

Chiasmus in Ancient Greek and Latin Literatures

John W. Welch

Notwithstanding the fact that most recent scholarly attention has dealt with the occurrence of chiasmus in ancient Near Eastern languages and literatures, a significant amount of chiasmus is to be found in ancient Greek and Latin literatures as well. Indeed, the word „chiasmus” itself stems from the Greek word *chiazein*, meaning to mark with or in the shape of a cross, and chiasmus has been earnestly studied in Greek and Latin syntax and style far more extensively and many years longer than it has even been acknowledged in the context of Semitic and other ancient writings.

That chiasmus has received more attention in the Classical setting than in other ancient literatures is at the same time both ironic and yet completely understandable. The irony lies in the fact that more scholarly acceptance and utilization of chiasmus is found in connection with the appreciation of Western literary traditions than in the study of other ancient literatures, whereas chiasmus is relatively simple and certainly less informative in respect to the Greek and Latin authors than it is in regard to many of the writers from other arenas of the ancient world. One would expect the greater efforts to be made where the rewards promise to be the more attractive. Yet this situation is also easily explained. For one thing, numerous Western scholars have exhaustively studied secular Greek literary texts since the thirteenth century, and Latin, since it was spoken in Rome. The use of literary devices in Hebrew literature, on the other hand, has only been given relatively sparse scholarly treatment in the West for something over two hundred years, and the study of figures of speech in most other ancient languages, dialects and literatures can still be said to be somewhat in a state of infancy. In addition, since the occurrence of chiasmus in the Classical European texts is often a relatively simple phenomenon, it has usually been an easy thing for commentators to detect, natural to comment upon, and relatively inconsequential and uncontroversial once observed.

This, however, should not be taken to imply that the study of chiasmus or related structural aspects of Greek or Latin literary art forms is merely a mechanical exercise without much interpretative or appreciative value. To the contrary, the study of chiasmus in European traditions can be rewarding in several respects, both as to the Classical literatures themselves and as to the other bodies of writing with which they are compared and contrasted. For example, the frequency of chiasmus in a given author’s writing can be used as a guide in evaluating the author’s tendencies to embellish upon or vary from direct, „natural” forms of speech, and when comparing literatures, one can see certain similarities between chiasmus in early Greek writing, particularly in Homer, and chiasmus in other ancient writings, such as those studied in the earlier chapters of this volume. Although, as this essay will show, the complexity of chiasmus diminishes markedly in the later Greek and Latin writers (setting the style for most Western writing ever since), it is still important to observe and appreciate the extent chiasmus was used by them in order to confirm and compare the use of chiasmus in other ancient, especially biblical, texts.

Chiasmus appears in Greek and Latin writing from the time of Homer to the later Roman authors. Not all Classical compositions, however, use chiasmus to the same extent, and frequently it appears to be more of a poetical device (as it often is when it occurs in English¹) than an independent structural principle or form. Nevertheless, certain authors employ chiasmus in a complex fashion and for them the form serves true structural, and not mere ornamental functions. This will be demonstrated as their writings are examined, first as to Homer and then as to the later Latin and Greek writers.

Homer In many ancient literatures, as we have known since Bishop Lowth and as we have seen above, parallelism is one of the primary structural elements of literary style. In the Homeric epics, however, a different structural device is fundamental: the meter determines the basic structure of each of the 27,803 lines of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: dactylic hexameter makes each line in and of itself a structural unit. Since meter is of primary importance to *Homer*, chiasmus is by necessity a secondary feature of Homeric style, and like all else, it conforms to the demands of the metrical scheme.

Nevertheless, even in this role, chiasmus functions both grammatically and structurally in *Homer*. It is normally contained within the structure of individual lines, although isolated cases exist in which complicated chiastic figures extend over a number of lines as well. Due to the large number of syllables with short metric values in Ionic Greek, the dactylic hexameter did not drastically restrict the flexibility of word order in *Homer's* epic compositions, and thus grammatical chiasmus could often be used at the discretion of the bard.

When chiasmus is structural in *Homer*, it is sometimes called „*hysteron proteron*,“ i.e. „the latter first.“ *Hysteron proteron* describes passages which are constructed so that their first thought refers to some latter thought of a preceding passage, and their latter thought, to some preceding passage's former thought. Even though Cicero was aware of this Homeric technique², and even though scholars such as Wilamowitz-Moellendorff³ and Cedric Whitman⁴ have concerned themselves with Homeric symmetries in general, modern scholars have only recently begun to realize the structural effects and nature of *hysteron proteron*.⁵ Such inversions, rising to elaborate chiastic levels, occur in *Homer*, as will be shown after an initial examination of simple chiasmus in *Homer* has been made.

When *Homer* uses chiasmus in arranging the order of his words, it is usually short and simple. This use of chiasmus seldom exceeds one line in length, since it is subordinate to the metric composition of the individual lines themselves. Moreover, chiasmus in *Homer* rarely introduces antithetical ideas in its inverted second half. Most often the inversion is noun-adjective, adjective-noun, whereas in Hebrew it is more likely to be subject-verb, verb-subject. Homeric chiasmus rarely embodies a turning point or escalation of thought, as chiasmus so often does in Hebrew and other ancient literatures. Here it functions predominantly as a grammatical, ornamental form.

This is illustrated by the fact that the presence of chiasmus in a Homeric line is often accompanied by the presence of *té . . . té* in that verse. The simple addition which is connoted by the usage of *té . . . té*⁶ typifies the basic nature of chiasmus in *Homer*, as is illustrated by the following examples:

Il 3:179	Describing Agamemnon as „a king <i>good</i> and a <i>mighty warrior</i> “
Il 9:443	„Of words a speaker and a doer of <i>deeds</i> “
Il 16:224	„Cloaks windbreaking and fleecy <i>blankets</i> “
Il 16:857	„Its lot <i>mourning</i> and <i>leaving</i> youth and manhood“
Il 24:730	„Wives noble and innocent <i>children</i> “
Od 3:310	„Mother <i>despicable</i> and cowardly Aegisthus“
Od 10:235	„Pramnian wine she <i>fixed</i> and <i>mixed</i> in barley meal“
Od 24:340	„Pear trees <i>thirteen</i> and <i>ten</i> apple trees“

All these are examples of simple grammatical chiasmus. Of these eight examples, five are noun-adjective -- adjective-noun patterns, two are noun-participle -- participle-noun figures and one depends on case, namely, genitive-accusative -- accusative-genitive. All these examples of chiasmus are contained within single lines, and

with the exception of II 16:224, they are all found in speeches. These examples are typical of Homer's basic use of chiasmus.

On some occasions, Homer uses complex grammatical chiasmus involving several terms. This resembles the more elaborate chiasms studied in the preceding chapters. Although it is very difficult to isolate a rhetorical style from a poetic style in Homer (since the whole poem was spoken and all its speeches are poetic), chiasmus still seems to be employed by Homer as a predominantly rhetorical device. It was observed above that simple chiasms occur frequently in speeches; below is an example of an elaborate chiasm found in Phoenix' speech (II 9:434–606). This speech appears in the ninth book of the Iliad, which has been described as the book of the Iliad which contains more *oratio recta* than any other part of the Iliad.⁷ Coming from the hero's own tutor, this speech, of all speeches in the Iliad, should represent the paragon of Homeric rhetoric. In it, Phoenix presents a concise description of the heroic ideal: the hero should be a speaker of words and also a doer of great deeds.⁸ His speech is monumental in the Iliad.⁹ It sets the stage for Achilles' decision to stay in Troy, which in effect is the turning point of the Trojan war. When it is seen that the initial lines of Phoenix' speech revolve chiastically around a central turning point, one better understands the impact which this speech had on the heroic decision of Achilles, for in Phoenix' speech the focal point is the heroic ideal itself. Lattimore's translation of this passage, II 9: 437–445, reads as follows:

(a) How then shall I, dear child, be left in this place behind you all alone? Peleus the aged horseman sent me forth with you on that day when he sent you from Phthia to Agamemnon a mere child, who knew nothing yet (b) of the joining of battle nor (c) of debate (d) where men are made pre-eminent. Therefore he sent me along with you to teach you of all these matters, (c) to make you a speaker of words and (b) one who is accomplished in action. (a) Therefore apart from you, dear child, I would not be willing to be left behind.

This is a relatively complete chiastic composition coming within a stylistically unique passage in the Iliad (indicating that the use of chiasmus here was probably not accidental). Very little of the language in Phoenix' speech is formulaic, and its important words appear nowhere else in the Iliad. It follows that the passage, including its chiastic structure, was stylistically created especially for the purpose of embodying the description by Phoenix himself of the heroic ideal.

Examples such as these show the basic form of chiasmus in Homer. But his use of the form extends well beyond that which has been seen thus far. Frequently an inversion in the structural order of thoughts or events is found in Homer. When this occurs, the figure is referred to as *hysteron proteron*. As Bassett has described, *hysteron proteron* is formally equivalent to chiasmus, only functionally different.¹⁰ Where chiasmus gives order to words, *hysteron proteron* gives a structural order to the poet's thoughts. Although the term *hysteron proteron* has been familiar to scholars since the first century B.C.,¹¹ until recently there has been little consensus of opinion about its meaning and nature.¹² One of the most salient clues revealing its meaning, however, appears in Cicero. When Atticus asks two questions about the verdict of the trial of Clodius, Cicero answers the second question first and the first, second and explains his so doing by citing Homer as his model (Atticus 1, 16, 1). Homer was fond of this figure of inversion and repetition, but he was by no means bound to it. It was an ornamental, though functional, aspect of his style.¹³

Some of the examples of *hysteron proteron*, detected by Bassett, Bowra, and also the ancient scholiasts, are found in volleys of questions which are answered in the reverse order. For example:

Od 24:106ff. Agamemnon asks Amphimedon (a) how the suitors came to die, and (b) whether he does not remember him. Amphimedon replies (b) that he does remember him well, and then he tells (a) of the slaughter of the suitors. Od 15:509ff. Theoclymenus asks Telemachus whether he shall go (a) to the home of a prince in Ithaca or (b) Penelope. Telemachus answers that (b) it is impossible to see Penelope but (a) that he might become a guest at Eurymachus. Od 14:115ff. Odysseus asks, (a) who was your master? (b) perhaps I can give you tidings of him, for I have wandered far. Eumaeus responds, (b) no wanderer's tidings can have credence with my master's wife and son; (a) my master was Odysseus. Il 2:758–69 It is asked (a) who is the best fighter and (b) who has the best horses. The Muse replies (b) the best horses are those of Eumelos and (a) the best warrior is Aias in the absence of Achilles. Il 19:139ff. Agamemnon commands, (a) so rouse thee to battle and (b) I will render the gifts. Achilles replies (b) as thou wilt about the gifts, now (a) let us think of the battle.

These are clear examples of chiasitic structural inversions.

Other examples of *hysteron proteron* can be even more complex. In the catalogue of the troops in the third book of the Iliad, first the Achaeans are described, then the Trojans; the Trojans advance first, then the Achaeans. In the second onslaught it is the Achaeans who move first (Il 4:427 and 433). Similarly, in a series of five scenes, Il 15:55–322 contains another long chain of such inversions:

(55) When Zeus wakes on Mount Ida, he bids Hera to summon Iris (a) and Apollo (b). (143f.) She summons Apollo (b) and then Iris (a). (157, 221) After they report to Zeus, he dispatches Iris (a) and then Apollo (b). (229–232) The latter is given two commands: to take the aegis (c) and put the Achaeans to flight, and then to go to Hector (d) and rouse his strength. (308, 322) Then Apollo goes to Hector's aid (d) and finally he takes the aegis (c) and routs the Achaeans.

This pattern, again, exemplifies a compound structural chiasmus and lends continuity to the narrative.

A most marked example of *hysteron proteron* is noted by Aristarchus, on Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1086, a fragment of commentary dating to the middle of the first century B.C. It is observed therein that the conversation between Odysseus and his mother, Anticleia, in the underworld, Od 11:170 ff., utilizes the principle of *hysteron proteron* in a most extraordinary fashion. Odysseus asks the shade of his mother:

(a) How she had died, (b) Was it by a disease, (c) Or by the gentle shafts of Artemis. (d) About his father, (e) About his son, (f) Whether another had assumed his royal power, (g) And about his wife, where does she stay.

Anticleia responds in exactly the reverse order:

(g) She stays in thy halls, (f) No man has taken thy honor, (e) Telemachus is a peaceful lord, (d) Your father remains in the fields, (c) Artemis did not slay me, (b) Nor did a disease, (a) But I died of grief for thee.¹⁴

This is indeed remarkable and is not readily explicable except in the broader context of chiasmus in antiquity generally.

Although Homer does not always observe chiasitic orders, he does use *hysteron proteron* on many occasions, and as Aristarchus has said, „the poet's failure to use it is contrary to his wont.”¹⁵ Bassett concludes, „this inversion

cannot be accidental. The poet must invert intentionally.”¹⁶

Bassett offers four explanations for the use of *hysteron proteron* in Homer, most of which are harmonious with the use of chiasmus generally. He states that it was used (1) for variety, (2) for economy of thought, (3) because of the point of view of the second speaker, and (4) due to the need for continuity of ideas. Without flowing continuity, the oral recitation of a poem of this length would be confusing to the listener. With *hysteron proteron* the poet can direct the audience from one thought to the next, while the last is still fresh in its mind.

It is difficult to say which is more natural: the overlapping and connecting characteristics of an a-b-b-a-a-b pattern, or the abrupt alternating and juxtaposing order of a-b-a-b-a-b. Bassett chooses the former as the more natural, meaning the more primitive. He feels that the tendency to return to the last thought is „to be expected in all primitive speech.”¹⁷ This is probably true; children like chiasmus.¹⁸ From the position of a second speaker, the last thing mentioned will almost automatically receive the first attention. But in Homer’s style, *hysteron proteron* comprises more than the simple tendency to return to the last idea mentioned. It continues on, returning backwards until the first idea is reached again. Bassett convincingly insists that this entails more than an innate tendency. Homer’s epics, he says, are not „a product of primitive speech, but were written long after the reasoning processes had been well developed.”¹⁹ Homer’s style was intentional and mature.²⁰ Certain elements of primitive speech may lie in the distant origins of such an involved style as *hysteron proteron*, and they may contribute to the audience’s natural appreciation of the work, but the whole style in its complexity owes its existence to much more than one inherent human tendency. To say that Homer used chiasmus and *hysteron proteron* simply because of some vague inherent inclination toward inversion is to say that he chose dactylic hexameter because man has a natural sense of rhythm. Homer used *hysteron proteron* as a purposeful structural device, and understanding it is important „in helping us to understand the secret of the poet’s art.”²¹

Over the years, scholars have evaluated Homeric style, both internally and comparatively, in terms of his use of these devices. Contention has only arisen over defining the relationship of *hysteron proteron* to chiasmus. Among the scholiasts themselves a series of propositions and rebuttals can be studied. Aristarchus of Alexandria treated *hysteron proteron* as distinct from chiasmus and treated it with lawlike universality in Homer, applying it as a unique and compelling principle of textual criticism and interpretation in Homer.²² His rival Crates of Pergamum would not allow *hysteron proteron* to pass as a figure unique to Homer and said: „The Homeric *hysteron proteron* is nothing but rhetorical chiasmus.”²³ Crates and the Stoics of Pergamum considered *hysteron proteron* to be a rhetorical device which had been devised to give the lesser genre of rhetoric some of the majesty and order of poetry.²⁴ In the Middle Ages, the Bishop of Thessalonica, Eustathius, disparaged the use of inverted orders in Homeric thought, but still associated it directly with chiasmus

This is a novel order. It is chiastic . . . Homer’s order results in a lack of clearness: He has arranged four words, not in square order [Eustathius gives a diagram to explain this], but like the letter X. This is artificial and contorted. The poet has imitated the mind of a man whose mind is confused, and one who is not at home in arranging words naturally.²⁵

Hopefully, we need not accept Eustathius’ judgment that Homeric inversion reflects a state of confusion. But what of the equation of chiasmus and *hysteron proteron*? Certainly *hysteron proteron* is related to chiasmus, but to leave that relationship undefined or to suggest that *hysteron proteron* is merely ornamental like grammatical chiasmus invites confusion and controversy.

The answer appears to be relatively simple. When the scholiasts use the term *chiasmus*, they apparently mean simple grammatical chiasmus, an unpretentious criss-crossing of words. When they use the term *hysteron proteron* they refer to a structural order of ideas or events in an inverted arrangement.²⁶ There is more substance and significance to the latter, but the difference is only one of degree, not of kind. The problem basically arose because the scholiasts were cognizant that simple chiasmus played only a peripheral role in later Greek and Latin literary art, and thus they attributed little status to it in Homer.²⁷ But this should not imply that *hysteron proteron* or other larger symmetrical structures are to be treated equally lightly. The great poet cannot be judged exclusively according to the preferences of first century Greek grammarians. Homer's mind and his world thought differently from theirs. As will be seen next, Homeric literature was written within a deliberate framework of larger geometric precision. As a part of this framework, both chiasmus and *hysteron proteron* were structurally and grammatically influential as a principle of literary form.

The symmetrical structure of the *Odyssey* has been analyzed by John L. Myres.²⁸ Myres describes in great detail, which need not be duplicated here, the correspondences and intercalations between scenes in many sections of this epic. He is able to show significant evidences of concentric structures throughout the *Odyssey*, and frequently concludes that the number of elements involved is too great to be due to coincidence. In Books I–V, for example, in which Telemachus seeks Odysseus, the incidents take place at

A Olympus (1, 1–105) B Ithaca (1, 106–2, 434) C Pylos (3, 1–407) C' Sparta (4, 1–610) B' Ithaca (4, 623–847) A' Olympus (5, 1–493).

In Books XVII–XXIII, Myres suggests the following structure in the Vengeance of Odysseus:

A Penelope – Theoclymenus: prediction B Argus: Melanthius and Antinous C Penelope invites Odysseus D The defeat of Irus E Penelope receiving the Suitors' gifts F Insult of Eurymachus G Penelope receives Odysseus: bird omen H Decision to abide by the Test of the Bow G' Telemachus, Eurycleia, Philoetius: geese F' Insult of Ctesippus E' Penelope proposes test of the bow D' Failure of the Suitors C' Penelope allows Odysseus' claim B' Massacre: Antinous and Melanthius A' Penelope recognizes Odysseus: prediction fulfilled.

Not only is the order of these events in the Vengeance of Odysseus, like other structures in the *Odyssey*, relatively clear, but one notices above that the centerpiece of this particular episode is not the massacre, as the modern mind would expect, nor Penelope's ultimate recognition of Odysseus, but rather Penelope's decision to abide by the Test of the Bow and the divine approvals which accompany that decision. Observing the chiasmic character of this passage and the many other duplicative or parallel symmetries in the composition of the *Odyssey* is elementary to appreciating the literary achievements of this timeless epic.

Similar efforts have been made identifying inverted parallel arrangements in the *Iliad* as well.²⁹ The patterns in the *Iliad*, however, do not appear to be as precise as those seen above in the *Odyssey*. Certain writers have attributed the presence of repetitive patterns in the *Iliad* to the direct influence of Geometric art on Homeric composition, though it is not certain that Homer composed as late as the period in which Geometric art was flourishing. Cedric Whitman is one of the foremost proponents of this school. His statement, „the real analogue of Homeric style is Geometric art,”³⁰ characterizes his study. „It is the spirit of the Geometric Age,” he says, „which is at work here, and the form which it produced would have been all but impossible in any other time.”³¹ It should be apparent that we no longer need to view such patterns as unique to the Homeric or Geometric age. Literary works from this age, like

those of many other periods, reflect a high propensity towards symmetry, as Whitman's schematization of the structure of the Iliad has amply shown. Whitman expressed his conclusions concerning symmetry in Homer as follows:

Homer's scenes are, furthermore, placed especially in the Iliad, in balancing positions, echoing each other either through similarity or contrast. The most obvious example, of course, is the balance of the Quarrel in Book I of the Iliad by the Reconciliation in Book XXIV. Thus there is a circular composition also of scenes themselves, scenes framing scenes in concentric rings around centerpieces, exactly as central motifs are heavily framed by borders in Geometric painting. Concentric circles are a universal device in Geometric art, and an especial favorite in Athenian Protogeometric; and the principle of balance around a central point which is implied in concentric circles is far and away the dominating formal principle in the Iliad. The poem as a whole forms one large concentric pattern, within which a vast system of smaller ones, sometimes distinct and sometimes interlocking, gives shape to the several parts.³²

Whitman provides his reader with numerous examples and an expanded chart depicting the symmetrical structure of the Iliad. Most noticeable are the parallels between Books 9 and 16. Other parallels are not as distinct as these. Whitman recalls further:

It has been suggested that such „onion skin” design arose from a device originally mnemonic . . . but if this device was originally mnemonic and functional such a purpose is clearly superceded when it becomes the structural basis of a fifteen-thousand-line poem such as the Iliad. It has become an artistic principle.³³

Although Geometric art provides certain analogues for Homeric style, significant differences should also be observed between the geometric model, to which Whitman looks, and the chiasmic mode. The similarity of vase paintings and temple friezes with Homeric imagery³⁴ and structure is limited. In a geometric temple frieze, for example, the center image is always the most important, but in the Iliad and in the Odyssey, the central books are not climactic and are the most asymmetrical, as Whitman admits. As such they comprise a curious centerpiece in terms of Geometric art. Furthermore, the painted rings which border the central motif on geometric vase paintings do not themselves culminate in relative high points. Rather they repeat the same figure over and over again in a linear extension. This, again, is unlike the progressive subsections contained within these epics. Thirdly, the rings on the bottom half of most vases do not reflect those on the top half exactly. From this it would seem that symmetry in Geometric art is not strictly analogous to symmetry in Homer, and therefore, it may be erroneous to expect to find an explanation for all types of Homeric symmetry in Geometric art.

Furthermore, literary devices, such as chiasmus and *hysteron proteron*, for example, are not explained by the principles of Geometric art. Lord speaks directly to this point:

I doubt if the artistic pattern is dynamic to this degree and in this way. This is not to deny that such balances of pattern are felt by the singers -- we have seen them operative on the level of interlinear connections, where they play a part in determining the positions of words in a line and perhaps even thereby the choice of words. But to suppose that such patterns would be the cause of changes of essential ideas and meaning may be carrying their influence too far.³⁵

To explain Homer's use of chiasmus and *hysteron proteron*, it would therefore appear necessary to find another precedent or pattern. And as Kosmala suggests, we should recall that the use of symmetry in composition „is not

an invention of the Greeks. Very probably it is a Semitic inheritance, like the alphabet.”³⁶ Bassett makes a similar suggestion:

There seem to be but two possible explanations. The first is that Homer and his predecessors were influenced by Asiatic peoples. This does not seem impossible. The Orient is the native soil of the *raconteur*: Ionia must have had some contact with the peoples of southwestern Asia and Mesopotamia. But until we have more knowledge of the channels by which this influence could have reached the bards before Homer, another explanation commends itself more strongly.³⁷

The information concerning the possible chiasmic influence of Eastern literatures on Homeric writing, which Bassett did not have when he wrote earlier in this century, has surely been exposed and explored in recent times and in the preceding chapters of this book. The conclusion which this suggests is that Homer’s use of chiasmus and symmetrical composition should not be understood as an exclusively Hellenic product or tendency. The pattern which is seen in Homer is, from many other contexts, a familiar one.

Latin and Later Greek Authors In the traditions which followed in Homer’s footsteps, chiasmus became a figure of syntax which served many Greek and Latin authors in a variety of ways. In general, chiasmus became a simpler figure in the later writers than *hysteron proteron* or symmetrical structure had been in Homer. It rarely functions as an element of structure, giving continuity to multi-termed passages. In the later writers, except in relatively rare instances, chiasmus was restricted to making individual sentences into stylistic units,³⁸ and thus Nägelsbach calls chiasmus and anaphora „the ruling powers of the structure of the Latin sentence.”³⁹ Since Greek and Latin are highly inflected, they permit flexibility in word order and accommodate the composition of simple chiasmus with relative ease. Nevertheless, chiasmus is not always found to be a natural, intrinsic aspect of Classical styles, for in some authors it is artificial.⁴⁰ While some use it frequently, it appears rarely in others. Therefore, in those authors where it does appear saliently, it can be considered an important part of their stylistic artistry. Bernhard, after accusing Nägelsbach of exaggerating the point, does not exaggerate when he says:

„How an author relates to these principles of placing words is extremely important in judging his style, and it constitutes a significant deficiency in our stylistic research that so far only a few authors have been studied with this approach in mind.”⁴¹

If neglecting chiasmus constitutes a significant deficiency in our analyses of Classical style, the deficiency is currently greater in Greek studies than in Latin. Even though „the psychological effect of word order is stronger in Greek than in Latin,”⁴² most of the exhaustive studies of chiasmus in Classical literature have concentrated on Latin authors and little attention has been paid to chiasmus in the Classical Greek literature.

In these literatures, chiasmus served at least seven distinct stylistic purposes. Chiasmus aided in metrical composition, added variety to expression, placed emphasis on particular words, juxtaposed contrasting terms, brought corresponding thoughts closer together, gave simple prose a rhetorical tinge, and created passages which were aesthetically pleasing. Several commentators expound upon these purposes, illustrating them with examples from various authors. Such comments include the following. Concerning the first function of chiasmus, aiding in metrical composition, Steele observes:

[In the Aeneid] the chiasmic arrangement gives a desirable succession of dactyls and spondees. In some verses this order of the words gives an available succession of long and short syllables.⁴³

Secondly, Havers explains that chiasmus occurs to meet the need for variety, stating, „Furthermore, the need for variety leads to chiasmus.”⁴⁴ He continues by emphasizing that chiasmus not only can help an author avoid monotony, but it also creates a different rhetorical form through which emphatic statements can be made:

„The endeavor to avoid monotony coincides in many respects with the need for an especially penetrating style of speech.”⁴⁵

A style of speaking is forceful if it places emphasis clearly on central ideas, and chiasmus possesses an inherent characteristic which can juxtapose contrasting terms and draw emphatic attention to them.⁴⁶ Hofmann considers emphasis and continuity the two most significant psychological moments of chiasmus. According to his terminology, important concepts are arranged by chiasmus on the *Hochtonstellen im Satz* and the ideas are connected in chiasmus by an *Anknüpfung* of one term to the next.⁴⁷ Beside these functional purposes, chiasmus finally fulfills artistic purposes.⁴⁸ As an element of style, it is an aspect of literary refinement and polish. Steele describes it as being able to impart even to simple narrative „somewhat of a rhetorical tinge.”⁴⁹ Elsewhere it is described as „strongly rhetorical” and as „an additional ornament.”⁵⁰ Thus, through these seven purposes, chiasmus was available to serve Greek and Latin authors both practically and artistically. Because it has been more frequently studied in Latin, those authors will be considered first, and the Greek writers second.

Chiasmus was employed frequently and consciously by many Latin authors. It is observed that „the criss-cross arrangement of words is a common phenomenon in Latin.”⁵¹ The literally thousands of examples of chiasmus which are observed in available commentaries on the classical Latin authors demonstrate the extensiveness of chiasmus throughout this body of literature. Steele lists 1257 examples of chiasmus in Livy; 211 in Sallust; 365 in Caesar; 1088 in Tacitus; 307 in Justinus; etc.⁵² Furthermore the consensus of scholastic opinion holds that such chiasms were consciously created for one or more of the purposes listed above. When the terms forming the chiasmus are near to each other and are not separated by a number of intervening terms, it must be agreed that the use of the figure is a part of „a conscious rhetorical art.”⁵³ For the most part it is only on occasions where many words intervene that chiasmus may be considered simply an inadvertent result.⁵⁴

Depending on its usage, chiasmus can be either a natural or an artificial form of speech in Latin. When a thought or a short sentence is fully enclosed in a chiasm, the figure is considered natural and unaffected.⁵⁵ Examples of this are found in Cicero, Rep. 2, 33: „This *mother* we know but are ignorant of the *father*.” Likewise in Ennius, Ann. 269: „*Despised* is the good orator, while the uncouth soldier is *loved*.” Hofmann considers chiastic disjunction natural when, in effect, it takes the place of a conditional clause,⁵⁶ as in Plautus, Trin. 250: „While a night she *grants*, she *moves* in with her whole household.” But chiasmus becomes artificial when the impact of its inversion extends no further than to isolated words, genders, cases, or groups of words.⁵⁷ Furthermore, chiasmus can become contrived when the same word is repeated as the means of creating the chiasm.⁵⁸ This is characteristic of Sallust:⁵⁹ „Defensoribus moenium praemia *modo, modo* formidinem ostentare.”

The reason that chiasmus in Latin and Greek is often called artificial is that its scope is relatively limited. Complex chiasmus is fairly rare in Latin authors. Steele concludes from his extensive studies, „Chiasmus is found chiefly with two pairs of words.”⁶⁰ Occasionally extended examples can be found in the form of alternating pairs, such as ab-ba-ab-ba, e.g. Caesar, B. Gall. 3, 19, 3: „Opportunitate loci, hostium inscientia, virtute militum, pugnare

exercitatione.” Nägelsbach also comments on this type of construction and gives the following example of an interesting chiastic arrangement in the form of ab-ba-cd-dc:

Lael. 15, 52: „Whoever he is, who hides, so that he esteems no one and no one esteems him, lives abounding in troops and rich in all things.’ One sees here that chiasmus has penetrated the whole sentence and that it is wrong to limit chiasmus to short coordinated disjunctive clauses.”⁶¹

Despite these types of structures, it is evident that chiasms which are composed of three or more pairs or groups of three or more are rare in Latin.⁶² This is shown by the following chart of the relative frequencies of three types of chiasms as they appear in four authors:⁶³

Sallust Caesar Tacitus Justinus 190 294 887 240 10 55 117 19 11 16 84 48

Chiasms with two pairs of words:

Chiasms with three or more pairs:

Chiasms with groups of three or more words:

The third line of this chart includes all possible chiastic arrangements which involve two groups of three or more words (regardless of the order of the words in the second half as long as an inversion occurs somewhere among them).⁶⁴ Even including all such varieties in what might be called extended chiasms, simple chiasmus still appears approximately twelve times more frequently than the extended forms of chiasmus here.

Thus it is evident that chiasmus is used by many authors. It is particularly employed to show contrasts and to connect phrases and clauses together without the use of transitional particles. In respect to each author, chiasmus may reveal a separate aspect of his style. Sallust, for example, utilizes chiasmus in his writings for the sake of variety: „He is continually striving after variety in words, constructions and arrangement. He freely uses chiasmus which is a conscious element of his style.”⁶⁵ In both the *Catilina* and *Jugurtha*, chiasmus appears frequently, although it is often contrived and artificial and depends upon the repetition of the same word at the center, e.g.: „Domum *alius alius* agros cupere.” Many of Sallust’s chiasms are exclusively grammatical and do not depend upon content nor do they create marked contrasts in meaning, and to this extent they resemble the inversions present in the fragmentary writings of Claudius, the second century B.C. historian, who uses „die doppelte chiastische Umstellung . . . gern und oft.”⁶⁶

Cicero used chiasmus especially when writing carefully and deliberately. „In those epistles of Cicero which were most freely and rapidly written chiasmus does not often occur.”⁶⁷ Chiasmus in Cicero frequently employs pairs of adverbs such as *umquam, semper* (Att. 8, 1, 3) or *prius, deinde* (ad Fam. 3, 12, 1) or repeat the same word, such as *tranquilla, tranquillissimus* (Att. 7, 7, 4) or *cogito, cogito* (Att. 9, 5, 3). Cicero’s wry sarcasm is also enhanced by chiasmus, as in Att. 9, 12, 3: „Nos vivimus et stat urbs.”

Chiasmus was also useful to Caesar. It appears regularly in all his works, being slightly more prevalent in his more popular works, *The Gallic Wars* and *The Civil War*. But in general, Caesar’s chiasms are short and pragmatic, consistent with Caesar’s forthright style throughout:

In the use of chiasmus there are no features which are peculiar to Caesar . . . Nor do we find, as in Sallust, long sentences in which there is a chiastic arrangement throughout.⁶⁸

In Livy, chiasmus operates as a directing force of syntax. Characteristic of Livy is chiasmus which depends primarily upon grammatical constructions.⁶⁹ Only a few depend upon content or introduce contrasting ideas; most simply repeat a parallel idea as in 24, 6, 7; 30, 26, 8 and 7, 4, 7:

„Finis regni Syracusani ac Punici imperii. The boundary of the kingdom of *Syracuse* and the *Carthaginian* empire. „Superavit paternos honores, avitos aequavit. He surpassed his father’s honors and his grandfather’s he equaled. „Vita agresti et rustico cultu. In life rural and clownish in up-bringing.”

Concerning chiasmus in Livy, Steele states: „The words in the two members of the chiasmus are opposite in meaning or strongly contrasted in only a small number of the instances.”⁷⁰ According to Steele, chiasmus occurs 1257 times in Livy. Nevertheless, chiasmus in Livy is little more than a grammatical device within which the historian arranges his diction and colors his interior sentence design.

Of Seneca, a Silver Age author, it is said, „Chiasmus is not a very prominent feature in the style of Seneca.”⁷¹ Tacitus used chiasmus sporadically in his different works.⁷² In works such as *Germania* and *Dialogus*, which are largely declarative, there are few contrasts and subsequently anaphora predominates over chiasmus. In the *Annals* and *Histories*, which show more frequent rhetorical touches, „chiasmus is more freely used.”⁷³ Pliny the Younger uses chiasmus only in writings which he appears to have very carefully prepared.⁷⁴ Apuleius, a second century satirist and philosopher, used chiasmus to conform the form of his sentences with their content. As Bernhard observes: „Besonders hervorzuheben sind diejenigen Stellen, in denen das Verbum zu einem zweiten Verbum in Antithese tritt.”⁷⁵ Yet in Apuleius’ works other than the *Metamorphoses*, chiasmus is not apparent⁷⁶ and he is never obsessed with carrying out „dies oder jenes Stellungstypus.”⁷⁷

Thus far we have seen chiasmus mostly in prose, but in much of Latin literature, chiasmus is also used in poetic works. Vergil’s use of chiasmus is perhaps one of the more ingenious aspects of his style. In the *Aeneid*, Vergil uses chiasmus in order to make his poetry smoother and more picturesque. Many lines could be quoted in which a chiastic order of words was necessary to maintain the dactylic hexameter.⁷⁸ „Nearly every page of Vergil furnishes a number of examples of chiasmus.”⁷⁹ A comparison of Vergilian hexameter to Lucretian hexameter reveals further some of the functionings of chiasmus in Vergil. Lucretius’ purpose was primarily to formulate his ideas logically rather than artistically. This gave his verses a different movement and sequence, and made it impossible for him to use chiasmus as frequently as it was used by Vergil. The fact that Lucretius rarely used chiasmus illuminates the following statement:

The flowing dactylic hexameters of the *Aeneid* represent an extraordinary triumph on the part of Vergil over his predecessor Lucretius, whose *De Rerum Natura* is in dactylic hexameters which seem to be forcibly carved out of the spondaic Latinate rock.⁸⁰

The phrase „spondaic Latinate rock” here refers to the fact that long syllables occur more frequently in Latin than in Greek, making Greek more compatible with dactylic hexameter than Latin. By employing chiasmus, however, Vergil was able to make his poetry more flowing than Lucretius and at the same time more like Homer’s, which was Vergil’s epic model.⁸¹

Up to this point, attention has been paid almost exclusively to the presence of very short chiastic passages in Latin authors. This was required because of the relatively extensive history of scholarly attention which has been given

to this type of chiasmus in Latin literature. In addition to these shorter chiasms, however, longer chiastic passages have also been suggested to exist in certain Latin texts. In some of these cases, the pattern is identifiably chiastic. Charles Talbert refers to several of these analyses in support of his claim that the chiastic passages which he observes in the Gospel of John are analogous to the „chiastic architectural pattern for larger units” found in Classical sources.⁸² Actually, however, as Talbert seems to have later recognized,⁸³ most of the instances of structural organizations in Classical writings supply evidence only of the architectonic principle of *balance*, but rarely of inversion or chiasm.

In the Aeneid, for example, the balance between the first six books and the last six is in the form of direct, not introverted, parallelism.⁸⁴ Similarly, although it has been claimed that relationships exist between the first and last books of Vergil’s Georgics, this observation is only offered to extend parenthetically a general argument that Books I and III are a pair, as are Books II and IV.⁸⁵ (More particularly, this argument is advanced to rebut Drew’s assertion that Books I and II of the Georgics, concerning inanimate objects, form a unit unrelated to Books III and IV, about living creatures.⁸⁷) Likewise, the suggestion that Catullus 68b is chiastic is not particularly persuasive. Wohlberg proposes to find an A–B–C–B–A pattern here, but the proposed arrangement is not far removed from a simple dramatic prologue – central action – epilogue pattern. Furthermore, his proposal’s strength lies primarily in the occurrence of a simple triad of similes at the center and in his disregard of a significant portion of lamentation.⁸⁷ These passages manifest elements of balanced composition, but not chiasm.

In a fairly small number of cases, however, a case can be made that extended chiasmus was used by some Latin authors. In Vergil, Georgics IV, 453–527, for example, Gilbert Norwood observes the following structure in the speech of Proteus:

A Death beside a stream owing to rejection of love B Impressive Greek geographical names C Persistent singing, utterly indifferent to the world around D Simile of birds E The infernal streams F Heart of the Story E An infernal stream D Simile of a bird C Persistent singing, utterly indifferent to the world around B Impressive Greek geographical names A Death beside a stream owing to rejection of love.⁸⁸

Norwood concludes:

„It is difficult to believe that so large and well-balanced a structure is nothing but illusion. Vergil, with entire consciousness of what he was doing, set out an arrangement analogous to an elaborate Greek stanza, so as to suffuse a narrative, beautiful and touching in phrase, rhythm, and piercing splendor, with the additional glory of lyric form.”⁸⁹

This passage, although only 65 lines long, comes close to the more intricate chiastic creations which one encounters in the earlier ancient literatures.

In Catullus 64, Clyde Murley and C. W. Mendell see a general structure as follows:

A Introduction B The Human guests at the wedding B’ The Divine guests at the wedding A’ Conclusion.⁹⁰

Both sections B and B’ center on a song, one the Lament (132–201), the other the Song of Parcae (323–381). Although the balance overall is imprecise (the A–B section are over twice the length of the B’–A’ sections), the

central portion of B may contain a certain degree of chiasmus, if we allow the affairs in Crete and the travels to Dia to parallel the affairs and travels in respect to Athens.

Finally, expanding Skutsch's analysis of Propertian's *Monobiblos*, Courtney finds certain relations to exist between several of the 22 poems contained in Propertian's Book I.⁹¹ The order, however, is less than precise,⁹² and the evidence of any rigorous application of chiasmus here must be discounted.

Less attention has been paid to chiasmus in late Greek than in Latin. Perhaps this is because the phenomenon of chiasmus in Latin is more striking, since it is created without the aid of particles like *men . . . de*, with which chiasmus often appears in Greek.⁹³ Nevertheless, the love for contrast and polarity is just as marked in Greek thought and syntax as it is in Latin. Chiasmus is a natural mode of expression for many Greek authors. It has been said that it is „as natural to the Greek as mother's milk; not to us.”⁹⁴

The use of chiasmus varies greatly from one Greek author to the next. Some authors have a special proclivity for using the form, others seem to avoid it. Still others use chiasmus for promoting special philosophical ideas or achieving certain literary goals. Heraclitus, for example, used chiasmus to accentuate his notions of eternal flux and opposition. In the three examples which follow, it can be seen that Heraclitean chiasmus is not dependent on form, but on content, e.g. grammatically Fragment 22 is noun-verb--noun-verb but the thought pattern is a-b-b-a:

- Fr. 22 **Cool things become warm, and the warm grows cool; The moist dries, the parched becomes moist.**
- Fr. 66 **Immortals become mortal, mortals become immortal. They live in each other's death and die in each other's life.**
- Fr. 98 **Opposition brings concord. Out of discord comes the fairest harmony.**⁹⁵

Plato appears to use chiasmus and symmetry „more than any other prose writer,”⁹⁶ and since Plato's style is exceedingly free and unaffected by the influence of rhetorical tricks,⁹⁷ his use of chiasmus is probably best explained as an attempt at variety or emphasis or economy of thought. Plato, who in his meticulous style was extremely conscious of word choice and word order,⁹⁸ created the following chiasms:

„Will they not any deed or any word say and do?” *Rep.* 494e „The soul to rule and govern, the body be governed and to be ruled.” *Phaedo* 80a „His children and others of his *household*; I too have a *household*, yea two sons . . .

who are still children.” *Apo.* 34cd

Most of Plato's chiasms are compact units. Some rely on content, others rely on form to create the inversion. They are literary embellishments which serve a structural function, although less rigidly or extensively than either Homeric *hysteron proteron* or Near Eastern complex chiasmus. Bassett queries whether Plato derived his fondness for the inverted order from Homer,⁹⁹ but this query has not been answered and if such were found to be the case it would show the durability of the form in spite of Plato's otherwise harsh criticisms of Greek education based on Homeric models. Other explanations of Plato's fondness for chiasmus may lie in his reaction against Gorgian antithesis, or in the possibility that his use of chiasmus is a smaller scale production of the cyclic structure of longer passages and dialogues,¹⁰⁰ although this possibility has never been seriously explored.

Although chiasmus is frequent in Plato, it appears to be rare among the other Greek authors.

In Attic orators and in Greek prose writers in general after the fourth century the occurrences of chiasmus are negligible, except where there is a logical reason for the inversion.¹⁰¹

Equally rare are other Greek passages which have been analyzed as chiasmic in an extended mode. Some have viewed the rising action and falling action in structure of certain Greek tragedies as chiasmic, but this is only a broad generalization of the drama. *Prometheus Bound*, for example, contains four scenes, each of which is a trilogy of sorts. The first and last speak of punishment; the second discusses the past, and the third, the future.¹⁰² But this is only a remedial application of chiasmus, at best. In the *Medea*, it has been observed that the order of main attention toward characters follows the sequence children-Creon-Jason-Aegeus-Jason-Creon-children.¹⁰³ This draws attention to the unique position of Aegeus as the pivot of the drama, but even Buttrey attributes this phenomenon to little more than ordinary dramatic characteristics and assumes that it went unobserved. Elsewhere in Greek literature, an occasional chiasm is perhaps observable. In Plutarch's *Marius*, 43:3–44:6, a short section containing two rhetorical statements about certain pitiless murderers and three anecdotes (the second of which is central and most important) is said to be chiasmic.¹⁰⁴ Further, one is reminded of the fact that Herodotus, Plutarch and others were conscious of balance and architecture within the units of their literary compositions.¹⁰⁵ But little here is distinctly chiasmic in form.

Examples of other structural aspects of Greek and Latin literature could be given, and indeed there are probably many other chiasmic passages yet to be discovered and analyzed as such. But the result of the present study should already be apparent: chiasmus is present in Classical Greek and Latin, but its role is secondary, at least in the writers who followed Homer. Although the complexity of chiasmus diminishes in the later texts, so that chiasmus cannot be said to play as great a role here as it does, e.g., in biblical literature, its observance lends a significant dimension to the modern reader's appreciation of an important aspect of classical Greek and Latin syntax and stylistics. Its acceptance and utilization here corroborates the claim that chiasmus was consciously observed and intentionally employed on all levels of complexity in antiquity.

FOOTNOTES

1 Chiasmus is often employed by English poets. For example, in Pope's *Essay on Man* this short chiasm appears: „ . . . Flame lawless through the void *destroying others, by himself destroyed.*” In English, chiasmus often may seem stilted, but this is not always so -- and it certainly was not the case when used in antiquity. Even in English, chiasmus can still capture a sense of natural rhythm and immediate appeal, as in the nursery rhyme: „Old King Cole was a *merry old soul* And a *merry old soul* was he.” Likewise maxims such as „He who fails to *prepare*, prepares to fail” sound solid and convincing, largely because of the sense of completeness and tautology which the form seems to convey.

2 Cicero, *Atticus* 1, 16, 1.

3 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Griechische Literatur*, 17, quoted in Samuel A. Bassett, „Hysteron Proteron Homerikos,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 31 (1920), 42.

4 Cedric H. Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, p. 97.

5 Bassett, *HSCP*, 31:47. Older schools have asserted that intricacy of form is Alexandrine, and wholly un-Homeric. See C. W. Mendell, *YCS*, 12:213. This view is no longer tenable.

6 Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, p. 666f. Like the Latin *et...et*, or the English „both...and,” this expression links two equivalent classes of objects or types of actions to each other. The particle *te* is usually used with a correlative conjunction and although *té . . . té* most often connects clauses, it may be used to collate single words, especially in poetry.

7 George W. Elderkin, *Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic*, p. 6.

8 II 9:443, quoted above.

9 Adam Parry, „The Language of Achilles,” *TAPA*, 87:4.

10 Bassett, *HSCP*, 31:54.

11 The Roman commentators Servius and Donatus both used the term *hysteron proteron*, but the Greek grammarians used *prothysteron* or *hysterologia*. See Scholia Euripides Orestes 702; Scholia Euripides Phoenissae 887; and also Choeroboscus Grammaticus *Peri Tropon*.

12 Bassett, *HSCP*, 31:39

13 *Ibid.*, p. 41.

14 For further discussion of this passage see *Ibid.*, pp. 46–47. See also Od 11, 210–14 answered in 11, 216–22; Od 7, 237–39 answered in 7, 241 and 7, 290–96 and 9, 19.

15 Scholia A on Odyssey 56.

16 Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer*, p. 122.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 128.

18 See note 1 above.

19 Bassett, *loc. cit.*

20 Gilbert Murray, *The Rise of the Greek Epic*, p. 121.

21 Bassett, *HSCP*, 31:51.

22 Scholia T on Psi 679.

23 Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer*, p. 125.

24 Bassett, *HSCP*, 31:59.

25 Eustathius, *Commentarii ad Homerii Iliadem et Odysseam*, Georg Lehnert ed., 390, 2 and 496, 14.

- 26 Bassett, *HSCP*, 31:59.
- 27 Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer*, p. 126.
- 28 John L. Myres, „The Pattern of The Odyssey,” *JHS*, 72:1–19. See also A. Yen, *JAOS*, 95:404–5.
- 29 See, e. g., Whitman, *Homer*, p. 97; Bowra, *Homer*, pp. 98, 106; Bowra in Wace & Stubbings, eds., *Companion to Homer*, p. 43.
- 30 Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*, p. 100.
- 31 *Ibid.*, p. 284.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 97.
- 33 *Ibid.*, p. 98. See also Bowra, *Homer*, pp. 98, 106; Bowra in Wace & Stubbings, eds., *Companion to Homer*, p. 43.
- 34 Hampe, *Gleichnisse Homers und die Bildkunst seiner Zeit*, p. 38.
- 35 Albert B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, p. 168.
- 36 Kosmala, „Ancient Hebrew Poetry,” *VT* 14:445.
- 37 Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer*, p. 128.
- 38 R. B. Steele, „Anaphora and Chiasmus in Livy,” *TAPA*, 32:166.
- 39 Nägelsbach and Müller, *Lateinische Stilistik*, p. 728.
- 40 Leumann, Hofmann, Szantyr, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, II, Pt. 2, No. 2, 696.
- 41 Max Bernhard, *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura*, p. 31.
- 42 Eduard Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, I, p. 65.
- 43 R. B. Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, Caesar, Tacitus and Justinus*, p. 4f.
- 44 Wilhelm Havers, *Handbuch der Erklärenden Syntax*, p. 180.
- 45 *Ibid.*, p. 181.
- 46 Steele, *TAPA*, 32:185. Nägelsbach, p. 697, „der Chiasmus offenbart das gegensätzliche Verhältnis unmittelbar und ohne weiteres.”
- 47 J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, p. 123.
- 48 *Ibid.*, „Die Form des Chiasmus ist ein Kennzeichen kunstvoller rhetorischer Sprache.”

49 Steele, *loc. cit.*

50 Leumann, Hofmann, Szantyr, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, pp. 696, 723.

51 Steele, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

52 *Chiasmus in Sallust, Caesar, Tacitus, and Justinus*, p. 61.

53 Steele, *TAPA*, 32:154–55.

54 Nägelsbach calls attention to a chiastic arrangement in Caesar's *Gallic Wars* 1, 1, but upon closer examination it becomes apparent that there are 14 words between a–b and a'–b', casting some doubt on the intentionality of this particular chiasm. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, p. 123 also comments: „To a certain extent chiasmus occurs only accidentally where the verb is repeated for the sake of a parallel scheme.”

55 Leumann, Hofmann, Szantyr, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, p. 696.

56 Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, p. 122.

57 *Ibid.* „Compared with this more or less unaffected form of chiasmus, it is hardly natural or native to contrapose bare words or groups of words, for example, Cic. Att. 14, 12, 3: „a man adverse to *dialectic* but in *arithmetic* he is sufficiently trained.”

58 Leumann, Hofmann, Szantyr, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, p. 696.

59 Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, et al.*, p. 16.

60 Steele, *TAPA*, 32:185.

61 Nägelsbach, p. 681.

62 Leumann, Hofmann, Szantyr, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, p. 696. „Chiasms of two members which are longer than two words each are rare. Even rarer is chiasmus involving three members.”

63 Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, et al.*, p. 61.

64 See also Leumann, Hofmann, Szantyr, *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, p. 697. „Often chiasmus and anaphora are bound to each other, specifically when there are three or more members.”

65 Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, et al.*, p. 13.

66 Margarete Zimmerer, *Der Annalist Qu. Claudius Quadrigarius*, p. 116.

67 R. B. Steele, „Chiasmus in the Epistles of Cicero, Seneca, Pliny and Fronto,” in *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, p. 339.

68 Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, et al.*, p. 29.

69 Steele, *TAPA* 32; such chiasms often form patterns such as adjective-noun-noun-adjective, verb-adverb-adverb-verb, etc.

70 *Ibid.*, p. 173.

71 Steele, in *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, p. 342.

72 Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, et al.*, p. 38.

73 *Ibid.*, p. 41.

74 Steele, in *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, p. 346f.

75 Bernhard, p. 32.

76 *Ibid.*, p. 34.

77 *Ibid.*, p. 38.

78 Steele, *Chiasmus in Sallust, et al.*, p. 4f. „His verses are often composed of two half-verses, between which chiasmus is frequent.”

79 *Ibid.*

80 Charles Rowan Beye, *The Iliad, the Odyssey and the Epic Tradition*, p. 10.

81 This fact further illuminates the character of chiasmus in Homer: since Homer could compose dactylic hexameter „chiasmus for chiasmus' sake,” but Vergil was more often compelled to create „chiasmus for the hexameter's sake.” Cf. A. Wace and F. Stubbings, *A Companion to Homer*, p. 23.

82 C. H. Talbert, „Artistry and Theology: An analysis of the Architecture of John 1:19–5:47,” *CBQ* 32:360–61.

83 C. H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*, p. 67.

84 G. E. Duckworth, *Structural Patterns and Proportions in Vergil's Aeneid*. Indeed, evidence shows that Vergil tended to disregard any elaborate structure in material from which he borrows. See C. W. Mendell, „The Influence of Epyllion on the Aeneid,” *Yale Classical Studies* 12:218.

85 G. E. Duckworth, „Vergil's *Georgics* and the *Laudes Gal li*,” *AJP* 80:230.

86 D. L. Drew, „The Structure of Vergil's *Georgics*,” *AJP* 50:242–54.

87 J. Wohlberg, „The Structure of the Laodamic Simile in Catullus 68b,” *CP* 50:42–46.

88 G. Norwood, „Vergil, *Georgics* IV: 453–527,” *CJ* 36:354.

89 *Ibid.*, pp. 354–55.

90 C. Murley, „The Structure and Proportion of Catullus 64,” *TAPA* 68:308; C. Mendell, *YCS* 12:212–13.

91 O. Skutsch, „The Structure of the Propertian *Monobiblos*,” *CP* 58:238–39; E. Courtney, „The Structure of Propertius Book I and Some Textual Consequences,” *The Phoenix* 22:251.

92 Courtney relates 1 to 19; 2–3–4–5 to 15–16–17–18; 6 to 14; 7 to 9; 10 to 13, and 11 to 12.

93 J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, p. xliii.

94 George G. Loane, *A Short Handbook of Literary Terms*, p. 38.

95 P. Wheelwright, *Heraclitus*, pp. 29, 68, 90.

96 Bassett, *HSCP*, 31:60.

97 Nordon, *Kunstprosa*, I, 3.

98 Cf. Dionysius Hal., *De Comp. Verb.*, XXV. „Plato did not cease, when eighty years old, to comb and curl his dialogues and reshape them in every way. Surely every scholar is acquainted with the stories of Plato’s passion for taking pains, especially that of the tablet which they say was found after his death, with the beginning of the *Republic* arranged in elaborately varying orders.”

99 Bassett, *HSCP*, 31:62.

100 Robert S. Brumbaugh, *Plato’s Mathematical Imagination*, p. 167.

101 Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer*, p. 126.

102 G. Thomson, „Notes on *Prometheus Vincetus*,” *CQ* 23:155–63.

103 T. Buttrey, „Accident and Design in Euripides’ *Medea*,” *AJP* 79:1–17.

104 J. F. Carney, „Plutarch’s Style in the *Marius*,” *JHS* 80:24–31.

105 John L. Myres, *Herodotus, Father of History*, pp. 81–91; Richard Lattimore, *Greek Lyrics*, p. 57.