Homer and Oral Tradition:
The Formula, Part I

Mark W. Edwards

This survey of the formula in Homer is divided into ten sections; the first five follow, the remainder will appear in a later issue of *Oral Tradition*. The sections are arranged as follows:

§Bibliographies and surveys.

§The structure of the Homeric hexameter.

§The formula and the hexameter.

§The history of Homeric formulae: Homer, Hesiod, the *Homeric Hymns*, and later poetry.

§Enjambement.

§Studies of specific formulae.

§Formulae and meaning.

§Analyses of formulae and tests for orality.

§Homer and the criticism of oral poetry.

§Future directions.

Each of the first nine sections is followed by a list of references; a few items appear in more than one list. I have commented on most of the items, but for reasons of space a few are merely listed. Reviews are normally not included, and my knowledge of dissertations is usually limited to the synopses in *Dissertation Abstracts*. There must be omissions, for which I apologize; I will try to refer to them in later updates.[1]

§1: Bibliographies and Surveys

The fullest resource is the annual listing of articles, books, and reviews in Marouzeau, which began with 1924 and currently appears about three years after the year covered; the categories

Homer, Homerica, Homerici Hymni, and Hesiod are not further subdivided. For the years 1930-70 the Marouzeau listings appear in Packard and Meyers 1974, consolidated as an alphabetical listing of authors and provided with a subject index including entries under "Language," "Meter," "Poetics," and "Composition," an *index locorum*, and an index of Homeric words. This is a very valuable resource, which one hopes will be continued. The most recent full bibliography to appear is Foley 1985, which unfortunately only became available to me as I was completing the final version of my own survey. This work contains over 1,800 annotated listings of work on oral poetry and formulae in more than 90 language areas, preceded by a long Introduction which summarizes the research done in different language areas from 1928 to 1982 (in three chronological divisions) and indicates some important directions taken in recent work. Entries are alphabetized and coded to show the areas studied, and each is summarized in about 3-4 sentences; in a sampling of these annotations I found them to be accurate, perceptive, and reliable. An index divided by language areas lists alphabetically all authors who deal with (for example) Ancient Greek; there are no subdivisions.

Other surveys can best be mentioned in reverse chronological order. The latest is Heubeck 1982, which has no separate section on formulae. Foley 1981 briefly reviews M. Parry's work and gives a full and detailed survey of Lord's work on both Homer and South Slavic. Holoka 1979 covers the whole range of Homeric studies from 1971-77 (including reviews), with sections on "Composition," "Poetics, metrics," and "Language, formulas, word studies." The listing is useful, but the summaries are here only about a sentence in length. Latacz 1979 gives a fine summary of the history of the theory that Homer was an oral poet from the publication of Wolf's *Prolegomena* in 1795 to the present, reprinting some of the most important work and adding a 45-page bibliography, subdivided into "Bibliographies and surveys after 1945," "Selected publications before Milman Parry," and "Publications from Milman Parry onwards." Pasorek 1977 continues a long tradition of detailed surveys of all aspects of Homeric scholarship. Mette 1976, both a listing and a commentary, has sections on Metrics and Language. Heubeck 1974 covers the years 1940-70 and lists works alphabetically by author, following an introductory survey which includes sections on oral poetry, language, and style. There are indices of names and subjects,

modern authors mentioned in the survey, Homeric words, Homeric characters, and an *index locorum*. Holoka 1973 gives brief summaries of the work of Milman Parry, Lord (very uncritically: "Lord proves, yet again, that quantitative investigation of formulae can indeed enable us to differentiate the truly oral from the literary imitation. In the process he debunks the impressionistic assertion by G. S. Kirk, C. M. Bowra, and A. Parry that Homeric poetry is formulaic to an extent that Yugoslavian is not" [263]), and others. He also has sections on "Epithet," "Formula," and other topics. The listing is useful, the summaries should be used with discretion. Haymes 1973 is an alphabetic listing by author's name of work on oral poetry in all languages. Hainsworth 1969 is a short review on contemporary knowledge with sections on "Comparison," "Formula," "Verse," and "Art." Willcock 1967 is another good quick account of the position at that time. Dodds 1968 gives a very general overview of Parry's work, placing it in the framework of an excellent summary of twentieth-century Homeric scholarship. Lesky 1966 gives a fine survey of meter, language, and oral characteristics in a very few pages. Combellack 1955 covers the years 1939-55, giving "what is basically a discussion of trends in the main fields of Homeric activity" (18); he has a short section on oral poetry (51-53).

References

Combellack 1955
       F. M. Combellack. "Contemporary Homeric Scholarship: Sound or Fury?" *Classical Weekly*, 49:17-26, 29-55.
Dodds 1968
       E. R. Dodds. "Homer iii: Homer as Oral Poetry; iv: Homer and the Philologists." In *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship*. Ed. M. Platnauer (2nd revised ed.). Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 13-24.
Foley 1981
       J. M. Foley. "The Oral Theory in Context." In *Oral Traditional Literature: A Festschrift for Albert Bates Lord*. Ed. J. M. Foley. Columbus: Slavica Publishers. pp. 27-122.
Foley 1985
       _____. *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research: An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography*. Garland Folklore Bibliographies, 6. New York: Garland Publishing.
Hainsworth 1969
       J. B. Hainsworth. *Homer*. Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics No. 3. Oxford: Clarendon.
Haymes 1973
       E. R. Haymes. *A Bibliography of Studies Relating to Parry's and Lord's Oral Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Printing Office.

Heubeck 1974
        A. Heubeck. *Die homerische Frage*. Erträge der Forschung, Band 27. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Heubeck 1982
        _____. "Zur neueren Homerforschung." *Gymnasium*, 89:385-447.
Holoka 1973
        J. P. Holoka. "Homeric Originality: A Survey." *Classical World*, 66:257-93. Holoka 1979
Holoka 1979
        _____. "Homer Studies 1971-1977." *Classical World*, 73:65-150.
Latacz 1979
        J. Latacz. *Homer: Tradition und Neuerung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
Lesky 1966
        A. Lesky. *A History of Greek Literature*. Trans. J. Willis and C. de Heer. London: Methuen. pp. 58-65.
Marouzeau 1924-
        J. Marouzeau (J. Ernst and others). *L'Année philologique*.
Mette 1976
        H. J. Mette. "Homer 1971-1977." *Lustrum*, 19:5-64.
Packard and Meyers 1974
        D. W. Packard and T. Meyers. *A Bibliography of Homeric Scholarship: Preliminary Edition 1930-70*. Malibu: Undena.
Pasorek 1977
        G. Pasorek. "Forschungsbericht: Homer." *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft*, 30:1-14.
Willcock 1967
        M. M. Willcock. "The Present State of Homeric Studies." *Didaskalos*, 2:59-69.

§ 2: The Structure of the Homeric Hexameter

After a brief review of some recent theories of the origin of the Homeric hexameter, this section will deal with its structure and the ways in which words and word-groups fit within its framework; of course this is intimately connected with the characteristics of formulaic diction, which will be dealt with in section 3. I do not attempt to cover theories of the nature of caesura (for which see most recently Allen 1973:113-22) or of the nature of meter and rhythm (for which see Devine and Stephens 1984, mentioned below, which has superseded much previous work).

The question of the antiquity of Homeric formulae is very much interconnected with that of the origin of the Greek hexameter, which has often been discussed and is the subject of several significant recent studies. West 1973 considered that "dactylic verse was a South Mycenaean development dating probably from the second half of the [second] millennium, while the stereotyped stichic hexameter represents a further development in

the Ionian branch of the tradition, perhaps late Mycenaean, perhaps post-migration" (188); he claimed that the meter originated in a hemiepes (- u u - u u -) plus a paroemiac (u̲ - u u - u u - u̲). This view was strongly attacked by Hoekstra (1981:33-53), who pointed out the difficulties caused for this hypothesis by the juxtaposition of the alternative B1 and B2 caesurae (P and T in Hoekstra's terminology) after positions 5 and 5 1/2 (see below). West's indeterminate (*anceps*) syllable at the beginning of his paroemiac is inadequate to account for these alternative (and most important) breaks in the verse, and Hoekstra shows that there are a number of ancient-looking formulae which end or begin at each of these alternative positions; he can even provide (p. 45) a considerable list of alternative formulae of similar meaning to fit before or after either B1 or B2 caesurae. It thus seems that the old technique embraced the alternative positions. In addition, Hoekstra lists a number of ancient-looking expressions which bridge the B caesura (including *Priamoio païs* and similar forms), and points out that the idea that the hexameter resulted from a coalescence of two short verses can only be tenable if none of these expressions goes back to the earliest singers. Nagy 1974 put forward an alternative theory, that the hexameter arose from a pherecratean pattern (u̲ u̲ - u u - u̲) expanded by the insertion of three dactyls. Nagy is aware of the problem of accounting for the B1 and B2 caesurae (p. 57f.), and ingeniously argues that they arise from the junctions of formulae which were created for use in shorter verses, such as the unexpanded pherecratean. He backs up this view with a full listing of formulae which would fit into such verses, and alternative formulae which show dactylic expansion of the kind he postulates as the origin of the hexameter. His fundamental idea is that a traditional poetic language leads to the crystallization of metrical formulae, which in turn affect the meter and give rise to the caesurae and bridges, and he supports the old idea of a phraseological correspondence between the Homeric *kleos aphthiton* and a postulated Vedic *śráva(s) ákṣitam* (reconstructed from two other verbal combinations), both deriving from an Indo-European prototype **klewos ṇdhgʷhitom* (p. 1). These views are repeated, with additional arguments, in Nagy 1979. Hoekstra (1981:40, note 36) does not find Nagy's views convincing. Peabody (1975:21f.) examines the relationship of the Greek hexameter to the Iranian Avesta and Indian Vedas, and suggests that a common Indo-European base lay behind all three, and that the hexameter

is "a hybrid primary combination that resulted from the fusion of dimeter and trimeter verse forms" (p. 47); he finds parallels to the caesurae of the hexameter in the meters of the other languages. Gentili and Giannini 1977 and Gentili 1981 associate the origin of the hexameter with that of dactylo-epitrite. Miller (1982:48-56) gives an outline, based on West and Nagy "as far as they are compatible" (p. 49) and disagreeing with Peabody.

The most accessible brief statement of current opinions on the articulation of the Homeric hexameter is Kirk (1985:18-24); he lays much stress on the 3-part verse or "threefolder" (described below), gives a number of examples, and emphasizes the effects of the lengths of the verse-cola. The older, pre-Fränkel view can be found in Bowra 1962. The fundamental work is Fränkel 1926/1968. In its original form this article appeared in 1926; at the beginning of the later, heavily-revised version, Fränkel remarks that a reviewer of the first article proclaimed that it marked the beginning of a new era in the study of the rhythm of Greek verse, and adds wryly that in fact its influence has remained comparatively slight. This is no longer true, at least in the study of Homeric formulae. Fränkel's great contribution was to shift the focus away from the metrical feet, six dactyls (- u u: a heavy syllable followed by two light ones) or spondees (- -: two heavy syllables) of which the Homeric hexameter is formed, to the "cola," the words or word-groups which form the compositional units of the verse. These cola are separated by "sense-breaks," which may be strong, as at the beginning and end of a sentence or clause (marked in modern texts by punctuation) or weak, i.e., simply a word-boundary; or somewhere between these extremes. Fränkel insists that in every Homeric verse there are four cola divided by three strong or weak sense-breaks or "caesurae." For Fränkel, the first of these caesurae (A) has four possible positions, the others (B and C) two each, occurring as follows:

foot	1			2			3			4			5			6	
position	1	1½	2	3	3½	4	5	5½	6	7	7½	8	9	9½	10	11	12
scheme	-	u	u	-	u	u	-	u	u	-	u	u	-	u	u	-	u
caesura		A1	A2	A3	A4			B1	B2		C1		C2				

A line like *alla soi, ô meg' anaides, ham' hespometh', ophra su chairêis* (*Iliad* 1.158) shows the three caesurae in their commonest positions and marked by punctuation. The four cola in the verse quoted are of different metrical shapes: - u u -; u u - u; u - u u; - u u - -; and this, as well as the various alternative positions of the caesurae, gives flexibility and variety to the verse. The meter of Longfellow's *Hiawatha* may be compared: if two of these verses are treated as one ("Should you ask me, / whence these stories? / Whence these legends / and traditions?"), the result is a line with about the same number of syllables as the Homeric hexameter but with four *identical* cola, three *rigidly-fixed* caesurae, and virtually no variety or flexibility.

Fränkel also states that any of the caesurae may be postponed if preceded by a "heavy word" or word-group of not less than six *morae* in length (a *mora* is equivalent to one short syllable). This postponement may go so far as to place an A caesura in the B1 position, or a B caesura in the C1 position, the normal alternative positions being bridged-over. This principle allows Fränkel to account for the significant number of verses which fall into three cola instead of four (see below). Fränkel is sensitive to the importance of his new approach for appreciation of the sense and rhythm of Homeric verse; he suggests, for instance, that sometimes the first colon may be characterized as lively and vigorous, the second as quiet and relaxed, the third as emotional or emphatic, the fourth as heavily-loaded. Even more important, he observes (1968:115) that Homeric formulae fit the length of the common cola, and thus serve as building-blocks of Homeric verse.

Significant work on the position and importance of sense-breaks in the Homeric verse, and the kinds of phrases which fit between them, had previously been done, especially by Bassett (1905, 1917, 1926) and Witte (1972), to some extent preparing the way for Fränkel. He may perhaps be criticized for overstressing the necessity for identifying four cola and three caesurae; he himself admitted that it was occasionally difficult to choose between alternative A caesurae, and in such cases it is probably useless to attempt to do so; and his doctrine of the "heavy word" is perhaps hardly necessary, since long words are sometimes unavoidable and because of their length must displace a caesura and be followed by one. But his identification of the fundamental importance of sense-breaks of various types, and his ability to see that not only words and word-groups but also formulae fall

between these sense-breaks and hence form the units of which the verse is composed, instead of the metrical units of dactyls and spondees, meant that no one aware of his work can read a hexameter in the same way afterwards. (See further the summary of his ideas in Fränkel 1962:29-34 and 1968:6-19).

Porter 1951 attempted to revise Fränkel's work by placing the alternative C caesura a syllable *after* the commoner C1, i.e., after position 9, instead of after the long syllable of the fourth foot (after position 7) as Fränkel had; he also accepted only two positions for the A caesura (after positions 2 and 3) instead of the four admitted by Fränkel. He can thus reduce the possibilities of variation of caesurae in a verse to eight. He is almost certainly wrong about the C caesura, for the figures he prints (23) for the positions of punctuation show that Fränkel's position for the alternative C (after position 7) is a much more important sense-break than Porter's, and the fact that so many noun-epithet formulae begin there (*podas ôkus Achilleus*, etc.) clinches the argument. On the A caesura, his arguments may again not be convincing, but he has the virtue of demonstrating that it is often a mistake to attempt to pinpoint this caesura. Besides reprinting figures on punctuation-points in Homer and Hesiod, Porter (using a different system of notation from Fränkel's) gives tables listing the occurrences of cola (according to his system), the lengths of each colon, the patterns of bridging-over of cola, and the metrical shape of words which end at each position of the verse (based on thousand-line samples of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the Hesiodic poems, the long Hymns, and Callimachus). There is much more of value in Porter's article, though its main conclusions have not been accepted.

Rossi 1965 took issue with Fränkel's theories of displacement and bridging of caesurae, and (using another new terminology) gives percentages for the position of caesurae in *Iliad* 1. He agrees with Porter that a colon is not a unit of meaning, though phrase divisions, when they occur, are often at caesural points, and criticizes Fränkel for calling caesurae "sense-breaks." Rossi sees many verses "che ricavano la loro virtù espressiva proprio da un sottile conflitto fra colizzazione 'regolare' e flusso sintattico obliterato dal ritmo" (246). For him, syntactic considerations can be decisive only in cases where the meter is indifferent and there is a possibility of rhythmical choice. He shows that Fränkel's "heavy word" is often not important to the sense, rejects Fränkel's

insistence that the A caesura can be postponed to positions 3 1/2 or 4 only if preceded by a heavy word, and allows the A caesura at those positions even if it is preceded not by a heavy word but by earlier word-ends. In reply to Porter's view that a colon of only two syllables, or even one, is meaningless, Rossi holds that a short word often gains emphasis by filling a colon itself (250-51). It was pointed out long ago that some important monosyllables (verb-forms such as *bê, stê, tlê*, etc.) are used mainly at the beginning of a verse or phrase, to give them weight; Fränkel refined this by pointing out that they occur at the start of a colon; Rossi goes further, claiming that such monosyllables are themselves a colon, either alone or with a weak particle which adds a short syllable. He gives a long list of examples, and lists the minimum and maximum lengths for each colon, with examples of their various combinations. This view seems to me acceptable. In an Appendix, Rossi discusses further the nature of other very short cola. (His views are summarized in Rossi 1978:102-7.)

Kirk 1966, like Porter, was concerned about the very short cola possible under Fränkel's system, and carefully examines the theories of both scholars. He refuses to accept Fränkel's A1 and A2 caesura positions because of the shortness of the first colon in these cases, and sees the weakness of Porter's alternative C caesura. Kirk raises the question of what a colon really is: is it a unit of meaning, as Fränkel said? But many verses do not have four sense-units. A rhythmical unit, as Porter thought? Kirk is more inclined to accept this latter proposition. Do the cola in fact correspond to the sense-divisions? Kirk marks the rhythmical cola on a 24-line passage (on Porter's system, but without his alternative C caesura after position 9) and compares them with the sense-cola, admitting that there is room for much difference of opinion here. He finds that only 12 of the 24 verses fall into four cola, and in only two do these correspond exactly to the sense-cola. Kirk therefore looks for factors other than sense-breaks or the four-colon theory to explain prevalence of word-end in certain positions and inhibitions on it in others, and after detailed arguments summarizes his views thus: "The B caesura is a structural division of the verse primarily designed to integrate it and prevent it from falling into two equal parts; the C caesura tends to introduce a distinct verse-end sequence; the tendency to caesura around the middle of the first "half" of the verse is due primarily to the average lengths of Greek words available in the

poetical vocabulary, with the preference for caesura at 3 due largely to the preference for internal caesura except before the verse-end sequence; the inhibitions on word-end at 3 1/2 and 7 1/2 are caused by the desire to avoid any strong possibility of three successive trochaic cuts, that on 4 being due to the desire to avoid a monosyllabic ending, especially after a heavy word, to a major part of the verse" (103). Euphony is thus a sufficient reason for the position of the word-boundaries, rather than a fixed colometric structure. The hexameter often falls into four parts, but sometimes the sense-division is not into 4 parts but into 3 or 2; the first and third cola often disappear or are unrealistically short. Kirk's views are very reasonable, and his theories are often confirmed by Devine and Stephens 1984.

Ingalls 1970 questions Kirk's views that some of Fränkel's cola are too short to be acceptable (he does not mention Rossi's support for Fränkel), and gives an alternative colon-analysis (on Fränkel's principles) of the passage analyzed by Kirk, finding that "every verse is divisible into four cola. Wherever the normal caesura is bridged, it is by means of either a heavy word or *Wortbild* . . . . Futhermore, only two verses, 444 and 449, do not fall into reasonable sense divisions" (11-12). Ingalls' analysis differs from Kirk's in 15 of the 24 verses, and though sometimes his divisions seem preferable to Kirk's he accepts such odd cola as *hoi d'* and *apo*. A comparison of the analyses strengthens one's feelings that it is unwise to be too categorical about marking the precise position of a caesura if there is no immediately obvious sense-break.

The metrical shape of words obviously affects their position within the verse. Here the basic study is that of O'Neill 1942, who declared: "What I have done is to classify statistically, according to metrical type and position in the line, 48,431 words contained in 7152 hexameters from seven different texts" (106). His sample consisted of 1,000 lines each of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the *Works and Days* and part of the *Shield* of Hesiod, Aratus' *Phaenomena*, and 1,000 hexameters each of Callimachus, Apollonius, and Theocritus. Words are categorized according to the metrical place they fill, i.e., syllables lengthened "by position" are counted as long and elided syllables are ignored. The final syllable of the verse is always counted as long in the statistics for word-distribution, but a table enables some adjustments to be made. Words are located according to the position of their final

syllables. O'Neill's results are set out in 38 tables of figures and percentages, which show that in most cases words of a given metrical shape occur predominantly in a very few of their possible positions, very often in only two positions. O'Neill calls this "localization." "The discovery that localization is practically universal in the hexameter is one of the chief contributions of the present paper to metrical knowledge" (114). The localization of the various metrical shapes does not change from poet to poet or over the centuries, though (as O'Neill shows in detail) its strictness varies slightly (Hesiod being closer to the *Iliad* than the *Odyssey* is).

O'Neill prints a detailed exegesis of the results of his tables. Tables 1-28 list positions, numbers, and percentages for all metrical word-shapes in the works studied. Table 29 gives statistics on long and short final syllables of the verse. Among the other tables, of special interest are Table 31, which shows at a glance in which positions in the verse each word-shape occurs, and Table 35, which gives relative frequencies of each word-type. A supplement usefully summarizes the history of metrical understanding of the hexameter from ancient times.

O'Neill's work remains valuable, though doubtless it will one day be replaced by computerized figures. So far the only similar published work known to me is Dyer 1967. Dyer was one of the pioneers of computerized work on Homer, and his long article deals with computerized grammatical analysis, scansion by computer program, and the hexameter meter. Starting from the work of O'Neill and McDonough, he outlines procedures for computerized identification and tabulation of the various metrical word-types, word-groups, or readily recognizable forms such as middle participles. He gives complete figures (for the *Iliad*) for the positions in which twenty word-types occur, and shows how each of these word-types has an established relationship with one or more of the cola of the hexameter. Of course the techniques of using computers have changed greatly since Dyer wrote, but his work is fundamental to investigation of the hexameter and so far as I know has not yet been followed up.

To return to the subject of cola, Beck 1972a (said to be a refinement of Beck 1972b, which I have not seen) takes up the problems of locating the A caesura, which in Fränkel's theory can fall anywhere between the beginning of the verse and the B caesura or be bridged entirely, pointing out the weaknesses in the

theories of both Fränkel and Porter. The inhibition on word-end after the second trochee or the second metron (after positions 3 1/2 and 4) vanishes if there is word-end at 2 or 3 (Meyer's Law). Beck argues against Kirk's explanations for the inhibition of word-end at these points, and suggests that a simple reason explains inhibition after both 3 1/2 and 4, i.e., "a previously undetected principle of composition which limits, directly and drastically, the words which may normally start at 3 1/2 and 4" (221). This principle "limits words starting at 3 1/2 or 4 to those which continue units which themselves started no earlier than the beginning of the line or which, if they did start earlier than the beginning of the line, will subsequently be complete at the [B] caesura" (222). This means that in almost all cases, even if a new word begins at 3 1/2 or 4, it is the continuation of a syntactic unit which either began just beforehand or will be completed immediately afterwards at the caesura, so that positions 3 1/2 and 4, though not bridged by a word, are bridged by a syntactic unit of two or more words (223).

Beck examines 297 verses of the *Iliad* and 312 of the *Odyssey*, finding only two exceptions to his principle. The principle has the natural side-effect of bringing about word-end at position 2 or 3 if there is word-end at 3 1/2 or 4, since this usually means that the syntactic unit began earlier in the verse, of course with a word-boundary; Meyer's Law is thus explained. The theory is interesting, but should now probably give place to the more comprehensive work of Devine and Stephens (see below).

Beekes 1972 sets out to show that O'Neill's localization results derive from a very few rules, which in turn determine the structure of the hexameter. He summarizes these as: "The Greek hexameter has a caesura, realized by a syntactical boundary, at [position] 5 or 5 1/2. Often the final cadence is marked off by a syntactical boundary at 8; as word end at 7 1/2 would give a 'false start' to such a final cadence, it is forbidden. To avoid verse end effect at the beginning, word end at 3 1/2 and long final syllable at 4 are avoided. Perhaps to avoid the suggestion of verse end long final syllable is avoided at 8 and 10. A monosyllable at the end of the verse is also avoided" (9). These rules are well known; Beekes gives no explanation for their origin, which can now be sought in Devine and Stephens 1984.

Peabody 1975, after discussing the relationship of the Greek hexameter to the meters of other Indo-European languages and the

nature of syllable length, devotes a chapter (pp. 66-117) to the system of cola and its interaction with formulae. He follows Porter in allowing only two positions for the A caesura (after positions 2 or 3) and Fränkel in placing the alternative C caesura after position 7. Peabody does not consider that a caesura should be considered a pause in sense, but "useful only for analytic purposes" (p. 67). He also thinks that the long fourth colon should often be divided into two parts. (The "law of increasing members," which states that the final colon of a sentence should be longer than the others [see Allen 1973:119], makes this unlikely). Peabody also discusses the ways in which words are adjusted to fit the cola, and the cola to each other, and identifies verses with three cola (pp. 88-91) and with five (the colon after the C caesura being divided into two: pp. 92-94). Further sections discuss the transfer of cola from one place in the verse to another, and the way formulae fit within the cola (see section 3). Minton 1975, a study of verse-structure and formulae, uses Hesiod's *Theogony* as illustration (see section 4), but should be mentioned here for its acute observations on three-part verses (33f.), which he says are more than twice as common in the *Theogony* as in Homer (34).

The proportion of dactyls and spondees in Homeric verse has continued to receive attention. Jones and Gray 1972 seem to have been the first to apply modern statistical discipline to the existing metrical data on the numbers and positions of dactyls and spondees in hexameter verse. Using the data published by J. La Roche (in *Wiener Studien* 20-22 [1898-1900]), the 32 possible patterns of dactyls and spondees (counting the last foot as a spondee) are tabulated for each book of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and for the poems as wholes (the latter results are printed), as well as for Hesiod, the Hymns, Aratus, Apollonius, Callimachus, and Nonnus. Tables are printed giving the order of frequency of the pattern in each work, the differences between the books of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and the works as wholes (only the *Catalogue of Ships* in the *Iliad* and Book 11 of the *Odyssey* show statistically significant differences). In frequency of patterns there is little difference between the Homeric poems, Hesiod, and the Hymns, but a good deal of difference between this group and the later authors. In the same year Rudberg 1972 announced that he had rechecked La Roche's figures (using Allen's Oxford Classical Text) and found a number of errors. Rudberg points out that contrary to the statement of La Roche, sequences of metrically identical verses are

not rare. Of verses with five dactyls, 35.8% in the *Iliad* and 36.2% in the *Odyssey* are preceded or followed by another of the same type; two other metrical types also occur in pairs more than 25% of the time. "Un vers homérique sur cinq est précédé ou suivi par un vers du même type métrique" (p. 12; I take this to mean that on average there are 2 successive identical verses in every 10). Runs of seven and six metrically identical verses occur once each, runs of five are found 11 times, runs of four 39 times, runs of three 297 times. Not surprisingly, in the *Catalogue of Ships* there are more spondees than usual. Rudberg also gives the percentage of verses with spondees in each of the metrical feet. Martínez Conesa 1971 offers statistics for the proportion of dactyls and spondees in *Iliad* 1 and discusses the length and number of words in the metrical cola, over-lengthening, the positioning of 5-syllable words, and verses with a spondee in the fifth foot.

Michaelson, Morton, and Wake 1978 examine sentence-length in the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, Hesiod's *Works and Days*, *Theogony*, and *Shield*, Aratus, and Apollonius, finding that sentences coterminous with the verse predominate in Homer and equal numbers of sentences occupy one and two lines (but *Odyssey* 19 has twice as many one-verse lines). In Apollonius and Aratus more sentences end (and of course begin) within the verse (55% compared with less than 40% for Homer). Hesiod lies midway between Homer and Apollonius in complexity of structure. The authors suggest that the preponderance of one- and two-line sentences, a tendency for multi-line sentences to end with the end of the line, and the use of short part-lines to complete broken lines are characteristic of oral composition.

Devine and Stephens 1976 use data on the combinations of phonemes used to implement long and short syllables in the first four feet of the hexameter (of various periods) to refute the theory that "there is a multiplicity of metrical elements in Greek corresponding to postulated differences in the phonetic duration of phonemes and syllables" (141); they support the correctness of the ancient view that "there are only two metrically relevant distinctive elements, *longum* and *breve*, which stand respectively in a one-to-one correspondence to linguistically heavy and light syllables" (141). In a highly technical monograph of far-ranging importance (1984) the authors study the whole question of constraints on word boundaries ("bridges") in Greek meter. They list the constraints on word-end in the hexameter, test the

explanations of earlier scholars, and examine in detail the circumstances of the resolution of a heavy syllable into two light ones and the relationship of this to word-boundaries. Both bridges and resolution, in the hexameter and in other meters, are accounted for by means of a phonological theory of matrices which explains both the synchronic phenomena and the diachronic changes in strictness of observance of the constraints. They reaffirm that word-boundaries must not falsely signal metrical boundaries (p. 130); that "many rhythmic bridges are evidently constraints against false line end or false caesura/diaeresis" (p. 130); that "iteration of word boundary coinciding with foot boundary in opposition to the basic podic structure is even more strongly avoided" (i.e., there is a constraint against repeated trochaic cuts: p. 131). This work, complex and expressed with great concision, is based upon rigorous argument and an immensely detailed knowledge both of Greek verse and of metrical usages in other languages; it supersedes most previous work on word-position in meter and must henceforth be taken into consideration in any study of the hexameter.

References

Allen 1973
      W. S. Allen. *Accent and Rhythm*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bassett 1905
      S. E. Bassett. "Notes on the Bucolic Diaeresis." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 36:111-24.
Bassett 1917
      _____. "The Hephthemimeral Caesura in Greek Hexameter Poetry." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 48:85-110.
Bassett 1919
      _____, "Versus tetracolos." *Classical Philology*, 14:216-33.
Bassett 1926
      _____. "The So-called Emphatic Position of the Runover Word in the Homeric Hexameter." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 57:116-48.
Beck 1972a
      R. Beck. "A Principle of Composition in Homeric Verse." *Phoenix,* 26:213-31.
Beck 1972b
      _____. "Meter and Sense in Homeric Verse." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 32 (5):5757A.
Beekes 1972
      R. S. P. Beekes. "On the Structure of the Greek Hexameter: 'O'Neill' Interpreted." *Glotta*, 50:1-10.

Bowra 1962
          M. Bowra. "Metre." In *A Companion to Homer*. Ed. A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings. London: Macmillan. pp. 19-25.

Devine and Stephens 1976
          M. Devine and L. Stephens. "The Homeric Hexameter and a Basic Principle of Metrical Theory." *Classical Philology*, 71:141-63.

Devine and Stephens 1984
          _____. *Language and Meter: Resolution, Porson's Bridge, and their Prosodic Basis*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Durante 1971
          M. Durante. *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca I. Continuità della tradizione poetica dell'età micenea ai primi documenti*. Incunabula Graeca, 50. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Durante 1976
          _____. *Sulla preistoria delta tradizione poetica greca II. Risultanze della comparazione indoeuropea*. Incunabula Graeca, 64. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Dyer 1966
          R. Dyer. "The Prospects of Computerized Research on Homer." *Revue: Organisation internationale pour l'étude des langues anciennes par ordinateur*, 4:25-30.

Dyer 1967
          _____. "Towards Computational Procedures in Homeric Scholarship." *Revue: Organisation internationale pour l'étude des langues anciennes par ordinateur*, 5:1-54.

Fränkel 1926/1968
          H. Fränkel. "Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter." Originally published in *Göttinger Nachrichten* 1926, rev. version in *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*. Munich: Beck. pp. 100-56.

Fränkel 1962
          _____. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*. Translation of *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (rev. ed., Munich 1962) by M. Hadas and J. Willis. New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Fränkel 1968
          _____. *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*. Munich: Beck.

Gentili 1981
          B. Gentili. "Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-30 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 75-106.

Gentili and Giannini 1977
          _____ and P. Giannini. "Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro." *Quaderni Urbinati di cultura classica*, 26:7-51.

Hoekstra 1981
          A. Hoekstra. *Epic Verse before Homer*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Horrocks 1980
          G. C. Horrocks. The Antiquity of the Greek Epic Tradition: Some New Evidence." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 26:1-11.

Ingalls 1970
          W. B. Ingalls. "The Structure of the Homeric Hexameter: A Review." *Phoenix,* 24:1-12.

Jones and Gray 1972
    F. P. Jones and F. E. Gray. "Hexameter Patterns, Statistical Inference, and the Homeric Question. An Analysis of the La Roche Data." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 10:187-209.

Kirk 1961
    G. S. Kirk. "Dark Age and Oral Poet." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Soeiety,* 7:34-48. Rpt. in *Homer and the Oral Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 19-39.

Kirk 1966
    _____. "The Structure of the Homeric Hexameter." *Yale Classical Studies*, 20:76-104.

Kirk 1985
    _____. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol 1: Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 17-37.

Martínez Conesa 1971
    J. A. Martínez Conesa. "Glosas al hexámetro homérico." *Estudios clásicos*, 15:377-89.

Michaelson, Morton and Wake 1978
    S. Michaelson, A. Q. Morton, and W. C. Wake. "Sentence Length Distributions in Greek Hexameters and Homer." *Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing Bulletin*, 6.3:254-67.

Miller 1982
    G. Miller. *Homer and the Ionian Epic Tradition: Some Phonic and Phonological Evidence against an Aeolic 'Phase.'* Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 38. Innsbruck: Rauchdruck Ges.

Minton 1975
    W. W. Minton. "The Frequency and Structuring of Traditional Formulas in Hesiod's *Theogony*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 79:26-54.

Nagy 1974
    G. Nagy. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

O'Neill 1942
    G. O'Neill, Jr. "Localization of Metrical Word-types in the Greek Hexameter." *Yale Classical Studies*, 8:105-78.

Peabody 1975
    B. Peabody. *The Winged Word: A Study in the Technique of Ancient Greek Oral Composition as Seen Principally through Hesiod's* Works and Days. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Porter 1951
    H. M. Porter. "The Early Greek Hexameter." *Yale Classical Studies*, 12:3-63.

Rossi 1965
    L. E. Rossi. "Estensione e valore del 'colon' nell'esametro omerico." *Studi Urbinati,* 39:239-73.

Rossi 1978
    _____. "I Poemi omerici come testimonianza di poesia orale." In *Storia e civiltà dei Greci*. Milan: Bompiani. I.1. pp. 73-147.

Rudberg 1972
    S. Y. Rudberg. "Etudes sur l'hexamètre homérique." In *Studi classici in onore di Quintino Cataudella*, vol. I. Catania: Università di Catania. pp. 9-23.

Schmitt 1967
        R. Schmitt. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Schmitt 1968
        _____. *Indogermanische Dichtersprache*. Wege der Forschung, 165. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
West 1973
        M. L. West. "Greek Poetry 2000-700 B.C." *Classical Quarterly*, 23:179-92.
Witte 1972
        K. Witte. *Zur homerischen Sprache* (reprint of articles previously published in *Glotta* 1909-1914). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

§ 3: The Formula and the Hexameter

This section is particularly concerned with different aspects of the work of Milman Parry, and will deal with definitions of formula; "ornamental" and "particularized" epithets; overlapping or "equivalent" formulae and the law of economy; the adaptations and adjustments which formulaic expressions undergo when they are juxtaposed or must be modified in order to fit into a particular position in the verse; and the force of analogy in the formation of formulae, including "schematizations" or "structural formulae."

The history of the understanding of Homeric oral techniques can be read in Latacz (1979:25-44). He tells a depressing story of how in the years following Wolf's assertion on external evidence that Homer was illiterate (in his famous *Prolegomena* of 1795), the first steps were taken towards Milman Parry's analysis of oral techniques. In 1840 Gepper pointed out that epithets in Homer were so closely linked with their nouns that the poet had little freedom of choice, and in the same year Gottfried Hermann (in an article reprinted in Latacz 1979:47-59) showed by a number of arguments from internal evidence that the poems were intended to be heard, not read, that the sense is complete within a verse or part of a verse, that the epithets are useful for filling spaces in the verse-structure as well as for ornamentation, and that these characteristics made for easy extemporaneous composition. Other scholars were already working on the collections of folk-epic which had appeared, and connections between these and Homer were already being made. The way was clear for further studies of oral technique, but the focus of attention turned instead to Lachmann's theories of the aggregation of epics from shorter songs, and the

long duels between Analysts and Unitarians began. Work on the metrical shapes of words and phrases and their positioning in the hexameter verse was continued, especially by Ellendt, Mintzer, Seymour, Witte, Bassett, and Meillet, but the synthesis between this and the characteristics of oral poetry had to wait for Milman Parry. However, in 1875 appeared Prendergast's *Complete Concordance to the Iliad of Homer*, sixteen years in the making and intended to facilitate the composition of Homeric verse in English public schools. Five years later came Dunbar's *Complete Concordance to the Odyssey of Homer*, compiled "during hours snatched from the duties of an arduous profession" (that of a country doctor in Scotland), including an apology for errors due to the writing of 62,400 lines of Greek which had "somewhat weakened and impaired his eyesight." In 1885 followed Schmidt's *Parallel-Homer: oder Index aller homerischen Iterati in lexikalischer Anordnung*. These works (all recently reprinted) are of immense use in the study of formulae, a use of which their toiling authors never dreamed.

An excellent account of Milman Parry's work on Homer and of his collecting of oral songs in Yugoslavia is given in Adam Parry's introduction to his edition and translation of his father's collected works (Parry 1971). Milman Parry's work is remarkable not only for the range of his insights but for his thoroughness and his rigorous insistence on proof. It had already been accepted that Homeric diction was created by the verse, and that obsolete and dialectical forms were retained when they provided useful metrical alternatives. But even in his Master's thesis of 1923 Parry's new understanding of the whole system of formulae and the use of epithets can already be detected.

Definitions of the formula

A formula is, in Parry's famous definition, "an expression regularly used, under the same metrical conditions, to express an essential idea" (Parry 1971:13; repeated with insignificant changes at 1971:272). The existence of formulae in Homer was recognized in antiquity and is beyond any doubt; but are they traditional or the creation of one poetic genius? Parry held that they are proved to be traditional because "they constitute a system distinguished at once by great extension and great simplicity" (p. 16). "Extension"

he demonstrated by tabulating the number of personal name-epithet formulae for major characters fitting after the B2 and Cl caesurae (see section 2; Parry's charts are on pp. 10-16, 39). By "simplicity" he meant what is also called economy, the use of only one expression for one person in one metrical shape and position; he showed that of 40 different name-epithet formulae of one metrical shape in one grammatical case, only six were not used for one character alone, i.e., 34 were reserved each for one of 34 persons. Parry thought that no one poet would create such a specialized system and it must therefore be traditional (p. 37f.).

Hoekstra (1965:8-14) gives a detailed assessment and appreciation of Parry's work, and points out that not until his long article in 1930 does Parry say that Homeric poetry is wholly formulaic and orally composed. To do this Parry had both to extend his definition and to drop his criteria of "extension and simplicity" (p. 11). This is obvious in Parry's formulaic analysis of *Iliad* 1.1-25 and *Odyssey* 1.1-25 (1971:301-4), for many of the expressions here called formulae are not used regularly, and are not part of a system. So new criteria are needed for identifying a formula and the traditional character of a formula. Parry's "essential idea" is also vague semasiologically, and "regularly employed" does not apply to a few obviously very ancient expressions which happen to occur only once in extant epic. Hoekstra also holds that "formulaic" should not be applied to single words, nor to combinations of particles (as some scholars have done). Homeric poetry is thus not entirely formulaic.

Hainsworth 1968 also begins with a summary of Parry's results, with comments and elaborations. He points out that name-epithet formulae in the nominative case are convenient and doubtless traditional, but that there are many gaps in the system in the oblique cases. Name-epithet formulae in the nominative are fixed in position, located both by metrical convenience and by sentence-patterns at the verse-end, but with formulae in other grammatical cases mobility of position increases sharply. So Hainsworth makes out "a prima facie case for impeaching the uncritical analogical extension of the technique of use of nominative personal names to the whole diction of the epics" (p. 31). He also observes that name-epithet formulae in the nominative are often altered in shape, and gives a useful list of examples (p. 30, note 3); this vitiates Parry's "under the same metrical conditions." Parry's definition applies to the traditional ornamental epithets of

name-epithet formulae, but has been extended to cover expressions in which all words are functional (pp. 33-35); and fixity of position must not be part of the definition. Hainsworth then presents a revised definition of a formula (pp. 35-36). The essence of a formula is repetition, so it must be a "repeated word-group," and "the use of one word created a strong presumption that the other would follow. This degree of mutual expectancy I choose as the best differentia of the formulaic word-group." The word-group remains the same formula despite changes in metrical shape of its component words caused by elision or correption, inflection, shifts in meaning, changes in prefixes of suffixes, or use of alternative forms of word-stem. The formula also remains the same despite changes in the word-group arising from rearrangement of the word-order, the separation of constituent words, and the insertion, omission, or change of particles or prepositions. A formula is also capable of extension by the addition of further terms. The remainder of Hainsworth's book examines in detail certain common-noun-epithet formulae (see below), and establishes the validity of his approach beyond doubt.

A fundamental, and very lucid, approach to the nature of a formula can be found in Kiparsky 1976. Kiparsky compares formulae with the "bound expresssions" of ordinary language (e.g., "livelong day," "foregone conclusion"). Are formulae in oral literature special cases of such bound expressions? Hainsworth distinguished unchanging formulae and those which can be modified in various ways. The former can be treated as "ready-made surface structures" (Kiparsky 1976: p. 83), which do not however have an absolutely fixed metrical form as they may be altered by (for example) elision. Flexible formulae must be composed of grammatically-related constituents, and many grammatical relationships can be shown by a deep-structure analysis to be impossible in formulae (for example, adjective + verb, adverb + noun). Kiparsky makes the most important point that his analysis "allows for the inflection, separation, and modification of formulae without singling out one form as the prototype and postulating analogical processes to generate the others" (a point also made by Nagler, see below). He goes on to show how expansion of formulae fits within this analysis. Hainsworth's abandonment of the metrical criterion as part of the definition is important, because it enables the definition to be used also for formulae in relatively free meters and in oral prose. "(T)he formula makes possible the

improvisation of metrical verse. This is, however, a specialized utilization of formulaic language, not its cause" (p. 88). Kiparsky also discusses phonological repetition (Parry's "puns"), and compares the characteristics of some other oral literatures. His article is an excellent preparation for the sometimes more difficult exposition of Nagler.

Nagler 1974 (which includes a revised and expanded form of Nagler 1967) is a most important contribution to the theory of oral composition, or more precisely, of composition using traditional techniques. Nagler's first chapter discusses the "puns" or phonological repetitions Parry noted in Homer (Parry 1971:72), adding several other examples, and suggests that "these corresponsions should suggest the operation of psychological cola or rhythmical groups of some sort bearing a hitherto undetermined relation to formulas" (p. 8). Later he drops the word "formula" in favor of "allomorph," which is "a derivative not of any other phrase but of some preverbal, mental, but quite real entity underlying all such phrases at a more abstract level" (p. 12). The "entity" Nagler refers to as a "Gestalt," the preverbal template which is realized in the appropriate spoken form at the moment of utterance. The second chapter discusses the poetic significance of certain formulae and the symbolism which can be seen in them, using as example the particularly rich associations of *krêdemnon* ("head-binder," "veil," "battlement," "seal") with violation of chastity. Nagler's use of generative grammar and his perceptive and sympathetic insights make his work valuable in a unique way, and it has not yet been carried further and perhaps not yet properly appreciated and assimilated. Nagy 1976 also considers the problems arising from Parry's definition of the formula, and offers "a working definition of the formula that leaves out the factor of meter as the prime conditioning force: *the formula is a fixed phrase conditioned by the traditional themes of oral poetry*. Furthermore, I am ready to propose that *meter is diachronically generated by formula rather than vice versa*." Miller (1982:35-48) criticizes Kiparsky's views and finds that "all structuralist and truly generative accounts of the formula have been inadequate because of their grounding in erroneous assumptions, reliance on sentence-based models of grammar, and the mechanical mindlessness attributed to the poet"; he prefers a theory put forward in Miller and Windelberg 1981, which (so far as I know) has not yet appeared.

"Distinctive," "generic," and "equivalent" epithets; "economy"

Parry divided Homeric epithets into two types: "ornamental" or "fixed" epithets, which have no relationship to the context and are only a convenience for versification; and "particularized" epithets, which concern the immediate action. The latter may be dealt with briefly. Parry gave them his usual thorough examination (1971:153-65), pointing out that *polumêtis* is an ornamental epithet for Odysseus, whereas *polutropos* is not; the difference is determined by the context. At *Odyssey* 10.330 *polutropos* replaces the generic *diiphilos*, normal in that position; *pelôrios* is similarly used 10 times in place of *diiphilos*.

Ornamental epithets are subdivided into "distinctive" and "generic." The important question with these epithets is, can they have any actual meaning in an individual instance? Parry insisted strongly that they could not; it was the point which his scholarly peers found hardest to accept. (The topic will be dealt with in section 7.) In a later article (1971:240-50) Parry examined ornamental "glosses," Homeric words whose meaning is unknown or doubtful, showing that they survived even after their meaning was forgotten because of their metrical convenience.

"Distinctive" epithets are those used for one person alone in one metrical configuration. Parry showed that of 40 different name-epithet formulae of one metrical shape in one grammatical case, only six were not unique for one character alone; 34 were reserved each for one of 34 persons. He asserted that no one poet would create such a specialized system, so that it must be traditional (p. 37f.).

"Generic" epithets occupy a fixed position in the line (often separated from the personal name), refer to general heroic characteristics, and can be used for any god or hero (1971:64f., 83f.). Among the commonest examples are d*ouriklutos, diiphilos, megathumou,* and for smaller metrical spaces *dios* and *amumôn*. Did the poet have a choice among these for a particular hero? Parry gives a list of 61 of these epithets and their use (pp. 89-91), showing that of the 164 forms which occur, 91 are metrically unique while 73 could be replaced by another generic epithet. There is no alternative for *dios,* which qualifies 32 heroes, so the poet was satisfied without choice here; the same is true of the other 90. The choice of epithet is thus decided not by character but by the metrical shape of the name. The metrically identical

or "equivalent" generic epithets arise, Parry argued (p. 184f.), because they have passed over to that category after once being "distinctive" (confined to one hero); all generic epithets must have been "distinctive" at one time in order to become ornamental. Then, when their significance had been lost, they could be applied to another name by analogy. Thus *androphonoio*, used three times for Ares, ten times for Hector, and once for Lycourgos, must at one time have been applied either to Ares or to Hector, and then became a distinctive epithet for Hector; but its single usage with another hero shows that the link with Hector is breaking. In this way arose the overlapping usage of the metrically identical *androphonoio* and *hippodamoio, antitheos* and *iphthimos* (p. 186).

But what of "equivalent" formulae, those few cases where more than one metrically identical formula is used for the same character? Since they give no metrical advantage for composition, why do they exist? Do they constitute a serious breach of the economy of the system? Parry showed that many of them arise from analogy: "[The bard], by analogy, will draw from two unique formulae one which will repeat the metre of an already existing formula" (p. 176). Where analogy has not been at work, it must be that the meter has not yet brought about economy, as with *eriauchenes hippoi* and *hupsêchees hippoi*, if both formulae are in fact traditional (p. 180). Some have been preserved because they are part of whole-verse formulae.

These equivalent formulae have been the subject of valuable work since that of Parry. Pope 1963 points out that we know nothing of the stock of formulae used by poets other than the composer of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, that the gaps in even the fullest systems of name-epithet formulae are large, and that of the 379 different noun-epithet combinations in the similes only 53 (15%) occur in the rest of the *Iliad* and can be considered traditional formulae (he restricts his definition of formula to expressions repeated in identical metrical shape). Pope asks the provocative question: "Is what makes an oral poet great that he knows more formulae or that he uses fewer?" (p. 19). Hainsworth 1978 emphasizes a diachronic approach, suggesting a process of sorting and selection of formulae and an influx of commonplace epithets beside the old mysterious ones (see below, section 4). Janko 1981 studies the pattern of occurrence of equivalent personal-name-epithet formulae. A list of the occurrences of the two equivalent formulae for Hera shows that long sequences of the

same formula occur: the poet has a tendency to use the same formula repeatedly, instead of seeking variation, as one would expect of a literate author. The chance of the same formula occurring 5 times in a row, as happens in *Iliad* 5, is only one in fifteen (254). There is a run of five cases of *androphonoio* after *Hectoros* (instead of the equivalent *hippodamoio*), a chance of only one in ten. The doublet formulae for Aphrodite occur randomly in the *Iliad*, but there is noticeable run of one form in the *Hymn to Aphrodite*—it looks as though the poet "temporarily forgot about the existence of the doublet" (255). Two equivalent phrases exist for "he/she answered him/her," since one developed because of the usefulness of its final movable *n* and then became common even without the *n*. A listing shows that some formulae are strongly associated with one form or the other (though the totals are often very small). In some stretches of the texts one form is preferred; there is a run of 19 instances of one form in the *Odyssey*. Janko concludes (a) that the memory of his previous usage played a part in poet's choice, and (b) the poet sometimes tended to forget one of the alternative forms (258-59). The facts Janko provides are very interesting, but one is sometimes worried by his assumption (a) that artistry is identical with variation (". . .the poet learns to eschew monotony more successfully by alternation. . .[259]. . .Artistry is triumphantly reasserted in [*Iliad* 24], where the poet alternates between the doublets"), and (b) that if a run of one alternative recurs, the poet has recalled the preceding choice and not changed it, whereas if the other alternative occurs, he has recalled the last usage and changed it (260).

Schmiel 1984 addresses the same problem of choice between two equivalent formulae. He lists five possible explanations of the choice: that it arises from meaning and context; that one formula is associated with a particular phrase in the rest of the sentence; that one alternative temporarily slips from the poet's memory; that one alternative phrase is associated with a specific character; and that the poet alternates between formulae for the sake of artistic variation. He then tests these possible explanations by examining the occurrences of three sets of equivalent formulae. In the case of *chalkeon/meilinon enchos* "bronze/ash spear" there are long runs of each form, so there is no artistic variation; there is no association with a specific character; the same verse occurs six times with "bronze," so there may be a whole-verse association. More interesting is the fact that context appears to be significant;

Schmiel finds that in 15 cases either "bronze [spearhead]" or "ash [shaft]" would be appropriate, but in another 13 cases the alternative more suitable for the context is chosen. In only one case is the less suitable formula used, where an "ash" spear is held fast in a shield, obviously by the bronze point (*Iliad* 20.272; unfortunately Schmiel does not mention that here a considerable number of MSS have "bronze," whereas in a few other instances I checked there is little variation; in studies like this the critical apparatus must always be consulted, though for Homer it is an imperfect instrument). Schmiel justly thinks these results "both clear and significant" (p. 35). In a second case, *doru chalkeon/meilinon* "bronze/ash weapon," Schmiel finds an alternation of forms, but spaced so far apart that it is unlikely to be intentional; 3 of the 5 *Iliad* examples of *meilinon* are associated with Meriones, but the significance of the association is doubtful; since 5 of the 10 *Iliad* examples occur in Book 16, in the sequence *abbab*, memory may perhaps be a factor; there is no valid whole-line association. So far as the context is concerned, in 7 of the 12 occurrences either epithet is suitable; in the other 5, the form more suitable to the context has been chosen (I notice that in one of them, *Iliad* 16.346, one MS has the less apt form). For Schmiel's third instance, *poluphloisboio thalassês* and *thalassêa euruporoio* "noisy sea" and "sea wide-to-cross," all possibilities except context can be eliminated. From this aspect, Schmiel finds that "noisy" is found in a context of noise, sea-shore, and (often) emotional distress, whereas "wide-to-cross" in two of its three occurrences is the highway home for the character involved, and in the other is the open sea crashing over a ship, where either form would be acceptable. So Schmiel concludes, reasonably, that "suitability to the context is the best explanation for the choice of formula in the three sets of interchangeable formulae which have been studied in this paper" (p. 37). (Janko has pointed out to me in conversation that if Schmiel is right the formulae in question are no longer, strictly speaking, "equivalent" in meaning.)

Paraskevaides 1984 provides a listing of synonymous nouns in Homer, divided into two sets, one of synonymous nouns sharing the same epithets and one of synonymous nouns used with different epithets. He gives a detailed account of each noun (e.g., "sword"), showing which metrical shapes are provided for by usages of the various Greek words and what positions they occupy in the hexameter. There is no index of Greek words. He states bluntly,

in the introduction to his second section (those with different epithets), that "the use of different epithets cannot point to a particular description. . . . The terms are used without distinction of meaning" (p. 83). He does not list any of the three systems examined by Schmiel. The collection of material is useful.

Also relevant to this topic is Hainsworth 1976, which deals with the appearance of certain expressions in clusters. Hainsworth points out that all eight instances of *gerôn Priamos theoeidês*, of the thirty-eight times he is named in the *Iliad*, occur in Book 24. The Greek army is "broad" seven times between *Iliad* 1.229 and 4.436, then only twice more in the whole poem. Hainsworth lists other similar examples, and also clusters of repeated whole-verses, and concludes that "an expression, once having come to the surface of the mind and been used, tends to remain there for some time and be used again before it sinks into oblivion"; "the stock [of formulae] must be understood to include an uncertain, temporary, and everchanging component" (p. 86). Abramowicz 1972 examines repetitions of a word or root within a short space in Homer and in the Hymns to Delian Apollo and Aphrodite, without reference to formulae.

Usage of formulae: juxtaposition, modification, and positioning

Though he seems not to have known of Hermann Fränkel's work on the structure of the hexameter, which first appeared in 1926 (see section 2), Parry's study of formulae had naturally made him well aware that they fit between the caesural pauses of the verse. In his *thèse* (1971:198f.) he pointed to the fact that many metrical irregularities arise from modifications of formulae, such as the use of nouns in a different case, or verbs in a different person or tense, with consequent change of word-endings. He also discussed (p. 202f.) metrical irregularities arising from juxtaposition of two formulae when the ending of one is not in metrical accord with the beginning of the other. Metrical flaws arising from neglect of initial or medial digamma were examined both in Parry's major monograph and in a later article (p. 222f., 391f.). He concludes—as all would nowadays accept—that the text should not be emended in an attempt to remove such metrical irregularities.

The first application of Milman Parry's insights, and for a long time the only one apart from Parry's own later work, was

Chantraine 1932, an article on the "play of formulae" in *Iliad* 1. It remains the only work of its kind, an excellent source for observing how formulae are used. Chantraine deals with repeated verses, verses repeated with slight modifications, the combining of formulae which fall between the various caesurae, and modifications and changes of position of formulae. He makes a special study of the voyage to Chryse, with its high level of repeated phrases (here his views are somewhat flawed because type-scenes were not fully understood). Calhoun 1933, though dealing mainly with repetitions of whole verses, also has some perceptive remarks on the arrangement of formulae in the verse. Bowra 1963 has some useful observations on repetitions of formulae.

Hoekstra 1964 is a work of the greatest importance. After a review of Parry's work (see above), Hoekstra studies the effects on formulaic usage of three linguistic changes in Greek: quantitative metathesis (the exchange of quantity from *êo* to *eô*); the dropping of initial digamma (consonantal *u*); and the optional addition of a final *-n* to certain verb and noun forms. These linguistic changes added flexibility to pre-existing formulae by allowing the extension or declension of nouns, the conjugation of verbs, the replacement of archaic words or forms by more familiar substitutes, the insertion of additional words (particles, conjunctions, etc.), and changes of position. Hoekstra found that "the evidence for the existence of formulae originally built upon quantitative metathesis is extremely slight" (p. 38). It thus appears that this linguistic innovation virtually coincided with the ending of the creation of new formulae, perhaps the end of oral composition. A separate chapter deals with certain passages which show metrical and stylistic peculiarities arising from declension, conjugation, replacement, splitting, moving, and enjambement of formulae. A final chapter discusses the creation of epic diction. Besides its many brilliant insights, Hoekstra's work is of fundamental importance because it demonstrates beyond doubt that the presence in a verse or passage of later linguistic elements is no proof of interpolation, but merely shows that the poet is making use of innovations in his speech to increase the flexibility of his formulae and facilitate his composition.

My own long article (Edwards 1966) studies the relationship of formula and verse by examining sentence-construction and the sense-units that occur in each of the sections into which a Homeric verse is divided by its caesurae (see section 2). In the first half of

the verse, name-epithet formulae are not found, but the names or patronymics of some heroes fit well before the A caesura (*Atreïdês, Priamidês*); the various kinds of enjambement and runover words are also discussed (see section 5). Between the A and B caesurae, ornamental adjectives in certain sentence-patterns are examined, and some examples of the use of significant adjectives are given here. After the B caesura, I study the phrases which complete the sense before the end of the verse (or are complete clauses in themselves), those which begin at B and enjamb into the next verse, and adjectives falling between the B and C caesurae (ornamental and significant). Between the C caesura and the verse-end several different types of phrase occur, including essential parts of the sentence, ornamental adjectives, and new sentences which may either be complete at the verse-end or enjamb. Of particular interest are verses which are alike (or substantially so) until the C caesura and then end differently, often by replacing an ornamental epithet with the beginning of a new enjambing clause; this variety within the constricted space of five syllables seems to indicate considerable skill on the poet's part. In the conclusion I stress the importance of the caesurae as points of articulation for formulae and sense-units and the occasional addition of emphasis by the positioning of words, and suggest that a significant sense should sometimes be attributed to epithets which are normally only ornamental. In later articles I examine the treatment of formulae in Book 18 of the *Iliad*, certain alternative formulae used to convey the meaning "he/she answered," and the various formulae used to introduce direct speech (Edwards 1968, 1969, 1970). In his important short study of poetic techniques in Homer, Patzer collects the various formulae meaning "[so] he spoke" and discusses their different emphasis and semantic content (1970:15-26).

In his important book (1968) Hainsworth, after discussing Milman Parry's work and giving a revised definition of a formula (see above), proceeds with his study of formulae of two metrical shapes, - u u - $\underline{u}$ and u u - $\underline{u}$, showing how they are moved to different positions in the verse and how their metrical usefulness is increased by changes in word-shape (elongation) or word-order (inversion). Hainsworth's concern is with the association in the poet's mind between (for instance) *kartera desma* "strong bonds," *kraterôi eni desmôi, desmoio* u - *kraterou*, and *desmois* u u - *krateroisi*. He points out (pp. 72-73) that a system would have to be impracticably large to provide a formula for every need that

might be anticipated, and so only the principal needs are accommodated; others are covered by techniques of expansion, separation of the terms of the formula (even over the verse-end), and adaptation to receive connectives and prepositions, all of which Hainsworth illustrates in detail. In a final chapter Hainsworth suggests that a narrow limitation of position of a formula is not the starting-point of the technique but its conclusion: "Highly schematized formula-types are then the consequence of ossification of more flexible systems at points of frequent use" (p. 113).

This type of investigation has been continued by Woodlock 1981, which gives the results of a similar kind of analysis to Hainsworth's carried out on noun-verb expressions in the *Iliad*. The data used are all such phrases which occur between the Cl and C2 caesurae and the end of the verse. Woodlock shows the favored positions for each expression and the mechanisms for changing the metrical shape when required. The appendices include a useful list of these noun-verb expressions in the *Iliad* in the various forms in which they occur.

Two articles by Glavičić (1968 and 1969) study the third colon of the Homeric verse. Often this space is filled by a verb, sometimes by two words which are not a syntactic unity, and the level of association with the adjacent cola varies. The author thinks that the wide variety of semantic content casts doubt on the idea that every hexameter is composed of four cola. Glavičić 1971 deals with the interlacing of two binary syntagmes as *abab*. Various causes bring about the alteration of the simple order: a complement; the position of the verb; and the poet's tendency to emphasize a part of the phrase. Glavičić holds that these structures show the poet's conscious aspiration to create new formulae, more complicated but more poetic, as well as a more artificial phrase structure, and thinks for the more complex examples the poet must have used writing. He has many interesting examples. Muñoz Valle 1971 points out that hyperbaton, the breaking of the normal union of syntactic elements by the insertion of other words, occurs in Homer not for stylistic but for metrical reasons, primarily the need for expansion or for placing certain words in a particular metrical position. In appendixes he discusses the various types of splitting: by a preposition (e.g., *philên es patrida gaian*), by a verb (e.g., *nees êluthon amphielissai*), by a noun (e.g., *Dios noon aigiochoio*), and by other parts of speech. Unfortunately he gives very few

examples of each type. Tsopanakis 1983, a very detailed work, studies and classifies the metrical irregularities in final syllables (long syllable in hiatus not shortened; short syllable in hiatus not elided; open or closed short syllable counted as long), which Parry had attributed to modification or juxtaposition of formulae, and examines those which occur because of hyperbaton, tmesis, anastrophe, enjambement, and other variations from natural word-order. He concludes that often there is more than one factor contributing to the appearance of an irregularity.

In his study of the origin of the Homeric hexameter, Nagy has fine examples of the expansion of formulae (1974:49-102). Minton 1975, after an analysis of formulae in Hesiod's *Theogony*, has some good pages on the ways in which the formulae fit into the cola of the verse, including three-part verses (46-54). Friedrich 1975 compares the order of words and clauses in Homeric Greek and in Proto-Indo-European. Peabody's study of Hesiod's compositional technique (1975) includes a rather obscure section on formulae and cola (pp. 96-114). Muellner 1976, though primarily concerned with uses of the word *euchomai*, contains many useful illustrations of manipulation and juxtaposition of formulae. Houben 1977 studies the sequence of main and subordinate clauses in Homeric Greek. O'Nolan 1978 lists numerous "doublets" in Homer, expressions composed of two synonymous terms (English "with might and main"; Homeric *kata phrena kai kata thumon*, etc.), discusses their meaning, and shows how they fit within the verse in various metrical circumstances. Powell 1978 and Edwards 1980 examine the formulaic expressions that occur in the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* Book 2. Ingalls 1982 examines some mythological digressions in the *Iliad* and finds they contain "an inordinately large number of late linguistic features and . . . there is much evidence of the formular modification necessary to incorporate the new language into the traditional verse" (206). Miller (1982:57-69) lists and discusses phonological parallels in formulae. Mueller (1984:148-58), in an interesting but controversial chapter, suggests that sometimes the poet's mind "does not operate with a stock of formulas but copies parts of a particular text inscribed in its memory" (p. 158).

Russo 1971 and 1976, Ingalls 1972 and 1976, and Rossi 1978 give surveys of much of the above work.

Analogy, "schematizations," and "structural formulae"

        In his major monograph Parry had demonstrated the force of analogy in the formation of Homeric expressions, and used it to explain some metrical faults: "Analogy is perhaps the single most important factor for us to grasp if we are to arrive at a real understanding of Homeric diction" (1971:68). He also pointed out that "a great many equivalent noun-epithet formulae derive naturally from that operation of analogy which, as we saw, is the dominant factor in the development of hexametric diction from its beginning to its end" (p. 176); the normal formula is *anax hekaergos Apollôn,* but *anax Dios huios Apollôn* is also found by analogy with *Dios huios Apollôn.* Parry is also aware of the importance of parallels of sound (p. 72f., 319f.). In a later study Parry spoke of analogical systems in which one word was exchanged for a metrically identical substitute, such as *autar epeidê zessen/speuse/teuxe* (p. 276), and he adds perceptive remarks about *alge' ethêke* and the parallel expressions with changes in each of the two words (pp. 308-9). Further on he remarks that "*teuche kunessin* is like *dôken hetairôi*" (p. 313), without elaborating the point that here *both* words are different and the similarities are only in meter and syntax.

        Russo 1963 takes up this last point, and says: "I should like to suggest an approach that follows Parry's lead in seeking localized phrases whose resemblance goes no further than the use of identical metrical word-types of the same grammatical and syntactic pattern, as truly representing certain more general types of formulaic systems" (237). O'Neill (see section 2) showed that words occur in the hexameter at preferred positions according to their metrical shape; Russo points out that certain grammatical types, of certain metrical shapes, also have preferred positions. He gives an analysis of *Iliad* 1.1-7 along these lines (241f.), finding (for example) nouns shaped - u followed by a verb shaped u - - at the verse-end (*alge' ethêke, muthon eeipen*), and reversed, verb - u followed by noun u - - (*teuche kunessin*). In another article (1966) he analyzes further passages (using the term "structural formula" for this kind of system), and, finding such patterns more common in Homer than in Apollonius, suggests that they are an indication of oral composition. An appendix lists a number of structural formulae according to their position in the verse.

        Hainsworth 1964 and Minton 1965 perceive the value of

Russo's emphasis that "phrases of a given metrical value and internal shape, expressing a more or less constant syntactic relationship within themselves, tend to have a very limited placement in the hexameter line" (Minton 1965:243), but express doubt that this is a mark of oral composition. Their reservations were confirmed by Packard 1976. By use of computer programs for automatic hexameter scansion and automatic morphological analysis of Homeric Greek, Packard checked the occurrences of some of Russo's patterns of structural formulae in *Odyssey* 1 with those in an equivalent number of verses of Quintus of Smyrna's *Posthomerica* (4th century A.D.). He found that sometimes the one poet has more examples, sometimes the other, and that of all Russo's list of patterns, in the samples examined Homer has 87 occurrences and Quintus 106. Packard also found some patterns which occur significantly more frequently in Quintus than in Homer. Oral composition is thus obviously not the reason for the these structural formulae, but their existence in hexameter poetry is obviously of much interest.

References

Abramowicz 1972
     S. Abramowicz. "Répétitions et hantises verbales chez Homère." *Eos*, 60:223-34.

Bowra 1963
     C. M. Bowra. "Style." In *A Companion to Homer*. Ed. A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings. London: Macmillan. pp. 26-37.

Calhoun 1933
     G. M. Calhoun. "Homeric Repetitions." *University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, 12:1-25.

Cantilena 1982
     M. Cantilena. *Ricerche sulla dizione epica. I. Per uno studio della formularità degli Inni Omerici*. Filologia e critica, 42. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Chantraine 1932
     P. Chantraine. "Remarques sur l'emploi des formules dans le premier chant de l'Iliade." *Revue des études grecques*, 45:121-54.

Edwards 1966
     M. W. Edwards. "Some Features of Homeric Craftmanship." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 97:115-79.

Edwards 1968
     _____. "Some Stylistic Notes on *Iliad* XVIII." *American Journal of Philology*, 89:257-83.

Edwards 1969
          _____. "On Some 'Answering' Expressions in Homer." *Classical Philology*, 64:81-87.

Edwards 1970
          _____. "Homeric Speech Introductions." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 74:1-36.

Edwards 1980
          _____. "The Structure of Homeric Catalogues." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 110:81-105.

Friedrich 1975
          P. Friedrich. *Proto-Indo-European Syntax: The Order of Meaningful Elements*. Butte: Journal of IE Studies Monographs.

Glavičić 1968
          B. Glavičić. "Sulle peculiarità sintattiche del terzo *colon* di Omero." *Živa antika*, 18:161-98 (in Serbo-Croatian with Italian résumé).

Glavičić 1969
          _____. "II terzo colon di Omero, come unità sintattica." *Živa antika*, 19:175-206 (in Serbo-Croatian with Italian résumé).

Glavičić 1971
          _____. "Sur l'ordre plus complexe des mots dans l'oeuvre d'Homère." *Živa antika*, 19:443-62 (in Serbo-Croatian with French résumé).

Hainsworth 1964
          J. B. Hainsworth. "Structure and Content in Epic Formulae: The Question of the Unique Expression." *Classical Quarterly*, 14:155-64.

Hainsworth 1968
          _____. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Hainsworth 1976
          _____. "Phrase-clusters in Homer." In *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to Leonard R. Palmer*. Ed. A. M. Davies and W. Meid. Innsbruck: Becvar. pp. 83-86.

Hainsworth 1978
          _____"Good and Bad Formulae." In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Ed. B. C. Fenik. Leiden: Brill. pp. 41-50.

Hoekstra 1964
          A. Hoekstra. *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes*. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.

Houben 1977
          J. L. Houben. "Word-order Change and Subordination in Homeric Greek." *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 5:1-8.

Ingalls 1972
          W. Ingalls. "Another Dimension of the Homeric Formula." *Phoenix*, 26:111-22.

Ingalls 1976
          _____. "The Analogical Formula in Homer." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 106:211-16.

Ingalls 1982
          _____. "Linguistic and Formular Innovation in the Mythological Digressions in the *Iliad*." *Phoenix*, 36:201-8.

Janko 1981
          R. Janko. "Equivalent Formulae in the Greek Epos." *Mnemosyne*, 34:251-64.

Kiparsky 1976

    P. Kiparsky. "Oral Poetry: Some Linguistic and Typological Considerations." In *Oral Literature and the Formula*. Ed. B. A. Stolz and R. S. Shannon III. Ann Arbor: Center for Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies. pp. 73-106.

Latacz 1979

    J. Latacz. *Homer: Tradition and Neuerung*. Wege der Forschung, 173. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Miller 1982

    D. G. Miller. *Homer and the Ionian Epic Tradition: Some Phonic and Phonological Evidence against an Aeolic 'Phase.'* Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 38. Innsbruck: Rauchdruck Ges.

Miller and Windelberg 1981

    _____. and M. L. Windelberg. *A Text Linguistic Analysis of Formulaic Composition* (provisional title; forthcoming).

Minton 1965

    W. W. Minton. "The Fallacy of the Structural Formula." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 96:241-53.

Minton 1975

    _____. "The Frequency and Structuring of Traditional Formulas in Hesiod's *Theogony*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 79:25-54.

Mueller 1984

    M. Mueller. The *Iliad*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Muellner 1976

    L. C. Muellner. *The Meaning of Homeric EYXOMAI Through its Formulas*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 13. Innsbruck: Becvar.

Muñoz Valle 1971

    I. Muñoz Valle. "Las motivaciones del hipérbaton en los poemas homéricos." *Cuadernos de filología clásica*, II:165-86.

Nagler 1967

    M. N. Nagler. "Towards a Generative View of the Homeric Formula." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 98:269-311.

Nagler 1974

    _____. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nagy 1974

    G. Nagy. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nagy 1976

    _____. "Formula and Meter." In *Oral Literature and the Formula*. Ed. B. A. Stolz and R. S. Shannon III. Ann Arbor: Center for Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies. pp. 239-60.

O'Nolan 1978

    K. O'Nolan. "Doublets in the *Odyssey*." *Classical Quarterly,* 28:23-27.

Packard 1976

    D. W. Packard."Metrical and Grammatical Patterns in the Greek Hexameter." In *The Computer in Literary and Linguistic Studies: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium*. Ed. A. Jones and R. F. Churchhouse. Cardiff: University of Wales Press. pp. 85-91.

Paraskevaides 1984
        H. Paraskevaides. *The Use of Synonyms in the Homeric Formulaic Diction*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Parry 1971
        Milman Parry. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. A. Parry. Oxford: Clarendon.

Patzer 1970
        H. Patzer. *Dichterische Kunst und poetisches Handwerk im Homerischen Epos*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Peabody 1975
        B. Peabody. *The Winged Word: A Study in the Technique of Ancient Greek Oral Composition as Seen Principally through Hesiod's* Works and Days. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Pope 1963
        M. W. M. Pope. "The Parry-Lord Theory of Homeric Composition." *Acta Classica*, 6:1-21.

Powell 1978
        B. B. Powell. "Word Patterns in the Catalogue of Ships (B494-709). A Structural Analysis of Homeric Language." *Hermes*, 106:255-64.

Rossi 1978
        L. E. Rossi. "I Poemi omerici come testimonianza di poesia orale." In *Storia e civiltà dei Greci*. Milan: Bompiani. I.1. pp. 73-147.

Russo 1963
        J. A. Russo. "A Closer Look at Homeric Formulas." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 94:235-47.

Russo 1966
        _____. "The Structural Formula in Homeric Verse." *Yale Classical Studies*, 20:217-40.

Russo 1971
        _____. "The Meaning of Oral Poetry. The Collected Papers of Milman Parry: A Critical Re-assessment" *Quaderni Urbinati di cultura classica*, 12:27-39.

Russo 1976
        _____. "Is 'Oral' or 'Aural' Composition the Cause of Homer's Formulaic Style?" In *Oral Literature and the Formula*. Ed. B. A. Stolz and R. S. Shannon. Ann Arbor: Center for Coordination of Ancient and Modern Studies. pp. 31-54.

Schmiel 1984
        R. Schmeil. "Metrically-interchangeable Formulae and Phrase-clusters in Homer." *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 9.3:34-38.

Tsopanakis 1983
        A. G. Tsopanakis. *Homeric Researches: From the Prosodic Irregularity to the Construction of the Verse*. Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki.

Woodlock 1981
        L. T. Woodlock. "Noun-verb Associations and the Formula in Homer's *Iliad*." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 42:683A.

Young 1967
        D. Young. "Never Blotted a Line? Formula and Premeditation in Homer and Hesiod." *Arion*, 6:279.324.

§ 4: The History of Homeric Formulae: Homer, the Homeric Hymns, and Later Poetry.

Homeric formulae have a long life-span. A few have been thought to date from the Mycenaean period (around 1400 BC) or even earlier. They are found in Hesiod, who composed about the same time as Homer, and continue on in epic, didactic, hymnic, and oracular hexameters, in elegiac couplets, and even in lyric poetry. And because of Homer's immense influence they are found in archaizing hexameters far into the Roman period.

Homer and before Homer

How old are the Homeric formulae? Both Page (1959:218-96) and Webster (1958:91-135), writing soon after the decipherment of the Mycenaean script, and influenced by the evidence of old forms in the epic dialect and by the *Iliad's* descriptions of places and objects which ceased to exist after the Mycenaean period, considered that some Homeric formulae might go back to Mycenaean times. Kirk 1961 gives a useful review of the evidence, pointing out that cultural details could have survived in a non-poetic tradition, and is agnostic about survival of formulae; much could have been developed during the "Dark Age" between the Mycenaean period and the 8th century. Durante 1981 investigated the pre-Ionian period of Greek epic poetry and found a number of Mycenaean legacies; in a second volume (1976) he listed Vedic parallels for certain aspects of Homeric poetry, notably in meter, epithets, metaphor and simile, personification, hymnic form, and the terminology of poetic creativity. Even richer in Vedic and other parallels to Homeric expressions is Schmitt 1967, which includes chapters on heroic poetry, epithets and attributes of divinities, sacred (or hymnic) poetry, and meter. (See also many of the essays in Schmitt 1968.) Horrocks 1980 points out that in Homer proverbs which are not attached to the verb stand either initially in the clause or before the direct object. Vedic parallels suggest that this is a Proto-Indo-European usage, but since it does not occur in the Mycenaean of the Linear B tablets Horrocks suggests it was preserved only in dactylic poetry, which thus must have existed during, and even before, the Mycenaean period. Horrocks discusses three formulaic systems which he claims support

this theory.

If the traditional language derives from Mycenaean times, the question arises whether there was more than a single line of descent. Taking up an idea put forward some twenty-five years ago by Notopoulos 1960, Pavese has argued in a series of monographs and articles (1972, 1974, 1981) that differences in language and formulaic usage show that there developed in mainland Greece a poetic tradition, including Hesiod, the composers of the Hymns, and those of later choral lyric, which was separate from that of Homer's Ionia; Pavese holds that the two streams both derive from a common source prior to the Ionian migration. Pavese's work on the language and formulaic usage in early poetry is very valuable, but it is not clear that the contact between the mainland and Ionia during the period between the migration to Ionia (about 1000 BC) and the 8th century was ever so slight as to foster such different poetic traditions. The recent work of Mureddu 1983, which shows that the formulae for major characters in Homer and Hesiod are virtually identical, has made Pavese's view even harder to accept.

At all events, there are few formulae likely to date from long before Homer's time. Hainsworth 1962 confronts the problem of why there are so few clearly identifiable survivals of Mycenaean language or culture in Homer, if the tradition derives from that period, and concludes that old formulae have been replaced by new. This important article begins his studies of the flexibility of formulae, worked out later in his book (1968). His next article (1964) also deals with the question of new formulae. After pointing out that formulae develop only at a limited number of positions in the verse, he studies how the poet creates a new expression if no suitable formula already exists, illustrating the techniques of adaptation and substitution the poet adopts; he then examines the unique expressions at certain points, showing that in each category the number of expressions which have no evident source far exceeds the total of those apparently adapted or constructed on the basis of known patterns. This proves that the poet used more creativity than is sometimes attributed to him, even allowing for our limited sample of Greek epic poetry. Hainsworth returns to the topic in his important Cincinnati talk (1978), discussing the process of sorting and selection of formulae. There is a conflict between special epithets (e.g. *polumêtis*), reserved for a particular hero and giving richness and color, and

"generic" ones (e.g. *dios*), applicable to anyone and useful for ease and economy. Nominative formulae for the main gods use few generic epithets (*klutos, kreiôn* are representative), and the mundane *thea leukôlenos Hêrê* spreads at the expense of the more dramatic *boôpis potnia Hêrê*. Similarly, formulae for a helmet show an influx of commonplace epithets (*chalkeios,* etc.) beside the old, mysterious ones like *tetraphalêros*. Special epithets like *anax andrôn* are occasionally taken over for other heroes. "The formula becomes outmoded. Its colour turns first into the rust of archaism, and finally into the magnificence of the unknown and incomprehensible: at which stage the old formula is ripe for replacement by the neutral product of generative processes, and the cycle begins anew" (p. 50).

        Hoekstra's very important monograph (1964) examines certain phenomena of linguistic innovation in early Greek, specifically quantitative metathesis, the observance or neglect of initial digamma, and the use of movable *n*, showing that in each case the innovation in language has led to increased flexibility in declining, conjugating, and otherwise adapting formulae. So linguistic innovations affected the development of epic style and brought changes in the epic diction. In a later article (1975) Hoekstra analyzes the usage of several expressions and identifies innovations which have entered the diction under the influence of spoken contemporary Ionic. He also shows (1978) that certain cases of metrical lengthening (*āponeesthai, āneres*) are connected with evolution of epic diction, and that certain types arose from substitution in other phrases which are demonstrably late; *proti Ilion āponeesthai* is adapted from *Ilion aipu neesthai*, and other cases arose by analogy. Metrical lengthening is thus due to different causes and occurred at different stages in the evolution of epic diction. In another monograph (1981) he carries further his investigation of the relationship between Homer and the traditional phraseology, treating several problems involving the occurrence of hiatus at the mid-verse caesura and the influence of spoken Ionic on the use of generalizing *te*. He also discusses West's views (1973) on the origins of Greek meters (see section 2), concluding that "it seems certain that the earliest narrative poetry that has left any traces in Homer was already composed in hexameter" (p. 53). An examination of the invention of significant names suggests that they have strong links with the mainland and were probably already fixed in verse before the Ionian migration. A further

examination of the *amplitudo* or fullness of some epic expressions (a whole verse means only "then he answered") leads to the same conclusion, that epic narrative had already taken the metrical form of the hexameter before it emigrated to Ionia. The *amplitudo* too is more likely to have arisen in Mycenaean times.

The ancient question of the composition of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and the relationship between them, has also been approached through examination of formulae. Page 1955 produced a useful list of words and expressions which occur in one poem but not in the other, and asserted that the traditional vocabulary and stock of formulae of the *Iliad* were so different from those of the *Odyssey* that the two poets must have been separated not only in time but in locality. Page did not use statistical checks, and the number of occurrences of some of his examples is low; his argument was severely damaged by a demonstration (Young 1959) that a similarly loose technique can show that *Paradise Lost* could not have been composed by the same author as Milton's other poems.

In an article on the Homeric Hymns (see below), Postlethwaite 1979 suggested that the poet's facility in handling the various kinds of techniques for modifying formulae (as studied by Hainsworth 1968) can be used to identify the stylistic traits of individual poets. In a later article (1981) he applied the same technique of analysis to the "continuation" of the *Odyssey* (from 23.297 to the end), finding "quite radical stylistic differences" from the parts of the epics he used as a control. He found mobility of formulae less common than elsewhere (including in the *Hymns*), separation of component parts twice as common as in the control passages (and close to the *Hymns*), and expansion more than twice as common as in the rest of the *Odyssey* (though here, as Postlethwaite indicates, the figures are small, and show [for what they are worth] that the phenomenon is three times as frequent in the *Odyssey* as in the *Iliad*). Postlethwaite concludes that the "continuation" is by a different poet than the *Iliad* and the rest of the *Odyssey*, and the similarity in quantity of formulaic diction must be due to conscious imitation. These striking results need careful consideration by other scholars.

Hesiod

Hesiod is agreed to be roughly a contemporary of Homer (some placing him a little earlier, some a little later), and a number of works have been specifically devoted to comparison of his use of formulae and Homer's. A useful start was made with the listing in Kretschmer 1913 of phrases repeated within each of the major poems and within the corpus as a whole, with Homeric references added where relevant, though his work is far from complete. Sellschopp 1934 devotes much of her study of Hesiod's use of epithets to an examination of lines and phrases common to his work and to the *Odyssey*, deciding that the latter can often be shown to be the later work; her work is still useful, but her results have to a large extent been refuted by G. P. Edwards (see below). Hoekstra 1957 began his very important work on formulae with the problem of how far Hesiod was influenced by formulaic diction, and studied the Hesiodic modifications of Homeric formulae. He concluded that Hesiod's formulae are much the same as Homer's but at a later stage of development.

Notopoulos 1960 pointed out the importance of Kretschmer's demonstration that there are formulae within Hesiod which do not occur in Homer, and claimed that these were formulae of a regional Boeotian school of poetry. He worked out statistics (now outdated) for formulaic repetitions in Hesiod, based on Kretschmer's lists and the Homeric repetitions listed in Rzach's 1902 edition of Hesiod. Krafft 1963 studied the meaning of certain words and phrases in Hesiod in comparison with the Homeric meaning, and concluded with a useful listing (according to their position in the verse) of formulae which occur only within Hesiod or are common to Hesiod and Homer, identifying those which occur once only or more than once in Homer. Angier 1964 goes beyond formulaic usage and deals with verbal and thematic repetitions as an organizing device in the *Theogony*. Rosenmeyer 1965 discusses Hesiod's use of formulae, finding indications that they may bear a closer relationship to the context than they do in Homer, and that Hesiod "tends to compose, not only in formulas, but in words. . . . In the end the word, not the formula, determines the progress and the unity of his speech" (307). In Matsen 1968 (which I have not seen) "the *Works and Days* is examined in the light of the three Parry/Lord criteria for oral composition: formulae, enjambement, themes" (3989A).

In his major edition of the *Theogony* (1966), West gives his view that this may be the oldest Greek poem we have, and lists (after Krafft) some of the Hesiodic, non-Homeric formulae, but he has no separate discussion. In his edition of the *Works and Days* (1978) and in his study of *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (1985) he does not treat formulae. His discussion of orality in the *Works and Days* (1981) is mentioned in section 8.

G. P. Edwards 1971 is an important and comprehensive comparison of Hesiod and Homer, including (after a review of previous studies) an examination of similar word-forms, parallel phrases, verbal repetitions, formulae, and formulaic systems. Edwards found that Hesiod's observation of economy is not so close as Homer's. In addition, he studied parallels arising from similarity of sound (an innovative approach), the versification and use of enjambement, and the special question of phrases common to Hesiod and the *Odyssey*, where he disproves Sellschopp's arguments that some Odyssean expressions derive from Hesiod. He concluded that Hesiod's use of formulae is much like Homer's, and that the two must be considered similar in "orality"; he thought that Notopoulos' theory of two separate streams of poetic tradition surviving from pre-migration times in Ionia and in mainland Greece was most improbable in the light of the extensive similarities between Homeric and Hesiodic diction, and that "the most economical hypothesis may be that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* already existed and were known on the Greek mainland by Hesiod's time" (p. 203).

As part of his argument for separate Ionian and mainland poetic traditions (see above), Pavese (1972:35f.) discusses non-Homeric elements in Hesiod's language, and lists (p. 121f.) by metrical position all repeated expressions not found in Homer but occurring (1) within the works of Hesiod; (2) in Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns*; (3) in Hesiod and archaic lyric; (4) in Hesiod, the *Hymns*, archaic lyric, and archaic elegiac; and (5) in Hesiod and in lyric poetry. He also examines (p. 165f.) the flexibility Hesiod shows in manipulating formulae, on Hainsworth's principles (see section 3), and the overlapping formulae which violate economy.

Minton 1975 accepts G. P. Edwards' demonstration of the oral character of Hesiod's work, tackles the problem of comparing the density of formulae in Hesiod and Homer, and works out a more refined system of calculating the proportion of formulae (see section 8). He finds 57.5% of Homer pure formula, compared with

36.6% of the *Theogony* and slightly over 22% of the *Works and Days*. He gives a very careful analysis of two 25-verse samples from the *Theogony*. Peabody 1975 is a large and difficult work (for a sympathetic appreciation see M. N. Nagler's review in *Arion*, n.s. 3/3 [1976]: 365-77) which bases most of its exposition on the *Works and Days*. Peabody is interested in the relationship of the formulae to the cola of the verse (see above, section 2) rather than in individual formulae; his appendices list the metrical shapes of words occurring in the poem, the ways in which they appear in the verse, and the arrangement of cola.

     In order to discover if Hesiod uses the same formulae as Homer to express similar concepts under the same metrical conditions, Mureddu 1983 examines noun-epithet formulae occurring in all grammatical cases and verse-positions for a number of divinities and for "mankind," "gods," Olympus, the sea, and sexual union. She finds a remarkable overall unity in the Homeric and Hesiodic usages; in only a very few cases does Hesiod replace a Homeric formula with an alternative. This demonstration of the uniformity of this aspect of Ionic and mainland poetic diction argues strongly, perhaps decisively, against the theory of separate traditions descending from Mycenaean times. Verdenius 1985, a new commentary on the *Works and Days*, does not discuss formulae.

The Homeric Hymns

     Three of the four long Homeric Hymns (those to Demeter, Apollo, and Aphrodite) are dated not much later than Homer, and the fourth (to Hermes) is usually considered not later than the fifth century; so their usage of formulae has attracted a good deal of study. Porter 1949 deals with repetition of words, sounds, and themes in the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, but not with formulae. Post-Parryan studies of the relationship of the Homeric Hymns to Homer began with Notopoulos 1962, who published a formulaic analysis of lines 1-18 of the *Hymn to Apollo* and gave figures and percentages of formulaic verses in the four long Hymns, compared with samples from the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and the main works of Hesiod. He declared that this showed the oral character of the Hymns. This pioneering work is open to criticism both because of its easy equation of "formulaic" with "oral" and because of the

looseness of the principles on which formulae are identified, and it has now been superseded.

Preziosi 1966 is a careful study of the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, identifying Homeric formulae and analogous phrases found in the Hymn, and formulae and analogous phrases recurring within the Hymn itself. She found that 75.5% of verses in the Hymn contain formulae found in Homer, usually in the same metrical position, or 44.25% of its metra. Expressions analogous to those found in Homer (Parry's "system of schematization") occur in 23% of verses (11.5% of metra). Fifty-nine non-Homeric formulae recur within the Hymn, in 36% of its verses (22.5% of the metra); expressions analogous to others within the Hymn are found in 35.5% of the verses (14% of the metra).

Hoekstra 1969 examines the Hymns to Apollo, Aphrodite, and Demeter to see whether they show a different stage of development from that in the Homeric epics. He studies the evidence of vocabulary, inflection, substitution within formulae, juxtaposition of formulae, and non-Homeric archaisms of formulae in these Hymns, and concludes that in the Delian part of the *Hymn to Apollo* only the final part (the gatherings at Delos, about lines 140-81) shows oddities; in the Pythian part of this Hymn there are few oddities but they suggest sub-epic composition, with archaisms due to the poetic genre; the *Hymn to Aphrodite* shows modifications in diction which are not matched in Homer and argue for a later stage of development; and the *Hymn to Demeter* also presents un-Homeric modifications and a development beyond the Homeric stage.

Richardson's edition of the *Hymn to Demeter* (1974) usefully prints formulaic parallels in Homer, Hesiod, and the other Hymns, discusses coincidences with certain Homeric passages (p. 31f.), and lists expressions which have parallels in Hesiod but not Homer, those which are adaptations of Homeric expressions, those which are paralleled in the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, and new or adapted proper-name formulae. He suggests this Hymn was composed later than, and with an awareness of, at least the *Theogony* and perhaps the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. He also discusses the occasional lack of formulaic economy and the use of enjambement (see section 5 below). Richardson does not take a stand on whether this is oral composition or a good literary imitation of one. In his Appendix II, Richardson discusses the relationship to his own work of G. P. Edwards' researches on Hesiodic diction and the language, Hoekstra's work on the use of moveable *n*, and the question of oral

poetry and the use of writing, sensibly pointing out the ambiguities in both terms ("both literate and illiterate poets premeditate") and that no one doubts that the long Hymns were composed for recitation and used traditional techniques of epic composition.

Gaisser 1974 appeared in the same year as Richardson's work. She compares the use of noun-epithet combinations in the *Hymn to Demeter* with that in Homer, and looks for differences from the Homeric norm which occur also in Hesiod and the other Hymns (showing herself aware that Homeric usage itself is not monolithic). She has major sections on Hesiodic expressions in the Hymn (finding Homeric vocabulary used in new combinations), expressions that use non-Homeric, non-Hesiodic vocabulary, expressions using Homeric vocabulary in a non-Homeric way ("an individual quirk of style"), and a few expressions not found in Homer or Hesiod but occurring in other Hymns. Gaisser concludes that this Hymn is close to Hesiod in style, especially in a tendency to use nouns which are not found in noun-epithet combinations in Homer, and in its different handling of generic epithets. There are also apparently individual stylistic features in choice of vocabulary, and in length and positioning of noun-epithet combinations. In the final section of his second monograph on the epic tradition (Pavese 1974), the author discusses late linguistic features in Hesiod and the Hymns and presents statistics on the percentages of formulae in samples of the two parts of the *Hymn to Apollo* and the *Hymn to Hermes* (p. 117, note 6). Schröder 1975 is a concise and complicated monograph which carefully compares the formulaic expressions in the Delian part of the *Hymn to Apollo* and the *Iliad*, concluding that the former is older than our *Iliad* in its present form. Càssola's edition of the Hymns (1975) does not list the formulae. Van Nortwick's dissertation on the *Hymn to Hermes* (1975) studies the noun-epithet combinations (especially for Hermes and Apollo) in that Hymn and in Homer, finding a variety of new usages; he also examines certain whole-verse expressions, the use of enjambement, and the sentence-structure. Pellizer 1978 is concerned with verbal repetitions rather than formulae.

A very interesting recent development is the suggestion by Postlethwaite 1979 that one can use as a mark of oral composition "the composer's facility in handling the various types of formula modification," and further, that "the variations in frequency of these modifications [in the four long Hymns] may reflect individual stylistic traits in their composers" (1). He analyzes the usage of

common-noun + epithet word-groups (following Hainsworth's technique, see section 3) in order to examine how frequently they are moved to alternative positions or modified by expansion or separation of their elements. Samples of 430 lines each of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are used as a control (and are found to be much alike). He finds a greater mobility of expressions in the Hymns than in Homer (with the exception of the *Hymn to Demeter*), and a greater frequency of separation of elements and of expansion. He concludes that the probability is that if the Homeric epics were orally composed, so were the Hymns, since they show the same techniques of mutation of formulae; but that there is considerable variation among the individual Hymns, which is probably due to individual composers. Some might quibble over minor details of Postlethwaite's study, and the total figures for such relatively short compositions are regrettably low, but his results give support to a view which is itself intrinsically probable.

Several papers presented at a convention held in Venice in 1977 and published in 1981 deal in detail with formulaic usage in the Hymns. Segal 1981 examines the formulaic artistry in the *Hymn to Demeter*, and considers the poem is an oral work but shows divergences from the Homeric practice; there is more variation of epithets, more violation of economy, and more "necessary" enjambement. He argues that it certainly marks a stage beyond Homer. Segal gives special treatment to the distinctive accumulation of epithets in a single verse (p. 112), the variations of formulae (p. 119), non-formulaic usage at times of special significance, the theme of time, and expressions for wrath and grief. All this may be an individual poet's natural organic development, a work dependent on inherited tradition but also sophisticated and artistically self-conscious. Kirk 1981 discusses the familiar problems of the relationship of the Delian and Pythian parts of the *Hymn to Apollo*, together with the criteria for dating. He finds no evidence of a distinct non-Ionic mainland tradition beyond Hesiod. He then provides a commentary on the Hymn, drawing attention to modifications of Homeric language. Kirk is particularly critical of the handling of some parts of the Pythian section, finding a "maladroit bending of particular Homeric passages" (p. 179). He concludes that "both parts typically exemplify sub-epic technique, which is not, I think, a fully oral one" (p. 180). Herter 1981 examines the numerous formulae common to the *Hymn to Hermes* and Homer, and discusses how

the poet has varied the old formulae to suit his theme. He notes that a good many formulae seem to come from early but non-Homeric epic (p. 194). Pavese 1981 repeats his view that the works of Hesiod, the Hymns, and the epic cycle were orally composed in a mainland tradition independent of the Ionic tradition of Homer, summarizing the arguments of his earlier monographs (1972, 1974).

Cantilena 1982 is a careful monograph giving a comprehensive formulaic analysis of each of the Hymns; the author tabulates the formulaic density, verse by verse, in each Hymn, and prints a list of formulae and formulaic expressions which do not occur in other early epic. He also gives a line-by-line commentary on the treatment of formulaic expressions in each Hymn. Cantilena agrees with Pavese's view of a mainland oral tradition, including Hesiod and the Hymns, which is separate from the Ionic. He gives a good summary of previous work, and a full discussion of whether the Hymns are oral or not. In appendices he lists the proportion of formulae in every verse of the Hymns, the percentage of formulaic language calculated by Notopoulos' method, and the formulae recurring in the Hymns which occur in or are similar to those occurring in Homer, Hesiod, and other Hymns. There is much of value in Cantilena's work, but it must now be considered in association with Janko's (see below).

Janko 1982 is an impressive work and of great importance. The author sets out to examine, and to tabulate statistically, the use of innovative and archaizing diction in Hesiod and the Hymns, and gives excellent summaries and assessments of previous work over this large area, including the validity of various tests for oral poetry and the use of non-Homeric formulae in Hesiod and the Hymns. Examining certain kinds of linguistic changes, he observes a small development from the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*, a larger one to the *Theogony*, and a further small one to the *Works and Days*. The changes between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (Ionian poetry) are mirrored in those between the *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, which suggests that mainland poetry fell under Ionian domination because of the pre-eminence of Homer. He then uses statistical methods to fit the results of his application of the criteria to the Hymns within this framework. After detailed treatment of each of the longer Hymns, he concludes that the epic was brought from some area of Mycenaean culture and evolved in the Aeolic settlements in Asia Minor during the Dark Ages. One branch

continued to develop in the northern parts of this area, subject to later influence by the Ionic tradition, producing the *Hymn to Aphrodite* and the *Cypria*, whereas in the southern part Ionic-speakers took over, not long before the Homeric poems, and added several new features to the diction from their vernacular. Here the *Iliad* (perhaps about 750) and the *Odyssey* (perhaps about 735) were created, and later the Delian part of the *Hymn to Apollo* (perhaps about 655). The Ionian tradition was taken to Boeotia, and used by Hesiod (together with some Attic and Aeolic influence) in the *Theogony* (perhaps about 670) and the *Works and Days* (perhaps about 650). Later on, the mainland tradition took on peculiar characteristics, such as the false archaism which shows up in the *Catalogue of Women* (which can hardly be earlier than the *Theogony* but shows slightly earlier features of diction) and the *Hymn to Demeter*. These characteristics increase in the later S*hield of Heracles*, the Pythian part of the *Hymn to Apollo* (both after 600), and the *Hymn to Hermes* (in the later sixth century). Janko includes good accounts of previous work and adds to our knowledge in many different areas, and shows himself aware (p. 191) of an important corollary of his work—that if his observations are correct (which seems indubitable, though some may quarrel here and there with the force of the deductions he makes from them) the texts of the Homeric poems must have been fixed in some way, whether by writing or memorization, before the time of Hesiod, and the other poems too at the time of their composition, in order to freeze the diction at that particular stage in its chronological and regional development.

Later Poetry

Studies of the use of Homeric formulae in later Greek poetry must be listed summarily:

Lyric poetry: Page 1963, Aloni 1981 (Archilochus); Gentili 1969; Giannini 1973 (elegiac); Mawet 1975 (epigrams).

Inscriptions: Di Tillio 1969.

Delphic oracles: McLeod 1961; Rossi 1981.

Batrachomyomachia: Glei 1984.

Panyassis: McLeod 1966; Matthews 1974.

Apollonius of Rhodes: Fränkel 1968; Campbell 1981b.

Quintus of Smyrna: Vian 1959; Campbell 1981a.

References

Aloni 1981
          A. Aloni. *Le Muse di Archiloco*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
Angier 1964
          C. Angier. "Verbal Patterns in Hesiod's Theogony." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 68:329-44.
Campbell 1981a
          M. Campbell. *A Commentary on Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomerica XII*. Mnemosyne Supplement, 71. Leiden: Brill.
Campbell 198l b
          _____. *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius*. Mnemosyne Supplement, 72. Leiden: Brill.
Cantilena 1982
          M. Cantilena. *Ricerche sulla dizione epica: I. Per uno studio delta formularità degli Inni Omerici*. Filologia e critica, 42. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
Cassola 1975
          F. Cassola. *Inni omerici*. Milan: Mondadori.
Di Tillio 1969
          Z. Di Tillio. "Confronti formulari e lessicali tra le iscrizioni esametriche ed elegiache dal VII al V sec. a.C. e l'epos arcaico." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 7:45-73.
Durante 1971
          M. Durante. *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca I. Continuità della tradizione poetica dell'età micenea ai primi documenti*. Incunabula Graeca, 50. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
Durante 1976
          _____. *Sulla preistoria della tradizione poetica greca II. Risultanze delta comparazione indoeuropea*. Incunabula Graeca, 64. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.
Edwards 1971
          P. Edwards. *The Language of Hesiod*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Fränkel 1968
          H. Fränkel. *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*. Munich: Beck.
Gaisser 1974
          J. H. Gaisser. "Noun-epithet Combinations in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 104:113-37.
Gentili 1969
          B. Gentili. "L'interpretazione dei lirici greci arcaici nella dimensione del nostro tempo. Sincronia e diacronia nello studio di una cultura orale." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 8:7-21.
Giannini 1973
          P. Giannini. "Espressioni formulari nell'elegia greca arcaica." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 16:7-78.
Glei 1984
          R. Glei. *Die Batrachomyomachie: Synoptische Edition und Kommentar*.

Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang.

Hainsworth 1962
J. B. Hainsworth. "The Homeric Formula and the Problem of Its Transmission." *Bulletin of the London Institute of Classical Studies*, 9:57-68.

Hainsworth 1964
_____. "Structure and Content in Epic Formulae: The Question of the Unique Expression." *Classical Quarterly*, 14:155-64.

Hainsworth 1968
_____. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hainsworth 1978
_____. "Good and Bad Formulae." In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Ed. B. C. Fenik. Leiden: Brill. pp. 41-50.

Hainsworth 1981
_____. "Criteri di oralità nella poesia arcaica non omerica." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-30 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 3-27.

Herter 1981
H. Herter. "L'inno omerico a Hermes alla luce della problematica della poesia orale." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-30 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 183-201.

Hoekstra 1957
A. Hoekstra. "Hésiode et la tradition orale." *Mnemosyne*, 10:193-225.

Hoekstra 1964
_____. *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Hoekstra 1969
_____. *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Formulaic Tradition*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Hoekstra 1975
_____. "Aèdes anciens et poètes ioniens: le témoignage de quelques expressions homériques." In *Le Monde grec: Hommages à C. Préaux*. Ed. J. Bingen, G. Cambrier, and G. Nachtergael. Brussels: Editions de 1' Université de Bruxelles. pp. 25-31.

Hoekstra 1978
_____. "Metrical Lengthening and Epic Diction." *Mnemosyne*, 31:1-26.

Hoekstra 1981
_____. *Epic Verse before Homer*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Horrocks 1980
G. C. Horrocks. "The Antiquity of the Greek Epic Tradition: Some New Evidence." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 26:1-11.

Janko 1982
R. Janko. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirk 1961
G. S. Kirk. "Dark Age and Oral Poet." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 7:34-48. Rpt. in *Homer and the Oral Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp. 19-39.

Kirk 1981

    "Orality and Structure in the Homeric 'Hymn to Apollo'." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e Ia tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-30 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 163-82.

Krafft 1963

    F. Krafft. *Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod*. Hypomnemata Supplement, 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Kretschmer 1913

    P. F. Kretschmer. *De iteratis Hesiodeis*. Bratislavia: Schles. Volkszeitung.

Matsen 1968

    P. P. Matsen. "Hesiod's *Works and Days* and Homeric Oral Poetry." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 29:3989-90A.

Matthews 1974

    V. J. Matthews. *Panyassis of Halicarnassos*. Mnemosyne Supplement, 33. Leiden: Brill.

Mawet 1975

    F. Mawet. "Epigrammes, thrènes et dithyrambes. Les lamentations funèbres l'épopée." In *Le Monde grec: Hommages à C. Préaux*. Ed. J. Bingen, G. Cambrier, and G. Nachtergael. Brussels: Editions de l' Université de Bruxelles. pp. 34-44.

McLeod 1961

    W. E. McLeod. "Oral Bards at Delphi." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 92:317-25.

McLeod 1966

    _____. "Studies on Panyassis—An Heroic Poet of the Fifth Century." *Phoenix*, 20:95-110.

Minton 1975

    W. W. Minton. "The Frequency and Structuring of Traditional Formulas in Hesiod's *Theogony*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 79:26-54.

Mureddu 1983

    P. Mureddu. *Formula e tradizione nella poesia di Esiodo*. Filologia e critica, 46. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Nagy 1979

    G. Nagy. "On the Origins of the Greek Hexameter: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives." In *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science IV (= Festschrift O. Szemerényi)*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins B.V. pp. 611-31.

Notopoulos 1960

    J. A. Notopoulos. "Homer, Hesiod, and the Achaean Heritage of Oral Poetry." *Hesperia*, 29:177-97.

Notopoulos 1962

    _____. "The Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry." *American Journal of Philology*, 83:337-68.

Page 1955

    D. L. Page. *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Page 1959

    _____. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Page 1963

    _____. "Archilochus and the Oral Tradition." In *Entretiens Hardt,* 10. Geneva: Vandoeuvres-Genève. pp. 117-63.

Pavese 1972
   C. O. Pavese. *Tradizioni e generi poetici della grecia arcaica*. Filologia e critica, 12. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Pavese 1974
   _____. *Studi sulla tradizione epica rapsodica*. Filologia e critica, 13. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Pavese 1981
   "Poesia ellenica e cultura orale (Esiodo, gli 'Inni' e la tradizione orale)." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-30 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 231-59.

Peabody 1975
   B. Peabody. *The Winged Word: A Study in the Technique of Ancient Greek Oral Composition as Seen Principally through Hesiod's* Works and Days. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Pellizer 1978
   E. Pellizer. "Tecnica compositiva e struttura genealogica nell' Inno omerico ad Afrodite." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 27:115-44.

Pope 1963
   M. W. M. Pope. "The Parry-Lord Theory of Homeric Composition." *Acta Classica*, 6:1-21.

Porter 1949
   H. N. Porter. "Repetition in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite." *American Journal of Philology*, 70:249-72.

Postlethwaite 1979
   N. Postlethwaite. "Formula and Formulaic. Some Evidence from the Homeric Hymns." *Phoenix*, 33:1-18.

Postlethwaite 1981
   _____. "The Continuation of the *Odyssey*. Some Formulaic Evidence." *Classical Philology*, 76:177-87.

Preziosi 1966
   P. G. Preziosi. "The *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*: An Oral Analysis." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 71:171-204.

Richardson 1974
   N. J. Richardson. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosenmeyer 1965
   T. G. Rosenmeyer. "The Formula in Early Greek Poetry." *Arion*, 4:295-311.

Rossi 1981
   L. E. Rossi. "Gli oracoli come documento d'improvvisazione." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-30 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 203-30.

Schmitt 1967
   R. Schmitt. *Dichtung and Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Schmitt 1968
   _____. *Indogermanische Dichtersprache*. Wege der Forschung, 165. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Schröder 1975
   J. Schröder. *Ilias und Apollonhymnos*. Beiträge zur klassische Philologie,

59. Meisenheim: Hain.

Segal 1981

    C. Segal. "Orality, Repetition and Formulaic Artistry in the Homeric 'Hymn to Demeter'." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-30 settembre 1977*. Ed. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrlce Antenore. pp. 107-62.

Sellschopp 1934

    I. Sellschopp. *Stilistische Untersuchungen zu Hesiod*. Hamburg; rpt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.

Troxler 1964

    H. Troxler. *Sprache und Wortschatz Hesiods*. Zurich: Juris-Verlag.

Van Nortwick 1975

    T. Van Nortwick. "The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: A Study in Early Greek Hexameter Style." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 36:6073A.

Verdenius 1985

    W. J. Verdenius. *A Commentary on Hesiod, Works and Days 1-382*. Mnemosyne Supplement, 86. Leiden: Brill.

Vian 1959

    F. Vian. *Recherches sur les Posthomériques de Quinte de Smyrne*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Webster 1956

    T. B. L. Webster. "Early and Late in Homeric Diction." *Eranos*, 54:34-48.

Webster 1958

    _____. *From Mycenae to Homer*. London: Methuen.

West 1966

    M. L. West. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West 1978

    _____. *Hesiod: Works & Days*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West 1981

    _____. "Is the 'Works and Days' an Oral Poem?" In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-30 settermbre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 53-73.

West 1985

    _____. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Young 1959

    D. Young. "Miltonic Light on Professor Denys Page's Homeric Theory." *Greece & Rome*, 6:96-108.

§ 5: Enjambement

Enjambement, the continuation of a sentence from one verse to the next, is characteristic of Homer, but the nature of the running-over of the sense is more restricted than in literate writers, and attempts have been made to use this feature to differentiate oral from literate poetry. In Homer the framework of the sentence

is usually clear, with at least two of subject, verb, and object expressed before the enjambement occurs. This characteristic arises largely from the use of formulaic diction, and probably eases both the poet's composition and the listeners' comprehension.

Bassett 1926 examined the question whether an enjambing word standing at the beginning of the verse and followed by a pause or sentence-end—the "runover" position—carries special emphasis. He counted about 3,000 examples in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and examined in turn the finite verbs, infinitives, nouns, adjectives, participles, adverbs, and pronouns which occur in this position. He concluded that emphatic runover words owe their emphasis to other considerations than their position, but that they are important for their part in producing "*civilité*," the continuity of thought characteristic of Homeric verse. The idea is sound, though Bassett tended to play down too much the striking emphasis of some runover words, and his collection of material is still useful and could well form a basis for future research.

Parry 1929 divided enjambement into two types: "unperiodic," in which "the sentence, at the verse end, already gives a complete thought," and "necessary," in which "the verse end [falls] at the end of a word group where there is not yet a whole thought, or . . . in the middle of a word group" (203). On this principle he categorized samples of 100 verses each from six books of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, Apollonius' *Argonautica*, and Virgil's *Aeneid*, finding percentages of verses with no enjambement respectively 48.5%, 44.8%, 34.8%, and 38.3%; with "unperiodic" enjambement 24.8%, 26.6%, 16%, and 12.5%; and with "necessary" enjambement 26.6%, 28.5%, 49.1%, and 49.2%. The forms of "unperiodic" enjambement "more than anything else, give the rhythm in Homer its special movement from verse to verse" (207), and he attributes the difference in Apollonius and Virgil to their writing out their verses without haste, whereas Homer's traditional formulaic technique enabled him to put his spoken verse together rapidly and his need for speed in verse-making pushed him into the "adding" style of "unperiodic" enjambement. Parry goes on to discuss briefly how enjambement in Homer is related to the use of formulaic phrases, pointing out the rarity of enjambement between an adjective and its noun (unless the adjective can be understood as a substantive).

Lord 1948 compares enjambement in South Slavic heroic poems, and from an analysis of 2400 verses finds that 44.5% show

no enjambement, 40.6% show "unperiodic," and only 14.9% "necessary" enjambement. He compares the types of "necessary" enjambement in South Slavic poetry with the types found in Homer, finding the Homeric style has far more devices for continuing the thought over the end of the line, especially its use of participles and complementary infinitives and the possibility of beginning a new thought at the bucolic diaeresis and continuing it into the next line.

Both Kirk and I worked on enjambement in independent articles which appeared in the same year. Kirk 1966 analyzed all 867 verses of *Iliad* 16, and gives a table showing totals of features such as types of enjambement, stops and pauses at verse-end and at the main caesural positions, runover words, and sentences of four or more verses. He refines Parry's categories and terminology, using "progressive" for Parry's possibly misleading "unperiodic" enjambement and subdividing Parry's "necessary" category into three types: "periodic," in which (for example) a subordinate clause fills one verse and the main clause follows in the next; "integral," in which the sense overruns the verse-end and no kind of pause or punctuation is possible between the successive verses; and "violent" enjambement, when the verse-end separates a preposition or a preceding adjective or dependent genitive from its noun. These types are further modified in his discussion and tabulation, and he examines in particular the "cumulation" or addition of further phrases or clauses to a sentence already potentially complete. His figures for *Iliad* 16 show 332 non-enjambed lines (38.3%), 248 instances of "progressive" (28.6%), 106 of "periodic" (12.2%), 181 of "integral" (20.9%), the last including 3 cases of "violent" enjambement (0.35%).

My own study of the positioning of words and formulae in Homeric verse (Edwards 1966) makes a similar distinction between two types of "necessary" enjambement, and analyzes the grammatical structure of the instances in *Iliad* 1 and *Odyssey* 17. The kinds of "harsh" enjambement (Kirk's "violent" category) are also analyzed grammatically and reasons suggested for its occurrence in particular instances, with some comparisons between Homeric usage and that of Apollonius and Quintus of Smyrna. "Unperiodic" enjambement and the various kinds of runover word are also discussed, the results confirming Bassett's idea of its contribution to the smooth progression of the sense but showing that it may draw emphasis from its position in a way he did not

allow for. Other sections examine sentences which begin at the mid-verse caesura or bucolic diaeresis and enjamb into the following verse. It is suggested that a new sentence beginning at the bucolic diaeresis, where often a conventional formulaic word or phrase could have been used instead, shows special skill on the part of the poet. Glavičić 1970 studies the grammatical constructions of enjambing sentences in Homer, dividing them into eight groups and concluding with a brief account of three ways in which the thought is developed; his second article (1971) extends the same examination to Hesiod, finding that in the latter the constructions are smoother and more uniform, with less tension between meter and syntax.

Clayman and Van Nortwick 1977 challenged Parry's statistics on the grounds that his samples were not random, that he used only the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Argonautica*, and that he failed to test his results for statistical significance. They provide new figures for Parry's categories, based on a random sample of one-tenth of the verses of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, one-fifth of the *Argonautica*, and the whole text of the *Theogony, Works and Days,* and *Shield of Heracles*, the four long Homeric Hymns, Aratus' *Phaenomena*, Callimachus' *Hymns*, and Theocritus' *Idylls*. They find a higher proportion of "necessary" enjambement in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* than Parry did, and claim that Parry's stress on "unperiodic" enjambement as characteristically Homeric and the result of oral verse-making is false, as according to their own figures the difference is not statistically significant. Barnes 1979 shows that the differences between their figures and Parry's for lines with no enjambement result from a different definition, and provides more accurate figures (according to Parry's categories) for all the poems mentioned, based not on samples but on examination of the whole of the works (using E. Lyding's unpublished 1949 Bryn Mawr dissertation for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*). (For the poems not examined by Cantilena [see below] these figures are the most accurate available.) Many of the differences are statistically significant. They show a decrease in the proportion of lines with no enjambement in the later poems, and an increase in necessary enjambement; "unperiodic" enjambement is lower in the *Argonautica* than in Homer, but higher in Theocritus' *Idylls*, and so is an unreliable criterion for chronology or oral composition. Barnes suggests that the significantly higher percentage of verses without enjambement in the earlier poems is a result of the

presence of formulae, which are a product of the oral tradition, and so Parry's assertion of a correlation between enjambement characteristics and oral composition is correct.

G. P. Edwards (1971:93-100) gives detailed figures (using Parry's categories) for enjambement in each 100 lines of Hesiod's works, placing him firmly beside Homer. Peabody (1975:125-43) analyzes the syntactic structures in Hesiod, the linkage of sense across caesurae of the verse, and the use of enjambement, discussing particular cases in the *Works and Days* and comparing the structure of Sanskrit epic. His Appendix III, a structural listing of all verses in the *Works and Days*, includes indications of enjambement. In his edition of the *Hymn to Demeter*, Richardson (1974:331-33) discusses Parry's enjambement figures for Homer, G. P. Edwards' for Hesiod, and his own (in Parry's categories) for the longer Homeric Hymns; he notes that "violent" enjambement between adjective and noun occurs five times in the *Hymn to Demeter*, all the result of adaptation of formulae, and is very doubtful that this suggests a "literary" poet. Van Nortwick 1976 examines enjambement in the *Hymn to Hermes*.

Cantilena 1980 supersedes much of the previous work, and provides the best figures now available for the works he studies (*Iliad* 9, *Odyssey* 12, *Homeric Hymns*, *Batrachomyomachia*, and the *Hymns of Callimachus*). He prints his analysis of the enjambement in these poems line by line in an Appendix, following the system used by Kirk (with minor refinements). He explains the differences between his figures and Kirk's, e.g. in non-enjambing verses (Kirk 25.95%, Cantilena 36.53%), by the different nature of subject-matter and amount of dialogue in the books he uses and in the Patrocleia (used by Kirk). But "periodic" enjambement is about the same (12-13%). In only 7 of the 26 categories listed by Cantilena does Homer differ from Callimachus by 5% or more; in one of these the figures are too small to be significant, and in the other six, the *Homeric Hymns* agree closely with Homer, not with Callimachus. The percentage of lines without enjambement does not vary much in any of the poems studied (35-39%), except in the *Batrachomyomachia*, where it rises to 44%. Progressive enjambement is also fairly constant (Homer 31%, Callimachus 28.6%). Obviously no distinction between oral and written composition is possible on these grounds, and Cantilena well observes that Homer *seems* to use enjambement less because of his formulaic style: a sentence often begins (for example) *autar*

Achilleus. . . . and enjambs, but the familiarity makes the enjambement hardly noticeable. Cantilena finds "violent" enjambement in about 0.8% of Homeric verses and about 4.9% of those of Callimachus, and is afraid that the difference of 4 percentage points is small (p. 25); but his figures really mean that less than 1 verse in 100 in the Homeric poems shows such enjambement compared to nearly 5 verses in 100 in Callimachus, so the phenomenon occurs five times as often. In Homer and the *Homeric Hymns*, "violent" enjambement comes about through the dislocation or modification of formulae, and it is easy to show a close formulaic connection between the last word of the verse and the enjambing ones. But in Callimachus' *Hymns*, despite the pale echoes of formulae, the syntax is articulated very differently, in a way which Cantilena finds inconceivable in oral poetry: "Negli Inni di Callimaco enjambement violenti, *Spaltungen* ed iperbati di vario grado vanno spesso insieme, fino a combinazioni talmente complesse da riuscire inconcepibili per un poeta improvvisatore e incomprensibili ad un semplice ascoltatore" (pp. 31-32). The *Batrachomyomachia* (which announces itself as a written work) has significantly more non-enjambing lines than Homer, whereas Callimachus has less than Homer; only in "progressive" enjambement is the *Batrachomyomachia* significantly closer to Callimachus than to Homer, and Cantilena rightly thinks this confirms his view that enjambement is not enough to distinguish oral style from its imitation. It may be added that Barnes' figures show a wide difference between *Iliad* 3 (461 verses) and *Iliad* 19 (424 verses) in non-enjambing lines (55.9% to 41.4%) and in lines with "necessary" enjambement (19.6% to 32.3%), so it is only on the largest scale that differences in total figures have any real meaning. The rhapsode thinks "hexametrically," as Cantilena says, and only in unusual cases avails himself of the "violent" enjambement which is much more common in literate poets; but Homer's liking for a fresh start to a sentence or clause at the bucolic diaeresis must not be ignored.

References

Barnes 1979
>   H. R. Barnes. "Enjambement and Oral Composition." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 109:1-10.

Bassett 1926

        S. E. Bassett. "The So-called Emphatic Position of the Runover Word in the Homeric Hexameter." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 57:116-48.

Cantilena 1980

        M. Cantilena. *Enjambement e poesia esametrica orale: una verifica*. Quaderni del giornale filologico Ferrarese, 1. Ferrara: Tosi.

Clayman and Van Nortwick 1977

        D. L. Clayman and T. Van Nortwick. "Enjambement in Greek Hexameter Poetry." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 107:85-92.

G. P. Edwards 1971

        G. P. Edwards. *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context*. Oxford: Blackwell. Chapter VII.

M. W. Edwards 1966

        M. W. Edwards. "Some Features of Homeric Craftsmanship." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 97:115-79.

Glavičić 1970

        B. Glavičić. "Su alcune deviazioni dalla norma, 'Verso-Proposizione' in Omero." *Živa antika*, 20:15-53 (in Serbo-Croatian with Italian résumé).

Glavičić 1971

        _____. "La struttura del verso e della proposizione in Esiodo." *Živa antika*, 21:65-102 (in Serbo-Croatian with Italian résumé).

Kirk 1966

        G. S. Kirk. "Verse-structure and Sentence-structure in Homer." *Yale Classical Studies*, 20:105-52. Rpt. ("somewhat shortened and simplified") in *Homer and the Oral Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976. pp. 146-82.

Lord 1948

        A. B. Lord. "Homer and Huso III: Enjambement in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 79:113-24.

Parry 1929

        M. Parry. "The Distinctive Character of Enjambement in Homeric Verse." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 57:200-20. Rpt. in *The Making of Homeric Verse*. Ed. Adam Parry. Oxford: Clarendon. pp. 251-65.

Peabody 1975

        B. Peabody. *The Winged Word: A Study in the Technique of Ancient Greek Oral Composition as Seen Principally through Hesiod's* Works and Days. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Richardson 1974

        N. J. Richardson. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Nortwick 1976

        T. Van Nortwick. "The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: A Study in Early Greek Hexameter Style." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 36:6073A.

Stanford University

Notes