Ὣς ἔφαθ᾽ Ἥφαιστος δὲ τιτύσκετο θεσπιδαὲς πῦρ.
πρῶτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, καῖε δὲ νεκροὺς
πολλούς, οἵ ῥα κατ᾽ αὐτὸν ἅλις ἔσαν, οὓς κτάν᾽ Ἀχιλλεύς.
πᾶν δ᾽ ἐξηράνθη πεδίον, σχέτο δ᾽ ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ.   345
ὡς δ᾽ ὅτ᾽ ὀπωρινὸς Βορέης νεοαρδέ᾽ ἀλωὴν
αἶψ᾽ ἀγξηράνῃ. χαίρει δέ μιν ὅς τις ἐθείρῃ·
ὡς ἐξηράνθη πεδίον πᾶν, κὰδ δ᾽ ἄρα νεκροὺς
κῆεν· ὁ δ᾽ ἐς ποταμὸν τρέψε φλόγα παμφανόωσαν.
καίοντο πτελέαι τε καὶ ἰτέαι ἠδὲ μυρῖκαι,   350
καίετο δὲ λωτός τε ἰδὲ θρύον ἠδὲ κύπειρον,
τὰ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα ἅλις ποταμοῖο πεφύκει.
τείροντ᾽ ἐγχέλυές τε καὶ ἰχθύες οἳ κατὰ δίνας,
οἳ κατὰ καλὰ ῥέεθρα κυβίστων ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα
πνοιῇ τειρόμενοι πολυμήτιος Ἡφαίστοιο.   355
καίετο δ᾽ ἲς ποταμοῖο ἔπος τ᾽ ἔφατ᾽ ἔκ τ᾽ ὀνόμαζεν·
"Ἥφαιστ᾽, οὔ τις σοί γε θεῶν δύνατ᾽ ἀντιφερίζειν,
οὐδ᾽ ἂν ἐγὼ σοί γ᾽ ὧδε πυρὶ φλεγέθοντι μαχοίμην.
λῆγ᾽ ἔριδος, Τρῶας δὲ καὶ αὐτίκα δῖος Ἀχιλλεὺς
ἄστεος ἐξελάσειε· τί μοι ἔριδος καὶ ἀρωγῆς;"   360

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:

> ἐκ δ' εὐνὰς ἔβαλον, κατὰ δὲ πρυμνήσι' ἔδησαν
> ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ βαῖνον ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης,
> ἐκ δ' ἑκατόμβην βῆσαν ἑκηβόλῳ Ἀπόλλωνι
> ἐκ δὲ χρυσηΐς νηὸς 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:

> εὖ μέν τις δόρυ θηξάσθω, εὖ δ' ἀσπίδα θέσθω,
> εὖ δέ τις ἵπποισιν δεῖπνον δότω ὠκυπόδεσσιν,
> εὖ δέ τις ἅρματος ἀμφὶς ἰδὼν πολέμοιο μεδέσθω,
> ὥς κε πανημέριοι στυγερῷ κρινώμεθ' Ἄρηϊ,

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 Homer[2]. The long -*a*- of ἀνξηράνη in 347 instead of η is singular, and has provoked Chantraine (*Grammaire homérique* 1.17) to think of an Atticism of our vulgate. ἐθείρη 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.

[2] On this word and its history and its position in the epic tradition, cf. W. Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae* 473—475 (Gütersloh, 1892), H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 2.408 (Heidelberg, 1960—70), G. P. Shipp, *Studies in the Language of Homer* 77 (Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society 8, Cambridge, 1953). Schulze is probably right in assuming an original *ὀπωαρινός, contracted later to ὀπωρῖνός Cf. Ὠαρίων > Ὠρίων.

ἐθείρεται 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 Leaf[3] by means of some inexact parallels. But
perhaps the most striking line of all these unusual lines is 352

<div align="center">τὰ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα ἅλις ποταμοῖο πεφύκει.</div>

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 ῥέεθρα ἅλις ποταμοῖο πεφύκει, with ἅλις separating ῥέεθρα
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 πνοιῇ or ῥιπῇ 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. Mo-
dern 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 αὐτόν has its proper reference"
I accept Leaf's athetesis: αὐτὸν 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. Whatmough[4]
treated it as a linguistic archaism, comparing it with Vedic Sanskrit *tā*,
a form of identical function but containing a long vowel. He holds that
Indo-European **tā* passed to Greek *tă* in all forms of Greek save for
this one passage. But all a priori considerations of the likelihood of
such a development aside[5], Whatmough's explanation is of course
impossible since all cases of inherited (a:) passed to (ε:) (*eta*) in Attic
and Ionic: his explanation demands **τή*, and since we in fact have τά,
his explanation cannot be correct. Chantraine (*Grammaire homérique*
1.103) assumes that *tă* is metrically lengthened to *tā* 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

---

[3] 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 κῆεν in 349
is Hephaistos, then the δ' is strange, for clearly the subject of τρέψε must be Hephai-
stos. If the subject of κῆεν 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 **tă* 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 τα.

the poet to place a form in a position which required metrical lengthening[6]. W, Schulze (*Quaestiones epicae* 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 αἴ 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 — οὕς 21.135, οἵ 21.206, ἥ 21.277; or long by virtue of appearing in a closed syllable: ὅς τέκε 21.159, ὅς θ' 21.253, ὅν ῥα 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 περί is not rare either, occurring as it does at the beginning of the line six times in the *Iliad* (e. g., οἵ περί 1.258, 2.751, 757, οὗ πέρι 10.244) and within the line after pause seven times (e. g. ὅς περί 2.831, ὅν περί 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. ἀμφηρεφέα τε *Il.* 1.45) and for doubling of the consonant (the frequent ἐπεί 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. τὸν ἕτερον (*Od.* 5.266 — *Metrical Lengthening in Homer* 217—218) and ἰανθῇ (*Od.* 22.59 — *Metrical Lengthening in Homer* 215).

led to make the mistake of introducing τά 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[10]. This new line was line 351, and caused the correct earlier version with feminine concord:

> καίντο πτελέαι καὶ ἰτέαι ἠδὲ μυρῖκαι,
> αἳ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα

to be changed to the neuter τά. αἳ cannot pick up both feminines and neuters - only the neuter can do that - and as a result αἳ had to be changed to τά in 352.

Restoring αἳ 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 ἅλις splitting ῥέεθρα 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' fight with the river, we may adopt ἅλις ἔσαν from this line and thus extend the original 351 to: αἳ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα ἅλις ἔσαν. In so doing we shall presumably have to suppose that it was the original 351 with its ἅλις ἔσαν which suggested to the poet including 344 in this passage as well as in 236[11]. Rather

---

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

> σὺ δὲ Ξάνθοιο παρ' ὄχθας
> δένδρεα καῖ', ἐν δ' αὐτὸν ἵει πυρί

[11] That ἅλις πεφύκει 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 ἅλις in pastoral scenes with reduplicating forms of the perfect. Cf.

Il. 2.90 αἳ μέν τ' ἔνθα ἅλις πεποτήαται, αἳ δέ τε ἔνθα
Il. 17.54 χώρῳ ἐν οἰοπόλῳ, ὅθ' ἅλις 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 (Il. 4.483—484, 14.288, Od. 9.141)[12].

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:

οἳ κατὰ καλὰ ῥέεθρα κυβίστων ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα

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

αἵματι δ' ἄξων
νέρθεν ἅπας πεπάλακτο καὶ ἄντυγες αἳ περὶ δίφρον
ἅς ἄρ' ἀφ' ἱππείων ὁπλέων ῥαθάμιγγες ἔβαλλον
αἵ 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:[13]

---

[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 diffficulty here in that, though ἔνθα can easily mean 'there' (Il. 14.216) or 'where' (Il 1.610), it tends, with verbs of motion to mean 'thither' (Il. 13.23), and seems always to be so used in the phrase ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα (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 ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα in this line (and to a lesser extent in this meaning) I would again cite 2.90 (quoted above n. 11). ῥέεθρα and ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα appear together also in Il. 2.459 — 462:

Τῶν δ', ὥς τ' ὀρνίθων πετεηνῶν ἔθνεα πολλά,
χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἢ κύκνων δουλιχοδείρων,
Ἀσίῳ ἐν λειμῶνι, καϋστρίου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα,
ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ποτῶνται ἀγαλλόμενα πτερύγεσσι
And ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα meaning 'here and there' and appearing at the end of a line is

αἵ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα πεφύκεσαν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα.

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

342 ὡς ἔφαθ', Ἥφαιστος δὲ τιτύσκετο θεσπιδαὲς πῦρ.
343 πρῶτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, καῖε δὲ νεκρούς.
345 πᾶν δ' ἐξηράνθη πεδίον, σχέτο δ' ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ.
    ὡς δ' ὅτ' ὀπωρινὸς Βορέης νεοαρδέ' ἀλωὴν
    αἶψ' ἀνξηράνῃ· χαίρει δέ μιν ὅς τις ἐθείρῃ·
    ὡς ἐξηράνθη πεδίον πᾶν, κὰδ δ' ἄρα νεκρούς
    κῆεν· ὁ δ' ἐς ποταμὸν τρέψε φλόγα παμφανόωσαν.
350 καίοντο πτελέαι καὶ ἰτέαι ἠδὲ μυρῖκαι,
352 αἳ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα πεφύκεσαν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα·
353 τείρονθ' ἐγχέλυές τε καὶ ἰχθύες οἳ κατὰ δίνας,
355 πνοιῇ τειρόμενοι πολυμήτιος Ἡφαίστοιο.
    καίετο δ' ἲς ποταμοῖο, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·

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 ἀνξηράνῃ. 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 καῖε δὲ νεκρούς of 343 to κὰδ δ' ἄρα νεκρούς, a rather minor change; and omit 345, a line which we should perhaps rather prefer to keep:

342 ὡς ἔφαθ', Ἥφαιστος δὲ τιτύσκετο θεσπιδαὲς πῦρ.
343 πρῶτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, κὰδ δ' ἄρα νεκρούς
349 κῆεν· ὁ δ' ἐς ποταμὸν τρέψε φλόγα παμφανόωσαν.
350 καίοντο πτελέαι καὶ ἰτέαι ἠδὲ μυρῖκαι,
352 αἳ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα πεφύκεσαν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα·
353 τείροντ' ἐγχέλυές τε καὶ ἰχθύες οἳ κατὰ δίνας,
355 πνοιῇ τειρόμενοι πολυμήτιος Ἡφαίστοιο.
    καίετο δ' ἲς ποταμοῖο, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·

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 *Il.* 10. 263—265:
    ἔκτοσθε δὲ λευκοὶ ὀδόντες
ἀργιόδοντος ὑός θαμέες ἔχον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα
εὖ καὶ ἐπισταμένως· μέσσῃ δ' ἐνὶ πῖλος ἀρήρει.

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 ὀπωρινός (346), ἀνξηράνη (347), and the troublesome δ' of 349. ὀπωρινός, 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):

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ὀπωρινὸς Βορέης φορέῃσιν ἀκάνθας

and can have been inserted here at any time out of the poet's stock of formulas. ἀγξηράνη 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 ῥέεθρον ἀποξηρᾶναι (all mss.: ἀποξηρῆναι Hude) which seems possibly reminiscent of this passage[15]. I have no good explanation for this form[16], but feel that the major reason for its being here is the ἐξηράνθη of 345: ἐξηράνθη was there first, ἀγξηράνη 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: μιν (347) referring to an inanimate object is unusual, though not unexampled (Shipp *Studies* 35); 348 with its κὰδ δ' ἄρα νεκρούς contains a flat repetition of the κατὲ δὲ 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 μοῦνα 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 instrusion which we would find considerable difficulty in explaining. The verb ξηραίνω from ξηρός must be a relatively late development in Greek (cf. A. Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre* 109—112 [Heidelberg, 1917]), and cannot therefore have had an aorist *ksēransa at a time when *(ns) was being simplified to */nn/ (>/:n/). Hence the aorist had to be formed by analogy with other verbs. If the analogy chosen was σημαίνω as it usually was, then the aorist was ἐξήρηνα; but if the analogy was μένω ἔμεινα then the aorist might well be ἐξῆρᾱνα 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 /ε:/. The relation [e] : [e:] (μένω ἔμεινα) suggested [a] : [a:] (ξηραίνω ἐζήρᾱνα).

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 αὐτὰρ ὅ 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 Ὣς ἔφαθ', Ἥφαιστος δὲ τιτύσκετο θεσπιδαὲς πῦρ.
343 πρῶτα μὲν ἐν πεδίῳ πῦρ δαίετο, καῖε δὲ νεκρούς.
345 πᾶν δ' ἐξηράνθη πεδίον, σχέτο δ' ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ.
349 αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἐς ποταμὸν τρέψε φλόγα παμφανόωσαν.
350 καίοντο πτελέαι καὶ ἰτέαι ἠδὲ μυρῖκαι.
353 τείροντ' ἐγχέλυές τε καὶ ἰχθύες οἳ κατὰ δίνας·
356 καίετο δ' ἲς ποταμοῖο ἔπος ἔφατ' ἐκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν·

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 αἳ περὶ καλὰ ῥέεθρα πεφύκεσαν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα
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,

11.17—8; ἠ(ὲ) 2.29—32, 326—8, 3.487—90, 8.605—9; καὶ 2.108—9, 12.295—6; εἰ 3.90—1, 4.831—2, 20.207—8. More interesting cases include; ἔνθα (4x) 3.108—11; πολλὰ 3.273—4; τρὶς μάκαρες 6.154—5; the chiastic arrangement of gold-silver-silver-gold (7.86—91); οὔτις 9.366/9; εὐνή 10.334—5; πρίν 10.384—5, 19.585—6; τρὶς 11.206—7, 21.125—6; λᾶαν 11.594/6; ξειν- 14.56—8; κτήματα 15.11/13; μοῦνον 16.118—20; οἶνος 21.293/5; οὔθ' ὅσσοι 21.346—7; τῇ ἑτέρῃ 22.183—4. 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:

κλαῖε μὲν 'Αργείη 'Ελένη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα,
κλαῖε δὲ Τηλέμαχος τε καὶ 'Ατρεΐδης 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 οἵ τε (2.496—539) in the Catalogue of the Ships, and the repetiton of ἐν (18.483/5, 587—8/90), the presence of ἐν plus ἄλλον (18.535, 536—7) and τεῦξ-' (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; Νιρεύς (2.671—3) in the Catalogue; 'Ατρειδ- 9.339/41; Αἴαντε 13.46—7, 16.555—6 'Αμφίλοχ- 15.568—9, 16.318/20; Πατροκλο- 16.815—6; "Εκτορ 17.141—2; Αἰνείας 20.160—1; Λητ- 21.497—8.

Interesting, but not verbal, examples follow: παντ-; 1.288—9; ἔνθα 1.610—1; ἡμεῖς 4.405—6; τρὶς 5.436—7, 8.169—70, 11.462—3, 18.228—9, 21.176—7; δεινή 5.739//42 flanking ἐν 5.740—1; πολλοί 6.227/9, 17.430—1, 23.30—2; κὰδ δ' 7.57—8, 24.578—80; τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' 7.164—5/7=8.262—3/5; χρυσ- 8.43—4, 11.633/5, 13.22//25—6; πολλ' frequent in book nine (541—599); π- interrogative 10.406—8; 12.416—20 where forms of τεῖχος alternate with οὔτε; ἄλλῳ 13.730—2; πεντήκοντ' 16.168—9; ῥη- 17.283/5, 461—2; ἄκρον 20.227/9; μῆτι 23.315—6/7; ἄν 23.887-8.

The repetition of a verb is also more frequent in the *Iliad*: ῥίγησεν 4.148/50; ἤθελε 10.228—31; βέβληται 11.660/2; τεθνα- 15.496—7; ζωει- 16.14—5; the etymologically interesting play with the verb 'brandish' and the names Πηλεύς and Πήλιον 16.142—4=19.389—91; οὖλον κεκλήγοντες 17.756//8; λισσομ- 19.304—5; τερπ- 19.312—3; δυ- 19.367—8; ἑλκ- 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.*