ORAL TRADITION

Festschrift for John Miles Foley

This page is intentionally left blank.

"Stricken to Silence": Authoritative Response, Homeric Irony, and the Peril of a Missed Language Cue[1]

Andrew E. Porter

The Formula

The formula[2] "Thus he spoke, but they in fact all were stricken to silence" (ὣς ἔφαθ᾽, οἳ δ᾽ ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ)[3] occurs sixteen times in Homer[4] and has received significant treatment in a number of recent studies focusing on its referential force. Its "connotative level of signification" (Kelly 2007:6) has been projected in part for the *Iliad,* and important themes and functions have been suggested. Silvia Montiglio (1993:175-78) has considered the formula's meaning within the *Iliad* both etymologically and more generally, and found that it suggests "une rupture anormale," "la déchirure" of the normal communication process. John Miles Foley has linked the formula in the *Iliad* with the speech that precedes it, since "each initial speech proposes or reports a radical, usually unexpected action" (1995:13) that promises either the winning or losing of *kleos*. Foley's research further demonstrates that the

---

[1] I wish to thank my anonymous external reviewers along with Casey Dué, Scott Garner, David Mulroy, and Kevin Muse for their remarks on earlier drafts of this article.

[2] I employ the term formula to speak of recurring words or traditional idioms, in an exactly equivalent metrical arrangement, allowing for a change in verbal number or substantive case (or even of other, lesser component parts). I also speak of formulaic phrases, lines, or systems, as patterns of words with one or more important parts repeated as component(s), but with a varying amount of replacement of parts within the system. It is agreed generally that a formula must recur at least once to be considered as such (cf. Hainsworth 1968:42, Finkelberg 1986:1, Olson 1995:224-27), but the strongest conclusions can be drawn from formulae, such as "stricken to silence," that recur a great many times. Kelly (2007:10) works with a minimum of three in his referential commentary on Book 8 of the *Iliad*. William Merritt Sale (1993:101) calls a formula repeating fewer than six times an "infrequent formula." My definition is not meant, however, to deny the existence of formula flexibility of the type noted by J. B. Hainsworth (1968).

[3] All translations throughout are my own, and are meant, in as much as is reasonable, to match the traditional cola of the Homeric line. The chief resource for cola research was the TLG database (http://www.tlg.uci.edu). Quotations follow the texts of M. L. West (1998, 2000) and Peter Von der Mühll (1962), without the formatting practice of indentation, that, although welcome as a break for the reading eye, sometimes (like book divisions) obscures the formulaic junctures of the text. (For example, compare *Il*. 7.403-5 with 9.693-95.)

[4] *Il*. 3.95, 7.92, 7.398, 8.28, 9.29, 9.430, 9.693, 10.218, 10.313, 23.676; *Od*. 7.154, 8.234, 11.333, 13.1, 16.393, 20.320. Foley (1995:25) considers two related silence phrases that fill other cola. I employ "Homer" (or "Homeric") throughout to stand for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as texts or for the preliterate oral poet (or *aoidos*, "epic singer") who sang each one. I will say more about my assumptions of a "poet" in due course.

formula leads, immediately or inevitably, to the "qualification if not dismissal of the proposed or reported action" (15) that precedes the silence formula. Raymond Person (1995) uses conversation analysis to suggest that the formula marks that a speaker will follow with a "dispreferred response," essentially a response that is delayed and mitigated. Adrian Kelly's study (2007:85-86) of the formula in the *Iliad* highlights the relationship between the speech that immediately precedes the formula and the speech that ensues, in terms of agreement or disagreement.[5]

The formula's employment in the *Odyssey* has been less easy to demarcate.[6] The present study will suggest a reading that spans both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. I will argue that the real heart of the formula is in what it cues in the action of the narrative that follows for the external audience attending the poetic rendition. It points to the immediately ensuing speech as authoritative in setting the subsequent narrative trajectory. In the two exceptions, where the formula's cue is not followed in the narrative that ensues, I will argue that the poet is being ironic. The poet uses metonymic irony of narrative perspective to heighten tension and create suspense in especially central narrative moments. Our consideration of the "stricken to silence" formula begins, after a review of traditional referentiality, with a consideration of its fourteen regular occurrences, followed by the two instances of its ironic employment, one in each epic.

Traditional Referentiality, Metonymy, and Text

As John Miles Foley has shown, Homeric formulae contain meaning that extends well beyond their simple function as metrically convenient integers.[7] Meaning is found not primarily in the individual contextual setting of a singular instance of a formula, but through interpreting the instance in connection with its repeated usage elsewhere in the tradition, with formulae being the product of generations of performance. In short, formulae are traditional, and when used, must be read by "reference" to their use within the tradition, a process of metonymy, whereby the "part stands for the whole" (Foley 1991:7).[8] The audience informed by the tradition can in turn comprehend the meaning of specific metonyms in the text, because they share a body of

---

[5] Kelly's focus is thus on the preceding speech rather than on the significance of the ensuing speech for the subsequent narrative direction, the central point to be addressed in the current essay.

[6] As Foley (1995:20-24) has noted, the qualification theme (cf. Person's 1995 general category of a "dispreferred response") is consistently present in the *Odyssey*, along with the *kleos* theme in some, but not all, cases.

[7] See, for example, Foley 1999, where he demonstrates how traditional lexica, proverbial rules, and a sample test case from *Odyssey* 23 show traditional referentiality in action. Foley (2004) has also successfully applied his own methodology in detail to South Slavic epic. A significant application of Foley's strategies for referential readings of Homer in particular has been carried out by Kelly (2007), who has created an impressive lexicon of formulaic diction for *Iliad* 8. See Foley 1991:1-37 and 1995:7 for other and earlier pioneers in this field. See Elmer 2011 for an excellent summary of the present state of the oral-formulaic theory. The impetus for the present study derives from consideration of the formula in light of Foley's research methodologies.

[8] A detailed linguistic study of metonymy can be found in various articles in Barcelona et al. 2011. See especially its included article by Carita Paradis on the change in semantic field for a metonym.

knowledge that is their cultural inheritance (45). As David Elmer summarizes the phenomenon (2011:605):

> Phrases and formulae function more as metonymic than as purely denotative signifiers, allowing the performer to evoke traditional resonances that far exceed the semantic value of his or her [individual] words.

The foregoing description assumes an audience informed by a tradition of performance shared by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The research of Richard Janko[9] supports the impression (for example, Hainsworth 1968:42-43, n.1) that both epics likely represent a common song tradition (that they were sung by exactly the same *aoidos* ["epic singer"] is perhaps less likely[10]) and that other early Greek hexameter traditions were memorialized in writing only later. The question of how common the tradition represented by the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is usually becomes acute for the researcher whenever there seems to be a difference in the use of a particular formula between the two epics.[11] In the end, while the question is important, it cannot be wholly answered *a priori*. In part, the answer will always be related to whether or not we can read a common tradition underlying both epics in vocabulary, formulae, themes, type scenes, and other story elements (similes, characterization, and the like), no matter what the absolute dating is for the written memorialization of each. It is possible that the two epics' unique and often contrasting narrative concerns (Whitman 1958:293, Steiner 2010:1-3) and slightly different temporal origins will necessarily generate similarities *and differences*. Study of formulae will shed light on the relationship between these two epics and help us to comprehend their shared, but also dissimilar lexica.[12] What can be said in the affirmative is that the present study finds a common meaning in both epics for the formula "Thus he spoke, but they in fact all were stricken to silence" (ὣς ἔφαθ᾽, οἳ δ᾽ ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ) in fourteen of its sixteen occurrences.[13]

---

[9] The changes in epic diction over time are mapped by Janko (1982:47), and his overall findings support the close dates of composition for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The neglect of the initial digamma, for example, is put at 17.2% for the *Iliad* and 17.9 % for the *Odyssey*, but at 33.7% for the *Theogony* and 37.9% for the *Works and Days*. The *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* sits, unsurprisingly (considering the other indications of its lateness), at 56%. Janko's seminal study is concerned with relative, rather than absolute dating. See also the earlier comments of Hainsworth (1968:42-43, n.1). The date of memorialization in writing is of course a different question than the relative ages of the origins of the stories themselves, an important point to remember, since the Cyclic Epic stories may be earlier than the stories contained in Homer's epics (See Burgess 2006:150 and 2001).

[10] West (2011:364), in his review of the "Homeric Question," notes that most scholars "would now accept that the *Odyssey* is by a different poet from the *Iliad*," but we have no way of knowing for sure and this is far from a consensus view. Milman Parry's (1933-35, in A. Parry 1971:444-45) original pondering over the question is still of value.

[11] The problem of finding a common meaning for formulae within either epic is further complicated by possible interpolations of verses or even books. The disputed *Doloneia, Iliad* 10, contains two instances of our formula's use.

[12] Richard Martin's working principle of providing a grammar for each epic, followed by one for the two together, accords well with the approach taken here (1989:14, following G. M. Bolling 1946:343).

[13] The two anomalous instances of the formula, at *Il*. 9.430 and *Od*. 20.320, will be considered afterwards.

Authoritative Response: Fourteen Narrative Moments in Homer

In each of the following fourteen narrative moments from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, we will see that the formula "Thus he spoke, but they in fact all were stricken to silence" (ὣς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ) follows an initial speech and leads to a speech response that acts as the authoritative answer to what has just been said.[14] It thus acts as the hinge from what went before, but more significantly, functions as a metonymic harbinger or traditional narrative cue for the external audience of an ensuing pattern of response. The pattern includes support by the group, who accept the reply as authoritative and representative of its own perspective. The intent of the speech is carried out in every case, and the poet's[15] narrative continues forward along the trajectory that the narrative cue has set. The poet knows where he is taking the narrative moment when he employs this formula, and his audience, informed by the traditional cue, also expects what will transpire.

What occurs immediately after the formula displays a discernible pattern that has the following, basic structure:

Initial Speech (I)—Formula (F)—Authoritative Response (AR)—Group Acceptance (GA)

The foregoing pattern can regularly include certain additional strategic elements, most notably a note of extended delay (D)[16] and a speech (or speeches) that confirms (C) the intent and also sometimes partly modifies (M) the directive of the authoritative response following the silence formula, so that the larger possible pattern would be:

I—F—D—AR—C—M—GA

We turn now to consider this pattern for each of our key formula's fourteen occurrences, first in the *Iliad*, then in the *Odyssey*.

1) The "stricken to silence" formula is first employed by Homer at *Iliad* 3.95, after which Menelaus steps forward to offer the authoritative response (3.97-110). Hector has just spoken in the space between the Trojans and Achaeans, after Paris reluctantly agreed to fight in a

---

[14] Deborah Beck (2005) reminds us that most speeches in Homer are not solitary monologues, but part of a conversation, something true of all but one of our formula's contexts.

[15] By "poet" I mean to suggest intentionality in the placement of the "stricken to silence" formula, something that moves beyond tradition alone, to the poetic performance and performer working within the tradition, cuing his audience as to what lies ahead. I use "poet" to refer to an unknown, preliterate *aoidos* (Greek epic singer), responsible for shaping each epic song as his own. As with the more competent of the *guslari* (South Slavic epic poets), such as Salih Ugljanin, Stanko Pižurica, or Avdo Medjedović (see the CD-ROM of archival material in the updated edition of Lord 1960/2000), I assume that the *aoidos* or *aoidoi* (Greek epic singers) who gave us the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were of exceptional abilities. Having said this, I do not deny that we cannot know exactly what the original, dictated (M. Parry 1933-35 in A. Parry 1971:451, Janko 1990, Powell 1997, Haslam 1997:80-84) texts looked like (cf. Foley's [1990:5-8] "oral-derived"); nor did the performance tradition suddenly stop with these memorializations, but continued to live on.

[16] The very use of the "stricken to silence" formula, as Montiglio (1993) has suggested, itself creates a delay.

representative duel with Menelaus for possession of Helen herself. The aggrieved husband of Helen takes up the challenge, and the Achaeans, "hoping to cease from miserable war" (3.112), react with joyful acceptance of his response. The acceptance is understandable, especially since the envisioned outcome would be an immediate end to the conflict through treaty (3.92-94). The shorter pattern I—F—AR—GA is all that the poet deems necessary. Here we find no extra delay or further speech confirming or modifying the authoritative reply toward which the formula points.

2) Our formula next shows up at *Iliad* 7.92, a verse whose placement follows the narration of Apollo's plan to turn the tide of battle in favor of the Trojans by stirring up Hector to engage in a duel with an unnamed Achaean (7.38-42). The Olympian plan is transmitted by divine means to the warrior-prophet Helenus who advises Hector privately. Hector addresses the Trojans and Achaeans. While the speech, which includes a challenge to any Achaean to meet him in a duel, bears a great affinity with the duel of *Iliad* 3 (example 1 above), it is not, as before, meant to bring peace or an end to the war, nor is Helen up for grabs. For each Achaean whom Hector addresses, it is rather a question of killing Hector and gaining his armor or being killed, dying as a "valorous fighter" (7.73, ἀριστῆες) and obtaining lasting "fame" (κλέος, 7.91). There is an added formulaic note of delay ("yet after a delay" [ὀψὲ δὲ δή], 7.94)[17] following the initial speech and key formula (7.93-95):

αἴδεσθεν μὲν ἀνήνασθαι, δεῖσαν δ᾽ ὑποδέχθαι·
ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ Μενέλαος ἀνίστατο καὶ μετέειπεν·
νείκει ὀνειδίζων, μέγα δὲ στοναχίζετο θυμῷ·

While ashamed to refuse him, they were afraid to take up the challenge;
yet after a delay, Menelaus stood forth and spoke;
scolding them with a reproach, he groaned deeply in his spirit.

After the extended delay, Menelaus' authoritative response comes in the form of a *neikos* ("reproach") speech, and, like other comparable speeches in the *Iliad*, has as its direct intent the shaming of the fearful and hesitating troops into action.[18] The first five lines of the speech are purposely scornful and hyperbolic (7.96-100):

---

[17] This line-initial formula ending at the A2 position and employed twelve times in Homer is regularly part of larger formulae, including "yet after a delay, he spoke" (ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε), used seven times in Homer: *Il.* 7.399, 8.30, 9.31, 9.432, 9.696; *Od.* 7.155, 20.321 (with an additional variant form at *Il.* 7.94). As Kelly (2007:87) observes for the *Iliad* (but I note the same to be true for the *Odyssey*), this formula is often associated with our key formula when it is deployed by the poet and usually indexes "a speech which qualifies or rejects" the prior speech. On the colometry of the epic hexameter line, see Fränkel 1955:104, Nagy 1974, Peabody 1975:66-70, Edwards 1986:4-54, Foley 1990:80-82, Sale 1993, Nagy 2000, and Garner 2011:3-17. Within the current essay, I follow Berkley Peabody's schematization:

$$—\cup\cup|—|\cup\cup—|\cup|\cup—|\cup\cup|—\cup\cup—\underline{\cup}$$
$$\quad A^1 \ A^2 \qquad B^1 \ B^2 \qquad C^1 \quad C^2$$

[18] James Morrison (1992:132, n.18) notes that exhortation to battle can include "advice, criticism, or warning" (cf. *Il.* 2.381-93, 4.223-421, 19.408-17); cf. Schadewaldt 1938:29-40. Louise Pratt (1993:122) and Jonathan Ready (2011:54) both conclude that a proper *neikos* is directed at the "blameworthy," not "the praiseworthy."

ὤι μοι ἀπειλητῆρες, Ἀχαιΐδες, οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοί·
ἦ μὲν δὴ λώβη τάδε γ' ἔσσεται αἰνόθεν αἰνῶς,
εἰ μή τις Δαναῶν νῦν Ἕκτορος ἀντίος εἶσιν.
ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν πάντες ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε
ἥμενοι αὖθι ἕκαστοι ἀκήριοι, ἀκλέες αὔτως. . . .

Ah me! Braggarts! Women and no longer men!
To be sure your response will be shameful, dreadfully dreadful,
unless now, some one of the Danaans faces Hector.
No, but may you all turn to water and dirt
sitting there, each of you, thus inanimate and bereft of glory.

Menelaus concludes his berating response by saying that he himself will don armor and fight, and after his speech, he begins to do just what he has said. Yet, unlike in Book 3, where Menelaus faced the man who had stolen his wife, he now has no intensely personal stake in who enters the engagement. There will follow not only a confirmation of his call to action, but also a modification: his brother Agamemnon will urge him to allow another to fight: "No, now you sit down among the company of your companions / and the Achaeans will raise up another champion to contend with this man" (ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν ἵζε' ἰὼν μετὰ ἔθνος ἑταίρων, τούτῳ δὲ πρόμον ἄλλον ἀναστήσουσιν Ἀχαιοί. [*Il.* 7.115-16]).

Menelaus' speech is followed not only by the confirming speech (with modification) of Agamemnon but also by a further supportive (*neikos*) speech by Nestor (7.124-60). Now the nine foremost Achaean champions stand to answer the call to battle. Even though the Greater Ajax will win the glorious right to engage Hector, group assent is everywhere evident when all the foremost heroes' lots are shaken together in Agamemnon's helmet (7.175-83). This second instance of the "stricken to silence" formula consequently provides an example of the longer pattern I—F—D—AR—C—M—GA.

3) The "stricken to silence" formula next appears at *Iliad* 7.398. Idaeus, Priam's messenger, has just spoken to the Achaeans by their ships. His message was an offer of partial indemnity, that Paris would give back everything (except Helen!) carried off by him from Sparta, along with added goods. Idaeus also requested a temporary truce for the burning of corpses. Our key formula follows, made more emphatic with an extended silence (7.399; cf. 7.94), after which Diomedes gives the authoritative response denying Paris' partial offer of indemnity. Complete group assent is immediately indicated (7.403-04):

ὣς ἔφαθ'· οἳ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπίαχον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν,
μῦθον ἀγασσάμενοι Διομήδεος ἱπποδάμοιο·

Thus he spoke, and all the all the sons of the Achaeans shouted in assent,
marveling at the authoritative word of Diomedes tamer of horses;

Diomedes has remained appropriately silent concerning the request for a truce, something not his to grant. Agamemnon's ensuing speech acts to confirm the response of all the Achaeans, which is in reality the authoritative response of Diomedes (see μῦθον in 404 and 406),[19] but further, to consent to the appeal for time to burn the corpses.

4) *Iliad* 8.28 brings the sole example of the "stricken to silence" formula played out in the narrative of the divine assembly. Zeus orders the gods off of the battlefield for the moment, to keep them away from the sort of involvement that the external audience knows is constantly part of their activity in the poet's narrative.[20] The move is essential, since the poet knows from his comprehension of this traditional tale that the Achaeans are to be pinned against their ships in desperate need of the stubborn-hearted Achilles (something the poet will present in his rendition of the story in Books 9 to 17). The traditional story line is clearly present in the poet's mind and shaping his narrative. He keeps the gods out of the war, since they might shield the Achaeans from their immediate, albeit temporary, "ruin" (οἶτος).[21]

Zeus' speech includes a threat and is followed by our key formula. An extended delay ensues (8.29-30). The subsequent authoritative response comes appropriately from Zeus' favorite child, Athena, who speaks for the other gods. Her reply is unsurprisingly accepting of Zeus' will: "But of course we shall keep away from the war" (ἀλλ' ἤτοι πολέμου μὲν ἀφεξόμεθ', 8.35). She says that she and the other gods will only offer helpful counsel (8.36).[22] While the narrative that ensues shows that the group assents to Athena's speech (which god would openly disobey Zeus?), the text does not include the usual retort of the crowd normally found after the authoritative response. Yet, for the moment, and as the ensuing narrative clearly indicates, Athena's word is authoritative for the group in what follows: the Achaeans suffer in the immediate aftermath of Zeus' decision and no god intervenes as one hero after another leaves the battlefield. Zeus has begun to put his plan into action, and without the gods: "there, wailing and victory shouts were heard from men / both from those killing and from those being killed" (ἔνθα δ' ἅμ' οἰμωγή τε καὶ εὐχωλὴ πέλεν ἀνδρῶν / ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων, 8.64-65).

5) Agamemnon, whose incompetent hegemony is part of the poet's comprehension of his character, provides us with the fifth example of an initial speech leading to the poet's use of the "stricken to silence" formula at *Iliad* 9.29. Agamemnon, true to his ambiguous leadership ability, opines that Zeus has apparently devised for him an "evil deception" (9.21). He advises the Achaeans crowded against the ships and awaiting the Trojan onslaught at dawn, to flee (9.26-28).[23] It is a chaotic moment. Would they actually leave on their ships at night? Would they

---

[19] The poet's use of μῦθος further confirms the group's acceptance of Diomedes' speech as the authoritative reply. In Martin's scheme (1989:22), the *muth-* root here indicates an authoritative command.

[20] Most notable in this regard in the *Iliad* are the actions of Aphrodite, Ares, and Athena in Diomedes' *aristeia* in Book 5.

[21] This impending ruin will reach its apex in the death of Patroclus (Book 16), leading to Achilleus' grief-driven and vengeful return to battle (Book 20).

[22] Here as elsewhere we see that even clear agreement with the speech preceding the "stricken to silence" formula is mitigated somewhat in the speech following it, as Foley (1995:11; cf. Person 1995) has shown.

[23] As James McGlew has noted (1989:288-89; so also Hainsworth 1993:62), we cannot take *Il*. 9.9-78 as equivalent to the problematic scene in *Il*. 2.16-440. The exhortation to depart seems quite real.

wait until the morning? Nobody asked, since all were unable to speak. The extent of the silence is evident from the length of the description, three full lines in all, including the hemistich "yet after a delay spoke" (ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε, 9.31) that will mark the response as disagreeing with Agamemnon's suggestion (9.29-31):[24]

> ὣς ἔφαθ᾽, οἳ δ᾽ ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ,
> δὴν δ᾽ ἄνεω ἦσαν τετιηότες υἷες Ἀχαιῶν.
> ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης·

> Thus he spoke, but they in fact all were stricken to silence.
> For a long time they were speechless; the sons of the Achaeans were grieved,
> yet after a delay spoke Diomedes of the great war cry.

The authoritative response of Diomedes that ensues upbraids Agamemnon. Even though Agamemnon is displaying a decided lack of "courage" (ἀλκήν, 9.34)—Diomedes resolutely declares that the son of Atreus can leave—the rest of the Achaeans intend to stay and fight without him until Troy falls (9.42-46). A traditional affirmation by the group (9.50-51) sums up the common assent, the very one we saw used in the group response following the formula in *Iliad* 7.398. Nestor, the sagacious counselor,[25] adds a confirming speech to the rather impetuous tone of Diomedes' authoritative response. He proposes a feast to enliven the spirits of the men, while reminding Agamemnon of his duty to take charge (9.68-69). While Nestor's speech does not modify the essence of what Diomedes says, it does mitigate the intensity of the moment. By advising Agamemnon to take charge, he is telling him, like Diomedes, that he and the others must stay. By suggesting a feast, he creates a conciliatory environment, an expectable outcome for the "clear-voiced speaker of the Pylians,"[26] whose central task it is "to foster and preserve the solidarity of the community" (Roisman 2005:36).

6) At *Iliad* 9.693, our formula follows the embassy's unsuccessful attempt to mitigate Achilles' wrath with appropriate recompense from Agamemnon who has erred. Agamemnon has queried the reaction of Achilles to his attempted reparations, and Odysseus' reply is the initiatory speech before the "stricken to silence" formula is employed. Odysseus addresses Agamemnon, rehearsing Achilles' gravely disappointing answer that he remains angry and refuses the gifts. Odysseus advises that the foremost warrior cannot be forced to rejoin the Achaeans. The news is horrible and the reality of the Achaean situation is embodied in the following silence. The

---

[24] Compare example 2 and note 17 above.

[25] On Nestor's wisdom opposed to rash action, see *Il.* 1.254-84; as a contrast to panic, see *Od.* 24.54. Homer's extended description at *Iliad* 4.294-310 (cf. *Il.* 2.360-68) draws the listeners' attention to the sagacious and balanced preparation that informs Nestor's leadership style. Note Hanna Roisman's remarks (2005:36), mediating between the poet's high regard for Nestor and modern scholars' legitimate reservations about his military ability (Kirk 1985:360-61, Postlethwaite 2000:82), that Nestor's sagaciousness and balance are found in his sustaining the values of the community, not in the actual tactics he employs (18).

[26] λιγὺν Πυλίων ἀγορητήν. λιγύν in this formulaic phrase includes, as Roisman (2005:24, n.23) notes, the sense of pleasantness, both "of sound and resonance of voice." Nestor is first described by this epithet at *Iliad* 4.293, and, although not used here, the epithet would have no doubt been in the audience's mind.

"stricken to silence" formula is present, followed by the greatest number of silence-related formulae seen so far, all of which we have encountered already (see 7.403-4, 9.30-31), but never concurrently in one locus (9.693-96):

> ὣς ἔφαθ᾽, οἱ δ᾽ ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ
> {μῦθον ἀγασσάμενοι· μάλα γὰρ κρατερῶς ἀγόρευσεν}·[27]
> δὴν δ᾽ ἄνεω ἦσαν τετιηότες υἷες Ἀχαιῶν.
> ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης·

> Thus he spoke, but they in fact all were stricken to silence,
> marveling at the authoritative word, for he had spoken very strongly.
> For a long time they were speechless; the sons of the Achaeans were grieved,
> yet after a delay spoke Diomedes of the great war cry.

This is clearly a desperately hopeless moment in the narrative, and the poet has chosen to emphasize it as such by adjoining four full formulaic lines of emphatic pathos before we hear the authoritative response from the group's representative, Diomedes. Diomedes is less congenial than the messenger Odysseus. He first reprimands Agamemnon for his attempt at supplicating Achilles, then further advises that they "leave him alone" (9.701). What the troops need now, so Diomedes makes clear, is sleep! Agamemnon should then lead them at the break of dawn (9.705-09). All are said to "approve" (9.710), "marveling at the authoritative word of Diomedes tamer of horses" (711). Each is said to have left for his shelter and slumber (9.712-13).

7) While the men do as advised by Diomedes, some cannot sleep, at least according to the narrative in Book 10, where we find the next two recurrences of our formula. The difficulty with assessing the two instances of the formula's use is of course the thorny question of whether or not Book 10 has belonged to the *Iliad* from the time of its first inscription, or whether it was added later from another epic performance.[28] Book 10, whose place in the *Iliad* is questioned in the scholia,[29] has been regarded as pedantic and odd at times, and yet there are traditions contained in Book 10 that are clearly very old, such as the Rhesos story (*Il.* 10.435, on which see Fenik 1964). The root of the book's peculiarities, in fact, may lie in the nature of its controlling "ambush" theme as Casey Dué and Mary Ebbott propose (2010; cf. Dué 2010). If their argument is correct, then the book's conventions and idioms only appear peculiar when read without

---

[27] Although this line is bracketed in West's edition and disliked by the Alexandrians, I see no good reason to consider it un-Homeric. Rather, the Alexandrians' view suggests a failure "to take account of the habits of formular composition" (Hainsworth 1993:149; cf. Willcock 1978:284).

[28] See Dué and Ebbott (2010:3-29) for a comprehensive overview of approaches to the *Doloneia*.

[29] The writer of the T scholia (Ersbe 1969-88, vol. 3:0b; cf. Eust. 785.41-45 [van der Valk 1971:2] and Cic. *De Orat* 3.34, 137) reports its tradition as saying that "the lay . . . was not part of the [original] *Iliad*, but was added to the work by Pisistratus" (τὴν ῥαψῳδίαν . . . μὴ εἶναι μέρος τῆς Ἰλιάδος, ὑπὸ δὲ Πεισιστράτου τετάχθαι εἰς ποίησιν).

awareness of this theme.[30] As we will note, the regular pattern and implications of the formula "Thus he spoke, but they in fact all were stricken to silence" (ὣς ἔφαθ᾽, οἱ δ᾽ ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ) are in fact very much present in Book 10.[31]

The "stricken to silence" formula is found first at *Iliad* 10.218 and comes after a nighttime assembly that immediately follows a speech by Nestor. He asks for a volunteer to go on a night foray to reconnoiter Trojan deliberations (10.204-17). Promise is made of fame (*kleos*) and gifts to the man who returns with intelligence. No extended delay occurs before the authoritative response of Diomedes, who takes up Nestor's challenge. In his speech, Diomedes says he will go, but that it would instill "more comfort and courage" (10.223) and prove more thoughtful for two to undertake the excursion together. No regular assent formula is noted in the singular ensuing line (10.227) before the poet offers us the catalogue of heroes that wish to volunteer. The overwhelming response of the seven leading warriors, however, makes the point that Diomedes' reply is the will of the group. Agamemnon offers a confirming speech (10.234-39), but he adds a caveat as a light modifier, that the Achaean most capable in ability, rather than most prominent in social standing, be selected as a partner (10.237-39). Odysseus is chosen, and he adds his own short speech (10.249-53) that the mission be hastened before daybreak.

8) At *Iliad* 10.313, we find the key formula employed in the Trojan camp. Hector can sleep no better than Agamemnon! An assembly is called, and Hector, like Agamemnon, requests a volunteer for a reconnaissance mission to learn if their adversaries are keeping guard or planning flight.[32] The reward for the potential volunteer is then identified: the best horses and chariot of the Achaeans (10.305-06). Again, as with the first passage within the *Doloneia*, there follows the "stricken to silence" formula with no extended delay. There are, however, four lines of negative character description (10.314-17) before the introduction to Dolon's speech (10.318) that will act as the authoritative reply to Hector. The poet may wish here, through his inclusion of a biographical sketch, to enhance this narrative moment. Like digressions, which effectively "put time in slow motion" (Austin 1966:158), and like type scenes, where "Homer expands, curtails, and otherwise refashions the details . . . to fit each situation" (Reece 1993:87), these tailored lines of characterization slow down narrative time and tighten the narrative focus for the audience.

Dolon's reply is ominous, since he agrees to undertake a reconnaissance mission straight to Agamemnon's ship, but nevertheless desirously and acquisitively insists on obtaining the chariot and team of "the son of Peleus."[33] The poet and audience may surmise that the prize is to be Achilles' immortal team of Xanthus and Balius, yet Dolon's actual naming of the hero portends his own disaster. (Who goes up against Achilles and expects to come out unscathed?)

---

[30] Such has been the case for Analysts (for example, Ranke 1881) from early on, but also for more contemporary scholars who assume an oral background for the book, such as Georg Danek (1988).

[31] Additionally, a shared pattern associated with our key formula here and in *Iliad* 23 is considered below within the discussion of the later passage.

[32] Hector then acts for the poet as Agamemnon's character doublet. On doublets, see Fenik 1974:172-207.

[33] See Foley 1999:204-21 on the metonymic nature of noun-epithet formulae in Homer. On the history of the epithet generally, see Reece 2011.

Dolon even makes Hector swear on his scepter that he will do what he requests, a clear example of the folktale theme of a "hasty oath" that usually ends in disaster.[34]

We are not given the usual formulaic assent by the group, but we may be meant to hear the fearful assent of the crowd in their silence. There are no detractors in the group, but a short confirmation speech given by Hector acts to endorse Dolon's doltish offer (10.329-31). Dolon's inherent thoughtlessness is seen, not just in his hasty wish, but also in the poet's intended contrast with Diomedes, his greater doublet who saw safety through acting in concert with another. Hector swears what the poet calls a "perjuring" (ἐπίορκος, 10.332) oath, here of an unintentional lie, promising what Dolon will never be able to acquire, Achilles' steeds. Hector is unaware of the poet-narrator's judgment on his oath making. How can Hector know what Fate has in store for his doomed respondent? Dolon is sent off on his perilous mission, alone.

9) The last instance of the "stricken to silence" formula in the *Iliad* occurs in 23.676, during the funeral games for Patroclus. Epeius addresses his fellow Achaeans and challenges them to a boxing match. He defies any man to fight him for a prize, threatening to obliterate his opponent in the match. He even claims that his opponent's friends will have to carry him away (23.673-75)! The ensuing formula leads to a response only in action, which does not otherwise occur in the passages under consideration. The representative reply comes in the form of Euryalus "alone" (23.677) taking up the challenge. The poet makes it clear that his was the authoritative response of the group; others are reticent to respond. As in the case of the night raid of Book 10, fear must be understood to mitigate their excitement. Another feature common with the second narrative moment in the *Doloneia* (10.314-17) is a four-line biography following the response in action (23.677-80). Euryalus loses, however, despite his fine pedigree.

10) *Odyssey* 7.154 is the first occurrence of our formula in that epic. Odysseus has washed up on the island of Phaeacia, met Nausicaa the princess daughter of the reigning royals, and been instructed to supplicate her parents by directly addressing her mother Arete (6.310-15), which he does. Odysseus' entreaty (7.146-52) includes a reference to his hardships, a wish for his patrons' prosperity, and a request that conveyance home be provided.

A note by the poet just before our key formula pictures Odysseus retiring to the ashes (7.153-55):

> ὣς εἰπὼν κατ' ἄρ' ἕζετ' ἐπ' ἐσχάρῃ ἐν κονίῃσι
> πὰρ πυρί· οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ.
> ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε γέρων ἥρως Ἐχένηος.

> Thus speaking, he sat down in the hearth in the ashes
> by the fire, but they all were stricken to silence.
> Yet after a delay, spoke the aged hero Echeneus.

The poet has expanded the moment of silence just before our formula in line 154. He has replaced the first colon (extending to A1) consisting of the familiar "thus he spoke" (ὣς ἔφαθ') with a whole line (153) utilizing an initial participial construction, "thus speaking" (ὣς εἰπών),

---

and followed by the enjambed phrase "by the fire" (πὰρ πυρί; cf. Foley 1995:9) in line 154. The initial participle acts to replace the first part of the formula, something not at all surprising considering the less traditionally stable and more ambiguous nature of the first colon.[35] The whole line and a quarter acts to support the key formula, which is itself followed by the traditional note of delay ("yet after a delay," ὀψὲ δὲ δή, 7.155) that we have often seen previously.

Echeneus' authoritative response (7.159-66) on behalf of those present seeks to urge Alcinous to act as the community's leader: to raise the stranger from the dust, to show him hospitality, to pour libations, and to respect Odysseus as a suppliant. In the narrative, the assent of those present is indicated first by the poet's description of the carrying out of Echeneus' advisement, including a meal and libations (7.168-84).[36] Alcinous displaces his favorite son Laodamas to give his chair to their guest, the servants set up the feast, and Odysseus eats. Following the meal, Alcinous orders libations poured before he makes a speech promising the requested conveyance home (7.191-96). Alcinous does all that Echeneus advises in his speech, which gains the approval of the crowd (7.226-27). The poet, however, waits to note the crowd's approval until after proper hospitality has actually been offered and the king has himself made known his acceptance of Echeneus' admonition.

11) At *Odyssey* 8.234, the "stricken to silence" formula follows the pugnacious yet graceful reply of Odysseus to the rude testing from his youthful hosts Laodamas and Euryalus, who question the veracity of his intentions and insult his honor (*Od*. 8.213). Odysseus defiantly offers to best any comer except his host in athletic competition in any area save running (8.202-33). Odysseus' defensive response suggests that he is no scurrilous imposter, but rather the heroic Achaean described in his references to retrospective heroic events.[37]

Odysseus' reply is followed by our formula without any added note of delay. The poet next informs us that Alcinous "alone" answers (8.235). To him then belongs the authoritative response. Alcinous is conciliatory in what he says. After mitigating remarks about the unrepresentative nature of the senseless youth who misspoke, he instead recommends that Odysseus see where the Phaeacians really excel, in areas not referenced by Odysseus in his counter-challenge: acrobatics, seafaring, feasting, the lyre, dancing, changes of clothes, hot baths, and beds (8.246-49). Odysseus has already experienced feasting, and now the *aoidos* Demodocus is called forward to sing an amusing story in an effort to lighten the tense mood (8.236-55). Alcinous also intends that activities such as dancing and acrobatics should follow, along with the offering of gifts to atone for the earlier slight. Even the impetuous Euryalus makes amends (8.401-11). There is no formulaic assent, yet assent is portrayed and assumed: the

---

[35] It is this least stable colon's variability that has led to a lack of agreement over the actual positioning and existence of the A1 and A2 breaks. (See Edwards 1986:177-85 and Foley 1990:72-84 for a sketch of the possibilities.) This and the other formulaic variation bring to mind Hainsworth's (1968:30-31 and *passim*) observations about formula flexibility and the possibility of "boosting" formula length. Compare the comments of Foley (1995:25) about the existence of "multiple phraseological pathways to the same metonymic meaning."

[36] As Heubeck et al. point out (1988:32), two scenes, the meal and libation, are brought together but the close of the meal's activities does not occur until 7.232.

[37] Odysseus has not yet disclosed exactly which Achaean he is, a revelation that finally and intentionally finds its moment at *Odyssey* 9.19.

authoritative response of Alcinous has unquestionably set the trajectory in some detail for the subsequent narrative.

12) *Odyssey* 11.333 constitutes the next appearance of our formula. Odysseus has just finished the captivating story of his visit to the underworld[38] and has concluded with his catalogue of women.[39] The effect of his speech is noted by an added formulaic line "And they were in a state of amazement throughout the shadowy hall" (κηληθμῷ δ' ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα, 11.334), which acts through its descriptiveness to add a momentary delay for the poet's own auditors.[40]

The ensuing response of Queen Arete is doubly marked as authoritative, both by the preceding "stricken to silence" formula and by the words employed to introduce what she says: "Among these then white-armed Arete began her authoritative response" (τοῖσιν δ' Ἀρήτη λευκώλενος ἤρχετο μύθων, 11.335). She points out the excellence of Odysseus and bids that the Phaeacians not send him away without an appropriate level of honorific gifts from their individual possessions (11.336-41). The Queen's response is quickly supported by representative members of the elite gathered for Odysseus' stories. The respected elder Echeneus advises people to obey the Queen's order (11.344-46), and King Alcinous agrees with his wife's response, supporting her advisement to delay sending off Odysseus until sufficient donations have been collected (11.348-53; cf. 339-41).

13) *Odyssey* 13.1, the next instance of our formula, is appropriately placed at the commencement of a new book, since the formula, although responding to what went before, more importantly, as we have been noting, sets the trajectory for what follows. Odysseus has just completed his enthralling story with a brief mention of Calypso, the same divinity he references at the beginning of his tale at *Odyssey* 9.29. The very formula that followed the last instance of "stricken to silence" we considered (11.333) is again deployed here: "And they were in a state of amazement throughout the shadowy hall" (κηληθμῷ δ' ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα, 13.2, cf. 11.334). This time, however, it is Alcinous who steps in to provide the authoritative response.

Alcinous begins by saying that he thinks Odysseus will not be driven back from making his native shore again. Following this rather prophetic note, he charges each of the leading men present to provide gifts: clothing, gold, tripod, and cauldron, noting that a collection can later be made among the subjects of the land to restore what has been donated (13.4-15). The internal audience's assent is first noted by the poet through a formulaic line confirming their agreement, including the use of an authoritative command in 13.16: "Thus spoke Alcinous, and to those present his command was pleasing" (ὣς ἔφατ' Ἀλκίνοος, τοῖσιν δ' ἐπήνδανε μῦθος). The subsequent narrative describes Alcinous' proclamation being carried out, beginning with the

---

[38] It is possible, however, to view this visit instead as a case of necromancy (West 1997:426) or a "vision" (Louden 2011:197-221).

[39] *Od*. 11.235-327. On the Catalogue of Women, see Sammons 2010:74-102.

[40] Cf. *Od*. 13.2 for the full line; for the hemistich beginning at B2, see *Od*. 10.479, 11.334, 23.299.

King's own further order that libation and prayer be made for the conveyance of Odysseus home to Ithaca (13.50-52).[41]

14) *Odyssey* 16.393 follows a strong speech by Antinous (16.364-92) arguing for the murder of Telemachus, who has returned home alive from his voyage to the Peloponnesus after the suitors' failed marine ambush. The suitors have just entered the palace as the "noisy throng" (ἀθρόοι, 361) who seat themselves in their own exclusive enclave, allowing neither agemates nor elders to join their company (16.361-62). Antinous speaks to this group. In his address he warns the suitors that Telemachus is too capable in counsel and intellect and the other citizens are no longer kind to them. In the second part of his speech, introduced by the "rhetorical fulcrum" (Foley 1999:224) "but come . . ." (ἀλλ' ἄγετε, 16.376), Antinous urges his fellow suitors to kill Telemachus before he calls an assembly, an act, he argues, that would surely prove most disadvantageous to their interests.

Following the passionately desperate speech of Antinous and the "stricken to silence" formula, Homer adduces no extra formulae emphasizing additional delay. The poet has included, however, a brief characterizing biography (16.395-98) before the authoritative reply of Amphinomus, an option he has used after two other instances of the "stricken to silence" formula we have considered to this point.[42] The poet's characterization of Amphinomus through the formula "for he had good sense" (φρεσὶ γὰρ κέχρητ' ἀγαθῆσιν, 16.398) follows a previous note that he was more pleasing than others to Penelope in what he said. The formula is used positively elsewhere in the *Odyssey* of Clytemnestra before she was corrupted by Aegisthus (3.266) and of the pious actions of the faithful swineherd Eumaeus (14.421) when entertaining the disguised Odysseus. The referential import in the use of this traditional idiom consequently seems to characterize Amphinomus as a cut above the other suitors. The first hemistich of the last line before Amphinomus speaks, "He, being well intentioned toward them, addressed those assembled and spoke" (ὅ σφιν ἒϋ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν, 16.399), further suggests his reasonable disposition.[43] The tenor of the biography (cf. Fenik 1974:192-95, Race 1993:86) causes us to expect a mitigating response from this classy suitor, of whom even Penelope thought decently, and we are not disappointed.

---

[41] The collection of the goods from the common folk to replace what is given by the foremost leaders is not within the range of the narrative's chronology but has clearly been accepted as a guarantee by those responding with donations.

[42] See *Il*. 10.313 and 23.676.

[43] The second hemistich formula "addressed those assembled and spoke" (ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν), a "boilerplate" (Foley 1999:221-23, 256) introduction, occurs fourteen times in Homer, beginning at B1, and has "He, being well intentioned toward them" (ὅ σφιν ἒϋ φρονέων) in the first hemistich in eleven of those instances. (The other traditional possibility for the first hemistich ending at B1, "Then among these Amphinomus" [τοῖσιν δ' Ἀμφίνομος, cf. *Od*. 20.244], could not [as is the case also with other names that fit metrically in the alternative phrase, but do not end in a long vowel, such as Alcinous and Antinous] have been employed since the second hemistich of our present line begins with a vowel.) The eleven instances of "He, being well intentioned toward them" (ὅ σφιν ἒϋ φρονέων) (*Il*. 1.73: Kalchas, 253: Nestor, 2.78: Nestor, 2.283: Odysseus, 7.326: Nestor, 9.95: Nestor, 15.285: Thoas, 18.253: Panthous; *Od*. 7.158: Echneus, 16.399: Amphinomus, 24.53: Nestor) suggest not that "cheery" or "kind" (note the words of Nestor in *Il*. 1.253), but rather "well intentioned" (so Roisman 2005:31-34, espec. 32, n.42; cf. Kirk 1985:78) and perhaps "reasonable" advisement in a speech will follow.

Amphinomus' authoritative reply, which begins less confrontationally with himself as the model to emulate, is a negative wish that argues against the suitors' killing of Telemachus, followed by a recognition of the need to pursue some type of rational process for their actions (*Od*. 16.400-05):

ὦ φίλοι, οὐκ ἂν ἐγώ γε κατακτείνειν ἐθέλοιμι
Τηλέμαχον· δεινὸν δὲ γένος βασιλήϊόν ἐστι
κτείνειν· ἀλλὰ πρῶτα θεῶν εἰρώμεθα βουλάς.
εἰ μέν κ' αἰνήσωσι Διὸς μεγάλοιο θέμιστες,
αὐτός τε κτενέω τούς τ' ἄλλους πάντας ἀνώξω·
εἰ δέ κ' ἀποτρωπῶσι θεοί, παύσασθαι ἄνωγα.

Friends, I would not be willing to be involved in killing
Telemachus. It is an ominous matter to go about killing a royal;
rather, first let us inquire what the gods desire.
If the ordinances of great Zeus recommend it,
then I will myself kill and advise all others to do likewise,
but if the gods are opposed, I advise we relent.

A formulaic hemistich exclusive to the *Odyssey*, "and to them his advice was pleasing" (τοῖσιν δ' ἐπιήνδανε μῦθος, 16.406),[44] along with the group's immediate actions indicate group acceptance of Amphinomus' response. There will be no thoughtless rush to murder Telemachus, as the intent of Amphinomus' reply makes sure (not that the suitors give over considering it: 16.448). There is no speech by any other group member, but the strength of the "stricken to silence" cue in normally plotting the immediate story trajectory is perhaps seen in the ensuing narrative, where Penelope herself echoes the sentiments of Amphinomus (16.418-33).

If the foregoing analysis of the "stricken to silence" formula is accurate, then certain conclusions can be drawn. The formula represents the inner tectonics of the poet's plan, inherited from the tradition with which he thoughtfully works. Specifically, the formula "Thus he spoke, but they in fact all were stricken to silence" (ὣς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ) cues the external audience of each epic that an "official" or "representative" reply will come, one whose intent is normally acceptable to the group, and which will set the immediate narrative direction. The formula then has an idiomatic meaning, and it acts metonymically for the informed external audience, who expect it to foreshadow the narrative direction. This formula is of course not directly heard by the internal audience, who are not privy to the poet's authorial perspective and the tradition-laden metonym. The internal audience is, however, able to recognize the silence as a significant moment, as one that means to call forth from the group an authoritative response that it should heed. In each of the fourteen cases we have considered, they do just that.

---

[44] See *Od.* 13.6, 16.406, 18.50, 18.290, 20.247, 21.143, and 21.269.

Two Ironic Narrative Moments in Homer

The metonymic significance of the formula for what follows in each narrative moment has been demarcated for both epics. The external audience listening to the poetic performance awaits a particular narrative trajectory in each case, an expectation cued by the "stricken to silence" formula. The internal audience, although not privy to the formula, seems, in every case, to accept the speech following the (formula and formulaic) silence as authoritative. What happens, however, when the internal audience ignores the authoritative speech, and when the seriousness of the silence falls on "deaf ears"? What is portended when the language cue does not set the narrative trajectory for the external audience, when what should happen after the authoritative speech is overcome by the stubborn blindness of a central character or group within the story? As we will see in the first instance, Achilles will not respond to the authoritative speech of a surrogate father, despite the pleas of his closest friends, and loses his dearest companion as a result. In the second case, the suitors are deaf to warnings and lose their very lives. The result of all these "incongruities" (Muecke 1970:33) between what normally would happen and what actually transpires in these key moments, between the assuming and limited perspective of the characters and the more informed and objective perspective of the audience, is a sense of irony that operates to harbinger peril.[45] We will return to the question of irony, after considering the two aberrant examples of our formula's employment in Homer.

1) At *Iliad* 9.430 the first of two missed narrative cues occurs during what is perhaps the central moment of the *Iliad*, the embassy to Achilles.[46] All who have come to Achilles are his closest friends in the war against Troy (9.197-204) and all have been suitably shown hospitality. Odysseus has given the opening speech, a long oration meant to persuade Achilles to restrain his "great-hearted *thumos*" (μεγαλήτορα θυμὸν, 9.255)[47] and to accept the compensatory offer made by Agamemnon to atone for past wrongs (9.225-306). Minimally, Odysseus urges that Achilles act out of pity for his friends (9.301-02).

Odysseus' speech is followed by Achilles' long, emotional, and philosophical refusal (9.308-429) to provide any immediate assistance, and is accompanied by the "stricken to silence" formula. Achilles' emotional response begins with anger over his lot, in a war fought for a *geras*-grabbing commander like Agamemnon. The rhetorical questions of Achilles and his comments *in toto* suggest an entrenched disillusionment. His response to any immediate aid is a firm "no" (9.345), even if he experiences some softening of his intractable position (Scodel 1989). Achilles' speech is described by J. B. Hainsworth (1993:101) as "too egotistical to have any

---

[45] Irony works on two levels, through both language and situation (cf. Muecke 1970, Foley 1999:19), as we shall see.

[46] Donna Wilson's (2002:71-108) discussion of the embassy to Achilles, while not at every point in agreement with my own, highlights the centrality of the embassy in the poet's presentation.

[47] The traditional way to index a hero's inner force for vitality. On the primitive *thumos* as a separate psychic part of a hero's emotional self, see Snell 1953 and Sullivan 1988. The noun-epithet formula "great-hearted *thumos*" (μεγαλήτορα θυμόν) occurs sixteen times in Homer, always extending from the C1 position to line end. (The formula "haughty *thumos*," [ἀγήνορα θυμόν] contains the same "essential idea" [M. Parry 1930:80, in A. Parry 1971:272] between the C2 position and line end, found in *Od.* 11.562; cf. the nominative θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ, which is found in the same position in 24 instances).

validity." It is centered upon himself, and even the short simile of the mother bird (9.323-27) provides no relief from the pathos of personal indignation. The intensity of Achilles' resolution is underscored through the poet's use of anacoluthon, followed by asseveration (9.358-59). Achilles is passionate here, and so abruptly breaks away from the normal narration perspective of what he was saying, changing in mid-thought to declare emphatically what Odysseus himself will see (9.356-9):

> νῦν δ᾽, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἐθέλω πολεμιζέμεν Ἕκτορι δίωι,
> αὔριον ἱρὰ Διὶ ῥέξας καὶ πᾶσι θεοῖσιν,
> νηήσας εὖ νῆας, ἐπὴν ἅλαδε προερύσσω
> ὄψεαι. . . .

> But now, since I do not wish to make war against godlike Hector
> tomorrow, after having made sacrifices to Zeus and all the gods,
> after loading my ships, when I draw them down to the sea,
> you will see. . . .

This change from an expected construction expresses Achilles' heated emotional state. The asseveration continues throughout his speech, as he fully rejects Agamemnon's offer of recompense piece by piece.

The meaning of all this forcefully expressive language is clear: he may even head home and they are free to watch! And why not, he argues, after the hubristic (ἐφυβρίζω, 9.368) treatment he has received from Agamemnon. Achilles continues his tirade of censorious statements and hypothetical refusals until, toward the end of his invective, he finally declares that it is his "haughty *thumos*" (θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ, 9.398)[48] and "wrath" (μῆνις, 9.42) that will keep the embassy's plan from succeeding.

The "stricken to silence" formula follows this harsh response by Achilles, and joined with it are formulaic lines of delay (9.431-32) we have encountered already in Books 7 and 9, which suggest that the respondent will not endorse Achilles' decision. Adding to the nexus of emotional undertones is the descriptive characterization of the closest of Achilles' companions, who will provide what should be the authoritative response. Phoenix, Achilles' surrogate father, is described with an emotionally charged formula as "having broken out in tears, for he was afraid for the ships of the Achaeans" (δάκρυ᾽ ἀναπρήσας· περὶ γὰρ δίε νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν, 9.433).[49]

Phoenix addresses Achilles (9.434-605) by reviewing his own history in retrospect, which reminds Achilles and the audience that he fled from his own home and joined Achilles', only to be made a surrogate parent to the hero, a toddler at the time. Phoenix's intent seems to be for Achilles to accept his authority as a surrogate parent while bringing the crisis of the moment into focus by emphasizing certain themes: the need for restraint when angered and the necessity of

---

[48] See note 47 above.

[49] The first hemistich formula, "having broken out in tears" (δάκρυ᾽ ἀναπρήσας), that ends at line-position B1 is also used of Telemachus in the *Odyssey*, who in anger at the suitors' insolence throws the royal scepter onto the ground to the gasps and pity of those assembled (2.81).

accepting supplication. Digressions abound to drive his point home, in what is the longest speech of any emissary.[50] The supplication is for Achilles to subdue his "great *thumos*" (θυμὸν μέγαν, 9.496) and to show pity, before it is too late.[51]

Despite the appeals and the presence of traditional formulae cuing what should follow, Achilles rejects Phoenix's call to come and save his closest friends and heroic community through responsive action, and to gain honor by accepting gifts that betoken his martial greatness. Neither does Achilles' reply (9.607-19) offer any real answers to the issues Phoenix has raised. Despite Achilles' rejection, Ajax makes a few parting sallies supporting the tenor of Phoenix's speech, but the effort falls on deaf ears. The embassy leaves in dejection. Achilles has held out, and the normal pattern of the authoritative answer setting the narrative trajectory has been broken. It is a moment of irony as the implications of what traditionally follows are muted by Achilles' refusal to assist his friends or heed the speech of a member of his own household. Jasper Griffin (1980:74, n.46) appropriately remarks that "it is surely made clear by Achilles that it is not his 'ethic' that prevents his return, but on the contrary his own passionate emotion, overriding a code which for him, as for other heroes, made his return the appropriate action."[52] Achilles' inaction, in Wilson's words (2002:108), "signals dissolution of familial and friendship bonds and even of civilized existence." The poet, through Achilles' refusal to follow the normal narrative trajectory, highlights the significance of the present narrative moment. What follows, moreover, on the next day of fighting, as the audience who have heard the story before know, is not just devastation for the Achaeans whom Achilles refuses to assist in his recalcitrance, but also devastation for Achilles, who will lose his dearest companion.[53]

2) A second break in the traditional narrative trajectory suggested by the missed "stricken to silence" metonym is found after the recurrence of the formula at *Odyssey* 20.320. The setting now is the palace of Odysseus after the unimpeded progress of the suitors in their hubristic and wanton behavior. Most recently, the suitor Ktessipus has hurled an ox's hoof at Odysseus disguised as a beggar. Telemachus is of course well aware that it is Odysseus that Ktessipus has nearly hit, yet it affords him a moment to warn the suitors to cease their rude action and to affirm that he has come of age and will tolerate it no longer (20.304-19). Following the "stricken to silence" formula and a familiar formulaic line of delay (20.321; cf. *Il*. 7.94), the external audience expects the response of the suitor Agelaus (20.322-37) to be authoritative.

---

[50] For a detailed consideration of Phoenix's crucial speech, see Rosner 1976 and Held 1987.

[51] "Great *thumos*" (θυμὸν μέγαν), filling the colon B2 to C2, seems to be the poet's adaptation of the more traditional epithet, "great-hearted thumos" (μεγαλήτορα θυμόν), employed only in the last colon, from C1 to line end. See note 47 above.

[52] Cf. Collins 1988:29, n.6.

[53] Achilles' decision not to accept Phoenix's speech as authoritative, if read from the perspective of Ruth Scodel's thesis about Achilles' word (1989), may be seen to have come at the point when he first made his grievous promise not to fight until fire reached his ships. Considering the isolated position of his ships "detached from the rest of the fleet" (C. Parry 1817:340), however, this promise was destined from the moment given to provide neither meaningful nor timely assistance to his friends, nor a reasonable or merciful response to the pleas of any future embassy.

Agelaus' response (20.322-37) is quite supportive of Telemachus' concern. In the first part of his reply, he contends that Telemachus has spoken justly and joins him in advocating non-violence, admonishing the suitors to treat guests and servants with respect (20.322-25):

> ὦ φίλοι, οὐκ ἂν δή τις ἐπὶ ῥηθέντι δικαίῳ
> ἀντιβίοισ' ἐπέεσσι καθαπτόμενος χαλεπαίνοι·
> μήτε τι τὸν ξεῖνον στυφελίζετε μήτε τιν' ἄλλον
> δμώων, οἳ κατὰ δώματ' Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο.

> Friends, indeed no one should, in response to what has been said in justice,
> assail him with harsh, opposing words.
> Do not continually maltreat either the stranger or any other male
> slave who is in the household of godlike Odysseus.

These same conciliatory and agreeable words were used by the poet already in his story within Book 18 (414-17), after Eurymachus had hurled a stool at Odysseus disguised as a beggar, and a common thread has been observed joining the two incidents: "In each case the poet has made one of the 'better' suitors acknowledge the validity of Telemachus' complaint" (Russo et al. 1992:123).

The second part of Agelaus' authoritative response appends a polite advisement (20.326-37), with his counsel beginning by acknowledging the propriety of Penelope's refusal to consider a marriage when there was still hope that Odysseus would return. That return day, according to Agelaus, is now past. The poet has Agelaus provide a call to action, for Telemachus to explain to his mother that she should marry the best man.

Following a chiastic pattern, the second part of Agelaus' speech first finds confirmation of its authoritative nature in the immediate reply of Telemachus himself, who affirms that he has in fact already urged his mother to marry whomever she wishes (20.341-42).[54] The first part of the speech directed toward his fellow suitors, however, is quite another matter. What follows is anything but a clear affirmation by the group to change their insensitive and hubristic behavior as Agelaus has advised. Their impious behavior begins with veiled threats toward the prophet Theoclymenus, who has just uttered a foreboding interpretation of the suitors' own perilous dilemma (20.351-57). It continues with attempted provocation (ἐριθίζω, 20.374) directed towards Telemachus from each of the suitors (20.374, 384), threatening the very guest that Agelaus had advised them not to maltreat, but now also openly advising abusive behavior against the prophet himself (20.381-83):

> ἀλλ' εἴ μοί τι πίθοιο, τό κεν πολὺ κέρδιον εἴη·
> τοὺς ξείνους ἐν νηὶ πολυκλήϊδι βαλόντες
> ἐς Σικελοὺς πέμψωμεν, ὅθεν κέ τοι ἄξιον ἄλφοι.

---

[54] Telemachus, for the sake of the imminent revenge, also goes along with the first assumption mentioned by Agelaus, that Odysseus is now dead.

> But if perhaps you would listen to me, the following idea seems more advantageous:
> let's load these guests into a many-benched ship
> and send them to the Sicilians, where some profit might accrue to you!

The context for the suitors' reply, now that the response of Agelaus has been deprived of any efficacy, is a bizarre picture of a topsy-turvy, apocalyptic threat to the suitors' reality, at least as visualized through the prophet's narrative perspective (20.351-57). The prophetic visualization follows the poet's own grizzly introduction (20.347-49), as the ambience of the hall and the food being eaten by the suitors changes to portend imminent destruction: laughter is heard as lament, walls bleed, specters fill the courtyard, and darkness blankets the place. It is as though the natural order of the physical realm has been upset by the suitors' moral decadence, their imminent doom and descent to Hades proleptically portrayed.

The suitors seem blind to any reality check and haughtiness is their only response, evident not only in their suggestion to sell Telemachus' guests to the Sicilians as slaves (Russo et al. 1992:126), but also in their treatment of others in the narrative that immediately follows. The suitors as a group seem incapable of comprehending the authoritative response of their fellow suitor, Agelaus. They appear incognizant of the dark foreboding of their present position signaled by the grim portents of the prophet Theoclymenus. Destruction looms. Further, the "stricken to silence" formula, clearly operative in all fourteen cases considered earlier and controlling of the actions and attitudes of those who attend each authoritative speech, is here, as in the case of Achilles, not controlling the outcome. What is the poet doing?

Metonymic Irony of Narrative Perspective

The mechanism that the poet uses in the last two instances of the "stricken to silence" formula we have considered is metonymic irony of narrative perspective. Metonymic irony is by far the most traditional type of irony, since it operates at the level of the audience's knowledge of the greater story tradition. As outlined earlier in our consideration of metonymy, formulae, when encountered, must be read by reference to their use within the tradition; the audience informed by the tradition can thus access the meaning of metonyms in the text because they share a body of knowledge that is their cultural inheritance. Within the poet's narrative, the use of formula as metonym for the creation of narrative content relies inevitably upon the audience, who are, in some sense, co-authors through the tradition of the full story being told. Their traditional knowledge, consequently, is assumed by the poet in the creation of irony.

In the last two cases we have considered, the response of Achilles and then the suitors, metonymic irony starts to form at the phraseological level, where the external audience experiences each instance of the "stricken to silence" formula without the normal meaning inherent in its employment, and realizes that something is wrong. The traditional implications of the formula are suspended. In each case, a part or most of the internal audience (Achilles and the suitors, respectively) is not stricken by the sort of silence that produces respect for the authoritative response of the group (as in the other fourteen examples from the *Iliad* and

Odyssey).[55] This instant is the temporal beginning of irony, and, since the employment and reading of the "stricken to silence" formula deals with a form of lexical ambiguity, it is this moment that is closest to traditional "rhetorical" irony.[56]

The ironic instant in narrative time, however, is in no way restricted to the question of the ambiguity of language, but rather, is intricately bound to the external audience's superior position and knowledge as auditors of a traditional story.[57] Consequently, irony is fully achieved both through the missed metonym of the language cue and the narrative perspective created by the poet. It is found in the juxtaposition of the awareness of the external audience of the normal path of the "stricken to silence" metonym gained from familiarity with the traditional language and story patterns, set against the intractable stubbornness, blindness, and ignorance of the internal audience with regard to the true significance of the authoritative speech that follows the silence formula.[58] When the external audience first sees Achilles and then the suitors deaf to the pleas and warnings of others, intractable and unheeding of the speech that follows the silence, they sense that something is wrong. They recognize that the normal trajectory of the metonym has been broken by characters acting from a limited perspective within the action of each plot.

The effect of metonymic irony of narrative perspective is an intensification of suspense in each of the two moments in the poets' rendition of the traditional epic stories.[59] The external audience, informed by the traditional use of the language cue, feels the jarring resilience of both Achilles and the suitors against what should be the authoritative speech of Phoenix and the suitor Agelaus respectively. A sense of foreboding is felt, and peril looms large in the auditors' minds as they think of what will follow in the future: Achilles will lose his closest comrade and the suitors will die as a consequence of the direction they are taking at this juncture in Homer's story.

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

---

[55] For a formative example of metonymic irony in Homer beginning at the phraseological level, compare Foley's comments about "sweet sleep" (1999:232). For the development of irony in various disciplines beyond the limited use of the term in early classical sources, see Kierkegaard 1965 [1841], Muecke 1970, Enright 1986, Dane 1991, Stringfellow 1994, and Colebrook 2002.

[56] Since the internal audience, unlike the external audience, cannot hear the formula, but only the silence, we do not have here an actual case of rhetorical irony for the internal audience, as it is normally described. (See Stanford 1939:1-11, among others)

[57] The prophet Halitherses, no doubt also aware of the portentousness of the moment through prophetic inspiration, acts as an exception, and consequently can be seen to join the gods, poet, and external audience in viewing events from an elevated narrative perspective.

[58] Compare the comments of D. C. Muecke (1970:44) about "dramatic" irony: "The greater the contrast between, on the one hand, the victim's confident assumption that he is a free agent and that things will happen as he expects them to and, on the other, the spectator's view of him as a blind wretch fixed to the wheel of an irreversible, unstoppable action, the more intense the irony." The internal audience does not hear the formula nor understand the metonymic implications, although it does hear the peculiar silence and the authoritative response speech, and in the case of Achilles and the suitors, that part of the narrative cue is ignored. The mechanism causing failure to heed the authoritative speech may be "delusion" (ἄτη), possibly part of Achilles', but definitely part of the suitors' (for example, *Od*. 18.143, 20.170, and so forth) condition. On Achilles' "unreal view of reality" see Arieti 1985:198; see Scodel 1989:93 and Redfield 1975:106 for views that do not find Achilles to be the cause of the moral dilemma.

[59] On suspense in Homer see Morrison 1992.

References

Arieti 1985   James A. Arieti. "Achilles' Guilt." *Classical Journal*, 80:193-303.

Austin 1966   Norman Austin. "The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 7:299-312.

Barcelona et al. 2011   Antonio Barcelona, Réka Benczes, and José Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez. *Defining Metonymy in Cognitive Linguistics: Towards a Consensus View*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Beck 2005   Deborah Beck. *Homeric Conversations*. Hellenic Studies, 14. Washington, D. C.: Center For Hellenic Studies.

Bolling 1946   G. M. Bolling. "The Personal Pronouns of the *Iliad*." *Language*, 22:341-43.

Burgess 2001   Jonathan Burgess. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. http://journal.oraltradition.org/issues/21i/burgess

Burgess 2006   _____."Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference." *Oral Tradition*, 21:148-89.

Colebrook 2002   Claire Colebrook. *Irony in the Work of Philosophy*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Collins 1988   Leslie Collins. *Studies in Characterization in the* Iliad. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 189. Frankfurt: Athenäum.

Dane 1991   Joseph Dane. *The Critical Mythology of Irony*. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.

Danek 1988   Georg Danek. *Studien zur Dolonie*. Wiener Studien, 12. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Dué 2010   Casey Dué. "Agamemnon's Densely-packed Sorrow in *Iliad* 10: A Hypertextual Reading of a Homeric Simile." In Tsagalis 2010. pp. 279-99.

Dué and Ebbott 2010   _____ and Mary Ebbott. Iliad *10 and the Poetics of Ambush*. Hellenic Studies, 39. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Edwards 1986   Mark Edwards. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Formula, Part I." *Oral Tradition*, 1:171-230. http://journal.oraltradition.org/issues/1ii/edwards

Elmer 2011	David Elmer. "Oral-Formulaic Theory." In Finkelberg 2011, vol. 2. pp. 604-07.
Enright 1986	D. J. Enright. *The Alluring Problem: An Essay on Irony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ersbe 1969-88	Hartmut Ersbe, ed. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. Vols 1-7. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
Fenik 1964	Bernard Fenik. Iliad *X and the Rhesos: the Myth*. Latomus, 73. Brussels: Société d'études latines.
Fenik 1974	_____.*Studies in the* Odyssey. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
Finkelberg 1986	Margalit Finkelberg. "Is ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ a Homeric Formula?" *Classical Quarterly*, 35:1-5.
Finkelberg 2011	_____,ed. *The Homer Encyclopedia*. Vols. 1-3. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
Foley 1990	John Miles Foley. *Traditional Oral Epic: The* Odyssey*,* Beowulf*, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Foley 1991	_____.*Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Foley 1995	_____."Sixteen Moments of Silence in Homer." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 50:7-26
Foley 1999	_____.*Homer's Traditional Art*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University.
Foley 2004	_____,ed. and trans. *The Wedding of Mustajbey's Son Bećirbey as Performed by Halil Bajgorić*. Folklore Fellows Communications, 283. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
Fränkel 1955	Hermann Fränkel. *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens. Literarische und philosophiegeschichtliche Studien*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
Garner 2011	R. Scott Garner. *Traditional Elegy: The Interplay of Meter, Tradition, and Context in Early Greek Poetry*. American Classical Studies, 56. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Griffin 1980	Jasper Griffin. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hainsworth 1968   J. B. Hainsworth. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hainsworth 1993   _____. *The* Iliad*: A Commentary, Volume III: Books 9-12*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Rpt. 2000.

Haslam 1997   M. Haslam. "Homeric Papyri and the Transmission of the Text." In Morris and Powell 1997. pp. 55-100.

Held 1987   George F. Held. "Phoenix, Agamemnon, and Achilles: Parables and Paradeigmata." *Classical Quarterly*, 37:245-61.

Heubeck et al. 1988   Alfred Heubeck, Stephanie West, and J. B. Hainsworth, eds. *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey*, Volume I: Introduction and Books I-VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Rpt. 1998.

Janko 1982   Richard Janko. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Rpt. 2007.

Janko 1990   _____. "The *Iliad* and its Editors: Dictation and Redaction." *Classical Antiquity*, 9:326-34.

Kelly 2007   Adrian Kelly. *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer,* Iliad *VIII*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kierkegaard 1965 [1841]   Søren Kierkegaard. *The Concept of Irony with Continual Reference to Socrates*. Trans. by Howard and Edna Hong. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Orig. publ. as *Om Begrebet Ironi med stadigt Hensyn til Socrates*. Kjøbenhavn: P.G. Philipsen. 1841.

Kirk 1985   G. S. Kirk. *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*, *Volume I: Books 1-4*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Rpt. 2001.

Lord 1960/2000   Albert B. Lord. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 2nd ed., with intro. by Stephen Mitchell and Gregory Nagy.

Louden 2011   Bruce Louden. *Homer's* Odyssey *and the Near East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin 1989   Richard P. Martin. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the* Iliad. Myth and Poetics. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

McGlew 1989   James F. McGlew. "Royal Power and the Achaean Assembly at *Iliad* 2.84-393." *Classical Antiquity*, 8:283-95.

Montiglio 1993   Silvia Montiglio. "La menace du silence pour le héros de l'Iliade." *Metis*, 8:161-86.

Morris and Powell 1997   Ian Morris and Barry B. Powell, eds. *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden: Brill.

Morrison 1992   James V. Morrison. *Homeric Misdirection: False Predictions in the* Iliad. Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Muecke 1970   D. C. Muecke. *Irony*. The Critical Idiom, 13. Norfolk, UK: Cox and Wyman.

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

Nagy 2000   _____. "Reading Greek Poetry Aloud: Evidence from the Bacchylides Papyri." *Quaderni Urbinati Di Cultura Classica*, 64:7-28.

Olson 1995   S. Douglas Olson. *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's* Odyssey. Leiden: Brill.

A. Parry 1971   Adam Parry, ed. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

C. Parry 1817   C. H. Parry. "A Critical Examination of Certain Modern Opinions Respecting the Troad, and the Description of Homer." *The Classical Journal*, 30:326-43.

M. Parry 1930   Milman Parry. "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I. Homer and Homeric Style." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 73-77. Rpt. in A. Parry 1971:266-324.

M. Parry 1933-35   _____. "Ćor Huso: A Study of Southslavic Song." Field notes, expedition to Yugoslavia. Extracts publ. in A. Parry 1971:437-64.

Paradis 2011   Carita Paradis. "Metonymization: A Key Mechanism in Semantic Change." In Barcelona et al. 2011. pp. 61-88.

Peabody 1975   Berkley 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.

Person 1995   Raymond F. Person. "'The Became Silent to Silence' Formula in Homer."
                             Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies, 36:327-39.

Postlethwaite 2000   Norman Postlethwaite. *Homer's* Iliad*: A Commentary on the Translation of
                             Richmond Lattimore.* Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Powell 1997   Barry B. Powell. "Homer and Writing." In Morris and Powell 1997. pp. 3-32.

Pratt 1993   Louise H. Pratt. *Lying and Poetry from Homer to Pindar: Falsehood and
                             Deception in Archaic Greek Poetics*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of
                             Michigan Press.

Race 1993   William Race. "First Appearances in the *Odyssey*." *Transactions of the
                             American Philological Association*, 123:79-107.

Ranke 1881   Fritz Ranke. *Homerische Untersuchungen, I: Die Doloneia*. Leipzig: Gosslar.

Ready 2011   Jonathan L. Ready. *Character, Narrator, and Simile in the* Iliad. Cambridge:
                             Cambridge University Press.

Redfield 1975   James Redfield. *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad*: The Tragedy of Hector*.
                             Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Reece 1993   Steve Reece. *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the
                             Homeric Hospitality Scene*. Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity. Ann
                             Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Reece 2011   _____."Epithets." In Finkelberg 2011, vol. 1:257-59.

Roisman 2005   Hanna Roisman. "Nestor the Good Counsellor." *Classical Quarterly*, 55:17-38.

Rosner 1976   J. Rosner. "The Speech of Phoenix: *Iliad* 9.434-609." *Phoenix*, 30:314-27.

Russo et al. 1992   Joseph Russo, Manuel Fernandez-Galiano, and Alfred Heubeck. *A Commentary
                             on Homer's* Odyssey*, Volume III: Books XVII-XXIV*. Oxford: Oxford University
                             Press. Rpt. 2002.

Sale 1993   William Merritt Sale. "Homer and Roland: The Shared Formular Technique, Part
                             I." *Oral Tradition*, 8:87-142.

Sammons 2010   Benjamin Sammons. *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*. Oxford:
                             Oxford University Press.

Schadewaldt 1938   Wolfgang Schadewaldt. *Iliasstudien*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.

Scodel 1989   Ruth Scodel. "The Word of Achilles." *Classical Philology*, 84:91-99.

Snell 1953   Bruno Snell. *The Discovery of the Mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
                          Press. New ed. New York: Dover. 1982.

Stanford 1939   W. B. Stanford. *Ambiguity in Greek Literature: Studies in Theory and Practice*.
                          Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steiner 2010   Deborah Steiner. Odyssey*, Books 17-18*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics.
                          Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stringfellow 1994   Frank Stringfellow. *The Meaning of Irony: A Psychoanalytical Investigation*.
                          Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sullivan 1988   Shirley D. Sullivan. *Psychological Activity in Homer*. Ottawa: Carleton
                          University Press.

Tsagalis 2010   Christos Tsagalis, ed. *Homeric Hypertextuality*. Trends in Classics, 2. Berlin:
                          Walter de Gruyter.

van der Valk 1971   M. van der Valk, ed. *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad
                          Homeri Iliadem*. Vol. 2. Leiden:Brill.

Von der Mühll 1962   Peter Von der Mühll. *Odyssea*. Stuttgart: Bibliotheca Teubneriana. Rpt. 1993.

West 1997   M. L. West. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

West 1998   _____,ed. *Homeri Ilias volumen prius, rhapsodias I-XII*. Stuttgart: Bibliotheca
                          Teubneriana.

West 2000   _____, ed. *Homerus Ilias volumen alterum, rhapsodiae XIII-XXIV*. Munich:
                          K. G. Saur.

West 2011   _____."Homeric Question." In Finkelberg 2010, vol. 2. pp. 362-64.

Whitman 1958   Cedric Whitman. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard
                          University Press.

Willcock 1978   M. M. Willcock, ed. *Homer:* Iliad *I-XII*. London: Bristol Classical Press. Rpt.
                          1998.

Wilson 2002   Donna Wilson. *Ransom, Revenge, and Heroic Identity in the* Iliad. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.