"Ως ἔφαθ' Ἡραίστος δ' ἐτυσκετο θεσπιδαές πῦρ.
πρώτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, καὶ δ' ἐνεκροῦς
πολλοὺς, οἳ ἔρα κατ' αὐτὸν ἄλως ἔσαν, οἳ κτάν' Ἀχιλλεύς.
pᾶν δ' ἐξηράνθη πεδίον, σχέτο δ' ἀγιάδον ὕδωρ.

Ὡς δ' ἦτο ὁ ποιοῦνς Βορέης νεοκρότο θλωήν
ἀρτὶ ἀγείρανη, χαίρει δ' ἐν μὲν δ' τις ἡθείρη
ὡς ἐξηράνθη πεδίον πᾶν, καὶ δ' ἀφα νεκροὺς
κηέν: ὡς δ' ἐς ποταμόν τρέψε φλόγα παμφανόωσαν.
καίοντο πτελέαι τε καὶ ἱτίειν ἴδε μωρίακι,
καίετο δ' ἐν λωτοίς τε ἴδε ὁρόν ἴδε κύπερον,
tὰ περὶ καλὰ βέθηρα ἄλως ποταμών περίκεις.

τείροντ' ἐγχέλων τε καὶ ἱγνῆς οἳ κατὰ δίνας,
οἳ κατὰ καλὰ βέθηρα κυβίστοιν ἔνθα καὶ ἐνθα

πνοή τείρομενοι πολυμήτιος Ἡραίστοιο.
καίετο δ' ἐς ποταμών ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἐκ τ' ὀλυμαξεν·

"Ἡραίστος, οὗ τις σοί γε θεών δύνατ' ἀντιφερέσθεν,
οὔτι ἄν ἔγω σοι γ' ὤδε πυρὶ φλεγάθοντι μαχοσίην.
λῆγ' ἐρίδος, Τρῶας δ' καὶ αὐτίκα δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς
ἄστεος ἐξελάσθει τί μοι ἐρίδος καὶ ἀρωγής;"

The passage is to be translated roughly as follows: "Thus she
spoke, and Hephaistos made ready his portentous fire. First it flared up
in the plain and began to burn the many corpses which were in heaps
throughout it, which Achilles had killed. And the whole plain dried
up and the gleaming water was stayed. And as when in Fall Boreas
quickly dries up a newly-watered garden, and whoever tills it rejoices,
so the whole plain was dried, and it burned up the corpses. And he
turned the bright-shining flame towards the river. The elms and willows
and tamarisks began to burn, and the lotus and rush and galingale
began to burn which had grown up in plenty around the fair streams of
the river. The eels and the fish which were in its eddies suffered greatly,
which dived here and there through its fair streams, troubled by the
blast of Hephaistos of many counsels. And the river itself caught fire
and spoke out and called him by name: "Hephaistos, no one of the gods
can match himself with you, nor would I fight with you thus blazing
up with fire. Cease from strife, and straightway glorious Achilles might
drive the Trojans out of the city. What have I to do with strife and
protection?""
The passage describes Hephaistos' fight with the river Xanthos, and is remarkable in a number of ways. Thematically it is remarkable in that here we have both a foreshadowing of the upcoming battle of the gods, and also, perhaps more importantly, a personification of the symbols fire and water — a symbolism which Cedric Whitman has done much to clarify. As Whitman says, (Homer and the Heroic Tradition 139—140 [Cambridge, 1958] „All naturalism is here left far behind, and the basic imagery of the aristeia of Achilles has completely run away with the action. It is, in fact, an inversion of nature for fire to lick up water”.

This inversion of nature, or in any event the striking nature of the passage, is marked rhetorically as well. Anaphora in the Iliad is not rare, though it is far from the rule. One can instance passages like 1.436—439:

εκ δ’ ευνάζες ἔβαλον, κατὰ δὲ πρυμνήσι’ ἐδησαν
ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ βαίνον ἐπὶ βραγμινὶ θαλάσσης,
ἐκ δ’ ἐκατόμβην βῆσαν ἐκηβόλω τ’ Ἀπόλλωνι
ἐκ δὲ χρυσάτες νηῆς βῆ ποντοπόροιο,

where ἐκ begins four lines, creating an effect, to be sure, but an effect that is not particularly compelling or necessary. Or again we find anaphora in Agamemnon’s advice in 2. 382—384:

ἐδ μέν τις δόρυ θηξάσθω, εδ δ’ ἀσπίδα θέσθω,
ἐδ δέ τις ἱπποῖσιν δείπνον δότω ὠκυπόδεσσιν,
ἐδ δέ τις ἁρματος ἄμφες ἱδων πολέμοιο μεδέσθω,
ὡς κε πανημέριοι στυγερω κρινώμεθ’ Ἅρηι,

a passage which underlines the importance and significance of an action soon to be postponed by a catalogue of ships. But rarely, if indeed ever, do we find the prolonged repetition of a verb at the beginning of a line such as that found in the four-fold repetition of forms of καίω in our passage.¹

Rhetorical singularity is matched by linguistic strangeness, ὀπωρινός with long -i- does occur elsewhere in the poems, but rarely, even though it is the normal, indeed only, form of the word in Homer². The long -α- of ἄνξηράνη in 347 instead of η is singular, and has provoked Chantraine (Grammaire homérique 1.17) to think of an Atticism of our vulgate. ἔθείη at the end of the same line is a word of unknown meaning explicated only by the phrase χρυσέαις φολίδεσσιν

¹ I have collected the most striking cases of anaphora to be found in the poems in Appendix II.
έθείρεται of Orph. Arg. 932 which, as Leaf says, explains nothing. δ' in 349 marks a change of action or direction on the part of the subject rather than a change of subject, and this, too, is striking, though it has been defended by Leaf⁸ by means of some inexact parallels. But perhaps the most striking line of all these unusual lines is 352

τὰ περὶ καλὰ ἡθνοὶ ἀλις ποταμοῖο πεφύκει.

This line combines the unusual, in fact unique, scansion of τὰ as a long (?) syllable in the first foot of the line with the awkward word order ἡθνοὶ ἀλις ποταμοῖο πεφύκει, with ἀλις separating ἡθνοὶ from ποταμοῖο. Furthermore ποταμοῖο is flat and otiose, since it is clear from 349 above that we are dealing with a river. And yet in spite of all these linguistic difficulties there are no textual problems recorded from antiquity. The scholiasts were concerned only with whether to read πνοιὴ or πριή in 355 (cf. 21. 12), and with the absorbing question of how it was possible for the plain to be burned together with its corpses while Achilles, who was also in the plain, escaped conflagration. Modern scholars have commented on a number of matters, but have called into question only line 344 which is, according to Leaf: „probably a mere interpolation from 236 where ωτὸν has its proper reference” I accept Leaf’s athetesis: ωτὸν is very harsh here.

I shall in what follows be concerned primarily with line 352, and in fact particularly with its first word, τὰ. The irregular scansion of this form has been explained in a number of ways. Whatmough⁴ treated it as a linguistic archaism, comparing it with Vedic Sanskrit ā, a form of identical function but containing a long vowel. He holds that Indo-European *tā passed to Greek ῆ in all forms of Greek save for this one passage. But all a priori considerations of the likelihood of such a development aside⁵, Whatmough’s explanation is of course impossible since all cases of inherited (aː) passed to (eː) (eta) in Attic and Ionic: his explanation demands *τή, and since we in fact have τὰ, his explanation cannot be correct. Chantraine (Grammaire homérique 1.103) assumes that τὰ is metrically lengthened to τὰ here, though he fails to provide any reason why the poet should have chosen to create a line which necessitated so great a departure from ordinary linguistic usage. If one is to assume metrical lengthening, he also now—thanks to Parry and Lord — owes it to his readers to explain what caused

---

⁸ W. Leaf and M. Bayfield, The Iliad of Homer xlvi (London, 1924). The question is, of course, what is the subject in these lines. If the subject of κήεν in 349 is Hephaistos, then the δ' is strange, for clearly the subject of τρέψε must be Hephaistos. If the subject of κήεν is 'fire', the syntax is saved, but we encounter a rough transition.

⁴ J. Whatmough, Poetic, Scientific and Other Forms of Discourse 91 (Sather Classical Lectures 29, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1956).

⁵ The Skt. ntr. plur. is always tā(ni), even in the Veda. In order to posit *tā in Greek, we should require the variant *tā in Sanskrit, thus showing that both existed in Indo-European. Otherwise we must assume that Sanskrit always and only had tā, and that Greek had always and only τὰ.
the poet to place a form in a position which required metrical lengthening\(^6\). W, Schulze (Quaestiones epicæ 375) followed in this by Leaf (Iliad 1.595) avoided the difficulties inherent in both the explanations just recorded. He assumed that the poets had the option of beginning a line with a short syllable whenever the spirit moved them. In so doing he converted a descriptive label of the ancient writers on metrics into a poetic license allowed the poets. That this is a questionable inference no one will doubt, and without going further into the question here, I shall assume that Schulze’s explanation is impossible, and that the poets did not have the option of placing a short syllable in the first arsis\(^7\).

No one of the explanations given in the past for the occurrence of τά is really convincing, and furthermore at best all only approach the question of its phonetic realization: was it [ta:], or was it [ta], or was it perhaps [tapp]? But this really is a rather insignificant question, and the important question is: how did line 352 come to have τά, however realized phonetically, placed in the first arsis in an open syllable? My answer to this question is that the poet, led on by rhetorical considerations, has simply made a mistake: how he covered it up in his performance I do not know, though I assume that he made up the full quantity of the syllable either by lengthening the vowel or by doubling the \(p\)- of the following word\(^8\). It is my belief that line 351 is an intruder into the text, a Homeric intruder to be sure, but one that did not appear in earlier recitations of this scene; and that the insertion of line 351 caused the metrically correct \(α\) of original 352 to be changed to the metrically anomalous τά\(^9\).

The relative pronoun is not rare in the first foot of the line, but elsewhere it is either long by nature — e. g., to take examples only from this same book — \(ο\ς 21.135, ο\ς 21.206, η 21.277\); or long by virtue of appearing in a closed syllable: \(δ\ς τέκε 21.159, δ\ς θ’ 21.253, δν τάξι 21.283\): τά is of course excluded from the arsis of the foot save when followed by a word beginning with two consonants. Relative plus \(πέρι\) is not rare either, occurring as it does at the beginning of the line six times in the Iliad (e. g., οι \(πέρι 1.258, 2.751, 757, ο\ς \(πέρι 10.244\) and within the line after pause seven times (e. g. \(δ\ς \(πέρι 2.831, δν \(πέρι 5.325\)). The question then of course arises: how was the poet

---

\(^6\) The major weakness of theories operating with metrical lengthening has been that no account has been taken of the poets’ choice of a word. Scholars have simply noted that a word needs a syllable lengthened if it is to enter the verse, but they have not concerned themselves with explaining how the poets could choose a word of impossible metrical shape. On this cf. my Metrical Lengthening in Homer 29—34 (Incunabula Graeca 35, Rome, 1969).

\(^7\) On the nature and shortcomings of the doctrine of the stichos akephalos cf. Metrical Lengthening in Homer 210—222.

\(^8\) There are analogies both for lengthening (e. g. \(άμφηρεφέα \tauο \ II. 1.45\) and for doubling of the consonant (the frequent \(έτελ\) in the first foot must have been pronounced [eppei] — cf. Metrical Lengthening in Homer 220).

\(^9\) There are other metrical mistakes in the first arsis. Cf. τόν \(πέρι\) (Od. 5.266 — Metrical Lengthening in Homer 217—218) and ιανθη (Od. 22.59 — Metrical Lengthening in Homer 215).
led to make the mistake of introducing τὰ into a position from which it was metrically excluded? The answer lies in the poet’s desire to achieve still greater dramatic and rhetorical effect in a scene already dramatically and rhetorically effective, and also in his desire to complete a description which probably seemed to him deficient: trees growing on a river bank without shrubs and other vegetation would be most strange. Hence he inserted rushes, etc. In order to make more impressive and authentic his description of the fire’s progress towards the river, and in order also to create another case of anaphora, he inserted a new line which destroyed the previous grammatical concord and occasioned the metrical error. This new line was line 351, and caused the correct earlier version with feminine concord:

καίντο πτελέαν καὶ ἵτεαν ἢδὲ μυρίκαι,
αἱ περὶ καλὰ βέθρα

to be changed to the neuter τὰ. αἱ cannot pick up both feminines and neuters—only the neuter can do that—and as a result αἱ had to be changed to τὰ in 352.

Restoring αἱ to the earlier version is not enough, for πεφύκει cannot easily be changed to allow plural concord. We must, in order to support the position just adopted, endeavor to restore (or perhaps better to recreate) the original ending of the line. We have already observed that the end of the line as it stands in the text—with ἀλις splitting βέθρα from ποταμοῖο and in turn being separated from πεφύκει by ποταμοῖο is queer. Though the following inference from this fact is not logically inevitable, it may well be that the present ending is not the original ending. What the original ending of the line may have been is ultimately anybody’s guess, but I should like to offer a guess of my own.

Line 344 is unnecessary and seems out of place, repeated as it is from 21.236. It can be omitted without any loss in sense or of force in this passage. And if we suppose that 344 was in fact absent from earlier versions of the description of Hephaistos’ flight with the river, we may adopt ἀλις ἔσαν from this line and thus extend the original 351 to: αἱ περὶ καλὰ βέθρα ἀλις ἔσαν. In so doing we shall presumably have to suppose that it was the original 351 with its ἀλις ἔσαν which suggested to the poet including 344 in this passage as well as in 236. Rather

10 That trees alone and not bushes were originally involved is indicated, though certainly not proved, by 21.337—338:

σῶ δὲ Ξάνθοιο παρὸ ὄξθας
δένθρα καὶ', ἐν δ' αὐτὸν ἵει πυρὶ

11 That ἀλις πεφύκεi and the text as it stands in our Iliad is that of Homer and not some later interpolator is strongly indicated by Homer’s use elsewhere of ἀλις in pastoral scenes with reduplicating forms of the perfect. Cf.

II. 2.90 αἱ μὲν τ' ἔνθα ἀλις πεποτήτας, αἱ δὲ τε ἔνθα
II. 17.54 χῷφο ἐν οἰοπόλῳ, δ' ἀλις ἀναβέβροχεν ὕδωρ
In all these passages we have to do with trees and flowers, and in the latter two, at least, with water.
better, though, is to assume πεφύκεσαν here, for Homer elsewhere seems to like this verb with trees (II. 4.483—484, 14.288, Od. 9.141). Even if we extend 'original' 353 by πεφύκεσαν, we still need a tag to complete the line, a tag which will extend from the bucolic diaeresis to the end of the line. Clearly any number of possibilities are conceivable here, including even a complete change of subject and topic with a complete stop after πεφύκεσαν. Whatever we suggest is bound to be hypothetical, but it is possible that by mining still deeper in the passage at hand, we can in fact find a suitable conclusion to the line. Line 354:

οὶ κατὰ καλὰ βέθρα κυβίστων ἑνθα καὶ ἑνθα

aside from introducing a flat repetition of καλὰ βέθρα, is syntactically difficult and otiose after the οἰ κατὰ δίνας of 353. If, as Leaf suggests, we are to understand ἡσαν after δίνας, we have a complete sentence, and then the next line, 154, becomes strange because of its lack of connective. 11.535:

ἀματι δ' άξων
νέρθεν ἄτας πεπάλακτο καὶ ἄντυγες αὶ περὶ δίφρον
ἄς ἄρ' ἄρ' ἱππεῖον ὁπλέων ῥαθάμιγγες ἑβαλλον
αἰ τ' ἀπ' ἐπισσώτρων

„and the axle under the chariot was all splashed with blood and the rails which encircled the chariot, struck by flying drops from the feet of the horses, from the running rims of the wheels” (Lattimore’s translation), which Leaf cites as parallel is not really parallel because particles are there present, and Monro’s discussion (Homeric Grammar § 271) to which Leaf refers merely substantiates the omission of ‘to be’ in relative clauses, and does not support the possibility of a second relative clause without connective when the relative pronouns are in the same case. Rather it leaves 354 almost totally unsupported, and hence suspect. It may indeed be that an earlier recitation (performance) of this passage did not include 354. And if so, we are free to use the tag of this line to complete our hypothetical original 352 which will now have read:

12 On the assumption of πεφύκεσαν, of course, we may welcome line 344 back to the text. It still seems awkward, however.

13 There is a semantic difficulty here in that, though ἑνθα can easily mean 'there' (II. 14.216) or 'where' (II 1.610), it tends, with verbs of motion to mean 'thither' (II. 13.23), and seems always to be so used in the phrase ἑνθα καὶ ἑνθα (so LSJ s. v.). With verbs of state or rest, though, it must always have meant 'here and there' and only later have become restricted to the meaning 'hither and thither' because so frequently used with verbs of motion. By way of support for ἑνθα καὶ ἑνθα in this line (and to a lesser extent in this meaning) I would again cite 2.90 (quoted above n. 11). βέθρα and ἑνθα καὶ ἑνθα appear together also in II. 2.459 — 462:

Τῶν δ', ὅς τ' ὄρνιθων πετεηνων ἔθνεω πολλά,
γρανν ἡ γεράνων ἡ κύκνων δουλιχοδέφων,
'Ασίω ἐν λειμών, καυστρόν ἁμφὶ βέθρα,
ἕνθα καὶ ἑνθα ποτῶνται ἄγαλλόμενα πτερύγεσσι

And ἑνθα καὶ ἑνθα meaning 'here and there' and appearing at the end of a line is
αἰ περὶ καλὰ ἰέθρα πεφύκεσαν ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα.

And the entire passage in its „more original” form will be:

342 ὡς ἔφαθʹ, "Ηφαιστός δὲ τιτύσκετο θεσπιδάς πῦρ.
343 πρῶτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, καίε δὲ νεκροὺς.
345 πᾶν δʼ ἐξηράνθη πεδίον, σχέτο δʼ ἀγαλμὸν ὑδώρ.
ὡς δʼ ὁ τ’ ὑπωρίνης Βορέης νεοαιρέ’ ἀλώνην
αἰὼν ἀνξηράνθην’ χαίρει δὲ μὴν ὡς τός θείρῃ
ὡς ἐξηράνθη πεδίον πᾶν, κάδ δʼ ἀρὰ νεκροὺς
χέεν’ ὃ δ’ ἐς ποταμὸν τρέψε φλόγα παμφανώσαν.
350 καίετο πτελέαι καὶ ἰτέαι ἦδε μυρίαι,
352 αἰ περὶ καλὰ ἰέθρα πεφύκεσαν ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα:
353 τείρονθ’ ἐγχέλωης τε καὶ ἰχθύες οἱ κατὰ δίνας,
355 πνοιὴ τειρόμενοι πολυμήτιος Ηφαιστόνοι.
καίετο δ’ ἐς ποταμοῖο, ἐπος τ’ ἔφατ’ ἐκ τ’ ὁνόμαζεν’

I feel that the passage as newly constituted (or reconstituted) is equally as Homeric as that of our vulgate.

I might also in passing again call attention to the strange forms in the simile in lines 346—348, especially to the singular ἀνξηράνθη. We might be encouraged by what has preceded to feel that this simile is also a late entry into our passage, and hence be tempted to remove it as well. If we do so, of course, we shall have to change the καίε δὲ νεκροὺς of 343 to καδ δ’ ἀρὰ νεκροὺς, a rather minor change; and omit 345, a line which we should perhaps rather prefer to keep:

342 ὡς ἔφαθʹ, "Ηφαιστός δὲ τιτύσκετο θεσπιδάς πῦρ.
343 πρῶτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, κατ δ’ ἀρὰ νεκροὺς
349 κήεν’ ὃ δ’ ἐς ποταμὸν τρέψε φλόγα παμφανώσαν.
350 καίετο πτελέαι καὶ ἰτέαι ἦδε μυρίαι,
352 αἰ περὶ καλὰ ἰέθρα πεφύκεσαν ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα:
353 τείρονθ’ ἐγχέλωης τε καὶ ἰχθύες οἱ κατὰ δίνας,
355 πνοιὴ τειρόμενοι πολυμήτιος ’Ηφαιστόνοι.
καίετο δ’ ἐς ποταμοῖο, ἐπος τ’ ἔφατ’ ἐκ τ’ ὁνόμαζεν’

These changes are probably not to be made, for excising the simile introduces an abruptness to the passage, an excessive spareness, which to me at least renders this endeavor hazardous in the extreme.

Rather we should stop short of this point and leave the passage as I have given it in its first version, already shorn of its lotus and rush and its diving and tumbling fish. But even stopping here — assuming that my reconstruction of the history of the passage is correct — we have made a few gains, and can draw three rather important conclu-

exampled in the remarkable II. 10. 263—265:

ἐκτοσθε δὲ λευκοὶ ὀδόντες
ἀργίόδοντος ὡς θαμέες ἔχον ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα
εὗ καὶ ἐπισταμένων’ μέση δ’ ἐνὶ πιλοὶς ἀρήτει,
sions. 1) The poets could make metrical mistakes; 2) through these metrical mistakes we can at least in this instance catch a glimpse of earlier recitations: we are free also to imagine that other mistakes — of whatever nature — may likewise point in some cases to variations of earlier performances; 3) possibly most important, the text as newly constituted with its metrical error was not changed by later singers or scribes. What this means or implies for the history of epic recitation and textual history I leave to others better equipped than I to decide.

APPENDIX I

We have probably done enough in excising 344, 351, 354, but problems yet remain in the text. We still have ὑπωρινός (346), ἀνξηράνη (347), and the troublesome δ’ of 349. ὑπωρινός, though, is the regular Homeric word, and we can take no exception to it as such, but the line in which it occurs is formulaic (cf. Od., 5. 328):

ώς δ’ ὑτ’ ὑπωρινός Βορέης φορέησιν ἀκάνθως

can and have been inserted here at any time out of the poet’s stock of formulas. ἀνξηράνη is a more serious problem. That it is the correct reading and not merely an Atticizing mistake of the tradition seems proved by Herodotus 2.99.2: τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον ἔθεθην ἀποξηράνα (all mss.: ἀποξηράναι Hude) which seems possibly reminiscent of this passage14. I have no good explanation for this form15, but feel that the major reason for its being here is the ἐξηράνθη of 345: ἐξηράνθη was there first, ἀνξηράνη is secondary to it. We may from this fact infer that there existed (earlier) recitations of this passage which did not include the simile, and we can support this conclusion by the following observations: μὲν (347) referring to an inanimate object is unusual, though not unexampled (Shipp Studies 35); 348 with its κάδ δ’ ἀρα νεκροὺς contains a flat repetition of the καὶ ἔρα νεκροὺς of 343 and seems dependent on it. The δ’ of 349 still causes trouble. But the resulting

14 See the appendix for further speculation as to earlier versions of the passage.
15 Herod. 7. 109.2 also contains a form of this verb: ταύτην τὰ ὑποζύγια μονὰ ἀρδόμενα ἀνεξήρηνε, and here the manuscript tradition is nearly unanimous in reading -η-. It thus seems that, save while imitating Homer, Herodotus used -η- in the aorist of this verb.
16 I do, though, feel that it is genuine Ionic and not an Attic intrusion, an Attic intrusion which we would find considerable difficulty in explaining. The verb ἀνξηράνειν from ἀνξηρός must be a relatively late development in Greek (cf. A. Debrunner, Griechische Wortbildungslehre 109—112 [Heidelberg, 1917]), and cannot therefore have had an aorist *kserénsa at a time when *(ns) was being simplified to */n/ (< */n/). Hence the aorist had to be formed by analogy with other verbs. If the analogy chosen was σημαίνειν as it usually was, then the aorist was ἐξηράνη; but if the analogy was μένειν ἡμείνα then the aorist might well be ἐξήρανα for the relation of short vowel (plus /i/) in the present to long vowel in the aorist allowed /a:/ at any time after the passage in Attic-Ionic of */a:/ to /e:. The relation [e:] : [e:] (ἐξηράειν ἐξήρανα)
passage as printed in the text is itself flat because of the excision of 345. Hence we can take another tack and retain 345, even though doing so causes difficulties with 349 which now needs an opening trochee. This can be supplied in a number of ways, and rather than attempt originality, I shall supply the lack by writing αύτάρ δ γ', without making any claim that it is correct here. I also omit the descriptive relative clauses and phrases on the grounds that they can be inserted or omitted ad lib., and arrive at:

342 "Ως ἔφαθ', "Ηφαιστός δὲ τιτύσκετο θεσπιδαές πῦρ.
343 πρῶτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, καθε δὲ νεκροὺς.
345 πάν δ' ἐξηράνθη πεδίον, σχέτο δ' ἀγλαῖν ὑδωρ.
349 αύτάρ δ' γ' ἐς ποταμὸν τρέψε φλόγα παμφανόσαν.
350 καλοντο πτελέαι καὶ ιτέαι ἥδε μυρίκαι.
353 τείροντ' ἐγχέιουσε τε καὶ ιχθύες οἱ κατὰ δίνας:
356 καίετο δ' ἐς ποταμοῖο ἐπος ἔφατ' ἐκ τ' ὄνομαζεν'.

The question then is: now that we have arrived at this passage, where are we? No one will doubt that the Greek is grammatical and that it is at least vaguely Homeric, but similar exercises can be performed on almost any other passage in the poems. The only difference here — a slight one, perhaps — is that we have some linguistic evidence for a lack of final polish on this passage, and have inferred from this that it is (as we have it) of relatively recent origin. It may be that we have by our excisions recovered the ,,original“ 342—360, but I doubt it, for I do not feel that an original ever existed: there were versions of this passage, to be sure, but no original save for the situation of the fight of Hephaistos with the river. What we have in our shortest version, then, is not an ,,original“ version that was ever sung — though it could conceivably have been — but rather the bare bones of that particular casting of the scene which Homer chose on this one occasion. He could have sung this sparest version, though this was probably his least favorite choice; or he could have sung it with the descriptive lines:

352 αἱ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεσθαι περύκεσαν ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα
355 πνοιῇ τειρόμενοι πολυμήτιος Ἡφαίστοιο

alone added; or he could have sung it without only 344, 351, 354; or he could have sung it the way it appears in our texts, complete with simile and metrical mistake.

APPENDIX II

Repetitions at the beginnings of lines tend to involve those words which are both adversative in nature and also usually appear initially in their clause, both in poetry and in prose. Among such I might instance exempli gratia from the Odyssey: οἱ (μὲν... δὲ) 1.110—11, 7.104—5, 13.67—8, 110—11 (in various cases); οὔτ(ε) 1.414—5, 2.200—1,
More interesting cases include:


Of the above the reader will observe that some are thematically important, others not. The only case I have found of a verb repeated was 4.184—5:

κλαίε μὲν Ἀργείη Ἐλένη, Διός ἐκγεγαυΐα,
kλαίε δὲ Τηλέμαχος τε καὶ Ἀτρείδης Μενέλαος.

The Iliad has many of the same banal instances as the Odyssey, and there is no need to cite examples here. Only special circumstances, such as οἱ τε (2.496—539) in the Catalogue of the Ships, and the repetition of ἐν (18.483/5, 587—8/90), the presence of ἐν plus ἀλλον (18.535, 536—7) and τεν ὑπερ (18.610—11/13) in the description of the Shield of Achilles deserve mention. Too, personal names occur more frequently in the Iliad, and hence, because it is easier to repeat a name in the same metrical slot than to move it about in the line, the same name often enough appears in successive lines; Νυμφεύς (2.671—3) in the Catalogue; Ἀτρείδ- 9.339/41; Ἀστροκτε- 13.46—7, 16.555—6 'Ἀμφιλοχ- 15.568—9, 16.318/20; Πατροκλό- 16.815—6; Ἕκτορ 17.141—2; Ἀλνείας 20.160—1; Άης- 21.497—8.


The repetition of a verb is also more frequent in the Iliad: διήρησεν 4.148/50; ἡδελε 10.228—31; βέβληται 11.660/2; τεθνα- 15.496—7; ἠκτε- 16.14—5; the etymologically interesting play with the verb 'brandish' and the names Πηλεύς and Πήλιον 16.142—4=19.389—91; οὗτον κεκλήγοντες 17.756/8; λυσμο- 19.304—5; τερπ- 19.312—3; δε- 19.367—8; ἐλκ- 22.464—5. Of course such a judgment is bound to be subjective, but it seems to me that few, if any, of the above can compete with Iliad 21.350—6 for rhetorical effectiveness.

Providence.

W. F. Wyatt, Jr.