

Ronald Blankenburg  
Radboud University  
ronald.blankenburg@ru.nl  
ORCID: 0000-0001-7369-6035

## TMESIS AS A CORRELATE OF PROSODIC PHRASING IN HOMER

### Abstract

Both universion and de-universion are evidenced in Homeric epic. Syntactical considerations shed a light on the exact status of the adposition: preverb, adverb, or preposition. Approaching tmesis from a performative perspective contributes to the categorization of adpositions. Its main contribution, however, is the acknowledgement of the minor phonological phrase as the adposition's scope. Together with the observance of metrical-rhythmical restrictions on word end in Homer's hexameter, the minor-phrase boundaries show that the analysis of adpositions in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as *in tmesi* respects the adpositions' adverbial use. Rhythmical rearrangement resulted in higher valuation of adpositions' prepositive character, especially at positions of frequent word end, but maintains the minor phrase as adpositions' scope in performance.

**Keywords:** Homeric tmesis, universion, adposition, rhythmical rearrangement, prosodic phraseology

## Introduction

In the study of Homeric syntax, the syntactical rules of written language have long been the standard<sup>1</sup>. Written Classical Greek provided scholars with grammatical and syntactical tools to analyze the discourse of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*<sup>2</sup>. In recent years, linguistic studies have focused more on the Homeric epic as spoken language, in accordance with a better appraisal of the Homeric epic as a reflection of performance practice and transcript. It is especially the work of E.J. Bakker that has shed a new, and more fruitful, light on Homeric discourse<sup>3</sup>. In his footsteps, various studies using a cognitive approach to Homeric composition and discourse have appeared; as a result, several syntactical and stylistic aspects of Homeric language and presentation have already been reinterpreted in frames that deviate considerably from the analysis of written Greek<sup>4</sup>.

Tmesis is one of the phenomena in Homeric syntax analyzed in accordance with the syntax of written Classical Greek. Haug defines tmesis as follows<sup>5</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup> I thank the anonymous reviewers of *Quaestiones Oralitatis* for their necessary corrections and helpful suggestions.

<sup>2</sup> I will work from the following assumptions: i) the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as handed down through the manuscript tradition are transcripts (NAGY 2001) of successful performances, ii) both poems have an origin in oral composition and transmission into the Dark Age from the Mycenaean period (DICKINSON 1986; VERMEULE 1991; KELLY 2006; SHERRATT 2017), iii) their material fixation is to be dated in the second half of the 8th century BCE (JANKO 1998, 2015; THEODORSSON 2006; READY 2015), but iv) evidence suffices for textual variants as scripts for performances well into the 1st century BCE (BIRD 2010), and v) the name of the author Homer is accepted in accordance with tradition (WEST 2011). Primary text edition from which citation have been taken are listed in the bibliography. Translations are freely based on the Loeb edition by MURRAY, WYATT (1999; *Iliad*) and MURRAY, DIMOCK (1995; *Odyssey*).

<sup>3</sup> BAKKER 1997a, 1997b, 2005.

<sup>4</sup> *E.g.*, by BAKKER 1990 (on enjambment), 1993; MINCHIN 1992; GOTTESMAN 2008; CURRIE 2013 (on parentheses); HORN 2015 (on conceptual metaphor); GRETHLEIN, HUITINK 2017 (on 'vividness').

<sup>5</sup> In FINKELBERG 2011:884; cf. Haug in GIANNAKIS 2014 s.v. 'Tmesis'.

Materialization in the form of two separate words of what would be a compound verb in Classical Greek, as in τὸν καὶ Μηριόνης πρότερος πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε (*Il.* 13.306), where the verb would appear as προσεῖπε in Classical Greek. The phenomenon is called *tmesis* “cutting,” “separation” by ancient grammarians because from the perspective of later Greek the phenomenon is a splitting of a unit. However, comparative linguistics shows that compound verbs arose from the amalgamation of independent adverbs/prepositions (the later “preverbs”) and verbs, so it is likely that epic Greek has simply preserved the original stage. It has been argued that Homer here reflects a pre-Mycenaean state of the language, since there are no certain attestations of *tmesis* in Mycenaean Greek, but in view of our scanty knowledge of Mycenaean Greek, and in particular of the verbal system, it must remain unclear for how long *tmesis* was acceptable in the vernacular.

Haug focuses on the state of the verb and of the ‘preverb’, considering the separation of the two as an original, pre-Mycenaean constellation still visible in Homer, but gradually replaced by univervation<sup>6</sup>. Less attention is given to the status of the ‘preverb’: it is labeled adverb/preposition without further specification of the adposition<sup>7</sup> that only over time, so it seems, became attached to the verb<sup>8</sup>. In this contribution, I will argue that the adposition’s rather independent status in Homer is primarily a correlate of prosodic phrasing, which results in the adposition best compared to particles<sup>9</sup>. In addition to the

<sup>6</sup> Ancient Greek *τμήσις* is used in the sense of ‘cutting’ (Arist. *de An.* 412b28), or ‘ravaging’ (*Phal* 1.107). Plato applies it to express ‘logical division’ (*Plt.* 276d) or ‘section’ (*Smp.*190e). The latter meaning of the *nomen actionis* derives from the application of τέμνειν ‘divide logically’ (*Plhb.* 49a; *Plt.* 287b, *Sph.* 223c).

<sup>7</sup> HAUG 2012 argues for the preverbs as independent place words.

<sup>8</sup> Attachment to the verb in Greek is proclitic as in the case of the augment and the present and perfect tense reduplications. KURYŁOWICZ 1964:172 analyses the verb encliticized to the preverb as a consequence of univervation in (Sanskrit and) Greek.

<sup>9</sup> Preverbs are conventionally credited with adverbial or prepositional status (KURYŁOWICZ 1964:171–178; BOOIJ, KEMENADE 2003:1–2). KARLSSON 2018, 278 describes the construction variance in Homer as ‘construction

semantic and syntactic evidence available<sup>10</sup>, I will rally prosodic evidence to support the claim that the adposition resembles the adverbial particle, and for the conditions which made both set collocations of preverb and verb, and of adpositions *in tmesi*, acceptable in the Homeric vernacular<sup>11</sup>. I will also briefly address the orthographic consequences of these conditions for all adpositions, including preverbs.

The occurrence and use of tmesis, side by side with compound verbs, is significantly more frequent in Homer than after Homer<sup>12</sup>. Homer uses both verbs with preverbatum and verbs without it, as he inherited both: in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* certain set collocations of preverb and verb appear, as they were handed down by tradition<sup>13</sup>. In addition to Haug's claim, there are interesting parallels for Homer's practice in Mycenaean Greek<sup>14</sup>: tablets Ae 134 and Ae 108 from Pylos read *o-pi ... o-ro-me-no*, reminiscent of ἐπί ... ὄρονται

---

*splitting* into multiple descendent constructions through multidirectional grammaticalization processes'. As a container term Karlsson (among other, cf. IMBERT 2019) uses 'spatial particle'. Starting from the observation that prepositions tend to govern inanimate complements whereas preverbs increase verbal transitivity through their selection of human referents or personal pronouns, VITI 2018 argues for topicality as the 'connection between space and transitivity'. Viti nonetheless refers to the preverb as a 'local particle'. VAN BEEK 2018 argues for non-privative  $\acute{\alpha}$ - (derived from copulative \**sm*-) as a preverb (like in Indo-Iranian).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. HAUG 2009; BERTRAND 2014; CONTI 2015.

<sup>11</sup> Also as an independent development: de-univerbation as a means in opposing opacity. Cf. the argument by MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 1997 in favour of conceptual distance to the semantics of the verb as a determining factor in the behaviour of Greek preverbs.

<sup>12</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:218–219.

<sup>13</sup> That is, as a poetic device, as preverbatum appears to have been the norm in Mycenaean administrative prose (HORROCKS 1981:148–163; DUHOUX 1998), and only continues after Homer in poetry or imitations of poetry (PRIESTLY 2009).

<sup>14</sup> DUHOUX 1994–1995. Evidence from other branches of (Proto-)Indo-European shows that both the set collocations of preverb and verb and the rather independent adposition are facts of pre-Homeric language just as they are facts of the language of Homer himself, cf. KURYŁOWICZ 1964; BOOIJ, KEMENADE 2003; BOLEY 2004; VITI 2008; BERTRAND 2014; KARLSSON 2018.

(Od. 14.104), and showing that the bards inherited the adpositions *in tmesis* next to the set collocations<sup>15</sup>. This frequency and usage of tmesis do not invalidate the rules of classical Greek when analysing the non-configurationality<sup>16</sup>, or looseness, of Homeric syntax; they merely call for broader acceptance of the independent status of the adposition.

### **The adposition *in tmesis*: adverbs, prepositions, preverbs, particles**

The technical term preverb implies that the little word is part of the verb<sup>17</sup>, whether or not the two form an orthographical whole<sup>18</sup>. In Classical Greek, tmesis of the compound verb is used for rhetorical purposes. The compound verb is the norm, and tmesis is a deliberate deviation from that norm<sup>19</sup>. Tmesis practically always makes the preverb precede the verbal form. As soon as it is no longer automatically seen as part of the verbal form, the free-floating adposition needs to be linguistically categorized. In their standard reference work, Kühner and Gerth<sup>20</sup> treat tmesis as tmesis of the preposition<sup>21</sup>. In their view, tmesis indicates the hyperbaton of the

<sup>15</sup> But cf. Thompson in BAKKER 2010:197.

<sup>16</sup> The terminology used by DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:142; cf. BAKKER 2005:38–55; HEWSON, BUBENIK 2006.

<sup>17</sup> BOOIJ, KEMENADE 2003:1 ‘The notion ‘preverb’ is a traditional descriptive notion in Indo-European linguistics. It refers to morphemes that appear in front of a verb, and which form a close semantic unit with that verb. In many cases, the morpheme that functions as a preverb can also function without a verbal context, often as an adverb or an adposition. Most linguists use the notion ‘preverb’ as a cover term for preverbal words and preverbal prefixes. The preverb may be separated from the verb whilst retaining its close cohesion with the verb, which is called ‘tmesis’. [...] we take the notion ‘complex predicate’ to refer generally to multi-morphemic expressions with verbal valency’.

<sup>18</sup> IMBERT 2010.

<sup>19</sup> PRIESTLEY 2009:118.

<sup>20</sup> KÜHNER, GERTH 1963, I 530–538.

<sup>21</sup> In turn, the preposition is seen as a development from adverbs denoting location. In Homer, they still can be found used in that manner, e.g. *Il.* 13.800, 16.188, 18.480, 19.118, and many other examples. See further below and KÜHNER, GERTH 1963, III 526–527.

prepositional preverb and the verb proper<sup>22</sup>. Terminological confusion arises when they assume adverbial meaning for the preverb. Usage of the term preposition is then restricted to instances where the preverb is joined to a substantive in a specific case. The grammatical rules of noun governance are being applied to categorize those preverbs as prepositions.

In Kühner and Gerth, the hyperbaton<sup>23</sup> of preposition and verb is presented as the original linguistic situation<sup>24</sup>. Only gradually was the hyperbaton supplanted by the compound verb. In written classical Greek, the compound verb had become the standard<sup>25</sup>. The Homeric epics then prove to be composed in a period of transition. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* present their audience with both the hyperbaton verb-type, and the compound verb<sup>26</sup>. The hyperbaton type, featuring the actual tmesis, is not something artificial. It must have been natural to the ears of Homer's audience<sup>27</sup>. In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, tmesis does not result in cut-off prepositions, but in independent adverbs side by side with verbal forms:

Wir betrachten zuerst die Homerische Sprache, in der [...] eigentlich nur von einer scheinbaren Tmesis die Rede sein kann, da in ihr die Präpositionen nicht von ihrem Verb getrennt sind, sondern als selbständige Adverbien neben ihrem Verb stehen.  
(p. 531)

---

<sup>22</sup> The only exceptions Kühner, Gerth mention are διὰ δ' ἀμπερές *Il.* 11.377, 17.309, ἐκ δ' ὀνομακλήδην *Od.* 4.278, 21.422.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:12, 111–112, 211–222, especially 218–219 discussing hyperbaton in the prepositional phrase without regard for the prepositional preverb.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. BOOIJ, KEMENADE 2003:2.

<sup>25</sup> KÜHNER, GERTH 1963, I 533.

<sup>26</sup> BOOIJ, KEMENADE 2003 refer to the former as 'complex predicate', and to the latter as 'complex verb'.

<sup>27</sup> KÜHNER, GERTH 1963, I 530; in Homer, tmesis cannot produce poetic effects ('semantic stress') like it can in the writings of the Hellenistic and Roman poets (GIANNAKIS 2021).

Kühner and Gerth divide the instances of tmesis in Homer into two groups: the instances where the preposition seems to be a preverb (cut-off preposition), but is actually an independent adverb<sup>28</sup>, and the preverbs seemingly governing a substantive in a certain case, like a true, governing, preposition<sup>29</sup>. Kühner and Gerth consider the preverb as a preposition governing a substantive when the preposition immediately precedes the substantive<sup>30</sup>. Identification as a true preposition despite hyperbaton follows from three conditions<sup>31</sup>:

1. The intervening words are particles or enclitics<sup>32</sup>.
2. The intervening word is an attributive genitive<sup>33</sup> (sometimes together with a particle)<sup>34</sup>.
3. The preposition, used as a postposition, practically immediately follows the substantive<sup>35</sup>.

A different approach to linguistic categorization can be found in remarks on Homeric grammar by Chantraine, who

---

<sup>28</sup> As in *Il.* 1.67, 2.699, 3.34, 3.135, 4.63, 4.161, 7.425, 8.108, 12.195, 12.312, 13.394, 17.91, *Od.* 4.525, 12.312, and 5.196.

<sup>29</sup> Kühner, Gerth speak of tmesis in Homer as 'resembling true tmesis'.

<sup>30</sup> But, it must be noted, such noun governance is not merely a matter of preverb and subsequent noun case: hyperbaton must be taken into account as well, especially when due to the intervention of particles, cf. DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:68–69.

<sup>31</sup> Apart from unique instances like *Il.* 8.115, 11.831, 13.829, *Od.* 5.155, 9.535, and 11.115.

<sup>32</sup> E.g. *Il.* 2.310, 4.135, 9.106, 11.128, 18.432, *Od.* 3.348, 8.245, 14.452, 19.435.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:103–107.

<sup>34</sup> E.g. *Il.* 1.44, 3.128, 8.378, 11.357, 12.284, 14.227, 15.739, 16.315, 24.428, 24.750, *Od.* 15.492.

<sup>35</sup> E.g. *Il.* 5.64, 5.729, 23.377, 24.254, *Od.* 1.220. Hyperbaton thus creates a gradually increasing unease with identification of the preverb as a preposition. This unease is furthered by the possibility, taken for granted by KÜHNER, GERTH (p. 531), that the specific noun-case is due to the semantics of the verb alone. If the intervening words between the preverb and the noun are important enough (DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:94, 108, 298 distinguish between lexicals and nonlexicals; it is noteworthy that in their analysis (p. 298) prepositions themselves can be both lexical *and* nonlexical), the governance of the noun by the verb is more likely. In such cases, the preverb should be considered an independent adverb.

explains the origin of preverbs (*préverbes*) as similar to that of prepositions and adverbs (II 82)<sup>36</sup>:

Le terme «préposition», calqué sur le grec *πρόθεσις*, est, comme on l'a déjà observé, mal choisi. Il s'agit, en réalité, de petits mots invariables qui deviennent préciser l'idée exprimée, et qui, originellement, sont autonomes. Ils peuvent s'employer soit absolument, soit à côté d'un verbe comme adverbess ou comme préverbes, soit à côté d'un nom comme prépositions.

According to Chantraine, the adpositions, in themselves invariable in form<sup>37</sup>, entered the language to further specify or support the ability of the noun-cases to give meaning<sup>38</sup>. Apparently, extra support gradually grew more important. The different cases had clear and restricted semantic value themselves, but the formal syncretism of the various cases inevitably led to less precise case-bound semantics (p. 35). Adverbs and prepositions filled the growing gap, specifying and strengthening the original meaning of the various noun-cases. Their exact grammatical classification is determined by their position in relation to the other words used. When found in the vicinity of a noun whose inherent case-semantics it clearly strengthens, it is classified as preposition. When used seemingly independent of other words, it is classified as adverb. If the adposition, however, 'specifies the meaning of the verb', it is a preverb, and hence 'separated from the verb itself' (p. 83).

Horrocks (1981) considers tmesis in Homer as an archaism preserved by tradition and deliberately removed from the

<sup>36</sup> CHANTRAINE 1953 II:82.

<sup>37</sup> Though many adverbs and prepositions in Homer actually appear in various forms: the adverbial value 'up' can be expressed by *ἀνά* and *ἄν*, the prepositional value '(coming) from the side of' by either *παρά* or *πάρ*. Many other, similar examples may be added. CONTI 2014; VITI 2018.

<sup>38</sup> KURYŁOWICZ 1964:171–178 identifies as the main diachronic source of prepositions a set of local particles which could originally be employed as both adverbial and adnominal modifiers.



univerbating practice of, e.g. Mycenaean Greek. Any ‘fission’ predates composition of the Homeric epic, as a tool of the poet. Haug (2009, 2012) states that categories preverb and preposition move away from PIE since it only evidences adverbs. He argues that instances of tmesis, as other archaisms, were replaced by univerbating vernacular whenever possible<sup>39</sup>. Univerbation itself predates the composition of the Homeric epic; for spatial particles in long distance tmesis, Haug allows for the preservation of the old semantic and directional function, itself to be considered an archaism. Particle status is based on omissibility, redundancy preserved in formulae *vis-à-vis* sufficient semantics, as expressed in noun-case.

Categorization of the adposition *in tmesi* thus answers questions concerning the development of the adverb into a preposition, the adverb supporting the meaning of a verb (like a preposition to a noun), and, if supporting the meaning of the verb, the identification of the adverb as a preverb. My contribution to categorization includes prosodic aspects of the adposition’s usage, starting with its scope in phonological phrasing. In order to present the argument, I will first describe the phrasal domain of tmesis as the phonological phrase, the unit tied together through sandhi (phonological *legato*), and apposition. Phonological phrasing does not automatically align with syntactical phrasing, grammatical clauses, of metrical colometry. As a method, I will then identify the ‘little words’ within their appropriate phonological-phrasal domain, the minor phonological phrase, in order to more accurately categorize them as word type and gauge their semantic value in performance.

---

<sup>39</sup> HAUG 2012:97. FINKELBERG 2012 considers tmesis as vernacular.

### Scope and proximity within the phrasal domain

Chantraine states that, as soon as the adverb associated itself with a specific noun-case, it became a preposition<sup>40</sup>:

Lorsque «l'adverbe» s'associe avec un cas, il devient une préposition. . . (and using as an example *Il.10.28*: ἦλυθον ἐς Τροίην)  
Mais bientôt la préposition a été sentie comme indispensable avec l'accusatif.

In Chantraine's example, *Il.10.28*, ἦλυθον ἐς Τροίην 'had come to Troy' originally could do *without* the preposition renders. The accusative alone stated the meaning clearly enough. As soon as invariable ἐς ('to the inside, to the interior'<sup>41</sup>) associated itself with the accusative case, it developed into a preposition. Soon enough, the little word became necessary to understand the expression. For several reasons, Chantraine's explanation, and Kühner-Gerth's with it, needs to be reconsidered. The most important reason is that both explanations consider nearly all prepositions, possibly, *in statu nascendi*<sup>42</sup>. Chantraine states that it is often impossible to clearly identify between an adverb and a preposition (84)<sup>43</sup>:

Le texte homérique offre de nombreux exemples où la construction prépositionnelle est en train de se constituer et où l'on peut se demander si nous avons affaire à une préposition, ou à un adverbe, ou un préverbe. La connaissance du vocabulaire, des formules, du mouvement permettent souvent de deviner ou de déterminer s'il s'agit d'une préposition ou non.

<sup>40</sup> CHANTRAINE 1953 II:84.

<sup>41</sup> CHANTRAINE 1953 II:102: 'dans avec mouvement'; 103: 'vers', 'à l'intérieur de'.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. POMPEO 2002:92.

<sup>43</sup> The identification of a preverb is only loosely related to this problem, since both KÜHNER, GERTH and CHANTRAINE assume an adverbial value for the preverb, thus maintaining the division between adverb and preposition. HEWSON 2008:86–87, as an alternative, categorizes particles, prepositions, and conjunctions as adverbs.

For Kühner and Gerth, the cohesion between preposition and noun is the main reason to identify a preposition; in their view, the evidence for cohesion stems from the proximity of the preposition and the noun<sup>44</sup>. If the two stand immediately together, a little word like ἐκ is indeed a true preposition, as it is in *Il.* 8.403 αὐτὰς δ' ἐκ δίφρου βάλεω κατὰ θ' ἄρματα ἄξω 'and themselves will I hurl from the chariot, and will break the chariot in pieces'. Depending on what intervenes between the preposition and its noun<sup>45</sup>, ἐκ remains a preposition or rather turns into an adverbial expression, as in *Il.* 18.29–30 ἐκ δὲ θύραζε ἔδραμον ἄμφ' Ἀχιλῆα δαΐφρονα 'and ran out from inside around battle-minded Achilles'. Instances like *Il.* 1.346 ἐκ δ' ἄγαγε κλισίης Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρηον 'out (?) he brought from the hut beautiful Briseïs' or *Od.* 16.165 ἐκ δ' ἦλθεν μεγάραιο πάρεκ μέγα τειχίον αὐλῆς 'and forth (?) he went from the hall, past the great wall of the court' apparently lie somewhere between true preposition and adverbial expression. At first sight, such a categorization sounds arbitrary, based on the assumption<sup>46</sup> that adpositions appear in various grammatical shapes and syntactical functions in Homer's hexameters.

But this assumption does not consider what Homer's audience perceived: a narrative in recognisable phrases. The performer of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* had to either keep and utter certain words together in one phrase, or deliberately allow for a pause between them.<sup>47</sup> A disruptive pause creates enjambment<sup>48</sup>. Phrasing has to be equally observed when dealing with the adposition: its scope, its range of grammatical

<sup>44</sup> Cf. DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:211–216.

<sup>45</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000 speak of 'hyperbaton on the left branch'.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. CHANTRAINE 1953 II:84.

<sup>47</sup> In BLANKENBORG 2022 I identify the phonological phrases in the Homeric epics in accordance with the continuation of phonological *legato*, and options for pause as the absence of sandhi, without the risk of rhythmic disruption, see below.

<sup>48</sup> As defined in PARRY 1971:251–265; KIRK 1966; HIGBIE 1990; CLARK 1994; 1997; 2004; BLANKENBORG 2016.

influence and syntactical function, is limited within the boundaries of the coherent phrase. In order to be identifiable as a preposition, the little word needs to share a phrasal domain with the noun<sup>49</sup>: without a single domain for prepositional word groups, little words cannot be identified as prepositional. Nor can they be identified as preverbs (or postverbs<sup>50</sup>) without a single domain shared with the verb.

Phrases in Homeric poetry have been variously determined. Bakker<sup>51</sup> put the phrasal domain in Homeric poetry on a par with the intonation units, interpreted as rhythmical spurts<sup>52</sup>, reflecting cognitive processes that are not equally grammatically or syntactically coherent<sup>53</sup>. Between metrical boundaries

<sup>49</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:82, 211–215.

<sup>50</sup> The technical term *preverb* seemed least problematic: even if the little word stands in closer relation to a noun than to the verb, at least it precedes the verb. Still, there are examples that even refute the *pre-*part of preverb (CHANTRAINE 1953 II:83): *Il.* 12.195 ὄφρ' οἱ τοὺς ἐνάριζον ἅπ' ἔντεα μαρμαίροντα 'while they were stripping from (?) these their shining arms'; *Il.* 2.699 ζῶς ἐὼν τότε δ' ἦδη ἔχεν κᾶτα γαῖα μέλαινα 'while he was still alive; but by that time the black earth already held him down (?)'; *Il.* 7.425 ἀλλ' ὕδατι νίζοντες ἅπο βρότον αἱματόεντα 'but with water they washed from them (?) the clotted blood'; *Il.* 17.91 ὦ μοι ἐγὼν εἰ μὲν κε λίπω κᾶτα τεύχεα καλὰ 'ah, woe is me! If I leave behind (?) the fair armour'; *Od.* 5.196 νύμφη δ' ἐτίθει πάρα πᾶσαν ἐδωδὴν 'and the nymph set before him (?) all kinds of food'; *Od.* 9.17 ἐγὼ δ' ἂν ἔπειτα φυγὼν ὕπο νηλεὲς ἦμαρ 'and that I hereafter escaping safely (?) the pitiless day of doom'. The examples show that, if the *Verbalbegriff* can be expressed in hyperbaton, the little word may *follow* the verb. If it does, the little word may still represent both grammatical categories: it may be prepositional, and it may be adverbial. This changes after Homer: In post-Homeric Greek, the anastrophe positioning is rare, cf. KÜHNER, GERTH 1963 I:533–535. In post-Homeric Greek, adverbial preverbs cannot follow their verb, though prepositional preverbs can (cf. the examples in KÜHNER, GERTH 1963 I:535–538). This observation makes a choice between adverb and preposition in Homer even more difficult to make. Hyperbaton also shows that the technical term *preverb* is still too close to the realm of written language with its normative compound verbs. The examples above show that the little word in Homer *is not* the preverb of classical Greek. For now, it is no more than an adposition, a *particle* (cf. HEWSON, BUBENIK 2006:56–57).

<sup>51</sup> BAKKER 1990, 1997b, 2005.

<sup>52</sup> BAKKER 2005:38–55. His linguistic analysis of Homeric syntax is largely based on the more general findings in the work of Wallace Chafe.

<sup>53</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:206–209 and BAKKER 2005:50–51 do not think it necessary for a unit to contain a verbal form. The intonation units

as positions of frequent word end (like the verse end, the third foot caesura, and several auxiliary caesurae), Homeric discourse is hence labelled 'special speech'<sup>54</sup>, 'with the units into which the passage easily divides'<sup>55</sup>. In performance, meant units practically coincide with the cola from metrical colometry<sup>56</sup>. Bakker acknowledges that intonation units may straddle positions of frequent word end, even the verse end<sup>57</sup>, but such rhythmical profiles are considered running against the 'basic rhythm of the hexameter'<sup>58</sup>. Others have gone further in their search for coherent phrasing, preferably on a scale that allows for larger scale phrasal domains<sup>59</sup>. Devine and Stephens (1994) argue for analysis and identification of *phonological* phrases on the basis of apposition and sandhi. Phonological apposition (accentuation and clisis) keeps phonetic words together in the *minor* phonological phrase<sup>60</sup>; syntactical apposition, together with vowel coalescence and consonantal liaison, ties the constituents of the *major* phonological phrase together<sup>61</sup>. The syllabification of metrical surface structure

---

do not correspond with the units formed by the stylistic norms of written language (BAKKER 2005:47), not even when several intonation units are grouped together. In written language, syntax organizes; in Homer, it merely continues (BAKKER 1997b).

<sup>54</sup> BAKKER 1997a:159–183; 1997b; 2005:46–47, 68. Cf. VISSER 1987:80–82.

<sup>55</sup> BAKKER 1997b:291.

<sup>56</sup> PARRY 1971:13; RUSSO 1966:220; BAKKER 1988b:152–164; HAINSWORTH 1993:16.

<sup>57</sup> BAKKER 1997b:303; 2005:54–55.

<sup>58</sup> BAKKER 2005:55; cf. 52, 68. In the progressive movement that replaces syntax in Homeric composition units team up to form larger wholes. Alternatively, the larger wholes that emerge as the rearrangement of intonation units, serve as the adpositions' scope, cf. BONIFAZI 2012:201–209.

<sup>59</sup> CLAYMAN 1981 and VAN NORTWICK 1977 wish for semantics to determine 'sense-pauses' (cf. WEST 1982:36; 1997; HAGEL 1994/1995:106). PORTER 1951 and DEVINE, STEPHENS 1978 do not allow for disruption of phrasal domains *within* word groups that are phonologically tied together through vowel coalescence and consonantal liaison. RUIJGH 1987 considers the lexical word and its nonlexical appositives as a non-breakable unit ('phonetic word') within the phrase.

<sup>60</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:285–289.

<sup>61</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:409–410.

evidences the phonological tie that is sandhi<sup>62</sup>. In Homer, minor phonological phrases, like intonation units, are sensitive to the demarcating value of positions of frequent word end<sup>63</sup>; major phonological phrases are built through sequencing metrical cola (the metrical phrases demarcated by positions of frequent word end), more often than not without regard for the (often automatically assumed) demarcating value of the positions of frequent word end (the caesurae, the diereses, and the verse end) themselves<sup>64</sup>. Patterning the major phonological phrases unto the metrical colometry and the syntactical clauses brings out a mismatch: phrases and clauses differ in the way they terminate<sup>65</sup>. The positions of frequent word end (or *compositional pausa*), that is, caesura, dieresis, and verse end, primarily function as minor phrase boundaries, and are not commonly straddled by appositional or clitic groups. The phrasal domain of the minor phrase<sup>66</sup> is thus clearly demarcated in size and location. Perhaps better rephrased as: ‘The status of the apposition, itself appositional, is defined within, and through, this domain, that is, the phonological minor phrase.

My aim will be to present, through examples, the way adpositions, including preverbs, are categorized prosodically in Homeric poetry. In this presentation, the minor phonological

<sup>62</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:235–246; BLANKENBORG 2022:70–82.

<sup>63</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:398–401 assume the hemistich as the archetypical minor phrase. Positions of frequent word end ‘focus’ constituents.

<sup>64</sup> Apposition that seemingly straddles the verse’s positions of frequent word end (as in verses where the third foot caesura is ‘syntactically’ ignored e.g. *Il.* 1.48 ἀπάνευθε νεῶν ‘at some distance from the ships’, KIRK 1966/1985) is to be considered the result of rearrangement of constituents into rhythmical phrases: despite the prepositive character of the adposition in the rhythmical phrase, its location right before a position of frequent word end shows that, whatever the rearrangement, at least some of its, originally, postpositive value (ἀπάνευθε ‘at some distance’) is retained.

<sup>65</sup> In BLANKENBORG 2016 and 2022 I have shown what the consequences of this patterning are for performance: rests of some duration are distributed rather randomly.

<sup>66</sup> Synonymous for the appositional group as an intonational phrase, cf. GOLDSTEIN 2014.

phrase will serve as the main phrasal domain. To illustrate the minor phrase's preferability as the adposition's scope (over other domains like the metrical colon and the major phonological phrase), I present a 6-step analysis (metrical, cognitive-grammatical, syntactical, rhythmical, phonological, semantical) of a Homeric example<sup>67</sup>, *Odyssey* 6.125, as an elaborate instance of the method applied.

1. Metrical: A lot of Kühner and Gerth's 'preposition groups' are broken in two by, for example, the third foot caesura. The third foot caesura (indicated as: in *Od.* 6.125 below) frustrates the coherence of a phrasal domain for the preposition:

ἦ νύ που ἀνθρώπων : εἰμὶ σχεδὸν αὐδέντων

*Od.* 6.125

Can it be that I am somewhere near men of human speech?

The caesura frustrates a single metrical-phrasal domain for the preposition group ἀνθρώπων σχεδὸν αὐδέντων 'near men of human speech'. The metrical boundary divides the line into two hemistichs. In the first, ἦ νύ που ἀνθρώπων, the genitive ἀνθρώπων follows που as in *Od.* 4.639–640 ἀλλά που αὐτοῦ || ἀγρῶν 'but somewhere there, on his lands'. In the second hemistich, εἰμὶ σχεδὸν αὐδέντων, σχεδόν can be seen as an adverb<sup>68</sup>. The adverb strengthens the meaning of the genitive ἀνθρώπων, though the genitive itself is in the previous colon. If a genitive is to be found in the same metrical-phrase colon, αὐδέντων can be used as a substantive<sup>69</sup>, and, as such, as appositional 'people of human speech' to ἀνθρώπων. Such analysis leads to new questions. Why is the

<sup>67</sup> Cf. DAITZ 1991; DAVID 2006:126.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. CHANTRAINE 1953 II:148.

<sup>69</sup> The closest parallel is the predicative use in *Il.* 19.407 αὐδήεντα δ' ἔθηκε θεὰ 'the goddess (Hera) rendered them with human speech'.

apposition strengthened by an adverb, while ἀνθρώπων goes without it? Why is ἀνθρώπων grammatically autonomous, and the apposition subject to the development of grammatical governance?

2. Cognitive-grammatical: is this an instance of ‘weak-focus Y2 hyperbaton’<sup>70</sup>, or ‘Y2VprepY1 hyperbaton’ that is ‘predictable in verse’?<sup>71</sup> In Y2VprepY1 hyperbaton, the describing adjective (αὐδηέντων) is separated from its noun (ἀνθρώπων) by both the verb (V) and the preposition (prep). This analysis is hindered, however, by the identification of σχεδόν as an adverb, *and* by the appositional prosodic phrasing (appositional due to the caesura separating the hemistichs, see under 1 above).
3. Syntactical: hyperbaton requires a coherent phrasal domain<sup>72</sup>, but syntactical apposition based on metrical phrasing resists hyperbaton. If studied as a juxtaposition of internally coherent metrical-colon spurts, *Od.* 6.125 requires quite some license in order to identify σχεδόν as a preposition or an adverb, and even for identification of hyperbaton.
4. Rhythmical: the third-foot metrical boundary of *Od.* 6.125 (syllabification .ἀν.θρῶ.πω.νει.μί), and the fourth-foot word end are straddled due to liaison (syllabification .νει.μισ.χε.δὸν-).
5. Phonological: rhythmically, ἀνθρώπων εἰμὶ σχεδόν belongs to a single major phrase. The order of words (with the noun first and then the adjective, see under 2 above) resists identification of σχεδόν as a preposition within an Y1VprepY2 hyperbaton preposition group, though it is not so difficult to see why it has been analysed as such. Still, the particle σχεδόν carries an auxiliary accent,

<sup>70</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:91.

<sup>71</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:112.

<sup>72</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:82–83, allow for far greater licences in Homer.



as if it were a proclitic; this is not surprising as phonological *legato* (-σ.χε.δὸ.ναὺ.δη.έν.των) seems to support the particle's proclitic character. The combination of σχέδον, however, with proclitic εἰμί into a metrical phrase<sup>73</sup> suggests that clitic σχέδον is in fact enclitic. In that case, σχέδον ought to be read – despite the proclisis that rhythmical rearrangement into the major phrase suggests. Paroxytone σχέδον, due to anastrophe, then resembles the anastrophic accentuation of postpositions. But σχέδον is not a postposition either, since it does not constitute one phonetic word together with the noun ἀνθρώπων<sup>74</sup>. If it is at least postpositive it is 'right branch demarcating'<sup>75</sup>: it marks the metrical boundary (= position of frequent word end) between prosodically characterized units.

6. Semantical: The location of the adposition *within* the minor phrase reflects the semantic and syntactical value of σχέδον/σχέδον. As σχέδον the little word is realised in performance as an adverbial expression. In translation Od. 6.125 may be rendered as 'Really, somewhere in the world of men? Can I be close? To those of human speech?'

The above analysis proves to be a complex and possibly confusing way to reach an outcome that nonetheless affects interpretation and translation. In the remainder of this paper, I will focus on positive argumentation: first on the prosodic characterization of adpositions (step 4 and 5 above), then on possible phonological adaptations (step 5 above), and finally on interpretative consequences (step 6 above).

---

<sup>73</sup> Between the penthemimeral caesura (position 5) and the bucolic die-resis (position 8).

<sup>74</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:301–308.

<sup>75</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:289–291, 377, 394–395.

### Prosodic characterization of the adposition

If the adposition is evaluated depending on its location in the phrasal domain, its prosodic characterization determines interpretation, and translation, as either an adverb, a preposition, or a preverb. To illustrate the various factors at play and their consequences for interpretation, I present thirteen examples, grouped together because of the occurrence of the word for “chariot” (or “bench”) in the genitive case:

1. ἀρχὸν Ἀλιζώνων Ὀδίον μέγαν ἔκβαλε δίφρου

*Il.* 5.39

The leader of the Halizones, great Odios, he threw out of the chariot

2. ὄρσο πέπον Καπανηϊάδη καταβήσεο δίφρου

*Il.* 5.109

get moving, my friend, offspring of Kapaneus, step down from the chariot

3. αὐτὰρ ὁ γ' αἰσθμαίνων εὐεργέος ἔκπεσε δίφρου

*Il.* 5.585 = *Il.* 13.399

but he fell dying from the well-made chariot

4. ἐοῦ δ' ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου

*Il.* 8.44 = *Il.* 13.26

he stepped onto his own chariot

5. αὐτὰς δ' ἐκ δίφρου βαλέω κατὰ θ' ἄρματα ἄξω

*Il.* 8.403

And themselves will I hurl from the chariot, and will break the chariot in pieces

6. τῶ δ' αὖτ' ἐκ δίφρου γοναζέσθην

*Il.* 11.130

both of them begged on their knees from the chariot

7. ὦς ὁ πρόσθ' ἵππων καὶ δίφρου κεῖτο τανυσθείς

*Il.* 13.392 = *Il.* 16.485

similarly he was lying full length in front of the horses and chariot

8. Πάτροκλος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἐπεὶ ἴδεν ἔκθορε δίφρου

*Il.* 16.427

And as Patroklos noticed him from the other side, he jumped to the ground from the chariot

9. κάππεσ' ἀπ' εὐεργέος δίφρου

*Il.* 16.743

to the ground he fell from the well-made chariot

10. αἰεὶ γὰρ δίφρου ἐπιβησομένοισιν ἔϊκτην

*Il.* 23.379

for the two of them constantly seemed about to step onto the chariot

11. Ἑκτορα δ' ἔλκεσθαι δησάσκετο δίφρου ὀπισθεν

*Il.* 24.15

to drag Hektor he repeatedly tied him to the rear end of the chariot

12. σπερχόμενος δ' ὁ γέρων ξεστοῦ ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου

Il. 24.322

hurriedly the old man stepped onto the polished chariot

13. καὶ δ' ἐπὶ δίφρου εἶσαν

Il. 24.578

down on a bench they made him sit

All examples feature a genitive and a verb<sup>76</sup>. In accordance with Chantraine, all cited instances of genitive case nouns originally could do without an adposition further nuancing noun-case semantics. If the adpositions are perceived as autonomous *adverbial* expressions, either in univertation or freestanding, the translation<sup>77</sup> of the first in the above series of quotations may differ from what seems to be the standard:

1. ἀρχὸν Ἀλιζώνων Ὀδίων μέγαν ἔκβαλε δίφρου

Il. 5.39

leader of the Halizones, great Odios, he threw out, out of the chariot

The combination 'he threw out, out of the chariot' completes the verse from the bucolic dieresis to verse end. The words ἔκβαλε δίφρου are not strongly tied together phonologically<sup>78</sup>. Ἐκβαλε is presented as a form of the compound verb ἐκβάλλειν followed by a genitive governed by the preverb ἐκ-. The proximity of the particle and the verb seems to be the only

<sup>76</sup> Not necessarily with the verb governing the noun in genitive case.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. the 'chunked' translations in BAKKER 1997b, and the comments on this type of translation in EDWARDS 2002:9–13.

<sup>78</sup> As metrical syllabification ἔκ.βα.λε.δίφ.ρου does not evidence any influence of sandhi on the rhythmical realisation of word-final -λε in accordance with metrical requirements. Position 10 ([-]λε) qualifies as an option for secondary pause (BLANKENBORG 2022).

reason to suggest universion<sup>79</sup>. The same applies to 2, ὄρσο πέπον Καπανηϊάδη καταβήσσο δίφρου, one of the few verses without a caesura in the third foot<sup>80</sup>: from the hephthemimeres (following position 7), the word group ‘step down, from the chariot’ fills the hexameter until the verse end. Depending on the classification of the particle as preverbal κατά-, or separate κατά, the translation may be:

- α. ‘step down, down/away from the chariot’ (adverb or preverb);
- β. ‘down, take the step, down/away from the chariot’ (adverbial expression, or together with ὄρσο as κάτω in Y2 hyperbaton);<sup>81</sup>
- γ. ‘down, take the step, from the chariot’ (preposition in Y1 hyperbaton);
- δ. ‘step down from the chariot’ (preverb governing the genitive case).

Universion καταβήσσο is the result of the proximity of adposition and verb in one phrase: Y2 hyperbaton (translation β) is very unlikely<sup>82</sup>. In 3, αὐτὰρ ὁ γ’ αἰσθμαίνων εὐεργέος

<sup>79</sup> Preverb and verb might as well have been printed as separate words: ἐκ βάλε.

<sup>80</sup> In 1.2% of the Homeric hexameters the third foot caesura fails, cf. VAN RAALTE 1986:81: ‘The incidental absence of caesura should be considered as an occasional licence which is unobjectionable only in virtue of a general regularity with regard to the observance of caesura.’ Most hexameters without a caesura in the third foot feature word end after the fourth thesis, and regularly after the second, as *Il.* 5.39 does (an additional reason to distinguish two separate vocatives in this line). Thus, we find a verse with two marked positions of word end, hephthemimeres (following position 5) and trithemimeres (following position 3), cf. KORZENIEWSKI 1968:31.

<sup>81</sup> Thought κατόρνυμι does not occur in Homer. Postpositive κάτω is attested in *Il.* 5.162, whereas word end at the bucolic dieresis with accent on an ultima (κάτω), is rare in the Homeric hexameter. In general, prepositive localisation before positions of frequent word division is strongly avoided, cf. DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:308.

<sup>82</sup> Proximity does not, however, automatically create a compound verb. Still, it is tempting to suggest that the prepositive and, especially, clitic character of the adposition is the origin of the later prefix to the compound verb, cf. the remarks on the augment and accentuation in CHANTRAINE 1961:308–313, and the adverbial character of the augment in BAKKER 2005:114–120.

ἐκπεσε δίφρου, similar considerations allow for ἐκ πέσε δίφρου, 'out he fell, from the chariot. Matters are further complicated by the Y1verbY2 hyperbaton: the epitheton 'well-made' stands between the third foot caesura and the bucolic dieresis, but is separated from its noun. Prepositive ἐκ creates a phrasal reset<sup>83</sup>, similar to the start of a new prosodically characterised phrase. If εὐεργής counts as a noun<sup>84</sup>, translation runs 'but he, dying, out of the work of craft, out he fell, out of the chariot'. Phrasal reset from the bucolic dieresis does not render the hyperbaton poetically meaningful. Preverbal ἐκ- results in a major phonological phrase εὐεργέος ἐκπεσε δίφρου, a single rhythmical phrase with Y1verbY2 hyperbaton of possibly appositional constituents as a result. Orthographically, the new rhythmical and syntactical arrangement is presented as Y1verbY2 hyperbaton: that is, featuring a compound verb.

Y1verbY2 hyperbaton also features in the 4 (ἐοῦ δ' ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου) and 12 (σπερχόμενος δ' ὁ γέρων ξεστοῦ ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου<sup>85</sup>). Most manuscripts read a compound verb ἐπιβαίνειν 'to step onto': the preverb seems to govern the genitive case, either preceding or following the verbal form<sup>86</sup>. A different situation is found in 10 (αἰεὶ γὰρ δίφρου ἐπιβησομένοισιν ἔκτιν) where reading ἐπὶ βησομένοισιν cannot turn ἐπί into postpositive ἔπι at position 6<sup>87</sup>. Prepausal and phrase-final δίφρου gets rhythmically isolated. Semantically, ἐπί is bidirectional: the 'semantic' domain contains the words on its

<sup>83</sup> Cf. DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:383-384 for phrasal restart through a preposition.

<sup>84</sup> Cf., e.g. *Od.* 4.695, 22.319.

<sup>85</sup> The *varia lectio* σπερχόμενος δ' ὁ γεραιὸς εὐὸ ἐπεβήσετο δίφρου (A Y) renders similar hyperbaton.

<sup>86</sup> A genitive case preceding the verbal form is suggestive of postpositive and adverbial ἔπι.

<sup>87</sup> Despite being bidirectional (DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:324: 'it is probable that in many instances the rules of word rhythm are extended to the phrasal domain in fluent speech, so that the appositive coheres both to the left and to the right') ἐπί is phonologically prepositive only because of the third foot caesura.

left and its right. On prosodic grounds, ἐκ is prepositive and forms a prosodic unit together with the verbal form θόρε in 8 (Πάτροκλος δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἐπεὶ ἴδεν ἐκθορε δίφρου); the metrical phrase ἐκθορε δίφρου is syntactically autonomous. Are we to understand ἐκθορε or ἐκ θόρε? Given the proximity of ἐκ and θόρε, is ἐκ's prepositive character ample justification for rendering the adposition as a preverb in print? I present the remaining quotations, some with slightly modified translations, to address the issue:

5. αὐτὰς δ' ἐκ δίφρου βαλέω κατὰ θ' ἄρματα ἄξω

*Il.* 8.403

them I will throw out, out of the chariot and to pieces I will break the chariot

6. τῶ δ' αὖτ' ἐκ δίφρου γοναζέσθην

*Il.* 11.130

both of them, from the chariot, begged on their knees

7. ὥς ὁ πρόσθ' ἵππων καὶ δίφρου κεῖτο τανυσθείς

*Il.* 13.392 = *Il.* 16.485

similarly, he, in front of the horses and chariot, was lying, full length

9. κάππεσ' ἀπ' εὐεργέος δίφρου

*Il.* 16.743

to the ground he fell from the well-made chariot

11. Ἑκτορα δ' ἔλκεσθαι δησάσκετο δίφρου ὀπισθεν

*Il.* 24.15

to drag Hektor he repeatedly tied him to the chariot at the rear end

## 13. καὶ δ' ἐπὶ δίφρου εἶσαν

Il. 24.578

down on a bench they made him sit

None of the examples features an affix governing the genitive case. Il. 16.743 does have a verbal form with a preverb (attached to the verb as a prefix)<sup>88</sup>, but here it is ἀπό that governs the genitive case, or at least strengthens its meaning<sup>89</sup>. If the dieresis after the first foot is prosodically marked<sup>90</sup>, ἀπό is adverbial: 'down he fell from his position, from the well-made chariot'. The resulting postpositive character of ἀπό should change its accentuation by anastrophe into paroxytone ἄπ(ο). Such consequences are less likely for ἐπὶ in 13 (καὶ δ' ἐπὶ δίφρου εἶσαν): a phrase consisting of καὶ δ' ἐπὶ is not probable<sup>91</sup>. Then again, καὶ may be prepositive, and form one prepositive word group<sup>92</sup> together with ἐπὶ: καὶ ἐπὶ 'down onto'. Alternatively, it is prepositive to the major phrasal domain, and in Y1XY2 hyperbaton with the verbal form. Regularly it is thus understood, and prosodically it may have been prepositive and proclitic (καδ'). It cannot, however, be compared to the classical preverb *in tmesi*, because of the distance from the verbal form, as well as the intervening prepositive ἐπὶ, the phonetic word ἐπὶ δίφρου, and the impossibility of a minor

<sup>88</sup> Again, the proximity of the particle and the verbal form turns the particle into a preverb, but cf. (also with assimilation) καὶ δ' ἔπεσε and καὶ δ' ἐπὶ δίφρου εἶσαν cited below.

<sup>89</sup> For this and similar examples it would be useful to assume monosyllabic \*ἄπ as equivalent to ἀπό.

<sup>90</sup> The dieresis after the first foot might, combined with hephthemimeral word division preparing for a coherent closure of the hexameter in λίπε δ' ὅστέα θυμός, render a better rhythmical colometry than allowing for a meaningless third foot caesura after εὐεργέος. Avoidance of synizesis at the main caesura is then an additional advantage (*contra* JANKO 1992:404, who explains the irregularities as adaptations of a formulaic prototype).

<sup>91</sup> Though it is not impossible, cf. DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:319.

<sup>92</sup> The elision of δέ reduces δ' to an onset (DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:305), without any phonetic clisis.



phonological phrase containing *both* *καὶ* and *εἶσαν*. The distance locating *καὶ* and *εἶσαν* in two separate phrases and separating them prosodically identifies the adposition as an adverbial form; there is no phrasal domain for a *Verbalgestalt*<sup>93</sup>. In 5 and 13, it seems arbitrary to conclude that there is either a compound verb, or only a simplex. Proximity of particle and verb, resulting in a possibly appositive interrelation between the two words, cannot strengthen the suggestion of a preverb in hyperbaton here. The position of particle and verbal form in 6 (τῷ δ' αὖτ' ἐκ δίφρου γουναζέσθην) is similar to 5 and 13; no dictionary, however, accounts for a compound verb ἐκγουνάζομαι or ἐκγουνόομαι, and neither do I. The particle ἐκ is prepositive to the substantive in genitive case δίφρου, but the distance from the verbal form is too great to consider the particle as prepositive to γουναζέσθην. Neither is it in hyperbaton to the verbal form, as there is an intervening bucolic dieresis<sup>94</sup>. The distance and phrase-demarcation prevent labeling the adpositions in 7 and 11 as possible preverbs in hyperbaton. With reference to *Il.* 16.427, the affixing of ἐκ in ἔκθογε, the conclusion must hence be that univerbation results from the phonology of the phrasal domain, without any claim or consequence for adverbial modification through the preverb; its character remains autonomously adverbial. Affixing results from phonology rather than semantics.

<sup>93</sup> Or 'complex predicate' (BOOIJ, KEMENADE 2003). Considering ἐπί a preverb in hyperbaton creates the need to account for a new compound verb ἐπιίζω / ἐπίζω in Homer, cf. the compound verbs ἐπιιζάνω in Q.S. 6.38 and ἐπιίζομαι (Att. ἐφέζομαι) in Lucill. *Epigr.* 47.

<sup>94</sup> The line Ἀτρεΐδης τῷ δ' αὖτ' ἐκ δίφρου γουναζέσθην shows a familiar rhythmical pattern of trithemimeres, word end allowed under the conditions of Wernicke's law (unless δίφροο is read, as suggested, but not actually read by LEAF 1900–1902:477. Though not commenting on the genitive case realisation, HAINSWORTH 1993:239 describes the line as an 'oddly spondaic verse') followed by a spondaic fifth foot, and a tetrasyllabic spondaic word mapped at verse end.

### Affixing within the phrasal domain

Pre- and postpositive character is a phonological issue related to the prosodically characterized phrase and indicative of its scope<sup>95</sup>. Univerbation renders appositives as affixes. Chantraine<sup>96</sup> identifies univerbation with a *préverbe*, when the resulting compound verb i) occurs more often in the Homeric epics, or ii) occurs in the works of other authors, apart from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and iii) occurs there with exactly the same meaning<sup>97</sup>.

Comparable analysis of later development of the adposition in, primarily, written texts led to the identification of cut-off preverbs. The scholiast presents a remarkable insight on the first ‘compound’ verb of the *Iliad* προΐαψεν: Τ προΐαψεν οὖν ἔβλαψε πρὸ ὅρου παραπέμψασα Ἄϊδη τουτέστι πρὸ τοῦ πρέποντος ἀνθρώποις θανάτου (Τt: ἢ περιττεύει ἢ πρὸ ὥς τὸ νῆας τε προπάσας) ‘Τ “it sent them before”, meaning that it harmed them by sending them to Hades before their time, that is, before the death that is appropriate for men (Τt: or the πρὸ is redundant as it is in νῆας τε προπάσας)’. Τ suggests a strictly adverbial value for the particle<sup>98</sup>. Τ seems to agree with modern editors when he comments on the first case of *Verbalgestalt*-hyperbaton in the *Iliad* in *Il.* 1.25 κρατερόν

<sup>95</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:286–287.

<sup>96</sup> CHANTRAINE 1953 II:82–84.

<sup>97</sup> Taking into account, of course, that the particle cannot be seen as a preposition. This impossibility of identification as a preposition stems from the case of the noun following the particle, e.g. χείρας ἀπὸ ξίφει τμήξας ἀπὸ τ’ αὐχένα κόψας ‘after chopping off the hands with his sword, and cutting off the neck’ in *Il.* 11.146, where the particle ἀπὸ cannot be taken to govern either the dative nor the accusative case.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. the use and position of πρὸ in *Il.* 13.800 ὡς Τρῶες πρὸ μὲν ἄλλοι ἀρηρότες αὐτὰρ ἔπ’ ἄλλοι ‘similarly the Trojans, some in ranks at the front, but others behind’ (though indicating not time there but location). Τt does not automatically agree with Τ, but does not suggest a meaningful compound verb either. Equally interesting is the observation by Herodianus in *Aint* that the verbal part of the third ‘compound’ verb in the *Iliad* started with an aspiration (δασύνεται τὸ ξυνέηκε): surely not *word-internal*.

δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλεν· τὸ δὲ ἐξῆς ἐπέτελλεν 'without hyperbaton: ἐπέτελλεν'<sup>99</sup>.

Adpositions seem to appear in four different phonological shapes: prepositive, postpositive, bidirectional, or prosodically non-clitic (in case of elision of the monosyllabic adposition). Most of the adpositions that are seen as preverbs in hyperbaton, are either pre- or postpositive. Meant adpositions merely serve to strengthen, or further specify, case-meaning of autonomous nouns. The semantic function may be compared to a preparatory prepositional object. The adverbial meaning (locative, temporal, 'spatial', or abstract) is clearly stated, e.g., ἀντί 'face to face with it', περί 'surrounding it, all around', κατὰ 'down', ἐς 'getting closer'. An object is not expressed until later, possibly (when autonomous) with yet another spatial or temporal semantic relation. Adverbial ἀμφί, for example, is used both in combination with three different cases, and without any:

Ἀχαιοὶ || ἕστασαν ἀμφὶ Μενoitιάδῃ

*Il.* 17.266-267

the Greeks took their places on both sides, close to the son of Menoeteus

ἀμφὶ δ' ἑὸν φίλον υἱὸν ἐχεύατο πῆχεε λευκῷ

*Il.* 5.314

on both sides, towards her beloved son she stretched both her white arms

μαχέσθον || πίδακος ἀμφ' ὀλίγῃς

*Il.* 16.824-825

the two of them fight, on both sides, over (some of) the little fountain

<sup>99</sup> Ancient grammarians used ἐξῆς 'linear contiguity', as opposed to ὑπερβατόν.

ῥῆξεν δέ οἱ ἀμφὶ χιτῶνα

*Il.* 13.439

he tore for him on both sides his tunic

ἀμφὶ δ' ἑταῖροι || εὔδον

*Il.* 10.151–152

on both sides his friends were sleeping

Prefixed ἀμφί is attached to a verb, or to an adjective (as is *πρό* in *νῆας τε προπάσας*):

ἐπεὶ σε μάλιστα πόνος φρένας ἀμφιβέβηκε

*Il.* 6.355

since for you, most of all, the pain has left markings in the brain  
on both sides

φρένες ἀμφιμέλαιναι (Leaf, following MMS; West prints  
ἀμφὶ μέλαιναι)

*Il.* 1.103

the midriff on both sides black

The position of the adposition immediately before the adjective or the verbal form does not seem to affect either the case of the adjective μέλαιναι, or the use of the transitive verb βέβηκε with an accusative-object (*φρένας*). The adposition does not have more or less modifying effect on the adjective or the verb than it has on the noun cases<sup>100</sup>. The same applies to other adpositions<sup>101</sup>. Many adpositions have alternative forms with the same or similar meaning and usage. All

<sup>100</sup> The use of related ἀμφίς is similar to that of the adposition ἀμφί.

<sup>101</sup> CHANTRAINE 1953 II:90–144.

‘prepositional’ adpositions can be separated from ‘their’ noun by hyperbaton<sup>102</sup>.

If proximity and the prepositive character of an adposition can lead to a compound verb, there is no reason in principle to deny the possibility of compound adjectives like ἀμφιμέλαι-  
ναι<sup>103</sup>. Similarly, there is no reason not to print triple preverbs as in ὑπεκπροθέει. However, if (i) there is no difference in usage of the adposition (as it is always autonomous and adverbially used), and (ii) proximity and the prepositive character of the adposition are the only reasons to print compound verbs (regardless of the adposition’s autonomous character), compound preposition groups may be an option too. For example, ἀναστρατόν instead of ἀνὰ στρατόν; θοὰς ἐπινῆας (or θοὰς ἐπίνηας) instead of θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας. *Il.* 1.25 would appear in print as κρατερόν δ’ ἐπιμῦθον ἔτελλε (or κρατερόν δ’ ἐπίμυθον ἔτελλε). A marked bucolic pause, however, would rather turn the adposition into a postpositive: κρατερόν ἐπιμῦθον ἔτελλε. The latter option makes better grammatical and semantic sense in accordance with the prosodic argument<sup>104</sup>.

<sup>102</sup> DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000:111–112. This observation pertains to the ‘double preposition’ or the ‘double preverb’. For CHANTRAINE, the ‘double preposition’ is a result of the ‘double preverb’ (145). With the exception of ἀμφὶ περὶ, all these ‘double prepositions’ have -ἐξ or -πρό as their second part. If the governing rules for prepositions in classical Greek are applied, these double particles govern the noun case one might expect looking at the **first** part, for example παρέκ τὴν νῆσον. Not unexpectedly, such double forms appear to be more often used as adverbs: their phonological realisation may even equal the minor phonological phrase (DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:319–322). The sequence of two ‘prepositional’ particles may be cut up by an intervening sentential clitic (καὶ δ’ ἐπὶ).

<sup>103</sup> But cf. KIRK 1985:64 who remarks that the scholiasts read two separate words.

<sup>104</sup> But carries consequences for the accentuation of the phonetic word (DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994:369). Hence νηυσὶν ἐπι κλονέονται (West) ‘to the ships they were driven’ instead of νηυσὶν ἐπι κλονέονται (Leaf) ‘near the ships they were driven together’ (*Il.* 18.7); κρατερόν ἐπι μῦθον ἔτελλε ‘in addition he gave him a powerful warning’ (*Il.* 1.25), νύμφη δὲ τίθει πάρα πᾶσαν ἐδωδὴν ‘and the nymph placed all kind of food within reach’ (*Od.* 5.196). In *Il.* 15.144 Ἴριν θ’ ἣ τε θεοῖσι μετ’ ἄγγελος ἀθανάτοισι (Leaf) ‘Iris, who is her messenger among the immortal gods’, CHANTRAINE (1953 II:85) argues

### Prosodically identified adpositions

Prosodic phrasing resists analysis of adverbially used adpositions as preverbs, as I will illustrate with examples from the *Iliad*'s first book. In *Il.* 1.3, the adposition has a strictly adverbial meaning 'forth', and might as well stand separated from the verb: πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προὐΐαψεν (West: προΐαψεν) 'and many excellent souls it sent forth to the house of Hades'<sup>105</sup>. Reading the adposition as a prefix suggests that it should be understood as prepositive, as *\*pro-* is in the Indo-European tradition where it is collocated with the subsequent verb at an early time. Phonological demarcation is uncommon after the fifth foot trochee (Third Law of Meyer). Demarcation at the enehemimeral word division, however, is unlikely, too: meeting the metrical requirements of the fifth foot thesis requires major-pharse resyllabification Ἄ.ι.διπ. The adposition may in fact well be nonclitic<sup>106</sup>. A comparable nonclitic adposition appears in *Il.* 1.73 ὃ σφιν ἔϋ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν 'well-disposed towards them he rose, and in their midst he spoke', when printed ὃ σφιν ἔϋ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετ' εἶπεν, or with the particle accentuated μέτ(ι) as an adverb. The position of μετ' as a nonclitic due to elision presupposes that the initial vowel of εἶπεν is due to diektasis of the stem-vowel, not the proclitic augment<sup>107</sup>. The phonological character of the adposition may easily have changed over time, but this was not an isolated development to maintain archaic forms and formulas<sup>108</sup>.

---

for an impossible enclitic postposition μέτ (< μέτα), impossible as it would create a third foot dieresis. If the adposition would be postpositive (regardless of the prosodic surface structure), it should have been adverbial, and unelided, monosyllabic μέτ. Cf. the defence of the reading μετάγγελος (or rather μετάγγελος cf. *Il.* 23.199) in LEUMANN 1950:69.

<sup>105</sup> The same adverbial meaning for the adposition can be found in, for example, *Il.* 1.195 and 1.442, and, together with the same verb, in 11.55.

<sup>106</sup> Compare the preference for a nonclitic adposition at the fifth foot trochee (-δ') in *Il.* 1.19 ἐκπέσσαι Πριάμοιο πόλιν εὐδ' οἶκαδ' ἱκέσθαι 'to destroy Priam's citadel and to return home safely'.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. BAKKER 2005:106–108, 114–120.

<sup>108</sup> HORROCKS 1981:152–183; JANKO 1992:11n15, 17.

In his comment on *Il.* 1.6, Eustathius mentions that some wrote διὰ στήτην (not read by West, and an ‘extraordinary variant’ according to Leaf). The adposition’s prepositive status is evidenced through resyllabification (δι.ὰς.τή.την). *Il.* 1.8 τίς τάρ σφωε θεῶν ξριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι ‘Who then of the gods brought the two together to fight in strife?’ seems a similar situation, but the adposition’s proclisis is prosodically strengthened (Hermann’s Bridge). When dealing with examples like these, Chantraine<sup>109</sup> and Leumann<sup>110</sup> both consider the advantages of separating prefix and verb, as in *Il.* 1.65 εἰ ταρ ὁ γ’ εὐχολῆς ἔπι μέμφεται ἢ δ’ ἑκατόμβης (West: ἐπιμέμφεται) ‘Perhaps he is not very pleased with a promise either, or with an offering’. For them the result is a postposition ἔπι. Prosodically, however, it is not: ἔπι is the start of a minor phrase, not its termination. It is either proclitic, or, as is more likely for the adverb, nonclitic though appositive. Nonetheless, both scholars suggest that certain univerbations and compound adjectives are the result of misunderstandings: μετὰγγελος in *Il.* 15.144 Ἴριν θ’ ἣ τε θεοῖσι μέτ’ ἄγγελος ἀθανάτοισι (Leaf), ἀντάξιος in *Il.* 11.514 ἡτρός γάρ ἀνὴρ πολλῶν ἀντ’ ἄξιος ἄλλων (Leaf; West: ἀντάξιος). Any postpositive character of μέτ’ is prosodically refuted. Monosyllabic μέτ is prepositive but not clitic; it explains the affixing leading to μετὰγγελος, but frustrates interpretation of μετ’ as a postposition. The prepositive character of ἀντ’ in *Il.* 11.514 accounts for the affixing ἀντάξιος, but does not evidence identification of ἀντ’ as proclitic.

If the adposition is best understood as separated from a verb, as in *Il.* 1.73 cited above, univerbation at positions of frequent word end leads not only to a different verse in print, but possibly to a different meaning. Depending on the localization of the third foot word division, the translation of *Il.* 1.58 τοῖσι δ’ ἄν ιστάμενος μετ’ (or μέτ) ἔφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς

<sup>109</sup> CHANTRAINE 1953 II:85.

<sup>110</sup> LEUMANN 1950:71–72.

(West: ἀνιστάμενος μετέφη) is either ‘for them he rose and in their midst he spoke, swift Achilles’, or ‘for them he took position in their midst and he spoke, swift Achilles’<sup>111</sup>. In many verses, where, as in *Il.* 1.58, there is little reason to doubt the prepositive character of the adposition, separation of adposition and verb has hardly any consequences except for orthography. In *Il.* 1.140 ἀλλ’ ἦ τοι μὲν ταῦτα μέτα φρασόμεσθα καὶ αὖτις (West: μεταφρασόμεσθα) tmesis is to be preferred. The compound verb μεταφράζομαι is hapax in Homer, and ill-chosen in combination with καὶ αὖτις. Separate prefix and verb, and allow for an audible demarcation at hephthmimeres: ‘but surely when it comes to these things, at a later time (μέτα), we will consider them once again’. There is something suspicious in the fact that where adpositions are used as separate words at various positions in the hexameter (and bisyllabic adpositions appear as monosyllabic), they appear as bisyllabic preverbs immediately following penthemimeres remarkably often: at that metrical position they can only be prepositive and are almost inevitably proclitic. Alternatively, they appear as monosyllabic in combination with an augment, which is usually superfluous<sup>112</sup>. The resulting univertion effectively avoids a trochaic caesura<sup>113</sup>.

Apparently, Homer separated what editors and commentators would like to see written as a compound. On *Il.* 1.258 οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλὴν Δαναῶν περὶ δ’ ἔσπε μάχεσθαι ‘you who

<sup>111</sup> The problem in this verse is, of course, not only μετ(ι) and the location of the third foot word end. If the adposition is indeed to be understood in this shape, the consequences of elision should be accounted for. If the caesura is penthemimeres, and the adposition is prepositive, there is no problem. On the other hand, a trochaic caesura and postpositive adposition result in elision at the word division, the possibility of which is not yet satisfactory established in Homer. Monosyllabic μετ/μέτ might be reconsidered. The use of ἄν is problematic, too, though only with regards to orthography (CONTI 2015).

<sup>112</sup> As in *Il.* 23.379, cited above, or *Od.* 6.127 ὡς εἰπὼν θάμνων ὑπεδύσσετο δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς ‘having spoken thus, godlike Odysseus left his shelter under the thicket’.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. the observations of STEINRÜCK 2005, especially when considering an enoplon as the second colon of the hexameter.



of the Greeks are superior when it comes to council as well as to doing battle', Leaf<sup>114</sup> comments: 'Construe περίεστε μὲν βουλήν Δαναῶν περίεστε δὲ μάχεσθαι: cf. *Od.* 19.326 περίεμι γυναικῶν.' Kirk might identify a rising threefolder<sup>115</sup>, but the bucolic dieresis does not separate minor phrases. The second occurrence of the adposition is prepositive, and *still* it is separated from the verb: it is strictly adverbial, as was the first occurrence in this line.

### Concluding remarks

I realize that my choice to work from a set of examples raises new questions without providing exhaustive answers. Further research is needed to establish the exact categorization of Homer's adpositions. My focus on the prosodically motivated scope of the adposition may, however, shed a light on three existing questions. First, the issue of combining adpositions with various, and variable, noun cases. Second, the issue of combining several adpositions with or without a combination with a noun case or verbal form. And, third, the issue of hyperbaton of adposition and noun case, or, in the case of tmesis, the verbal form.

The semantics of the adposition that eventually (in Classical Greek) develops into a noun-governing pre- or postposition, originally only strengthened the case-based semantics of the noun. It is therefore not surprising to find, in later Greek, adpositions with a wider semantic range combined with more than one noun case. Adpositions like ἐκ and ἀπό, however, seem semantically limited, partly due to ongoing noun-case syncretism<sup>116</sup>. In most instances in the Homeric epics, it will be clear to which noun in the verse an adposition is to be understood as strengthening its meaning, based on identification of the adposition as either post- or prepositive. Above, I gave

<sup>114</sup> LEAF 1900–1902 I:22–23.

<sup>115</sup> KIRK 1985:60.

<sup>116</sup> CHANTRAINE 1953 II:82.

various examples concerning the use of the adposition ἀμφί. Also of interest are cases where traditional grammatical explanations are not conclusive, or at least suspect. One might propose to call these examples instances of *variable* noun cases. Theoretically, however, it would be better not to mention the noun cases at all<sup>117</sup>. Numerous instances of compound verbs, seemingly coined by Homer, can be explained as *simplicia* when the preverb is identified as an adverb that cannot and does not govern any noun case; I have given examples above. In addition, consider an example like *Od.* 6.91 εἴματα χερσὶν ἔλοντο καὶ ἐσφόρεον μέλαν ὕδωρ ‘they took the garments in their arms and carried them into the black water(?)’. The verb ἐσφορέω is used constructed with an accusative indicating direction; the only other instance of this verb is *Od.* 19.32, where the accusative indicates the direct object, as is the case with related εἰσφέρω. A stronger hephthemimeres turns the preverb into an adverb, and annuls any governing: ‘they took the garments in their arms and onto them, repeatedly, brought black water’. At first sight, semantics did not benefit from this alteration; on the other hand, the current explanation and translation of the verse are not at all in line with the usage of the verbs εἰσφέρω and ἐσφορέω in Homer.

Then, the combinations of adpositions into two- or threefold prepositions, adverbs and preverbs:

<sup>117</sup> In, e.g. *Il.* 1.125 ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πολίων ἐξεπράθομεν τὰ δέδασται ‘But the things we gathered from the plunder of cities, these things have been assigned’ (with the knowledge that the aorist form ἐξεπράθομεν is hapax in Homer) it is tempting to allow for a (formulaic) prototype with a trochaic caesura and postpositive ἐκ (resulting in πολίων ἐκ ‘from the cities’). Admittedly, it would call for more adaptations underlying the printed, augmented verbal form. Similarly, allowing for a trochaic caesura in e.g. *Od.* 6.127 ὥς εἰπὼν θάμνων ὑπεδύσετο διος Ὀδυσσεύς ‘having spoken thus godlike Odysseus emerged from the thicket’ potentially leads to new problems, especially of orthographic nature: if an adposition form ὕπ is not accepted, we end up with elision at the main word division.

ἐνθ' ἣ τοι πλυννοὶ ἦσαν ἐπηετανοὶ πολὺ δ' ὕδωρ καλὸν  
 ὑπεκπρορᾷ μάλα περ ῥυπόωντα καθῆραι ἐνθ' αἶ γ' ἡμιό-  
 νους μὲν ὑπεκπροέλυσαν ἀπῆνης

*Od.* 6.86-88

Where the cisterns were, always filled to the rim, and much pure water came to the surface to cleanse even the worst stains; there they unyoked the mules from under the carriage

In 87 ὑπεκπρο- is seen as an adverbial preverb, in 88 as governing ἀπῆνης. It is remarkable that the element ἐκ always precedes an important metrical boundary, either on the second or the fourth thesis. Depending on the strength of the metrical boundary as a minor phrase end, the particles \*ὕπ and ἐκ combined are postpositive, and easily combined with variable noun cases. More consequential is a verse-initial phrase like *Il.* 19.351 οὐράνου ἐκκατέπαλτο δι' αἰθέρος 'he jumped up from heaven down through the sky'. The bucolic pause following δι' αἰθέρος makes a threefold verse-structure likely, with a minor-phrase demarcation within the first half of the line. With a trithemimeres following ἐκ, the adposition becomes postpositive. Supportive evidence can be found in *Il.* 11.94, where the form κατεπάλμενος is attested.

Finally, the issue of tmesis. Where prosodic analysis shows that the pre- or postpositive character of an adposition can be determined to such an extent that the Homeric epics also show proof of the adposition-status proper, the notion of tmesis must be abandoned for quite a number of instances when dealing with the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, as the de-univerbation is a correlate of prosodic minor-phrasing. Furthermore, the number of instances of hyperbaton of an adposition and an alleged corresponding noun must be reduced as well, and for the same reason. A line like *Il.* 1.44 βῆ δὲ κάτ' Οὐλύμπιοι καρήνων χωόμενος κῆρ (West: κατ'), read with a first foot minor-phrase end at the dieresis, may once more serve as an example. As may *Il.*

1.53 ἐννῆμαρ μὲν ἄνα στρατὸν ὤιχετο κῆλα θεοῖο (West: ἀνὰ) and, with the fourth foot word end preceding the adposition, *Il.* 2.208 αὐτίς ἐπεσσεύοντο νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων (as read by West) in showing that the observance of the compositional *pausae* as minor-phrase demarcations makes identification of ἄνα and ἄπο as adpositions with adverbial meaning nearly unavoidable. Further research is required to shed a light on the scope of adpositions, including preverbs, in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as a whole, to further refine and define the adposition's syntactical status and contribution. In order to reevaluate the adposition's status in Homer within the wider field of 'oral syntax', other ancient Greek text types that are considered scripts for, or transcripts of, performable texts need to be included in the analysis.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

BAKKER 1988: E.J. Bakker, *Linguistics and Formulas in Homer: Scalarity and the Description of the Particle 'per'*, Amsterdam 1988.

BAKKER 1990: E.J. Bakker, *Homeric Discourse and Enjambment: A Cognitive Approach*, "Transactions of the American Philological Association" 120 (1990), pp. 1–21.

BAKKER 1993: E.J. Bakker, *Discourse and Performance: Involvement, Visualization, and 'Presence' in Homeric Poetry*, "Classical Antiquity" 12.1 (1993), pp. 1–29.

BAKKER 1997a: E.J. Bakker, *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*, Ithaca–London–NY 1997.

BAKKER 1997b: E.J. Bakker, *The Study of Homeric Discourse*, [in:] I. Morris, B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, pp. 284–304.

BAKKER 2005: E.J. Bakker, *Pointing at the Past: From Formula to Performance in Homeric Poetics*, Cambridge Mass.–London 2005.

BAKKER 2010: E.J. Bakker, *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, Oxford 2010.

BERTRAND 2014: N. Bertrand, *On tmesis, word order, and noun incorporation in Homeric Greek*, [in:] A. Bartolotta (ed.), *The Greek verb. Morphology, syntax, and semantics. Proceedings of the 8th international meeting on Greek linguistics (Agrigento, October 1–3, 2009)*, Louvain 2014, pp. 11–30.

BIRD 2010: G.D. Bird, *Multitextuality in the Homeric Iliad*, Washington DC 2010.

BLANKENBORG 2016: R.J.J. Blankenborg, *Ending in the Middle? Enjambment and Homeric Performance*, “YAGE” 1 (2016), pp. 66–105.

BLANKENBORG 2022: R.J.J. Blankenborg, *Audible Punctuation. Performative Pause in Homeric Prosody*, Cambridge MA 2022.

BOLEY 2004: J. Boley, *Tmesis and Proto-Indo-European Syntax*, Innsbruck 2004.

BONIFAZI 2012: A. Bonifazi, *Homer’s Versicolored Fabric. The Evocative Power of Ancient Greek Epic Word-Making*, Washington DC 2012.

BOOIJ, KEMENADE 2003: G. Booij, A.M.C. Kemenade, *Preverbs: An Introduction*, “Yearbook of Morphology” (2003), pp. 1–11.

BORTONE 2002: P. Bortone, *The status of the ancient Greek cases*, “Studies in Greek linguistics” 22/1 (2002), pp. 69–80.

BORTONE 2010: P. Bortone, *Greek prepositions from antiquity to the present*, Oxford 2010.

CHAFE 1988: W. Chafe, *Linking Intonation Units in Spoken English*, [in:] J. Haiman, S.A. Thompson (eds.), *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*, Amsterdam 1988, pp. 1–15.

CHAFE 1994: W. Chafe, *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time. The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speech and Writing*, Chicago 1994.

CHANTRAINE 1953: P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, Paris 1953.

CHANTRAINE 1961: P. Chantraine, *Morphologie Historique du Grec*<sup>3</sup>, Paris 1961.

CLARK 1994: M. Clark, *Enjambment and Binding in Homeric Hexameter*, "Phoenix" 48 (1994), pp. 95–114.

CLARK 1997: M. Clark, *Out of Line: Homeric Composition Beyond the Hexameter*, Lanham 1997.

CLAYMAN 1981: D.L. Clayman, *Sentence Length in Greek Hexameter Poetry*, [in:] R. Grotjahn (ed.), *Hexameter Studies*, Bochum 1981, pp. 107–136.

CLAYMAN, NORTWICK 1977: D.L. Clayman, T. Nortwick, *Enjambement in Greek Hexameter Poetry*, "Transactions of the American Philological Association" 107 (1977), pp. 85–92.

CONTI 2014: L. Conti, *Zu den Fokusadverbien bei Homer. Analyse von ἔτι*, "Historische Sprachforschung / Historical Linguistics" 127 (2014), pp. 208–227.

CONTI 2015: L. Conti, *Zum adverbialen Gebrauch von ἀνὰ bei Homer*, "Glotta" 91 (2015), pp. 27–45.

CURRIE 2013: B. Currie, *The Genitive Ὀδυσεῦς (Od.24.398) and Homer's 'Awkward' Parentheses*, "The Journal of Hellenic Studies" 133 (2013), pp. 21–42.

DAITZ 1991: S.G. Daitz, *On Reading Homer Aloud. To Pause or not to Pause*, "American Journal of Philology" 112 (1991), pp. 149–161.

DAVID 2006: A.P. David, *The Dance of the Muses. Choral Theory and Ancient Greek Poetics*, Oxford 2006.

DEVINE, STEPHENS 1976: A.M. Devine, I.D. Stephens, *The Homeric Hexameter and a Basic Principle of Metrical Theory*, "Classical Philology" 71 (1976), pp. 141–163.

DEVINE, STEPHENS 1978: A.M. Devine, I.D. Stephens, *The Greek Appositives: Towards a Linguistically Adequate Definition of Caesura and Bridge*, "Classical Philology" 73 (1976), pp. 314–328.

DEVINE, STEPHENS 1980: A.M. Devine, I.D. Stephens, *On the Phonological Definition of Boundaries*, [in:] M. Aronoff, M.-L. Kean (eds.), *Juncture*, Saratoga 1980, pp. 57–78.

DEVINE, STEPHENS 1984: A.M. Devine, I.D. Stephens, *Language and Meter: Resolution, Porson's Bridge and their Prosodic Basis*, California 1984.

DEVINE, STEPHENS 1993: A.M. Devine, I.D. Stephens, *Evidence from Experimental Psychology for the Rhythm and Meter of Greek Verse*, "Transactions of the American Philological Association" 123 (1993), pp. 379–403.

DEVINE, STEPHENS 1994: A.M. Devine, I.D. Stephens, *The Prosody of Greek Speech*, Oxford 1994.

DEVINE, STEPHENS 2000: A.M. Devine, I.D. Stephens, *Discontinuous Syntax*, Oxford 2000.

DICKINSON 1986: O.T.P.K. Dickinson, *Homer, the Poet of the Dark Age*, "Greece & Rome" 33/1 (1986), pp. 20–37.

DUHOUX 1994–1995: Y. Duhoux, *Le mycénien connaissait-il la tmesé?*, "Minos" 29–30 (1994–1995), pp. 187–202.

DUHOUX 1998: Y. Duhoux, *Autour de la tmesé grecque*, [in:] L. Isebaert, R. Lebrun (eds.), *Quaestiones Homericae. Acta Colloquii Namurcensis (habiti diebus 7–9 mensis Septembris anni 1995)*, Louvain–Namur 1998, pp. 71–80.

EDWARDS 1991: M. Edwards, *The Iliad: A Commentary V*, Cambridge.

EDWARDS 2002: M. Edwards, *Sound, Sense and Rhythm*, Princeton 2002.

FINKELBERG 2011: M. Finkelberg, *The Homer Encyclopedia*, Malden–Oxford 2011.

FINKELBERG 2012: M. Finkelberg, *Late Features in the Speeches of the Iliad*, [in:] Ø. Anderson, D. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, Cambridge 2012, pp. 80–95.

FRIEDRICH 1988: R. Friedrich, *Is θεῶν ἔριδι (Il.1.8 and 20.66) a Formula?*, "Hermes" 116 (1988), pp. 476–477.

FRIEDRICH 2000: R. Friedrich, *Homeric Enjambment and Orality*, "Hermes" 28/1 (2000), pp. 1–9.

GIANNAKIS 2014: G.K. Giannakis (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics* (EAGLL), Leiden–New York 2014.

GIANNAKIS 2021: G.K. Giannakis, *The Concept of Emphasis in Ancient Greek and Indo-European*, [in:] G.K. Giannakis, L. Conti, J. De la Villa, R. Fornieles (eds.), *Synchrony and Diachrony of Ancient Greek. Language, Linguistics, and Philology*, Berlin–Boston, pp. 413–438.

GOLSTON 2021: C. Golston, *A Quantitative Tetrameter for Proto-Indo-European*, [in:] G.K. Giannakis, L. Conti, J. De la Villa, R. Fornieles (eds.), *Synchrony and Diachrony of Ancient Greek. Language, Linguistics, and Philology*, Berlin–Boston, pp. 439–461.

GOTTESMAN 2008: A. Gottesman, *The Pragmatics of Homeric Kertomia*, "The Classical Quarterly" 58/1 (2008), pp. 1–12.

GRETHLEIN, HUITINK 2017: J. Grethlein, L. Huitink, *Homer's Vividness: An Enactive Approach*, "The Journal of Hellenic Studies" 137 (2017), pp. 67–91.

HAGEL 1994–1995: S. Hagel, *Zu den Konstituenten des griechischen Hexameters*, „WS" 107 (1994–1995), pp. 77–108.

HAINAL 2004: I. Hainal, *Die Tmesis bei Homer und auf den mykenischen Linear B-Tafeln: ein chronologisches Paradox?*, [in:] J. Penney (ed.), *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies*, Oxford 2004, pp. 146–178.

HAINSWORTH 1993: B. Hainsworth, *The Iliad: A Commentary* III, Cambridge 1993.

HAUG 2009: D. Haug, *Does Homeric Greek have prepositions? Or local Adverbs? (And what's the difference anyway?)*, [in:] V. Bubenik, J. Hewson, S. Rose (eds.), *Grammatical Change in Indo-European Languages*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia, pp. 103–120.



HAUG 2012: D. Haug, *Tmesis in the Epic Tradition*, [in:] Ø. Anderson, D. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, Cambridge 2012, pp. 96–105.

HEWSON 2008: J. Hewson, *Tmesis and Anastrophe: The Beginnings of Configuration in Indo-European Languages*, [in:] J. Rasmussen, T. Olander (eds.), *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European: Methods, Results, and Problems*, Copenhagen 2008, pp. 85–92.

HEWSON, BUBENIK 2006: J. Hewson, V. Bubenik, *From case to adposition. The development of configurational syntax in Indo-European languages*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia 2006.

HIGBIE 1990: C. Higbie, *Measure and Music: Enjambment and Sentence Structure in the Iliad*–Oxford 1990.

HORN 2015: F. Horn, Ἑπεα πτερόεντα again: a cognitive linguistic view on Homer's 'winged words', "Hermathena" 198 (2015), pp. 5–34.

HORROCKS 1981: G.C. Horrocks, *Space and Time in Homer: Prepositional and Adverbial Particles in the Greek Epic*, New York 1981.

IMBERT 2010: C. Imbert, *Multiple preverbalization in Homeric Greek: A typological insight*, *Cognitextes* 4, <<https://journals.openedition.org/cognitextes/387?lang=en>> (access: 15 February 2022).

JANKO 1992: R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary IV*, Cambridge 1992.

JANKO 1998: R. Janko, *The Homeric Poems as Oral Dictated Texts*, "The Classical Quarterly" 48/1 (1998), pp. 1–13.

JANKO 2015: R. Janko, *From Gabii and Gordion to Eretria and Methone: The Rise of the Greek Alphabet*, "Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies" 58/1 (2015), pp. 1–32.

KARLSSON 2018: E. Karlsson, *A Radical Construction Grammar approach to construction split in the diachrony of the spatial particles of Ancient Greek: Some theoretical preliminaries*, [in:] E. Coussé, P. Andersson, J. Olofsson (eds.),

*Grammaticalization meets Construction Grammar*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia 2018, pp. 277–310.

KELLY 2006: A. Kelly, *Homer and History: Iliad 9.381–4*, “*Mnemosyne*” 59/3 (2006), pp. 321–333.

KIRK 1966: G.S. Kirk, *Studies in Some Technical Aspects of Homeric Style*, “*Yale Classical Studies*” 20 (1966), pp. 75–152.

KIRK 1985: G.S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary I*, Cambridge 1985.

KORZENIEWSKI 1968: D. Korzeniewski, *Griechische Metrik*, Darmstadt 1968.

KÜHNER, GERTH 1963: R. Kühner, B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*<sup>3</sup>, Darmstadt 1963.

KURYŁOWICZ 1964: J. Kuryłowicz, *The Inflectional Categories of Indo-European*, Heidelberg 1964.

LEAF 1900–1902: W. Leaf, *The Iliad*<sup>2</sup>, London 1900–1902.

LEUMANN 1950: M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, Basel 1950.

MÉNDEZ DOSUNA 1997: J. Méndez Dosuna, *Fusion, fission, and relevance in language change: de-univerbation in Greek verb morphology*, “*Studies in Language*” 21/3 (1997), pp. 577–612.

MINCHIN 1992: E. Minchin, *Scripts and Themes: Cognitive Research and the Homeric Epic*, “*Classical Antiquity*” 11/2 (1992), pp. 229–241.

MOJENA 1992: A. Mojena, *The behaviour of Prepositives in Theocritus’ Hexameter*, “*Glotta*” 70 (1992), pp. 55–60.

NAGY 2001: G. Nagy, *Homeric Poetry and Problems of Multiformity: The ‘Panathenaic Bottleneck’*, “*Classical Philology*” 96/2 (2001), pp. 109–119.

OESTERREICHER 1997: W. Oesterreicher, *Types of Orality in Texts*, [in:] E.J. Bakker, A. Kahane (eds.), *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*, Cambridge MA–London 1997, pp. 190–214.

PARRY 1971: M. Parry, *The Distinctive Character of Enjambment in Homeric Verse*, [in:] A. Parry (ed.), *The Making*

of *Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Oxford 1971, pp. 251–265.

POMPEO 2002: F. Pompeo, *Dall'avverbio localistico alla preposizione in Omero*, Rome 2002.

PORTER 1951: H.N. Porter, *The Early Greek Hexameter*, “Yale Classical Studies” 12 (1951), pp. 3–63.

PRIESTLEY 2009: J. Priestley, *Tmesis in Herodotus*, “Glotta” 85/1–4 (2009), pp. 118–178.

READY 2015: J.L. Ready, *The Textualization of Homeric Epic by Means of Dictation*, “Transactions of the American Philological Association” 145/1 (2015), pp. 1–75.

RUSSO 1966: J. Russo, *The Structural Formula in Homeric Verse*, “Yale Classical Studies” 20 (1966), pp. 219–240.

SCHIFFRIN 1987: D. Schiffrin, *Discourse Markers*, Cambridge 1987.

SHERRATT 2017: S. Sherratt, *Homeric Epic and the Context of Bardic Creation*, [in:] S. Sherratt, J. Bennet (eds.), *Archaeology and the Homeric Epic*, Oxford 2017, pp. 35–52.

STEINRÜCK 2005: M. Steinrück, *Lagaroi: Le temps de la re-rythmisation de l'hexamètre*, “Mnemosyne” 58 (2005), pp. 481–498.

THEODORSSON 2006: S.-T. Theodorsson, *Eastern Literacy, Greek Alphabet, and Homer*, “Mnemosyne” 59/2 (2006), pp. 161–187.

VAN BEEK 2018: L. Van Beek, *Ἀτλας ἀστεμφής: Traces of local particles in Greek compounds and the origins of intensive alpha*, “Glotta” 94 (2018), pp. 38–81.

VAN RAALTE 1986: M. Van Raalte, *Rhythm and Metre*. diss., Leiden 1986.

VENDRYES 1945: J. Vendryes, *Traité d'accentuation grecque*, Paris 1945.

VERMEULE 1991: E. Vermeule, *Myth and Tradition from Mycenae to Homer*, “Studies in the History of Art” 32, *Symposium Papers XVI: New Perspectives in Early Greek Art* 32 (1991), pp. 98–121.

VISSER 1987: E. Visser, *Formulae or Single Words? Towards a new Theory on Homeric Verse-making*, "WJA" 14 (1987), pp. 21–37.

VITI 2008: C. Viti, *Coding Spatial Relations in Homeric Greek: Preverbs vs. Prepositions*, "Historische Sprachforschung / Historical Linguistics" 121 (2008), pp. 114–161.

VITI 2018: C. Viti, *From space words to transitive markers: the case of ancient Greek en 'in'*, "Transactions of the American Philological Association" 106/3 (2018), pp. 375–413.

WEST 1982: M.L. West, *Greek Metre*, Oxford.

WEST 1997: M.L. West, *Homer's Meter*, [in:] I. Morris, B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden 1997, pp. 218–237.

WEST 1998/2000: M.L. West (ed.), *Homeri Ilias*, Stuttgart 1998/2000.

WEST 2011: M.L. West, *The Homeric Question Today*, "Proceedings of the American Philological Society" 155/4 (2011), pp. 383–393.

WEST 2017: M.L. West (ed.), *Homerus. Odyssea*, Berlin–Boston 2017.

ZANCHI 2019: C. Zanchi, *Multiple Preverbs in Ancient Indo-European Languages. A Comparative Study on Vedic, Homeric Greek, Old Church Slavic, and Old Irish*, Tübingen 2019.