Homer and Oral Tradition:
The Formula, Part II[1]

Mark W. Edwards

§6. Studies of specific formulae

This section deals with the usage and adaptation of individual formulae, and with the availability of formulae for particular concepts. It does not cover studies of the meaning of obscure words, or how much significance a formulaic expression might retain in conventional usage (see §7), or the location of formulae within the verse (see §3).

The discussion is arranged in four parts: name-epithet formulae; epithets; common-nouns and epithets; verbs.

1. Name-epithet formulae

The fundamental work was Milman Parry's first monograph, published in 1928 (M. Parry 1971). Parry listed the commonest proper name and epithet formulae after the mid-verse caesura (10-13) and after the caesura in the fourth foot (15-16), and gave tables showing the formulae of different lengths for eleven major gods and heroes in the nominative case (39) and the genitive case (57). He also listed the proper name and epithet formulae for heroines (97f.), for the Greek race (101), for other peoples (99ff.), and for countries (106-9).

Page 1959 lists formulae for Priam (241-42), Hector (248-51), Patroclus (286), Helen (287), Alexander/Paris (290f.), Aeneas (291), the Achaeans (242-48), the Trojans (251f.) and Ilium/Troy (292-94).

Bowra 1960 examines the epithets for Troy and other cities to determine if the meanings are appropriate, his work including a listing of the formulae by metrical shape. He does not use the material to determine how far the formulaic system is complete, or list the metrical variants which preserve or violate economy. He

She finds a remarkable overall unity in the Homeric and Hesiodic usages.

Sale 1984 studies the sets of formulae used for the home of the gods, based on words both for Olympus and for Ouranos. The Olympus formulaic sets are far more extensive; for instance, there are three formulae for "gods in Olympian homes" and eighteen for Olympus itself, whereas the Ouranos set has one and four respectively. Sale 1987 studies the *Iliad* formulae for place, for instance "to Troy" and "in the Greek camp." He holds that a high level of formulaic usage means that formulae for the idea were abundant, whereas a low level means that few or no formulae were available. The set of formulae meaning "in the Greek camp" shows a great deal of extension (i. e., formulae are provided for almost all purposes), and good economy (there is little overlap). Sale's approach is important, in that he includes (for instance) in the formulaic set "in the camp" phrases meaning "beside the swift ships" and "by the ship-sterns" (but not "in the huts," as this is said to refer to the buildings, not the encampment). In an appendix Sale gives "most of the groups and formulaic sets for the places where the action of the *Iliad* occurs: the Greek camp at the ships, the battlefield, the Troad itself, Troy-city. The charts, but not the Appendix, include Olympus." The lists are subdivided into motion-to, locative, and motion-from. The motion-to set shows extension and economy; so do the locatives, except for "in Troy," which is much less formulaic. "This means that when Homer was composing the *Iliad* there were few or no formulae available to him meaning 'in Troy-city'." In motion-from, relatively few formulae are available for "from the Greek camp," and *none* for "from Troy-city." These results must be taken very seriously.

2. Epithets

The major work on the epithets used with the names of heroes is Amory Parry 1973. Though her principal concern was the meaning of ἀμύμων, besides listing and examining the usages of this epithet with the many characters with which it is employed she also listed (Appendix II) the occurrences of the following epithets, giving in each case a brief account of the context: ἰσόθεος φώς, ἐΰς (ἠΰς) ἀντίθεος, θεοειδής, μεγάθυμος, ἴφθιμος, δαΐφρων, ἄλκιμος, ἀγλαός, and "looking like the

gods." Appendix III gives similar data on διογενής, διοτρεφής, and on κλυτός and κλειτός and their compounds. There is also information on δειλός (43 n.1) and ἀγαυός (50 n.1).

In an earlier work, M. Parry 1928 (1971) gave lists of generic epithets (89-90) and of epithets found with only one hero (92). Page 1959 (269-70) examined the use of φαίδιμος, ὄβριμος, ἀγλαός, and ἄλκιμος. Bergson 1956 considers the synonymous and metrically equivalent pair of epithets ποδώκης and ποδάρκης, and points out that the former occurs in various circumstances whereas the latter survives only in ποδάρκης δῖος ᾿Αχιλλεύς and but for this would probably have disappeared. Μελαίνης and κελαινῆς (genitives) occur as similar doublets in the tragedians, following the Homeric example. Pope 1960 (129-35) lists and discusses the epithets of Odysseus in the *Iliad*, *Iliad* Book 10, and the *Odyssey*, concluding that some were discarded because their meaning was no longer acceptable (and was thus still of some importance.) Edwards 1966 (168ff.) discusses epithets occurring after the bucolic diaeresis.

Cramer 1974 points out that ἐσθλός, usually taken to be the alternative for δῖος before Odysseus's name when an initial vowel is required by the meter, actually occurs for this hero only in the phrase πατὴρ ἐμὸς ἐσθλὸς ᾿Οδυσσεύς (3 times), and suggests it "ought to be read as an expanded and modified form of πατέρ᾿ ἐσθλόν" (79), the epithet applying not to Odysseus but to πατήρ. "[T]he phrase (by itself) ἐσθλὸς ᾿Οδυσσεύς ought to disappear from oral theory" (79). Cramer does not note, however, that πατὴρ ἐμός occurs in the same position in the verse twice when *not* followed by Odysseus' name (and πατὴρ δ᾿ ἐμός five times), so the likelihood is that the longer phrase is thought of as a combination of two shorter ones and his point is not valid.

Whallon 1979 discusses the usage of ἀνδροφόνος, ἱππόδαμος, and ἀντίθεος, all used for more than one hero. Parry thought that epithets develop from being "particularized" (i.e. relevant to context) to "distinctive" (used for one person alone, relevant to context), then to "ornamental" (one person, not relevant to context) and finally "generic" (used for more than one hero). Whallon suggests that ἀνδροφόνος was replacing ἱππόδαμος for Hector (they occur eleven and five times respectively) because at the time of the *Iliad* contextual relevance was growing, and Hector in fact kills 27 opponents to Diomedes' 20

and Odysseus' 18; this epithet is never found with the latter two names.

Janko 1981 examines the usage of ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως, in various cases and positions; usually ἤματα πάντα follows. He indicates how archaic and innovative elements in the forms of the expression are retained side by side.

3. Common-nouns and epithets

The major work is Paraskevaides 1984, in which the author lists sets of noun-epithet formulae expressing the same concept, dividing them into two groups: synonymous nouns sharing the same epithets (e.g. the set including ξίφος ὀξύ and φάσγανον ὀξύ), and synonymous nouns with different epithets (e.g. ἀσπίδα ταυρείην and σάκος αἴολον). For each phrase he gives the metrical shape, the position(s) in the verse, and the number of occurrences in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The listings are arranged under 103 English subheads, including some abstractions (for instance, "brightness," "riches," "sorrow," "wrath," "youth"). The reasons for the arrangement of the set of formulae for each concept are not very clear, but an alphabetical list of the English subheads is provided at the end of the book. The work has been done with care, but caution must be exercised in using it for some purposes, as it suffers from the weakness of one-verse concordances; for example, ἀσπίδα ταυρείην is said to occur once only (85), at the beginning of the verse (*Iliad* 13.163), but ἀσπίδα πάντοσ' ἐΐσην | ταυρείην (*Iliad* 13.160-61) may also be relevant. Paraskevaides has interesting ideas on lack of economy (140), and a useful bibliography.

The pioneering work in this area was Gray 1947, a study of the formulae for sea, shield, and helmet; her work contains very valuable insights, but her division of formulae into "traditional" and "individual" has become dubious since Hainsworth 1968 showed the extent of mobility and modification of formulae.

Pope 1963 reviews Parry's ideas, pointing out the inadequacy of the name-epithet systems for covering all grammatical cases and numbers and the main metrical shapes, and examines the common-noun plus epithet formulae in the *Iliad* similes. He finds a total of 379 different noun-epithet combinations, of which only 53 occur in the main body of the poem. He concludes that the poet must be capable of composing without the aid of a stock of traditional formulae. Hainsworth 1968 examines and lists all

common-noun + epithet formulae which appear in the metrical form - ⌣ ⌣ - ⏖ and ⌣ ⌣ - ⏖, showing what different positions in the verse they can take and how their metrical shape can he modified. Hainsworth's earlier work (1962 and 1964) is also relevant.

In what follows, work done on noun-epithet formulae for particular concepts is listed in alphabetical order of the English expression. To save space, concepts covered by Paraskevaides alone are not included.

Boundary: As part of a study of the meaning of πεῖραρ Bergren 1975 lists and examines the formulae in which it occurs in Homer and Hesiod as well as in later poetry.

Bow: Paraskevaides 1984:86; Page 1959:278-80.

Chariot: Paraskevaides 1984:49; Page 1959:280.

City: Cole 1977 lists and comments on the words for this concept in Homer and early Greek lyric, including the epithets and prepositions used with them.

Fire: Paraskevaides 1984:74; Hainsworth 1958 studies the formulaic usages and connotations of φλόξ and other words for "fire" in Homer, showing that this word does not occur in the *Odyssey* because it is traditionally associated with certain heroes and circumstances which are not pertinent to that poem.

Earth: Haslam 1976; Mureddu 1983:23.

Food and Drink: Chantraine 1964 examines the usage of certain nouns with these meanings and the formulae in which they occur, as part of a study of their relationship to verbs from the same roots.

Gods: Mureddu 1983:37.

Heart: Combellack 1975 examines the use of epithets with φρένες to see if Agamemnon's heart is "black" in *Iliad* 1.103 because he is angry or because hearts are generically so, full of black blood; and shows that the epithet is used where appropriate to add the sense "stirred by emotion" (*Iliad* 20.35 being a possible exception).

Helmet: Paraskevaides 1984:27; Gray 1947; Hainsworth 1978.

Horses: M. Parry 1971:113.

Human beings: Paraskevaides 1984:55; M. Parry 1971:114; Mureddu 1983:32.

Night: Mureddu 1983:64.

Room: Paraskevaides 1984:47; Hainsworth 1978 discusses the epithets associated with θάλαμος.

Ruler: Paraskevaides 1984:96; Wathelet 1979 categorizes the

formulaic uses of ἄναξ and its derivatives ἄνασσα and ἀνάσσω (for gods and heroes), and those of βασιλεύς (for gods only) in Homer and Hesiod, concluding that the sense of the two words drew closer together as the formulaic tradition developed; βασιλεύς, a word of unknown origin, gained ground, and the formulaic usages suggest it is linked to the administration of justice. Hooker 1979 notes that ἄναξ in *Odyssey* 4.87-88 is applied not to a god or hero but to the master of a servant.

Sea: Paraskevaides 1984:35; Gray 1947; Page 1959:225-30; Mureddu 1983:67; Schmiel 1984.

Shield: Paraskevaides 1984:84; M. Parry 1971:115; Gray 1947; Page 1959:270-71; Whallon 1966 points out that Ajax's shield is always a σάκος, Hector's always an ἄσπις (though with other heroes little distinction seems to be made), so the nouns do not form parts of a single formulaic system.

Ships: M. Parry 1971:109; Alexanderson 1970 examines all formulaic expressions for ships, including the different grammatical cases, metrical shapes, and epithets separated from nouns, and also instances of the same idea (e.g. "to the ships") expressed by different formulae. He finds a widely-extended system, with phrases often extending over the caesurae; economy is not absolute, because of certain overlapping phrases developed through analogy, some of which are preferred in special contexts or a particular place in the verse. He does not discuss the possible relevance of the meaning to the context. See also Sale 1987.

Sky: Page 1959:230-31; Mureddu 1983:21; Sale 1984.

Spear: Paraskevaides 1984:22; Page 1959:238ff.; Whallon 1966;Watts 1969; Shannon 1975 includes a brief section on the usages of the spear-words μελίη, ἐϋμμελίης, and μείλινος; Schmiel 1984.

Strife: Mureddu 1983:62.

Sword: Paraskevaides 1984:20; Page 1959:277-78; Watts 1969.

Wine: Paraskevaides 1984:68; Page 1959:231; Severyns 1946:86-93 lists the different formulae used, indicating whether the digamma before οἶνος is observed or neglected; Vivante 1982.

Year: Emlyn-Jones 1967 rejected the view that ἐνιαυτός means "the space of a year" and ἔτος "one of a series of years," claiming that they are used indifferently according to metrical requirements. This was convincingly countered by Beekes 1970, who quotes all the instances of both words and shows that ἔτος is *always* used with a numeral in formulaic instances, whereas ἐνιαντός is

recurrently used with εἰς; he holds that ἐνιαυτός meant "the day on which the year cycle is completed," and its occasional use with a numeral is an encroachment (presumably arising from analogy) on the regular usage of ἔτος.

4. Verbs

Milman Parry (1971:45f.) gave examples of how verbs and verbal phrases of certain metrical shapes precede name-epithet formulae, and listed some of the formulae for "suffer woes" used in various metrical conditions (310-11). Woodlock 1981 lists and examines all noun-verb expressions in the *Iliad* which occur between the C1 and C2 caesurae and the end of the verse. Paraskevaides 1984 (127-31) illustrates some of the ways in which formulae containing a verb can be modified.

The largest-scale study of a particular verb is Muellner 1976, a work important for its methodology, for its demonstrations of the "play of formulae" (the ways they are transformed, adapted, and modified for aesthetic effect), and for its results. Muellner studies the usage of the verb εὔχομαι, usually translated as "pray," "boast," "profess." He classifies the formulae for prayers which include this verb, showing the transformations and adaptations they undergo, and determines the meaning in these contexts as "speak/say sacredly." A similar classification of the verb's secular uses (and its alternations with φημί) suggests the rendering "say (proudly, accurately, contentiously)"; the single legal use (*Iliad* 18.499) seems to mean (by Mycenaean Greek parallels) "say" or perhaps "state." An important part of the value of Muellner's work is his sympathetic appreciation of Homer's mastery of the formulaic style and his consciousness of the aesthetic effects of manipulation and usage: "Formulas are not clichés, receptacles of cant, or merely convenient phrases to help a faltering performer. They are metrical combinations of words in which the heritage of the primordial past could achieve its highest potential for the expression of living poetic meaning" (140). He allows himself expressions such as "the contextual and formal constraints . . . are being played with for expressive purposes" (23), "The pressure of this variation aesthetic on the poet's resources generates many new combinations" (25), "the existence of such doublets makes sense in terms of poetic performance. They are virtuoso pieces in which the composer . . . displays his ability not simply to form single

lines from smaller units but to re-use with elegantly slight alteration . . . whole groups of lines" (57). Muellner's work is alone of its kind, on this scale, and we need more like it.

Mureddu 1983 (115-21) gives an account of the formulae for sexual union in Homer and Hesiod. Haslam 1976 discusses the usages of λείβω and εἴβω, γαῖα and αἶα, and shows that the variant forms developed for metrical reasons.

A good deal of work has been done on the various expressions used to introduce or conclude direct speech. (Expressions including "winged words" are discussed in §7 part 5, and the phrase ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαξε in §7 part 6.) Combellack 1939, examining places where the usual "so spoke..." formulae are not used at the end of a speech, studied the three usual classes of such formulae; he found that the omission is due to unusual temporal or local relationships, not textual corruption. Krarup 1941 listed the occurrences of ὅ σφιν ἐΰ φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν (which he finds to be used in circumstances of fright and danger) and ὥς ἔφαθ' οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ. Fournier 1946 studied φημί, ἀγορεύω, ἐρέω, and εἶπον in particular, finding no differences in sense and listing the formulaic usages. Stokes 1966 compares the speech formulas of the *Iliad* with those of the *Odyssey*, finding a high degree of similarity, and examines those which occur in only one poem. Edwards 1968 categorizes and comments upon the formulaic expressions which introduce direct speech, in three groups. The first consists of expressions where the sense of the verb is straightforwardly "addressed" or "answered" (sometimes qualified by an adverb or participle); these are subdivided according to semantic content and metrical shape. In the second group, expressions with a verb of more specific sense (e.g. "reproached") are listed. Finally, anomalous expressions are listed according to their occurrence in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Edwards 1969 discusses the usage of the various formulaic expressions for "X answered," starting from three passages where different forms occur in close succession with the name of the same Homeric character. He concludes that in general the principle of economy is maintained, though there are certain unsurprising irregularities and in a few instances a liking for variation may be suspected; the textual tradition may also sometimes be responsible for irregularities. Patzer 1972 (15-26) lists and discusses the formulae for "so he spoke," with their metrical, syntactical, and semantic variants.

Scully 1984 examines the formulae for deliberation used in the *Iliad*, especially those which include ὀχθήσας and μερμηρίζειν, finding a significant difference in usage in the case of Achilles; in Books 16 and 22 "we see by formulaic comparison that he is lifted up out of the common language and suspended between man and god, both because he uses stereotypic patterns which outline choice in a manner that differs from other heroes and because he is associated with other patterns generally employed for the gods" (24). An earlier article (Audiat 1947) had listed the formulaic usages of ὀχθήσας and examined the passages, concluding that the meanings include "irritated," "anxious," and "astonished" (and combinations of the three).

Note

[1]§§1-5 of this survey appeared in *Oral Tradition* 1 (1986):171-230. §9, which was listed at the beginning of the survey as "Homer and the Criticism of Oral Poetry," will be postponed to a later date.

References

Alexanderson 1970
B. Alexanderson. "Homeric Formulae for Ships." *Eranos*, 68:1-46.
Allison 1969
E. P. Allison. "Geographic and Ethnic Formulas in Homer and the Catalogue of Ships." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 29:2233A.
Amory Parry 1973
A. Amory Parry. *Blameless Aegisthus: A Study of ἀμύμων and Other Homeric Epithets* (*Mnemosyne*, Supplement 26). Leiden: Brill.
Audiat 1947
J. Audiat. "Une Formule homérique, μέγ' ὀχθήσας" *Revue des études anciennes*, 49:41-57.
Austin 1975
N. Austin. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Bartonek 1959
A. Bartonek. "Die Wortparallelen αὐδή and φωνή in der archaischen epischen Sprache." *Sborník Prací Filosofické Fak. Brnenské Univ. Rada archeol. klas.*, 4:67-76.
Beekes 1970
R. S. P. Beekes. "ἔτος and ἐνιαυτός in Homeric formulas." *Glotta*, 47:138-43.
Bergren 1975
A. Bergren. *The Etymology and Usage of ΠΕΙΡΑΡ in Early Greek Poetry*.

American Classical Studies, 2. State College, PA: American Philological Association and Commercial Printing.

Bergson 1956
L. Bergson. "Eine Bemerkung zur Ökonomie der poetischen Kunstsprache." *Eranos*, 54:68-71.

Bowra 1960
C. M. Bowra. "Homeric Epithets for Troy." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 80:16-23.

Bowra 1961
_____. "ἐϋκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί." *Mnemosyne*, 14:97-110.

Calhoun 1935
G. M. Calhoun. "The Art of Formula in Homer— ἔπεα πτερόεντα." *Classical Philology*, 30:215-27.

Chantraine 1964
P. Chantraine. "Les Noms d'action répondant aux verbes signifiant 'manger' et 'boire' chez Homére: ἐδητύς, βρῶσις, βρωτύς, βρώμη, πόσις, ποτής." *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 59:11-23.

Cole 1977
D. R. Cole. "Asty and Polis: 'City' in Early Greek." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 37:6460A.

Combellack 1939
F. M. Combellack. "Omitted Speech Formulas in Homer." *University of California Publications in Classical Philology*, 12:43-56.

Combellack 1975
_____. "Agamemnon's Black Heart." *Grazer Beiträge*, 4:81-87.

Cramer 1974
O. C. Cramer . "Ulysses the Good? What is the Formula at *Od.* 2.71, 3.98, 4.328?" *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 104:77-80.

Cretia 1960
P. Cretia. "La Mer chez Homère." *Studii Classice*, 2:309-16 (in Rumanian with French summary).

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

Edwards 1968
_____. "Homeric Speech Introductions." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 74:1-36.

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

Emlyn-Jones 1967
C. J. Emlyn-Jones. "ἔτος and ἐνιαυτός in Homeric Formulas." *Glotta*, 45:156-61.

Fournier 1946
H. Fournier. "Formules homériques de référence avec verbe 'dire'." *Revue de Philologie*, 20:29-68.

Gray 1947
        D. H. F. Gray. "Homeric Epithets for Things." *Classical Quarterly*, 61:109-21.
Hainsworth 1958
        J. B. Hainsworth. "No Flames in the *Odyssey*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 68:49-56.
Hainsworth 1960
        _____. "Ἄπτερος μῦθος: A Concealed False Division?" *Glotta*, 38:263-68.
Hainsworth 1962
        _____. "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.
Hainsworth 1978
        _____. "Good and Bad Formulae." In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Ed. B. C. Fenik. Leiden: Brill. pp. 41-50.
Haslam 1976
        M. W. Haslam. "Homeric Words and Homeric Metre: Two Doublets Examined (λείβω/εἴβω, γαῖα/αἶα)." *Glotta*, 54:201-11.
Hinterlechner 1953
        W. Hinterlechner. *Typische und untypische Verwendung der homerischen Epitheta*. Dissertation (Wien).
Holoka 1983
        J. P. Holoka. " 'Looking Darkly' (ὑπόδρα ἰδών): Reflections on Status and Decorum in Homer." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 113:1-16.
Hooker 1979
        J. T. Hooker. "Homeric Nominatives in -τα." *Glotta*, 45:14-23.
Hooker 1979
        _____. "A Note on ἄναξ." *Živa antika*, 29:260.
Janko 1981
        R. Janko. "Ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως: The Genealogy of a Formula." *Mnemosyne*, 34:382-85.
Krarup 1941
        P. Krarup. "Beobachtungen zur Typik and Technik einiger homerischer Gesprächsformeln." *Classica et Mediaevalia*, 4:230-47.
Liveris 1960
        A. Liveris. *Les Epithètes chez Homère*. Athens.
Muellner 1976
        L. C. Muellner. *The Meaning of Homeric εὔχομαι Through Its Formulas*. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 13. Innsbruck: Becvar.
Munoz Valle 1974
        I. Muñoz Valle. *Investigaciones sobre el estilo formular épico y sobre la lengua de Homero*. Valencia: Editorial Bello.

Mureddu 1983

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

Page 1959

D. L. Page. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Paraskevaides 1984

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

M. Parry 1971

Milman Parry. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. A. Parry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Patzer 1970

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

Pope 1960

M. W. M. Pope. "Athena's Development in Homeric Epic." *American Journal of Philology*, 81:113-35.

Pope 1963

_____. "The Parry-Lord Theory of Homeric Composition." *Acta Classica*, 6:1-21.

Sale 1984

W. M. Sale. "Homeric Olympus and Its Formulae." *American Journal of Philology*, 105:1-28.

Sale 1987

_____. "The Formularity of the Place-Names in the *Iliad*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 117 (TBP).

Schmiel 1984

R. Schmiel. "Metrically-interchangeable Formulae and Phrase-clusters in Homer." *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 9.3.34-38.

Scully 1984

S. Scully. "The Language of Achilles: The ὀχθήσας Formulas." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 114:11-27.

Severyns 1946

A. Severyns. *Homère II: Le Poète et son oeuvre*. Brussels: Lebègue.

Severyns 1970

_____. "Homeric Formulas and Achaean History." *Bucknell Review*,18.1:26-36.

Shannon 1975

R. S. Shannon. *The Arms of Achilles and Homeric Compositional Technique*. (*Mnemosyne*, Supplement 36). Leiden: Brill.

Stanford 1969

W. B. Stanford. "Euphonic Reasons for the Choice of Homeric Formulae?" *Hermathena*, 108:14-17.

Stokes 1966

W. R. Stokes. "Studies in Homeric Formulas." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 37:465A.

Van der Valk 1966
          M. H. A. L. H. van der Valk. "The Formulaic Character of Homeric Poetry."
          L'Antiquité classique, 35:5-70.
Vivante 1975
          P. Vivante. "On Homer's Winged Words." *Classical Quarterly*, 25:1-12.
Vivante 1982
          _____. "The Syntax of Homer's Epithets of Wine." *Glotta*, 60:13-23.
Wathelet 1968
          P. Wathelet, "Les Verbes ἐρύω and ἔρυμαι dans les formules de l'épopée." In *Studio
          Mycenaea* (Proceedings of the Mycenaean Symposium. Ed. by A. Bartonek. Opera
          Universitatis Purkynianae Burnensis Facultatis Philosophica, Brno. Fac. Philos., 127).
          Brno: Purkynme. pp. 105-11.
Wathelet 1979
          _____. "Mycénien et grec d'Homère: ἄναξ et βασιλεύς dans la tradition
          formulaire de l'épopée grecque." *Živa antika*, 29:25-40.
Watts 1969
          A. C. Watts. *The Lyre and the Harp: A Comparative Reconsideration of Oral Tradition
          in Homer and Old English Poetry*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Whallon 1961
          W. Whallon. "The Homeric Epithets." *Yale Classical Studies*, 17:97-142.
Whallon 1966
          _____. "The Shield of Ajax." *Yale Classical Studies*, 19:7-36.
Whallon 1969
          _____. *Formula, Character and Context*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University
          Press.
Whallon 1979
          _____. "Is Hector *androphonos*?" In *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to
          B. M. W. Knox*. Berlin: de Gruyter. pp. 19-24.
Woodlock 1981
          L. T. Woodlock. "Noun-verb Associations and the Formula in Homer's *Iliad*."
          Dissertation Abstracts, 42:683A.

§7. Formulae and meaning

This section lists works which discuss how much meaning should be attributed to recurrent formulaic expressions. It therefore includes the problems of whether a formula retains any real meaning in conventional uses, and how apparently inappropriate uses of a formula can be explained. Works dealing primarily with the meaning of obscure words are not included.

After a general section, separate parts deal with five well-known "irrational" uses of a formula: "blameless Aegisthus;" Penelope's "fat" hand; the beggar Irus's "lady mother;" and with two expressions which may or may not have special significance, "winged" and "unwinged" words and ἔπος τ'ἔφατ'ἔκ τ'

ὀνόμαζε. A final section covers work on the special topics of whether Homer was limited by formulaic style when he wished to express new ideas, and to what extent characterization is conveyed by formulaic language or the absence of it.

1. General

In his excellent introduction to his edition of his father's work Adam Parry points out that the demonstration that epithets and even phrases in Homer are chosen for their metrical convenience, not their appropriateness to the context, is the feature of his work that "has aroused most disagreement, even antagonism, for it has seemed to many to deny the poetry the possibility of artistic expression" (M. Parry 1971:xxvi). A. Parry further notes that (lv, note 2) M. Parry "seemed to believe that the ornamental epithet had virtually no meaning at all: it was a sort of noble or heroic padding." In his long chapter "The Meaning of the Epithet in Epic Poetry" (1971:118-72), Parry insisted that fixed epithets are an aid to versification, not chosen for their relevance to the immediate context, and quoted in support the earlier statements of Düntzer, expressed as long ago as 1862 (see Latacz 1979:88; above, Part I, §1), that the poet could not choose an epithet with a view both to its signification and to its metrical value (124). Parry disagrees strongly (125, 129) with the emotional effect Ruskin attributed to the juxtaposition of "the earth . . . our mother still—fruitful, life-giving" (φυσίζοος αἶα) with the death of Castor and Pollux (*Iliad* 3.243). For Parry, an epithet "becomes ornamental when its meaning loses any value of its own and becomes so involved with the idea of the substantive that the two can no longer he separated. The fixed epithet then adds to the combination of substantive and epithet an element of nobility and grandeur, but no more than that" (127). 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. Sheppard 1935 and 1936 are good examples of the kind of approach that Parry was combatting.

Parry's basic ideas are reasserted in Combellack 1959, an influential article in which the author sets out to illustrate that "one result of Milman Parry's work on the Homeric style has been to remove from the literary study of the Homeric poems an entire

area of normal literary criticism" (193). With reference to Ruskin's comment, "if Parry is correct in his analysis . . . we can no longer with any confidence urge that the adjective φυσίζοος was deliberately chosen by the poet because of any kind of peculiar appropriateness of meaning" (197). Similarly, it is dangerous to think of any usages as mock-heroic or used in parody. Combellack "do[es] not want to be understood as arguing that . . . Homer never used an epithet with deliberate artistic purpose, or as opposing the general theory that Homer sometimes used his formulary language in a wondrously skillful way" (207); but "the hard fact is that in this post-Parry era critics are no longer in a position to distinguish the passages in which Homer is merely using a convenient formula from those in which he has consciously and cunningly chosen *le mot juste*" (208).

Later Combellack returns to the topic (1965) with a collection of passages "where it seems that the poet has been led away from logic because he is involved in a common formulary situation" (41), in particular some instances where swiftness is stressed although it is inappropriate to the context, and the repeated statements that the victorious Hector stripped the armor from Patroclus (though it was actually Apollo's work). Combellack concludes with the view that we can never understand what use Homer has made of his tradition because we cannot compare him with his predecessors and contemporaries: "The new in literature can be discovered only by comparison with the old, and if the old is not in existence the comparison is impossible" (55). In an article on "invented" Homeric characters and episodes Combellack (1976:53-55) accepts that very occasionally a modification or manipulation of a formula may occur because of its inappropriateness in a context; for example, Zeus becomes "lightning-gatherer" instead of the usual "cloud-gatherer" when he is explicitly said to be *clearing away* the clouds (*Iliad* 16.298), and Achilles becomes "great-hearted" instead of "swift-footed" when the next verse begins with "to the feet" (*Iliad* 23.168).

In a long and rather loosely written article Whallon (1961) sets out "to show the literary value of certain epithets in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*" (97); he lists the epithets for 15 characters in both poems, plus "equestrians" and some patronymics, and shows that they have meaning in some contexts, but pays no regard to metrical necessity or special effect. Whallon 1965 maintains that formulaic epithets for Iliadic heroes are true to individual character

but indifferent to context, whereas kennings in *Beowulf* are true to generic character but significantly appropriate to context. He compares the two kinds of formulae in detail.

Bowra 1962 (31) lists some instances where a standard expression may be modified in particular circumstances. He suggests that even fixed epithets, despite their familiarity, emphasize the words to which they are attached, and help the swift flow of the narrative (34); the repeated verses also are far from devoid of poetic effect, and may have different effects in different circumstances. Rosenmeyer 1965 (296-97) discusses the views of Parry and others on the force of ornamental epithets, and finds Combellack's views too restrictive; the conventional phrases are the poetry itself—"The bard regards his poetic phrase as indistinguishable from poetic substance" (297).

In my article on arrangement of words in the verse (Edwards 1966) I include a discussion of the force of ornamental adjectives used in the runover position (138-46), between the A and B caesurae (153-54), and between the B and C caesurae (164-66). My conclusion is that "a significant sense can occasionally be attributed to ornamental adjectives and conventional phrases, and that this should be considered possibly intentional on the poet's part" (177). In a later article (Edwards 1968b) I examine the usage of formulae in *Iliad* 18 in an attempt to identify special effects of emphasis and meaning; Segal 1971 does the same for Andromache's speech at *Iliad* 22.437-76.

Stanford 1971 points out some of the weaknesses in Parry's arguments for the virtual meaninglessness of fixed epithets, with brief mention of the occasional use of incongruous epithets, not because they are meaningless, but just in order to keep the verse going.

In the first part of an important article A. Parry (1972:1-9) raises the question of the consciousness of Homer's audience: how much significance should the ideal member of Homer's audience attribute to the formulaic expressions? M. Parry suggested that because of repetition, set phrases do not bear an individual meaning, and consciousness cannot focus on them; epithets used of more than one hero cannot tell us anything unique about each one. But there seems to be some appropriateness in ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν for Agamemnon (particularly since it is in an unusual position) and δῖος for Achilles in *Iliad* 1.7. Because the epithets are chosen for metrical convenience does not mean that they lack meaning.

In this second part of this article (9-22) the author argues that the direct addresses of the poet (usually to Patroclus, Menelaus, and Eumaeus) signify emotion, or at least a special appropriateness to the character. Matthews 1980 holds that metrical or otherwise non-aesthetic reasons are responsible. In a section on "Narrative: The Poet's Voice" in my book on Homer (1987:37-38), I lean towards Parry's view.

Vivante has published a number of works on the meaning of Homeric epithets. In one article (1973) he argues that epithets express some naturally inherent property, a broad identity rather than a qualification. When predication of qualities is needed, it is done by a verb or sentence. He also lists the epithets meaning "strong" (160 n. 6), "swift" (161 n. 7), and "wise" (161 N. 8), showing that they are rarely used predicatively. In a later article (1980) he is concerned not with the meaning (or lack of meaning) of an epithet, but with the difference caused by its presence or absence; he asks: "What difference does it make to our perception of a sentence whether there is an epithet or not?" (157). He examines a number of examples, and finds that the epithets are "poetically essential in giving us a sense of extension, as if their very length were suggestive of actual space" (158-59). Vivante 1982a, a full-length work devoted to epithets in Homer, points out that an epithet refers to an intrinsic quality of the object ("hollow ship"), irrelevant to narrative occasion; this gives a poetic effect. Epithets are used in passages of description rather than in narrative or in direct speech. Clusters of epithets and the recurrence of epithets are studied (in a rather obscure section). Vivante also studies certain noun-epithet expressions in their context, asserting the difference made by the use of an epithet (*not* the significance of the epithet), definitions of epithet, and explanations of the contrast between ornamental and significant epithets, dealing harshly with M. Parry and most subsequent scholars. Much of what Vivante says is hard to follow, but he is correct in asserting that the presence of an epithet may well mean more than simply that it fills a gap in the verse. Vivante 1982b again asks: "Why do nouns have an epithet in Homer? When do they lack it?" (13), and concludes: "I maintain that the presence or absence of the epithet is intimately connected (a) with the syntactic function which is most intrinsic to the noun, (b) with the distinctness of the sentence in which the noun occurs" (14). He studies the epithets for "wine" in all grammatical cases, showing

that use of an epithet is commonest in the accusative and least frequent in the nominative; this shows a syntactic preference.

Bowra 1960 examines the epithets for Troy and other cities to determine if the meanings are appropriate, his work including a collection of formulae arranged by metrical shape. He does not, however, use the information to determine how far they go to complete the system or list the metrical variants which preserve or violate economy. He finds the epithets usually appropriate but not illuminating. Pinsent 1984 examines the epithets used (in the *Iliad* only) for Troy, for the Trojans and for the Greeks, to see if any differences can be found which might throw light on the dates at which the two peoples entered the epic language. Not surprisingly, he finds this impossible: "Formulaic epithets are devised and employed for metrical and not for historical reasons. The Achaeans are very frequently referred to with formulaic epithets because the metrical shape of the word meant that it was most usually employed in the second half of the hexameter, where the use of a formulaic epithet made it easier to fit it in. The Trojans, like the Argives and the Danaans, are metrically more flexible, and so less frequently require the assistance of a formulaic epithet" (150). Some of the methodology may not be quite sound, but the collection of information is useful.

Muñoz Valle 1974 (87-100) examines the formulaic expressions for Athena, including τέκος, κούρη, and θυγάτηρ, to see if they are synonyms, concluding that though the words have different connotations these are neutralized in formulaic usages and are used according to metrical convenience. Redfield 1979 analyzes the meanings and usage of words in formulae in *Iliad* 1.1-7, including style and poetic devices; he finds familiar diction used in unusual ways. Schwabl 1979 I have not seen. Floyd 1980 discusses the usage and meaning of κλέος ἄφθιτον in early Greek, together with those of the Vedic *śrávah . . . ákṣitam*; he concludes that the idea they share is "poetically preserved fame," posthumous in Greek but in Vedic associated with wealth and guaranteed by the gods. Tsagarakis 1982:32-46 discusses the usage of ὀξυόεντι and χαλκείῳ after ἔγκεϊ, and some phrases for Odysseus, suggesting that one ornamental epithet may be chosen over another because of its meaning. There is a good section on modifications of formulaic phrasing in Macleod 1982 (40-42). Cosset 1983 examines the usage of the formulae πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς, Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω, and μητίετα Ζεύς, concludes that in almost

all cases μῆτις retains some significance and the character makes use of the qualities suggested by the formula. Schmiel 1984 tests the "equivalent" epithets (see Part I, §3, p. 194) for "spear" and "sea," finding that in most cases the poet chooses the epithet most appropriate to the context; therefore the meaning must retain some significance. Finally, one should note a return almost to the view of Sheppard in a recent review of G. S. Kirk's *Iliad* commentary, which remarks that "Πηληϊάδεω [*Iliad* 1.1] gets no comment, despite the central role that the absent Peleus plays in Achilles' heart (reaching its memorable climax in Book 24)" (*Classical Review*, 36 [1986]:2).

2. "Blameless Aegisthus"

Milman Parry (1971:122) quoted Eustathius' explanation (probably from Aristarchus) of the use of ἀμύμων "blameless" for the wicked Aegisthus (*Odyssey* 1.29): "not referring to his crimes, but to his natural virtues: he had high birth, beauty, intelligence, and other things of the same sort." Parry himself thought that in such apparently illogical cases "the poet simply used certain epithets as ornaments without ever thinking that his audience would try to relate them to the circumstances of the moment. In some of the cases it so fell out that the idea of the epithet and the meaning of the sentence could not be reconciled" (124).

Amory Parry 1973 took this particular instance of apparently illogical usage as the foundation for an exhaustive study of the epithets of heroes. She found the meaning "blameless" to be unsatisfactory, both in the contexts in which the word occurs and etymologically, and concluded the original meaning was not moral but something like "beautiful in body," and the rendering "handsome" best accounts for the course of development; the connotation "good" was acquired early in the tradition, and supplanted the other in a few traditional phrases (157). Her general —and very reasonable—conclusion was that the audience never became as insensitive to the meaning of epithets as Parry claims; laudatory epithets to some extent retain their different connotations, and ἀμύμων, μεγάθυμος, and ἄλκιμος (for example) are not synonyms. Ἀμύμων is thus not in fact inappropriate for Aegisthus when its proper meaning is understood.

Lowenstam 1981 (44-45) divides the applications of ἀμύμων into three categories: practices (e.g. dancing); practitioners

collectively (seers etc.) and specifically (individuals); and products of practices (objects or abstractions). He finds the common denominator to be "skillful, cunning." Aegisthus is five times called δολόμητις, so in his case ἀμύμων can be translated "crafty." He thus finds none of the famous instances of illogical use is really inappropriate. In conclusion, he quotes *Iliad* 2.265-66, where the weedy Thersites' shoulders are not "broad" as usual but a periphrasis is used, as also for a woman's shoulders in *Odyssey* 8.527-29.

Combellack 1982 refers to the old commentators' explanation of inappropriate epithets, that they mean "not at that time but by nature," and suggests that in the cases of ἀμύμων for Aegisthus and Pandarus the doctrine be reversed, and interpreted "not by nature, but at that time" (361). Aegisthus is correct in exacting vengeance for a wrong done to his father, and in the context this is the important aspect; similarly in the case of Pandarus (*Iliad* 4.89) ἀμύμων "can be interpreted as referring to a particular aspect of this personage in the particular context in which the adjective occurs" (371)—Pandarus is a skillful archer. This suggests a deliberate choice of epithets, not a careless one. Combellack's idea is new and very interesting; perhaps it could he taken even further, by suggesting that it is significant that at the time the epithet is applied to the characters it is pertinent to them in Combellack's sense, but neither of the characters has yet performed the action for which he incurs censure; it may be highly relevant that Aegisthus is not given the epithet *after* we are told of his killing Agamemnon, nor Pandarus *after* he has loosed his truce-breaking shot against Menelaus.

3. Penelope's "fat hand"

The usage of *Odyssey* 21.6, where Penelope takes up the bronze, ivory-handled key of her store-room χειρὶ παχείη "with her powerful hand" —a formula otherwise used for heroes—was mentioned by Milman Parry (1971:151) as an example of an expression usually perfectly acceptable, but odd in a certain instance, demonstrating that the poet's audience cared little for the sense of the epithet. Schlesinger 1969 explains that Penelope carries the key "'in (her) fist,' that is, in her clenched, 'thick' hand" (236), either because it is heavy, or to conceal it from the servant women. He shows that the phrase is generally used of grasping a weapon. Wyatt 1978 points out that at *Odyssey* 18.195

Athena makes Penelope taller and πάσσονα "stouter," and her
"powerful" hand here reminds us of her beauty; her hand is singled out
because it is highly visible in this scene, and the expression could better
be rendered "plump, well-turned." Later he added supporting evidence
from Modern Greek (Wyatt 1983). Lowenstam 1981 (43-44) prefers the
translation "strong hand," and adds that Penelope is twice given the
epithet ἰφθίμη "strong;" this is clearly a positive quality. Eide 1980 I
have not seen.

4. Irus' "Lady mother"

Milman Parry referred to the surprising use of πότνια μήτηρ
"lady mother" for the mother of the beggar Irus (*Odyssey* 18.6),
grouping it with Penelope's "fat hand" (1971:151; see last section) as
an indication that the audience paid little attention to the meaning of
the epithet. Combellack 1959 (204) discusses the view that humor or
parody is intended—"Of course, for all we know, Homer may have
meant πότνια μήτηρ to be a jolly misuse of a dignified formula, and
his audience may have grinned with him" (204)—but feels that since
Parry's discoveries there is just no means of being certain. Lowenstam
1981 (40-43) divides the adjectives occurring with "mother" into five
categories, and feels that since the others refer to proper social behavior
and marital status, not rank, there is no reason to suppose that the
πότνια category should be different. He therefore takes the meaning
to be "wedded mother," which also has etymological support. Irus is
a legitimate child. There are, however, some difficulties in reconciling
this meaning with the common application of the epithet to goddesses,
including those who are virgin.

5. "Winged" and "unwinged" words

Calhoun 1935 (the article is a good example of the dilemma of an
older scholar able to accept Milman Parry's discoveries in theory but not
always their direct results for the poems) held that the famous "winged
words" phrase indicated heightened emotional situations. He examined
all the occurrences and their contexts, including MSS variants. Parry
responded (M. Parry 1971:414-18; published in 1937) by repeating his
own view that the phrase is used when the character who is to speak
has been the subject of the last verses, so that the use of his name in the
line would he clumsy" (414); no other formula fills this need, and so the
choice is

purely metrical; emotion there may be, but so there is in most speeches.

Combellack 1950 (a short but wide-ranging and thoughtful article) reminds us that the scholia say the meaning is "swift; for nothing is swifter than speech" (21). The metaphor is generally agreed to be that of the flight of a bird from speaker to listener; the alternative explanation, the feathered tip of an arrow, is not usually accepted. Are winged words peculiar in some way? No; for Parry's rebuttal of Calhoun is fair. So there is nothing special about the 124 instances of "winged" words; "All words are winged, but Homer happens to mention that fact only now and then" (23). Some scholars thought the phrase means that words fly away and are lost, and Combellack inclines towards this view, which is supported by the scholia on *Iliad* 16.101: "for words disappear, being winged." Perhaps Homer is reminding us not that words are swift, but that they are evanescent—an implied contrast with deeds. The unfamiliarity of writing lends special point to this. "How melancholy it is that this man whose life must have been devoted largely or entirely to words and not to deeds should have felt impelled to remind his listeners 124 times that while the deeds of the heroes of the Trojan War would remain forever in men's minds, his own words were winged ephemerids doomed to die almost as soon as they were spoken. And yet these great deeds of the heroes who won and the heroes who lost at Troy owe their immortality to Homer's words that die" (25).

Hainsworth 1960 argues that the obscure phrase ἄπτερος . . . μῦθος, used four times in the *Odyssey* after a speech by a male to a female who does not reply, is not (as others have held) contrasted with "winged words" to give the meaning "she was silent." Some ancient commentators held that the phrase means "swift to persuade," and this meaning of ἄπτερος may have arisen from a misunderstanding of ἔπεα πτερόεντα as ἔπε᾽ ἀπτερόεντα without change of meaning. Van der Valk 1966 (59-64) returns to the meaning "her words remain unwinged," i.e. the hearer does not give voice to her thoughts. Latacz 1968 also discusses the meaning of this phrase.

Vivante 1975 holds that the phrase is not really a metaphor, as words do fly from mouth to ears: "Words are winged on the strength of their own nature, and not because they serve some alleged purpose. They fly out when the situation allows it, when there is an opening in the action or a moment of release, and not

for any definite purpose" (4, n. 1); "Words have wings when they seem to fly out on their own account, unsolicited by any question, unconditioned by the necessities of dialogue, unenforced by any overriding need" (5). The idea may seem a little fanciful, but Vivante quotes good examples of sudden inspiration of speech, such as the sight of Helen (*Iliad* 3.155), Achilles' pity for Patroclus (*Iliad* 16.6), and his surprise at the sight of Athena (*Iliad* 1.201). D'Avino 1980-81, giving a lengthy review of the question and of the meaning of ἔπος/ἔπεα, and of the resonances of the formula, concludes "il problema della loro interpretazione va tenuto distinto per motivi di metodo da quello della formula, anche se i risultati devono non essere incongruenti, e possono avvalorarsi a vicenda" (117); there is no reason to give the prefix ἀ- in ἄπτερος other than a privative sense. In the fifth volume of the recent Mondadori commentary on the *Odyssey*, Russo (1985:161-63) reviews the bibliography of the question and accepts "swift" for ἄπτερος.

6. ῎Επος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε

The modern debate began with Calhoun 1935, in which the author listed and examined the occurrences and suggested that the phrase expressed "emotion, and earnest, affectionate, or cordial address" (224). He thought it was the use of ἐξονόμαζε that conveyed this, and did not consider the (probably much more likely) contribution of the phrases which usually precede ἔν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί or χειρί τέ μιν κατέρεξεν.

Jacobsohn 1935 concerned himself mainly with whether the phrase is an example of *hysteron-proteron*, and decided it was not. In his article on "winged words" (1971:414-18) Parry responded to Calhoun that the phrase was used, instead of some other, "purely for grammatical reasons" (416), and pointed out that it also occurs several times in parallel with ἐνένιπεν "rebuke."

Couch 1937 analyzed in detail the 43 occurrences of the formula, and concluded that in most cases it is used to introduce the words of a god or mortal who enjoys superiority over the person addressed. In instances in which the two parties are equals, or the speaker is inferior, the speaker has some moral superiority in the circumstances or is in the privileged position of a petitioner. Couch found no recognizable difference in sense in the eleven verses in which the phrase is prefixed by ἔν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρί. Both

touching and naming a person are likely to carry emphasis, and Couch is very probably right. The formula is included in Edwards' analysis of speech-introductions (1968a:10-11) and considered to be used primarily between intimates, but occasionally in contempt.

D'Avino 1969 points out that ὀνομάζω in Herodotus and other authors sometimes means "translate into words," and after a review of other scholars' work and the uses of the word and its cognates concludes that in the Homeric phrase ἐξονομάζω means "formulare compiutamente un discorso" (32). Munoz Valle 1971 (and 1974:43-52), in a sensible and comprehensive article, collects the occurrences of the expression (17 in the *Iliad*, 25 in the *Odyssey*) and divides them into four categories according to whether the following speech begins with a name in the vocative, a common noun (e.g. "stranger") or an adjective in the vocative (this is the largest group), a verb in the imperative or second-person indicative without a vocative, or none of the above (two instances only, both in the *Odyssey*). He also lists the views of former scholars, dividing them into those who hold that the second part of the expression is merely synonymous with the first, and those who think it once had the meaning "addressed by name." He himself proposes that the latter part once meant "addressed by name," but became fossilized and evolved into the instances where no name was used, finally degenerating into his last category, which has no vocative and no second-person verbs. Muñoz Valle holds (sensibly) that different meanings must be accepted in different contexts and reflect different stages in development, but that they must not be used to identify periods of composition or different authors.

7. The expression of new ideas, and characterization by language

A. Parry 1956 argues that "the formulaic character of Homer's language means that everything in the world is regularly presented as all men (all men within the poem, that is) commonly perceive it" (3). This applies to speech too: "Since the economy of the formulaic style confines speech to accepted patterns which all men assume to be true, there need never be a fundamental distinction between speech and reality; or between thought and reality" (4). But Achilles' superb speech in reply to Odysseus at *Iliad* 9.308ff. is concerned with "the awful distance between appearance and reality" (4). Achilles has no language in which to express his disillusionment; instead, he expresses it by "misusing the language he disposes of. He asks questions that cannot be

answered and makes demands that cannot be met. He uses conventional expressions where we least expect him to . . ." (6). Parry's deductions are questionable, and he gives virtually no examples of misuse of the conventional language. Reeve 1973 draws attention to some of the weaknesses in Parry's argument. Claus 1975 realizes that the formulae "do not describe or create a perfect and inflexible world of thought patterns that can be regarded as reality" (16), and though aware of some of the problems in Parry's article, takes up the question whether Achilles sees the ideals of his society as false (again without detailed reference to usage of formulae). In an interesting recent article Nimis 1986 reviews both the question of Achilles' alienation and that of his language, using up-to-date critical theories: "Achilles' speeches can be said to be examples of . . . rule-changing creativity . . . [H]e is a sign-producer who wishes to change the 'code,' to articulate a meaning for whose communication and accurate reception no adequate conventions exist as yet. . . .The dilemma of Achilles, therefore, is not peculiar to formulaic diction or any other signifying system" (219). Nimis concludes, reasonably enough, "to essentialize the 'meaning' of the poem into a statement of some transcendent truth or other is to put the poet in a position relative to his society which is just as theoretically impossible for him as it is for Achilles. Homer's 'stance' in the poem is complex, and, like Achilles' own speeches and actions, contradictory" (224).

Hogan 1976, starting out from A. Parry's idea, studies occurrences of redundant πρίν, where the actual clause introduced by the word is preceded by a redundant adverbial use of the same word. Four of the eighteen examples in the *Iliad* are in the speeches of Achilles himself, two more have him as subject or object of the subordinate clause, two are attributed to him by other speakers, and one is addressed to him. "The repeated use by Achilles of this figure and its attribution by others to him very nearly make it a personal stylistic mannerism" (306). One wonders if the statistics are significant enough to bear this weight. Starting again from A. Parry's idea, Duban 1981 examines the language of Hector in his duels with Ajax and with Achilles (and also the language of the Paris-Menelaus duel), and finds three characteristics: a preoccupation with fame; frequent use of the verb "to know"; and a periodic and rhetorical balance when he is in control of the situation. Duban also refers to Bassett's

comments on the picturesque language Hector uses, and considers that these features add up to the "exaggerated sense of his own capacities which is Hektor's trademark" (98).

Friedrich and Redfield 1978 compare 897 lines of the speeches of Achilles in the *Iliad* with about the same number spoken by others in his presence, in search of individual personality traits which they think can be determined despite formula and meter. After a brief theoretical criticism of A. Parry 1956, they examine nine distinctive features of Achilles' speech, divided under the headings of rhetoric, discourse, and syntax/lexicon. Particularly characteristic of Achilles' speeches are richness of detail, cumulative series, vividness in depicting hypothetical images, and "poetic directness." Narrative is relatively unimportant in Achilles' speeches, and he is relatively brief. Asyndeton, however, is significantly frequent, contributing to his "abrupt, informal, forceful way of speaking" (279), and he uses more elaborate vocative expressions, more titles, and more terms of abuse. He also makes significantly greater use of the emotive particles $\hat{\mathring{\eta}}$ and $\delta\acute{\eta}$, which "add a tone of certainty, urgency, pathos, or irony" (282); there is also a higher frequency of $\mu o\iota$ and lower frequency of $\tau o\iota$, a distribution "consistent with Achilles' first-person, self-declaratory rhetorical stance—so often contrasted with the second-person, persuasive stance of counter-speakers" (282). Achilles' speeches also show a much more frequent use of $\nu\hat{\nu}\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (26 times against 7 in the control sample), which is "consistent with his combination of imagination and realism; his mind goes out into a world of possibility, and then abruptly returns to the situation before him" (283). These results are very interesting; a similar comparative study of enjambement, word-positioning, and sentence-length would probably reveal further idiosyncrasies in Achilles' speeches. (See now Griffin 1986.)

Messing 1981 challenges the above results on the grounds that the sample is inadequate, the text is insecure, and the methodology in applying stylometric criteria is defective. His objections are met (adequately, I think) in Friedrich and Redfield 1981. Scully 1984 also finds differences in the language of Achilles (see §6, part 4).

Holoka 1983 lists and examines the 26 occurrences of $\dot{\upsilon}\pi\acute{o}\delta\rho\alpha$ $\dot{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\nu$, finding that the phrase conveys anger or annoyance at "an infraction of propriety" (16), often directed towards a subordinate.

References

Amory Parry 1973

    A. Amory Parry. *Blameless Aegisthus: A Study of* ἀμύμων *and Other Homeric Epithets*. Leiden: Brill.

Bergren 1975

    A. Bergren. *The Etymology and Usage of* πεῖραρ *in Early Greek Poetry*. American Classical Studies, 2. State College: American Philological Association and Commercial Printing.

Bowra 1960

    C. M. Bowra. "Homeric Epithets for Troy." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 80:16-23.

Bowra 1962

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

Calhoun 1935

    G. M. Calhoun. "The Art of Formula in Homer—ἔπεα πτερόεντα." *Classical Philology*, 30:215-27.

Claus 1975

    D. B. Claus. "*Aidôs* in the Language of Achilles." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 105:13-28.

Combellack 1950

    F. M. Combellack. "Words that Die." *Classical Journal*, 46:21-26.

Combellack 1959

    _____. "Milman Parry and Homeric Artistry." *Comparative Literature*, 11:193-208.

Combellack 1965

    _____. "Some Formulary Illogicalities in Homer." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 96:41-56.

Combellack 1975

    _____. "Agamemnon's Black Heart." *Grazer Beiträge*, 4:81-87.

Combellack 1976

    _____. "Homer the Innovator." *Classical Philology*, 71:44-55.

Combellack 1982

    _____. "Two Blameless Homeric Characters." *American Journal of Philology*, 103:361-72.

Cosset 1983

    E. Cosset. "Tradition formulaire et originalité homérique: réflexions sur trois épithètes de l'*Iliade*." *Revue des études grecques*, 96:269-74.

Couch 1937

    H. N. Couch. "A Prelude to Speech in Homer." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 68:129-40.

D'Avino 1969

    R. D'Avino. "La funzionalità di ὀνομάζω e la formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε." *Studia classica et orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata*. Rome: Istituto di Glottologia. vol. 2:7-33.

D'Avino 1980-81

  _____. "Messagio verbale e tradizione orale: hom. ἔπεα πτερόεντα." *Helikon*, 20-21:87-117.

Duban 1981

  J. M. Duban. "Les Duels majeurs de l'*Iliad*e et le langage d'Hector." *Les Etudes classiques*, 49:97-124.

Edwards 1966

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

Edwards 1968a

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

Edwards 1968b

  _____."Some Stylistic Notes on *Iliad* 18." *American Journal of Philology*, 89:257-83.

Edwards 1969

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

Edwards 1987

  _____. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Eide 1980

  T. Eide. "A Note on the Homeric χειρί παχείη." *Symbolae Osloenses*, 55:23-26.

Floyd 1980

  E. D. Floyd. "*Kleos aphthiton*: An Indo-European Perspective on Early Greek Poetry." *Glotta*, 58:133-57.

Friedrich and Redfield 1978

  P. Friedrich and J. Redfield. "Speech as a Personality Symbol: The Case of Achilles." *Language*, 54:263-87.

Friedrich and Redfield 1981

  _____. "Contra Messing." *Language*, 57:901-03.

Griffin 1986

  J. Griffin. "Words and Speakers in Homer." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 106:36-57.

Hainsworth 1960

  J. B. Hainsworth. "Ἄπτερος μῦθος : A Conealed False Division?" *Glotta*, 38:263-68.

Hainsworth 1972

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

Hainsworth 1978

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

Hogan 1976

  J. C. Hogan. "Double πρίν and the Language of Achilles." *Classical Journal*, 71:305-10.

Holoka 1983
        J. P. Holoka. "'Looking Darkly' (ὑπόδρα ἰδών): Reflections on Status and Decorum in Homer." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 113:1-16.

Jacobsohn 1935
        H. Jacobsohn. "Zum homerischen ἔπος τ᾽ ἔφατ᾽ ἐκ τ᾽ ὀνόμαζεν." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 62:132-40.

Latacz 1968
        J. Latacz. "Ἄπτερος μῦθος — ἄπτερος φάτις: ungeflügelte Wörte?" *Glotta*, 46:27-47.

Lowenstam 1981
        S. Lowenstam. "Irus' 'Queenly' Mother and the Problem of the Irrational Use of Homeric Epithets." *Pacific Coast Philology*, 16.1:39-47.

Macleod 1982
        C. W. Macleod. *Homer: Iliad Book XXIV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matthews 1980
        V. J. Matthews. "Metrical Reasons for Apostrophe in Homer." *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 5:93-99.

Messing 1981
        G. M. Messing. "On Weighing Achilles' Winged Words." *Language*, 57:888-900.

Muñoz Valle 1971
        I. Muñoz Valle. "Interpretación de ia fórmula homérica ἔπος τ᾽ ἔφατ᾽ ἔκ τ᾽ ὀνόμαζε." *Emerita*, 39:305-14.

Muñoz Valle 1974
        _____. *Investigaciones sobre el estilo formular épico y sobre la lengua de Homero*. Valencia: Editorial Bello.

Nimis 1986
        S. Nimis. "The Language of Achilles: Construction vs. Representation." *Classical World*, 79:217-25.

A. Parry 1956
        A. Parry. "The Language of Achilles." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 87:1-7.

A. Parry 1972
        _____. "Language and Characterization in Homer." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 76:1-22.

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

Pinsent 1984
        J. Pinsent. "The Trojans in the Iliad." In *The Trojan War*. Ed. L. Foxhall and J. K. Davies. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press. pp. 137-62.

Redfield 1979
        J. M. Redfield. "The Proem of the *Iliad*: Homer's Art." *Classical Philology*, 74:95-110.

Reeve 1973
        M. D. Reeve. "The Language of Achilles." *Classical Quarterly*, 23:193-95.

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

Russo 1985
        J. Russo. *Omero: Odissea vol. V*. Milan: Mondadore.

Schlesinger 1969
        A. C. Schlesinger. "Penelope's Hand." *Classical Philology*, 64:236-37.

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

Schwabl 1979
        H. Schwabl. "Τὸ πρόβλημα τῶν παραδοσιακῶν μορφῶν σύνθεσης στὸν ῾Ομηρο." Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου Ἀθηνῶν, 27:94-106.

Segal 1971
        C. P. Segal. "Andromache's *Anagnorisis*: Formulaic Artistry in *Iliad* 22:437-76." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 75:33-57.

Sheppard 1935
        J. T. Sheppard. "Zeus-Loved Achilles: A Contribution to the Study of Stock Epithets in Homer's *Iliad*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 55:113-23.

Sheppard 1936
        _____. "Great-hearted Odysseus: A Contribution to the Study of 'Stock Epithets' in Homer's *Odyssey*." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 56:36-47.

Stanford 1971
        W. B. Stanford. "Remarks on the Collected Works of Milman Parry." *Hermathena*, 112:36-51.

Teodorescu 1939
        S. Teodorescu. "Die formelhaften Wendungen bei Homer: Formel und Wiederholung." *Rivista Clasica Bucuresti*, 11/12 (1939-40):38-91.

Tsagarakis 1982
        O. Tsagarakis. *Form and Content in Homer*. (*Hermes* Einzelschriften, 46). Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Van der Valk 1966
        M. van der Valk. "The Formulaic Character of Homeric Poetry and the Relation between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*." *L'Antiquite classique*, 35:5-70.

Vivante 1973
        P. Vivante. "On Poetry and Language in Homer." *Ramus*, 2:143-62.

Vivante 1975
        _____. "On Homer's Winged Words." *Classical Quarterly*, 25:1-12.

Vivante 1980
        _____. "Men's Epithets in Homer: An Essay in Poetic Syntax." *Glotta*, 58:157-72.

Vivante 1982a
        _____. *The Epithets in Homer: A Study in Poetic Values*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Vivante 1982b
        _____. "The Syntax of Homer's Epithets of Wine." *Glotta*, 60:13-23.

Wathelet 1974
        P. Wathelet, "Les Phéniciens dans la composition formulaire de l'épopée." *Revue belge de philologie*, 52:5-14.
Whallon 1961
        W. Whallon. "The Homeric Epithets." *Yale Classical Studies*, 17:97-142.
Whallon 1965
        _____. "Formulas for Heroes in the *Iliad* and in *Beowulf*." *Modern Philology*, 63:95-104.
Whallon 1969
        _____. *Formula, Character and Context*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Wyatt 1978
        W. F. Wyatt. "Penelope's Fat Hand (*Od.* 21.6-7)." *Classical Philology*, 73:343-44.
Wyatt 1983
        _____. "Elpida's Fat Hand." *Classical Philology*, 78:234-35.

§8. Analyses of formulae

This section lists studies which identify the formulae in passages of early epic, and work done on methods of estimating the density of formulae and their results.

Even before Milman Parry, the repeated expressions in early epic had aroused the interest of scholars, and much diligent work had been done. The concordance to the *Iliad* by Prendergast/Marzullo (1962) and that to the *Odyssey* and *Homeric Hymns* by Dunbar/Marzullo (1962)—first issued in 1875 and 1880 respectively—print the entire line in which each word in the poems occurs; unfortunately some very common words are omitted. Schmidt 1885 (dedicated to Schliemann) listed, in alphabetical order, Homeric repetitions of at least 6 morae in length, including (unlike most of the older concordances) those which enjamb into the following line. The work is still useful. For quick reference when reading Homer, the editions of van Leeuwen (1912-13, 1917) are convenient, as they include marginal notations of parallel passages.

For Hesiod, Paulson's index (1890) merely listed the Hesiodic references for each word in the Hesiodic poems. The larger version of Rzach's edition (1902) listed the Homeric parallels. Kretschmer 1913 listed the expressions repeated within each Hesiodic poem and within the Hesiodic corpus (using Rzach's 1908 edition of the *Catalogue*), in each case dividing them according to length and metrical position. Several good concordances are now available,

including the *Shield of Heracles* and the Hesiodic fragments: Minton 1976, which follows the model of Prendergast and Dunbar but with no words omitted; and Tebben 1977a, a keyword-in-context computer-based work. Hofinger 1978 is a lexicon rather than a concordance, but has a Supplement (1985) including the latest fragments. Tebben has also produced (1977b) a keyword-in-context concordance to the *Homeric Hymns*. Much earlier, Windisch 1867 had listed the Homeric parallels in the *Homeric Hymns*, and Brandt 1888 those in the *Batrachomyomachia*.

        Milman Parry included formulaic analyses of two Homeric passages in his published work, and a number of other scholars have been stimulated to similar and more extensive analyses, usually with the purpose of calculating the relative density of formulae in an effort to determine if a given work was orally composed. Notopoulos and Pavese also sought to show differences between Ionian and mainland formulae (see §4). The following analyses of formulae in early epic have been published.

Homer: *Iliad*:   1.1-25; Parry 1971:301ff.
                     1.1-7; Russo 1963:241-46.
                     1.1-15; Lord 1960:143.
                     1.1-5; Lord 1967:27ff.
                     2.87-94; Ingalls 1979:106-9.
                     5.45-47, 56-58, 65-69; Hainsworth 1968:110ff.
                     10 (entire); Querbach 1971.
                     12 (entire); Natunewicz 1970.
                     16 (entire); Querbach 1971.
                     16.586-610; Hainsworth 1981:16-17.
                     18.285-309; Russo 1976:45-47.
                     18.590-606; Gutzwiller 1977.
                     20.164-168; Lord 1967:28.
                     24.762-5; Hainsworth 1968:110ff.

        Odyssey: 1.1-25; Parry 1971:301ff.
                     8.266-366; Di Donato 1969.
                     17.303-27; Russo 1976:42-43.

Line-references for all expressions occurring twice in the *Iliad* or twice in the *Odyssey* are printed in Strasser 1984:81-138.

Hesiod: *Theogony*:   1-25, 676-700; Minton 1975:36-44.

521-557; Hainsworth 1981:17-18.

Works and Days: 42-68; Hainsworth 1981:18.

Shield: 77-101; Hainsworth 1981:19.

An unpublished analysis of the first 100 lines of each poem is referred to in Notopoulos 1960:180 note 13. All three poems and the principal fragments have been analyzed by Pavese; the results are summarized in Pavese 1974:32ff., 1981:235. Hesiodic formulae not found in Homer are printed in Pavese 1972:123-63 and 165-77.

Homeric Hymns: (all); Cantilena 1982.
              Apollo 1-18; Notopoulos 1962:356ff.
              Aphrodite: Preziosi 1966.
              Demeter: Richardson 1974.

Epic Cycle:
              Cypria fr. 6K; Notopoulos 1964:28ff.
              Thebais fr. 2K; Notopoulos 1964:28ff.
              Little Iliad fr. 19 Allen; Notopoulos 1964:28ff.
              Thebais frr. 1-5; Burkert 1981:47f.

Batrachomyomachia   (all): Brandt 1888.
                    197-201: Lord 1967:27.

Panyassis: McLeod 1966.

Delphic Oracles: McLeod 1961.

Inscriptions: Notopoulos 1960:195.
                  Di Tillio 1969.

The principles of identification and counting of formulae have changed with greater experience, and the work is best traced in chronological order. Milman Parry (1971:301-4) printed his famous analyses of the first 25 lines of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, putting "a solid line beneath those word-groups which are found elsewhere in the poems unchanged, and a broken line under the phrases which are of the same type as others" (301). Criticisms can be made of Parry's method, for instance on the grounds that he ignored part of his own definition of a formula—"under the same metrical

conditions"—when he included parallel phrases occurring in another part of the verse and juxtapositions of words with no grammatical connection (e.g., his notes on ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν and θεῶν ἔριδι). The first use made of Parry's discoveries by another scholar was Chantraine 1932, a study of formulaic usage in *Iliad* 1, listing repeated verses and beautifully demonstrating the changes and adaptations—the "play of formulae" (127). This article is still an excellent introduction to the working of formulae.

Lord 1960 (143) repeated the analysis of the first 15 lines of the *Iliad*, making some changes (for instance, he avoided Parry's errors in method but still did not indicate changes of position in the verse). Lord 1967 (27) repeats the analysis of *Iliad* 1-5, with further changes in line 5. He also analyzes *Batrachomyomachia* 197-201, and gives figures for density of formulae in Serbo-Croatian and other non-Greek poetry.

Notopoulos 1960 (195-96) analyzes the formulae in a few early inscriptions (the Perachora inscriptions, the Mantiklos bronze, the Dipylon vase [on which now see Watkins 1976:437-38], and Nestor's cup from Pitecusa). Notopoulos 1962 (354-57) analyzes the *Hymn to Apollo* 1-18, marking formulae in Parry's fashion and including even single words in the same position and the shortest phrases (e.g. καί ῥα at the start of verse). Notopoulos has since been criticized for this, and for counting as formulaic those lines which contain only one formula.

Russo 1963 (241-46) comments on the repeated expressions in *Iliad* 1.1-7, particularly from the point of view of their metrical position and shape. Krafft 1963 (163-96) lists Hesiodic phrases which occur more than once in Homer; those which occur only once in Homer; and phrases repeated only within Hesiod's works. In each he arranges the phrases according to their metrical position. Preziosi 1966 lists, in order of their occurrence, formulae in the *Hymn to Aphrodite* which: (I) are also found in Homer; (II) are analogous to formulae found in Homer; (III) are found more than once within the *Hymn*; and (IV) are analogous to other formulae in the *Hymn*. She improves upon Notopoulos' analyses by returning to Parry's principle of not including phrases of less than five syllables which are not noun-epithet combinations, and identifies phrases which occur in a different position in the line. Again reverting to Parry, she counts as analogous formulae only expressions in which at least one important word is identical. Statistics on the formulaic content of the *Hymn*, calculated

according to metra, are included.

In a detailed criticism of Notopoulos' work, Kirk 1966 points out that "some method of indicating the amount of formular material within the verse is necessary if . . . quantitative comparison is to have much value" (156, n. 2). In another criticism, G. P. Edwards 1971 (40-45) points out weaknesses in statistics given by Notopoulos 1960, and goes on to suggest a different method of evaluating the degree of formularity.

Minton 1975 gives a good discussion of the meaning of "formula density" at last, criticizing (very fairly) many previous statistical results and attempting to obtain greater precision. Minton analyzes the verse into the four (less often three) blocks between the three caesurae (see §2, 176-80); he then computes the percentage of formulae on the basis of these half-line, quarter-line, and occasionally one-third-line blocks. In his analysis, Minton still counts only phrases of the same metrical length (despite Hainsworth's new definition of a formula; see §3, 190-91), though he allows repetition from a different part of the line and change in the order of words; phrases "must be articulated into one or more of the metrical-rhythmic segments along which the poet constructs his line" (32), which eliminates the occasional enjambing formula. These principles ought perhaps to be slightly modified, but they represent a great advance on previous attempts to compute formula density.

In other work, McLeod 1961 lists the formulae from Homer, Hesiod, and the Epic Cycle which are found in the older Delphic oracles, and McLeod 1966 those in the fragments of Panyassis. Allison 1969 lists Homeric phrases containing "a geographic or ethnic name and the word to which that name is most closely related grammatically," together with repetitions of one or both words in the same metrical position. Di Donato 1969 (290-93) describes the formulae and analogical formulae in the Song of Demodocus (*Odyssey* 8.266-366). Natunewicz 1970 "presents, on separate pages, each of the lines of *Iliad* [12]. With the exception of [12].20 and 167 and approximately half of an additional 13 lines, similar formulaic phrases or formulae which appear elsewhere in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are given for each line." Querbach 1971 presents texts of *Iliad* 10 and 16 indicating all formulae and "formulaic systems" (= analogical formulae) which recur in the same metrical position in Homer; "particular attention is paid to the various expansions and combinations of the minimal length

units." He also gives an alphabetical listing of all formulas and formulaic systems identified, and density statistics, including "tabulations showing the amount and kind of formulaic material found at various positions in the line and in various types of text."

Pavese 1972 (123-65) lists (according to metrical position) the non-Homeric formulae in Hesiod which: (1) recur only in Hesiod; (2) recur in Hesiod, the *Homeric Hymns*, and other archaic epic; (3) recur in archaic elegiac; (4) occur in Hesiod, the *Hymns*, archaic epic, and archaic elegiac; and (5) are reflected in lyric. Pavese 1974 (32-33) gives figures for the percentage of verses in Hesiod which contain formulae, the number of non-Homeric formulae in Hesiod, and the percentage of verses containing formulae in the *Hymns* and in archaic elegiac verse. Pavese 1981 (235) gives a table of figures for formulae in the *Theogony* and the two parts of the *Hymn to Apollo* arranged according to their recurrence in Homer, Hesiod, the *Hymns*, and elegiac verse.

Gutzwiller 1977 identifies phrases which occur elsewhere in early epic and are in the same metrical position, using a dotted line to indicate analogous words.

In his edition of the *Hymn to Demeter*, Richardson 1974 lists formulaic parallels in Homer, Hesiod, and other early epic and elegy, indicating whether the occurrence is in the same position in the verse. He also lists phrases which have parallels in Hesiod but not in Homer (35-38), parallels with the *Hymn to Aphrodite* (42), and new or modified formulae (46-52).

Russo 1976 analyzes *Odyssey* 303-27 and *Iliad* 18.285-309, giving (cautiously) percentages for density; J. J. Duggan's contribution to the discussion following this paper (63-65) makes particularly good points about the problems of formulaic analysis.

Work has also been done on the special topic of Homeric similes. Pope 1963 (14-17) studied the noun-epithet combinations in the similes of the *Iliad*, finding 379 in all, of which only 53 recur in the rest of the poem. Hogan 1966 includes a discussion of the types of formulaic flexibility, "compares formulae and formulaic patterns from the similes with their narrative counterparts," and discusses the distribution of formulae found in the similes, finding that the similes of the *Iliad* have a considerable number in common with the *Iliad* narrative, and those simile motifs (e.g. sailing, plowing, flooding) which do not occur in the *Iliad* narrative have formulaic parallels in the narrative of the *Odyssey*. Thus "there is no reason to suppose, as some have done, that [the

similes] are special or 'late' accretions." Ingalls 1972 presents and compares the formulae and analogical formulae in 20 similes with those in a control passage (*Iliad* 1.1-100), using a rather wider definition of formula than Parry's; he gives a statistical table recording "both the number of morae repeated verbatim and the number of formulae morae [*sic*] including analogues; these numbers are also expressed as a percentage of 24." He found no significant difference between the formular texture of "late" similes and that of a passage of normal narrative. Ingalls 1979 further discusses these results (reducing the sample of similes from 20 to 11), with detailed statistical tables and a formulaic analysis of *Iliad* 2.87-94.

Burkert 1981 (47-48) underlines formulae in the fragments of the *Thebaid*, listing where they recur. Hainsworth 1981 points out that part of the problem of calculating the density of formulae in a passage is the question of analogical formulae. In his own analyses of *Iliad* 16.584-609, *Theogony* 521-57, *Works and Days* 42-68, and *Shield of Heracles* 77-101 he uses Minton's criteria for calculation.

In the most extensive analysis so far published, Cantilena 1982 presents a text of the *Homeric Hymns* with underlinings indicating expressions recurring in Homer, Hesiod, and other early epic down to Panyassis, some archaic inscriptions, and some Delphic oracles. He also provides a running commentary on the formulaic usage, and listings of the formulaic density of each line and of the formulaic density of each Hymn (calculated according to Minton's method), giving minimum and maximum figures according to whether traditional phrases are included as well as formulae (he uses "formula" for an expression recurring in the same metrical position, "traditional phrase" for one recurring in a different position; his criteria for identifying formulae are explained on 74-81). He also gives figures for formulaic density of the longer Hymns according to Notopoulos's method (which he justifiably criticizes, 84ff.). Cantilena also provides a list of formulae, arranged alphabetically in the following groups: (1) formulae made up of combinations or juxtapositions of formulae occurring in Homer and/or Hesiod; (2) formulae analogical to those occurring in Homer and/or Hesiod; (3) those which recur partially in Homer and/or Hesiod; (4) those which are partially analogical to those found in Homer and/or Hesiod; (5) other formulae; (6) formulae not yet listed which occur within the Hymns.

Ramersdorfer 1981 holds that "no one could dispute that it is possible, in the case of similar or identical verses, half-verses, and

word-groups, to establish in which place the proper verbal unity is better preserved, or where some kind of impropriety arises" (7). He sets out to distinguish between primary and secondary occurrences of word-groups, making the distinction on the grounds of more or less suitable usages and being careful not to associate this with chronology. He restricts his investigation to word-groups which occur once in *Iliad* 1-10 and once or more in other early Greek epic, finding 771 such groups in all and examining each, dividing them into various categories. I am not convinced that such a distinction is possible.

　　　Finally, in a very significant monograph, Strasser 1984 announces the completion of a computerized listing of repeated word-groups in Homer, Hesiod (including the *Shield* and the fragments), the *Homeric Hymns*, and the fragments of the epic cycle. In a lucid exposition of the principles on which the listing has been made he explains that by "repeated" he means occurring at least twice in the corpus studied; by "word-group" he means two or more words syntactically linked (up to the practical limit, set at one verse plus the first three words of the next). The listing is arranged by morphemes, so that all cases of nouns and forms of verbs appear together, and even prefixed forms (κλυτός ἀμφιγυνήεις appears with ἀγακλυτός ἀ and περικλυτός ἀ). As examples of his work Strasser prints (33-36) the first four pages of an alphabetical listing of repeated word-groups (ἀάατος ἄεθλος to ἀγαθός δίδωμι κακός) and a reference-list of word-groups which occur twice (only) in the *Iliad* or twice (only) in the *Odyssey* (84-138). The monograph also contains tables showing the distribution of repeated word-groups in individual works, the frequency and spread of repetitions, and a comparison of repetitions within the *Iliad* and within the *Odyssey*. There are also good discussions of "economy," the ways in which word-groups are adapted, the influence of sound, and other relevant points. Strasser hopes to make the complete listing available in machine-readable form. The impressive way in which Strasser handles his material encourages the hope of exciting results from his work.

　　　Mention must also be made of the recent development of computer programs permitting a rapid search for one or more words in the database of Greek literature provided by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, which has been created under the direction of Professor T. F. Brunner (University of California at Irvine, Irvine, CA 92717). The best-known of these programs are

the Ibycus produced by Dr. David Packard (Packard Humanities Institute, 300 Second St., Los Altos, CA 94022), and the UNIX-based system developed on the initiative of the Department of the Classics at Harvard University. These programs provide revolutionary opportunities for research which so far have barely begun to be exploited (see §10).

References

Allison 1969
 E. P. Allison. "Geographic and Ethnic Formulas in Homer and the Catalogue of Ships." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 29:2233A.

Brandt 1888
 P. Brandt. *Corpusculum Poesis Epicae Graecae Ludibundae*. I. Leipzig: Teubner.

Burkert 1981
 W. Burkert. "Seven Against Thebes: An Oral Tradition between Babylonian Magic and Greek Literature." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-80 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 29-48.

Cantilena 1982
 M. Cantilena. *Ricerche sulla dizione epica I. Per uno studio della formularità degli* Inni Omerici. Rome: Ateneo.

Chantraine 1932
 P. Chantraine. "Remarques sur 1'emploi des formules dans le premier chant de 1'*Iliad*e." *Revue des études grecques*, 45:121-54.

Di Donato 1969
 R. Di Donato. "Problemi di tecnica formulare e poesia orale nell'epica greca arcaica." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, 38:243-94.

Di Trillio 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: I Iscrizioni sepolcrali." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 7:45-73.

Dunbar/Marzullo 1962
 H. Dunbar. *A Complete Concordance to the Odyssey of Homer; Completely revised and enlarged by B. Marzullo*. Hildesheim: Olm.

Edwards 1971
 G. P. Edwards. *The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gutzwiller 1977
 K. J. Gutzwiller. "Homer and Ariadne." *Classical Journal*, 73:32-36.

Hainsworth 1981
 J. B. Hainsworth. "Critici 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.

Hogan 1966
J. C. Hogan. "The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 27:1352A.

Hofinger 1978
M. Hofluger. *Lexicon Hesiodeum cum indice inverso*. Leiden: Brill.

Ingalls 1972
W. B. Ingalls. "Studies in Homeric Formulae: Linguistic Lateness and Formular Irregularity in the Homeric *Iliad*." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 33.1:738A.

Ingalls 1979
_____. "Formular Density in the Similes of the *Iliad*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 109:87-109.

Kirk 1966
G. S. Kirk. "Formular Language and Oral Quality." *Yale Classical Studies*, 20:153-74.

Krafft 1963
F. Krafft. *Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod*. Hypomnemata, 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Kretschmer 1913
P. F. Kretschmer. *De iteratis Hesiodeis*. Bratislava: Schles. Volkzeitung.

Lord 1960
A. B. Lord. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lord 1967
_____. "Homer as Oral Poet." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 72:1-46.

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.

Minton 1976
_____. *Concordance to the Hesiodic Corpus*. Leiden: Brill.

Natunewicz 1970
M. A. T. Natunewicz. "Formulae and Formulaic Phrases in *Iliad* M." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 31:2896-97A.

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.

Parry 1971
>   M. Parry. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. A. Parry. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Paulson 1890
>   J. Paulson. *Index Hesiodeus*. Lund. (photographically reproduced, Hildesheim: Olm, 1962.)

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

Pavese 1974
>   _____. *Studi sulla tradizione epica rapsodica*. Filologia e critica, 13. Rome: Edizioni del'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 orate: Atti del convegno di Venezia 28-80 settembre 1977*. Ed. C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, C. O. Pavese. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 231-59.

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

Prendergast/Marzullo 1962
>   L. Prendergast. *A Complete Concordance to the Iliad of Homer; Completely revised and enlarged by B. Marzullo*. Hildesheim: Olm.

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

Querbach 1971
>   C. W. Querbach. "A Formulaic Analysis of Books Ten and Sixteen of the *Iliad*." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 31:6576A.

Ramersdorfer 1981
>   H. Ramersdorfer. *Singuläre Iterata der Ilias*. Königstein/Ts: Hain.

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

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

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: University of Michigan. pp. 31-54.

Rzach 1902
>   A. Rzach. *Hesiodi Carmina (Editio Maior)*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Schmidt 1885
>   C. E. Schmidt. *Parallel-Homer: oder Index aller homerischen Iterati in lexikalischer Anordnung*. New impression, 1965. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Strasser 1984

    F. X. Strasser. *Zu den Iterata der frühgriechischen Epik*. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 156. Königstein/Ts: Hain.

Tebben 1977a

    J. R. Tebben. *Hesiod-Konkordanz: A Computer Concordance to Hesiod*. Hildesheim: Olm.

Tebben 1977b

    _____. *Homer-Konkordanz: A Computer Concordance to the Homeric Hymns*. Hildesheim: Olm.

van Leeuwen 1912-13

    J. van Leeuwen. *Ilias: cum Prolegomenis, Notis Criticis, Commentariis Exegeticis*. 2 vols. Leiden: Sijthoff.

van Leeuwen 1917

    _____. *Odyssea: cum Notis Criticis, Commentariis Exegeticis, Indicibus ad utrumque Epos Pertinentes*. 2 vols. Leiden: Sijthoff.

Watkins 1976

    C. Watkins. "Syntax and Metrics in the Dipylon Vase Inscription." In *Studies in Greek, Italic, and Indo-European Linguistics Offered to L. R. Palmer on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*. Ed. A. M. Davies and W. Meid. Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 16. Innsbruck: Becvar.

Windisch 1867

    G. E. O. Windisch. *De Hymnis Homericis Maioribus*. Leipzig: Teubner.

[Section 9 will appear in a later issue of *Oral Tradition*.]

§10. Future directions

This is an exciting time for Homerists. New commentaries are attempting to consolidate the advances of the past, new directions for further study have been opened up, and new research tools have become available. Advances in our understanding of formulaic usage are being put to use in appreciation of Homeric poetry, and there are improved possibilities for further research.

A new multi-author commentary on the *Odyssey* has already appeared in Italian (Mondadore: Milan), and an English version is being prepared for Oxford University Press. The first volume of a new commentary on the *Iliad*, by G. S. Kirk, is already available (1985), and further volumes by Kirk and others will be published by Cambridge University Press within about two years. Many of the scholars responsible for these joint efforts have pioneered work on Homeric formulae; besides Kirk, J. B. Hainsworth, A. Heubeck, A. Hoekstra, R. Janko, N. J. Richardson, and J. Russo are identified with distinguished contributions in this area.

Erbse's massive edition (1969-) of the scholia to the *Iliad* is now complete except for the second volume of the indices, and the final volume of van der Valk's edition of Eustathius' commentary (1971-87) has just appeared. The *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (1955-) is producing fascicles at an accelerated rate, and has now reached ἐπαμύντωρ. In recent years, M. L. West has provided up-to-date commentaries on Hesiod's *Theogony* (1966) and *Works and Days* (1978), together with an edition of the Hesiodic fragments (Merkelbach and West 1967) and immensely useful books on the Orphic poems (1983) and the *Catalogue of Women* (1985). Stephanie West's *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (1967) has provided easy access to what is known of the texts before they were edited by the Alexandrian scholars. A recent book (Apthorp 1980) marks a revival of interest in the textual tradition of the Homeric poems. The availability of texts on computer databases and the new capabilities for word-search (see §8) will also facilitate further studies in Homer's formulaic usage and vocabulary.

The following suggestions for future directions which studies of Homeric formulae might take are, I am afraid, very subjective; in particular, I know that they do not do justice to the area of linguistics and the great contributions made to our knowledge by the work of Gregory Nagy and his students. What I say below represents certain approaches, especially recent ones, which I think are valuable and should be exploited further. I also mention a number of projects which I have long thought interesting, but which I have not been able either to work on myself or to make attractive to graduate students.

1. Though not specifically concerned with formulae, an important recent article by J. Griffin (1986) identifies differences in vocabulary between the narrative and the speeches in Homeric epic. Griffin finds that many abstract nouns, particularly those conveying moral judgments, emotional states, and some personal qualities, occur only in direct speech; some words are used only by a speaker about himself or herself; many negative epithets (beginning with alpha-privative) occur only or mainly in speeches; and superlative forms of adjectives are much commoner in speech. He suggests "that the language of Homer is a less uniform thing than some oralists have tended to suggest" (50).

In the latter part of the same article Griffin, following up the interest Homer shows in different kinds of oratory (*Iliad* 3.209-24),

compares the vocabularies of Achilles and Agamemnon, finding that of the former "much richer and more interesting" (51). (Here he is expanding the work of Friedrich and Redfield; see §7.) Achilles' speeches include more asseveration, more exaggeration, more numerous and longer similes, and a more imaginative vocabulary. In an Appendix, Griffin lists words which occur only in Achilles' speeches and only in those of Agamemnon. This kind of analysis must be extended to the speeches of other characters, and is also relevant for study of the direct-speech books of the *Odyssey* (see below). Length and structure of sentences, use of enjambment, and emphatic positioning of words in the speeches of different characters might well be compared in addition to vocabulary—any attentive reader of the *Iliad* notices what striking effects Achilles can produce by these means.

2. There has been other recent work on Homeric vocabulary, a rich field for study. A recent monograph by Kumpf (1984) lists in separate indexes all words which occur only once in Homer (listed alphabetically and in order of occurrence), those which are proper names, and those which do not occur elsewhere in Greek, giving statistical tables for each book of the poem, a comparison of frequency between *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and list of passages of 100 lines or more without a *hapax*. A paper on Homeric vocabulary by N. J. Richardson (1987) has just appeared. The work of Strasser on repeated word-groups in Homer (1984; see §8) is also relevant.

3. J. B. Hainsworth opened up a number of very important ways of investigating Homeric formulae which have not yet been fully exploited. Postlethwaite has applied the results of Hainsworth's study of the flexibility of formulae to the last book of the *Odyssey* and to the *Homeric Hymns* (see §4, 210, 215-16), and his work needs evaluation and extension. So do the results of Hainsworth's 1978 article on sorting and selection of formulae (see §4, 208-9), and the work of Hainsworth 1976 and Janko 1981 on clustering of words and formulae (see §3, 197, 194-95).

4. Much more research is needed on the placing of formulae within the verse. Some basic work has been done on the relationship of formulae, sense-units, and metrical cola (see §3, 197-201), but usually we cannot tell which words or phrases in a sentence came to the poet's mind first, when the (apparently) non-formulaic parts were shaped to lead up to ready-made formulae, and when formulae were modified in order to allow for

the positioning of special or unconventional words and phrases. How are sentences which are semantically basically identical adapted to fit proper names of different shape? If Achilles, after all, had been named "Agamemnon," or if his father had been named Laertes instead of Peleus (thus changing the form of his patronymic), a good many verses of the *Iliad* would have had to be reshaped. Related to this is Russo's work on the preferred positions of certain grammatical forms, irrespective of their metrical shape (Russo 1963, see §3, 202, and also Minton 1965, §3, 202-3).

Here the ability to program a computer would be a great advantage, so that one could (for instance) compare all instances of a verb following the B caesura and scanning u _ u u (e.g. ἀμείβετο), and all instances of participles in that position scanning u _ (e.g. ἰδών).

A particularly interesting part of such a study would be a comparison of sentences and clauses which start at the C caesura (= bucolic diaeresis). Many years ago (in Edwards 1966:167-76; see §3, 198-99) I made a preliminary investigation, and tentatively suggested that the flexibility and skill shown by the poet within the restriction of these five syllables might be a characteristic of Homer himself. In Edwards 1968:276, n. 28 (§3, *ibid.*) I gave some rough statistics for pauses in sense at this position in *Iliad* 18, but much more work is needed.

5. More research could well be done on the structure of complex sentences, which is very clearly connected with techniques of oral composition and delivery. Usually in Homer the main clause of a sentence comes first, the simplest structure for both composer and audience. In what circumstances are subordinate clauses placed ahead of the main clause? What kinds of clauses? Are there differences between narrative and speech, or between different speakers? In Edwards 1966 (123-24; see §3, 198-99) I gave some figures on subordinate clauses and participial phrases occurring before the main clause in *Iliad* 1 and *Odyssey* 17, and this primitive effort should be extended (perhaps by computer). Clayman 1981 gathered statistics on sentence length in all Greek hexameter poetry from the eighth to the second centuries B.C., measured by number of words, number of syllables, number of phonemes, number and percentage of sentences which are punctuated at verse-end, and number and percentage of one-line sentences in each work, and her results might assist such further

study. It is unfortunate that she did not separate narrative and speech.

6. In the four books of the *Odyssey* in which Odysseus takes over as narrator, many of the regular formulae must be adapted to the first person instead of third. What happens when this cannot be done? If the hero had agreed to eat when Circe served him dinner (*Odyssey* 10.371-72), what could have been done about changing the normal οἳ δ’ ἐπ’ ὀνείαθ’ἑτοῖμα προκείμενα χεῖρας ἴαλλον to the first person plural? How has the expression of ideas been altered because of the first-person narrator? Are there any indications that the text as we have it has been adapted from a version not narrated by Odysseus himself?

7. The statistics for preferred positions in the hexameter of words of various metrical shapes, which were prepared by O'Neill on the basis of thousand-line samples, should be revised (with the help of a computer) for the complete text of the poems, along the lines indicated by Dyer (see §2, 180-81).

8. A short article by M. D. Reeve (1972) examines Odysseus' almost verbatim repetition to Achilles of Agamemnon's offer of restitution (*Iliad* 9.264-99), and decides on the evidence of two adapted verses that it must have been composed *before* the preceding speech of Agamemnon (9.122-57). Similar comparisons might well be made of all cases where a passage is repeated in more or less identical language, to see how formulae and other expressions are adapted for necessary changes, for instance from third-person verb-forms to first. Such verbatim repetitions raise the questions, as Reeve in fact does, of whether blocks of lines, and even whole tales, were incorporated into the monumental epic.

9. There is room for more studies of the use and non-use of available formulae, with the aim of better appreciating where the poet has adopted, modified, or avoided conventional diction. I attempted to do this for *Iliad* 18 many years ago (1968; see §3, 199), and this approach is one of the aims of the new Cambridge *Iliad* commentary, but there will surely be room for more to be done.

10. Little use seems to have been made of Stephanie West's edition of Ptolemaic papyri, and no recent work has appeared on Homeric quotations in pre-Alexandrian authors (except for Labarbe 1949). Careful study of the papyri and the scholia, from the

viewpoint of our present knowledge of formulaic usage, might give us a better idea of the nature and interrelationships of pre-Alexandrian texts of Homer, perhaps even a sounder hypothesis about the date and circumstances of the writing down of the text, and how, where, and why later copies of it were made.

11. Finally, in many cases an advance made recently by a particular author needs careful review, assessment, and extension. I think especially of the theoretical approach taken by Nagler 1974 (see §3, 192); of Muellner's study of the meaning and use of a particular verb (1976; see §6); of Janko's major work on the comparative diction of Homer, Hesiod, and the *Hymns* (1982; see §4, 217-18); and of the approach recently taken by Sale (1984, 1987; see §6), which could well be much more widely applied.

<p style="text-align:center">* * * * *</p>

It may seem odd that nothing has been said above about progress towards determining to what extent Homeric composition was oral. Everyone agrees that archaic epic—like much later Greek literature— was intended to be heard rather than read, and Homer of course was oral in that sense. Few scholars doubt that the conventions of Homeric diction and narrative structure were developed in a non-literate society, and that this must be taken into account for a proper understanding of the poems. Beyond this I do not see that we can go at the moment. We simply do not yet know enough about so many stylistic features of Homer, Hesiod, and the early *Homeric Hymns* to enable significant comparisons to be made with the poems of later, indubitably literate composers. Investigation of enjambment alone, without further study of sentence-structure, proved of little use for distinguishing Homeric from undeniably literate composers (see §5, 223-29), and statistics of formulaic usage are a difficult tool to handle (see §8). It may well be that usage of type-scenes of a regular structure—a study which Milman Parry was entering upon at the time of his death—will provide a better answer to this problem. But discussion of this must await a survey of research on Homeric type-scenes, which will appear in this journal at a future date.

<p style="text-align:right">Stanford University</p>

References

Apthorp 1980
>M. J. Apthorp. *The Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Clayman 1981
>D. L. Clayman. "Sentence Length in Greek Hexameter Poetry." In *Hexameter Studies*, 11. Ed. R. Grotjahn. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Erbse 1969
>H. Erbse. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Griffin 1986
>J. Griffin. "Homeric Words and Speakers." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 106:36-57.

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

Kumpf 1984
>M. M. Kumpf. *Four Indices of the Homeric Hapax Legomena; together with Statistical Data*. Hildesheim: Olm.

Labarbe 1949
>J. Labarbe. *L'Homère de Platon*. Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres.

Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos. Ed. B. Snell and H. Erbse. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Merkelbach and West 1967
>R. Merkelbach and M. L. West. *Fragmenta Hesiodea*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Reeve 1972
>D. Reeve. "Two Notes on *Iliad* 9." *Classical Quarterly*, 22:1-4.

Richardson 1987
>N. J. Richardson. "The Individuality of Homer's Language." In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Ed. J. M. Bremer et al. Amsterdam: Grüner. pp. 165-84.

Van der Valk 1971
>M. van der Valk. *Eustathii Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*. Leiden: Brill.

M. L. West 1966
>M. L. West. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: Clarendon.

M. L. West 1978
>_____. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford: Clarendon.

M. L. West 1983
>_____. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford: Clarendon.

60   MARK W. EDWARDS

M. L.West 1985
          _____. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*.
          Oxford: Clarendon.
S. West 1967
          S. West. *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer*. Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag.