ἐπεί. As noted in Section 5.5, the event that occurs in the ἐπεί-clauses is to be expected based on what follows in its main clause, but is not of itself expressly predicted by the preceding text. We can deduce then that an ἐπεί-clause with the function performed by an αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clause would not have suggested itself to the poet.

As noted in Section 3.9 the use of ἀλλά with ἐπεί to achieve a contrastive sense differs from the highly recurrent use of ἀλλά with ὅτε, where any contrastive sense of ἀλλά has typically been neutralised, and is certainly never used to answer a preceding negative clause.

### 3.10.2 The relative and local sense of ἔνθα with ἐπεί

In his study on ἐπεί Bolling described the ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 10.87-91 as “peculiar because of ἔνθ’ ἐπεὶ [is] taken up by ἔνθ’ οἵ γ’ in the partner”.[127] Beyond that, Bolling did not comment in this isolated incident of ἔνθα before a subordinator. The ἐπεί-clause and main clause read as follows: ἔνθ’ ἐπεὶ ἐς λιμένα κλυτὸν ἤλθομεν, ὃν πέρι πέτρη / ἠλίβατος τετύχηκε διαμπερὲς ἀμφοτέρωθεν, / ἀκταὶ δὲ προβλῆτες ἐναντίαι ἀλλήλῃσιν / ἐν στόματι προύχουσιν, ἀραιὴ δ’ εἴσοδός ἐστιν, / ἔνθ’ οἵ γ’ εἴσω πάντες ἔχον νέας ἀμφιελίσσας.

In fact there are a couple of features which make the instance above peculiar. First, the ἐπεί-clause extends beyond the typical one line that an average ἐπεί-clause reaches, extending to four lines. In this regard it resembles a number of ὅτε-clauses where the subordinate clause of arrival contains within it a description of the place arrived at: for example, the subordinate clause of *Iliad* 5.780-783 extends for four lines to describe the scene that greets Athena and Hera when they reach the Achaean warriors, and *Iliad* 6.242 extends all the way to 250 with a description of Priam’s palace before the main clause is reached at line 251. In a similar manner, the ὅτε subordinate clauses at *Iliad* 24.443-445, 24.448-457, *Odyssey* 6.85-88, 9.181-194, 17.204-212 and 21.42-47 extend over a number of lines in order to accommodate a description of the place arrived at. A number of the main clauses following these ἐπεί-clauses start with ἔνθα.

Second, of the 220+ ἐπεί-clauses this is one of only two indicative ἐπεί-clauses to be followed by a main clause with ἔνθα: the other is in answer to the lengthy ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 12.1-4.[128] ὅτε-clauses, on the other hand, are answered by ἔνθα around twenty times.[129]

---

[127] Bolling 1959: 26.

[128] Bolling 1950: 375 did not mention this second indicative instance.

[129] Bolling 1950: 375 only lists out instances in the *Odyssey*: *Odyssey* 1.18, 2.151, 3.279 etc. There are also Iliadic occurrences: *Iliad* 5.335, 5.784 etc.

The use of ἔνθα at the beginning of the ἐπεί-clause fits well with the preceding description of the island that they had arrived at – a land of midnight sun. But the rest of the subordinate clause recalls an ἐπεί-clause and it seems likely that the form of the ἐπεί-clause is indeed modelled on an ἐπεί-clause. Perhaps an ἐπεί-clause was chosen in order to mark completion of the event of arrival which had begun at line 81. ὅτε-clauses on the other hand typically present an arrival which answers to a preceding departure.

### 3.10.3 The immediacy of αὐτίκα with ἐπεί

In Section 4.6 we note that *Odyssey* 21.404-405, 409 ἀτὰρ πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς, / αὐτίκ’ ἐπεὶ μέγα τόξον ἐβάστασε καὶ ἴδε πάντῃ / ... / ὣς ἄρ' ἄτερ σπουδῆς τάνυσεν μέγα τόξον Ὀδυσσεύς presents the proper noun subject at the end of the line, with ἐπεί on the following line. Given the short first vowel of ἐπεί it is not surprising that we do not find ἐπεί placed first in the metrical line; but the normal solution of employing αὐτάρ directly before ἐπεί is precluded by the earlier coordination of the clause with ἀτάρ.

The poet adopts αὐτίκ’ instead of αὐτάρ to head the metrical line. This adverb is metrically congruent and syntactically unobtrusive. Furthermore, its semantics of “immediately” are well suited to the context, provided we read αὐτίκ’ with the main clause at line 409. From line 393 onwards Odysseus has been scrutinising the bow that the swineherd has brought him, looking for signs of worm infestation, turning it round and round to such an extent that the suitors exclaim at the time he is spending inspecting it. Odysseus’s leisurely tackling of the bow is drawn to a close with the ἐπεί-clause of lines 404-405 which we classify in the Appendix as a “Completive ἐπεί-Clause” and with the turning to the main clause in which Odysseus strings the bow. On three other occasions an ἐπεί-clause concludes gazing and is then followed by αὐτίκα to suggest a brisk close to that emotional gazing and the turning to a more dynamic act.[130]

## 3.11 A Note on the absence of Homeric *ἐπεὶ δέ

There appears to be a phenomenon which is the mirror image of apodotic δέ, namely the absence of δέ in preposed subordinate clauses. It seems likely that the two matters are linked, as the absence or presence of one seems to relate inversely with the absence or presence of the other. It is a pattern which is spread across the subordinators, and as with apodotic δέ would benefit from a dedicated study. Below certain observations are set out, by way of making the case for a more comprehensive investigation of so-called “asyndetic” subordination.

---

[130] *Iliad* 19.19-20 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν ᾗσι τετάρπετο δαίδαλα λεύσσων // αὐτίκα μητέρα ἣν ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, 24.513-515 and *Odyssey* 5.76-77.

There are no instances of the phrase *ἐπεὶ δέ in Homer.[131] The preceding sections of this chapter have illustrated that there is indeed limited opportunity for the combination *ἐπεὶ δέ, given hexametric considerations, word order restrictions and the drive towards starting the metrical line with the subordinate clause. But there are four examples of ἐπεί-clauses which start in the middle of the line, thus illustrating that the poet was not averse to non-line initial positions where *ἐπεὶ δέ could, from a metrical perspective at any rate, have been accommodated.[132] Even more strikingly, on the one occasion when temporal ἐπεί does appear at the head of the line, namely at *Iliad* 23.1 in a *stichos akefalos*, there too it is not followed by δέ but is instead coordinated to the preceding text by αὐτάρ of the preceding line.

### 3.11.1 Other Subordinators not coordinated with δέ

Based on a comparison with other subordinators in Homer, it seems possible that the absence of *ἐπεὶ δέ is not merely a product of the hexameter but, rather, is part of a widespread Homeric tendency not to coordinate preposed subordinate clauses with δέ.

Other temporal subordinators have drawn attention in the past for their lack of coordination with δέ in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Although they have not been identified as forming a group, examples of εὖτε, ἕως, ὄφρα and ἠΰτε[133] "in asyndeton" are mentioned by Kühner-Gerth, and explained as a product of "wenn die Rede zu einem neuen Gedanken übergeht".[134]

Of the subordinators, εὖτε has attracted the most attention from commentators for its asyndeton.[135] Indeed, in a monograph on the subject Debrunner noted an absent δέ from the subordinate clause and a sometimes present δέ in the main clause and conjectured that this was triggered by a hypothetical etymology of εὖτε from εὖ-τε[136].

We can expand these earlier observations by noting that ὅτε is also never followed by δέ. [137] The fact that metrically convenient ἀλλά often precedes ὅτε may have diverted scholars' attention from the absence of δέ.

---

[131] But note that Hesiod's *Works and Days* line 291 contains the ἐπεί-clause ἐπὴν δ' εἰς ἄκρον ἵκηται.

[132] *Iliad* 21.26, *Odyssey* 11.98, *Odyssey* 14.175 and *Odyssey* 21.297. We can note that preposed ἐπεί could, metrically, conclude the one foot with its short ἐ and start the next foot with its long-πεὶ (as happens regularly in the non-temporal use, see for example *Iliad* 1.112, 1.235, 1.274 etc.) and then be followed by δέ.

[133] We should perhaps take ἠΰτε out of the group for our purposes as its metrical shape precludes it from being followed by δέ, permitting only δ' and a long syllable.

[134] Kühner-Gerth 1904: 346. Examples include *Iliad* 1.93 ἕως ὃ ταῦθ' ὥρμαινε and *Iliad* 4.220 ὄφρα τοὶ ἀμφεπένοντο.

[135] See Bolling 1955: 224. Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 660 also makes this observation regarding εὖτε.

[136] Debrunner 1927: 185-188. By this analysis (which cannot be the whole story, given the same behaviour with the other subordinators) Debrunner does partly prefigure the observations in this thesis on the absence and presence of δέ in ἐπεί-clauses and main clauses respectively.

[137] There is only one case of a mid-line ὅτε-clause, but it is preceded by ταὶ δ': *Iliad* 18.67 ῥήγνυτο: ταὶ δ' ὅτε δὴ Τροίην ἐρίβωλον ἵκοντο.

It is particularly valuable to note that temporal ὡς only exceptionally combines with δέ, although it has a metrical shape which is conducive to starting the line and being followed by δέ.[138] On two occasions δέ does appear to follow temporal ὡς, but we may tentatively see these instances either as late or as erroneous editing. [139]

### 3.11.2 ἦμος and comparative and quantitative subordinators coordinate with δέ

Unlike the temporal subordinators so far enumerated, ἦμος is always coordinated with δέ.[140] Comparative ὡς, unlike temporal ὡς, is frequently combined with δέ, see for example *Iliad* 2.147, 9 ὡς δ’ ὅτε κινήσῃ Ζέφυρος βαθὺ λήϊον ἐλθὼν / ... / ὣς τῶν πᾶσ’ ἀγορὴ κινήθη and *Iliad* 5.161, 3 ὡς δὲ λέων ἐν βουσὶ θορὼν ἐξ αὐχένα ἄξῃ, / ... / ὣς τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους.

If we look at the rarely occurring quantitative adverbials ὅσσον and ὁσσάκι we find that these are coordinated either with δ’ or with a single τ’, save for one instance with ὅσσον in which, most strikingly, it is then the main clause which takes δέ.[141]

### 3.11.3 Relationship with apodotic δέ

Lahmeyer identified six subordinators which may be followed by a main clause containing the so-called apodotic δέ: ἐπεί, ὅτε, ὡς, εὖτε, ἕως, and ὄφρα.[142] Strikingly, these are all subordinators which we noted above never coordinate to preceding text with δέ.[143]

Lahmeyer noted only three Homeric subordinators which are never answered by apodotic δέ: πρίν, ἦμος[144] and ἡνίκα. Of these, πρίν is generally used as an adverb and ἡνίκα only appears postposed (and only once). But Lahmeyer’s observation regarding ἦμος is interesting as this is precisely the subordinator that we remarked above always combines with δέ. Regrettably, comparative ὡς is not mentioned by Lahmeyer and is too frequently attested for us to be able to conduct a survey of the structure of its following clauses; ὅσσον and ὁσσάκι are also not discussed by Lahmeyer.

---

[138] Again, even when the subordinator occurs in the middle of the line ὡς δέ is still not attested: *Iliad* 23.202 βηλῷ ἔπι λιθέῳ: τοὶ δ' ὡς ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι. There are a number of ὡς-clauses which require no more than an elided subject and do not need an accusative demonstrative pronoun (which could head the clause as it does in a number of instances, see for example *Iliad* 3.21 τὸν δ' ὡς οὖν ἐνόησεν), meaning that the line should start with ὡς, since there is no noun phrase that could appear before ὡς. But instead we see a wide variety of phrases which may suggest that ὡς δ' is being avoided by finding other ways to coordinate the subordinator: see *Iliad* 2.321, 3.396, 10.519-520, 19.282-3, 21.550 and *Odyssey* 17.301.

[139] At *Iliad* 4.151 we read ὡς δὲ ἴδεν νεῦρόν and at *Iliad* 5.846 ὡς δὲ ἴδε βροτολοιγὸς. For the simple reason that εἶδε(ν) is a well attested alternative to ἴδε(ν), it is tempting to wonder whether there was not an earlier reading of these clauses of ὡς εἶδε(ν).

[140] *Iliad* 1.47.5, 1.477, 7.433 etc.

[141] *Odyssey* 7.108-110 ὅσσον Φαίηκες περὶ πάντων ἴδριες ἀνδρῶν // νῆα θοὴν ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἐλαυνέμεν, ὣς δὲ γυναῖκες // ἱστὸν τεχνῆσσαι: πέρι γάρ σφισι δῶκεν Ἀθήνη.

[142] Lahmeyer 1879: 1-6.

[143] ἠΰτε was not considered by Lahmeyer; indeed a glance at the five preposed subordinate clauses governed by it suggest that apodotic δέ does not follow it. This confirms our conjecture, mentioned above, that ἠΰτε may only feature in the group of subordinators which do not coordinate with δέ because of its metrical shape.

[144] Lahmeyer 1889: 6 noted a variant reading at *Odyssey* 13.19 of νῆα δ' ἐπεσσεύοντο, φέρον δ' εὐήνορα χαλκόν, but notes in accordance with others that this is an improbable reading.

There appears then to be a correlation between absence of δέ in the subordinate clause and its occasional presence in the main clause and conversely the presence of δέ in the subordinate clause and its absence in the main clause.

### 3.11.4 δέ marking narrative focus in the subordinate clause

In the later chapters on discourse function we find that ἐπεί-clauses communicate information that is anticipated, sometimes already known. As such, there is little narrative interest in the information contained in that clause. By contrast, if we look at some examples of subordinate clauses which are coordinated with δέ, new information is contained there – sometimes to the exclusion of the main clause.

If we take one instance from the ὅσσον group, we can see that the subordinate clause is where the new information lies, and that the relative main clause restates what was said before the subordinate clause. In the following example, the narrative first records that the Trojans retreated. The subordinate clause then states: *by as much as a javelin's throw*, and the main clause then turns to restate what had been said before: *by this much did the Trojans retreat.* The placing of new information in the subordinate clause and old information in the main clause is the reverse of what we find with ἐπεί-clauses:

Iliad 16.588-589, 592
χώρησαν δ’ ὑπό τε πρόμαχοι καὶ φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ.
**ὅσση δ’ αἰγανέης ῥιπὴ ταναοῖο τέτυκται,** / ... /
τόσσον ἐχώρησαν Τρῶες, ὤσαντο δ’ Ἀχαιοί.

An instance from the comparative ὡς group (which here, and on many occasions is coordinated with δέ) shows a similar emphasis on the subordinate clause. The narrative first records that Diomedes killed two sons of Priam. The subordinate clause then adds that: *like a lion leaping among cattle and breaking the necks of a heifer or cow*, and the main clause then answers: *this was how Diomedes attacked the two sons*, causing them to leave their chariot and stripping them of their armour.

*Iliad* 5.159, 161-164
ἔνθ’ υἷας Πριάμοιο δύω λάβε Δαρδανίδαο / ... /
**ὡς δὲ λέων ἐν βουσὶ θορὼν ἐξ αὐχένα ἄξῃ**
**πόρτιος ἠὲ βοὸς ξύλοχον κάτα βοσκομενάων,**
ὣς τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐξ ἵππων Τυδέος υἱὸς
βῆσε ...

In constructions such as the above, the interest is on the information of the subordinate clause, which may explain why the subordinate clause takes δέ. It is less clear how this analysis might apply to ἦμος-clauses. In ἦμος-clauses the sun is rising or setting or straddling the sky. It may be that in origin the interest in a sentence prefaced by ἦμος lay in the subordinate clause: *it was at midnight that they...*

There is a body of literature regarding δέ and its tendency to mark new information and new stages, even topics. The investigation into the topic marking characteristics of δέ reached its fullest form in Bakker 1993 which developed Ruijgh's earlier formulation of the particle as denoting the transition to a new topic.[145] Bakker illustrated with a number of examples from Homer and from fifth-century Greek that δέ marks what he termed a "boundary".[146]

There is also substantial research showing that subordinate clauses may be morphologically marked for carrying the topic,[147] but equally there is evidence (although less cross-linguistically substantiated) that in some languages the topic marker cannot appear in the subordinate clause.[148] It seems possible then that the presence of δέ only with certain subordinators may be explicable by current understanding of the behaviour of δέ, together with an understanding of how adverbial clauses relate informationally to their main clauses.

### 3.11.5 A word of caution regarding the Homeric data

The Homeric data on subordination with δέ is in such stark contrast to what has been noted by at least two scholars of fifth-century Greek, that we are forced to question whether it is not simply the hexameter combined with the discouragement of variation that comes from Homeric "thrift" that has produced the peculiar picture of asyndetic subordinate clauses.

Bakker cited two Herodotean temporal clauses with δέ: 2.121 ὥς δὲ ἡμέρη ἐγένετο, and 7.45.1 ὥς δὲ ὥρα πάντα μὲν τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ὑπὸ τῶν νεῶν ἀποκεκρυμμένον.[149] In respect of the first example Bakker suggested that "the adverbial clause marked by *dé* is discourse-organizing in that it effects a thematic break in the narrative". Bakker asserted that δέ, "automatically co-occurring with preposed finite subclauses, forms a combination with the preposed subordinator that is almost as tight and grammaticalized as in the case of ho + dé."[150]

By reference to the first two books of Xenophon's *Hellenica*, Muchnová noted that out of 68 occurrences of ἐπεί, 47 of them are preposed clauses which combine with a following δέ.

---

[145] Ruijgh 1971: 128.

[146] Bakker 1993 *passim*.

[147] See Thompson, Longacre et al. 2011: 291-295.

[148] See Kuno 1972 on Japanese topic marking. In a study of the Kampolondugu dialect of the Malian language Supiyre, Carlson 1987: 3ff. illustrated that adverbial clauses are normally skipped over when it comes to switch-referencing.

[149] Bakker 1993: 286-287.

[150] Bakker 1993: 293-4.

Muchnová followed Bakker in suggesting that δέ naturally combines with adverbial clauses to mark boundaries.[151] It is not inconceivable that the use of δέ changes between the Homeric poems and fifth-century Greek.

## 3.12 Conclusion

The last seventy years or so of scholarship have been characterised by the desultory citing of the phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεί in support of a range of theories. While the phrase's regularity and the limited options for switching to alternative combinations with ἐπεί indicate the operation of Parry's "thrift", the genesis of the phrase is more prosaic (metaphorically) than scholars would like to believe. The phrase is not a happy match of narrative needs and oral-formulaic expediency; rather, it carries the marks of poetic composition at its most pragmatic and distorting.

There may well be a further goad pushing ἐπεί into a combination with αὐτάρ: this is the possibility that ἐπεί will not combine with δέ. This idea should be considered further.

---

[151] Muchnová 2011: 67-71.

# Chapter 4 Syntax: Left-Dislocation before the Subordinate Clause

## 4.1 Introduction

Nouns or noun phrases often precede Homeric temporal ἐπεί-clauses, for example *Iliad* 16.394-395 Πάτροκλος δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν πρώτας ἐπέκερσε φάλαγγας, / ἂψ ἐπὶ νῆας ἔεργε παλιμπετές. The preposition of the noun phrase in this manner is a phenomenon which is typically termed “left-dislocation”. Interest in the placement of noun phrases outside of a clause in Greek traditionally concentrated on anacolouthic-type constructions where the grammatical case of the initial noun or noun phrase did not agree with its grammatical function within the following clause.

Little attention has been paid to the phenomenon of left-dislocation of noun phrases whose grammatical case agrees with a following clause, as is the case with most ἐπεί-clauses including the example above. The preliminary scope of this chapter (in Sections 4.4 to 4.8) is then to establish the variety of constructions which are attested in Homer in which a noun phrase precedes a preposed ἐπεί-clause. We observe that in Homer any noun placed before a Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clause is in syntactic accord with the subordinate clause but not necessarily with the main clause.

Over the past twenty five years or so it has been desultorily observed that Ancient Greek presents with a striking collocation of the two phenomena of left-dislocation and subordination. But explanations regarding why left-dislocation and subordination coincide rely on the prevailing view in general linguistics on the function of dislocation, namely that a thematising discourse function is performed which extends beyond the level of the sentence, in particular to establish discourse theme(s) for the following sections of text.

In Sections 4.9 and 4.10 we draw on the cross-linguistic work of Prince 1997 and 1998 which advocate a range of functions for left-dislocation. Following one of the functions identified by Prince, we argue that contrary to current opinion, no broad textual discourse function is performed by a noun which is left-dislocated before temporal ἐπεί. Rather, we suggest that left-dislocation is triggered by the syntax of subordination and is a natural, even default, syntax with a preposed subordinate clause, serving to facilitate discourse processing by extracting information which is pertinent to the main clause from out of the subordinate clause. The ideas of Diessel 2005 in which a hearer’s processing times of subordinate clauses are considered are influential in the formulation of this hypothesis.

In the penultimate section of this chapter it is observed that a different syntactic phenomenon, namely cataphora, has been noted by a number of linguists as occurring with English subordinate clauses. It is further observed that cataphora is correspondingly poorly attested, indeed not identified, in Ancient Greek. It is suggested that the two distinct mechanisms of left-dislocation and cataphora may well be employed in response to the syntactic circumstance of subordination to the same cognitive benefit: to ensure that the subordinate clause carries only supplemental information which is not necessary for the intelligibility of the main clause.

## 4.2 Cross-linguistic accounts of the syntax of left-dislocation

Linguists have long been aware of a construction whereby a clause appears to be headed by a noun which in one way or another does not fit syntactically with the clause to which it appears to relate. In the handbooks of ancient and modern languages this phenomenon has traditionally been termed variously “nominative absolute”, “nominativus pendens” or “casus pendens”.

A change in grammatical case between an initially placed noun-phrase and the case in which that noun was employed in the clause which followed was the defining feature of this phenomenon. Havers, who produced two wide ranging studies in the 1920s on what he termed “unconstrued nominatives”, offered examples of this switch, such as “Dein Wort, dein Evangelium, an dieses glauben wir”, and the Modern Greek ἕνας χωριάτης ἐπέθανε τὸ παιδί του, literally “a farmer, his child died”.[152]

Ross’s 1967 doctoral thesis on “Constraints on Variables in Syntax” observed the possibility in English of a reordering of a sentence where “the original term is not deleted, but remains behind in pronominal form, as a kind of place-marker”.[153] Thus, a sentence which started “the man my father works with in Boston is going to tell the police that...” could be reordered as “the man my father works with in Boston, he’s going to tell the police that...” with the reordered sentence being classified as starting with a “left-dislocated” noun.[154] Sentences with an apparent change of grammatical function between an initial noun and the clause that follows it also qualified as “left-detached”, for example, “*this guitar, I’ve sung folksongs on it all my life*.” Ross’s formulation marks the beginning of modern studies on left-dislocation in which the form and function of preposed nouns are investigated (irrespective of whether or not they syntactically agree with the clause they are preposed to).

A positive correlation of left-dislocation and subordination has subsequently been noted as a phenomenon of the Indo-European languages, although there has been little specific interest in the English position.[155] In Danckaert’s study of the Latin position on this correlation, it is stated that “the possibility of fronting an XP to a position to the left of a subordinating conjunction appears to be shared by many old IE languages”. Alongside Latin examples, Danckaert cited examples from Vedic Sanskrit, Old-Avestan, Gothic and ancient Greek.[156]

---

[152] Havers 1925: 210, 228. On the other hand, preposed nouns such as in *Pater tuus, is erat frater patruelis meus* or *tua uxor quid agit?*, where the nominative case of the preposed noun accords with the grammatical function of the anaphoric pronoun in the clause proper, are analysed by Havers 1925: 210-211 as being “nicht außerhalb der Satzkonstruktion”.

[153] Ross 1960: 421.

[154] *Ibid*.

[155] Muchnová 2011: 74 notes that whereas left-dislocation with respect to subordinate clauses is frequent in Ancient Greek and is often to be found in an identical form in translations of Ancient Greek into French, in Czech and English “une telle dislocation est rare si les sujets de la régissante et de la proposition en ἐπεί sont coréférentiels”.

Examples abound in Latin of “temporal subordinate clauses containing a finite verb form [which] can appear first in a complex sentence, but more frequently are preceded by a Discourse Topic, such as this example from Sallust’s *Jugurtha* 48.1: “*Iugurtha ubi Metelli dicta cum factis composuit..., statuit armis certare*”.[157] Following the historical account of Marouzeau 1949,[158] Panhuis 1982 and Danckaert 2012 both offer detailed studies of left-dislocation before subordinate clauses in Latin, with the latter being a substantial monograph on the subject. In terms of the function of left-dislocation (which we consider from Section 4.8 onwards of this chapter in respect of ἐπεί-clauses) Panhuis talks of the preposed material as being "thematic" and of the "preponderance of the higher level communicative organization of the text over the lower level syntactic organization of the sentence."[159] Danckaert offers a more complex analysis in which there is a “topic like variety” and a “focus like variety” of left-dislocation. These findings do not immediately correlate with the findings of this chapter on function, but it would be valuable to conduct an integrated study of the Latin and Greek position in a future investigation.[160]

## 4.3 Investigations of left-dislocation in Greek

Four pages of Havers’s 1925 monograph set out dozens of instances in Ancient Greek where an initial nominative noun is prefaced to a clause but performs no subsequent grammatical function in that clause. His examples included *Iliad* 11.833-834 ἰητροὶ μὲν γὰρ Ποδαλείριος ἠδὲ Μαχάων / τὸν μὲν ἐνὶ κλισίῃσιν ὀΐομαι ἕλκος ἔχοντα.[161] Havers termed this phenomenon the “isolated-emphatic nominative”. He distinguished it from other types of “unconstrued nominative” which he dealt with in his 1927 monograph.[162]

Greek handbooks before and after Havers’s work offer reduced lists with similar analysis. Notably, Schwyzer-Debrunner dedicates one and a half pages to the phenomenon, with some categorisation which resembles the divisions established by Havers 1925 and 1927.[163]

---

[156] Danckaert 2012: 97, citing examples from, among others, Fortson 2010: 160-161. Reflecting the negligible research on the Greek position, Danckaert states (erroneously in fact) that “in Ancient Greek the phenomenon is only marginally attested”.

[157] Spevak 2010: 170-171.

[158] According to Marouzeau 1949: 123, subordinating conjunctions and relative pronouns occur in second position over one thousand times in Plautus’ colloquial Latin sections.

[159] Panhuis 1982: 83.

[160] See also Spevak 2010: 4-15.

[161] Havers 1925: 233.

[162] Including the nominative of (i) naming, (ii) enumeration, (ii) apposition etc.

[163] Schwzyer-Debrunner 1950: 65-67. See also Kühner-Gerth 1898: 47 and Chantraine 1963: 16.

Beginning in 1990, nine or ten studies on Ancient Greek (most typically on word order) have offered new ideas on left-dislocation. None is a monograph on the subject of left-dislocation. Notably, Ruijgh and Bakker both published studies in 1990 which suggested the diagnostic use of late positioned particles to identify left-dislocation. Bakker published a further study in 1993 investigating the discourse function of δέ which included some consideration of left-dislocation with δέ before a subordinate clause. Then, the investigations into pragmatics and word order in Dik 1995, Slings 1997, Matić 2003, Dik 2007, Bertrand 2010; and Allan 2012 and 2014 all contained small sections on left-dislocation.

All of the aforementioned studies adopted S. C. Dik's pragmatic ideas of left-dislocation as a "theme" for the text that follows, extending beyond the sentence within which the left-dislocated item occurs. We will note in Section 4.8 and subsequent sections that this idea does not do justice to the regularity with which left-dislocation is employed before a subordinator - we suggest there that such regularity is an indicator that the left-dislocation is associated with the syntactic environment of subordination. More immediately, in the sections which immediately follow this, we will note that there is an ambiguity which pervades almost all of these studies as to how to recognise left-dislocation.

## 4.4 Recognising left-dislocation in Greek

In verbal zero anaphora languages such as Greek the regular use of a pronoun with a verb is uncommon, as the verbal inflections carry argument information. Identification of left-dislocation cannot, then, rely on a resumptive pronoun in these languages.[164] A range of indicators of left-dislocation other than a resumptive pronoun have been identified for Ancient Greek. A divergence in approach is discernible between the treatment of independent clauses and of subordinate clauses.

### 4.4.1 Criteria for left-dislocation: Before an independent clause

**Accepted criteria**

Devine and Stephens identified three[165] positive markers for recognising left-dislocation (which they referred to as a unit of intonation) in Greek:[166]

---

[164] Bakker 1990: 10-17 and Allan 2012: 22 n.31 both observed the diagnostic difficulties of left-dislocation in verbal zero anaphora languages. Ninety years earlier, Havers 1925: 210 n.3 had similarly observed that "in den klassischen Sprachen ist die Aufnahme durch ein Pronomen durchaus nicht immer die Regel". See also Ebeling 1905: 118 on the Romance languages and also Duranti and Ochs 1979.

[165] Following Devine and Stephens, Bertrand 2010: 256-258 split marker (ii) into initially placed phrases and parenthetical phrases. But given that they are both recognised by the position of postpositives, they should be categorised together for our purposes.

[166] Devine and Stephens 1994: 478-479.

1. The Fränkel late postpostive position: an independent unit of intonation is marked out by a late placed postpositive, as explained in the following sub-section;
2. The Marshall late interrogative position: a non-initial position of an interrogative pronoun or interrogative adverb marks the words before it as forming their own unit;[167]
3. The Ross 1967 measure of left-dislocation: the presence of a resumptive pronoun in the clause proper.

This list reflects the state of knowledge today, with Bertrand recently citing it with approval.[168] In practice, criterion (1) is the most heavily applied when looking for left-dislocation; criteria (2) and (3) are only rarely applicable.

### Sole criterion: Fränkel postpositive

Fränkel 1933 explored the interpretive value of exceptions to “Wackernagel’s Law” on postpositives occurring in second position in the sentence,[169] in particular as such exceptions could be understood to mark cola within a sentence or paragraph. In interpreting a number of his cited instances, he used the language of “as regards”, which evokes contemporaneous interpretations of the role of unconstrued nouns, in particular of Havers 1925.

Ruijgh was the first to recognise the value of Fränkel postpositives in diagnosing left-dislocation (or, as he termed it, a “theme”). He noted that a late placed ἄρα could be a marker of a theme, offering six varied examples from Homer, including *Odyssey* 8.55-56 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα / βάν ῥ’ ἴμεν.[170]

Following Ruijgh, Bakker looked at some instances of left-dislocation, recognising them by late placed postpositives.[171] H. Dik offered some Herodotean examples of left-dislocation, again identifying them with the help of postpositives.[172] Matić likewise identified left- dislocation with the pair μέν... δέ in fifth-century Greek, for example Herodotus’s *Histories* 2.35.3 οὐρέουσι αἱ μὲν γυναῖκες ὀρθαί, οἱ δὲ ἄνδρες κατήμενοι.[173]

---

[167] Marshall 1987: 19 formulated the rule that ἄν must follow an interrogative word and never precede it (subject to three attested exceptions). Taylor 1990 extrapolated from Marshall’s rule on interrogatives and from Fränkel’s earlier rule on the colon-marking nature of ἄν, to formulate the rule that interrogatives alone must mark a colon.

[168] Bertrand 2010: 257-258.

[169] See footnote 81.

[170] Ruijgh 1990: 229-231. Illustrated with this particular example, Ruijgh noted that the Homeric theme would not necessarily be a noun phrase.

[171] Bakker 1990: 10-17.

[172] Dik 1995: 36, 50, 97, 120-121.

[173] Matić 2003: 580-582.

### 4.4.2 Criteria for left-dislocation: Before a preposed subordinate clause

As far as identification of an “unconstrued noun” is concerned (as opposed to the more prosodically orientated left-dislocation), case disagreement has been the traditional measure, as noted in Section 4.3 above. Case disagreement between a noun which is placed before a preposed subordinate clause and the following main clause is sufficiently common to have resulted in a number of citations of subordinate clauses with such “unconstrued” nouns.[174] When the field was opened up to instances where there is grammatical accord between the initial noun and the text that follows, a range of differences sentences were added to the inventory with sight being lost of the traditional list. There are no updated lists in Greek handbooks of left-dislocated noun phrases before subordinators (unlike the studies available in Latin, notably Marouzeau 1949); the following sections are an attempt to address the lacuna as regards ἐπεί.

In this study it is assumed that unless a noun phrase precedes a parenthetical subordinate clause (as determined base on the criteria set out in Section 2.3), any noun phrase which precedes a subordinator is left-dislocated. There is sufficient evidence from those instances which include Fränkel postpositives for us to recognise that the prosodic treatment of a noun phrase before a subordinator in Homer is that of left-dislocation.

**Preliminary criterion: Fränkel postpositive**

The quest for a Fränkel postpositive was generally followed also when looking at left-dislocation before a subordinate clause. An express formulation of this approach can be found with Bakker who cited *Iliad* 1.57 οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο and suggested that the third-position-in-the-clause of οὖν was precisely such an instance of Ruijgh’s exceptional late placing due to left-dislocation.[175]

Other scholars have not expressly admitted that they would identify left-dislocation before a subordinate clause only where a Fränkel postpositive were identified, but have nevertheless adhered to that restriction. For example, Slings investigated left-dislocation in particular as manifested with subordinate clauses. Three examples were cited by him from Plato’s writings of what he termed the use of a “theme”: only subordinate clauses which contained a post-positive out of the Wackernagel position were selected.[176] For example, Plato, *Republic* 454d7-9 καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν καὶ τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν γένος, ἐὰν μὲν πρὸς τέχνην τινὰ ἢ ἄλλο ἐπιτήδευμα διαφέρον φαίνηται, τοῦτο δὴ φήσομεν ἑκατέρῳ δεῖν ἀποδιδόναι.[177] Allan evidently applied the same principle in the section of his study dedicated to subordination and left-dislocation.[178]

---

[174] For example, Kühner-Gerth 1898: 47 cited Xenophon *Anabasis* 2.5.41 Πρόξενος δὲ καὶ Μένων ἐπείπερ εἰσὶν ὑμέτεροι μὲν εὐεργέται, ἡμέτεροι δὲ στρατηγοί, πέμψατε αὐτοὺς δεῦρο, and similarly *Anabasis* 3.3.16.

[175] See Bakker 1990: 13 n.40. In fact, αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ (and indeed ἀλλ' ὅτε δή ῥ') present(s) with ἄρα beyond its canonical Wackernagel position of second in the sentence. Ruijgh 1990: 222 simply explained αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ of *Iliad* 1.458 as the obligatory postposing of ῥ’ after the conjunction ἐπεί, which does not do justice to the detailed approach taken in the remainder of Ruijgh’s 1990 study.

[176] Slings 1997: 106-201.

The same observation should also be made about when δή follows ἐπεί, as it often does. Furthermore, following Marshall 1987 and Taylor 1990 with respect to interrogatives,[179] we can note that ἄν (in the form of ἐπήν)[180] must follow ἐπεί and never precede it.

**Alternative criterion: preposed to a subordinator**

Among scholars there are two or three exceptions to the adherence to the Fränkel postpositive. First, Bakker 1993 identifies a number of subordinate clauses as being prefaced by a left-dislocated noun where there is no late postpositive (unlike Bakker 1990 where left-dislocated nouns are only identified as such where there is a late postpositive). By reference to examples from Herodotus and Xenophon, Bakker observed that preposed temporal subordinate clauses were sometimes prefaced by a "Noun Phrase marked by δέ".[181] He suggested that this type of prefatory phrase was, by virture of "being placed before the sub-clause, ... what some linguists would call left "dislocated": it stands outside the network of the clause to which it belongs." No Fränkel particle supports this analysis.

Muchnová, who quoted Bakker in support of her analysis, in turn cited nine instances from Xenophon's *Hellenica* where a preposed ἐπεί-clause is preceded by a noun, and categorised these as "left-dislocated". Muchnová cited, for example, Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3, 1, 9, 1 ὁ δὲ Δερκυλίδας ἐπεὶ παρέλαβε τὸ στράτευμα, γνοὺς ὑπόπτους ὄντας ἀλλήλοις τὸν Τισσαφέρνην καὶ τὸν Φαρνάβαζον, κοινολογησάμενος τῷ Τισσαφέρνει ἀπήγαγεν εἰς τὴν Φαρναβάζου χώραν τὸ στράτευμα.[182] Muchnová did not comment on the fact that none of these instances contains a Fränkel postpositive.

Finally, Allan 2014 sought a justification in a left-dislocated interpretation of an initial noun before a subordinator by presenting it as a choice between a syntactic relationship between the initial noun and the main clause and a more remote relationship, namely left-dislocation, between the initial noun and the main clause. He stated that "the fact that these [nominative proper nouns] are separated from the main clause by an intervening (participial or subordinate) clause makes it unattractive to view them as belonging to the main clause".[183] Allan generalised further that "only the presence of a Setting [i.e. a temporal subordinate clause] gives a reliable indication of what one is dealing with", namely left-dislocation.[184]

---

[177] See also Plato, *Republic* 565d9-e1 and Plato, *Timaeus* 37e1-3.

[178] Allan 2014: 185 cited *Iliad* 1.68 ἤτοι ὅ γ' ὣς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἕζετο and 6.510-511 ὃ δ' ἀγλαΐηφι πεποιθὼς // ῥίμφά ἑ γοῦνα φέρει, which both consist of participial clauses before a finite clause.

[179] See footnote 167.

[180] See *Odyssey* 4.222 ὃς τὸ καταβρόξειεν, ἐπὴν κρητῆρι μιγείη, and also *Odyssey* 4.414. There are no instances of noun phrases preceding ἐπεί κε.

[181] Bakker 1993: 285. See Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 4, 7, 11, 4, 7, 12 and Herodotus 1, 111, 3.

[182] See Muchnová 2011: 75. She also cited 1.3.4.1, 1.5.20.1, 2.2.19.2, 2.3.14.2, 2.4.10.7 and 1.6.19.1.

[183] Allan 2014: 189 n.23.

### 4.4.3 Relationship of a left-dislocated noun phrase to the following clause complex

In 1997 Slings briefly considered whether a noun dislocated before a subordinate clause relates just to the subordinate clause or to the following main clause as well. He suggested that it is best to read the noun as "standing outside the following complex of clauses" (by which we must infer he intended the subordinate clause and the main clause).[185] Slings did not look in sufficient detail at the three examples that he adduced to show us precisely how the initial theme might relate to both the subordinate clause and the main clause. But in raising the question of the syntactic and/or sense relations of the left-dislocated noun, Slings was a lone voice.[186]

Regarding the choice of case of the left-dislocated noun, Slings proposed the operation of a "case hierarchy" of Nominative – Accusative – Genitive – Dative, suggesting that the choice of case of the theme is not determined by the specific syntax of the clause proper, but rather by an assessment of whether the role of the theme in the following clauses is more akin to that of an agent or patient. He proposed that a binary choice is typically made between nominative for an agentive function and accusative for a patient function.[187]

Slings's Case Hierarchy is not borne out by any of the left-dislocation Homeric examples examined in this thesis. As explored in the remainder of this chapter, the case of the initial noun is determined solely by the syntax of the subordinate clause.

Before embarking on the analysis of left-dislocation before preposed ἐπεί-clauses, we should note that the sentence-initial noun, or nouns, which precede(s) the seven Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses are directly governed by the verb of the main clause. There is nothing to suggest that the initial noun, or nouns, are in a relationship of left-dislocation to the following text. The Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses are accordingly not further discussed in this chapter.

## 4.5 Left-dislocated nominative pronouns

Homeric idiosyncracies make necessary a division into left-dislocated proper nouns and left-dislocated pronouns. As explored in the following sub-sections, the hexameter appears sometimes to send the proper nouns to a late placed position in the subordinate clause where we conjecture that in a prose text a left-dislocated noun might have been used. Similarly, the hexameter precludes the masculine singular demonstrative pronoun from starting the line, resulting in some aberrations in the information structure of the text, which requires specific analysis; again, this is explored further in the following sub-sections.

---

[184] Allan 2014: 197.

[185] See Slings 1997: 196.

[186] The prevailing assumption, not expressly articulated and certainly never justified, is that a dislocated noun before a subordinate clause relates to the main clause rather than to the subordinate clause. Regarding the nominative absolute in subordinate clauses Kühner-Gerth 1898: 47 stated that "der Nominativ [schliesst sich] einem darauf folgenden Nebensatze als Subjekt an, obwohl man nach der Struktur des Satzes einen anderen Kasus erwarten sollte." See also Havers 1927: 111-113, Chantraine 1963: 16 and Muchnová 2011: 75.

[187] Slings 1997: 198-199. See also Bertrand 2010: 283-286.

### 4.5.1 A note on the hierarchy of constituents

When we examine the sequence οἳ δ’ ἐπεί the question arises as to whether there is a syntactic rule which requires the pronoun to be placed first in the sentence (and which may then cause *apparent* left-dislocation). Indeed, as formulated in "Wackernagel's Law", it is recognised that δ’ must stand second in the clause and cannot ordinarily take other positions in the line. It is also recognised that δ’ following the pronoun correlates with particular referencing, so that if a topic shift is to be marked, the syntagm *pronoun + δ’* will typically be employed,[188] which might suggest that the pronoun would need to be placed first in the clause.

A look at other subordinators, in particular ὄφρα εἵως, shows that a sequence of *subordinator – pronoun without δέ* can be employed with the same referencing effect, as set out in Section 4.5.4, as an initial pronoun followed by δέ. So, instances with the subordinator ὄφρα indicate that in the environment of an adverbial subordinator, δ’ can be dropped from the pronoun without loss of subject-shift marking, so that the subordinator takes priority in the word order. For example:

1. *Iliad* 4.220 ὄφρα τοὶ ἀμφεπένοντο βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον. τοὶ unites the previously individuated Achaeans who were tending to the wounded Menelaus, as "combination referencing" as discussed in sub-Section 4.5.5.
2. *Iliad* 12.195 ὄφρ’ οἳ τοὺς ἐνάριζον ἀπ’ ἔντεα μαρμαίροντα, where οἳ unites the previously individuated Greeks.
3. *Iliad* 15.343 ὄφρ’ οἳ τοὺς ἐνάριζον ἀπ’ ἔντεα, τόφρα δ’ Ἀχαιοί. Here in a more or less identical line to *Iliad* 12.195 the previously individuated Trojans are united and are now stripping the armour off their Achaean victims.

These instances are formally identical to the position taken by continuing topic uses of the demonstrative with ὄφρα, so that there is no remaining lexical marking of the distinction between continuing topic and shifting topic Thus, at *Odyssey* 10.125 ὄφρ’ οἱ τοὺς ὄλεκον λιμένος πολυβενθέος ἐντός, the demonstrative pronoun directly continues the subject of the preceding lines, namely the Lastrogynians.

---

[188] See footnote 199.

### 4.5.2 Introduction

Ross noted that “the rule of Left Dislocation does not require the NP to be dislocated not to be a pronoun”. He offered a couple of examples: “Him, they let him go yesterday” and “Me, I like beer”.[189] An earlier observation by Havers that pronouns rarely occur in that position does however raise the question of whether all languages which employ left-dislocation are as flexible with left-dislocated pronouns as Ross’s generalisation might suggest.[190]

As regards the left-dislocation of pronouns in Ancient Greek, Havers cited the Homeric instance of *Odyssey* 13.81, 84 ἡ δ’, ὥς τ’ ἐν πεδίῳ τετράοροι ἄρσενες ἵπποι, / ... / ὣς ἄρα τῆς πρύμνη μὲν ἀείρετο and a number of fifth century examples.[191] In Section 4.4.2 above it was noted that Bakker cited οἳ δ’ of *Iliad* 1.57 οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο as an instance of left-dislocation.[192]

Thirty two ἐπεί-clauses start with a nominative demonstrative pronoun followed by δ’, most frequently the masculine plural οἱ (referred to as “**Pronominal ἐπεί-Clauses**”). The subordinator then directly follows this preliminary syntagm of pronoun + δ’. **Table 4.1** offers the first couple of instances and citations for the remainder.

**Table 4.1.** Nominative pronouns before the ἐπεί-clauses

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 1.57-58 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο<br>τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς |
| 2. | *Iliad* 3.340-341 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν<br>ἐς μέσσον Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἐστιχόωντο |
| | See similarly *Iliad* 4.382, 5.573, 10.272, 10.296, 11.642, 12.105, 16.563, 21.26, 22.475, 23.813, 24.329, 24.349, 24.719, *Odyssey* 3.65, 3.470, 8.360, 8.372, 10.112, 10.453, 11.98, 16.478, 19.213, 19.251, 20.279, 21.57, 21.222, 21.273, 21.297, 23.88, 23.300, 24.205, 24.384 and 24.489 | |

### 4.5.3 The syntax and topical continuity of sentences with left-dislocated nominative pronouns

The left-dislocated pronoun is frequently the elided subject of the subordinate clause and main clause, for example *Iliad* 3.340-341 οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν, / ἐς μέσσον Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἐστιχόωντο and similarly *Iliad* 6.504-501, 10.272-273, 10.296-297, 11.642-643 etc. On all of these occasions, which is the majority of ἐπεί-clauses with left-dislocated pronouns, the subject of the subordinate clause and main clause is identical: we can say that there is subject continuity between the subordinate clause and the main clause. But there are a range of exceptions to this simple syntactic arrangement. We can summarise the syntax as follows, taking into account the exceptions:

---

[189] Ross 1967: 430.

[190] Havers 1925: 221-222, in his study of what he called the “isoliert-emphatisch Nominativ”, did not find many instances of pronouns in that function.

[191] Havers 1925: 237.

[192] See also, Muchnová 2011: 75 citing Xenophon, *Hellenic*a 2.3.14.2 οἱ δ᾽ ἐπεὶ τὴν φρουρὰν ἔλαβον, τὸν μὲν Καλλίβιον ἐθεράπευον πάσῃ θεραπείᾳ, and Allan 2014: 185 n.9 citing *Iliad* 1.68 ἤτοι ὅ γ' ὣς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἕζετο (earlier cited by Ruijgh 1989: 230 as an instance of left-dislocation) and *Iliad* 6.510-511.

1. The left-dislocated pronoun is always the elided subject of the subordinate clause.
2. The subject of the main clause is typically grammatically congruent with the left-dislocated pronoun; exceptions are set out at (3) below. See *Iliad* 3.340-341 οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν, / ἐς μέσσον … ἐστιχόωντο, 10.272-273 τὼ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ὅπλοισιν ἔνι δεινοῖσιν ἐδύτην, / βάν ῥ' ἰέναι, and 10.296-297 οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ ἠρήσαντο…, //βάν ῥ' ἴμεν.
3. There is always topical continuity to the extent that the left-dislocated pronoun is an argument of the main clause, but on some occasions there is no grammatical congruence between the left-dislocated pronoun and the main clause. The pronoun is nevertheless continued as an argument in the main clause. A sentence uttered by the then newly elected head of the Labour Party of the United Kingdom, Jeremy Corbyn, offers an English example of the resumption of a noun (with grammatical incongruence) in a main clause where that noun had first been prefixed to a preceding subordinate clause: “I think meat eaters, if they wish to carry on eating meat, that’s up to them to do so.”[193] The four exceptions are as follows:

   3.1. there is anaphoric resumption of the preposed pronoun in the main clause with a reiterating synonym which is also in the nominative. See *Odyssey* 11.98-99 ὁ δ’ ἐπεὶ πίεν αἷμα κελαινόν, / καὶ τότε δή μ’ ἐπέεσσι προσηύδα μάντις ἀμύμων;

   3.2. the main clause presents a μέν ... δ’ / αὐτάρ arrangement in which the left-dislocated pronoun is divided between the two limbs. The main clause following *Iliad* 24.329 redivides the uniting οἳ δ’ of the subordinate clause which covers Priam, his horseman and his kinsmen into a nominative οἳ μέν which refers to the kinsmen and an accusative τὼ δ’ which refers to Priam and his horseman. The main clause following the subordinate clause of *Odyssey* 8.360 splits the left-dislocated dual pronoun τώ into ὁ μέν and ἡ δ’;[194]

   3.3. the main clause presents an individual as the patient (in the accusative) where that individual had previously been included in the preceding left-dislocated nominative plural pronoun. This is the case at *Iliad* 4.382-384 οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ᾤχοντο ἰδὲ πρὸ ὁδοῦ ἐγένοντο, / Ἀσωπὸν δ’ ἵκοντο βαθύσχοινον λεχεποίην, / ἔνθ’ αὖτ’ ἀγγελίην ἐπὶ Τυδῆ στεῖλαν Ἀχαιοί where Tydeus of the main clause was included in the initial οἳ δ’; or

---

[193] If we allow for differences between English and Greek of verbal anaphora and of nominal inflection.

[194] The second limb of the main clause at *Iliad* 5.575 expressly resumes the left-dislocated subject before the ἐπεί-clause of οἳ δ'; but the first limb, an accusative τὼ μέν is governed by a verb whose subject is the same as that of the ἐπεί-clause (and indeed of the second limb). See similarly *Iliad* 24.719.

3.4. the main clause introduces a new character in the nominative who addresses the left-dislocated plural characters. The continuing affectedness of the left-dislocated character is marked by the dative anaphoric pronoun in the main clause. See *Iliad* 1.57-58 οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο, / τοῖσι δ’ ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς, and similarly *Odyssey* 21.273 and 24.489.

The number and variety of the exceptions to grammatical congruence listed at (3) above suggest a general rule that the main clause should be read with a left-dislocated relationship to the initial pronoun even where the main clauses contain elision of the subject (and where an alternative reading of grammatical governance between the pronoun and the main clause could therefore be read). So, a literal rendering of *Iliad* 3.340-341 into English should read *These two, when they were armed on either side of the battle, they strode into the space between the Achaians and Trojans*, and not *These two-when they were armed on either side of the battle-strode into the space between the Achaians and Trojans*.

### 4.5.4 Referencing function of the left-dislocated pronouns

All the left-dislocated pronouns, bar two unexplainable instances with the feminine pronoun[195] and two which have an unusually long reference ambit (discussed below as “remote referencing”), refer backwards in precisely the manner that they do when they appear in independent clauses.

#### Independent clauses display identical referencing

Most of the referencing with the pronouns reflects a topic shift back to a subject who had been in the scene in the preceding line(s) but simply not the grammatical subject of those lines. For example, at *Iliad* 1.57 οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν refers back to the people who were summoned at line 54 by Achilles. Lines 55-56 were occupied with explaining why Achilles summoned the meeting. This type of referencing is followed in the majority of other uses of the nominative pronoun before ἐπεί.[196] The same referencing pattern is seen with most of the ὅτε[197] and ὡς[198] clauses.

---

[195] At *Odyssey* 21.57 and 23.88 the feminine demonstrative pronoun refers to the same subject as that of the preceding lines. Reynen 1957: 30 puzzles over the choice of the pronoun at *Odyssey* 21.57. He suggests that the excitement in the narrative development as to the events that occur following the ἐπεί-clause, when the grief-struck Penelope returns to the suitors, is behind the use of a Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause with οὖν.

[196] See *Iliad* 4.383, 10.296, 11.642, 21.26, 22.475, 24.329, 24.349, 24.719, *Odyssey* 8.360, 8.372, 10.112, 11.98, 16.478, 19.213, 19.251, 20.279, 21.222, 21.273, 21.297, 23.300, and 24.384.

[197] See *Iliad* 9.669, 10.526, 11. 618, *Odyssey* 1.332 and 18.208, 7.3, 21.42 and 21.63.

[198] See *Iliad* 8.251, 13.330, 18.222, 18.530, 23.202, *Odyssey* 3.34, and 22.407.

This use of the pronoun with δ’ is well recognised outside the subordination environment. Chantraine cites an example from *Iliad* 1.347 τὼ δ’ αὖτις ἴτην παρὰ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν.[199] Starting from the beginning of *Iliad* 1, we find many other similar resumptive uses of the pronoun + δέ in independent clauses. Some examples with the masculine plural nominative are *Iliad* 1.314 (which answers to μέν), 1.472 (which also answers to μέν), 1.480, 2.85, 2.270 etc.[200] It is, however, remarkable that by contrast with this use of the pronoun in independent clauses, the pronoun before ἐπεί-clauses does not respond to a noun or noun phrase marked by μέν, except in the case of line 384 of *Odyssey* 24 which is known for its divergent language.

A less well attested referencing relationship uses the dual or plural pronoun to combine previously separate subjects: the separate subjects were engaged in the same or mirrored event in all cases. For example, at *Iliad* 3.340 οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν, Paris and Menelaus are referred to together having been individuated in the preceding lines as they armed themselves.[201] Again, the same referencing pattern is found with ὅτε-clauses,[202] and on one occasion with ὡς.[203]

This type of referencing is seen in other syntactic environments, as can be observed by an examination of the first eighteen books of the *Iliad*. See for example *Iliad* 4.378 οἳ δὲ τότ’ ἐστρατόωνθ’ ἱερὰ πρὸς τείχεα Θήβης which unites Tydeus and Polynices who had been individually mentioned in the preceding lines. See similarly *Iliad* 6.218 and 14.393. I have, however, found no mention of this “combination referencing” (as we can term it) in the grammatical handbooks.[204] It is, again, noticeable that this use of the pronoun does not respond to a preceding noun or noun phrase marked by μέν, but this is less surprising than the resumptive referencing referred to above, since here the plural pronoun is aggregating the subjects of the preceding lines.

In conclusion, there is no referencing distinction that can be drawn between the pronouns in left-dislocated position and at the head of an independent clause. It seems then that the resumptive function of the pronoun would not itself determine a need for left-dislocation. The other notion of “topic persistence” is also not a possible trigger for the use of left-dislocation here, if we consider the equal extent of persistence in non left-dislocated examples.

---

[199] Chantraine 1963: 159 terms this referencing use as a “changement de sujet”.

[200] See also Bakker 1993: 282-283.

[201] See also *Iliad* 5.573, 10.272, 12.105, 16.563, 23.813, *Odyssey* 3.65, 3.470, 10.453 and 20.279.

[202] *Iliad* 3.15, 5.14, 5.630, 5.850, 6.121, 11.232, 13.604, 16.462, 20.176, 21.148 and 22.248 all with the phrase οἳ δ' ὅτε δὴ σχεδὸν ἦσαν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἰόντες and then *Iliad* 1.432, 3.421, 4.446, 6.297, 7.313 and 9.669, 8.60, 10.180 , 18.67, 18.520, 23.38, 23.138, 10.566, *Odyssey* 1.126, 6.85, and 16. 324. All identified by a fresh study of these ἐπεί-clauses. I have not seen any other study which undertakes this distinction.

[203] *Odyssey* 24.391.

[204] Reynen 1957: 35 describes this use of the pronoun as a “merging of the two subjects”.

For example, the men who are the subject of *Iliad* 1.480 continue as the prevailing subject for seven lines.

### Exceptional remote referencing found before two ἐπεί-clauses

So far, pronominal referentiality before ἐπεί has echoed the referentiality in independent clauses. There are, however, two occasions where the pronoun refers back across a chasm not seen with independent clauses. Based on a study of οἱ δ’ in the first eighteen books of the *Iliad*, this use of the pronoun seems limited to the two ἐπεί-clauses in **Table 4.2** below and to a ὅτε-clause at *Iliad* 1.312, 432-433 οἳ ... ἐπέπλεον / ... / οἳ δ’ ὅτε δὴ ... ἵκοντο / ἱστία μὲν στείλαντο.

**Table 4.2.** Nominative pronouns before the ἐπεί-clauses with remote resumptive referencing force

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Odyssey* 23.370-371, 24.205 | τοὺς δ’ ἄρ’ Ἀθήνη<br>νυκτὶ κατακρύψασα θοῶς ἐξῆγε πόληος / ... //<br>οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ πόλιος κατέβαν, τάχα δ’ ἀγρὸν ἵκοντο |
| 2. | *Odyssey* 24.412, 489-490 | ὣς οἱ μὲν περὶ δεῖπνον ἐνὶ μεγάροισι πένοντο: / ... //<br>οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν σίτοιο μελίφρονος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο<br>τοῖς ἄρα μύθων ἦρχε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς |

As with the other dislocated pronouns discussed in the preceding Section 4.5.3, the case of the pronoun reflects the syntax of the subordinate clause but not necessarily of the main clause. There is topical continuity between the subordinate clause and the main clause, although in the case of the second example it is somewhat cosmetic – suggesting that the poet sensed that the subject of the subordinate clause must be continued in some form in the main clause.

The ἐπεί-clause of *Odyssey* 24.205 points back to the end of *Odyssey* 23. There, Odysseus and his supporters had departed for his father’s farm. *Odyssey* 24.1ff. then occupies itself with the suitors in the underworld until it reaches the subordinate clause when it returns to Odysseus.[205]

The ἐπεί-clause at line 489 picks up the banquet with Odysseus and his family which began at line 412. Before concluding the meal the narrative turns to the residue of the suitors’ camp at lines 413 to 471 and the forming of plans to avenge the suitors’ deaths and then to a second scene on Olympus where the gods agree that the warring between the sides must end. The dining scene is then returned to with the subordinate clause.[206]

---

[205] Reynen 1957: 41-42 also observed that the events described between the end of *Odyssey* 23 and the ἐπεί-clause at 23.205 do not relate at all to Odysseus and co.

[206] See Reynen 1957: 41-42 on this as well. But Reynen suggested that it is οὖν which manages the subject switch. Russo et al. 1992: 413 follow Reynen.

The anaphoric semantics of ἐπεί-clause, as outlined in Section 2.4, have probably extended the reach of the demonstrative pronoun on these two occasions. A superficial investigation of ὅτε suggests that it is less tightly bound to the preceding text, so that the question remains as to how the demonstrative range was expanded before this subordinator as well. Perhaps on all three occasions the alleged power of left-dislocation to “return topics back into the register over long gaps of absence”[207] is at work here. A more substantial investigation of the referencing relations of the demonstrative pronouns should be undertaken to ascertain this.

### 4.5.5 Continuous topic referencing

It was noted at Section 3.10.1 that ἀλλ’ of the two ἐπεί-clauses of *Iliad* 6.504 ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἐπεὶ κατέδυ κλυτὰ τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ and *Iliad* 24.14 ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν ὑφ' ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους marks a contrast with a negative statement in the preceding line. As to the use of the pronominal phrase ὅ γ’, this cannot be explained by the introduction of a new or returning subject, since the subject is unchanged from the preceding lines.

In the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* there is a well-attested phrasal pattern in past tense narrative of *οὐδέ / οὐ + nominative proper noun ... ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’* where ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ is line initial and continues the subject of the preceding clause, as it does here.[208] The semantics and history of this sequence have not yet been the subject of a dedicated study. The conditions for placing the pronominal phrase ὅ γ’ before ἐπεί at *Iliad* 6.504 and *Iliad* 24.14 are likely then to be based on this lexical pattern.

The syntactic relationship of ὅ γ’ with the remainder of the sentence resembles that of the other left-dislocated nouns:

1. syntactic agreement with the preposed subordinate clause;
2. partial syntactic agreement with the main clause, with δ’ in the main clause at *Iliad* 24.15 Ἕκτορα δ' ἕλκεσθαι δησάσκετο ruling out a parenthetical interpretation of the subordinate clause; and
3. topical continuity between the left-dislocated noun and the main clause.

### 4.5.6 Reynen’s view on the function of the subordinate clauses with left-dislocated pronouns

Reynen not infrequently suggests that a Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause with οὖν is preferred over αὐτάρ for purposes of discourse management, in particular to mark out the events of the subordinate clause as subordinate in narrative interest to what follows. For example, regarding the pronoun of *Iliad* 5.573 οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν νεκροὺς ἔρυσαν μετὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν Reynen acknowledges that the ἐπεί-clause “involves a change of subject”, yet states: “the formular οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν seems to be necessary rather than αὐτὰρ ἐπεί because here the next stage of the events is captured in an ἐπεί-clause in its complete state and is subordinated to what follows”.[209]The pronoun is required to clarify who is the subject of the ἐπεί-clause after the change of subject in the preceding lines.

---

[207] Givón 2001: 32.

[208] See *Iliad* 1.320, 2.3, 2.420, 4.389, 5.321, 12.305, 12.393 etc.

The length and detail of Reynen’s exposition cannot be answered by one of equivalent scale, but with the help of **Table 4.3** we can look at some particularly obvious illustrations of how a choice between αὐτάρ and and the pronoun is determined by information needs. In these cases the clauses started by αὐτὰρ ἐπεί are more numerous than the Pronominal ἐπεί-Clauses; the clauses started by αὐτὰρ ἐπεί are the statistically predominating structure, and οὖν has been included in the Pronominal ἐπεί-Clauses for metrical reasons. The second syllable of ἐπεί needs to be shortened, which must in part explain the use of οὖν following a number of the pronominal ἐπεί’s so that the subordinate phrase is a demonstrative pronoun + δ’ + ἐπεί + οὖν.

**Table 4.3.** Comparison of ἐπεί-clauses with initial αὐτάρ or with a left-dislocated pronoun

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 1.467, 2.430 and 7.319; | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα |
| | *Odyssey* 16.478 and 24.384 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα |
| 2. | *Iliad* 9.177, Od. 3.342, 3.395, 7.184, 7.228 & 18.427 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ’ ἔπιόν θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| | *Odyssey* 21.273 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν σπεῖσάν τ’ ἔπιόν θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| 3. | *Iliad* 24.790,[210] and *Odyssey* 2.9, 8.24 and 24.421; and | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο of |
| | *Iliad*.1.57 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο, |
| 4. | *Odyssey* 24.349 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη |
| | *Iliad* 22.475 | ἣ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη |
| | [*Odyssey* 5.458 | ἀλλ’ ὅτε δή ῥ’ ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη] |

If we look at the first set of ἐπεί-clauses, we can note that the three occurrences with αὐτὰρ ἐπεί are the culmination of sequential linearity on one theme, at one place, with the same heroes the subject of the verbs. Thus, taking the first instance:

> *Iliad 1.465-468*
> *μίστυλλόν τ’ ἄρα τἆλλα καὶ ἀμφ’ ὀβελοῖσιν ἔπειραν,*
> *ὤπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα.*

---

[209] Reynen 1957: 18.

[210] See Reynen 1957: 3 n.1. It is omitted in most manuscripts.

> ***αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα***
> *δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης.*

The two occurrences of οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα follow clauses which have had grammatical subjects different from those of the ἐπεί-clauses. First, towards the end of *Odyssey* 16 Odysseus and Telemachus are preparing dinner at Eumaeus's hut when Eumaeus the swineherd returns from his day's work (lines 452-453). An exchange between Eumaeus and the father and son ensues which culminates in father and son exchanging conspiratorial smiles (lines 454-477). The narrative then returns to the event of dinner preparations by completing them with the Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause at line 478. The pronoun is used to pick up Odysseus and Telemachus exclusively, the preparers of the meal.[211]

## 4.6 Left-dislocated nominative proper nouns

The study of proper noun left-dislocation in Homer is much complicated by the hexameter. If we apply the criteria established with pronominal left-dislocation above of (i) grammatical concord with the subordinate clause, (ii) no grammatical concord with the main clause, and (iii) topical continuity, we find that there are eight proper nouns which are placed *before* the subordinator and a similar number which appear *after* the subordinator. The only discernable difference between the two groups is metrical congruity with ἐπεί.

**Table 4.4.** ἐπεί-clauses preceded by left-dislocation of a proper noun

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 2.661-662 | **Τληπόλεμος** δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν τράφ' ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ εὐπήκτῳ<br>αὐτίκα πατρὸς ἑοῖο φίλον μήτρωα κατέκτα |
| 2. | *Iliad* 5.27-29 | **Τρῶες δὲ μεγάθυμοι** ἐπεὶ ἴδον υἷε Δάρητος<br>τὸν μὲν ἀλευάμενον, τὸν δὲ κτάμενον παρ' ὄχεσφι,<br>πᾶσιν ὀρίνθη θυμός: ἀτὰρ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη |
| 3. | *Iliad* 8.269-271 | ἔνθ' Αἴας μὲν ὑπεξέφερεν σάκος: **αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἥρως**<br>**παπτήνας**, ἐπεὶ ἄρ τιν' ὀϊστεύσας ἐν ὁμίλῳ<br>βεβλήκοι, ὃ μὲν αὖθι πεσὼν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὄλεσσεν |
| 4. | *Iliad* 13.1-2 | **Ζεὺς** δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρῶάς τε καὶ Ἕκτορα νηυσὶ πέλασσεν<br>τοὺς μὲν ἔα παρὰ τῇσι πόνον τ' ἐχέμεν καὶ ὀϊζὺν |
| 5. | *Iliad* 16.394-395 | **Πάτροκλος** δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν πρώτας ἐπέκερσε φάλαγγας<br>ἂψ ἐπὶ νῆας ἔεργε παλιμπετές, οὐδὲ πόληος |
| 6. | *Iliad* 23.1-3 | ὣς οἳ μὲν στενάχοντο κατὰ πτόλιν:] αὐτὰρ **Ἀχαιοὶ**<br>ἐπεὶ δὴ νῆάς τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἵκοντο<br>οἳ μὲν ἄρ' ἐσκίδναντο ἑὴν ἐπὶ νῆα ἕκαστος |

---

[211] Reynen 1957: 39-40 notes the "absence of precision of expression" arising from the fact that the ἐπεί-clause refers to the two preparers whereas the main clause refers to the diners which must include the third member Eumaeus.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7. | *Odyssey* 21.404-405, 409 | …] ἀτὰρ **πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς**,<br>αὐτίκ’ ἐπεὶ μέγα τόξον ἐβάστασε καὶ ἴδε πάντῃ / ... /<br>ὣς ἄρ' ἄτερ σπουδῆς τάνυσεν μέγα τόξον Ὀδυσσεύς. |

**Table 4.4** above contains the only three occasions (at numbers 3, 6 and 7) when a sentence containing a temporal ἐπεί-clause is commenced on the line preceding the line on which ἐπεί itself is placed. This unusual phrasing perhaps attests to the pressure on the poet to produce subordinate clauses with proper nouns preceding them. While line final αὐτὰρ ὅ γ’ ἥρως and αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοί occur quite frequently, [212] the sequence ἀτὰρ πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς appears only once elsewhere, namely at *Iliad* 10.488-489 ἀτὰρ πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεὺς / ὅν τινα Τυδεΐδης ἄορι πλήξειε παραστὰς.

Placing the proper noun before the subordinator is found with other temporal subordinators. Before temporal ὡς we find the following instances: *Iliad* 6.237 Ἕκτωρ δ’ ὡς Σκαιάς τε πύλας καὶ φηγὸν ἵκανεν, and also *Iliad* 11.284, 14.440, 15.379, 15.422, 15.484, 16.278, 16.419, 19.282-3, 22.136, *Odyssey* 8.272 and 10.375. We find a similar arrangement on one occasion with ὅτε at *Iliad* 13.240 Ἰδομενεὺς δ’ ὅτε δὴ κλισίην εὔτυκτον ἵκανε. (On the other hand, in the case of δμῶες δ’, εὖτ’ at *Odyssey* 17.320, the εὖτε-clause can be construed only as a parenthetical clause which is preceded by the noun δμῶες which governs the main clause after an interrupting parenthetical clause.)

By reference to metrical conditions, the poet had a choice as to where to place these proper nouns in the line. These preposed proper nouns are attested in other parts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* sitting elsewhere in the line. For example, (i) out of six nominative occurrences Τληπόλεμος commences the second foot at *Iliad* 2.657 and 5.632, (ii) Ζεύς occurs approximately three hundred times in the nominative and amidst those occurrences is not shy, amongst other positions, to conclude the metrical line (and thus to occupy the *second* syllable in the foot) or to start the second foot (as for example at *Iliad* 4.381 ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς) and (iii) Πάτροκλος, among other examples of its metrical flexibility, starts the second foot at *Iliad* 16.130, straddles the second and third foot at *Iliad* 11.807, starts the third foot at *Iliad* 16.291 and straddles the fourth and fifth foot at *Iliad* 16.460.

### 4.6.1 The syntax and topical continuity of sentences with left-dislocated proper nouns

The grammatical relationship between the left-dislocated noun and the preposed subordinate clause and main clause resembles that of the left-dislocated pronouns examined in Section 4.5.3. The subject of the subordinate clause is often the subject of the main clause, as illustrated in the first, second and fourth examples etc. of the above table, so that there is subject continuity between the subordinate clause and main clause. The syntax can be summarised as follows:

---

[212] *Iliad* 5.308, 5.327, 8.268, 10.154, 11.483, 13.164 and 23.896.

1. The left-dislocated noun is always the elided subject of the preposed ἐπεί-clause.
2. The subject of the main clause is not always grammatically congruent with the left-dislocated noun but the left-dislocated noun nevertheless functions as an argument of the main clause. As with the left-dislocated pronouns, we can say that there is topical continuity between the subordinate clause and the main clause. The following arrangments are attested in those instances where the subject of the main clause is not congruent with the left-dislocated noun:
    2.1. the main clause presents with a μέν ... δ’ / αὐτάρ arrangement in which the subject of the subordinate clause is either continued only by the second of those two limbs or is divided between the two limbs.[213] Thus, the main clause which follows the subordinate clause of *Iliad* 8.269-270 divides into two clauses with the second clause continuing the left-dislocated subject: ὃ μὲν αὖθι πεσὼν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὄλεσσεν / αὐτὰρ ὃ αὖτις ἰὼν πάϊς ὣς ὑπὸ μητέρα δύσκεν.[214] Similarly, the main clause to the subordinate clause of *Iliad* 23.1-2 splits the left-detached αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοί into οἳ μέν (some of them) and and accusative Μυρμιδόνας δ’ which is governed by Achilles; or
    2.2. the main clause presents a change of grammatical subject. The main clause at *Iliad* 5.29 restates the left-dislocated subject as πᾶσιν and also places it in the experiential dative, with the grammatical subject becoming θυμός.

### 4.6.2 Referencing function of the left-dislocated proper nouns

The left-detached subjects which precede ἐπεί-clauses and which are set out at **Table 4.4** need to be expressed for information purposes. For example, Tlepolemos of *Iliad* 2.661 needs to be restated following the three line digression about his ancestry. The Trojans of *Iliad* 5.27 and 11.459 have not been mentioned for a long time as a group in either instance. The ὅ γ’ ἥρως of *Iliad* 8.268 is a phrase used a further six times in that position in the line: here, as on the other occasions, it picks up a character who was not the subject of the immediately preceding line(s).

---

[213] A division in the main clause of the ἐπεί-clause’s subject into μέν ... δ' is seen also where the subject is not express in the ἐπεί-clause. See for example *Iliad* 23.57-59 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο // οἳ μὲν κακκείοντες ἔβαν κλισίηνδε ἕκαστος, // Πηλεΐδης δ' ἐπὶ θινὶ πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης.

[214] Havers 1927: 111 identifies the preposed nominative phrase of this ἐπεί-clause (but not of any other ἐπεί-clause) as in some sense unconstrued, namely as a nominative followed by anacolouthon. Leaf and Bayfield 1895: 435 suggest “ἥρως is left as a *nominativus pendens* without a verb, the construction changing at ὃ μέν (the man struck by Teukros’ arrow)”.

### 4.6.3 Hexametric interference with word order and lexical choices

Our investigations are complicated by the hexameter, which prevents certain proper nouns from standing first in the line in the left-dislocated position and on other occasions it may encourage a proper noun to stand first in the line instead of the metrically impossible masculine singular demonstrative pronoun.

#### ἐπεί-clauses with identical referencing to those with left-dislocated proper nouns, but with the proper noun placed after the subordinator

The metrical shape of proper nouns in certain ἐπεί-clauses, as set out in the following table, precludes their preposition. These ἐπεί-clauses are selected out of all remaining clauses which contain an express subject and are chosen for displaying the same topical continuity between the ἐπεί-clause and main clause that we see in the ἐπεί-clauses of **Table 4.1** and **Table 4.4**. The only syntactic distinction that can be made between the ἐπεί-clauses which are set out in the following table and those of the aforementioned tables is the position of the subject. We discuss the remaining ἐπεί-clauses – those which display no continuity of subject in the main clause – in Section 4.10.2.

**Table 4.5** ἐπεί-clauses with the proper noun after the subordinator

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ἐπεί-clauses with nominative proper nouns *directly after* ἐπεί, i.e. clause initially** | | |
| 1. | *Iliad* 7.148 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ **Λυκόοργος** ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐγήρα |
| 2. | *Iliad* 16.198-199 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντας ἅμ’ ἡγεμόνεσσιν **Ἀχιλλεὺς**<br>στῆσεν ἐὺ κρίνας, [κρατερὸν δ’ ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλε: |
| 3. | *Iliad* 21.383 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ **Ξάνθοιο** δάμη **μένος**, οἳ μὲν ἔπειτα |
| 4. | *Odyssey* 9.296 -7 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ **Κύκλωψ** μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν<br>ἀνδρόμεα κρέ’ ἔδων καὶ ἐπ’ ἄκρητον γάλα πίνων |
| **ἐπεί-clauses with the nominative proper noun in the tail** | | |
| 5. | *Iliad* 22.376 | τὸν[215] δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐξενάριξε ποδάρκης δῖος **Ἀχιλλεύς** |
| 6. | *Iliad* 24.513-514 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα γόοιο τετάρπετο δῖος **Ἀχιλλεύς**<br>καί οἱ ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἦλθ’ ἵμερος ἠδ’ ἀπὸ γυίων |
| 7. | *Iliad* 20.318 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ’ ἄκουσε **Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων**,<br>See similarly *Iliad* 21.377, 23.161, *Odyssey* 7.167, 8.143, 8.446, 13.159 and 15.92 each with a different proper noun |
| 8. | *Odyssey* 1.150-151 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο<br>**μνηστῆρες**, [τοῖσιν μὲν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἄλλα μεμήλει,<br>μολπή τ’ ὀρχηστύς τε: τὰ γὰρ τ’ ἀναθήματα δαιτός:<br>κῆρυξ δ’ ἐν χερσὶν κίθαριν περικαλλέα θῆκε |

---

[215] This left-dislocated pronoun is discussed in Section 4.7.3.

Λυκόοργος, Ἀχιλλεὺς / Ἀχιλεὺς lack a long first syllable; Κύκλωψ with its two long syllables precludes δ' ἐπεί from following it. *Ξάνθοιο μένος is a metrical impossibility and the full proper noun Ξάνθος could not have preceded δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν, since it would have left ἐπεί starting the second foot.

Similarly, seven of the eight proper nouns that complete the αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσ' clause could not have appeared line initially. Together they form the backbone of the formation of a pattern of this nature. Thus, Ποσειδάων, Μενέλαος, Ὀδυσσεύς and Ἀγαμέμνων all lack a long first syllable; Ἥρη with its two long syllables precludes δ' ἐπεί from following it; Λαοδάμας (being πάϊς Ἀλκινόοιο) with its occupation of a whole foot precludes initially light syllabled δ' ἐπεί from following it. But *Ἀλκίνοος δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν could have sat at the beginning of the line, yet it does not do so-instead we see *Odyssey* 7.167's αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσ' ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο. Here the αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε group has taken on a life of its own, with its own paradigmatic power, so that the one proper noun that could have appeared line initially does not do so.

***The syntax of sentences with proper nouns after the subordinator***

The referencing relationship between the subject of the ἐπεί-clause and the main clause recalls that of the dislocated nouns as noted above in Section 4.6.1:

1. The subject of the main clause is not always grammatically congruent with the subject of the ἐπεί-clause:
    1.1. there is a change of grammatical subject in the main clause but there is an anaphoric link back to the subject of the ἐπεί-clause through the use of an oblique case demonstrative pronoun. In the main clause at *Iliad* 19.55 Achilles addresses the Achaeans who are the subject of the ἐπεί-clause. The role of the Achaeans as addressees is asserted by the use of τοῖσι δ' at the beginning of the main clause; or
    1.2. the plural subject of the main clause includes more than just the singular subject of the ἐπεί-clause. The main clause at *Iliad* 21.383 includes Xanthus of the ἐπεί-clause but also Hephaestus of the earlier lines, in what we term above in Section 4.5.4 "combination referencing". Here the events of the main clause affect the subject of the ἐπεί-clause (and continue the storyline of the ἐπεί-clause) while at the same time drawing in a second character.

2. There is always topical continuity to the extent that the left-dislocated noun is an argument of the main clause.

***Referencing function of the proper nouns***

In the ἐπεί-clauses of **Table 4.5** the nominative nouns are required in order to establish who is the subject of the clause. The river Xanthus is mentioned as the subject of *Iliad* 21.383 following the preceding six lines which described Hera's instructions to Hephaestus to hold off with his fire. The Cyclops is expressly mentioned at *Odyssey* 9.296, following the two line account of the terror and wailing of Odysseus and his comrades. Achilles of *Iliad* 16.198 had not been mentioned since line 155 when he had been gathering together his own army of Myrmidons.

In **Table 4.5** we isolated those ἐπεί-clauses which position the proper noun in the "tail", to enable an easier check of possible "reiterating synonym" behaviour (see Section 4.10.2). In fact, the apparent "tail" ἐπεί-clauses perform precisely the same informational function as the aforementioned ἐπεί-clauses. These are not cases where the noun simply clarifies, for the avoidance of doubt, who is the subject: rather, the use of the proper noun is necessary for the intelligibility of the text. So, Achilles of *Iliad* 22.376 had been mentioned close to the ἐπεί-clause but the attention had been off him while other Achaeans stepped forward to abuse Hector's freshly slaughtered body.[216]

**Hexametric challenges to information structuring with the third person nominative masculine singular**

Unless a syllable cluster follows it, the masculine singular nominative demonstrative ὁ is metrically precluded from commencing the hexametric line.[217] Not surprisingly, then, our ἐπεί-clauses preceded by a left-dislocated pronoun show a bias for feminine, dual or plural subjects – a bias not present in those ἐπεί-clauses with an elided or proper noun subject.[218]

At *Iliad* 21.26, *Odyssey* 11.98 and 21.297[219] we find three instances where ὁ δ' ἐπεί is in fact attested, being where the ἐπεί-clauses appear at the "masculine" caesura, after the first long syllable of the third foot. [220] Conversely, the feminine, dual and plural pronouns could not in fact have appeared at this central caesura, without breaching the general requirement for a central caesura.

Where the ἐπεί-clause starts at the beginning of the line, under- or over-articulation of the subject seems to have been adopted in a context where the masculine singular demonstrative pronoun would have sufficed informationally but is metrically precluded. For example, the proper noun of *Iliad* 16.394 Πάτροκλος δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν may well be in place of ὁ δ', since he is the subject of the simile of the preceding lines and of the action before those lines. The ἐπεί-clauses of *Iliad* 11.225, *Odyssey* 21.205; and *Odyssey* 24.349 all start with αὐτὰρ ἐπεί and have an elided subject, but are probably cases which would have started with ὁ δ’ ἐπεί if not for the hexametric restriction. Most strikingly, *Odyssey* 24.349 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη of which the grammatical subject is Laertes, is identical to *Iliad* 22.475 ἣ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη save for the intial pronoun.[221]

---

[216] In these two cases of Achilles at the end of the ἐπεί-clause, the pan-Homeric drive to place Achilles in line final position (and indeed the metrical impossibility of placing him in the left-detached position at the beginning of the line as mentioned in the next section) may account for its tail position (see Kahane 1994: 117, 156 on the 93.6% occurrence of Ἀχιλλεύς in line final position).

[217] It is observable that αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' is used thirty times across the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as a distant demonstrative, in referencing contexts where ὁ δ' might also have occurred were it not for the metre. But *αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἐπεί is a metrical impossibility and so is not seen as an uninterrupted phrase.

[218] Out of 128 instances with an elided subject, we have one first person singular, ten first person plurals, three duals, thirty five masculine singulars, four feminine singulars, and seventy five third person plurals (which all seem to relate to male only groups).

[219] These are listed in **Table 4.1**.

[220] Bolling 1959 notes *Iliad* 21.26 as coming after the caesura (page 23) and separately lists out *Odyssey* 11.98 and 21.296 without comment although they fall at the same position in the line.

## 4.7 Left-dislocated oblique case nouns and pronouns

### 4.7.1 Previous studies

Bolling classified some of the ἐπεί-clauses which were prefaced with an oblique case pronoun together with ἐπεί-clauses which were prefaced by nominative pronouns, describing them as where “an oblique case in the accompaniment has been drawn forward”[222] but classified others as where the “ἐπεί constituent is preceded by other sometimes longer parts of the sentence”.

As noted in the introduction, Slings recognised the possibility of left-dislocated items in oblique cases and was interested in the phenomenon as it appeared before subordinate clauses. His theory can be summarised as the proposal that if a left-dislocated noun had an agent-like function in the main clause it would be likely to appear in the nominative, but if the left-dislocated noun had a patient-like function, it would be likely to appear in the accusative. In fact, as we show below, the choice of an oblique case for the left-dislocated noun in Homer is simply determined by the syntax of the ἐπεί-clause.

The initial position of some of the oblique case pronouns performs a contrastive discourse function with preceding text. The oblique case pronouns are therefore analysed as two groups. First we consider those which most resemble the group of nominative left-dislocations.

### 4.7.2 Left-dislocated oblique case pronouns which perform no discourse function

We start by considering the six ἐπεί-clauses whose left-dislocated oblique case pronouns most resemble the syntax and function set out in Sections 4.5 and 4.6. Five of these ἐπεί-clauses describe the same event of bathing, as set out in the following table.

**Table 4.6.** Oblique case pronouns before the ἐπεί-clauses

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 24.587-588, *Odyssey* 8.454-456 | τὸν δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ<br>ἀμφὶ δέ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνα – main clause at 24.588, part of the ἐπεί-clause of *Odyssey* 8.455<br>(ἔκ ῥ’ ἀσαμίνθου βὰς ἄνδρας μέτα οἰνοποτῆρας – main clause of *Odyssey* |

---

[221] Reynen 1957: 22-23 explains the difference as reflecting a contrast between the light fainting of Laertes who arouses easily from this attack in a ἐπεί-clause which, according to Reynen, is therefore with αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, and the “deep, prolonged loss of consciousness” of Andromache from which she arouses with the Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause.

[222] Bolling 1959: 24-25.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | 8.456) |
| 2. | *Odyssey* 4.49-51, 17.88-90 | τοὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ,<br>ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρα χλαίνας οὔλας βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνας<br>ἕς ῥα θρόνους ἕζοντο παρ’ Ἀτρεΐδην Μενέλαον. (4.51)/<br>ἔκ ῥ’ ἀσαμίνθου βάντες ἐπὶ κλισμοῖσι καθῖζον (17.90). |
| 3. | *Odyssey* 3.455-456 | τῆς δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ μέλαν αἷμα ῥύη, λίπε δ’ ὀστέα θυμός<br>αἶψ’ ἄρα μιν διέχευαν, ἄφαρ δ’ ἐκ μηρία τάμνον |

### Syntax

The syntactic characteristics of these left-dislocated oblique case constructions are more or less identical to what we see with the nominative left-dislocations. [223] These characteristics bear no relationship to the schema suggested by Slings which may perhaps better suit later Greek:

1. The left-dislocated pronoun is elided in the ἐπεί-clause but functions in the ἐπεί-clause with the same grammatical case as it is found in in its left-dislocation.
2. The argument structure of the main clause is not congruent with the left-dislocated noun, so that:
    2.1. the dislocated noun is repeated in the main clause in the same case. See *Iliad* 24.587-589 of the first row of Table 3.5; or
    2.2. the dislocated noun is elided in the main clause where it functions as the subject. See the second row of Table 3.5; or
    2.3. the dislocated noun is picked up by an anaphoric pronoun in the main clause which is in a different case from that it in which it is dislocated in. See the third example.

### Referencing function

The referential relationship between these oblique case pronouns and their preceding referents is neither of the resumptive sort, nor of the “combination” sort. Rather, the referents are simply referring back to a preceding proper noun reference, thus creating cohesion back to the earlier reference and avoiding unnecessary repetition of the full noun phrase.[224]

In the case of left-dislocation of an oblique case noun or pronoun before the ἐπεί-clauses set out in

**Table 4.6** there is no organisation of the wider discourse which is performed by the left-dislocation: the referent is neither new to the text nor needing to be reintroduced after a hiatus. Nor is there any evident discontinuity or discourse boundary which might have needed to be marked by the left-dislocation. Rather, the left-dislocation operates at the level of the sentence to extract the topic – a topic which is common to the subordinate clause and the main clause - from the ἐπεί-clause and position it at the head of the sentence to facilitate processing of the main clause constituents.

---

[223] Again, we have counterevidence for any suggestion that the oblique case demonstrative pronoun must sit first in the clause. See *Iliad* 16.187 with ἐπεί, and *Iliad* 12.195 and Illiad 13.83 with ὄφρα.

[224] The explanation for the asymmetry between the nominative pronouns which generally mark a topic switch and oblique pronouns which seem to be able to mark a continuing topic or a topic switch must lie in the asymmetry between the typical elision of nominative subjects within the verbal conjugation and the retention of direct or indirect objects.

### 4.7.3 Left-dislocated oblique case pronouns which cohere the discourse

There are four further instances of left-dislocation of an oblique case pronoun. In these four instances a discourse function of cohesion of text is performed by the dislocation, in contrast to the intances of left-dislocation which have so far been examined. The first two instances perform a discourse function which appears to be independent of the following subordination. The third and fourth instances, on the other hands, are seen frequently before a different subordinating conjunction, namely ὡς.

**Table 4.7.** Oblique case nouns whose left-dislocation coheres the text

| **Type (I) μέν ... δ’ ἐπεί**[225] | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 6.422, 425-427 | οἳ μὲν πάντες ἰῷ κίον ἤματι Ἄϊδος εἴσω: / ... //<br>μητέρα δ’, ἣ βασίλευεν ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὑληέσσῃ,<br>τὴν ἐπεὶ ἂρ δεῦρ’ ἤγαγ’ ἅμ’ ἄλλοισι κτεάτεσσιν,[226]<br>ἂψ ὅ γε τὴν ἀπέλυσε λαβὼν ἀπερείσι’ ἄποινα, |
| 2. | *Iliad* 24.751, 754-755 | ἄλλους μὲν γὰρ παῖδας ἐμοὺς πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεὺς / ... //<br>σεῦ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐξέλετο ψυχὴν ταναήκεϊ χαλκῷ<br>πολλὰ ῥυστάζεσκεν ἑοῦ περὶ σῆμ’ ἑτάροιο |

---

[225] In theory, a nominative pronoun or noun-phrase could equally well perform the discourse functions described here.

[226] The distribution of the preposed noun phrase across two lines is found in similar manner before the ὡς subordinator at *Iliad* 19.282-283 Βρισηῒς δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτ' ἰκέλη χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ // ὡς ἴδε Πάτροκλον δεδαϊγμένον ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ.

| **Type (II) Bridging Function** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3. | *Iliad* 22.376-377 | τὸν δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐξενάριξε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς<br>στὰς ἐν Ἀχαιοῖσιν ἔπεα πτερόεντ’ ἀγόρευεν |
| 4. | *Odyssey* 11.34-35 | τοὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ εὐχωλῇσι λιτῇσί τε, ἔθνεα νεκρῶν,<br>ἐλλισάμην, τὰ δὲ μῆλα λαβὼν ἀπεδειροτόμησα |

### Syntax

As with the preceding left-dislocated items, the syntax can be described as follows:

1. The left-dislocated pronoun is elided in the ἐπεί-clause but functions in the ἐπεί-clause with the same grammatical case as is found in its left-dislocation.
2. The subject of the main clause is sometimes but not always grammatically congruent with the left-dislocated noun, so that:
   - 2.1. the left-dislocated argument is repeated in the main clause in the same grammatical case, as at *Iliad* 6.426-427; or
   - 2.2. the left-dislocated argument is elided in the main clause but is treated there in a different grammatical case, as in the second example above.

### Referencing and discourse function

The two sentences containing the ἐπεί-clauses of Type I take part in a μέν ... δε correlation,with both clauses describing the fate allotted to civilian victims of raids and wars. The common theme invites the hypothesis that the unusual syntax and textual relations of these two instances are limited in their productivity.

A textual bond between, on the one hand, the ἐπεί-clause and main clause and, on the other hand, the preceding sentence, is established both by the correlative μέν… δε relationship and by the left-dislocation. However, although the chapters on discourse function demonstrate that temporal ἐπεί-clauses typically cohere to earlier text, a further textual bond beyond that established by μέν and left-dislocated δέ is barely detectable with these two ἐπεί-clauses: we can say that the correlative construction is associated with an absence of the textual referencing which is traditionally found with ἐπεί-clauses. (The same cannot, however, be said of the cohering function of the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses which are also marked by correlatives.) In this regard, these two ἐπεί-clauses form part of a group of six Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses, whose discourse function is examined in Section 5.5.

The ἐπεί-clauses of Type II present us with two instances that may form part of the pattern that is seen frequently with ὡς-clauses. These two ἐπεί-clauses are distinctive for the absence of involvement of the referent of the left-dislocated pronoun in the main clause. Many ὡς-clauses resemble this construction, starting with an accusative pronoun which is then not referred to in the main clause, for example *Iliad* 3.21-23 τὸν δ’ ὡς οὖν ἐνόησεν ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος / ἐρχόμενον προπάροιθεν ὁμίλου μακρὰ βιβῶντα, / ὥς τε λέων ἐχάρη μεγάλῳ ἐπὶ σώματι κύρσας. See similarly *Iliad* 5.95, 5.711 etc.

A full understanding of these ἐπεί-clauses and of the ὡς-clauses with oblique-case left-dislocation can come only with a separate study of temporal ὡς. A preliminary assessment suggests that the pronoun may be placed before the subordinator to give it a bridging effect, asserting that the preceding scene with the referent of that pronoun is indeed linked to the following scene with the different subjects, creating through the cosmetics of syntax (since ordinarily a dislocated noun before a subordinate clause marks the topic of the main clause) an impression of continued involvement of the character of the preceding scene.

In the case of the second ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 11.34-35 it is possible that the word order arises in part as an awkward adaptaion of *Odyssey* 10.526 αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν εὐχῇσι λίσῃ κλυτὰ ἔθνεα νεκρῶν. But the precision with which the ἐπεί-clauses appear to be crafted makes it unlikely that this ἐπεί-clause would have been employed if it were syntactically or semantically unsuitable.

## 4.8 Left-dislocated subject and object

Muchnová noted an instance in Xenophon’s writings where both the subject and object were placed before the subordinator: *Hellenica* 1.6.24.2 οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ γεγενημένα καὶ τὴν πολιορκίαν ἐπεὶ ἤκουσαν, ἐψηφίσαντο βοηθεῖν ναυσὶν ἑκατὸν καὶ δέκα. Muchnová interpreted the subordinate clause as consisting of ἤκουσαν alone with the text before the subordinator as being “left-subordinated”.

This rare construction is found four times in the *Iliad* with temporal ἐπεί-clauses. The productiveness of such a construction is called into question by the fact that all four attestations of it share common language, with three starting with the word Ἕκτωρ, and the other use referring to Hector pronominally. The occurrences are set out below in **Table 4.8**. A fifth example of a left-dislocated subject and object is found with a non-temporal ἐπεί-clause *Iliad* 24.50-52 αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' Ἕκτορα δῖον, ἐπεὶ φίλον ἦτορ ἀπηύρα, / ἵππων ἐξάπτων περὶ σῆμ' ἑτάροιο φίλοιο / ἕλκει.

**Table 4.8.** ἐπεί-clauses with left-dislocated subject and oblique case noun

| **Left-dislocation of Hector and an object** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 6.474-475 | αὐτὰρ ὅ γ'[227] ὃν φίλον υἱὸν ἐπεὶ κύσε πῆλέ τε χερσὶν<br>εἶπεν ἐπευξάμενος Διΐ τ' ἄλλοισίν τε θεοῖσι |
| 2. | *Iliad* 15.716 | Ἕκτωρ δὲ πρύμνηθεν ἐπεὶ λάβεν οὔ τι μεθίει |

---

[227] The referencing of αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' at line 474 is out of harmony with the other 31 occurrences of this phrase. Here, αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' continues the subject of the previous line. Otherwise, αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' consistently (subject to this one exception) picks up a subject which has been left for a while and indeed seems to occupy the slot that ὁ δέ cannot take on at the beginning of a line (*Iliad* 2.667, 3.328, 5.308, 5.327, 5.585 etc.).

| **Left-dislocation of Hector and an object where Hector is marked by μέν** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3. | *Iliad* 16.762-763 | Ἕκτωρ μὲν κεφαλῆφιν ἐπεὶ λάβεν οὔ τι μεθίει<br>Πάτροκλος δ' ἑτέρωθεν ἔχεν ποδός |
| 4. | *Iliad* 17.125-127 | Ἕκτωρ μὲν Πάτροκλον ἐπεὶ κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἀπηύρα,[228]<br>ἕλχ' ἵν' ἀπ' ὤμοιϊν κεφαλὴν τάμοι ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ, / ... //<br>Αἴας δ' ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε φέρων σάκος ἠΰτε πύργον |

### Syntax

The relationship between the left-dislocated items and the ἐπεί-clause and main clause recalls that of the left-dislocation of single items examined so far. The dislocated subject and object are both the grammatical arguments of the ἐπεί-clause. Both items are also loosely performing the same grammatical function in the main clauses, with only the accusative υἱόν at *Iliad* 6.474 not performing that role in the main clause although remaining the subject of the direct speech that follows the main clause.

### Referencing and discourse function

The third and fourth ἐπεί-clauses in this group share the feature of contrasting μέν of the left-dislocated phrase with δέ of the subsequent sentence. The subordinate clause is effectively parenthesised inside the correlative relationship so that we call these two clauses "Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses"; the overriding correlative relationship seems to be associated with a dilution of the discourse function of the ἐπεί-clauses. As set out in Section 5.5, the event of these two subordinate clauses is not anticipated by the preceding text in the manner typical of the wider use of the preposed ἐπεί-clauses.

Muchnová's aforementioned example from Xenophon differs from the four Homeric examples in that the preposed object is not operative in the main clause. It may be that the example from Xenophon is representative of a literary style in which constituents can be moved around the sentence without the loss of intelligibility that might arise in an oral context.

## 4.9 Existing studies on the function of left-dislocation

It is generally held that left-dislocation is a syntactic construction which is selected to perform a particular discourse function. The most widely cited function is that of introducing or reintroducing a topic which functions as the topic for the following section of discourse; this is indeed what is generally suggested for Greek.

---

[228] Aristarchus recorded the phrase ἐπεὶ κλυτὰ τεύχε' ἀπηύρα, as an alternate tradition to *Iliad* 11.100's ἐπεὶ περίδυσε χιτῶνας:

### 4.9.1 Left-dislocation in general linguistics

As outlined in Section 4.2, identification of "nominative absolutes" and other instances of "unconstrued nouns" were originally based on apparent changes of case between the case of the initial noun and the case in which that noun was governed later in the clause. Paul explained the reason for the change of case as: "der bekannte Widerspruch zwischen grammatischen und psychologischen Subjekt wird so ausgeglichen daß das psychologische Subjeket im Nominativ, also in der Form des grammatischen Subjekts vorantritt und dann noch einmal durch ein Pronomen wider aufgenommen wird, dessen Form sich nach dem rein grammatischen Verhältnis bestimmt".[229]

More recently, now that left-dislocation (as it is now termed) recognises the continuation of the same grammatical case between the initial noun and the clause proper, various ideas on the reason for left-dislocation have been developed and continue alongside each other. It is beneficial to quote Tizón-Couto's recent summary of the different trends in interpretation:-

> *"The functionality of LD in discourse, as well as its structure and interpretation, can be viewed from several perspectives. First, from a cognitive or informational perspective, LD would be the means to avoid grammatical complexity, to avoid new elements in argument position and to ease processing. In other words, LD is a possible method to obey the cognitive-linguistic limitations given in linguistic interaction."*
>
> *"Second, from an interactive point of view, LD would be the means to negotiate referents and compete for or gain the floor."*
>
> *"Last, from a more specific point of view that I term (con)textual, the most cited main 'referent foreground/setting' function of LD can be argued to achieve more specific shades affected by contextual features and speakers' attitudes."*[230]

Working backwards, the final perspective listed was the one which first gained currency. Keenan and Schieffelin 1976 were early proponents of the idea that the left-dislocation of a noun achieves a discourse function, such as that of establishing a new referent as central to the following discourse while at the same time marking out a new section, or of reintroducing a referent into the discourse and making it the "centre of attention". They offered examples such as "Uh Pat McGee. I don't know if you know him. He lives in Palisades", and "An' so my red sweater, I haven't seen it since I got it". Regarding the first example, they noted that "the introduction of "Pat McGee" initiates a case history relevant to the current topic or concern of the interlocutors."[231] S. C. Dik followed these pioneers on the discourse function of "left-dislocation", but named the "left-dislocated" noun a "theme".[232]

---

[229] Paul 1901: §199.

[230] Tizón-Couto 2008: 244-245.

The second perspective identified above by Tizón-Couto related to heavily interactive dialogue, where one person may wish to establish their right to speak on a matter by asserting what the subject matter is before going into detail. This idea does not directly touch on the Homeric picture, except to the extent that the idea was first formulated by Duranti and Ochs (1979) in respect of data from Italian. Certain valuable observations which are pertinent to Greek were made regarding how a verbal zero-anaphora language can display left-dislocation.

The first idea mentioned above is derived from the highly original work of Prince. She suggested that a number of unconnected functions of left-dislocation can be seen in different environments in English. She identified three of these functions: simplifying discourse processing, triggering a (po)set inference,[233] and amnestying an island violation.[234] Prince emphasised that these functions cannot be united under an umbrella function: "what is to be taken as a single syntactic form, Left-Dislocation, in fact has three separate functions, distinguishable on distributional (and possibly prosodic) grounds, and [these] functions differ in type as well as substance."[235] This identification of different functions for left-dislocation supports our proposal in the following sections that the function of left-dislocation before a subordinate clause in Greek is distinguishable from what is identified for other instances of left-dislocation.

The first function identified by Prince is not a discourse function, but rather a syntactic result of processing/cognitive needs determining the linguistic shape of an utterance. It is the most similar in its cognitive orientation to what we suggest in this chapter regarding left-dislocation before subordination; but the details are different. She proposed that "a 'Simplifying' Left-Dislocation serves to simplify the discourse processing of discourse-new entities by removing them from a syntactic position disfavored for discourse-new entities and creating a separate processing unit for them. Once that unit is processed and they have become discourse-old, they may comfortably occur in their positions within the clause as pronouns."[236]

---

[231] See Keenan and Schieffelin 1976: 243-244. See also Givón 1988.

[232] Dik 1978: 132-141.

[233] This is formulated as "a 'Poset' Left-Dislocation serves to trigger an inference on the part of the hearer that the entity represented by the initial NP stands in a salient partially-ordered set relation to some entity or entities already evoked in the discourse model". One of the examples offered is "She had an idea for a project. She's going to use three groups of mice. One, she'll feed them mouse chow, just the regular stuff they make for mice. Another, she'll feed them veggies. And the third she'll feed junk food." (See pages 123-124.)

[234] This is formulated as being "the result of an attempt to produce a syntactically impossible Topicalization, where the pronoun is of the 'resumptive' type, occurring instead of the illicit gap." One of the examples offered is "There are always guests who I am curious about what they are going to say". (See page 130ff.)

[235] Prince 1997: 135.

[236] Prince 1997: 122.

Prince suggested that subjects in the possessive form, in the nominative form, or in an embedded clause were disfavoured syntactic roles for new subjects. In the formulation of Prince there is then a sentence-level need to restructure the syntax so that the syntax is managed easily from a cognitive perspective. Interestingly, three of the examples are of left-dislocation before a subordinate clause: “The guy, when he came over and asked me if I wanted a route, he made it sound so great”, “Any company, if they’re worth 150 million dollars, you don’t need to think for a minute they’re not gonna know what you’re doin’” and “My grandmother, I remember when she used to work, we’d get mild and a pound of butter”.

### 4.9.2 Left-dislocation in Greek

The studies and comments on left-dislocation in Ancient Greek are largely unanimous in their view that a discourse function is performed by left-dislocation. They vary in the finer details of that function, but the formulations are largely derivative of the formulations of Keenan and Schieffelin referred to above, as refined in the Functional Grammar of Dik 1997 with the terminology of “theme” for left-dislocation. Only Bertrand’s study stands out, both for its suggestions that there is no distinguishing discourse function to be found with left-dislocation and for its thoroughness.

Bakker’s formulation set the tone for the observations that recur with later scholars of word order in Greek. He stated that “the basic function of themes is to specify the ‘domain’ (universe of discourse) within which (or the entity about which) the subsequent clause(s) say(s) something [...] In continuous narration, a theme effects what may be called a topic switch, as we have seen in the previous section, while in conversation a speaker may utter a theme constituent to establish the leading topic of the subsequent conversation”.[237]

Bertrand found no difference in information marking or discourse management function between fronted noun phrases and left-dislocated noun phrases. Both, he found, could mark new topics, contrastive topics, topics belonging to a wider group, the resumption of a topic or the conclusion of a paragraph. The thoroughness of Bertrand’s study is compelling. Bertrand in effect rejected the applicability to Ancient Greek of the Functional Grammar framework to left-dislocation. He did not return to a consideration of the more prevalent cognitive based ideas of manageability; rather, he concluded that the theme bore no functional characteristics but rather only syntactically distinct characteristics.[238]

Comments by literary scholars draw on the prevailing view of the discourse-function of left-dislocation. For example, regarding *Iliad* 13.1 Ζεὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρῶάς τε καὶ Ἕκτορα νηυσὶ πέλασσε, Janko states that "the prominence of Zeus's name stresses that the success is his more than Hector's".[239]

---

[237] Bakker 1990: 11. Muchnová adopted a similar formulation as outlined in the following section.

[238] Bertrand 2010: 277-281.

### 4.9.3 Left-dislocation before a subordinate clause in Greek

By reference to a couple of examples from Herodotus, Bakker extended his thoughts on Greek left-dislocation to cover dislocation before a subordinate clause. The left-dislocated noun-phrase is, according to Bakker, the "thematic participant" in the "new event sequence" which is marked out in the "frame" achieved by the sub-clause,[240] suggesting that left-dislocation was particularly suitable before a subordinate clause thanks to its introduction of a new theme.

Slings considered only left-dislocation before subordinate clauses. However, as noted above, he relied on a Fränkel postpositive marker for confirmation of left-detachment. This reliance threw up markedly complex left-dislocated phrases. So, alongside his identification of a principal function of left-dislocation as being a strategy to mark "here is something with respect to which I am going to produce a predication", he then identified a further three factors which may act singly or in combination to encourage the use of a "theme":

1. "for someone who wishes to produce a predication with respect to something which is mainly or entirely new information, a Theme construction is an obvious strategy";
2. "if a potential Topic has focal properties, then there is, again, the danger of an overload of focality in the clause; a focal Topic plus a Focus. This, too, may lead the speaker to use a chunking strategy, for instance a Theme construction"; and
3. "a potential Topic constituent may simply be too long to be accommodated within the clause, because lengthy clauses are avoided in natural language use".[241]

Bertrand later noted that although Slings may have been referring to weighty left-dislocated phrases, he (Bertrand) had found one example with a left detached σύ and one with a left detached ὅ.[242] In other words, Bertrand was of the view that Slings may have been attaching undue significance to aberrant instances of left-dislocation.

Muchnová expressly relied on Bakker's formulation in her examination of nine instances of left-dislocation before a subordinate clause in Xenophon.: left-dislocation (i) reintroduces a referent that was not until then in the foreground of the discourse or introduces a new topic, and (ii) marks discontuity and hence a boundary and break between the preceding narrative and what follows.[243]

---

[239] Janko 1994: 42.

[240] Bakker 1993: 285-286.

[241] Slings 1997: 196.

[242] Bertrand 2010: 279.

[243] Muchnová 2011: 75.

Allan noted that “themes and setting clauses are often combined”, but did not attempt an explanation of this coincidence, unlike Bakker 1993.[244] Similar to his predecessors, Allan found that a left-detached noun before a subordinate clause reintroduces “a topic which has been out of the centre of attention for a while” and “resumes the narrative revolving around the discourse topic.”[245]

As with the more general investigations on left-dislocation in Greek, these formulations on discourse function are not compelling. None of the aforementioned scholars has compared these left-detached subordinate clauses with subordinate clauses whose subject is within the clause itself.

## 4.10 The discourse simplifying function of left-dislocation before subordinate clauses

In Sections 4.5 to 4.7 we showed that whenever the express grammatical subject of the ἐπεί-clause continues as the subject of the main clause or, less frequently, continues to play the role of an oblique argument, the subject of the ἐπεί-clause is left-dislocated. In the light of the Homeric tendency towards a limited range of phrasal patterns, it has been important to note that bespoke ἐπεί-clauses which occur line-medially also favour left-dislocation. The only exception to a left-dislocated position is where the subject is metrically awkward so that it cannot be placed comfortably before the subordinator, in which case the subject is placed within the ἐπεί-clause, as outlined in Section 4.6.3 above.

The fact that there are options, guided by metrical needs, suggests that the placing of the noun before the subordinator is a *tendency* rather than a rule. This optionality of where to place the subject is echoed by the optionality of the selection of cataphora in English in sentences with preposed subordinate clauses; as outlined in Section 4.10.4 below it seems likely that cataphora and left-dislocation are different responses to a shared linguistic tendency to expel the topic (typically the subject) from the ἐπεί-clause where it is shared with the main clause.

We noted in Sections 4.5.5, 4.7.3 and 4.8 that there are six instances where the left-dislocation creates a bond with surrounding text and performs there a discourse function. But in general there is no discourse function performed by left-dislocation before the ἐπεί-clause. The referencing relations of introducing a resumed or combined topic (in the case of pronouns) or a new topic (in the case of nouns) are normal for information marking. We did not look in any detail at the matter of *topic persistence* – i.e. whether the left-dislocated items continue as the subject of text for a longer period than the same items when they are not left-dislocated which has been suggested by some as a reason for left-dislocation, as noted in the preceding section –

---

[244] Allan 2012: 8, 20. “Setting” is adopted from Dik 1997 to refer to “adverbial clauses preceding the (main) clause which specify time, location and/or other circumstantial state of affairs”.

[245] Allan 2014: 189-190.

for the simple reason that all the evidence points to another reason for the left-dislocation: the syntax of subordination. When we discuss the parallel phenomenon of cataphora in Section 4.10.4 we will draw on Prince’s observations on a cognitive motivation for left-dislocation in some cases.

Below we bring together different pieces of evidence in favour of what we can term “discourse simplifying left-dislocation”, i.e. left-dislocation which serves to introduce the subject of a postposed main clause at the earliest stage in a sentence. In Diessel 2005 it is argued, based on evidence from an English corpus, that a postposed main clause gives rise to a longer “recognition domain” of a sentence than a preposed main clause, since the hearer is alerted to the presence of a complex sentence in the former case (because of the initial subordinator) and so postpones complete processing until the entire sentence is uttered. By bringing forward the argument of the subordinate clause (in the case where it is shared with the main clause), the hearer is provided with some of the information necessary to begin comprehending the main clause, which, we hypothesise, simplifies and expedites processing of the discourse.

### 4.10.1 Summary of positive evidence from ἐπεί

As outlined in the preceding sections, dislocation of a noun or pronoun before a subordinate clause appears to occur where that noun is the topic of the preposed subordinate clause and main clause. The grammatical case of the noun always reflects the syntax of the preposed subordinate clause, and sometimes, but not always, reflects the syntax of the main clause.

### 4.10.2 Negative evidence from ἐπεί

On twenty two occasions the express subject of an ἐπεί-clause is not continued into the main clause, neither syntactically nor topically. In all such cases the subject is found after ἐπεί, although on many occasions the subject would have been a good metrical fit before the subordinator. The post-subordinator position of these nouns confirms the impression of a pattern whereby a noun is left-dislocated before a preposed subordinate clause only where it is the topic of the main clause.

Seven of the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses contain express nouns in their subordinate clause, for example *Iliad* 13.174-175 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Δαναῶν νέες ἤλυθον ἀμφιέλισσαι, / ἂψ εἰς Ἴλιον ἦλθε, μετέπρεπε δὲ Τρώεσσι. As is the case with all Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses, as discussed further in Section 6.4Chapter 6, the subject and events of the preposed subordinate clause do not share their scene with that of the main clause. No Correspondent ἐπεί-Clause is preceded by a left-dislocated noun. In Section 3.8, we note that αὐτάρ is prefaced to all Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses and would seem to bear contrastive meaning. But this use of αὐτάρ would not itself have precluded a noun phrase following it, with both items then being left-dislocated before the subordinator.

Regarding the metrical flexibility of νέες ἀμφιέλισσαι of the example cited above, we can note that a line-initial phrase *νῆες δ Ἀργείων ἐπεί [ἤλυθον] would have been a fine metrical fit for the preposed subordinate clause. The collocation of νῆες and Ἀργείων is well-attested, see *Iliad* 12.246, 16.272, 17.165, 19.236 etc. It might have been thought that the low animacy of the ships might push them to a late position in the clause, but see *Iliad* 7.467, 14.75, 15.564, *Odyssey* 7.328 etc. where ships stand at the head of the line.

The events of a further fourteen Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses share their scene with that of the main clause, but the role played by the subject of the subordinate clause in the scene of the subordinate clause is, in one way or another, fleeting, so that the subject of the subordinate clause is not active in the main clause. Consider, for example, *Odyssey* 9.362-363 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωπα περὶ φρένας ἤλυθεν οἶνος, / καὶ τότε δή μιν ἔπεσσι προσηύδων μειλιχίοισι where the wine is the agent of the Cyclops's drunkenness but is not mentioned again in the main clause or following clauses.[246] οἶνος, which is the subject of this example, could, from a metrical perspective, have stood at the beginning of the line as *οἶνος ἐπεί; indeed οἶνος appears at the head of the line at *Odyssey* 21.293 and 295.

Finally, on a further four occasions the events of the ἐπεί-clauses share their scene and subject with that of the main clause, but the subject in the ἐπεί-clauses does not, informationally, need to be supplied, but functions as a "reiterating synonym" and therefore sits at the tail and is not left-dislocated,[247] for example, at *Iliad* 18.614-615 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πάνθ' ὅπλα κάμε κλυτὸς ἀμφιγυήεις, / μητρὸς Ἀχιλλῆος θῆκε προπάροιθεν ἀείρας we have an epithet for Hephaestus at the end of the subordinate clause instead of line initial *Ἥφαιστος δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν.[248]

### 4.10.3 Evidence from other subordinators

The other Homeric temporal subordinators are divisible into two groups by reference to whether the preposed subordinate clauses and main clauses share their scenes or not. Whereas there is a tendency for the scenes of ἐπεί, ὅτε and ὡς-clauses to be shared with their main clauses, there is little or no connection of subject matter between the preposed subordinate clauses and main clauses of ἕως, εὖτε and ὄφρα, to the extent that two different scenes are typically depicted in the two clauses.

The difference in scene continuity between the two groups is parallelled by a difference in distribution of left-dislocated nouns or pronouns. Whereas the first group displays frequent left-dislocation, the latter group displays it only on the rare occasions that there is scene (and subject) continuity between the preposed subordinate clause and the main clause.

---

[246] See also *Iliad* 1.605, 16.187-188, 18.349, *Odyssey* 10.360, 11.385-386, 12.1-4, 12.13, 12.364 and *Odyssey* 24.71 and also the following instances which happen to start with a left-dislocated pronoun but are then followed by a nominative noun in the subordinate clause: *Iliad* 24.587, *Odyssey* 4.49-50, 8.343-455, 14.175-177 and 17.88-89.

[247] See the discussion in Halliday and Hasan 1976: 280ff. on the function of "reiterating synonyms".

[248] Like *Odyssey* 8.272 Ἥφαιστος δ' ὡς οὖν. See also the three other instances of ἐπεί-clauses with reiterating synonyms: *Iliad* 19.54, *Odyssey* 6.99 and 11.246.

By way of example, when ἕως is used in preposed subordinate clauses (on fourteen occasions), it marks either (i) two dynamic events executed by two different people during the same time period, (ii) a state and a dynamic event undergone and executed by two different people respectively, or (iii) very rarely, a state and a dynamic event undergone and executed by one person simultaneously.[249]

For groups (i) and (ii) the subject of the subordinate clause is placed after the subordinator; an elided subject is not attested,[250] for example, (i) *Iliad* 15.539-540 ἕως ὃ τῷ πολέμιζε μένων, ἔτι δ’ ἤλπετο νίκην, / τόφρα δέ οἱ Μενέλαος ἀρήϊος ἦλθεν ἀμύντωρ, and of group (ii) *Iliad* 1.193-194 ἕως ὃ ταῦθ’ ὥρμαινε κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν / ἕλκετο δ’ ἐκ κολεοῖο μέγα ξίφος, ἦλθε δ’ Ἀθήνη.

For group (iii) the subject stands at the head of the subordinate clause and main clause. This is confined to two instances at *Odyssey* 12.327-328 οἱ δ’ εἵως μὲν σῖτον ἔχον καὶ οἶνον ἐρυθρόν / τόφρα βοῶν ἀπέχοντο λιλαιόμενοι βιότοιο and *Odyssey* 19.530.

### 4.10.4 Discourse simplifying left dislocation as an alternative to cataphora

Modern English subordination allows cataphora from pronominal substitution in a preposed subordinate clause to a co-referential full form in the main clause, for example: “when she feels bored, Mary will watch television”.[251] Thus, in the subordinate clause it is possible, although not obligatory, for the two grammatical subjects to be referring to the same person. On the other hand, in the coordinated sentence “she feels bored and Mary watches television” the two grammatical subjects cannot refer to the same person. This possibility of cataphora has been noted as a possible general discriminant for distinguishing coordination from subordination cross-linguistically.[252]

Carden noted that “the majority of [Carden’s] backwards-anaphora examples involve a single structural type, where a genitive pronoun or a Ø in a preposed adverbial refers to the subject of the following main clause”. Carden suggests that cataphora, which we see so very much with subordinate clauses, is not employed for discourse function purposes, but rather for syntactic reasons which are independent of rules of anaphora. Regarding this type of cataphora, Carden suggested that a speaker may prefer a pronominal genitive over a full noun-phrase genitive.[253]

---

[249] See Chantraine 1963: 261 for an account which is briefer than this.

[250] The motivation for restating the grammatical subject as is seen with ἕως ὃ must be to draw a distinction between the subject of the ἐπεί-clause and that of the main clause. But see *Iliad* 15.539.

[251] This example is taken from Quirk et al. 1972: 577. As noted by Quirk et al., the reverse with the full subject in the ἐπεί-clause and the substituted subject in the main clause (which is what we see in Homeric Greek) is also possible in English.

[252] See Haspelmath 2004b: 30, paraphrasing Yuasa and Sadock regarding coordination: “A pronoun in the first clause cannot corefer with a full NP in the second clause”, as mentioned also in Bril 2010: 3. Cristofaro 2003: 17 mentions cataphora briefly.

Carden's suggestion that a genitive may not want to carry a full noun-phrase recalls Prince's views outlined in Section 4.9.1. There we noted that Prince suggested that subjects in the possessive form, in the nominative form, or in an embedded clause were disfavoured syntactic roles for new subjects and might therefore be left-dislocated. Perhaps cataphora and left-dislocation are alternative responses across a variety of syntactically challenging positions. At any rate, as far as Homeric left-dislocation is concerned, placing the subject *within* the preposed ἐπεί-clause seems to be avoided while yet being tolerated where metrically necessary.

No examination of cataphora in subordination has been undertaken to date for Classical Greek or Homeric Greek, nor indeed to my knowledge of any other ancient Indo-European language. Given that it is thought that in English cataphoric subordination is not only discretionary for the speaker, but is indeed often the "marked" form,[254] no definitive theories can necessarily be deduced on the back of an ancient corpus when it fails to display cataphora in subordination.

### 4.10.5 Cataphora in Homer

There is no cataphora of the grammatical subject in ἐπεί-clauses. On the rare occasions that there is an elided subject in the subordinate clause and an express subject in the main clause (with both subjects being of the same person and number), the context tells us that the subject of the two clauses is different, see for example *Odyssey* 14.11-112 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δείπνησε καὶ ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῇ, / καί οἱ πλησάμενος δῶκε σκύφος, ᾧ περ ἔπινεν, and *Odyssey* 19.505-506 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νίψεν τε καὶ ἤλειψεν λίπ' ἐλαίῳ, / αὖτις ἄρ' ἀσσοτέρω πυρὸς ἕλκετο δίφρον Ὀδυσσεὺς.

If such sentences had been English sentences there would have been ambiguity in the mind of the audience, albeit typically brief thanks to the context, as to the identity of the subjects; such ambiguity is a product of the optionality present in English syntax. We must wonder whether the Homeric poet would have chosen such a construction if it had given rise to ambiguity; in other words, we may tentatively conjecture that a cataphoric interpretation was not available. On all such occasions the contextually singular interpretation is that that express subject is *different* from the subject of the subordinate clause.

## 4.11 Prolepsis before a Complement Clause

Akin to left-dislocation is the phenomenon of "prolepsis", sometimes known as "anticipation". Prolepsis is where the subject of a complement clause is anticipated and made the object of the verb of the preceding main clause, such as at *Iliad* 2.409 ἤδεε γὰρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀδελφεὸν ὡς ἐπονεῖτο, where ἀδελφεόν precedes the subordinator ὡς.[255]

---

[253] See Carden 1982: 374.

[254] Reinhart 1976: 27 observes that when both anaphora and cataphora are permitted by the grammar, cataphora is only used when there is a reason to do so.

Prolepsis is traditionally explained as giving a more "prominent place to the subject", as presenting the subject as "more lively", or as a means of "emphasising or throwing into relief the main idea or ideas of the utterance".[256] A fresh approach was offered in Panhuis 1984 who applied the framework of "Functional Sentence Perspective" (with its notions of theme, rheme and communicative dynamism) to this construction. Panhuis argued that the "proleptic constituent occurs earlier in the sentence... in order to secure that the subordinate clause, which as a whole is very rhematic, is disturbed as little as possible by thematic elements".[257]

Panhuis's analysis bears some resemblance to the approach taken to left-dislocation in this chapter, inasmuch as Panhuis suggests that a component of a complement clause may be extracted from that clause and placed in the main clause due to its communicative properties. However, in its treatment of the complement clause as rhematic Panhuis's categorisation departs from the thematic-rhematic assessment which would be afforded to the Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses if we adopted the Functional Sentence Perspective framework. As set out in the following chapters on discourse function, the ἐπεί-clauses offer little or no new information and as such are better classified thematic rather than rhematic; if we applied Panhuis's approach, the subject of a thematic ἐπεί-clause would not require extraction from that clause since it is already in a thematic environment. A combined study of prolepsis and of left-dislocation might therefore benefit from a common theoretial framework to enable us to explore the possibility that the same mechanisms may underpin the shared feature of the postioning of a component of the subordinate clause before the clause itself.

## 4.12 Conclusion

Left-dislocation before an ἐπεί-clause in Homer takes the syntactic form of grammatical agreement with the subordinate clause and of topical agreement with the main clause. There is then a two-fold dislocation. Slings 1997 suggested that a left-dislocated item before a preposed subordinate clause related to the following complex of clauses. As far as the data from ἐπεί is concerned, the relationship between the left-dislocated item does not extend beyond the sentence. We suggest that there is what we can term "proximate" left-dislocation between the left-dislocated item and the subordinate clause and "anacolouthic" left-dislocation between the left-dislocated item and the main clause. The distinction between proximate left-dislocation in which the syntax is maintained and anacolouthic left-dislocation where the distance between the dislocated item and the clause is too great for grammatical case to be followed may be of wider application than just before the preposed subordinate clauses.

---

[255] See Kühner-Gerth 1904: 577-580 and Smyth 1956: 488.

[256] See the citation by Panhuis 1984: 26-27 of Smyth 1956, Kühner-Gerth 1904 and Gonda 1958 respectively.

[257] *Idem*, 37.

The reason for the left-dislocation before the subordinate clauses is not usually motivated by performing a discourse function. Rather, it is the natural, even default, way of ordering a sentence which consists of a preposed subordinate clause and main clause where the subject of the preposed subordinate clause continues into the main clause, typically as the subject but not necessarily so.

# Chapter 5 Discourse Function: Overview

## 5.1 Discourse analysis and subordination

Analysis of the grammar of text beyond the level of the sentence arose in the late1950s and and reached a particularly fertile period in the 1970s.[258] Study of subordinate clauses, in particular of adverbial clauses, early on occupied a prominent position in this field of “discourse analysis”. Longacre, for example, published in 1968 an account of discourse in Philippine languages in which he noted that one discourse “paragraph” might be marked off from a succeeding “paragraph” by the use of a temporal adverbial clause at the beginning of the succeeding paragraph which referred to the final event of the preceding paragraph (“head-tail linkage”) in a form of back-referencing. He also noted that one sentence might be linked in a similar back-referencing way to the next sentence through a subordinate clause.[259] Longacre’s earlier observations on backward reference is later supplemented by various studies including Thompson 1987 in which English adverbial clauses are found to recapitulate, summarise or point backwards in the text in some other way.

Save for the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses and those ἐπεί-clauses of the *Iliad* which start books, Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses fall into the categories identified in the work of Longacre and Thompson. The clauses cohere back to preceding text in a variety of ways, as explored in Chapter 6. There is a special type of backwards cohesion performed by the subordinate clauses which are explored in Chapter 7: this cohesion somewhat resembles Longacre’s head-tail linkage, in which Completive ἐπεί-Clauses refer back to the final event of the preceding line. However, the function of such clauses is closely linked to the durative nature of the events described in these clauses. In general, any correlation between durative events and the use of subordinate clauses has gone unmentioned in the general literature on subordinate clauses; the Homeric data should be able to contribute to a broader picture of a possible correlation.

Individual ideas which were developed within discourse analysis have also been applied to the sub-field of analysis of subordination structures. In particular, the idea of the linguistic marking of “foregrounding” clauses versus “backgrounding” clauses of Hopper 1979 and of Hopper and Thompson 1980[260] was applied a few years later to subordination by scholars such as Reinhart, with the suggestion that a subordinate clause would present backgrounded information whereas a main clause would present foregrounded information.[261] A variant of this idea of backgrounded information is found in the work of, among others, Ramsay, who writes of preposed “when-clauses” as providing a “frame” for the material that follows.[262]

---

[258] Brown and Yule 1983 is the classic textbook from the 1980s on discourse analysis which gives a good representation of the achievements of the thirty years preceding the book.

[259] As summarised in Thompson, Longacre and Hwang 2007: 273-275.

[260] Where a correlation is observed between verbal aspect, word order and case marking on the one hand and backgrounding/foregrounding on the other hand.

[261] Reinhart 1984: 782-791 explored various meanings of foregrounding and backgrounding. We can attempt to summarise her wide-ranging observations as follows: foregrounding is where temporally ordered clauses contain the “narrative skeleton”. Backgrounding provides information or evaluation

The discourse function of Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses, which are discussed in Chapter 6, fall within the domain of foregrounding/backgrounding or of framing. A superficial assessment would suggest that preposed ὅτε-clauses and ὡς-clauses also perform this function.

### 5.2 Discourse analysis and temporal subordination in Ancient Greek

The idea that temporal subordination can create a relationship with surrounding text and not just within the single sentence came relatively late to Ancient Greek linguistics. Bakker 1991 was a pioneering article in investigating differences in discourse function in *oratio obliqua* (with a basic accusative-infinitive syntax) between preposed temporal ὡς-clauses employing the indicative and those employing the infinitive.[263]

Illustrated by a Herodotean passage containing nine indicative subordinate clauses and seven subordinate clauses with infinitives rather than indicative verbs, Bakker suggested that the indicative ὡς-clauses had only a discourse organisation function and did not themselves propel the narrative forward.[264] Thus, for example, one of the indicative clauses, according to Bakker, relates to the same theme as that of the preceding paragraphs (building a treasure store room), while at the same time acting as a paragraph-separator.[265] Another clause, according to Bakker, which introduces the arrival of a new day, is used as a paragraph marker to distinguish the narrative regarding the events of the previous day from those of the following day. The infinitive ὡς clauses, on the other hand, “propel the narrative forwards” and do not organise the text.

Buijs’s 2005 investigations into what motivates Xenophon’s choice between a participial clause and an ἐπεί / ἐπειδή / ὡς clause inevitably sacrificed depth for breadth as regards accounting for the meaning of the subordinators. Perhaps Buijs’s clearest statement on ἐπεί’s fuction is that “an ἐπεί- clause reflects the speaker’s organization of events in the depicted world in that it introduces a new stage in the development of the story-line by

---

material which is not on the temporal line. Reinhart (page 796) offered the examples of *While Max was doing the dishes, Rosa sneaked out* and *Thinking about his beloved aunt, Max scratched his car* as examples of the distribution of backgrounded and foregrounded material between subordinate and main clauses respectively.

[262] Ramsay 1987: 246.

[263] As noted by Bakker, the existence of the two different morphosyntactic constructions had been noted previously by Cooper 1971, 1974 but without a real explanation for the motivation behind the two forms.

[264] “Propelling the narrative forward” is associated with events to be found in the main clause rather than in a subordinate clause. As summarised by Thompson 1987: 440ff., a number of studies (including Labov and Waletzky. 1967 and. Labov 1972) have found that events that form part of the story line, in particular those providing new information of an event in a sequence of events, will not be found in a subordinate clause.

[265] With the benefit of our study on Homeric Completive ἐπεί-clauses, we might in fact view this use as completive, thus recoginising the duration of the event.

presenting a factual statement which the reader/hearer needs in order to comprehend the sequel."[266] At certain points Buijs's analysis observes a relationship between the event of the ἐπεί-clause and preceding text[267], but this is never asserted as a feature peculiar to ἐπεί-clauses. Buijs's citations and analysis of subordinate clauses in Xenophon is an excellent source for considering subordination in fifth-century Greek and offers various perspectives, but self-avowedly does not formulate generalisations of the discourse function.

Finally, the various studies on word order as determined by discourse function in Ancient Greek have tended to include a brief summary on temporal subordinate clauses, which they tend to term "settings", and their position in the sentence. These observations do not include anything apparently unique to Ancient Greek, but rather simply adopt the language and analysis of general linguists. Thus, Allan 2012 offers one example of a "setting clause" from Herodotus and summarises that a typical setting clause "creates both an anaphoric link to the preceding discourse, [as well as providing a background] to the subsequent discourse unit".[268]

## 5.3 Discourse function of Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses in Homer

Reynen's 1957 monograph on οὖν with ἐπεί provided an account unparallelled in its detail of how subordinate clauses with οὖν related back to its preceding text. He regularly writes of the ἐπεί-clauses "connecting back" and equally of "standing in the background" of the events that follow. We often adopt Reynen's observations in this study, but depart from him in finding that there is no lesser connection with the preceding text where the ἐπεί-clauses are without οὖν.

Muchnová 2011 dedicated two pages to the discourse function of preposed ἐπεί in Homer. The study did not expressly consider only temporal examples, but the six instances selected appear to be temporal. Muchnová suggested that the six instances perform the same discourse function as that which she had identified for Xenophon: "la proposition en ἐπεί ... signale une nouvelle étape dans le développement du récit ou résume ce qui a été dit auparavant, servant ainsi de tremplin pour un nouvel épisode (ou une de ses parties)".[269] Drawing further on her analysis of the Xenophon examples, Muchnová classified the first of her examples as "circumstantial" and the remaining five as "temporal". As regarding the Homeric position, we do not find any benefit to this distinction.

The first example Muchnová cites is *Iliad* 1.57, which we classify as a "Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clause" in Section 6.2. Muchnová's analysis above applies particularly well to this example. As we note in Section 6.2, Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses leave behind a preceding event or series of preceding events to restart the narrative from a new tangent.[270]

---

[266] Buijs 2005: 7.

[267] *Idem*, 168 on Xenophon's *Hellenica* 6.1.1-3 ἀφικνεῖται πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ... ἐπεὶ ἀφίκετο εἰς τὴν Λακεδαίμονα where Buijs describes the ἐπεί-clause as a "back reference" to the earlier statement.

[268] Allan 2012: 21.

[269] Muchnová 2011: 145.

But the five other examples that Muchnová cites[271] are all what we term "Completive ἐπεί-Clauses", as classified in Chapter 7. In these instances, as we note in Chapter 7, there is continuity of scene and perspective, with no marking of a new stage. Muchnová does not labour too hard to force these instances into the general mould, although she does suggest that they mark out "mini-étapes". But nor does she exclude them from her umbrella category of marking new stages / resumption for the purposes of introducing a new episode.[272]

## 5.4 Discourse function of Postposed Subordinate Clauses and Suppletion

Regarding the discourse function of postposed adverbial clauses (including temporal clauses), it has been summarised that "adverbial clauses in final position often have a local function, elaborating on the [state of affairs] of their main clause by specifying reasons, temporal circumstances, etc."[273] This view goes back at least as far as Chafe who found that preposed (in contrast to postposed) adverbial clauses tended to "provide a temporal, conditional, causal or other such orientation for the information in the upcoming main clause".[274]

The discourse function of a broad selection of postposed Homeric ἐπεί-clauses was studied by Muchnová. The selection chosen by Muchnová was, however, non-temporal clauses, but is still of interest for the broader picture of the discourse function of ἐπεί. In accordance with the more widely held view on the function of postposed subordinate clauses, Muchnová indeed found that the ἐπεί-clause related to its preceding main clause, acting to justify the speech act of the main clause.[275] Muchnová noted that while the function of the clause related back only to the main clause, the *contents* of the main clause consist of universal truths or of information already known to the audience based on earlier text which occurs before the main clause. For example, in respect of *Odyssey* 1.220 ἐπεὶ σύ με τοῦτ᾽ ἐρεείνεις, Muchnová noted that in addition to justifying the previous speech act of assertion of the main clause, the ἐπεί-clauses restates that which is already known, namely the question posed back at line 206.[276]

---

[270] *Ibid*.

[271] *Iliad* 1.458, 464, 467, 469 and 484.

[272] See Muchnová 2011: 146.

[273] Verstraete 2004: 824. An example to illustrate this idea is offerd by Verstraete *idem*, 821-822: "All week we were unable to ski Gers, a steep bowl with Flaine's best powder runs, because of avalanche risk. On our last day it opened *as* we were passing."

[274] Chafe 1984: 444. See also Givón 1990: 844-847, Bakker 1991: 233 234, Ford 1993 and Diessel 2008.

[275] Muchnová 2011: 116-140.

[276] Muchnová 2011: 138.

A ready selection of postposed temporal ἐπεί-clauses to consider are the postposed clauses of seeing previously identified as such by Reynen.[277] (Reynen himself did not suggest any difference in function between pre- and post- posed ἐπεί-clauses of seeing.) If we examine the first two instances of postposed clauses describing seeing, we find that they describe unanticipated perception.

At *Iliad* 5.508ff. a summary of the reasons behind Ares's vigour on the battlefield is offered. We are told that that Apollo had instructed Ares to act, when he had seen (ἐπεὶ ἴδε) that Athena was no longer on the battlefield, an absence-and a sighting of such absence-which had not been mentioned previously. Similarly, in *Iliad* 11, Nestor recounts to Patroclus some of his own military adventures as a young man. In combat against the Epeians, Nestor struck dead the leader of the Epeians' horsemen. The Epeians fled in disarray upon seeing that their leader had fallen (ἐπεὶ ἴδον ἄνδρα πεσόντα, line 745). It makes full sense within the storyline that the other Epeians would see their struck leader, but it is not something expressly anticipated.

So, we find that the lack of a wider textual link renders these postposed temporal ἐπεί-clauses characteristic of what is generally postulated for the discourse function of postposed adverbial clauses. But in their lack of a wider link these clauses are not representative of ἐπεί: they contrast with the Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses all of which are found to link back, and, as noted above, Muchnová found that *non-temporal* postposed ἐπεί-clauses link to the wider speech context.

In fact, it may be the case that these temporal postposed ἐπεί-clauses are doing the work of a number of subordinators: postposed ὡς-clauses of seeing are not attested and, in general, temporal postposed ὡς-clauses seem not to be attested. Similarly, postposed temporal ὅτε clauses are not found, with ὅτε being used only as a relative marker for postposed clauses. In Homer, postposed ἐπεί-clauses can probably be described as the suppletive form of postposed ὡς clauses.[278]

## 5.5 Discourse function of Parenthetical and Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses

There are no published cross-linguistic studies of the discourse function of parenthetical subordinate clauses. As noted in Section 2.3, it is rare to find any mention by scholars of an intermediate position for subordinate clauses. We find that there is a difference in discourse function between the Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses and the preposed ἐπεί-clauses of seeing (*Iliad*

---

[277] Reynen 1958: 68 n. 3 identified the full list of such clauses: *Iliad* 5.508ff., 11.744ff., 12.83, 12.399f., 16.210f., 16.659f., 18.226ff., 18.234ff., *Odyssey* 2.155, 4.523, 10.151f., 10.219, 11.615, 21.83, 23.90ff. There is a vll. of *Odyssey* 11.390 with ἐπεὶ ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι alternating with ἐπεὶ πίεν αἷμα κελαινόν.

[278] An asymmetry in usage of subordinators between initial and final position seems to be known. Diessel 2005: 464-465 noted that the great majority of postposed causal closes in his English corpus were marked by *because*, but that causal clauses that precede the main clause are typically marked by *since* or *as*.

4.217, 5.27-28 and 11.459),[279] with the discourse function of the Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses recalling postposed clauses.

Seven Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses were set out at **Table 2.1** in Chapter 2 and for ease of reference are set out again below at **Table 5.1**. As far as the Homeric evidence from Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses goes, it appears that the discourse function of parenthetical subordinate clauses should be distinguished from that of preposed subordinate clauses. It was noted in Section 2.3.1 that the sentences of **Table 5.1** form part of a structurally wider sequence of text. Aside from the Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses which are discussed below in this section and the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses, Preposed ἐπεί-Clauses are not linked by particles to surrounding text; see Section 4.5.4 for some observations on the absence of any μέν … δέ correlation when a left-dislocated pronoun is employed before ἐπεί.

**Table 5.1.** Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses

| **Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses with local Discourse Function** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 9.195 | ὣς δ’ αὔτως Πάτροκλος, ἐπεὶ ἴδε φῶτας, ἀνέστη |
| | See similarly *Iliad* 16.427, 17.60, 22.236-237, *Odyssey* 10.414-415 and 23.214 | |
| **Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clause with broad Discourse Function** | | |
| 2. | *Iliad* 8.10, 397 | ὃν δ' ἂν ἐγὼν ἀπάνευθε θεῶν ἐθέλοντα νοήσω / ... //<br>Ζεὺς δὲ πατὴρ Ἴδηθεν ἐπεὶ ἴδε χώσατ’ ἄρ’ αἰνῶς |

We can look at the discourse function of the subordinate clauses of the first two instances. At *Iliad* 9.195 Patroclus stands up upon seeing the Embassy to Achilles, in a manner similar to that of Achilles who just rose to his feet. While it is predictable from the context that Patroclus will see the two men (two lines earlier Achilles leaps up to greet the men), we do not find here either that Patroclus is urged to catch sight of the two men (as we see with the ἐπεί-clause of seeing set out in Section 6.3.4 in the following chapter) or that it is anticipated that Patroclus would look out for the two men. The subordinate clause simply informs the audience of the trigger for Patrolcus also responding to the arrival, namely that he too saw the men arrive.

Similarly, at *Iliad* 16.427, Patroclus leaps out of his chariot upon seeing Sarpedon. Looking out for Sarpedon had not before then been a matter of interest for Patroclus: the subordinate clause does not answer any prior build up to looking out for Sarpedon. Rather, it explains why Patroclus left the comfort of his chariot.

In thegroup of subordinate clauses of seeing, the clause of *Iliad* 8.397 should probably be distinguished from the other five instances by reference to the absence of any structural relationship between the full sentence and the sentence of the preceding or following text, and by reference to the fact that Zeus's sighting of the events is foreshadowed back at *Iliad* 8.10 when Zeus warns that he will deal violently with any god that he sees going off to assist either the Trojans or the Greeks.

---

[279] The Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses of seeing at *Iliad* 12.143, 15.279 and 15.395 seem to perform a discourse function similar to the parenthetical and postposed clauses, as discussed in Section 6.4.

It was noted in Section 2.3.2 that six preposed ἐπεί-clauses resemble the Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses in their discourse function although their syntax recalls that of conventional preposed clauses. These six clauses are set out below. All six of these clauses are embedded in wider correlative constructions.

**Table 5.2.** Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Noun/pronoun + μέν … noun/pronoun + δ' ἐπεί** | | |
| 1. | *Iliad* 6.422, 425-427 | οἳ μὲν πάντες ἰῷ κίον ἤματι Ἄϊδος εἴσω: / … /<br>μητέρα δ', ἣ βασίλευεν ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὑληέσσῃ,<br>τὴν ἐπεὶ ἂρ δεῦρ' ἤγαγ' ἅμ' ἄλλοισι κτεάτεσσιν,<br>ἂψ ὅ γε τὴν ἀπέλυσε λαβὼν ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα |
| 2. | See also *Iliad* 24.754-755 | |
| **οὐδέ … ἀλλ' ὅ γ' ἐπεί** | | |
| 3. | *Iliad* 6.504-506 | οὐδὲ Πάρις δήθυνεν ἐν ὑψηλοῖσι δόμοισιν,<br>ἀλλ' ὅ γ', ἐπεὶ κατέδυ κλυτὰ τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ,<br>σεύατ' ἔπειτ' ἀνὰ ἄστυ ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι πεποιθώς. |
| 4. | See also *Iliad* 24.12-15 | |
| **Noun/pronoun + μέν + ἐπεί … noun/pronoun + δ'** | | |
| 5. | *Iliad* 16.762-763 | Ἕκτωρ μὲν κεφαλῆφιν ἐπεὶ λάβεν οὔ τι μεθίει:<br>Πάτροκλος δ' ἑτέρωθεν ἔχεν ποδός… |
| 6. | See also *Iliad* 17.125-126 | |

The tight bond between the correlative sentences evidently discourages relationships being made in other directions; perhaps it also reduces the cognitive space available for development of the components of the individual sentences. So, the discourse function of the subordinate clause within such a bond is reduced to supplementing the information in the main clause; it does not itself link to preceding or following text.

We will examine two examples. In the first instance Andromache reminds Hector that she is an orphan, having been bereaved of her father by Achilles when he attacked her parents' city, and having lost her mother to a later slaughter after her mother's release from captivity by Achilles. The reference to the mother's captivity by Achilles is in the ἐπεί-clause. Before this reference we have no specific knowledge that would lead us to expect that the mother was taken captive rather than killed.[280]

In the third instance cited Paris’s arming of himself, as described as concluded in the subordinate clause, is somewhat predictable from *Iliad* 6.340, some one hundred and sixty lines earlier where Paris had told Hector that he would arm himself. But, while we find this type of physical verbal gap very occasionally between the beginning of an action and its completion the uncertainty as to whether or not the action is completed distinguishes this gap; here the audience has no certainty after line 341 that Paris is indeed arming himself during the period (lines 341-503) when Hector is busy in the palace – the narrative may take a different direction in which Paris has chosen not to arm himself after all despite assuring Hector that he would do so. In fact Paris does arm himself as captured in the subordinate clause, but its distance from the original pronouncement means that it does not share with the other affirmative protases that direct responsiveness. The subordinate clause simply serves to elaborate on the context in which the event of interest – namely rushing out of the palace – takes place. [281]

## 5.6 Preposed Temporal Subordination with ὡς and ὅτε

### 5.6.1 ὡς-clauses

There are forty six preposed temporal ὡς-clauses in Homer.[282] Chantraine notes that Homeric temporal ὡς is particularly associated with verbs denoting perception:, such as *Iliad* 3.396 καί ῥ’ ὡς οὖν ἐνόησε θεᾶς περικαλλέα δειρὴν, 15.379 Τρῶες δ’ ὡς ἐπύθοντο.[283] Reynen 1958 demonstrated that whereas the ὡς-clauses typically include an object of perception which has already been described in the preceding lines, thus creating a sequential link between the ὡς-clauses and the preceding text, the event of perception which is described in the ὡς-clause is not itself foreshadowed by the preceding text.

Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses which denote seeing or hearing are – with certain exceptions - distinguishable in their function from preposed temporal ὡς-clauses, since the ἐπεί-clauses describe perception which has been expressly anticipated in preceding text. In Section 6.3.4 we compare *Odyssey* 10.453 οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ ἀλλήλους εἶδον φράσσαντό τ' ἐσάντα, with *Odyssey* 24.391 οἱ δ' ὡς οὖν Ὀδυσῆα ἴδον φράσσαντό τε θυμῷ, observing that whereas the former relates back to a solicitation to look, the latter is a sighting which has not been textually anticipated.

---

[280] Kirk 1990: 216 notes in respect of this ἐπεί-clause that it was military custom not to kill the women in battle but to take them captive.

[281] Perhaps it is coincidence that the subjunctive instance of οὐδέ ... ἀλλ' ἐπεί at *Iliad* 22.258 and at Xenophon’s *Hellenica* at 2.4.19.1 cited by Muchnová (see Chapter 1) also relate to arming for battle (although *Iliad* 22.258 describes the stripping of armour (the ἐπεί-clause of *Iliad* 24.14 instead refers to the yoking of horses).

[282] Tebben 1994 and Tebben 1998.

[283] Chantraine 1963: 254-255.

### 5.6.2 ὅτε-clauses

There are one hundred and sixty four preposed ὅτε-clauses.[284] As part of the research for this study it has been observed that Homeric ὅτε-clauses are divisible into three simple groups, namely (i) arrival at a place, (ii) the introduction of a new time period (through expressions such as "when Zeus brought the third day") and (iii) action, typically presented in the narrative portion of direct speech[285] which triggers a change in the trajectory of the narrative, so that the main clause and following clauses contrast with the events that occurred before the subordinate clause.

The first two groups of ὅτε-clauses fit well into the broad designation of backgrounding or "framing", as described by Ramsay 1987: arrival at a place is on the storyline, but at the same time, particularly with the ὅτε -clauses, the arrival sets the physical scene, sometimes extending over many lines.[286] The ὅτε-clauses in the third group are not backgrounded and their events are not predictable,[287] but typically introduce a change to the trajectory of the narrative which either starts with, or is triggered by, the events of the subordinate clause. They are predominantly found in the narrative passages of direct speech.

Unlike ἐπεί-clauses, ὅτε-clauses do not cohere back to an express anticipation in the preceding text; but sometimes the events follow on logically, even predictably, such as the arrival of a sixth day after the mention of the preceding five days.

## 5.7 Discourse Function of Preposed Temporal ἐπεί -Clauses in fifth-century Greek

In fifth-century Greek the division of labour between ἐπεί and other anterior temporal subordinators does not correspond to that seen in Homer. Regarding the discourse function of the other subordinators in fifth-century Greek, Bakker wrote of a forthcoming study in which he would distinguish between the function of ἐπεί and ὡς in Greek narrative;[288] but this study is outstanding. Buijs 2007 admitted that he does not succed in identifying a difference in function in Xenophon’s work between ἐπεί and ὡς.[289]

---

[284] *Ibid.*

[285] The extent of the poet's consciousness that the narrative ὅτε clauses are within direct speech is evidenced by the first person subjects at (i) *Odyssey* 4.252-255, 10.17-18 and 10.249; and (ii) κεῖνος at *Iliad* 6.200 and *Odyssey* 3.286-8 and κεῖθεν at *Odyssey* 4.519. κεῖνος is a demonstrative pronoun for deictic referencing by speakers.

[286] See most notably *Iliad* 6.242ff., 24.448ff., and *Odyssey* 9.181ff.

[287] For example, in Odysseus' account of events in *Odyssey* 10, Eurylochus had witnessed the metamorphosis of his comrades into swine by Circe and had rushed back to the waiting comdades at the sea shore. His experience left him mute (line 246), but when, in the ὅτ-clause, he was questioned by his comrades, he opened up (in the main clause).

[288] Bakker 1991: 234 n.16.

The discourse function of temporal ἐπεί-clauses in Xenophon is analysed briefly by Muchnová. She cites four examples from the *Hellenica*. :

> *3.1.4.1-3.1.5.1 οἱ δ’ ἔπεμψαν τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν τριάκοντα ἱππευσάντων, νομίζοντες κέρδος τῷ δήμῳ, εἰ ἀποδημοῖεν καὶ ἐναπόλοιντο. ἐπεὶ δ’ εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀφίκοντο, συνήγαγε μὲν στρατιώτας καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἠπείρῳ Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων.*
> *3.1.6.1 ἐπεὶ δὲ σωθέντες οἱ ἀναβάντες μετὰ Κύρου συνέμειξαν αὐτῷ, ἐκ τούτου ἤδη καὶ ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις ἀντετάττετο τῷ Τισσαφέρνει,*
> *4.38.1 ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡμέρα ἐγένετο καὶ τὰ πεπραγμένα ἐπύθοντο οἱ Μαντινεῖς, εὐθὺς πέμποντες εἴς τε τὰς ἄλλας Ἀρκαδικὰς πόλεις προηγόρευον ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις εἶναι.*
> *2.2.1.1 ἐπεὶ δὲ τὰ ἐν τῇ Λαμψάκῳ κατεστήσατο, ἔπλει ἐπὶ τὸ Βυζάντιον.*

In all four cases she suggests that they create a referential frame for the events that follow, although in the case of the last example she varies it slightly to say that the subordinate clause creates “le point de départ pour une nouvelle étape dans le récit”.

## 5.8 Book divisions marked by an ἐπεί-clause

The use of an adverbial clause at the beginning of narrative which summarises preceding events and orientates the audience is well known, both across world literature and languages[290] and within Greek literature.[291] Contrary to a chorus of scholarship suggesting that there is nothing distinctive about the way in which ἐπεί (or ὡς for that matter) is used at the beginning of books when compared with its use within books, it is noticeable that it is only when ἐπεί is used at the beginning of books that it performs a broad orientating function.

*Iliad* 3, 13, and 15, and *Odyssey* 11 and 12 start with temporal ἐπεί-clauses. Enjambed *Iliad* 23.1-2 αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ / ἐπεὶ δὴ νῆάς τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἵκοντο can also be fruitfully classified together with this group of book-initial ἐπεί-clauses. *Odyssey* 11.385 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ψυχὰς μὲν ἀπεσκέδασ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλῃ is likewise usefully included in an examination of such a group; the subordinate clause marks a resumption of Odysseus’s account of his *nostos* to the Phaeacians which had been interrupted by Odysseus himself at *Odyssey* 11.328-384.

The discourse function of some of the aforementioned clauses is distinguishable from the discourse function of temporal ἐπεί-clauses when employed *within* books. Specifically, the four *Iliadic* temporal ἐπεί-clauses and *Odyssey* 11.385 relate back to preceding text and relate forward to the following text in a manner not attested where the temporal ἐπεί-clause is found *within* a book. This observation is germane to the unresolved question of when and how the Homeric poems were divided into forty eight books.

---

[289] Buijs 2007: 22 n.28.

[290] Labov and Waletzky 1967: 32 noted that it is characteristic of most narrative to a greater or lesser degree, to place clauses relating to “orientation” at the beginning of the narrative. They noted that they “serve to orient the listener in respect to person, place, time, and behavioral situation”. Longacre 1979: 118.

[291] See the brief comments of Muchnová 2011: 67 and Bakker 1991: 239 n.19

### 5.8.1 Limited range of techniques for starting books

Investigations into the origins of the division of each of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* into twenty four books has traditionally focused on the internal unity (or otherwise) of each book. But a study in the 1970s by Goold followed the linguistic orientated focus of the oral-formulaic hypothesis and argued that in addition to good structuring of content of individual books, the beginning and end of books "are, for the most part, marked by formal and thematic features characteristic of the style and design of the poems as a whole". He noted that "for the most part the action of a unit is brought to an end by the advent of night or sleep (book-end), and the action of the next unit begins with dawn or the initiavei of a sleepless person (book-beginning)", and further that "the significance of these book-divisions would be seriously compromised if similar breaks were found in the middle of books. They are not. Occasionally dawn does rise in the middle of an Iliadic book (cf. 1.477; 23.109; 23.226; 24.788), but in no case is a break in the action indicated. Obviously, when dawn rises four times in the course of the Cyclops story (Od. 9.152; 170; 3-7; 437), there is no question of a partition in the text. Nor at 4.306 (in the middle of the Spartan book), 5.228 (in the middle of the Calypso book), or 10.187 (in the middle of the Circe book)."[292]

Interest in the wording of book endings and book beginnings was futher sparked by the appendix on book divisions in Stanley 1993. By reference to the verbal patterns at the beginning and end of books, Stanley strove to illustrate that the book divisions of the *Iliad* were the "product of creative adjustment of material at hand... [at] a stage in the rhapsodic period rather than prior to it". Stanley concluded that there are four major types of transition: (1) a summary typically involving a ὥς statement, although the construction as a ὥς clause is sometimes absent, (2) a shift from a general scene to a close-up, (3) temporal discontinuity and change of scene, and (4) where the divisions bisect a continuous narrative of action by the same individual or group.[293]

Stanley classified the ἐπεί-clauses at the beginning of *Iliad* 13 and 15 in his first group of transition strategies, namely in the sub-category of those where a book-initial summary is provided but is not in the form of a ὥς clause. Stanley commented that in both of these cases the "previous book has ended with a retrospect of its own, and the new summary is inessential"; but he also noted that the summary at the beginning of *Iliad* 15 "reinforces the picture of Trojan rout with further details",[294] which as we shall ourselves explore touches on the fact that the ἐπεί-clause in fact provides new information. The ἐπεί-clause at the beginning of *Iliad* 3 was placed into the fourth group, described as marking a "transition from Trojan Catalogue to armies". The ἐπεί-clause of *Iliad* 23.1-2 was not discussed (as indeed in general it is disregarded by those who investigate book-divisions), the attention instead being on the ὥς clause at the beginning of *Iliad* 23 which allows it to be classified in the first of Stanley's groups.[295]

---

[292] Goold: 1977: 26-28.

[293] Stanley 1993: 249-261.

Skafte Jensen, in her own words, further "develop[ed] and expan[ded] the findings of Edwards and Stanley". She allowed the examination to extend from the *Iliad* to include also the *Odyssey* and tabulated the beginning and end of all forty eight Homeric books. Skafte Jensen published a study in 1999 in which she argued on a number of grounds "for the song division being a genuine part of the text".[296] She tabulated against the beginning and end of each song the types of transitional passages used for the transition from one book to the next: among other starting points, she noted that there is very often a summary at the beginning of a book and that the previous books are closed with "some kind of rounding off".[297] Skafte Jensen also noted that a book is "regularly connected with the preceding one by means of a particle" and even mentioned the four instances in which the books start with αὐτὰρ ἐπεί.[298]

The overwhelming reaction to Skafte Jensen's study was to suggest that the techniques of transition could equally be found within the text. Edwards's response was echoed by a number of respondents to Jensen's initial position: "It seems to me that MSJ's careful analysis and tabular survey of the transitional passages between books suffers (as does Stanley's fine study of these transitions) from a failure to recognize that these transitional passages are identical in language and content with the 'paragraph'-divisons which occur throughout both poems. Therefore, in my opinion no analysis of the phrasing at the 46 book-divisions is completely satisfactory unless these 46 breaks are compared with the thousands (surely) of 'paragraph'-divisions which do *not* coincide with book-divisions, to see if and how the wording differs between those which fall at book-end and those which do not".[299]

---

[294] *Idem*, 252-253.

[295] Edwards 1994: 451 similarly limited his investigations to the *Iliad*. He noted that "the books are most frequently introduced with a phrase summarizing the preceding action (ὣς οἳ μέν, ὣς ὃ μέν, ἄλλοι μέν) followed by words introducing a new scene (books 2, 9, 10, 12, 16, 18, 20, 22, 23). In other cases there is a different summarizing phrase (book 3), or the preceding book ends with a summary (before the start of books 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15)."

[296] Skafte Jensen 1999: 14.

[297] *Idem*, 14-19.

[298] *Idem*, 20.

[299] Edwards 1999: 52. See similarly Heiden 1999: 55: "Since many perceived poetic unities and narrative transitions occur within "songs" ..., [Skafte Jensen]'s own criteria might suggest that the epics could have been "divided" into many more than the 48 "songs" transmitted by the tradition", and de Jong 1999: 63: "Since [the singer] could never sing these enormous songs at one go, he must have employed certain devices to create-natural or dramatic-pauses, the most important being sunrises and

It is precisely such a comparison that Edwards recommends that we can offer as regards the ἐπεί-clauses. But our comparison focuses not on the wording of the ἐπεί-clauses (which displays no particular differences from other ἐπεί-clauses), but rather on its discourse function, i.e. its relationship to preceding and following text.

### 5.8.2 The unique discourse function of certain book-initial ἐπεί-clauses

As far as *Iliadic* book divisions with ἐπεί are concerned, a distinction can be drawn between the book-internal use of ἐπεί and the use of ἐπεί at the beginning of books. In fact, in its entry for αὐτάρ (in which all instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί were classified according to the relationship of the ἐπεί-clause to preceding and following text), *LfrgE* placed *Iliad* 3.1, 15.1 and *Odyssey* 11.385 in a separate group which extended to include only three other instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, namely at *Odyssey* 4.233, 12.260 and 391 and a "borderline" case of *Odyssey* 8.24 (as well as one instance of αὐτάρ + proper noun at *Odyssey* 24.472).

In contrast with the other two classifications of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses proposed by *LfrgE* (namely, a predominating group where the clause is described as resuming the immediately preceding text, and a second smaller group where the clause is classified as contrasting a later action or state which is described in the subordinate clause with an earlier state), these instances are distinguished for referring back to a relatively more remote episode ("eine weiter zurückliegende Episode") and, in the words of *LfrgE*, αὐτάρ "macht vielmehr einen Neuanfang oder leitet zum Hauptgeschehen zurück".

In similar terms, Reynen distinguished Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν of *Iliad* 13.1 from other instances of ἐπεὶ οὖν (while at the same time asserting its credentials for belonging with the other ἐπεί-clauses): "the ἐπεὶ οὖν clause is referring to Zeus's promise of *Iliad* 11.186ff. to grant Hector overwhelming strength... such a backwards referring from *Iliad* 13.1 back more than 1,100 verses may at first glance seem fantastical, but it is not so. This is because behind the foregrounded battle scene the power of Zeus to be felt everywhere."[300]

*LfrgE* and Reynen each considered only a sub-section of temporal ἐπεί-clauses - in the case of *LfrgE* only those clauses which started with αὐτάρ were considered, and in the case of Reynen only those clauses which contained οὖν. The task that falls to the current study then is to investigate in the round, i.e. by reference to all temporal ἐπεί-clauses, (i) whether it is the case that book initial ἐπεί-clauses perform a different function from the various discourse functions which are identified as being performed book-internally by ἐπεί-clauses, and (ii) if the first point is affirmative, how the additional clauses which *LfrgE* distinguished and classified together with the book initial clauses are to be treated.

---

sunsets, changes of scene, and summaries. These elements are also found in the middle of books, and their use therefore did not automatically signal a pause."

[300] Reynen 1957: 34.

### 5.8.3 Detailed discussion of book-initial ἐπεί-clauses

1/ The ἐπεί-clause of *Iliad* 3.1 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόσμηθεν ἅμ' ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕκαστοι has unusually large reach, looking back either to when first the Greeks from line 494 and then the Trojans from line 805ff. streamed onto the battlefield, or looking back only to when the Trojans emerged. While ἕκαστοι at the end of the ἐπεί-clause is generally interpreted to refer just to the Trojan army on the basis that the immediately preceding text referred to the Trojan army,[301] the main clause which consists of a μέν and δέ structure, in which first the Trojans and then the Greeks are referred to, leaves the ἐπεί-clause ambiguous as to which armies are referred to in the ἐπεί-clause.

Whether the ἐπεί-clause refers only to the Trojan battalions or also to the Greek battalions, the ἐπεί-clause has an unusually broad perspective, relating back over a description of at least 72 lines. It serves to conclude the description of the Catalogues and then to turn to the confrontation of the two sides: in its function of turning to a new episode of narrative, this ἐπεί-clause is also aberrant when compared with the book-internal ἐπεί-clauses.

2/ In another unique use of an ἐπεί-clause, at *Iliad* 13.1 Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρῶάς τε καὶ Ἕκτορα νηυσὶ πέλασσε Zeus is unexpectedly presented as the agent of the Danaan rout to the ships which occured at the end of *Iliad* 12. Zeus had indeed pronounced back at *Iliad* 11.186ff. that he would grant Hector the upper hand against the Achaeans once Agamemnon had been taken out of battle.

Regarding the possibility of intended cohesion between *Iliad* 11.186 and *Iliad* 13.1, Reynen commented that “a backward referencing from *Iliad* 13.1 over more than 1,100 verses may at first glance seem fantastical but [...] behind the foregrounded battle scene the power of Zeus is to be felt everywhere”.[302] Zeus is indeed mentioned a number of times between the initial pronouncement and the ἐπεί-clause including some 34 lines before the end of *Iliad* 12 where Zeus is described as granting the greater glory to Hector who leaps inside the Achaean wall. But irrespective of the logical and consistent links between the ἐπεί-clause and preceding text, using an ἐπεί-clause to bring a new character onto the scene and presenting him expressly for the first time only in that clause as active in the specific events of the subordinate clause is unique within the Homeric poems.

3/ The two line ἐπεί-clause at the beginning of *Iliad* 15 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ διά τε σκόλοπας καὶ τάφρον ἔβησαν / φεύγοντες, πολλοὶ δὲ δάμεν Δαναῶν ὑπὸ χερσίν describes a full rout of the Trojans. As noted by *LfrgE* in its examination of the relationship of the αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clause to preceding text, the end of *Iliad* 14 merely consists of accounts of the *aristeia* of Ajax (from line 504) and of other Greeks;[303] a rout is not mentioned.

---

[301] Krieter-Spyro 2009: 12.

[302] See Reynen 1957: 33-34 for a similar discussion on the link between declaration and ἐπεί-clause.

In fact, in the final seventeen lines of *Iliad* 14 only one mention is even made of any warriors on the battlefield retreating. But this one reference does not make clear whether reference is being made to the movement of the Trojans, or whether indeed it is simply a generic reference which is intended as nothing more than an epithet of Ajax: Ajax is described at lines 520-521 as οὐ γάρ οἵ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπισπέσθαι ποσὶν ἦεν / ἀνδρῶν τρεσσάντων. This is an explanatory or epexegetical clause responding to the preceding line's statement on the high number of Trojans that Ajax caught and killed, with Ajax being described as ταχύς.

However, Janko indicates that a rout *is* to be inferred from the language used at *Iliad* 14.506ff. and the actions described in that passage;[304] but we must take exception to this interpretation. First, Janko states that "mass hand-to-hand combat often leads to a rout", implying that the audience should understand that these accounts of hand-to-hand combat indicate here an imminent rout. Yet such combat has been underway since line 442 with heroes from each side in turn temporarily gaining the upper hand and no rout directly followed any of those encounters.

Janko also states that "there are verbal parallels with the beginnings of other Homeric routs", substantiating this by noting that line 507 πάπτηνεν δὲ ἕκαστος ὅπῃ φύγοι αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον is identical to that of *Iliad* 16.283. But the act of peering about when described in *Iliad* 16 is not used as a metaphor for, or metonym of, flight itself and so we cannot assume that here movement is denoted.[305] Further, it is stated that "the old variant for 506" τοὺς δ' ἄρα πάντας ὑπὸ τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα is from *Iliad* 8.77 καὶ πάντας ὑπὸ χλωρὸν δέος εἷλεν. But although at *Iliad* 8.77 that phrase indeed precedes a rout, that same line does not precede a rout at either *Odyssey* 22.42 or 24.450. Given that the *Odyssey* does not tend to describe military combat, more significant is a further observation that the Iliadic occurrences of the shorter phrases τρόμος ἔλλαβε γυῖα (*Iliad* 3.34 and 24.170) and χλωρὸν δέος (*Iliad* 7.479 and 17.67) do not precede a rout either. Finally, while Janko correctly cites *Iliad* 5.37 Τρῶας δ' ἔκλιναν Δαναοί as the relevant comparandum for line 508 ἐπεί ῥ' ἔκλινε μάχην κλυτὸς ἐννοσίγαιος, the former can most naturally be interpreted as a physical movement backwards of the Trojans, whereas the latter suggests a swing in fortune on the battlefield which does not necessarily imply a rout of either side.

The ἐπεί-clause bears an imprecise relationship to the preceding text, taking a leap in the sequence of events beyond the point reached at the end of *Iliad* 14. In its relationship to the preceding text, the ἐπεί-clause cannot then be classified as a Completive ἐπεί-Clause. Nor should it be classified as an Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clause as the vagaries of Homer’s battles mean that even when it is clear that one side will prevail, the timing and nature of any ultimate rout is still to be determined and is not an inevitable immediately following step.

---

[303] Even Stanley 1993: 253 who posited a pattern of book initial summaries for many of the Homeric books recognises that the ἐπεί-clause which starts *Iliad* 15 is not a mere restatement of information already known, describing it rather as "reinforce[ing] the picture of Trojan rout with further details".

[304] Janko 1992: 224.

[305] At *Iliad* 16.283 the lexically identical line seems rather to express general fear.

That the interim success of the Greeks that comes at the end of *Iliad* 14 would culminate in a rout was not foretold by the gods in the narrative that precedes the description. Indeed, it cannot be said that the rout is the fulfilment of an earlier prediction. The ἐπεί-Clause of *Iliad* 15.1-2 cannot then be classified as a Remote Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clause.

The event of the main clause and subsequent lines turns away from the rout to the gods, specifically to Zeus’s discovery of Hera’s deception which had been described in the preceding book. The main clause divides into a μέν limb which describes the Trojans frozen in fear next to their chariots and a δέ limb in which Zeus wakes up. The poem then occupies itself with the dénouement of Hera’s plotting and Zeus’s discovery, returning to the Trojans at line 241 with the urging of Apollo to Hector to rise and fight again. In summary, the ἐπεί-clause refers back with a broad brush perspective to what has gone before, easing the way for the main clause to change scene.[306]

4/ Clause initial (but line final) αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοί of *Iliad* 15.1-2 αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ / ἐπεὶ δὴ νῆάς τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἵκοντο is linked through correlative particles to the preceding clause which starts with οἳ μέν at the beginning of line 1.[307] The event of the ἐπεί-clause itself responds to Achilles’s jubilating cry to the Achaeans of 22.391-2: νῦν δ’ ἄγ’ ἀείδοντες παιήονα κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν / νηυσὶν ἔπι γλαφυρῇσι νεώμεθα, τόνδε δ’ ἄγωμεν. After these lines the scene had first narrowed to Achilles’s treatment of Hector’s body and then shifted focus to the Trojans’ grief at what was unfolding before their eyes.

*Iliad* 23.1-2 returns the audience to the Achaeans, describing them as having arrived back at their camp. But there is an uncharacteristic leap in the narrative between Achilles’s urging to go back to the camp and their arrival at the camp: there is no intermediate account of the actual journey to the camp. Exceptional for an ἐπεί-clause, we have here entirely new information that cannot be said to follow naturally or inevitably from what has preceded. The main clause and the following text remain with the same scene although move briskly onto a next stage, namely the formal mourning of Patroclus. Yet again then we find that this book-initial ἐπεί-clause distinguishes itself from other ἐπεί-clauses, most notably the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.

---

[306] It is interesting to consider Iliad 8.343-344 where a mid-book ἐπεί-clause with the wording of *Iliad* 15.1-2 occurs (save for a switch of roles between the Trojans and Achaeans). Here, the relationship of the ἐπεί-clause to preceding text is one of completion of an event described in the preceding text, and is thus starkly different from the relationship borne by the same ἐπεί-clause at *Iliad* 15.

[307] This sequence of line final αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ contrasting with the preceding subject (typically pronoun plus μέν, but not always) is seen a further eleven times (*Iliad* 1.27, 11.326 etc.). See the entry for αὐτάρ

5/ The ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 11.1 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλθομεν ἠδὲ θάλασσαν, displays a well attested resumptive completive function as discussed in Appendix 3 under the heading "Travel: Travel by Sea – Arriving at the Seashore".

6/ The ἐπεί-clause of *Odyssey* 11.385-386 is included in this group because the pause in Odysseus's narrative which this clause resumes is so deliberately long, so expressly portrayed as a break from narrative and so sharply delineated from Odysseus's non-narratival dialogue that it is of itself, irrespective of whether there were a wider group of narrative resuming clauses, a distinct resumer of narrative.

Odysseus's narrative break at lines 328- 384 (known as the "Intermezzo") within the narrative of the *Odyssey* is not currently thought of as late or an interpolation.[308] It is therefore particularly interesting to examine this instance of managing the resumption of narrative as coming without the possible labelling of late or artificial. We accordingly start with this instance.

Immediately prior to the Intermezzo, Odysseus had been recalling the various female ghosts which had arisen when Odysseus had summoned all manner of ghosts from his dug out pit. The ghost of Teiresis, his reason for summoning the ghosts, has already been and gone. So had the ghost of his mother. The turn of the women was lengthy and numerous, prefaced with αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες / ἤλυθον, ὤτρυνεν γὰρ ἀγαυὴ Περσεφόνεια, (*Odyssey* 11.225-6). Characters, many of which are otherwise not mentioned in the *Iliad* or Odysseus, are enumerated: Tyro, Antiope, Alcmene, Megara, etc. (lines 235 to 327).

The interruption of Odysseus's narrative opens with Odysseus saying that he would need the remainder of the night to list out all the rest of the women that he saw. Rather, he asserts at lines 330-331: ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥρη / εὕδειν. Odysseus suggests he could sleep on the ship or at Alcinous's palace. There follows a discussion among the Phaeacian nobles which tangentially relates to whether they should host their guest at the palace, but more ostensibly is a general discussion round their positive feelings towards him. Alcinous concludes it by insisting that Odysseus remain with them at least until the next day (lines 350-351) and then urges Odysseus to continue with his story and tell them whether he saw any of his comrades who went with him to Troy and died there (lines 371-372). Odysseus agrees at line 379 to continue and even to tell them the adventures of his comrades who did survive Troy but thereafter died.

Odysseus then resumes his narrative with the ἐπεί-clause. The ἐπεί-clause moves the action forward, describing an event that had not been described earlier: Persephone sends the women away without Odysseus having listed the remainder of them out, thus creating space for the heroes' ghosts to take up the stage. On the one hand the narrative had previously only reached the point of recounting a partial list of the women ghosts who had appeared to

---

[308] See the bibliography in Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989: 97 for more on the current view that the *Intermezzo* is not a late interpolation.

Odysseus and, in comparison to the general use of ἐπεί-clauses, there is therefore an abrupt move forward; on the other hand the act of the sending away of the ghosts still binds tightly into the text through the reference to Persephone herself sending the women away which tidily recalls the fact that it was Persephone herself who was described as having sent the women out to Odysseus at line 226.

External to Odysseus's narrative is both Odysseus's protestation that it would take the whole night to list out all the women ghosts who appeared and Alcinous's request to hear what the heroes had to report. The wider narrative, then, drives towards the next stage of the séance in which the women ghosts are narratively set aside for the men. But within the narrative recounted by Odysseus, the dismissal of the female ghosts is abrupt.

The function of this ἐπεί-clause possesses no features common to other discourse function performed by ἐπεί-clauses: being at the beginning of a narratival section it certainly does not form part of a two time frame group, it responds to no earlier instructions (as might have come from Circe) to expect the dismissal of the female ghosts and await the male ghosts (indeed the majority of this séance is unpredicted by Circe), nor does it evoke any known type scene.

The resumption of narrative allows for a new scene and, literally, a fresh start. In this case, the new scene is male ghosts who, among others, will recount to Odysseus what happened to them upon leaving Troy (in the case of Agamemnon) and will recount how they were treated after death in Troy (in the case of Achilles). The old scene is closed down, more distinctly than - and without the build up that we would see with - inter-textual transitions from one moment to the next, by our ἐπεί-clauses. The same pattern of relative abrupt closure of one act/scene and introduction of the next can be seen with the six orthographic book headings.

7/ The ἐπεί-clause which starts at *Odyssey* 12.1 is the beginning of a four line description of the return of Odysseus and his comrades to Circe's island. This clause is unusually lengthy for an ἐπεί -clause, but is otherwise typical of a Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clause and is discussed in Appendix 3 under the heading "Travel: Travel by Sea – Journey by Sea".

### 5.8.4 Other αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses identified by *LfrgE* as bearing broad narratival linking

As noted above, *LfrgE* classified the αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses of *Odyssey* 4.233, 8.24, 12.260 and 391 within the same group as the book-initial αὐτὰρ ἐπεί -clauses of *Iliad* 3.1 and 15.1 and *Odyssey* 11.385. Of these additional clauses it is clear that the first two should be treated within the separate group of Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses (see Section 6.2.2), while *Odyssey* 12.260 is an Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clause and 12.391 is a simple Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clause. The difference in classification between this study and that of *LfrgE* may be explicable by *LfrgE's* restriction to the αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses which are of course a sub-group of all of ἐπεί-clauses, such restriction to some extent obscuring the existence of other recurring textual relations which ἐπεί displays. In particular, half of the twelve Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses start with a pronoun rather than with αὐτάρ and so are not noted by *Lfrg*E.

### 5.8.5 Reassessing the division into books

A scenario in which the text that we have today is the product of an original continuous text which was eventually carved up at more or less suitable points, but left otherwise untouched, is challenged by our findings regarding the book initial ἐπεί-clauses of *Iliad* 3.1, 13.15, 15.1 and *Odyssey* 11.385. As far as these clauses are concerned, they perform a role which is not found *within* the books: some of these book-initial ἐπεί-clauses move the narrative forward by providing new information while others have an unusually broad sweep.

But, in Andersen’s words, “even if we agree that the book division is made according to certain rules and the transitions are of certain types ... that in itself does not speak for originality. A redactor or philologist would have been able to take care of conventional techniques, and to do it differently in the two poems, according to the tradition and nature of each poem”.[309] Based on the evidence from ἐπεί, we are still left with a range of possibilities as to how and in what context the poems were structured as books: at one extreme, that an original poet-performer himself divided it there and drew on a range of possible starting points to help orientate an audience as to the wider picture using ἐπεί in a way that he would not have used song-internally, and at the other extreme that a late Alexandrian redactor introduced ἐπεί-clauses at the beginning of freshly carved out books

It would be invaluable to compare the aberrant use of ἐπεί described above with how ὥς within books compares to ὥς at the beginning of books. Such a comparison would be an arduous task, given that there are over 1,000 instances of Homeric ὥς; but the fruits of such work should reward. The one instance of a book-initial ὅτε-clause at *Iliad* 21.1 could also be compared to book-internal uses of ὅτε.

---

[309] Anderson 1999: 39.

# Chapter 6 Discourse Function: Cohesion

## 6.1 Introduction

In Chapter 7 we will consider "Completive ἐπεί-Clauses", ἐπεί-clauses which express completion of an event begun earlier in the text. In those cases, the events of the ἐπεί-clauses are expected. The remaining temporal ἐπεί-clauses are discussed in this chapter: these ἐπεί-clauses also denote events which are expected. The discovery that all temporal ἐπεί-clauses (barring only "intermediate" subordinate clauses as outlined below) link back to an earlier anticipation is perhaps the most interesting find of this chapter, as it completes the picture of a subordinator (as sketched by others but only, to date, in respect of the non-temporal ἐπεί-clauses) which consistently point backwards in the discourse or discourse environment.

The anticipation answered by the ἐπεί-clauses arises from two discourse structures. First, on a number of occasions the narrative breaks off for a digression. It is then resumed by an ἐπεί-clause which recapitulates the event described before the digression; we call these "Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses". Second, an event is signalled as expected to occur by signposting of one form or another: by a command, an invitation, an endeavour, an inference etc. *and* the events which follow this event are at a greater level of interest; we call these "Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses". The nature of the link backwards of the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses and Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses is not itself particularly exotic, having been identified in English examples and in analyses of other Greek texts. The space devoted in this thesis to analysing the function of these ἐπεί-clauses is therefore comparatively small.

But there is an additional phenomenon which distinguishes some of the Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses from what has been noted regarding subordination in other languages: on fourteen occasions the ἐπεί-clauses are found as the second limb of a two time period structure. When the ἐπεί-clauses appear marking a second time period they function as "Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses", closing down a preceding temporal expression which had been marked with imperfective aspect. As a construction which depends on verbal aspect it recalls the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which, as outlined in the following chapter, also tend to answer a preceding imperfect event.

There are a few temporal ἐπεί-clauses which do not relate back. These are ἐπεί-clauses which are encased inside a wider phrasal structure than a mere suy relationship. We examine them at the end of this chapter together with the parenthetical subordinate clauses; we hypothesise that the local phrasal relations restrict the ability of these ἐπεί-clauses to form their own link. There are also three Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses which refer to seeing something which has not been anticipated previously. This is examined within the section on Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses.

## 6.2 Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses

Twelve ἐπεί-clauses recapitulate an event which had been stated earlier before a digression. In our superficial examination of ὡς and ὅτε-clauses in Homer we find no similar function. These "Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses" are to be distinguished from Completive ἐπεί-Clauses on many grounds including because the preliminary account presents the event as already completed and because the Recaptiulating ἐπεί-Clause does not itself use any lexical device to emphasise completion. Linguistic accounts of subordination which serves to recapitulate are vague and tend to blur the distinction between recapitulation and completion – an essential distinction in the case of Homeric ἐπεί-clauses.

### 6.2.1 Previous studies in general linguistics and Greek

Thompson et al. suggested that "semantic information encoded in preposed clauses tends to be less significant, often repeating or giving predictable information from what has already been stated".[310] In an earlier study Thompson had offered one example which she labelled in passing as "recapitulating":

> *"Only after he stopped smiling and shrieking did he go to Stephanie and hug her. That hug was also interrupted by additional shrieks. Quite a lot of noise from a normally silent chimpanzee!*
> *After spending about fifteen minutes with Stephanie, Nim went over to Wer, Josh and Jennie, and hugged each of them in turn."*

"The predicate in question is spending... closer inspection reveals that this spending is actually recapitulative, and summarizes the previous events of going, hugging and shrieking."[311] If this were a Homeric temporal clause, we would want to distinguish it from the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses, as this clause conceives of the passage of time and the continuation of the events previously described over some period.

Two of the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses contain οὖν and so were commented on by Reynen, but only regarding *Iliad* 10.272 did Reynen engage with the recapitulating character of the ἐπεί-clause. He observed that the ἐπεί-clause is a "verbatim take-up of line 254 ... which is a shorthand formula for the exhaustive depiction which follows of the two acts of individuals arming themselves". But Reynen hesitated to describe the ἐπεί-clause as merely "recapitulating", as he sensed a further function to the ἐπεί-clause, namely that "it stands in the background ... after all the preparations, the flow of the narrative moves over to Diomedes's and Odysseus's long awaited night time scouting mission."[312]

---

[310] Thompson et al. 2007: 296.

[311] Thomspon 1987: 437.

[312] Reynen 1957: 37.

Bakker echoed Reynen’s observations on restatement and backgrounding, when he suggested that “an obvious way in which a temporal subclause may contribute to text-creation is to recapitulate what was said in the previous discourse, so as to create a convenient starting-point for what follows.” [313] Bakker then offered an example from Herodotus’s *Histories* 7.44-45: θηεῖτο καὶ τὸν πεζὸν καὶ τὰς νέας, θηεύμενος δὲ ἱμέρθη τῶν νεῶν ἅμιλλαν γινομένην ἰδέσθαι. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐγένετό τε καὶ ἐνίκων Φοίνικες Σιδώνιοι, ἥσθη τε τῇ ἁμίλλῃ καὶ τῇ στρατιῇ. **ὡς δὲ ὥρα** πάντα μὲν τὸν... Bakker commented that “in this passage the hôs-clause restates what was said in the previous discourse in such a way that a meaningful starting-point and setting is created for the telling of what follows.”[314]

Reynen and Bakker’s assessments fit well with the Homeric Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses, although Bakker’s example from Herodotus displays a type of recapitulation not seen in Homer: an initial account of viewing in the imperfect is followed by an account of events that ensued from the viewing. The initial act of viewing is then returned to in the ὡς-clause with a further account of events that ensued from the viewing.

### 6.2.2 Discussion of the data

The following table sets out all the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses. Between the initial narration and the ἐπεί-clause sits a digression which offers detail on a particular point relating to the first account. Following the table we examine the components of this construction.

**Table 6.1.** Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 1.54, 57-58 | τῇ δεκάτῃ δ' ἀγορήνδε καλέσσατο λαὸν Ἀχιλλεύς: / ... //<br>οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο,<br>τοῖσι δ' ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς:] |
| 2. | *Iliad* 10.254, 272-273 | ὣς εἰπόνθ' ὅπλοισιν ἔνι δεινοῖσιν ἐδύτην. / ... //<br>**τὼ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ὅπλοισιν ἔνι δεινοῖσιν ἐδύτην,**<br>βάν ῥ' ἰέναι, λιπέτην δὲ κατ' αὐτόθι πάντας ἀρίστους |
| 3. | *Iliad* 10.295-297 | ὣς ἔφαν εὐχόμενοι, τῶν δ' ἔκλυε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη.<br>**οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ ἠρήσαντο Διὸς κούρῃ μεγάλοιο**<br>βάν ῥ' ἴμεν ὥς τε λέοντε δύω διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν |
| 4. | *Iliad* 12.86, 104-106 | οἳ δὲ διαστάντες σφέας αὐτοὺς ἀρτύναντες / ... //<br>τῶν ἄλλων μετά γ' αὐτόν: ὃ δ' ἔπρεπε καὶ διὰ πάντων.<br>**οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ ἀλλήλους ἄραρον τυκτῇσι βόεσσι**<br>βάν ῥ' ἰθὺς Δαναῶν λελιημένοι, οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔφαντο |

---

[313] Bakker 1993: 287-288. Bakker 1991: 240 made the same point more briefly and with different ὡς-clauses.

[314] *Loc. Cit.*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5. | *Iliad* 15.704, 15.716-717 | Ἕκτωρ δὲ πρυμνῆς νεὸς ἥψατο ποντοπόροιο / ... //<br>**Ἕκτωρ δὲ πρύμνηθεν ἐπεὶ λάβεν, οὐχὶ μεθίει**<br>ἄφλαστον μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων, Τρωσὶν δ' ἐκέλευεν |
| 6. | *Odyssey* 5.237-238, 241-243 | δῶκε δ' ἔπειτα σκέπαρνον ἐύξοον: ἦρχε δ' ὁδοῖο<br>νήσου ἐπ' ἐσχατιήν, ὅθι δένδρεα μακρὰ πεφύκει, / ... //<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ δεῖξ' ὅθι δένδρεα μακρὰ πεφύκει,**<br>ἡ μὲν ἔβη πρὸς δῶμα Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων,<br>αὐτὰρ ὁ τάμνετο δοῦρα: θοῶς δέ οἱ ἤνυτο ἔργον |
| 7. | *Odyssey* 8.15-17, 24-25 | ὣς εἰποῦσ' ὤτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἑκάστου.<br>καρπαλίμως δ' ἔμπληντο βροτῶν ἀγοραί τε καὶ ἕδραι<br>**ἀγρομένων**: πολλοὶ δ' ἄρ' ἐθηήσαντο ἰδόντες / ... //<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο**<br>τοῖσιν δ' Ἀλκίνοος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε: |
| | See also (8) *Iliad* 16.185-189, (9) *Odyssey* 4.220, 233-234 **(10)** [*Odyssey* 10.180-2][315], (11) *Odyssey* 13.259, 271-273 and (12) *Odyssey* 21.295-298 | |

Three recurring features of the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses are: (i) a preceding first account in the aorist of the event of the ἐπεί-clause, (ii) lexical echoes (as underlined in the table) between the two accounts, and (iii) the tendency for the event of the main clause to introduce a new trajectory to the narrative which is unrelated to the events of the ἐπεί-clause other than to the extent of being temporally sequential. Examples 4 and 5 are particularly straightforward for illustrating the recapitulation and closing down of an event:

4/ At *Iliad* 12.75-77 Polydamas suggests that the Trojans dismount their horses, leaving them with their horsemen and order themselves behind Hector. At lines 83 to 87 the Trojans do precisely this, dismounting from their horses and ordered themselves (line 86 αὐτοὺς ἀρτύναντες). There then follows an excursus with a description of the closing in: how the Trojans arranged themselves into five companies (lines 88 to 104).

The ἐπεί-clause allows the narrative to leave the excursus by returning to the reference at line 86 of ἀρτύναντες, this time with the phrase ἄραρον τυκτῇσι βόεσσι (line 105), expanding the aorist participial form ἀρτύναντες into a lexically resonant οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ ἀλλήλους ἄραρον τυκτῇσι βόεσσι. The main clause, in which they set off for the fray of battle, does not develop the idea of them having ordered themselves, and nor do the subsequent events relate to this point.

5/ In *Iliad* 15 the Trojans have the upper hand and are fighting by the ships - Hector has even caught hold of the stern of an Achaean ship. The narrative then digresses to give some history of the ship before returning to Hector and restating, in an ἐπεί-clause, that he had seized hold of the stern. In the main clause Hector calls out to the Trojans. We can note again how the ἐπεί-clause has closed down any point of interest that might arise from Hector being up on the stern of the ship; the main clause does not, for instance, recount that Hector remained there or that he found it to offer a good vantage.

---

[315] The ἐπεί-clause of *Odyssey* 10.181 is the most puzzling use of ἐπεί in the poems. The preceding line uses an aorist of θεάομαι to describe the admiration of Odysseus' shipwrecked comrades when they see the stag that Odysseus has hunted down for them. An aorist use would indeed seem appropriate as the one item cannot be stared at for any length of time. Yet the next line restates this admiration using an ἐπεί-clause to describe it. The juxtaposition of the two lines, albeit with an aside that the animal was very great, is seen otherwise with a Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clause.

In all twelve instances an event or events sit(s) between the first account and the ἐπεί-clause, which we can call the “Digressed Event”. Unlike the event that sits between the first account of an event and a Completive Resumptive ἐπεί-clause, the Digressed Event does not continue along the temporal line on which the interrupted event is located. Instead, the Digressed Event pauses the flow of time to elaborate on the event first described in the initial account. Time only moves forward on the storyline at the main clause following the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clause which repeats what had been described in the first account.[316]

In terms of verbal aspect, we can observe that this too recognises that the ἐπεί-clauses have not continued the action beyond where it was left off – the same aorist aspect is used for the first account as is used for the second account. This static repetition contrasts with the progression of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, where we tend to find that an imperfective aspect within a preceding independent clause is answered by aorist aspect of a following ἐπεί-clause.

### 6.2.3 ἄρα in independent clauses

In his study of ἄρα Grimm noted that ἄρα is sometimes used to return the narrative to its starting point following a digression.[317] If we take a couple of Grimm’s examples we observe that the events which occur after the recapitulating line with ἄρα belong to the same event trajectory as the recapitulated event. Thus the recapitulation between *Iliad* 4.499 and 501 ἀλλ' υἱὸν Πριάμοιο νόθον βάλε Δημοκόωντα / … / τόν ῥ' Ὀδυσεὺς ἑτάροιο χολωσάμενος βάλε δουρὶ is followed by three lines describing the after-effects of the strike. In addition, at the beginning of *Iliad* 14, Nestor’s encounter with the wounded Achaeans is interrupted, returned to with the particle ἄρα and then opens up into a dialogue: *Iliad* 14.27, 37. Νέστορι δὲ ξύμβληντο διοτρεφέες βασιλῆες /… / τώ ῥ' οἵ γ' ὀψείοντες ἀϋτῆς καὶ πολέμοιο.

A notable feature of recapitulation with ἄρα seems to be that the events following the recapitulated event tend to be of the same level of interest, following a sequence, as that of the recapitulated event. We find that by contrast the events that follow an event recapitulated by ἐπεί tend to be at a different level of the narrative leading to a climactic moment, such as a speech or a military encounter.

---

[316] The small and large digression in Homer has been much examined by scholars. See in particular Auerbach 1953, Richardson 1990, and Rengakos 1995. Of particular relevance to our study here is the observation at Richardson 1990: 36 that “when the narrator interrupts the story to tell us these facts-descriptions, background information, character introductions - he stops the forward motion of the story”.

[317] Grimm 1962: 24-25. Grimm offered nine examples: (i) *Iliad* 4.449, (ii) *Iliad* 4.499, 501, (iii) *Iliad* 5.615, (iv) *Odyssey* 19.392, 468, (v) *Iliad* 14.30-35, (vi) *Iliad* 14.27-37, (vii) *Odyssey* 13.188-194, (viii) *Iliad* 16.641,644, and (ix) *Iliad* 13.333, 337.

A separate investigation into linguistic markers of recapitulation should perhaps be undertaken, looking at the syntactic and lexical devices used. The observations of Puigdollers on the use of αὖ / αὖτε to mark the reintroduction of a topic after a digression, illustrated by *Odyssey* 3.404-412 and *Iliad* 4.127-133 could also be taken into account.[318]

## 6.3 Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses

The events of around 35 ἐπεί-clauses are expected, based on preceding text. But the fact that they are anticipated events is not because they have already been commenced (as with Completive ἐπεί-Clauses) nor because they have already been described (as with Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses), but because they are the natural and obvious event to occur based on what has already been recounted. A simple example is *Odyssey* 9.361-362 τρὶς μὲν ἔδωκα φέρων, τρὶς δ' ἔκπιεν ἀφραδίῃσιν. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωπα περὶ φρένας ἤλυθεν οἶνος. The drink, described in the earlier lines as derived from wine, would be expected to have an effect on the Cyclops's mind. We call ἐπεί-clauses which recount these types of expected events "Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses".

The Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses are typically catalysts for the events in the main clauses and following sentences. While the events of the ἐπεί-clauses are usually on the story line, they are of subsidiary interest and of lower dynamism than the events that follow; often the narrative has been developing a momentum towards the events of the main clause and following clauses. Sometimes the dramatic event of the main clause is not predictable in its detail although the momentum of the narrative gives way to it, but at other times it is anticipated.

We look at the range of Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses as a single group, although arranged according to the different triggers that signal that an event will occur. But we have extracted out of this group two sets of ἐπεί-clauses: those ἐπεί-clauses which describe seeing and those which describe hearing. It is by chance that they both relate to sensual perception: the former are of particular interest because their distinctiveness enables them to be distinguished from the wide range of ways in which to describe seeing, including with ὡς-clauses. The ἐπεί-clauses of seeing differ in function in being used to mark where there was express solicitation to view. The latter deserve individual study because they mark out a particular type of hearing: where a speech was required by etiquette, but did not add any new information.

### 6.3.1 Previous studies in general linguistics and Greek

In his article on adverbial subordination, Diessel stated that "in their basic use initial adverbial clauses function to present information that is pragmatically presupposed providing a thematic ground for new information asserted in subsequent clauses... Consider for instance the following example from Time Magazine.

---

[318] Puigdollers 2009: 92-96

> *About 45 minutes later, Teresa Lewis called the police to report that her husband and stepson had been killed. But when the police arrived, Julian Lewis was still alive. [Time Magazine, Friday, Sept 10, 2010]*

“When the reader of a journalistic article is told that somebody called the police, as in the first sentence of this example, he or she has good reasons to assume that the article will continue with information about what happened “when the police arrived.” The when-clause, thus, connects the complex sentence to the previous discourse; it creates a thematic ground for the ensuing (main) clause(s) based on information from the preceding sentence.”[319]

While the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses do not fit Diessel's description particularly well, as it is not clear what "thematic ground" would be established by these ἐπεί-clauses, and most ὡς and many ὅτε-clauses do not connect back to previous discourse in the manner suggested by Diessel, the description fits the Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses very well.

A similar account had earlier been given by Thompson et al. regarding the use of adverbial clauses for the purpose of linkage in certain Philippine languages. They noted that “a back-reference may proceed along an expectancy chain and encode ‘script-predictable’ information so that the action which is referred to in a back-reference is really an action which would naturally succeed the action which is referred to in the preceding sentence.” We cite later in Section 7.2.1 their example of “they killed a wild pig, cut it up, and cooked it. After eating it...”.[320] But we depart from Thompson et al. and follow Diessel and Reynen more closely in finding that the ἐπεί-clause is also selected for marking its events as in the background compared to the greater drama of the main clause and subsequent clauses.

Reynen viewed the Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses (of which thirteen are with οὖν and were therefore studied by Reynen) as representing the most original function of the temporal ἐπεί-clauses. He identified two basic features to these ἐπεί-clauses: (i) the event of the ἐπεί-clause takes a leap (“Sprung”) from the stage previously reached in the narrative but that it is anticipated by preceding text, sometimes by way of command and execution, and (ii) the ἐπεί-clauseis allows “a completely new starting point for the narrative that follows”.[321] But as noted in Chapter 2, Reynen ascribed these functions to the power of οὖν rather than to the clause as a whole.

Some of the ἐπεί-clauses respond to a preceding solicitation such as instructions or a pronouncement, with a degree of repetition ensuing between the solicitation and the execution. A number of literary scholars have examined instances of “double presentations” of this sort, finding that there can be narratival benefit to the repetition, such as the bringing out of different elements to those originally envisaged in the first account.[322] However, instances with the ἐπεί-clauses have not been identified as performing a narratival device of this sort; indeed the ἐπεί-clauses do not depart from the earlier commences or pronouncements nor go into sufficient detail to warrant the attribute of introducing new nuances or of emphasising faithful compliance.

---

[319] Diessel 2013: 343.

[320] Thompson et al. 2007: 277.

[321] Reynen 1957: 3, 14, *passim*.

### 6.3.2 Discussion of the data: Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses

The Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses describe events which are expected from the preceding narrative. For ease of review it helps to categorise them into different groups, which we have done in the following table. The first occurring instance of each type is discussed following the table.

**Table 6.2.** Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses: sequential events** | | |
| 1. | *Iliad* 4.380-384 | οἳ δ' ἔθελον δόμεναι καὶ ἐπῄνεον ὡς ἐκέλευον:<br>ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἔτρεψε παραίσια σήματα φαίνων.<br>**οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ᾤχοντο ἰδὲ πρὸ ὁδοῦ ἐγένοντο,**<br>**Ἀσωπὸν δ' ἵκοντο βαθύσχοινον λεχεποίην,**<br>ἔνθ' αὖτ' ἀγγελίην ἐπὶ Τυδῆ στεῖλαν Ἀχαιοί |
| | See similarly (2) *Iliad* 21.25-28, (3) *Iliad* 22.466, 475 (4) *Odyssey* 9.361-363, (5) *Odyssey* 10.80-81, 87, 91, (6) 10.234-238, (7) 10.290-291, 316-318 and (8) *Odyssey* 24.345-350.[323] The following ἐπεί-clauses related to growing up or old, where it is evident from the narrative that this stage would be reached: (9) *Iliad* 2.661,[324] (10) 7.148, (11) 11.223-226, (12) 24.754 and (13) *Odyssey* 14.175-177. | |
| **Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses: Endeavour-Success** | | |
| 14. | *Iliad* 5.561, 571-574 | τὼ δὲ πεσόντ' ἐλέησεν ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος, / ... /<br>Αἰνείας δ' οὐ μεῖνε θοός περ ἐὼν πολεμιστὴς<br>ὡς εἶδεν δύο φῶτε παρ' ἀλλήλοισι μένοντε.<br>οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν νεκροὺς ἔρυσαν μετὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν,<br>τὼ μὲν ἄρα δειλὼ βαλέτην ἐν χερσὶν ἑταίρων |
| | See similarly (15) *Iliad* 6.466-468, 474, (16) 8.266-271, (17) *Odyssey* 10.109-112, and (18) *Odyssey* 24.38-39, 43-44. | |
| | **Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses: Pronouncement-Execution** | |
| 19. | *Iliad* 21.372-383 | ἀλλ' ἤτοι μὲν ἐγὼν ἀποπαύσομαι εἰ σὺ κελεύεις, / ... /<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Ξάνθοιο δάμη μένος, οἳ μὲν ἔπειτα** |

---

[322] See Reichel 1994 and de Jong 2004: 195-220.

[323] The wording of ἐπεί-clauses (2) *Iliad* 22.475 and (8) *Odyssey* 24.349 are the same, describing the recovery of an individual from a fainting fit, except that the first ἐπεί-clause is preceded by a pronoun and the second is preceded by αὐτάρ. See the explanations of de Jong 2012: 185 and Reynen 1957: 22-24, neither of which are convincing.

[324] Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 586 characterises this ἐπεί-clause as “rein affirmativ”, although he is interested rather in what he believes the particle οὖν may be contributing to the textual cohesion.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | παυσάσθην, Ἥρη γὰρ ἐρύκακε χωομένη περ |
| | See similarly (20) *Odyssey* 8.358, 360 and (21) 11.95-99 | |
| **Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses: Command-Execution** | | |
| 20. | *Iliad* 6.176-179 | καὶ τότε μιν ἐρέεινε καὶ ᾔτεε σῆμα ἰδέσθαι<br>ὅττί ῥά οἱ γαμβροῖο πάρα Προίτοιο φέροιτο.<br>αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σῆμα κακὸν παρεδέξατο γαμβροῦ,<br>πρῶτον μέν ῥα Χίμαιραν ἀμαιμακέτην ἐκέλευσε |
| | See similarly (23) *Iliad* 11.641-643,[325] (24) *Iliad* 23.802-3, 813-814,[326] (25) *Iliad* 24.582, 587-589,[327] (26) *Iliad* 24.716-717, 719-720 and (27) *Odyssey* 8.370-372.[328] | |
| **Remote Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses** | | |
| 28. | *Iliad* 16.93-96, 393-395 | μή τις ἀπ' Οὐλύμποιο θεῶν αἰειγενετάων<br>ἐμβήῃ: μάλα τούς γε φιλεῖ ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων:<br>ἀλλὰ πάλιν τροπάασθαι, ἐπὴν φάος ἐν νήεσσι<br>θήῃς, τοὺς δὲ τ' ἐᾶν πεδίον κάτα δηριάασθαι. / ... //<br>ὣς ἵπποι Τρῳαὶ μεγάλα στενάχοντο θέουσαι.<br>**Πάτροκλος δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν πρώτας ἐπέκερσε φάλαγγας**<br>ἂψ ἐπὶ νῆας ἔεργε παλιμπετές, οὐδὲ πόληος |
| | See similarly (29) 16.526, 562-565, (30) *Odyssey* 4.477-480, 581-586, (31) 11.74-77, 12.13-15[329], (32) 12.124-127, 260-261, (33) 16.132-133, 150-151, 340-341, and (34) *Odyssey* 16.301-303, 21.205-206. | |

---

[325] Reynen 1957: 32-33 notes the relationship of the event of the ἐπεί-clause to the order of the preceding line as one of "order-execution". But he notes that the ἐπεί-clause also allows for the build up of the preceding narrative (the expectation of the arrival of ἐπεί-clause) to be answered in the main clause. As ever, Reynen offers this analysis within the context of his interpretation of οὖν.

[326] Reynen 1957: 36 does not comment on the link back to the original command but notes that the ἐπεί-clause acts "as a basis for the now beginning battle which is the focus of this scene".

[327] Reynen 1957: 25 notes the relationship of the ἐπεί-clause to the preceding text of command-execution. He also notes that the events of the main clause and following clauses is expected from the preceding text but that there are elements of significant excitement, such as the involvement of Achilles himself in the return of Hector's bathed body.

[328] Reynen 1957: 18 sees this taking up of the ball as only the "the prelude to the directly following performance of the command to dance" and therefore finds it an unusual instance in which only in the clauses following the ἐπεί-clause is the executiong of the command carried out. But it is in fact surely a strained reading to construe the performance of the command as taking place only at a later stage, notwithstanding the lexical echo between ὀρχήσασθαι of line 371 and ὀρχείσθην of line 378.

[329] De Jong 2001: 296 observes that "verbal echoes underscore the correspondence between word and deed: νεκρός τ' ἐκάη καὶ τεύχεα νεκροῦ (13) ≈ κακκῆαι σὺν τεύχεσιν (11.74); τύμβον χεύαντες (14) ≈ σῆμά τέ μοι χεῦαι (11.75); πήξαμεν ... [ἐπὶ] τύμβῳ ... ἐρετμόν (15) ≈ πῆξαί ... ἐπὶ τύμβῳ ἐρετμόν (11.77)." This echoing is unusual for an affirmative ἐπεί-clause with the distance of a book between the word and the deed.

1/ Agamemnon reminds Diomedes of the valour of his father Tydeus in the past. The events of the ἐπεί-clause which describe Polynices's and Tydeus's departure from Mycenae is anticipated by the impulse of the preceding lines: lines 380-381 the Mycenaeans want to oblige a request from Tydeus and Polynices for reinforcements but receive bad omens that cause them to refuse; lines 382-383 Tydeus and Polynices leave in a two line ἐπεί-clause that covers both departure and arrival. Tydeus's purpose in Mycenae is solely to gather an army, so that when that purpose is thwarted the inevitable next stage is that Tydeus will leave Mycenae.

The ἐπεί-clause then points forward to the focus of Agamemnon's speech, namely the extraordinary feats of valour displayed by Tydeus. In the analysis of this ἐπεί-clause which contains οὖν, Reynen does not comment on any backward link to the preceding text but recognises well the narrative's interest in the events of the main clause and the following lines.[330]

10/ The events in this group "endeavour – success" follow in a seamless manner from previous events which have an impulse towards the event of the ἐπεί-clause – they are most similar to the first group of "sequential" ἐπεί-clauses. The event of rescuing two Achaean corpses which is achieved in the ἐπεί-clause of *Iliad* 5.573 is an opening for the events of the main clause and subsequent clauses where two rescuers, Menelaus and Antilochus, display a brief resurgence of Achaean strength. With this example the renewed prowess of the two Achaeans is not anticipated prior to its occurrence but then occupies the following fourteen lines and triggers a response from Hector.[331]

22/ The expected nature of the events of these "command-execution" ἐπεί-clauses is particularly easy to trace. In respect of the first attested instance, at *Iliad* 6.178 Wackernagel had noted the affirmative relationship, categorising the connection between ἤτεε σῆμα ἰδέσθαι and αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σῆμα κακὸν παρεδέξατο as "selbstverständliche Folge aus Vorerzähltem". However, he attributed the marking of affirmation to δή.[332] But when this ἐπεί-clause is placed alongside the ἐπεί-clauses listed above at (23) to (27), it is evident that it is not the particle which creates the bond, but rather the subordinate clause. The interest, as ever, is on the main clause where Bellerophon is set a task.

28/ Of the ἐπεί-clauses categorised in the sub-group "Remote Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses" some have a particularly great anaphoric span. The ἐπεί-clauses point back in the narrative to an earlier occasion when the action of the ἐπεί-clauses was adumbrated. Often the action of the main clause was also adumbrated but was expressly or implicitly contingent on the prior but anticipated performance of the events of the ἐπεί-clause.

---

[330] Reynen 1957: 11 notes that the ἐπεί-clause "reaches the stage of line 372f. which presents quite generally the topic of Tydeus' bravery, from which he had departed in order to explain his knowledge of it more precisely". But, as ever, Reynen finds this relationship to be marked by the particle οὖν and not by the innate meaning of an ἐπεί-clause.

[331] Reynen 1957: 18-19 offers a similar analysis, nothing that "the audience has not the slightest reason to expect" the joint fighting of Menelaus and Antilochus.

[332] Wackernagel 1916: 32.

At *Iliad* 16.91-96 Achilles orders Patroclus to send the Trojans in rout but to prevent them from entering their city and rather cause them to battle on the plain. Lines 293-393 describe how Patroclus sends the Trojans in rout away from the Achaean ships and back towards the city. And as they are heading towards the city Patroclus turns back the head of the rout in the ἐπεί-clause and sends them back in the direction of the ships in the main clause. From the immediate unfolding of the battle scene it is not predictable that Patroclus will prevent the Trojans from entering their city. But by employing ἐπεί to govern the clause which describes the turning back, the poet reminds the audience to recall the fact that Patroclus is acting on instructions and that this action of turning the Trojans back is to be expected. The main clause stays with Patroclus's compliance with Achilles's order: *he turned them back towards the ships and did not allow them to reach the city*.[333] Again, the narrative is interested in what occurs in the lines after the expected event of the ἐπεί-clause: face to face battle unfolds, in gory detail, between the Trojan and Achaean warriors.

### 6.3.3 Discussion of the data: ἐπεί-clauses of listening

Over fifty percent of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* combined is direct speech.[334] Many speeches are concluded by a phrase referring back to the act of speech, such as ὣς φάθ', ὣς ἐφάμην.[335] The formulaic phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε as completed with a proper noun epithet occurs after only eight speeches. In the following table we list out the eight occurrences.

**Table 6.3.** Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses: sequential ἐπεί-clauses in respect of listening

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 20.318 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων |
| | See also *Iliad* 21.377, *Iliad* 23.161, *Odyssey* 7.167, *Odyssey* 8.143, *Odyssey* 8.446, *Odyssey* 13.159 and *Odyssey* 15.92 with different proper nouns | |

---

[333] Janko 1994: 367 notes that Patroclus "is still obeying his orders (83ff.) by blocking the Trojans' front ranks from their retreat and driving them back upon the ships". Reynen 1957: 22 n.1 observes that Achilles' command to Patroclus is ἰέναι πάλιν (line 87) and further at line 95 πάλιν τροπάασθαι and doubts whether this is the subsequent action described in the ἐπεί-clause and main clause suggesting that the physical distance between the original order and its execution is too great. But there is the other message threaded into Achilles' speech which is that the Trojans must not reach the city but must be forced to fight out on the plain (see lines 92 and 96) and it is, rather, this message which the ἐπεί-clause picks up, as suggested by Janko.

[334] Griffin 1986: 37 puts it at 45% of the *Iliad* and 67% of the *Odyssey*.

[335] De Jong 1987: 195-208 discusses some of the formulas used to conclude speech but does not address αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε.

There has been little interest in this set of ἐπεί-clauses beyond the desultory comments on its formulaic quality as containing a recurrent phrase.[336] Reynen suggested a link between these ἐπεί-clauses and the postposed clauses with ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσε,[337] but aside from the overlap in vocabulary which seems rather the product of the finite nature of language, there is no obvious connection between the two phrases, most certainly not in function. [338]

The αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε ἐπεί-clauses all follow speeches which are of a peculiarly formal inclination. The speeches themselves do not provide new information but rather express the apparently required consent or formal instruction to a subsequent action, a consent or instruction without which the addressee of the speech would seem unable to proceed. The speech is addressed by someone of inferior status to a superior, marking further the formulaic, even ritual, nature of the consent. Surprisingly, these speeches seem not to have attracted attention from Homerists, and we have found no discussion regarding why these speeches are employed.

Half of the ἐπεί-clauses also use αὐτίκα to introduce the main clause,[339] indicating how the addressee had only been awaiting for the formality of a speech before commencing on his/her intended course of action. αὐτίκα is otherwise infrequent following ἐπεί-clauses,[340] but is relatively frequent after the better attested ὡς-clauses which bear a *circumstance – reaction* relationship between the subordinate clause and main clause.[341]

No other subordinate clause is used to sign off ritual listening of this sort. ὡς-clauses capture only impulsive listening, with the main clauses describing impulsive responses.[342] The six ἐπεί-clauses of taking an oath, which are classified as Completive ἐπεί-Clauses and relate back to the preceding text as such, present an event whose narrative function echoes that of the Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses of listening: once an oath has been received action can commence.

If we consider other epic texts, we can note that line 107 of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε ποδήνεμος ὠκέα Ἶρις uses the same phrase, but not with the same function as seen in Homer. There, Iris hears instructions addressed to her to go and summon Eilithyia and she complies with them – Iris was no subordinate awaiting only these instructions before carrying out her own wishes; rather, the ἐπεί-clause appears to be used as a restatement of line 102 where we are told that the goddesses had sent Iris out to collect Eilithyia.

---

[336] Ruijgh 1957: 34 and Bolling 1959: 19.

[337] Reynen 1958: 68 n.3: "*Iliad* 2.16 hat sich wohl an Y 318f. und die entsprechenden Stellen angeschlossen".

[338] The four postposed ἐπεί clauses present us with an inferior who is given orders by his superior: at *Iliad* 2.16 ὣς φάτο, βῆ δ' ἄρ' ὄνειρος ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσε Zeus give orders to Dream, and at *Odyssey* 17.348, 551 and 574 ὣς φάτο, βῆ δὲ συφορβός, ἐπεὶ τὸν μῦθον ἄκουσεν the swineherd is given orders by his three masters, Telemachus, Penelope and Odysseus.

[339] *Iliad* 21.378, 23.162, *Odyssey* 8.447 and 15.93.

[340] Occurring only after the ἐπεί-clauses at *Iliad* 2.662, 19.20, 24.515, *Odyssey* 2.379, 3.448, 5.77, 8.361, 10.238, 12.261, 13.272 and 21.404-405.

[341] See *Iliad* 2.322, 5.713, 11.582, 18.531, 21.419, 23.39 and 23.118. There are no examples in the *Odyssey*.

[342] Thus, for example, there are are two ὡς-clauses with ἄκουσε (*Odyssey* 8.272 and 17.492) that come closest in lexical form to the αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε ἐπεί-clauses. However, there is no element of ritual hearing, even though in the first example the anticipation of the hearing is prepared by mention of a messenger coming with news.

Below we analyse the relationship of the first three instances of αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε. They happen to be the most complicated of the eight instances, with the subordinate – superior relationship less well defined than in the remainder.

1/ At line 293 of *Iliad* 20 Poseidon embarks on a sixteen line speech to the gods urging them to rescue Aeneas from the imminent destructive path of Achilles who is being supported by Apollo. Poseidon had earlier at lines 133-143 suggested to a number of the other gods that they, as gods, do not pit themselves against each other but keep an eye on the activities of Ares and Apollo on the battlefield, since these gods had not chosen to stay back from involving themselves. Poseidon returns to this point now, when he worries that Aeneas is being threatened too much by Achilles and suggests to the gods that they now involve themselves.

Hera responds to Poseidon at lines 310 to 317 saying that she and Athena cannot assist Poseidon in saving Aeneas, since they have sworn never to prevent the destruction of the Trojans. But, she says, Poseidon may decide for himself whether to save Aeneas or also sit back. In this manner, she implies to Poseidon that she will not take revenge on him or on the Trojans if he does take Aeneas's part. Poseidon's response to this is to go straight down to the battlefield and confound Achilles's intentions for Aeneas. This is an instance of one god receiving the approval of other gods prior to embarking on what sounds like an already chosen course of action.

2/ At lines 331 to 341 of *Iliad* 21 Hera urges Hephaestus to send fire against the River god Scamander who is is sweeping away Achilles. Hephaestus complies at lines 342 to 355. At line 347 Scamander appeals to Hephaestus to stop the fire. When there is no response from Hephaestus, Scamander in turn appeals to Hera. This double appeal reflects the original two staged process of implementing the fire, with Hera conceiving the idea and Hephaestus enacting it. Hephaestus, it seems, is not empowered to stop the process he has set in motion, without first receiving instructions from Hera. And, it seems, Hera is unwilling to instruct Hephaestus without first receiving an entreaty addressed directly to herself from Scamander[343].

Thus, once Hera has received Scamander's entreaty, she instructs Hephaestus to stop the fire: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη... The entreaty addressed to Hera is formulaic, or ritual. The sentiment had already been expressed in Scamander's address; but it has been followed up with the second appeal as a matter of necessary courtesy or ritual. Only once this courtesy has been complied with could Hera arrange for the fire to be stopped.

---

[343] This two tiered divine plan is not dissimilar in its careful follow through to that of Zeus and Athena regarding the final battle between the suitors and Odysseus at *Odyssey* 24.472ff.

3/ Agamemnon and the other Achaeans had complied with Achilles’s request (communicated via Agamemnon: ἠῶθεν δ' ὄτρυνον ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγάμεμνον...) of lines 49-53 of *Iliad* 23 that they fetch wood and prepare a pyre for Patroclus. The details of their industrious collection of wood and preparations of the pyre are set out at lines 110 to 139. Following the preparations, Achilles addresses the river Spercheius as he places a lock of his hair in the hands of Achilles; all the Achaeans then weep. At this point Achilles calls an end to proceedings, but not by addressing the Achaeans directly, since he does not, formally, have authority over the Achaeans, but by asking Agamemnon to disperse the people.

Yet, unofficially, Achilles has determined the sequence of events since the beginning of *Iliad* 23. Agamemnon has presented himself and his Achaeans at the service of Achilles, and it is now only Achilles who can release Agamemnon and the Greeks from their tasks. The phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσεν of line 161 underlines the subservient role that Agamemnon has adopted: at this stage in proceedings, the pyre having been prepared, the Achaeans are ready to retire back from the proceedings. But having adopted a subordinate role, Agamemnon must now wait for Achilles formally to release them from their task. *Once Achilles has spoken*, the Greeks can disperse back to their ships.

### 6.3.4 Discussion of the data: ἐπεί-clauses of solicited seeing

The preposed ἐπεί-clauses of seeing[344] have been isolated here from the other Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses in order to highlight the difference in function between these clauses and other expressions of seeing (in particular postposed ἐπεί-clauses of seeing and preposed ὡς-clauses of seeing, which are examined in Sections 5.4 and 5.6.1 respectively).

**Table 6.4.** Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses: Seeing

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Odyssey* 10.426, 453-454 | ὄφρα ἴδηθ' ἑτάρους ἱεροῖς ἐν δώμασι Κίρκης / ... /<br>**οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ ἀλλήλους εἶδον φράσσαντό τ' ἐσάντα,**<br>κλαῖον ὀδυρόμενοι, περὶ δὲ στεναχίζετο δῶμα |
| | See similarly (2) *Iliad* 4.205 (ὄφρα ἴδῃ Μενέλαον ἀρήϊον ἀρχὸν Ἀχαιῶν), 217-219 and (3) *Odyssey* 21.217-218 (σῆμα ἀριφραδὲς ἄλλο τι δείξω, / ὄφρα μ' ἐῢ γνῶτον), 222-223 | |

The three ἐπεί-clauses in the above table relate to an earlier solicitation to view; the event of seeing does not present as a new event, but rather as an event that follows the already established narrative trajectory.

1/ In *Odyssey* 10 Odysseus and his comrades set eyes on each other again, having been earlier divided into two groups (one group turned into pigs at Circe’s and the other group waiting by the shore). The expectation, on the part of the unscathed comrades by the shore, of seeing their porcine comrades is built up by Odysseus's urging of his comrades at the shore to hasten to the halls of Circe ὄφρα ἴδηθ' ἑτάρους ἱεροῖς ἐν δώμασι Κίρκης (line 426). A similar expectation on the part of those comrades already with Circe is hinted at in the narrative: in the presence of his comrades, Circe sends Odysseus off to collect the shore-based-band. The choice of an ἐπεί-clause with ἐπεί reflects then that this sighting of each other is expected by the actors in the scene.

---

[344] Reynen 1958: 68 n.3 listed out all the ἐπεί-clauses of seeing, as dealt with in this section, except for *Odyssey* 10.452, *Iliad* 11.459 and 12.143 which are added here to the list.

We can contrast this anticipated reunion with the surprise meeting of Dolius and his sons with their former master Odysseus at *Odyssey* 24.391 which is instead expressed with a ὡς-clause yet with the same verbs ἴδον and φράσσαντό. The surprise sighting is experienced unilaterally by Dolius and his sons; a ὡς-clause accords with the unprompted act of viewing: Odyssey 24.387, 391-393 ἦλθ' ὁ γέρων Δολίος, σὺν δ' υἱεῖς τοῖο γέροντος, / ... / οἱ δ' ὡς οὖν Ὀδυσῆα ἴδον φράσσαντό τε θυμῷ, ἔσταν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι τεθηπότες.

### 6.3.5 Discussion of the data: ἐπεί-clauses of unsolicited seeing

Unlike the instances set out at **Table 6.4** above, a pattern of using Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses with events of seeing which are not solicited is observable in the case of the three Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses of Seeing which are discussed in Section 6.4.5. As regards those three clauses, we observe that there may be a suppletive relationship with ὡς-clauses, since the subordinator ὡς is not found participating in the the correspondent structure.

In addition to those three Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses, one further Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clause which describes unanticipated seeing is found at *Iliad* 5.27-29 Τρῶες δὲ μεγάθυμοι ἐπεὶ ἴδον υἷε Δάρητος / τὸν μὲν ἀλευάμενον, τὸν δὲ κτάμενον παρ' ὄχεσφι, / πᾶσιν ὀρίνθη θυμός. There is also an uncertain additional instance of anticipated seeing in a preposed ἐπεί-clause at *Iliad* 11.459. In both of these instances a suppletive relationship with ὡς may be an influence as it seems to be also with the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses.

In Section 4.6.2 it was noted that the proper noun Τρῶες is required at the beginning of *Iliad* 5.27 and 11.459, rather than subject elision or a pronoun, since the Trojans have not been mentioned in the text for some time. However, although the metrical shape of this noun is well suited to being followed by ὡς (irrespective of whether it is amplified by μεγάθυμοι) which, as noted in the previous section, is the typical way to introduce unanticipated seeing, the form ἴδον (which often follows ὡς) does not readily combine with these components. In the event that the poet did indeed wish to use a temporal subordinate clause to describe the Trojans viewing their calamity, the metrical conditions are therefore right for the poet to seek a substitute for a ὡς-clause.

There is in fact some linguistic evidence that the poet may indeed have been reaching for a ὡς-clause rather than an ἐπεί-clause in the case of *Iliad* 5.27 and perhaps also of 11.459. The wording of the main clause at *Iliad* 5.29 πᾶσιν ὀρίνθη θυμός (which resonates with the tendency of ὡς-clauses to precede main clauses which describe emotional responses) is found also at *Iliad* 16.280 and 28.223 and on both of those occasions that wording is the main clause to a ὡς-clause which describes unanticipated seeing.[345]

The use of a preposed ἐπεί-clause to describe an unanticipated act is not necessarily evidence that the subordinator had lost its anaphoric semantics outside of the particular context of *Iliad* 5.27. As argued by Visser,[346] words are sometimes use in Homer without all of their inherent semantics in contexts where other components of a particular sentence are essential (in this case the Trojans and the son of Dares) and cannot be exchanged with alternatives. In this case ἐπεί may have been used as a metrical doublet of ὡς.

Some editions of the *Iliad* (including van Thiel 2010) have a preposed ἐπεί-clause at *Iliad* 11.459 so that the line reads Τρῶες δὲ μεγάθυμοι **ἐπεὶ** ἴδον αἷμ' Ὀδυσῆος instead of Τρῶες δὲ μεγάθυμοι **ὅπως** ἴδον αἷμ’ Ὀδυσῆος as preferred in the edition of, among others, West 1998-2000. This discrepancy derives from variant readings in manuscripts as well as the comments of scholiasts.[347]

While a reading with ἐπεί at *Iliad* 11.459 would be inconsistent with the pattern of use established in the preceding section in respect of the three certain attestations of Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses of seeing, since the sighting by the Trojans of Odysseus and his blood is not expressly anticipated, and while the reading would also be inconsistent with the wider pattern established in this thesis of Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses linking back tightly to anticipations in the text, the evidence from *Iliad* 5.27 suggests that the poet may have compromised here too on the inherent semantics of ἐπεί as part of a broader practice of poetice licence. In the case of the main clause at *Iliad* 11.461 that exact same clause is found one one other occasion, namely at *Iliad* 13.332 where it answers to a temporal ὡς-clause of seeing. So, as with *Iliad* 5.27 it seems possible that the poet was reaching for a ὡς-clause but had difficulty constructing it and so opted for ἐπεί.

The alternative reading with ὅπως is not without justification. While it is used only rarely as a temporal conjunction, its association with seeing is established at *Iliad* 12.208, and *Odyssey* 3.373 and 22.22, albeit there in postposed clauses. In a multiform account of the composition of the poems,[348] both readings (with ἐπεί or ὅπως) appear to be justifiable responses to an evident compositional challenge.

---

[345] Interestingly, on the first of those occasions Τρῶες is also the subject of the subordinate clause and there an unusual middle form εἴδοντο has been used to follow Τρῶες: Iliad 16.278 Τρῶες δ' ὡς εἴδοντο Μενοιτίου ἄλκιμον υἱὸν. It seems then that the different solutions were found in Iliad 5.27 and in 16.278 for the same metrical difficulty.

[346] See footnote 519.

[347] The *apparatus criticus* to Allen 1917 notes that as well as the Venetus A manuscript, the manuscript families **d**, **p**, and **q** have ὅπως, but that the vulgate has ἐπεί. The *apparatus criticus* to West 1998 notes that the Venetus A manuscript includes a *varia lectio* of ἐπεί.

[348] See Nagy 1996 for a formulation and defence of multiformity.

## 6.4 Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses

Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses answer a preceding temporal expression which is almost always marked by μέν. A similar structure is seen with some ὅτε-clauses and with some ἦμος-clauses. In this structure the ἐπεί, ὅτε or ἦμος clause ends the time period introduced in the preceding temporal expression and introduces a new time period. The preceding temporal expression may consist of a subordinate clause and main clause, often introduced by ὄφρα or ἕως, or may consist of a single main clause introduced by a temporal adverb or particle such as τότε. Sometimes ἕως is used in these contexts simply as temporal adverb meaning “meanwhile” and is followed by a single main clause (see for example *Iliad* 12.141-142 οἳ δ' ἤτοι εἵως μὲν ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς / ὄρνυον ἔνδον ἐόντες ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ νηῶν).

The ἐπεί and ὅτε clauses mark out time periods through actions of animate beings rather than through nature. The events that are described as occurring within the marked out time period, i.e. which are described in the main clause, relate to or are undertaken by different actors from those referred to in the time marking ἐπεί-clauses and are often in response to the event of the ἐπεί-clause; for example the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clause of *Iliad* 13.174 describes the arrival of the Achaean ships, whereas the main clause recounts the return of the Trojan hero Imbrios to Troy. As with the single Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses, the interest is in the events of the main clause and subsequent sentences and not in the subordinate clause.

### 6.4.1 Existing observations on Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses

Comments by Greek scholars on the function and phrasal arrangement of Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses are desultory but largely accurate. In connection with an apparently aberrant usage of ἕως and ὄφρα which occurs only within such constructions Kühner-Gerth correctly observed “ἕως statt τέως in ἕως μέν zur Einleitung einer imperfektischen Handlung, deren Endpunkt dann durch eine adversative Zeitbestimmung wie ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ, αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ genauer bestimmt wird, daher = *aliquamdiu*, M141. N, 143. O, 277. P, 727. 730. ,β, 148. γ, 126. In gleichem Sinne vereinzelt ὄφρα = τόφρα, indes O.547”.[349]

### 6.4.2 Similar Homeric constructions

This study deals only with past tense ἐπεί-clauses. But the same structure is seen with ἐπεί-clauses in the future tense and in similes.[350] In the course of this study at least one ὅτε subjunctive ἐπεί-clause has also been spotted responding to a preceding time frame.[351] There are also a number of present tense constructions with πρὶν μέν ... νῦν δὲ such as at *Iliad* 9.19, 21, and one instance in which the ἐπεί-clause is in the past tense, but the main clause is in the present tense.[352]

---

[349] Kühner-Gerth 1904: 228. In its entry for αὐτάρ *LfrgE* similarly captured the relationship as “eine spätere Handlung oder ein Zustand kontrastiert mit einem früheren Zustand; im vorangehenden Satz oft ὄφρα, ἦος, τόφρα, τῆος, aufgenommen durch αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, selten αὐτὰρ νῦν”. But the correlative role that the μέν .... αὐτάρ... relationship plays here was overlooked by *LfrgE*.

[350] See *Iliad* 11.476-9 (future indicative in a simile), *Iliad* 17.727- 729 (future indicative in a simile), and *Iliad* 11.187-194, 11.202-209, *Odyssey* 5.361-364 and 6.259-264 (all subjunctives regarding future activity).

There is also the evidently related pattern of a countable time period (e.g. nine days) which is sometimes marked by μέν and sometimes not, and which is then concluded by a ὅτε-clause. For example, *Odyssey* 15.476-477 ἑξῆμαρ μὲν ὁμῶς πλέομεν(IMPF) νύκτας τε καὶ ἦμαρ: / ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ ἕβδομον ἦμαρ ἐπὶ Ζεὺς θῆκε Κρονίων, *Odyssey* 19.151-155 ὣς τρίετες μὲν ἔληθον(IMPF) ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειθον Ἀχαιούς: / ἀλλ’ ὅτε τέτρατον ἦλθεν ἔτος καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὧραι, etc. As with the adverbial ἐπεί-clauses under discussion here, the events of the first time period are described in the imperfect.[353]

Finally, there is an infrequently occurring unrelated construction with ὅτε which bears a superficial resemblance to the ἐπεί-clauses investigated here. A distinction between the two constructions is not mentioned in the handbooks or monographs. In this second construction, the events of the first ἐπεί-clause describe habitual events which create the conditions for the events of the first main clause. The events of the second ἐπεί-clause are not temporally sequential, but rather occur at an alternative habitual time frame, again creating the conditions for the events of the second main clause. The relationship between the two sentences is sometimes contrastive, but sometimes intensifying, see for example, *Iliad* 20.226-229.[354]

### 6.4.3 Correspondent constructions in later Greek

The correspondent construction extends beyond Homer. There is one example in Hesiod’s *Works and Days* with ὅτε[355] and one which Buijs noted in Xenophon’s writings *Anabasis* 3.4.49 ὁ δὲ ἀναβάς, ἕως μὲν βάσιμα ἦν, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου ἦγεν, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄβατα ἦν, καταλιπὼν τὸν ἵππον ἔσπευδε πεζῇ.[356] Bakker cited Thucydides, *Peneloponnesian War*, 3, 91, 1 μέχρι μὲν οὖν οἱ τοξόται εἶχόν τε τὰ βέλη …, οἱ δὲ ἀντεῖχον …: ἐπειδὴ δὲ τοῦ τε τοξάρχου ἀποθανόντος οὗτοι διεσκεδάσθησαν. Bakker identified a correlative relationship between μέχρι μὲν and ἐπειδὴ δέ, and the fact that the intervening οἱ δέ was not a response to μέχρι μέν.[357] He did not otherwise comment on the construction: but we can note the use of the imperfective aspect in both the μέχρι-clause and main clause clause of the first sentence.

---

[351] *Odyssey* 18.132-135 οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτέ φησι κακὸν πείσεσθαι ὀπίσσω, // ὄφρ᾽ ἀρετὴν παρέχωσι θεοὶ καὶ γούνατ᾽ ὀρώρῃ: // ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ καὶ λυγρὰ θεοὶ μάκαρες τελέσωσι, // καὶ τὰ φέρει ἀεκαζόμενος τετληότι θυμῷ.

[352] *Iliad* 24.543-548 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί τοι πῆμα τόδ' ἤγαγον Οὐρανίωνες // αἰεί τοι περὶ ἄστυ μάχαι τ' ἀνδροκτασίαι τε.

[353] The contrast of one countable time period to another is also found without an ἐπεί-clause, but with the imperfect-aorist contrast largely intact. The following instances have been spotted during the course of this research, but they are unlikely to be the full list: (i) *Iliad* 11.707 ἕρδομεν ἱρὰ θεοῖς: οἳ δὲ τρίτῳ ἤματι πάντες; (ii) *Odyssey* 10.80-81, (iii) *Odyssey* 14.249-252, 257, (iv) *Iliad* 1.54-55, (v) *Odyssey* 10.28-29, (vi) *Odyssey* 12.447, (vii) *Odyssey* 14.314, (viii) *Odyssey* 7.252-253 (ix) *Odyssey* 9.82-83; (x) *Iliad* 24.610-612; (xi) *Iliad* 12.25; and (xii) *Iliad* 24.107.

[354] The other instances are *Iliad* 3.209-224 , *Iliad* 10.11-15, *Odyssey* 8.87-92, *Odyssey* 11.510-527 (contains three ἐπεί-clauses which each contrast with the other two in an intensifying relationship), and *Odyssey* 12.237-241.

[355] *Works and Days* 130-132.

[356] Buijs 2005: 112-114. His interest centered here on the choice of ἐπεί over a causal “relator” such as διότι or the more firmly temporal (in his view) relator ὅτε.

### 6.4.4 Imperfective aspect

In existing scholarship, there a generic but inexact observation from a handbook on the use of imperfective aspect in conrrespondent constructions, as well as a more precise observation in Napoli’s analysis of aspect which is, however, specific to only one instance. Kühner-Gerth described ἕως μέν before a following ἐπεί-clause as introducing an “imperfektische Handlung”;[358] it is unclear from this account whether the “imperfecktische Handlung” is to be understood as that of the ἐπεί-clause or of the main clause.

Napoli commented on the verbal aspect of the expression preceding the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clause of *Iliad* 1.605 (see the first example of **Table 6.5**).[359] Regarding δαίνυντ’ of line 602 which is an instance where the clause before the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses is independent and is not of the form subordinate-clause/main-clause, Napoli commented that “the imperfect seems to have the function of indicating that the action has gone on during a determinate period, which is one of the peculiar imperfective functions cross-linguistically”.[360]

Putting the two sets of observations together and combining it with our own we can observe that whether the temporal expression before the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clause consists of an ἐπεί-clause and a main clause or simply of an independent clause(s), the verbal aspect of all these clauses is always in the imperfect. The imperfective aspect asserts that the event is ongoing, awaiting conclusion from a Correspondent ἐπεί-Clause.

The use of the imperfective aspect in main clauses before the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses is particularly striking and contrasts with what is seen where there is no answering second time period. In such cases (where there is no second time period, i.e. no Correspondent ἐπεί-Clause,) the first, indeed only, ἐπεί-clause with ἕως or ὄφρα remains in the imperfect but the main clause tends to be in the aorist.[361]

---

[357] Bakker 1993: 301-302.

[358] See above regarding “Earlier Studies on Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses”.

[359] Napoli did not isolate passages with Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses and only analysed this one instance and only with regard to the verb preceding the ἐπεί-clause.

[360] Napoli 2006: 81.

[361] So, in cases where there is no second time period ὄφρα behaves as follows: the sequence ὄφρα + imperfect... τόφρα + aorist is attested at *Iliad* 4.220-1 ὄφρα τοὶ ἀμφεπένοντο βοὴν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον, / τόφρα δ' ἐπὶ Τρώων στίχες ἤλυθον ἀσπιστάων, and similarly, *Iliad* 8.87-9, 11.357-359, 17.106-7, 18.15-16, 18.380-381, *Odyssey* 5.424-425 and 10.125-126. ἀλλ' ὅτε + imperfect... τόφρα + aorist is attested at *Odyssey* 10.569-72. εὖτ' + imperfect... τόφρα + aorist is attested at *Odyssey* 20.73-6. Exceptionally, ὄφρα + imperfect... τόφρα + imperfect is attested at *Iliad* 15.343-5 and *Iliad* 12.195-6. It suffices to consider the ὄφρα examples above, but for completeness’ sake we can note that the first three instances of ἕως display a similar sequence to that of ὄφρα, namely ἕως + imperfect...aorist. Thus: (i) *Iliad* 1.193-4, (ii) *Iliad* 10.507-508 and (iii) *Iliad* 11.411-412.

### 6.4.5 Discussion of the data: Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses

The Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses have an affirmative relationship to the preceding text which falls across the full range of Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses discussed in the preceding section. Particularly notable are the five Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses which refer to the end of the Trojan War with the Achaeans victorious: these are instances of encyclopaedic knowledge which therefore benefit from being placed in an ἐπεί-clause to clarify that nothing new is being communicated.[362] Our principal interest in the following examination is to highlight the expected nature of the events of the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses.

#### Discussion of Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses (other than those of seeing)

The full set of Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses, other than those in respect of seeing, are set out at **Table 6.5**. A selection of the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses is then discussed, with the numbering of the table being followed. The Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses of seeing are discussed later within this sub-section.

**Table 6.5.** Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses (other than those of seeing)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 1.601-606 | ὣς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα<br>δαίνυντ’, οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης,<br>οὐ μὲν φόρμιγγος περικαλλέος ἣν ἔχ’ Ἀπόλλων,<br>Μουσάων θ’ αἳ ἄειδον ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατέδυ λαμπρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο,**<br>οἳ μὲν κακκείοντες ἔβαν οἶκόνδε ἕκαστος, |
| | See also (2) *Iliad* 11.264-268, (3) *Iliad* 12.10, 13-17 (4) *Iliad* 13.172-175, (5) *Iliad* 13.314-317, (6) *Iliad* 15.318-22, (7) *Iliad* 15.547-549, (8) *Iliad* 20.41-49, (9) *Odyssey* 3.126-131, (10) *Odyssey* 13.314-319, (11) *Odyssey* 15.361-368, and (12) *Odyssey* 22.116-122. | |

1/ *Iliad* 1 concludes with the gods dining on Olympus the whole day long (with imperfect δαίνυντ’ and ἐδεύετο); but when the sun sets they retire to their individual homes. As a subordinate clause relating to the setting of the sun, an ἦμος-clause might have been expected.[363] Precisely this structure is seen at *Odyssey* 9.161ff., 9.556ff., 10.183ff., 10.476ff., 12.29ff. and 19.424ff. which all start with the line ὣς τότε μὲν πρόπαν ἦμαρ ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα and end with the line ἦμος δ’ ἠέλιος κατέδυ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθεν. Of these instances *Odyssey* 19.424ff. contains particularly identical wording to that of *Iliad* 1.601ff.

The explanation for the change from an ἦμος-clause must lie in the fact that the scene of *Iliad* 1.601ff. is set among the gods on Olympus. The laws of nature do not wholly apply to them, to the extent that the description of night falling in the standard ἦμος-clause of καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθεν was felt unsuitable. An adapted ἐπεί-clause was therefore constructed, perhaps deliberately employing ἐπεί rather than ἦμος (and not just by necessity to facilitate different wording) so as to reduce the association with the sun and the laws of nature.[364]

---

[362] See ἐπεί-clauses (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) of **Table 6.5**.

[363] Muchnová 2011: 146-147 noted that ἦμος was typically used but that this ἐπεί-clause was also attested.

As to why an ἐπεί-clause rather than a ὅτε-clause was chosen, when ὅτε-clauses often deal with marking natural time, it seems to be the case that correspondence clauses with ὅτε in respect of natural time are not found (see Section 6.4.6 below). The arrival of evening is heavily marked and expected by the first time period, so that there is nothing odd in the use of ἐπεί; but outside of the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses we would have expected the arrival of evening to have been marked by ὅτε.

5/ Apollo is initially depicted holding his aegis steady in his hands with the imperfect ἔχ' at line 318. While he holds it steady weapons fall on both sides, with the imperfect ἥπτετο. But then Apollo shakes it in the ἐπεί-clause and the Danaans flee in terror. The event of the ἐπεί-clause is expected, since at lines 229-230 Zeus tells Apollo to shake the aegis fiercely over the Achaeans (τῇ μάλ' ἐπισσείων) with the aim of frightening them.

11/ Unrevealed Odysseus takes part in an archery contest with the suitors and as long as he has (with imperfect ἔσαν) arrows is able to fell the suitors (with imperfect βάλλε and ἔπιπτον). But when, in the ἐπεί-clause, he runs out of arrows a different course of action commences and he puts on his armour and picks up two spears. This running out of arrows is anticipated earlier in the text when Telemachus offered to bring armour and two spears and Odysseus accepted, urging him to go while there was still time (lines 101 to 107).

### Discussion of Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses of seeing

Although, as discussed in the following section, preposed clauses with ὅτε and ἦμος mark out a second time period following a first time period, preposed clauses with ὡς performing this function are absent. ὡς-clauses, as noted in Section 2.4.1, tend to describe an unanticipated event of perception, in particular that of seeing. Now, although the three events of seeing which appear in Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses employ ἐπεί as the subordinator, it must be noted that there is no textual anticipation of the perception; this absence of anticipation is atypical for Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses. The three clauses are listed in the table below.

---

[364] Monteil 1963: 290-295 observes the strong connection between the sun and the use of ἦμος even beyond the language of Homer, but does not address the question of this stray use of the ἐπεί-clause.

**Table 6.6.** Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses of seeing

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 15.277-280 | ὣς Δαναοὶ εἵως μὲν ὁμιλαδὸν αἰὲν ἕποντο<br>νύσσοντες ξίφεσίν τε καὶ ἔγχεσιν ἀμφιγύοισιν:<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ἴδον Ἕκτορ’ ἐποιχόμενον στίχας ἀνδρῶν**<br>τάρβησαν, πᾶσιν δὲ παραὶ ποσὶ κάππεσε θυμός. |
| | See also (2) *Iliad* 12.141-145[365] and (3) *Iliad* 15. 390-397[366] | |

---

[365] Commentators have largely remained silent on what to supply for εἵως of the first time period in line 141.

[366] See Scodel 2008 for a discussion of this passage and the evidence that lines 390-394 shows for simultaneity.

The phrasing of a number of preposed temporal ὡς-clauses recalls these clauses, for example: *Iliad* 3.154 οἳ δ’ ὡς οὖν εἴδονθ’ Ἑλένην ἐπὶ πύργον ἰοῦσαν, 11.284, 15.484 etc. We must wonder then whether the instances in **Table 6.6** are “suppletive” realisations of ὡς clauses, but if this is so then the reason why is not immediately obvious and further investigation must be left until a full study of the precise conditions in which a preposed ὡς clause may be used. In these three instances the “circumstantial” function described by Muchnová applies to these three clauses: the perception in the preposed clause is the trigger for the events of the main clause and subsequent clauses.

1/ The Danaans do not initially realise that Hector has returned to the scene and they continue to rush after the Trojans (with imperfect ἕποντο). When they see Hector they are frightened. In the subsequent clauses they turn and flee. We might think that a subordinate clause with ἐπεί could reflect the fact that the event fulfils earlier predictions, here those set out in a foreshadowing simile. But if we turn to consider how another foreshadowing simile affects the structure of the following text, namely the foreshadowing simile preceding *Iliad* 17.730-733 (as discussed in the following section on ὅτε-clauses), we can note that there the simile does not trigger the use of ἐπεί; this suggests that foreshadowing similes do not affect the narrator’s perception of predictability of the pure narrative line. Rather, as with examples (2) and (3), an ἐπεί-clause is used to describe the perception despite its lack of anticipation.

### 6.4.6 Correspondent preposed clauses with ὅτε and ἦμος

Preposed ὅτε-clauses are also employed to mark the end of a first time period and the start of a second time period.[367] The events of these ὅτε-clauses are not temporal by nature (such as the start of a new day) or typical of a new scene (such as the arrival at a new place, except on two occasions), although outside of this structure a large number of ὅτε-clauses are concerned precisely with setting a temporal or descriptive scene. The aspectual distinction between the imperfect of the first time frame and the aorist of the second time frame is identical to that seen with the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses. Similarly, the first time frame is marked by μέν.

There are two distinctions between this group of ὅτε-clauses and the Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses: (i) the events of these ὅτε-clauses are not anticipated by the preceding text; and (ii) they occur in narrative in direct speech, except for two instances which describe arrival. This distribution mirrors that seen with ὅτε-clauses outside of this correspondent function.[368]

We can look at the first attested instance, at *Iliad* 9.550-556. There Phoenix narrates a mythical story, parallelled to that of Achilles, of the hero Meleager and his refusal to take part in battle. As long as Meleager fought with the Aetolians it went badly for the enemy, the

---

[367] See *Iliad* 9.550-556, 13.143-146, 17.730-733, *Odyssey* 2.148-151, 3.265-270, 12.329-332, 14.229-238 and 24.162-166.

[368] This distribution is mentioned in Section 5.6.2.

Kouretes. But when Meleager took offence (ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ), angered with his mother, he refused to fight further and lay with his wife Cleopatra.

On twelve occasions the subordinator ἦμος answers to a preceding time expression.[369] As with the general use of ἦμος, the clauses relate to the time of day: most typically dawn or dusk. It should be noted that the same aspectual contrast between the imperfect for the temporal subordinate clause and main clause of the first time frame (sometimes reduced to a single clause with τότε μέν) and aorist for the ἦμος-clause of the second time frame is generally observed, see for example *Iliad* 8.66-69.

---

[369] *Iliad* 8.66-69, 11.84-90, and 6.777-780, and *Odyssey* 9.56-59, 9.162-169, 9.306-308, 9.436-8, 9.556-9, 10.183-6, 10.476-479, 12.29-32 and 19.424-427

# Chapter 7 Discourse Function: Completion

## 7.1 Introduction

A small portion of the Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses were studied in the preceding chapter. It was shown that the event described in those ἐπεί-clauses is in one way or another already anticipated or expressly referred to in the earlier text. The remaining Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses, in fact the majority of all such clauses, now remain to be considered.

We can observe that the balance of the ἐπεί-clauses also relate back to an earlier textual anticipation. But the relationship of these clauses to preceding text is one of completing an action which had been described as commenced earlier in the text. In Chapter 8 we will note a variety of recurring lexical and stylistic features in these ἐπεί-clauses which perform the semantic function of marking an event as well and truly finished. The completive semantics, even aspect, of these clauses leads us to term these clauses “Completive ἐπεί-Clauses”.

An example of the phenomenon we are investigating is *Odyssey* 2.377-378 ὣς ἄρ’ ἔφη, γρῆυς δὲ θεῶν μέγαν ὅρκον ἀπώμνυ. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὅρκον. This is an instance of what we sub-categorise as a “Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clause”, with a first account of the event juxtaposed to a second subordinated account. This chained structure is found frequently in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but aside from a passing reference from Chantaine it has barely been examined in secondary literature.[370]

ἐπεί-clauses with two other relationships to the preceding text are also identified. “Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses” are quite common and are used where an event is described as commenced but then left for an account of something else, before being revisited for its completion in the ἐπεί-clause, for example *Odyssey* 24.67, 71 καίεο δ' ἔν τ' ἐσθῆτι θεῶν ... .// ... / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δή σε φλὸξ ἤνυσεν.

“Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses” are found where an event is mentioned in a first account but its execution is not covered in full in that first account (either from the perspective of the detail of the actors or of the sub-events of the event), but is covered in its entirety in a ἐπεί-clause, for example *Iliad* 3.340 οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν which summarises the arming of the two warriors who have armed themselves in the preceding lines, one in full detail but one only in one line.

Completive ἐπεί-Clauses describe the following events (each termed a “Completive Event” in the remainder of this chapter): preparing a fire for roasting, burning the thigh pieces of an animal, roasting meat, preparing a meal, dining, arming for battle, making up a fresh bed, warming water, gathering together, beautifying oneself for seduction, travelling, praying, gathering wood for a pyre, cremating a body, conducting libations, swearing an oath (as in the example of a Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clause above), weeping, laundering clothes, sexual intercourse, looking after a flock of sheep, forging armour, staring with admiration, taking part in a sports competition, forging bonds for a snare, positioning a snare in place, tidying a hall, dodging the attack of an enemy, performing a dance with a ball and drawing a bow for shooting an arrow.

---

[370] Chantraine 1963: 359.

The striking *catena* of Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses has given rise to some cursory observations by scholars. The same cannot be said for the Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses and Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, whose powers of textual cohesion have hitherto gone unacknowledged.

We identify three particular details of the preceding text and of the Completive Event itself which give rise to the need for an answering ἐπεί-clause marking completion: (i) signposting, or as we term it here “preparation”, by preceding events anticipating the Completive Event; (ii) the durative nature of the Completive Event; and (iii) a preliminary account of the Completive Event, often in the imperfective aspect.

The choice of ἐπεί as subordinator for Completive ἐπεί-Clauses suggests that ἐπεί marks anaphoric referencing. Without anaphoric referencing the event of a Completive ἐπεί-Clause could be interpreted as denoting a new event: ἐπεί (rather than ὅτε for example) ensures that the audience understands that the event referred to is the one commenced earlier in the narrative. The function of these subordinate clauses varies according to whether they are Chained, Resumptive or Cumulative.

In Section 7.7 we consider the ἐπεί-clauses for dinner preparations and the consumption of the dinner itself. The ἐπεί-clauses in this semantic field often follow closely one after the other. We examine the event described in each subordinate clause to show that they are sensed by the poet to be of duration.

In Appendix 3 we present in tabular form, across around 30 pages, the balance of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. We go through each instance and note whether it is a Chained, Resumptive or Cumulative ἐπεί-clause. Further, we note down the three details of a Completive Event which give rise to the need for an answering ἐπεί-clause, as mentioned above: *aspect*, *duration of the event*, and *preparation*. In Section 7.7 and Appendix 3 there is no linear development of further theory, and so the examples can be considered in any order that suits the reader.

## 7.2 Cross-linguistic analyses of subordination used to complete an event

The examples of subordinate clauses adduced in cross-linguistic studies of subordination often involve events of duration. The studies tend to identify diverse discourse functions for the subordinate clauses; surprisingly, none of the studies particularly highlights the coincidence subordination with events of duration.

### 7.2.1 Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

Observations of one clause being juxtaposed to another clause (where the contents of the second clause appear to repeat the contents of the first clause) tend to draw on data from non-literate cultures. We can divide the observations into approximately three groups: a predominant theory that this type of juxtaposition serves simply to link one clause to the next (“**linkage**”), a theory that it is used to create an impression of continuity of events (“**continuity**”), and a theory that it is used to facilitate retention of information in contexts where that information must be adequately absorbed (“**procedural discourse**”). The phenomenon is typically noted as consisting of a series of clausal juxtapositions, what we can call a *vinculum vinculorum*.

#### Linkage

The most comprehensive cross-linguistic account of adverbial clauses which relate to and are juxtaposed to an immediately preceding account is to be found in the recent study of Thompson et al. Their study dedicated four pages to discussing the syntax and referencing relations of adverbial clauses marking anteriority. They discussed these in the context of examining how adverbial clauses are used to perform the discourse function of “linkage”.[371]

They enumerate three particular ways in which an adverbial clause may link back to an element in a preceding sentence. There may be a “back reference” in which there is lexical repetition: *He went. When he arrived in the forest, he chopped the trees. When he had chopped them, he shaped them. When he had shaped them, he went home again*. This example is taken from Longacre’s data from the *Itneg* language. There may also be “reciprocal coupling”, as illustrated by *They said, “Why not let us be the ones to build it?” When they heard this....* Or there may be “script-predictable referencing”, such as *They killed a wild pig, cut it up, and cooked it. After eating it...*”[372]

It is the first of three ways, namely “back referencing”, which resonates particularly strongly with the Greek examples of what we term “Chained ἐπεί-clauses”. Thompson et al. did not elaborate much further on this construction, but it is noticeable that they are silent on any idea that there might be any discourse function beyond linkage that is performed by “back referencing”. Interestingly, they note in reference to “some structures in New Guinea” that this back-referencing is “more characteristic of the oral style than of the written style. In the written style there is sometimes a certain reluctance to write in back-reference, a reluctance especially observable in the new literates.”[373]

---

[371] Thompson et al. 2007: 276-280.

[372] We return to this third option in Section 6.3 in respect of what we term “Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-clauses”.

[373] Thompson et al. 2007: 277.

Earlier and later accounts of this chaining draw on a variety of exotic languages and tend similiarly to find that linking is the likely function. For example, in 2009 Dixon stated that "some languages have what can be called a 'bridging device' whereby the last part of one sentence is summarized at the beginning of the next, as an aid to discourse continuity. For example the textual extract from Konso [a Cushitic language in South-West Ethiopia] [...] includes 'Then when this milk made the children grow, the aunt was fed up with them. After she was fed up with them, she took the cow and gave it to them.' In some instances a bridging device could be regarded as a clause linker; or it may just serve to link sentences in a discourse (and might in time develop into a marker of clause linking)."[374]

## Continuity

Sequences of juxtaposed subordinate clauses are attested in certain epic Slavic songs, as noted by Arend, drawing on the earlier work of Miklosich 1890 who in turn cited the 1886 study of Bistrom on Russian folk-songs.[375] There is, for example, the attested the sequence (as translated into German) of "er stellte auf sein Zelt, das aus weißem Lein; als er es aufgestellt, schlug er Feuer; als er Feuer geschlagen, legte er es an; al ser es angelegt hatte, kochte er Grütze; al ser sie gekocht hatte, verzehrte er die Grütze."[376] Miklosich explained this sequence as a product of a desire for "Stetigkeit" in which each detail is recounted and lingered on.[377]

## Procedural Discourse

The most detailed study of procedural discourse[378] is Marchese 1987. This study found that in recordings of instructions in the Godié language of the Ivory Coast preposed subordinate clauses featured prominently: "if you have done x,"[379] and that furthermore "each initial subordinate clause repeat[ed] information of the previous clause and 'frame[d]' the following comment."[380] Marchese's corpus tended to consist of the reference to a step to be performed first in the imperative and then repeated but in the conditional voice. Marchese hypothesised that "the frequency of conditionals can be directly attributed to the discourse goal of teaching someone a procedure. It stands to reason that the smaller the chunks, the easier it will be for the hearer to identify and remember the processes involved. Thus, conditionals are more frequent in procedural discourse because we are dealing with a process which must be remembered and carried out."[381]

---

[374] Dixon 2009: 8. See also Schulze et al. 1973 and Overall 2009: 173.

[375] Arend 1933: 17

[376] Miklosich 1890: 7.

[377] Unlike later Arend, Miklosich did not suggest a comparison with ἐπεί-clauses. Rather, he compared it to *Odyssey* 21.42-53. These lines do not contain repetition of events; rather, they recount with attention to the detail of each action what Penelope does when she prepares to fight the suitors.

[378] A term coined by Grimes 1968.

[379] Cross-linguistically, future temporal clauses and conditional clauses can overlap in function (with the same subordinator sometimes functioning for both).

[380] Marchese 1987: 270.

Marchese's observations on this phenomenon did not extend to investigating whether certain event classes (such as those with duration) attract the construction more than others. We will show that the "chaining" with Completive ἐπεί-Clauses heavily favours verbs which have natural duration.

### 7.2.2 Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

Many of the examples offered by linguists to explain how preposed adverbial clauses link backwards and forwards involve events of some duration which are completed in the adverbial clause. In their textbook on "Discourse Analysis" Brown and Yule analysed an extract from William Wharton's novel *Birdy* and noted the full adverbial clause (and not only the preposition "after") "after she's finished eating" as being a marker of topic-shift:[382]

> *"By the end of the week, I rubberband the treat food dish onto the end of an extra perch and put it into the cage through the door. I lock the door open with a paper clip. At first, Birdie's shy, but then she jumps on the perch ... She sits eating the treat food at the opening of the door and looking at me. How does she know to look into my eyes and not at the huge finger next to her?*
> *"After she's finished eating, she retreats to the middle of the perch. I lift it gently to give her a ride and a feeling the perch is part of me and not the cage. ...".*"

The linguists observed that "the topic shift is marked by the adverbial phrase and the new topic would seem to be picked up with 'she retreats to the middle of the perch'". We might also want to observe the fact that while the adverbial clause may be used as the mechanism for shifting topic it is at the same time completing an event of some duration, namely eating treat food. An example like this matches perfectly our Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses (which, as defined further in Section 7.3, are Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which complete an event following the insertion of another event between the commencement of the event of the ἐπεί-clause and its conclusion in the ἐπεί-clause).

### 7.2.3 Cross-linguistic observations on Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

A passing recognition of the completive nature of ἐπεί-clauses which lexically denote completion has entered the repertoire of work on subordination. Thompson et al. noted the phenomenon which they termed "summary-head linkage" where "the first sentence of a successive paragraph has a clause which summarizes the preceding paragraph. Thus, we may have a paragraph involving description of a variety of activities. The next paragraph may begin, *When he had done all this*, or something to that effect."[383]

---

[381] *Idem*, 276.

[382] Brown and Yule 1983: 97.

## 7.3 Existing Accounts of constructions in fifth-century Greek or Homeric Greek which resemble the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

### 7.3.1 Constructions in Herodotus

A 1980 study of clause structure, arrangement and linkage in Herodotus's prose briefly noted that clause linkage and marking of the end-point can be achieved through repetition of a verb. Müller observed that the repetition can be of the identical finite verb used on the first occasion, but that often the verb form is changed so that the second occurrence entails a change of verbal aspect. He offered a couple of examples, the first of which is a ὡς subordinate clause with a change between imperfect ἤια and aorist ἐσῆλθον which recalls a number of ἐπεί-clauses of arrival: (i) 1, 111, 2-3 ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκπλαγεὶς ἤια ἔσω. ὡς δὲ τάχιστα ἐσῆλθον and (ii) 1, 113, 3 καὶ ἔθαψε τοῦ βουκόλου τὸ παιδίον, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἐτέθαπτο.[384]

Regarding the first example Müller noted that "whereas the first clause describes the process, in the second second clause the end-point of the process is put before your eyes."[385] This is indeed similar to the structure that we find in Homer in the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, although there we identify a relationship of duration (expressed only aspectually) and completion (expressed with necessary lexical support). Müller then went on to observe that the most frequent form of lexical repetition in clause linking is in fact through a participial form.[386]

In his study of subordinate clauses in Herodotus, Bakker commented on an individual instance of a subordinate clause which appeared to restate what had already been recounted: at 1.121 we read ὡς δὲ χαλεπῶς ἐλαμβάνετο ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ περιεόντος παιδὸς καὶ πολλὰ πρὸς αὐτὴν λέγων οὐκ ἔπειθε, ἐπιτεχνήσασθαι τοιάδε μιν. Bakker commented on this that "the first part of this clause recapitulates what was said in the preceding discourse (the mother being outraged at the treatment of her son's body, and her threatening to denounce the remaining one if he did not try and get it back) and is, as such, 'given'. This kind of propositional overlap, expressed as an adverbial element, is a powerful means of effecting a discourse boundary. ... In Herodotus, this strategy very often takes the form of lexical overlap, whereby the predicate of a clause is repeated in the form of a preposed participle which functions as frame for the immediately following clause. This produces interparagraph relations of the following type: 'Solon *arrived* at the palace of Croesus. *Having arrived* he was welcomed by the king'."[387] So, as with Müller, it is suggested that participial chaining is the typical mechanism. It is noticeable that Bakker's example of a subordinate clause shows the clause to be in the imperfective aspect. Bakker is unusual in suggesting a discourse boundary where others see only linkage. Bakker cross-referred to Marchese's study on procedural discourse in this context.

---

[383] Thompson et al. 2007: 274, based on Longacre's earlier data from the Philippines.

[384] Müller 1980: 59.

[385] *Ibid*.

[386] *Idem*, 61.

[387] Bakker 1991: 240.

### 7.3.2 Participial chaining in Homer

The repetition of a verbal lexeme or lexical synonym in proximate clauses which describe the same event is profuse in Homer. The syntax of such repetition typically takes the form of subordination with ἐπεί in the form of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. But there are approximately twenty five instances in which the repetition is in the form of a participle, for example *Iliad* 1.595-596 ὣς φάτο, μείδησεν δὲ θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη, / μειδήσασα δὲ παιδὸς ἐδέξατο χειρὶ κύπελλον or *Iliad* 20.61-62 ἔδδεισεν δ' ὑπένερθεν ἄναξ ἐνέρων Ἀϊδωνεύς, / δείσας δ' ἐκ θρόνου ἆλτο καὶ ἴαχε, μή οἱ ὕπερθε. Chantraine suggested that repetition with a participle was a development of an earlier repetition with an ἐπεί. [388] As outlined below, however, the two arrangements seem rather to exist alongside each other, dealing at least in part with different event classes.

In the case of the participial group the verbal aspect of the first account of the relevant event tends to be the same as that of the second account of the event: most instances are with an aorist indicative followed by an aorist participle, and a smaller group (which marks simultaneity of occurrence of the repeated event with the onset of another event) present an imperfect indicative and a present tense participle. This is a significant departure from the subordinate group where, in particular when the repetitions are in juxtaposed lines and are Completive ἐπεί-Clauses as outlined further in this chapter, the aspect of the first account is typically imperfect and the aspect of the second account is aorist.

The following participial chainings with the same lexemes were noted by Chantraine: *Iliad* 1.595-596 μείδησεν / μειδήσασα, 10.576-577 λούσαντο / λοεσσαμένω, 11.5, 10 στῆ / στᾶσ', 12.294, 298 ἔσχετο / σχόμενος, 14.171, 175 ἀλείψατο / ἀλειψαμένη, 20.61-62 ἔδδεισεν / δείσας, 22.33-34 ᾤμωξεν / οἰμώξας, 24.799, 801 ἔχεαν / χεύαντες, *Odyssey* 1.29, 31 μνήσατο / ἐπιμνησθεὶς, 4.401, 403 εἶσι / ἐλθὼν, 15.463-464 κατένευσε / καννεύσας, and 19.600, 602 ἀνέβαιν' / ἀναβᾶσα.[389] The additional instance of *Odyssey* 10.310-311 ἔστην / στάς was noted during the course of research for this thesis. Of all of these instances, only Chantraine's final example has imperfective aspect in the first account.

---

[388] Chantraine 1963: 359. Kühner-Gerth 1904: 80 also offered some examples from fifth-century Greek of this type of participial chaining. Migrón 1983: 74 explored the possibility of a genetic relationship between the participial chaining seen in Old-Indic and that seen in Homer.

[389] Chantraine 1963: 359. Chantraine also noted *Odyssey* 9.148-149 ἐπικέλσαι / κελσάσῃσι which is certainly a case of anadiplosis but is not two accounts of the same event.

A smaller group of participial chaining with lexical synonyms was noted by Chantraine:[390] *Iliad* 10.194, 198 τάφροιο διέσσυτο / τάφρον δ' ἐκδιαβάντες, 11.457-458 εἷλκε (vv.ll ἕλκε) / σπασθέντος, 21.502, 504 συναίνυτο / λαβοῦσα, *Odyssey* 9.543, 546 ἀφικόμεθ' / ἐλθόντες, 24.533-534 δέος εἷλε / δεισάντων.[391]

More revealing for our purposes than Chantraine's distinction between lexical repetition and repetition with synonyms is a sub-division of these repetitions into those where the repetition is in juxtaposed lines, i.e. classical chaining, and those where there is a gap of one more or lines between the first account and the second account. The former group appears to be unconnected and independent of chaining with ἐπεί-clauses whereas the latter group resembles linking with Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses and appears to be selected as a complementary alternative to Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses.

The juxtaposed instances are predominantly limited to emotional reactions, all of which are semelfactives: μειδήσασα, δείσας/ δεισάντων, οἰμώξας, καννεύσας. But with *Iliad* 10.576-577 λούσαντο / λοεσσαμένω and 11.457-458 εἷλκε (vv.ll ἕλκε) / σπασθέντος chaining of two durative events is found. The bathing of the first case is an event which is familiar from Completive ἐπεί-Clauses: *Iliad* 24.587, *Odyssey* 4.49, 8.454 and 17.88 τὸν / τοὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ.

As far as the semelfactives in the participial chaining are concerned, the actionality of those events may explain why an *aorist – aorist* relationship is selected over the *imperfect – aorist* arrangement of most juxtaposed chaining with Completive ἐπεί-Clauses (whose events are typically durative). But we cannot deduce that the participial chaining is in complementary distribution with ἐπεί chaining, nor, as Chantraine would have it, that one is the progenitor of the other, since the greater edifice surrounding ἐπεί chaining (in particular, the typical solicitation of the event prior to its occurrence in the first of the two subsequent accounts) is missing from the participial chaining. Rather, we have two different and unrelated devices for distinct textual and event constructions. The purpose of the semelfactive chaining is beyond the scope of this study, but it seems possible that the paradox of the brevity of an emotionally expressive event may warrant a pause on that moment by way of anadiplosis.

As regards the juxtaposed instances at *Iliad* 10.576-577 λούσαντο / λοεσσαμένω and 11.457-458 εἷλκε (vv.ll ἕλκε) / σπασθέντος, the lack of narratival build-up suffices to distinguish the context of these repetitions from what is found with Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.

---

[390] Chantraine also isolated a group where the repeating participle is in the present tense and another event is commenced while the event of the repeating participle is continued. The instances cited by Chantraine are Iliad 4.213-214 εἷλκεν (vv.ll ἕλκεν) / ἐξελκομένοιο, 13.660, 662 χολώθη / χωόμενος, 23.696, 698 ἄγον / ἄγοντες, 24.412, 414 κεῖται / κειμένῳ, Odyssey 1.422-423 τέρποντο / τερπομένοισι and 12.309, 311 ἔκλαιον / κλαιόντεσσι. The additional instance of Iliad 1.34-35 βῆ / κιών can be added. These present tense repetitions clearly mark out that the event is incomplete and that another event occurs not after that first event but while that event continues.

[391] Migrón 1983: 73 described δέος εἷλε as an "ingressive aorist" expression.

The reason for a repetition being employed may nevertheless be similar to that identified with the events of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses: the event is of sufficient duration that the poet wishes to pause on it for a moment by way of lexical repetition.

The detached participial repetitions, by contrast, cover a range of events and resemble closely in structure and function certain ἐπεί-clauses, namely the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses. The participial repetitions cover a range of events, including στᾶσ', σχόμενος, ἀλειψαμένη, χεύαντες etc., but no semelfactives. The type of material that falls between the two accounts of the event is of one sort, and recalls the digressions before Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses: between the first account of the event and its repetition lies a digression consisting of a description of a relevant object, place or purpose. For example, between lines 5 and 10 of *Iliad* 11 is a description of the location of the ship on which a goodess stood; between lines 294 and 298 is a description of the shield which Sarpedon held out; and between lines 171 and 175 of *Iliad* 14 is a description of the olive oil used by Hera for anointing her body.

If we compare the aspectual and lexical relationship between these participles and preceding text with that between Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses and preceding text, we find similarities: the first account is typically aorist, with lexical repetition between the two accounts being frequent. The significant difference lies in the textual distance between the first account and the second account: the digression between the first account and the participial repetition tends to be of one or two lines, whereas the length of digression prior to a Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clause covers a section of lines which often enter double figures (see Section 6.2).

It appears to be the case that a participial repetition of an event is chosen following a digression where the initial account is not particularly textually remote. Whereas the proximity of an earlier account of an event to a following participial repetition permits the non-anaphoric (and less cumbersome) participial form to be employed, the ἐπεί of the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses serves to point with deliberation back to an earlier and more remote referent.[392]

In conclusion, textual linking with participles is distinguishable from that with ἐπεί-clauses by a number of measures. Where chaining of one juxtaposed clause to another is concerned, there is a difference in use of verbal aspect: the aorist aspect is used in the first account where it is followed by a participial repetition, whereas imperfective aspect is used in the first account when it is followed by an ἐπεί-clause. This difference largely coincides with a difference in the actionality of the types of events that the two constructions relate to, with the former tending to be semelfactives. Where linking by participial repetition follows a digression, the verbal aspect and lexical choice resembles that of Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses: the choice between the two constructions seems motivated by the distance between the initial account and the recapitulation, with a participle being favoured where the gap is small.

---

[392] In Section 6.2, it is suggested that resumption with ἄρα is chosen where the events described following the digression following the same tempo as that of the event itself, whereas ἐπεί is preferred where a new trajectory is taken.

### 7.3.3 Sucession of subordinate clauses

It is evident that the Greek language did not avoid, perhaps indeed even welcomed, the quick succession of subordinate clauses of similar syntax. Muchnová observed that “en grec, on rencontre parfois une accumulation d’occurrences de ἐπεί dans un seul segment.” She cited from Xenophon the instances of *Anabasis* 7.7.55.4 ἐπεὶ δὲ εἶδον, ἥσθησαν καὶ προσέθεον. Ξενοφῶν δ’ ἐπεὶ εἶδε Χαρμῖνόν τε καὶ Πολύνικον· Ταῦτα, ἔφη, σέσωσται δι’ ὑμᾶς τῇ στρατιᾷ and similarly *Anabasis* 6.1.25.2, 6.6.35.3, 7.3.40.3, *Hellenica* 2.2.12.3, 4.2.19.3, 6.2.20.1 and Cyropaedia 7.5.6.1.[393]

Moorhouse drew attention to the phenomen in Homer of “the use of ἀλλ' ὅτε δή... in which the words are repeated four times at short intervals, always at the start of a line, and mark different stages of a self-contained sequence of thought or action.”[394] Moorhouse cited the passages at *Iliad* 3.209ff., 6.172ff. and 10.338ff. Moorhouse did not mention them, but there are a further passage two or three ἀλλ’ ὅτε-clauses in quick succession: *Odyssey* 12.178ff., 4.513ff., and 24.162ff.

The observations of Muchnová and Moorhouse on the absence of an aversion to repeating subordinate clauses one after the other removes some of the mystery surrounding the chains of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.

## 7.4 Previous analyses of the discourse function of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses in Homer

No distinction is made by any scholar between the three types of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses as are identified in this chapter; nor indeed is there any conscious extraction of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses out of the full group of ἐπεί-clauses. But looking across a range of studies, we can pick out a cluster of observations on the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which correctly identify many of their characteristics.

### 7.4.1 The function of the individual ἐπεί-clauses

**No Backgrounding Function**

Reynen noted in respect of many Completive ἐπεί-Clauses (as termed by us-Reynen himself did not place them in a single group) that “nothing significant follows the clause”.[395] This observation chimes with our own, finding that the ἐπεί-clauses do not providing a setting for what follows.

---

[393] Muchnová 2011: 53.

[394] Moorhouse 1952: 101-102.

[395] See Reynen 1957: 40 on the Completive ἐπεί-Clause of *Odyssey* 16.478 οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα, and similarly the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses of *Odyssey* 4.49 and 17.88 τοὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ.

### The Completion Marking Nature of the ἐπεί-clauses

The closest we can find with respect to the Homeric data to an observation that ἐπεί-clauses can serve to mark completion of an event is Grimm’s description of the particle ῥ’ in certain of the ἐπεί-clauses as marking the “Endpunkt” of a recounted event.[396] He offers the instances of *Iliad* 2.421 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ηὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο, *Iliad* 1.484 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἵκοντο κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν, *Iliad* 14.383 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἕσσαντο περὶ χροῒ νώροπα χαλκὸν and *Iliad* 14.280 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὅρκον. The examples that Grimm selected out of the full list of ἐπεί-clauses with ῥ’ are indeed noticeably all “Completive ἐπεί-Clauses”.

## 7.4.2 The association with type scenes

In a much cited and influential study Arend 1933 illustrated how certain scenes, including those of arrival, bathing, sacrifice, arming and oath-taking consist of components which “normally occur in the same order, some elaborated to a greater or lesser extent to suit the context, others appearing in minimal form or even omitted altogether.”[397] Arend called these scenes “Typische Scenen”. As noted by Arend, Lord 1960 and Edwards 1992, among others, the type scene can be very elaborate or can consist of a single line.

Pertinent to this study, Arend noted that the full type scene or some or all of the components of a type scene are often concluded with an ἐπεί-clause. He categorised these ἐπεί-clauses as “Abschlußformel” *closing formulas*.[398] Arend drew on the ethnographic work of other cultures and suggested that when we find a sequence of these ἐπεί-clauses it is “like a child climbing stairs: it does not always move immediately to the next step, but first lifts up the other foot to join its partner”.[399] He referred to *Iliad* 1.450ff. where there is a sequence of ἐπεί-clauses but also to *Odyssey* 2.8-9 where there is only one ἐπεί-clause. Arend did not comment on any variation in verbal aspect.

Allowing the poet greater sophistication than Arend, Durante noted very briefly that αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses describe events such as sacrifices, dining and libations and enable the poet to “deliver a varied narrative rhythm, alternating scenes of war with moments of less emotional tension”.[400]

---

[396] Grimm 1962: 7

[397] As paraphrased by Edwards 1992: 290. And for a summary of scholarship on type scenes see Edwards 1992: 290-298.

[398] For example see Arend 1933: 77 on recurrent αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ' ἔπιον θ', ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός.

[399] Arend 1933: 17.

[400] Durante 1971: 56 (my translation from the Italian). See also West 1988: 166. Both Durante and West were in favour of treating these ἐπεί-clauses as of great antiquity with Aeolic traces.

Durante's articulation valuably captured the difference in tempo between type scenes and other scenes, attributing the cohesion between these scenes to the ἐπεί-clauses. In the following section we take this argument in a different direction in connection with Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses; we note that there is indeed a difference of pace and detail between type scenes and other scenes – we suggest that the poet needs to balance out the disparity by linguistically plumping up the type scenes without troubling himself with additional details.

In Section 3.2 we considered Katz' suggestion, based largely on an examination of the phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, that αὐτάρ is a "sacral particle". We dismissed this suggestion on a number of grounds. For completeness' sake we can simply observe again that Katz remarked that "there are a tremendous number of αὐτάρ clauses, including many of the rigidly formulaic ones, that describe what French Hellenists refer to as 'the cuisine of sacrifice', that is to say, are concerned with emotionally charged rites and ritual feasting: prayer, sacrifice, libation, eating and drinking."[401] Katz noted further that αὐτὰρ ἐπεί is found also with clauses of prayer, libations and oaths.

### 7.4.3 Verbal aspect

One of the salient observations made during the course of research for this thesis is that where there are two accounts of the same event, with the second account being introduced by an ἐπεί-clause, the first account is typically in the imperfect. Yet in relation to ἐπεί, it has not previously been noted by scholars that an imperfect account often precedes the account in the ἐπεί-clause.[402]

Even outside of the ἐπεί-clauses or other subordinate clauses there is little noting by scholars of a sequence of imperfective aspect of an event followed later by the aorist aspect. Chantraine provided the citations for a small number of pairs of the same verb with different aspectual stems occurring in close textual proximity in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* but did not offer any analysis and did not particularly identify those in the sequence imperfect – aorist.[403] Furthermore, with Chantraine's examples the two verbs of each pair have different subjects. A handful of other scholars have also looked at instances of different aspectual stems occurring in close succession, but again by reference to the same verbs with different subjects and without noticing any tendency for an imperfect of an event to be followed by an aorist describing that same event.[404]

If we consider more broadly what is understood of Homeric verbal aspect, we note that the traditional view with broadest consensus is that the Homeric (and fifth-century Greek) imperfect indicative marks the duration of an event whereas the aorist indicative marks the occurrence of the event in the past without further nuance.[405]

---

[401] Katz 2007: 74.

[402] Other than Kühner-Gerth 1904: 228 who notes that in the case of Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses the event before the second subordinate clause is placed in the imperfect.

[403] Chantraine 1963: §287.

[404] See in particular Wackernagel 1920: 182-183, Koller 1951: 92 and Giannakis 1997: 201.

While there a number of instances where this traditional division cannot apply,[406] a reformulation of this division along actionality lines has been attempted and appears useful, in particular to our investigation of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses: a study was brought out in 2006 by Napoli who looked specifically at the Homeric position by reference to the actionality (that is to say, the inherent semantic character) of the verbs involved. She modelled how low transitivity verbs tend to appear mostly in the present stem, leaving the aorist to verbs with higher transitivity.

In Section 7.5.2 we set out our observations on the Homeric evidence that the Completive Events are Vendlerian "accomplishments": the events tend to contain an object but are subjectively viewed by the poet as being unfolding and of internal structure. This evidence of the poet's perception and treatment of Completive Events comes from not only from ἐπεί-clauses but also from other descriptions of the events in other contexts and syntactic environments. In Section 7.5.3 we note that the Completive Events tend to include an object, and should be classified as Vendlerian "Accomplishments",

## 7.5 The components of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

At least three features make up the environment in which Completive ἐπεί-Clauses are found. First, the Completive Event tends to be anticipated in the preceding text, often through direct speech exhortations to undertake the event, in a manner that we call "preparing" the event. Second, the Completive Event is typically one of duration – one that we know ourselves, through experience and/or anecdote, to be of duration and that is often shown by the poet through various means to be interpreted by him too as of duration. Third, the occurrence of the Completive Event is recounted twice: first in an account which typically uses imperfective aspect and second in the ἐπεί-clause.

### 7.5.1 Preparation of the event

Completive ἐπεί-Clauses tend to be used where the event is "prepared". This correlation leads us to hypothesise that Completive ἐπεί-Clauses are employed as a balancing response to the build-up of the event: a one line account of the execution of the event might feel disproportionate to a textual build-up, whereas a two line account gives the event some weight and impression of time pausing on the event, without forcing the poet to enter into the details of the event.

---

[405] This has a long history going back at least as far as Curtius 1852: 187-192. Of recent studies note for example Chantraine 1963:§271-281ff. who offered the general summary that the aorist stem denotes "une action pure et simple" whereas the imperfect stem denotes "la durée et le développement de l'action".

[406] Most notably, (i) verbs which are preceded by a negative have been noted as regularly appearing in the imperfect (Hermann 1920, Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 270, n. 6, Chantraine 1963: §285 and Rijksbaron 1994 Section 6.2.2 refers to this phenomenon. and (ii) verbs which require the response of a third party, have been noted as often appearing in the imperfect (See Blass 1889). See also Rodenbusch 1908.

The type of preparation varies according to the context of the event. Many of the hospitality events involve instructions to a third party such as a handmaid, comrade or wife. Thus, the ordering of handmaids to heat water is a "preparation" for the warming of the water (which is then expressed with two accounts) as seen at *Iliad* 18.343ff. The ordering of handmaids to bathe guests is in turn a preparation for the bathing of the guests (again, then expressed in two accounts) as seen at *Odyssey* 6.210ff. The instructions to handmaids to prepare a bed for a guest anticipates the making up of the bed (sometimes in two accounts, although see the following sub-section) as seen at *Odyssey* 7.335-338 and 23.277-280.

In contexts which are less overtly those of hospitality, one person tends to give the order or exhortation to the other to do something, and sometimes one character makes a unilateral but express declaration that he will do something. Libations are often suggested by a guest to the host as seen at *Iliad* 9.171ff., *Odyssey* 3.333ff., and 18.418ff., although sometimes it is the host who makes the suggestion, as seen at *Odyssey* 7.179ff and in the case of the suitors dining together it is suggested by one suitor to the others at *Odyssey* 21.263ff. Wood for a funeral pyre is ordered to be fetched by the leader of an army (*Iliad* 24.778ff.). The participation in athletic games is ordered by the leader of the participants (*Odyssey* 8.97ff.). And a hero arming himself announces that he will go off and don his protective armour and equip himself with suitable weapons (*Iliad* 6.340 and 7.193).

Where there is no preparation, the structure with a Completive ἐπεί-Clause is not usually employed: instead a simple aorist account suffices. So, whereas bathing tends to be prepared and to answer with a two account structure, on four of the six occasions where it is not prepared a single account of the event itself suffices (see the final sub-section of this section for a discussion of the other two accounts): (i) *Iliad* 5.905 the unanticipated bathing of Ares by Hebe, (ii) *Odyssey* 8.364 the unanticipated bathing of Aphrodite by the Graces, (iii) *Odyssey* 5.264, with the use of an aorist participle, where the bathing sits inside a boat preparation and valediction scene, and (iv) *Odyssey* 6.96 the bathing which is embedded in a laundry and picnic scene. Similarly, many dining scenes are preceded by extensive preparations, as detailed in Section 4.4, and are then followed by the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. But where they are not so preceded, a single line account of dining typically suffices. Thus, the poet sometimes cares to draw attention to the duration of the event and sometimes does not care to do so depending largely on whether there is a preceding build-up to the event.

The above generalisation should be qualified by the following deviations:

1. *Where there is preparation of an event but no following two-account structure with a Completive ἐπεί-Clause*

Not all preparations lead to a two-account structure. As noted above, the two-account structure, in particular with Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, seems to be employed to recognise the duration of an event without going into further detail about the event itself. But where the narrative engages with the detail of the event itself, it does not conclude it with a ἐπεί-clause. So, although seven oaths are prepared by solicitation of the oath, the prepared oaths of *Iliad* 15.36 and *Odyssey* 17.155 are followed by direct speech of the oaths themselves, with no concluding ἐπεί-clause. Similarly, arming is often described in detail and with prior anticipation and on such occasions is not concluded with an ἐπεί-clause; only brief descriptions of arming are concluded with a ἐπεί-clause. So, at *Iliad* 11.15 Agamemnon urges the Achaeans to arm themselves for battle. Lines 16 to 45 then describe Agamemnon's arming of himself. Agamemnon's arming simply concludes by shifting to the actions of the charioteers of the cavalry.

Rarely, we cannot identify the distinguishing factors which give rise to the execution of an event in a single paratactic account despite the event having been prepared (and despite appearing elsewhere with a second account in a Completive ἐπεί-Clause). For example, the readying of a bed for a guest appears twice with a Completive ἐπεί-Clause (*Odyssey* 7.340 and 23.29), on both occasions with prior instructions issued to handmaids. But on three further occasions beds are made with prior instructions but with no following Completive ἐπεί-Clause (see *Iliad* 9.658ff., 24.643ff. and *Odyssey* 4.296ff.).

2. *Where there is no preparation but there is nevertheless a two-account structure*

Some events expressed with Completive ἐπεί-Clauses are typically prepared, yet occasionally appear without preparation (while remaining expressed with Completive ἐπεί-Clauses). And a handful of events are never prepared, yet often appear as two-account events. Thus, two descriptions of gathering are concluded with a Completive ἐπεί-Clause although the gathering was unanticipated (*Iliad* 24.789 and *Odyssey* 24.420); elsewhere Completive ἐπεί-Clause accounts of gathering are prepared in the preceding text.

Weeping, not surprisingly, is not produced to order, so that the event of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses is not prepared by the preceding text. In a similar category is spontaneous gazing with admiration as seen at *Iliad* 24.629ff., *Odyssey* 4.43ff. and *Odyssey* 10.179ff.[407]

It is noted in the following section on aspect that in these instances where there has been no preparation of the event the first account tends to be in the aorist. This use of the aorist is a departure from the wider pattern of imperfective aspect in the first account.

The various dinner preparation stages are not "prepared" in the preceding narrative either. One stage follows after another with the stages of greatest duration being presented in two accounts, the second of which is a Completive ἐπεί-Clause. Here the poet does not so much strive to respond to the narrative’s stress positions (since the individual stages are not themselves stipulated by the events of the preceding narrative or by exhortation) as he strives to capture a sense of time inevitably spent on preparing a meal.

---

[407] Although note the less spontaneous admiration at *Iliad* 19.18-19, *Odyssey* 5.75fff. and 7.134ff. which is anticipated in the narrative preceding the double account.

### 7.5.2 Duration of Completive Events

Completive Events tend be durative verbs with telicity. These verbs are identified as a cross-linguistic group by Vendler 1957 and termed “Accomplishment Verbs”. Certain events are of lower telicity such as weeping, gazing and sexual intercourse; these events occur with phasal verbs denoting *finish* (see Section 8.5), which suggests that these events should also be categorised as accomplishments.[408]

#### Evidence outside the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

The Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses illustrate the poet’s awareness that there is time between the commencement of a Completive Event and its conclusion for other events to occur. In addition, there is a substantial body of evidence that Homer sensed Completive Events to be of substantial duration. The various ways in which the poet emphasised the duration of the events and used it to structure the narrative are highlighted in Section 7.7 in the discussion of each dinner preparation event and in the Appendix in the column headed “Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event”. We can divide them into four types of evidence:

1. Even on occasions when the ἐπεί-clause structure is not used, a separate set of events is sometimes temporally paralleled to the type of event seen elsewhere in ἐπεί-clauses. [409] Thus, bathing of the body is not only familiar to us as a matter that is of inevitable duration but is also recognised as of duration by the poet on three occasions where he temporally parallels an event alongside the event of bathing at *Odyssey* 3.464 (bathing of Telemachus is paralleled to a sacrifice and dinner preparations), *Odyssey* 10.449-450 (bathing of comrades by Circe is paralleled to Odysseus going to his ship to collect his remaining comrades and returning with them) and *Odyssey* 24.365-366 (where the bathing of Laertes is presumably paralleled to dinner preparations – it is not entirely clear from the narrative); only the first of these is concluded with a Completive ἐπεί-Clause. Similarly, in an account

---

[408] See Dowty 1979: 60 where eleven diagnostic criteria are enumerated for distinguishing between states, activities, accomplishments and achievements. If a verb is a “complement of finish” a sentence would be deemed to be ungrammatical or anomalous if that verb denoted a state, activity or achievement, but grammatical and semantically normal where the verb denotes an accomplishment.

[409] Since Zielinski 1899 declared that Homer does not present events as occurring simultaneously, but rather presents what would be simultaneous in the Real World as occurring linearly, there have been studies of the ways in which and the extent to which Homer does indeed present events as occurring simultaneously but also recognition of some of his idiosyncracies. See also Scodel 2008 , Richardson 1990, Rengakos 1995 and De Jong 2001: 212.

with no ἐπεί-clause, the gathering together of the Achaeans at *Iliad* 2.52ff. takes place while a meeting of the senior Achaeans takes place.

2. One event, typically that of arrival, intersects with another scene which is underway, with that scene consisting of a Completive Event. Here the poet's awareness of the durativity of the event is evidenced by him using it to present a frieze, as it were, of the undertaking of the event upon which the new entrant haps. So, at *Iliad* 11.771-777 Nestor arrives at Peleus's house at the moment when Peleus is burning thigh pieces to the gods. And at at *Iliad* 10.34 Agamemnon is engaged in putting on his armour when Menelaus comes upon him.
3. Expressions of long duration and of brevity assert the possibility of the duration of the event. So, the process of collecting wood for Hector's pyre (again a version without the ἐπεί-clause) is described as lasting nine days at *Iliad* 24.784. And at *Iliad* 8.545ff. the Trojans prepare dinner quickly (lines 506, 545 καρπαλίμως), it being night time; this adverb asserts a contrast with the normal lengthiness of dinner preparations.
4. In respect of events whose completion is captured with Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses, we find other accounts which do not conclude with the ἐπεί-clause where further details of the stages involved in the event are supplied. So, the tidying of hall/house at *Odyssey* 20.149ff. (which is not concluded with a ἐπεί-clause) provides further details of how the house should be swept and rugs should be placed on chairs, details beyond those of the event concluded with the ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 22.457. And the communal prayers which are sometimes concluded with what we have categorised as a Cumulative ἐπεί-clause are shown on other occasions to be broken down into prayer by a leader and prayer or assent by the surrounding group (see for example *Iliad* 3.275ff. and the further examples discussed in Appendix 3 under the section dealing with prayers).

We have illustrated with only a small number of examples four ways in which the poet indicates his sensitivity to the duration of the types of events that are completed with Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. The reader is encouraged to read through Sections 7.7 and Appendix 3 to see the numerous other instances in which the duration of Completive Events is evidenced in the poems.

### Flexibility to skip Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

We generally find that where Completive Events occur outside the ἐπεί-clause structure this tends to be either (i) where they are mentioned in passing with no "preparation", (ii) where they are mentioned with ostentatious brevity, or (iii) where they are discussed in such detail that an ἐπεί-clause becomes redundant. Regarding point (iii) it is notable that some events, such as weeping, are harder to offer detail on than others, such as the process of arming which consists of sub-events of different weapons and defensive equipment. The latter type of event is more easily stretched out into a detailed account with corresponding loss of ἐπεί-clause.

There are three dining preparation scenes in which few ἐπεί-clauses are employed, despite details of the various stages being provided. First, the meal in Eumaeus's hut (*Odyssey* 14.418-447) contains all of the typical dining preparation components but uses no ἐπεί-clauses. This may be due to the third person singular that needs to be used when compared with the typical third person plural subject of dining, but is surely also to do with emphasising the different context.

Secondly, at the scene between Achilles and Priam when Hector's body lies on a bier and Achilles has not yet allowed the father to behold the son's corpse, Achilles and Priam take part in a formal waited meal prepared by Achilles's comrades. But although the basic stages of slaughter, roasting and distribution are present, no prolongation of the account with ἐπεί-clauses is employed. Only the consumption of the meal itself is divided in two, between an imperfect account and then the typical ἐπεί-clause. The inclusion of the basic preparation stages on the one hand, but the avoidance of the impression of prolongation surely relates to the etiquette and dignity with which the scene is conducted and at the same time the sympathy to the emotional undertone of empathy which would render indecent a suggestion of elaborate and drawn out preparation:[410]

> *Iliad 24.621-628*
> *ἦ καὶ ἀναΐξας ὄϊν ἄργυφον ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεὺς*
> *σφάξ᾽: ἕταροι δ᾽ ἔδερόν τε καὶ ἄμφεπον εὖ κατὰ κόσμον,*
> *μίστυλλόν τ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐπισταμένως πεῖράν τ᾽ ὀβελοῖσιν,*
> *ὄπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα.*
> *Αὐτομέδων δ᾽ ἄρα σῖτον ἑλὼν ἐπένειμε τραπέζῃ*
> *καλοῖς ἐν κανέοισιν: ἀτὰρ κρέα νεῖμεν Ἀχιλλεύς.*
> *οἳ δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ὀνείαθ᾽ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον.*
> *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο*

Similarly, Odysseus's farewell meal hosted by Alcinous on the island of the Phaeacians at the beginning of *Odyssey* 13 is a typical formal setting but misses the ἐπεί-clauses. It becomes clear when we consider this instance that the ἐπεί-clauses are not used because the context insists on rush. All the components of a hospitality dinner are present and so is much of the familiar vocabulary, but it is rearranged to allow the ἐπεί-clauses to be missed: preparing a feast, sacrificing a bull, burning the thigh pieces, dining, a minstrel performing (*Odyssey* 13.23-27) and libations

---

[410] The brevity of the phrasing in this passage and the absence of ἐπεί-clauses seems to have been overlooked by commentators, with the consensus being that it is a "conventional description of the meal" (Macleod 1982: 142) and similarly that "the description of the meal follows conventional patterns" (Richardson 1993: 342).

(*Odyssey* 13.55-50-55). The poet avoids creating an impression of leisureliness in the events when, even it were so, it would be at odds with Odysseus's impatience-Odysseus is so eager to be on his way that he keeps looking at the sun (line 29) and the extent of his desperation to be away is compared to a hungry man who has spent all day ploughing fallow land (lines 31-35).

### Flexibility to use Completive ἐπεί-Clauses for durative effect

Outside of the dining scenes, we have an unusual use of a Completive ἐπεί-Clause at *Iliad* 4.125 where the poet shows that he can create an impression of duration and slow down the perception of time for a dramatic moment. At *Iliad* 4.93-100 Athena urges Pandarus to let fly an arrow against Menelaus. Pandarus accepts this urging without discussion (104 ὣς φάτ' Ἀθηναίη, τῷ δὲ φρένας ἄφρονι πεῖθεν). Lines 105 to 126 recount in the fullest detail of any such scene Pandarus's preparations for shooting the arrow – he uncovers his bow, with the pedigree of the bow being given, bends the bow, strings it, is concealed by other warriors as he does this, takes out a feathered arrow that has never been shot, fits the arrow to the string, makes a vow to Apollo to sacrifice hecatombs and draws the bow bringing the string to his chest and the arrowhead to the bow.

This detailed account culminates in an ἐπεί-clause which describes the full drawing of the bow, which appears to repeat the description of the preceding lines: αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ κυκλοτερὲς μέγα τόξον ἔτεινε. Here we can contrast the imperfect ἕλκε of the preceding line (although elaborated with the aorist πέλασεν) with the aoristic κυκλοτερὲς ... ἔτεινε. Thus, the perfectivising subordinate clause can be seen to be a culmination of the earlier "drawing".[411]

### 7.5.3 First account with imperfective aspect

The first account of an event before a Chained or Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clause tends to be in the imperfective aspect. InChapter 2 Section 2.13 we noted that temporal ἐπεί-clauses tend to take the aorist aspect. In the vast majority of cases there is, then, a sequence of imperfect followed by aorist in respect of the same event.

### Imperfective aspect before Chained and Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

Subject to very few exceptions, the first account of an event, prior to the second account in an ἐπεί-clause, typically presents in the imperfective aspect, that is to say in the past tense with the present stem of the verb. It is notable that the majority of the verbs which are used in the imperfective aspect in the first accounts are verbs for whom the present stem is, by the measure of statistic distribution across the past tense uses of that verb, the rare stem (and in that sense, irrespective of morphology, the "marked" stem). Taking into account the other observations in this chapter, the use of the rarely occurring imperfect in these first accounts is likely to denote duration of the event and not simply the occurrence of the event in the past.

---

[411] This is close to the view of Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 659) that this ἐπεί-clause is simply a repetition of line 122.

There are, however, a small number of first accounts of events, where the indicative verb which is in the imperfect is a verb whose present stem is used frequently in Homer in the past tense and in a variety of contexts and would therefore appear to be the “unmarked stem”. Some of these instances are even cases of verbs whose only attested stem is the present stem, i.e. they are cases of *imperfectiva tantum*.

This latter variety is of some significance to our understanding of aspect: in the contexts of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses it is evident that the poet was sensitive to the imperfective aspect and to the meaning that it could carry, even if in other contexts that meaning had been “bleached”. We offer a couple of examples of both sorts. For the many other very clear examples of this, we leave the reader to examine the relevant portion of Section 7.7 and the column labeled “verbal aspect” in Appendix 3.

1. *Statistically Rare Imperfect*. The aorist phrase ὡπλίσσατο δόρπον is found at *Odyssey* 2.20, 9.291 and 9.34 where it serves within the respective scenes as the only account of preparing dinner. However, on the unique occasion when the meal preparations are to be interrupted and then returned to with an ἐπεί-clause, an imperfect version of the expression is found: *Odyssey* 16.453, 478 δόρπον ἐπισταδὸν ὡπλίζοντο / ... / οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα

   Similarly, the imperfect ἠγείροντο of the first account at *Odyssey* 2.8-9 οἱ μὲν ἐκήρυσσον, τοὶ δ’ ἠγείροντο μάλ’ ὦκα. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο is one of only four occasions when the present stem of ἀγείρω is used in the past tense indicative (across the active, middle and passive), against 21 aorist uses; and as noted in Appendix 3 regarding the ἐπεί-clauses of gathering, the three other uses of the imperfect all describe gathering with a focus on the process.

2. *Statistically Predominant Imperfect.* At *Odyssey* 17.84 Telemachus’s leading of the stranger Theoclymenus from the *agora* to his parents’ palace is presented with the imperfect ἦγεν. In the following line the two men arrive in an ἐπεί-clause.

Now, this imperfect-aorist sequencing is particularly interesting given that the imperfect of ἄγω is the more highly used stem compared to the aorist; the imperfect is used in such lines as *Iliad* 9.660/4[412] τῷ δ’ ἄρα παρκατέλεκτο γυνή, τὴν Λεσβόθεν ἦγε where it has pluperfect sense relative to the time of the narrative, one certainly of completion achieved and *Iliad* 21.35-36 τόν ῥά ποτ’ αὐτὸς / ἦγε λαβὼν ἐκ πατρὸς ἀλωῆς οὐκ ἐθέλοντα again, where the event of leading is again in the past relative to the time of the narrative. The sequencing is interesting because an aspectual patterning of imperfect-aorist is adhered to even with this verb whose present and aorist aspectual stems do not consistently denote in the past tense duration and completion respectively.

---

[412] Different textual traditions number the lines differently.

The imperfect κλαῖον is seen as part of a description of the weeping of a number of heroes – a description which is then concluded with an ἐπεί-clause which describes again the weeping. κλαῖον is the unmarked form of the verb, with the aorist indicative occurring only twice (see Section 7.7 and the discussion in Appendix 3 on weeping). If we look at the two dozen or so uses of the present stem in the past tense we find that they are largely used to describe a scene of weeping; we can conjecture then that the stem preserves its durative meaning in general and in particular when used prior to our ἐπεί-clauses.

As noted above, most of the events described in the imperfect – aorist sequences are of duration and telicity. So, in most cases the present stem in the past tense of the verb used to describe the event is the rarely occurring stem, the statistically marked stem (although often not particularly marked from a morphological perspective). Furthermore, the imperfect indicative stem often occurs only if it is part of a two-account structure: if there is to be only one account of the event then the aorist stem is used.

We generally associate rarer forms with the taking on of the positive feature of a binary system.[413] In these instances the rarer form, the imperfect, is used in cases where duration is denoted. It seems then that the aspectual stems used in the two accounts of Completive Events correlate with the nature of these events as Vendlerian accomplishments.

### Imperfect-aorist sequences in other environments

In Section 6.4 we note that Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses as well as certain preposed clauses with ἦμος and ὅτε sometimes function as correspondent clauses, as outlined in Section 6.4.6. We note there that the imperfect indicative is employed to denote duration of an event (which is not the event of the following ἐπεί-clause) but not in anticipation of completion of the event but rather of it lasting until interrupted by the event of the ἐπεί-clause. This use of the imperfect originates in the same duration marking function of the imperfect, but it is in a different textual relation from that displayed by the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.

### Imperfect-aorist sequencing with other subordinators

Many ὅτε-clauses of arrival in a place (sometimes denoted simply with the verb γένοντο, but note that not always arriving at the final destination, such as the second example of *Iliad* 14.432-433 below), on the other hand, do present as accomplished what is earlier presented in the imperfective aspect. Thus, these ἐπεί-clauses are most typically preceded by an account in the imperfect of movement towards the destination, for example, *Odyssey* 5.439-442 νῆχε παρέξ, ἐς γαῖαν ὁρώμενος, εἴ που ἐφεύροι / ἠιόνας τε παραπλῆγας λιμένας τε θαλάσσης. / ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ ποταμοῖο κατὰ στόμα καλλιρόοιο / ἷξε νέων, τῇ δή οἱ ἐείσατο χῶρος ἄριστος; *Iliad* 14.432-433 οἳ τόν γε προτὶ ἄστυ φέρον βαρέα στενάχοντα. / ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ πόρον ἷξον ἐϋρρεῖος ποταμοῖο.[414]

---

[413] See Friedrich 1974.

It seems likely that the aspectual relationship of these ἐπεί-clauses to the preceding related account of a journey under way is part of the same cohesive device as that seen with the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. ὅτε is preferred in these instances for the marking of a new setting for the events that follow the ἐπεί-clause. See further in Section 7.6.2.

#### Aorist-aorist sequencing

Chaining of an ἐπεί-clause to an immediately preceding account is typically found where the verbal aspect of the preceding account is imperfect. But there is occasional chaining to a preceding aorist. As noted in Section 7.5.1, this seems to occur where the event was not “prepared” prior to its occurrence, such as (i) the dining of *Odyssey* 6.97-100, 9.86-88 and 10.57-59, (ii) the gathering at *Iliad* 24.789-790 and *Odyssey* 24.420-421, and (iii) the gazing at *Odyssey* 10.179-180.

We should further note the rare linguistic structure in which a phrase with τόφρα brings us back to an earlier scene and describes the execution of an event (typically in the aorist) before it is concluded by an ἐπεί-clause. This structure of *pronouncement-change of scene-return to the earlier scene followed by an ἐπεί-clause* is seen with the arming scene at *Iliad* 7.193, 206-8, with the bathing scene of *Odyssey* 3.464ff. and with the bed preparation scene at *Odyssey* 23.177-180, 289-293.

## 7.6 Textual relations of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

### 7.6.1 Relationship to the preceding text

The Completive ἐπεί-Clauses relate back to the preceding text in three possible ways:

1. The ἐπεί-clause is juxtaposed to an immediately preceding account of the Completive Event. But the duration or incompletion of the event is denoted in that first account, as opposed to its completion. It is denoted in one of the following ways:

    1.1. Most typically, the event of the ἐπεί-clause is described in the imperfect indicative in the immediately preceding line, either with the same verbal lexeme as that of the ἐπεί-clause or with a synonym of that of the ἐπεί-clause, for example *Odyssey* 2.377-378 ὣς ἄρ’ ἔφη, γρῆυς δὲ θεῶν μέγαν ὅρκον ἀπώμνυ. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὅρκον; or

---

[414] See for example also *Iliad* 11.166-171 and *Odyssey* 9.542-543.

1.2. The commencement of the event of the ἐπεί-clause is described by an immediately preceding ingressive verbal form or inchoative expression, for example *Iliad* 9.211-212 πῦρ δὲ Μενοιτιάδης δαῖεν μέγα ἰσόθεος φώς. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλὸξ ἐμαράνθη where δαῖεν means *to light a fire*; or

1.3. The first stage of the event is described, such as the first drops for libation or the placing of meat over a fire for roasting, for example *Iliad* 9.213-215 ἀνθρακιὴν στορέσας ὀβελοὺς ἐφύπερθε τάνυσσε, / πάσσε δ’ ἁλὸς θείοιο κρατευτάων ἐπαείρας. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὤπτησε καὶ εἰν ἐλεοῖσιν ἔχευε,

(types (1.1), (1.2) and (1.3) each a type of “**Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clause**”).

Here the two accounts work together to create an impression of duration of the event itself, with assertion of duration being the sole function in such a construction. In this way, using the rhetorical device of repetition with aspectual variation, the poet achieves an impression of duration without offering any further detail of the event itself.

The Completive Events often singly or in combination form type scenes. Type scenes are often presented in a brief and accelerated form when compared with the (sometimes literal) blow-by-blow account of other Homeric narrative. The shorter narrative time allotted to the events of most type scenes when compared with the events of other narrative creates a mismatch between the timing of the different scenes, as if they are told by different narrators or belong to different poems.

It seems likely that Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses are employed to address the temporal imbalance between type scenes and other scenes: the poet uses the device of Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses with type scenes to assert duration of the events of the type scenes. Asserting duration of an event within a type scene in turn answers the need for parity of temporal progression with other events of greater drama and detail. In this way the poet can present events of different timing alongside each other, using the ἐπεί-clauses not so much to link the events as to equalise the tempo.

The device of Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses to emphasise duration is prevalent in past tense narrative of Homer to an extent that is probably not consonant with contemporary English and European literature. The disparity may well reside precisely in the epic nature of the Homeric poems: the 51 days of the *Iliad* and the 40 days of the *Odyssey* are covered in full detail with all events recounted. If there were to be a minute by minute account the narrative would exceed our 24 books. Such an account is of course not essayed, and, as Durante phrases it, a “lyrical evocation” of each event is not attempted: instead we find some events described briefly and signed off with Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.

2. The event of the ἐπεί-clause is described earlier in the text in one of the three ways listed above at (I), (II) and (III) of (i), (at this stage a “**Commenced Event**”), but, before being

completed by the ἐπεί-clause, the Commenced Event is interrupted by an event (a “**Sequential Event**”) which (i) starts simultaneously with, or immediately after, the Commenced Event, and (ii) occupies time which follows on from the temporal plane of the Commenced Event, so that time has evidently passed between the start of the Commenced Event and the completion of that event in the ἐπεί-clause. The ἐπεί-clause then completes the earlier Commenced Event. The Sequential Event relates to the Commenced Event in one of the following ways:[415]

2.1. as an intersecting event so that two scenes coincide and unite, for example at the ἐπεί-clause of *Odyssey* 3.65 roasting is completed with a Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause but after the beginning of roasting at line 33 the arrival of Athena and Telemachus on to the scene is described;
2.2. by sub-events within the same scene. The ἐπεί-clause simultaneously returns us to the Commenced Event and completes the sub-events, for example *Odyssey* 24.67-71 καίεο δ’ ἔν τ’ ἐσθῆτι θεῶν καὶ ἀλείφατι πολλῷ / καὶ μέλιτι γλυκερῷ: πολλοὶ δ’ ἥρωες Ἀχαιοὶ / τεύχεσιν ἐρρώσαντο πυρὴν πέρι καιομένοιο, / πεζοί θ’ ἱππῆές τε: πολὺς δ’ ὀρυμαγδὸς ὀρώρει / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δή σε φλὸξ ἤνυσεν Ἡφαίστοιο;
2.3. rarely, and clustering around the end of the *Odyssey*,[416] by the description of an event that runs parallel to the Commenced Event, but in an unconnected scene, normally described briefly.[417] Most notable is the example of *Odyssey* 23.296-300 ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἵκοντο: / αὐτὰρ Τηλέμαχος καὶ βουκόλος ἠδὲ συβώτης / παῦσαν ἄρ’ ὀρχηθμοῖο πόδας, παῦσαν δὲ γυναῖκας, / αὐτοὶ δ’ εὐνάζοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα. / τὼ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν φιλότητος ἐταρπήτην ἐρατεινῆς,

(types (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3) each a type of “**Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clause**”).

Here the poet exploits his knowledge of the duration of the event to allow another event or events to occur between the beginning and end of the event of the two accounts. Thus, not only is duration asserted through the initial imperfect use and the presentation of another simultaneous event, but the interlacing of other events is made possible through this structure; or

3. one or more of the actors of the event of an ἐπεί-clause whose subject is plural, are described prior to the ἐπεί-clause as undertaking or undergoing the event, but either:

---

[415] See the footnotes to Section 4.3.2 *Duration of the Events of the ἐπεί-clauses* where bibliography is given on the simultaneity of events in Homer.

[416] Reynen 1957: 42-44 contains some useful discussion on this.

[417] The Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-clauses of *Odyssey* 24.205 and 24.489 are particularly striking for the first adumbration of the event being left for a prolonged account of events in an unconnected scene or scenes. See Section 0 regarding “remote referencing” of the nominative pronouns.

3.1. not all of the actors are mentioned in the first account, for example *Iliad* 19.40-54 αὐτὰρ ὃ βῆ παρὰ θῖνα θαλάσσης δῖος Ἀχιλλεὺς / σμερδαλέα ἰάχων, ὦρσεν δ’ ἥρωας Ἀχαιούς. / καί ῥ’ οἵ περ τὸ πάρος γε νεῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι μένεσκον / ... / καὶ μὴν οἳ τότε γ’ εἰς ἀγορὴν ἴσαν, οὕνεκ’ Ἀχιλλεὺς / ... / τὼ δὲ δύω σκάζοντε βάτην Ἄρεος θεράποντε / Τυδεΐδης τε μενεπτόλεμος καὶ δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς / ... / αὐτὰρ ὃ δεύτατος ἦλθεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων / ... / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἀολλίσθησαν Ἀχαιοί;

3.2. all of the actors are mentioned but without expressly attributing to all of them the undergoing of the full event, for example *Iliad* 3.328-330, 339-340 αὐτὰρ ὅ γ’ ἀμφ’ ὤμοισιν ἐδύσετο τεύχεα καλὰ / δῖος Ἀλέξανδρος Ἑλένης πόσις ἠϋκόμοιο. / κνημῖδας μὲν πρῶτα περὶ κνήμῃσιν ἔθηκε / ... [*here is further description of Paris’s arming and then follows a bare account of Menelaus’s arming*]// ὣς δ’ αὔτως Μενέλαος ἀρήϊος ἔντε’ ἔδυνεν. / οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν; or

3.3. not all of the sub-events which are covered by the event of the ἐπεί-clause are individuated in the preceding narrative, for example *Odyssey* 22.448-457 πρῶτα μὲν οὖν νέκυας φόρεον κατατεθνηῶτας, / κὰδ δ’ ἄρ’ ὑπ’ αἰθούσῃ τίθεσαν εὐερκέος αὐλῆς, / ... / αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα θρόνους περικαλλέας ἠδὲ τραπέζας / ὕδατι καὶ σπόγγοισι πολυτρήτοισι κάθαιρον. / αὐτὰρ Τηλέμαχος καὶ βουκόλος ἠδὲ συβώτῃς / λίστροισιν δάπεδον πύκα ποιητοῖο δόμοιο //ξῦον: ταὶ δ’ ἐφόρεον δμῳαί, τίθεσαν δὲ θύραζε. / αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ πᾶν μέγαρον διεκοσμήσαντο – probable other stages in clearing the hall are mentioned in Section 3.5,

(types (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) each a type of “**Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clause**”)

Here the ἐπεί-clause includes in its completive ambit all participants or events not mentioned in full in the first account. The first account and the ἐπεί-clause work together to assert the extent (including duration) and completeness of the event.

There is no difference in form between these three types of ἐπεί-clauses, save that the Resumptive and Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses show a higher occurrence of noun phrases at the head of the clause, which is understandable from the higher incidence of a change of subject from the preceding line. The events of Chained and of Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses tend to be similar and often the same event (on different occasions) can appear either as Chained or as Resumptive – they tend to be of the type of event that is not easily divisible into sub-events: particularly clear examples are the warming of water, weeping and gazing. The events of some Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, on the other hand, are divisible into sub-events and tend to appear only with the cumulative function, for example, tidying a hall or preparing a set of armour.

### 7.6.2 Relationship to the following text

In Section 1.3 it was noted that Reynen had observed that ἐπεί-clauses with οὖν tended to be followed by events which simply followed the same course as the events of the ἐπεί-clauses and the text preceding it. We can now extend that observation to cover the full range of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.

The Completive ἐπεί-Clauses in respect of meal preparations tend to continue in a steady line from one stage to the next: we cannot, for example, distinguish burning the thigh pieces from roasting of the outer meats in terms of narrative interest.[418] Only the final ἐπεί-clause of consumption of the meal is followed by a more dramatic event, typically speech-giving. But here the typical collocation with a sequence of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses of dinner preparation makes it unattractive for us to distinguish the final ἐπεί-clause of consumption and suggest that it has a different function.

If we select a set of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses outside the meal preparation group, such as arriving at the seashore, we can observe that the seven times recurring Odyssean ἐπεί-clause of reaching the shore αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλυθον ἠδὲ θάλασσαν / κατήλθομεν is followed by events of low dynamism: summoning comrades to return to the palace to collect provisions for the journey (*Odyssey* 2.407ff.), dining at nightfall (*Odyssey* 4.429), taking dinner and sleeping (*Odyssey* 4.572-573), mooring the ship and then leaving the shore (*Odyssey* 8.52ff.) and upbraiding comrades for eating holy cattle (*Odyssey* 12.392ff.). Only *Odyssey* 11.2ff. and 13.68ff. develop into a scene of a sea journey.

Unique events described in Completive ἐπεί-Clauses similarly tend to be followed by an event at the same level of the narrative. Thus, the ἐπεί-clause of washing clothes at *Odyssey* 6.94 is followed by a description of laying out the clothes to dry. Similarly, the ἐπεί-clause of completing the shield at *Iliad* 18.609 is followed by an account of preparing the other items of armour.

There are a few events described by ἐπεί-clauses where the events that follow are of greater drama than the events of the ἐπεί-clauses such as arriving for a duel and then taking part in the duel (see for example *Iliad* 7.206-208). These appear to be candidates for where the notion of backgrounding might apply to the function of these ἐπεί-clauses. However, it is notable that when these same events appear without a concluding ἐπεί-clause, they are nevertheless still prefaced to a following event of higher drama. So, there are other occasions where the ἐπεί-clause of arming is not employed following an account of arming but where the climactic event of moving out onto the battlefield then ensues. The paratactic arming accounts with similar levels of drama in the text that follows them reduce the likelihood that where ἐπεί-clauses of arming are used it is in order to mark out the following drama.

---

[418] The six identical ἐπεί-clauses of libation always follow a meal. They are likewise followed by events of low dynamism: thrice retiring to bed (*Odyssey* 3.395, 7.184 and 18.425), once embarking on a journey (*Iliad* 9.177), once further discussion before a second libation (*Odyssey* 3.341) and once-although intended to be a libation before bed-an archery contest (*Odyssey* 21.271).

Arrival is an event which carries discourse features associated equally with ἐπεί-clauses and with ὅτε-clauses . How the arrival relates to events in the following text appears to determine whether an ἐπεί or ὅτε-clause is used. A separate detailed study should be conducted on this matter.

Both in narrative and in nature arrival tends to entail express intention to make a journey and duration of the journey itself. Not surprisingly then, as intention and duration are components of most Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, eighteen ἐπεί-clauses, some of these recurring a number of times, recount arrival at a particular point. They are listed out in Appendix 3, from event 7 of “Entry into a Hall” onwards. (And as outlined in Chapter 8 the phrasing of the ἐπεί-clauses of arrival are often distinctive with features such as clausal parallelism such as *Odyssey* 23.87 ἡ δ' ἐπεὶ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν and the verb being placed first as at *Iliad* 1.484 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἵκοντο κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν.)

But arrival at a place necessarily introduces a new location against which events affecting the character or characters who have arrived can unfold. We note in Section 5.6.2 that backgrounding appears to be a principal role of ὅτε-clauses; accordingly, the majority of preposed temporal subordinate clauses denoting arrival are in fact expressed with ὅτε. But a not insignificant forty seven ἐπεί-clauses denoting arrival are attested.[419]

We can attempt to distinguish the discourse function of the ἐπεί-clauses of arrival from the ὅτε-clauses of arrival along the following lines: (i) ἐπεί-clauses mark arrival at a place as one event out of a sequence of events which all fall on one continuum with a single encompassing momentum of low interest, for example *Iliad* 1.483-487 ἣ δ' ἔθεεν κατὰ κῦμα διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἵκοντο κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν, / νῆα μὲν οἵ γε μέλαιναν ἐπ' ἠπείροιο ἔρυσσαν / ... / αὐτοὶ δ' ἐσκίδναντο κατὰ κλισίας τε νέας τε.; (ii) the ὅτε-clauses set the scene or background for what is to follow, with a discernible disjunct between the events leading up to and including the ὅτε-clause and the events of the following lines, so that the narrative following the disjunct stands more or less independently of what precedes it, for example *Iliad* 1.314, 432-439 οἳ δ' ἀπελυμαίνοντο καὶ εἰς ἅλα λύματ' ἔβαλλον, / ... / οἳ δ' ὅτε δὴ λιμένος πολυβενθέος ἐντὸς ἵκοντο / ἱστία μὲν στείλαντο, θέσαν δ' ἐν νηῒ μελαίνῃ, / ... / ἐκ δ' εὐνὰς ἔβαλον, κατὰ δὲ πρυμνήσι' ἔδησαν: / ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ βαῖνον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης, / ἐκ δ' ἑκατόμβην βῆσαν ἑκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι: / ἐκ δὲ Χρυσηῒς νηὸς βῆ ποντοπόροιο.

A comparison between the above two instances brings out how two superficially similar sequences of events, in both cases with the mooring of a boat following the arrival, can either lead to the closing down of a scene (the dispersal to individual huts following the ἐπεί-clause) or to the opening up of a scene in which various items and people (note the fourfold ἐκ δ') emerge from the boat.

---

[419] *Iliad* 1.432 οἳ δ' ὅτε δὴ λιμένος πολυβενθέος ἐντὸς ἵκοντο, 3.421, 6.297, 7.313 etc.

## 7.7 Discussion of the data: dinner preparations and consumption

### 7.7.1 Introduction

The details of dining preparations are repeated across the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in similar form and with a number of recurring ἐπεί-clauses.[420] The sequence of stages with the attested ἐπεί-clauses is:

> *slaughter of the victim – preparation of a fire for roasting the meat – burning thigh pieces – roasting outer meats – concluding dinner preparations – partaking of the meal*

The fact that sometimes the ἐπεί-clauses of dinner preparation are in close sequence to each other has been noted previously, most notably by Arend 1933 in his comparison that we cited in Section 7.4.2 of a child climbing stairs, but without the understanding that we develop herein that these ἐπεί-clauses are part of a structure marking duration. Across the following pages we show that these ἐπεί-clauses are employed to recognise and indeed assert the time taken with each of the steps (in the case of Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses) or to exploit the time taken for narrative structure (in the case of Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses).

Hainsworth noted that the typical Homeric l meal scene is not expanded by the ornamentation of one of its components (as arming scenes are) but by "piling up one element on another".[421] Our investigations do not find that arming scenes ornament one part of arming over others; the principal difference between the arming scene and the meal scene is that each stage of arming is relatively momentary: pulling on a breast plate, putting shin guards in place, is momentary compared to the burning of thigh pieces, the roasting of meat and the act of dining itself. It is then with the meal scene that we find that each stage is set out and accentuated with the support of ἐπεί-clauses so that its duration can be recognised.

It is only dinner preparations which offer the chain of subordinate clauses which are noted by some scholars as characteristic of Procedural Discourse (see Section 7.2.1 for a discussion of this). Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which conclude prayer stand at the head of descriptions of dinner preparations but are not of the chaining variety – rather, they are typical Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.

---

[420] Arend 1933: 63-78 provided a lengthy list of potential components which can constitute a typical dining scene and a list of the various scenes. Gunn 1971: 30 in his study of "thematic composition" subsequently summarised it well as "certain elements form a fairly rigid skeleton: a prayer is offered; the victim is slaughtered, flayed, sliced, spitted, roasted, and drawn off the spits or served; a brief expression of eating then precedes a formula of transition into the next theme". There is much additional literature on the subject of dining scenes. See Edwards 1992: 306-307 for good summary of the research on this matter. Reece 1993 *passim* also contains some discussion on dining scenes.

[421] Hainsworth 1993: 91.

Four passages which display such preposed ἐπεί-clauses in close proximity to each other are found at *Iliad* 1.456-470, 2.418-433, 9.211-223 and *Odyssey* 3.421-474. We offer below the last of these passages.

> *Odyssey 3.421-474*
> *εὔχετ’ ἀπαρχόμενος, κεφαλῆς τρίχας ἐν πυρὶ βάλλων.*
> ***αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ εὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο,***
> *αὐτίκα Νέστορος υἱὸς ὑπέρθυμος Θρασυμήδης*
> *ἤλασεν ἄγχι στάς: πέλεκυς δ’ ἀπέκοψε τένοντας*
> *αὐχενίους, λῦσεν δὲ βοὸς μένος. αἱ δ’ ὀλόλυξαν / ... /*
> *οἱ μὲν ἔπειτ’ ἀνελόντες ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης*
> *ἔσχον: ἀτὰρ σφάξεν Πεισίστρατος, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν.*
> ***τῆς δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ μέλαν αἷμα ῥύη, λίπε δ’ ὀστέα θυμός,***
> *αἶψ’ ἄρα μιν διέχευαν, ἄφαρ δ’ ἐκ μηρία τάμνον*
> *πάντα κατὰ μοῖραν, κατά τε κνίσῃ ἐκάλυψαν*
> *δίπτυχα ποιήσαντες, ἐπ’ αὐτῶν δ’ ὠμοθέτησαν.*
> *καῖε δ’ ἐπὶ σχίζῃς ὁ γέρων, ἐπὶ δ’ αἴθοπα οἶνον*
> *λεῖβε: νέοι δὲ παρ’ αὐτὸν ἔχον πεμπώβολα χερσίν.*
> ***αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ’ ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχνα πάσαντο,***
> *μίστυλλόν τ’ ἄρα τἆλλα καὶ ἀμφ’ ὀβελοῖσιν ἔπειραν,*
> *ὤπτων δ’ ἀκροπόρους ὀβελοὺς ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες.*
> *τόφρα δὲ Τηλέμαχον λοῦσεν καλὴ Πολυκάστη,*
> *Νέστορος ὁπλοτάτη θυγάτηρ Νηληϊάδαο.*
> ***αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ,***
> *ἀμφὶ δέ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα,*
> *ἔκ ῥ’ ἀσαμίνθου βῆ δέμας ἀθανάτοισιν ὁμοῖος:*
> *πὰρ δ’ ὅ γε Νέστορ’ ἰὼν κατ’ ἄρ’ ἕζετο, ποιμένα λαῶν.*
> ***οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ ὤπτησαν κρέ’ ὑπέρτερα καὶ ἐρύσαντο,***
> *δαίνυνθ’ ἑζόμενοι: ἐπὶ δ’ ἀνέρες ἐσθλοὶ ὄροντο*
> *οἶνον οἰνοχοεῦντες ἐνὶ χρυσέοις δεπάεσσιν.*
> ***αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο,***
> *τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἦρχε Γερήνιος ἱππότα Νέστωρ:*

In the context of examining how the poet recounts the stages comprising a meal, we can note below a recipe from the internet, which illustrates how meal preparations attract temporal ἐπεί-clauses. Writers of recipes strive to communicate to their audience how long to expect each stage to take. One way of achieving this is through the use of temporal clauses. Homer strives for this same precision in his past tense accounts:

> *So first, I sauteed half a large onion with 3 cloves of garlic and 3 large carrots peeled and sliced up in about 1/3 cup of vegetable broth. [... ]*
> *I added some olive oil after a while (probably 2 tablespoons) because the veggies started to stick to the bottom. Then I added a ton of frozen corn. I mean really who doesn't like corn? It sweetens your food without ruining the taste.*
> *After the carrots began to soften, I added everything else! So I added around 15 ounces of tomato sauce I had left over, a can of garbanzo beans, 15 ounces of black beans, 15 ounces of red beans and about a half cup of water. The water could probably be left out, or cut in half because it was not really absorbed. I just was afraid it would be too dry so I chucked some in there. [... ]*
> *After everything was thrown in the pot, I left it on low heat for 25 minutes and then ate over mashed potatoes and topped with Daiya cheese.*[422]

### 7.7.2 Event preparation

The majority of the various stages of dinner preparation are captured on one or more occasions with a Completive ἐπεί-Clause (and its preceding first account of the event). Very distinctly from the events of the other Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, the events making up dinner preparations are not "prepared". For example, there is no prior warning that thigh pieces will be burned, no order to burn them, no fire readied (aside from *Iliad* 9.211-213) for them.

Thus, the narrative structure of dinner preparations is different from those of the other events of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. The function of the double-account is correspondingly subtly different. With dinner preparations, the double account alone serves to slow down the pace of the narrative and insist on recognition of the time taken. With other events, the initial preparation of the event serves to begin to apply the brakes to the narrative so that by the time we reach execution of the deed we are looking at the event up close and expect due recognition of time spent on the event.

In light of the absence of the preparation of each of the events that make up dinner preparation, in the discussion that follows each of the events that make up the dinner preparations we look only at the verbal aspect of the first account of the event and any evidence that the poet sensed the events to be of duration. Only in Appendix 3, when we consider the other events, do we specify the nature of preparation of the events.

### 7.7.3 Analysis of the ἐπεί-clauses

The Completive ἐπεί-Clauses of dining preparation and of dining itself are analysed below. Verbal aspect and evidence of the poet's awareness of duration of the particular event are discussed. Prior textual “preparation” of the stages is not considered since, as noted above, preparation is consistently absent.

---

[422] From http://1womansquest.blogspot.co.uk/2014/02/chili-chill.html

### 7.7.4 Slaughtering the victim

**Table 7.1.** Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clause

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Odyssey* 3.449-6 | ἤλασεν ἄγχι στάς: πέλεκυς δ’ ἀπέκοψε τένοντας<br>αὐχενίους, λῦσεν δὲ βοὸς μένος. αἱ δ’ ὀλόλυξαν<br>θυγατέρες τε νυοί τε καὶ αἰδοίη παράκοιτις<br>Νέστορος, Εὐρυδίκη, πρέσβα Κλυμένοιο θυγατρῶν.<br>οἱ μὲν ἔπειτ’ ἀνελόντες ἀπὸ χθονὸς εὐρυοδείης<br>ἔσχον: ἀτὰρ σφάξεν Πεισίστρατος, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν.<br>**τῆς δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ μέλαν αἷμα ῥύη, λίπε δ’ ὀστέα θυμός,**<br>αἶψ’ ἄρα μιν διέχευαν, ἄφαρ δ’ ἐκ μηρία τάμνον |

Two accounts of killing the victim are present here in adjacent lines at 454-455. The context renders the first account inchoative, with the ἐπεί-clause confirming the death of the victim.

Ordinarily, slaughter of an animal victim is directly followed in the text by an account of skinning and extraction of the thigh pieces for burning.[423] But on this occasion of a sacrifice led by Nestor in honour of Athena, slaughter is uniquely followed by an ἐπεί-clause of blood flowing out and death, before turning to extraction of the thigh pieces for burning. This additional line (and loss of reference to skinning) has been noted by scholars[424] but without insight as to the trigger for the line.

This ἐπεί-clause is necessitated by the preceding additional stage of striking the animal on the head, at which first stage it does not die but is stunned: 3.449-450 πέλεκυς δ’ ἀπέκοψε τένοντας / αὐχενίους, λῦσεν δὲ βοὸς μένος.[425] The elaborate description tells us that at this first stage the women present at the sacrifice utter a sacred cry. The second stage then follows in which the animal is actually slaughtered. At this stage the familiar verb σφάξεν is used but requires a confirmation that this time the animal is not merely stunned but has died, which is achieved with the ἐπεί-clause.

---

[423] See Schema 8 “Sacrifical Meal” of Arend 1933.

[424] In relation not only to this ἐπεί-clause of dying but also to the preceding account of striking the victim on the head and stunning it, de Jong 2001: 87 describes this as an “expansion of the simple‘he/they slaughtered’ (cf. *Odyssey* 12.359; 13.24-25; 14.74,425-426;17.180-181;20.250-251).”

[425] Commentators are in agreement that this phrase refers merely to stunning the animal (see, on line 450, Heubeck et al. 1988: 188 and Stanford 1959: 265). Indeed, although many variants of this idiom denote death (*Iliad* 5.296, 8.123, 8.315 τοῦ δ' αὖθι λύθη ψυχή τε μένος τε., *Iliad* 11.579, 13.412 εἶθαρ δ' ὑπὸ γούνατ' ἔλυσεν, *Iliad* 4.469 and a further seven times λῦσε δὲ γυῖα, and *Iliad* 7.16 and 15.435 λύντο δὲ γυῖα), there are occasions when fear or fainting is the necessary interpretation: see in particular *Iliad* 21.114 etc. (x9) λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ and *Odyssey* 18.238 λελῦτο δὲ γυῖα ἑκάστου.

Lines 454-455 together form a couplet of (i) an inchoative account of killing, σφάξεν and (ii) a completion of killing when the blood flows. In other contexts, where there has not been a quasi-death in the preceding lines, σφάξεν suffices to denote the act of slaughter without qualification.[426]

### 7.7.5 Preparing a fire for roasting

Two accounts of a fire are found at *Iliad* 9.211-212, in adjacent lines: πῦρ δὲ Μενοιτιάδης δαῖεν μέγα ἰσόθεος φώς. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλὸξ ἐμαράνθη. This uniquely detailed account of non-sacrifical meat preparation contains a Chained ἐπεί-clause not seen elsewhere to describe the raising up and dying down of a fire ready for grilling meat for a meal.[427] The meal for which the fire is prepared takes place inside Achilles's hut at the seashore and caters to the embassy of Phoenix, Odysseus and Ajax.

#### Verbal Aspect

The imperfect – aorist relationship δαῖεν-κατὰ ... ἐκάη is seen also at the paratactic account of *Iliad* 21.343-349 (which relates not to a dinner but to a fire on the battlefield) although there the imperfect account is further augmented by a second imperfect καῖε. The present stem δαίω is more ordinarily not answered by an aorist in which the fire is dimmed – typically the narrative's interest is on the starting of the fire and not on its end: *Iliad* 5.4, 9.211, 18.206, 18.347, *Odyssey* 7.7 and 8.436. Bearing in mind these examples, it is not certain that we can claim a durative meaning to the present stem in the past tense: if there is a single account of the burning it is the present stem that is used, and it is furthermore the textually most frequent stem to be used for the past tense.[428] An inchoative sense of "started the fire" is a fine partner for the ἐπεί-clause of the next line.

### 7.7.6 Burning the thigh pieces

**Table 7.2.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses denoting burning the thigh pieces

| **Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clause** |
|---|

---

[426] See for example *Iliad* 1.459, 2.422, 24.622, *Odyssey* 12.359 and 14.426. The final example of *Odyssey* 14.426 presents a different ordering of the events compared to *Odyssey* 3.449-6 with κόψε (line 425), τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχή (line 426), ἔσφαξάν (line 426) and διέχευαν (lin 427).

[427] The preparation of fire needed for sacrifices and subsequent roasting of meat for dining is mentioned only at *Iliad* 9.88, *Odyssey* 7.13, 9.231, (9.251 and 308 where the fire prepared by Polyphemus is set up to anticipate the fire used to gouge out Polyphemus' eye) and 16.2. And only rarely, relative to the large number of meal preparations described, is the presence of fire during meal preparations expressly acknowledged (*Iliad* 2.426, 9.468, 23.33, *Odyssey* 3.441, 3.446, 14.422 and 429).

[428] An aorist subjunctive δάηται is seen at *Iliad* 20.316 and 21.375. A reduplicated perfect with present tense reference is used nine times.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 1.460, 462-465 | μηρούς τ’ ἐξέταμον κατά τε κνίσῃ ἐκάλυψαν / ... /<br>καῖε(IMPF) δ’ ἐπὶ σχίζῃς ὁ γέρων, ἐπὶ δ’ αἴθοπα οἶνον<br>λεῖβε: νέοι δὲ παρ’ αὐτὸν ἔχον πεμπώβολα χερσίν.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ’ ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχν’ ἐπάσαντο,**<br>μίστυλλόν τ’ ἄρα τἆλλα καὶ ἀμφ’ ὀβελοῖσιν ἔπειραν, |
| 2. | See also (2) *Iliad* 2.423, 425-428, (3) *Odyssey* 3.456-457, 459-462 and (4) *Odyssey* 12.360-365 which all bear very similar wording to the first example. | |

Burning of the thigh pieces, unlike roasting of the outer meats (see the next section), is uniquely an act within a formal prayer and sacrifice scene. Indeed it is cited thirteen times as evidence of piety outside of the temporal line of the narrative.[429] As an event within the storyline of the narrative it occurs only as a precursor to a full dinner scene. The thigh pieces themselves are not then eaten but are evidently burnt entirely as a sacrifice – they form the meat that is not touched by the diners. On the other hand, the entrails that are roasted with the thigh pieces are to be eaten.

As shown in Schema 8 *Sacrifical Meal* of Arend 1933, burning of the thigh pieces occurs as a stage in four of seven of the most extensive meal descriptions (missing from the meal preparation scenes of *Iliad* 7.314ff., 24.621ff., and *Odyssey* 14.413ff.). In those four accounts (listed in the table above) burning is mentioned first in the imperfect and then with an ἐπεί-clause.

### Use of the ἐπεί-clause

Within the storyline, burning of the thigh pieces occurs five times: four times in the ἐπεί-clause structure (*Iliad* 1.462ff., 2.425ff., *Odyssey* 3.459ff. and 12.363ff.) and a fifth time in the abbreviated hospitality-farewell meal of *Odyssey* 13.24-27 hosted by the Phaeacians in which Odysseus is longing to be back on water. There, the poet shows his flexibility to dispense with imperfective-ἐπεί-clause accounts and reduce an event down to a past participle: *Odyssey* 13.24, 26-27 τοῖσι δὲ βοῦν ἱέρευσ’ ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο / ... / Ζηνὶ κελαινεφέϊ Κρονίδῃ, ὃς πᾶσιν ἀνάσσει. / **μῆρα δὲ κείαντες** δαίνυντ’ ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα / τερπόμενοι: μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδός.

The durational nature of thigh piece burning is evidently so extensive that the poet slots in another activity after the first mention of the burning of thigh pieces: entrails are spitted and put over the fire for roasting at (i) *Iliad* 1.463 (for this we must read meat other than the thigh pieces), (ii) 2.425, (iii) *Odyssey* 3.460 (again, meat other than thigh pieces must be read here) and (iv) 12.363. That second stage of roasting is also presented as an imperfect event: ἔχον, ὑπείρεχον, ἔχον, ἐπώπτων. This is answered by the second part of the burning thigh pieces ἐπεί-clause: καὶ σπλάγχν’ ἐπάσαντο.

---

[429] On all occasions without mention of any meal that it may have preceded: *Iliad* 1.40, 8.240, 15.373, 22.170, 24.34, *Odyssey* 3.273, 4.764, 9.553, 17.241, 19.366, 19.397, 21.267, 22.336.

In the aforementioned fourth instance, in which Eurylochus and his other hungry comrades have been left unsupervised on Helios's island, the first mention of the burning of thigh pieces is not expressed in the indicative but, due to the different circumstances of no wine which triggers different wording, the burning is expressed as a present participle αἰθομένοις (*Odyssey* 12.362).

### Poet's consciousness of the time consuming nature of burning thigh pieces

In addition to the interlacing of roasting entrails with the burning of the thigh pieces and describing its completion, there are a couple of scenes in which burning of the thigh pieces together with roasting the entrails is used as an intersection point with an arrival scene.

In *Iliad* 11.771ff. Nestor recalls Achilles's house and his father's activities when he arrived on his quest to recruit Achilles and Patroclus into the Achaean army headed for Troy:

> *Iliad 11.771-774*
> *ἔνθα δ' ἔπειθ' ἥρωα Μενοίτιον εὕρομεν ἔνδον*
> *ἠδὲ σέ, πὰρ δ' Ἀχιλῆα: γέρων δ' ἱππηλάτα Πηλεὺς*
> *πίονα μηρί' ἔκηε/ἐκαῖε*[430] *βοὸς Διῒ τερπικεραύνῳ*
> *αὐλῆς ἐν χόρτῳ: ἔχε δὲ χρύσειον ἄλεισον*

Similarly, *Odyssey* 3 opens with Telemachus and Athena-Mentor arriving by boat at Pylos where they are in the middle of making sacrifices to Poseidon. The precise point at which they arrive is the burning of the thigh pieces and roasting of the entrails, although here inverted. The choice of this moment for arrival emphasises that the poet understood that burning and roasting were not momentary activities, but rather a slow-motion scene during which other events might well occur. The poet's insistence that the two events co-occurred is underlined by his choice of the temporal conjunction εὖτε: *Odyssey* 3.9-10 εὖθ' οἱ σπλάγχν' ἐπάσαντο, θεῷ δ' ἐπὶ μηρία καῖον, / οἱ δ' ἰθὺς κατάγοντο ἰδ' ἱστία νηὸς ἐίσης.

### Verbal Aspect

The imperfect-aorist relationship of καῖε-κατὰ ... ἐκάη is identical in all four instances of burning the thigh pieces which are completed with an ἐπεί-clause as set out in **Table 7.2** above. The first account is not supplemented by any adverbs of duration whereas the completion of the event of the ἐπεί-clause is emphasised by the compound verb κατακαίω and also by the parallelism asserting that preliminary preparations over the fire are complete. The context, the wording, the construction, and what is known about burning asserts a relationship between the two descriptions of durativity to completion. Since the first account is not marked lexically or structurally for duration whereas the second account is supported lexically in order to mark completion, it seems likely that for the verb καίω the imperfect-aorist aspectual distinction marks the presence or absence of duration.

---

[430] The manuscripts present us with variae lectiones.

The simple verb καίω shows a difference in its preferred aspect depending on the voice used. The transitive active voice statistically prefers the aorist, denoting things which have been burnt by man (see *Iliad* 1.40, 8240, 11.773 etc.). The middle/passive voice prefers the imperfect with its grammatical subject typically a fire or pyre[431] whose dying out is not normally mentioned. The complex verb κατακαίω, on the other hand, which is associated with complete burning, employs the active voice only once (in the imperfect, for the first limb of the chained pair at *Iliad* 2.425) and otherwise employs the aorist passive voice, sometimes tmetically as we see with the ἐπεί-clauses. The six instances of ἀνακαίω, meaning to start a fire, all employ the active voice with the imperfect voice (see *Odyssey* 7.13 etc.).

### 7.7.7 Roasting the outer meats

**Table 7.3.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses denoting roasting of outer meats

| **Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clause** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 9.213-216 | ἀνθρακιὴν στορέσας ὀβελοὺς ἐφύπερθε τάνυσσε,<br>πάσσε δ’ ἁλὸς θείοιο κρατευτάων ἐπαείρας.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὤπτησε καὶ εἰν ἐλεοῖσιν ἔχευεν,**[432]<br>Πάτροκλος μὲν σῖτον ἑλὼν ἐπένειμε τραπέζῃ |
| **Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clause** | | |
| 2. | *Odyssey* 3.32-33, 65-66 | ἔνθ’ ἄρα Νέστωρ ἧστο σὺν υἱάσιν, ἀμφὶ δ’ ἑταῖροι<br>δαῖτ’ ἐντυνόμενοι κρέα τ’ ὤπτων(IMPF) ἄλλα τ’ ἔπειρον / ... /<br>**οἱ δ’ ἐπεί ὤπτησαν κρέ’ ὑπέρτερα καὶ ἐρύσαντο**<br>μοίρας δασσάμενοι δαίνυντ’ ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα. |
| 3. | *Odyssey* 3.463, 470-472 | ὤπτων(IMPF) δ’ ἀκροπόρους ὀβελοὺς ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες. / ... /<br>**οἱ δ’ ἐπεί ὤπτησαν κρέ’ ὑπέρτερα καὶ ἐρύσαντο**<br>δαίνυνθ’ ἑζόμενοι: ἐπὶ δ’ ἀνέρες ἐσθλοὶ ὄροντο<br>οἶνον οἰνοχοεῦντες ἐνὶ χρυσέοις δεπάεσσιν. |
| 4. | *Odyssey* 20.252-256, 260, 279-280 | σπλάγχνα δ’ ἄρ’ ὀπτήσαντες ἐνώμων, ἐν δέ τε οἶνον<br>κρητῆρσι κερόωντο: κύπελλα δὲ νεῖμε συβώτης.<br>σῖτον δέ σφ’ ἐπένειμε Φιλοίτιος, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν,<br>καλοῖς ἐν κανέοισιν, ἐῳνοχόει δὲ Μελανθεύς.<br>οἱ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον. / ... /<br>πὰρ δ’ ἐτίθει σπλάγχνων μοίρας, ἐν δ’ οἶνον ἔχευεν / ... /<br>**οἱ δ’ ἐπεί ὤπτησαν κρέ’ ὑπέρτερα καὶ ἐρύσαντο** |

---

[431] The imperfects of *Iliad* 21.350, 351 and 356 take as their subject natural features, such as trees and a stream. These items are not burnt out, but instead at line 381 Hephaestus quenches his fire.

[432] V.l. of ἔθηκεν instead of ἔχευεν.

μοίρας δασσάμενοι δαίνυντ’ ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα:

Roasting of the outer meats is presented as the final stage[433] of meal preparations in eleven scenes.[434] The outer meats are never offered to the gods and so form part of the secular meal scene alone. Although, as discussed below, the poet displays awareness of the long time taken to roast meat (a universal fact not related only to the Homeric circumstances), he generally prefers not to highlight this duration perhaps so as not to saturate the audience with durative-completive constructions. Thus, a single account of roasting is found in seven descriptions of roasting: six times with the aorist indicative account ὤπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα[435] and once with the aorist participle ὀπτήσας.[436]

In fact, a breakdown of the meat roasting into an imperfect-ἐπεί-clause construction is largely reserved for allowing an interruption into the meal preparations by a new entrant onto the scene, presenting us with three instances of “Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses”. Unlike the Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses of burning the thigh pieces, where the burning is supported by another related act (namely the roasting of the entrails), here the ἐπεί-clauses of roasting of the outer meat follow a full interruption by a character entering on to the scene.[437]

### The roasting of meat is a drawn out process

In addition to the evidence from the Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, there is further evidence from a simile of roasting to suggest that the poet was sensitive to the drawn-out nature of that event. At *Odyssey* 20.25-28, Odysseus’s tossing and turning on his bed pondering how to take revenge on the suitors is compared to a sausage’s tossing and turning over a fire by a man wishing it would roast quickly: μάλα δ’ ὦκα λιλαίεται ὀπτηθῆναι (line 27), confirming the poet’s knowledge that sausages cook slowly.

---

[433] As detailed in the next section on the completion of meal preparations, additional stages follow some accounts of roasting. Thus, cutting up of the meat, serving of bread, the distribution of the meat and/or the pouring of wine are mentioned on occasions.

[434] In the scenes with the four ἐπεί-clauses and the seven further scenes mentioned in this paragraph and cited in the footnotes below.

[435] *Iliad* 1.466, 2.429, 7.318, 24.624, *Odyssey* 14.431 and 19.423. Roasting of the meats is the final stage of the meal preparations with these paratactic accounts and dining will follow shortly, although as noted in the next section additional acts such as serving of the breads is specified where it is a hosted meal.

[436] *Odyssey* 14.76.

[437] Montiglio 2000: 9ff. identifies some positive evidence for silence in Greek ritual which may explain why burning of the thigh pieces is not a scene which is itself interrupted.

### Discussion of the Examples

#### *Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clause*

1. In *Iliad* 9, Achilles and Patroclus host Odysseus, Phoenix and Ajax in Achilles's hut, for dinner and discussion. The dinner preparations take place inside the hut. As noted by Hainsworth, "the standard scene is cast in the 3rd person, not in the plural singular." [438] This change of number,[439] coupled with this scene being in any case the "most elaborate description of a non-sacrificial meal in Homer"[440] gives us, among other things, this expanded account of roasting, but loses many other ἐπεί-clauses (which may explain the toleration of an ἐπεί-clause in this scene).

Here, the first account of roasting is not simply ὀπτάω in the imperfect indicative, but instead is an account of the first stage of roasting: ὀβελοὺς ἐφύπερθε τάνυσσε / ... κρατευτάων ἐπαείρας *he laid the spits over the embers when he had lifted them to the andirons*.

Here then the chaining structure consists of two limbs, the first of which denotes the very first stage of roasting, namely the positioning of the meat above the heat. As with a minority of instances across the different ἐπεί-clauses (most notably the libation ἐπεί-clauses), this particular sequence uses the aorist of a verb to denote only the preliminary stage of the event which is then expressed as completed in the ἐπεί-clause.

#### *Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses*

1. At the beginning of *Odyssey* 3, although Telemachus and Athena-Mentor put in to land while Nestor and his subjects were burning the thigh pieces, by the time the pair arrived at the dinner scene Nestor and his subjects had moved on to roasting the meat (line 32 with the imperfect ὤπτων). As noted in a footnote above in the section on thigh roasting, it is credible that the poet might have preferred an interruption of the secular roasting stage to that of the sacred thigh-burning stage on ritual grounds.

   Following line 32 the two separate scenes scenes are now united as one, with Nestor's son inviting the new arrivals to join the feasting group. The roasting is not yet returned to as other hostly etiquette is complied with: inner meats (hitherto not mentioned, but which, according to the other accounts, would have been prepared before the roasting of the outer flesh had been commenced) are offered to the guests and wine is poured into a cup. The individual pre-dinner prayers are offered to Poseidon by Athena and Telemachus as urged by Nestor's son. Finally, the roasting is completed at line 65 with the ἐπεί-clause.

---

[438] Hainsworth 1993: 91 on lines 206-221.

[439] Meaning, for example, that the recurring single account ὤπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα could not be used.

[440] *Ibid*.

2. The break between the preliminary account of roasting at *Odyssey* 3.463 in the imperfect and its completion at line 472 is simpler than the preceding one discussed above. Here Telemachus is absent from the initial preparations, this time being bathed by Nestor's daughter Polycaste. Telemachus then arrives and sits beside Nestor and the roasting is then completed with the ἐπεί-clause.
3. At *Odyssey* 20.252 roasting of the entrails of slaughtered sheep, goats and swine is taking place at the palace at Ithaca, hosted by the suitor Amphinomus. Following further details on the dinner and the welcoming by Telemachus of disguised Odysseus to a small table of his own where he is offered wine and some entrails (a certain sign that roasting is not completed),[441] the narrative switches at lines 276 to 278 to a scene of a sacrifice of a hecatomb to Apollo at a grove away from the palace. The narrative then switches back to the dinner through an ἐπεί-clause capturing the dining scene. The ἐπεί-clause concludes the roasting of the outer flesh, a stage in the preparations which has not been mentioned earlier although typically follows the tasting of the entrails. Here, the stage of roasting the outer meats has to be inferred from the audience's familiarity with the sequence for preparaing a meal. Due time is indeed allowed to pass after burning of the thigh pieces and tasting of the entrails – a unique pause occurs between tasting of the entrails at lines 252-261 and the roasted meat. Telemachus addresses Odysseus, Antinous urges his fellow suitors not to arrest Telemachus, and heralds elsewhere offer a hecatomb to Apollo.

### 7.7.8 Full preparation of a meal

**Table 7.4.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses denoting meal preparation.

| **Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 1.466-8 | ὤπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα**<br>δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης. |
| 2. | *Iliad* 2.429-431 | *As above* |
| 3. | *Iliad* 7.318-320 | *As above* |
| **Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses** | | |
| 4. | *Odyssey* 16.453, 478-479 | ἤλυθεν: οἱ δ' ἄρα δόρπον ἐπισταδὸν ὡπλίζοντο(IMPF), / ... //<br>**οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα**<br>δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης. |
| 5. | *Odyssey* 24.363-364, | εὗρον Τηλέμαχον καὶ βουκόλον ἠδὲ συβώτην |

---

[441] As at *Odyssey* 3.40.

| | |
|---|---|
| 384-385 | ταμνομένους κρέα πολλὰ κερῶντάς τ’ αἴθοπα οἶνον / ... // |
| | **οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα** |
| | ἑξείης ἕζοντο κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε: |

A fork in the narrative road of dining opens up following paratactic roasting of the outer meats ὤπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα: either further details on finessing the dinner arrangements can be explored, or any final acts can be swept up in a concluding ἐπεί-clause.

To understand what drives the choice, we need to look forward in the text to the final account of dining. Dining in a host-guest arrangement scene[442] is typically concluded by the line οἳ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον. This has not been noted previously by scholars,[443] but is evident if we consider the fourteen uses of this line, all of which involve a host and a guest(s)[444]. Elaboration on self-service dining, on the other hand, is typically concluded by the line δαίνυντ’, οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης[445] whose suitability may derive from the basic meaning of δαίνυμι *to share*.[446]

It must be noted that the two alternative concluding lines of dining display different subject referencing. The guest line uses οἳ δ’, which requires the preceding lines to display a different subject, namely the host or servant of the host offering provisions to the guest. The self-service line, on the other hand, uses an elided subject in δαίνυντ’ referring back to the same subject of the preceding line(s). Thus, we can see that it is not only the final dining line which is varied according to the context, but inevitably also the preceding lines are affected.

In the detailed accounts of dining preparation, the point of diversion in the dinner preparation wording[447] between a self-service account and a hosted account does indeed seem to be at the aforementioned “fork in the road” following roasting of the meats. So, in the scenes of the “Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses” in the table above, roasting is followed immediately by the ἐπεί-clause of conclusion whose main clause is the self-service δαίνυντ’... These three scenes are indeed self-service scenes: *Iliad* 1.459ff., the Achaeans with Chryseis on the island of Chryse; *Iliad* 2.422ff., the Achaean elders at Agamemnon’s hut; and *Iliad* 7.316ff. the celebratory feast following military success at Agamemnon’s hut.

---

[442] Which we measured here by either the express provision of food by the host or the host’s comrade or servant (*Iliad* 9.90, *Odyssey* 5.196, 8.470, 14.443, 16.49-51, 17.94), an assertion of a host-guest relationship in connection with the provision of food or drink (*Iliad* 9.203-204, *Odyssey* 1.123-124, 8.42) or a direct or indirect speech invitation to dine from the host to the guest (*Iliad* 24.618-619, *Odyssey* 4.60, 4.213, 15.93-94).

[443] Reece 1993: 24 simply characterises this line as largely Odyssean, which recognises the distribution but not the distinguishing contexts in which it occurs.

[444] *Iliad* 9.91, 9.221, 24.627, *Odyssey* 1.149, 4.67, 4.218, 5.200, 8.71, 8.484, 14.453, 15.142, 16.54, and 17.98. Only 20.256 stands out as of a different context, since there the suitors are helping themselves to the produce of Odysseus’ palace; the use of host-guest language there may be intentional so as to emphasise the perversion of hospitality committed by the suitiors.

[445] *Iliad* 1.468, 1.602, 2.431, 7.320, 23.56, *Odyssey* 16.479 and 19.425.

[446] See the entry for δαίομαι in Chantraine 1968-1980.

[447] The early stages with a dinner invitation or absence thereof also display differences in wording.

Similarly, the dining preparation scenes concluded by the two Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses set out above, are both dining scenes with no host. First, at *Odyssey* 16.453ff., where it is Odysseus and Telemachus who are preparing dinner within Eumaeus’s hut (with less detail so that there is no articulated roasting stage). Secondly, the dinner prepared by Telemachus and the cowherd at Odysseus’s request at *Odyssey* 24.364ff.

If we turn then to the accounts of roasting which are not followed by this ἐπεί-clause of conclusion + self-service main clause, we will find that these are all instances of a host-guest relationship. First, at the hosting scene of Priam by Achilles we read at *Iliad* 24.624-627 ὤπτησάν τε περιφραδέως, ἐρύσαντό τε πάντα. / Αὐτομέδων δ’ ἄρα σῖτον ἑλὼν ἐπένειμε τραπέζῃ / καλοῖς ἐν κανέοισιν: ἀτὰρ κρέα νεῖμεν Ἀχιλλεύς. / οἳ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον. Here, instead of αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο after the roasting, we are told of Automedon (Achilles’s charioteer) serving the bread while Achilles serves the meat. The dining itself is introduced with the prhase οἳ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’... The hostly nature of this scene is underlined by Achilles’s words to Priam at 24.618-619 ἄγε δὴ καὶ νῶϊ μεδώμεθα δῖε γεραιὲ / σίτου. A similar arrangement is seen with the other two accounts of roasting at *Odyssey* 14.431 and 19.423 which are likewise not followed by the ἐπεί-clause.

### Function of the ἐπεί-clause

Arend, in his schema, described the ἐπεί-clause as an “Abschlußvers”. It is, rather, the poet’s marking of the duration of meal preparations and his inclusion of stages not necessarily mentioned in each dining account. This ἐπεί-clause is, however, skipped when the narrative is structured so as to assert a host-guest relationship.

### The multiple-staged nature of meal preparations

The poet’s awareness of the involved nature of preparing a meal is evident through his listing out of the various stages of the preparations in a number of dining scenes. The two interrupted dinner preparation scenes which are concluded with the resumptive ἐπεί-clause in question allow for simultaneous activity to take place, which underscores the poet’s sensitivity to the duration thereof.

### Verbal Aspect

The phrase ὡπλίσσατο δόρπον / δεῖπνον appears only in the aorist[448] except on the unique occasion when the meal preparations are to be interrupted and then returned to with an ἐπεί-clause as at *Odyssey* 16.453 δόρπον ἐπισταδὸν ὡπλίζοντο.

---

[448] *Odyssey* 2.20, 4.574, 9.291, 9.311, 9.344 and 10.116.

## Discussion of the Examples

### *Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses*

1/ The ἐπεί-clause αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα of *Iliad* 1.467, at the evening meal of the Achaeans who have travelled to Chryses's island, follows straight on from the activity preparatory to a dinner described in the preceding lines 459-466, but it does not have the responsive quality that the first limbs of most Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses display. It is too generic to be seen as the antiphonal partner to any one activity previously described and is, rather, a merism referring to all the activites described in the precedine lines.

As with other Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses, this ἐπεί-clause serves to sum up all the events that preceded it and to include all those other details that the poet did not choose to mention. Thus at *Odyssey* 3.66, 14.431 and 20.280, which are part of hosted meals, cutting up of the meat is mentioned after the roasting has been described whereas here roasting is the last stage mentioned before the ἐπεί-clause. At *Iliad* 24.624ff. roasting is followed by the serving of bread and the distribution of the meat, before dining commences. And at *Odyssey* 3.471-472, the pouring of wine after the roasting is mentioned, whereas it is not here.

The same analysis of this ἐπεί-clause applies to the following ἐπεί-clause in respect of the sacrifice and meal led by Agamemnon in *Iliad* 2 for the Achaean elders and for the next ἐπεί-clause which describes another meal at the huts of Agamemnon in honour of Ajax in which one bull is prepared for a meal (no sacrifice is mentioned) as opposed to the plural victims of the previous two meals.

### *Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clauses*

5/ This dinner preparation is the activity that Eumaeus finds Telemachus and disguised Odysseus engaged in when he returns from delivering a message in the city. The narrative stays with this scene but turns away from the physical labour to an exchange between Telemachus and Eumaeus on what Eumaeus had seen in the city. This exchange, sandwiched between Athena's transformation of Odysseus into an elderly beggar and a conspiratorial smile between father and son, is terminated by a return to the dinner preparations which are picked up by the Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause which concludes the earlier preparation. Thus, here, the meal preparations have not been elaborated upon, with the exchange between Telemachus and Eumaeus occupying the space and time that would otherwise have been spent on enumerating the preparations. This ἐπεί-clause completes the generalised activity of preparing dinner that was introduced before the interlude.

6/ The second dining preparation scene, whose conclusion is similarly captured in a pronominal ἐπεί-clause, resembles the first scene in its arrangement. Laertes and Odysseus, reunited, arrive at Laertes's house where they find Telemachus, the cowherd and the swineherd cutting up meat and mixing wine. The kitchen activity is in the accusative and present participle form, suggesting ongoing activity. The narrative remains in Laertes's house but digresses to whisk away Laertes to be bathed, leading to an exchange between Laertes and Odysseus on Laertes's improved looks but feebleness of body. The narrative then returns to the dinner preparations, using the ἐπεί-clause to conclude what had been commenced earlier.[449]

---

[449] Reynen 1957: 40-41 offers a similar analysis.

### 7.7.9 Consumption of dinner

**Table 7.5.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses denoting dining.

| **All are Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses except for number 10: *Odyssey* 24.412, 489-490** | | |
|---|---|---|
| Third Person Plural Dining – with the ἐπεί-clause αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο | | |
| 1. | *Iliad* 1.468-470 and on four further occasions[450] | δαίνυντ’(IMPF), οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο(IMPF) δαιτὸς ἐΐσης.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο**<br>κοῦροι μὲν κρητῆρας ἐπεστέψαντο ποτοῖο |
| 2. | *Iliad* 9.91-92 and on ten further occasions[451] | οἳ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον(IMPF)<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο**<br>τοῖς ὁ γέρων πάμπρωτος ὑφαίνειν ἤρχετο μῆτιν |
| 3. | *Odyssey* 3.66-68 | μοίρας δασσάμενοι δαίνυντ’ ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο**<br>τοῖς ἄρα μύθων ἦρχε Γερήνιος ἱππότα Νέστωρ: |
| 4. | *Odyssey* 3.471-474 | δαίνυνθ’ ἐζόμενοι: ἐπὶ δ’ ἀνέρες ἐσθλοὶ ὄροντο<br>οἶνον οἰνοχοεῦντες ἐνὶ χρυσέοις δεπάεσσιν.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο**<br>τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἦρχε Γερήνιος ἱππότα Νέστωρ: |
| 5. | *Odyssey* 12.307-308 | νηός, ἔπειτα δὲ δόρπον ἐπισταμένως τετύκοντο.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο**<br>μνησάμενοι δὴ ἔπειτα φίλους ἔκλαιον ἑταίρους, |
| 6. | *Odyssey* 15.301-304 | τὼ δ’ αὖτ’ ἐν κλισίῃ Ὀδυσεὺς καὶ δῖος ὑφορβὸς<br>δορπείτην(IMPF): παρὰ δέ σφιν ἐδόρπεον(IMPF) ἀνέρες ἄλλοι.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο,**<br>τοῖς δ’ Ὀδυσεὺς μετέειπε, συβώτεω πειρητίζων |
| 7. | *Odyssey* 15.500-502 | δεῖπνόν τ’ ἐντύνοντο κερῶντό τε αἴθοπα οἶνον.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο,**<br>τοῖσι δὲ Τηλέμαχος πεπνυμένος ἤρχετο μύθων: |
| Third Person Plural Dining – with unique ἐπεί-clauses | | |
| 8. | *Odyssey* 5.200-202 | οἱ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον(IMPF).<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος,**<br>τοῖς ἄρα μύθων ἦρχε Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων: |

---

[450] The pair of lines of *Iliad* 1.468-469 recur at *Iliad* 2.431-2, 7.320-323 (note the interruption between the two lines), 23.56-57 and *Odyssey* 16.479-480.

[451] The pair of lines at *Iliad* 9.91-92 recur at *Iliad* 9.221-2, 24.627-8 and *Odyssey* 1.149-150, 4.67-8, 8.71-2, 8.484-5, 14.453-4, 15.142-3, 16.54-5 and 17.98-9.

| **All are Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses except for number 10: *Odyssey* 24.412, 489-490** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9. | *Odyssey* 6.97-100 | δεῖπνον ἔπειθ’ εἵλοντο παρ’ ὄχθῃσιν ποταμοῖο,<br>εἵματα δ’ ἠελίοιο μένον τερσήμεναι αὐγῇ.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτου τάρφθεν δμῳαί τε καὶ αὐτή,**<br>σφαίρῃ ταὶ δ’ ἄρ’ ἔπαιζον, ἀπὸ κρήδεμνα βαλοῦσαι |
| 10. | *Odyssey* 24.412, 489-490 | ὣς οἱ μὲν περὶ δεῖπνον ἐνὶ μεγάροισι πένοντο: / ... /<br>**οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν σίτοιο μελίφρονος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο**,<br>τοῖς δ’ ἄρα μύθων ἦρχε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς |
| First Person Plural Dining | | |
| 11. | *Iliad* 11.779-780 | ξείνιά τ’ εὖ παρέθηκεν, ἅ τε ξείνοις θέμις ἐστίν.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπημεν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος**<br>ἦρχον ἐγὼ μύθοιο κελεύων ὔμμ’ ἅμ’ ἕπεσθαι: |
| 12. | *Odyssey* 9.86-88 and 10.57-59 | αἶψα δὲ δεῖπνον ἕλοντο θοῇς παρὰ νηυσὶν ἑταῖροι.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτοιό τ’ ἐπασσάμεθ’ ἠδὲ ποτῆτος**<br>9.88 δὴ τοτ’ ἐγὼν ἑτάρους προΐειν πεύθεσθαι ἰόντας,<br>10.59 δὴ τότ’ ἐγὼ κήρυκά τ’ ὀπασσάμενος καὶ ἑταῖρον |
| Third Person Singular Dining | | |
| 13. | *Odyssey* 5.94-96 | αὐτὰρ ὁ πῖνε(IMPF) καὶ ἦσθε(IMPF) διάκτορος ἀργεϊφόντης.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δείπνησε καὶ ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῇ,**<br>καὶ τότε δή μιν ἔπεσσιν ἀμειβόμενος προσέειπεν: |
| 14. | *Odyssey* 14.109, 111 | ὣς φάθ’, ὁ δ’ ἐνδυκέως κρέα τ’ ἤσθιε(IMPF) πῖνέ τε οἶνον / ... /<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δείπνησε καὶ ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῇ,**<br>καί οἱ πλησάμενος δῶκε σκύφον, ᾧ περ ἔπινεν |
| Extraordinary Dining | | |
| 15. | *Iliad* 2.314-318 | ἔνθ’ ὅ γε τοὺς ἐλεεινὰ κατήσθιε(IMPF) τετριγῶτας:<br>μήτηρ δ’ ἀμφεποτᾶτο ὀδυρομένη φίλα τέκνα:<br>τὴν δ’ ἐλελιξάμενος πτέρυγος λάβεν ἀμφιαχυῖαν.<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ τέκν’ ἔφαγε στρουθοῖο καὶ αὐτήν,**<br>τὸν μὲν ἀρίζηλον θῆκεν θεὸς ὅς περ ἔφηνε: |
| 16. | *Odyssey* 9.292, 296-298 | ἤσθιε(IMPF) δ’ ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, οὐδ’ ἀπέλειπεν, / ... /<br>**αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν**<br>**ἀνδρόμεα κρέ’ ἔδων καὶ ἐπ’ ἄκρητον γάλα πίνων**<br>κεῖτ’ ἔντοσθ’ ἄντροιο τανυσσάμενος διὰ μήλων. |

The act of consuming a meal is the most highly recurring component of a type scene. It is also phrasally very regular. The act is typically described in two limbs: a line in the imperfect, and then a line with an ἐπεί-clause which concludes the dining.

For the purposes of this Section 7.7.9 which relates to the consumption of food, a study of all references to the act of consumption of food, whether or not an ἐπεί-clause is used, was undertaken. One word references to consumption of food, such as at Iliad 4.386 δαινυμένους alongside solicitation – response structures such as at Iliad 7.370, 7.380 νῦν μὲν δόρπον ἕλεσθε

... / δόρπον ἔπειθ' εἵλοντο as well as extended passages describing preparation and consumption as exemplified with the ἐπεί-clauses have all been studied. There are approximately sixty references to the consumption of food.[452]

## Use of the ἐπεί-clause

The ἐπεί-clause follows on from a first account, typically in the imperfect, of dining. This two-account structure in turn answers to a preceding build up, with suggestions of dining and/or details (often elaborate, consisting of some or all of the stages examined in the preceding pages) of the preparation.

### *Where the ἐπεί-clause is not used*

Where dining is mentioned in passing, with little or no preceding build-up one line typically suffices. Certain aoristic phrases recur.[453] Where the dining is expressly durative (i.e. with the support of a durative temporal expression), so that a scene is depicted, a one line account in the imperfect suffices; this is seen at the feasts of each of the Trojans and Achaeans following the burial truce at the end of *Iliad* 7: line 476-477 παννύχιοι ... / δαίνυντο, Τρῶες δὲ κατὰ πτόλιν ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι. And at *Odyssey* 4.15 ὣς οἱ μὲν δαίνυντο καθ' ὑψερεφὲς μέγα δῶμα is presented as occurring simultaneously with the event described in the following lines. The funeral feast for Hector is held in the halls of Paris at the end of *Iliad* 24 with the line 802 εὖ συναγειρόμενοι δαίνυντ' ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα.

The preparation for rushed dinners may be presented in some detail, but there we see no use of the two-account structure for the description of the actual dining. Thus, at *Iliad* 8.545ff. the Trojans bring oxen, sheep and wine from the city for their meal out on the plain pursuant to Hector's instructions at *Iliad* 8.503ff. This is done quickly (lines 506, 545 καρπαλίμως), it being night time. No account at all of the actual dining is provided. Similarly, the valedictory meal hosted by the Phaeacians at the beginning of *Odyssey* 13 is presented in abbreviated format, so as to recognise the haste that Odysseus experienced (as touched upon in the introduction to this section). There the dining is presented in the same line as the burning of the thigh pieces. The imperfect is still employed for the act of dining to recognise that the event would have been of duration, but it is not answered by a ἐπεί-clause: *Odyssey* 13.26 μῆρα δὲ κείαντες δαίνυντ’ ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα. Finally, at *Odyssey* 14.347 the unanticipated single account of dining is accompanied by an adverb meaning “quickly”: ἐσσυμένως παρὰ θῖνα θαλάσσης δόρπον ἕλοντο.

---

[452] See Iliad 1.468, 1.602, 2.399, 2.431, 4.345, 4.386, 7.320, 7.380, 7.477, 8.53, 9.91, 9.221, 11.730, 11.780, 18.314, 19.179, 19.346, 23.56, 23.201, 24.627, 24.802, Odyssey.1.9, 1.26, 1.149, 2.20, 3.66, 3.309, 3.471, 4.15, 4.67, 4.218, 4.429, 4.574, 4.624, 4.786, 5.94, 5.200, 6.97, 7.177, 7.203, 8.38, 8.71, 8.98, 8.484, 9.86, 9.162, 9.292, 9.312, 9.557, 10.9, 10.57, 10.61, 10.184, 10.452, 10.468, 10.477, 12.30, 12.308, 12.398, 13.26, 14.109, 14.250, 14.347, 14.453, 15.142, 15.373, 15.501, 16.54, 16.479, 17.98, 17.269, 17.358, 17.506, 19.402, 19.425, 20.256, 20.348, 21.290, 24.386, and 24.489.

[453] Variants of the phrase δεῖπνον ἕλοντο recur. Thus, the non-princely dining at the morning's meeting at *Iliad* 2 is ordered by Agamemnon at *Iliad* 2.381 νῦν δ' ἔρχεσθ' ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ἵνα ξυνάγωμεν Ἄρηα and then undertaken by the Achaeans at *Iliad* 2.399 κάπνισσάν τε κατὰ κλισίας, καὶ δεῖπνον ἕλοντο with no description of any build-up. Similarly, at *Iliad* 7.370, following the duel between Ajax and Hector, Antenor urges the Trojans to take their evening meal.

The elaborate dining scene of the suitors with unrevealed Odysseus at *Odyssey* 20.250-283 employs the line οἳ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον to describe the consumption of the entrails and the line μοίρας δασσάμενοι δαίνυντ’ ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα to describe consumption of the main meal. No ἐπεί-clause follows, allowing the disorder that follows and abuse of Odysseus to take place within the dining scene. Indeed at line 348 we are assured that dining is continuing: αἱμοφόρυκτα δὲ δὴ κρέα ἤσθιον: ὄσσε δ’ ἄρα σφέων.

### *Alternative to the ἐπεί-clause*

The occasional subordinate clause of dining appears but, by contrast with our ἐπεί-clauses, appears to be ornamental, but possibly taking on the role of pausing on the dining for due effect. Thus, following the dining ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 14.454, the diners go to bed, yet we find the reference to completion of dining repeated in a participial clause, perhaps to break the abruptness between dining and sleeping:

> *Odyssey 14.454-456*
> *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο,*
> *σῖτον μέν σφιν ἀφεῖλε Μεσαύλιος,* ***οἱ δ’ ἐπὶ κοῖτον***
> ***σίτου καὶ κρειῶν κεκορημένοι*** *ἐσσεύοντο.*

### Events preparatory to Dining

Against each instance discussed below we note that the consumption of dining, when completed with a ἐπεί-clause, is typically preceded by quite elaborate details on the preparation of the food – the preparation of meat, the setting out of food by maidservants etc. As noted above, it is the basic accounts of dining with no account of the preparation involved which tend to present no ἐπεί-clause.

### Dining is a drawn out process

In addition to the resumptive structure between *Odyssey* 24.412 and the ἐπεί-clause of 489 which suggests that the poet believed that dining was of sufficiently long duration that substantial events could take place in parallel, we have the prolonged dining scene at *Odyssey* 20.250ff. (see under the discussion above on “Where the ἐπεί-clause is not used”) during which other events take place. At *Odyssey* 24.385ff. dining starts in the imperfect and is then interrupted by the arrival of other diners, indicating the poet’s awareness of the durative nature of dining so that others can arrive during the course of the event.

At *Odyssey* 19.401-402 the poet’s awareness that dining is a prolonged process is illustrated by his depiction of Autolycus being towards the end of dining (παυομένῳ δόρποιο) when the as-yet-unnamed baby Odysseus is presented to him for a new to be chosen: τόν ῥά οἱ Εὐρύκλεια φίλοις ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκε / παυομένῳ δόρποιο...

Finally, the collocation of the adverb for “quickly” (ἐσσυμένως) with dining at *Odyssey* 14.347 supports our understanding that the poet perceived of dining as an event of duration which could be adjusted to be briefer if circumstances required.

### Verbal Aspect

As always, the ἐπεί-clauses are in the aorist. By contrast, the preceding first accounts of dining tend to present in the imperfect with some of the verbs employed being *imperfectiva tantum*.

1-7/ It is noticeable that literary commentators have tended to term this recurrent ἐπεί-clause “useful”[454] or a “transition formula”.[455]

1, 3 and 4/ The highly occurring middle δαίνυντο is found only in the imperfect and not in the aorist. But in favour of reading meaning into the use of the imperfect, we can note that it appears largely in contexts where it is answered by an ἐπεί-clause or where duration is emphasised.[456] Similarly, ἐδεύετο of the recurring line δαίνυντ’, οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης is a verb found only in the imperfect.

2 and 8/ The recurring line οἳ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον contains the verb in the imperfect; this is a verb for which three aorist indicative examples are also attested-at *Iliad* 15.19 and *Odyssey* 8.443, 447. The expression in the imperfect, with the same metaphorical sense, is found at *Odyssey* 9.288 ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἀναΐξας ἑτάροις ἐπὶ χεῖρας ἴαλλε and at *Odyssey* 10.375-6 Κίρκη δ’ ὡς ἐνόησεν ἔμ’ ἥμενον οὐδ’ ἐπὶ σίτῳ / χεῖρας ἰάλλοντα, στυγερὸν δέ με πένθος ἔχοντα. The imperfect is unlikely to have a durative sense, but it may have a conative sense. More significant is that the meaning of the line presents an ingressive account of dining: *they threw their hands upon the food*, denoting the first stage of dining.

5/ Together with 9 and 12, the aorist of the first account τετύκοντο stands out from the other first accounts for its non-imperfective aspect. As with 9 and 12, this use echoes a wider pattern of using the aorist where there is no prior build up to dining – here there is only the request from Odysseus not to dine from the cattle of Helios.

6/ Both δορπείτην and ἐδόρπεον are in the imperfective aspect. The aorist form occurs at *Odyssey* 7.215 ἀλλ’ ἐμὲ μὲν δορπῆσαι ἐάσατε κηδόμενόν περ. The verb occurs only twice elsewhere.

---

[454] Kirk 1985: 161 on *Iliad* 2.430.

[455] Gunn 1971: 30.

[456] Napoli 2010: 81 views the imperfect stem δαίνυντ' as having aspectual meaning. She comments on *Iliad* 1.602 δαίνυντ', οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης, // ... // αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατέδυ λαμπρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο (together with the imperfect πολεμίζομεν of *Odyssey* 14.240 and the imperfect δέμον of *Odyssey* 23.192) as “these sentences do not depict habitual situations; they refer to durative actions linked to a single, specific occasion in the past, and continued through a more or less long period, until another action began (such a change is denoted by aorist stems).”

7 and 10/ The lines directly prior to the ἐπεί-clauses describe in one line the preparation of the meal with imperfective aspect.

9 and 12/ In these two instances the aoristic phrase δεῖπνον εἵλοντο / ἕλοντο is used for the first account. The dining here is unanticipated by the preceding text. The aorist phrasing recalls a pattern across the ἐπεί-clauses for a first account of the event to be in the aorist where there is no preparation of the event. This was discussed in Section 4.3.

11/ The first stage of dining is described in the line preceding the ἐπεί-clause, with an aorist account of placing of the food before the diners. This construction is one of a few instances scattered across the events where the first account is presented in the form of a description of the first stage.

13, 14, 15 and 16/ The masculine singular ἤσθ(ι)ε and πῖνε are straightforward marked imperfects in contrast to their attested aorist forms (suppletive ἔφαγε for ἤσθ(ι)ε).[457] There seems no reason not to attribute to the imperfect of these verbs a durative meaning.

## Discussion of the Examples

### *Third Person Plural Dining – with the ἐπεί-clause αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο*

1/ The chained structures here are found in contexts of dining with prior preparations of reasonable degrees of elaboration. As noted earlier in this section, the first line of the chained pair denotes communal dining: δαίνυντ’, οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης. (The line μοίρας δασσάμενοι δαίνυντ’ ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα of *Odyssey* 3.66 and *Odyssey* 20.280 is, on the other hand, associated with hosted dining.)

2/ Heubeck et al. described these two lines as “a stock pair of verses, 3 times in the *Iliad*, 8 times in the *Odyssey*. There is a set scene describing the preparation of meat.”[458]

3-7/ The ἐπεί-clauses at examples 3-7 follow descriptions of dining which have diverged from the typical wording seen within the ἐπεί-clauses of 1 and 2, due to a tweak to the narrative.

3/ The dinner preparations at Nestor’s banquet which Telemachus and Athena join are interrupted by the arrival of the pair at the point of roasting the outer meats. The completion of roasting the outer meats is managed with a Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause which then leads to slightly altered language for the first account of dining (μοίρας δασσάμενοι δαίνυντ’ ) from that which we ordinarily see for hosted dining.

---

[457] Napoli 2010: 83 noted the aspectual contrast in the sequence κατήσθιε ~ αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ ... ἔφαγε of *Iliad* 2.314, 317 and suggested that “the imperfect of κατεσθίω, denot[es] the action of “eating” as in the course of development, [and] is followed by the indicative aorist of ἔφαγον, denoting the same action as having attained its final limit”. Such an analysis of this particular aspectual sequence confers a marked meaning on both partners; yet the imperfect form ἤσθιον and aorist form ἔφαγον participate in a single Homeric verbal paradigm for eating (see for example the recent elaboration of verbal suppletion across different texts and time periods in Greek of Kölligan 2007: 68-71). This attribution of meaning to both stems runs contrary to the binary approach of markedness to aspectual stem generally advocated by Napoli.

[458] Heubeck et al. 1988: 378.

4/ As with the preceding example, the farewell meal hosted by Nestor towards the end of *Odyssey* 3 for Telemachus and disguised Athena uses a variant of the language of the constructions at *Odyssey* 2, to accommodate the Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause of roasting at line 470. Lines 471-472 assert the hostly nature of this dining scene.

5/ The brief dining on the shore of Helios’s island when Odysseus and his comrades first arrive there is given a particular focus by the discussion that precedes this dining in which Odysseus extracts a promise from his comrades that they will eat only their own food and not any of Helios’s sacred cattle.

6/ In a structure that recalls *Odyssey* 3.464-465 τόφρα δὲ Τηλέμαχον λοῦσεν καλὴ Πολυκάστη / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ (see the discussion on bathing ἐπεί-clauses in the Appendix) the dining of these lines was not mentioned earlier. Indeed, Odysseus and the swineherd were last seen asleep at the end of *Odyssey* 14. Until line 301 the narrative had turned to events occurring with Telemachus. The narrative switches back to Odysseus and the swineherd for whom a day has passed and we find that they are now busy with a meal. The first line of the account serves to point back to what had been occurring. The ἐπεί-clause then concludes the act.

7/ At *Odyssey* 15.500ff. the dining preparations of Telemachus and Eumaeus are brief evening preparations by the seashore after arrival by boat. There is then no detail of the slaughtering of meat etc. But nevertheless the narrative places a focus on the time taken to consume the meal, commensurate with the slow pace of the narrative at this point: all details are provided – the mooring of the ship, the preparation of the meal, the discussions afterwards.

### Concluding dining with a unique ἐπεί-clause

8/ Calypso hosts Odysseus with the support of her handmaids. She is served ambrosia and nectar while Odysseus is served the food of mortals. The first line of the dining description is the conventional hostly line of οἱ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον. As suggested in Section 8.4.4, the ἐπεί-clause in the second line is adapted to accommodate the fact that a goddess’s “desire for food” is not suited to the divine context. Thus, the ἐπεί-clause used is αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος.

9/ The account of Nausicaa and her handmaids laundering their clothes by the river streams is a slow and deliberate account. Thus, when the narrative recounts that they dined, due time is given to the description of the meal through a two line account of parataxis followed by the ἐπεί-clause, even though the prior preparation consists only of the mention back at lines 75-76 that Nausicaa’s mother had packed victuals for their outing.

10/ At line 386 of *Odyssey* 24 Odysseus, Telemachus and Laertes are beginning to settle down to a post-victory banquet when Odysseus’s former slave Dolius and his sons appear. After welcoming them and embracing each other, the meal is resumed at line 412. That banquet, like most dining, commences in the imperfective aspect. Before concluding the meal the narrative turns first to the remaining pro-suitor camp at lines 413 to 471 and the forming of plans to avenge the killings of the suitors and then to Mount Olympus at lines 472-488 where the gods agree that the warring between the two factions must be brought to an end. It is against the background of the conversation of the pro-suitor camp and the intentions of the gods that the meal at the palace is returned to and concluded and Odysseus wonders aloud whether they are about to be ambushed.

οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν σίτοιο μελίφρονος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο of line 489 concludes the dining, after a break for scenes with the suitors’ camp and then with the gods. It is a unique line within the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but shared with Homeric Hymn 3.500’s subjunctive version: αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν σίτοιο μελίφρονος ἐξ ἔρον ἧσθε. Employing the same metaphor of ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο, this ἐπεί-clause recalls the much repeated line αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο which is the only other ἐπεί-clause used to conclude elided third person plural dining.

The reason for not choosing the default phrase with πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος is likely to have been motivated by the actions that follow. In all cases where dining is concluded with “wine and food”, the following activity is sedentary or supine: talking or sleeping. In this case Osdysseus and his father and son leap up to fight against the remaining insurgents. They would have been less able to do do this on the back of a wine fuelled meal.[459]

### *First Person Plural Dining*

There are a handful of expressions for single accounts of dining in the first person plural, always brief affairs with little or no prior anticipation.[460] But for more elaborate dining with a prior build up (for which we might have expected an imperfect + ἐπεί-clause structure), the poet did not employ, and presumably did not know of, an expression for imperfective dining for the first person plural. The poet deals with this in two ways: (i) by skipping out the imperfective account, so that we move from a prepared meal by a host, to the consumption, as at *Iliad*

---

[459] Russo page 413 suggests that μελίφρονος evokes the wine by transferred epithet, cf. μελίφρονα οἶνον. Indeed the collocation in line 489 is surprising: μελίφρων qualifies οἶνον on all occasions, namely at *Iliad* 6.264, 8.188, 8.506, 8.546, and 24.284 and at *Odyssey* 7.182 , 10.356, 13.53, 15.148 except this one in question and at *Iliad* 2.34 where it qualifies ὕπνος, which is a more likely candiate for such an adjective than σῖτος. In which case, why use this line rather than πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο? Or is there free variation, as an exception to the principle of economic thrift? Accepting that there is a motivation for the variation, it seems to me that it does lie in the activity that follows the meal. The transfer of epithet may still have function though, to suggest a typical full meal, but downgrading to implication through transferred epithet the extent of the wine drunk.

[460] See *Iliad* 11.730, *Odyssey* 4.429, *Odyssey* 4.574. Responding to some prior build up, a first person plural line of dining follows a motif of account of hunting or providing an animal(s) for meat ἥμεθα δαινύμενοι κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ pops up at *Odyssey* 9.162, 9.557, 10.184, 10.468 and 10.477.

11.772ff.; or (ii) by using a referentially unsuitable third person plural account (which is furthermore aorist) as at *Odyssey* 9.86 and 10.57.

11/ At *Iliad* 11.772ff. Nestor recalls to Patroclus the scene when he came to Peleus's house to ask Patroclus and Achilles to join the coalition with Agamemnon to recover Helen. Meat preparation was underway for a meal. Achilles sprang up and led the guests to a table and placed a meal before them. In the next line the ἐπεί-clause recounts that they had consumed the meal.

12/ The structure here recalls that of *Odyssey* 6.97ff back at number 9. The details of the dinner preparations are non-existent beyond a reference to drawing water in the line preceding the account of dining. Yet the slow pace of the narrative here encourages the poet to pause on the dining moment and patch together a two line account of the dining: first with the paratactic aorist line in the third person and then returning to the first person account for the ἐπεί-clause.

### ***Third Person Singular Dining***

Across the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* there are three hosted meals at which a single guest but not the host dines, all of which are found in the *Odyssey*: Circe hosts Hermes (*Odyssey* 5.91ff.), Alcinous hosts Odysseus (*Odyssey* 7.166ff.), and Eumaeus hosts Odysseus (*Odyssey* 14.45ff.).[461] The descriptions of the three meals are lexically similar to each other and also structurally similar to all of the hosted dining scenes described above. The description of dining changes to accommodate the facts, but still, as with the plural scenes of hosted dining, selects an imperfective account. The ἐπεί-clause that follows the first and third accounts, which must also be adapted to the singular, is juxtaposed to the imperfective account of dining and reverts back to the type of merism seen with other hospitality ἐπεί-clauses. The whole dining scene is anticipated beforehand by an invitation by the host to dine.

The middle account of Odysseus being hosted by the Phaeacians and dining by himself, having just arrived, is not completed with a ἐπεί-clause, although its single account is presented in the imperfect with the same phrasing as that of the two accounts where that account forms the first of two accounts: *Odyssey* 7.177 αὐτὰρ ὁ πῖνε καὶ ἦσθε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς. Instead, this imperfect serves to allow dining to extend across a series of events that occur while dining takes place: the act of libating by the gathering of Phaeacians at lines 181-184, the urging to bed of the Phaeacians by Alcinous (lines 186ff.) and Odysseus's reply (lines 208ff.) including his request to be allowed to continue to eat his dinner (line 215). Following this there is no further mention of the act of dining itself, but the end of Odysseus's meal is marked clearly at line 232 when the maids are described as clearing away the meal.

---

[461] The scene at *Odyssey* 17.343ff. in which Telemachus passes bread and meats to disguised Odysseus cannot be categorised as a hostly scene, as the offering of food is presented as a spontaneous afterthought to a hungry beggar. There, Odysseus eats in the imperfect at line 358 while a bard sings. In the next line he finishes eating with a unique εὖθ' ὁ δεδειπνήκειν. Homeric accounts of an individual dining by himself out of the hosted context are few. It is then difficult to point to the precise phrasing that the poet would have overlooked in favour of this chained account; but given the creativity shown by the poet in creating our two pairs of chained lines, the poet was, at the very least, rejecting the option of creating one line to describe the dining. *Odyssey* 17.506 offers one such instance of a line account of dining: *Odyssey* 17.506 ὁ δ' ἐδείπνει δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.

13/ In *Odyssey* 5's account of Circe's hospitality towards Hermes who has come to urge her to release Odysseus, Hermes drinks and dines in the imperfect (πῖνε καὶ ἦσθε). This account is followed by a juxtaposed αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clause, in the aorist. As noted most recently by de Jong[462] in her narratological commentary on the Odydsey, there are multiple breaches of hospitality etiquette, including Hermes's initial failure to wait at the door to be invited in and Circe's asking him of his purpose for visiting *before* inviting him to dine.

14/ In *Odyssey* 14's account of the swineherd Eumaeus's hospitality towards Odysseus, the same two verbs πῖνε and ἦσθιε of the previous sceme are used but the order is reversed to accommodate other details. Eumaeus expressly mentions that the meat he has to offer is of poor quality: *Odyssey* 14.81-82 ἔσθιε νῦν, ὦ ξεῖνε, τά τε δμώεσσι πάρεστι, / χοίρε': ἀτὰρ σιάλους γε σύας μνηστῆρες ἔδουσιν, but this is nevertheless a clear hospitality scene as underlined by the structuring.

### ***Exceptional Dining***

15/ The dining scene of the cannibalistic "host", the Cyclops Polyphemus, also contains an ἐπεί-clause to signify the completion of dining. Thus, at *Odyssey* 9.292 to 298 the hospitality formula of an imperfective account of dining (292 ἤσθιε δ' ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, οὐδ' ἀπέλειπεν...) completed by a two line ἐπεί-clause, starting 296 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν describes the Cylops's feasting on two of Odysseus's comrades.[463] The chaining character seen with most dining ἐπεί-clauses is interrupted here to recount the horror of the other comrades.

> *Odyssey 9.292-298*
> ***ἤσθιε*** *δ' ὥς τε λέων ὀρεσίτροφος, οὐδ' ἀπέλειπεν,*
> *ἔγκατά τε σάρκας τε καὶ ὀστέα μυελόεντα.*
> *ἡμεῖς δὲ κλαίοντες ἀνεσχέθομεν Διῒ χεῖρας,*
> *σχέτλια ἔργ' ὁρόωντες, ἀμηχανίη δ' ἔχε θυμόν.*
> ***αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν***
> *ἀνδρόμεα κρέ' ἔδων καὶ ἐπ' ἄκρητον γάλα πίνων,*
> *κεῖτ' ἔντοσθ' ἄντροιο τανυσσάμενος διὰ μήλων.*

---

[462] De Jong 2001: 129-130.

[463] In his book on Homeric hospitality scenes Reece 1993: 25 aptly observed that in respect of Polyphemus' and the Laestrogyinan Antiphates' treatment of their guests "Homer perverts the typical banquet scene, creating a black parody on a formal level, by applying the conventional diction of the banquet to their cannibalistic feast".

This first account of dining by the Cyclops is followed by two briefer accounts, which rely on a single aorist account, although the first of these two accounts is then chained by a participle: *Odyssey* 9.310-311 σὺν δ’ ὅ γε δὴ αὖτε δύω μάρψας ὡπλίσσατο δεῖπνον. / δειπνήσας and 9.344 σὺν δ’ ὅ γε δὴ αὖτε δύω μάρψας ὡπλίσσατο δεῖπνον. The actual consumption is described in this line, as confirmed by the direct speech of line 347 ἐπεὶ φάγες ἀνδρόμεα κρέα.

16/ A similar construction to describe the devouring by a snake of a sparrow and her babies is used at *Iliad* 2. There, the imperfective κατήσθιε of eating is followed by a description of the devastation that the mother experiences followed by an ἐπεί-clause concluding the devastation.

## 7.8 Conclusion

We have shown in this chapter how the poet displays particular sensitivity to events of duration, often those which form parts of type scenes, but to which he does not necessarily wish to dedicate much space. He uses ἐπεί-clauses in combination with preceding accounts in the imperfect, or expressed in some other way as being an incomplete, to create an impression of an event which took a while – these instances of Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses are not used simply to link one event to the next, nor are they a mark of the primitive poet expressing each stage slowly. Rather they are the poet at his Greek and literary best, sequencing ἐπεί-clauses close to each other – with such close sequencing seen in fifth-century Greek as noted by Muchnová – to assert the duration of an event that is of low narrative interest.

Sometimes, events that are of duration are used by the poet to allow the weaving in or intersecting of other events. In such cases the poet uses the same device as seen with the Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses of presenting the event before the ἐπεί-clause in the imperfect; but then he interrupts it in order to intersperse another event before returning with the same type of ἐπεί-clauses lexically marked for completion as we see with the Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. These instances of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses are more similar in their discourse function to what has been noted by linguists of the discourse function in English of adverbial clauses.

Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, by which the events of the previous lines are typically mentioned with some lacunae and then comprehensively summarised as completed in the Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, are perhaps the most easy to relate to by speakers of English. But it is interesting to observe how precisely the poet operates – regularly drawing on these Cumulative Completive ἐπεί-Clauses where details of the sub-events that form part of a larger events have been omitted in the first narrative.

We have now reviewed the discourse function of all past tense temporal ἐπεί-clauses in Homer. Neither in Chapter 6 nor in this chapter have we found any simple “linkage” function of the sort sketched out by Thompson et al. (see Section 6.3.1). Nor is there any evidence of the "circumstantial" function identified by Rijksbaron and Muchnová beyond the three Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses of Seeing discussed in Section 0.

The discourse function of the ἐπεί-clauses varies from the completive function sketched out in this chapter where the ἐπεί-clause combines with preceding text to recognise the duration of an event but does not set it as background to subsequent events, to the recapitulating and expectancy chain functions examined in Chapter 6 where there the ἐπεί-clause serves in part to place emphasis on what follows in the main clause. In all cases the contents of the ἐπεί-clause tie back tightly to preceding text. It is evident from the examples cited from scholars of fifth-century Greek that temporal ἐπεί is not necessarily used in the same manner in later Greek. It would be interesting to conduct an identical study of all Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses of a prose author as a starting point for mapping changes in use of the subordinators between Homer and later Greek.

# Chapter 8 Discourse Function: the lexical and phrasal patterns of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

## 8.1 Introduction

In Chapter 7 we showed that the majority of Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses mark completion of an event which had been commenced earlier in the text. It is these clauses, which we had termed “Completive ἐπεί-Clauses”, which are characterised by distinctive phrasing or lexical patterns.

The largest group of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which displays a common shape consists of doublets, such as at *Iliad* 9.212 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλὸξ ἐμαράνθη. The doublets consist of two verbal phrases which are more or less synonymous but with the second phrase sometimes denoting a later (and often less significant or essential) stage. We can compare these doublets to English “done and dusted”, “dead and buried”, or “lost and gone”.

The attested alternative patterns to doublets are sometimes used to denote an event which is elsewhere captured with a doublet. The alternatives are (1) the use of a phasal verb to denote completion or full satisfaction, such as ἐτέλεσσε or τάρπησαν, (2) an inflection of πᾶν to denote the exhaustive extent to which an act is completed, and (3) the positioning of the verb first in the clause.

On a number of occasions a doublet appears to be the preferred option, that is to say that it is the more frequently used option, sometimes displaying small lexical or inflectional alterations to accommodate variations in context. The alternatives to doublets are used when the metrical and/or narrative context affects the suitability of a familiar phrase. Thanks to the hexameter and to the economic thrift of the Homeric composition style, we can detect a complementary distribution between the use of doublets and the other three patterns to the extent that denotion of an act done thoroughly and completely or the denotion of a patient totally affected (which is the natural meaning of phasal verbs denoting completion and of πᾶν) is to be inferred as the function of the doublets.

## 8.2 Existing observations on the phrasal shape of ἐπεί-clauses

Parry tabulated some of the clauses which start with αὐτὰρ ἐπεί, selecting those which conclude at the trochaic caesura; his tabulation is reproduced below. Parry suggested that each of these phrases made up a formula expressing the idea “but when he (we, they) had done so and so” which “may be called a system, since it is clear that the poet, or poets, who used them, felt the exact device, as I have taken care to analyze it, for fitting into the verse verb-forms of certain moods and measures.”[464]

---

[464] Parry 1930: 85-86.

Other than Parry there has not been any published study which identifies or categorises the phrasal patterns of ἐπεί-clauses. Parry’s tabulation is valuable for highlighting the extent to which the verb is placed first in an ἐπεί-clause. But as we show across the remainder of this chapter, the verb may be placed first as part of a two limb construction, or it may be placed first in order to emphasise completion of an event.

**Table 8.1.** Parry’s Table of “Formulaic” αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | δείπνησε | | (twice) |
| | κατέπαυσα | | *Odyssey* 4.583 |
| | τάρπησαν | | (3 times)[465] |
| | τάρπημεν | | (twice)[466] |
| | παύσαντο | | (3 times) |
| αὐτὰρ ἐπεί | ῥ’ | ἕσσαντο | (3 times) |
| | | εὔξαντο | (4 times) |
| | | ἤγερθεν | (4 times) |
| | | ἵκανε | *Odyssey* 17.28 |
| | | ἵκοντο | (3 times) |
| | | ὤπτησε | *Iliad* 9.215 |
| | | ἐτέλεσσε | *Odyssey* 11.246 |
| | | ἐνέηκε | *Odyssey* 4.233 |
| αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ | σπεύσε | | (3 times) |
| | τεῦξε | | (2 times) |
| | ἔλθητε | | *Iliad* 15.147 |
| αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν | ἔλθῃσιν | | (3 times) |
| | ἀγάγῃσιν | | *Iliad* 24.155 |

## 8.3 Completive function of distinctive wording

It is well established that languages systematise lexical and derivational bases for denoting the doing of “something thoroughly and completely”.[467] Based on cross-linguistic data, Bybee et al. identified three sorts of semantic nuances to the constructions used to denote the complete performance of an action, of which the first two are denoted by the lexical and phrasal system employed in Homer:

---

[465] This in fact occurs four times. Katz 2007: 76 n.58 noted this error.

[466] This in fact occurs only once. Katz 2007: 76 n.58 noted this error.

[467] Bybee et al. 1994: 57-59.

> *"1. The object of the action is totally affected, consumed, or destroyed by the action.*
>
> *2. The action involves a plural subject of intransitive verbs or object of transitive verbs, especially an exhaustive or universal plural, such as 'everyone died' or 'he took all the stones'.*
>
> *3. The action is reported with some emphasis or surprise value."*[468]

Cross-linguistically, the use of lexemes meaning "finish" to denote completion are widespread. Less widespread but also reasonably well attested is the use of "go", such as English "he went and told her the whole story" and other auxiliary forms such as "to put", "to fail", "to put into".[469]

The use of doublets to denote completion is not discussed in the literature on completives or doublets, although intuitively it seems that the English doublets mentioned above such as "done and dusted" must perform a similar completive marking function to that performed by the various Homeric doublets discussed below. In the following section we will explore how the doublets are constructed – in particular we will note the large extent to which the doublets consist of bespoke wording which is restricted to the doublets alone.

## 8.4 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed through doublets

Approximately half of all ἐπεί-clauses show a division into two more or less parallelled parts, which are fitted into one metrical line. This group contains the most highly repeated ἐπεί-clauses.

### 8.4.1 Homeric doublets

"Doublets" were noted as a feature of the *Odyssey* by O'Nolan in a study published in 1978. These doublets typically start at the 3rd-foot or 4th-foot caesura and are "a combination of two terms which are two all intents synonymous". O'Nolan cited examples such as κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε (*Odyssey* 1.145 etc.), θάνατόν τε μόρον τε (*Odyssey* 9.61 etc.) and ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε (*Odyssey* 2.24 etc.).[470] O'Nolan's examples consist largely of two nouns, but also occasionally two verbs.

O'Nolan suggested that the function of doublets was the same as that of noun-epithet formulas, "to allow the visionary eye to rest momentarily on certain features of the thought. Without such pauses of the thought, which slow the forward movement, a storyteller, whether he composes in prose or verse, would not be able to tell a long tale [...] He has frequent recourse to epithet and doublet, facets of traditional thought, which moment by moment take over and leave his mind free to concentrate on the narrative movement, the shape of things to come.”[471] O’Nolan did not attribute any meaning to the doublet construction, but added it to the inventory of oral compositional tools of the poet.

---

[468] *Ibid*.

[469] *Ibid*.

[470] O'Nolan 1978: 23-29.

O’Nolan cited three of the ἐπεί instances of parallelism and was troubled by them but nevertheless placed two of them within his group of doublets. He cited *Odyssey* 2.9 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο, *Odyssey* 2.378 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὅρκον and *Odyssey* 3.342 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ' ἔπιον θ', ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός.[472] He dismissed the third ἐπεί-clause as containing “merely two ideas which are closely associated” but not a doublet. Regarding the first two ἐπεί-clauses he noted that they “transgressed the barrier of the caesura”. But he felt that their “composition as a whole” gained them entry into the orally-motivated doublets group. But he noted further that “it is remarkable that *Iliad* 1.57 shows a variation before the doublet, namely οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο.”[473]

It seems better that the ἐπεί-clauses should be distinguished from O’Nolan’s wide and interesting group of doublets for the following reasons: (1) their parallelism tends to start before the caesura (whereas O’Nolan notes that “traditional” material such as doublets tend to occur in the second half of the line), (2) they tend to consist of more than just two parts of speech and instead to approach or consist of two clauses, and (3) their parallelism seems to convey meaning, as outlined in the remainder of this section.

O’Nolan’s study followed the earlier work of Meister who suggested that we do not always find a felicitous match between narrative content and verse length, but, rather, we sometimes witness sentence padding[474], or even sentence shortening, to match the end of the clause with the end of the verse.[475] Meister argued that the extending of a line’s contents to meet the end of the hexameter was usually achieved through the addition of words which do not fit the context particularly well, being words or phrases which are borrowed from other verses and are inserted without attention to whether they are suited to the details of the particular context.

Meister identified two methods of sentence padding: first, where the padding contains a repetition of what was said in the first part of the line, but with different wording (“**Method 1**”) for which Meister offered the examples (i) *Odyssey* 3.211 ὦ φίλ’, ἐπεὶ δὴ ταῦτά μ’ ἀνέμνησας καὶ ἔειπες, (ii) *Odyssey* 3.392 ᾤξεν ταμίη καὶ ἀπὸ κρήδεμνον ἔλυσε, (iii) *Odyssey* 4.444 ἀλλ’ αὐτὴ ἐσάωσε καὶ ἐφράσατο μέγ’ ὄνειαρ, (iv) *Odyssey* 4.476 (ἱκέσθαι) οἶκον ἐυκτίμενον καὶ σὴν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν, and (v) *Odyssey* 16.41 αὐτὰρ ὅ γ’ εἴσω ἴεν καὶ ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν. Second, by introducing a second element which is governed by, or contained in (*enthalten*) the preceding concept ( “**Method 2**”) for which Meister offered the examples (i) *Odyssey* 10.417 τρηχείης Ἰθάκης, ἵνα τ’ ἔτραφεν ἠδ’ ἐγένοντο, (ii) *Odyssey* 16.341≈ 17.604 βῆ ῥ’ ἴμεναι μεθ’ ὕας, λίπε δ’ ἕρκεά τε μέγαρόν τε, and (iii) *Odyssey* 19.535 τὸν ὄνειρον ὑπόκριναι καὶ ἄκουσον.[476] It is notable that Meister does not include the ἐπεί-clauses in his list.

---

[471] *Idem*, 34.

[472] *Idem*, 26, 29 and 32.

[473] *Idem*, 29.

[474] Meister 1921: 28-34.

[475] Steinitz 1976: 39 practises a similar analysis on the chaining feature that he observed in some of the oral poetry of the Khanty people. He attributes the repetition of a nominal phrase across one line and the next as due to a phrase which is too long for one line, but too short for two.

### 8.4.2 Discussion of the data: marking completion

Many Completive ἐπεί-Clauses consist of doublets whose structure can be assessed against Meister’s understanding. Method 1, which we can call “Verbal Doublets” is represented in **Table 8.2** Method 2, which relates only to nouns in our ἐπεί-clauses and so is called “Nominal Doublets” is represented in **Table 8.3** We show that the wording of the second limb of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses is highly suited and tailored to the context. Even more objectively than this is the direct correlation between the use of a second paralleling limb and an earlier account of the Completive Event.

In the discussion following the tables we work through some of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. We show that the bespoke nature of the second limbs of the doublets and their suitability to the context suggests that they are not in the nature of “sentence padding” but must originate from a primary motive to create parallelistic phrases.

O’Nolan’s slightly broader idea of the function of doublets as a mere tool of the oral poet with no semantic benefit seems inapplicable to these Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. We note that it is Completive ἐπεί-Clauses out of the full range of Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses which display doublets, which is suggestive of a correlation between form and function. Furthermore, if we consider the alternative word-patterns for Completive ἐπεί-Clauses of (1) the use of a phasal verb to denote completion or full satisfaction, (2) an inflection of πᾶν to denote the comprehensiveness of an act, and (3) the positioning of the verb first in the clause (which we note below in Section 8.7 is suggestive of marking completion) we can infer that the doublets of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses are likely to act as a merismatic marker of completion.

Looking to the function of these ἐπεί-clauses we can understand why parallelism has such a strong presence among these clauses. All of the doublets express completion of a matter begun earlier. The parallelism is a device for expressing absolute completion of a matter, with the second limb most typically conveying a further advance of the basic act. They are similar to the English “done and dusted”, “dead and buried”, “tried and tested”, “lost and gone”, “cut and dried”.

In the course of this study we have identified a few further parallelistic phrases: *Iliad* 22.502 αὐτὰρ ὅθ’ ὕπνος ἕλοι, παύσαιτό τε νηπιαχεύων, *Iliad* 23.228 τῆμος πυρκαϊὴ ἐμαραίνετο, παύσατο δὲ φλόξ, *Odyssey* 5.390 καὶ τότ’ ἔπειτ’ ἄνεμος μὲν ἐπαύσατο ἠδὲ γαλήνη / ἔπλετο νηνεμίη; *Odyssey* 16.480 κοίτου τε μνήσαντο καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἕλοντο. We should also not lose sight of the subjunctive ἐπεί-clause *Odyssey* 1.293 αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν δὴ ταῦτα τελευτήσῃς τε καὶ ἕρξῃς and the later *Odyssey* 11.80 ταῦτά τοι, ὦ δύστηνε, τελευτήσω τε καὶ ἕρξω. The semantic domain of these phrases and of those cited above from Meister recall parallelistic expressions in English such as "home and dry", "safe and sound" and "fast asleep".[477]

---

[476] *Ibid*.

The Completive ἐπεί-Clauses fall almost exclusively into the group of events which form part of, or the entirety of, "Type Scenes", for examples bathing, prayer, and dinner preparations. The conditions which contribute to the coincidence of Completive ἐπεί-Clauses with type scenes is discussed in Sections 7.4.2 and 7.6.1. For the time being we simply note that they are organised below in the same order in which Edwards[478] arranged the various type scenes in his survey of the literature on such scenes.[479]

### 8.4.3 Verbal Doublets

ἐπεί can goven two or three finite verb phrases; but such multi-sub-clauses is restricted, in the case of temporal clauses, to ἐπεί-clauses which denote completion of an event or events commenced earlier in the narrative.

**Table 8.2.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with Verbal Doublets

| Citation | First Limb | Second Limb (and third limb if also attested) |
|---|---|---|
| Bathing | | |
| 1. *Odyssey* 3.466 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε | καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ |
| 2. *Odyssey* 10.364-365 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε | καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ, //<br>ἀμφὶ δέ με χλαῖναν καλὴν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα |
| 3. *Odyssey* 19.505 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νίψεν τε | καὶ ἤλειψεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ |
| 4. *Iliad* 24.587-588, *Odyssey* 8.454-455 | τὸν δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν | καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ //<br>ἀμφὶ δέ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνα |
| 5. *Odyssey* 4.49-50, 17.88-89 | τοὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ | καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ / |

---

[477] There are several ἐπεί-clauses with a parallelistic structure whose discourse function does not appear to be that of focusing on completion of an event. They nevertheless cover the same semantic fields in which certainty or completion is significant: *Odyssey* 24.349 / *Iliad* 22.475 αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη, *Iliad* 4.382-383 οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ᾤχοντο, ἰδὲ πρὸ ὁδοῦ ἐγένοντο and *Iliad* 16.187 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τόν γε μογοστόκος Εἰλείθυια // ἐξάγαγε πρὸ φόωσδε καὶ ἠελίου ἴδεν αὐγάς, *Odyssey* 21.222 τὼ δ' ἐπεὶ εἰσιδέτην εὖ τ' ἐφράσσαντο ἕκαστα and *Odyssey* 10.453 οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ ἀλλήλους εἶδον φράσσαντό τ' ἐσάντα (these final two recall English "had a good look at").

[478] Edwards 1992: 284.

[479] Reece 1993: 6-7 offers a similar grid containing 38 elements which recur in hospitality scenes.

| Citation | First Limb | Second Limb (and third limb if also attested) |
|---|---|---|
| | λοῦσαν | |
| | ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρα χλαίνας οὔλας βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνας | |
| 6. *Iliad* 10.574-5 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί σφιν κῦμα θαλάσσης ἱδρῶ πολλὸν / | |
| | νίψεν ἀπὸ χρωτὸς | καὶ ἀνέψυχθεν φίλον ἦτορ |
| Meals/Sacrifice: Slaughtering the victim | | |
| 7. *Odyssey* 3.455 | τῆς δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ μέλαν αἷμα ῥύη | λίπε δ’ ὀστέα θυμός |
| Meals: Preparing a fire for roasting | | |
| 8. *Iliad* 9.212 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη | καὶ φλὸξ ἐμαράνθη |
| Meals and Sacrifices: Burning the thigh pieces | | |
| 9. *Iliad* 1.464, 2.427, *Odyssey* 3.461 and 12.364 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ’ ἐκάη | καὶ σπλάγχν’ ἐπάσαντο |
| Meals: Roasting Meat | | |
| 10. *Odyssey* 3.65, 3.470, 20.279 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ ὤπτησαν κρέ’ ὑπέρτερα | καὶ ἐρύσαντο |
| 11. *Iliad* 9.215 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὤπτησε | καὶ εἰν ἐλεοῖσιν ἔχευεν |
| Meals: Full preparation of a meal | | |
| 12. *Iliad* 1.467, 2.430 and 7.319 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου | τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα |
| 13. *Odyssey* 16.478 and *Odyssey* 24.384 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόνου | τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα, |
| Meals: Consumption of a Dinner | | |
| 14. *Odyssey* 5.95 and 14.111 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δείπνησε | καὶ ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῇ |
| Assembling | | |
| 15. *Iliad* 24.790,[480] *Odyssey* 2.9 and 24.421 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἤγερθεν | ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο[481] |
| Arrival | | |
| 16. *Odyssey* 23.88 | ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ εἰσῆλθεν | καὶ ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν |
| 17. *Iliad* 24.329 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν πόλιος κατέβαν | πεδίον δ’ ἀφίκοντο |
| 18. *Odyssey* 12.197-198 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τάς γε παρήλασαν | οὐδ’ ἔτ’ ἔπειτα / φθόγγον Σειρήνων ἠκούομεν οὐδέ τ’ ἀοιδήν |
| Prayer | | |
| 19. *Iliad* 1.458, 2.421, *Odyssey* 3.447 and 12.359 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ηὔξαντο | καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο |

---

[480] *Iliad* 24.790 is omitted in many manuscripts.

[481] The same ἐπεί-clause is found at *Odyssey* 8.24 and in pronominal form at *Iliad* 1.57. In both instances they function there with recapitulating force.

| Citation | First Limb | Second Limb (and third limb if also attested) |
|---|---|---|
| 20. *Odyssey* 12.359 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ εὔξαντο | καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν |
| Libations | | |
| 21. Six times[482] | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ’ | ἔπιόν θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| 22. *Odyssey* 21.273 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν σπεῖσάν τ’ | ἔπιόν θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| Oath Taking | | |
| 23. *Iliad* 14.280, *Odyssey* 2.378, 10.346, 12.304, 15.438 and 18.59 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσά/έν τε | τελεύτησά/έν τε τὸν ὅρκον |
| Weeping | | |
| 24. *Iliad* 24.513-514 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα γόοιο τετάρπετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, // | καί οἱ ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἦλθ’ ἵμερος ἠδ’ ἀπὸ γυίων |
| Laundry (not included in Edwards’s Type Scenes list) | | |
| 25. *Odyssey* 6.93 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πλῦνάν τε | κάθηράν τε ῥύπα πάντα[483] |

The addition of the nuance of completion means that the Homeric parallel ἐπεί-clauses denote the one act of completion of a particular task or event. But they capture the one act in one of three ways: (i) pure synonymy in which the same event is described in two different ways (“Pure Synonymy”); (ii) two closely linked sequential acts, which, notwithstanding their distinctness, are probably partial synonyms, since we see occasions when their sequencing is reversed (“**Progressive Synonymy**”); and (iii) two closely linked sequential acts which answer to an earlier reference to each of these acts (“**Progressive Responsive Synonymy**”).

In the discussion in the following sections the ἐπεί-clauses of **Table 8.2** are referred to by the number given to them in the table and are not presented again, for example “1/” refers to *Odyssey* 3.466 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ.

### Pure Synonymy

Some of the ἐπεί-clauses contain two limbs which are pure synonyms of each other; but as noted above we can nevertheless observe that the event of the second limb sometimes expresses further finality than the event of the first limb, often by virtue of being more abstract and in ambit consequently more all-encompassing.

The second limb is often polysemous and draws on metaphor for its meaning. We can often contrast the relative referential clarity of meaning of the first limb and its express anchoring within the narrative with the opaqueness of the second limb. But although the second phrase has some referential ambiguity it at the same time serves to disambiguate the aspectual meaning of the first limb: the first limb is not to be understood as merely describing the event in the past tense but rather asserting its total completion.[484] The disambiguation role of the second limb in a parallelistic structure is well understood in the literature on parallelism.[485]

---

[482] *Iliad* 9.177, *Odyssey* 3.342, 3.395, 7.184, 7.228 and 18.427.

[483] This late placed πάντα marks the ἐπεί-clause as a hybrid between the ἐπεί-clauses consisting of doublets and those which use an inflection of πᾶς to mark completion.

In answer to Meister's general suggestion that the second limb of a parallelistic phrase might be mere sentence padding[486] we will observe the prevalent uniqueness of the wording of the second limb and its particular relationship to the first limb. Significantly, the second limbs of those ἐπεί-clauses which occur only once show a higher propensity for sharing phrases with the wider text

6/ αὐτὰρ ἐπεί σφιν κῦμα θαλάσσης ἱδρῶ πολλὸν / νίψεν ἀπὸ χρωτὸς καὶ ἀνέψυχθεν φίλον ἦτορ. These two limbs denote the same unique event of cooling down with sea water after the rushed reconnaissance mission into the Trojan camp. The second limb of ἀνέψυχθεν φίλον ἦτορ is found in a similar form at *Iliad* 13.84 with a similar meaning of refreshing the soul, but without the reference to water: οἳ παρὰ νηυσὶ θοῇσιν ἀνέψυχον φίλον ἦτορ. The West wind is also described with a line-final phrase of ἀναψύχειν ἀνθρώπους at *Odyssey* 4.568.

7/ Unusually for our doublets, this first example employs a phrase seen twice elsewhere in the same metrical position and on one occasion moved by one metrical foot to the left.[487] We might think then that this instance of parallelism is a case of "sentence padding". But whereas on those other occasions it is the sole announcement of death, here it clarifies a statement which seems to focus on the flowing of blood but in actuality is a confirmation of the death of the animal as explored in the preceding chapter.

8/ The second limbe φλὸξ ἐμαράνθη does not appear elsewhere and nor is the form ἐμαράνθη attested elsewhere. But the verb μαραίνω is found on one other occasion, in a line that recalls the above ἐπεί-clause: *Iliad* 23.228 τῆμος πυρκαϊὴ ἐμαραίνετο, παύσατο δὲ φλόξ.[488] It is evident then that there is an underlying parallelistic phrasal pattern relating to the dying out of a flame. Thus, although some scholars are right to see in the ἐπεί-clause an influence from *Iliad* 1.464 and 2.427 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ' ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχν' ἐπάσαντο,[489] when they seek to explain the unique application of the verb κατακαίω to the flame itself, they should place greater emphasis on the parallelistic pattern feeding into this ἐπεί-clause.

---

[484] This observation is also relevant when considering the discourse function for appreciating that with these events the aorist stem tends to be the unmarked stem and needs further bolstering in order for a nuance of completion to emerge.

[485] See in particular Berlin 1985: 96.

[486] We must stress again that Meister did not comment on any of the ἐπεί-clauses. Perhaps this was a deliberate omission as he may have sensed that the same rules did not apply to them.

[487] *Iliad* 12.386 κάππεσ' ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ πύργου, λίπε δ' ὀστέα θυμός and also *Iliad* 16.743 and *Odyssey* 12.414.

[488] Richardson 1993: 197 notes this association but offers no futher comment.

[489] See Hainsworth 1993: 91-92 who mentions both sources.

12 and 13/ The alliteration of this ἐπεί-clause[490] is so comprehensive that we cannot doubt that this ἐπεί-clause was constructed as one phrase and that the second limb has not been added merely in order to reach the end of the line. Furthermore, the phrase τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα is not seen elsewhere in this metrical position although at *Odyssey* 8.61 τετύκοντό τε δαῖτ’ is used in a different metrical position and the form τετύκοντο appears in two other contexts and in different metrical positions to here, at *Odyssey* 12.307 and 20.390.

14/ The first limb is literal in meaning. The second limb ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῇ does not appear anywhere else. ἐδωδῇ in the dative appears only in this formula. In other cases, it is used 13 other times, always, as here, in the word final position.

Of the seventy attestations of ἀραρίσκω only at *Odyssey* 4.777: ὃ δὴ καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἤραρεν ἡμῖν do we see a metaphorical use but it is dissmiliar to the meaning here, there referring to advice which pleases the listeners. The metaphor of satisfying the soul with food is unique to this ἐπεί-clause and must have ancient origins which are certainly not the product of efforts to reach the end of the line.[491]

15/ The phrase of the second limb ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο is not seen anywhere else and is evidently a bespoke creation for this line[492]. Merry suggested that ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο expresses the completed result of ἤγερθεν[493]. But ἤγερθεν, being in the aorist, already expresses a completed result. We should observe rather that the first description ἤγερθεν is lexically anchored to the preceding narrative (with one or more preceding inflections of ἀγείρω), whereas the second description has a relationship with the first description but less directly to the wider narrative[494].

16/ This ἐπεί-clause recalls the paratactic *Odyssey* 16.41 αὐτὰρ ὅ γ’ εἴσω ἴεν καὶ ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν which we noted above was one of the instances that Meister suggested included sentence padding. Indeed, the second limb ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν restates the meaning of the first limb. The second limb ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν does indeed occur on two further occasions, once identically to *Odyssey* 16.41[495] and once as a single phrase[496]. But although we do have this single phrase attestation, the role of the phrase as a parallel marker of completion of the form “home, safe and sound” or “well and truly inside” surely has semantic value.

---

[490] Kirk 1985: 160 notes this alliteration.

[491] Merry 1887: 67 draws our attention to Genesis 18.5 where the Hebrew phrase *we-sa‘adu libbekhem*, referring to dining, is translated by the King James Bible as “and comfort ye your hearts”.

[492] Although this nominative plural ὁμηγερέες is attested in four other places (*Iliad* 2.789, 7.415, 24.84 and 24.99) it is found in the very different metrical position of completing the first foot, occupying all of the second and commencing the third foot. The dative form ὁμηγερέεσσι occurs once in the same metrical position as here but with a different syntactic structure: *Iliad* 15.84-5 ὁμηγερέεσσι δ' ἐπῆλθεν // ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι. Further, there is nothing particularly formulaic about ἐγένοντο at the end of the line-a mere 11 out of 37 uses of this form appear at the end of the line.

[493] Merry 1887: 28.

[494] But we should note the etymological connection between ὁμηγερέες and ἀγείρω.

[495] At *Odyssey* 16.41.

[496] *Odyssey* 8.80 Πυθοῖ ἐν ἠγαθέῃ, ὅθ' ὑπέρβη λάινον οὐδὸν.

17/ This ἐπεί-clause, unusual with its δ' for the second limb recalls the abbreviated main clause of *Odyssey* 24.205 οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ πόλιος κατέβαν, τάχα δ' ἀγρὸν ἵκοντο where τάχα δ'... commences the main clause. The phrase πεδίον δ' ἀφίκοντο is unique to this ἐπεί-clause. It is likely in this Completive ἐπεί-Clause, as with all Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, that the meaning of finality is significant: Priam is accompanied by his sons and sons-in-law until he is well and truly out of the city – they do not turn away from him until the last possible moment.

23/ The second limb, τελεύτησάν τε τὸν ὅρκον is not found as a phrase elsewhere. It seems probable that it is a pure synonym for uttering an oath, based on the fact that whereas this ἐπεί-clause follows always after a reported oath, with no direct speech, if we turn to oaths which contain direct speech, they are completed simply with ὣς φάτο (*Iliad* 10.322) or ὣς ἄρα φωνήσασ' (*Odyssey* 5.192). Thus, even with fuller accounts of the oath, there is no additional act mentioned that could be covered by the phrase τελεύτησάν τε τὸν ὅρκον. Again, this phrase asserts further finality of the basic act of swearing the oath.[497]

24/ The first line of the ἐπεί-clause would suffice to denote completion as it uses the verb τετάρπετο – *had his pleasure of*. But the ἐπεί-clause continues with a second line to assert the fullness and sincerity of the grief – it was no empty gesture. There are a number of alternative readings to these two lines[498] , but the nature of this parallelism is familiar to us from the other examples and fits well with them. The second limb is wholly original in expression.

25/ The phrase κάθηράν τε ῥύπα πάντα does not occur elsewhere. Indeed the noun ῥύπα is a hapax legomenon, although the verbal form ῥυπόω is used six times (only in the *Odyssey*).

**Progressive Synonymy**

For some ἐπεί-clauses the second limb describes an event which must be sequential to the event of the first limb. This might best be paralleled to a phrase such as "dead and buried" or "done and dusted". The second event is somewhat similar to the metaphorical cherry on the cake: it is an embellishment on the first and primary event.

1-5/ The second limb, oiling the body, and the optional next line of the provision of cloaks, are the next stages of a bathing scene. Indeed, Reece notes that the Mycenaean Tablets record not only oil reserved for guests, but also cloaks[499] confirming that full two-lined ἐπεί-clause relays associated stages of bathing. The limbs of the ἐπεί-clause act together merismatically to capture the full bathing experience. Where a second line is included in these ἐπεί-clauses, as noted in the table, this second line contains nominal parallelism.

---

[497] O'Nolan 1978: 26 discussed in further detail the likelihood that these two limbs are synonyms.

[498] Richardson 1993: 328 records a number of them.

[499] See Reece 1993: 33 n.16. He cites tablets PY Fr 1231 and KN Ld 573.

ἐπεί-clauses (1) and (2) lack a direct object whereas (4) and (5) contain the direct object at the head of the line. The main clauses to all four types of ἐπεί-clauses take as their grammatical subject the one who has been bathed. ἐπεί-clauses (4) and (5), could – metrically – have started with αὐτάρ so that they read as *αὐτάρ ἐπεὶ δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ. ἐπεί-clauses (1) and (2) on the other hand, could not have started with a pronoun

*Odyssey* 4.252 ἀλλ’ ὅτε δή μιν ἐγὼ λόεον καὶ χρῖον ἐλαίῳ which shows a rare instance of Homeric ὅτε being used to mark the event as simultaneous to the second event in the following main clause.

10-11/ The outer flesh has been roasted and is then drawn off the spits. These two stages follow naturally one from the other, and together represent completion of the roasting stage. The second limb, consisting only of ἐρύσαντο, is used with this meaning only in these ἐπεί-clauses and in the various paratactic accounts of roasting (*Odyssey* 1.466 etc.). (In the paratactic accounts the word is found earlier in the line.) In the same position, at the end of the line, the same form is found also at *Odyssey* 8.504 but with a different meaning of dragging the Trojan horse.

The Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause presents unusually with the express direct object (κρέ’ ὑπέρτερα) in the first limb. This direct object reflects the fact that the ἐπεί-clause is used after a longish break in the narrative, thus requiring the object to be specified expressly, as it cannot be inferred by reference. This suggests that the ἐπεί-clause was composed with the intention for it to be used after a break in the narrative. By contrast, on the one occasion where the ἐπεί-clause of roasting follows directly on from its first account, the object is dropped, the stage of de-spitting is skipped, and the meat is immediately placed in baskets: αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὤπτησε καὶ εἰν ἐλεοῖσιν ἔχευεν.

21-22/ As noted by Monro regarding the libation of *Iliad* 9.176ff, the “first drops were emptied in libation, and the cup was then filled.”[500] It is then likely that the drinking presented in the second limb follows sequentially after the pouring of libation of the first limb. The meaning of the ἐπεί-clause as a whole is “once they had finished with the wine”.

The phrase ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός is unique to these ἐπεί-clauses. The phrase ἤθελε θυμός without ὅσον is seen at *Iliad* 17.702 in a main clause and *Odyssey* 13.40 in a relative clause. The more common expression of ἤθελε θυμῷ[501] appears always in a main clause. In sum, it seems unlikely that our second limb which starts at ἔπιόν is borrowed from elsewhere. Furthermore the notion of “to their heart’s content” is wholly resonant with the nature of many of the other Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.

---

[500] Monro 1884: 344.

[501] See *Iliad* 16.255, 21.655, 21.177 and 24.236.

### Progressive Responsive Synonymy

There are a couple of parallelistic ἐπεί-clauses in which the two limbs answer to two preceding anticipatory stages. Reversal of order is not uncommon.[502]

1/ In Section 7.7.6 we note that there is a first account of burning the thigh pieces; after that first account, the entrails (σπλάγχν’) are roasted over the fire. See in particular *Iliad* 2.426-7 σπλάγχνα δ’ ἄρ’ ἀμπείραντες ὑπείρεχον Ἡφαίστοιο. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ’ ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχν’ ἐπάσαντο, and more obliquely but no less certainly at *Iliad* 1.463, *Odyssey* 3.460, and 12.363.

The phrase σπλάγχν’ ἐπάσαντο is unique in this position and indeed is seen only once elsewhere in a line which looks like a reworking of this line for the different metrical needs: *Odyssey* 3.9 εὖθ’ οἱ σπλάγχνα πάσαντο, θεῷ δ’ ἐπὶ μηρί’ ἔκαιον. The reversal of order of the events in this alternative phrase underlines our understanding that these events together denote a particular stage in meal and sacrifice events, namely using the fire as required; the poet relates to the account of these two events not as a precise sequencing but as a merism of the roasting stage.

18/ This ἐπεί-clause, which means “well and truly out of reach of the Sirens”, refers with its second limb to the account from lines 183ff. of the dangerously enchanting voices of the sirens. The wording of the first limb relates back to the original instructions of Circe at line 55 where she says αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν δὴ τάς γε παρὲξ ἐλάσωσιν ἑταῖροι. There the completive sense of the ἐπεί-clause relies solely on the lexical force of the line. The more elaborate ἐπεί-clause here fits the very detailed and tense account of the deed itself in contrast with Circe’s relatively brief instructions: the underlining of the escape from danger benefits from the parallelistic structuring of the two lines.

19/ The recurring ἐπεί-clause for prayer includes the stage which either accompanies or follows prayer, namely the casting of grain. This stage is always presaged in the preceding text by the taking of grain, see for example at *Iliad* 1.449 οὐλοχύτας ἀνέλοντο. The unique ἐπεί-clause for prayer of *Odyssey* 12.359 has been altered because there is no grain to cast, as expressly detailed in the text (*Odyssey* 12.358). As with the roasting of meats above at *Iliad* 9.215ff., the ἐπεί-clause is adapted by way of cutting off the second limb and fast forwarding to the next stage, normally presented in the main clause, of slaughtering and skinning.

The phrase οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο is unique to these ἐπεί-clauses. καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν of *Odyssey* 12.359 has probably been borrowed from the main clauses of *Odyssey* 1.459 and 2.422, but we cannot say that the phrase here is used merely in order to complete the line; rather, it is necessary information.

---

[502] *Odyssey* 5.264 εἵματά τ' ἀμφιέσασα θυώδεα καὶ λούσασα.

### Coordination of Verbal Doublets

An examination of **Table 8.2** reveals that τε ... τε, τε καί and καί are the prevalent subordinators used for linking two subordinated finite verb phrases in ἐπεί-clauses. Ruijgh characterised the high frequency of τε in two limbed ἐπεί-clauses as indicative of "traditional character".[503] Ruijgh's classification as traditional addressed the lexical recurrence of τε from the perspective of compositional ease for the poet(s), but it did not address why τε (over δέ, for example) is favoured as the recurrent conjunction.

Ruijgh's observation is nevertheless important as it distinguishes between the recurrent phrases whose wording is found only within ἐπεί-clauses and phrases whose wording has been borrowed from outside the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. The former seem to be native to ἐπεί-clauses and contain only τε ... τε, τε καί and καί, whereas the latter are foreign to ἐπεί-clauses, being found only in clauses which consist of phrases found outside the ἐπεί-clauses: *Iliad* 24.329 10 οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν πόλιος κατέβαν, πεδίον δ' ἀφίκοντο, *Odyssey* 3.455 τῆς δ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ μέλαν αἷμα ῥύη, λίπε δ' ὀστέα θυμός, and *Odyssey* 12.197-198 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τάς γε παρήλασαν, οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔπειτα / φθογγήν Σειρήνων ἠκούομεν οὐδέ τ' ἀοιδήν.

It is generally recognised that καί and τε coordinate elements of the same hierarchical level whereas δέ marks the progression of sequential events.[504] A coordination of verbs of the same hierarchical level, i.e. synonyms (as opposed to of sequential events) would accord with our proposed reading of the clauses set out in **Table 8.2** as marking a lesser or greater degree of synonymy.

### 8.4.4 Nominal Doublets

**Table 8.3.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with Nominal Doublets[505]

| | | First object | Verb | Second object |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Meals: Consumption of a Dinner** | | | | |
| 1. | Occurs twenty one times[506] | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος | ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο | |

---

[503] Ruijgh 1957: 35 n.1.

[504] See in particular Ruijgh 1971: §128 - §178. In §173 Ruijgh observes the preference in Homer for the use of τε to coordinate two subordinated limbs, while noting at §156 that in Homer δέ is found coordinating two subordinated limbs more frequently than is found in later Greek. Based on our observations above that coordination with δέ seems to be associated with the piecing together of phrases from outside ἐπεί-clauses, it may be prudent to be cautious in coming to the conclusion that Ruijgh reaches that the reason for Homer's use of δέ is simply because the clauses which are coordinated are short relative to later Greek.

[505] There is a further ἐπεί-clause which might appear to be employing quasi-synonymous objects, but reference to the narrative shows that the referents are distinct: the two objects of the affirmative ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 12.13 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νεκρός τ' ἐκάη καὶ τεύχεα νεκροῦ pick up an earlier request to burn both the body and the armour.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | καὶ ἐδητύος | | |
| 2. | *Odyssey* 24.489 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν σίτοιο μελίφρονος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο[507] | | |
| 3. | *Iliad* 5.201 and 11.780 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ | τάρπησαν / τάρπημεν | ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος |
| **Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed through Nominal Parallelism with Conjunct Hyperbaton** | | | | |
| 4. | *Odyssey* 9.87 and 10.58 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτοιό τ’ | ἐπασσάμεθ’ | ἠδὲ ποτῆτος |
| **Travel: Travel by Sea-Putting to Sea** | | | | |
| 5. | *Odyssey* 2.407, 4.428, 4.573,[508] 8.50, 12.391, 13.70 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα | κατήλθομεν / κατήλυθον | ἠδὲ θάλασσαν |
| 6. | *Iliad* 22.462[509] | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πύργόν τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν | ἶξεν | ὅμιλον |
| **Travel: Travel by Sea – Journey by Sea** | | | | |
| 7. | *Odyssey* 12.260-261 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πέτρας | φύγομεν | δεινήν τε Χάρυβδιν / Σκύλλην τ’ |

This group is small, relating only events of dining or arrival. In the case of the dining ἐπεί-clauses, the use of two nouns is well attested beyond these ἐπεί-clauses. The ἐπεί-clauses listed at 4-7 share an additional syntactic feature of “conjunct hyperbaton” which we note below appears to be associated with the merismatic function.

### Nominal Doublets with the oblique objects in linear sequence

It is notable that the poet avoids referring directly to the act of consumption through verbs of eating or dining, instead preferring periphrastic expressions of partitive verbs follows by nouns of food and drink. The pairing of food and drink to refer collectively to being well-fed appears also outside of the ἐπεί-clause structure; it is notable though that it is used only in the context where full partaking of a meal is intended: *Iliad* 9.705-706 τεταρπόμενοι φίλον ἦτορ / σίτου καὶ οἴνοιο, 19.160-161 ἀλλὰ πάσασθαι ... / σίτου καὶ οἴνοιο, 19.167 ὃς δέ κ' ἀνὴρ οἴνοιο κορεσσάμενος καὶ ἐδωδῆς, *Odyssey* 14.46 σίτου καὶ οἴνοιο κορεσσάμενος κατὰ θυμόν and, where hunger is described, 14.456 σίτου καὶ κρειῶν κεκορημένοι, 15.334 σίτου καὶ κρειῶν ἠδ’ οἴνου βεβρίθασιν and 20.378 σίτου καὶ οἴνου κεχρημένον. On occasion a tricolon is used, such as at *Odyssey* 3.479-480 σῖτον καὶ οἶνον ἔθηκεν / ὄψα τε.

---

[506] *Iliad* 1.469, 2.432, 7.323, 9.92, 9.222, 23.57, 24.628, and *Odyssey* 1.150 with μνηστῆρες supplied as the subejct on the following line, 3.67, 3.473, 4.68, 8.72, 8.485, 12.308, 14.454, 15.143, 15.303, 15.501, 16.55, 16.480, 17.99.

[507] Although there is no nominal parallelism, there being only one object, this ἐπεί-clause is included here as it appears to be derived from the preceding instance.

[508] A second occurrence of this ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 11.1 is categorised with those beginning a book and is examined in Chapter 5.

[509] Richardson 1993: 156 notes a variant in Papyrus 12 which reads with two objects which are even more closely paralleled to each other: [αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Σκαιάς] τε πύλ[ας καὶ] φηγὸν ἵκανεν.

1/ As part of his thesis arguing for an early Aeolic layer to the poems and against the need for an Arcado-Cyprian phase, Durante observed that the recurring αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο looks Aeolic.[510] He notes that ἐδητύος is a form for food that is no longer present in other words, that there is the archaism of the tmesis of ἐξ-ἕντο, that ἔρον corresponds to Ionic ἔρωτα, and that the use of ἔρος outside the sexual sphere would seem to be an archaism.[511]

2/ The ἐπεί-clause has only the one object σίτοιο. The idiom ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο is otherwise uniquely associated with the above discussed ἐπεί-clause αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον. Occurring, as it does, towards the end of *Odyssey* 24 it is reasonably likely that this single object ἐπεί-clause is derived from the double object ἐπεί-clause.

σίτοιο μελίφρονος has been substituted for πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος so that the connotations of a substantial and inebriating meal can be toned down – now they have only eaten and not drunk.[512] The diners (Odysseus, Telemachus, Laertes and others) have a final showdown with the suitors following this meal; their performance would be hampered by a heavy meal accompanied by drink.[513]

3/ As with the preceding ἐπεί-clause, the typical ἐπεί-clause for concluding dining cannot be used due at *Iliad* 11.780 due to the first person plural. This ἐπεί-clause concludes a scene of hosted dining at Peleus's home which certainly includes meat – the ἐπεί-clause of *Odyssey* 9.87 and 10.58 discussed below at number (4) would have been unsuited to this context.

Heubeck et al. comment regarding *Odyssey* 5.201, which is back in the third person plural but otherwise identical to the preceding *Iliad* 11.780, that "both halves of the line are formulaic, put together as an *ad hoc* replacement for the usual αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο".[514] They do not comment on what triggered the change from the usual formula, but we can hazard a reasonable guess. The diners here are Calypso and Odysseus. Calypso is served ambrosia and nectar, while Odysseus is given the food of mortals. This ἐπεί-clause surely recognises that "desire for food and drink" cannot be ascribed to an immortal. The explanation for this *ad hoc* replacement alerts us, then, to the poet's sensitivity to the literal meaning of the ἐπεί-clause.

---

[510] Durante 1971: 38.

[511] West 1988: 164 supports Durante's view summarising the ἐπεί-clause as possessing "archaic vocabulary, tmesis, and the specifically Aeolic (Lesbian) ἔρος." West adds only that "the specialized sense borne here by ἐξίημι is paralleled in Sappho 94.23 ἐξιής πόθον".

[512] The lightweight Elepenor suffers such inebriation after a meal with sweet wine that he knocks himself off a ladder when leaving Circe's palace and dies (*Odyssey* 10.477, 552-560).

[513] On the other hand, Russo et al. 1992: 413 suggest that μελίφρονος "fulfils the functions of including the wine in the meal; cf. μελίφρονα οἶνον, vii 182, xiii 53." Indeed on eight occasions across the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* this adjective is governed by a noun meaning "wine". But the adjective is used once to describe sleep (*Iliad* 2.34) and once to describe wheat (*Iliad* 8.188), albeit the latter occurrence is in a passage whose syntax is "confused" (Kirk 1990: 313). Further, the noun σῖτος governs the adjective μελίφρονος and σῖτος is known not to mean general comestibles, but rather to refer to solid food, even grain or bread (see the entry for σῖτος in Chantraine 1968-1980).

[514] Heubeck et al. 1988: 272.

### Nominal Doublets with the oblique objects in hyperbaton

Meister's three examples mentioned above as "Method 2" do not contain any instances of conjunct hyperbaton. But in their study of hyperbaton across Ancient Greek literature, Devine and Stephens suggested that this type of hyperbaton, where a part of speech is "straddled by a pair of conjuncts" is well attested in Greek.[515] From the Homeric poems Devine and Stephens cited a number of examples, presented in the table below.[516] Example 7 recalls ἐπεί-clause number (5).

**Table 8.4.** Instances of Homeric Conjunct Hyperbaton identified by Devine and Stephens 1999

| **Where a verb is straddled by a pair of conjuncts** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 1.50 | οὐρῆας μὲν πρῶτον ἐπῴχετο καὶ κύνας ἀργούς |
| 2. | *Iliad* 5.480 | ἔνθ' ἄλοχόν τε φίλην ἔλιπον καὶ νήπιον υἱόν |
| | See also *Iliad* 8.349, 11.2, *Odyssey* 9.199 and 10.274 | |
| **Where a preposition or adjective is straddled by a pair of conjuncts** | | |
| 3. | *Iliad* 11.9 | ἠνορέῃ πίσυνοι καὶ κάρτεϊ χειρῶν |
| 4. | *Iliad* 16.45 | νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων |
| 5. | *Odyssey* 16.273 | πτωχῷ λευγαλέῳ ἐναλίγκιον ἠδὲ γέροντι |
| **Where a noun is straddled by a pair of nominal conjuncts** | | |
| 6. | *Iliad* 1.66 | ἀρνῶν κνίσης αἰγῶν τε τελείων |
| 7. | *Iliad* 7.274 | Διὸς ἄγγελοι ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν |

Devine and Stephens analysed the syntax from a phrase-structure perspective. But they also considered the triggers for such a word order. They suggested that "in Greek the mere existence of a conjunct constitutes heaviness and can induce hyperbaton. In English, if a postponed subject conjunct is not heavy, it suggests an afterthought."[517]

What strikes us about the list above and indeed about the ἐπεί-clauses which display conjunct hyperbaton is that the two conjoined elements are not of individual interest. Neither conjunct in any of the examples is individually or together returned to in the following narrative nor is it the focus of attention in the preceding narrative. Rather, the two conjuncts represent something more general, a broader noun class or wider group, with the two nouns forming a merism, which recalls in effect the merism analysed above. So, in the case of the above instances the two items listed in hyperbaton really represent “the animals in the camp”, “his close family”, “looking fearsome”, “to everyone”, again “his close family” etc. The effect of placing the governing element between the two conjuncts is to assert the parity of the two items, merging the individual semantics to produce a broader concept.

---

[515] Devine and Stephens 1999: 116-118.

[516] The examples are presented on pages 116-118 and 16-162.

[517] *Idem*, 18.

A similar effect is achieved in the instances of hyperbaton with the ἐπεί-clauses: the two items are not of individual interest – rather, they point to completion of an event whose object is no longer, and perhaps never was, of interest. We can return now to the discussion of the ἐπεί-clauses in **Table 8.3**:

4/ The verb of this twice-used ἐπεί-clause is conjugated in the first person plural, which precludes the use of the typical ἐπεί-clause αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος ... ἕντο etc. This ἐπεί-clause appears to be constructed for a meatless meal in contrast with the ἐπεί-clause for the first person plural hospitality dining scene of *Iliad* 11.780 discussed above at number (3). The two scenes in which this ἐπεί-clause occurs are scenes of communal dining by the shore following arrival by boat. The use of σίτοιό rather than an expression containing ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος, as above at *Iliad* 11.780 is probably employed to assert the lightness of the meal, being of grain/bread rather than meat.[518]

As to the use of πατέομαι, which means to “partake of, taste of”, this verb lacks the notion of satisfaction (and indeed of completion) shared by ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο and τάρπησαν / τάρπημεν. The contexts in *Odyssey* 9 and 10 where these lines occur do not indicate that light dining (other than to the extent that meat is unlikely to be available) is to be understood. Indeed, as discussed above in connection with Aristarchus’s proposed variant reading at *Iliad* 9.222, the semantics of πατέομαι are not well suited to Completive ἐπεί-Clauses, except where it is the progressive second limb of a verbal doublet, as in the case of αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ' ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχν' ἐπάσαντο of *Iliad* 1.464 etc.

The substitution of σίτοιο for ἐδητύος gives rise to a different metrical scheme for the remainder of the line from that engendered by ἐδητύος. Given the postulated oral context of the composition of the poems, it seems reasonable to infer that ἐπασσάμεθ’ of these two lines is acting as a metrical doublet for τάρπημεν and should be understood as having a semantic function which is identical (in the case only of these two lines) to that of ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο.[519]

---

[518] Moritz 1950: 136 n.3 notes that *Iliad* 24.625, *Odyssey* 9.6 and 12.18 draw a contrast between meat and σίτος.

[519] See the evidence adduced byVisser 1988 for such an approach in the analysis of Homeric formulas. By reference to the theme of “killing in battle”, Visser illustrated that a formulaic line can have components which are “semantically functional” such as the names of killers and victims, and components which are “metrically functional” while being “semantically neutral” such as different words all being used as synonyms for *kill* notwithstanding the general attribution of additional nuances, such as ἐξενάριξεν and ἐνήρατο which originally mean *to strip off arms, to despoil*, but are generally used in Homer with no nuance beyond *killing*.

5/ The phrase ἠδὲ θάλασσαν, as the second object, occurs only in this construction, although it occurs in the genitive at *Odyssey* 10.274. Indeed, this is the only directional use of the accusative form. The sense of the phrase is "right at the shore's edge". If only one item were referenced, it would give undue focus to that word, suggesting that it might be the topic of the subsequent lines. But the main clauses reveal that it is rather the location that is of interest: so at *Odyssey* 2.408ff. the focus is on who is at the shore and leading them briefly back from the shore, and at 4.574, sleep by the shore follows the ἐπεί-clause.

This ἐπεί-clause is unusual in not fitting perfectly with its context on two of the occasions on which it is used, namely *Odyssey* 4.426-429 and *Odyssey* 4.571-573. On both occasions multiple ships are referred to in the preceding lines and so this ἐπεί-clause should also refer to plural ships.

This is a solely Odyssean ἐπεί-clause. Since it is multiple ships which typically adorn the seashore in the *Iliad*, unlike the lone rafts and ships which transport the wanderers of the *Odyssey*, the Odyssean ἐπεί-clause is unsuitable for the *Iliad*. The Iliadic unsuitability of the line rests on its metrical inflexibility: the second syllable of the singular νῆα remains metrically short when preceding κατήλυθον, but the second syllable of the plural νῆας would not remain metrically short if it were to precede κατήλυθον.

6/ In this ἐπεί-clause Andromache reaches a viewing point from which she can see her felled husband. The value of the parallelism is to reduce the emphasis on any particular point that Andromache had reached, to neutralise the placed reached, and point towards what Andromache was to see.

7/ As noted by Heubeck and Hoekstra[520] "πέτρας is not an element in a list of three: acc. δεινήν τε Χ. and Σκύλλην τ' amplify πέτρας which mean here the same as σκόπελοι". Here then we have nominal parallelism with pure synonymy.

### 8.4.5 Limitations on the productivity of doublets marking completiveness

The nature of completive-marking doublets, with their use of different verbs for each doublet inevitably imposes a cognitive burden on the speaker and audience. Such a burden is compensated for by the poetic and vivid effect of the doublets, but still restricts the extent to which the construction could be described as a grammaticalised mechanism. Based on the range of doublets in use in Homer, some of which occur only once, we can conjecture that it is a productive arrangement (in the sense that new and original doublets are created) but that the doublet may not readily be so created given the restrictions imposed not only by the hexameter but also by the need to find suitable second limbs on an event by event basis. It would be interesting to conduct a cross-linguistic study of the use of doublets to denote completion.

---

[520] Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989: 133.

## 8.5 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses with phasal verbs

**Table 8.5.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with phasal verbs denoting completion

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **With τέρπω** | | |
| Meals: Consumption of a Dinner | | |
| 1. | *Odyssey* 6.99 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτου τάρφθεν δμωαί τε καὶ αὐτή |
| Weeping | | |
| 2. | [*Iliad* 24.513-514 | [αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα γόοιο τετάρπετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, /<br>καί οἱ ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἦλθ’ ἵμερος ἠδ’ ἀπὸ γυίων] [521] |
| 3. | *Odyssey* 19.213, 19.251, 21.57 | ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τάρφθη πολυδακρύτοιο γόοιο |
| Gazing with Admiration (not included in Edwards’s list of Type Scenes) | | |
| 4. | *Odyssey* 4.47[522] | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ὁρώμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖσι |
| 5. | *Iliad* 24.633 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐς ἀλλήλους ὁρόωντες |
| 6. | *Iliad* 19.19 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν ᾗσι τετάρπετο δαίδαλα λεύσσων |
| **With κορέννυμι** | | |
| Weeping | | |
| 7. | *Odyssey* 20.59 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κλαίουσα κορέσσατο ὃν κατὰ θυμόν |
| 8. | *Odyssey* 4.541, 10.499 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κλαίων τε κυλινδόμενός τε κορέσθην |
| Coitus (not included in Edwards’s list of Type Scenes) | | |
| 9. | *Odyssey* 23.300 | τὼ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν φιλότητος ἐταρπήτην ἐρατεινῆς |
| **With τελέω** | | |
| Coitus (not included in Edwards’s list of Type Scenes) | | |
| 10. | *Odyssey* 11.246 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐτέλεσσε θεὸς φιλοτήσια ἔργα |
| **With σπεύδω** | | |
| Cyclops finishing his shepherding tasks in the cave | | |
| 11. | *Odyssey* 9.250, 9.310, 9.343 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σπεῦσε πονησάμενος τὰ ἃ ἔργα |

The frequent use of aorist forms of τέρπω, κορέννυμι and τελέω draws out a particular nuance of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses: the completion asserts that things are being done as they should – English equivalents are *well and truly*, *to his heart’s content*, *had his fill of*. The first six instances with τέρπω employ the τάρπ- stem which has been analysed as denoting having full completion of, “sich befriedigen” rather than enjoyment. [523] We would therefore not include in the above list *Odyssey* 8.131 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἐτέρφθησαν φρέν’ ἀέθλοις where the stem τέρπ- used and where completion of the event is signalled rather by πάντες.

---

[521] Discussed above in the parallelistic group.

[522] The same ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 10.181 does not appear to have completive function, but rather to recapitulate. See below regarding the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses.

[523] See Latacz 1966, in particular pages 180 and 195 where the earlier analysis of Fulda 1865 is supported and refined. See also Chantraine 1963: 51.

Outside the ἐπεί-clauses, κορέννυμι tends to remain within the domain of having fullness of: thus, see *Iliad* 19.167 ὅς δέ κ’ ἀνὴρ οἴνοιο κορεσσάμενος καὶ ἐδωδῆς and *Odyssey* 14.46 σίτου καὶ οἴνοιο κορεσσάμενος κατὰ θυμόν. The use of σπεύδω with a participle is unique to the three instances of the ἐπεί-clause.

The indicative verbs seem to be used here as what is sometimes termed “aspectual verbs”: they assert perfection of the activity. Other than consumption of a meal, the events in this group are of lower telicity than of the preceding and following groups, and thus the support of these aspectual verbs is employed in to establish the nuance of completion.

## 8.6 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with an inflection of πᾶν

ἐπεί-clauses using the adverb πάντα or πάντῃ also denote completion, as illustrated in the preceding chapter on discourse function. One instance of each of adjectival πάντες, πάντας and πᾶν also mark completion but *Odyssey* 16.340 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πᾶσαν ἐφημοσύνην ἀπέειπε is an affirmative ἐπεί-clause. Aside from certain ἐπεί-clauses which appear to be necessary adaptations of ἐπεί-clauses in other groups (see the discussion following this table) these ἐπεί-clauses occur in unique, non-type scene contexts. As with the ἐπεί-clauses with the verb placed first (discussed as the final completive group), these are ἐπεί-clauses whose events are not associated with subjective satisfaction nor ritual fulfilment. The quasi-auxiliary verbs of the next group denoting nuances of satisfaction, and the previous parallelistic group conveying a nuance of “well and truly” relate to a subjective judgement which does not fit with the events of this group. These ἐπεί-clauses fall back on the objective lexical πάντα.

**Table 8.6.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with an inflection of πᾶν

| **ἐπεί-clauses which are included in Edwards’s List of Type Scenes** | | |
|---|---|---|
| Arming | | |
| 1. | *Iliad* 7.207 | αὐτὰρ **ἐπεὶ** δὴ πάντα περὶ χροῒ ἕσσατο τεύχη |
| Bathing | | |
| 2. | *Odyssey* 6.227-228 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα λοέσσατο καὶ λίπ’ ἄλειψεν, /<br>ἀμφὶ δὲ εἵματα ἕσσαθ’ ἅ οἱ πόρε παρθένος ἀδμής |
| Assembling for Battle | | |
| 3. | *Iliad* 19.54 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἀολλίσθησαν Ἀχαιοί |
| 4. | *Iliad* 16.198-199 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντας ἅμ’ ἡγεμόνεσσιν Ἀχιλλεὺς<br>στῆσεν ἐῢ κρίνας, [κρατερὸν δ’ ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλε:. |
| Allurement and Seduction | | |
| 5. | *Iliad* 14.187 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα περὶ χροῒ θήκατο κόσμον |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ἐπεί-clauses which are included in Edwards's List of Type Scenes** | | |
| Funeral Rites: Gathering Wood | | |
| 6. | *Iliad* 23.127 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πάντη παρακάββαλον ἄσπετον ὕλην |
| **ἐπεί-clauses which denote events not included in Edwards's list of Type Scenes** | | |
| Completing Armour | | |
| 7. | *Iliad* 18.614 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πάνθ' ὅπλα κάμε κλυτὸς ἀμφιγυήεις |
| Gazing with Admiration | | |
| 8. | *Odyssey* 5.76, 7.134 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα ἑῷ θηήσατο θυμῷ |
| 9. | *Odyssey* 21.405 | αὐτίκ' ἐπεὶ μέγα τόξον ἐβάστασε καὶ ἴδε πάντη |
| Sport | | |
| 10. | *Odyssey* 8.131 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἐτέρφθησαν φρέν' ἀέθλοις[524] |
| Placing a Snare | | |
| 11. | *Odyssey* 8. 282 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα δόλον περὶ δέμνια χεῦεν |
| Tidying a hall | | |
| 12. | *Odyssey* 22.457 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πᾶν μέγαρον διεκοσμήσαντο |

Some of the ἐπεί-clauses in the above table appear to be a variation of attested parallelistic ἐπεί-clauses or ἐπεί-clauses with verbs lexically denoting completion (as set out in the previous group). These "adapted" protase are notably members of type scenes, unlike the majority of the ἐπεί-clauses in this group:

1/ The thrice occurring αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἕσσαντο περὶ χροῒ νώροπα χαλκὸν of *Iliad* 14.383, *Odyssey* 24.467, and 24.500 emphasises completion through positioning ἕσσαντο first in the clause. But at *Iliad* 7.207 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα περὶ χροῒ **ἕσσατο** τεύχη, the need for a singular verb ἕσσατο instead of the plural ἕσσαντο triggers a new phrase, due to the metrical incongruity of the singular and the plural forms[525]. The completive nuance of this phrase relies not solely on the use of the aoristic aspect but rather on the use of the adverb πάντα to express the completion of the arming. Interestingly, we can further observe that line 206 which reads ὣς ἄρ' ἔφαν, Αἴας δὲ κορύσσετο νώροπι χαλκῷ would have matched uncomfortably an ἐπεί-clause which had ended with χροῒ νώροπα χαλκὸν.

2/ Similarly *Odyssey* 6.227 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα λοέσσατο καὶ λίπ' ἄλειψεν appears to be a variant of αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ' ἐλαίῳ, and αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νίψεν τε καὶ ἤλειψεν λίπ' ἐλαίῳ. But here the change is solely syntactically motivated rather than stylistic:

---

[524] This ἐπεί-clause could also be categorised in the following group for its use of τέρπω.

[525] Kirk 1990: 261 offers a similar analysis regarding this phrase but does not suggest that this is part of a wider phenomenon.

this is an unusal instance of a hero needing to wash himself, away from the comforts of a hot bath prepared and administered for him by a handmaid.[526]

3/ αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἀολλίσθησαν Ἀχαιοί, of *Iliad*19.54 is employed to conclude the gathering together of the Achaeans for the reconciliation speeches between Agamemnon and Achilles. This phrase is used instead of the more familiar, verb fronting and parallelistic αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο of *Iliad* 1.57,[527] 24.790,[528] and *Odyssey* 2.9, 8.24 and 24.421. The reason for this different choice of phrase lies in the details of the gathering which culminates at *Iliad* 19.54 which are different from those which reach their climax at the other citations.

Between the decision to call a meeting and the holding of the meeting, no details of individuals, or types of people, who attended the meetings are provided at any the meetings which culminate at *Iliad* 1.57, 24.70, *Odyssey* 2.9, 8.24 and 24.421. For each of these meetings then the phrase αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο does not need elaboration as there has been no individuation of the masses summoned at the meeting. Those present at the reconcilation meeting of *Iliad* 19, on the other hand, are partially individuated. Thus, although at line 41 of *Iliad* 19, Achilles ὦρσεν δ’ ἥρωας Ἀχαιούς, between lines 42 and 53 names and details of individuals who came to the meeting are recounted: the rowers of the ships, the stewards of the food, Diomedes and Odysseus both limping and Agamemnon himself nursing a wound from the hands of Coön all arrive at the meeting. When, at line 54 the temporal ἐπεί-clause is introduced to express the completion of the gathering it would have been unclear whether just the listed individuals had arrived or whether it was all of the Achaeans if the phrase ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο were used. Appreciating the Homeric style to clarify when there is room for doubt, we can understand that different phrase πάντες ἀολλίσθησαν Ἀχαιοί is used which assures us that the subject of the gathering was the Ἀχαιοί[529].

It seems likely then that the gathering phrase to be used at *Iliad* 19.54 was varied to include reference to Ἀχαιοί, and that the two words ἀολλίσθησαν Ἀχαιοί carry equal weight, both conveying otherwise unknown information. A similar analysis can be offered of the ἐπεί-clause of *Iliad* 16.198-199, where a standard ἐπεί-clause of gathering would not have made clear precisely who had gathered.

---

[526] Odysseus had expressly rejected the assistance Nausicaa’s handmaids in the preceding lines, lending support to our impression that the poet is deliberately adapting the standard transitive wording to accommodate the self-conscious reflexive bathing.

[527] Although note that *Iliad* 1.57 contains the subordinating variant with the variant of οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν.

[528] Omitted in many manuscripts and generally disregarded when considering the structure of this ἐπεί phrase of gathering (see. for example footnote 1 in Reynen 1957: 3).

[529] Contrary to Edwards 1991: 241 who notes the unformularity of this phrase and suggests that the “innovative language makes room for πάντες, picking up the emphasis of 42-6”.

## 8.7 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses expressed with a verb which is placed first in the clause

**Table 8.7.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses with the verb placed first

| **Arming** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 14.383, *Odyssey* 24.467, 24.500 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἕσσαντο περὶ χροῒ νώροπα χαλκὸν |
| **Arrival** | | |
| 2. | *Iliad* 1.484 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἵκοντο κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν |
| 3. | *Odyssey* 17.28, 17.85, 17.178 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἵκανε / ἵκοντο δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας |
| **Reception of a guest: preparing the bed** | | |
| 4. | *Odyssey* 7.340, 23.291 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ στόρεσαν πυκινὸν λέχος ἐγκονέουσαι |
| **Bathing: warming the water** | | |
| 5. | *Iliad* 18.349, *Odyssey* 10.360 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ ζέσσεν ὕδωρ ἐνὶ ἤνοπι χαλκῷ |
| **Forging Bonds for a Snare (not included in Edwards’s list of Type Scenes)** | | |
| 6. | *Iliad* 18.609 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε |
| **Completing Armour (not included in Edwards’s list of Type Scenes)** | | |
| 7. | *Odyssey* 8.276 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε δόλον κεχολωμένος Ἄρει |

In his discussion of formulaic patterns Parry observed that there is a pattern of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί being followed directly by the verb in the indicative and that such phrases conclude at the trochaic caesura. An analysis of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί-clauses by reference to verb-first order is therefore in fact not without precedent.[530] But when we categorise in one group those ἐπεί-clauses which contain only one verbal phrase separately from the parallelistic group discussed earlier, we depart from the preceding studies. And further, we innovate in recognising that it is only in the context of asserting completion that the verb is regularly placed first in the subordinate clause.

### 8.7.1 Possible Semantic Significance to Verb First

Matić echoed the earlier work of Helma Dik in suggesting that the grammatical formulation of unmarked word order for Greek of Subject – Object – Verb can be captured discourse configurationally as Topic – Focus – Verb, which might coincide with the unmarked grammatical ordering but would not necessarily do so. Matić modified Dik’s model in various ways, including with the proposal that a verb can be placed in topic position, i.e. first in the clause, subject to certain conditions.[531]

Notably, Matić identified that the topicalised verb should stand in contrast in one way or another with a preceding or following item. For example, a verb may be topicalised in an enumerative chain. Matić offered the instance of Herodotus’s *Histories* 1.180.1 **ῥέει** δὲ ἐξ Ἀρμενίων, ἐὼν μέγας καὶ βαθὺς καὶ ταχύς: **ἐξιεῖ** δὲ οὗτος ἐς τὴν Ἐρυθρὴν θάλασσαν. Matić identified three other contrastive relationships: (i) a hedging expression where “the topicalised verb ... evokes an alternative set consisting of different grades of certainty”; (ii) where “topicalised verbs... evoke states of affairs ... [which] are denied in the following discourse, explicitly or via implicature.”; and (iii) where topicalised verbs are “used as devices for summarising the preceding paragraph and announcing the new one by evoking alternative states of affairs.”[532]

---

[530] Parry 1930: 85, and echoed by Durante 1976: 55-56.

[531] Matić 2003: 608-614.

We could analyse the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses listed above in **Table 8.7** in a similar manner to Matić, noting that the verb is placed first to highlight a contrast of the completed state with the preceding incomplete state. The contrast would be backward referring, rather than forwards. But it is also the case that the only new information in these ἐπεί-clauses is the aorist in the verb and its unusual position in the clause, which in itself marks that the information is contained there. So, the donning of armour is expressly mentioned in the first three ἐπεί-clauses mentioned at (1) above. Similarly, the destination of the Achaean camps of the second example is expressly referred to six lines earlier with the same words as in the ἐπεί-clause: καὶ τότ’ ἔπειτ’ ἀνάγοντο μετὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν.

Of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which place their verb first, the ἐπεί-clauses at (2) and (3) with ἵκοντο / ἵκανε placed first in the line are particularly remarkable as they can be compared to the many ὅτε-clauses of arrival which almost all place the verb at the end of the line, for example *Iliad* 1.432 οἳ δ’ ὅτε δὴ λιμένος πολυβενθέος ἐντὸς ἵκοντο, 3.421, 4.446, 4.472, 6.172 etc.[533] A rare exception to the late placing of the arrival verb with ὅτε-clauses is found at *Odyssey* 24.362 οἱ δ’ ὅτε δή ῥ’ ἵκοντο δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας which shares the wording of this ἐπεί-clause.

### 8.7.2 Note of Caution on Word Order

It should be noted that it is particularly difficult to be prescriptive about the significance of word order in an individual instance in Homer as there sometimes appears to be borrowing of a phrase which has an apparently suitable word order in one place in a context which is less suitable. For example, one of the Quasi-Parenthetical ἐπεί-Clauses whose event we note in Section5.5 is barely anticipated by the preceding text carries the verb first notwithstanding the fact that there is no particular emphasis on the verb as carrying sole meaning within the clause (as is the case with many of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses), but that parenthetical clause echoes wording elsewhere where that word order seems suitable: *Iliad* 24.14 ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν ὑφ’ ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους shares the wording after the subordinator with that of *Odyssey* 3.478 ἔζευξαν ὑφ’ ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους; in that latter case the event was anticipated by a preceding order. On the other hand, the ἐπεί-clause at *Iliad* 6.504 ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’, ἐπεὶ κατέδυ κλυτὰ τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ, which is similarly poorly anticipated, also places the verb first, but has a variety of word orders and phrases to choose from (such as *Iliad* 11.19 θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνε).

---

[532] Matić 2003: 611-612.

[533] An exception to this is those clauses where the verb of arrival is followed by a relative clause describing the place of arrival, where the syntax requires the verb to appear before the relative clause: *Iliad* 4.210, 5.780, 10.526, 18.520, *Odyssey* 15.101, 15.501. A non-syntactically motivated exception is *Iliad* 3.264.

We must also recognise that metrical conditions will sometimes be the sole determinant of word order. This seems the probably explanation behind the divergence in order between *Iliad* 2.661 Τληπόλεμος δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τράφ’ ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ εὐπήκτῳ and *Iliad* 7.148 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Λυκόοργος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐγήρα.

## 8.8 Completive ἐπεί-Clauses: no pattern

The wording of eight Completive ἐπεί-Clauses shares no common pattern (neither of word order nor of lexical choice) with other Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.[534] Four of these clauses use lexical items to emphasise the extent of the fulfilment of the event such as the use of μέγα at *Iliad* 4.124 κυκλοτερὲς μέγα τόξον ἔτεινε and at *Odyssey* 9.296 μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν, the use of the preposition κατά at *Iliad* 2.318 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ τέκν' ἔφαγε στρουθοῖο καὶ αὐτήν, or the use of ἑκάτερθεν at *Iliad* 3.340 οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν.

The context of *Odyssey* 24.71 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δή σε φλὸξ ἤνυσεν Ἡφαίστοιο, may explain why the nuance of completion is not structurally emphasised on that occasion. Agamemnon, who addresses the ghost of Achilles and recounts the death of Achilles, surely rejects any marked completive word order so as to not to emphasise utter incineration of Achilles’s body, which would have equated to English “once you were burnt to a crisp”.

## 8.9 Observations on the wording of ἐπεί-clauses which are not Completive ἐπεί-Clauses

With the remaining ἐπεί-clauses, completion is not the principal meaning communicated. The nuance of an event completed and no longer ongoing is nevertheless still discernible. First, this is evident from the regularity with which the aorist aspect is used. Second, different lexical devices are used to assert completion. For example, the accusative object of *Odyssey* 11.98 ὁ δ’ ἐπεὶ πίεν αἷμα κελαινόν denotes draining of the cup, compared to the preceding partitive genitive of line 96: αἵματος ὄφρα πίω.[535]

The Expectancy Chain ἐπεί-Clauses together form the biggest group of the non-Completive ἐπεί-Clauses. As explored in Section 6.3, they are the group of ἐπεί-clauses which present events which are along the “expectancy chain”. With these ἐπεί-clauses the word order or structure is not distinctive. The majority of the ἐπεί-clauses follow a word order which places the verb late or last in the clause. See *Iliad* 5.573, 6.178, 6.425-427, 6.474, 7.148, 8.268-270, 8.343-344 etc. A far smaller number place the verb first in the line, see *Iliad* 2.661, 4.217, 21.26, 24.719, *Odyssey* 4.589; a number of these do not contain a direct object, which might otherwise have preceded the verb, so *Iliad* 2.661 ἐπεὶ οὖν τράφ' ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ εὐπήκτῳ, *Iliad* 22.26 ὃ δ' ἐπεὶ κάμε χεῖρας ἐναίρων etc.

---

[534] *Iliad* 2.318, 3.340, 4.124, 22.376, *Odyssey* 9.296-297, 11.34-35, 24.71, 22.260, and 24.205.

[535] See Schwyzer-Debrunner 1950: 103.

Seven out of the fourteen Correspondent ἐπεί-Clauses extend beyond one line, even to four lines, in the case of *Iliad* 12.13-16.[536] The greater length of these ἐπεί-clauses when compared with the other ἐπεί-clauses (which are typically of one line), is surely at least partially attributable to the increased intelligibility afforded to these ἐπεί-clauses from the establishment of the phrasal structure by the preceding temporal phrase or subordinate clause / main clause sequence. The audience already knows that when the main clause arrives it will show some movement away from the event that was described in the preceding temporal sentence or the preceding main clause (if there is one); they can therefore tolerate a longer subordinate clause as the sequence is foreshadowed by the overarching structure.

The wording of the Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses is unremarkable, save that as observed in Section 6.2, the wording sometimes echoes the language of a first account of the event of the ἐπεί-clause. For example, *Iliad* 10.254 ὣς εἰπόνθ' ὅπλοισιν ἔνι δεινοῖσιν ἐδύτην is recapitulated with the echoing ἐπεί-clause of 10.272 τὼ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ὅπλοισιν ἔνι δεινοῖσιν ἐδύτην.

There are a number of Recapitulating ἐπεί-Clauses which present the verb first in the line, but only in instances either (i) where the wording is shared with Completive ἐπεί-Clauses such as at Illiad 1.57, *Odyssey* 8.24 and 10.181 or where there is no express object (or it precedes the subordinator) such as at *Iliad* 10.296 οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ ἠρήσαντο or only a complement clause such as at *Odyssey* 5.241 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ δεῖξ' ὅθι δένδρεα μακρὰ πεφύκει; see also *Iliad* 22.376 and *Odyssey* 4.233. The remainder present the verb later in the clause: *Iliad* 10.272 (as above), *Iliad* 12.105 οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ ἀλλήλους ἄραρον τυκτῇσι βόεσσι and also *Odyssey* 10.87-90, 13.271 and 21.297.

The ἐπεί-clauses which commence a book are not striking in their form, nor display any particular unity. The ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 12.1-4 recalls somewhat the ὅτε-clauses with its four line description of the location. Indeed, the main clause at line 5 includes the locatival particle ἔνθ' which recalls many of the ὅτε-clauses.

## 8.10 Conclusion

The ἐπεί-clauses are easily divisible into two basic groups: ἐπεί-clauses which assert through their word order, word structure or lexemes completion of an event and the remaining ἐπεί-clauses which appear to follow the typical word order and do not use wording which denotes completion.

---

[536] See also *Iliad* 12.143-144, 15.320-321, 15.395-396, *Iliad* 20.47-48, *Odyssey* 3.130-131 and 13.316-316.

The existence of parallelistic ἐπεί-clauses to denote completion is particularly interesting: it offers us an example of an artistic manner of speaking which does not bear the marks of oral composition in the way that the noun-epithet or doublets of O'Nolan do.

# Chapter 9 Conclusion

The findings of this survey of Homeric ἐπεί-clauses pertain to three areas of scholarship. First and foremost, a better understanding is attained of how the ἐπεί-clauses (many of which are formulaic) are constructed and employed within the hexametric and compositional constraints of the Homeric poems. Secondly, certain points are identified which are likely to reflect Greek linguistic rules beyond those of the Homeric language, most notably the way in which left-dislocation functions before subordinate clauses. Thirdly, most of the linguistic findings are usefully amalgamated with cross-linguistic studies, in particular as regards left-dislocation and as regards the use of subordinate clauses to mark thorough completion of a Vendlerian accomplishment.

Regarding the first point of Homeric language and composition, at the beginning of Chapter 1 the theory was mentioned that oral literature avoids subordinate clauses. It is evident that such a theory does not hold for the Homeric position, not even at the earliest stages of composition, given the linguistic evidence that the ἐπεί-clauses consist of archaic words and noting the wide distribution range of temporal ἐπεί-clauses which are found in various contexts including introducing books, at the beginning, middle and end of type scenes, and concluding speeches.

Among the pieces of evidence that certain components of the ἐπεί-clauses are archaic, it was noted in Chapter 3 that Arcado-Cypriot αὐτάρ is the default coordinating conjunction for ἐπεί-clauses and in its juxtaposition to ἐπεί displays a willingness on the part of the earliest poet(s) to dilute or distort a word's semantics out of metrical necessity. Towards the end of the thesis, in Chapter 8, we noted that certain phrases, such as αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο whose wording is found only within ἐπεί-clauses, is markedly archaic. We also demonstrated in that chapter the extent to which ἐπεί-clauses, in particular those which mark completion of an event, are based on a fixed set of underlying phrasal patterns, this limited range being a recognised hallmark of oral composition.

Although it is therefore apparent that the earliest known Greek oral literature was at home with the syntax of subordinate clauses, an associated question was asked: do the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* use subordinate clauses in a particular *manner*, i.e. with a particular discourse function, which is found infrequently or not at all in written literature? In Chapter 6 it was illustrated that temporal ἐπεί-clauses sometimes restate an event described earlier, simply recapitulating after a narrative digression. On other occasions the ἐπεί-clauses set up a second time period which contrasts with and concludes a preceding description of a first time period. Both of these uses of subordinate clauses are recognised in scholarship of subordinate clauses outside of Homer and indeed outside of Greek. It is, however, the clauses which are the subject of the following Chapter 7 which display a textual relationship which is not much, if at all, identified in written text.

In Chapter 7 ἐπεί-clauses which complete events which were begun earlier in the text were examined. Where that clause completes an event whose description was interrupted for the account of another event, its function is addressed in cross-linguistic literature, although the association with events of duration (as is clearly the case in Homer) is not recognised. It is identified in written as well as oral texts. However, some of the ἐπεί-clauses which are examined in Chapter 7 (and which constitute the largest group of ἐπεί-clauses) are less consistently recognised in the scholarship of subordinate clauses. Where clauses of that sort are mentioned, they are cited from oral texts. We are referring here to what have been termed in this thesis the “Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses”.

Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses are juxtaposed to a preceding sentence which describes the same event as that described within the subordinate clause: we note that there is a distinction of aspect, with the first account typically being imperfective and the second perfective. Two or three examples have been noted in fifth-century Greek literature, but otherwise this chaining is not widely recognised as occurring in written texts. This construction appears to be limited to oral texts, with the function in Homer being to convey extended duration of an event.

Regarding points of wider relevance for the Greek language, left-dislocation before a subordinator is poorly understood in Greek, despite having received substantial attention in Latin studies over the past half century. It is recognised as a phenomenon in a number of ancient Indo-European languages and, as we illustrate in Chapter 4, is well attested in Homer before ἐπεί-clauses. We suggest that the function of this type of left-dislocation is local to the sentence and does not order discourse on a wider scale, its function helping the hearer to process essential information that relates to the main clause. A study similar to that of Chapter 4 conducted on a fifth-century Greek prose author would be a useful comparison.

There has long been strong interest in the direct speech use of ἐπεί, both Homeric and fifth-century Greek, for its evident discourse marking functions, most recently explored by Muchnová 2011. It would be beneficial to integrate this study with a summary of the work on other ἐπεί uses in a comprehensive overview of ἐπεί in Homer and in later Greek.

A number of findings in this thesis should be of wider linguistic interest. In particular, our observations on the “discourse simplifying” function of left-dislocation before subordinate clauses can be added to the growing evidence that there is a range of functions performed by left-dislocation. The use of subordinate clauses (in particular “Completive ἐπεί-Clauses”) in connection with events of duration, more specifically Vendlerian accomplishments, in order to mark the completion of those events or to exploit the duration of those events for narrative purposes should also be of interest to scholars of other languages.

# Appendix 1 Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses

| Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Iliad* 1.57 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο |
| 2. | *Iliad* 1.458 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ηὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο |
| 3. | *Iliad* 1.464 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ’ ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχν’ ἐπάσαντο |
| 4. | *Iliad* 1.467 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα |
| 5. | *Iliad* 1.469 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 6. | *Iliad* 1.484 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἵκοντο κατὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν |
| 7. | *Iliad* 1.605 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατέδυ λαμπρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο |
| 8. | *Iliad* 2.317 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ τέκν’ ἔφαγε στρουθοῖο καὶ αὐτήν |
| 9. | *Iliad* 2.421 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ηὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο |
| 10. | *Iliad* 2.427 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ’ ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχν’ ἐπάσαντο |
| 11. | *Iliad* 2.430 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα |
| 12. | *Iliad* 2.432 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 13. | *Iliad* 2.661 | Τληπόλεμος δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τράφ’ ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ εὐπήκτῳ |
| 14. | *Iliad* 3.1 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόσμηθεν ἅμ’ ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕκαστοι |
| 15. | *Iliad* 3.340 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν |
| 16. | *Iliad* 4.124 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ κυκλοτερὲς μέγα τόξον ἔτεινεν |
| 17. | *Iliad* 4.217 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ἴδεν ἕλκος, ὅθ’ ἔμπεσε πικρὸς ὀϊστός |
| 18. | *Iliad* 4.382-383 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ᾤχοντο ἰδὲ πρὸ ὁδοῦ ἐγένοντο,<br>Ἀσωπὸν δ’ ἵκοντο βαθύσχοινον λεχεποίην |
| 19. | *Iliad* 5.27-28 | Τρῶες δὲ μεγάθυμοι ἐπεὶ ἴδον υἷε Δάρητος<br>τὸν μὲν ἀλευάμενον, τὸν δὲ κτάμενον παρ’ ὄχεσφιν |
| 20. | *Iliad* 5.573 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν νεκροὺς ἔρυσαν μετὰ λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν |
| 21. | *Iliad* 6.178 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σῆμα κακὸν παρεδέξατο γαμβροῦ |
| 22. | *Iliad* 6.425-427 | μητέρα δ’, ἣ βασίλευεν ὑπὸ Πλάκῳ ὑληέσσῃ,<br>τὴν ἐπεὶ ἂρ δεῦρ’ ἤγαγ’ ἅμ’ ἄλλοισι κτεάτεσσιν,<br>ἂψ ὅ γε τὴν ἀπέλυσε λαβὼν ἀπερείσι’ ἄποινα |
| 23. | *Iliad* 6.474 | αὐτὰρ ὅ γ’ ὃν φίλον υἱὸν ἐπεὶ κύσε πῆλέ τε χερσὶν |
| 24. | *Iliad* 6.504 | ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεὶ κατέδυ κλυτὰ τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ |
| 25. | *Iliad* 7.148 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Λυκόοργος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐγήρα |
| 26. | *Iliad* 7.207 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα περὶ χροῒ ἕσσατο τεύχεα |
| 27. | *Iliad* 7.319 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα |
| 28. | *Iliad* 7.323 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 29. | *Iliad* 8.268-270 | ἔνθ’ Αἴας μὲν ὑπεξέφερεν σάκος, αὐτὰρ ὅ γ’ ἥρως<br>παπτήνας, ἐπεὶ ἄρ τιν’ ὀϊστεύσας ἐν ὁμίλῳ<br>βεβλήκοι, ὃ μὲν αὖθι πεσὼν ἀπὸ θυμὸν ὀλέσσεν |

| **Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 30. | *Iliad* 8.343-344 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ διά τε σκόλοπας καὶ τάφρον ἔβησαν<br>φεύγοντες, πολλοὶ δὲ δάμεν Τρώων ὑπὸ χερσίν |
| 31. | *Iliad* 9.92 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 32. | *Iliad* 9.177 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ’ ἔπιόν θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| 33. | *Iliad* 9.212 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ πῦρ ἐκάη καὶ φλὸξ ἐμαράνθη |
| 34. | *Iliad* 9.215 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὤπτησε καὶ εἰν ἐλεοῖσιν ἔχευεν |
| 35. | *Iliad* 9.222 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 36. | *Iliad* 10.272 | τὼ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ὅπλοισιν ἔνι δεινοῖσιν ἐδύτην |
| 37. | *Iliad* 10.296 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἠρήσαντο Διὸς κούρῃ μεγάλοιο |
| 38. | *Iliad* 10.574-575 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί σφιν κῦμα θαλάσσης ἱδρῶ πολλὸν<br>νίψεν ἀπὸ χρωτὸς καὶ ἀνέψυχθεν φίλον ἦτορ |
| 39. | *Iliad* 11.225 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἥβης ἐρικυδέος ἵκετο μέτρον |
| 40. | *Iliad* 11.267 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τὸ μὲν ἕλκος ἐτέρσετο, παύσατο δ’ αἷμα |
| 41. | [*Iliad* 11.459 | Τρῶες δὲ μεγάθυμοι ὅπως ἴδον αἷμ’ Ὀδυσῆος] |
| 42. | *Iliad* 11.642 | τὼ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν πίνοντ’ ἀφέτην πολυκαγκέα δίψαν |
| 43. | *Iliad* 11.780 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπημεν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος |
| 44. | *Iliad* 12.13-16 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μὲν Τρώων θάνον ὅσσοι ἄριστοι<br>πολλοὶ δ’ Ἀργείων οἳ μὲν δάμεν, οἳ δὲ λίποντο,<br>πέρθετο δὲ Πριάμοιο πόλις δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ,<br>Ἀργεῖοι δ’ ἐν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδ’ ἔβησαν |
| 45. | *Iliad* 12.105 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἀλλήλους ἄραρον τυκτῇσι βόεσσιν |
| 46. | *Iliad* 12.143-144 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῖχος ἐπεσσυμένους ἐνόησαν<br>Τρῶας, ἀτὰρ Δαναῶν γένετο ἰαχή τε φόβος τε |
| 47. | *Iliad* 13.1 | Ζεὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρῶάς τε καὶ Ἕκτορα νηυσὶ πέλασσεν |
| 48. | *Iliad* 13.174 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Δαναῶν νέες ἤλυθον ἀμφιέλισσαι |
| 49. | *Iliad* 14.187 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα περὶ χροῒ θήκατο κόσμον |
| 50. | *Iliad* 14.280 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὅρκον |
| 51. | *Iliad* 14.383 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἕσσαντο περὶ χροῒ νώροπα χαλκὸν |
| 52. | *Iliad* 15.1-2 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ διά τε σκόλοπας καὶ τάφρον ἔβησαν<br>φεύγοντες, πολλοὶ δὲ δάμεν Δαναῶν ὑπὸ χερσίν |
| 53. | *Iliad* 15.279 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ἴδον Ἕκτορ’ ἐποιχόμενον στίχας ἀνδρῶν |
| 54. | *Iliad* 15.320-321 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατ’ ἐνῶπα ἰδὼν Δαναῶν ταχυπώλων<br>σεῖσ’, [ἐπὶ δ’ αὐτὸς ἄϋσε μάλα μέγα, τοῖσι δὲ θυμὸν |
| 55. | *Iliad* 15.395-396 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῖχος ἐπεσσυμένους ἐνόησε<br>Τρῶας, ἀτὰρ Δαναῶν γένετο ἰαχή τε φόβος τε |
| 56. | *Iliad* 15.549 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Δαναῶν νέες ἤλυθον ἀμφιέλισσαι |
| 57. | *Iliad* 15.716 | Ἕκτωρ δὲ πρύμνηθεν ἐπεὶ λάβεν οὔ τι μεθίει |

| **Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 58. | *Iliad* 16.187-188 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τόν γε μογοστόκος Εἰλείθυια<br>ἐξάγαγε πρὸ φόωσδε καὶ ἠελίου ἴδεν αὐγάς |
| 59. | *Iliad* 16.198-199 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντας ἅμ’ ἡγεμόνεσσιν Ἀχιλλεὺς<br>στῆσεν ἐῢ κρίνας, κρατερὸν δ’ ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλε: |
| 60. | *Iliad* 16.394 | Πάτροκλος δ’, ἐπεὶ οὖν πρώτας ἐπέκερσε φάλαγγας |
| 61. | *Iliad* 16.563 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐκαρτύναντο φάλαγγας |
| 62. | *Iliad* 16.762 | Ἕκτωρ μὲν κεφαλῆφιν ἐπεὶ λάβεν οὔ τι μεθίει |
| 63. | *Iliad* 17.125 | Ἕκτωρ μὲν Πάτροκλον ἐπεὶ κλυτὰ τεύχε’ ἀπηύρα |
| 64. | *Iliad* 18.349 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ ζέσσεν ὕδωρ ἐνὶ ἤνοπι χαλκῷ |
| 65. | *Iliad* 18.609 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε |
| 66. | *Iliad* 18.614 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πάνθ’ ὅπλα κάμε κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις |
| 67. | *Iliad* 19.19 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν ᾗσι τετάρπετο δαίδαλα λεύσσων |
| 68. | *Iliad* 19.54 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἀολλίσθησαν Ἀχαιοί |
| 69. | *Iliad* 20.47 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ μεθ’ ὅμιλον Ὀλύμπιοι ἤλυθον ἀνδρῶν |
| 70. | *Iliad* 20.318 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ’ ἄκουσε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων |
| 71. | *Iliad* 21.26 | πτῶσσον ὑπὸ κρημνούς. ὃ δ’ ἐπεὶ κάμε χεῖρας ἐναίρων |
| 72. | *Iliad* 21.377 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ’ ἄκουσε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη |
| 73. | *Iliad* 21.383 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Ξάνθοιο δάμη μένος, οἳ μὲν ἔπειτα |
| 74. | *Iliad* 22.376 | τὸν δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐξενάριξε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς |
| 75. | *Iliad* 22.462 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πύργόν τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἷξεν ὅμιλον |
| 76. | *Iliad* 22.475 | ἣ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη |
| 77. | *Iliad* 23.1-2 | ὣς οἳ μὲν στενάχοντο κατὰ πτόλιν:] αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ,<br>ἐπεὶ δὴ νῆάς τε καὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἵκοντο |
| 78. | *Iliad* 23.57 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 79. | *Iliad* 23.127 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πάντῃ παρακάββαλον ἄσπετον ὕλην |
| 80. | *Iliad* 23.161 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ’ ἄκουσεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων |
| 81. | *Iliad* 23.813 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν |
| 82. | *Iliad* 24.14 | ἀλλ’ ὅ γ’ ἐπεὶ ζεύξειεν ὑφ’ ἅρμασιν ὠκέας ἵππους |
| 83. | *Iliad* 24.329 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν πόλιος κατέβαν, πεδίον δ’ ἀφίκοντο |
| 84. | *Iliad* 24.349 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν μέγα σῆμα παρὲξ Ἴλοιο ἔλασσαν |
| 85. | *Iliad* 24.513-514 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥα γόοιο τετάρπετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς<br>καί οἱ ἀπὸ πραπίδων ἦλθ’ ἵμερος ἠδ’ ἀπὸ γυίων |
| 86. | *Iliad* 24.587-588 | τὸν δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ<br>ἀμφὶ δέ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνα |
| 87. | *Iliad* 24.628 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 88. | *Iliad* 24.633 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐς ἀλλήλους ὁρόωντες |
| 89. | *Iliad* 24.719 | οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ εἰσάγαγον κλυτὰ δώματα, τὸν μὲν ἔπειτα |

| | **Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses** | |
|---|---|---|
| 90. | *Iliad* 24.754 | σεῦ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐξέλετο ψυχὴν ταναήκεϊ χαλκῷ |
| 91. | *Iliad* 24.790 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο |
| 92. | *Odyssey* 1.150 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 93. | *Odyssey* 2.9 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο |
| 94. | *Odyssey* 2.378 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὅρκον |
| 95. | *Odyssey* 2.407 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλυθον ἠδὲ θάλασσαν |
| 96. | *Odyssey* 3.65 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεί ὤπτησαν κρέ’ ὑπέρτερα καὶ ἐρύσαντο |
| 97. | *Odyssey* 3.67 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 98. | *Odyssey* 3.130 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Πριάμοιο πόλιν διεπέρσαμεν αἰπήν |
| 99. | *Odyssey* 3.342 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ’ ἔπιον θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| 100. | *Odyssey* 3.395 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τε πίον θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| 101. | *Odyssey* 3.447 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ εὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο |
| 102. | *Odyssey* 3.455 | τῆς δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ μέλαν αἷμα ῥύη, λίπε δ’ ὀστέα θυμός |
| 103. | *Odyssey* 3.461 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ’ ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχνα πάσαντο |
| 104. | *Odyssey* 3.466 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ |
| 105. | *Odyssey* 3.470 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεί ὤπτησαν κρέ’ ὑπέρτερα καὶ ἐρύσαντο |
| 106. | *Odyssey* 3.473 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 107. | *Odyssey* 4.47 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ὁρώμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖσιν |
| 108. | *Odyssey* 4.49-50 | τοὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ,<br>ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρα χλαίνας οὔλας βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνας |
| 109. | *Odyssey* 4.68 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 110. | *Odyssey* 4.233 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐνέηκε κέλευσέ τε οἰνοχοῆσαι |
| 111. | *Odyssey* 4.428 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλυθον ἠδὲ θάλασσαν |
| 112. | *Odyssey* 4.541 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κλαίων τε κυλινδόμενός τε κορέσθην |
| 113. | *Odyssey* 4.573 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλθομεν ἠδὲ θάλασσαν |
| 114. | *Odyssey* 4.583 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατέπαυσα θεῶν χόλον αἰὲν ἐόντων |
| 115. | *Odyssey* 5.76 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα ἑῷ θηήσατο θυμῷ |
| 116. | *Odyssey* 5.95 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δείπνησε καὶ ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῇ |
| 117. | *Odyssey* 5.201 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος |
| 118. | *Odyssey* 5.241 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ δεῖξ’ ὅθι δένδρεα μακρὰ πεφύκει |
| 119. | *Odyssey* 6.93 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πλῦνάν τε κάθηράν τε ῥύπα πάντα |
| 120. | *Odyssey* 6.99 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτου τάρφθεν δμῳαί τε καὶ αὐτή |
| 121. | *Odyssey* 6.227-228 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα λοέσσατο καὶ λίπ’ ἄλειψεν<br>ἀμφὶ δὲ εἵματα ἕσσαθ’ ἅ οἱ πόρε παρθένος ἀδμής |
| 122. | *Odyssey* 7.134 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα ἑῷ θηήσατο θυμῷ |
| 123. | *Odyssey* 7.167 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ’ ἄκουσ’ ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο |

| **Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 124. | *Odyssey* 7.184 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ’ ἔπιόν θ’, ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| 125. | *Odyssey* 7.228 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ’ ἔπιόν θ’, ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| 126. | *Odyssey* 7.340 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ στόρεσαν πυκινὸν λέχος ἐγκονέουσαι |
| 127. | *Odyssey* 8.24 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο |
| 128. | *Odyssey* 8.50 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλυθον ἠδὲ θάλασσαν |
| 129. | *Odyssey* 8.72 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 130. | *Odyssey* 8.131 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἐτέρφθησαν φρέν’ ἀέθλοις |
| 131. | *Odyssey* 8.143 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ’ ἄκουσ’ ἀγαθὸς πάϊς Ἀλκινόοιο |
| 132. | *Odyssey* 8.276 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε δόλον κεχολωμένος Ἄρει |
| 133. | *Odyssey 8.282* | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα δόλον περὶ δέμνια χεῦεν |
| 134. | *Odyssey* 8.360 | τὼ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ δεσμοῖο λύθεν, κρατεροῦ περ ἐόντος |
| 135. | *Odyssey* 8.372-373 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν σφαῖραν καλὴν μετὰ χερσὶν ἕλοντο<br>πορφυρέην, τήν σφιν Πόλυβος ποίησε δαΐφρων |
| 136. | *Odyssey* 8.377 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σφαίρῃ ἀν’ ἰθὺν πειρήσαντο |
| 137. | *Odyssey* 8.446 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ’ ἄκουσε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς |
| 138. | *Odyssey* 8.454-455 | τὸν δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ,<br>ἀμφὶ δέ μιν χλαῖναν καλὴν βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνα |
| 139. | *Odyssey* 8.485 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 140. | *Odyssey* 9.87 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτοιό τ’ ἐπασσάμεθ’ ἠδὲ ποτῆτος |
| 141. | *Odyssey* 9.250 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σπεῦσε πονησάμενος τὰ ἃ ἔργα |
| 142. | *Odyssey* 9.296 -7 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωψ μεγάλην ἐμπλήσατο νηδὺν<br>ἀνδρόμεα κρέ’ ἔδων καὶ ἐπ’ ἄκρητον γάλα πίνων |
| 143. | *Odyssey* 9.310 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σπεῦσε πονησάμενος τὰ ἃ ἔργα |
| 144. | *Odyssey* 9.343 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σπεῦσε πονησάμενος τὰ ἃ ἔργα |
| 145. | *Odyssey* 9.362 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Κύκλωπα περὶ φρένας ἤλυθεν οἶνος |
| 146. | *Odyssey* 10.58 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτοιό τ' ἐπασσάμεθ' ἠδὲ ποτῆτος |
| 147. | *Odyssey* 10.87-90 | ἔνθ’ ἐπεὶ ἐς λιμένα κλυτὸν ἤλθομεν, ὃν πέρι πέτρη<br>ἠλίβατος τετύχηκε διαμπερὲς ἀμφοτέρωθεν<br>ἀκταὶ δὲ προβλῆτες ἐναντίαι ἀλλήλῃσιν<br>ἐν στόματι προὔχουσιν, ἀραιὴ δ’ εἴσοδός ἐστιν |
| 148. | *Odyssey* 10.112 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ εἰσῆλθον κλυτὰ δώματα, τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα |
| 149. | *Odyssey* 10.181 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ὁρώμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖσι |
| 150. | *Odyssey* 10.237 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δῶκέν τε καὶ ἔκπιον, αὐτίκ’ ἔπειτα |
| 151. | *Odyssey* 10.318 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δῶκέν τε καὶ ἔκπιον οὐδέ μ’ ἔθελξε |
| 152. | *Odyssey* 10.346 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὅρκον |
| 153. | *Odyssey* 10.360 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ ζέσσεν ὕδωρ ἐνὶ ἤνοπι χαλκῷ |

| **Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 154. | *Odyssey* 10.364-365 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ,<br>ἀμφὶ δέ με χλαῖναν καλὴν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα |
| 155. | *Odyssey* 10.453 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἀλλήλους εἶδον φράσσαντό τ’ ἐσάντα |
| 156. | *Odyssey* 10.499 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κλαίων τε κυλινδόμενός τε κορέσθην |
| 157. | *Odyssey* 11.1 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλθομεν ἠδὲ θάλασσαν |
| 158. | *Odyssey* 11.34-35 | τοὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ εὐχωλῇσι λιτῇσί τε, ἔθνεα νεκρῶν,<br>ἐλλισάμην, [τὰ δὲ μῆλα λαβὼν ἀπεδειροτόμησα |
| 159. | *Odyssey* 11.98 | κουλεῷ ἐγκατέπηξ’. ὁ δ’ ἐπεὶ πίεν αἷμα κελαινόν |
| 160. | *Odyssey* 11.246 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐτέλεσσε θεὸς φιλοτήσια ἔργα |
| 161. | *Odyssey* 11.385-386 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ψυχὰς μὲν ἀπεσκέδασ’ ἄλλυδις ἄλλῃ<br>ἁγνὴ Περσεφόνεια γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων |
| 162. | *Odyssey* 12.1-4 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ποταμοῖο λίπεν ῥόον Ὠκεανοῖο<br>νηῦς, ἀπὸ δ’ ἵκετο κῦμα θαλάσσης εὐρυπόροιο<br>νῆσόν τ’ Αἰαίην, ὅθι τ’ Ἠοῦς ἠριγενείης<br>οἰκία καὶ χοροί εἰσι καὶ ἀντολαὶ Ἠελίοιο |
| 163. | *Odyssey* 12.13 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νεκρός τ’ ἐκάη καὶ τεύχεα νεκροῦ |
| 164. | *Odyssey* 12.197-198 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τάς γε παρήλασαν οὐδ’ ἔτ’ ἔπειτα<br>φθόγγον Σειρήνων ἠκούομεν οὐδέ τ’ ἀοιδήν |
| 165. | *Odyssey* 12.260-261 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πέτρας φύγομεν δεινήν τε Χάρυβδιν<br>Σκύλλην τ’, [αὐτίκ’ ἔπειτα θεοῦ ἐς ἀμύμονα νῆσον |
| 166. | *Odyssey* 12.304 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσάν τε τελεύτησάν τε τὸν ὅρκον |
| 167. | *Odyssey* 12.308 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 168. | *Odyssey* 12.359 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' εὔξαντο καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν |
| 169. | *Odyssey* 12.364 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μῆρ' ἐκάη καὶ σπλάγχνα πάσαντο |
| 170. | *Odyssey* 12.391 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλυθον ἠδὲ θάλασσαν |
| 171. | *Odyssey* 13.70 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλυθον ἠδὲ θάλασσαν |
| 172. | *Odyssey* 13.159 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ' ἄκουσε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων |
| 173. | *Odyssey* 13.271 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τόν γε κατέκτανον ὀξέϊ χαλκῷ |
| 174. | *Odyssey* 13.316-317 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Πριάμοιο πόλιν διεπέρσαμεν αἰπήν,<br>βῆμεν δ' ἐν νήεσσι, θεὸς δ' ἐκέδασσεν Ἀχαιούς |
| 175. | *Odyssey* 14.111 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δείπνησε καὶ ἤραρε θυμὸν ἐδωδῇ |
| 176. | *Odyssey* 14.175-177 | Τηλεμάχου: τὸν ἐπεὶ θρέψαν θεοὶ ἔρνεϊ ἶσον<br>καί μιν ἔφην ἔσσεσθαι ἐν ἀνδράσιν οὔ τι χέρεια<br>πατρὸς ἑοῖο φίλοιο, δέμας καὶ εἶδος ἀγητόν |
| 177. | *Odyssey* 14.454 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 178. | *Odyssey* 15.92 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τό γ’ ἄκουσε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος |
| 179. | *Odyssey* 15.143 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 180. | *Odyssey* 15.303 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 181. | *Odyssey* 15.366 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἥβην πολυήρατον ἱκόμεθ’ ἄμφω |

| **Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 182. | *Odyssey* 15.438 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσάν τε τελεύτησάν τε τὸν ὅρκον |
| 183. | *Odyssey* 15.501 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 184. | *Odyssey* 16.55 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 185. | *Odyssey* 16.340 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πᾶσαν ἐφημοσύνην ἀπέειπε |
| 186. | *Odyssey* 16.478 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα |
| 187. | *Odyssey* 16.480 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 188. | *Odyssey* 17.28 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἵκανε δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας |
| 189. | *Odyssey* 17.85 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἵκοντο δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας |
| 190. | *Odyssey* 17.88-89 | τοὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ,<br>ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρα χλαίνας οὔλας βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνας |
| 191. | *Odyssey* 17.99 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 192. | *Odyssey* 17.178 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἵκοντο δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας |
| 193. | *Odyssey* 18.59 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ὄμοσάν τε τελεύτησάν τε τὸν ὅρκον |
| 194. | *Odyssey* 18.427 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τε πίον θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| 195. | *Odyssey* 19.213 | ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τάρφθη πολυδακρύτοιο γόοιο |
| 196. | *Odyssey* 19.251 | ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τάρφθη πολυδακρύτοιο γόοιο |
| 197. | *Odyssey* 19.505 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νίψεν τε καὶ ἤλειψεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ |
| 198. | *Odyssey* 20.59 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κλαίουσα κορέσσατο ὃν κατὰ θυμόν |
| 199. | *Odyssey* 20.279 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ ὤπτησαν κρέ’ ὑπέρτερα καὶ ἐρύσαντο |
| 200. | *Odyssey* 21.57 | ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τάρφθη πολυδακρύτοιο γόοιο |
| 201. | *Odyssey* 21.205 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τῶν γε νόον νημερτέ’ ἀνέγνω |
| 202. | *Odyssey* 21.222 | τὼ δ’ ἐπεὶ εἰσιδέτην εὖ τ’ ἐφράσσαντο ἕκαστα |
| 203. | *Odyssey* 21.273 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν σπεῖσάν τε πίον θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός |
| 204. | *Odyssey* 21.297 | ἐς Λαπίθας ἐλθόνθ’: ὁ δ’ ἐπεὶ φρένας ἄασεν οἴνῳ |
| 205. | *Odyssey* 21.404-405 | ὣς ἄρ' ἔφαν μνηστῆρες: ἀτὰρ πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς,<br>αὐτίκ’ ἐπεὶ μέγα τόξον ἐβάστασε καὶ ἴδε πάντῃ |
| 206. | *Odyssey* 22.119 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λίπον ἰοὶ ὀϊστεύοντα ἄνακτα |
| 207. | *Odyssey* 22.260 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ δούρατ’ ἀλεύαντο μνηστήρων |
| 208. | *Odyssey* 22.457 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πᾶν μέγαρον διεκοσμήσαντο |
| 209. | *Odyssey* 23.88 | ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν |
| 210. | *Odyssey* 23.291 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ στόρεσαν πυκινὸν λέχος ἐγκονέουσαι |
| 211. | *Odyssey* 23.300 | τὼ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν φιλότητος ἐταρπήτην ἐρατεινῆς |
| 212. | *Odyssey* 24.43 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί σ’ ἐπὶ νῆας ἐνείκαμεν ἐκ πολέμοιο |
| 213. | *Odyssey* 24.71 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δή σε φλὸξ ἤνυσεν Ἡφαίστοιο |
| 214. | *Odyssey* 24.205 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ πόλιος κατέβαν, τάχα δ’ ἀγρὸν ἵκοντο |
| 215. | *Odyssey* 24.349 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἄμπνυτο καὶ ἐς φρένα θυμὸς ἀγέρθη |

| **Preposed Past Tense Temporal ἐπεί-Clauses** | | |
|---|---|---|
| 216. | *Odyssey* 24.384 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα |
| 217. | *Odyssey* 24.421 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ’ ἐγένοντο |
| 218. | *Odyssey* 24.467 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἕσσαντο περὶ χροῒ νώροπα χαλκόν |
| 219. | *Odyssey* 24.489 | οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν σίτοιο μελίφρονος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο |
| 220. | *Odyssey* 24.500 | αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἕσσαντο περὶ χροῒ νώροπα χαλκόν |

## Appendix 2 Preposed non-temporal ἐπεί-clauses

### Part 1: Vocative + ἐπεί

| **Vocative + ἐπεί** | |
|---|---|
| *Iliad* 1.352 | μῆτερ ἐπεί μ' ἔτεκές γε μινυνθάδιόν περ ἐόντα |
| *Iliad* 3.59 | Ἕκτορ ἐπεί με κατ' αἶσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἶσαν |
| *Iliad* 6.77 | Αἰνεία τε καὶ Ἕκτορ, ἐπεὶ πόνος ὔμμι μάλιστα |
| *Iliad* 6.333 | Ἕκτορ ἐπεί με κατ' αἶσαν ἐνείκεσας οὐδ' ὑπὲρ αἶσαν |
| *Iliad* 6.382 | Ἕκτορ ἐπεὶ μάλ' ἄνωγας ἀληθέα μυθήσασθαι |
| *Iliad* 7.288 | Αἶαν ἐπεί τοι δῶκε θεὸς μέγεθός τε βίην τε |
| *Iliad* 13.68 | Αἶαν ἐπεί τις νῶϊ θεῶν οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν |
| *Iliad* 13.775 | Ἕκτορ ἐπεί τοι θυμὸς ἀναίτιον αἰτιάασθαι |
| *Iliad* 14.65 | Νέστορ ἐπεὶ δὴ νηυσὶν ἔπι πρυμνῇσι μάχονται |
| *Iliad* 22.378-379 | ὦ φίλοι, Ἀργείων ἡγήτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες,<br>ἐπεὶ δὴ τόνδ' ἄνδρα θεοὶ δαμάσασθαι ἔδωκαν |
| *Odyssey* 1.231 | ξεῖν', ἐπεὶ ἂρ δὴ ταῦτά μ' ἀνείρεαι ἠδὲ μεταλλᾷς |
| *Odyssey* 2.96 | κοῦροι ἐμοὶ μνηστῆρες, ἐπεὶ θάνε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς |
| *Odyssey* 3.103 | ὦ φίλ', ἐπεί μ' ἔμνησας ὀϊζύος, ἥν ἐν ἐκείνῳ |
| *Odyssey* 3.211 | ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ δὴ ταῦτά μ' ἀνέμνησας καὶ ἔειπες |
| *Odyssey* 4.204 | ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ τόσα εἶπες, ὅσ' ἂν πεπνυμένος ἀνὴρ |
| *Odyssey* 5.408 | ὤ μοι, ἐπεὶ δὴ γαῖαν ἀελπέα δῶκεν ἰδέσθαι |
| *Odyssey* 6.187 | ξεῖν', ἐπεὶ οὔτε κακῷ οὔτ' ἄφρονι φωτὶ ἔοικας |
| *Odyssey* 8.236 | ξεῖν', ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀχάριστα μεθ' ἡμῖν ταῦτ' ἀγορεύεις |
| *Odyssey* 13.4 | ὦ Ὀδυσεῦ, ἐπεὶ ἵκευ ἐμὸν ποτὶ χαλκοβατὲς δῶ |
| *Odyssey* 13.228 | ὦ φίλ', ἐπεί σε πρῶτα κιχάνω τῷδ' ἐνὶ χώρῳ |
| *Odyssey* 14.149 | ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ δὴ πάμπαν ἀναίνεαι, οὐδ' ἔτι φῇσθα |
| *Odyssey* 14.386 | καὶ σύ, γέρον πολυπενθές, ἐπεί σέ μοι ἤγαγε δαίμων |
| *Odyssey* 15.260 | ὦ φίλ', ἐπεί σε θύοντα κιχάνω τῷδ' ἐνὶ χώρῳ |
| *Odyssey* 15.390 | ξεῖν', ἐπεὶ ἂρ δὴ ταῦτά μ' ἀνείρεαι ἠδὲ μεταλλᾷς |
| *Odyssey* 16.91 | ὦ φίλ', ἐπεί θήν μοι καὶ ἀμείψασθαι θέμις ἐστίν |
| *Odyssey* 17.174 | κοῦροι, ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἐτέρφθητε φρέν' ἀέθλοις |
| *Odyssey* 17.185 | ξεῖν', ἐπεὶ ἂρ δὴ ἔπειτα πόλινδ' ἴμεναι μενεαίνεις |
| *Odyssey* 19.141 | κοῦροι, ἐμοὶ μνηστῆρες, ἐπεὶ θάνε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς |
| *Odyssey* 20.227 | βουκόλ', ἐπεὶ οὔτε κακῷ οὔτ' ἄφρονι φωτὶ ἔοικας |
| *Odyssey* 24.131 | κοῦροι ἐμοὶ μνηστῆρες, ἐπεὶ θάνε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς |
| *Odyssey* 24.400 | ὦ φίλ', ἐπεὶ νόστησας ἐελδομένοισι μάλ' ἡμῖν |

## Appendix 2

### Part 2: νῦν δ' + ἐπεί

| **νῦν δ' + ἐπεί** | |
|---|---|
| *Iliad* 9.344 | νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ἐκ χειρῶν γέρας εἵλετο καί μ' ἀπάτησεν |
| *Iliad* 9.356 | νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐθέλω πολεμιζέμεν ῞Εκτορι δίῳ |
| *Iliad* 18.101 | νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὐ νέομαί γε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν |
| *Iliad* 18.333 | νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν Πάτροκλε σε' ὕστερος εἶμ' ὑπὸ γαῖαν |
| *Iliad* 22.104 | νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ὤλεσα λαὸν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ἐμῇσιν |
| *Iliad* 23.150 | νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ οὐ νέομαί γε φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν |
| *Odyssey* 6.191 | νῦν δ', ἐπεὶ ἡμετέρην τε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἱκάνεις |
| *Odyssey* 15.346 | νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ἰσχανάᾳς μεῖναι τέ με κεῖνον ἄνωγας |
| *Odyssey* 23.225 | νῦν δ', ἐπεὶ ἤδη σήματ' ἀριφραδέα κατέλεξας |
| *Odyssey* 23.354 | νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ἀμφότερω πολυήρατον ἱκόμεθ' εὐνήν |

### Part 3: ἀλλ' + ἐπεί

| **ἀλλ' + ἐπεί** | |
|---|---|
| *Iliad* 9.119 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀασάμην φρεσὶ λευγαλέῃσι πιθήσας |
| *Iliad* 19.137 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀασάμην καί μοι φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς |
| *Odyssey* 2.278 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ὄπιθεν κακὸς ἔσσεαι οὐδ' ἀνοήμων |
| *Odyssey* 5.137 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὔ πως ἔστι Διὸς νόον αἰγιόχοιο |
| *Odyssey* 14.467 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν τὸ πρῶτον ἀνέκραγον, οὐκ ἐπικεύσω |
| *Odyssey* 17.226 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δὴ ἔργα κάκ' ἔμμαθεν, οὐκ ἐθελήσει |
| *Odyssey* 18.362 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δὴ ἔργα κάκ' ἔμμαθες, οὐκ ἐθελήσεις |
| *Odyssey* 19.485 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐφράσθης καί τοι θεὸς ἔμβαλε θυμῷ |
| *Odyssey* 22.71 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἔλλαβε τόξον ἐΰξοον ἠδὲ φαρέτρην |
| *Odyssey* 23.260 | ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐφράσθης καί τοι θεὸς ἔμβαλε θυμῷ |

## Appendix 3 Discussion of all Completive ἐπεί-Clauses other than those connected with dining

In this appendix we work through the remaining “Completive ἐπεί-Clauses”, drawing attention to the two accounts of the event of each ἐπεί-clause, and exploring the aspectual differences of the two accounts. Where applicable we discuss verbal aspect and where available we note down evidence that the poet conceived of these events as being of duration. Where the Completive Events occur elsewhere in the poems without the ἐπεί-clause construction we compare them to identify differences in function.

The appendix consists of two tables. Where ἐπεί-clauses function in, or as, type scenes, they tend to display a range of different relationships to the preceding text. The first table is intended for ἐπεί-clauses of type scenes, and offers three columns for Chained, Resumptive and Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses. So, ἐπεί-clauses in respect of the same Completive Event (e.g. arming) may be used on one occasion with one type of relationship to the first account of the event, and so may function as a Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clause, and on another occasion with another type of relationship, e.g. may function as a Resumptive ἐπεί-clause. We place each citation of an ἐπεί-clause in the appropriate column. We follow the order of type scenes which is listed in Edwards 1992.

Completive ἐπεί-Clauses in respect of events outside of the type scenes occur less frequently and typically only once for a particular type of event. A simplified table with a single column for the type of ἐπεί-clause is adequate. This is the second table, and starts on page 270.

# Appendix 3

**Table 9.1.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which are or form part of recognised type scenes

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arming[537] | | | | | | |
| 1. | Chained to a preceding imperfect:<br>(i) *Iliad* 7.206-208<br>ὣς ἄρ' ἔφαν, Αἴας δὲ κορύσσετο νώροπι χαλκῷ. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα περὶ χροϊ ἕσσατο τεύχεα / σεύατ' ἔπειθ' οἷός τε πελώριος ἔρχεται Ἄρης. As noted in the column on Verbal Aspect, the aspect of κορύσσετο is classified as imperfect, but has no classified aorist alternative. | *Odyssey* 24.496-501 ὣς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ὤρνυντο καὶ ἐν τεύχεσσι δύοντο, / τέσσαρες ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆ', ἓξ δ' υἱεῖς οἱ Δολίοιο: / ἐν δ' ἄρα Λαέρτης Δολίος τ' ἐς τεύχε' ἔδυνον, / καὶ πολιοί περ ἐόντες, ἀναγκαῖοι πολεμισταί. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἕσσαντο περὶ χροϊ νώροπα χαλκόν, / ᾤϊξάν ῥα θύρας, ἐκ δ' ἤϊον, ἦρχε δ' Ὀδυσσεύς. | *Iliad* 3.340-341 οἳ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν ἑκάτερθεν ὁμίλου θωρήχθησαν / ἐς μέσσον Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἐστιχόωντο. The ἐπεί-clause is preceded by an account of Paris's arming which is given in full detail, but Menelaus's arming is given only one imperfect line.[538] | κορύσσετο appears a number of times in single line accounts of arming. But we can note that on the other occasions on which the indicative stem is used the present stem seems suitable, used either to describe a scene which greets a hero's eyes or to describe an introduction to arming which is completed in the following lines of description.[539] It largely behaves as an *imperfectivum tantum*, [540] similar to θωρήσσω.<br>A past tense of δύω | There are temporally parallel events which occur alongside the arming described in the Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses:<br>(i) at *Iliad* 6.340 Paris asks Hector to *wait* for him (ἐπίμεινον) while he puts on his armour. Meanwhile Hector goes off to see his wife and son;<br>(ii) at *Iliad* 7.193 Ajax asks his comrades to | The one arming himself announces that he will arm (*Iliad* 6.340 and 7.193)<br>Or, the leader urges the warriors to arm (*Iliad* 14.371ff. and *Odyssey* 24.495).<br>Although the duel of Paris and Menelaus is |

---

[537] Arend 1933: 92-99 and Lord 1960: 89-91 are the classical accounts of the arming scene. We can note that where the narrative recounts in detail what the hero wore there the poet steers the narrative back towards action by bringing the hero out of the place where he has put on his armour without having recourse to an ἐπεί-clause. (See *Iliad* 5.737ff., 8.388ff., 10.29ff., 11.16ff., 16.130ff., 19.364 etc. In addition there is the brief arming of *Iliad* 13.241ff. which is also followed by physical movement.)

[538] Reynen 1957: 31 describes the ἐπεί-clause as "uniting two events... We have in the preceding text two independent and adjacent events, but the independence of the second event may be limited as it inclines and points towards the first event."

[539] See *Iliad* 4.274 τὼ δὲ κορυσσέσθην, ἅμα δὲ νέφος εἵπετο πεζῶν, which describes the scene of arming that greets Agamemnon when he goes to the Ajaxes; *Iliad* 16.130 ὣς φάτο, Πάτροκλος δὲ κορύσσετο νώροπι χαλκῷ where a detailed description of arming follows and 19.364 ἀνδρῶν: ἐν δὲ μέσοισι κορύσσετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς where, again, a detailed description of arming (this time of Achilles) follows.

[540] Save only for the aorist form, marked by an -α, is attested at *Iliad* 19.397 κορυσσάμενος, See Chantraine 1968-1980: 569. The verb appears to be a denominative from the Mycenaean attested ko-ru-to .

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (ii) *Iliad* 14.381-384<br>οἰχόμενοι δ' ἐπὶ πάντας ἀρήϊα τεύχε' ἄμειβον: / ἐσθλὰ μὲν ἐσθλὸς ἔδυνε, χέρεια δὲ χείρονι δόσκεν. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἕσσαντο περὶ χροῒ νώροπα χαλκὸν / βάν ῥ' ἴμεν: ἦρχε δ' ἄρά σφι Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων<br>Chained to a preceding ingressive account:<br>(iii) *Odyssey* 24.466-468<br>πείθοντ': αἶψα δ' ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ τεύχεα ἐσσεύοντο. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἕσσαντο περὶ χροῒ νώροπα χαλκόν / ἀθρόοι ἠγερέθοντο πρὸ ἄστεος εὐρυχόροιο. | | | accompanied by a noun phrase of armour occurs in three of the accounts which precede their ἐπεί-clauses. That past tense is always the imperfect. In almost all other accounts of arming in which the verb δύω is used, the aorist form is used.541 The imperfective aspect is undeniably employed in anticipation of the Completive ἐπεί-Clauses.<br>In the account preceding the ἐπεί-clause of *Odyssey* 24.467 ἐπὶ τεύχεα ἐσσεύοντο is used. This phrase also occurs at *Iliad* 2.808 where it has only the meaning of movement towards their belongings in order to flee to the ships. | pray for him *while he puts on his armour*: ἀλλ' ἄγετ' ὄφρ' ἂν ἐγὼ πολεμήϊα τεύχεα δύω. The comrades comply at lines 200-205.<br>An instance of intersection of arrival with an arming scene (and which is not completed with a ἐπεί-clause):<br>(iii) at *Iliad* 10.34 Menelaus finds Agamemnon *putting on his armour* with a present participle (ἀμφ' ὤμοισι τιθήμενον ἔντεα). | heavily anticipated in the text preceding the duel, the arming at *Iliad* 3.328ff. for the duel is not announced beforehand. The arming at *Odyssey* 24.466-467 is also unanticipated. |
| | Reception of a guest: preparing the bed [542] | | | | | |
| 2. | Chained to a first stage of the event: | - | - | - | Between Penelope's instructions to Eurycleia and the account of the | At *Odyssey* 7.335-338 Arete orders her |

---

[541] *Iliad* 2.578, 4.222, 7.103, 9.596, 11.16, 13.241, 15.120, 17.194, 19.368 and *Odyssey* 22.133, 22.114 and 23.366. Four exceptions, all of the same phrase θώρηκα περὶ στήθεσσιν ἔδυνε, are at *Iliad* 3.332, 11.19, 16.133 and 19.371.

[542] Edwards 1992: 304 summarises that "in stable oikoi like those of Nestor, Menelaus, and Alkinous, the woman arranges the bed when the guest arrives, supervises the bath before the feast, and provides gifts of clothing on his departure". Reece 1993: 32-33 offers some generalisations on the bedding scenes including the tendency for the guest's bed to be placed under the portico; he also observed how the narrative can manipulate this typical scene for effect.

| Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Odyssey* 7.339-341<br>αἱ δ’ ἴσαν ἐκ μεγάροιο δάος μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσαι:[543] //<br>αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ στόρεσαν πυκινὸν λέχος ἐγκονέουσαι, / ὤτρυνον δ’ Ὀδυσῆα παριστάμεναι ἐπέεσσιν<br>Chained to an aorist account with τόφρα, which points back to the simultaneity of the bed preparation events with other events:<br>*Odyssey* 23.289-292<br>τόφρα δ’ ἄρ’ Εὐρυνόμη τε ἰδὲ τροφὸς ἔντυον εὐνὴν /<br>ἐσθῆτος μαλακῆς, δαΐδων ὕπο λαμπομενάων. /<br>αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ στόρεσαν πυκινὸν λέχος ἐγκονέουσαι, / γρηῢς μὲν κείουσα πάλιν | | | | preparation, the recognition scene between Penelope and Odysseus finally takes place, as Odysseus exclaims at the impossibility of moving the bed to outside the bedroom. A 100+ line exchange takes place between the couple and *meanwhile* τόφρα (line 289) the maids are preparing the bed. The end of the exchange coincides with the bed being finished. | handmaids to prepare the bed.<br>Penelope issues instructions to her handmaid Eurycleia to prepare a bed for Odysseus outside the bedroom at *Odyssey* 23.277-280 |

---

[543] Before the bed is first set out, torches need to be carried to the place where the bed is to be prepared. The value of the light is most expressly captured at *Odyssey* 23.289-290 ἔντυον εὐνὴν // ... δαΐδων ὕπο λαμπομενάων. The motif of handmaids carrying torches δάος μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχουσαι occurs at the beginning of four of the five scenes in which handmaids prepare beds (only at *Iliad* 9.658ff. is no mention of torches made). In addition to the two scenes with ἐπεί-clauses in which handmaids prepare the beds, and the bed preparation scene just mentioned at *Iliad* 9.658ff. where Patroclus orders Achilles’ maids to prepare a bed for Phoenix for the night, there are two further scenes with the involvement of handmaids: (i) at *Iliad* 24.643ff. where Achilles orders his maids to prepare a bed for Priam. Note the improbable reference to μέγαρον at line 647; indeed the edition of Leaf and Bayfield 1898 comments that “the lines are probably not original here”, and (ii) at *Odyssey* 4.296-301 when Helen requests her handmaids to prepare beds for Telemachus and Nestor’s son. There are also two instances in which no maids are instructed, and the description is brief (at *Odyssey* 3.399ff. where Nestor points to a bed for Telemachus, and (v) at *Odyssey* 14.518ff. where Eumaeus hosts Odysseus in his hut). It is not easy to differentiate between the two scenes with handmaids which do conclude with a ἐπεί-clause and the three which do not.

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | οἴκόνδε βεβήκει | | | | | |
| Bathing: Warming the Water | | | | | | |
| 3. | Chained to a preceding imperfect account:<br>(i) *Iliad* 18.348-350<br>γάστρην μὲν τρίποδος πῦρ ἄμφεπε, θέρμετο δ' ὕδωρ: / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ ζέσσεν ὕδωρ ἐνὶ ἤνοπι χαλκῷ / καὶ τότε δὴ λοῦσάν τε καὶ ἤλειψαν λίπ' ἐλαίῳ<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 10.358-361<br>ἡ δὲ τετάρτη ὕδωρ ἐφόρει καὶ πῦρ ἀνέκαιε / πολλὸν ὑπὸ τρίποδι μεγάλῳ: ἰαίνετο δ' ὕδωρ. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ ζέσσεν ὕδωρ ἐνὶ ἤνοπι χαλκῷ / ἔς ῥ' ἀσάμινθον ἕσασα λό' ἐκ τρίποδος μεγάλοιο<br>Preparing water for bathing has been noted as a stage in some bathing type scenes[544]. Aside from the occasion in *Odyssey* 8 discussed below, | - | - | ἄμφεπε of ἀμφιέπω is an imperfect, but in its compound form is a stem that is *imperfectivum tantum*.<br>θέρμετο is similarly of an *imperfectivum tantum* stem.<br>The imperfect ἰαίνετο contrasts with the well attested aorist passive stem ἰάνθη (e.g. *Odyssey* 4.459). | At *Odyssey* 8.426ff. after Alcinous asks Arete to warm water for their guest Odysseus, (with which Arete complies), the narrative then diverges off to a parallel activity of Arete and Odysseus who do not wait passively, but rather engage in host-guest formalities (lines 438-448). | The ordering of comrades to place a cauldron on the fire for washing away the blood from the corpse (*Iliad* 18.343ff.).<br>The second warming of water is not expressly anticipated, but rather it forms the final stage of a sequence of hostly preparations by Circe's housemaids from *Odyssey* 10.348ff. The order to warm water is a feature of the |

---

[544] De Jong 2001: 211. But she does not mention the other aborted warming water scenes listed below. See also Edwards 1992: 306 who notes that the bathing scene is found in both the hospitality and the funeral domains.

| | Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | the ἐπεί-clauses conclude the only two occasions in which water is actually heated. | | | | | other aborted bathing scenes.[545] |
| | | | Bathing | | | |
| 4. | Chained to a preceding ingressive account with the middle voice:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 4.48-51<br>ἔς ῥ’ ἀσαμίνθους βάντες ἐυξέστας λούσαντο. / τοὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ, / ἀμφὶ δ’ ἄρα χλαίνας οὔλας βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνας / ἔς ῥα θρόνους ἕζοντο παρ’ Ἀτρεΐδην Μενέλαον<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 17.87-90<br>ἐς δ’ ἀσαμίνθους βάντες | Preceded by an account in the imperfect:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 19.392, 503-506<br>νίζε δ’ ἄρ’ ἆσσον ἰοῦσα ἄναχθ’ ἑόν: αὐτίκα δ’ ἔγνω / ... / ὣς ἄρ’ ἔφη, γρηῢς δὲ διὲκ μεγάροιο βεβήκει / οἰσομένη ποδάνιπτρα: τὰ γὰρ πρότερ’ ἔκχυτο πάντα. //<br>αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ νίψεν τε καὶ ἤλειψεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ, / αὖτις ἄρ’ ἀσσοτέρω | - | It appears probable that privacy is initially offered to the bather before the involvement of any handmaids. This distinction suggests itself by the initial use of the middle voice on a couple of occasions: λούσαντο in the first account at both *Odyssey* 4.453 and *Odyssey* 17.87.[546]<br>The imperfect of λούω is the marked stem occurring twice (once answered by an ἐπεί-clause (*Odyssey* 10.361ff.) and once at *Odyssey* 4.252 in a ὅτε-clause which marks | At *Odyssey* 4.252ff. Helen recalls that while she bathed Odysseus in Troy, he revealed his secret mission to her.<br>Secondly, there is a motif of bathing of an individual taking place while events are occurring elsewhere: (10.449-450, *Odyssey* 24.365-6). The third time at *Odyssey* 3.464 concludes with an ἐπεί-clause.[547] | Instructions to handmaids to bathe the guest, the provision of cloak and tunic and flask of olive oil, together with urging from handmaids to guest to bathe (*Odyssey* 6.210ff.)<br>The warming of water and the invitation to the |

---

[545] In addition to the two heating events concluded with an ἐπεί-clause there are four other references to heating water for a bath, three of which are not answered by execution of the event itself and the fourth of which is answered. At *Iliad* 14.6 Nestor volunteers the housekeeping skills of the captive girl Hecamede to warm a bath for wounded Machaon. The scene then shifts away and we do not find out whether Hecamede complies. At *Iliad* 22.444 the redundant warming of a bath for Hector is ordered by his unwitting wife to her handmaids. Again, and this time not surprisingly, we are not told whether the handmaids comply. And a third order to warm water at Illiad 23.39-40, again without narrative followthrough, is prompted by the vain hope of the Achaean chieftains that Achilles will allow himself to be cleaned up following the death of Patroclus. The fourth occasion at *Odyssey* 8.426ff. is discussed above, as it is an indicator of the long duration of warming water.

[546] Contrary to Arend’s comparison (1933: 126) of the stages of bathing to an account he had read in a 1929 newspaper report of bathing in Japan: “Man führte jeden von uns in einen Raum mit einem Holzkübel darin. Eine japanaischer Diener entkleidete mich. Wer beschreibt aber mein Erstaunen, also zwei der Geishas erschienen und mit Seife and Tüchern meinen Körper bearbeiten...”.

[547] De Jong 2001: 212 notes these three instances in her brief list of instances of “small scale simultaneity”.

| Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ἐϋξέστας λούσαντο. / τοὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ, / ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρα χλαίνας οὔλας βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνας, / ἔκ ῥ' ἀσαμίνθου βάντες ἐπὶ κλισμοῖσι καθῖζον.<br>Chained to a preceding ingressive account with a viewing of the prepared bath as the first stage:<br>(iii) *Odyssey* 8.450-456<br>ἔς ῥ' ἀσάμινθον βάνθ': ὁ δ' ἄρ ἀσπασίως ἴδε θυμῷ / θερμὰ λοέτρ', ἐπεὶ οὔ τι κομιζόμενός γε θάμιζεν, / ἐπεὶ δὴ λίπε δῶμα Καλυψοῦς ἠυκόμοιο. / τόφρα δέ οἱ κομιδή γε θεῷ ὣς ἔμπεδος ἦεν. / τὸν δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν δμῳαὶ λοῦσαν καὶ χρῖσαν ἐλαίῳ, / ἀμφὶ δέ μιν χλαῖναν καλὴν βάλον ἠδὲ χιτῶνα, / ἔκ ῥ' ἀσαμίνθου βὰς ἄνδρας μέτα οἰνοποτῆρας<br>Chained to a preceding imperfect account:<br>(iv) *Iliad* 10.572-576 | πυρὸς ἕλκετο δίφρον Ὀδυσσεὺς | | simultaneity), compared to the twenty one aorist indicatives.<br>(ἀπο)-νίζω is rare. The imperfect is probably the marked stem, since of the five imperfect indicatives, three are answered by ἐπεί-clauses (*Iliad* 10.572ff., *Odyssey* 6.223ff. and *Odyssey* 19.392ff.), one use is inexplicable (*Iliad* 11.830) and one occurrence is in a descriptive scene (*Odyssey* 1.112, on which see the discussion below on "tidying a hall").<br>Of the four aorist indicativs, two are found within ἐπεί-clauses (*Iliad* 10.572ff. and *Odyssey* 19.505ff.) and two are in adjacent lines describing the washing of a goblet and the washing of hands in single accounts (*Iliad* 16.229-230). | | bather to step into the bath (*Odyssey* 8.433ff.), the warming of water alone (*Odyssey* 10.361ff.), the removal of cloaks prior to stepping into the baths (*Odyssey* 17.87), and the fetching of water for washing the feet (*Odyssey* 19.392ff.).[548]<br>A couple of the accounts are unprepared: *Odyssey* 4.48ff., arrival at Menelaus's palace is followed immediately by bathing without even an |

---

[548] See Arend 1933: 124-126 for the structuring of bathing scenes including his observations that the language is adapted equally to bathing a corpse (such as at *Iliad* 24.58ff.) and to bathing in the sea (such as at *Iliad* 10.572-575ff.).

| Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| αὐτοὶ δ’ ἱδρῶ πολλὸν ἀπενίζοντο θαλάσσῃ / ἐσβάντες κνήμας τε ἰδὲ λόφον ἀμφί τε μηρούς. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί σφιν κῦμα θαλάσσης ἱδρῶ πολλὸν / νίψεν ἀπὸ χρωτὸς καὶ ἀνέψυχθεν φίλον ἦτορ, / ἔς ῥ’ ἀσαμίνθους βάντες ἐϋξέστας λούσαντο.<br>(v) *Odyssey* 6.224-229<br>αὐτὰρ ὁ ἐκ ποταμοῦ χρόα νίζετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς / ἅλμην, ἥ οἱ νῶτα καὶ εὐρέας ἄμπεχεν ὤμους, / ἐκ κεφαλῆς δ’ ἔσμηχεν ἁλὸς χνόον ἀτρυγέτοιο. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα λοέσσατο καὶ λίπ’ ἄλειψεν, / ἀμφὶ δὲ εἵματα ἕσσαθ’ ἅ οἱ πόρε παρθένος ἀδμής, / τὸν μὲν Ἀθηναίη θῆκεν Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα<br>(vi) *Odyssey* 10.361-366<br>ἔς ῥ’ ἀσάμινθον ἕσασα λό’ ἐκ τρίποδος μεγάλοιο, / θυμῆρες κεράσασα, κατὰ κρατός τε καὶ ὤμων, / ὄφρα μοι ἐκ κάματον θυμοφθόρον εἵλετο γυίων. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ, / ἀμφὶ δέ με χλαῖναν | | | | | invitation. The bathing of Telemachus at Oydssey 3.464ff. is also unanticipated.<br>The bathing in the sea at *Iliad* 10.572ff. is without prior anticipation. Here the emphasis achieved by pausing on the bathing with the double account serves to highlight the sense of safety and comfort once the Achaeans spies (who are the bathers) are back within the confines of their own camp. |

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | καλὴν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα, / εἷσε δέ μ’ εἰσαγαγοῦσα ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροήλου<br>Chained to a preceding aorist account:<br>(vii) *Odyssey* 3.464-467<br>τόφρα δὲ Τηλέμαχον λοῦσεν καλὴ Πολυκάστη, / Νέστορος ὁπλοτάτη θυγάτηρ Νηληϊάδαο. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ λοῦσέν τε καὶ ἔχρισεν λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ / ἀμφὶ δέ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν βάλεν ἠδὲ χιτῶνα, / ἔκ ῥ’ ἀσαμίνθου βῆ δέμας ἀθανάτοισιν ὁμοῖος | | | | | |
| | | | **Assembling for a council meeting, battle or funeral[549]** | | | |
| 5. | Chained to a preceding imperfect:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 2.8-10<br>οἱ μὲν ἐκήρυσσον, τοὶ δ’ | - | (i) *Iliad* 3.1-2 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κόσμηθεν ἅμ’ ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἕκαστοι / Τρῶες μὲν κλαγγῇ τ’ | In terms of distribution, in the past tense the present stem of ἀγείρω is the marked form, occurring only four times in the | Between Agamemnon’s order to the heralds to summon the Achaeans for a meeting at *Iliad* | The order to heralds to call a meeting (except when Achilles |

---

[549] The ἐπεί-clause of gathering used for Chained Completive ἐπεί-Clauses is also used once as a Recapitulating Clause at *Iliad* 1.57 as discussed in Section 6.3. Most gathering scenes do not conclude with a ἐπεί-clause. We find that the completive ἐπεί-clause pops up to conclude gathering which is orderly-rowdy gathering or rowdy meetings seem not to be associated with this wording. Thus, for example, (i) the meeting at the beginning of *Iliad* 9 where Agamemnon orders a meeting of the devastated Achaeans, (ii) Agamemnon’s assembly of all the Achaeans, employing heralds, of *Iliad* 2.50-52, 86ff. with its reassembling at 2.207ff. The disorderliness of the initial gathering is described from line 86 onwards; and (iii) Nestor’s account of a post-Trojan War assembly of the Achaeans called by Agamemnon and Menelaus to discuss how and when to depart from Troy at *Odyssey* 3.137. The two Atreides call together the Achaeans οὐ κατὰ κόσμον (138) in a disorderly manner and at an unusual time of day for a meeting: ἐς ἠέλιον καταδύντα. The Achaeans respond to the summoning, arriving heavy with wine (οἴνῳ βεβαρηότες) (line 139). For detailed studies of the assembly scene including the gathering stage, see Arend 1933: 116-121, Lord 1960: 68-81 and Rolland Martin’s “Recherches sur l’agora grecque (Paris, 1952).

| Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ἠγείροντο μάλ' ὦκα.[550] / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἤγερθεν ὁμηγερέες τ' ἐγένοντο, / βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν εἰς ἀγορήν, παλάμῃ δ' ἔχε χάλκεον ἔγχος<br>The same ἐπεί-clause of *Odyssey* 2.9 is chained to preceding aorist accounts, with the following main clauses:<br>(ii) *Iliad* 24.789, 791 τῆμος ἄρ' ἀμφὶ πυρὴν κλυτοῦ Ἕκτορος ἔγρετο[551] λαός. / ... / πρῶτον μὲν κατὰ πυρκαϊὴν σβέσαν αἴθοπι οἴνῳ<br>(iii) *Odyssey* 24.420, 422 αὐτοὶ δ' εἰς ἀγορὴν κίον[552] |  | ἐνοπῇ τ' ἴσαν ὄρνιθες ὣς is preceded by gathering of the Greeks and then the Trojans from *Iliad* 2.442 until the end of *Iliad* 2.<br>(ii) *Iliad* 16.198-199 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντας ἅμ' ἡγεμόνεσσιν Ἀχιλλεὺς / στῆσεν ἐὺ κρίνας, κρατερὸν δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλε. At line 129 Achilles announces that he will gather the Myrmidons together. At lines | indicative (always in the middle voice), compared to an aorist stem occurring twenty one times in the indicative (across the active, middle and passive voices). Of the two occurrences of the imperfect indicative which are not followed by a ἐπεί-clause, one of them is answered by lines asserting completion of the gathering and one is found in a context in which the process of gathering is of interest, rather than the completed act.[553] | 2.52 and the conclusive gathering itself at 86ff. (in an account that does not conclude with a ἐπεί-clause), a meeting of the senior Achaeans is held by Agamemnon. The paralleling of the two events temporally, of holding a meeting while others gather, asserts the time taken to gather people together.<br>The recurrence of the adverb ὦκα with ἠγείροντο at *Iliad* 2.8, 2.52 and *Odyssey* 2.8 | orders the meeting in which case he calls directly[555]), the due summoning by the heralds (if they have been instructed), and then the gathering of the people.<br>This preparatory action is missing from the two gathering scenes which are |

---

[550] This same clause is also used to describe gathering for battle at *Iliad* 2.8, and is then completed with the Cumulative ἐπεί-clause at *Iliad* 3.1 (see the next column). ἠγείροντο is likely to be imperfect and is interpreted that way by scholars that care to mention it (LSJ, for example, suggests that in Homer unattested ἤγειρον is imperfect). But it should be noted that there are certain gaps in the paradigms attested in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Of a postulated Indo-European stem *h2ger, Homeric ἀγείρω forms a full grade aorist attested in the middle and passive voice as ἀγέροντο or ἀγέρθη, an s-aorist ἤγειρα or unaugmented ἀγείρομεν and a present root + i̯e ἀγείρω (and a handful of reduplicated aorists). There is no attestation of a an s-aorist in any person other than the first person singular which may suggest some syncretism or suppletion of stems with no one stem conjugating for all persons.

[551] Although the verbal root of ἔγρετο, which also appears at *Iliad* 7.434, is uncertain. Shipp (1972: 434) notes that "as in both places it is so early in the morning it is hardly too wild a suggestion that ἔγρετο was actually understood at the time of the change of spelling as being from ἐγείρω, seeing that ἠγρόμην survived in Attic, as shown by unpoetic contexts in Ar. (LSJ)."

[552] κίον is traditionally viewed as aorist. See for example Risch §87a. But Létoublon 1985: 88 notes that although the form is aorist it seems to be used imperfectly as a metrical alternative to ἴε. In terms of the attestation here, the lack of prior anticipation of this gathering suggest that an aorist reading is more probable.

[553] (i) *Iliad* 2.50-52, 86, 94 αὐτὰρ ὃ κηρύκεσσι λιγυφθόγγοισι κέλευσε // κηρύσσειν ἀγορήνδε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιούς: // οἳ μὲν ἐκήρυσσον, τοὶ δ' **ἠγείροντο** μάλ' ὦκα: // ... // ἐπεσσεύοντο δὲ λαοί. // ... // οἳ δ' ἀγέροντο. Note that this is a chaotic gathering as described at lines 95ff., which may explain why an ἐπεί-clause is not

| **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ἀθρόοι, ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ. / ... / τοῖσιν δ’ Εὐπείθης ἀνά θ’ ἵστατο καὶ μετέειπε: | | 164ff. the details of the gathering Myrmidons are supplied.<br>(iii) *Iliad* 19.54-55 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἀολλίσθησαν Ἀχαιοί / τοῖσι δ’ ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς: At line 40 Achilles summons the Achaeans to a meeting. The names and state of some of them are detailed in the lines which follow, but the majority are not mentioned. The ἐπεί-clause covers all of those gathered.<br>As mentioned in Chapter 3 regarding the two ἐπεί-clauses with πάντας / πάντες, | | also confirms the poet’s consciousness that gathering a crowd together is a time consuming event which can, to an extent, be accelerated. We see this same collocation with a number of events which are of duration.[554] | chained by an aorist-ἐπεί-clause construction. |

---

used-the nuance of “well and truly” would not fit here; and (ii) *Odyssey* 11.632 ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἐπὶ ἔθνε' **ἀγείρετο** μυρία νεκρῶν where Odysseus is frightened away from the side of the pit where he is addressing ghosts by a swarm of spirits who are gathering.

[555] Arend 1933: 117.

[554] *Iliad* 2.785, 3.14 μάλα δ' ὦκα διέπρησσον πεδίοιο, *Iliad* 5.903 μάλα δ' ὦκα περιτρέφεται κυκόωντι, *Iliad* 7.337-338 ποτὶ δ' αὐτὸν δείμομεν ὦκα // πύργους ὑψηλοὺς, *Iliad* 7.417 τοὶ δ' ὡπλίζοντο μάλ' ὦκα etc.

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | the different construction of the ἐπεί-clauses themselves reflects the poet’s need to assert that despite individuation of some of the members, it was everybody who finally gathered. | | | |
| Allurement and Seduction | | | | | | |
| 6. | - | - | *Iliad* 14.187-188 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα περὶ χροῒ θήκατο κόσμον / βῆ ῥ’ ἴμεν ἐκ θαλάμοιο, καλεσσαμένη δ’ Ἀφροδίτην concludes Hera’s dressing preparations which run from lines 170-186. | - | - | At line 161, Hera’s plans are revealed to the audience: to adorn herself beauteously and then approach Zeus and seduce him. |
| Entry into a Hall | | | | | | |
| 7. | - | With a preceding imperfect account:<br>*Odyssey* 23.84-88<br>ὣς φαμένη κατέβαιν’ | - | The first account of movement, with imperfect κατέβαιν’, describes the movement *from* Penelope’s upper chamber.[556] | - | *Odyssey* 23.5-9 Eurycleia urges Penelope to go down and see her husband. |

---

[556] Létoublon 1985: 132 notes the sense of “walking with steps” with the imperfect use of the stem.

| | Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ὑπερώϊα: πολλὰ δέ οἱ κῆρ / ὥρμαιν’, ἢ ἀπάνευθε φίλον πόσιν ἐξερεείνοι, / ἦ παρστᾶσα κύσειε κάρη καὶ χεῖρε λαβοῦσα. / ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ὑπέρβη λάϊνον οὐδόν / ἕζετ’ ἔπειτ’ Ὀδυσῆος ἐναντίον, ἐν πυρὸς αὐγῇ, | | | | Again, at line 52, she repeats her request to Penelope to follow her to the hall. At line 83, Penelope agrees to go downstair, although she claims to be interested only in seeing her son, not believing that Odysseus has returned. |
| | | | Travel: Travel by Sea – Arriving at the Seashore | | | |
| 8. | The same ἐπεί-clause of αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα κατήλθομεν ἠδὲ θάλασσαν, is found on all occasions with only a switch from the third person plural to the first person plural at *Odyssey* 4.573 and 11.1. | Preceded by a present participle account with the main clause following the final / ... /:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 10.560, 569, 571[557], 11.2<br>ἐρχομένοισι δὲ τοῖσιν | - | The first accounts of journeying to the shore employ a variety of expressions denoting an incompleted journey:<br>(i) with imperfect βαῖνε in the first account;<br>(ii) and (iii) both with imperfect ἤϊα[559]; | The resumptive accounts offer evidence that the distance from the starting point to the seashore can be far enough that other events occur while making the journey. | Four of the journeys to the seashore are expressly anticipated ((1) *Odyssey* 2.404ff., Athena-Mentor urges |

---

[557] In this particular construction there is no main clause account of the journey itself, but rather there is the participial reference at line 561 ἐρχομένοισι and in the ὅτε sentence of line 569-570 ἀλλ' ὅτε δή ῥ' ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν καὶ θῖνα θαλάσσης // ἤομεν ἀχνύμενοι θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντες. A brief account then follows to recount that Circe slipped past the journeying men to leave animals by the ship for the sacrifice mentioned back at line 527.

| Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chained to a preceding imperfect with main clauses following / ... /:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 2.405-406, 408<br>ὣς ἄρα φωνήσασ’ ἡγήσατο Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη / καρπαλίμως: ὁ δ’ ἔπειτα μετ’ ἴχνια βαῖνε θεοῖο. / ... / εὗρον ἔπειτ’ ἐπὶ θινὶ κάρη κομόωντας ἑταίρους.<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 4.426-427, 429<br>αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆας, ὅθ’ ἕστασαν ἐν ψαμάθοισιν, / ἤια: πολλὰ δέ μοι κραδίη πόρφυρε κιόντι. / ... / δόρπον ἄρ’ ὁπλισάμεσθ’, ἐπί τ’ ἤλυθεν ἀμβροσίη νύξ<br>(iii) *Odyssey* 4.571-572, 574<br>αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆας ἅμ’ ἀντιθέοις ἑτάροισιν / ἤια, | ἐγὼ μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπον / ... / ἀλλ’ ὅτε δή ῥ’ ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν καὶ θῖνα θαλάσσης / ᾔομεν ἀχνύμενοι θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντες / ... / νῆα μὲν ἂρ πάμπρωτον ἐρύσσαμεν εἰς ἅλα δῖαν<br>Preceded by an imperfect account with the main clause following / ... /:<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 12.367-368, 392<br>βῆν δ’ ἰέναι ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν καὶ θῖνα θαλάσσης. / ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ σχεδὸν ἦα κιὼν νεὸς ἀμφιελίσσης / ... //[558] νείκεον ἄλλοθεν |  | (iv) with an aorist βήτην in the aorist account, but the directional ἐπὶ plus accusative makes clear that this is no description of an arrival but a description of a journey – the expression is given an ingressive nuance through the directional argument.<br>Aspect of the resumptive accounts:<br>(i) present participles;<br>(ii) with βῆν δ’ ἰέναι[560] in the first account;<br>(iii) with a first step expression of ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσατο[561]. |  | Telemachus to go to the boat and see his comrades who are awaiting him; (2) *Odyssey* 8.34-36 Alcinous orders the departure of 250 men for the seashore; (3) *Odyssey* 10.549 Odysseus urges his comrades to be on their way; and (4) the events at the beginning of *Odyssey* 13 centre around Odysseus’s departure from the Phaeacians |

---

[559] The discussion at Létoublon 1985: 81-84 of the use of the imperfect ἤϊα does not mention these two instances. He categorises the function of this stem as being one or more of: (i) associated with a descriptive phrase, (ii) for describing someone who accompanies the main hero (whose movement would be in the aorist), (iii) in the use of comparisons and similes to describe someone’s movements, and (iv) used absolutely but with centrifugal deixis, that is to say movement away from. Létoublon admits a few unclassificable exceptions to the group. A durational reading is not admitted, but is surely suited to our two instances. At *Odyssey* 10.309 the same line ἤϊα, πολλὰ δέ μοι κραδίη πόρφυρε κιόντι is used but there is not followed by an ἐπεί-clause, since on that occasion the journey is necessarily short: from being close to Circe’s house to being outside her house.

[558] An interruption en route then follows when Odysseus is struck by the aroma of sinful roasting by his comrades of Helios’ cattle (line 368f.). At that same time Helios goes off to report this offence to Zeus (374-390).

| Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| πολλὰ δέ μοι κραδίη πόρφυρε κιόντι. / ... / δόρπον θ' ὁπλισάμεσθ', ἐπί τ' ἤλυθεν ἀμβροσίη νύξ<br>Chained to a preceding aorist:<br>(iv) *Odyssey* 8.48-49, 51<br>κούρω δὲ κρινθέντε δύω καὶ πεντήκοντα / βήτην, ὡς ἐκέλευσ', ἐπὶ θῖν' ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο. / ... / νῆα μὲν οἵ γε μέλαιναν ἁλὸς βένθοσδε ἔρυσσαν | ἄλλον ἐπισταδόν, οὐδέ τι μῆχος<br>Preceded by an ingressive account with the main clause following / ... /:<br>(iii) *Odyssey* 13.63-65, 71<br>ὣς εἰπὼν ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, / τῷ δ' ἅμα κήρυκα προΐει μένος Ἀλκινόοιο, / ἡγεῖσθαι ἐπὶ νῆα θοὴν καὶ θῖνα θαλάσσης: / ... / αἶψα τά γ' ἐν νηῒ γλαφυρῇ πομπῆες ἀγαυοὶ | | | | with Odysseus employing the phrase αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ νέομαι at *Odyssey* 13.61 just prior to his departure for the seashore).<br>With three of the journeys to the shore, the traveller is returning to home base, having wandered away from the seashore. The return to the shore is not expressly anticipated, although may be expected from the context (see *Odyssey* 4.426ff., 4.571ff. and 12.367ff.). |

---

[560] Létoublon 1985: 136 "Dans la locution idiomatique βῆ δ' ἰέναι, le sens de βῆ est maintenant clair: "il fit un pas", "il se mit en marche pour aller", aoriste inchoatif renvoyant à l'instant du départ".

[561] The text then expands on the retinue that accompanied *Odyssey* (lines 66-69) before returning to completed the journey.

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Travel: Travel by Sea – Journey by Sea | | | | | | |
| 9. | - | Preceded by an imperfect account:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 12.194, 197-199 ὀφρύσι νευστάζων: οἱ δὲ προπεσόντες ἔρεσσον / ... //<br>αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τάς γε παρήλασαν, οὐδ’ ἔτ’ ἔπειτα<br>φθόγγον Σειρήνων ἠκούομεν οὐδέ τ’ ἀοιδήν, / αἶψ’ ἀπὸ κηρὸν ἕλοντο ἐμοὶ ἐρίηρες ἑταῖροι<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 11.639-12.2 τὴν δὲ κατ' Ὠκεανὸν ποταμὸν φέρε κῦμα ῥόοιο, / ... / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ποταμοῖο λίπεν ῥόον Ὠκεανοῖο<br>// νηῦς, | - | The imperfect ἔρεσσον may be an *imperfectivum tantum*, since as far as the Homeric data is concerned there are no aorist attestations (but overall there are few attestations of the verb). Of the other two imperfect indicative attestations ἔρεσσον of *Odyssey* 9.490 is followed by a ὅτε-clause and *Odyssey* 11.78 may refer to a habitual rowing. | - | The ἐπεί-clause echoes the subjunctive ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 12.55 αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν δὴ τάς γε παρὲξ ἐλάσωσιν ἑταῖροι, in the original instructions from Circe regarding this event. |
| Arrival | | | | | | |
| 10. | Chained to an imperfect account: | - | - | The imperfect ἦγεν of *Odyssey* 17.84 is not by any means the | - | (i) Back at lines 52-53 |

| | Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (i) *Odyssey* 17.84-86 ὣς εἰπὼν ξεῖνον ταλαπείριον ἦγεν ἐς οἶκον. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἵκοντο δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας / χλαίνας μὲν κατέθεντο κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε<br>Chained to an aorist account of the first stage (departure):<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 17.177-179<br>ὣς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἀνστάντες ἔβαν πείθοντό τε μύθῳ. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἵκοντο δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας, / χλαίνας μὲν κατέθεντο κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε<br>Chained to a pluperfect account of the first stage (departure):<br>(iii) *Odyssey* 17.26-29 ὣς φάτο, Τηλέμαχος δὲ διὰff σταθμοῖο βεβήκει, / κραιπνὰ ποσὶ προβιβάς, κακὰ δὲ μνηστῆρσι φύτευεν. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἵκανε δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας / ἔγχος μέν ῥ' ἔστησε φέρων πρὸς κίονα μακρήν | | | (statistically) marked past tense stem, and morphologically it is the aorist which is the marked stem: of the transitive voice there are 69 imperfect indicative attestations compared to 47 aorist indicative attestations. The difference in function between the imperfect and aorist is not evident (see for example the final destination use of *Odyssey* 22.474, selected at random). It is particularly interesting to note that the poet nevertheless selects the imperfect for the first account. | | Telemachus had announced that he would escort the stranger who had travelled with him to the palace.<br>(ii) The herald Medon urges the suitors to come into the palace and dine (line 175).<br>(iii) Telemachus announces to the swineherd at line 6 that he is going to the city. Odysseus in turn urges Telemachus to be on his way (line 22). |
| | | | | Departure from a City | | |
| 11. | Chained to an imperfect | Preceded by an | - | At *Iliad* 24.324ff. the verbs are | - | Priam's |

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | account:<br>*Iliad* 24.324-330 πρόσθε μὲν ἡμίονοι ἕλκον τετράκυκλον ἀπήνην, / τὰς Ἰδαῖος ἔλαυνε δαΐφρων: αὐτὰρ ὄπισθεν / ἵπποι, τοὺς ὃ γέρων ἐφέπων μάστιγι κέλευε / καρπαλίμως κατὰ ἄστυ: φίλοι δ’ ἅμα πάντες ἕποντο / πόλλ’ ὀλοφυρόμενοι ὡς εἰ θάνατον δὲ κιόντα. / οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν πόλιος κατέβαν, πεδίον δ’ ἀφίκοντο[562] / οἳ μὲν ἄρ’ ἄψορροι προτὶ Ἴλιον ἀπονέοντο | imperfect account:<br>*Odyssey* 23.371-372, / ... / 24.203 ἤδη μὲν φάος ἦεν ἐπὶ χθόνα, τοὺς δ’ ἄρ’ Ἀθήνη / νυκτὶ κατακρύψασα θοῶς ἐξῆγε πόληος. / ... / οἱ δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐκ πόλιος κατέβαν, τάχα δ’ ἀγρὸν ἵκοντο[563] | | all in the imperfect. Their function may be partly descriptive.<br>As noted regarding the imperfect ἦγεν of *Odyssey* 17.84, thepresent stem is not the marked stem. | | departure for Achilles to collect Hector’s body is preceded by various rituals including libations to Zeus at *Iliad* 24.305ff.<br>At *Odyssey* 23.359 Odysseus tells his wife he is going to the farm to see his father Laertes. |
| | | | | **Arrival at a Viewing Point or other Pausal Point** | | |
| 12. | Chained to an aorist account of the first stage:<br>*Iliad* 22.460-462 ὣς φαμένη μεγάροιο διέσσυτο μαινάδι ἴση / παλλομένη κραδίην: ἅμα δ’ ἀμφίπολοι κίον αὐτῇ | *Iliad* 24.331-332, 349-353 τὼ δ’ οὐ λάθον εὐρύοπα Ζῆν / ἐς πεδίον προφανέντε: ... / ... / οἳ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν μέγα σῆμα παρὲξ Ἴλοιο ἔλασσαν, / στῆσαν ἄρ’ | - | At *Iliad* 22.450 Andromache asks two handmaids to accompany her out of the innermost part of the house so that she can see what the commotion is. | - | The first account tells us that Andromache rushed out of the hall like a possessed woman (μαινάδι |

---

[562] The observations of Reynen 1957: 36 do not recognise that departure from the city is achieved in the ἐπεί-clause. He notes that it unites the event of Priam travelling in his chariot with that of the people of the city accompanying Priam. But he does not recognise that the ἐπεί-clause serves to complete the first stage of Priam’s journey.

[563] Note that the subordinate clauses form part of near identical lines but with different syntactic treatment of the second limb. At line 203 the second limb forms the main clause.

| | Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πύργόν τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἷξεν ὅμιλον[564] / ἔστη παπτήνασ’ ἐπὶ τείχεϊ, τὸν δ’ ἐνόησεν | ἡμιόνους τε καὶ ἵππους ὄφρα πίοιεν / ἐν ποταμῷ: δὴ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἤλυθε γαῖαν.<br>τὸν δ’ ἐξ ἀγχιμόλοιο ἰδὼν ἐφράσσατο κῆρυξ | | In the first account of travelling at *Iliad* 24.331-332 we are simply told that Priam and his horseman *appeared on the plain*. The continuation of the journey, so that they reach the monument, must be read into the narrative.[565] While the journey is under way a parallel scene, of Zeus sending Hermes down to meet Priam and his horsemen takes place, so that as common with Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses, there is a coincidence of the two scenes in the main clause. | | ἴση). The punctuality of this act fits with the aorist use. |
| | | | | Travel: Travel by Sea – Arrival after Sea Journey | | |
| 13. | Chained to two imperfect accounts:<br>*Iliad* 1.478, 483-485 καὶ τότ’ ἔπειτ’ ἀνάγοντο μετὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν / ... / ἣ δ’ ἔθεεν κατὰ κῦμα | - | - | As noted above, the imperfect (ἀν)άγοντο is not evidently marked as opposed to the aorist form.<br>ἔθεεν is the imperfect of a suppletive conjugation. | - | - |

---

[564] In addition to the completive relationship between Andromache’s announcement that she will go to the wall and her arrival there, there is an affirmative relationship that points back further in the text. It recalls the earlier time when Andromache had prematurely assumed Hector’s death and had lingered on the wall trying to catch a glimpse of what was happening (*Iliad* 6.372-3) (see de Jong 2012: 174). On discovering that this was how Andromache was passing her time, Hector urged Andromache to go back into the palace and busy herself with the loom and household work (*Iliad* 6.490-493). The ἐπεί-clause here links back to this point, reminding us that there was an ironic reason why Andromache was blithely unaware of what has happening and why she was the last to reach the wall.

[565] Reynen 1957: 36 describes this as “the overlooked but latently continuing event (as is evident from the progress shown at line 349 compared to back at line 331b)”.

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | διαπρήσσουσα κέλευθον. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἵκοντο μετὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν Ἀχαιῶν / νῆα μὲν οἵ γε μέλαιναν ἐπ' ἠπείροιο ἔρυσσαν | | | | | |
| | Hurrying in rout to the trench | | | | | |
| 14. | Chained to a preceding imperfect:<br>*Iliad* 8.336, 341-345<br>οἳ δ' ἰθὺς τάφροιο βαθείης ὦσαν Ἀχαιούς: / ... //<br>ὣς Ἕκτωρ ὤπαζε κάρη κομόωντας Ἀχαιούς,<br>αἰὲν ἀποκτείνων τὸν ὀπίστατον: οἳ δὲ φέβοντο.<br>αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ διά τε σκόλοπας καὶ τάφρον ἔβησαν<br>φεύγοντες, πολλοὶ δὲ δάμεν Τρώων ὑπὸ χερσίν,<br>οἳ μὲν δὴ παρὰ νηυσὶν ἐρητύοντο μένοντες | | | | | |
| | Prayer | | | | | |
| 15. | - | Preceded by accounts in the imperfect:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 11.29-30, 34-35 πολλὰ δὲ | The accounts prior to the ἐπεί-clauses present one person as praying, although there is a group | With the cumulative ἐπεί-clauses the first account presents with an imperfect form. But this is the unmarked stem | On three occasions communal praying (not before a meal) is individuated sufficiently | Prayers which progress on to a communal meal and so which are |

| Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | γουνούμην νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα, / ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἰθάκην στεῖραν βοῦν, ἥ τις ἀρίστη, / ... / τοὺς δ’ ἐπεὶ εὐχωλῇσι λιτῇσί τε, ἔθνεα νεκρῶν, / ἐλλισάμην, τὰ δὲ μῆλα λαβὼν ἀπεδειροτόμησα<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 12.356-360 τὰς δὲ περίστησάν τε καὶ εὐχετόωντο θεοῖσιν, / φύλλα δρεψάμενοι τέρενα δρυὸς ὑψικόμοιο: / οὐ γὰρ ἔχον κρῖ λευκὸν | participating in the prayer. The ἐπεί-clause serves to include those others who had not been individuated in the first account.<br>(i) *Iliad* 1.457-459 ὣς ἔφατ’ εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ’ ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ηὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο, / αὐέρυσαν μὲν πρῶτα καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ | and probably does not mark duration.[566] As the first stage of cumulative ἐπεί-clauses, we do not expect durative expressions. | that we can form an impression of the events being referred to in the ἐπεί-clause. The narrative variously portrays one person as speaking for them all or selects one hero’s prayer as if to offer the audience a sample of the types of prayers being uttered. A brief mention of the prayers of the remaining mass then follows . [567] | *preceded* by preparations of the victim are concluded by the ἐπεί-clause[568]. Otherwise Homeric prayer is generally treated only briefly, without a concluding ἐπεί-clause and without prior anticipation[569]. The concluding line ὣς ἔφατ’ |

---

[566] Thus, with the meaning “pray” (rather than “boast”), the imperfect indicative εὔχετο occurs nineteen times and the imperfect indicative εὔχοντο occurs four times. The aorist indicative with the meaning “pray”, across all persons and numbers, occurs a mere seven times, of which four are to be found in the ἐπεί-clauses. εὐχετάομαι and γουνόομαι are attested only in the present/imperfect stem.

[567] See the prayer uttered by Agamemnon at *Iliad* 3.275ff which is then followed by individual prayers from the Trojans and Achaenas declaring that the oaths referred to by Agamemnon must be complied with. And see the prayer uttered by Theano, a priestess to Athena, which is recorded as uttered by her yet at the same time is affirmed as a communal prayer: *Iliad* 6.311-312 ὣς ἔφατ' εὐχομένη, ἀνένευε δὲ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη. // ὣς αἳ μέν ῥ' εὔχοντο Διὸς κούρῃ μεγάλοιο. And see communal prayer at *Iliad* 15.369ff by the Danaans at a straitened moment on the battlefield as they find the Trojans beyond their defensive wall: all are praying, but it is Nestor’s prayer that is recorded as direct speech, and ends with line 377 ὣς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, μέγα δ' ἔκτυπε μητίετα Ζεύς,

[568] This limit on the use of the praying ἐπεί-clause has not been previously noted. Prayers before dining are made over an animal victim that will be used partly as a sacrifice and partly for consumption by the diners. On the unique occasion that prayer and sacrifice are combined without a following meal, at *Iliad* 3.245ff, for the purposes of marking an oath, we can observe that there is no concluding ἐπεί-clause.

[569] Thus, Arend 1933 does not consider prayer as one of his type scenes, although he includes the ἐπεί-clause of praying in his *Schema* 8 of Meals. Edwards 1992: 315 offers an extensive bibliography on Homeric prayers. He notes that the fullest treatment is Muellner 1976, who divides the prayer “into three elements: the invocation of the deity; the claim to favor; and a specific request. These elements may be preceded by the scene-setting and a gesture by the person praying, and followed by a narrator’s remark about the deity’s response”.

| Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | ἐυσσέλμου ἐπὶ νηός. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ εὔξαντο καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν / μηρούς τ’ ἐξέταμον κατά τε κνίσῃ ἐκάλυψαν | ἔδειραν,<br>(ii) *Iliad* 2.419-422 ὣς ἔφατ’, οὐδ’ ἄρα πώ οἱ ἐπεκραίαινε Κρονίων, / ἀλλ’ ὅ γε δέκτο μὲν ἱρά, πόνον δ’ ἀμέγαρτον ὄφελλεν. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ ηὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο / αὐέρυσαν μὲν πρῶτα καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν<br>(iii) *Odyssey* 3.445-449 χέρνιβά τ’ οὐλοχύτας τε κατήρχετο, πολλὰ δ’ Ἀθήνῃ / εὔχετ’ ἀπαρχόμενος, κεφαλῆς τρίχας ἐν πυρὶ βάλλων. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ’ εὔξαντο καὶ οὐλοχύτας προβάλοντο, / αὐτίκα Νέστορος υἱὸς ὑπέρθυμος |  |  | εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ’ ἔκλυε is the phrasal motif of the majority of prayers, which are those of individuals and a spontaneous nature.[570] |

---

[570] With Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη (*Iliad* 5.121, 10.295, 23.771, *Odyssey* 3.385, 6.328) and with μητίετα Ζεύς (*Iliad* 16.249, 24.314 and *Odyssey* 20.102). Rarely, prayers are recounted as uttered by groups, typically of unindividuated members. The phrase ὧδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν is employed to introduce such prayers (See *Iliad* 3.297 etc.). In these cases a congretation of Greeks or of Greeks and Trojans are addressing Zeus and wishing for a certain outcome to the events unfolding before them (such as the resolution to a duel, the selection of a certain lot). These prayers are concluded with the words ὣς (ἄρ') ἔφαν.

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Θρασυμήδης / ἤλασεν ἄγχι στάς: πέλεκυς δ' ἀπέκοψε τένοντας | | | |
| Funeral Rites – Collecting Wood for a Pyre (for Patroclus's Pyre) | | | | | | |
| 16. | Chained to a preceding imperfect:<br>*Iliad* 23.125-128<br>κὰδ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' ἀκτῆς βάλλον ἐπισχερώ, ἔνθ' ἄρ' Ἀχιλλεὺς / φράσσατο Πατρόκλῳ μέγα ἠρίον ἠδὲ οἷ αὐτῷ. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πάντῃ παρακάββαλον ἄσπετον ὕλην / εἵατ' ἄρ' αὖθι μένοντες ἀολλέες. αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς | - | - | - | At *Iliad* 24.784 the process of depositing wood for Hector's pyre is described as taking nine days. | Lines 110-124 – the cutting down of wood for the pyre is presented in great detail. |
| Funeral Rites: Burning the Body (of Achilles) | | | | | | |
| 17. | - | Preceded by an imperfect account:<br>*Odyssey* 24.67-72<br>καίεο δ' ἔν τ' ἐσθῆτι θεῶν καὶ ἀλείφατι πολλῷ / καὶ μέλιτι γλυκερῷ: πολλοὶ δ' ἥρωες Ἀχαιοὶ / τεύχεσιν ἐρρώσαντο πυρὴν πέρι καιομένοιο, / πεζοί θ' ἱππῆές τε: πολὺς δ' ὀρυμαγδὸς ὀρώρει / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δή | - | As noted above in the discussion on burning the thigh pieces, the transitive imperfect καίω is the marked form. | The pyre with Patroclus's body burns for a whole night (*Iliad* 23.217-218).<br>Furthermore, Achaeans have time to walk round the pyre while the body burns. | The placing of Achilles on a bier at line 44 and the subsequent mourning for seventeen days, evidently leading up to the moment of cremation. |

| | Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | σε φλὸξ ἤνυσεν Ἡφαίστοιο, / ἠῶθεν δή τοι λέγομεν λεύκ’ ὀστέ’, Ἀχιλλεῦ | | | | |
| Libations | | | | | | |
| 18. | Chained to a preceding first stage:<br>*Iliad* 9.176-178 νώμησαν δ’ ἄρα πᾶσιν ἐπαρξάμενοι δεπάεσσιν. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ’ ἔπιόν θ’ ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός / ὡρμῶντ’ ἐκ κλισίης Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο.<br>The ἐπεί-clauses are identical for the remaining five libations with changes only to a Pronominal ἐπεί-Clause for *Odyssey* 21.271 in order to exclude Odysseus | - | The following libation appears to be a continuation of the earlier libation at *Odyssey* 3.341:<br>*Odyssey* 3.390, 394-396 τοῖς δ’ ὁ γέρων ἐλθοῦσιν ἀνὰ κρητῆρα κέρασσεν / ... / εὔχετ’ ἀποσπένδων, κούρῃ Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ’ ἔπιον θ’, ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός, / οἱ μὲν | The first account is not presented in the imperfect, but instead as the first stage, namely the pouring of drops into cups. | The intersection of an arrival with a libation scene: (i) *Odyssey* 17.135-138, and (ii) *Odyssey* 7.222-224 and 256-258, in two accounts of the same event.<br>There are a couple of group libations following meals which do not conclude with an ἐπεί-clause, which both conclude rushed meal scenes.[571] | Aside from the libation of *Odyssey* 3.393-395, the libations are always anticipated by a host or guest suggesting that libations be made. Bringing water for washing hands is found at *Iliad* 9.171ff., *Odyssey* 3.332ff. and |

---

[571] The first libation concludes Diomedes and Odysseus’ post-reconnaissance bathing and meal. The bathing in the sea is presented as a slow and luxurious affair (see the discussion above in bathing) but the bathing in baths and the meal that follows is presented very succinctly; the single line account of libations concludes this scene.

The second libation scene, namely at *Odyssey* 13.55, is noted by Arend 1933: 77 for its absent ἐπεί-clause. This libation is the conclusion to Odysseus’ farewell dinner with the Phaeacians. As noted throughout this Appendix, this is a scene where the ingredients of a typical hospitality meal are presented, but without the ἐπεί-clauses, in order to assure the audience and Odysseus that this meal was not unduly prolonged. Arend distinguished this second libation scene from the other libation scenes which conclude with a ἐπεί-clause on account of all libators remaining seated while Odysseus interrupts the libations to depart (“aufbricht”). It is not evident that Odysseus does in fact interrupt the scene-indeed it seems to have reached a natural end. The reason explained above is more likely account of why the ἐπεί-clause is omitted.

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | from the group of those libating. The first limbs are all identical to *Iliad* 9.176 except for the Cumulative ἐπεί-clause discussed in the relevant column. (See *Odyssey* 3.341, 7.183, 18.425, and 21.270).<br>The main clause to *Odyssey* 7.184 is τοῖσιν δ' Ἀλκίνοος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε; the main clause to *Odyssey* 18.425 is βάν ῥ' ἴμεναι κείοντες ἑὰ πρὸς δώμαθ' ἕκαστος; and the main clause to *Odyssey* 21.271 is τοῖς δὲ δολοφρονέων μετέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς. | | κακκείοντες ἔβαν οἶκόνδε ἕκαστος | | | 21.263ff. All six scenes are prefaced by the preparatory act of the wine being mixed.[572] |
| | | | Oath-Taking | | | |
| 19. | Chained to a preceding imperfect:<br>(i) *Iliad* 14.278-280 ὤμνυε δ' ὡς ἐκέλευε, θεοὺς δ' | - | -<br>: | One party demands the oath and states its contents, the other party complies with that request.[573] | Single accounts of oaths tend to include the direct speech. See for example *Iliad* 10.320-331. | The imperfect of (ἀπ)ὤμνυμι is reserved for the first limb of a |

---

[572] As noted by Arend 1933: 76-78, it is the group libations which attract the ἐπεί-clause αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σπεῖσάν τ' ἔπιόν θ' ὅσον ἤθελε θυμός and we can further note that it is the group libations which are "prepared". Indeed the libations by individuals are either more substantial or briefer. See further Edwards 1975: 55-56 and for a general overview of the essentially ritual nature of libations see Burkert 1979: 41-44 and Benveniste 1969, ii 211-212.

[573] See Arend 1933: 122-123 and the *Schema* at the end of Arend 1933 on oaths as well as Edwards 1975: 67. See also Janko 1994: 194 for a clear summary of the various types of accounts of oath giving.

| **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ὀνόμηνεν ἅπαντας / τοὺς ὑποταρταρίους οἳ Τιτῆνες καλέονται. //<br>αὐτὰρ ἐπεί / ῥ’ ὄμοσέν τε τελεύτησέν τε τὸν ὅρκον) / τὼ βήτην Λήμνου τε καὶ Ἴμβρου ἄστυ λιπόντε<br>The ἐπεί-clauses are identical for the remaining five oaths with changes only of number to the verb. The first limbs vary as follows, with the main clauses following after / ... /:<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 10.345, 347 ὣς ἐφάμην, ἥ δ’ αὐτίκ’ ἀπώμνυεν, ὥς ἐκέλευον / ... / καὶ τότ’ ἐγὼ Κίρκης ἐπέβην περικαλλέος εὐνῆς.<br>(iii) *Odyssey* 12.303, 305 ὣς ἐφάμην, οἵ δ’ αὐτίκ’ ἀπώμνυον, ὥς ἐκέλευον / ... / | | | | | chaining phrase.[574] The aorist is used for single accounts of oaths.<br>The aorist ὀνόμηνεν which appears in the first limb of the first chained construction at *Iliad* 14.278 describes the event which took place before the oath.[575] |

---

[574] But note the exceptional *Odyssey* 14.331 ὤμοσε δὲ πρὸς ἔμ' αὐτόν, ἀποσπένδων ἐνὶ οἴκῳ versus the imperfect of *Odyssey* 19.288 ὤμνυε δὲ πρὸς ἔμ' αὐτόν, ἀποσπένδων ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.

[575] The full phrase θεοὺς δ' ὀνόμηνεν ἅπαντας must be treated as a circumstantial clause which in fact precedes the giving of the oath. The aorist is thus explicable as being an action completed before the oath itself. This interpretation is supported by the oaths that are recorded in direct speech in the Homeric poems, where the gods are invoked first before the oath itself is given: see for example *Iliad* 10.329, 15.36, 19.258, *Odyssey* 5.184, 14.158, 17.155, 19.303 and 20.230. (The invocation of the gods which appears to come at the end of a pronouncement, at *Iliad* 7.411 is understood to be an elliptical reference to the unarticulated comment to a truce and so is not in essence backward looking.). My thanks to Professor Jonathan Powell for drawing my attention to this prima facie stray use of the aorist in what I have established is an imperfect environment anticipating the resolution of the following aorist ἐπεί-clause.

| | **Chained ἐπεί-clauses** | **Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses** | **Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | στήσαμεν ἐν λιμένι γλαφυρῷ εὐεργέα νῆα;<br>(iv) *Odyssey* 15.437, 439 ὣς ἔφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ἀπώμνυον ὡς ἐκέλευεν / ... / τοῖς δ’ αὖτις μετέειπε γυνὴ καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ;<br>(v) *Odyssey* 18.58 ὣς ἔφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ἀπώμνυον ὡς ἐκέλευεν / ... / τοῖς αὖτις μετέειφ’ ἱερὴ ἲς Τηλεμάχοιο; and<br>(vi) *Odyssey* 2.377 ὣς ἄρ’ ἔφη, γρῆυς δὲ θεῶν μέγαν ὅρκον ἀπώμνυ. / ... / αὐτίκ’ ἔπειτά οἱ οἶνον ἐν ἀμφιφορεῦσιν ἄφυσσεν | | | | | |
| | | | | Weeping | | |
| 20. | Chained to an imperfect account:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 4.539-541 κλαῖον δ’ ἐν ψαμάθοισι καθήμενος, οὐδέ νύ μοι κῆρ / ἤθελ’ ἔτι ζώειν καὶ ὁρᾶν φάος ἠελίοιο. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κλαίων τε κυλινδόμενός τε κορέσθην<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 10.497-499 *Odyssey* 10.497-500 κλαῖον δ’ ἐν λεχέεσσι καθήμενος, οὐδέ | With a preceding imperfect account:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 19.204, 208-209, 213-214<br>τῆς δ’ ἄρ’ ἀκουούσης ῥέε δάκρυα, τήκετο δὲ χρώς:<br>...ὣς τῆς τήκετο καλὰ παρήϊα δάκρυ χεούσης, / κλαιούσης ἑὸν ἄνδρα παρήμενον. αὐτὰρ | - | The present stem κλαῖον is the unmarked stem, with an aorist indicative stem occurring only rarely, once at *Odyssey* 3.261 and once at *Odyssey* 24.293, on both occasions to describe mourning that did not take place. | - | - |

| Chained ἐπεί-clauses | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| νύ μοι κῆρ / ἤθελ’ ἔτι ζώειν καὶ ὁρᾶν φάος ἠελίοιο. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κλαίων τε κυλινδόμενος τε κορέσθην,<br>(iii) *Odyssey* 20.58-59 κλαῖε δ’ ἄρ’ ἐν λέκτροισι καθεζομένη μαλακοῖσιν. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κλαίουσα κορέσσατο ὃν κατὰ θυμόν<br>(iv) *Odyssey* 21.55-57 ἑζομένη δὲ κατ’ αὖθι, φίλοις ἐπὶ γούνασι θεῖσα / κλαῖε μάλα λιγέως, ἐκ δ’ ᾕρεε τόξον ἄνακτος / ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τάρφθη πολυδακρύτοιο γόοιο<br>Chained to a preceding ingressive account:<br>(v) *Odyssey* 19.249-251 ὣς φάτο, τῇ δ’ ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑφ’ ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο, / σήματ’ ἀναγνούσῃ τά οἱ ἔμπεδα πέφραδ’ Ὀδυσσεύς. / ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τάρφθη πολυδακρύτοιο γόοιο | Ὀδυσσεὺς / ... //[576]<br>ἡ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν τάρφθη πολυδακρύτοιο γόοιο,<br>ἐξαῦτίς μιν ἔπεσσιν ἀμειβομένη προσέειπε: | | | | |

---

[576] Odysseus pities her but does not himself weep.

**Table 9.2.** Completive ἐπεί-Clauses which do not form part of recognised type scenes

| | **Chained / Resumptive / Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Events which do not form part of Recognised Type Scenes | | | | |
| Laundry | | | | |
| 1. | Chained to a preceding imperfect:<br>*Odyssey* 6.92-94<br>στεῖβον δ' ἐν βόθροισι θοῶς ἔριδα προφέρουσαι. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πλῦνάν τε κάθηράν τε ῥύπα πάντα, / ἑξείης πέτασαν παρὰ θῖν' ἁλός, ἧχι μάλιστα<br>The trampling on the clothes is the process for laundering them[577]. | στείβω occurs in Homer only three times, always with the present stem. | - | The loading up of a wagon with the clothes for washing (*Odyssey* 6.72ff.) and the bringing of the clothes to the river streams. |
| Coitus | | | | |
| 2. | Resumptive ἐπεί-clauses with the first stage described in the preceding accounts:<br>(i) *Odyssey* 11.242-248 ἐν προχοῇς ποταμοῦ παρελέξατο δινήεντος. / ... / αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ' ἐτέλεσσε θεὸς φιλοτήσια ἔργα / ἔν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε:<br>The preliminary act of lying together prior to coitus is described twice, first at line 242[578] and then, following the | The ἐπεί-clause at *Odyssey* 23.300 functions as Resumptive Completive ἐπεί-Clause and recognizes that the couple's earlier arrival at their bed at line 296 was an allusion to love-making.[579] | | At *Odyssey* 23.295ff. the couple are led to their bed. The narrative then turns away demurely to the turning to bed of Telemachus and the cowherds. |

---

[577] Stanford 1959: 312 on line 92.

[578] But the six other uses of this word παραλέχομαι (always attested as παρελέξατο and aside from this occasion found only in the *Iliad*), certainly refer to the act of copulation itself despite the euphemism. In five of those instances (*Iliad* 2.515, 6.198, 16.184, 20.224 and 24.676) the bringing forth of a child is juxtaposed to this

| | Chained / Resumptive / Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | comment that they were concealed by a wave, the act is restated with different words at line 245.<br>(ii) *Odyssey* 23.295-297, 300<br>ἐς θάλαμον δ’ ἀγαγοῦσα πάλιν κίεν. οἱ μὲν ἔπειτα / ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἵκοντο: / αὐτὰρ Τηλέμαχος καὶ βουκόλος ἠδὲ συβώτης / ... / τὼ δ’ ἐπεὶ οὖν φιλότητος ἐταρπήτην ἐρατεινῆς / τερπέσθην μύθοισι, πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐνέποντες | | | |
| | | Finishing a Series of Domestic Tasks | | |
| 3. | Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses:<br>Three instances of the same cumulative ἐπεί-clause αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σπεῦσε πονησάμενος τὰ ἃ ἔργα (at *Odyssey* 9.250, 310 and 343) come at the end of a description of a list of tasks that the Cyclops works through in the morning or evening in managing his flock. The main clauses which follow these three subordinate clauses describe firstly addressing the comrades, then eating a couple of the comrades for breakfast and then eating a couple of comrades for dinner respectively. | - | - | - |

---

euphemistic account of lying together. In the one other occurrence of this word at *Iliad* 14.237, Hera asks of Sleep to assist her in her mission to “lie alongside him”. When her wish is granted, it is clear that copulation is performed (see in particular lines 346-351).

[579] Reynen 1957: 42-43 suggests that the ἐπεί-clause presents a later stage in the events, and not a mere completion; he notes that the stage of removal of the clothes had not been mentioned earlier. But it seems to us that the phrase ἀσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ serves to refer to the purpose that the bed was used for.

| | **Chained / Resumptive / Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Completing Armour | | | | |
| 4. | Resumptive ἐπεί-clause with a preceding account in the imperfect:<br>(i) *Iliad* 18.478, 609-610<br>ποίει δὲ πρώτιστα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε / ... / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε / τεῦξ’ ἄρα οἱ θώρηκα φαεινότερον πυρὸς αὐγῆς.<br>Between the initial imperfect account and the aorist conclusion to the preparing of Achilles’s shield, the details of what the shield looked like are offered.<br>Cumulative ἐπεί-clause:<br>(i) *Iliad* 18.610-615<br>τεῦξ’ ἄρα οἱ θώρηκα φαεινότερον πυρὸς αὐγῆς, / τεῦξε δέ οἱ κόρυθα βριαρὴν κροτάφοις ἀραρυῖαν / καλὴν δαιδαλέην, ἐπὶ δὲ χρύσεον λόφον ἧκε, / τεῦξε δέ οἱ κνημῖδας ἑανοῦ κασσιτέροιο. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πάνθ’ ὅπλα κάμε κλυτὸς ἀμφιγυήεις / μητρὸς Ἀχιλλῆος θῆκε προπάροιθεν ἀείρας.<br>The sword that Achilles brandishes when he subsequently arms himself is not mentioned. The use of the aorist to recount some details of an event and the omission of others – here, the sword – are typical ingredients for an all- | ποίει, as the imperfect of the first account, is the marked stem of the verb. But there are a couple of imperfect uses which do not particularly occur in a descriptive or incomplete environment. notably *Iliad* 7.435 and 20.147. | - | - |

| | **Chained / Resumptive / Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | encompassing ἐπεί-clause which does immediately follow[580] and serves to assert completion of the metalworking and design process. | | | |
| | Gazing with Admiration | | | |
| 5. | Chained to a preceding imperfect:<br>(i) *Iliad* 19.18-20 τέρπετο δ' ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔχων θεοῦ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ φρεσὶν ᾗσι τετάρπετο δαίδαλα λεύσσων, / αὐτίκα μητέρα ἣν ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα<br>(ii) *Iliad* 24.629, 631, 633-634 θαύμαζ' / ... / θαύμαζεν / ... / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐς ἀλλήλους ὁρόωντες / τὸν πρότερος προσέειπε γέρων Πρίαμος θεοειδής<br>(iii) and (iv) *Odyssey* 5.75-77[581] and *Odyssey* 7.133-136[582], θηεῖτο ... / αὐτὰρ | A distinction in function between the aorist and imperfect of θεάομαι is not readily ascertainable.<br>θαυμάζω in the past indicative is found only in the imperfect. | - | A detailed description of the scene that faces the gazing hero *precedes* the accounts of gazing of *Odyssey* 5.75fff. and 7.134ff. Given the poet's tendency to focalise scenes through the eyes of a character (see the footnote below) can expect an account of gazing to follow the description.<br>The gazing of *Iliad* 19.18-19 is preceded by an account of the |

---

[580] The failure to interpret the ἐπεί-clause as asserting the provision by Hephaestus of other items beyond those listed must be partly to blame for the proliferation of stories about the history of the sword. Edwards 1991: 232 lists a few suggestions, including that of the Townleian scholia who suggested that the reason no sword is mentioned is because Hephaestus had given the sword to Nereus who had given it to Thetis who in turn had passed in on to Achilles.

[581] At lines 73-44 we read θήλεον. ἔνθα κ' ἔπειτα καὶ ἀθάνατός περ ἐπελθὼν // θηήσαιτο ἰδὼν καὶ τερφθείη φρεσὶν ᾗσιν. Heubeck et al. 1988: 263 described the consequent three fold repetition (of θηήσαιτο / θηεῖτο / θηήσατο) as "inelegant". But we need to recognise how carefully the poet has adapted the underlying motif of gazing with admiration as a device for inserting description of a scene, to this scene with a divinity. It has been noted that descriptions of settings are typically incorporated into the impetus of the narrative by "being presented as part of the discourse of one of the characters of the story. Or, if presented in the discourse of the narrator, as an explicit or implicit report of what one of the characters is perceiving", Byre 1994: 4. (See also de Jong 2001: 128 and the bibliography there on the relationship between descriptions of scenery and their focalisation through characters. Further, there is also the observable fact that the poet is loath ever to describe scenery with his own voice; thus, a principal home of description of scenery nature is in the non-storyline world of similes.) Here, these apparently hyper-redundant lines are required to counter certain nuances of a typical hospitality scene: the luxury-bereft-traveller or the home-comforts-deprived-warrior with all their joy when they see civilisation are stylised characters that cannot straightforwardly be applied to a divinity. Yet the template for describing a setting is to be followed, and as a result a god is to be found admiring the earthly cave of a minor goddess. The poet, anticipating the stylised focalisation of the gazing through Hermes, defends it with lines 73 and 74, arguing that even a god would have wanted to stare at it. (A different adaptation of the motif of admiring gazing is found at *Odyssey* 17.264ff.. There

| | **Chained / Resumptive / Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα ἑῷ θηήσατο θυμῷ / [(5.77) αὐτίκ’ ἄρ’ εἰς εὐρὺ σπέος ἤλυθεν. οὐδέ μιν ἄντην] [(7.136) καρπαλίμως ὑπὲρ οὐδὸν ἐβήσετο δώματος εἴσω.]<br>Chained to a preceding aorist:<br>(v) *Odyssey* 10.179-181 θηήσαντ’ ἔλαφον: μάλα γὰρ μέγα θηρίον ἦεν. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ὁρώμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖσιν / χεῖρας νιψάμενοι τεύχοντ’ ἐρικυδέα δαῖτα.<br>Resumptive ἐπεί-clause with preceding imperfect account:<br>(vi) *Odyssey* 4.43-48 θαύμαζον κατὰ δῶμα διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος: / ... //[583] αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ὁρώμενοι ὀφθαλμοῖσιν / ἔς ῥ’ ἀσαμίνθους βάντες ἐυξέστας λούσαντο. | | | inability of the Myrmidons to look at Achilles’s divine armour, unlike Achilles, whose emotions grew stronger the more he looked at it. A full account of gazing is thus expected.<br>But at *Iliad* 24.629 the mutual admiration of Achilles and Prima is unprepared, adding sincerity through spontaneity to what might otherwise be interpreted as a ritual.<br>The gazing at *Odyssey* 4.43ff. and *Odyssey* 10.179ff. is unanticipated, with what is admired being described after the first account of gazing. |
| | | Sport | | |
| 6. | Cumulative ἐπεί-clause:<br>*Odyssey* 8.131-132 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντες ἐτέρφθησαν φρέν’ ἀέθλοις / τοῖς ἄρα Λαοδάμας μετέφη πάϊς Ἀλκινόοιο | - | At *Odyssey* 8.109-132 the competitive games of the Phaeacians are performed in front of Odysseus. Many details are provided of these games (*Odyssey* | Alcinous urges his Phaeacian subjects to take part in sports competitions so that Odysseus can see their strengths (*Odyssey* 8.97-103). |

---

the act of admiring is done by disguised Odysseus in front of his own palace, thus presenting Homer’s audience with a description of Odysseus’ palace; the guile of this admiration is such that the poet cannot ascribe the act itself to Odysseus but uniquely places the words of description and admiration into his mouth, thus circumventing a need to describe Odysseus as *pretending* to gaze with admiration, while still achieveing a description of the physical scene.)

[582] Van Otterlo 1944: 20 cites this passage as an example of ring composition and quotes it as θηεῖτο ~ αὐτὰρ ἐπεί...θηήσατο . In fact, this is extracted from the two lines 133 and 134, which show no further internal detail on the event of gazing. These two lines do not themselves, surely, form ring composition. The first limb of the “ring composition”, if we were to call it that, is in fact to be found back at lines 82-83 where we are told that: πολλὰ δέ οἱ κῆρ// ὥρμαιν' ἱσταμένῳ, πρὶν χάλκεον οὐδὸν ἱκέσθαι. and then follows a description of the palace which Odysseus pondered.

[583] The intermediate lines describe what is admired, namely the bright light shining over Menelaus’ palace.

| | **Chained / Resumptive / Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet's Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 8.110-130): running, wrestling, jumping, discus throwing and boxing. Other accounts of sports events present evidence of other contests.[584] | |
| | | Forging Bonds for a Snare | | |
| 7. | Chained to a preceding imperfect:<br>*Odyssey* 8.274-277<br>ἐν δ' ἔθετ' ἀκμοθέτῳ μέγαν ἄκμονα, κόπτε δὲ δεσμοὺς //<br>ἀρρήκτους ἀλύτους, ὄφρ' ἔμπεδον αὖθι μένοιεν. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε δόλον κεχολωμένος Ἄρει / βῆ ῥ' ἴμεν ἐς θάλαμον, ὅθι οἱ φίλα δέμνια κεῖτο, | The use of the imperfective aspect in κόπτε marks the event as being of duration. Of all the indicative uses of κόπτω[585] and its compound form ἀποκόπτω, thirteen employ the aorist and four use the imperfect. Of those four imperfect instances two are of the forging of bonds as already described, one is in a passage which uses only the imperfect: *Odyssey* 22.477 χεῖράς τ' ἠδὲ πόδας κόπτον κεκοτηότι θυμῷ and the other is an instance at *Odyssey* 9.290 which cannot be distinguished from the aorist occurrences. | The poet's consciousness of the protracted process for Hephaestus's works is evidenced at *Iliad* 18.379-381 when Hephaestus there is forging rivets (with the same phrase as here κόπτε δὲ δεσμοὺς) for tripods. Thetis comes in *while this work is taking place* marking the work as activity of some duration. | There is some build up to the preparation of bonds by Hephaestus in the two lines preceding Hephaestus's work in which we are told that he goes to his smithy pondering evil (*Odyssey* 8.272-273). |
| | | Placing a Snare | | |
| 8. | Cumulative ἐπεί-clause:<br>At *Odyssey* 8.278ff. Hephaestus sets out the snare all over his bed chambers. He spreads the bonds around the bedposts | - | - | In the preceding lines Hephaestus forges the snare. |

---

[584] As noted by de Jong 2001: 199-200, based on the other accounts of athletic games (*Iliad* 11.698–702, 23.257–897, 23.629–45 and *Odyssey* 24.85-92) the sports games "may include boxing, wrestling, running, horse-racing, jumping, panoply fighting, discus throwing, spear throwing, and archery. In the present instance the narrator deals quickly with a number of contests ... before rushing on to the main event: the quarrel."

[585] The meaning of the Homeric verb is to beat or smite. Its collocation with bonds is found only here and in the *Iliad* 18 account (Autenrieth 1889).

| | **Chained / Resumptive / Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (278 in the imperfect χέε) and hangs them from the roofbeams (279). Then the ἐπεί-clause follows:<br>*Odyssey* 8.282-283<br>αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πάντα δόλον περὶ δέμνια χεῦεν / εἴσατ’ ἴμεν ἐς Λῆμνον, ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον | | | |
| | | Tidying a Hall | | |
| 9. | Cumulative ἐπεί-clause:<br>Just some of the stages involved in tidying the hall after the slaughter of the suitors are mentioned: carrying out the corpses, cleaning the seats and tables with water and sponger, and scraping the floor with hoes.<br>*Odyssey* 22.456-458<br>ξῦον: ταὶ δ’ ἐφόρεον δμῳαί, τίθεσαν δὲ θύραζε. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ πᾶν μέγαρον διεκοσμήσαντο / δμῳὰς ἐξαγαγόντες ἐϋσταθέος μεγάροιο | - | In *Odyssey* 1 Athena’s arrival at Odysseus’s palace intersects with the preparation scene of *Odyssey* 1.106ff. She finds the suitors in the middle of playing games, mixing wine, cleaning with sponges, setting the tables and cutting up meat.<br>At *Odyssey* 20.149ff. the housemaid Eurycleia orders the other handmaids to tidy the house with additional details on what that entails: sweeping out the house, sprinkling water, throwing purple rugs on the chairs, and wiping all the tables over with sponges. | Odysseus instructs Telemachus and the herdsmen to clear out the hall, even using a subjunctive version of our ἐπεί-clause. |
| | | Dodging Spears | | |
| 10. | Cumulative ἐπεί-clause<br>*Odyssey* 22.255-256, 260-261<br>ὣς ἔφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἄρα πάντες ἀκόντισαν ὥς ἐκέλευεν, //<br>ἱέμενοι: τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐτώσια θῆκεν | - | - | The showdown between the suitors and Odysseus’s family reaches its climax when the goatherd collects twelve spears from Odysseus’s store-room at line 144. The dodging of these spears is the answer to this climax. |

|  | **Chained / Resumptive / Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses** | **Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses)** | **Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event** | **Preparation of the Event** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Ἀθήνη, / ... //αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ δούρατ’ ἀλεύαντο μνηστήρων / τοῖς ἄρα μύθων ἦρχε πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς:<br>Of the twelve spears held by twelve suitors (line 144), six spears were cast by the suitors in a first round of fighting (line 252 ἀλλ’ ἄγεθ’ οἱ ἓξ πρῶτον ἀκοντίσατ’, αἴ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς). Of these six spears to be cast, only three actual casts of those spears are mentioned, all of which are unsuccessful; three remain unaccounted for but are, surely, captured by a completive ἐπεί-clause. |  |  |  |
|  |  | Dancing with a Ball |  |  |
| 11. | Chained to preceding –σκ imperfects:<br>*Odyssey* 8.374-378<br>τὴν ἕτερος ῥίπτασκε ποτὶ νέφεα σκιόεντα / ἰδνωθεὶς ὀπίσω, ὁ δ’ ἀπὸ χθονὸς ὑψόσ’ ἀερθεὶς / ῥηιδίως μεθέλεσκε, πάρος ποσὶν οὖδας ἱκέσθαι. / αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ σφαίρῃ ἀν’ ἰθὺν πειρήσαντο / ὀρχείσθην δὴ ἔπειτα ποτὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ. | - | - | - |
|  |  | Stripping a body of its armour |  |  |
| 12. | Resumptive ἐπεί-clause with preceding imperfect account:<br>*Iliad* 22.368, 376-377<br>καὶ τό γ’ ἄνευθεν ἔθηχ’, ὃ δ’ ἀπ’ ὤμων τεύχε’ ἐσύλα / ... / τὸν δ’ ἐπεὶ ἐξενάριξε ποδάρκης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς / στὰς ἐν Ἀχαιοῖσιν ἔπεα πτερόεντ’ ἀγόρευεν | Some translators interpret ἐσύλα inceptively (Murray: “[he] set about stripping from the shoulders the blood-stained armour”), or duratively (Rieu “as he removed the bloodstained arms from Hector’s shoulders”) although others have chosen to read it perfectively (Mazon “puis, des épaules, il détache les armes | Between the commencement of stripping the armour and its conclusion other Greeks gather around to admire the exposed body and to mistreat it, wounding it and addressing it scornfully. | This event is not prepared beforehand. |

| Chained / Resumptive / Cumulative ἐπεί-clauses | Verbal Aspect, in particular of the First Account (for chained and resumptive ἐπεί-clauses) | Evidence of Poet’s Awareness of the Durational Nature of the Event | Preparation of the Event |
|---|---|---|---|
| | sanglantes”). An inceptive or durative reading means that the ἐπεί-clause would conclude this action. For many of the other twenty one Homeric occasions where this verb appears, an *imperfectivum tantum* is used and the context does not invite an inceptive or durative meaning. But on the other hand *Iliad* 15.524 which contains the one instance of the same phrase ὃ δ’ ἀπ’ ὤμων τεύχε’ ἐσύλα does look inceptive or durative, being followd by τόφρα δὲ τῷ ἐπόρουσε Δόλοψ αἰχμῆς. | | |

# Bibliography

**Agrell, S.** 1908. *Aspektänderung und Aktionsartbildung bein polnischen Zeitwort: ein Beitrag zum Studium der indogermanischen Präverbia und ihrer Bedeutungsfunktionen.* Lund: Lunds Universitets Årsskrift.

**Allan, R. J.** 2012. "Clause Intertwining and Word Order in Ancient Greek," *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 12: 5-28.

- 2014. "Changing the Topic – Topic Position in Ancient Greek Word Order," *Mnemosyne* 67: 181-213.

**Allen, T. W.** 1917-1919. *Homeri Opera, Tomi III-IV, "Odysseae" Libros Continentes*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**-** 1931. *Homeri Ilias,* 3 volumes. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Altenberg, B.** 1984. "Causal linking in spoken and written English," *Studia Linguistica* 83: 20-69.

**Alter, R.** 1983. "The Dynamics of Parallelism," *Hebrew University Studies in Literature and the Arts* II/I: 71-101.

- 1983. "From Line to Story in Biblical Verse," *Poetics Today* 4: 615-37.

**Amacker, R**. 1998. "Ordre des mots et subordination: la traiectio chez Varron," in Garcia-Hernandez, B., ed. *Estudios de Linguïstica Latina*, Madrid, 139-154.

**Andersen, Ø**. 1999. "*SO* Debate: Dividing Homer: When and How were the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* Divided into Songs?" *Symbolae Osloenses* 74: 35-40.

**Anscombre, J. C. and Ducrot, O**. 1977. "Deux mais en français?" *Lingua* 43: 23-40.

**Arend, W.** 1933. "Die typischen Szenen bei Homer," *Problemata* 7. Berlin: Weidmann.

**Ariel, M.** 2008. *Pragmatics and Grammar.* Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Armstrong, J. I.** 1958. "The Arming Motif in the Iliad," *American Journal of Philology* 79: 337-54.

**Auerbach, E.** 1953. *Mimesis – The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

**Bader, F.** 1973. "Mycenien to-so-de, to-so-jo," *Minos* 14: 85-109.

**Baker, R.** 2014. "The diachronic development and distribution of ὄφρα in the Homeric poems," *Glotta* 90: 3-45.

**Bakker, E. J.** 1990. "Homeric Discourse and Enjambement: A Cognitive Approach," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 120: 1-21.

- 1991. "Foregrounding and indirect discourse: Temporal subclauses in a Herodotean short story," *Journal of Pragmatics* 16: 225-247.

- 1993. "Boundaries, Topics, and the Structure of Discourse: An Investigation of the Ancient Greek Particle *de*", *Studies in Language* 17: 275-311.

- 1997. *Poetry in speech: orality and Homeric dicourse.* Ithaca, New York and London: Cornell University Press.

- 2005. *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

**Bakker, S. J. and Wakker. G. C., eds.** 2009. *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek.* Leiden/Boston: Brill.

**Babiniotis, G.** 2012. *"Lexiko tis Neas Ellinikis Glossas*," *Dictionary of Modern Greek*, 4th edn. Athens: Kentro Lexikologias.

**Basset, S. E.** 1917. "The Hephthemimeral Caesura in Greek Hexameter Poetry," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 48: 85-110.

**Berlin, A.** 2008. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*, 2nd edn. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans and Dearborn, Michigan: Dove.

**Bertrand, N.** 2010. *L'ordres des mots chez Homère: Structure informationelle, localisation et progression du récit.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Paris-Sorbonne.

**Besslich, S.** 1966. *Schweigen, Verschweigen, Übergehen: Die Darstellung des Unausgesprochenen in der Odyssee.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter

**Bickel, B.** 2010. "Capturing particulars and universals in clause linkage: A multivariate analysis," in Bril 2010: 51–101.

**Biraud, M.** 1985. "La syntaxe de hos dans la langue homérique: du subordonnant relatif au subordonnant conjonctif", in Braun, R., ed., *Hommage a Jean Granarolo: philologie, litteratures et histoire anciennes*, Paris, 159-172.

**Blass, F.** 1889. *Demosthenische Studien.* Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Volume 41. Frankfurt am Main.

**Blass, F., Debrunner, A. and Rehkopf, F.** 1896. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

**Blass, R.** 1989. "Pragmatic effects of coordination: the case of 'and' in Sissala," *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 1: 32-51.

**Bolinger, D.** 1977. "Another Glance at Main Clause Phenomena," *Linguistic Society of America* 53: 511-519.

**Bolling, G. M.** 1950. "Entha in the Homeric Poems," *Language* 26: 371-378.

- 1955. "Ionic Forms in Homer," *Language* 31: 223-231.

- 1959. "Description of ἐπεί's Syntax in Homer," *Glotta* 38: 18-38.

**Bonifazi, A.** 2008. "Memory and Visualization in Homeric Discourse Markers," in McKay, A., ed., *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, Leiden/Boston, 35-64.

- 2009. "Discourse Cohesion Through Third Person Pronouns. The Case of κεῖνος and αὐτός in Homer," in Bakker and Wakker 2009: 1-20.

**Bowra, C. M.** 1934. "Homeric Words in Cyprus," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 54: 54-74.

- 1962. *Primitive Song.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

**Brandt, W.** 1908. *Griechische Temporalpartikeln vornehmlich im ionischen und dorischen Dialekt.* Göttingen: W.F. Kästner.

**Bril, I., ed.** 2010. *Clause Linking and Clause Hierarchy.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia:John Benjamins.

**Broccias, C.** 2006. "The construal of simultaneity in English with special reference to as-clauses," *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 4: 97–133.

**Brown, G. and Yule, G.** 1983. *Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics: Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Brugmann, K.** 1913. *Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax,* 4th edn. Munich: Beck.

**Büchner, W.** 1937. "Probleme der homerischen Nekyia," *Hermes* 72: 104-122.

**Buijs, M.** 2005. *Clause combining in Ancient Greek narrative discourse: the distribution of subclauses and participial clauses in Xenophon's Hellenica and Anabasis.* Leiden/Boston: Brill.

**Burkert, W.** 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual.* Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

**Bybee, J.** 2002. "Main clauses are innovative, subordinate clauses are conservative," in Bybee, J. and Noonan, M., eds. *Complex Sentences in Grammar and Discourse,* Amsterdam, 1-17.

**and Perkins, R. and Pagliuca, W.** 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world.* Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

**Byre, C. S.** 1994. "On the Description of the Harbor of Phorkys and the Cave of the Nymphs, Odyssey 13.96-112," *The American Journal of Philology* 115: 1-13.

**Carden, G.** 1982. "Backwards anaphora in discourse context," *Journal of Linguistics* 18: 361-387.

**Carlson, R.** 1987. "Narrative connectives in Sùpyìré" in Tomlin 1987: 1-19.

- 1994. *A grammar of Supyire.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

**Chafe, W.** 1984. "How people use adverbial clauses," *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 437-449.

**-** 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Chantraine, P.** 1958. *Grammaire Homérique. Tome 1*, 2nd edn. Paris: Klincksieck.

- 1963. *Grammaire Homérique. Tome 2.* Paris: Klincksieck.

- 1968-1980. *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.

**Chaytor, H. J.** 1945. *From Script to Print*, 1st edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Clackson, J.** 2007. *Indo-European Linguistics: an Introduction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Clayman, D. L.** 1981. “Sentence Length in Greek Hexameter Poetry,” *Quantitative Linguistics* 11: 107-36.

**Colvin, S.** 2007. *A Historical Greek Reader – Mycenaean to the Koiné.* Oxford University Press.

**Conti, L. J.** 1990. “Zur Verwendung von epí + Dativ und epí +Akkusativ neben Bewegungsverben bei Homer,” *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 56: 17-37.

**Conybeare, F. C. and Stock, St. G.** 1905. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek.* Boston: Ginn and Company.

**Cooper, III, G. L.** 1971. *Zur syntaktischen Theorie und Textkritik der attischen Autoren.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Zurich.

- 1974. “Intrusive oblique infinitives in Herodotus,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 14: 23-76.

**Corlu, A.** 1966. *Recherches sur les mots relatifs à l’idée de prière d’Homère aux Tragiques.* Paris: Klincksieck.

**Cristofaro, S.** 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Culicover, P. W. and Jackendoff, R.** 1997. “Semantic Subordination despite Syntactic Coordination,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 195-217.

**Curtius, G.** 1852. *Griechische Schulgrammatik.* Prague.

- 1863. *Erläuterungen zu meiner Griechischen Schulgrammatik.* Prague: von Tempsky.

**Danckaert, L. J. M.** 2012. *Latin embedded clauses: the left periphery*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

**Davidson, T**. 1874. *The Grammar of Dionysios Thrax: Translated from the Greek*. St. Louis, Missouri: Studley.

**de Jong, I. J. F.** 1991. “Narratology and Oral Poetry: The Case of Homer,” *Poetics Today* 12: 405-423

- 1999. “*SO* Debate: Dividing Homer: When and How were the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* Divided into Songs?” *Symbolae Osloenses* 74: 58-63.

- 2001. *A narratological commentary on the Odyssey.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 2004. *Narrators and Focalizers: the presentation of the story in the Iliad*, 2nd edn. London: Bristol Classical Press.

- 2007. “Chapter One – Homer”, in de Jong, I. J. F. and Nünlist R., eds. *Time in Ancient Greek Literature – Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*, Leiden, 17-37.

- 2012. *Homer – Iliad Book XXII. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*. General editor: G. S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Debrunner, A.** 1927. “Alte Probleme der homerischen Sprache,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 45: 73-195.

**Declerck, R.** 1997. *When-Clauses and Temporal Structure.* London and New York: Routledge.

**Defour, T.** 2007. *A Diachronic Study of the Pragmatic Markers well and now.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Ghent.

**Denniston, J. D.** 1954. *The Greek Particles*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Deutscher, G.** 2008. *Nominalization and the Origin of Subordination*. Paper prepared for The 12th Biennial Rice University Symposium on Language.

**Devine, A. M. and Stephens, L. D.** 1994. *The Prosody of Greek Speech.* New York: Oxford University Press.

- 1999. *Discontinuous Syntax: Hyperbaton in Greek.* New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Dickey, E.** 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Diessel, H.** 2001. “The ordering distribution of main and adverbial clauses: A typological study,” *Language* 77: 343-365.

- 2005. “Competing motivations for the ordering of main and adverbial clauses,” *Linguistics* 43: 449-470.

- 2008. “Iconicity of sequence: A corpus-based analysis of the positioning of temporal adverbial clauses in English,” *Cognitive Linguistics* 19: 465-490.

- 2013. “Adverbial subordination,” in Luraghi, S. and Parodi, C., eds., *Bloomsbury Companion to Syntax*, London, 341-354.

**Dik, H. 1995.** *Word Order in Ancient Greek: a Pragmatic Account of Word Order Variation in Herodotus.* Amsterdam: Gieben.

**-** 2007. *Word order in Greek tragic dialogue.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Dik, S. C.** 1978. *The theory of functional grammar.* Dordrecht: Foris.

**Dixon, R. M. W.** 2009. “The Semantics of Clause Linking in Typological Perspective,” in Dixon and Aikhenvald 2009: 1-55.

**Dixon, R. M. W. and Aikhenvald, A. Y., eds.** 2009. *The Semantics of Clause Linking – a cross linguistic typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Dover, K. J.** 1960 (reprinted with corrections 1968). *Greek Word Order.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Dowty, D.** 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague’s PTQ.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

**Drubig, H. W. and Schaffar, W**. 2001. *“Focus constructions,”* in Haspelmath, M., König, E., Oesterreicher, W. and Raible, W., eds. *Language Typology and Language Universals,* Berlin, 1079-1104.

**Dry, H. A.** 1983. “The Movement of Narrative Time,” *Journal of Literary Semantics* 12: 19-53.

**Dryer, M. S.** 2013. “Order of Adverbial Subordinator and Clause,” in Dryer and Haspelmath 2013, online.

**and Haspelmath**, **M., eds.** 2013. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online.* Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.

**Düntzer, H.** 1848. *De Zenodoti studiis Homericis.* Göttingen.

**Duhoux, Y.** 1997 “Grec écrit et grec parlé: Une étude contrastive des particules aux Ve – IVe siècles,” in Rijksbaron 1997: 15-48.

- 1997. “Quelques idées reçues, et néanmoins fausses, sur les particules grecques,” *L’antiquité classique* 66: 281-8.

**Dunkel, G. E.** 1988. “Indogermanisch *át, Vedisch átha,” *Historische Sprachforschung* 101: 53-78.

- 2008. “Luvian -tar and Homeric τ’ ἄρ,” in Lubotsky et al. 2008: 137-149.

**Durante, M.** 1976. *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca.* Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

**Duranti, A. & Ochs, E.** 1979. “Left-dislocation in Italian conversation,” in Givón 1979: 377-416.

**Ebeling, H**. 1885. *Lexicon Homericum.* Leipzig: Teubner.

**Edwards, M. W.** 1975. “Type-scenes and Homeric Hospitality,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 105: 51-72.

- 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. *Volume V: books 17-20.* General editor: G. S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 1994. “Review of Taplin 1992,” *American Journal of Philology* 115: 449-471.

- 1992. “Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene,” *Oral Tradition* 7: 284-330.

- 1999. “*SO* Debate: Dividing Homer: When and How were the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* Divided into Songs?” *Symbolae Osloenses* 74: 52-54.

**Egetmeyer, M**. 2010. *Le dialecte grec ancien de Chypre: Tome I: Grammaire.* Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

**Fabricius-Hansen, C. and Ramm, W.** 2008. *‘Subordination’ versus ‘Coordination’ in Sentence and Text.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

**Fanning, B. M.** 1990. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Federspiel, M.** 2008. “Notes linguistiques et critiques sur le Livre III des Coniques d’Apollonius de Pergè,” *Revue des études grecques* 121: 515-545.

**Fenik, B.** 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Techniques of Homeric Battle Description*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.

**Fiedler, I. and Schwarz, A.** 2004. “Focus or narrative constructions?” Paper presented at a workshop on Topic and Focus. *Information Structure and Grammar in African languages,* University of Amsterdam, December 3-4.

**Filik, R. and Sanford, A. J.** 2008. “When is cataphoric reference recognised?” *Cognition* 2008: 1112-1121.

**Fish, J.** 2007. “A plus-verse from the “Odyssey” in "PHerc." 1507, Philodemus' "On the Good King According to Homer",” *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 159: 73-80.

**Foley, J. K.** 1978. “The Traditional Structure of Ibro Bašić’s “Alagić Alija and Velagić Selim,” *The Slavic and East European Journal* 22: 1-14.

**Ford, C. E.** 1993. *Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Fortson, B. W.** 2010. *Indo-European Language and Culture,* 2nd edn. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

**Fränkel, E.** 1933. “Kolon und Satz: Beobachtungen zur Gliederung des antiken Satzes, II,” *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse*: 319-354.

- 1965. *Noch einmal Kolon und Satz. Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse,* Volume 2. Munich: Beck.

**Fraser, B.** 2002. “Word order in Greek stichic verse: subject, verb, and object,” *Glotta* 78: 51-101.

**Friedländer, P. and Hoffleit, H. B.** 1948. *Epigrammata. Greek inscriptions in verse from the beginnings to the Persian Wars.* Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

**Friedrich, P.** 1974. *On Aspect Theory and Homeric Aspect*. *International Journal of American Linguistics,* Memoir 28. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

- 1975. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax: The Order of Meaningful Elements. Journal of Indo-European Studies,* Monograph Series Number 1. Butte: Montana College of Mineral Science and Technology.

**and Redfield, J.** 1978. “Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles,” *Language* 54: 263–88.

**Fuchs, A.** 1902. *Die Temporalsätze mit den Konjunktionen “bis” und “so lange als”.* Würzburg: Stuber.

**Fulda, A.** 1865. *Untersuchungen über die Sprache der homerischen Gedichte*. Duisburg: Falk & Volmer.

**Garvie, A. F.** 1994. *Homer: Odyssey, Books VI to VIII. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Gehring, A.** 1891. *Index Homericus.* Leipzig: Teubner.

**Genette, G.** 1983. *Narrative Discourse – an essay in method,* translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

**Giannakis, G. K.** 1997. *Studies in the syntax and semantics of the reduplicated presents of Homeric Greek and Indo-European.* Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwisseschaft.

**Gil, D. 2004.** "Riau Indonesian Sama: Explorations in macrofunctionality," in Haspelmath 2004a: 371-424. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

**Givón, T., ed.** 1979. *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 12: Discourse and Syntax.* New York: Academic Press.

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

- 1990. *Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction,* Volume 2. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

**Goffman, E.** 1979. "Footing," *Semiotica* 25: 1-29.

**Goldstein, D. M.** 2008. "Review of Dik 2007," *Bryn Mawr Classical Review,* 2008.06.08.

- 2010. *Wackernagel's law in fifth-century Greek.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

**Gonda, J.** 1958. "On the So-called Proleptic Accusative in Greek," *Mnemosyne* 11: 117-122.

**Goold, G. P.** 1977. "The Nature of Homeric Composition," *Illinois Classical Studies* 2: 1-34.

**Gordon, P. C. and Hendrick, R.** 1997. "Intuitive knowledge of linguistic co-reference," *Cognition* 62: 325-370.

- 1998. "The Representation and Processing of Coreference in Discourse," *Cognitive Science* 22: 389-424.

**Graziosi, B. and Haubold, J**. 2010. *Homer: Iliad, Book VI.* Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Green, G. M.** 1976. "Main Clause Phenomena in Subordinate Clauses," *Language* 52: 382-397.

**Griffin, J.** 1986. "Homeric Words and Speakers," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106: 36-57.

**Grimes, J. E.** 1968. *The thread of discourse,* 1st edn. The Hague: Mouton.

**Grimm, J.** 1962. "Die Partikel ἄρα im frühen griechisen Epos," *Glotta* 40: 3-41.

**Guiraud, C.** 1962. *La phrase nominale en Grec d'Homère à Euripide*. Paris: Klincksieck.

**Gunn, D. M.** 1971. "Thematic Composition and Homeric Authorship," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 75: 1-31.

**Haegeman, L.** 2012. *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and the Composition of the Left Periphery*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Haiman, J. and Thompson, S. A., eds.** 1988. *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

**Hainsworth, B. J.** 1968. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**-** 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume III: books 9-12.* General editor: G. S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Hale, A., ed.** 1973. *Clause, sentence, and discourse patterns in selected languages of Nepal.* Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

**Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R.** 1976. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

**Harris, A. and Campbell, L.** 1995. *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Hart, G. R.** 1965. “The Grouping of Place-Names in the Knossos Tablets,” *Mnemosyne* 18: 1-28.

**Hartung, J. A.** 1828. *Commentatio de part. δή et ἤδη.* Erlangen: Joh. Ja. Palm und Ernst Enke.

- 1832. *Lehre von den Partikeln der griechischen Sprache.* Erlangen: Joh. Ja. Palm und Ernst Enke.

**Haspelmath, M., ed.** 2004a. *Coordinating constructions.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins.

2004b. “Coordinating constructions: an overview,” in Haspelmath 2004a: 3-39.

- 2013. “Nominal and Verbal Conjunction,” in Dryer and Haspelmath, online.

**Hawkins, J. A.** 1994. *A Performance Theory of Order and Constituency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 2004. *Efficiency and Complexity in Grammars.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Heiden, B.** 1999. “*SO* Debate: Dividing Homer: When and How were the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* Divided into Songs?” *Symbolae Osloenses* 74: 55-58.

**Held, M.** 1962. “The YQTL-QTL (QTL-YQTL) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and in Ugaritic,” in Ben-Horin, M., Weinryb, B. D. and Zeitlin, S., eds. *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neuman, President, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, Philadelphia,* Leiden, 281-290.

- 1965. “The Action-Result (Factitive-Passive) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84: 272-282.

**Hermann, E.** 1912. “Die Nebensätze in den griechischen dialektinschriften,” Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner.

**Hernnstein Smith, B.** 1968. *Poetic Closure. A Study of How Poems End*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Hettrich, H.** 1976. *Kontext und Aspekt in der altgriechischen Prosa Herodots.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

**Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A.** 1988. *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey. Volume II. Books IX – XVI.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Heubeck, A., West, S. and Hainsworth, J. B.** 1988. *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey. Volume 1. Introduction and Books I – VIII.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Hiller, E.** 1886. “Die Partikel Ra,” *Hermes* 21: 563-569.

**Hoekstra, A.** 1965. *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes: Studies in the Development of Greek Epic Diction.* Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitg. Mij.

**Hoenigswald, H. M.** 1964. “George Melville Bolling,” *Language* 40: 329-336.

**Holmes, B.** 2007. “The Iliad’s Economy of Pain,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137: 45-84.

**Hooper, J. B. and Thompson, S. A.** 1973. “On the Applicability of Root Transformations,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 465-497.

**Hopper, P. J. and Thompson, S. A.** 1980. “Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse,” *Language* 56: 251-299.

**Hornblower, S.** *A Commentary on Thucydides. Volume 1: Books 1-3*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Horrocks, G.** 2010. *Greek: a history of the language and its speakers,* 2nd edn. Chichester/Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

**Humbert, J.** 1960. *Syntaxe Grecque,* 3rd edn. Paris: Klincksieck.

**Hunt, A. S., ed.** 1911. *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

**Hyman, L. M. and Watters, J. R.** 1984. “Auxiliary Focus,” *Studies in African Linguistics* 15: 233-273.

**Jakobson, R.** 1966. “Grammatical Parallelism and Its Russian Facet,” *Language* 42: 399-429.

**Janko, R.** 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: books 13-16. General editor: G. S. Kirk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Johannessen, J. B.** 2014. “Left dislocation in main and subordinate clauses,” *Nordic Atlas of Language Structures (NALS) Journal* 1: 406-414.

**Kahane, A.** 1994. *The Interpretation of Order: A Study in the Poetics of Homeric Repetition.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Katz, J.** 2007. “The Epic Adventures of an Unknown Particle,” in George, C., McCullagh, M., Nielsen, B., Ruppel, A. and Tribulato, O., eds. *Greek and Latin from an Indo-European Perspective,* Cambridge, 65-79.

**Keenan, E. L.** 1971. “Two kinds of presupposition in natural language,” in Fillmore, C. and Langendoen, T., eds. *Studies in linguistic semantics,* New York, 45-54.

**Keenan, E. O. and Schieffelin, B.** 1976. “Foregrounding Referents: A Reconsideration of Left-dislocation in Discourse,” *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 240-257.

**Kelly, A.** 2007. *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer, Iliad VIII*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Killen, J. T. and Olivier, J.-P.** 1989. *The Knossos Tablets,* 5th edn. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.

**Kirk, G. S.** 1962. *The Songs of Homer.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 1976. *Homer and the Oral Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: books 1- 4.* General editor: G. S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume II: books 5-8.* General editor: G. S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Kiparsky, P.** 1995. “Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax,” in Battye, A. and Roberts, I., eds. *Clause Structure and Language Change.* New York and Oxford, 140-169.

**Kitis, E.** 2000. “Temporality and causality: the case of Greek subordinating connectives,” *Revue de Sémantique et Pragmatique* 8: 121-141.

**-** 2006. “Causality and Subjectivity: the causal connectives of Modern Greek,” in Pishwa, H., ed. *Language and memory: Aspects of knowledge representation,* Berlin and New York, 223-267.

**Kitts, M.** 2012. *Sanctified Violence in Homeric Society: Oath-making Rituals in the Iliad.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Knebel, G.** 1959. “Bemerkungen zu 'Description of ἐπεί’s Syntax' von G. Melville Bolling,” *Glotta* 38: 38-43.

**König, E.** 1991. *The meaning of focus particles: A comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.

**Kölligan, D.** 2007. *Suppletion und Defektivität im griechischen Verbum*. Bremen: Hempen Verlag.

**Koller, H.** 1951. “Präsens historicum under erzählendes Imperfekt: Beitrag zur Aktionsart der Praesenstammzeiten im Lateinischen und Griechschen,” *Museum Helveticum* 8: 63-99.

**Konnerth, L.** 2014. “Additive Focus and Additional Functions of Karbi (Tibeto-Burman) =tā,” *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 206-222.

**Kortmann, B.** 1997. “The evolution of adverbial subordinators in Europe,” in Schmid, M. S., Austin J. R. and Stein D., eds. *Historical Linguistics 1997,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 213-228.

**Kraus, W.** 1970. “Ein konzessive-adversatives επεί? Vorstudie für einen griechischen Thesaurus,” in Wimmel, W., ed. *Forschungen zur römischen Literatur,* Wiesbaden, 146-150.

**Krieter-Spiro, M.** 2009. *Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar, iii.ii*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

**Kühner, R. and Gerth, B.** 1898. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre, Erster Band*. Hanover and Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

- 1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Zweiter Teil: Satzlehre, Zweiter Band*. Hanover and Leipzig: Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

**Labov, W. and Waletzky, J.** 1967. “Narrative analysis,” in Helm, J., ed. *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts,* Seattle, 12-44.

**Labov, W.** 1972. *Language in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: Univerysity of Pennsylvania Press.

**Lahmeyer, L.** 1879. *De Apodotico Qui Dicitur Particulae De In Carminibus Homericis Usu.* Leipzig: Teubner.

**Lakoff, G.** 1986 “Frame Semantic Control of the Coordinate Structure Constraint,” in Farley, A. M., Farley, P. T. and McCullough, K., ed. *Papers from the Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Theory,* Chicago, 152-167.

**Lambrecht, K.** 1987. “On the Status of SVO sentences in French discourse,” in Tomlin 1987: 217-262.

- 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Lamers, H. and Rademaker, A.** 2007. “Talking about myself: a pragmatic approach to the use of the aspect forms in Lysias 12.4-19,” *Classical Quarterly* 57: 458-476.

**Lange, L.** 1873. *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel εἰ*. Leipzig: Hirtzel.

**Latacz, J.** 1966. *Zum Wortfeld “Freude” in der Sprache Homers.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

**Laury, R., ed.** 2008. *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining. The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

**Leaf, W.** 1900- 1902. *The Iliad.* London: Macmillan and Co.

**Létoublon, F.** 1985. *Il allait, pareil à la nuit. Les verbes de movement en grec: supplétisme et aspect verbal.* Paris: Klincksieck.

**Leumann, M.** 1949. “μέν und μήν, δέ und δή,” *Museum Helveticum* 6: 85-89.

**-** 1950. *Homerische* Wörter. Basel: Reinhardt.

**Longacre, R. E.** 1968. *Discourse, paragraph and sentence structure in selected Philippine languages*. Dallas: SIL International.

- 1972. *Hierarchy and universality of discourse constituents in New Guinea languages*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

- 1979. “The paragraph as a grammatical unit,” in Givón 1979: 116-34.

- 1996. *The Grammar of Discourse*. Berlin: Springer.

**Lord, A.** 1948. “Homer and Huso III: Enjambement in Greek and South Slavic Heroic Song,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 79: 113-124.

- 2000. *The Singer of Tales,* 2nd edn. Cambridge, Massachussets: Harvard University Press.

**Lubotsky, A., Schaeken, J. and Wiedenhof, J., eds.** 2008. *Evidence and Counter-Evidence. Essays in Honour of Frederik Kortlandt: Volume 1: Balto-Slavic and Indo-European Linguistics*. Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.

**Luraghi, S.** 2004. “Null Objects in Latin and Greek and the Relevance of Linguistic Typology for Language Reconstruction,” in Jones-Bley, K., della Volpe, A., Huld, M. and Robbins Dexter, M., eds. *Proceedings of the 15th Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, JIES Monograph 49,* Washington, 234-256.

**and Keydana, G.** 2012. “Definite referential null objects in Vedic Sanskrit and Ancient Greek,” *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 44: 116-128.

**Mackie, H.** 1996. *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

**MacLeod, C. W**. 1982. *Homer: Iliad, Book XXIV. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Marchese, L.** 1987. “On the role of conditionals in Godié procedural discourse,” in Tomlin 1987: 383-408.

**Marouzeau, J.** 1949. *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine, volume 3: les articulations de l’énoncé*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

**Marshall, M. H. B.** 1987. *Verbs, nouns, and postpositives in Attic prose*. Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

**Martin, R. P.** 1989. *Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

**Matić, D.** 2003**.** “Topic, focus, and discourse structure: ancient Greek word order,” *Studies in Language* 27: 573–633.

**Matthews, P. H.** 1997. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Meillet, A.** 1921. *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale (Tome I et II).* Paris: Société de Linguistique de Paris.

- 1922. *Introduction à l’étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, 5th edn. Paris: Librairie Hachette.

**Meister, K**. 1921. *Die Homerische Kunstsprache*. Leipzig: Teubner.

**Meltzer, H.** 1904. “Zur Lehre von den Aktionen bes. im Griechischen,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 17: 187-277.

**Merry, W. W.** 1887. *Homer Odyssey I – XII*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Messing, G. M.** 1981. “On Weighing Achilles’ Winged Words,” *Language* 57: 888–900.

**Migron, S.** 1993. “Catena and climax in Vedic prose,” *Die Sprache* 35: 71–81.

**Miklosich, Franz.** 1890. *Die Darstellung im slavischen Volksepos*. Vienna: F. Tempsky.

**Minton, W. W.** 1965. “The Fallacy of the Structural Formula,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 96: 241-253.

**Monro, D. B.** 1884. *Iliad, with an introduction, a brief Homeric grammar, and notes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- 1891. *Homeric Grammar*, 2nd edn. London: Duckworth Press.

**and Allen, T. W.** 1920. *Homeri Opera, Tomi I-II, “Iliadis” Libros Continentes*, 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Monteil, P.** 1963. *La Phrase Relative en Grec Ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.

**Montiglio, S.** 2000. *Silence in the Land of Logos*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

**Moorhouse, A. C.** 1952. “Observations on Epic ἀλλά,” *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Volume 2: 100-104.

**Most, G. W.** 1986. “Pindar, Nem. 7,31-36,” *Hermes* 114: 262-271.

**Muchnová, D.** 1991. “Les propositions causales dites de motif”, in Biraud, M., ed. *Etudes de syntaxe du grec classique. Recherches linguistiques et applications didactiques. Actes du premier Colloque International de Didactique de la Syntaxe du Grec classique* 17, 18, 19 Avril 1991 Université de Nice, Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Nice 7, Paris, 135-143.

- 1995. “Les propositions causales en ἐπεί,” *Graecolatina Pragensia* 14: 89-96.

- 2000. “ἐπεί en tant que particle dans les phrases autonomes,” *Graecolatina Pragensia* 18: 119-136.

- 2003. “ἐπεί homérique,” *Gaia* 7: 105-116.

- 2006. “Entre conjonction et particule: le cas de ἐπεί en grec ancien,” in Crespo, E., de la Villa, J. and Revuleta, A. R., eds. *Word Classes and Related Topics in Ancient Greek*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 557-569.

- 2009. “New Approaches to the Interpretation of ἐπεί in Homer,” *Graecolatina et Orientalia* 21-22: 15-30.

- 2011. *Entre conjonction, connecteur et particule : le cas de ἐπεί en grec ancien*. Université Charles de Prague. Editions Karolinum.

**Muellner, L. C.** *The Meaning of Homeric EYXOMAI through its Formulas.* Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

**Murray, A. T.** 1919. *The Odyssey, with an English translation by A. T. Murray*. 2 volumes. London: Heinemann.

**Mutzbauer, C.** 1886. *Der homerische Gebrauch der Partikel μέν.* Cologne: J. A. Brocker.

**Nagler, M. N.** 1974. *Spontaneity and tradition: a study in the oral art of Homer.* Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

**Nagy, G.** 1996. *Poetry as performance. Homer and beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**-** 2000. “Review of Martin L. West (ed.), *Homeri Ilias. Recensuit / testimonia congessit. Volumen prius, rhapsodias 1-XII continens.* Stuttgart and Leipzig: Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 1998,” *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2000.09.12: http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2000/2000-09-12.htm.

- 2004. *Homer’s Text and Language*. Urbana/Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

**Napoli, M.** 2006. *Aspect and Actionality in Homeric Greek.* Milan: Francoangeli.

**Nieberding, R.** 1882. *Ueber die parataktische Anknüpfung des Nachsatzes in hypotaktischen Satzgefügen, insbesondere bei Homer*. Gross-Glogau: Mosche.

**Nilsson, M. P.** 1907. *Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles*: *I.* Würzburg: A. Stubers Verlag.

**Nonato, R.** 2014. *Clause Chaining, Switch Reference and Coordination*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

**Notopoulos, J. A.** 1964. “Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 68: 1-77.

**O'Connor, M. P.** 1980. *Hebrew Verse Structure*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

**O'Neill, E.** 1942. "The Localisation of Metrical Word-types in the Greek Hexameter: Homer, Hesiod and the Alexandrians," *Yale Classical Studies* 8: 105-178.

**O'Nolan, K.** 1978. "Doublets in the Odyssey," *Classical Quarterly* 28: 23-7.

**Ong, W. F.** 1982. *Orality and Literacy*. London and New York: Methuen & Co.

**Overall, S.** 2009. "The semantics of clause linking in Aguaruna," in Dixon and Aikhenvald 2009: 167-192.

**Panhuis, D. G. J.** 1982. *The communicative perspective in the sentence: A study of Latin word order*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins.

- 1984. "Prolepsis in Greek as a Discourse Strategy," *Glotta* 62: 26-39.

**Parry, M.** 1928. *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère*. Reprinted in: Parry, A., ed. 1971, *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry,* Oxford, 1-190.

- 1929. "The Distinctive Character of Enjambement in Homeric Verse," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 60: 200-220.

- 1930. "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 41: 73-147.

**Paul, H.** 1909. *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. Halle: Niemeyer.

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

**Pelliccia, H**. 1989. "Pindar, Nemean 7.31–36 and the Syntax of Aetiology," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92: 71–101.

**Pfudel, E.** 1871. *Beiträge zur Syntax der Causalsätze bei Homer*. Liegnitz: Jahresbericht über die Königliche Ritter-Akademie zu Liegnitz.

**Pinkster, H.** 1990. *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London and New York: Routledge.

**Porter, H. N.** 1951. "The Early Greek Hexameter," *Yale Classical Studies* 12: 34-55.

**Prince, E. F.** 1997. "On the functions of left-dislocation in English discourse," in Kamio, A., ed. *Directions in Functional Linguistics,* Philadelphia: 117-144.

**-** 1998. "On the limits of Syntax, with reference to Left-Dislocation and Topicalization," in Culicover, P. and McNally L., eds. *Limits of Syntax,* San Diego, 281-302.

**Probert, P.** 2015. *Early Greek Relative Clauses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Puigdollers, A. R. R.** 2009. "The particles αὖ and αὖτε in Ancient Greek as topicalizing Devices," in Bakker and Wakker 2009: 83-109.

**Pulleyn, S. J.** 2000. "The supposed causal εἰ in Homer," *Mnemosyne* 53: 257–266.

**Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svatvik, J., eds.** 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.

**Radin, A. P.** 1988. "Sunrise, Sunset: ἦμος in Homeric Epic," *American Journal of Philology* 109: 293-307.

**Ramsey, V.** 1987. “The functional distribution of preposed and postposed ‘if and ‘when’ clauses in written discourse,” in Tomlin 1987: 383-408.

**Reece, S.** 1993. *The Stranger’s Welcome – Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

- 2009. *Homer’s Winged Words – The Evolution of Early Greek Epic in the light of Oral Theory*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

**Reichel, M.** 1994. *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

**Reinhardt, K.** 1961. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

**Reinhart, T.** 1976. *The syntactic domain of anaphora*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

1984. “Principles of gestalt perception in the temporal organization of narrative texts,” *Linguistics* 22: 779-809.

**Rengakos, A.** 2013. “Zeit und Gleichzeitigkeit in den homerischen Epen,” in Koppenfels, W., Krasser, H., Kühlmann, W., Möllendorff, P., Riedweg, C., Schuller, W. and Stillers, R., eds. *Antike und Abendland,* Berlin, 1-33.

**Reynen, H.** 1957. “Die Partikel οὖν bei Homer,” *Glotta* 36: 1-47.

- 1958. “Die Partikel οὖν bei Homer.” *Glotta* 37: 67-102 and 182-204.

**Rhode, A.** 1867. *Über den Gebrauch der Partikel ἄρα bei Homer*. Mörs: J. W. Spaarmann.

**Richardson, N.** 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume VI: books 21-24.* General editor: G. S. Kirk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Richardson, S. D.** 1990. *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

- 1999. “Special Abilities,” in de Jong, I. J. F., ed. *Homer: Critical Assessments, Volume IV, Homer’s Art*. London and New York, 432-461.

**Riemann, O. and Goelzer H.** 1897. *Grammaire comparée du grec et du latin: Syntaxe*. Paris: Colin.

**Rijksbaron. A.** 1972. “Ἐπεί en ὡς, temporal of kausaal?” *Lampas* 5: 465-476.

- 1976a. “How does a messenger begin his speech? Some observations on the opening lines of Euripidean messenger speeches,” in Brenner, J. M., Radt, S. L. and Ruijgh, C. J., eds. *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J. C. Kamerbeek,* Amsterdam, 293-308.

- 1976b. *Temporal and Causal Conjunctions in Ancient Greek*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

- 1980. “De semantiek van Griekse hypothetische bijzinnen, ” *Lampas* 13: 130-145.

- ed. 1997. *New Approaches to Greek Particles. Proceedings of the Colloquium Held in Amsterdam, January 4-6, 1996, to Honour C.K. Ruijgh on the Occasion of his Retirement*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

- 2002. *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, 3rd edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

**Rimmon-Kenan, S**. 2002. *Narrative Fiction*, 2nd edn. London and New York: Routledge.

**Risch, E.** 1974. *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

**Rix, H.,** ed. 2001. *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben*, 2nd edn. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

**Rodenbusch, E.** 1907. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Aktionsarten," *Indogermanische Forschungen* 21: 116-145.

- 1908. "Präsenstamm und perfektive Aktionsart," *Indogermanische Forschungen* 22: 402-408.

**Rohde, E.** 1895. "Nekyia," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 50: 625-631.

**Rosen, H. B.** 1973. "Satzbau und augmentloses historischen Tempus im homerischen Tatsachenbericht," *Folia Linguistica* 6: 315-330.

**Ross, J. R.** 1969. "On the cyclic nature of English pronominalization," in Reibel, D. A. and Schane, S. A., eds. *Modern Studies in English*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 187-200.

**Ruijgh, C. J.** 1957. *L'élément Achéen dans la Langue épique*. Assen: van Gorcum and Co.

- 1966. "Quelques remarques sur l'absence de kai; et sur l'emploi des particules -ge et -de dans les textes mycéniens", in Palmer, L. R and Chadwick, J., ed. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Colloquium on Mycenaean Studies*, Cambridge, 203-210.

- 1971. *Autour de "Te Epique." Etudes sur la syntaxe grecque*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

- 1985. "L'emploi 'inceptif' du thème du présent du verbe grec," *Mnemosyne* 38: 1-61.

- 1990. "La places des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel," in H. Eichner and H. Rix, eds., *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, Wiesbaden, 213-233.

**Russo, J. A.** 1942. "Homer's Style: Nonformulaic Features of an Oral Aesthetic," *Oral Tradition* 9: 371-389.

- 1963. " A Closer Look at Homeric Formulas," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 94 : 235-247.

**and Fernandez-Galiano, M. and Heubeck, A.** 1992. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume III. Books XVII – XXIV.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Rutherford, R. B.** 1992. *Homer: Odyssey, Books XIX and XX. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Rutherford, W. E.** "Some Observations concerning Subordinate Clauses in English," *Language* 46: 97-115.

**Rynell, A.** 1952. *Parataxis and Hypotaxis as a Criterion of Syntax and Style*. Lund: C.WK. Gleerup.

**Scheppers, F.** 2011. *The Colon Hypothesis: Word Order, Discourse Segmentation and Discourse Coherence in Ancient Greek*. Brussels: Brussels University Press.

**Schiffrin, D.** 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Schrier, O. J.** 1973. "Het kausale en temporale gebruik van ἐπεί en ὡς in Herodotus / avec remarques de Rijksbaron," *Lampas* 6: 342-347.

**Schulze, M. and Bierie, D.** 1973. “Chaining and Spotlighting: Two types of paragraph boundaries in Sunwar,” in Hale 1973: 389-399.

**Schwyzer, E. and Debrunner, A.** 1950. *Griechische Grammatik II., Syntax und syntaktische Stylistik*. Munich: Beck.

**Scodel, R.** 1982. “The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 86: 33-50.

- 2008. “Zielinski’s law reconsidered,” *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 138: 107-25.

**Shaer, B., Cook, P., Frey, W. and Maienborn, C.** 2009. *Dislocated Elements in Discourse: Syntactic, Semantic, and Pragmatic Perspectives.* New York/London: Routledge.

**Shalev, D.** 2011. “Mimēsis, Dihēgēsis, Style: Socrates’ paraphrase in Plato Republic 393.d.8-394.a.6 of Homer Iliad 1.11-42,” *Papers on Grammar* XI: 233-272.

**Shipp, G. P.** 1972. *Studies in the Language of Homer*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Shopen, T.** 2007. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, volume 1: Clause Structure; volume 2: Complex Constructions; volume 3: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Sicking, C. M. J.** 1996. “Aspect Choice. Time reference or discourse function?” in Sicking, C. M. J. and Stork, P., eds. *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*, Leiden, 1-118.

**Skafte Jensen, M.** 1999. “*SO* Debate: Dividing Homer: When and How were the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* Divided into Songs?” *Symbolae Osloenses* 74: 5-35.

**Slings, S. R.** 1997. “Figures of speech and their lookalikes: Two further exercises in the pragmatics of the Greek sentence,” in Bakker, E. J., ed. *Grammar as interpretation*, Leiden/New York/Cologne, 169-214.

**Snell, B. and Mette, H. J., eds.** 1955-2010. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

**Sousa, O. C.** 1999. “Constructing Reference in Children’s Narratives,” *Psychology of Language and Communication* 3: 29-40.

**Spevak, O.** 2010. *Constituent Order in Classical Latin Prose*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

**Stahl, J. M.** 1907. *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechen Verbums der klassischen Zeit.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

**Stanford, W. B.** 1959. *The Odyssey of Homer, 2 vols.* London: Macmillan.

**Stanley, K.** 1993. *The Shield of Homer. Narrative Structure in the “Iliad”*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

**Stein, D.** 1991. “Semantic aspects of syntactic change,” in Kastovky, D., ed. *Historical English Syntax. Topics in English Linguistics*, Berlin, 355-366.

**Steiner, D.** 2010. Homer*: Odyssey, Books XVII and XVIII. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Steinitz, W.** 1976. “Ostjakische Volksdichtung und Erzählungen aus zwei Dialekten Kommentare, ” in Sauer, G. and Schulze, B., eds. *Ostjakologische Arbeiten, Band II,* Budapest.

**Tannen, D.** 1987. “Repetition in Conversation: Towards a Poetics of Talk,” *Language* 63: 574-605.

**Taplin, O**. 1992. *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Taylor, A.** 1990. *Clitics and Configurationality in Ancient Greek.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

**Tebben, J. R.** 1994. *Concordantia Homerica, Pars I Odyssea: A computer concordance to the Van Thiel edition of Homer’s Odyssey, 2 vols*. Hildesheim, Zurich, New York: Olms-Weidmann.

**-** 1998. *Concordantia Homerica, Pars II Ilias: A computer concordance to the Van Thiel edition of Homer’s Iliad, 3 vols*. Hildesheim, Zurich, New York: Olms-Weidmann.

**Thompson, S. A.** 1987. “‘Subordination’ and Narrative Event Structure” in Tomlin 1987: 435-454.

**- and Longacre, R. E. and Hwang, S. J.** 2007. “Adverbial Clauses,” in Shopen 2007, volume 3: 237-300.

**Tizón Couto, D.** 2008. “A Corpus-based Analysis of Left-Dislocation in Late Modern English. A functional approach to the construction and discourse functions,” *Estudos Linguisticos / Linguistic Studies* 2: 237-254.

**Tomlin, R., ed.** 1987. *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

**Tsopanakis, A. G.** 1966. *Problems in the Homeric Hexameter.* Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki.

**Tzamali, E.** 2001. “Zur Verselbständigung von Nebensatzen im Altgriechischen,” *Mnemosyne* 54: 386-392.

**van der Valk, M. H. L. H.** 1949. *Textual Criticism of the Odyssey.* Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff’s Uitgeversmaatschappij N. V.

**van Otterlo, W. A. A.** 1944. *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitg. Mij.

**van Thiel, H.** 1991. *Homeri Odyssea*. Hildesheim, Zurich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

- 1996. *Homeri Ilias*. Hildesheim, Zurich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

- 2010. *Homeri Ilias*. Hildesheim, Zurich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag.

**Vendler, Z.** 1957. “Verbs and Times,” *Philosophical Review* 66: 143-160.

**Verstraete, J. C.** 2004. “Initial and final position of adverbial clauses in English: the constructional basis of the discoursive and syntactic differences,” *Linguistics* 42: 819-853.

- 2007. *Rethinking the Coordinate-Subordinate Dichotomy.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

**Visser, E.** 1988. “Formulas or Single Words?” *Wurzburgerjahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 14: 21-37.

**Viti, C.** 2008. “The meanings of coordination in the early Indo-European languages,” *Revue de Sémantique et Pragmatique* 28: 35-64.

**von der Mühll, P.** 1962. *Homeri Odyssea*, 3rd edn. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner.

**von Thiersch, F. W.** 1818. *Griechische Grammatik vorzüglich des homerischen Dialects.* Leipzig.

**Wace, A. B. and Stubbings, F. H.** 1962. *A Companion to Homer.* London: Macmillan & Co Ltd.

**Wackernagel, J.** 1892. “Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung,” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333-436.

- 1916. *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- 1920. *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch.* Basel: Birkhäuser.

**Wakker, G. C.** 1997. “Emphasis and Affirmation: Some aspects of μήν in Tragedy,” in Rijksbaron 1997: 209-231.

**Watkins, C.** 2001. *How to Kill a Dragon.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Weichmann, D. and Kerz, E.** 2013. “The positioning of concessive adverbial clauses in English.” *English Language and Linguisticis* 17: 1-23.

**Weinrich, H.** 1964. *Tempus-Besprochene und erzählte Welt.* Paris: Seuil.

**West, M. L.** 1967. “Epica,” *Glotta* 44: 135-148.

- 1988. “The Rise of the Greek Epic,” *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 108: 151-172.

- 1997. *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- 1998-2000. *Homeri Ilias, 2 vols.* Stuttgart/Leipzig: K. G. Saur Verlag (vol. 1) and Munich/Leipzig: de Gruyter (vol. 2).

- 2007. *The Wider Context: Common Elements in Indo-Iranian, Greek and other Poetic Traditions and Mythologies. (Indo-European Poetry and Myth).* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Westbury, J.** 2014. *Left-Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew: A Cognitive Linguistic Account.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Stellenbosch.

**Wyatt, W. F. J.** 1969. *Metrical Lengthening in Homer.* Rome: Incunabula Graeca.

**Yakubovich, Ilya.** 2010. *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language.* Leiden: Brill.

**Yates, A. D.** 2011. *Homeric BH Δ’IENAI: A Diachronic and Comparative Approach.* Master’s thesis, University of Georgia.

**Yuasa, E. and Sadock, J. M.** 2002. “Pseudo-subordination: a mismatch between syntax and semantics,” *Journal of Linguistics* 38: 187-111.

**Zielinski, T.** 1899-1901. “Die Behandlung gleichzeitiger Ereignisse im antiken Epos,” *Philologus Supplement* 8: 105-49.

**Zycha, J.** 1885. “Gebrauch von ἐπεί, ἐπείπερ; ἐπειδή, ἐπειδήπερ,” *Wiener Studien* 7: 82-115.